BAPTISM:

A DIVINE COMMANDMENT TO BE OBSERVED

Being A Sermon Preached At Barbican, October 9, 1765 At The Baptism Of The Reverend

Mr. Robert Carmichael, Minister Of The Gospel In Edinburgh.

The Preface

The following discourse was not designed for the press; had it, the subject of it would have been a little more enlarged upon; and, perhaps, might have appeared in a little better dress; but as the publication of it is become necessary, I chose to let it go just as it was delivered, as nearly in the very words and expressions, as my memory could assist me; the sense, I am sure, is no where departed from; that it might not be said, that any thing that was spoken is concealed, changed, or altered. The warmest solicitations of my friends would never have prevailed upon me to have made it public, being unwilling to renew the controversy about baptism unnecessarily; and being determined only to write in self-defense, when attacked, or whenever the controversy is renewed by others; for I am very sensible, that the argument on both sides is greatly exhausted, and scarce any thing new can be expected, that is serious and pertinent: but the rude attack upon the sermon in two letters in a news-paper, determined me at once to send it out into the world, as being a sufficient confutation of itself, without any remarks at all, of the lies and falsehoods, calumnies, cavils and impertinencies, with which the letters abound; whereby it will appear to every reader, how fairly that writer charges me *with railing against my brethren*, *and the whole Christian world*; and how injuriously he represents me, as treating all that differ from me as *fools*, *unlearned*, *ignorant of the scriptures*, *and unclean*. It is hard we cannot practice what we believe, and speak in vindication of our practice, without being abused, vilified and insulted in a public news-paper; is this treating us as *brethren*, as the writer of the letters, in a canting way, affects to call us? And how does this answer to the false character of *Candidus*, he assumes? I shall not let myself down so low, nor do I think it fitting and decent to go into, and carry on a religious controversy in a newspaper, and especially with so worthless a writer, and without a name. This base and cowardly way of writing, is like the Indians' manner of fighting; who set up an hideous yell, pop off their guns behind bushes and hedges, and then run away and hide themselves in the thickets. However, if the publication of this discourse should be of any service to relieve or strengthen the minds of any, with respect to their duty in the observance of the ordinance of baptism, I am content to bear the indignities of men, and shall reckon it an over-balance to all their reproaches and insults. *J. G.*

Baptism A Divine Commandment

Being about to administer the Ordinance of Baptism, before we enter upon the administration of it, I shall drop a few words on the occasion, from a passage of scripture you will find in

1 JOHN 5:3

For this is the love of God, that we keep his commandments, and his commandments are not grievous.

What I shall say in the following discourse, will much depend upon the sense of the word *commandments*; by which are meant, not the ten commandments, or the commandments of the moral law delivered by Moses to the children *of Israel*; which, though they are the commands of God, and to be observed by Christians under the present dispensation; since we are not without law to God, but under the law to Christ (1 Cor. 9:21); and are to be kept from a principle of love to God, for the end of the commandment is charity, or love, out of a pure heart, and of a good conscience, and of faith unfeigned (1 Tim. 1:5); yet there commands are not easy of observation, through the weakness of the flesh, or corruption of nature; nor can they be perfectly kept by any of *Adam's* fallen race; for there is not a just man upon earth, that doeth good and sinneth not (Eccl. 7:20); and he that offends in one point is guilty of all (Jam. 2:10); and is exposed to the curse and condemnation of the law, which runs in this tenor, Cursed is every one that continueth not in all things which are written in the book of the law, to do them (Gal. 3:10); hence this law in general is called a fiery law, the letter which kills, and the ministration of condemnation and death, which make it terrible to offenders; however, it may be delighted in by believers in Christ after the inward man: nor are the commandments of the ceremonial law intended, which being many and numerous, were burdensome; especially to carnal men, who were frequently ready to say concerning them, *What a weariness is it*? One of its precepts, circumcision, is called a *yoke*, *which*, says the apostle Peter, neither our fathers nor we were able to bear (Acts 15:10); because it bound persons to keep the whole law, which they could not do; and the whole is said to be a *yoke of bondage* (Gal. 5:1), and consequently its commandments grievous; besides this law was abrogated before the apostle *John* wrote this epistle, and its commandments were not to be kept; Christ had *abolished* this *law of commandments contained in ordinances*; and there is now a *disannulling* of the whole of it, because of its *weakness* and *unprofitableness* (Eph. 2:15; Heb. 7:18); rather the commandments of faith and love the apostle speaks of in chapter 3:23 may be designed; And this is his commandment, that we should believe in the name of his Son Jesus Christ, and love one another, as he gave us commandment: there were exhortations, injunctions and commands of Christ to his disciples, which were to be kept by them, and were not grievous. *Ye believe in God*, *s*ays he (John 14:1), *believe also in me*; and again, A new commandment I give unto you, that ye love one another, as I have loved you (John 8:34); but inasmuch as Christ, as lawgiver in his church, has appointed some special and peculiar laws and ordinances to be observed, and which he calls *his* commandments, he that hath my commandments and keepeth them, he it is that loveth me (John 14:21); very agreeably to our text; and after he had given his apostles a commission to preach and baptize, he adds, teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you (Matthew 28:20); and whereas, among these commandments and ordinances, baptism and the Lord's supper are the chief and principal, I choose to understand the text of them;[1] and since we are about to administer the first of these at this time, I shall confine my discourse chiefly to that, and shall attempt the following things.

I. To shew that baptism, water-baptism, is a command of God and Christ, or a divine command.

II. That being a divine command, it ought to be kept and observed.

III. The encouragement to keep it; it is the love of God, and it is a commandment not grievous.

I. The ordinance of water-baptism is a divine command. *John*, the forerunner of our Lord, was the first administrator of it, and from thence was called the *Baptist*; and he did not administer it of his own mind and will, but had a mission and commission from God to do it; *There was a man sent from God*, *whole name was John*; and he was sent by him, not to preach the gospel only, but to baptize; for so he himself says, he that sent me to baptize with water, the same said unto me, etc. (John 1:6, 33). Hence Christ put this question to the chief priests and elders of the Jews, the baptism of John, whence was it? from heaven or of men? (Matthew 21:25, 26), this brought them into such a dilemma, that they knew not what answer to give, and chose to give none; our Lord's design by the question was to shew that *John's* baptism was of divine institution, and not human; wherefore he charges the Pharisees and Lawyers with rejecting the counsel of God against themselves, being not baptized of him (Luke 7:30), that is, of *John*; and he elsewhere (Matthew 3:15), speaks of his baptism as a part of righteousness to be fulfilled, and was fulfilled by him. Now *John's* baptism and Christ's were, as to the substance of them, the same; *John's baptism* was allowed of and approved of by Christ, as appears from his submission to it; and the ordinance was confirmed by the order he gave to his apostles to administer it: one of *John's* disciples said to his master, Rabbi, he that was with thee beyond Jordan, to whom thou bearest witness, behold, the same baptizeth, and all men come to him (John 3:26); though, as is said afterwards, Jesus himself baptized not, but his disciples (John 4:2); that is, they baptized by his orders; and which were renewed after his resurrection from the dead, saying, Go ye therefore, and teach all nations, baptizing them, etc. (Matthew 28:19), and which orders were obeyed by his apostles, as many instances in the *Acts of the Apostles* shew; and that it was water baptism they administered, according to Christ's instructions and directions.

In matters of worship there ought to be a command for what is done; as this ordinance of baptism is a solemn act of worship, being performed *in the name of the Father*, *and of the San*, *and of the holy Ghost*. God is a jealous God, and especially with respect to the worship of him; nor should any thing be introduced into it but what he has commanded; and careful should we be hereof, left he should say unto us, *who hath required this at your hands*? (Isa. 1:12), it is not enough that such and such things are not forbidden; for on this footing a thousand fooleries may be brought into the worship of God, which will be relented by him. When *Nadab* and *Abibu* offered strange fire to the Lord, which he commanded not, fire came down from heaven and destroyed them: we should have a precept for what we do, and that not from men, but from God; lest we incur the charge of worshipping God in vain, teaching for doctrines the commandments of men (Matthew 15:9), and involve ourselves in the guilt of superstition, and will-worship.

Wherefore, the baptism of infants must be wrong; since there is no command of God and Christ for it; if there was any, it might be expected in the New Testament, and in that only; it is absurd to send us to the Old Testament for a command to observe a New Testament-ordinance; it is a groin

absurdity to send us so far back as to the 17th chapter of *Genesis*[2] for a warrant for the ordinance of baptism; we might as well be lent to the first chapter of that book; for there is no more relating to that ordinance in the one than in the other. Was there a like precept for the baptism of infants under the New Testament, as there was for the circumcision of infants under the Old Testament, there could be no objection to it; but it is an absurdity of absurdities to affirm, that baptism comes in the room of circumcision; since baptism was in force and use long before circumcision was abolished; circumcision was not abolished until the death of Christ, when that, with other ceremonies, had an end in him; but baptism was administered many years before to multitudes, by *John*, by the order of Christ, and by his apostles; now where is the good sense of saying, and with what propriety can it be laid, that one thing succeeds another, as baptism circumcision, when the one, said to succeed, was in use and force long before the other teared, it is pretended it succeeded?

If there is any precept for Infant-baptism, it must be in the New Testament; there only it can be expected, but there it cannot be found; not in Matthew 19:14, Suffer little children, and forbid them not to come unto me, for of such is the kingdom of heaven; which is no precept, but a permission, or grant, that little children might come, or be brought unto him; but for what? not for baptism; but for that for which they were brought, and which is mentioned by the evangelist in the preceding verse, *that he should put his hands on them*, *and pray*, or give them his blessing; as it reams it was usual in those times, and with those people, as formerly, to bring their children to persons venerable for religion and piety, to be blessed by them in this way; and such an one they might take Jesus to be, though they might not know he was the Messiah. Two other evangelists say, they were brought unto him *that he should touch them*; as he sometimes touched diseased persons when he healed them; and these children might be diseased, and brought to him to be cured of their diseases; however, not to be baptized by thrill, for he baptized none; they would rather have brought them to the disciples, had it been for such a purpose; and had it been the practice of the apostles to baptize infants, they would not have refused them; and our Lord's entire silence about Infant-baptism at this time, when there was so fair an opportunity to speak of it, and enjoin it, had it been his will, has no favorable aspect on that practice. The reason given by thus for the permission of infants to come to him, *for of such is the kingdom of heaven*, is figurative and metaphorical; and not to be understood of the infants themselves, but of such as they; of such who are comparable to them for their humble deportment, and harmless lives; or to use our Lord's words elsewhere, such who are *converted*, *and become at little children* (Matthew 18:2).[3] Nor is a command for Infant-baptism contained in the commission to baptize (Matthew 28:19), Go ye, therefore, and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the holy Ghost.

It is argued, that "since all nations are to be baptized, and infants are a part of them, then, according to the command of Christ, they are to be baptized." But it should be observed, that the commission is indeed to *teach* all nations, but not to *baptize* all nations; the antecedent to the relative *them*, is not *all nations*; the words παγτα τα εθνη, *all nations*,are of the neuter gender; but αυτουϖ, *them*, is of the masculine, and do not agree; the antecedent is μαθηταϖ, *disciples*, which is understood, and supposed, and contained in the word μαθητευσατε, *teach*, or *make disciples*; and the sense is, teach all nations, and baptize them that are taught, or are made disciples by teaching. If the above argument proves any thing, it would prove too much; and what proves too much, proves nothing: it would prove, that not only the infants of Christians, but the infants of Turks, Jews, and Pagans, should be baptized, since they are part of all nations; yea, that every individual person in the world

should be baptized, heathens, as well as Christians, and even the molt profligate and abandoned of mankind, since they are part of all nations.[4]

And as there is no precept for the baptism of infants, so no precedent for it in the word of God. Though there was no clear and express command for it, which yet we think is necessary, and is required in such a case; yet, if there was a precedent of any one infant being baptized, we should think ourselves obliged to pay a regard unto it; but among the many thousands baptized by *John*, by Christ, or, however, by his order, and by his apostles, not one single instance of an infant being baptized can be found. We read, indeed, of households being baptized; from whence it is argued, that there might be, and it is probable there were, infants in them, who might be baptized; but it lies upon those who are of a different mind, to prove there were any in those households. To put us upon proving a negative, that there were none there, is unfair. However, as far as a negative can be proved, we are capable of it.[5] There are but three families usually observed, if so many; *Lydia's*, the Jailor's, and that of *Stephanas*, if not the fame with the Jailor's, as some think. As for *Lydia's* household, or those in her house, they were *brethren*; whom, afterwards, the apostles went to see, and whom they *comforted*; and so not infants. As for the Jailor's household, they were such as were capable of hearing the word preached to them, and of believing it; for it is said, *he rejoiced*, *believing in God with all his house* (Acts 16:40, 34): and if any man can find any other in his house, besides *all* that were in it, he must be reckoned a very sagacious person. As for the household of *Stephanas*, (if different from the Jailor's) it is said, that *they addicted themselves to the ministry of the saints* (1 Cor. 1:16; 16:15): and whether this be understood of the ministry of the word to the saints, or of the ministration of their substance to the poor, they must be adult persons, and not infants. Seeing then there is neither precept nor precedent for Infant-baptism in the word of God, of which I defy the whole world to give one tingle precedent, we cannot but condemn it as unscriptural, and unwarrantable.[6] I proceed,

II. To shew that the ordinance of water-baptism, being a divine command, it ought to be kept, and observed, as directed to in the word of God.

First, I shall shew, by whom it is to be kept and observed. 1. By sensible, repenting sinners. *John's* baptism was called *the baptism of repentance* (Mark 1:4); because repentance was previous to it; and the very first persons that were baptized by him, were such who were sensible of their sins, repented of them, and ingenuously confessed them; for it is said, they were *baptized of him in Jordan*, *confessing their sins*; and whereas others applied to him for baptism, of whom he had no good opinion, he required of them, that they would first bring forth fruits meet for repentance; and not to think with themselves, we have Abraham to our father (Matthew 3:6-9); since such a plea would be of no avail with him; and the very first persons that were baptized after our Lord had given to his apostles the commission to baptize, were penitent ones; for under the first sermon after this, three thousand were pricked in their heart, and cried out, *Men and brethren*, *what shall we do*? To whom the apostle *Peter* gave this instruction and direction: Repent, and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ (Acts 2:38); and accordingly, on their repentance, they were baptized. 2. This command is to be kept and observed by believers in Christ; *he that believeth and is baptized*, *shall be saved* (Mark 16:16). Faith goes before baptism, and is a pre-requisite to it; as the various instances of baptism recorded in the scriptures shew. *Philip* went down to *Samaria*, and preached Christ there to the inhabitants of it; and when they believed Philip, preaching the things

concerning the kingdom of God, and the name of Jesus Christ, they were baptized both men and women (Acts 8:12).

The same minister of the word was bid to join himself to the chariot of an Eunuch, returning from *Jerusalem*, where he had been to worship, and whom he found reading a prophecy in *Isaiah*; and said unto him, *Understandest thou what thou readest*? To which he answered, *How can I*, *except some man should guide me*? And being taken up into the chariot with him: from that scripture, *Philip* preached Jesus to him, his word, and ordinances, as the sequel shews; for when they came to a certain water, the Eunuch laid, *See*, *here is water*; *what doth hinder me to be baptized*? *And Philip said*, *If thou believest with all thine heart*, *thou mayest*. Otherwise not, it seems; for notwithstanding his religion and devotion, without faith in Christ, he had no right to that ordinance; He answered and said, I believe that Jesus Christ is the Son of God (Acts 8:36, 37); upon which profession of his faith, he was baptized. The apostle *Paul* preached the gospel at *Corinth* with success; and it is observed by the historian, that many of the Corinthians hearing, believed, and were baptized (Acts 18:8). First they heard the word, then they believed in Christ, the sum and substance of the word, and upon the profession of their faith, were baptized. 3. The ordinance of water-baptism is to be attended to, and observed by such who are the disciples of Christ; it is said that Jesus made and baptized more disciples than John (John 4:1). First made them disciples, and then baptized them; that is, ordered his apostles to baptize them; with which his commission to them agrees, *Teach all nations*, *baptizing them*; make disciples, and baptize them that are so made. Now, what is it to be disciples of Christ? Such may be said to be so, who have learned to know Christ, and believe in him; who are taught to deny sinful self, righteous self, and civil self, for his sake, and to take up the cross and follow him, in the exercise of grace and in the discharge of duty: and, 4. Such as have received the Spirit of God, are proper persons to observe the ordinance of baptism, and submit unto it: Can any man forbid water, that these should not be baptized, who have received the holy Ghost as well as we? (Acts 10:47); as a Spirit of illumination and conviction, as a Spirit of sanctification, faith and consolation, and as a Spirit of adoption.

2dly, Next let us consider in what manner the ordinance of baptism is to be kept and observed: and,

1. It should be kept in faith; for *without faith it is impossible to please God*; *and whatsoever is not of faith*, *is sin* (Heb. 11:6; Rom. 14:23).

2. In love, and from a principle of love to Christ, and which is the end of every commandment, and of this; *If ye love me*, says Christ's, *keep my commandments* (John 14:15 3). It should be kept as it was at first delivered and observed: the manner in which it is to be performed and submitted to, is immersion, or covering the whole body in water; and which agrees with the primary sense of the word βαπτιζω, which signifies to *dip* or *plunge*, as all learned men know;[7] and he must be a novice in the Greek language, that will take upon him to contradict what has been ingenuously owned by so many men of learning. Had our translators thought fit to have translated the word, which they have not in those places where the ordinance of baptism is made mention of, for reasons easily to be guessed at, but have adopted the Greek word *baptize* in all such places; had they truly translated it, the eyes of the people would have been opened, and the controversy at once would have been at an end, with respect to this part of it, the mode of baptism; however we have proof sufficient that it was performed, and ought to be performed by immersion, as appears,

1. By the places where it was administered, as the river *Jordan*, where *John* baptized many, and where our Lord himself was baptized; and *A*Enon, near *Salim*, which he chose for this reason, *because there was much water there* (Matthew 3:6, 13); now if the ordinance was administered in any other way than by immersion, what need was there to make choice of rivers and places abounding with water to baptize in?

2. By the instances of persons baptized, and the circumstances attending their baptism, as that of our Lord, of whom it is said, When he was baptized, he went up straightway out of the water (Matthew 3:16); which manifestly implies that he had been in it, of which there would have been no need, had the ordinance been administered to him in any other way than by immersion; as by sprinkling or pouring a little water on his head, as the painter ridiculously describes it. The baptism of the Eunuch is another instance proving baptism by immersion; when he and *Philip* were come to a certain water, and it was agreed to baptize him, it is said, they went down both into the waters both Philip and the Eunuch, and he baptized him. And when they were come up out of the water, the Spirit of the Lord caught away Philip (Acts 8:38, 39). The circumstances *of going down into* the water, and *coming up out of* it, manifestly shew in what manner the Eunuch was baptized, namely, by immersion; for what reason can be given why they should go *into* the water, had it been performed in any other way?

3.**[8]** The end of baptism, which is to represent the burial and resurrection of Christ, cannot be answered any other way than by immersion; that it is an emblem of the burial and resurrection of Christ, and of the burial and resurrection of believers in him, is clear from Romans 6:4, Colossians 2:12 *buried with him by baptism*, and in *baptism*. Now only an immersion or covering of the whole body in water, and not pouring or sprinkling a little water on the face, can be a representation of a burial; will any man in his senses say, that a corpse is buried, when only a little dust or earth is sprinkled or poured on its face?

4. The figurative baptisms, or the allusions made to baptism in scripture, shew in what manner it was administered; the passage of the Israelites under the cloud, and through the sea, is called a being *baptized in the cloud and in the sea* (1 Cor. 10:1, 2); and with great propriety may it be called a baptism, as that is by immersion; for the waters standing up as a wall on each fide of them, through which, and the cloud over their heads, under which they passed, they were like persons immersed in water:**[9]** likewise the overwhelming sufferings of Christ are fitly called a baptism, in allusion to baptism by immersion.**[10]** I have a baptism to be baptized with, says he; and how am I straitened until it be accomplished? (Luke 12:50); and which sufferings of Christ, in prophetic language, agreeable to baptism by immersion, are thus described; I am come into deep waters, where the floods overflow me (Ps.119:1, 2). Once more; the extraordinary donation of the Spirit on the day of Pentecost, is called a being *baptized with the holy Ghost* (Acts 1:5); the emblem of which was a rushing mighty wind, which filled all the house where they were sitting (Acts 2:2); so that they were as if immersed into it, and covered with it, and therefore very properly called *a baptism*, in allusion to baptism by immersion. I go on,

III. To observe the encouragement, motives, and reasons given to keep this ordinance, as well as others,

1. The apostle says, *this is the* love *of God*; that is, this shews love to God; it is a plain case, that a man loves God, when he keeps his commandments; this is an evidence, that he loves not in word, and in tongue only, but in deed and in truth. Others may say that they love God and Christ; but this is the man that truly loves them, even he that *hath my commandments*, says Christ (John 14:21), *and keepeth them*; *he it is that loveth me*: and it is a clear care, that such a man has a sense of the love of God and Christ; the love of the Father is in him; and the love of Christ constrains him to observe his ordinances, and keep his commands; and such may expect greater manifestations of the love of God and Christ unto them; for of such that keep the commandments of Christ, he says, I will love him, and manifest myself to him; — and my Father will love him, and we will come unto him, and make our abode with him (John 14:23); which is no small inducement and encouragement to an observation of the ordinances and commands of Christ, and among the rest this of baptism.

2. Another encouraging motive and reason is, the commandments of God and Christ are not grievous, hard and difficult to be performed. The Lord's supper is not; nor is baptism. What is baptism in water, to the baptism of sufferings Christ endured for us? And yet how desirous was he of accomplishing it? (Luke 12:50). And therefore why should we think it an hardship, or be backward to comply with his will, in submitting to the ordinance of water-baptism? When *Naaman* was bid by *Elisha* to dip himself in *Jordan*, and be clean; which he relented as too little and trifling a thing, and thought he might as well have stayed in his own land, and dipped himself in one of the rivers of *Syria*; one of his servants took upon him to allay and repress the heat of his passion and resentment, by observing, that if the prophet had bid him do some great thing, which was hard and difficult to be performed, he would have gone about it readily; how much rather then, he argued, should he attend to the direction of the prophet, when he only bid him *wash in Jordan*, *and be clean*? (2 Kings 5:13). There are many that will go into baths, and plunge themselves in them for pleasure or profit, to refresh their bodies, or cure them of disorders; but if plunging in water is directed to, as an ordinance of God, then it is a grievous thing; and, indeed, no ordinance is grateful to a carnal mind; but to believers in Christ, *wisdom's ways are ways of pleasantness*, *and her paths of peace*. Christ's yoke, if it may be called so, is easy, and his burden light. Now to close with a few words:

1. Let none despise this command of God, the ordinance of baptism; remember it is a command of his; be it at your peril if you do; it is hard kicking against the pricks; it is dangerous to treat with contempt any of the commands of God, and ordinances of Christ; *beware*, lest that should come upon you, and be fulfilled in you, *behold*, *ye despisers*, *and wonder*, *and perish*. (Acts 8:40, 41).

2. Let such who see it their duty to be baptized, not tarry, but immediately submit unto it; let them make haste, and delay not, to keep this command; remembering the motives, and encouragement to it.

3. Let those that yield obedience to it, do it in the name and strength of Christ; in the faith of him, from love to him, and with a view to his glory.

ENDNOTES:

1[1] Let the commandments be what they may, which are chiefly intended in the text; yet since water-baptism is a commandment of God, and allowed to be such, and the rest of the commandments mentioned are not denied to be, nor excluded from being the commandments of God; there can be no impropriety in treating on the commandment of baptism particularly and singly from this passage of scripture; and it might have escaped, one would have thought, a sneer, though it has not, of a scurrilous writer, in a late newspaper, referred to in the preface.

1[2] That we are ever referred to this chap. or, for a proof of Infant-baptism, is denied, and pronounced a willful, is representation, by the above mentioned writer, in his second letter in the newspaper. This man must have read very little in the controversy, to be ignorant of this. The very last writer that wrote in the controversy, that I know of, calls the covenant made with *Abraham* in that chapter "the grand turning point, on which the issue of the controversy very much depends; and that if *Abraham's* covenant, which included his infant-children, and gave them a sight to circumcision, was not the covenant of grace; then he freely confesses, that the *main ground*, on which they assert the *right of infants to baptism*, is taken away; and consequently, the principal arguments in support of the doctrine, are overturned." Bostwick's Fair and Rational Vindication of the Right of Infants to the Ordinance of Baptism, etc. p. 19.

1[3] The above letter-writer, in the news-paper, observes, "that the *kingdom of heaven s*ignifies either the kingdom, or church of Christ here, or the kingdom of glory above. If the former, they are declared, by Christ himself, real subjects of his among men; if the latter, if members of the invisible church, why not of the visible?" But, in fact, they themselves are not intended, only such as they; such who are comparable to them for meekness and humility; for freedom from malice, pride, and ambition. But admitting that the words are to be understood of infants literally, the kingdom of heaven cannot design the kingdom, or church of Christ under the gospel dispensation, which is not national, but congregational; consisting of men gathered out of the world, by the grace of God, and who make a public profession of Christ, which infants are not capable of, and so cannot be real subjects of it; and if they were, they mull have an equal right to the Lord's supper, as to baptism, of which they are equally capable. The kingdom of glory then being recant, it is asked, if members of the invisible church, why not of the visible? They may be, when it appears that they are of the invisible church, which only can be manifest by the grace of God bestowed on them; and it is time enough to talk of their baptism when that is evident; and when it is clear they have both a right unto, and meetness for the kingdom of heaven.

1[4] But our letter-writer says, "When the apostles received their commission, they could not understand it otherwise than to baptize the *parents* that embraced the faith of Christ; through their preaching, and all their *children* with them, as was the manner of the ministers of God in preceding ages, by circumcision;" but if they so understood it, and could not other ways understand it, it is strange they should not practice according to it, and baptize children with their parents; of which we have no one instance. By the *ministers of God in preceding ages*, I suppose, he means the priests and prophets, under the Old Testament-dispensation; but these were not the operators of circumcision, which was done by parents and others: and surely it cannot be said, it was the usual manner of ministers to baptize parents, and their children with them in those ages; and it is pretty unaccountable how they should baptize them by circumcision, as is affirmed; this is something unheard of before, and monstrously ridiculous and absurd.

1[5] The above writer affirms, that my manner of "proving the negative, was *by barely asserting* there were no children in any of the families, mentioned in the scriptures, as baptized." The falsity of which appears by the following descriptive, characters given of the patrons in the several, families, and the reasonings upon them.

1[6] In his turn, the writer in the news-paper, "defies me to produce one scripture precept, or precedent, for delaying the *baptism of children of* Christian parents; or for baptizing adult persons, born of such parents. On this the controversy hinges." It is ridiculous to talk of a precept for delaying that which was not in being; and of a precedent for delaying that which had never been practiced. If a warrant is required for baptizing adult persons, believers, it is ready at hand (Mark 16:16), and precedents enough: and we know of no precept to baptize any other, let them be born of whom they may; and as for precedents of the baptism of adult persons, born of Christian parents, it cannot be expected, nor reasonably required of us; since the Acts of the Apostles only give an account of the planting of the first churches; and of the baptism of those of which they first consisted; and not of those that in a course of years were added to them. Wherefore, to demand instances of persons, born of Christian parents, and brought up by them, as baptized in adult age, which would require length of time, is unreasonable; and if the controversy hinges on this, it ought to be at an end, and given up by them.

1[7] The letter-writer makes me to say, "All the world acknowledge βαπτιζω, signifies to dip or plunge, and never to sprinkle or pour water on any thing," which is a false representation of my words, and of the manner in which they were delivered; however, this I affirm, that in all the Greek Lexicons I ever few, and I have seen a pretty many, I do not pretend in have fern all that have been published; yet in what my small library furnishes me with, the word is always rendered in the first and primary sense by mergo, immergo, to *dip* or *plunge into*; and in a secondary and consequential sense, by abluo, lavo, to *wash*, because what is dipped is washed; and never by persundo or aspergo, to *pour or sprinkle*; as the Lexicon published by *Constantine*, *Budaeus*, etc. those of *Hadrian*, *Junius*, *Plantinus*, *Scapula*. *Sebreveius*, and *Stockins*, besides a great number of critics that might be mentioned; and if this writer can produce any one Lexicographer of any note, that renders the word to *pour or sprinkle*, let him name him. This *ignorant scribbler* puts the following questions, "Did the Jews plunge their whole bodies in water always before they did eat? Did they dip their pots, brazen vessels and beds?" He does not suffer me to answer the questions, but answers for me, "He knows the contrary." But if I may be allowed to answer for myself, I must say, by the testimonies of the Jews themselves, and of others, I know they did; that is, when they came flora market, having touched the common people, or their clothes, immersed themselves in water; so says *Maimonides* in Misn. Chagigah. c. e. sect. 7. "If the Pharisees touched but the garments of the common people they were defiled, and needed immersion, and were obliged to it." And *Scaliger* observes, de Emend. Temp. 1. 6. p. 271. "That the more superstitious part of the Jews, every day before they sat down to meat, dipped the whole body; hence the Pharisee's admiration at Christ (Luke 11:38)." According to the law of *Moses* (Lev. 11:32), unclean vessels were washed by putting or dipping them into water; and according to the traditions of the ciders, to which our Lord refers (Mark 7:4), not only brazen vessels and tables, but even beds, bolsters and pillows unclean, in a ceremonial sense, were washed by immersion in water. So the Jews say in their Misnah, or book of traditions, "A bed that is wholly defiled, a man dips it part by part." Celim, c. 26. sect. 14. See also Mikvaot, c. 7. sect. 7.

1[8] The above letter-writer asks, "How often must I be told, that the particle ειϖ and εκ are in hundreds of places in the New Testament rendered *unto* and *from*?" be it so; it follows not, that they mull be so rendered here. Greek particles or prepositions have different significations, according to the words and circumstances with which they are used; nor is it as proper or a more just reading of the words, "they went down *unto* the water and came up from it;" it is neither proper nor just; for before this, they are expressly said to come to a certain water, to the waterside; wherefore when they went down, they went not *unto* it, if they were there before, but *into* it; as it must be allowed the preposition sometimes, at least, signifies; and circumstances require that it should be so rendered here, let it signify what it may elsewhere; and this determines the sense of the other preposition, that it tour and ought to be rendered out of; for as they went down into the water, when they came up, it must be out of it. What he means by the strange question that follows, "What will he make of Christ's going *into a mountain*?" I cannot devise, unless he thinks the translation of Luke 6:12 is wrong, or nonsense, or both; but has this wiseacre never heard or read of a cave in a mountain, into which men may go, and properly be said to go into the mountain; and such an one it is highly probable our Lord went into, to pray alone; such as the cave in mount Horeb, into which *Elijab* went. But his tip-top translation of all is that of John's baptizing in *Jordan*, which he supposes might be rendered, by baptizing the people *with the river Jordan*. This is the man that reproaches me with very freely finding fault with the translators; my complaint is only of a non-translation, not of a wrong one; but this man finds fault with the translation as wrong, or however thinks it may be corrected or mended, and that in more places than one.

1[9] The letter-writer I have often referred to, affirms, that "the learned world universally maintain, that the Israelites were no other ways *baptized in the sea*, than by being sprinkled with the spray of the tolling waves, agitated by the wind that blew as they passed through the channel." Who the learned world be, that maintain this whimsical notion, I own, I am quite ignorant of, having never yet met with any learned man that ever asserted it. It is a mere conceit and a wild imagination, and contrary to the sacred scriptures, which represent the waves of the feat through which the Israelites passed, not as agitated and tossed about, but as standing unmoved, as a wall on each side of them, whatever was the care in that part where the Egyptians were; *The floods*, says the inspired writer, *stood uprights as an heap*, *and the depths were congealed in the heart of the sea* (Ex. 15:8). And if there was a continual spray of the tossing waves, as the Israelites passed through the channel, how could they pass through the sea on *dry ground*? As they are said to do (Ex. 14:16, 22, 29). What this man scoffs at, the celebrated *Grotius*, who is universally allowed to be a man of learning and sense, expresses in a note on 1 Corinthians 10:2 "*were baptized*, that is, as if they were baptized; for there was some likeness in it; the cloud was over their heads, and so water is over them that are baptized; the sea encompassed the sides of them, and so water those that are baptized."

1[10] The same writer is pleased to represent this explanation of the baptism of the Spirit as ridiculous; but some of greater learning than he can pretend to, have so explained it, as particularly Dr. *Casaubon*, famous for his great knowledge of the Greek language; though perhaps this *very illiberal* man will call the learned doctor a dunce for what he says; his words on Acts 1:5 are these, "though I do not disapprove of the word *baptize* being retained here, that the antithesis may be full; yet I am of opinion that regard is had in this place to its proper signification, for βαπτιζειν is to immerse, so as to *tinge* or *dip*; and in this sense the apostles were truly said to be baptized; for the house in which this was done was filled with the holy Ghost, so that the apostles seemed to be plunged into it as into a pool." In confirmation of which, he makes mention on Acts 2:2 of an

observation in a Greek commentary on it, “the wind filled the whole house, filling it like a pool; since it was promised to them (the apostles) that they should be *baptized*, *with the Holy Ghost*.” It seems to be the same commentary, *Erasmus*, on the place, says went under the name of *Chrysostom*, in which are there words, as he gives them, “the whole house was so filled with fire, though invisible, as a pool is filled with water.” — Our scribbler, in order to expose the notion of dipping, as used in the baptism of the spirit, and fire, condescends, for once, to read *dip*, instead of *baptize*; “*John* said I indeed dip you *with* water, but one, mightier than I, cometh, he shall *dip* you *with* the holy Ghost, and *with fire*.” But not only the word *baptize s*hould be read *dip*, but the preposition “should be rendered *in*; *in* water; and *in* the holy Ghost; and *in* fire; and the phrase *of dipping in* fire, is no unusual one, both in Jewish and Greek authors; as I have shewn in my Exposition of the place, and of Acts 2:3.

BAPTISM:

A PUBLIC ORDINANCE

of Divine Worship

As the first covenant, or testament, had ordinances of divine service, which are shaken, removed, and abolished; so the New Testament, or gospel dispensation, has ordinances of divine worship, which cannot be shaken, but will remain until the second coming of Christ: these, as Austin says,[1] are few; and easy to be observed, and of a very expressive signification. Among which, baptism must be reckoned one, and is proper to be treated of in the first place; for though it is not a church ordinance, it is an ordinance of God, and a part and branch of public worship. When I say it is not a church ordinance, I mean it is not an ordinance administered in the church, but out of it, and in order to admission into it, and communion with it; it is preparatory to it, and a qualification for it; it does not make a person a member of a church, or admit him into a visible church; persons must first be baptized, and then added to the church, as the three thousand converts were; a church has nothing to do with the baptism of any, but to be satisfied they are baptized before they are admitted into communion with it. Admission to baptism lies solely in the breast of the administrator, who is the only judge of qualifications for it, and has the sole power of receiving to it, and of rejecting from it; if nor satisfied, he may reject a person thought fit by a church, and admit a person to baptism not thought fit by a church; but a disagreement is not desirable nor advisable: the orderly, regular, scriptural rule of proceeding seems to be this: a person inclined to submit to baptism, and to join in communion with a church, should first apply to an administrator; and upon giving him satisfaction, be baptized by him; and then should propose to the church for communion; when he would be able to answer all proper questions: if asked, to give a reason of the hope that is in him, he is ready to do it; if a testimony of his life and conversation is required, if none present can give it, he can direct where it is to be had; and if the question is put to him, whether he is a baptized person or not, he can answer in the affirmative, and give proof of it, and so the way is clear for his admission into church fellowship. So Saul, when converted, was immediately baptized by Ananias, without any previous knowledge and consent of the church; and, it was many days after this that he proposed to join himself to the disciples, and was received (Acts 9:18,19,23,26-28), and as it is water baptism which is meant, I shall,

I. First, prove that this is peculiar to the gospel dispensation, is a standing ordinance in it, and will be continued to the second coming of Christ. This is opposed to the sentiments of such who say baptism was in use before the times of John, of Christ and his apostles; and of such who restrain water baptism to the interval between the beginning of John's ministry and the death of Christ, when they supposed this, with other external rites, ceased; and of such, as the Socinians,[2] who think that only the first converts to Christianity in a nation are to be baptized, and their children, but not their after posterity. There were indeed various washings, bathings, or baptisms, under the legal dispensation, for the purification of persons and things unclean, by the ceremonial law; which had a doctrine in them, called the doctrine of baptists, which taught the cleansing of sin by the blood of Christ; but there was nothing similar in them to the ordinance of water baptism, but immersion

only. The Jews pretend, their ancestors were received into covenant by baptism, or dipping, as well as by circumcision and sacrifice; and that proselytes from heathenism were received the same way; and this is greedily grasped at by the advocates for infant baptism; who fancy that John, Christ, and his apostles, took up this custom as they found it, and continued it; and which they imagine accounts for the silence about it in the New Testament, and why there is neither precept for it, nor example of it; but surely if it was in such common use as pretended, though no new precept had been given, there would have been precedents enough of it; but no proof is to be given of any such practice obtaining in those times, neither from the Old nor New Testament; nor from the apocryphal books written by Jews between them; nor from Josephus and Philo the Jew, who wrote a little after the times of John and Christ; nor from the Jewish Misnah, or book of traditions: only from later writings of theirs, too late for the proof of it before those times.[3] John was the first administrator of the ordinance of baptism, and therefore is called "the Baptist" (Matthew 3:1), by way of emphasis; whereas, had it been in common use, there must have been many baptizers before him, who had a like claim to this title; and why should the people be so alarmed with it, as to come from all parts to see it administered, and to hear it preached, when, had it been in frequent use, they must have often seen it? and why should the Jewish Sanhedrim send priests and Levites from Jerusalem to John, to know who he was, whether the Messiah, or his forerunner Elias, or that prophet spoken of and expected? and when he confessed, and denied that he was neither of them, they say to him, "Why baptizest thou then?" by which thing and which they expected it appears it was a new thing, and which they expected when the Messiah came, but not before; and that then it would be performed by some great personage, one or other of the before mentioned; whereas, had it been performed by an ordinary teacher, common Rabbi or doctor, priest or Levite, in ages immemorial, there could have been no room for such a question; and had this been the case, there would have been no difficulty with the Jews to answer the question of our Lord; "The baptism of John, whence was it, from heaven or of men?" they could have answered, It was a tradition of theirs, a custom in use among them time out of mind, had this been the known case; nor would they have been subject to any dilemma: but John's baptism was not a device of men; but the "counsel of God", according to his will and wise determination (Luke 7:30). John had a mission and commission from God, he was a man sent of God, and sent to baptize (John 1:6,33), and his baptism was water baptism, this he affirms, and the places he made use of for that purpose show it, and none will deny it.

Now his baptism, and that of Christ and his apostles, were the same. Christ was baptized by John, and his baptism was surely Christian baptism; of this no one can doubt (Matthew 3:13-17), and his disciples also were baptized by him; for by whom else could they be baptized? not by Christ himself, for he baptized none (John 4:2). And it is observable, that the baptism of John, and the baptism of Christ and his apostles, were at the same time; they were contemporary, and did not the one succeed the other: now it is not reasonable to suppose there should be two sorts of baptism administered at the same time; but one and the same by both (John 3:22,23,26; 4:1,2). The baptism of John, and that which was practiced by the apostles of Christ, even after his death and resurrection from the dead, agreed,

1. In the subjects thereof. Those whom John baptized were sensible penitent sinners, who were convinced of their sins, and made an ingenuous confession of them; and of whom he required "fruits meet for repentance", and which showed it to be genuine; and hence his baptism is called, "the baptism of repentance", because he required it previous to it (Matthew 3:6-8; Mark 1:4). So the

apostles of Christ exhorted men to repent, to profess their repentance, and give evidence of it, previous to their baptism (Acts 2:38). John said to the people that came to his baptism, "That they should believe on him which should come after him, that is, on Christ Jesus", upon which they were baptized in his name (Acts 19:4,5), faith in Christ was made a prerequisite to baptism by Christ and his apostles (Mark 16:16; Acts 8:36,37).

2. In the way and manner of the administration of both. John's baptism was by immersion, as the places chosen by him for it show; and the baptism of Christ by him is a proof of it (Matthew 3:6,16; John 3:23), and in like manner was baptism performed by the apostles, as of the eunuch by Philip (Acts 8:38,39).

3. In the form of their administration. John was sent of God to baptize; and in whose name should he baptize, but in the name of the one true God, who sent him, even in the name of God, Father, Son, and Spirit? The doctrine of the Trinity was known to John, as it was to the Jews in common; it is said of John's hearers and disciples, that they were "baptized in the name of the Lord Jesus" (Acts 19:5). The same form is used of the baptism of those baptized by the apostles of Christ (Acts 8:16; 10:48), which is only a part of the form put for the whole, and is sufficiently expressive of Christian baptism, which is to be performed "in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost" (Matthew 28:19).

4. In the end and use of baptism, John's baptism, and so the apostles was, upon repentance for the remission of sins (Mark 1:4; Acts 8:38), not that either repentance or baptism procure the pardon of sin; that is only obtained by the blood of Christ; but baptism is a means of leading to the blood of Christ; and repentance gives encouragement to hope for it, through it. Now since there is such an agreement between the baptism of John, as administered before the death of Christ; and between the baptism of the apostles, after the death, resurrection, and ascension of Christ; it is a plain case, it was not limited to the interval of time from the beginning of John's ministry to the death of Christ; but was afterwards continued; which further appears from the commission of Christ (Matthew 28:19), "Go ye therefore, and teach all nations, baptizing them"; and though water is not expressed, it is always implied, when the act of baptizing is ascribed to men; for it is peculiar to Christ to baptize with the Holy Spirit (Matthew 3:11; Acts 1:5), nor did he give to his apostles, nor to any man, or set of men, a commission and power to baptize with the Spirit: besides, an increase of the graces of the Spirit, and a large donation of his gifts, are promised to persons after baptism, and as distinct from it (Acts 2:38). The apostles, doubtless, understood the commission of their Lord and Master to baptize in water, since they practiced it upon it; such was the baptism administered by Philip, who, having taught the eunuch the doctrine of it, when they came to a "certain water", he said to him, "See, here is water, what doth hinder me to be baptized?" that is, in water; and when Philip had observed unto him the grand requisite of it, even faith in Christ, which he at once professed; and the chariot in which they rode being ordered to stand, theft went down both into the water, and he baptized him; this was most certainly water baptism; and so was that which Peter ordered to be administered to Cornelius and his friends, upon their receiving of the Holy Ghost, and so a baptism different from that; "Can any man forbid water, that these should not be baptized?" (Acts 8:36,38,39; 10:47,48). And this was designed to be continued unto the end of the world, to the second coming of Christ; as the ordinance of the supper is to be kept to that time, the ordinance of water baptism is to be continued as long; hence says Christ, to encourage his ministers to preach

his gospel, and to baptize in his name; "Lo, I am with you always", in the ministry of the word, and in the administration of baptism, "even unto the end of the world" (Matthew 28:19,20).

II. Secondly, I shall next consider the author of it; and show, that it is not a device of men, but an ordinance of God; it is a solemn part of divine worship, being performed in the name of the Three divine Persons in Deity, Father, Son, and Spirit, and by their authority; in which the name of God is invoked, faith in him expressed, and a man gives up himself to God, obliges himself to yield obedience to him, expecting all good things from him. Now for an act of religious worship there must be a command of God. God is a jealous God, and will not suffer anything to be admitted into the worship of him, but what is according to his word and will; if not commanded by him, he may justly say, "Who hath required this at your hands?" and will resent it: a command from men is not sufficient; no man on earth is to be called master; one is our Master in heaven, and him only we are to obey: if the commandments of men are taught for doctrines, in vain is the Lord worshipped; what is done according to them is superstition and will worship. Indeed, as it is now commonly practiced, it is a mere invention of men, the whole of it corrupted and changed; instead of rational spiritual men the subjects of it, infants, who have neither the use of reason, nor the exercise of grace, are admitted to it; and instead of immersion in water, and immersion out of it, a very expressive emblem of the sufferings of Christ, his death, burial, and resurrection from the dead; sprinkling a few drops of water on the face is introduced; with a number of foolish rites and ceremonies used by the papists, and some of their usages are retained by some Protestants; as sponsors, or sureties for infants, and the signing them with the sign of the cross. In short, the face of the ordinance is so altered, that if the apostles were to rise from the dead, and see it as now performed, they would neither know nor own it to be the ordinance commanded them by Christ, and practiced by them. But as it is administered according to the pattern, and as first delivered, it appears to be of an heavenly original; the "counsel of God", a wise appointment of his, and in which all the Three Persons have a concern; they all appeared at the baptism of Christ, and gave a sanction to the ordinance by their presence; the Father by a voice from heaven, saying, "This is my beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased!" as in his person, so in this act of his, in submitting to the ordinance of baptism; the Son in human nature, yielding obedience to it; and the Spirit descending on him as a dove; and it is ordered to be administered in the name of all three, Father, Son, and Spirit. Which, among other things, is expressive of divine authority, under which it is performed. Christ received from God the Father honor and glory, as at his transfiguration, so at his baptism, by the voice from heaven, owning his relation to him, as his Son, and expressing his well pleasedness in him, as obedient to his will; the Son of God, in human nature, not only left an example of it, that we should tread in his steps; though he himself baptized none, yet he countenanced it in his disciples, and gave them orders to do it; which orders were repeated, and a fresh commission given for the same after his resurrection from the dead: and the Spirit of God showed his approbation of it, by his descent on Christ at his baptism; and his authority for it is to be seen in the administration of it in his name, as in the name of the other Two Persons; so that it is to be regarded, not as an institution of men, but as an ordinance of God; as a part of righteousness to be fulfilled, a branch of the righteous will of God, to be observed in obedience to it.

III. Thirdly, the subjects of baptism are next to be inquired into; or who they are to whom it is to be administered, and according to the scripture instances and examples, they are such who,

1. Are enlightened by the Spirit of God to see their lost state by nature, the exceeding sinfulness of sin, and Christ as the only Saviour of sinners; who look to him and are saved; and such only can see to the end of the ordinance, which is to represent the sufferings and death, burial and resurrection of Christ; hence baptism was by the ancients; called φωτισμοϖ, "illumination"; and baptized persons φωτιζομενοι, "enlightened" ones; and the Syriac and. Ethiopic, versions of Hebrews 6:4 translate the word "enlightened" by baptized; an emblem of this was the falling off from the eyes of Saul, as it had been scales; signifying his former blindness, and ignorance, and unbelief, now removed; upon which he arose and was baptized (Acts 9:18).

2. Penitent persons; such who having seen the evil nature of sin, repent of it, and acknowledge it; such were the first who were baptized by John that we read of; they were "baptized of him in Jordan, confessing their sins" (Matthew 3:6), being made sensible of them, they ingenuously confessed them; and such were the first who were baptized after Christ had renewed the commission to his disciples, upon his resurrection, to teach and: baptize; such as were pricked to the heart, were exhorted to profess repentance and give evidence of it, and then be baptized, as they were (Acts 2:37,38,41), and it is pity that these first examples of baptism were not strictly followed.

3. Faith in Christ is a prerequisite to baptism (Mark 16:16), this is clear from the case of the eunuch, desiring baptism, to whom Philip said, "If thou believest with all thine heart, thou mayest"; by which it seems, that if he did not believe, he had no right to the ordinance; but if he did, he had; upon which he professed his faith in Christ; and upon that profession was baptized (Acts 8:36), and the various instances of baptism recorded in scripture, confirm the same; as of the inhabitants of Samaria, who, upon believing in Christ, "were baptized, both men and women"; so the Corinthians, "hearing" the word preached by the apostle Paul, "believed" in Christ, whom he preached, "and were baptized", upon their faith in him (Acts 8:12; 18:8), and without faith it is impossible to please God in any ordinance or part of worship; and what is not of faith is sin; and without it no one can see to the end of the ordinance of baptism, as before observed.

4. Such who are taught and made disciples by teaching, are the proper subjects of baptism, agreeable both to the practice of Christ and his commission; it is said, "that Jesus made and baptized more disciples than John" (John 4:1), he first made them disciples, and then baptized them, that is, ordered his apostles to baptize them; and so runs his commission to them, "Go teach all nations, baptizing them", that is, those that are taught, and so made disciples; and they are the disciples of Christ, who have learnt to know him, and are taught to deny sinful, righteous, and civil self, for his sake, and to take up the cross and follow him.

5. Such who have received the Spirit of God, as a Spirit of illumination and conviction, of sanctification and faith, as the persons before described may well be thought to have, should be admitted to baptism (Acts 10:47; see Gal. 3:2), from all which it appears, that such who are ignorant of divine things, impenitent, unbelievers, not disciples and followers of Christ, and who are destitute of the Spirit, are not proper subjects of baptism, let their pretences to birthright be what they may; and so not the infants of any, be they born of whom they may; and to whom the above characters, descriptive of the subjects of baptism, do by no means belong: with respect to their first birth, though born of believing parents, they are carnal and corrupt, and children of wrath, as others; "That which is born of the flesh is flesh"; and they must be born again, or they cannot see, possess, and enjoy the kingdom of God, or have a right to be admitted into the church of God

now, nor will they enter into the kingdom of God, into heaven hereafter, unless born again; their first and carnal birth neither entitles them to the kingdom of God on earth, nor to the kingdom of God in heaven, be it taken in either sense; for the baptism of such there is neither precept nor precedent in the word of God.

(1.) First, there is no precept for it; not the words of Christ in Matthew 19:14, "But Jesus said, Suffer little children", etc. For,

a. Let the words be said to or of whom they may, they are not in the form of a precept, but of a permission or grant, and signify not what was enjoined as necessary, but what was allowed of, or which might be; "Suffer little children", etc.

b. These children do not appear to be newborn babes. The words used by the evangelists, neither παιδια nor βρεφη, do not always signify such; but are sometimes used or such who are capable of going alone, and of being instructed, and of understanding the scriptures, and even of one of twelve years of age (Matthew 18:2; 2 Tim. 3:15; Mark 5:39,42). Nor is it probable that children just born should be had abroad; besides, these were such as Christ called unto him (Luke 18:16), and were capable of coming to him of themselves, as is supposed in the words themselves; nor is their being brought unto him, nor his taking them in his arms, any objection to this, since the same are said of such who could walk of themselves (Matthew 12:22 17:16; Mark 9:36).

c. It cannot be said whose children these were; whether they belonged to those who brought them, or to others; and whether the children of believers, and of baptized persons, or not; and if of unbelievers, and of unbaptized persons, the Paedobaptists themselves will not allow such children to be baptized.

d. It is certain they were not brought to Christ to be baptized by him, but for other purposes; the evangelist Matthew (Matthew 19:13,15), says, they were brought to him that he "should put his hands upon them, and pray", as he did, that is, for a blessing on them; as it was usual with the Jews to do (Gen. 48:14,15). The evangelists Mark and Luke say, they were brought to him, "that he would touch them", as he did when he healed persons of diseases; and probably these children were diseased, and were brought to him to be cured; however, they were not brought to be baptized by Christ; for Christ baptized none at all, adult or infants; had they that brought them this in view, they would have brought them to the disciples of Christ, and not to Christ, whom they might have seen administering the ordinance of baptism, but not Christ: however, it is certain they were not baptized by Christ, since he never baptized any.

e. This passage rather concludes against Paedobaptism than for it, and shows that this practice had not obtained among the Jews, and had not been used by John, by Christ, and his disciples; for then the apostles would scarcely have forbid the bringing of these children, since they might readily suppose they were brought to be baptized; but knowing of no such usage in the nation, whether of them that did or did not believe in Christ, they forbade them; and Christ's silence about this matter, when he had such an opportunity of speaking of it to his disciples, and enjoining it, had it been his will, does not look very favorably upon this practice.

f. The reason given for suffering little children to come to Christ, "for of such is the kingdom of heaven", is to be understood in a figurative and metaphorical sense; of such who are comparable to children for modesty, meekness, and humility, and for freedom from rancor, malice, ambition, and pride (see Matthew 18:2); and which sense is given into by Origen,[4] among the ancients, and by Calvin and Brugensis, among the moderns. Nor does the commission in Matthew 28:19 contain in it any precept for infant baptism; "Go, teach all nations, baptizing them", etc. For,

(a.) The baptism of all nations is not here commanded; but the baptism only of such who are taught; for the antecedent to the relative "them", cannot be "all nations"; since the words παντα τα εψνη, "all nations", are of the neuter gender; whereas αυτουϖ, "them", is of the masculine; but μαψευταν, disciples, is supposed and understood in the word μαψητευσατε, "teach", or "make disciples"; now the command is, that such who are first taught or made disciples by teaching under the ministry of the word, by the Spirit of God succeeding it, should be baptized.

(b.) If infants, as a part of all nations, and because they are such, are to be baptized, then the infants of Heathens, Turks, and Jews, ought to be baptized, since they are a part, and a large part, of all nations; as well as the children of Christians, or believers, which are but a small part; yea, every individual person in the world ought to be baptized, all adult persons, heathens as well as Christians; even the most profligate and abandoned of mankind, since they are a part of all nations.

(c.) Disciples of Christ, and such who have learned to know Christ, and the way of salvation by him, and to know themselves, and their need of him, are characters that cannot agree with infants; and if disciples and learners are the same, as is said, they must be learners or they cannot be disciples; and they cannot be learners of Christ unless they have learnt something of him; and according to this notion of disciples and learners, they ought to learn something of him before they are baptized in his name; but what can an infant be taught to learn of Christ? to prove infants disciples that text is usually brought (Acts 15:10), which falls greatly short of proving it; for infants are not designed in that place, nor included in the character; for though the Judaizing teachers would have had the Gentiles, and their infants too, circumcised; yet it was not circumcision, the thing itself, which is meant by the intolerable yoke; for that was what the Jewish fathers, and their children, were able to bear, and had bore in ages past; but it was the doctrine of the necessity of that, and other rites of Moses, to salvation; and obliged to the keeping of the whole law, and was in tolerable; and which doctrine could not be imposed upon infants, but upon adult persons only.

(d.) These two acts, teaching, or making disciples, and baptizing, are not to be confounded, but are two distinct acts, and the one is previous and absolutely necessary to the other: Men must first be made disciples, and then baptized; so Jerom[5] long ago understood the commission; on which he observes, "First they teach all nations, then dip those that are taught in water; for it cannot be that the body should receive the sacrament of baptism, unless the soul has before received the truth of faith." And so says Athanasius,[6] "Wherefore the Saviour does not simply command to baptize; but first says, teach, and then baptize thus, "In the name of the Father, nd of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost"; that faith might come of teaching, and baptism be perfected."

(2.) Secondly, there is no precedent for the baptism of infants in the word of God. Among the vast numbers who flocked to John's baptism from all parts, we read of no infants that were brought with them for that purpose, or that were baptized by him. And though more were baptized by Christ than

by John, that is, the apostles of Christ, at his order, yet no mention of any infant baptized by them; and though three thousand persons were baptized at once, yet not an infant among them: and in all the accounts of baptism in the Acts of the Apostles in different parts of the world, not a single instance of infant baptism is given. There is, indeed, mention made of households, or families, baptized; and which the "paedobaptists" endeavor to avail themselves of; but they ought to be sure there were infants in these families, and that they were baptized, or else they must baptize them on a very precarious foundation; since there are families who have no infants in them, and how can they be sure there were any in these the scriptures speak of? and it lies upon them to prove there were infants in them, and that these infants were baptized; or the allegation of these instances is to no purpose. We are able to prove there are many things in the account of these families, which are inconsistent with infants, and which make it at least probable there were none in them, and which also make it certain that those who were baptized were adult persons and believers in Christ. There are but three families, if so many, who are usually instanced in: the first is that of Lydia and her household (Acts 16:14,15), but in what state of life she was is not certain, whether single or married, whether maid widow or wife; and if married, whether she then had any children, or ever had any; and if she had, and they living, whether they were infants or adult; and if infants, it does not seem probable that she should bring them along with her from her native place, Thyatira to Philippi, where she seems to have been upon business, and so had hired a house during her stay there; wherefore her household seems to have consisted of menial servants she brought along with her, to assist her in her business: and certain it is, that those the apostles found in her house, when they entered into it, after they came out of prison, were such as are called "brethren", and were capable of being "comforted" by them; which supposes them to have been in some distress and trouble, and needed comfort. The second instance is of the jailor and his household, which consisted of adult persons, and of such only; for the apostles spoke the word of the Lord to "all" that were in his house, which they were capable of hearing, and it seems of understanding; for not only he "rejoiced" at the good news of salvation by Christ, but "all" in his house hearing it, rejoiced likewise; which joy of theirs was the joy of faith; for he and they were believers in God, Father, Son, and Spirit; for it is expressly said, that he "rejoiced, believing in God with all his house"; so that they were not only hearers of the word, but rejoiced at it, and believed in it, and in God the Saviour, revealed in it to them (Acts 16:32-34), all which shows them to be adult persons, and not infants. The third instance, if distinct from the household of the jailor, which some take to be the same, is that of Stephanus; but be it a different one, it is certain it consisted of adult persons, believers in Christ, and very useful in the service of religion; they were the first fruits of Achaia, the first converts in those parts, and who "addicted themselves to the ministry of the saints" (1 Cor. 16:15), which, whether understood of the ministry of the word to the saints, which they gave themselves up unto; or of the ministration of their substance to the poor, which they cheerfully communicated, they must be adult persons, and not infants. There being then neither precept nor precedent in the word of God for infant baptism, it may be justly condemned as unscriptural and unwarrantable.

(3.) Thirdly, nor is infant baptism to be concluded from any things or passages recorded either in the Old or in the New Testament. Baptism being an ordinance peculiar to the New Testament, it cannot be expected there should be any directions about the observance of it in the Old Testament; and whatever may be gathered relative to it, from typical and figurative baptisms, under the former dispensation, there is nothing from thence in favor of infant baptism, and to countenance that; and yet we are often referred thereunto for the original and foundation of it, but to no purpose.

a. It is not fact, as has been asserted,[7] that the "infants of believers" have, with their parents, been taken into covenant with God in the former ages of the church, if by it is meant the covenant of grace; the first covenant made with man, was that of works, made with Adam, and which indeed included all his posterity, to whom he stood as a federal head, as no one ever since did to his natural offspring; in whom they all sinned, were condemned, and died; which surely cannot be pleaded in favor of the infants of believers! after the fall, the covenant of grace, and the way of life and salvation by Christ, were revealed to Adam and Eve, personally, as interested therein; but not to their natural seed and posterity, and as interested therein; for then all mankind must be taken into the covenant of grace, and so nothing peculiar to the infants of believers; of which not the least syllable is mentioned throughout the whole age of the church, reaching from Adam to Noah. The next covenant we read of, is that made with Noah, which was not made with him and his immediate offspring only; nor were any taken into it as infants of believers, nor had they any sacrament or rite as a token of it, and of God being their God in a peculiar relation. Surely this will not be said of Ham, one of the immediate sons of Noah. That covenant was made with Noah, and with all mankind to the end of the world, and even with every living creature, the beasts of the field, promising security from an universal deluge, as long as the world should stand; and so had nothing in it peculiar to the infants of believers. The next covenant is that made with Abraham and his seed, on which great stress is laid (Gen. 17:10-14), and this is said[8] to be "the grand turning point on which the issue of the controversy very much depends; and that if Abraham's covenant, which included his infant children, and gave them a right to circumcision, was not the covenant of grace; then it is confessed, that the "main ground" is taken away, on which "the right of infants to baptism" is asserted; and consequently the principal arguments in support of the doctrine are overturned." Now that this covenant was not the pure covenant of grace, in distinction from the covenant of works, but rather a covenant of works, will soon be proved; and if so, then the main ground of infant's baptism is taken away, and its principal arguments in support of it overturned: and that it is not the covenant of grace is clear,

(a.) From its being never so called, nor by any name which shows it to be such; but "the covenant of circumcision" (Acts 7:8). Now nothing is more opposite to one another than circumcision and grace; circumcision is a work of the law, which they that sought to be justified by fell from grace (Gal. 5:2-4). Nor can this covenant be the same we are now under, which is a new covenant, or a new administration of the covenant of grace, since it is abolished, and no more in being and force.

(b.) It appears to be a covenant of works, and not of grace; since it was to be kept by men, under a severe penalty. Abraham was to keep it, and his seed after him; something was to be done by them, their flesh to be circumcised, and a penalty was annexed, in case of disobedience or neglect; such a soul was to be cut off from his people: all which shows it to be, not a covenant of grace, but of works.

(c.) It is plain, it was a covenant that might be broken; of the uncircumcised it is said, "He hath broken my covenant" (Gen. 17:14), whereas the covenant of grace cannot be broken; God will not break it, and men cannot; it is ordered in all things, and sure, and is more immovable than hills and mountains (Ps. 89:34).

(d.) It is certain it had things in it of a civil and temporal nature; as a multiplication of Abraham's natural seed, and a race of kings from him; a promise of his being the Father of many nations, and a

possession of the land of Canaan by his seed: things that can have no place in the pure covenant of grace and have nothing to do with that, any more than the change of his name from Abram to Abraham.

(e.) There were some persons included in it, who cannot be thought to belong to the covenant of grace; as Ishmael, not in the same covenant with Isaac, and a profane Esau: and on the other hand, there were some who were living when this covenant of circumcision was made, and yet were left out of it; who nevertheless, undoubtedly, were in the covenant of grace; as Shem, Arphaxad, Melchizedek, Lot, and others; wherefore this can never be the pure covenant of grace.

(f.) Nor is this covenant the same with what is referred to in Galatians 3:17 said to be "confirmed of God in Christ", which could not be disannulled by the law four hundred and thirty years after; the distance of time between them does not agree, but falls short of the apostle's date twenty four years; and therefore must not refer to the covenant of circumcision, but to some other covenant and time of making it; even to an exhibition and manifestation of the covenant of grace to Abraham, about the time of his call out of Chaldea (Gen. 12:3).

(g.) The covenant of grace was made with Christ, as the federal head of the elect in him, and that from everlasting, and who is the only head of that covenant, and of the covenant ones: if the covenant of grace was made with Abraham, as the head of his natural and spiritual seed, Jews and Gentiles; there must be two heads of the covenant of grace, contrary to the nature of such a covenant, and the whole current of scripture; yea, the covenant of grace, as it concerns the spiritual seed of Abraham, and spiritual blessings for them; it, and the promises of it, were made to Christ (Gal. 3:16). No mere man is capable of covenanting with God; the covenant of grace is not made with any single man; and much less with him on the behalf of others: whenever we read of it as made with a particular person or persons, it is always to be understood of the manifestation and application of it, and of its blessings and promises to them.

(h.) Allowing Abraham's covenant to be a peculiar one, and of a mixed kind, containing promises of temporal things to him, and his natural seed, and of spiritual things to his spiritual seed; or rather, that there was at the same time when the covenant of circumcision was given to Abraham and his natural seed, a fresh manifestation of the covenant of grace made with him and his spiritual seed in Christ. That the temporal blessings of it belonged to his natural seed, is no question; but that the spiritual blessings belong to all Abraham's seed, after the flesh, and to all the natural seed of believing Gentiles, must be denied: if the covenant of grace was made with all Abraham's seed according to the flesh, then it was made with his more immediate offspring, with a mocking, persecuting Ishmael, and with a profane Esau, and with all his remote posterity; with them who believed not, and whose carcasses fell in the wilderness; with the ten tribes who revolted from the pure worship of God; with the Jews in Isaiah's time, a seed of evildoers, whose rulers are called the rulers of Sodom, and the people the people of Gomorrah; with the scribes and Pharisees, that wicked and adulterous generation in the times of Christ: but what serious, thoughtful man, who knows anything of the covenant of grace, can admit of this? (see Rom. 9:6,7). It is only a remnant, according to the election of grace, who are in this covenant; and if all the natural seed of Abraham are not in this covenant, it can scarcely be thought that all the natural seed of believing Gentiles are; it is only some of the one and some of the other, who are in the covenant of grace; and this cannot be known until they believe, when they appear to be Abraham's spiritual seed; and it must be right

to put off their claim to any supposed privilege arising from covenant interest, until it is plain they have one; if all the natural seed of Abraham, as such, and all the natural seed of believing Gentiles, as such, are in the covenant of grace; since all they that are in it, and none but they are in it, who are the chosen of God, the redeemed of the Lamb, and will be called by grace, and sanctified, and persevere in faith and holiness, and be eternally glorified; then the natural seed of Abraham, and of believing Gentiles, must be all chosen to grace and glory, and be redeemed by the blood of Christ from sin, law, hell, and death; they must all have new hearts and spirits given them, and the fear of God put into their hearts; must be effectually called, their sins forgiven them, their persons justified by the righteousness of Christ, and they persevere in grace to the end, and be for ever glorified; (see Jer. 31:33,34; 32:40; Ezek. 36:25-27; Rom. 8:30). But who will venture to assert all this of the one, or of the other? And after all,

(i.) If their covenant interest could be ascertained, that gives no right to an ordinance, without a positive order and direction from God. It gave no right to circumcision formerly; for on the one hand there were persons living when that ordinance was appointed, who had an undoubted interest in the covenant of grace; as Shem, Arphaxad, Lot, and others, on whom circumcision was not enjoined, and they had no right to use it: on the other hand, there have been many of whom it cannot be said they were in the covenant of grace, and yet were obliged to it. And so covenant interest gives no right to baptism; could it be proved, as it cannot, that all the infant seed of believers, as such, are in the covenant of grace, it would give them no right to baptism, without a command for it; the reason is, because a person may be in covenant, and as yet not have the prerequisite to an ordinance, even faith in Christ, and a profession of it, which are necessary both to baptism and the Lord's Supper; and if covenant interest gives a right to the one, it would to the other.

(j.) Notwithstanding all this attention made about Abraham's covenant (Gen. 17:1-14), it was not made with him and his infant seed; but with him and his adult offspring; it was they in all after ages to the coming of Christ, whether believers or unbelievers, who were enjoined to circumcise their infant seed, and not all of them, only their males: it was not made with Abraham's infant seed, who could not circumcise themselves, but their parents were by this covenant obliged to circumcise them; yea, others, who were not Abraham's natural seed, were obliged to it; "He that is eight days old shalt be circumcised among you, which is NOT OF THY SEED" (Gen. 17:12). Which leads on to observe,

b. That nothing can be concluded from the circumcision of Jewish infants, to the baptism of the infants of believing Gentiles: had there been a like command for the baptism of the infants of believing Gentiles, under the New Testament, as there was for the circumcision of Jewish infants under the Old, the thing would not have admitted of any dispute; but nothing of this kind appears. For,

(a.) It is not clear that even Jewish infants were admitted into covenant by the rite of circumcision; from whence it is pleaded, that the infants of believers are admitted into it by baptism; for Abraham's female seed were taken into the covenant made with him, as well as his male seed, but not by any "visible rite" or ceremony; nor were his male seed admitted by any such rite; not by circumcision, for they were not to be circumcised until the eighth day; to have circumcised them sooner would have been criminal; and that they were in covenant from their birth, I presume, will

not be denied; as it was a national covenant, so early they were in it; the Israelites, with their infants at Horeb, had not been circumcised; nor were they when they entered into covenant with the Lord their God (Deut.29:10-15).

(b.) Circumcision was no seal of the covenant of grace under the former dispensation; nor is baptism a seal of it under the present: had circumcision been a seal of it, the covenant of grace must have been without one from Adam to Abraham: it is called a sign or token, but not a seal; it was a sign or mark in the flesh of Abraham's natural seed, a typical sign of the pollution of human nature, and of the inward circumcision of the heart; but no seal, confirming any spiritual blessing of the covenant of grace to those who had this mark or sign; it is indeed called, "a seal of the righteousness of faith" (Rom. 4:11), but not a seal to Abraham's natural seed of their interest in that righteousness, but only to Abraham himself; it was a seal to him, a confirming sign, assuring him, that the righteousness of faith, which he had before he was circumcised, should come upon the uncircumcised believing Gentiles; and therefore it was continued on his natural offspring, until that righteousness was preached unto, received by, and imputed to believing Gentiles.

(c.) Nor did baptism succeed circumcision; there is no agreement between the one and the other; not in the subjects, to whom they were administered; the use of the one and the other is not the same; and the manner of administering them different; baptism being administered to Jews and Gentiles, to male and female, and to adult persons only: not so circumcision; the use of circumcision was to distinguish the natural seed of Abraham from others; baptism is the badge of the spiritual seed of Christ, and the answer of a good conscience towards God; and represents the sufferings, burial, and resurrection of Christ; the one is by blood, the other by water; and ordinances so much differing in their subjects, use, and administration; the one can never be thought to come in the room and place of the other. Besides, baptism was in use and force before circumcision was abolished, which was not until the death of Christ; whereas, the doctrine of baptism was preached, and the ordinance itself administered, some years before that; now that which was in force before another is out of date, can never with any propriety be said to succeed, or come in the room of that other. Besides, if this was the case, as circumcision gave a right to the Passover, so would baptism to the Lord's Supper; which yet is not admitted. Now as there is nothing to be gathered out of the Old Testament to countenance infant baptism, so neither are there any passages in the New, which can be supported in favor of it.

i. Not the text in Acts 2:39. "The promise is unto you and to your children", etc. It is pretended, that this refers to the covenant made with Abraham, and to a covenant promise made to him, giving his infant children a right to the ordinance of circumcision; and is urged as a reason with the Jews, why they and their children ought to be baptized; and with the Gentiles, why they and theirs should be also, when called into a church state. But,

(i.) There is not the least mention made in the text of Abraham's covenant, or of any promise made to him, giving his infant seed a right to circumcision, and still less to baptism; nor is there the least syllable of infant baptism, nor any hint of it, from whence it can be concluded; nor by "children" are infants designed, but the posterity of the Jews, who are frequently so called in scripture, though grown up; and unless it be so understood in many places, strange interpretations must be given of them; wherefore the argument from hence for "paedobaptism" is given up by some learned men, as Dr. Hammond and others, as inconclusive.

(ii.) The promise here, be it what it may, is not observed as giving a right or claim to any ordinance; but as an encouraging motive to persons in distress, under a sense of sin, to repent of it, and declare their repentance, and yield a voluntary subjection to the ordinance of baptism; when they might hope that remission of sins would be applied to them, and they should receive a larger measure of the grace of the Spirit; wherefore repentance and baptism are urged in order to the enjoyment of the promise; and consequently must be understood of adult persons, who only are capable of repentance, and of a voluntary subjection to baptism.

(iii.) The promise is no other than the promise of life and salvation by Christ, and of remission of sins by his blood, and of an increase of grace from his Spirit; and whereas the persons addressed had imprecated the guilt of the blood of Christ, they had shed upon their posterity, as well as on themselves, which distressed them; they are told, for their relief, that the same promise would be made good to their posterity also, provided they did as they were directed to do; and even to all the Jews afar off, in distant countries and future ages, who should look on Christ and mourn, repent and believe, and be baptized: and seeing the Gentiles are sometimes described as those "afar of", the promise may be thought to reach to them who should be called by grace, repent, believe, and be baptized also; but no mention is made of their children; and had they been mentioned, the limiting clause, "Even as many as the Lord our God shall call", plainly points at and describes the persons intended, whether Jews or Gentiles, effectually called by grace, who are encouraged by the motive in the promise to profess repentance, and submit to baptism; which can only be understood of adult persons, and not of infants.

ii. Nor Romans 11:16, etc. "If the first fruits be holy", etc. For, *(i.)* By the first fruits, and lump, and by the root and branches, are not meant Abraham and his posterity, or natural seed, as such; but the first among the Jews who believed in Christ, and laid the first foundation of a gospel church state, and were first incorporated into it; Who being holy, were a pledge of the future conversion and holiness of that people in the latter day.

(ii.) Nor by the good olive tree, after mentioned, is meant the Jewish church state; which was abolished by Christ, with all the peculiar ordinances of it; and the believing Gentiles were never engrafted into it; the axe has been laid to the root of that old Jewish stock, and it is entirely cut down, and no engrafture is made upon it. But,

(iii.) By it is meant the gospel church state, in its first foundation, consisting of Jews that believed, out of which were left the Jews who believed not in Christ, and who are the branches broken off; into which church state the Gentiles were received and engrafted; which engrafture, or coalition, was first made at Antioch, when and hereafter the Gentiles partook of the root and fatness of the olive tree, enjoyed the same privileges, communicated in the same ordinances, and were satisfied with the goodness and fatness of the house of God; and this gospel church may be truly called, by the converted Jews in the latter day, their "own olive tree", into which they will be engrafted; since the first gospel church was set up at Jerusalem, and gathered out of the Jews; and so in other places, the first gospel churches consisted of Jews, the first fruits of those converted ones. From the whole it appears, that there is not the least syllable about baptism, much less of infant baptism, in the passage; nor can anything be concluded from hence in favor of it.

iii. Nor from 1 Corinthians 7:14 "For the unbelieving husband is sanctified by the wife, and the unbelieving wife is sanctified by the husband; else were your children unclean, but now are they holy"; which is by some understood of a federal holiness, giving a claim to covenant privileges, and so to baptism. But,

(i.) It should be told what these covenant privileges are; since, as we have seen, covenant interest gives no right to any ordinance, without divine direction; nor is baptism a seal of the covenant: it should be told what this covenant holiness is, whether imaginary or real; by some it is called "reputed", and is distinguished from internal holiness, which is rejected from being the sense of the text; but such holiness can never qualify persons for a New Testament ordinance; nor as the covenant of grace any such holiness belonging to it; that provides, by way of promise, real holiness, signified by putting the laws of God in the heart, by giving new hearts and new spirits, and by cleansing from all impurity, and designs real, internal holiness, shown in an holy conversation; and such who appear to have that, have an undoubted right to the ordinance of baptism, since they have received the Spirit as a Spirit of sanctification (Acts 10:47). But this cannot be meant in the text, seeing,

(ii.) It is such a holiness as heathens may have; unbelieving husbands and wives are said to have it, in virtue of their relation to believing wives and husbands, and which is prior to the holiness of their children, and on which theirs depends; but surely such will not be allowed to have federal holiness, and yet it must be of the same kind with their children; if the holiness of the children is a federal holiness, that of the unbelieving parent must be so too, from whence is the holiness of the children.

(iii.) If children, by virtue of this holiness, have claim to baptism, then much more their unbelieving parents, since they are sanctified before them, by their believing yoke fellows, and are as near to them as their children; and if the holiness of the one gives a right to baptism, why not the holiness of the other? and yet the one are baptized, and the other not, though sanctified, and whose holiness is the more near; for the holiness spoken of, be it what it may, is derived from both parents, believing and unbelieving; yea, the holiness of the children depends upon the sanctification of the unbelieving parent; for if the unbeliever is not sanctified, the children are unclean, and not holy. But,

(iv.) These words are to be understood of matrimonial holiness, even of the very act of marriage, which, in the language of the Jews, is frequently expressed by being sanctified; the word קרש to "sanctify", is used in innumerable places in the Jewish writings,[9] , to "espouse"; and in the same sense the apostle uses the word αγιαζω here, and the words may be rendered, "the unbelieving husband is espoused", or married, "to the wife"; or rather, "has been espoused", for it relates to the act of marriage past, as valid; "and the unbelieving wife has been espoused to the husband"; the preposition εν, translated "by", should be rendered "to", as it is in the very next verse; "God hath called us εν ειρηνη, to peace"; the apostle's inference from it is, "else were your children unclean", illegitimate, if their parents were not lawfully espoused and married to each other; "but now are they holy", a holy and legitimate seed, as in Ezra 9:2 (see Mal. 2:15), and no other sense can be put upon the words, than of a legitimate marriage and offspring; nothing else will suit with the case proposed to the apostle, and with his answer to it, and reasoning about it; and which sense has been allowed by many learned interpreters, ancient and modern; as Jerome, Ambrose, Erasmus,

Camerarius, Musculus, and others. There are some objections made to the practice of adult baptism, which are of little force, and to which an answer may easily be returned.

i. That though it may be allowed that adult persons, such as repent and believe, are the subjects of baptism, yet it is nowhere said, that they are the only ones: but if no others can be named as baptized, and the descriptive characters given in scripture of baptized persons are such as can "only" agree with adult, and not with infants; then it may be reasonably concluded, that the former "only" are the proper subjects of baptism.

ii. It is objected to our practice of baptizing the adult offspring of Christians, that no scriptural instance of such a practice can be given; and it is demanded of us to give an instance agreeable to our practice; since the first persons baptized were such as were converted either from Judaism or from heathenism, and about the baptism of such adult, they say, there is no controversy. But our practice is not at all concerned with the parents of the persons baptized by us, whether they be Christians, Jews, Turks, or Pagans; but with the persons themselves, whether they are believers in Christ or not; if they are the adult offspring of Christians, yet unbaptized, it is no objection to us: and if they are not, it is no bar in the way of admitting them to baptism, if they themselves are believers; many, and it may be the greater part of such baptized by us are the adult offspring of those who, without breach of charity, cannot be considered as Christians. As for the first persons that were baptized, they were neither proselytes from Judaism nor from Heathenism; but the offspring of Christians, of such that believed in the Messiah; the saints before the coming of Christ, and at his coming, were as good Christians as any that have lived since; so that those good men who lived before Abraham, as far back as to the first man, and those that lived after him, even to the coming of Christ, Eusebius[10] observes, that if any should affirm them to be Christians, though not in name, yet in reality, he would not say amiss. Judaism, at the time of Christ's coming, was the same with Christianity, and not in opposition to it; so that there was no such thing as conversion from Judaism to Christianity. Zachariah and Elizabeth, whose offspring John the first baptizer was, and Mary, the mother of our Lord, who was baptized by John, when adult, were as good Christians, and as strong believers in Jesus, as the Messiah, as soon as born, and even when in the womb of the Virgin, as have been since; and these surely must be allowed to be the adult offspring of Christians; such were the apostles of Christ, and the first followers of him, who were the adult offspring of such who believed in the Messiah, and embraced him upon the first notice of him, and cannot be said to be converted from Judaism to Christianity; Judaism not existing until the opposition to Jesus being the Messiah became general and national; after that, indeed, those of the Jewish nation who believed in Christ, may be said to be proselytes from Judaism to Christianity, as the apostle Paul and others: and so converts made by the preaching of the gospel among the Gentiles, were proselytes from heathenism to Christianity; but then it is unreasonable to demand of us instances of the adult offspring of such being baptized, and added to the churches; since the scripture history of the first churches contained in the Acts of the Apostles, only gives an account of the first planting of these churches, and of the baptism of those of which they first consisted; but not of the additions of members to them in later times; wherefore to give instances of those who were born of them, and brought up by them, as baptized in adult years, cannot reasonably be required of us: but on the other hand, if infant children were admitted to baptism in these times, upon the faith and baptism of their parents, and their becoming Christians; it is strange, exceeding strange, that among the many thousands baptized in Jerusalem, Samaria, Corinth, and other places, that there should be no one instance of any of them bringing their children with them to be

baptized, and claiming the privilege of baptism for them upon their own faith; nor of their doing this in any short time after. This is a case that required no length of time, and yet not a single instance can be produced.

iii. It is objected, that no time can be assigned when infants were cast out of covenant, or cut off from the seal of it. If by the covenant is meant the covenant of grace, it should be first proved that they are in it, as the natural seed of believers, which cannot be done; and when that is, it is time enough to talk of their being cast out, when and how. If by it is meant Abraham's covenant, the covenant of circumcision, the answer is the cutting off was when circumcision ceased to be an ordinance of God, which was at the death of Christ: if by it is meant the national covenant of the Jews, the ejection of Jewish parents, with their children, was when God wrote a "Loammi" upon that people, as a body politic and ecclesiastic; when he broke his covenant with them, signified by breaking his two staffs, beauty and bands.

iv. A clamorous outcry is made against us, as abridging the privileges of infants, by denying baptism to them; making them to be lesser under the gospel dispensation than under the law, and the gospel dispensation less glorious. But as to the gospel dispensation, it is the more glorious for infants being left out of its church state; that is, for its being not national and carnal, as before; but congregational and spiritual; consisting not of infants, without understanding, but of rational and spiritual men, believers in Christ; and these not of a single country, as Judea, but in all parts of the world: and as for infants, their privileges now are many and better, who are eased from the painful rite of circumcision; it is a rich mercy, and a glorious privilege of the gospel, that the believing Jews and their children are delivered from it; and that the Gentiles and theirs are not obliged to it; which would have bound them over to fulfil the whole law: to which may be added, that being born of Christian parents, and having a Christian education, and of having opportunities of hearing the gospel, as they grow up; and that not in one country only, but in many; are greater privileges than the Jewish children had under the former dispensation.

v. It is objected, that there are no more express commands in scripture for keeping the first day of the week as a sabbath; nor for women partaking of the Lord's Supper, and other things, than for the baptism of infants. As for the first, though there is no express precept for the observance of it, yet there are precedents of its being observed for religious services (Acts 20:7; 1 Cor. 16:1,2), and though we have no example of infant baptism, yet if there were scriptural precedents of it, we should think ourselves obliged to follow them. As for women's right to partake of the Lord's Supper, we have sufficient proof of it; since these were baptized as well as men; and having a right to one ordinance, had to another, and were members of the first church, communicated with it, and women, as well as

men, were added to it (Acts 8:12; 1:14; 5:1,14) we have a precept for it: "Let a man", ανψρωποϖ, a word of the common gender, and signifies both man and woman, "examine him or herself, and so let him or her eat" (1 Cor. 11:29; see Gal. 3:28); and we have also examples of it in Mary the mother of our Lord, and other women, who, with the disciples, constituted the gospel church at Jerusalem; and as they continued with one accord in the apostles' doctrine and in prayer, so in fellowship and in breaking of bread; let the same proof be given of the baptism of infants, and it will be admitted.

vi. Antiquity is urged in favor of infant baptism; it is pretended that this is a tradition of the church received from the apostles; though of this no other proof is given, but the testimony of Origen, none before that; and this is taken, not from any of his genuine Greek writings, only from some Latin translations, confessedly interpolated, and so corrupted, that it is owned, one is at a loss to find Origen in Origen. No mention is made of this practice in the first two centuries, no instance given of it until the third, when Tertullian is the first who spoke of it, and at the same time spoke against it.[11] And could it be carried up higher, it would be of no force, unless it could be proved from the sacred scriptures, to which only we appeal, and by which the thing in debate is to be judged and determined. We know that innovations and corruptions very early obtained, and even in the times of the apostles; and what is pretended to be near those times, is the more to be suspected as the traditions of the false apostles;[12] the antiquity of a custom is no proof of the truth and genuineness of it;[13] "The customs the people are vain" (Jer. 10:3). I proceed to consider,

IV. Fourthly, the way and manner of baptizing; and to prove, that it is by immersion, plunging the body in water, and covering it with it. Custom, and the common use of writing in this controversy, have so far prevailed, that for the most part immersion is usually called the "mode" of baptism; whereas it is properly baptism itself; to say that immersion or dipping is the mode of baptism, is the same thing as to say, that dipping is the mode of dipping; for as Sir John Floyer[14] observes "Immersion is no circumstance, but "the very act of baptism", used by our Saviour and his disciples, in the institution of baptism." And Calvin expressly says,[15] "The word "baptizing" signifies to plunge; and it is certain, that the rite of plunging was used by the ancient churches." And as for sprinkling, that cannot, with any propriety, be called a mode of baptism; it would be just such, good sense as to say, sprinkling is the mode of dipping, since baptism and dipping are the same; hence the learned Selden,[16] who in the former part of his life, might have seen infants dipped in fonts, but lived to see immersion much disused, had reason to say, "In England, of late years, I ever thought the parson "baptized his own fingers" rather than the child," because he dipped the one, and sprinkled the other. That baptism is immersion, or the dipping of a person in water, and covering him with it is to be proved,

1. From the proper and primary signification of the word βαπτιζω, "baptize", which in its first and primary sense, signifies to "dip or plunge into"; and so it is rendered by our best lexicographers, "mergo", "immergo", "dip or plunge into." And in a secondary and consequential sense, "abluo, lavo", "wash", because what is dipped is washed, there being no proper washing but by dipping; but never "perfundo or aspergo", "pour or sprinkle"; so the lexicon published by Constantine, Budaeus, etc. and those of Hadrian Junius, Plantinus, Scapula, Stephens, Schrevelius, Stockius, and others; besides a great number of critics; as Beza, Casanbon, Witsius, etc. which might be produced. By whose united testimonies the thing is out of question. Had our translators, instead of adopting the Greek word baptize in all places where the ordinance of baptism is made mention of, truly translated it, and not have left it untranslated, as they have, the controversy about the manner of baptizing would have been at an end, or rather have been prevented; had they used the word dip, instead of baptize, as they should have done, there would have been no room for a question about it.

2. That baptism was performed by immersion, appears by the places chosen for the administration of it; as the river Jordan by John, where he baptized many, and where our Lord himself was baptized by him (Matthew 3:6,13,16), but why should he choose the river to baptize in, and baptize

in it, if he did not administer the ordinance by immersion? had it been done any other way, there was no occasion for any confluence of water, much less a river;[17] a basin of water would have sufficed. John also, it is said, "was baptizing in Aenon, near Salim, because there was much water" (John 3:23), which was convenient for baptism, for which this reason is given; and not for convenience for drink for men and their cattle, which is not expressed nor implied; from whence we may gather, as Calvin on the text does, "That baptism was performed by John and Christ, by plunging the whole body under water;" and so Piscator, Aretius, Grotius, and others on the same passage.

3. That this was the way in which it was anciently administered, is clear from various instances of baptism recorded in scripture, and the circumstances attending them; as that of our Lord, of whom it is said, "That when he was baptized he went up straightway out of the water", which supposes he had been in it; and so Piscator infers from his going up out of it, that therefore he went down into it, and was baptized in the river itself; of which going down there would have been no need, had the ordinance been administered to him in another way, as by sprinkling or pouring a little water on his head, he and John standing in the midst of the river, as the painter and engraver ridiculously describe it: and certain it is, he was then baptized in Jordan; the evangelist Mark says "into Jordan" (Mark 1:9), not at the banks of Jordan, but into the waters of it; for which reason he went into it, and when baptized, "came up out" of it, not "from" it, but "out" of it; απο and εξ, signifying the same, as in Luke 4:35,41. So the preposition is used in the Septuagint version of Psalm 40:2 εξ and apo are "aequipollent", as several lexicographers from Xenophon observe. The baptism of the eunuch is another instance of baptism by immersion; when he and Philip were "come unto a certain water", to the water side, which destroys a little piece of criticism, as if their going into the water, after expressed, was no other than going to the brink of the water, to the water side, whereas they were come to that before; and baptism being agreed upon, "they went down both into the water", both Philip and the eunuch, "and he baptized him; and when they were come up out of the water", etc. Now we do not reason merely from the circumstances of "going down into, and coming up out of the water"; we know that persons may go down into water, and come up out of it, and never be immersed in it; but when it is expressly said, upon these persons going down into the water, that Philip baptized, or dipped, the eunuch; and when this was done, that both came up out of it, these circumstances strongly corroborate, without the explanation of the word "baptized", that it was performed by immersion; for these circumstances cannot agree with any other way of administering it but that; for a man can hardly be thought to be in his senses who can imagine that Philip went down with the eunuch into the water to sprinkle or pour a little water on him, and then gravely come out of it; hence, as the above learned commentator, Calvin, on the text says, "Here we plainly see what was the manner of baptizing with the ancients, for they plunged the whole body into the water; now custom obtaining, that the minister only sprinkles the body or the head." So Barnabas,[18] an apostolic writer of the first century, and who is mentioned in the Acts of the Apostles, as a companion of the apostle Paul, describes baptism by going down into and by coming up out of the water; "We descend," says he, "into the water full of sin and filth; and we ascend, bringing forth fruit in the heart, having fear and hope in Jesus, through the Spirit."

4. The end of baptism, which is to represent the burial of Christ, cannot be answered in any other way than by immersion, or covering the body in water; that baptism is an emblem of the burial of Christ, is clear from Romans 6:4 and Colossians 2:12. It would be endless to quote the great number, even of "paedobaptist" writers, who ingenuously acknowledge that the allusion in these

passages, is to the ancient rite of by immersion: as none but such who are dead are buried, so none but such who are dead to sin, and to the law by the body of Christ, or who profess to be so, are to be buried in and by baptism, or to be baptized; and as none can be properly said to be buried, unless under ground, and covered with earth; so none can be said to be baptized, but such who are put under water, and covered with it; and nothing short of this can be a representation of the burial of Christ, and of ours with him; not sprinkling, or pouring a little water on the face; for a corpse cannot be said to be buried when only a little earth or dust is sprinkled or poured on it.

5. This may be concluded from the various figurative and typical baptisms spoken of in scripture. As,

(1.) From the waters of the flood, which Tertullian calls[19] the baptism of the world, and of which the apostle Peter makes baptism the antitype (1 Pet. 3:20,21). The ark in which Noah and his family were saved by water, was God's ordinance; it was made according to the pattern he gave to Noah, as baptism is; and as that was the object of the scorn of men, so is the ordinance of baptism, rightly administered; and as it represented a burial, when Noah and his family were shut up in it, so baptism; and when the fountains of the great deep were broken up below, and the windows of heaven were opened above, the ark, with those in it, were as it were covered with and immersed in water; and so was a figure of baptism by immersion: and as there were none but adult persons in the ark, who were saved by water in it, so none but adult persons are the proper subjects of water baptism; and though there were few who were in the ark, it was attended with a salutary effect to them, they were saved by water; so such who truly believe in Christ, and are baptized, shall be saved, and that "by the resurrection of Jesus Christ", which was typified by the coming of Noah and his family out of the ark; to which baptism, as the antitype, corresponds, being an emblem of the same (Rom. 6:4,5; Col. 2:12).

(2.) From the passage of the Israelites under the cloud and through the sea, when "they were said to be baptized unto Moses, in the cloud and in the sea" (1 Cor. 10:1,2). There are various things in this account which agree with baptism; this was following Moses, who directed them into the sea, and went before them; so baptism is a following Christ, who has set an example to tread in his steps; and as the Israelites were baptized into Moses, so believers are baptized into Christ, and put him on; and this passage of theirs was after their coming out of Egypt, and at the beginning of their journey through the wilderness to Canaan; so baptism is administered to believers, at their first coming out of darkness and bondage worse than Egyptian, and when they first enter on their Christian pilgrimage; and as joy followed upon the former, "Then sang Moses and the children of Israel", etc. so it often follows upon the latter; the eunuch, after baptism, went on his way rejoicing: but chiefly this passage was a figure of baptism by immersion; as the Israelites were "under the cloud", and so under water, and covered with it, as persons baptized by immersion are; "and passed through the sea", that standing up as a wall on both sides them, with the cloud over them; thus surrounded they were as persons immersed in water, and so said to be baptized; and thus Grotius remarks upon the passage.

(3.) From the various washings, bathings, or baptisms of the Jews; called "various", because of the different persons and things washed or dipped, as the same Grotius observes; and not because of different sorts of washing, for there is but one way of washing, and that is by dipping; what has a little water only sprinkled or poured on it, cannot be said to be washed; the Jews had their

sprinklings, which were distinct from washings or bathings, which were always performed by immersion; it is a rule, with them, that "wherever in the law washing of the flesh, or of the clothes, is mentioned, it means nothing else than חכילת כל הגוף "the dipping of the whole body" in a laver--for if any man dips himself all over except the tip of his little finger, he is still in his uncleanness."[20] according to them.

(4.) From the sufferings of Christ being called a baptism; "I have a baptism to be baptized with", etc. (Luke 12:50), not water baptism, nor the baptism of the Spirit, with both which he had been baptized; but the baptism of his sufferings, yet to come, he was desirous of; these are called so in allusion to baptism, as it is an immersion; and is expressive of the abundance of them, sometimes signified by deep waters, and floods of waters; and Christ is represented as plunged into them, covered and overwhelmed with them (Ps. 62:7; 69:1,2).

(5.) From the extraordinary donation of the Holy Spirit, and his gifts unto, and his descent upon the apostles on the day of Pentecost, which is called "baptizing" (Acts 1:5; 2:1,2), expressive of the very great abundance of them, in allusion to baptism or dipping, in a proper sense, as the learned Casaubon[21] observes; *"Regard is had in this place to the proper signification of the word βαπτιζειν, to immerse or dip; and in this sense the apostles are truly said to be baptized, for the house in which this was done, was filled with the Holy Ghost; so that the apostles seemed to be plunged into it, as into some pool." All which typical and figurative baptisms, serve to strengthen the proper sense of the word, as it signifies an immersion and dipping the body into, and covering it in water, which only can support the figure used. Nor is this sense of the word to be set aside or weakened by the use of it in Mark 7:4 and Luke 11:38 in the former, it is said, "Except they wash, βαπτιζωνται, baptize, or dip themselves, they eat not"; and in it mention is made of βαπτισμων, "washings or dippings" of cups and pots, brazen vessels, and of tables or beds; and in the latter, the Pharisee is said to marvel at Christ, that he had not first εβαπτισψη, "washed, or dipped, before dinner"; all which agrees with the superstitious traditions of the elders, here referred to, which enjoined dipping in all the cases and instances spoken of, and so serve but the more to confirm the sense of the word contended for; for the Pharisees, upon touching the common people or their clothes, as they returned from market, or from any court of judicature, were obliged to immerse themselves in water before they eat; and so the Samaritan Jews:[22] "If the Pharisees, says Maimonides,[23] touched but the garments of the common people, they were defiled all one as if they had touched a profluvious person, and needed immersion," or were obliged to it: and Scaliger,[24] from the Jews observes, "That the more superstitious part of them, everyday, before they sat down to meat, dipped the whole body; hence the Pharisees admiration at Christ" (Luke 11:38). And not only cups and pots, and brazen vessels were washed by dipping, or putting them into water, in which way unclean vessels were washed according to the law (Lev. 11:32), but even beds, pillows, and bolsters, unclean in a ceremonial sense, were washed in this way, according to the traditions of the elders referred to; for they say,[25] "A bed that is wholly defiled, if a man "dips" it part by part, it is pure." Again,[26] "If he "dips the bed" in it (a pool of water) though its feet are plunged into the thick clay (at the bottom of the pool) it is clean." And as for pillows and bolsters, thus they say,[27] "A pillow or a bolster of skin, when a man lifts up the mouth of them out of the water, the water which is in them will be drawn; what must be done? He must "dip" them, and lift them up by their fringes." Thus, according to these traditions, the various things mentioned were washed by immersion; and instead of weakening, strengthen the sense of the word pleaded for.

The objections against baptism, as immersion, taken from some instances of baptism recorded in scripture, are of no force; as that of the three thousand, in Acts 2, not with respect to their number; it may be observed, that though these were added to the church in one and the same day, it does not follow, that they were baptized in one day; but be it that they were, there were twelve apostles to administer the ordinance, and it was but two hundred and fifty persons apiece; and besides, there were seventy disciples, administrators of it; and supposing them employed, it will reduce the number to six or seven and thirty persons each: and the difference between dipping and sprinkling is very inconsiderable, since the same form of words is used in the one way as in the other; and therefore it might be done in one day, and in a small part of it too.[28] Nor with respect to convenience for the administration of it; as water and places of it sufficient to baptize in: here can be no objection, when it is observed, what number of private baths were in Jerusalem for ceremonial uncleanness; the many pools in the city, and the various apartments and things in the temple fit for such a use; as the dipping room for the high priest, the molten sea for the common priests, and the ten brazen lavers, each of which held forty baths of water sufficient for the immersion of the whole body; all which they might be allowed the use of, as they were of the temple; they "having favor with all the people": not with respect to clothes, and change of garments; it was only everyone's providing and bringing change of raiment for himself. Another instance objected to is, that of the baptism of Saul (Acts 9:18), supposed to be done in the house where he was: but that does not necessarily follow, but rather the contrary; since he "arose" from the place where he was, in order to be baptized; and admitting it was done in the house, it is highly probable there was a bath in the house, in which it might be performed; since it was the house of a Jew, with whom it was usual to have baths to wash their whole bodies in on certain occasions; and had it been performed by sprinkling or pouring a little water on him, he needed not to have rose for that purpose. Besides, he was not only bid to arise and be baptized, which would sound very oddly if rendered, "be sprinkled" or "poured" (Acts 22:16), but he himself says, that he, with others, were "buried by" or "in baptism" (Rom. 6:4). Another instance is that of the jailer and his household (Acts 16:33), in which account there is nothing that makes it improbable that it was done by immersion; for it seems to be a clear case, that the jailer, upon his conversion, took the apostles out of prison into his own house, where they preached to him and his family (Acts 16:32), and after this they went out of his house, and he and his were baptized, very probably in the river without the city, where the oratory was (Acts 16:13), for it is certain, that after the baptism of him and his family, he brought the apostles into his house again, and set meat before them (Acts 16:33,34). Upon the whole, these instances produced, fail of showing the improbability of baptism by immersion; which must appear clear and manifest to every attentive reader of his Bible, notwithstanding all that has been opposed unto it. The next thing to be considered is,

V. Fifthly, the form in which this ordinance is to be administered; which is "in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost" (Matthew 28:19), which contains in it a proof of a Trinity of Persons in the unity of the divine essence, of the Deity of each Person, and of their equality to, and distinction from each other; and shows, that this ordinance is performed under the authority of all Three; in which a person submitting to it, expresses his faith in them, and invocation of them, and gives up himself to them; obliging himself to yield obedience to what they require of him, as well as putting himself under their care and protection. This form is sometimes a little varied and otherwise expressed; as sometimes only "in the name of the Lord Jesus" (Acts 8:16), which is a part of the form for the whole; and includes in it the substance of it, and of Christian baptism; and everything relating to the person and offices of Christ, and his relation to

and connection with the other Two persons. Cornelius and his family were ordered to be baptized, "in the name of the Lord" (Acts 10:48), that is, in the name of Jehovah, Father, Son, and Spirit; for κυριοϖ, Lord, in the New Testament, answers to Jehovah in the Old. The form of baptism in Matthew 28:19 is in the name of "the Father", etc. which single name denotes the one Deity, power, and substance of Father, Son, and Spirit; the equal dignity, co-eternal kingdom, and government in the Three perfect Persons; as it is expressed in the synodical epistle of the general council at Constantinople.[29]

VI. Sixthly, the ends and uses for which baptism is appointed, and which are answered by it.

1. One end of it, and a principal one, as has been frequently hinted, is, to represent the sufferings, burial, and resurrection of Christ; which is plainly and fully suggested in Romans 6:4,5 and Colossians 2:12 his sufferings are represented by going into the water, and being overwhelmed in it, his burial by a short continuance under it, and being covered with it, and his resurrection by an immersion out of it.

2. It was practiced both by John and by the apostles of Christ, for the remission of sins (Mark 1:4; Acts 2:38), not that that is the procuring and meritorious cause of it, which only is the blood of Christ; but they who submit unto it, may, by means of it, be led, directed, and encouraged to expect it from Christ. And so,

3. In like manner it is for the washing away of sin, and cleansing from it; "Arise, and be baptized, and wash thy sins" (Acts 22:16), this only is really done the blood of Christ, which cleanses from all sin; baptism neither washes away original nor actual sin, it has no such virtue in it;[30] but it is a means of directing to Christ the Lamb of God, who, by his atoning blood and sacrifice, has purged and continues to take away the sins of men.

4. A salutary or saving use and effect is ascribed unto it; "The like figure whereunto, baptism, doth also now save us"; should it be asked how, and by what means? the answer follows, "By the resurrection of Jesus Christ" (1 Pet. 3:21), that is, by leading the faith of the person baptized to Christ, as delivered for his offences, and as risen again for his justification.

5. In the same passage it is said to be of this use, and to serve this purpose, "The answer of a good conscience towards God"; a man who believes baptism to be an ordinance of God, and submits to it as such, discharges a good conscience, the consequence of which is joy and peace; for though "for" keeping the commands of God there is no reward, yet there is "in" keeping them; and this is their reward, the testimony of a good conscience: for great peace have they which love God and keep his commandments.

6. Yielding obedience to this ordinance of Christ, is an evidence of love to God and Christ (1 John 5:3), and such who from a principle of love to Christ keep his commandments, may expect, according to his promise, to have fresh manifestations of his and his Father's love, and to have communion with Father, Son, and Spirit (John 14:15,21,23). This is an end to be had in view, in obedience to it, and a very encouraging one.

The

Ancient Mode Of Baptizing,

BY IMMERSION, PLUNGING, OR DIPPING INTO WATER;

Maintained And Vindicated;

Against the Cavils and Exceptions of the Author of a late Pamphlet, entitled, The manner of Baptizing with Water cleared up from the Word of God and right Reason, etc.

Together with some remarks upon the Author's REASONS for the Practice of a FREE or mix Communion in Churches.

CHAPTER 1.

Some Remarks upon the Title of the Book, and the Author's method of writing.

The controversy about baptism, both with respect to its mode of administration, and proper subjects, has been of late so diligently searched into, and thoroughly discussed, that it may well seem needless to trouble the world with any further writings upon that subject, it being in a great measure only *actum agere*, to do the same thing over again, which has been well done already; but those of a different persuasion from us, being continually thrusting their *crambe millies cocta* upon us, and repeating the same things over and over again, though they have been sufficiently answered already, makes it necessary for us, in the defense of truth, and for the honor of Christ in his ordinance, to reply. A late anonymous author has thought fit to let the world know what a talent he has in that part of the controversy, which concerns the mode of administering this ordinance, by publishing a tract, whose title page runs thus, *The Manner of baptizing with Water, cleared up from the Word of God, and right Reason, in a plain free Debate upon that subject, between Mr.*. J.P. *and Mr.*. B. W. June 6th, 1726. *Published for instruction in righteousness*. How he has acquitted himself in the management thereof, and what improvements and discoveries he has made beyond others, is our present business to consider. It seems our author has not thought fit to say any thing concerning the subjects of baptism, but has confined himself to the mode of administration of it; whether it was because he did not care to engage in that part of the controversy, or whether he thought that it has been sufficiently handled already, and this not so, is what I do not pretend to determine; therefore seeing he has not thought proper to take notice of it, I shall not think my-self concerned to say any thing about it. From the title page we are given to expect, that *the manner of baptizing with water* shall be *cleared up* to us; for it seems we were all in the dark before about it,

or at least, there were such mists and fogs beclouding our apprehensions concerning this ordinance, that there was no seeing *clearly* into it, until the publication of this treatise, by which the author fancies these are dissipated, and the affair let in a *clear* light; but I hope to make it appear, before I have done, that instead of giving more light, he has *darkened counsel by words without knowledge*. The title also promises that this shall be cleared up *from the word of God*, *and right reason*. By the *word of God*, I suppose he means the written word of God, the scriptures of truth, which indeed are the only rule of our faith and practice; and from whence, under the conduct of the blessed Spirit, all our light in faith and worship springs; but what he means by *right reason*, needs explaining, and is not so easy to determine. If he means a just and strong way of reasoning, one might justly expect to find somewhat of it in this his performance; but the case being otherwise, I shall not, at present, farther inquire what else he designed by it; but only observe to him, that we ought to believe and act in matters of faith and worship, upon the sole credit and authority of the great God, as he has revealed his mind and will in the sacred writings.

The method which our author has taken, in order to set this matter in a clear light, is dialogue-wise, or in the form of a conference between two persons, or to use his own words, *in a plain free debate*. What moved him to take this method does not indeed much concern me to know, but yet I cannot forbear thinking, one reason might be, that he might have the opportunity of making his antagonist speak what he himself pleased; for it would have betrayed his weakness yet more, to have produced such arguments and objections which he was not, in his own way, able to solve: though at the same time it is an instance of his disingenuity, not fairly to propose those arguments which are made use of, nor give them their full weight and force, which he ought to have done in handling a controversy honestly and faithfully; as well as making his friend speak such weak and ridiculous things as never were, at least publicly, made use of in this controversy. Had he had a mind to have made a trial of his skill and his talents and abilities this way, why did not he take out the arguments of some such writers as *Tombs*, *Danvers*, *Keach*, *Stennet*, or *Gale*, and fairly propose them in their own words, and give an answer to them? But this would not have answered his design, which seems to be, exposing to ridicule and contempt the ordinance of baptism, by plunging or dipping; and would, moreover, have been a task too difficult and laborious for him. Perhaps he also thought, this method best to conceal himself from being known to be the author of it; but if it is truth he is in search of, and bearing a testimony to, why should he be ashamed of it? why did not he put his name to his book? This is such a poor, mean, and cowardly way of writing, as manifestly betrays either shame or fear to appear publicly in the cause he has espoused; if he thinks he is fighting *the Lord's battles*, why does not he appear like a man, in the open field, and not lie scouting behind the hedge? But perhaps this is to keep off a full blow that he is afraid might be given to him. But to go on, this debate or conference is represented, as managed by two persons, under the fictitious names of Mr.. J. P. a plunger in water, and Mr.. B. W. a baptizer with water; for it seems, according to our author, that plunging *in* water, and baptizing *with* water, are directly opposite to each other; but unless he can tell us, how a person can be baptized or dipped *into* water, without being baptized *with* it, they will not appear so opposite as he imagines, but of this more hereafter.

It is scarce worth my while to take any notice of the time when this conference was held, unless it be just to remark, that it would have been as well for the credit of the author, the good and peace of the churches of Christ, and the glory of his name, or better, if it had never been, or at least, if it had never been published; but it seems it is *published for instruction in righteousness*; but if any are instructed by it in that way, in which our blessed Lord thought it became him and his followers *to*

fulfill all righteousness, it will be contrary to the design and intention of the author; though I am credibly informed, that two persons have been already convinced by reading his book, that plunging or dipping the whole body in water, is the right way and mode of administering Baptism; such is the force of truth, that it will break out and appear, in spite of all opposition made against it.

I have nothing more to observe here, but only, that seeing the author has not thought fit to discover his name, the reader is desired to observe, that I shall call him by the name of Mr.. B. W, which is what he has been pleased to assume to himself; and so proceed to the consideration of this wild, jumbling, and confused debate, in the best order and method into which I am capable of ranging it: Though I should have observed to the reader, the terms or articles agreed upon in this conference. As,

1. "That whatever was spoke, should be tried by the written word of God, and that only." But I thought from the title page, that right reason was to be joined to the word of God, in the management of this debate; but perhaps the mode of baptizing, the thing debated, is to be tried by the one, and *cleared* up by the other.

2. "That in all they should use plainness of speech, without any cunning craftiness; granting unto him that spoke, the liberty of explaining his own words, and meaning;" but if *cunning craftiness* is not made use of, and *a handling the word of God deceitfully*, in this debate, by Mr. B. W. I am much mistaken.

3. "That all be done with the spirit of meekness, and true Christianity; without passion, prejudice, bitter reflection, or railing accusation." How Mr. B. W. has conformed and acted agreeably to this article, may be very easily observed, when he calls baptism, as administered by plunging, *a superstitious invention*; and a pleading for it, *fathering foolish lies upon God*, page 23 *and will-worship*, page 24. The last article is, "That they both should keep within the bounds of brevity "and civility; the one must not be tedious in speaking, nor the other troublesome in interrupting:" Which terms being agreed upon, to work they go, and what they made of it, is now our business to inquire.

CHAPTER 2

The first argument for dipping or plunging in water, as the right mode of baptizing, taken from John's practice, and our Lord's example, in Matthew 3:16 with the objections of Mr. B.W. thereunto, considered.

Mr. *B. W.* introduces his antagonist in page 6 producing the instance of Christ's being baptized by *John* in *Jordan*, in favor of plunging or dipping in water, as the right and only mode of baptizing: the text cited is, Matthew 3:16, *And Jesus, when he was baptized, went up straightway out of the water*; from whence he argues, that he had been in it, seeing he could never be said to go out of that wherein he had not been. To which Mr. *B. W.* replies:

1. That the words signify no more than that he *went up* from *the water*; as, says he, persons of your judgment have been often told. It is true, it is kind in such learned Gentlemen as Mr. *B*. *W*. that they will condescend to instruct such poor ignorant creatures as we plungers are commonly represented, and as I suppose this author takes us to be; but when they have done their part, we are left without excuse, and cannot say, that we have not been *told* to the contrary; though it is prodigiously affronting, that after all the pains they have taken to instruct us, yet that we should strenuously insist on the justness of our translation, as we think, to be a little more serious, we have just reason to do. The reason of this low criticism is, because the preposition απω, and not εφκ, is here made use of, but απω signifies *out of*, as well as *from*, and answers to the Hebrew מז, which also is of the same signification; and the rather it should be rendered so here, not only because it suits best with the scope of the place, but agrees with that parallel text in Acts 8:39 where εφκ is made use of: So that there can be no foundation there for this trifling criticism. But if Mr. *B*. *W*. should question whether the word απω is ever used in this sense, let him turn to the Septuagint in Psalm 40:2 which he seems to have some regard for, and there he will find it, where *David* says, the Lord *brought* him *up out of an horrible pit*, κι απω πηλου ιλυοϖ, *and out of the miry clay*. But,

2. He adds, "Supposing the translation very right, I wonder, says he, where "dipping, overwhelming, or plunging, can be seen therein!" What a prodigious deal of strong reasoning is here? And I as much wonder too, where washing with water, either by pouring or sprinkling, can be seen therein. He goes on, "you say, he went out of the water, therefore he had been in it; but if you had said, he had been dipped, overwhelmed, or plunged, I should have denied the consequence."

It seems, however, that he is willing to grant, that Christ's going into the water, and being there, is a necessary inference and consequence, justly deduced from his coming up out of the water; though he is unwilling to allow plunging to be so, for otherwise I doubt not, but that he would have denied the one as well as the other; and I hope he will be willing to grant, that Christ went down into the water, in order to be baptized, and that he came up out of it as a baptized person; therefore he is desired to observe, that we do not infer plunging merely from Christ's going down into the water, nor from his coming up out of it, but from his going down into it in order to be baptized, and from his coming up out of it as a baptized person; for that a person may go into water, and come again out of it, and not be plunged into it, we know as well as he; but that a person should go into water, and be baptized in it, as Christ was, without being dipped or plunged into it, is what we deny; and if those circumstance, of John's administering this ordinance in the river *Jordan*, and Christ, when baptized, coming up out of the water, are not demonstrative proofs of plunging, yet they are at least strong presumptive ones, and such as I challenge him to produce the like, in favor of this ordinance being administered to Christ, by washing with water, either by pouring or sprinkling. If plunging is not a *necessary inference* from what is revealed concerning Christ's baptism, I am sure sprinkling or pouring of water can never be; and I will leave it to any *impartial man of judgment*, to use his own phrase, whether there is not a greater probability, to put it upon no other foot, of Christ's being baptized by immersion, when he went into the *river Jordan* to be baptized, and accordingly was baptized there by *John*, than there is of his being baptized in that river only by an affusion or sprinkling of water upon him: So that he has but little reason, with that air of assurance, and in that dogmatical way, to say, "that John baptized in Jordan is true, but he never dipped nor plunged any in his life;" as he does in page 10. And here I cannot forbear mentioning a passage of those excellent divines, *John Polyander*, *Andrew Rivet*, *Anthony WaLeus*, and Anthony *Thysius*, who at the same time that they are endeavoring to have the mode of baptism, either by plunging or

sprinkling, accounted an indifferent thing, acknowledge this instance of Christ's baptism to be an example of plunging. Their words are these,[1] "Whether baptism is to be administered by a single or a trine immersion, was always judged a thing indifferent in the Christian church; as also whether plunging or sprinkling is to be used, seeing no express command is extant concerning it; and examples of sprinkling as well as of plunging may be found in scripture; for as in Matthew 1:1 Christ went into the water, and came out of it, as also the *Ethiopian*, Acts 8. So, many thousands are said to be baptized in one day, in the *city of Jerusalem*, Acts 2. Likewise many in private houses (Acts 16, 18; 1 Cor. 1:16), where such a going into water was scarcely possible:" Which, by the way, is a mistake in those great men, for none of the texts alleged, though they prove a baptism of whole households, yet they do not prove that it was administered in their houses; for most of them plainly shew, that this was performed before the apostles entrance into them; and if it had been done there, it would be no proof or evidence that it was done by sprinkling, seeing proper accommodations to baptize by immersion might be had, even in a house: Though there is no reason, as I have hinted, to suppose it was done there; all that I produced this passage for, is to show, that though those valuable writers were fond of these instances, as evidences of sprinkling; yet they could not but acknowledge, that the baptism of Christ, and of the Eunuch, were examples of plunging. But to return: I desire, when our author insinuates, that Christ's being plunged by *John* in the river *Jordan*, when he was baptized by him, is a *human conjecture*, which he is not willing to build his faith upon; I desire, I say, that he would consider whether his suppositions that Christ went *ankle* or *knee* deep into the water, and was baptized by pouring or sprinkling water upon him, and that the multitudes baptized by *John* in *Jordan*, went down some *little way* into the water, from whence, being baptized, without any such thing as *stripping*, and *shifting*, and *plunging*, as his words are, "they straightway came up, and went about their business," are not *human conjectures*; and whether, seeing things are so, he may not be justly numbered among those who build their faith upon human conjectures, which he seems to be resolved against. And if nothing but conjectures can be formed from Christ's baptism, concerning the mode of it, I persuade myself, that to every thinking and unprejudiced person, the conjecture, if it must be called so, of Christ's being plunged, when baptized, will appear more probable, and much preferable to that of his having water poured or sprinkled on him. As for his rejecting the observation which same have made on Mark 1:9 and saying, that it might as well be let alone, I do not much wonder at it, it no ways agreeing with his notion of baptism. The observation is this, that whereas it is said in Mark 1:9 that Jesus *was baptized of John in Jordan*, it might have been rendered εις τον Ιορδανην, *into Jordan*, as the preposition εις is frequently translated. Now to say, that he was *poured* or *sprinkled* of *John* into *Jordan*, would want sense, but to say, that he was plunged or dipped into *Jordan*, runs very smooth, and is very good sense; for a person cannot be said to be baptized, or dipped *in* a river, without being baptized or dipped *into* it; and indeed this is the meaning of all those scriptures which speak of *John's* baptizing in *Jordan*, as Matthew 3:6 and Mark 1:5. And whereas he says, that the Holy Ghost intends by it *a baptizing in Jordan*; he ought to observe, that this cannot be without a baptizing into it; to which, I suppose, he will readily reply, that this is taking for granted that the word properly signifies *to dip or plunge*; and he may take it for granted that we will do so, until he, or somebody else, can give us an instance where the word is otherways used; which I believe he, and greater masters of the Greek tongue than himself, will never be able to do. But,

3. Mr. *B. W.* not only represents plunging, as urged from Christ's baptism, to be a mere *non sequitur*, and an human conjecture, but also attended with nonsense, and very gross absurdities; as when he says, page 9 "By the same way of reasoning, you may as well persuade an impartial man

of judgment, that Christ is under water still, because it is said, that he went into the place where John at first baptized, and there he abode (John 10:40)." As if Christ's going to *Bethabara*, a place where *John* had formerly baptized, and Christ had dwelt in, was a parallel case to his going down into the river *Jordan*, to be baptized by *John* there. But I am persuaded, that the very mention of this, without making any further remarks upon it, will much more expose our author to the scorn and contempt of every *impartial man of judgment*, than our way of reasoning, for plunging, from Christ's baptism, ever will do us. He goes on in a trifling manner, to shew how weak and ridiculous our method of arguing from *John's* baptism is, "they were baptized in *Jordan*, says he; therefore they were plunged over head and ears;" which he fancies is as absurd, and as inconsequential, as if one should say, the staff stands in the corner, therefore it rains; or because, says he, it is said that *John* baptized in the wilderness, therefore in baptizing he thrust the people into thorns and briars."

What he means by all this ludicrous stuff I cannot tell, unless it be to banter the ordinance of water-baptism in general, and so join forces with the Quakers, utterly to explode it; for what he seems here to direct against the mode of baptizing by immersion, may be retorted upon any other, and particularly his own; thus, they were baptized in *Jordan*, therefore they went *ankle or knee deep* into it, and had water poured or sprinkled on them; which is equally as filly and ridiculous, as if one should say, "the staff stands in the corner, therefore it rains;" or because it is said, that *John* baptized in the wilderness, therefore in baptizing, he put the people *knee deep into thorns and briars*, and scratched their faces with them. But away with such ridiculous impertinencies as these. Could not the man distinguish between the place where *John* was preaching the doctrine of baptism unto repentance, and the place where he was administering the ordinance of it, the one being in the wilderness, and the other in the river *Jordan*, as he might have been informed, if he had more diligently consulted the text he has reference to, in Mark 1:4, 5. But what he fancies will most affect us, is, that *John* is said to baptize *with* water: now says our author, if "baptizing and. plunging signify the same thing, then *John* might have said, I plunge you indeed with water;" all persons, adds our author, but those of your judgment, would readily conclude, that such an expression wanted sense;" that is, because he looks upon us plungers, as he is pleased to call us, no doubt, as persons exceeding illiterate, and who are altogether unacquainted with language; whilst he, and those of his persuasion, must be considered as the only men of sense and learning; but if this penetrating man, this man of sense, can tell us, how a person can be plunged *in* water, without being plunged *with* it, what a prodigious discovery would he make to the world! and if it would want sense to read the words, "I plunge you indeed *with* water;" then pray let them be read, *I plunge you indeed* in *water*, and I hope they will not want sense then; aye, "but, says Mr. *B*. *W*. *John* tells us himself, that he baptized them *with* water; and, says he, lest plungers should not observe this, all the four evangelists take notice of it" (Matthew 3:11; Mark 1:8; Luke 3:16; John 1:26). I confess I have consulted all those texts, and find the words to be read thus, *I indeed baptize you*, εν υδαπ, *in water*, only in Luke 3:16 the preposition εν is omitted, which some, as *Pasor* and *Schmidius* think, in the other texts, is an Hebraism, or an Attic pleonasm, and then the sense and reading will be, either way, the same as what I have given; but then here is another prodigious absurdity behind, which those of a different persuasion from us think we are inevitably thrown into by this reading, and that is, that then we must be obliged to read the other part of the text thus, *he shall baptize you* in *the holy Ghost and in fire*; and this our author seems to have regard unto, when he says, "It is impossible that any impartial man of judgment can so much as imagine, that by being baptized with the holy Ghost, a being plunged in the holy Ghost should be understood; for the Lord himself tells

us, that by baptizing he means pouring;" for the proof of which, he mentions Isaiah 44:3 and Acts 10:44.

That the donation of the Spirit is sometimes expressed by pouring, sometimes by sprinkling, I frankly own; but this which John has reference to, is the extraordinary donation of the Spirit on the day of *Pentecost*, as is manifest from Acts 1:5. and therefore another word is made use of, as being more expressive of the glory and greatness of that dispensation; and when we consider the account that is given of it, by the inspired writer, as that *there came a sound from heaven*, *as of a rushing mighty wind*, *which* filled *the house where they were sitting*; and that *cloven tongues*, *like as of fire*, sat *upon each of them*; and that *they were all* filled *with the holy Ghost*; it will not seem so very strange, incongruous, and disagreeable to say, that they were as if they had been dipped or plunged all over therein. I am persuaded our author will acknowledge the learned *Casaubon* to be an *impartial man of judgment*, and yet he speaks of, and explains this affair much in the same language. His words are there, with which I shall conclude this chapter: "Although, says he,[2] do not disapprove of the word *baptizare* being retained here, that the antithesis may be full, yet I am of opinion, that a regard is had in this place to its proper signification, for βαπτιζειν is to immerse, so as to tinge or dip, and in this sense the apostles are truly said to be baptized, for the house in which this was done, was filled with the holy Ghost so that the apostles seemed to be plunged into it as into a fish-pool." And in the same way, their being baptized or dipped in fire, may be accounted for, that being expressive of the same thing, unless our author should think, that this is still a much more improper way of speaking, but among the best Greek authors, we have this phrase of dipping in fire made use of, and particularly in *Moschus*.[3]

CHAPTER 3

The second argument in favor of baptism by immersion, taken from the place John chose to baptize in, and the reason of that choice (John 3:23). with the weak replies, and foolish shifts and evasions which Mr. B. W. makes thereunto, considered.

Mr. *B. W.* next introduces his friend Mr. P. in page 11, 12 arguing for immersion, from those words in John 3:26. *And John also was baptizing in Enon, near to Salim, because there was much water there*, after this manner; namely, "*John* was baptizing in *Enon*, because there was much water there; therefore all that were baptized were overwhelmed with water. They were dipped, they were plunged, because there was much water there."

But this argument is not very fairly represented; for we do not argue merely from there being much water there, that they were dipped or plunged, but from their being *baptized* in a place of much water, and which was chose for that very reason. We know that there may be much water where no person is dipped or plunged into it; but that any person should be *baptized* in a place of much water, without being dipped or plunged into it, is what we deny. Moreover the reasonableness of concluding that baptism, in those times, was performed by immersion, we think may be fairly argued from John's choosing of, and baptizing in a place where there was much water, and we

believe it will appear so to every thinking and unprejudiced person; but let us consider what Mr. *B*. *W*. has to reply. And,

1st, To shew his learning and skill in choreography, he inquires what *Enon* was, whether it was a river or no, and seems to call in question its being so, and therefore tells us, page 13. *That such a river cannot be found in the best accounts we have of the land* of Israel: and adds, *and it is very probable*, *that* Enon *was either a village*, *or a tract of land*, *where there were abundance of springs and little rivulets of water*. Whether *Enon* is the name of a river, or of a city, town or village, or of a trace of land abounding with water, does not *much* affect our controversy, if it is but granted that there was much water there, for which reason *John* made choice of it to baptize in; and I hope it will be granted, that there was a sufficiency of water to baptize by immersion, especially seeing Mr. *B*. *W*. tells us in page 17 that *for plunging of people there need not be much water*. The Arabic version divides the word into two, and calls it Ain-Nun, which may be rendered, *the fountain of Nun*; as does also the *Syriac*, *Ain-Yon*, which *Junius* renders *the fountain of the Dove*: And as for *Salim*, near to which was *Enon*, and which is the best direction for the finding where it was; this was either *Shalem*, a city *of Shechem*, mentioned in Genesis 33:18 as some think, though this is not very likely, seeing that was in *Samaria*, with the inhabitants of which *John* had nothing to do; or else it is the same with *Shalim*, in 1 Samuel 9:4 as *Junius* and others think, though it seems rather to be that place which *Arias Montanus*[4] calls *Salim juxta torrentem*, Salim by the *brook*, which he places in the tribe of *Issachar*, not far from the lake of *Genesaret*; and may be called so, perhaps, either because it was near this *Enon*, where there was much water, or else because it was not far from the place where the two rivers *Jaboc* and *Jordan* met; as *Calvin*, from the geographers, observes upon this place. But supposing that our present best accounts of the land of *Israel*, make no mention of any such river as *Enon*; nor can it be determined by them what it was, or where it was; yet I hope it will be acknowledged, that the account of it in the sacred text is just, and that whether it be a river, village, or tract of land, yet there was *much water* there; for which reason *John* made choice of it as a proper place to baptize in, which is sufficient for our purpose. But,

2dly, From inquiring into the place itself, he proceeds to give us *the notation* of the word, or the reason of its name; for he says, the *learned tell us*, *that the word does signify a place of springs*: And the learned[5] also tell us, that it signifies an *eye*, as well as a spring or fountain; and also *soothsaying*, and *clouds*, or a *beclouding*; so that there is not much to be learned from that. And here I cannot forbear mentioning the observation of *Aretius*, upon this place; though I suppose that Mr. *B*. *W*. will think that he might as well have let it alone, who, after he had said that it was a town near *Jordan*, observes,[6] that it *signifies affliction*, *humility*, *and weeping*: I suppose he derives it from the Hebrew word hn[*Anab*, which sometimes signifies to humble and afflict; "thereby, says he, teaching us, "that such we are required to be in baptism and true repentance." But to go on: In order to strengthen this sense of the word, which Mr. *B*. *W*. says is given by the learned, he informs us, that "it is observable, that the town called. *Middin*, in Joshua 15:61 is called *Enon*, by the seventy Greek interpreters of the Old Testament;" whether this is an observation of his own, or of the learned with whom he converses, he does not tell us; if of the latter, he might have been so kind as to have told us who they were, that we might have consulted them, and have considered their proofs of it. By what goes before and after, it seems as if he meant that it was one of theirs; which when one comes to examine, it looks, according to the order of the text, as if it was *Secacah*, and not *Middin*, that is rendered *Enon*; the words in Joshua 15:61 *in the wilderness*, *Beth-arabah*, *Middin & Secacah*, are by the Septuagint thus rendered, etc. *Baddargeis*, *etc Tharabaam*, *etc*.

Aenon; so that if a regard is to be had to the order of the words, then as *Baddargeis* answers to *Beth-arabah*, so *Tharabaam* to *Middin*, and *Aenon* to *Secacah*; and if so, here is a fine piece of critical learning spoiled: But supposing that *Baddargeis* answers to *Bamidbar*, which we render, *in the wilderness*; and *Tharabaam* to *Beth-arabah*, and so *AEnon to Middin*, because the Septuagint make seven cities here, and in the following verse, when there are but fix, to what purpose is this produced? or what is gained by it? or how does this prove that the word signifies a place of springs? Yes, in Mr. *B. W*'s imagination, it serves a very good purpose, and sufficiently proves this signification of the word; but how? why *they* (the learned) *also observe*, says he, "that in Judges 5:10, there is mention made of those that fit in, upon, or near *Middin*, we read *injudgment*, where immediately the holy Ghost takes notice of the *places of drawing water*; so that, if any body would know wherefore *Middin* is rendered *Enon* by the Septuagint, the reason is ready, because of the *places of drawing water*."

A fine way of arguing indeed! what, *because Middin*, *in* Joshua 15:61 is rendered *Aenon* by the Septuagint, and because a word of the same form and found, is rendered in Judges 5:10. by the same επ Κριτηριου, "upon the judgment-seat;" and we read *in judgment*, where the holy Ghost immediately takes notice of the places of drawing water; therefore the reason is ready for any body to know why *Middin* is rendered by *Enon*, in the former text, and that is, because of the *places of drawing water*." Can any man in the world see any connection here? and how does this appear to be the ready, plain and easy reason of this version: Had either *Middin* or *Enon* been in the Septuagint text of Judges 5:10 there had been some tolerable color and pretense for all this, though that would have fell short of proving it to be the reason of such a version in Joshua 15:61 but here is not the least appearance of either; though it is true, there are some interpreters who think that the word rendered *judgment*, is the proper name of a place either of that city mentioned in Joshua 15:6,. or of a *path* or road-way which bore this name; so the *Masora*, *R. David Kimchi*, and *R. Levi Ben Gersom*; though the Targum, Septuagint, *R. Solomon Jarchi*, *R. Isaiah*, understood it of *judgment*, as we do, as well as many other interpreters and expositors; but granting that the word does signify a place of fountains and springs, and was so called, because of the places of drawing water, then I hope there was aplenty of water there, and what was sufficient for the baptizing of persons by immersion of the whole body; for which reason *John* made choice of it. But,

3. He goes on and says, "You and your friends must grant, that the words of the holy Ghost do not denote much water in one great channel, but many waters, streams or rivulets, in a certain tract or neighborhood." By the *words of the holy Ghost*, I suppose he means πολλα υδατα, which our translators have very well rendered *much water*; and he seems in this passage to have reference to that poor low criticism, which those of his persuasion are often obliged to have recourse to, which is, that there words are not expressive of a large quantity of water, but signify only, many little streams and rivulets, which are not sufficient for an immersion of the whole body, and therefore should have been rendered, not *much water*, but *many waters*. We grant that υδατα πολλα may be literally rendered *many waters*; but that they signify some little small streams and rivulets of water, and not a large quantity thereof, is what we deny. That *John* intends a large and not a small quantity of water, is manifest from his use of the phrase in other of his writings, as for instance, in Revelation 1:15, it is said of Christ, that *his voice* was *as the sound*, υδατοιν πολλαν, *of many waters*; but what found does little purling streams, and small rivulets of water make? And who can imagine the allusion should be made to them; or that these should be expressive of the voice of Christ in the gospel, especially in the ministry of it by the apostles, *whose sound went into all the*

earth, *and their words unto the end of the world*? Again, in Revelation 17:1 the great whore is represented as fitting επι των υδιτων των πολλων, "upon many waters," by which are metaphorically set forth unto us, those many people, kingdoms, and nations over whom she exercised a lawless and tyrannical power, as appears from verse 15 where the angel tells *John*, that the waters which he saw, where the *whore sitteth*, *are peoples*, *and multitudes*, *and nations*, *and tongues*: from whence it is manifest, that by this phrase is intended, not a small quantity of people, or some little petty nations and kingdoms, which were subject to the see of *Rome*; but a large quantity of people, even *multitudes*, and of nations and kingdoms, the chief and greatest; besides, our author, as well as others, would do well to consider, that υδατα πολλα is an Hebraism, and answers to מים רבים *Rabbim Mayim*, and by which the Septuagint frequently render there words; and that where small streams and rivulets cannot be intended, but large and great waters are spoken of, nay where indeed, the waters of the sea are plainly meant: As for instance, in Psalm 77:19 it is said concerning God's leading his people through the *Red Sea*, *Thy way is in the sea*, *and thy path*, εφν υδαοι ωολλοιϖ, *in many waters*, or as we justly read it, *in the great waters*; for surely the waters of the sea may be called so, and I hope that υδατα πολλα, here, does not signify many little streams and rivulets. Again, in Psalm 107:23, sea-faring persons are thus described, *they that go down to the sea in ships*, *that do business*, εφν υδαοι πολλοιϖ, *in many waters*, that is, *in great waters*, as the waters of the sea are; and I persuade myself, that none can be so weak as to imagine, that ships can sail in small streams and rivulets, or the business that the *Psalmist* speaks of, to be done in such places where there is not a sufficiency of water to dip or plunge into.

Moreover, if this phrase may not be allowed to be an Hebraism, it will be hard to prove that many waters signify a small quantity, and only some little streams or rivulets: Sure I am, some persons, of far superior learning to what Mr. *B*. *W*. discovers, have thought the contrary, as *Grotius*, *Piscator*, *Lightfoot*, and others; but if there may not be allowed to be good judges of the Greek tongue, I hope *Nonnus Panopolitanus* may, who flourished about the year 420 was a famous Greek and Christian poet, and turned this gospel, according to *John*, into Greek verse, who not only says, that the place where *John* was baptizing, was βαθυκυμονοϖ, "a place of deep waters," but also expresses υδατα πολλα by αφθονον υδωρ, *copiosa aqua*, "a large water, or abundance of water:" But because his version of the whole text makes much for the elucidation of it, I will transcribe it from him:— Ην δε κι αυτοϖ θεος Ιωαννης θεοπειθεα λαον αλητην Υδατι βαπτιζων βαθυκυμονος ενδυ θι σαλημ Κειθι γαρ ευρυποροιο κυλενδομενου ποταμοιο Χευμασιν αεναοις κυμαινεται α φθονον υδωρ Αρκιον ειμ ενι πασιν, Which may be rendered in English thus, "And the divine *John* himself also was baptizing in water, the straying people, who were obedient to God, at *or in* a place of deep waters, near to *Salem*, because there abundance of water, sufficient for them altogether, flowed in the ever-running streams of the winding river, whole passage over is very broad." But supposing that much water in one great channel is not intended, though I must confess I can see no reason why it should not, and that many waters, streams, or rivulets are here meant; yet, who does not know that many of these together, can not only fill large and capacious pools, sufficient enough for immersion, but also frequently form and feed very great rivers? so that I do not see that this will much help his cause, or affect our argument. But Mr. *B*. *W*. says, page 14. "But what and if the holy Ghost intends to give us the reason why the place was called *Enon*, because there were many waters, springs or rivulets there? what will become of your argument then, and how will you help yourself?" Where he insinuates, as if the design of the holy Ghost in there words, *because there was much water there*, is not to inform us of the convenience of this place for baptizing, or that it was the reason why *John* made choice of it, but to explain the meaning of the

word *Enon*, and to let us know, that the place was so called, because there was much water, or many springs or rivulets there: How trifling and ridiculous is this? Does the holy Ghost take such a method as this in other parts of the Bible, where the proper names of places are mentioned? and what necessity can there be for explaining of this any more than there is of others? and why is not the meaning of *Salim* as well as *Enon* given? Surely we need not be afraid of losing our argument from such interpretations and senses of scriptures as there, which will appear vain and trifling at the first view, to every impartial man of judgment; nor need we be much solicitous about helping ourselves, when pressed with such silly nonsense as this. But,

4. Mr. *B. W.* proceeds to charge the argument for plunging in baptism, taken from hence, not only with want of consequence, but as a vain conjecture: his words are there; "Granting, says he, that *Enon* was a great river, or a great water, yet it can never be proved that *John* plunged persons all over in it; that is nothing at all but your vain conjecture;" and then in his usual, positive, and dogmatical way, adds, "he baptized them, but he never plunged them." Here I need only reason as I did before, with regard to the baptism of Christ, and others, in *Jordan*, that if *John's* pitching upon *Enon*, as a convenient place to baptize in, *because there was much water there*, and his baptizing in that place is not a demonstrative proof of his baptizing by plunging, yet at least must be a strong presumptive one, and such an one as he can never produce in favor of his baptizing there by an affusion or sprinkling of water: And again, is to suppose that John baptized there by immersion, is a vain and trifling conjecture, I am sure, and I believe it will appear to every unprejudiced person, that to suppose that he did it by sprinkling or pouring, is much more so. And if we poor ignorant creatures may not be allowed to infer and conclude immersion from hence, without being charged with making vain and trifling conjectures; yet I hope he will be a little more sparing of the great *Calvin*, for whom, I do not doubt, from some few hints I have observed in this conference, he has a value and respect, and whom I persuade myself he will allow to be an *impartial man of judgment*, and to whole judgment he will always pay a deference: His note upon this text, is this; "Geographers write, says he, that there two towns, *Enon* and *Salim*, were not far from the confluence *of Jaboc* and *Jordan*, nigh to which they place *Scythopolis*. Moreover, from those words we may gather that baptism was performed by John and Christ, by a plunging of the whole body under water;"[7] and I think we may conclude this very fairly too, whatever Mr. B W. may think of it. But,

5thly, Our ingenious author, by a new turn and mighty stretch of thought, has found out another reason, besides that of convenience, for baptizing, which made *John* fix upon, and determined him in the choice of this place, there being much water there, and that is, that *the vast multitudes* which flocked to, and attended upon his ministry, might be *refreshed*; as also their horses, or their camels, or whatsoever we may suppose many of them did ride upon; by which, I suppose, he means *asses*. I cannot but observe, that he seems to speak this with some caution or guard upon himself, as he does also in page 17 where he says, speaking of the people which flocked to *John's* ministry, "a great number of them, doubtless, must travel many miles; and we must suppose, many on foot, and many otherwise:" and this I cannot but attribute to a self-consciousness in him, that he deserved to be numbered among those animals, or at least, to his being aware that this would be turned upon him, for his foolish and ridiculous glosses on the sacred writings. What seems the most to strengthen him in his folly, and upon which he says much stress, is the vast multitudes of people which followed *John*, and attended upon his ministry; and the unwise part *John* would have acted, if he had not chore places where refreshment might be had for themselves and their cattle: But surely the

man forgets himself, or at least, does not give himself time to consider, that *John* was now upon the declining hand, and had not those vast numbers and multitudes following him as formerly he had; the crowd was now after Christ, and not *John*; and though he had some which came to him, and were baptized, yet they were but few in comparison of what he had formerly, or what now followed Christ; as he might easily have observed, by reading this third chapter of *John*; and therefore there was no need for him to be so solicitous for accommodations for the people and their cattle, as is here by our author intimated; and to make his sense appear the more plausible, he tells us, that "by *John's* baptizing, we are to understand *John's* preaching, administering in his office, and fulfilling his course;" for which he cites, Matthew 21:25 and Acts 10:47. It is readily granted, that sometimes by *John's* baptism, we are to understand his whole ministry, and particularly the doctrine of baptism, preached by him, as distinct from the administration of the ordinance; but that by his baptizing here is meant his preaching, must be denied; for that it intends his administration of the ordinance of water-baptism, not only his act of *baptizing*, but the people's submission to it; for the text says, *they came and were baptized*, manifestly prove it; to say nothing of the place where it was performed, being a place of much water, the thing now in debate. He also insinuates, that great part of the land of *Judea* was sandy and barren; but not so barren as his arguments are. "You may understand, says he, what fort of a country, for water, a great part of that land was, from the great contentions between *Isaac's s*ervants, and others, about digging, finding, and enjoying wells of water;" but there contentions did not arise so much from the scarcity of water, as from the envy of the *Philistines* on the one hand, and from *Isaac's* servants, stiffly insisting upon their right and property, on the other: For though persons may have never such plenty of things, yet they are not willing to be defrauded of what is their just right.

He goes on: "Glad at heart they were when they found plenty of water, for their own refreshment, and the refreshment of their cattle." One would be almost tempted to think that the man was describing the sandy deserts of *Arabia*, rather than the fertile land of *Canaan*, and representing *the travelling companies of Dedanim* who being almost scorched with heat, are thrown into a transport of joy, at the sight of a spring of water; but who will it be most proper to give credit to, *Moses*, an inspired writer, who told the people of *Israel*, that God was bringing them into a *good land*, *a land of brooks of water*, *of fountains and depths*, *that spring out of valleys and hills*; or our blundering geographer, who represents it as a desert and wilderness. Moreover, it seems, that there need not be much water for the plunging of persons, and therefore *John* need not have chore this place upon that account; but I hope, so much is needful, as will cover the persons all over. And there is one thing therefore that we need not be afraid of being pressed with by our author, as we are by some, and that is, the scarcity of water in some parts. But what he says of the practice of our friends in *London*, is entirely false, which is, that they *plunge in little holes or tubs*; for I cannot see, but he must mean them, and not those in other places; because he adds, rather than the Thames, that is just by. Now there are but two places, in and about *London*, that I know of, which are made use of for the administration of this ordinance, the one is in the midst of a public meeting-house, and the other in an open place, where there are conveniences for a large number of spectators; and it is very rare that this ordinance is administered by us in a private manner, as same other performances commonly are, in a lying-in chamber; and that only in the presence of a midwife, a nurse, and two or three gossiping women. As for the instance of a certain plunger in the country, performing the ordinance in an horse-pond, in the middle of a town, I shall suspend my thoughts about it, and neither condemn nor commend his practice, unless I had a better account of it, with its circumstances, than Mr. *B*. *W*. has given; though I can see no great damage in it, as he has related it,

provided the water was not dirty and filthy: But I suppose he designs it as a banter upon us, and a diversion for his reader; much good may do him with it, and let him make the best of it he can.

CHAPTER 4.

The third argument insisted on, in favor of plunging or dipping, as the right mode of baptizing, taken from the practice of the apostles, and particularly from the instance of the Eunuch's baptism in Acts 8:38, 39 with the cavils and exceptions of Mr. B. W. against it, considered.

The next argument which our author, page 18 produces, as insisted on by us, for the proof of baptism by immersion, and which he excepts against, is taken from the practice of the apostles, and particularly the instance *of Philip's* baptizing the Eunuch, recorded in Acts 8:38, 39. thus; And he commanded the chariot to stand still; and they went dawn both into the water, bath Philip and the Eunuch, and he baptized him. And when they were came up out of the water, etc. Here I must again observe, as I have already, in a parallel case, that we do not from this instance infer plunging, merely from *Philip* and the *Eunuch's* going down into, and coming up out of the water; for we know, as well as he, that persons may go hundreds of times into water, as he says, without any design of plunging, or of being plunged; but we argue from both of them going down into the water; the one in order to administer the ordinance of water-baptism, and the other to submit unto it; and from their coming up out of it, as having performed it; from whence we think we have sufficient reason to conclude, that this was performed by immersion, or a plunging of the whole body under water; for to what purpose should they both go down into the water, if the ordinance was to be performed any other way? or what need would there have been of it? But if plunging cannot be inferred from hence, I am sure it is impossible that pouring or sprinkling should. But let us see what Mr. *B. W.* will infer from this instance, and has to except against our argument from hence. And,

1st, From *Philip* and the *Eunuch's* both going down into the water, and coming up out of it, in a profane and irreligious manner, he infers, that neither of them were *drowned there*. Does this become a minister of the gospel, to treat the sacred writings, and the accounts they give of a solemn ordinance of Christ, after this manner? Whatever profane loose he may give himself in his attempts to be witty on the mode of baptizing by immersion, which he supposes to be unscriptural, yet, at least, he ought to set bounds to himself, and not be so free in playing with, and bantering the very words of the holy Ghost. But,

2dly, If that is rejected, why then he infers from hence, that they were *both plunged* over head and ears in the water. This, I suppose, is designed to shew the absurdity of our way of reasoning, as he imagines: But does not the man consider, that the one went down as an *administrator*, the other as *a subject* of baptism; the one *to baptize*, the other *to be baptized*? But suppose the ordinance was administered by pouring or sprinkling water, might it not be as justly inferred, that because they both went down into the water, one to perform, and the other to have it performed, and came up again out of it, when it was done, therefore they both had water poured upon them, or were sprinkled with it? And then,

3dly, When he is asked why he could not have concluded, that *one* was plunged and the *other* not: he replies, "Why truly, says he, because I thought it out "of the way of all sense, reason and revelation so to infer." I hope he will not say that it is out of the way of *all sense*, *reason*, and *revelation* to infer, that the one went down in order to administer the ordinance of baptism, and the other to have it administered to him; but I suppose he means that it is out of the way of all sense, reason and revelation, to infer plunging from hence: But how then came the judicious *Calvin* to be so much out of the way, to conclude from hence that plunging was the ancient mode of baptizing, as he does, when he says, "here we see what was the rite of baptizing with the ancients; for they plunged the whole body into water?"**[8]** How came this great man to be guilty of matting such a *vain conjecture* as our author says it is? especially when he affirms there is not in sacred history, the *least shadow of a foundation* for it. But to proceed,

4thly, In order to elude the force of our argument, from their going down into the water, he observes, that whosoever goes to any water, especially out of a chariot, must go down to it. But he is desired to observe, that it is not said, that they both went down *to* the water, but they both went *into* it. As for the text in Psalm 107:23 which speaks of persons going *down to the sea in ships*, I hope our author does not think that they went by land in ships to the sea-side: If he would know what is meant by this, let him read ver. 26 where the distress that seafaring men are often in, is thus elegantly and beautifully described, *they mount up to the heaven*, *they go down again to the depths*, *their soul is melted because of trouble*; and what this means, those who have used the seas know full well, when their ships have been tossed up as it were to the heavens, and then again plunged into the depths of the sea, where they have been immersed in, and covered over with the waves thereof for a while, and on a sudden, have sprang out from thence. It is then they see the wondrous works of the Lord, in his remarkable appearance for them, and providential preservation of them.

5thly, He tells us, that "had he been in the Eunuch's place, he should not have chosen to have water poured upon him in the chariot, but for several reasons should have been entirely for going down to the water." He does not tell us what these *designs* are, that we might have considered them; but with his usual air of confidence affirms, that "there was no stripping, nor plunging, nor putting on change of raiment in the case;" and all the reason he has to assign for it, is, because "Philip was directly caught away by the Spirit of the Lord, and the Eunuch immediately went on his way rejoicing:" But I hope he will allow that *Philip* was come up out of the water first, before he was caught away, and that the Eunuch was got into his chariot, before he went on his way; and to suppose so much time as was necessary to change their raiment, is no way contrary to the account in the sacred text, and he would also do well to consider, that those words *directly*, and *immediately*, are not to be found there. But,

6thly, He argues, that if those who were baptized by the apostles were plunged or overwhelmed, "then what prodigious labor must the apostles go though, when three thousand were baptized in one day, yea perhaps in less than half of it!" To which I answer; There does not seem to be any necessity of concluding from Acts 2:41 that they were all baptized in one day; but if they were, when we consider that there were twelve apostles, and seventy disciples, who were employed in the ministry of the word, Luke 10:1 and so no doubt in baptizing, it will not appear so prodigiously fatiguing as our author intimates; for a single person, without having the strength either of *Hercules*, or *Samson*, and without much fatiguing himself, may baptize, in this way, a considerable number in a very little time. But then here is another difficulty behind, and that is, "What great

trouble must they be at in stripping, and shifting, and changing apparel! and what abundance of plunging garments they must have ready!" To which I reply, no more trouble than a single person has for himself, and no more plunging garments to be provided than every one to provide for themselves, which is no more trouble than when five or ten persons only are baptized: and when we consider how much *bathing* was in use among the Jews, it will not seem so strange, where, and how they should be so easily provided with plunging garments. Our objector goes on, and adds, "In what a poor condition was *Paul*, when he was plunged, having been so ill, and so long without eating or drinking! and after that, how unfit must *Paul* himself be under his wounds and bruises, and in the dead of the night, to go into some deep water, and take up the jailor and plunge him!" Here I cannot but remark the wretched blunder that our author makes, or at least the inadvertency, to say no worse of it, that he is guilty of, in talking as if the baptism *Paul* and the jailor was in one and the same night. But if he objects this is not his meaning, why did he write in such a blundering manner, and many times with want of sense, as when he talks of *Paul's taking up the jailor*, and many such like passages which are to be found in this his performance. But to proceed, that *Paul* was three-days before his baptism without eating or drinking, is true, but that he was so very ill as our author represents, does not appear so manifest; however, it is plain, that he was not so ill, but he was able to arise and be *baptized*, which he need not have done, had it been performed by pouring or sprinkling water upon him. As to *Paul's* unfitness, under his wounds and bruises, to plunge the jailor, I need only act, how he and *Silas* were capable of praying and singing the praises of God, and that so loud as the other prisoners heard them? and after thee preached the gospel to the jailor and his family, which must be a much more laborious work, and more spending and fatiguing to them, than baptizing of them was; but that same God who enabled them to perform the one, carried them through the other. Again, he says, "how improperly did *Peter s*peak in *Cornelius's* house, when he talked of *forbidding water*! whereas he should have said, can any man forbid these men from going to the river to be plunged?" to which I answer; if there is any impropriety in this text, it is not to be charged upon the words or sense of the holy Ghost, but upon our translation; for υδωρ "water," ought not to be put in construction, with κειλυσαι, "forbid," but with βαπτιζηναι, "to be baptized;" and so the whole be rendered thus, "Can any man forbid, that these should be baptized with water, which have received the holy Ghost as well as we?" and then the sense is this; has any man any thing to object why these who have received the holy Ghost, even as we, should not be admitted to the ordinance of water-baptism? for seeing they have received the greater privilege, why should they be deprived of the lesser? And this reading and sense of the words are confirmed by the learned *Erasmus*, in his notes upon the text, which are these," the Greeks, says he,[9] read after this manner, μητι υδωρ, etc. and the sense appears to be this: "Can any man forbid that there should be baptized in water, who have received the holy Ghost as well as we? for as the spirit is preferable to water, and seeing they have him, it will be no great matter if this be added also: Moreover the accusative το υδωρ. "water;" either depends upon the preposition κατα, which may be understood, or else adheres to the verb βαπτιζηναι, "to be baptized;" just in the same form in which we say, βαπτιζομοι βαπτιζισμα, "to be baptized with a baptism."

As to what Mr. *B*. *W*. says, concerning the use of plunging garments in baptism, that therefore the water comes to the body only a *filtering*, or as it can work its way through, which, says he, at best is only equivalent to sprinkling. I need only reply, it is sufficient in baptism that the whole body be plunged into and covered under water; nor does it much concern us, to observe and know, how it works its way through to the body. I hope he will acknowledge, that a corpse may be said to be truly buried, when covered with earth, though it is wrapt up in a shroud, or in its funeral clothes,

and put up close in a coffin, so that the earth with which it is covered, does not as yet touch it; even so a person may be truly said to be baptized, when in the name of the three Divine Persons, he is plunged into, and covered over with water, even though the water may not be supposed to have had time enough to have worked its way through to his body; and hen it has done so, how that is equivalent to sprinkling, no man can evise. But enough of this, I proceed to the next argument.

CHAPTER 5

The fourth argument taken from Romans 6:4 and Colossians 2:12 with the sense given of those scriptures, by Mr. B. W. considered.

Our next argument for baptism by immersion, which Mr. *B. W.* has thought fit to produce in page 24 and except against, is taken from *Romans* 6:4 and Colossians 2:12 where this ordinance is took notice of by the apostle, as a burial, and as representing the burial and resurrection of Christ; which argument may be formed thus, and not in the loose rambling way, in which he has represented it, and which, no doubt, he thought would best answer his purpose; namely, "If the end and design of baptism are to represent the burial and resurrection of Christ, then it ought to be performed by plunging into, and overwhelming with water; but the end and design of baptism, are to represent the burial and resurrection of Christ, therefore it ought to be performed by plunging into, and overwhelming with water; the reason is, because no other mode of baptizing either by pouring or sprinkling a little water on the face, can answer this end." But let us attend to what Mr. *B. W.* has to except. And,

1. He seems to deny this to be the end and design of the institution of this ordinance, when he asks, "But did Christ ever institute baptism for any such end? As for the Lord's Supper, he hath said, *Do this in remembrance of me*; and it is plain from the word, that in the Lord's Supper we s*hew forth his death till he come*: but where has he said, be plunged or baptized, to represent my burial or resurrection?" To which I answer, that though we have not the end of this institution declared, in so many express words, yet we think it may be fairly concluded from those texts now mentioned, and must continue to be of the same mind, for ought Mr. *B. W.* has advanced against it: Nor are we alone in our sentiments: For that Christ's burial and resurrection are represented by baptism, has been acknowledged by many, both ancient and modern divines, whose words I forbear to transcribe, partly because they have been many of them produced by others already, and partly because I would not fill my book with citations, and therefore shall only direct the reader to the reference in the margent.**[10]** Though Mr. *B. W.* is of opinion, that to infer this from those words, *buried with him in baptism*, is very absurd and inconclusive; and that "we may as well be hanged up against a tree, to represent Christ crucified, because it is said, that we *are* crucified with Christ." But can any mortal see this to be a parallel case? to say nothing how shocking this expression must be to every serious mind, and not to be borne with; no more than the wretched jargon which follows it, when he says, "and to make a fair end of you, be fore to see *you* dead under the earth or under the water;" which, I doubt not, to every impartial intelligent reader, will appear to have as little of argument as it has of sense in it. Besides, who does not see that all this, whatever he can mean by it, may be leveled as much against the ordinance of the Lord's-Supper, as that of Baptism.

Moreover, there are other texts, besides these mentioned, which demonstrate the representation of Christ's resurrection, which supposes his burial to be the end of baptism; as for instance, 1 Peter 3:21 where *baptism* is said *to save us*, *by the resurrection of Jesus Christ*. But how does it do that, but by representing the resurrection, of Christ unto us, and thereby leading our faith to it, to behold our justification and discharge, by a risen Savior? To which I might also add, 1 Corinthians 15:29 where the apostle evincing the truth of the resurrection of the dead, thus argues, else *what shall they do*, *which are baptized for the dead*, *if the dead rise not*? that is, "Who are baptized into the faith of the resurrection of Christ, which is represented thereby, and which is the confirmation of our resurrection;" the thing that is there debated; and which, if not true, the apostle argues that their baptism, as well as their faith, and his preaching, was in vain. Besides, if our author removes this end of baptism, he ought to have substituted another, and have told us what was the end and design of it, which he has not done; for all the ordinances of the gospel are, no doubt, designed for the comfort and edification of believers, and the confirmation of their faith in the person of Christ; and seeing there appears nothing more manifestly to be the end of it, than what has been mentioned, we shall think fit to abide by it. But,

2. Our author asks, "What there is in your plunging that represents Christ's burial and resurrection;" and to shew that there is no agreement, he runs the parallel between them, and observes, that Christ was *carried* to his grave, where, being *dead*, he was buried, and lay there *three days*, *and three nights*, and that in the *earth*, where a *great stone* was *rolled* at the mouth of the sepulcher, and when he arose, it was by *his own power*, and thereby declared to be *the Son of God*: But as for us, we go ourselves into the water, are plunged *alive*, and that not *three minutes*, in *water*; and that our *plunger dares not leave* us, nor *roll a stone upon* us; *and it is he that puts* us *in that pulls* us *out*, *and* we *are declared to be what* we *are*: What would the man have us be declared to be, what we are not? and then in a taunting manner says, "and this is the representation and the mighty resemblance." These are some of our author's masterly strokes, and when the candor of the reader has supplied the want of sense in his expression, and charitably conjectured at his meaning, I need only reply, that the things instanced in are only circumstantial, and not essential to a burial, and therefore unnecessary to be represented in baptism; nay, it would have been absurd to have had them: It is enough that the things themselves are, namely, the burial and resurrection of Christ, which are sufficiently represented by an immersion into water, and an immersion out of it. But who does not see that a Quaker, or any other person that denies the ordinance of the Lord's-Supper, may argue after the same manner, and say, you say that this ordinance represents a crucified Christ, and shews forth his death and sufferings, but pray how does it appear? you take a loaf of bread, and break it in pieces, and a bottle of wine, and pour it out; but Christ, when. he was crucified, was hanged on a tree, his head was crowned with thorns, his hands and feet were pierced with nails, and his side with a spear; but here are no thorns, nails, or spear made use of by you, his *real body* was treated after this manner, but yours is only a *loaf of bread*; he poured out his *blood*, you only *wine*; "and this is the representation, and the mighty resemblance." And I think all this may be said with as much justness as the other. But,

3. Mr. *B*. *W*. has got another way of getting off the argument taken from these texts, in Romans 6:3, 4 and Colossians 2:12 and that is, by asserting that the baptism of Christ's sufferings, and not water-baptism, is intended in them. It would be endless, and perhaps our author will say needless, to oppose to him the several expositors and interpreters, who understand, by baptism, the ordinance of water-baptism, in those texts; as well as a large number of them who think the allusion is made to

the ancient practice of baptizing by immersion; as *Grotius*, *Vorsiius*, *Paraeus*, *Piscator*, *Diodate*, and the *Assembly of Divines* on Romans 6:4 and *Zanchy* and *Davenant* on Colossians 2:12. I suppose that Mr. *B*. *W*. will reply, that these are but men, and their judgment fallible; I hope he does not think that he is more than a man, or that his judgment is infallible; and it wilt scarcely be accounted modestly in him, to set himself upon a level with them: Though I confess that his sense of the words is not disagreeable to the analogy of faith, yet I wonder that he should be so positive as to say that this is *the only meaning* of them, as he does in page 31. As to what he says with respect to those texts, one of them being produced as an argument to promote holiness in believers, and the other to strengthen their faith in the doctrine of justification; I cannot see, but to understand them of water-baptism, suits very well with the scope thereof, however it is ridiculed by our author: For why may not our baptism, wherein we profess our faith in a buried Christ, and that we are dead by him to the law, the world, and particularly to sin, be urged and made use of by the spirit of God, as an argument why we should not live any longer therein. And are there no force, power and cogency in this argument? Again, in baptism we profess our faith in the resurrection of Christ, which is represented hereby, and that we are risen with him, and therefore are under the highest obligations, to walk in newness of life, as the apostle himself argues. Moreover, what can have a greater tendency to strengthen our faith in the doctrine of justification, than this ordinance has? by which it is led to see where our Lord lay, and how our sins were left in the grave by him; and he, as our glorious representative, rising again *for our justification*, by whom we are acquitted and discharged from all sin and *condemnation*; and is such a way of arguing from hence, to promote holiness, and strengthen us in the doctrine of justification, to be wondered at, what is meant by it? But to proceed,

4. Supposing that the baptism of Christ's sufferings is intended here, and that we are buried with him therein, as our head and representative, it must be allowed, that Christ's sufferings are called so, in allusion to water-baptism; and if we are said to be *buried* with him in them, it must be in allusion to a person's being buried in water in that ordinance, which cannot be by pouring or sprinkling of water upon him, but by an immersion into it. So that our argument for plunging, from hence, is like to lose nothing by this sense of the words. That Christ's sufferings are called a baptism, in Matthew 20:22 and Luke 12:50, as also that by a *Synechdoche*, they are called the *blood of his cross*, is granted; but then the shedding of his blood was not the whole of Christ's sufferings, but a part only, and riffs is called the *blood of sprinkling*, not with regard to its being called a baptism; but because it is sprinkled upon a believer's conscience, and being so, speaks peace and pardon there; but when the greatness and multitude of Christ's sufferings are let forth, they are represented, not by a sprinkling of water, but by mighty floods of water, which overflowed him, so that he seemed, as it were, to be plunged into them, and overwhelmed with them; as he says, in Psalm 69:2. *I am come into deep waters*, *where the floods overflow me*; where the Septuagint use the word καταποντιζω, as they do also in verse 15 which Mr. *B*. *W*. in page 45 grants is very proper to express plunging by; and therefore no wonder then that his sufferings are compared to a baptism, and such an one as is administered by immersion: So that the argument from hence, notwithstanding all those cavils and exceptions, stands firm and unshaken. As to the argument taken from the universality of Christ's sufferings in every part of his body, which he makes his antagonist plead in page 32 he acknowledges it was never made use of by the greatest men of our persuasion, why then does he produce it? If every thing that has been dropt by weak Christians, in private conversation on the subject of infant-baptism, was published to the world, how silly and ridiculous would it appear?

CHAPTER 6

The fifth and last argument taken from the signification of the word βαπτιζω, *which always signifies to dip or plunge*, *with Mr. B. W's. exceptions to it*, *considered*.

The fifth and last argument used by us, for immersion in baptism, taken from the constant signification of the word βαπτιζω, *baptizo*, to dip or *plunge*, Mr. *B. W.* has thought fit to produce in page 33 and except against, which we hope, notwithstanding, to make good, however we may be represented by our author, as incapable of reading our mother tongue. And,

1. Mr. *B. W.* denies that βαπτω, *bapto*, and βαπτιζω, *baptizo*, signify one and the same thing; but the reason he gives, is not a sufficient one, and that is, because the holy Ghost never makes use of the former, when this ordinance is expressed, but the latter; for the holy Ghost may make use of what words he pleases, without destroying the sense of others; and by the way, then it may be observed, that ρανπζω, *rantizo*, and βαπτιζω, *baptizo*, do not signify one and the same thing; because the holy Ghost never makes use of the former, when the ordinance is expressed, but the latter. Besides, all the Lexicographers that I have been able to consult, tell me, that βαπτω and βαπτιζω do signify one and the same thing; for they render both by the very same words, and they are both promiscuously used by Greek authors: And indeed, why should not βαπτιζω, *baptizo*, the derivative, signify the same as its primitive? what, is its signification lessened by the addition of a syllable to it? Dr *Gale*[11] has given instances enough of derivatives in ζω, which signify the same with their primitives. And indeed, some have taken the word, under consideration, to be what grammarians call a frequentative, which signifies more than the derivative does. But,

2. It seems our author will scarcely allow βαπτω, *bapto*, to signify *dip* or *plunge*, and therefore puts it upon us to prove, that *Judas*, when he put his hand in the dish, thrust it all over in the sauce (Matthew 26:23), where the word εμβαπψας *embapsas*, is used; but he should have observed, that it was not his hand, but the sop in his hand, by a metonymy of the subject, as *Piscator* observes, which he dipt into the sauce, as he might have learned, by comparing the text with John 13:26. And in page 45 he says, "yea, with respect unto βαπτω itself, it is very evident that the Greeks did not directly mean plunging thereby; for when the Septuagint tell us in Daniel 4:33 that *Nebuchadnezzar's* body was wet with the dew of heaven, they make use of the very word;" and I would also add, very justly, it exactly answered to the Chaldee word יצטכצ here used. which word always signifies to tinge or dip, as dyers dip their clothes in their vats, and so is expressive of what a condition *Nebuchadnezzar's* body was in, he being as wet with the dew of heaven, as if he had been dipt or plunged all over in water. But enough of this; let us consider,

3. How we are like to come off with the word βαπτιζο, *baptizo*; And here our author in page 41 tells us, *ore rotundo*, and with confidence enough, in so many words, that "it never does signify plunging; washing with water by pouring or sprinkling, is the only meaning of it." The man has got a good assurance, but yet by his writing, he does not seem to have such a stock of learning; however what he wants in one, he makes up in the other. It is strange that all our Lexicographers,

so many learned critics, and good divines, should be so much mistaken, as to render the word to *dip* or *plunge*, and allow this to be the proper signification of it. I have myself consulted several Lexicons, as those of *Suidas*, *Scapula*, *Hadrian*, *Junius*, *Pasor*, as also another made by *Budaeus*, *Tusanus*, *Gesner*, *Junius*, *Constantine*, *Hartung*, *Hopper*, *and Xylander*, who all unanimously render the word by *mergo*, *immergo*, to *plunge* or *dip into*: And though they afterwards add also, *abluo*, *lava*, *to wash*, yet it is plato they mean such a washing, as is by dipping; and we are very willing to grant it, for we know that there can be no dipping without washing: But had they meant a washing by pouring or sprinkling, they would have rendered it by *persundo*, or *aspergo*, to *pour upon*, or s*prinkle*; but this they never do. And, to there I might add a large number of learned critics, and good divines, who grant, that the word in its first and primary sense; signifies to *dip* or plunge only; and to wash only in a secondary, remote, and consequential one; as *Casaubon*, *Camerarius*, *Grotius* (Matthew 3:6), *Calvin*,[12] *Alting*,[13] *Alsted*,[14] *Wendelin*,[15] and others. But what need I heap up authors, to prove that which no man of any tolerable learning will deny: But what will not ignorance, attended with a considerable share of confidence, carry a man through? I might oppose to him, the use of the word in many Greek authors, but this has been done better already than I am capable of doing it, to which I refer him,[16] and shall content myself, with just mentioning that passage of *Plutarch*,[17] βαπτιζων ονανυτον εις θαλασσαν, which I think the author I have reference to, has took no notice of; and let him try how his sense of pouring or sprinkling will agree with it. I am flare it will found very harsh, to render the words *pour* or *sprinkle thyself into the sea*, but will read very well to be rendered thus, *plunge thyself into the sea*: But I suppose he will take this to be a breach of the first article agreed upon in this conference; but why the Greek authors should not be allowed as evidences, in the sense of a Greek word, I cannot see: I am sure this is not very consistent with *right reason*, which the thing in debate was to be *cleared up from*, as well as from the word of God. But let us consider the use of the word with, the Septuagint, which I suppose he will not except against, because he has himself brought it into the controversy. And there are but two places, which I have as yet met with, where the word is used by them, and the first is in 2 Kings 5:14 where it is said of *Naaman* the *Syrian*, that he *went down*, κι εβαππζατο, *and baptized* or *dipped himself seven times in Jordan*: I presume our author will not say, that this is to be understood of a washing, by pouring or sprinkling; especially, seeing it answers to the Hebrew word טבל, which always signifies to dip or plunge, and is the word, which is so often rendered by βαπτο, *bapto*, and which, by the way, proves there two to be of the same signification, seeing they are promiscuously used by them, to express one and the same word. The other place is in Isaiah 21:4 where what we read, *fearfulness affrighted* me, they render, κ ανομια με βαπτιζει, *iniquity hath plunged me*; for to translate the words, *iniquity hath washed*, or *poured*, or s*prinkled me*, would be intolerable; but both the language and the sense are smooth and easy, by rendering them, *iniquity hath plunged me*; that is, into the depths of misery and distress; so that I am overwhelmed with horror and terror: And hereby also the sense of the Hebrew word בצת, here used, is very beautifully expressed. But let us now consider,

4. What exceptions Mr. *B*. *W*. makes against this universal sense of the word, and there are three places in the New Testament which he opposes to it. The first is in Mark 7:4 And when they come from the market, except they wash, they eat not, and many other things there be, which they have received to hold, as the washing of cups and pots, brazen vessels, and of tables. Whereupon Mr. *B*. *W*. observes, that the words of the holy Ghost are, except they first *baptize* themselves; and many other such things they have, as the *baptizing* of tables. Excellent observations indeed! But how does this prove that the word signifies only a washing, by pouring or sprinkling? I believe it will appear,

that this is meant of the washing of the whole body by dipping, which might be done, without their going *into a pond or a river* before they came home; for they had, no doubt, proper conveniences for immersion, when they came home, seeing bathing was in many cases required of the people, as well as of the priests; and to understand it of such a washing, seems better to express their superstitious solicitude to cleanse themselves from all impurity they might contract by converting with others in the market; it seems to be distinct from washing of hands in the former verse, where a different word is used. But supposing that washing of hands was intended here, does not every body know, that the usual manner of doing that, is not by pouring or sprinkling water upon them, but by putting them into it. And here I cannot but take notice of the observation of *Beza*[18] upon this text; βαπτιζεθαι, says he, in this place, is more than χερνιπτειν; for the former seems to respect the whole body, the latter only the hands, nor does βαπτιζειν signify to wash, but only by consequence, for it properly denotes to immerse for the sake of dipping."

As for the washing or baptizing of cups, pots, etc. it is well known that the cleansing of vessels, which were polluted by the falling of any dead creature that was unclean into them, was by putting into the water, end not by pouring or sprinkling water upon them. The express command in Leviticus 11:32, is, that *it must be put into the water*, or as the Septuagint render it βαφμοεται, *it must be dipt into water*. Moreover, their superstitious washing of vessels, which our Lord seems here to mean, and justly reprehends, of which we read many things in their Misnah,[19] or oral law, their book of traditions, was performed this way, where they make use of the word טבל to express it by, which always signifies to dip or plunge. But what need I use many words to prove this, when every old woman could have informed him of the usual manner of washing their vessels, which is not by pouring or sprinkling water upon them, but by putting them into it: And if he asks, did the Jewish women wash their tables so? There appears no reason to conclude the contrary; and if he should say, how and where could they do it? I answer, in or near their own houses, where they had conveniences for bathing themselves, and washing their garments, at proper times, without carrying them to a river.

The next place instanced in by him, is Hebrews 9:10. where the ceremonial law is said to stand *only in meats and drinks*, *and divers washings*; it is in the Greek text, *in divers baptisms*; and, says our author, "it is evident from the word of God, that those washings generally stood in pouring or sprinkling of water;" but that is a mistake of his, for they neither flood in them generally, nor particularly; for those ceremonial ablutions were always performed by bathing or dipping in water, and are called διαφοριο, *divers*, or *different*, not because they were performed different ways, as some by sprinkling, others by pouring, and others by plunging, but because of the different persons and things, the subjects thereof; as the priests, Levites, Israelites, vessels, garments, etc. And here it may not be atolls to observe what *Maimonides*,[20] who was one of the most learned of the Jewish writers, says concerning this matter, "Wherever, says he, the washing of the flesh or garments is mentioned in the law, it means nothing else than the washing of the whole body; for if a man washes himself all over, excepting the very tip of his little finger, he is still in his uncleanness." Nay, he says it is necessary that every hair of his head should be washed; and therefore the apostle might well call these washings, *baptisms*. The third and last instance produced by him, is 1 Corinthians 10:1, 2, where the apostle says, that *all our fathers were under the cloud*, *and all passed through the sea*; *and were all baptized unto Moses in the cloud*, *and in the sea*; which when our author has mentioned, he very briskly arks, "Pray how were our fathers baptized there?" to which, I hope, we shall be capable of returning an answer, without appearing to be so *bitterly*

graveled with this place, as he is pleased to make his friend say we are. As for the manner in which he represents some of our friends accounting for it; namely, that when the people of *Israel* passed through the Red sea, they had the waters stood up, both on their right hand, and on their left, and a cloud over them; so that there was a very great resemblance of a person's being baptized, or plunged under water. This, I say, is not so much to be despised, nor does it deserve so much ridicule and contempt, as he has pleased to cast upon it; and I believe will appear to any unprejudiced person, a much better way of accounting for it, than he is capable of giving, consistent with his way of administering the ordinance: Though I cannot but think that the Israelites *were first baptized in the cloud*, *and then in the sea*, according to the order of the apostle's words; and agreeable to the story in Exodus 14 where we read, that *the cloud went from before their face*, *and stood behind them*, and was between the two camps, to keep off the Egyptians from the Israelites. I am therefore of opinion, with the learned *Gataker*,[21] that the cloud when it passed over them, let down a plentiful rain upon them, whereby they were in such a condition, as if they had been all over dipt in water; so that they were not only covered by it, but baptized in it: Therefore our author very improperly directs us to Psalm 77:17, *the clouds poured out water*, as the better way of resolving the case; for the apostle does not say, that they were baptized *in the clouds*, but *in the cloud* which went before them, but now palling over them, in order to stand behind them, they were, as it were, immersed in it. But supporting that the text in Psalm 77 may be a direction in this case, and seem to explain what the apostle means by baptizing, it will no ways agree either with our author's sense of the word, nor his way of administering the ordnance: For, were the Israelites baptized under the clouds, by their pouring or sprinkling a small quantity of water upon their faces? the Hebrew word זרם here used, signifies an overflow, or an inundation of water: And *Ainsworth* reads it *streamed down* or *gushed with a tempest*; so that they were as persons overwhelmed, and plunged over head and ears in water; and therefore the apostle might well call it a being *baptized*.

But now let us consider also, how they might be said to be *baptized in the sea*; and there are several things, in which the Israelites passage through the Red sea, resembled our baptism. As for instance, their following of *Moses* into it, which may be meant by their being *baptized into* him, was an acknowledgment of their regard unto him, as their Guide and Governor; as our baptism is a following of Christ as our Prophet, who has taught and led us the way; as well as a profession of our faith in him, as our Surety and Savior, and a subjection to him, as our King and Governor: Theirs was at their first entrance upon their journey to *Canaan*, as ours is, when, in a way of profession, we publicly begin our Christian race: They, when they came out of it, could ring and rejoice, in the view of all their enemies being destroyed; as the believer also can in this ordinance, in the view of all his sins being drowned in the sea of Christ's blood, withers the instances of the Eunuch and Jailor. But in nothing is there a greater resemblance between them, than in their descending into it, and coming up out of it; which is very much expressive of the mode of baptism by immersion. And this I choose to deliver in the words of the judicious *Gataker*.[22] "The descent, (that is, of the Israelites) says he, into the inmost and lowest parts of the sea, and their ascent out of it again upon dry land, hath a very great agreement with the rite of Christian baptism, as it was administered in the primitive times; seeing in baptizing they went down into the water, and came up again out of the same; of which descent and ascent express mention is made in the dipping of the Ethiopian Eunuch (Acts 8:38, 39). Moreover, as in the Christian rite, when they were immersed, they were overwhelmed in water, and as it were buried; and in some measure, seemed to be buried together with Christ. And again, when they immersed, they seemed to rise, even as out of a grave, and to be risen with Christ (Rom. 6:4, 5; Col. 2:12). "So likewise, the waters of the sea standing up

higher than the heads of those that passed through it, they might seem to be overwhelmed; and in some respects, to be buried therein, and to immerse and rise out again, when they came out safe on the other side of the shore." And having now considered all those exceptions, which our author has made against this sense of the word, which is contended for, I hope it will appear, that he has little reason to make that vain triumph he does, in page 38 where, he asks, "Where now is your *baptizo*, that signifies nothing else but plunging and overwhelming?" As for his comparing the passage of the Israelites through the Red sea, to his travelling to *Scotland* with the Irish Sea on his left hand, and the German on his right, and to his journeying to *Cornwall*, with the British channel at some distance from him, on his left hand, and the channel of *Bristol* on his right, I cannot see it can be of any service, unless it be to lay aside the Israelites' passage through the sea as a miracle, and so furnish the atheist and deist with an argument, such an one as it is, for their purpose. As for his sneer upon plunging in it, I can easily forgive him, and pass it by, as well as that of the plunging of the Egyptians, with the same contempt in which he delivers them. Having thus considered his exceptions to those arguments produced for plunging, I shall in the next chapter take notice of his reasons against it.

CHAPTER 7

Mr. B. W.'s reasons against plunging in baptism, considered.

Mr. *B. W.* in the next place, proceeds to give us some reasons in page 43 why he is against the administration of the ordinance of baptism by plunging. And his

First reason is, "because there is not any foundation for it in the word of God; no precept, no example, says he, no necessary consequence, no words nor found of words to favor it;" and a little lower, "There is not a word, he means of plunging, nor the shadow of a word; and therefore I think I have good reason against it." Words are the shadows, representations, and expressions of our minds; but what the *shadow of a word* is, I cannot devise, unless he means the least appearance of a word: as perhaps he may; and that I suppose is an initial letter of a word, or an abbreviation, etc. But the holy Ghost does not write in such a manner, and therefore we expect to find whole words, or none at all. But to proceed, does he want a *precept*? let him read Matthew 28:19 or an *example*? let him take Christ for one (Matthew 3:16), the Eunuch (Acts 8:38, 39). And is no necessary consequence to be deduced from the places *John* and the apostles baptized in? nor from the circumstances which attended it, of going down and coming up out of the water? I hope it will appear to every thinking, and unprejudiced person, that it has been proved that not only the found of words, but the true sense of words favor it.

His *other* reason is, "because it is not only without foundation in the word of God, but it is directly against it;" but how does that appear? Why, suppose some poor creatures, says he, upon a bed of languishing, under consumptions, catarrhs, pains, sores, and bruises, be converted, and that perhaps in the depth of winter, it is their duty to be baptized, that is true? but is it their duty to be plunged? no, to be sure; for the whole word of God commands self-preservation; and therefore it is evident, that plunging is against the commands of God."

I suppose he takes it to be contrary to the sixth command; but if it is the duty of persons to be baptized, it is their duty to be plunged; for there is no true baptism without it? But what, in the depth of winter? why not? what damage is like to come by it? Our climate is not near so cold as *Muscovy*, where they always dip their infants in baptism, to this very day; as does also the Greek church in all parts of the world. But what, plunge persons when under consumptions, catarrhs, etc? why not? perhaps it may be of use to them for the restoration of health; and its being performed on a sacred account, can never be any hindrance to it. Whoever reads Sir *John Floyer's History of Cold-bathing*, and the many cures that have been performed thereby, which he there relates, will never think that this is a sufficient objection against plunging in baptism; which learned physician has also of late published *An Essay to restore the dipping of Infants in their Baptism*; which he argues *for*, not only *from* the signification of baptism, and its theological end, but likewise from the medicinal use of dipping, for preventing and curing many distempers. If it may be useful for the health of tender infants, and is in many cases now made use of, it can never be prejudicial to grown persons: He argues from the liturgy and rubric of the church of *England*, which requires *dipping* in baptism, and only *allows pouring of water* in case of weakness, and never so much as granted a permission for sprinkling. He proves in this book, and more largely in his former, that the constant practice of the church of *England*, ever since the plantation of Christianity, was to dip or plunge in baptism; which he says continued after the reformation until King *Edward* the sixth's time and after. Nay, that its disuse has been within this hundred years: And here I cannot forbear mentioning a passage of his, to this purpose,[23] "Our fonts are built, says he, with a sufficient capacity for dipping of infants, and they have been so used for five hundred years in *England*, both Kings and Common people have been dipped; but now our fonts stand in our churches as monuments, to upbraid us with our change or neglect of our baptismal immersion." And I wish he had not reason to say as he does,[24] that sprinkling was first introduced by the Assembly of Divines, in 1643, by a vote of 25 against 24, and established by an ordinance of parliament in 1644. Which complaint Mr. *Wall*[25] has taken up, who wrote the last in this controversy, having studied it for many years; and has fairly acknowledged, that immersion is the right mode of baptism; for which reason he calls upon his brethren, the clergy, to a reformation in it: As for those who would willingly conform to the liturgy, he says before them the difficulties they must expect to meet with; which, betides the general one of breaking an old custom, he mentions two more: The one is from those *who are presbyterianly inclined*, who as they were the first introducers of it, will be tenacious enough to keep it. And the other is, from midwives and nurses, *etc*. whole pride in the fine dressing of the child will be entirely lost. But to return from whence I have digressed. Mr. *B*. *W*. it seems, is of opinion, that baptism by plunging, is not only against the sixth, but also against the seventh command, for which reason he must be against it. To baptize by plunging, he insinuates is "a practice contrary to the whole current of Christ's pure precepts, of an uncomely aspect, and seemingly scandalous and ignominious to the honor of Christianity; and that one would think a man would as soon deny all right reason, and religion, as believe Christ would ever command such a practice."

But I appeal to any, even our worst adversaries, that make any conscience of what they say or do, who have seen the ordinance administered, whether it is of such an uncomely aspect, and so seemingly scandalous, as this defamer has represented it. "And, says he, to use the words of a servant of Christ, can we therefore imagine, that Christ's baptism should entrench so much upon the laws of civility, charity, and modesty, as to require women and maids to appear openly in the light of the fun, out of their wonted habit, in transparent and thin garments, next to nakedness, and in that

posture be took by a man in his arms, and plunged in the face of the whole congregation, before men and boys!" Who this servant of Christ is, whose words he uses, and has made his own, he does not tell us. I shall therefore inform the reader, they are the words of one *Ruffen*, an author he might well be ashamed to mention in the manner he does: However I shall not be ashamed to give Mr. *Stennett's* reply to this paragraph, in his excellent answer to that scurrilous writer, which I have put in the margent;[26] and would also recommend that book to the readers of our author, but especially to himself; for had he read it before he published his, perhaps it might have prevented it, or at least, have made him ashamed to quote those expressions, with such a complement upon the author of them. How does this become one, who calls himself a minister of the gospel, to be guilty of such a scandal and defamation as this is? What, did the man never see the ordinance administered? If he has, his wickedness in publishing this is the greater; if not, he ought to have took an opportunity to have informed himself, before he had made so free with the practice, as to asperse it after this manner. It is well known, that the clothes we use in baptism, are either the person's wearing apparel, or else those which are on purpose provided, which are made of as thick, or thicker stuff, than what are usually worn in the performance of the most servile work. those who have seen the ordinance administered, know with what decency it is performed, and with couth, I am persuaded what our author says will find but little credit. I have nothing else, I think, to observe now, unless it be, his arguing for the preferableness of applying water to the person, to any other mode of baptism, from the application of grace to us, and not us to that, in page 46 which I suppose was forgot in the conference, or else he had not an opportunity to crowd it in. To which I need only reply, that there does not appear to be any necessity of using a mode in baptism, that must be conformable to that; besides, if there was, does not every body know, that in plunging a person, there is an application of the water to him, as well as an application of him to the water? For as soon as ever a person is plunged, the water will apply itself to him. As to the vanity which he thinks we are guilty of, in monopolizing the name of *baptists* to ourselves, he may take the name himself if he pleases, seeing he thinks we have nothing to do with it, for we will not quarrel with him about it: But since it is necessary to make use of some names of distinction in civil conversation, he does well to tell us, what name we should be called by, and that is *plungers*; but then he will be hard put to it to shew the difference between a *Baptist* and a *plunger*. Betides, the old objection against the name *Baptist* being peculiar to *John*, or so an administrator, may as well be objected against this name as the other, because we are not all *plungers*, but by far the greatest part, are only *persons plunged*. However I could wish, as well as he, that all names were laid aside, especially as terms of reproach, and the great name of Christ alone exalted.

CHAPTER 8.

Concerning the free or mixt communion of churches.

Mr. *B*. *W*. here and there drops a sentence, signifying his love and affection to persons of our persuasion, as in page 42 "Christians of your persuasion, I hope, I dearly love;" this and such like expressions, I can understand no otherwise than as a wheedling and cajoling of those of his members, who are of a different persuasion from him in this point, whom he knows he must have grieved and offended, by this shameful and scandalous way of writing. And at the same time, when

he expresses so much love to them, he lets them know, that he "does not admire their plunging principle, though he does not love to make a great noise about it." I think he has made a great noise about it, and such an one as, perhaps by this time, he would be glad to have said. He signifies his readiness "to carry on evangelical fellowship, in all the acts thereof, with chearfulness," with those who are differently minded from him. That those of a different persuasion from us, should willingly receive into their communion such whom they judge believers in Christ, who have been baptized by immersion; I do not wonder at, seeing they generally judge baptism performed so, to be valid; but how Mr. *B*. *W*. can receive such, I cannot see, when he looks upon it to be no *ordinance of God*, page 41 and a *superstitious invention*, page 23. nay, *will-worship*, page 24. There are two churches in *London*, which, I have been informed, will not receive persons of our persuasion into their communion; but whether it is, because they judge our baptism invalid, and so we not proper persons for communion, or whether it is a prudential step, that their churches may not be over-run by us, I cannot tell; I think those of our persuasion act a very weak part in proposing to belong to any such churches, who, when they are in them, are too much regarded only for the sake of their subscriptions, are but *noun substantives* therein, and too many like *Issachar's* ass, *bow down between two burdens*. But to return, Mr. *B*. *W*. has thought fit, in the close of this conference, to produce "some few reasons for the equity and necessity of communion with saints as saints, without making difference in judgment about water-baptism, a bar unto evangelical church fellowship;" which I shall now consider.

1. "God has received them, and we should be followers of God as dear ildren. We are commanded to receive one another, as Christ hath received us to the glory of God." That we should be followers of God in all things, which he has made our duty, is certain, but his, and his Son's reception of persons, is no rule for the reception of church members. A sovereign lord may do what he pleases himself, but his servants must act according to his orders: God and Christ have received unconverted sinners, but that is no rule for churches; God the Father has so received them into his love and affections, as to let them apart for himself, provide all blessings of grace for them, nay, give himself in covenant to them, send his Son to die for them, his Spirit to convert them, and all previous to it. Christ also hath received them, so as to become a surety for them, take the charge both of their persons and grace, give himself a ransom for them, and bestow his grace upon them; for we are first apprehended by Christ, before we are capable of apprehending and receiving him: must we therefore receive unconverted persons into church-fellowship, because God and Christ have received them? It is what God has commanded us to do, and not all that he himself does, that we are to be followers of him in, or indeed can be; besides, the churches of Christ are oftentimes obliged, according to Christ's own rules, to reject those whom Christ has received, and cut them off from church-communion; witness the incestuous person; so that they are not persons merely received by Christ, but persons received by Christ, subjecting themselves to his ordinances, and to the laws of his house, that we are to receive, and retain in churches. The text in Romans 15:7 which speaks of receiving one another, as Christ, hath received us to the glory of God, can never be understood of the receiving of persons into church-fellowshipping For the persons who are exhorted both to receive and be received, were members of churches already; therefore that text only regards the mutual love and affection which they should have to one another, as brethren and church-members; which is enforced by the strong love and affection Christ had to them.

2. "All saints are alike partakers of the great and fundamental privileges of the gospel." If by the great and fundamental privileges of the gospel, he means union to Christ, justification by him, faith

in him, and communion with him, who denies that saints are partakers of these things? Though in some of them, not all *alike*; for some have more faith in Christ, and more communion with him, than others have: But what is this argument produced for? Or indeed, is there any argument in it? does he mean that therefore they ought to partake of gospel ordinances? who denies it? And we would have them partake of them *alike* too, both of Baptism and the Lord's supper; it is the thing we are pleading for.

3. "All believers, though in lesser things differently minded, are in a capacity to promote mutual edification in a church state." But then their admittance into it, and walk with it, must be according to gospel order, or else they are like to be of little service to promote mutual edification in it.

4. "It is observable that the churches for the free communion of saints, are "the most orderly and prosperous." This observation is wrong, witness the churches in *Northamptonshire*, where there is scarcely an orderly or prosperous one of that way; they having been made a prey of, and pillaged by others, to whole capricious humors they have been too much subject.

5. "Many waters should not in the least quench love, nor should the floods drown it." This is foolishly and impertinently applied to water-baptism: But what is it that some men cannot see in some texts of Scripture?

6. "Behold how good and how pleasant it is!" I think I must also make a note of admiration too, as wondering what the man means by giving us half a sentence! But perhaps this is to give us a specimen of *what shadows of words* are, though I suppose he means *for brethren to dwell together in unity*; it would have been no great trouble to have expressed it; but he is willing to let us know that he has got a concise way of speaking and writing. For brethren to dwell together in unity, is indeed very pleasant and delightful: But *how can two walk*, or dwell together thus, *except they are agreed*!

7. "All the saints shall for ever dwell in glory together." Who denies it? But does it from thence follow, that they must all dwell together on earth? And if he means that it may be inferred from hence, that they ought to be admitted, whilst here, to church-fellowship, who denies it? But I hope it must be in a way agreeable to gospel order; and he ought to have first proved, that admission to church-fellowship without water baptism, is according to gospel order, Jesus Christ, no doubt, receives many unbaptized persons into heaven; and so he does no doubt, such who never partook of the Lord's supper; nay, who never were in church-fellowship: But are these things to be laid aside by us upon that account? We are not to take our measures of acting in Christ's church here below, from what he himself does in heaven, but from those rules which he has left us on earth to go by. Having thus considered our author's reasons, for the free and mixt communion of saints, without making water baptism a bar to it; I shall take the liberty to subjoin some reasons against it, which I desire chiefly might be regarded and considered by those who are of the same persuasion with us, with respect to the ordinance of water-baptism. They are as follow:

1. Because such a practice is contrary to Christ's commission, in Matthew 28:19 where Christ's orders are to baptize those that are taught. It is not only without a precept of Christ, which in matters of worship we should be careful that we do not act without, (for he has no where commanded to receive unbaptized persons into churches) but it is also contrary to one which

requires all believers to be baptized; and this must be either before they are church members or after they are so, or never. The two latter, I dare say, will not be asserted, and therefore the former is true.

2. It is contrary to the order and practice of the primitive churches; it is not only without a precept, but without a precedent: The admission of the first converts after Christ's death, resurrection, and ascension, into church fellowship, was after this manner. First, *they gladly received the word*, then were *baptized*, and after that, *added to the church* (Acts 2:41). So the apostle *Paul* first believed, then was baptized, and after that assayed to join himself to the disciples (Acts 9:18, 26). Who therefore that has any regard to a command of Christ, and an apostolic practice, would break in upon such a beautiful order as this? I challenge any person, to give one single instance of any one that was ever received into those primitive churches without being first baptized.

3. It has a tendency to lay aside the ordinance entirely. For upon the same foot that persons, who plead their baptism in their infancy, which to us is none at all, may be received, those who never make pretensions to any, yea, utterly deny water-baptism, may also. Moreover, if once it is accounted an indifferent thing, that may, or may not be done; that it is unnecessary and unessential to church-communion, to which persons may be admitted without it, they will lie under a temptation wholly to omit it, rather than incur the trouble, shame, and reproach that attend it.

4. It has a tendency to lay aside the ordinance of the Lord's-Supper, and indeed all others. For, suppose a person should come and propose for communion, to any of those churches who are upon this foundation, and give a satisfactory account of his faith and experience to them, so that they are willing to receive him; but after all, he tells them he is differently minded from them, with respect to the ordinance of the Lord's-Supper: I am willing to walk with you, says he, in all other ordinances but that; and, as to that, I am very willing to meet when you do, and with you; to remember Christ's dying love: I hope I shall be enabled to feed by faith, upon his flesh and blood as well as you; but I think to eat the bread, and drink the wine, are but outward ceremonies, and altogether needless. I should be glad to know, whether any of these churches would reject this man? I am lure, according to their own principles, they cannot. Therefore has not this a tendency to lay aside the ordinance of the Lord's Supper? For if it is warrantable for one man, it is for ten or twenty, and so on *ad infinitum*. All that I can meet with, as yet, that is objected to this, is, that the Lord's-Supper is a church-ordinance, and cannot be dispensed with in such a case; but baptism is not, and therefore may. But baptism is an ordinance of Christ, and therefore cannot be dispensed with no more than the other: By a church-ordinance, they either mean an ordinance of the church's appointing; or else one that is performed by persons when in a church state. The former, I presume, they do not mean, because the Lord's-Supper is not in that sense a church-ordinance: And if they mean in the latter sense, that baptism is not a church-ordinance, then certainly it ought to be performed before they are in a church state; which is the thing pleaded for. When they talk of baptism's not being essential to salvation, who says it is? but will this tolerate the abuse, neglect, or omission of it? Is any thing relating to divine worship essential to salvation? but what, must it all be laid aside because it is not? is not this an idle way of talking?

5. It is a rejecting the *pattern* which Christ has given us, and a trampling upon his legislative power; is this doing all things according to his direction, when we step over the first thing, after believing, that is enjoined us? Is not this making too free with his legislative power, to alter his rules at

pleasure? and what else is it, but an attempt to jostle Christ out of his throne? It is no other than an imputation of weakness to him, as if he did not know what was best for his churches to observe; and of carelessness, as if he was unconcerned whether they regarded his will or no. Let such remember the case of *Nadab* and *Abihu*. In matters of worship, God takes notice of those things that seem but *small*, and will contend with his people upon that account. A power to dispense with Christ's ordinances, was never given to any men, or set of men or churches upon earth. An ordinance of Christ does not depend upon so precarious a foundation, as persons having, or not having light into it: If they have not, they must make use of proper means, and wait till God gives them it.

6. We are commanded to withdraw from *every brother that walks disorderly*; not only from persons of an immoral conversation, but also from those who are corrupt in doctrine, or in the administration of ordinances; if this is not a disorderly walking, to live in the abuse, or neglect and omission of a gospel ordinance,. I know not what is: We are not to suffer sin upon a brother, but reprove him for it; bear our testimony against it, lest we be partakers of his guilt; and if we are to *withdraw* from such disorderly persons, then we ought not to *receive* them.

7. This practice makes our separation from the Established church, look more like a piece of obstinacy, than a case of conscience: What, shall we boggle at reading the Common-prayer-book, wearing the surplice, kneeling at the Lord's supper, etc. and can at once drop an ordinance of Christ? If this is not straining at gnats, and swallowing of camels, I must confess myself mistaken. To all this I might have added also, that it is contrary to the constant and universal practice of the churches of Christ, in all ages of the world. To receive an unbaptized person into communion, was never once attempted among all the corruptions of the church of some: This principle of receiving only baptized persons into communion, was maintained by the authors of the glorious Reformation from Popery, and those who succeeded them. As for the present practice of our *Presbyterians* and *Independents*, they proceed not upon the same foot as our *Semi-Quakers* do. They judge our baptism to be valid, and their own too; and therefore promiscuously receive persons; but, according to their own principles, will not receive one that is unbaptized. And could we look upon their baptism valid too, what we, call mixed communion would wholly cease, and consequently the controversy about it be entirely at an end; therefore the *Presbyterians* and *Independents* do not maintain a free and mixt communion in the same sense, and upon the same foundation, as some of our persuasion do, which those persons would do well to consider. It may be thought necessary by some, that before I conclude, I should make an apology for taking notice of such a trifling pamphlet as this is, which I have been considering. Had it not been for the importunity of some of my friends, as well as the vain ovations, and silly triumphs, which those of a different persuasion from us are ready to make upon every thing that comes out this way, however weak it be, I should never have given myself the trouble of writing, nor others of reading hereof. If it should be asked, why I have been so large in considering several things herein, to which a shorter reply would have been sufficient? I answer, It is not because I thought the author deserved it, but having observed that the arguments and exceptions which he has licked up from others, have been, and still are, received by persons of far superior judgment and learning to himself, and who are better versed in this controversy than he appears to be; it is upon that account, as well as to do justice to the truth I have been defending, I have taken this method. But if any should think me blame-worthy, in taking notice of some things herein, which do not carry in them the appearance of an argument, I persuade myself they will easily forgive me, when they consider how ready some captious persons would

have been to say, I had passed over some of his material objections. However, without much concerning myself what any one shall say of this performance, I commit it to the blessing of God, and the consideration of every impartial reader.

A

Defense Of A Book, Entitled,

THE ANCIENT MODE OF BAPTIZING BY IMMERSION,

Plunging, Or Dipping In Water, Etc.

AGAINST MR. MATTHIAS MAURICE'S REPLY, CALLED,

Plunging into Water no Scriptural Mode of Baptizing, etc.

Chapter 1.

Some Remarks on Mr. M's entrance to his Work

Having lately attempted to vindicate the ancient mode of baptizing, by immersion, plunging, or dipping into water, against the exceptions of an anonymous pamphlet, entitled, *The manner of baptizing with water, cleared up from the word of God and right reason, etc.* The author, who appears to be Mr. *Matthias Maurice* of *Rowell* in *Northamptonshire,* has thought fit to reply. He seems angry at the treatment he has met with; but if he thought that his name would have commanded greater respect, why did not he put it to his book? and why did he refuse to give satisfaction to his friends when inquired of about the author of it? Would he be treated as a gentleman, a scholar, or a Christian? he ought to have wrote as such. Who is the aggressor? who gave the first provocation? If I have any where exceeded the bounds of Christianity, or humanity, I would readily acknowledge it upon the first conviction; but who indeed "can touch pitch, without being defiled with it?" Three or four pages are filled up with a whining, insinuating harangue, upon the nature of controversies, and the disagreeable temper and spirit with which they are frequently managed; designing hereby to wipe himself clean, whilst he is casting reproach upon others. I would not be an advocate for burlesque and banter in religious controversies; but if he would have them banished from thence, why does he make use of them, even in this his performance, which begins with such loud exclamations against them. As for instance, how does he pun upon presumptive proofs, page 13 and in page 27. Speaking of our baptizing in *holes* or *cisterns,* as he is pleased to call them, "Thus, says he, you have forsook the scriptural way of baptizing *with* water, and have hewn out unto yourselves cisterns," referring to Jeremiah 2:13 besides the frequent sneers with which his book abounds. Now if burlesque and banter, in general, ought to be laid aside, much more punning and bantering with the words of scripture, which are sacred and awful. Is this the man that directs others to "write in the fear of God, having the awful Judge, and the approaching

judgment in view;" and yet takes such a liberty as this? He says, page 7, "I shall not entertain the reader with any remarks upon his performance, as it is ludicrous, virulent and defaming:" Which, itself is a manifest defamation, as the reader cannot but observe; it being asserted without attempting to give one single instance wherein it appears to be so. With what face can he call it ludicrous; when he himself, in the debate, has been so wretchedly guilty that way? when he talks, page 9 of "Christ's being under water still: and in page 10 of *John's* thrusting the people into thorns and briars, when he baptized in the wilderness;" as also his concluding from *Philip* and the Eunuch's coming up out of the water, page 19 that "neither of them was drowned there;" with other such like rambling stuff, which he might have been attained to publish to the world. Moreover, what defamation has he been guilty of, in representing it, as the judgment of "some of us to baptize naked?" page 22. And in the words of *a servant of Christ,* as he calls him, page 44 tells the world that we "baptize persons in thin and transparent garments;" which, in other cases, would be accounted down right lying. Nay even in this his last performance, page 44 he has the assurance to insinuate, as if we ourselves thought plunging to be immodest, because we put lead at the bottom of our plunging garments; why could not he as well have argued from our making use of clothes themselves? it is strange that a carefulness to prevent every thing that looks like immodesty, should be improved as an evidence of it: None but a man that is ill-natured and virulent, would ever be guilty of such an insinuation.

What his friends, at Rowell, may think of his performances, I cannot tell; but I can assure him, that those of his persuasion at London think very meanly of them; and, as the most effectual way to secure the honor of their cause, which is endangered by such kind of writing as his, say, "he is a weak man that has "engaged in the controversy;" though, perhaps, some of his admirers may think that he is one of the mighty men of Israel, who, like another Samson, has smote us hip and thigh; but if I should say, that it is with much such an instrument as he once used, I know that I should be very gravely and severely reprimanded for it, my grace and good manners called in question, and perhaps be pelted into the bargain, with an old musty proverb or sentence, either in Greek or Latin; but I will forbear, and proceed to the consideration of his work, as he calls it. His first attack, page 8 is upon a final sentence of Latin, made use of to express the nauseous and fulsome repetition, of threadbare arguments in this controversy, to which he has thought fit, to give no less than three several answers.

1. He says the Latin is false, because of an erratum of *coctum* for *cocta;* which had I observed before the last half sheet had been worked off, should have been inserted among the *errata;* whereby he would have been prevented making this learned remark; though had it not fallen under my notice, before he pointed it to me, he should have had the honor of this great discovery. He does well indeed to excuse his making such low observations, as being beneath the vast designs he has in view. I might as well take notice of his Greek proverb, page 25 where οσπερ, is put for ασπερ, and charge it with being false Greek, though I should rather choose to ascribe it to the fault of the printer, than the inadvertency of the writer. However, he does well to let his readers know that he can write Greek; which they could not have come at the knowledge of, by his former performance. But why does not he give a version of his Latin and Greek scraps, especially seeing he writes for the benefit of the Lord's people, the Godly, and poor men and women, that cannot look into Dictionaries, and consult Lexicons; besides, all the wit therein will be lost to them, as well as others be left unacquainted with his happy genius for, and skill in translating.

2. He says, "the application of this *sentence* is false:" But how does it appear? why, because at *Rowell* he and his people are very moderate in the affair of baptism, they s*eldom* discourse of it; when every body knows, that has read my book, that the paragraph referred to, regards not the private conversation of persons on that subject, but the repeated writings which have been published to the world on his fide the question. If the different sentiments of his people, about Baptism, "make no manner of difference in affection, church-relation," etc. as he says page 9 why does he give them any disturbance? what could provoke him to write after the manner he has done? He knows very well, however mistaken they may be about this ordinance, in his apprehensions, yet that they are conscientious in what they do; why should he then sneer at them, as he does for their practice of plunging, and fix upon them the heavy charges of superstition and will-worship? Is not this man a wise shepherd, that will give disturbance to his flock, when the sheep are still and quiet?

3. He would have his reader believe, that in using this sentence, I would insinuate, that the notions wherein they differ from us about baptism are poisonous, when I intend no such thing; nor does the proverb, as expressed by me, lead to any such thought, but is used for a nauseous repetition of things, with which his performance, we are considering, very plentifully abounds. We do not look upon mistakes about the grace of God, the person of Christ, and the person and operations of the Spirit, to be of a lesser nature than those about Baptism, as he reproachfully insinuates; for we do with a becoming zeal and courage, oppose such erroneous doctrines in those who are of the same mind with us, respecting baptism, as much as we do in those who differ from us therein. Page 10. He seems to be angry with me for calling him an anonymous author; what should I have called him, since he did not put his name to his book? he asks, "Who was the penman of the epistle to the Hebrews?" Very much to the purpose indeed! and then brings in a scrap of Greek out of Synesius, with whom, however he may agree in the choice of an obscure life, yet will not in the affair of Baptism; for Synesius was baptized upon profession of his faith, and after that made bishop of Ptolemais. "Hundreds of precious tracts, he says, have been published without the names of their authors;" among which, I hope, he does not think his must have a place, it having no authority from the scripture, whatever else it may pretend to; as I hope hereafter to make appear.

Chapter 2.

The proofs for immersion, taken from the circumstances which attended the Baptism of John, Christ, and his Apostles, maintained: and Mr. M'ʼs demonstrative proofs, for pouring or sprinkling, considered.

The ordinance of water-baptism, is not only frequently inculcated in the New Testament, as an ordinance that ought to be regarded; but also many instances of persons who have submitted to it, are therein recorded, and those attended with such circumstances, as manifestly show, to unprejudiced minds, in what manner it was performed.

1. The baptism of Christ administered by John deserves to be mentioned, and considered first: This was performed in the river Jordan (Matthew 3:6, 13), and the circumstance of his coming up out of

the water, as soon as it was done, recorded verse 16 is a full demonstration that he was in it; now that he should go into the river Jordan, to have water poured, or sprinkled on him, is intolerable, and ridiculous to suppose. Mr. M. in his debate, page 6 tells us, that the words "only signify, □□□that he went up from the water;" to which I replied, that the preposition signifies out of, and is justly rendered so here. I gave him an instance of it, which he has not thought fit to except against; yet still he says, the "criticism delivers us from a necessity of concluding, that Christ was in the water:" though it has been entirely baffled; neither has he attempted to defend it. And, because I say, that "we do not infer plunging, merely from Christ's going down into, and coming up out of the water;" therefore he would have the argument from hence, as well as from the same circumstances attending the baptism of the Eunuch, wholly laid aside; which I do not wonder at, because it presses him hard. He seems to triumph, because I have not, in his positive and dogmatical way, asserted those circumstances, to be demonstrative proofs of immersion; as though they were entirely given up as such; but he is more ready to receive, than I am to give. This is a manifest indication, I will not say, of a wounded cause only, but of a dying one, which makes him catch at every thing to support himself under, or, free himself from those pressures, which lie hard upon him. We insist upon it, that those proofs are demonstrative, so far as proofs from circumstances can be so; and challenge him to give the like in favor of pouring or sprinkling. Is it not a wretched thing, to use our author's words; that not one text of scripture can be produced, which will vindicate the practice of sprinkling in baptism; and that among all the instances of the performance of the ordinance, which are recorded in scripture; not one single circumstance can render it so much as probable?

2. We not only read of many others baptized by *John*, but also the places which he chore to administer it in, which will lead any thinking, and considering mind to conclude, that it was performed by immersion: Now, one of those places, where John baptized a considerable number, and among the rest Christ Jesus, was the river *Jordan* (Matthew 3:6; Mark 1:5, 9), the latter of which texts Mr. M. says, page 12 "leads us to *no* other thought, than that Jesus was baptized of *John* at *Jordan*; as the preposition ειϖ, he says, is sometimes translated;" though he gives us no one instance of it. Now in his debate, page 7 he says, "that the holy Ghost himself tells us, that nothing else is intended by it than baptizing *in* Jordan;" and yet this man takes a liberty to differ from him. What will he be at next? to such straits are men driven, who oppose the plain words of the Holy Ghost, as he is pleased to say in another case. *Ænon* was another of those places, which *John* chose to baptize in; and the reason of his making choice of it was, *because there was much water there* (John 3:23), which was proper and necessary, for the baptizing of persons by immersion. Mr. M. says, page 19 "that the holy Ghost does not say that they were baptized there, because there was much water; but that *John* was also baptizing in *Ænon* because there was much water there;" but what difference is there? Why only between *John's* administering the ordinance, and the persons to whom it was administered. He says, page 21 that I have granted that the words, he means υδατα πολλα, literally denote, "many rivulets or streams;" which is notoriously false; for I do in express words utterly deny it; and have proved from the use of the phrase in the New Testament, and in the Septuagint version of the Old, as well as from *Nonnus's* paraphrase of the text, that it signifies "large waters, or abundance of them:" I do assure him, that neither of the editions of *Nonnus*, which he has the vanity to mention, was made use of by me; but if there had been any material difference in them, from what I have made use of, I suppose he would have observed it to me, if he has consulted them; and I would also inform him, that *Nonnus* has not always a Latin version printed along with it, as he wrongly asserts. I have consulted *Calvin* upon the place directed to by him: the

text says, that *Jesus and his disciples came into the land of Judea*; and *Calvin* upon it says, that "he came into that part of the country which was nigh to *Ænon*;" but neither the text, nor *Calvin* upon it, say that they were both at *Ænon*, as our author insinuates; so that from hence there appears no necessity of concluding that choice was made of this place for the accommodation of the large number of people which attended, either upon the ministry of Christ or *John*; that so both they and their cattle might be refreshed, as he ridiculously enough suggests. As to the account he has given of the land of *Canaan*, it is manifest, notwithstanding all his shifts and cavils, that he did represent it in general as a land that wanted water, especially a great part of it; now whatever little spots (for the land itself was not very large) might not be so well watered, yet it is certain, that in general it was; and is therefore called *a land of brooks of water*, etc. But since he acknowledges there was plenty of water at *Ænon*, where *John* was baptizing, which is sufficient for our purpose, we need not further inquire about the land.

3. Another remarkable instance of baptism is that of the Eunuch's, in Acts 8:38 which is attended with such circumstances, as would leave any person, that is seriously inquiring after truth, without any scruple or hesitation, in what manner it was performed. In verse 36 we are told, that *they came* unto *a certain water*, where the Eunuch desiring baptism, and *Philip* agreeing to it, after he had made a confession of his faith, it is said, verse 38 that *they went down both* into *the water*; they first came *to* it, and then went *into* it; which leaves that observation without any real foundation, which supposes that their going down into the water signifies no more than the descent which led to the rivers for they were come thither before, as appears from verse 36 where a phrase is made use of different from this in verse 38. Now though I had observed to our author, that it was not *to*, but *into* the water they went, to which he has not thought fit to reply; yet he still produces his impertinent instance *of going down to the sea in ships*; which is all that can be obtained from him, to set aside the force of this evidence; which, how weak and ridiculous it is, will easily appear to every judicious reader. Now if persons will but diligently consider those plain instances of baptism, in an humble and hearty search after truth, they will find that they amount to little less than a full demonstration that it was performed in those early times of *John*, Christ, and his apostles, by an immersion or plunging of the whole body under water, as has been fully acknowledged by many great and excellent divines, But now let us consider Mr. M's demonstrative proofs for pouring or sprinkling water in baptism, produced by him, page 14.

1. He says, "pouring water in baptism, is a true representation of the donation of the Spirit; being, according to God's word, instituted for that end" (Isa. 44:3; Ezek. 36:25; Matthew 3:11; 1 Cor.12:13). But the word of God no where expresses, or gives the least intimation, that baptism was instituted for any such end; it is true, the donation of the Spirit is sometimes called a *baptism*, and so are the sufferings of Christ; but do we make use of such mediums as there to prove the representation of them to be the end of this ordinance? though it would with equal strength conclude the one as the other: Besides, he might as well argue, that the end of baptism is to represent the passage of the Israelites through the Red Sea, because that is called *a baptism* also. But how does pouring of water in baptism, according to the practice of our modern Paedobaptists, represent the donation of the Spirit, when they only let fall a few drops of water upon the face? But the Spirit's grace is expressed by pouring *floods of water* upon his people in Isaiah 44:3 one of the texts referred to by our author. Though I have acknowledged, and still do, that the ordinary donation of the Spirit is sometimes expressed by pouring, and sometimes by sprinkling, yet that it was the extraordinary one which the disciples received on the day of Pentecost, that is particularly

called *the baptism of the Spirit and of fire*, by *John* and Christ. Now says Mr. M. page 17 if this was by pouring, then you are undone: perhaps not. But what does he think will undo us? why the prophecy of *Joel*, cited in Acts 2:16, 17. *I will* pour *out of my Spirit upon all flesh*. To which I reply, that though this extraordinary instance of the Spirit's grace is expressed, as well as the more ordinary ones are, by pouring, under the Old-Testament-dispensation, in allusion to those frequent libations, or drink-offerings, which were then used; yet it need not seem strange, that when this prophecy was nearer accomplishing, and there was a greater display of divine grace, that another word should be used which more largely expressed the abundance of it: It is no wonder that it should be more abundant in the exhibition than in the prophecy; besides this text, and all others in the Old Testament, which express the Spirit's grace in this, or any other form of language whatever, can never be looked upon as sufficient proofs of the manner in which a New-Testament ordinance is to be administered, which was never instituted with a view to represent it.

2. He says, *it*, that is, "pouring water in baptism," exactly answers to John's "baptism he said that *he baptized with water*" (Luke 3:15). But it seems, according to him in page 15 that the phrase of baptizing *with* water, regards the strength of the administrator's arms, *wherewith* he performs, and not the mode of baptizing; so that he can pretty easily tell us *wherein* and *wherewith* a person may be plunged, though he still says plunging *with* water is an expression without sense; but he cannot yet inform us how a man can be plunged *in* it, without being plunged *with* it. I urged that in all the evangelists the words are, εν υδαπ, "in water," excepting Luke 3:16 where the preposition is omitted, which has occasioned some to think it redundant in the other Evangelists, which I observe no ways hurts our sense and reading of the words; now he wonders that this should make for our reading, or be of any use to us; when all that I observe is, that it does not make against us; if it does, let him make it appear. *John* baptized *in* water, persons were baptized by him *in* the river *Jordan*, and not *with* it.

3. Another demonstrative proof of "pouring water in baptism, is, that it is exactly agreeable to the signification of the word, as the Lord gives it to us in the New Testament" (1 Cor. 10:2). Which place I shall more fully consider hereafter, and make it appear, that it is there to be understood in the sense of dipping or plunging.

4. His last proof is, "that it directly answers the promise of what Christ should do (Isa. 53:15), so *shall he* sprinkle *many nations*;" to this text he says, page 43 the commission in Matthew 28:19 refers, which if it does, though I cannot see it can without a very large stretch, it must be only in that part of it which concerns the *teaching* of the Gentiles by the ministry of the apostles, and not that which respects the *baptizing* of them; for the word here rendered *sprinkle*, is rwbd zyn[expressive *of speaking*, as *Kimchi* on the place observes; and the meaning is, that Christ shall speak to the Gentiles in the ministry of the gospel by the apostles, with so much power, majesty, and authority, that *Kings themselves shall shut their mouths at him*; that is, shall silently submit to the scepter of his grace, and to the doctrines of his gospel; *for that which had not been told them*, *shall they see*; *and that which they had not heard*, *shall they consider*. Moreover, who, in the world, could ever imagine, that the ordinance of water baptism, with the mode of its administration, should be intended here? a man must have his imagination prodigiously heated indeed, and his mind captivated with a mere jingle of words, that can look upon such proofs as there, fetcht out of the Old Testament, as demonstrative ones of the true mode of baptizing under the New. Thus we have had a *taste*, as he calls it, of his *demonstrations* of pouring or sprinkling water in baptism.

Chapter 3.

A vindication of Erasmus, *and of his version of* (Acts 10:47).

The author of the debate in page 22 urges the impropriety of *Peter's s*peech in *Cornelius*' house, when he talked of *forbidding water* in baptism, if plunging was the right mode of its administration; to which I replied, that if there was any impropriety in the text, it was not to be charged, either upon the words or sense of the holy Ghost, but upon our translation; and urged, that the word *water* should be put in construction with the word *to be baptized*, and not with the word *forbid*, and the whole text be rendered thus, *Can any man forbid that these should be baptized in water*, *which have received the holy Ghost as well as we*? and produced the testimony of *Erasmus* to confirm it. Now let us attend to Mr. M's animadversions upon it. And,

1. Within the compass of four or five lines, he tells two palpable and notorious untruths; for first, he affirms that I say that the words in Acts 10:47 are not good sense, when it is he that insinuates an impropriety in *Peter's* manner of speaking, supposing plunging to be the mode of baptism; what I say, is, that if there is any impropriety in it, it is not to be charged upon the words or sense of the holy Ghost, but upon our translation;" and yet he would have it, that I assert that the words are not good sense; where do I say so? It is true, I think the words are better rendered according to *Erasmus*' version; and, for what I can yet see to the contrary, I shall abide by it. Again, he says, that I think there is something wanting in the original. With what face can he say so? Or have I attempted a supplement to any part of it? How unfair is this? Yet this is the man that complains of rank injustice, wresting of words and wracking of sentences in polemical writings. He says, he fears God; I hope he does; but he has given but very little evidence of it, in his management of this controversy.

2. He next falls foul upon *Erasmus*, calling him *old Erasmus*; and represents him as disapproved of by the learned; when almost every body knows how much the learned world owes to that great man, and what deference is always paid to him; but why *old Erasmus*, and *great Beza*? Not that I would go about to diminish the praise of *Beza*, yet I cannot but be of opinion, that to let *Erasmus* upon a level with him, in respect of learning, can be no lessening of him; but it seems to me, that the reason of those different epithets which Mr. M. has given to those excellent men, is only because the version of the one removes the foundation of his impertinent cavil, and the note of the other, as he imagines, secures it to him.

3. He proceeds, in the next place, to find fault with my translation of *Erasmus*' version; but if he had had that candor which he would have the world believe he shews in the management of this controversy, he would have easily overlooked this, which he thinks is so much blame-worthy; especially when he could not but observe, that in the very same page, this text is rendered according to the transposition of *Erasmus*, without the negative particle, which hurts the sense: so that he might easily have perceived that this did not arise from a want of knowledge in translating, but from an inadvertency in writing.

4. As to what *Beza* says of this trajection, that it is *dura ac plane insolens*; I shall only say *cum pace tanti viri*, that the trajections in scripture, which he himself approves of, for which see his notes on John 8:25 and Acts 1:2 are not more easy or more usual.

5. The sense of the text requires such a transposition of the words; for the meaning is not, as if *Peter* thought that any person would go about to hinder them of water convenient for the administration of the ordinance of baptism; for such a sense of the words would be trifling and jejune, and yet this our version seems to incline to; but that there might be some who would be displeased with, and to their utmost oppose, the baptizing of those Gentiles. Hence Peter says, *Who can forbid that these should be baptized in water*? Therefore, and what will further confirm this sense and reading of the words, he commands them in the next verse to be baptized: he does not order water to be brought unto them, but that they *be baptized in the name of the Lord*. To all which,

6. Might be added, that this transposition of the words has not its confirmation only from the authority, judgment and learning of *Erasmus*, which is not inconsiderable, but also from others; for, as *Cornelius a Lapide* has observed, both the *Tigurine* version, and that of *Pagnine*'*s*, read the words the same way: so that however *Erasmus* may be disapproved of by the learned, as our author asserts, yet it seems this version is regarded by them.

Chapter 4.

The end of the institution of the ordinance of Baptism, considered.

As the ordinance of water-baptism derives its authority from Christ, so it was instituted by him for some end or other, which may make for his own glory, as well as for the comfort, edification, and increase of faith in his people; and what that end is, we shall now inquire. Mr. M. page 33 says, "the manifest end of it is a representation of the donation of the Spirit to us in the new covenant" (Isa. 44:3; Matthew 3:11; 1 Cor. 12:13). As for the former of there proofs, I need only say, that an Old-Testament-text can never be a proof or evidence of what is the end of the institution of a New-Testament-ordinance: Besides, if it could be thought to have any reference to the affair of baptism, it would only regard the mode, and not the end of this ordinance, for which he has cited it already, and to what purpose has been also shown. As for the two latter texts here produced by him, they only inform us, that the Spirit's grace is called *a baptism,* and so are the sufferings of Christ (Luke 12:50), the representation of which he will not own to be the end of baptism, though every body will see that this may be as strongly concluded from hence, as what he contends for; besides, the martyrdom of the saints is called *a Baptism* (Matthew 20:23), as also the passage of the Israelites through the Red Sea (1 Cor. 10:2), yet no body ever thought that the design of baptism was to represent either of these. Now these are what he calls the plain proofs of the manifest end of baptism, without any force upon scripture. What sort of readers does Mr. M. expect to have, that will be imposed upon by such proofs as there? But there are manifest proofs which fully discover to

us, that the end of this ordinance is to represent the sufferings, death, burial, and resurrection of Christ Jesus.

Christ has particularly instituted two ordinances, *Baptism* and the *Lord's-Supper,* to be observed by his people; and the end of the one is no less evident than that of the other. It is said of the Lord's-Supper, *As often as ye eat this bread, and drink this cup, ye do shew the Lord's death till he come* (1 Cor. 11:26). It is also said of Baptism, *That so many of us, as were baptized into Christ, were baptized into his death* (Rom. 6:3). Did Christ say in the celebration of the Ordinance of the Supper? *This is my blood of the New Testament, which is shed for many for the remission of sins* (Matthew 26:28). His disciples in his name have also laid, *Repent and be baptized every one of you, in the name of Jesus Christ, for the remission of sins* (Acts 2:38): that is, that their faith in that ordinance might be led to the blood of Christ, by which remission of sins was procured; to the grave of Christ, where they were left; and to a risen Savior, where they have a full discharge from them; all which, in a *very* lively manner, is represented in this ordinance of baptism. There are many other texts, besides their, which would lead any truly serious and inquiring mind to observe this to be the true end of baptism, as Romans 6:4, Colossians 2:12, 1 Peter 3:21, and 1 Corinthians 15:29 but because those texts are excepted against by Mr. M. it will be proper more particularly to consider them, and what he is pleased to advance against the commonly received sense of them.

1st, "Romans 6:4, Colossians 2:12" he says, "are not to be understood of water-baptism, but of the baptism of Christ's sufferings, in which his people were considered in him, and with him, as their head and representative." I firmly believe the doctrine of Christ's being a common head, representative, and surety of all the elect of God; for which reason, in my reply, I acknowledged his sense of those texts to be agreeable to the analogy of faith; on the account of which he triumphs, as if it shone *with an unconquerable evidence,* as his expression is, page 34 when I never owned it to be the true sense of the words; for a sense may be given of a text that is agreeable to the analogy of faith, which is foreign enough to the mind of the holy Ghost therein; as for instance, if of Genesis 1:1. *In the beginning God created the heaven and the earth;* a man should give such a sense as this, that God chore a certain number of men in Christ unto salvation, before he created the heaven and the earth: This is a sense that is agreeable enough to the analogy of faith, but none will say that it is the sense of the text. But let us a little consider the exposition of those texts, so much boasted of, and see how well it will bear. As for Romans 6:4, it does not say, that *we are buried with him* in *baptism,* but *by baptism into death:* So that according to Mr. M's exposition, it runs thus, *"We are buried with* Christ representatively in the grave, by his sufferings on the cross, *into* that *death* he there submitted to;" in which, how oddly things hang together, every judicious reader will observe. As to Colossians 2:12. though we are hid to be *buried with him* in *baptism,* yet it is added, *Wherein also you are risen with him;* but how we can be laid to be risen with him in the baptism of his sufferings, will, I believe, not be very easy, to account for. It is better therefore to understand those texts, in the more generally received sense both of ancient and modern divines, who unanimously interpret them of water baptism; in which the death, burial, and resurrection of Christ are very evidently represented, when performed by immersion.

2dly, He says, 1 Peter 3:21 is not meant of water baptism, but of the blood of Christ sprinkled upon the conscience. That the blood of Christ, as sprinkled upon a believer's conscience, is ever called a *Baptism,* I never met with; and, I will venture to say, can never be proved. Besides, the baptism that *Peter* speaks of was a *figure,* ανπτυπον, "an antitype" of *Noah's* ark, and of the deliverance of him

and his family by water; which was a kind of resurrection from the dead, and did well prefigure our salvation by the resurrection of Christ, represented to us in the ordinance of water baptism.

3dly, The sense of 1 Corinthians 15:29. given by me, is also objected against by Mr. M. page 32. and another substituted in its room. Let the readers of the controversy between us judge which is most agreeable. The text is difficult, and has employed the thoughts and pens of the most able and learned men in all ages: Both the senses have their defenders. I shall only refer the reader to the learned notes of Sir *Norton Knatchbull,* on 1 Peter 3:21 where both those texts are considered by him; and where he has sufficiently proved, from scripture, fathers, schoolmen, and modern interpreters, that the ordinance of baptism is a true figure, and just representation of the resurrection of Christ, and of ours by him.

Chapter 5

A consideration of the signification of the Greek word παπτιζω, and particularly, the use of it in Mark 7:4, Luke 11:38, and Hebrews 9:10.

That the proper, primary, common, and natural sense of the Greek word βαπτιζο, is to *dip* or *plunge,* has been acknowledged by the greatest masters of that language; and it is a rule which should be carefully attended to, that the first, natural, and common sense of a word ought to be used in the interpretation of scripture, unless some very good reason can be given why it should be used in a remote, improper, and consequential one. Now though the nature, end, and circumstances of the ordinance of baptism, manifestly shew that immersion is the right mode of administering it, and do abundantly confirm the sense of the Greek word, directing us to the proper and primary use thereof; yet some have endeavored to confine it to a more low and remote sense, but none have attempted to do it with more positiveness and confidence than our author. But what method does he take to effect it, and how does he succeed therein?

Why, 1st, he will exclude all the testimonies of the use of the word among Greek authors uninspired, especially Heathens; which is unreasonable If our translators had confined themselves to this rule, they would have made but poor work in their version of some part of the Bible, where a word is but once used, or at least but very rarely in that sense in which it is to be taken. Now if a controversy concerning the use of a Greek word in scripture arises, which cannot be determined by it, though I do not say this is the case in hand, what methods must be taken? Will it not be very proper to consult Greek authors, either Christian or Heathen, and produce their testimonies, especially the latter? who cannot be suspected of perverting the use of a word, having never been concerned in our religious controversies. But it seems, if we will make use of them, we must be said under an obligation to prove that: "they were delivered under the immediate inspiration of the holy Ghost" was ever such an unreasonable demand made in this world before? Or was the inspiration of the holy Spirit ever thought necessary to fix and determine the sense of a word? But I am willing to lay aside those testimonies in this controversy. And,

2dly, Be confined, as he would have me, to the use of the word in the New Testament; but then I must, it seems, be confined to the use of it, as applied to the ordinance of baptism, which is also unreasonable: He says the word, whenever applied to the ordinance, signifies *pouring* or *sprinkling* only; which is a shameful begging of the question; and if I should say it only signifies *dipping* or *plunging,* whenever applied to it, how must the controversy be decided? Must we not refer the decision of it to other texts of scripture? It is true, the circumstances, which attend the administration of the ordinance are sufficient to determine the true sense of the word, and I am willing to put it upon that issue; but I know he will not stand to it: Besides, why has he himself brought other texts of scripture into the controversy, where the ordinance or baptism is not concerned? As Mark 7:4, Hebrews 9:10, and 1 Corinthians 10:2 as also the Septuagint version in Daniel 4:33 why may not others take the same liberty? And what miserable replies has he made to my instances out of the latter? that in 2 Kings 5:14 he says, discovers that they, that is, the Septuagint, understood no more by it than, λουω. *No more* than λουω! Is not that enough? is not λουω a word that includes in it all kinds of washing, especially bathing of the whole body; and is always used by the Septuagint to express the Jewish bathings, which were always performed by immersion; and that *Naaman* understood the prophet of such a kind of washing, is manifest from his use of it; he *dipped* himself in *Jordan,* κατα το ρημα Ελισαιε*, according to the word of Elisha.* As for the other in Isaiah 21:4 he says, "it is no wonder they made use of the word, for they knew very well that sin procures showers of divine displeasure to be poured upon a person, people, and nation." I desire the next time he pretends to baptize an infant, that he would *pour showers* of water upon it, if he thinks proper, according to this sense of the word βαπτιζω, which he allows of. But however, though those testimonies must be laid aside, yet,

3dly, I hope Lexicons may be made use of to direct us in the sense of the word, if it is only as it is used in the New Testament. Yes, that will be allowed of; for Mr. M. himself consults Lexicons, though he does well to let us know so; for one would have thought, by his positiveness, that he had never looked into one in all his life. Well, but what do the Lexicons say? How do they render the word βαπτιζω? Why by *mergo, immergo,* to *dip* or *plunge into;* and this they give, as the first, and primary sense of the word; but do they make use of no other words to express it by? Yes, they also use *abluo, lavo,* to wash; and they mean such a washing as is by dipping, but Mr. M. page 38 asks, where do they tell us so? I answer in their Lexicons. Let *Scapula* be consulted, who thus renders the word βαπτιζο, *mergo seu immergo: Ut quae tingendi aut abluendi gratia aquae immergimus.* But,

4thly, Let us now consider those texts where the word is used in the New Testament; I am willing to be confined to those which Mr. M. himself has fixed upon, and we will begin,

First, With Mark 7:4 *and when they come from the market, except they wash* or baptize *(themselves) they eat not;* which may be understood either,

1. Of the things they bought in the market, which they did not eat until they were washed: Thus the *Syriac* version reads the words; *and what they buy in the market, unless it be washed, they eat not:* The same way read all the oriental versions, the *Arabic*, *Ethiopic,* and *Persic.* Now this must be understood of those things that may be, and are proper to be washed, as herbs, etc. And nobody will question, but that the manner of the washing there was by putting them into water. But,

2. If the words design the washing of persons, they must be understood, either of the washing of their whole bodies, or else of some part only; as their hands or feet: It seems most likely, that the washing of the whole body is intended, as *Grotius*,[1] *Vatablus, Drufius,*[2] and others think; because washing of hands is mentioned in the preceding verse. Besides, to understand it thus, better expresses the outward, affected sanctity of the more superstitious part of the people. All the Jews washed their hands and feet before eating; but those who pretended to a greater degree of holiness, washed their whole bodies, especially when they came from a market; and of this total ablution of the body is Luke 11:38 to be understood. And here I cannot forbear mentioning, a passage of the great *Scaliger*[3] to this purpose. "The more superstitious part of the Jews, says he, not only washed their feet, but their whole body. Hence they were called *Hemerobaptists,* who every day washed their bodies before they sat down to food; wherefore, the Pharisee, which had invited Jesus to dine with him, wondered that he sat down to meat before he had washed his whole body, Luke 11. But those that were more free from superstition, were contented with washing of their feet, instead of that universal immersion. Witness the Lord himself, who being entertained at dinner by another Pharisee, objected to him, when he was sat down to meat, that he had given him no water for his feet, Luke 7."

3. If, by this washing, we understand only the washing of their hands when they came from market; then it will be proper to inquire in what manner this was performed: And it must be observed, that whatever was the manner which they used, it was not used as a national custom, or as it was according to the word of God; but what was most agreeable to the traditions of the elders, as is manifest from the text itself. Now this tradition is delivered in their *Misna* in these words; "They washed their hands before they eat common food, by an elevation of them; but before they eat the tithes, the offering, and the holy flesh, they washed by immersion."[4] It is reported in the same tract, that *Johanan Ben Gud-Gada,* who, they say, was one of the most religious in the priesthood, "always eat his common food after the manner of purification for eating of the holy flesh;" that is, he always used immersion before eating; and it is highly reasonable to suppose, that the Pharisees, especially the more superstitious part, who pretended to a greater strictness in religion than others, used the same method. It deserves also to be remarked, that this tradition, which some of the Jews have been so tenacious of, that they would rather die than break it, is by them laid to be founded on Leviticus 15:11 *and hath not rinsed his hands in water;* where the Hebrew word qfç is used, which signifies a washing by immersion: and so *Buxtorf* renders it. Moreover, in the above said *Misna*[5] we are told many things concerning this tradition, as the quantity and quality of the water they used, the vessels they washed in, as well as how far this washing reached, which was qrp d[, by which they meant, either the *back of the hand* or the wrist or else the *elbow,* as *Theopylact* observes on Mark 7:3 who in this is followed by *Capellus.*[6]

Now some one of these, the word πυγμυ intends, which we translate *oft*. As to their manner of washing, it was either by taking water in one hand and pouring it upon the other, and then lifting it up,[7] that the water might run down to the aforesaid parts, that so it might not return and defile them; or else it was performed by an immersion of them into water; which latter was accounted the moot effectual way, and used by the more superstitious part of the Jews. Now those who contend the most for a washing of hands, and not the whole body, as *Pocock*[8] and *Lightfoot,* yet frankly acknowledge that it must be understood of washing of them by immersion. *Lightfoot's* words are these, "The Jews used, says he, µydy tlyfg "a washing of hands;"[9] that is, by lifting them up in the manner before described; and µyry tlibf an immersion of the hands; and the word νιψωνται, used

by our Evangelist, seems to answer to the former, and βαπτιζωονται, to the latter." So that from the whole, suppose washing of hands is here intended; yet the sense of the Greek word, βαπτιζω contended for, is nevertheless effectually secured: Nor need we be much concerned at 2 Kings 3:11 being thrown in our way by Mr. M. page 41. For,

1. The text does not say that *Elisha* poured water upon the hands of *Elijah,* to wash his hands withal: and if he asks what did he then do it for; suppose I should answer, I cannot tell, how will he help himself? It lies upon him to prove that he did it for that end, which he will not find very easy to do.

2. Some of the Jewish writers think,**[10]** that washing of hands, is not intended, but some very great miracle, which followed upon *Elisha's* pouring water on *Elijah's* hands, and is therefore mentioned as a thing known, and what would serve to recommend him to the kings of *Judah, Israel,* and *Edom.* But taken in the other sense, the recommendation would be but very inconsiderable; besides, they were now in a very great strait for water, ver. 9 and they might expect, from his former performance, some miracle would be now wrought by him for their relief, as was verses 17, 20. But,

3. Suppose washing of hands is intended, and that this phrase is expressive of *Elisha's* being *Elijah's* ministering servant, and that it was his usual method to wash his master's hands by pouring water upon them; it makes nothing against the sense of the word in Mark 7:4 since that regards the superstitious walking of hands, as has been observed, which was performed by an immersion of them, and is there justly reprehended by our Lord.

Secondly, The other text produced by Mr. M. in page 41 is Hebrews 9:10 where the apostle speaks of *divers washings* or *baptisms,* which I have asserted to be performed always by bathing or dipping, and never by pouring or sprinkling. And I still abide by my assertion, the instances produced by him being insufficient to disprove, it 1. He mentions Hebrews 9:19 where the apostle speaks *of Moses's* sprinkling the book and people with blood; but does he say that they were waffled therewith? or was ever this instance of sprinkling reckoned among the ceremonial ablutions? When only a few drops of blood or water are sprinkled upon persons or things, can they be said, in any just propriety of speech, to be washed therewith?

2. He instances in Exodus 29:4. which speaks of the washing of *Aaron* and his sons, but not a word either of sprinkling or pouring, so that it makes nothing for his purpose: Besides, the Septuagint here use the word λουω, by which they always express the Jewish bathings, which were performed by a total immersion of the body in water.

3. His next instance is Numbers 8:6, 7. Take the Levites from among the children of Israel, and cleanse them; and thus shalt thou do unto them to cleanse them; sprinkle water of purifying upon them. But why did not he read on? and let them shove all their flesh, and wash their clothes, and so make themselves clean; that is, by bathing their whole bodies, which was done, as the *Targum* of *Jonathan* upon the place says, *in forty measures of water.* Now, it was thus the Levites were washed. Sprinkling the water of purification, was indeed a ceremony used preparatory to this bathing, but was itself no part of it, as will more fully appear from,

4. His other instance in Numbers 19:18. where it is laid, that *tents, vessels,* or persons*,* that *touched a bone, or one slain, or one dead, or a grave,* were to be *sprinkled;* but why did not he transcribe the 19th verse? where his readers would have been informed, that as this sprinkling was to be done on the *third* and *seventh days*, so after that, on the seventh day, the unclean person was to purify himself*, and wash his clothes, and bathe himself in water:* So that all those aspersions before, were but so many preparations to the general washing or bathing himself all over in water, on the seventh day. I shall therefore still abide by it, that none of the ceremonial washings were performed by sprinkling; and indeed, to talk of washing by sprinkling, deserves rather to be laughed at, than to have a serious answer; it being no more reconcilable to good sense, than it is to the just propriety of language, or universal customs of nations. From the whole it appears, that *Maimonides* was not mistaken in his observation; and that the word in Hebrews 9:10 properly signifies *bathings* or *dippings.* And now,

Thirdly, We are come, as he says, to that great text, 1 Corinthians 10:2. which he directs to, as the poor man and woman's Lexicon; and it is pity but that they should know how to make use of it. Here the children of *Israel* are said to be *baptized in the cloud, and in the sea.* But since the word is here used in a figurative sense, it is not very fair in our antagonists to urge us with it, nor, indeed, any other place where it is so used; yet we are no: afraid of engaging with them in the consideration of those places, and particularly this; wherein there is enough to justify the apostle in the use of the word, and at the same time secure its sense on our side. When we consider, that the cloud in which they are said to be baptized, passed over them, so that they were covered therewith; and if it let down, at the same time, a shower of rain upon them, it makes it still look more like a baptism; which also is aptly resembled by their passage through the sea, the waters standing up on both tides, so that they seemed to be buried in them. Which things being considered, justifies the apostle, I say, in the use of the word, which strictly and properly signifies dipping or plunging. Words, when used in a figurative sense, though what is expressed by them is not literally true; yet the literal sense is not lost thereby: For instance, in the word *dipage* When a person has been in a large shower of rain, so that his clothes and body are exceeding wet, we often say of such an one, *he is finely dipt;* the meaning of which is, that he is as wet as if he had been dipt all over in a brook or river. So likewise of a person that has just looked into a book, controversy, art, or science; we say, that he has just *dipt into it;* whereby we mean, that he has arrived but to a small acquaintance with, or knowledge in those things. Now would it not be a vain thing for a man, from hence, to attempt to prove, that the word *dip* is not to be understood in its native, common, and literal sense, in which we mostly use it. This observation will serve to vindicate my way of accounting for the use of the word in the present text, as well as for βαπτω in Daniel 4:33. In fine, from the whole, we may well conclude that Baptism ought to be performed by immersion, plunging, or dipping in water, according to the practice of *John,* Christ, and his apostles, the nature and end of the ordinance, and the true and native signification of the word; which mode of baptizing has been used in all ages of the world, and I doubt not but will be, notwithstanding all opposition made against it.

As to the endangering of health by immersion, I referred the reader to Sir *John Floyer's History of Cold-bathing.* Mr. M. insinuates that I have misrepresented him. I only intimate to the reader, that Sir *John* gives a relation of several cures performed by cold-bathing: And I could easily fill up several pages with a catalogue of diseases for which he says it is useful, together with instances of cures performed by it. He asks, "Why I do not inform *my* reader in how many cases Sir J. F. and Dr. B. thought cold-bathing inconvenient and dangerous?" I could, indeed, soon acquaint the

reader, that Sir John *Floyer* thought it not proper to be used when persons were hot and sweating, nor after excessive eating or drinking; as also, that they should not stay in it too long, until they were chilled; and that if any danger came by it, it was usually in such cases: But this will do his cause no service, nor affect ours. I could also have told my reader, that he thinks cold-bathing to be useful in Consumptions, Catarrhs, *etc.* the cases which Mr. M. instances in; who cites Dr. *Cheyne's Essay on Health,* page 108. where the Doctor says, "that Cold-bathing should never be used under a fit of a chronical distemper, with a quick pulse, or with a headache, or by those that have weak lungs." But why does he not acquaint his reader that the Doctor in the very same paragraph, says, "that cold-bathing is of great advantage to health — It promotes perspiration, enlarges the circulation, and prevents the danger of catching cold."

So that every body will easily see, as all experience testifies, that there is no force in the argument, taken from the endangering of health by immersion. By this time the reader will be capable of judging whether Mr. Gill is fairly answered or no, as Mr. M. has expressed in his title-page; though it would have been as well to have left it for another to have made the remark, and so took the advice of the wise man, Let another praise thee, and not thine own mouth; a stranger, and not thine own lips (Prov. 27:2). But before I conclude, I shall take liberty to ask Mr.. M. four or five questions.

1. Why does he not tell the world who that servant of Christ is, whose words he uses; he says, I am mistaken in saying that they are the words of Ruffen; but I still aver, that they are used by him; but whether Ruffen took them from his servant of Christ, or his servant of Christ from Ruffen, I cannot tell; for that two men, without the knowledge of one another's words, should fall into the same odd, and awkward way of speaking, and commit the very same blunders, is not reasonable to suppose; but however, let him be who he will, Mr. Stennett's reply to Ruffen, which I have transcribed, fully detects the sin and folly of those indecent expressions. As to what Mr.. M. says, page 44 "that he is very willing that both Stennett and Ruffen should lie dormant;" I believe it, for as the latter will never be of any service to his cause, so the former would give a considerable blow to it, was his book more diligently perused.

2. What does he mean by the *word of the Lord,* he so often mentions, when speaking of the sense of the Greek word? Does he mean the original text of the New Testament? That uses a word in the account it gives of this ordinance, which, as has been made appear, always signifies to *dip* or *plunge.* Or, by *the word of the Lord,* does he mean our translation; which uses the word *baptize,* thereby leaving the sense of the Greek word undetermined, had not the circumstances, attending the accounts we have of the administration of this ordinance, sufficiently explained it; as will clearly appear to every one who considers them: Had this rendered it *dip*, as some other versions have done, none, one would think, would have been at a loss about the right mode of administering this ordinance; though in *Holland,* where they use no other word but *dipping* to express baptism by, yet they nevertheless use sprinkling; nay, as I am informed, the minister when he only sprinkles or pours water upon the face of the infant, says, "I dip thee in the name of the Father, of the Son, and of the holy Ghost." Such a force have prejudice and custom on the minds of men, that it puts them on doing what is contrary to the plain and manifest sense of words.

3. Why has he dropped his new found name of *Plungers,* which he seemed to be so fond of in his former performance, and thought so exceeding proper for us, and revived the old name of

Anabaptists? which we cannot be, neither according to his principles, nor our own; not according to ours, because we deny pouring or sprinkling to be baptism; not according to his, because he denies dipping or plunging to be baptism.

4. Why are Dr *Owen's* arguments for Infants-baptism published at the end of his book? How impertinent is this? When the controversy between us, is not about the subjects, but the mode of baptism: Perhaps his bookseller did this, seeing Mr. M. says nothing of them himself, nor recommends them to others; but if he thinks fit to shew his talent in this part of the controversy, he may expect attendance thereto, if what he shall offer deserves it.

5. Why has he not defended his wise reasons for mixed communion, and made some learned strictures upon those arguments of mine, which he has been pleased to call *frivolous*, without making any further reply to them? He has very much disappointed many of his friends, who promised both me and themselves an answer, to that part of my book especially; but perhaps a more elaborate performance may be expected from him, upon that subject, or some other learned hand. However, at present, I shall take my leave of him; but not with Proverbs 26:4 which he has been ashamed to transcribe at length, lest his readers should compare the beginning and end of his book together; whereby they would discover, how much he deserves the character of a Gentleman, a Scholar, or a Christian; as also, how well this suits the whining insinuations, with which he begins his performance. I shall add no more, but conclude with the words of *Job,* Teach me, and I will hold my tongue; and cause me to understand wherein I have erred. How forcible are right words? But what doth your arguing reprove?

The

DIVINE RIGHT OF INFANT BAPTISM,

Examined And Disproved;

Being an Answer to a Pamphlet, Entitled,

A brief Illustration and Confirmation of the Divine Right of Infant-Baptism.

PRINTED AT BOSTON IN NEW-ENGLAND, 1746.

CHAPTER 1.

The Introduction, observing the Author, Title, method and occasion of writing the Pamphlet under consideration.

Many being converted under the ministry of the word in New-England, and enlightened into the ordinance of believers baptism, whereby the churches of the Baptist persuasion at Boston and in that country have been much increased, has alarmed the paedobaptist ministers of that colony; who have applied to one Mr. Dickenson, a country minister, who, as my correspondent informs me, has wrote with some success against the Arminians, to write in favor of infant sprinkling; which application he thought fit to attend unto, and accordingly wrote a pamphlet on that subject; which has been printed in several places, and several thousands have been published, and great pains have been taken to spread them about, in order to hinder the growth of the Baptist interest. This performance has been transmitted to me, with a request to take some notice of it by way of reply, which I have undertook to do.

The running title of the pamphlet, is The Divine Right of Infant-Baptism; but if it is of divine right, it is of God; and if it is of God, if it is according to his mind, and is instituted and appointed by him, it must be notified somewhere or other in his word; wherefore the scriptures must be searched into, to see whether it is so, or no: and upon the most diligent search that can be made, it will be found that there is not the least mention of it in them; that there is no precept enjoining it, or directing to the observation of it; nor any instance, example, or precedent encouraging such a practice; nor any thing there laid or done, that gives any reason to believe it is the will of God that such a rite should be observed; wherefore it will appear to be entirely an human invention, and as such to be rejected. The title-page of this work promises an Illustration and Confirmation of the said divine right; but if there is no such thing, as it is certain there is not, the author must have a very difficult task to illustrate and confirm it; how far he has succeeded in this undertaking, will be the subject of our following inquiry. The writer of the pamphlet under consideration has chose to put his thoughts

together on this subject, in the form of a dialogue between a minister and one of his parishioners, or neighbors. Every man, that engages in a controversy, may write in what form and method he will; but a by-stander will be ready to conclude, that such a way of writing is chose, that he may have the opportunity of making his antagonist speak what he pleases; and indeed he would have acted a very unwise part, had he put arguments and objections into his mouth, which he thought he could not give any tolerable answer to; but, inasmuch as he allows the person the conference is held with, to be not only a man of piety and ingenuity, but of considerable reading, he ought to have represented him throughout as answering to such a character; whereas, whatever piety is shewn in this debate, there is very little ingenuity discovered; since, for the most part, he is introduced as admitting the weak reasonings of the minister, at once, without any further controversy; or if he is allowed to attempt a defense of the cause and principles he was going over to, he is made to do it in a very mean and trifling manner; and, generally speaking, what he offers is only to lead on to the next thing that presents itself in this dispute: Had he been a man of considerable reading, or had he read Mr. Stennett, and some others of the Antipaedobaptist authors, as is said he had, which had occasioned his doubt about his baptism, he would have known what answers and objections to have made to the minister's reasonings, and what arguments to have used in favor of adult-baptism, and against infant-sprinkling. What I complain of is, that he has not made his friend to act in character, or to answer the account he is pleased to give of him: However he has a double end in all this management; on the one hand, by representing his antagonist as a man of ingenuity and considerable reading, he would bethought to have done a very great exploit in convincing and silencing such a man, and reducing him to the acknowledgment of the truth; and, on the other hand, by making him talk so weakly, and so easily yielding to his. arguments, he has acted a wise part, and taken care not to suffer him to say such things, as he was not able to answer; and which, as before observed, seems to be the view of writing in this dialogue-way.

CHAPTER 2

Of the Consequences of renouncing Infant baptism.

The minister, in order to frighten his parishioner out of his principle of adult-baptism, he was inclined to, suggests terrible consequences that would follow upon it; as his renouncing his baptism in his infancy; vacating the covenant between God and him, he was brought into thereby; renouncing all other ordinances of the gospel, as the ministry of the Word, and the sacrament of the Lord's-Supper; that upon this principle, Christ, for many ages, must have forsaken his church, and not made good his promise of his presence in this ordinance; and that there could be no such thing as baptism in the world now, neither among Paedobaptists, nor Antipaedobaptists.

1st, The first dreadful consequence following upon a man's espousing the principle of believers baptism, is a renunciation of his baptism; not of the ordinance of baptism, that he cannot be laid to reject and renounce; for when he embraces the principle of adult-baptism, and acts up to it, he receives the true baptism, which the word of God warrants and directs unto, as will be seen hereafter: But it seems it is a renunciation of his baptism in his infancy; and what of that? it should

be proved first, that that is baptism, and that it is good and valid, before it can be charged as an evil to renounce it; it is right to renounce that which has no warrant or foundation in the word of God: But what aggravates this supposed evil is, that in it a person in his early infancy is dedicated to God the Father, Son, and holy Ghost; it may be asked, by whom is the person in his infancy dedicated to God, when baptism is said to be administered to him? Not by himself, for he is ignorant of the whole transaction; it must be either by the minister, or his parents: The parents indeed desire the child may be baptized, and the minister uses such a form of words, I baptize thee in the name of the Father, of the Son, and of the holy Ghost; but what dedication is here made by the one, or by the other? However, seeing there is no warrant from the word of God, either for such baptism, or dedication; a renunciation of it need not give any uneasiness to any person so baptized and dedicated.

2dly, To embrace adult-baptism, and to renounce infant-baptism, is to vacate the covenant into which a person is brought by his baptism, [page 4] by which covenant the writer of the dialogue means the covenant of grace, as appears from all his after-reasonings from thence to the right of infants to baptism.

1. He supposes that unbaptized persons are, as to their external and visible relation, strangers to the covenants of promise; are not in covenant with God; not so much as visible Christians; but in a state of heathenism; without hope of salvation, but from the uncovenanted mercies of God, [pages 4, 5, 6]. The covenant of grace was made from everlasting; and all interested in it were in covenant with God, as early, and so previous to their baptism, as to their secret relation God-wards; but this may be thought to be sufficiently guarded against by the restriction and limitation, "as to external and visible relation:" But I ask, are not all truly penitent persons, all true believers in Christ, though not as yet baptized, in covenant with God, even as to their external and visible relation to him, which faith makes manifest? Were not the three thousand in covenant with God visibly, when they were pricked to the heart, and repented of their fins, and gladly received the word of the gospel, promising the remission of them, though not as yet baptized? Was not the Eunuch in covenant with God? or was he in a state of heathenism, when he made that confession of his faith, I believe that Jesus Christ is the Son of God, previous to his going down into the water, and being baptized? Were the believers in Samaria, or those at Corinth, in an uncovenanted state, before the one were baptized by Philip, or the other by the apostle Paul? Was Lydia, whole heart the Lord opened, and who attended to the things that were spoken; and the Jailer, that believed and rejoiced in God, with all his house, in an uncovenanted state, before they submitted to the ordinance of baptism? Are there not some persons, that have never been baptized, of whom there is reason to believe they have an interest in the covenant of grace? Were not the Old Testament saints in the covenant of grace, before this rite of baptism took place? Should it be said, that circumcision did that then, which baptism does now, enter persons into covenant, which equally wants proof, as this; it may be replied, that only commenced at a certain period of time; was not always in use, and belonged to a certain people only; whereas there were many before that, who were in the covenant of grace, and many after, and even at the same time it was enjoined, who yet were not circumcised; of which more hereafter: From all which it appears, how false that assertion is.

2. That a man is brought into covenant by baptism, as this writer affirms; seeing the covenant of grace is from everlasting; and those that are put into it, were put into it so soon; and that by God himself, whole sole prerogative it is. Parents cannot enter their children into covenant, nor children

themselves, nor ministers by sprinkling water upon them; it is an act of the sovereign grace of God, who says, I will be their God, and they shall be my people: The phrase of bringing into the bond of the covenant, is but once used in scripture; and then it is ascribed to God, and not to the creature; not to any act done by him, or done to him (Ezek. 20:37), and much less,

3. Can this covenant be vacated, or made null and void, by renouncing infant-baptism: The covenant of grace is ordered in all things, and sure; its promises are Yea and Amen in Christ; its blessings are the sure mercies of David; God will not break it, and men cannot make it void; it is to everlasting, as well as from everlasting; those that are once in it can never be put out of it; nor can it be vacated by any thing done by them. This man must have a strange notion of the covenant of grace, to write after this rate; he is said to have wrote against the Arminians with some success; if he has, it must be in a different manner from this; for upon this principle, that the covenant of grace may be made null and void by an act of the creature, how will the election of God stand sure? or the promise of the covenant be sure to all the seed? What will become of the doctrine of the faints perseverance? or of the certainty of salvation to those that are chosen, redeemed, and called?

3dly, Another consequence said to follow, on espousing the principle of adult-baptism, and renouncing that of infants, is a renouncing all other ordinances of the gospel, as the ministry of the word, and the sacrament of the Lord's supper, practically denying the influences of the Spirit in them, and all usefulness, comfort and communion by them. All which this author endeavors to make out, by observing, that if infant-baptism is a nullity, then those, who have received no other, if ministers, have no right to administer sacred ordinances, being unbaptized; and, if private persons, they have no right to partake of the Lord's supper, for the same reason; and so all public ordinances are just such a nullity as infant-baptism; and all the influence: of the Spirit, in conversion, comfort, and communion, by them, must be practically denied, [pages 5, 6]. To which may be replied, that though upon the principle of adult-baptism, as necessary to the communion of churches, it follows, that no unbaptized person is regularly called to the preaching of the word, and administration ordinances, or can be a regular communicant; yet it does not follow, that a man that renounces infant baptism, and embraces believers baptism, must renounce all other ordinances, and look upon them just such nullities as infant-baptism is, and deny all the comfort and communion he has had in them; because the word may be truly preached, and the ordinance of the Lord's supper be duly administered, by an irregular man, and even by a wicked man; yea, may be made useful for conversion and comfort; for the use and efficacy of the word and ordinances, do not depend upon the minister or administrator; but upon God himself, who can, and does sometimes, make use of his own word for conversion, though preached by an irregular, and even an immoral man; and of his own ordinances, for comfort, by such an one, to his people, though they may be irregular and deficient in some things, through ignorance and inadvertency.

4thly, Another consequence following upon this principle, as supposed, is, that if infant-baptism is no institution of Christ, and to be rejected, then the promise of Christ, to be with his ministers in the administration of the ordinance of baptism, to the end of the world (Matthew 28:19, 20), is not made good; since for several ages, even from the fourth to the sixteenth century, infant baptism universally obtained, [pages 6-8]. To which the following answer may be returned; That the period of time pitched upon for the prevalence of infant, baptism is very unhappy for the credit of it, both as to the beginning and end; as to the beginning of it, in the fourth century, a period in which corruption in doctrine and discipline flowed into the church, and the man of sin was ripening apace,

for his appearance; and likewise as to the end, the time of the reformation, in which such abuses began to be corrected: The whole is a period of time, in which the true church of Christ began gradually to disappear, or to be hidden, and at last fled into the wilderness; where she has not been forsaken of Christ, but is, and will be, nourished, for a time, and limes, and half a time; this period includes the gross darkness of popery, and all the depths of Satan; and which to suffer was no ways contrary to the veracity of Christ, in his promise to be with his true church and faithful ministers to the end of the world. Christ has no where promised, that his doctrines and ordinances should not be perverted; but, on the contrary, has given clear and strong intimations, that there should be a general falling-away and departure from the truth and ordinances of the gospel, to make way for the revelation of antichrist; and though it will be allowed, that during this period infant-baptism prevailed, yet it did not universally obtain. There were witnesses for adult-baptism in every age; and Christ had a church in the wilderness, in obscurity, at this time; namely, in the valleys of Piedmont; who were, from the beginning of the apostasy, and witnessed against it, and bore their testimony against infant-baptism, as will be seen hereafter, and with these his presence was; nor did he promise it to any, but in the faithful ministration of his word and ordinances, which he has always made good; and it will lie upon this writer and his friends, to prove the gracious presence of Christ in the administration of infant-baptism.

5thly, It is said, that, upon these principles, rejecting infant-baptism, and espousing believers-baptism, it is not possible there should be any baptism at all in the world, either among Paedobaptists or Antipaedobaptists; the reason of this consequence is, because the madmen of Munster, from whom this writer dates the first opposition to infant-baptism; and the first Antipaedobaptists in England, had no other baptism than what they received in their infancy; that adult-baptism must first be administered by unbaptized persons, if infant-baptism is no ordinance of Christ, but a mere nullity; and so by such as had no claim to the gospel ministry, nor right to administer ordinances; and consequently the whole succession of the Antipaedobaptist churches must remain unbaptized to this day; and so no more baptism among them, than among the Paedobaptists, until there is a new commission from heaven, to renew and restore this ordinance, which is, at present, lost out of the world, [pages 6, 8, 9]. As for the madmen of Munster, as this writer calls them, and the rife of the Antipaedobaptists from them, and what is said of them, I shall consider in the next chapter.

The English Antipaedobaptists, when they were first convinced of adult-baptism, and of the mode of administering it by immersion, and of the necessity of letting a reformation on foot in this matter, met together, and consulted about it: when they had some difficulties thrown in their way, about a proper administrator to begin this work; some were for fending messengers to foreign churches, who were the successors, of the ancient Waldenses in France and Bohemia; and accordingly did send over some, who being baptized, returned and baptized others. And this is a sufficient answer to all that this writer has advanced. But others thought that this was a needless scruple, and looked too much like the popish notion of an uninterrupted succession, and a right conveyed through that to administer ordinances; and therefore judged, in such a care as theirs, there being a general corruption as to this ordinance, that an unbaptized person, who appeared to be otherwise qualified to preach the word, and administer ordinances, should begin it; and justified themselves upon the same principles that other reformers did, who, without any regard to an uninterrupted succession, let up new churches, ordained pastors, and administered ordinances: It must be owned, that in ordinary cases, he ought to be baptized himself, that baptizes another, or

preaches the word, or administers other ordinances; but in an extraordinary care, as this of beginning a reformation from a general corruption, where such an administrator cannot be had, it may be done; nor is it essential to the ordinance that there should be such an administrator, or otherwise it could never have been introduced into the world at all at first; the first administrator must be an unbaptized person, as John the Baptist was.

According to this man's train of reasoning, there never was, nor could be any valid baptism in the world; for John, the first administrator, being an unbaptized person, the whole succession of churches from that time to this day must remain unbaptized. It will be said, that he had a commission from heaven to begin this new ordinance; and a like one should be shewn for the restoration of it. To which I answer, that there being a plain direction for the administration of this ordinance, in the Word, there was no need of a new commission to restore it from a general corruption; it was enough for any person, sensible of the corruption, to attempt a reformation, and to administer it in the right way, who was satisfied of his call from God to preach the gospel, and administer ordinances, according to the word. I shall close this chapter with the words of Zanchy,[1] a Protestant Divine, and a Paedobaptist, and a man of as great learning and judgment, as any among the first reformers: "It is a fifth question, he says, proposed by Augustin, [contra Parmen. 1.2. c. 13. col. 42] but not solved, whether he that never was baptized may baptize another; and of this question he says, that is, Austin, nothing is to be affirmed without the authority of a council. Nevertheless, Thomas (Aquinas) takes upon him to determine it, from an answer of Pope Nicholas, to the inquiries of the Dutch, [as it is had in Decr. de Consec. dist. 4. can. 22] where we thus read; "You say, by a certain Jew, whether a Christian or a heathen, you know not, (that is, whether baptized or unbaptized) many were baptized in your country, and you desire to know what is to be done in this care; truly if they are baptized in the name of the holy Trinity, or only in the name of Christ, they ought not to be baptized again."

And Thomas confirms the same, by a laying of Isidore, which likewise is produced in the same distinction, [can. 21] where he says, "that the Spirit of Christ ministers the grace of baptism, though he be a heathen that baptizes. Wherefore, says Thomas, if there should be two persons not yet baptized, who believe in Christ, and. They have no lawful administrator by whom they may be baptized, one may, without sin, be baptized by the other; the necessity of death obliging to it. All this, adds Zanchy, proceeds from hence, that they thought water-baptism absolutely necessary; but what cannot be determined by the word of God, we should not dare to determine. But, says he, I will propose a question, which, I think, may be easily answered; supposing a Turk in a country where he could not easily come at Christian churches; he, by reading the New Testament, is favored with the knowledge of Christ, and with faith; he teaches his family, and converts that to Christ, and so others likewise; the question is, whether he may baptize them whom he has converted to Christ, though he himself never was baptized with water-baptism? I do not doubt but he may; and, on the other hand, take care that he himself be baptized, by another of them that were converted by him; the reason is, because he is a minister of the Word, extraordinarily raised up by Christ; so that such a minister may, with them, by the consent of the church, appoint a colleague, and take care that he be baptized by him." The reason which Zanchy, gives, will, I think, hold good in the case of the first Antipaedobaptists in England.

CHAPTER 3.

Of the Antiquity of Infant- baptism; *when first debated*; *and concerning the Waldenses*.

The minister, in this dialogue, in order to stagger his neighbor about the principle of adult-baptism, he had espoused, suggests to him, that infant-baptism did universally obtain in the church, even from the apostles times; that undoubted evidence may be had from the ancient fathers, that it constantly obtained in the truly primitive church; and that it cannot be pretended that this practice was called in question, or made matter of debate in the church, till the madmen of Munster set themselves against it; and affirms, that the ancient Waldenses being in the constant practice of adult-baptism, is a mere imagination, a chimerical one, and to be rejected as a groundless figment, [pages 7, 9].

I. This writer intimates, that the practice of infant-baptism universally and constantly obtained in the truly primitive church. The truly primitive church is the church in the times of Christ and his apostles: The first Christian church was that at Jerusalem, which consisted of such as were made the disciples of Christ, and baptized; first made disciples by Christ, and then baptized by his apostles; for Jesus himself baptized none, only they baptized by his order (John 4:1, 2; Acts 1:15). This church afterwards greatly increased; three thousand persons, who were pricked to the heart under Peter's ministry, repented of their sins, and joyfully received the good news of pardon and salvation by Christ, were baptized, and added to it; these were adult persons; nor do we read of any one infant being baptized, while this truly primitive church subsisted. The next Christian church was that at Samaria; for that there was a church there, is evident from Acts 9:31. This seems to have been founded by the ministry of Philip; the original members of it were men and women baptized by Philip, upon a profession of their faith in the things preached by him, concerning the kingdom of God, and the name of Jesus Christ (Acts 8:12); nor is there the least intimation given that infant-baptism at all obtained in this church. Another truly primitive Christian church, was the church at Philippi; the foundation of which was said in the two families of Lydia and the Jailer, and which furnish out no proof of infant-baptism obtaining here, as we shall see hereafter; for Lydia's household are called brethren, whom the apostles visited and comforted; and the Jailer's household were such as were capable of hearing the word, and who believed in Christ, and rejoiced in God as well as he (Acts 16:14, 15, 32-34, 40). So that it does not appear that infant-baptism obtained in this church. The next Christian church we read of, and which was a truly primitive one, is the church at Corinth, and consisted of persons who, hearing the apostle Paul preach the gospel, believed in Christ, whom he preached, and were baptized (Acts 18:8): but there is no mention made of any infant being baptized, either now or hereafter, in this truly primitive church state. These are all the truly primitive churches of whole baptism we have any account in the Acts of the apostles, excepting Cornelius, and his family and friends, who very probably founded a church at Caesarea; and the twelve disciples at Ephesus, who very likely joined to the church there, and who are both instances of adult-baptism (Acts 10:48; Acts 19:1-7). Let it be made appear, if it can, that any one infant was ever baptized: in any of the above truly primitive churches, or in any other, during the apostolic age, either at Antioch or Thessalonica, at some, or at Colosse, or any other primitive church of those times. But though this cannot be made out from the writings of the New Testament, we are told,

II. That undoubted evidence may be had from the ancient fathers, that infant-baptism constantly obtained in the truly primitive church. Let us a little inquire into this matter:

1. The Christian writers of the first century, besides the evangelists and apostles, are Barnabas, Herman, Clemens Romanus, Ignatius and Polycarp. As to the two first of there, Barnabas and Hermas, the learned Mr. Stennett[2] has cited some passages out of them; and after him Mr. David Rees;[3] for which reason, I forbear transcribing them; which are manifest proofs of adult-baptism, and that as performed by immersion; they represent the persons baptized, the one[4] as hoping in the cross of Christ, the other[5] as having heard the word, and being willing to be baptized in the name of the Lord; and both as going down into the water, and coming up out of it. Clemens Romanus wrote an epistle to the Corinthians, still extant; but there is not a syllable in it about infant-baptism. Ignatius wrote epistles to several churches, as well as to particular persons; but makes no mention of the practice of infant-baptism in any of them: what he lays of baptism, favors adult-baptism; since he speaks of it as attended with faith, love and patience: "Let your baptism, says he[6] remain as armor; faith as an helmet, love as a spear, and patience as whole armor." Polycarp wrote an epistle to the Philippians, which is yet in being; but there is not one word in it about infant-baptism. So that it is so far from being true, that there is undoubted evidence from the ancient fathers, that this practice universally and constantly obtained in the truly primitive church, that there is no evidence at all that it did obtain, in any respect, in the first century, or apostolic age; and which is the only period in which the truly primitive church of Christ can be said to subsist. There is indeed a work called The constitutions of the apostles, and sometimes the constitutions of Clemens, because he is laid to be the compiler of them; and another book of Ecclesiastical Hierarchy, ascribed to Dionysius the Areopagite, out of which, passages have been cited in favor of infant-baptism; but there are manifestly of later date than they pretend to, and were never written by the persons whose names they bear, and are condemned as spurious by learned men, and are given up as such by Dr. Wall, in his History of Infant Baptism.[7]

2. The Christian writers of the second century, which are extant, are Justin Martyr, Athenagoras, Theophilus of Antioch, Tatian, Minutius Felix, Irenaeus, and Clemens of Alexandria; and of all these writers, there is not one that lays any thing of infant-baptism; there is but one pretended to, and that is Irenaeus, and but a single passage out of him; and that depends upon a single word, the signification of which is doubtful at best; and besides the passage is only a translation of Irenaeus, and not expressed in his own original words; and the chapter, from whence it is taken, is by some learned men judged to be spurious; since it advances a notion inconsistent with that ancient writer, and notoriously contrary to the books of the evangelists, making Christ to live to be fifty years old, yea, to live to a senior age: The passage, produced in favor of infant-baptism, is this; speaking of Christ, he says,[8] "Sanctifying every age, by that likeness it had to him; for he came to save all by himself; all, I say, qui per eum renascuntur in Deum, "who by him are born again unto God;" infants, and little ones, and children, and young men, and old men; therefore he went through every age, and became an infant, to infants sanctifying infants; and to little ones a little one, sanctifying those: of that age; and likewise became an example of piety, righteousness, and subjection:" Now, the question is about the word renascuntur, whether it is to be rendered born again, which is the literal sense of the word, or baptized; the true sense of Irenaeus seems to be this, that Christ came to fare all that are regenerated by his grace and spirit; and none but they, according to his own words (John 3:3, 5), and that by assuming human nature, and parting through the several stages of life, he has sanctified it, and let an example to men of every age. And this now is all the evidence, the

undoubted evidence of infant-baptism, from the fathers of the first two centuries; it would be easy to produce passages out of the above writers, in favor of believers-baptism; I shall only cite one out of the first of them; the account, that Justin Martyr gave to the emperor Antoninus Pius of the Christians of his day; though it has been cited by Mr. Stennett and Mr. Rees, I shall choose to transcribe it; because, as Dr. Wall says,[9] it is the most ancient account of the way of baptizing next the scripture. "And now, says Justin,[10] we will declare after what manner, when we were renewed by Christ, we devoted ourselves unto God; lest, omitting this, we should seem to act a bad part in this declaration. As many, as are persuaded, and believe the things, taught and said by us, to be true, and promise to live according to them, are instructed to pray, and to ask, fasting, the forgiveness of their past sins of God, we praying and fasting together with them. After that, they are brought by us where water is, and they are regenerated in the same way of regeneration, as we have been regenerated; for they are then washed in water, in the name of the Father and Lord God of all, and of our Savior Jesus Christ, and of the holy Spirit." There is a work, which bears the name of Justin, called Answers to the orthodox, concerning some necessary questions; to which we are sometimes referred for a proof of infant-baptism; but the book is spurious, and none of Justin's, as many learned men have observed; and as Dr. Wall allows; and is thought not to have been written before the fifth century. So stands the evidence for infant-baptism, from the ancient fathers of the first two centuries.

3. As to the third century, it will be allowed, that it was spoken of in it; though as loon as it was mentioned, it was opposed; and the very first man that mentions it, speaks against it; namely, Tertullian. The truth of the matter is, that infant-baptism was moved for in the third century; got footing and establishment in the fourth and fifth; and so prevailed until the time of the reformation: Though, throughout these several centuries, there were testimonies bore to adult-baptism; and at several times, certain persons rose up, and opposed infant-baptism; which brings me,

III. To consider what our author affirms, that it cannot be pretended that this practice was called in question, or made matter of debate in the church, until the madmen of Munster let themselves against it, [page 7]. Let us examine this matter, and,

1. It should be observed, that the disturbances in Germany, which our Paedobaptist writers so often refer to in this controversy about baptism, and so frequently reproach us with, were first begun in the wars of the boors, by such as were Paedobaptists, and them only; first by the Papists, some few years before the reformation; and after that, both by Lutherans and Papists, on account of civil liberties; among whom, in process of time, some few of the people called Anabaptists mingled themselves; a people that scarce in any thing agree with us, neither in their civil, nor religious principles; nor even in baptism itself; for if we can depend on those that wrote the history of them, and against them; they were for repeating adult-baptism, not performed among them; yea, that which was administered among themselves, when they removed their communion to another society; nay, even in the same community, when an excommunicated person was received again;[11] besides, if what is reported of them is true, as it may be, their baptism was performed by sprinkling, which we cannot allow to be true baptism; it is laid, that when a community of them was satisfied with the person's faith and conversation, who proposed for baptism, the payor took water into his hand, and sprinkled it on the head of him that was to be baptized, using there words, I baptize thee in the name of the Father, of the Son, and of the holy Ghost:[12] And even the disturbances in Munster, a famous city in Westphalia, were first begun by Bernard Rotman, a Paedobaptism

minister of the Lutheran persuasion, assisted by other ministers of the reformation, in opposition to the Papists in the year 1532; and it was not till the year 1533, that John Matthias of Harlem, and John Bocoldus of Leyden came to this place;[13] who, with Knipperdolling and others, are, I suppose, the madmen of Munster this writer means; and he may call them madmen, if he pleases; I shall not contend with him about it; they were mad notions which they held, and mad actions they performed; and both dip avowed by the people who are now called Anabaptists; though it is not reasonable to suppose, that there were the only men concerned in that affair, or that the number of their followers should increase to such a degree in so small a time, as to make such a revolution in so large a city: However, certain it is, that it was not their principle about baptism, that led them into such extravagant notion, and actions: But what I take notice of all this for, is chiefly to observe the date of the confusions and distractions, in which there madmen were concerned; which were from the year 1533 to 1536: And our next inquiry therefore is, whether there was any debate about the practice of infant-baptism before this time. And,

2. It will appear, that it was frequently debated, before these men set themselves against it, or acted the mad part they did: In the years 1532 and 1528, there were public disputations at Berne in Switzerland, between the ministers of the church there and some Anabaptist teacher;[14] in the years 1529, 1527 and 1525, Oecolampadius had various disputes with people of this name at Basil in the same country;[15] in the year 1525, there was a dispute at Zurich in the same country about Paedobaptism, between Zwinglius, one of the first reformers, and Balthasar Hubmeierus,[16] who afterwards was burnt, and his wife drowned at Vima, in the year 1528; of whom Meshovius,[17] though a Papist, give, this character; that he was from his childhood brought up in learning; and for his singular erudition was honored with a degree in divinity; was a very eloquent man, and read in the scriptures, and fathers of the church. Hoornbeck[18] calls him a famous and eloquent preacher, and lays he was the first of the reformed preachers at Waldshut: There were several disputations with other, in the same year at this place; upon which an edict was made by the senate at Zurich, forbidding rebaptization, under the penalty of being fined a silver mark, and of being imprisoned, and even drowned, according to the nature of the offense. And in the year 1526, or 1527, according to Hoornbeck, Felix Mans, or Mentz, was drowned at Zurich; this man, Meshovius says,[19] whom he calls Felix Mantscher, was of a noble family; and both he, and Conrad Grebel, whom he calls Cunrad Grebbe, who are said to give the first rise to Anabaptism at Zurich, were very learned men, and well skilled in the Latin, Greek, and Hebrew languages. And the same writer affirms, that Anabaptism was set on foot at Wittenberg, in the year 1522, by Nicholas Pelargus, or Stork, who had companions with him of very great learning, as Carolostadius, Philip Melancthon, and others; this, he says, was done, whilst Luther was lurking as an exile in the cable of Wartpurg in Thuringia; and that when he returned from thence to Wittenberg he banished Carolostadius, Pelargus, More, Didymus, and others,[20] and only received Melancthon again. This carries the opposition to Paedobaptism within five years of the reformation, begun by Luther; and certain it is, there were many and great debates about infant-baptism at the first of the reformation, years before the affair of Munster: And evident it is, that some of the first reformers were inclined to have attempted a reformation in this ordinance, though they, for reasons best known to themselves, dropped it; and even Zwinglius himself, who was a bitter persecutor of the people called Anabaptists afterwards, was once of the same mind himself, and against Paedobaptism. But,

3. It will appear, that this was a matter of debate, and was opposed before the time of the reformation. There was a set of people in Bohemia, near a hundred years before that, who appear to

be of the same persuasion with the people, called Anabaptists; for in a letter, written by Costelecius out of Bohemia to Erasmus, dated October 10, 1519,[21] among other things said of them, which agree with the said people, this is one; "such as come over to their sect, must every one be baptized anew in meer water;" the writer of the letter calls them Pyghards; so named, he says, from a certain refugee, that came thither ninety-seven years before the date of the letter. Pope Innocent the third, under whom was the Lateran council, A.D. 1215, has, in the decretals, a letter, in answer to a letter from the bishop of Arles in Provence, which had represented to him,[22] that "some Heretics there had taught, that it was to no purpose to baptize children, since they could have no forgiveness of sins thereby, as having no faith, charity, etc." So that it is a clear point, that there were some that let themselves against infant-baptism in the thirteenth century, three hundred years before the reformation; yea, in the twelfth century there were some that opposed Paedobaptism. Mr. Fax, the martyrologist, relates from the history of Robert Guisburne,[23] that two men, Gerhardus and Dulcinus, in the reign of Henry the second, about the year of our Lord 1158; who, he supposes, had received some light of knowledge of the Waldenses, brought thirty with them into England; who, by the king and the prelates, were all burnt in the forehead, and so driven out of the realm; and after were slain by the Pope. Rapin[24] calls them German Heretics, and places their coming into England at the year 1166: But William of Newbury[25] calls them Publicans, and only mentions Gerhardus, as at the head of them; and whom he allows to be somewhat learned, but all the rest very illiterate, and says they came from Gascoigne; and being convened before a council, held at Oxford for that purpose, and interrogated concerning articles of faith, said perverse things concerning the divine sacraments, detesting holy baptism, the Eucharist and marriage: And his annotator, out of a manuscript of Radulph Picardus, the monk, shews, that the Heretics, called Publicans, affirm, that we must not pray for the dead; that the suffrages of the saints were not to be asked; that they believe not purgatory; with many other things; and particularly, afferunt isti parvulos non baptisandos donec ad intelligibilem perveniant etatem; "they assert that infants are not to be baptized, till they come to the age of understanding."[26]

In the year 1147, St Bernard wrote a letter to the earl of St Gyles, complaining of his harboring Henry, an Heretic; and among other things he is charged with by him, are there; "the infants of Christians are hindered from the life of Christ, the grace of baptism being denied them; nor are they suffered to come to their salvation, though our Savior compassionately cries out in their behalf, Suffer little children to come unto me, etc." and, about the same time, writing upon the Canticles, in his 65th and 66th sermons, he takes notice of a sort of people, he calls Apostolici; and who, perhaps, were the followers of Henry; who, says he, laugh at us for baptizing infants;[27] and among the tenets which he ascribes to them, and attempts to confute, this is the first, "Infants are not to be baptized:" In opposition to which, he affirms, that infants are to be baptized in the faith of the church; and endeavors, by instances, to show, that the faith of one is profitable to others;[28] which he attempts from Matthew 9:2 and Matthew 15:28; 1 Timothy 2:15.

In the year 1146, Peter Bruis, and Henry his follower, set themselves against infant-baptism. Petrus Cluniacensis, or Peter the Abbot of Clugny, wrote against them; and among other errors he imputes to them, are there: "That infants are not baptized, or saved by the faith of another, but ought to be baptized and saved by their own faith; or, that baptism without their own faith does not save; and that those, that are baptized in infancy, when grown up, should be baptized again; nor are they then rebaptized, but rather rightly baptized:"[29] And that there men did deny infant-baptism, and pleaded for adult-baptism, Mr. Stennett[30] has proved from Cassander and Prateolus, both Paedobaptists:

And Dr. Wall[31] allows these two men to be Antipaedobaptists; and says, they were "the first Antipaedobaptist preachers that ever let up a church, or society of men, holding that opinion against infant-baptism, and rebaptizing such as had been baptized in infancy;" and who also observes,[32] that the Lateran[33] council, under Innocent the II, 1139, did condemn Peter Bruis, and Arnold of Brescia, who seems to have been a follower of Bruis, for rejecting infant-baptism: Moreover, in the year 1140, or a little before it, Evervinus, of the diocese of Cologn, wrote a letter to St Bernard; in which he gives him an account of some heretics, lately discovered in that country; of whom he says, "they condemn the sacraments, except baptism only; and this only in those who are come to age; who, they say, are baptized by Christ himself whoever be the minister of the sacraments; they do not believe infant-baptism; alleging that place of the gospel, he that believeth, and is baptized, shall be saved."[34]

There seem also to be the disciples of Peter Bruit, who began to preach about the year 1126; so that it is out of all doubt, that this was a matter of debate, four hundred years before the madmen of Munster let themselves against it: And a hundred years before there, there were two men, Bruno, bishop of Angiers, and Berengarius, archdeacon of the same church, who began to spread their particular notions about the year 1035; which chiefly respected the sacraments of baptism and the Lord's-Supper. What they said about the former, may be learned from the letter sent by Deodwinus, bishop of Liege, to Henry I. King of France; in which are the following words:[35] "There is a report come out of France, and which goes through all Germany, that there two (Bruno and Berengarius) do maintain, that the Lord's body (the Host) is not the body, but a shadow and figure of the Lord's body; and that they do disannul lawful marriages; and, as far as in them lies, overthrow the baptism of infants:" And from Guimundus, bishop of Aversa, who wrote against Berengarius, who says, "that he did not teach rightly concerning the baptism of infants, and concerning marriage."[36] Mr. Stennett[37] relates from Dr. Allix, a passage concerning one Gundulphus and his followers, in Italy; divers of whom, Gerard, bishop of Cambray and Arras, interrogated upon several heads in the year 1025. And, among other things, that bishop mentions the following reason, which they gave against infant-baptism; "because to an infant, that neither wills, nor runs, that knows nothing of faith, is ignorant of its own salvation and welfare; in whom there can be no desire of regeneration, or confession; the will, faith and confession of another seem not in the least to appertain."

Dr. Wall, indeed, represents these men, the disciples of Gundulphus, as Quakers and Manichees in the point of baptism; holding that water-baptism is of no use to any: But it must be affirmed, whatever their principles were, that their argument against infant-baptism was very strong. So then we have testimonies, that Paedobaptism was opposed five hundred years before the affair of Munster. And if the Pelagians, Donatists, and Luciferians, so called from Lucifer Calaritanus, a very orthodox man, and a great opposer of the Arians, were against infant-baptism, as several Paedobaptist writers affirm; this carries the opposition to it still higher; and indeed it may seem strange, that since it had not its establishment till the times of Austin, that there should be none to let themselves against it: And if there were none, how comes it to pass that such a canon should be made in the Milevitan council, under pope Innocent the first, according to Carranza;[38] and in the year 402, as say the Magdeburgensian centuriators;[39] or be it in the council at Carthage, in the year 418, as says Dr. Wall[40] which runs thus, "Also, it is our pleasure, that whoever denies that new-born infants are to be baptized; or says, they are indeed to be baptized for the remission of sins; and yet they derive no original sin from Adam to be expiated by the washing of regeneration; (from

whence it follows, that the form of baptism for the forgiveness of sins in them, cannot be understood to be true, but false) let him be anathema:"

But if there were none, that opposed the baptism of new-born infants, why should the first part of this canon be made, and an anathema annexed to it? To say, that it respected a notion of a single person in Cyprian's time, 150 years before this, that infants were not to be baptized, until eight days old; and that it seems there were some people still of this opinion, wants proof. But however certain it is, that Tertullian[41] in the beginning of the third century, opposed the baptism of infants, and dissuaded from it, who is the first writer that makes mention of it: So it appears, that as soon as ever it was set on foot, it became matter of debate; and sooner than this, it could not be: And this was thirteen hundred years before the madmen of Munster appeared in the world. But,

IV. Let us next consider the practice of the ancient Waldenses, with respect to adult-baptism, which this author affirms to be a chimerical imagination, and groundless figment. It should be observed, that the people called Waldenses, or the Vaudois, inhabiting the valleys of Piedmont, have gone under different names, taken from their principal leaders and teachers; and so this of the Waldenses, from Peter Waldo, one of their barbs, or pastors; though some think, this name is only a corruption of Vallenses, the inhabitants of the valleys: And certain it is, there was a people there before the times of Waldo, and even from the apostles time, that held the pure evangelic truths, and bore a testimony to them in all ages,[42] and throughout the dark times of popery, as many learned men have observed; and the sense of there people concerning baptism may be best understood,

1. By what their ancient barbs or pastors taught concerning it. Peter Bruis, and Henry his successor, were both, as Morland affirms,[43] their ancient barbs and pastors; and from them there people were called Petrobrussians and Henricians; and we have seen already, that there two men were Antipaedobaptists, denied infant-baptism, and pleaded for adult-baptism. Arnoldus of Brixia, or Brescia, was another of their barbs, and is the first mentioned by Morland, from whom there people were called Arnoldists. Of this man Dr. Allix says,[44] that besides being charged with some ill opinions, it was said of him, that he was not found in his sentiments concerning the sacraments of the altar and the baptism of infants; and Dr. Wall allows,[45] that the Lateran council, under Innocent the second, in 1139, did condemn Peter Bruis, and Arnold of Brescia, who seems to have been a follower of Bruis, for rejecting infant-baptism, Lollardo was another of their barbs, who, as Morland says, was in great reputation with them, for having conveyed the knowledge of their doctrine into England, where his disciples were known by the name of Lollards; who were charged with holding, that the sacrament of baptism used in the church by water, is but a light matter, and of small effect; that Christian people be sufficiently baptized in the blood of Christ, and need no water; and that infants be sufficiently baptized, if their parents be baptized before them:[46] All which seem to arise from their denying of infant baptism, and the efficacy of it to take away sin.

2. By their ancient confessions of faith, and other writings which have been published. In one of there, bearing date A.D. 1120, the 12th and 13th articles run thus:[47] "We do believe that the sacraments are signs of the holy thing, or visible forms of the invisible grace; accounting it good that the faithful sometimes use the said signs, or visible forms, if it may be done. However we believe and hold, that the above said faithful may be saved without receiving the signs aforesaid, in case they have no place, nor any means to use them. We acknowledge no other sacrament but baptism and the Lord's-Supper." And in another ancient confession, without a date, the 7th article

is:[48] "We believe that in the sacrament of baptism, water is the visible and external sign, which represents unto us that which (by the invisible virtue of God operating) is within us; namely, the renovation of the Spirit, and the mortification of our members in Jesus Christ; by which also we are received into the holy congregation of the people of God, there protesting and declaring openly our faith and amendment of life." In a tract,[49] written in the language of the ancient inhabitants of the valleys, in the year 1100, called The Noble Lesson, are there words; speaking of the apostles, it is observed of them, "they spoke without fear of the doctrine of Christ; they preached to Jews and Greeks, working many miracles, and those that believed they baptized in the name of Jesus Christ." And in a treatise concerning Antichrist, which contains many sermons of the barbs, collected in the year 1120, and so speaks the sense of their ancient pastors before this time, stands the, following passage:[50] "The third work of antichrist consists in this, that he attributes the regeneration of the holy Spirit, unto the dead outward work (or faith) baptizing children in that faith, and teaching, that thereby baptism and regeneration must be had, and therein he confers and bellows orders and other sacraments, and groundeth therein all his Christianity, which is against the Holy Spirit."

There are indeed two confessions of theirs, which are said to speak of infant-baptism; but there are of a late date, both of them in the sixteenth century; and the earliest: is not a confession of the Waldenses or Vaudois in the valleys of Piedmont, but of the Bohemians, said to be presented to Ladislaus king of Bohemia, A.D. 1508, and afterwards amplified and explained, and presented to Ferdinand king of Bohemia, A.D. 1535; and it should be observed, that those people say, that they were fairly called Waldenses;[51] whereas it is certain there were a people in Bohemia that came out of the valleys, and sprung from the old Waldenses, and were truly so, who denied infant-baptism, as that sort of them called Pyghards, or Picards; who, near a hundred years before the reformation, as we have seen by the letter sent to Erasmus out of Bohemia, rebaptized persons that joined in communion with them; and Scultetus,[52] in his annals on the year 1528, says, that the united brethren in Bohemia, and other godly persons of that time, were rebaptized; not that they patronized the errors of the Anabaptist's, (meaning such that they were charged with which had no relation to baptism) but because they could not see how they could otherwise separate themselves from an unclean world. The other confession is indeed made by the ministers and heads of the churches in the valleys, assembled in Angrogne, September 12, 1532.[53] Now it should be known, that this was made after that "Peter Masson and George Morell were sent into Germany in the year 1530, as Morland[54] says, to treat with the chief ministers of Germany, namely, Oecolampadius, Bucer, and others, touching the reformation of their churches; but Peter Masson was taken prisoner at Dijon."

However, as Fox says[55] "Morell escaped, and returned alone to Merindol, with the books and letters he brought with him from the churches of Germany; and declared to his brethren all the points of his commission; and opened unto them how many and great errors they were in; into the which their old ministers, whom they called Barbs, that is to say Uncles, had brought them, leading them from the right way of true religion." After which, this confession was drawn up, signed, and swore to: From hence we learn, where they might get this notion, which was now become matter of great debate in Switzerland and Germany; and yet, after all this, I am inclined to think, that the words of the article in the said confession, are to be so understood, as not to relate to infant-baptism: They are these;[56] "We have but two sacramental signs left us by Jesus Christ; the one is baptism; the other is the Eucharist, which we receive, to shew that our perseverance in the faith, is such, as we promised, when we were baptized, being little children." This phrase, being little

children, as I think, means, their being little children in knowledge and experience, when they were baptized; since they speak of their receiving the Eucharist, to shew their perseverance in the faith, they then had promised to persevere in: Besides, if this is to be understood of them, as infants in a literal sense; what promise were they capable of making, when such? Should it be said, that "they promised by "their sureties;" it should be observed, that the Waldenses did not admit of godfathers and godmothers in baptism; this is one of the abuses their ancient Barbs complained of in baptism, as administered by the Papists.[57]

Besides, in a brief confession of faith, published by the reformed churches of Piedmont, so late as A.D. 1655, they have there words in favor of adult-baptism;[58] "that God does not only instruct and teach us by his word, but has also ordained certain sacraments to be joined with it, as a means to unite us unto Christ, and to make us partakers of his benefits. And there are only two of them belonging in common to all the members of the church under the New Testament; to wit, baptism and the Lord's-Supper; that God has ordained the sacrament of baptism to be a testimony of our adoption, and of our being cleansed from our sins by the blood of Jesus Christ, and renewed in holiness of life:" Nor is there one word in it of infant-baptism.

Upon the whole, it will be easily seen, what little reason the writer of the dialogue under consideration had to say, that the ancient Waldenses, being in the constant practice of adult-baptism, is a chimerical imagination, and a groundless fiction; since there is nothing appears to the contrary, but that they were in the practice of it until the sixteenth century; for what is urged against it, is since that time: And even at that time, there were some, that continued in the practice of it; for Ludovicus Vives, who wrote in the said century, having observed, that "formerly no person was brought to the holy baptistery, till he was of adult age, and when he both understood what that mythical water meant, and desired to be washed in it, yea, desired it more than once," adds the following words; "I hear, in some cities of Italy, the old custom is still in a great measure preferred."[59]

Now, what people should he mean by some cities of Italy, unless the remainders of the Petrobrussians, or Waldenses, as Dr. Wall observes,[60] who continued that practice in the valleys of Piedmont: And it should be observed, that there were different sects, that went by the name of Waldenses, and some of them of very bad principles; some of them were Manichees, and held other errors: And indeed, it was usual for the Papists in former times, to call all by this name, that dissented from them; so that it need not be wondered at, if some, bearing this name, were for infant-baptism, and others not. The Vaudois in the valleys, are the people chiefly to be regarded; and it will not be denied, that of late years infant-baptism has obtained among them: But that the ancient Waldenses practiced it, wants proof.

CHAPTER 4.

The Argument for Infant-baptism, taken from the Covenant made with Abraham, and from Circumcision, the Sign of it, considered.

The minister in this debate, in answer to his neighbor's requiring a plain scripture institution of infant-baptism, tells him; if he would "consider the covenant of grace, which was made with Abraham, and with all his seed, both after the flesh, and after the Spirit, and by God's express command to be sealed to infants, he would there find a sufficient scripture instance for infant-baptism:" And for this covenant he directs him to Genesis 17:2, 4, 7, 10, 12. He argues, that this covenant was a covenant of grace; that it was made with all Abraham's seed, natural and spiritual, Jews and Gentiles; that circumcision was the seal of it; and that the same institution, which requires circumcision to be administered to infants, requires baptism to be also administered to them, that succeeding circumcision, [page 10-18]. Wherefore,

First, The leading inquiry is, whether the covenant made with Abraham (Gen. 17), was the covenant of grace; that is, the pure covenant of grace, in distinction from the covenant of works; which is the sense in which it is commonly understood, and in which this writer seems to understand this covenant with Abraham; for of it, he says [p. 13], "it was the covenant of grace, that covenant by which alone we can have any grounded hope of salvation:" But that it was the covenant of grace, or a pure covenant of grace, must be denied: For,

1. It is never called the covenant of grace, nor by any name which shews it to be so; it is called the covenant of circumcision, which God is said to give to Abraham (Acts 7:8) but not a covenant of grace; circumcision and grace are opposed to one another; circumcision is a work of the law, which they that sought to be justified by, fell from grace (Gal. 5:2-4).

2. It seems rather to be a covenant of works, than of grace; for this was a covenant to be kept by men. Abraham was to keep it, and his seed after him were to keep it; something was to be done by them; they were to circumcise their flesh; and not only he and his seed were to be circumcised, but all that were born in his house, or bought with his money; and a severe penalty was annexed to it: In care of neglect, or disobedience, such a soul was to "be cut off from his people" (Gen. 17:9-14). All which favor nothing of a covenant of grace, a covenant by which we can have a grounded hope of salvation, but the contrary.

3. This was a covenant that might be broken, and in some instances was (Gen. 17:14); but the covenant of grace cannot be broken; God will not break it (Ps. 89:34), nor man cannot: It is a covenant ordered in all things, and sure; it cannot be moved; it stands firmer than hills, or mountains.

4. It must be owned, that there were temporal things promised in this covenant, such as a multiplication of Abraham's natural seed; a race of kings from him, with many nations, and a possession of the land of Canaan (Gen. 17:6, 8). Things which can have nothing to do with the pure covenant of grace, any more than the change of his name from Abram to Abraham [v. 5].

5. There were some persons, included in this covenant made with Abraham, of whom it cannot be thought they were in the covenant of grace, as Ishmael, Esau, and others; and on the other hand, there were some, and even living at the time when this covenant was made, and yet were not in it; who, nevertheless, were in the covenant of grace, as Arphaxad, Melchizedek, Lot, and others; wherefore this can never be reckoned the pure covenant of grace.

6. The covenant of grace was only made with Christ, as the federal head of it; and who is the only head of the covenant, and of the covenant-ones; wherefore, if the covenant of grace was made with Abraham, as the federal head of his natural and spiritual seed, of Jews and Gentiles; then there must be two heads of the covenant of grace, contrary to the nature of such a covenant, and the whole current of scripture: Yea, this covenant of Abraham's, so far as it respected his spiritual seed, or spiritual blessings for them, it and the promises were made to Christ (Gal. 3:16). No mere man is capable of covenanting with God, of stipulation and restipulation; for what has man to restipulate with God? The covenant of grace is not made with any single man; and much less with him on the behalf of others: When, therefore, at any time we read of the covenant of grace, being made with a particular person, or with particular persons, it must always be understood of making it manifest to them; of a revelation of the covenant, and of an application of covenant-blessings to them; and not of any original contract with them; for that is only made with them in Christ. To which may he added,

7. That the covenant of grace was made with Christ, and with his people, as considered in him, from everlasting; for so early was Christ set up as the mediator of it; the promise of eternal life in it was before the world was; and those interested in it, were blessed with all spiritual blessings and grace before the foundation of it; now could there be a mediator so early, a promise of eternal life so soon, and blessings of grace provided, and no covenant subsisting? wherefore the covenant made with Abraham in time, could not, strictly and properly speaking, be the covenant of grace. But,

8. To shorten this debate, it will be allowed, that the covenant made with Abraham was a peculiar covenant, such as was never made with any before, or since; that it was of a mixed kind; that it had in it promises and mercies of a temporal nature, which belonged to his natural seed; and others of a spiritual sort, which belonged to his spiritual seed: The former are more numerous, clear, and distinct; the latter are comprised chiefly in Abraham's being the father of many nations, or of all, that believe, and in God being a God to him and them (Rom. 4:11, 12, 16, 17). Which observation makes way for the next inquiry,

Secondly, With whom this covenant was made, so far as it respected spiritual things, or was a revelation of the covenant of grace; as for the temporal things of this covenant, it does not concern the argument. It is allowed on all hands, that they belonged to Abraham, and his natural seed: But the question is, whether this covenant, so far as it may be reckoned a covenant of grace, or a revelation of it, or respected spiritual things, was made with all Abraham's seed after the flesh, and with all the natural seed of believing Gentiles? This question consists of two parts,

1st, Whether the covenant made with Abraham, so far as it was a covenant of grace, was made with all Abraham's seed, according to the flesh? Which must be answered in the negative. For,

1. If it was made with all the natural seed of Abraham, as such, it must be with his more immediate offspring; and so must be equally made with a mocking and persecuting Ishmael, born after the flesh, the son of the bond-woman, as with Isaac, born after the Spirit, and the son of the free woman; and yet we find, that Ishmael was excluded from having a share in spiritual blessings, only temporal ones were promised him; and, in distinction and opposition to him, the covenant was established with Isaac (Gen. 17:19, 20, 21). Again, if this was the case, it must be equally made

with a profane Esau, as with plain-hearted Jacob; and yet it is said, Jacob have I loved, and Esau have I hated (Mal. 1:1, 2).

2. If it was made with all Abraham's seed according to the flesh, it must be made with all his remote posterity, and if and good to them in their most corrupt state; it must be made with them who believed not, and whole carcasses fell in the wilderness, and entered not into rest; it must be made with the ten tribes, that revolted from the pure service of God, and who worshipped the calves at Dan and Bethel; it must be made with the people of the Jews in Isaiah's time, when they were a sinful nation, a people laden with iniquity, a seed of evil-doers, children that were corrupters; whole rulers are called the rulers of Sodom, and the people the people of Gomorrah (Isa. 1:4, 6, 10), it must be made with the Scribes and Pharisees, and that wicked, adulterous, and hypocritical generation of men in the time of our Lord, who were his implacable enemies, and were concerned in his death; who killed him, persecuted his apostles, pleased not God, and were contrary to all men. What man, that seriously considers there things, can think that the covenant of grace belonged to these men, at least to all; and especially when he observes, what the apostle says, they are not all Israel, which are of Israel; neither because they are the seed of Abraham, are they all children? (Rom. 9:6, 7). Yea,

3. If it was made with all that are the seed of Abraham according to the flesh then it must be made with Ishmaelites and Edomites, as well as with Israelites; with his posterity by Keturah, as well as by Sarah; with the Midianites and Arabians; with the Turks, as well as with the Jews, since they descended and claim their descent from Abraham, as well as these. But,

4. To shut up this argument; this covenant made with Abraham, be it a covenant of grace, seeing it could be no more, at most, than a revelation, manifestation, copy, or transcript of it, call it which you will; it can never be thought to comprehend more in it than the original contract, than the eternal covenant between the Father and the Son. Now the only persons interested in the everlasting covenant of grace, are the chosen of God and precious; whom he has loved with an everlasting love; gave to his Son to be redeemed by his blood; for whom provision is made in the same covenant for the sanctification of their nature, for the justification of their persons, for the pardon of their sins, for their perseverance in grace, and for their eternal glory and happiness: So that all that are in that covenant are chosen to grace here, and glory hereafter, and shall certainly enjoy both: they are all secured in the hands of Christ, and are redeemed from sin, law, hell, and death, by his precious blood; and shall be saved in him with an everlasting salvation; they have all of them the laws of God put into their minds, and written on their hearts; they have new hearts and new spirits given them, and the stony heart taken away from them; they have the righteousness of Christ imputed to them; they have their sins forgiven them for his sake, and which will be remembered no more; they have the fear of God put into their hearts, and shall never finally and totally depart from him; but, being called and justified, shall be glorified (Jer. 31:33, 34; 32:40; Ezek. 36:25-27; Rom. 8:30).

Now if this covenant was made with all Abraham's natural seed, and comprehends all of them, then they must be all chosen of God; whereas there was only a remnant among them, according to the election of grace (Rom. 11:5): they must be all given to Christ, and secured in his hands; whereas there were some of them, that were not of his sheep, given him by his Father, and so did not believe in him (John 10:26); they must be all redeemed by his blood; whereas he laid down his life for his

sheep, his friends, his church, which all of Abraham's seed could never be said to be: In a word, they must be all regenerated and sanctified, justified and pardoned; must all have the grace of God, and persevere in it to the end, and be all eternally saved; and the same must be said of all the natural seed of believing Gentiles, if they also are all of them in the covenant of grace. But what man, in his senses, will affirm there things? And, upon such a principle, how will the doctrines of personal election, particular redemption, regeneration by efficacious grace, not by blood or the will of man, and the saints' final perseverance, be established? This Gentleman, whole pamphlet is before me, is said to have written with some success against the Arminians; but sure I am, that no man can write with success against them, and without contradiction to himself, that has imbibed such a notion of the covenant of grace, as this I am militating against.

2dly, The other part of the question is, whether the covenant made with Abraham, so far as it was a covenant of grace, was made with all the natural seed of believing Gentiles? which also must be answered in the negative: For,

1. It will be allowed, that this covenant respects Abraham's spiritual seed among the Gentiles; even all true believers, all such that walk in the steps of his faith; for he is the Father of all them that believe, whether circumcised or uncircumcised, Jews or Gentiles (Rom. 4:11, 12, 15); but not the natural seed of believing Gentiles. They, indeed, that are of the faith of Abraham, are his children in a spiritual sense, and they are blessed with him with spiritual blessings, and are such, as Christ has redeemed by his blood; and they believe in him, and the blessing of Abraham comes upon them: But then this spiritual seed of Abraham is the same with the spiritual seed of Christ, with whom the covenant was made from everlasting, and to them only does it belong; and to none can spiritual blessings belong, but to a spiritual seed, not a natural one. Let it be proved, if it can, that all the natural seed of believing Gentiles, are the spiritual seed of Abraham, and then they will be admitted to have a claim to this covenant. But, though it appears, that believing Gentiles are in this covenant, what clause is there in it, that respects their natural seed, as such? Let it be shown, if it can; by what right and authority, can any believing Gentile pretend to put his natural seed into Abraham's covenant? The covenant made with him, as to the temporal part of it, belonged to him, and his natural seed; and with respect to its spiritual part, only to his spiritual seed, whether Jews or Gentiles and not to the natural seed of either of them, as such.

2. The covenant made with Abraham, and his spiritual seed, takes in many of the seed of unbelieving Gentiles; who being called by grace, and openly believing Christ, are Abraham's spiritual seed, with whom the covenant was made: That there are many among the Gentiles born of unbelieving parents, who become true believers in Christ, and so appear to be in the covenant of grace, must be allowed; since many are received as such into the communion of the Paedobaptists, as well as others; and, on the other hand, there are many born of believing Gentiles, who do not believe in Christ, are not partakers of his grace, on whom the spiritual blessings of Abraham do not come; and so not in his covenant. Wherefore, by what authority do men put in the infant seed of believing Gentiles, as such, into the covenant, and restrain it to them, and leave out the seed of unbelieving Gentiles; when, on the contrary, God oftentimes takes the one, and leaves the other?

3. That all the natural seed of believing Gentiles cannot be included in the covenant of grace, is manifest, from the reason above given, against all the natural seed of Abraham being in it; shewing, that all that are in it are the elect of God, the redeemed of Christ, are effectually called by grace,

persevere to the end, and are eternally saved; all which cannot be said of all the natural seed of believing Gentiles: And if all the natural seed of Abraham are not in this covenant made with him, as it was a covenant of grace, it can hardly be thought that all the natural seed of believing Gentiles should.

4. Seeing it is so clear a case, that some of the seed of unbelieving Gentiles are in this covenant, and some of the seed of believing Gentiles are not in it, and that it cannot be known who are, until they believe in Christ, and so appear to be Abraham's spiritual seed; it must be right to put off their claim to any privilege supposed to arise from covenant interest, until it appear that they have one.

5. After all, covenant interest gives no right to any ordinance, without a positive order and direction from God. So, for instance, with respect to circumcision; on the one hand, there were some persons living at the time that ordinance was instituted, who undoubtedly had an interest in the covenant of grace, as Shem, Atrphaxad, Lot, and others, on whom that was not enjoined, and who had no right to use it; and, on the other hand, there have been many that were not in the covenant of grace, who were obliged to it: And so with respect to baptism, it is not covenant interest that gives a right to it; if it could be proved, as it cannot, that all the infant seed of believers, as such, are in the covenant of grace, it would give them no right to baptism, without a positive command for it; the reason is, because a person may be in covenant, and as yet not have the prerequisite to an ordinance, even faith in Christ, and a profession of it; which are necessary to baptism and the Lord's Supper. This leads me on,

Thirdly, To another inquiry, whether circumcision was a real of the covenant of grace to Abraham's natural seed; the writer, whole performance I am considering, affirms, that it was by God's express command to be sealed to infants; and that circumcision is the real of it [p. 10, 36]. But this must be denied: circumcision was no seal of the covenant of grace; for,

1. If it was, the covenant of grace, before that took place, must be without a real; the covenant subsisted from everlasting, and the revelation of it was quickly made after the fall of Adam; and there were manifestations of it to particular persons, as Noah, and others, before this to Abraham, and no circumcision enjoined: Wherefore, from Adam to Abraham, according to this notion, the covenant must be without a real; nay, there were some persons living at the time it was instituted, who were in the covenant, yet this was not enjoined them; as it would, if this had been designed as a seal of it.

2. Circumcision, in the institution of it, is called a sign, but not a seal; it is said to be אות Oth, a Token, or Sign (Gen. 17:11); but not חותם Chothem, a Seal; it was a sign or mark in the flesh, which Abraham's natural seed were to bear, until the promises made in this covenant were accomplished; it was a typical sign of the pollution of human nature, propagated by natural generation, and of cleansing from it by the blood of Christ, and of the inward circumcision of the heart; but did not seal or confirm any spiritual blessing of the covenant, to those on whom this mark or sign was let; it is never called a seal throughout the whole Old Testament; and so far is there from being any express command, that the covenant of grace should be sealed to infants by it, that there is not the least hint of it given.

3. It is indeed in the New Testament called a seal of the righteousness of faith (Rom. 4:11); but it is not said to be a real of the covenant of grace, nor a seal to infants: it was not a seal to Abraham's natural seed; it was only so to himself. The plain meaning of the apostle is, that circumcision was a seal to Abraham, and assured him of, or confirmed his faith in this, that he should be the father of many nations, in a spiritual sense; and that the righteousness of faith which he had, when he was an uncircumcised person, should also come upon, and be imputed unto the uncircumcised Gentiles: and accordingly, this mark and sign continued until the gospel, declaring justification by the righteousness of Christ, was preached, or ordered to be preached to the Gentiles; and could it be thought that circumcision was a real to others besides him, it could at most be only a seal to them that had both faith and righteousness, and not to them that had neither.

4. If it was a seal of the covenant of grace to Abraham's natural seed, it must be either to some or all; if only to some, it should be pointed out who they are; and if to all, then it must be sealed, that is, confirmed, and an interest in it assured of, to a mocking Ishmael; to a profane Esau; to Korah, Datban, and Abiram, and their accomplices, whom the earth swallowed up alive; to Achitophel, that hanged himself; to Judas, that betrayed our Lord; and to all the Jews concerned in his crucifixion and death; since there is reason to believe they were all circumcised. But,

5. The covenant made with Abraham, so far as it was a covenant of grace, was not made, as we have seen, with all Abraham's natural seed; and therefore circumcision could not be a seal of it to them. I pass on,

Fourthly, To another inquiry, whether baptism succeeded circumcision, and so became a real of the covenant: of grace to believers, and their natural seed? This must be answered in the negative; for,

1. There is no agreement between them, in the subjects to whom they are administered; circumcision was administered to Jews only, or such as became proselytes; baptism both to Jews and Gentiles, without any distinction, that believe in Christ; circumcision was administered to infants, baptism only to adult persons; circumcision belonged only to the males, baptism to male and female: Seeing then the subjects of the one and the other are so different, the one cannot be thought to succeed the other.

2. The use of the one and the other is not the same; the use of circumcision was to distinguish the natural seed of Abraham from others, until Christ was come in the flesh; the use of baptism is to be a distinguishing badge of the spiritual seed of Christ, such as have believed in him, and put him on; the use of circumcision was to signify the corruption of human nature, the necessity of regeneration, of the circumcision without hands, and of cleansing by the blood of Christ; the use of baptism is to answer a good conscience towards God to represent the sufferings, burial, and resurrection of Christ, and prerequires repentance and faith.

3. The manner of administering the one and the other is very different; the one is by blood, the other by water; the one by an incision made in one part of the body, the other by an immersion of the whole body in water; the one was done in a private house, and by a private hand; the other, for the most part, publicly, in open places, in rivers, and before multitudes of people, and by a person in public office, a public minister of the word. Now, ordinances so much differing in their subjects,

use, and manner of administration, the one can never be thought to come in the room and place of the other. But,

4. What puts it out of all doubt, that baptism can never be said to succeed circumcision is, that baptism was in force and use before circumcision was abolished, and its practice discontinued, or ought to be discontinued. Circumcision was not abolished till the death of Christ when, with other ceremonies of the law, it was made null and void; but, unto that time, it was the duty of Jewish parents to circumcise their infants; whereas some years before this, John came preaching the doctrine of baptism, and administered it to multitudes; our Lord himself was baptized, three or four years, according to the common computation, before his death; now that which is in force before another is out of date, can never, with any propriety, be said to succeed or come in the room of that other.

5. It has been proved already, that circumcision was no seal of the covenant of grace to Abraham's natural seed; and therefore, could it be proved, as it cannot, that baptism succeeds it, it would not follow that baptism is a real of the covenant of grace; there are many persons who have been baptized) and yet not in the covenant of grace, and to whom it was never sealed, as Simon Magus, and others; and, on the other hand, a person may be in the covenant of grace, and it may be sealed to him, and he may be comfortably assured of his interests in it, though, as yet, not baptized in water. The author of the dialogue before me says, [p. 16] that it is allowed on all hands, that baptism is a token or real of the covenant of grace; but it is a popular clamor, a vulgar mistake, that either that or the Lord's-Supper are seals of the covenant of grace. The blood of Christ is the seal, and the only seal of it, by which its promises and blessings are ratified and confirmed; and the holy Spirit is the only earnest pledge, seal, and sealer of the saints, until the day of redemption.[61]

And so all that fine piece of wit of our author, about the red and white seal, is spoiled and lost: [p. 17]. Upon the whole, we may see what sufficient scripture institution for infant-baptism is to be found in the covenant made with Abraham; since the spiritual part of that covenant did not concern his natural seed, as such, but his spiritual seed, and so not infants, but adult persons, whether among Jews or Gentiles, that walked in the steps of his faith; and seeing there is not one word of baptism in it, and much less of infant-baptism; nor was circumcision a seal of it, nor does baptism succeed that, or is a seal of the covenant of grace: Hence also, it will appear, what little reason there is for that clamorous outcry, so often made, and is by our author, of lessening and abridging the privileges of infants under the gospel dispensation, and of depriving them of what they formerly had; or for an harangue upon the valuable blessing, and great and glorious privilege they had, of having the covenant of grace sealed unto them by circumcision; or for that demand, how, why, and when, children were cut off from this privilege? or for such a representation, this being the care, that the gospel is a less glorious dispensation, with respect to infants, than the former was, [pp. 19, 20, 22,30]. Seeing the covenant of grace was never sealed to infants by circumcision; nor was that bloody and painful rite accounted a rich and glorious privilege; far from it; especially as it bound them over to keep the whole law, it was a yoke of bondage, an insupportable one: and it is a rich mercy, and glorious privilege of the gospel, that the Jews and their children are delivered from it; and that Gentiles and their children are not obliged to it: And as for the demand, how, why, and when, children were cut off from it, it is easily answered, that this was done by the death of Christ, and at the time of it, when all ceremonies were abolished; and that for this reason, because of the weakness, unprofitableness, and burdensomeness of that, and them: And as for the gospel-

dispensation, that is the more glorious, for infants being left out of its church-state; that is to say, for its being not national and carnal, as before, but congregational and spiritual; for its consisting, not of infants without understanding, but of rational and spiritual men, of believers in Christ, and prosessors of his name; and these not in a single and small country, as Judea, but in all parts of the world, as it has been, at one time or another, and it will be in the latter day: And as for infants themselves, their care is as good, and their privileges as many and better, than under the legal dispensation; their salvation is not at all affected by the abrogation of circumcision, or through want of baptism to succeed it. As the former did not real the covenant to them, and could not fare them, so neither could the latter, were it administered to them: To which may be added, that being born of Christian parents, and having a Christian education, and the advantage of hearing the gospel, as they grow up, and this not in one country, but many, must exceed all the privileges the Jewish children had under the former dispensation.

CHAPTER 5

A consideration of the several texts of scripture produced in favor of Infant-baptism.

The minister in the dialogue before me, being pressed by his neighbor to declare what were the numerous texts of scripture he referred to, as proving the continuance of children's privileges under the gospel-dispensation, meaning particularly baptism, mentions the following.

1st, The passage in Acts 2:39, For the promise is unto you, and to your children, and to all that are afar off, even as many as the Lord our God shall call. This scripture is often made use of by our author, and seems to be his dernier resort on all occasions, and the sheet-anchor of the cause he is pleading for. The promise spoken of, he says, undoubtedly, was the covenant made with Abraham; and was urged as a reason with the Jews, why they and their children ought to be baptized; and as a reason with the Gentiles, why they and their children, when called into a church-state, should be also baptized [p. 11, 12]. He makes use of it, to prove that this promise gives a claim to baptism, and that an interest in it gives a right unto it [p. 15, 16, 18, 29, 30].

1. It is easy to observe the contradictions, that such are guilty of, that plead for infant-baptism, from the covenant or promise made with Abraham, as this writer is. One while, he tells us, that persons are by baptism brought into the covenant of grace; and what a dreadful thing it is to renounce baptism in infancy; whereby the covenant is vacated, and the relation to the glorious God disowned, they were brought into by baptism [p. 4]. And yet here we are told, that interest in this promise gives a right and claim to baptism; but how can it give a previous right and claim to baptism, when it is by baptism, according to this writer, that persons are brought into this covenant?

2. The promise here observed, be it what it will, is not taken notice of, as what gives a claim and right to baptism, but as an encouraging motive to persons pricked in the heart, and in distress, both to repent, and be baptized for the remission of sins, and as giving them hope of receiving the holy Ghost, since such a promise was made; wherefore repentance and baptism were urged, in order to

the enjoyment of the promise; and, consequently, can be understood of no other than adult persons, who were capable of repentance, and of a voluntary subjection to the ordinance of baptism.

3. The children, here spoken of, do not design infants, but the posterity of the Jews, and such, who might be called children, though grown up: And nothing is more common in scripture,[62] than the use of the phrase in this sense; and, unless it be so understood in many places, strange interpretations must be given of them: wherefore the argument, from hence, for Paedobaptism, is given up by some learned men, as Dr. Hammond, and others, as inconclusive; but some men, wherever they meet with the word children, it immediately runs in their heads, that infants must be meant.

4. The promise, be it what it will, is restrained to as many as the Lord our God shall call, whether they be Jews or Gentiles, as well as to repenting and baptizing persons; and therefore can furnish out no argument for infant-baptism, but must be understood of adult persons, capable of being called with an holy calling, of professing repentance, and of desiring baptism upon it; and of doing this, that their faith might be led to the blood of Christ, for the remission of sin,

5. It seems clear from the context, that not the covenant made with Abraham, but either the promise of the Messiah, and salvation by him, the great promise made in the Old Testament to the Jews, and their posterity; or the particular promise of remission of sins, a branch of the new covenant made with the house of Israel, and mentioned in the preceding verse, and which was calculated for comfort, and pertinently taken notice of; or of the pouring out of the holy Ghost, which is last mentioned: And indeed all may be included in this promise, and used as a means to comfort them under their distress, and as an argument to encourage them to do the things they are pressed to in the foregoing verse.

2dly, To the former is added another scripture in Matthew 19:14. Suffer little children, and forbid them not to come unto me, for of such is the kingdom of heaven. Upon which, it is asked, how, and which way, should we bring our little children to Christ, but in the way of his ordinances? If they belong to the kingdom of heaven, they must have a right to the privileges of that kingdom, p. 20. To which I answer,

1. These little children do not appear to be new-born babes; the words used by the evangelists do not always signify such, but are sometimes used of such as are capable of going alone, yea, of receiving instructions, of understanding the scriptures, and of one of twelve years of age (Matthew 18:2; 2 Tim. 3:15; Mark 5:39, 42). Nor is it probable that children just born, or within the month, should be had abroad. Moreover, these were such as Christ called unto him (Luke 18:16), and were capable of coming to him of themselves, as these words suppose; nor does their being brought unto him, or his taking them in his arms, contradict this; since the same things are said of such as could walk of themselves (Matthew 12:22; 17:16; Mark 9:36).

2. It is not known whose children these were, whether the children of those that brought them, or of others; and whether their parents were believers in Christ, or not, or whether their patents were baptized or unbaptized; and if they were unbelievers and unbaptized persons, the Paedobaptists themselves will not allow that their children ought to be baptized.

3. Certain it is, that they were not brought to Christ, to be baptized by him; for the ends for which they were brought are mentioned; Matthew says, they brought them unto him, that he should put his hands on them, and pray; that is, for them, and bless them; as was usual with the Jews to do (Gen. 49:14-16); and it was common with them to bring their children to venerable persons, men of note for religion and piety, to have their blessing and their prayers; and such an one the persons that brought these children might take Christ to be, though they might not know him to be the Messiah. Mark and Luke say, they were brought to him, that he would touch them (Mark 10:13; Luke 18:15); as he sometimes used to do, when he healed persons of diseases; and probably some of these children, if not all of them, were diseased, and were brought to be cured; otherwise it is not easy to conceive what they should be touched by him for; however, they were not brought to be baptized: If the persons that brought them had their baptism in view, they would not have brought them to Christ, but to his disciples; seeing not he but they baptized the persons fit for it; they might have seen the disciples administer that ordinance, but not Christ; and from hence it is certain, that they were not baptized by Christ, since he never baptized any.

4. This passage concludes against Paedobaptism, and not for it; for it seems, by this, that it had never been the practice of the Jews, nor of John the Baptist, nor of Christ and his disciples, to baptize infants; for had this been then in use, the apostles would scarcely have rebuked and forbid those that brought these children, since they might have concluded they brought them to be baptized; but knowing of no such usage, that ever obtained in that nation, neither among those that did or did not believe in Christ, they forbad them; and Christ's entire silence about the baptism of infants at this time, when he had such an opportunity of speaking of it to his disciples, had it been his will, has no favorable aspect on such a practice.

5. This writer's reasoning upon the passage, is betide the purpose for which he produces it; if he brings it to prove any thing respecting baptism, it must be to prove that infants were brought to Christ, in order to be baptized by him, and not to him in the way of his ordinance, or in the way of baptism: the reason our Lord gives why they should be suffered to come to him, for of such is the kingdom of heaven, is to be understood of such as were comparable to little children, for modesty, meekness, and humility, and for freedom from rancor malice, ambition, and pride (Matthew 18:2). And so the Syriac version is, who are as these; and the Parsic version, which is rather a paraphrase, shewing the sense, who have been humble as these little children; and such are the proper subjects of a gospel church-state, sometimes called the kingdom of heaven, and shall inherit eternal happiness. If the words are to be literally understood of infants, and of their belonging to the kingdom of heaven, interpreted of the kingdom of grace, or of the gospel church-stare, according to this author's reasoning, they will prove too much, and more than he cares for; namely, that belonging to that kingdom, they have a right to the privileges of it, even to all of them, to the Lord's supper, as well as to baptism; but the kingdom of glory seems to be designed: And we are not unwilling to admit the literal sense, for the eternal salvation and happiness of infants dying in infancy, is not denied by us; and, according to this sense, our Lord's reasoning is strong, that seeing he thought fit to save the souls of infants, and introduce them into the kingdom of heaven, why should they be forbid being brought to him, to be touched by him, and healed of their bodily diseases? The argument is from the greater to the lesser; but furnishes out nothing in favor of Paedobaptism.

3dly, The next text mentioned is Matthew 18:6. But whoso shall offend one of these little ones which believe in me, it were better for him, that a mill stone were hanged about his neck, and that he were drowned in the depth of the sea.

Upon which it is observed, that the little one referred to was in an infant state, as appears from verse 21, and Mark 9:36 and that little children are reputed, by Christ, believers in him: And so here is a full anticipation of the common objection against the baptism of infants, and a justification of their claim to the seal of the righteousness of faith; as well as a strong declaration of the awful danger of offending there little ones, by denying them the covenant privileges, to which they have a righteous claim, [pages 20, 21, 23, 27]. But,

1. Though the little child, in verse 2d, which our Lord let in the midst of his disciples, and took an occasion from thence to rebuke and instruct them, was in an infant-state, yet those our Lord here speaks of, were not little ones in age; for how capable soever they may be of having the principle or habit of faith implanted in them, they cannot be capable of exercising it, or of acting faith, which the phrase used expresses; for if they are not capable of exerting reason, though they have the principle of it in them, they cannot be capable of exercising faith; nor indeed of being offended in the sense the word is here used, and to such a degree, that the offenders of them had better have died a violent death, than to be guilty of such offense. But,

2. The disciples of Christ are meant, his apostles, who were contending among themselves who should be greatest in the kingdom of heaven; which ambition our Lord rebukes, by placing a little child in the midst of them, verses 1, 2, saying to them, Except ye be converted, and become as little children, ye shall not enter into the kingdom of heaven; adding, that whoever humbled himself as the child before him, should be the greatest in it; and that such who received such humble disciples of his, received him; but those that offended them, would incur his resentment, and the greatest danger expressed in the words under consideration (vv. 3-6). And there were such, not only who by faith looked to Christ, and received him as their Savior, and made a profession of him; but preached the doctrine of faith; who, having believed, therefore spoke; and who may be said to be offended, when their persons were despised, their ministry rejected, and they reproached and persecuted; and, when it would go ill with them that should treat them in this manner. There were such, who were little ones, in their own esteem, and in the esteem of others.

3. Admitting that infants in age could be meant, and there to have the principle and habit of faith in them, yet this would not justify their claim to baptism, which this writer means, by the real of the righteousness of faith; though not baptism, but circumcision is designed by that phrase; since actual faith, yea, a profession of it, is a necessary prerequisite to baptism; If thou believest with all thine heart, thou mayest (Acts 8:37).

4. This writer seems conscious to himself, that faith in Christ is necessary to baptism, and is that which justifies a claim unto it; since he seems glad to lay hold on this text, and the sense he puts upon it, in order to anticipate the objection to infant-baptism taken from faith in Christ, being a pre-requisite to it; which he knows not how otherwise to get rid of, than to suppose that infants have faith, and that this is a proof of it. But,

5. Supposing this, either all infants have faith, or only some: If all; how comes it to pass, that there are so many, when grown up, that are manifestly destitute of it: Can the grace be lost? Is it not an abiding one? Is not He, who is the Author, the Finisher of it? If only some have it, how can it be known, who have it, and who not? Wherefore, to baptize upon this supposed faith, is to proceed on a very precarious foundation: It seems, therefore, much more eligible, to defer their baptism, till it appears, that they do truly and actually believe in Christ.

4thly, The next passage of scripture, produced in favor of infant-baptism, is 1 Corinthians 7:14. For the unbelieving husband is sanctified by the wife, and the unbelieving wife is sanctified by the husband, else were your children unclean; but now are they holy. Upon which, our author thus reasons; "If either of the parents be a believer, the children are reputed holy; that is, they have a covenant holiness, and have, therefore, a claim to covenant-privileges; — they are holy, by virtue of their covenant-relation to God, and must therefore, have a right to have

that covenant sealed to them in baptism" [p. 21]. But,

1. It ought to be told, what there covenant-privileges are, that children have a claim unto, by virtue of their covenant-relation, this writer so often speaks of. If baptism is one of them, as it seems to be his intention, that must be denied to be a covenant-privilege, or a privilege of the covenant of grace; for then all the covenant ones in all ages, ought to have enjoyed it; whereas they have not: And we have seen already, that covenant interest gives no right to any positive institution, or ordinance, without a divine direction; and that baptism is no real of the covenant.

2. It should be told, what this covenant is, whether it is a real or imaginary thing; it seems to be the latter, by our author's way of expressing himself. He says, children are reputed holy; that is, have a covenant-holiness: So that covenant-holiness is a reputed holiness; but such a holiness can never qualify persons for a New Testament ordinance; nor has the covenant of grace any such holiness belonging to it; that provides, by way of promise, for real holiness, signified, by putting and writing the laws of God in the heart, by giving new hearts and new spirits, and taking away the stony heart, and by cleansing from all impurity; this is real, inward holiness, and shews itself in an outward holy conversation: Where this appears, such have an undoubted right to the ordinance of baptism, since they must have received the holy spirit, as a spirit of sanctification (Acts 10:47).

3. A holiness, appertaining to the covenant of grace, can never be meant, since it is such a holiness, as unbelievers, yea, as heathens are said to have; it is such a holiness, as unbelieving husbands, and unbelieving wives are said to have, by virtue and in consequence of their relation to believing wives and believing husbands; and which they have prior to the holiness of their children; and on which their children's holiness depends. Now, surely, unbelievers and heathens, will not be allowed to be in covenant, or to be possessed of a covenant holiness, by virtue of their yoke-fellows; and yet, theirs, and their children's holiness, must be of the same kind and nature. Wherefore,

4. If children, by virtue of this holiness, have a claim to covenant-privileges, and to have the covenant sealed to them by baptism; then, much more, their unbelieving parents, because they are sanctified before them, by their believing yoke-fellows, and they are as near to them, as their children; and if the holiness of the one gives a right to baptism, why not the holiness of the other? And yet, our Paedobaptists do not pretend to baptize the unbelieving husband or wife, though

sanctified, whole holiness is the more near; but the children, that become holy through the sanctification of both, whose holiness is the more remote. For, it should be observed, that the holiness, spoken of in the text, be it what it will, is derived, or denominated, from both parents, believing and unbelieving; yea, the holiness of the children depends upon the sanctification of the unbelieving parent; for if the unbeliever is not sanctified, the children are unclean, and not holy. Besides, the words are not necessarily to be understood of infants, or young children, but of the posterity of such persons, whether of 40, or 50 years of age, or of what age soever; and must be unclean in the sense of the word, here used, if their unbelieving parent is not sanctified by, or to the believing one. But,

5. These words are to be understood of a matrimonial holiness; not merely of the holiness of marriage, as it is an institution of God, but of the very act of marriage, which, in the language of the Jews, is frequently expressed, by being sanctified, innumerable instances might be given of this; I have produced one in my exposition of this place, in which the word, מקרש Kadash, "to sanctify," is used no less than ten times, to espouse. And, for the sake of those who have it not, I shall transcribe the passage: And it is, as follows;[163] "a man çdqm Mekaddesh, "sanctifies," or espouses a wife by himself, or by his messenger; a woman, מתקרש Mithkaddesh, "is sanctified," or espoused by herself, or by her messenger; a man, מקרש Mekaddesh, "sanctifies," or espouses his daughter, when she is a young woman, by himself, or by his messenger: If any one says to a woman, התקרשי Hitbkaddeshi, "be thou sanctified," or espoused to me by this date (the fruit of the palm tree) התקרשי Hithkaddeshi, "be thou sanctified," or espoused by this (or any other thing:) If there is in any one of there things the value of a farthing, מקורשת Mekuddesheth, "she is sanctified," or espoused; and if not, she is not מקורשת Mekuddesheth, "sanctified," or espoused: If he says, by this, and by this, and by this; if there is the value of a farthing in them all, מקורשת Mekuddesheth, "she is sanctified," or espoused; but if not, she is not, מקורשת Mekuddesheth, "sanctified," or espoused: If she eats one (date) after another, she is not, מקורשת Mekuddesheth, "sanctified," or espoused, unless one of them is the value of a farthing."

In the Misnah, the oral law of the Jews, there is a whole treatise of קירושיך Kiddushin, "sanctifications," or espousals; out of which the above passage is taken: And in the Gemara is another, full of the disputes of the doctors on this subject: And Maimonides has also written a treatise of women and wives; out of which might be produced almost innumerable instances, in proof of the observation; and such, as can read, and have leisure to read the said tracts, may fully satisfy themselves in this matter. And in the same sense, the apostle uses the word ακαζς , here: And the passage should be rendered thus; the unbelieving husband is espoused, or married to the wife, or rather has been espoused; for it relates to the act of marriage past, as valid; and the unbelieving wife has been espoused to the husband. The preposition εν, translated by, should be rendered to, as it is in the very next verse, God hath called us, εν οιρηνη, "to peace." The passage is introduced, to support the advice the apostle had given to believers married to unbelievers, not to depart from them, but live with them, who had had some scruple upon their minds, whether they ought to cohabit with them, being unbelievers; he advises them, by all means, to dwell with them, unless the unbeliever departed, seeing they were duly, rightly, and legally espoused to each other; and, therefore, ought not, notwithstanding their different sentiments of religion, to separate from one another; otherwise, if they were not truly married to one another, as such a departure and separation would suggest, this consequence must necessarily follow, that children, born in such a state of cohabitation, where the marriage is not valid, must be spurious, and not legitimate: which is

the sense of the next clause, else were your children unclean, but now are they holy; that is, they would have been accounted illegitimate, but now legitimate. And,

6. This sense of the words is not novel, nor singular: It is agreeable to the minds of several interpreters, ancient and modern; as Jerom, Ambrose, Erasmus, Camerarius, Musculus, and others: which last writer, and who was a zealous Paedobaptist, makes this ingenuous confession; "formerly, says he, I have abused this place against the Anabaptists, thinking the meaning was, that the children were holy for the parents faith; which, though true, the present place makes nothing for the purpose"

5thly, To all which, this writer adds the commission in Matthew 28:19. Go, teach all nations, baptizing them, etc. Concerning which, he says, that as the commission to the sacred ministry enjoined the baptizing of all nations, whereof infants are a very great part; it also enjoined the baptizing infants, as a part of the nations they were to disciple and baptize, [p. 21]. And, elsewhere, he says, the words ought to be read, Go, disciple all nations, baptizing them;—and should be understood, as requiring the ministers of the gospel to make all nations disciples by baptizing them,—whereby every one is constituted a learner of Christ: And to prove, that infants are called disciples, he refers to Acts 15:10. Why tempt ye God to put a yoke on the neck of the disciples, etc. and to all, such scriptures, that respect the education of children, [pp. 24, 25]. But,

1. The commission does not enjoin the baptizing of all nations, but the baptizing of such as are taught; for the antecedent to the relative them cannot be all nations, since παντο τα ηθνη, the words for "all nations," are of the neuter gender; whereas αυτους "them," is of the masculine; but μαθευτας , "disciples;" is supposed and contained in the word μαθητευσατε, "teach, or make disciples;" such as are first taught, or made disciples by teaching under the ministry of the word, by the Spirit of God, Christ's orders are to baptize them.

2. If infants, as a part of all nations, were to be baptized, and because they are such; then the infants of Heathens, Turks and Jews, ought to be baptized, for they are a part of all nations, as well as the children of Christians, or believers.

3. We are very willing, the words should be rendered disciple all nations, or make all nations disciples; that is, disciples of Christ, which is the same, as believers in him; for they are the true disciples of Christ, that have learned the way of life, and salvation by him; that deny themselves, sinful, righteous, and civil self, for his sake; who forsake all, take up the cross, and follow him; who bear, and bring forth much fruit, love one another, and continue in the doctrine of Christ (Luke 14:27, 33; John 15:8; 13:35; 8:31). And such, and such only, are the proper subjects of baptism: so, agreeable to this commission and the sense of it, Christ first made disciples, and then baptized them, or ordered them to be baptized.

4. These two acts, discipling and baptizing, are not to be confounded together; they are two distinct acts, and the one is previous to the other, and absolutely (John 4:1, 2) necessary thereunto. Men are not made disciples by baptizing them, as this writer suggests, but they must be first disciples, and then baptized. So Jerom[64] long ago understood the commission, who has there words upon it; "first, they teach all nations, then dip those that are taught in water: For, it cannot be, that the body should receive the sacrament of baptism, unless the soul has before received the truth of faith." To

the same purpose, Athanasius says,[65] wherefore the Savior does not simply command to baptize, but first says, teach; and then baptize thus, in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost; that faith might come of teaching, and baptism be perfected."

5. Such a disciple, as this writer supposes to be constituted by baptism, namely, a learner of Christ, cannot agree with an infant. What can a new-born babe learn of Christ? What can it be taught of him, or receive by way of teaching, at the time of its baptism, or by being baptized? If learners and disciples are synonymous terms, as this author says, they cannot be disciples before they are learners; and they Cannot be learners of Christ, unless they have learned something of him: And, according to this notion, they ought to learn something of him, before they are baptized in his name. But what can an infant learn of Christ?

6. The text in Acts 15:10 is not to be understood of infants, but of adult persons; even converted Gentiles, who believed in Christ, and were his disciples; and upon whom, the false teachers would have imposed the yoke of the ceremonial law; and, particularly, circumcision: Which, because it bound over to the whole law, the apostle represents as an insupportable one; and calls this imposition of it on the believing Gentiles, a tempting of God: And as for any other passages that enjoin the education of children, or speak of it, they are never from thence called the disciples of Christ, nor any where else.

6thly, This writer asserts, that "it is plain that the apostles thus understood our Savior's meaning, and accordingly baptized Lydia and her household, and the Jailer and all his (Acts 16:15, 35); and the household of Stephanas" (1 Cor. 1:16); [p. 21]. But,

1. Seeing the understanding of our Savior's meaning in the commission, depends upon those instances of baptism, and so the warrant for the baptizing of infants, the Paedobaptists ought to be sure that there were infants in there families, and that they were baptized, or otherwise they must baptize them, at most, upon a very precarious foundation; for if the commission of itself is not clear for it, and those instances in which the apostles acted according to the commission, are not sufficient to vouch it, it must stand upon a very bad bottom, having neither precept nor precedent for it; and they must know, that there are families that have no infants in them, and how can they be sure there were any in these? And,

2. It lies upon them to prove there were infants in these families, and that these infants were baptized, or the allegation of those instances is to no purpose; how they can satisfy themselves without it, they best know; they ought not to put it upon us to prove a negative, to prove that there were none, this is unfair; and one would think, should not sit very easy upon their minds, to rest their practice on so poor a shift, and so unreasonable a demand. But,

3. We are able to make it appear, that there are many things in the account of the baptism of there families, which are inconsistent with infants, and which make it at least probable, that there were none in them; and certain, that those that were baptized were adult persons, and believers in Christ. As for Lydia, it is not certain in what state of life she was, whether single or married, whether maid, widow, or wife; whether she had any children, or ever had any; or if the had, and them living, whether they were infants or adult; and if infants, it does not seem probable that she should bring them along with her from her native place Thyatira to Philippi, where she seems to have been upon

business, and so had hired a house during her stay there; wherefore, her household seems to have consisted of menial servants she brought along with her, to assist her in her business; and certain it is, that those that the apostles found there, when they entered into it, after they came out of prison, were such as are called brethren, and were capable of being comforted by them (Acts 16:15, 40). And as for the Jailer's household, they were such as were capable of having the word of God spoken to them, and of rejoicing at it, and in the conversation of the apostles, at what was laid and done by them; and are even expressly said to believe in God, as the Jailer did, and together with him; and as for the household of Stephanas, that is, by some, thought to be the same with the Jailer's; but, if not, it is certain it consisted of adult persons, believers in Christ, and very useful in the public service of religion; for they were the first-fruits of Achaia, and addicted themselves to the ministry of the saints (1 Cor. 16:15). All which, in each of the instances, can never be said of infants. But,

7thy, This writer adds one text more, which, he says, must be allowed to be decisive in the present case, and that is Romans 11:17-25 from whence he thinks it is most evident, that since the believing Gentiles are grafted into all the privileges and spiritual blessings of the Jewish church, they cannot be cut off from that great blessing and privilege of having the covenant sealed to their infant seed [p. 21]. To which I reply,

1. It will readily be allowed, that believing Gentiles shared in all the spiritual blessings and privileges of the Jewish church, or of believers under the former dispensation; the same blessings of imputed righteousness and pardon of sin came upon the uncircumcision, as well as upon the circumcision, who walk in the steps of the faith of Abraham (Rom.4:6-12), for such that are Christ's, true believers in him, they are Abraham's seed, his spiritual seed, and heirs, according to the promise, of all spiritual blessings and privileges (Gal. 3:29). But,

2. The covenant of grace was never sealed to Abraham's natural seed; the covenant of grace itself did not belong to them, as such; nor was circumcision a seal of it to them; nor is baptism a seal of the covenant of grace to any; and therefore it is a great impropriety and impertinence to talk of cutting off from, that which was never had, and never was.

3. Though believing Gentiles share in the spiritual blessings and privileges which the Jewish church, or Jewish believers enjoyed, they never were grafted into that church; that church-state, with all the peculiar ordinances of it, was utterly abolished by Christ, signified by the shaking of the heavens and the earth, and removing of those things that are shaken, that those which cannot be shaken may remain (Heb. 12:26, 27). The Jewish church is not the olive-tree, of whole root and fatness the Gentiles partake; they are not grafted into the old Jewish stock; the ax has been laid to the root of that tree; and it is entirely cut down, and no engraftment is made upon it. But,

4. The olive-tree, of whose root and fatness believing Gentiles partake, is the gospel church-state, out of which the Jews that rejected Christ were left, and are the broken branches; and those that believed in Christ were taken in, and laid the first foundation of it; there are the first-fruits, and the root, which being holy, are a pledge of the future convection and holiness of that people; they of them that received the first-fruits of the Spirit, were first incorporated into a gospel church-state; and then the Gentiles which believed were received among them, and were engrafted into them; and this engrafture or coalition was first at Antioch, where and when, and hereafter, the Gentiles

partook of the root and fatness of the olive-tree; enjoyed the same privileges, communicated in the same ordinances, and were satisfied with the goodness and fathers of the house of God; and of this engrafture, and of this only, does this text speak; so that it is so far from being decisive in the present case, that there is not one word, one syllable about baptism in it, and still less can any thing, in favor of infant-baptism, be inferred from it. I shall conclude this chapter, and with it the affair of the divine right of infant-baptism, which, whether illustrated and confirmed in the Dialogue, must be left to the judicious reader, by observing, that the minister in it being required to give express New Testament proof for infant-baptism, which he was conscious to himself he could not do, in answer to it, requires express New Testament proof that women should partake of the Lord's Supper, and offers to prove infant-baptism by the same arguments that this should be proved. But,

1. We do not go about to prove women's right to partake of the Lord's Supper, by such arguments as this writer forms for us; as, by their covenant-interest, by their claim to have the covenant sealed to them, and by their being a part of all nations; and though we look upon their being believers and disciples of Christ, proper qualifications for their admission to the Lord's supper, when there can be made to appear to belong to infants, we shall readily admit them to baptism. But,

2. We prove their right to the ordinance of the Lord's Supper, by their right to the ordinance of baptism; for they that have a right to one ordinance, have to the other; that women believing in Christ: have a right to baptism, is clear, from Acts 8:12. Whey were baptized, both men and women, and therefore should partake of the Lord's Supper. Let it be proved, that infants ought to be baptized, and it will be allowed and insisted upon, that they partake of the Lord's Supper.

3. We prove it by their being church members; Mary the mother of Jesus, with other women, were of the number of the disciples that formed the first gospel church at Jerusalem; Sapphira, the wife of Ananias, was, with her husband, of the multitude that believed, and were together, and had all things common; after whole awful death, believers were the more added to the Lord, that is, to the church, both men and women (Acts 1:14, 15; 4:32; 5:9, 14). There were women in the church at Corinth; concerning whom the apostle gives rules respecting their conduct (1 Cor. 11:5, 6, 13; 14:34, 35). Now all those that are members of gospel churches, ought to eat the bread and drink the cup, in remembrance of Christ (1 Cor. 11:26). Women are members of gospel churches; and therefore ought to eat and drink in like manner.

4. We prove this by example: Mary, the mother of our Lord, and other women, being of the number of the disciples, which constituted the gospel church state at Jerusalem, as they continued with one accord in prayer and supplication, so likewise in breaking of bread (Acts 1:14, 15; Acts 2:1, 44, 46).

5. We prove this by a divine direction, exhortation, and command, Let a man examine himself, and so let him eat (1 Cor. 11:29). The word used is ανθρωπος , a word of the common gender, and signifies both men and women; in which sense it must be often understood, as in 1 Timothy 2:5 for is Christ a mediator only between God and men, and not women? Under the gospel dispensation, in a gospel church state, there is neither male nor female; they are all one in Christ, and enjoy the same privileges and ordinances (Gal. 3:28). Let the same proof, or as good, be given for infant-baptism, and we have done; let it be proved that infants have a right to any other gospel ordinance

as such; that they are or ought to be members of gospel churches; that there is either precept or precedent for the baptizing of them, and we shall readily admit them.

CHAPTER 6

Concerning the Mode of administering the Ordinance of Baptism, whether by immersion or by sprinkling.

The author of the dialogue under consideration affirms, that there is not one single Lexicographer, or critic upon the Greek Language, he has ever seen, but what agrees, that though the word baptizo sometimes signifies to dip, yet: it also naturally signifies to wash; and that washing, in any mode whatsoever, is the native signification of the word baptismas [p. 31], that the words baptize and baptism, as used in the New Testament, do not, from their signification, make dipping or plunging the necessary mode of administering the ordinance [p. 33], and that one single instance of that mode of administering the ordinance, is not to be found in all the New Testament [p. 34], nor is it probable it should be the mode [p. 38], and that the mode of administering it by sprinkling is a more lively emblem of what is signified and represented by it, than dipping or plunging can be supposed, and therefore the most proper one [p. 39].

First, As to the lexicographers, and critics on the Greek language, they agree that the word βαπτιζω, signifies, in its first and primary sense, "to dip or plunge," and only in a secondary and consequential sense, to wash, but never to pour or sprinkle; there being no proper washing, but what is by dipping; and for this we appeal to all the writers of this kind, and even to those this author mentions. Scapula, the first of them, renders βαπτιζω, by merga, seu immergo, ut quae tingendi, aut, abluendi gratia aquae immersimus, "to dip or plunge into, as what for the sake of dying or washing we dip into water;" item mergo, submergo, abruo aqua, "also to plunge, plunge under, overwhelm in water;" item abluo, lavo, "also to wash off, wash;" and βαπτιζωμας , he renders, by mergor, submergor, "to be plunged, plunged under;" and observes, that it is used metaphorically for obruer, to be overwhelmed; and βαπισμος , and βαπτισμα, he says, is, mersio, lotio, ablutio, ipse immergendi, item lavandi, seu abluendi actus, "plunging, washing, ablution, the act itself of plunging, also of washing or ablution." In all which he makes dipping, or plunging, to be the first and preferable sense of the words.

Stephens gives the same sense of the words, and so Schrevelius, who renders βαπτιζω, by baptizo, mergo, lavo, "baptize, plunge, wash." Pasor only renders it baptizo, baptize, without determining its sense. And Leigh, in his Critica Sacra, observes, that "the nature and proper signification of it, is to dip into water, or to plunge under water;" and refers to John 3:22, 23; Matthew 3:16 and Acts 8:38. And cites Casaubon, Bucanus, Bullinger, and Zanchy, as agreeing and testifying to this sense of it; and baptisma, he says, is "dipping into water, or washing with water." And there are the Lexicographers and Critics our author refers us to: To which I may add the Lexicon compiled by Budaeus, Constantine, and others, who render the word βαπτιζω, by immergo, mergo, intingo, lavacro tingo, abluo, madesacio, law, mundo; "plunge, plunge into, dip into, dip in a laver, wash

off, make wet, wash, cleanse:" And βαπτισμος , they say, is tingendi, hoc est mergendi actio, in quo significatu sinctura dicitur; "the action of tingeing, that is, of plunging; in which signification it is called a tincture, or dying;" and another by Hadrian Junius, who renders βαπτιζω, by immergo, "to plunge into;" and βαπτισμος , by immersio, lotio, baptismus, "immersion, washing, baptism." As for other critics on the Greek language, who assert, that the proper signification of the word baptizo, is to dip, or plunge; they are so numerous, that it would be tedious to reckon them up: I shall only mention a few of them, and their words. Calvin[66] says, "Ipsum baptizandi verbum mergere significat, & mergendi ritum veteri ecclesiae observatum fuisse constat;" the word baptize, signifies to plunge; and, it is plain, that the rite of plunging was observed in the ancient church." Beza, who must be allowed to be a learned critic in the Greek language, lays, on Mark 7:4 ,"Neque vero το βαπτιζειν, significat lavare nisi a consequenti, nam proprie dedarat tingendi causa immergere; " neither does the word baptizo, signify to walk, unless consequentially; for it properly signifies, to plunge into, for the sake of tinging, or dying;" and on Matthew 3:11 he says, "significat autem το βαπτιζειν, tingere quum παρα το βαπτειν, dicatur, & quum tingenda mergantur; "the word baptizo, signifies to dip (as Dyers in the vat) seeing it comes from bapto, to dip, and seeing things, that are to be dyed, are dipped."

Casaubon, another great critic on the Greek language, has these words on Matthew 3:6, "Hic enim fuit baptizandi ritus ut in aquas immergerentur, quod vel ipso vox βαπτιζειν, declarat fatis — unde intelligimus non esse ab re, quod jam pridem non nulli disputarant de taro corpore immergendo in ceremonia baptismi; vocem enim βαπτιζειν, urgebant;" for this was the rite of baptizing, that persons should be plunged into water, which the word baptizo, sufficiently declares. —Hence, we understand, that it was not foreign from the matter, which some time ago disputed, concerning plunging the whole body in the ceremony of baptism; for they urged the signification of the word baptizo. And, that this is the proper signification of the word, he observes, in his notes on Acts 1:5 and Acts 2:4. To which, I shall only add one more critic, and that is Grotius; who, on Matthew 3:6. thus writes; "Mersatione autem nan persusione agi solitum hunc ritum indicat & vocis proprietas, & loca ad eum ritum delecta (John 3:13; Acts 8:38), & allusiones multae apostolorum quae ad aspersionem referri non possunt" (Rom. 6:3; Col. 2:12), that this rite used to be performed by plunging, and not by pouring, both the propriety of the word, and the places chosen for this rite, shew (John 3:23; Acts 8:38), and the many allusions of the apostles, which cannot be referred to sprinkling" (Rom. 6:3, 4; Col. 2:12). I might have here subjoined, some instances of the use of the word in Greek authors, by which it appears to have the sense of dipping and plunging, and not of pouring, or sprinkling; but this has been largely done by Dr. Gale, and others. I shall, therefore, proceed,

Secondly, To consider the use of the words, baptize and baptism, in the New Testament; which our author says, do not, from their signification, make dipping or plunging, the necessary mode of administering the ordinance of baptism: And the places enumerated by him, in which they are used, are as follow.

1. The descent of the holy Ghost on the apostles, and on Cornelius, and his company, is called baptizing (Acts 1:5; 11:16), where he observes, it cannot be pretended that there was the least allusion to, or resemblance of dipping, or plunging, in this use of the word. But the learned Casaubon, a very great critic in the Greek tongue, before-mentioned and referred to, does pretend, that there is such an allusion and resemblance, his words on Acts 1:5 are there, "et si non improbo,

etc. although I do not disapprove of the word baptized, being retained here, that the antithesis may be full; yet, I am of opinion, that regard is had, in this place, to its proper signification; for βαπτιζειν, is to immerse, so as to tinge or dip: And, in this sense, the apostles are truly said to be baptized; for the house, in which this was done, was filled with the holy Ghost: So that the apostles seemed to be plunged into it, as into some pool." And the extraordinary descent of the spirit in those instances, is much more strongly expressed by a word, which signifies plunging, than if it had been expressed by a word, that signifies bare perfusion, and still left by sprinkling.

2. "Christ's crucifixion is called a baptism (Mark 10:38), but, being buffeted, spit upon, and lifted up upon the cross, says our author, bear no resemblance, nor can have any allusion to dipping, or plunging. But, it is easy to observe, that the sufferings of our Lord, which are compared to a baptism, in the place referred to, and in Luke 12:50, because of the greatness and abundance of them, are, sometimes, expressed by deep waters, and floods of waters; and he is represented as plunged into them, and covered and overwhelmed with them;" For so he says himself; The waters are come into my soul; I sink in deep mire, where is no standing; I am come into deep waters, where the floods overflow me (Ps. 119:1, 2). And, therefore, a word signifying immersion, and a covering of the whole body in water, is a very apt one to express the multitude of Christ's sufferings, and the overwhelming nature of them; and must, more fitly, express the same, than a word, which only signifies pouring, or sprinkling a few drops of water.

3. The text in Mark 7:4 is next mentioned; which speaks of the Jews, when come from the market, not eating, except they wash (baptizoontai); and of the washing (baptismous) of cups and pots, brazen vessels, and of tables, or beds, as the word signifies. And this, our author thinks, is an unexceptionable instance of these words signifying washing, without dipping, or plunging; since it can hardly be supposed, that they dipped themselves under water, every time they came from market, or, that they dipped their beds, every time they sat, or lay upon them. But, in answer to this, it should be observed, that our Lord is here speaking of the superstition of the Pharisees, who, when they came from market, or any court of judicature, if they touched any common persons, or their clothes, reckoned themselves unclean; and, according to the traditions of the elders, were to immerse themselves in water, and did: So that a most proper word is here made use of, to express their superstition. And, as for cups, pots and brazen vessels, what other way of washing them is there, than by dipping, or putting them into water? And, in this way, unclean vessels were to be washed, according to the law (Lev. 11:32), as well as all that were reckoned so by the traditions of the elders; and even beds, pillows and bolsters, when they were unclean in a ceremonial sense, and not, as this author puts it, every time they lay, or sat upon them, were to be washed by immersion, or dipping them in water; as I have proved from the Jews' oral law, which our Lord has respect to, in my Exposition of this place; to which, I refer the reader. Wherefore, the words are here used in their primary sense, as signifying dipping; and, if they did not so signify, they would not truly represent the superstition, they are designed to do.

4. The next passage produced, is 1 Corinthians 10:1, 2 which speaks of the Jewish fathers, being baptized unto Moses in the cloud, and in the sea. Upon which, this writer observes, that he thinks, he need not seriously undertake to convince his friend, he is debating with; "that the fathers were not dipped in the cloud, but that the rain from the cloud bore a much greater resemblance to sprinkling, or affusion, than to dipping." But let us a little examine this matter, and see wherein the agreement lay, between baptism and the Israelites passage under the cloud, and through the sea.

Which may be considered, either together, or separately: If together, the agreement between it and baptism, lay in this; the Israelites, when they passed through the Red Sea, had the waters on each side of them, which stood up, as a wall, higher than they, and the cloud over them; so that they were, as persons immersed in, and covered with water; and, in this view, it is easy to see, that the resemblance is much greater to immersion, than to sprinkling, or affusion: or this may be considered separately, as baptized in the cloud, and as baptized in the sea; in the cloud, when, as Gataker,[67] a Paedobaptist writer, thinks, it passed from before the face of the Israelites, and stood behind them, and was between the two camps, to keep off the Egyptians; and which, when it palled over them, let down a plentiful rain upon them, whereby they were in such a condition, as if they had been dipped all over in water; or, when under the cloud they were all over covered with it, as a person, when baptized by immersion, is all over covered with water; and they might be said to be baptized in the sea, when, as they passed through it, the waters standing up above their heads, they seemed as if they were immersed. The resemblance to plunging, therefore, considered in either way, must be nearer than to pouring, or sprinkling a small quantity of water. To which may be added, that the descent of the Israelites into the sea, when they seemed as though they were buried in the waters of it; and their ascent out of it again on the shore, have a very great agreement with baptism, as administered by immersion; in which, the person baptized goes down into the water, is buried with Christ therein; and comes up out of it, as out of a grave, or as the children of Israel out of the Red sea.

5. The last text mentioned, where the word baptism is used, is Hebrews 9:10 where our author observes, "the apostle, speaking of the ceremonial dispensation, tells us, that it stood only in meats, and drinks, and divers washings (baptismous) and carnal ordinances; and the principal of these washings, he exemplifies to us, verse 13 to be the blood of bulls and goats, and the ashes of an heifer, sprinkling the unclean: Here, therefore, the word cannot, with any appearance of modesty, be explained in favor of immersion." To which, I reply, that the ashes of an heifer, sprinkling the unclean, were so far from being the principal part of the Jewish washings or baptisms, that it was no part at all; nor is this mentioned by the apostle, as any exemplification of them, who understood there things better. Sprinkling the ashes of the heifer, and the waffling, or bathing of the person in water, which was by immersion, are spoken of, as distinct and separate things, in the ceremony referred to, Numbers 19:19 and indeed, washing by sprinkling, is not reconcilable to good sense, to the propriety of language, and to the universal custom of nations. However, certain it is, that the priests, Levites, Israelites, vessels, garments, etc. which were enjoined washing by the ceremonial law, and which washings, or baptisms, are here referred to, were done, by putting them into water, and not by pouring, or sprinkling water upon them. It is a rule with the Jews,[68] that, "wheresoever, in the law, washing of the flesh, or of the clothes is mentioned, it means nothing else, than כל הגק טבילת Tebileth Col hagoph, the dipping of the whole body in a laver—for if any man dips himself all over, except the tip of his little finger, he is still in his uncleanness." From the whole, it appears, that the words, baptize and baptism, in all the places mentioned, do, from their signification, make dipping, or plunging, the necessary mode of administering the ordinance of baptism. I now go on,

Thirdly, To vindicate those texts of scripture, which afford instances of the mode of administering baptism by immersion, from the exceptions of this writer, who confidently affirms, "that none of those texts will necessarily prove that any one person was baptized by dipping, by John Baptist, our blessed Savior, or his apostles." [p. 34]. And,

1. The first text brought into the debate, and excepted to, is Matthew 3:6. And were baptized by him in Jordan, confessing the sins. But we do not argue on this place, from those persons being baptized, to their being dipped, as this writer makes his neighbor to do, but from their being baptized in the river Jordan; for why should John choose the river Jordan to baptize in, and baptize in that river, if he did not administer the ordinance by immersion? Dr. Hammond, a Paedobaptist, thought that these words afford an argument for dipping in baptism, though our author will not allow it: His paraphrase of them is; "And he received them by baptism, or immersion in the water of Jordan, promising them pardon upon the sincerity of their conversion and amendment, or reformation of their lives." And in his note on Matthew 3:1 having respect to this place, says, "John preaching repentance to the Jews in the desert, received all that came unto him as new proselytes, forsaking their old relations, that is, their sins, and in token of their resolved change, put them into the water, dipped them all over, and so took them out again; and upon the sincerity of their change, promised them the remission of their sins, and told them of the Messiah which was suddenly to appear among them, and warned them to believe on him." The instances of washing in the pool of Siloam, in Solomon's ten lavers, or the hands in a bason, mentioned by our author, are very impertinent; and besides, such washing is not performed without dipping. Who ever washes his hands without dipping them in the water he washes in?

2. Another text mentioned, is John 3:23. John was baptizing in Enon near to Salim, because there was much water there. Upon which this writer observes, that "the words in the original are many waters; which implies many springs or brooks of water; waters suited to the necessity and convenience of the vast multitudes that resorted to John, as a supply of drink for themselves, and for the horses and camels which they rode upon, as well as for their baptism. Here is no appearance of dipping in the case.—Had John baptized all these multitudes by dipping, he must have stood almost continually in water, up to his waist, and could not have survived the employment but by miracle." To which I reply,

(1.) Admitting that the words in the original, many waters, imply many springs or brooks, this shews there was a confluence of water there; and every body knows, that many springs and brooks being together, could easily fill large pools, sufficient for immersion; and even form and feed great rivers, which is often the case; and besides, the use this author finds for there springs and brooks, requires a considerable quantity of water, namely, for the vast multitudes of men, and for their horses and camels; and surely, therefore, there must be a sufficient quantity to cover a man's body in.

(2.) The words πολλα υδατα, many waters, signify a large quantity, great abundance, both in the literal and metaphorical sense of the phrase, as it is used by the evangelist John elsewhere, see Revelation 1:15 and 17:1, 15 and by the Septuagint interpreters, it is used even for the waters of the sea (Ps. 127:19; 107:23) and answers to מים רבים, Mayim Rabbim, in Song of Solomon 8:7 many waters cannot quench love; which surely must refer not to a small, but a large quantity of water; and which phrase there, the Septuagint render by much water, as we do the phrase here.

(3.) There words are given as a reason, not for the convenience of drink for men and their cattle, but for the baptizing of men, and the convenience of that; that the men that came to John's baptism came on horses and camels, we know not; however, the text assigns no reason for the choice of the place upon the account of convenience for them, but for baptism only; and therefore, we should not

overlook the reason in the text, that is certain, and receive one, which, at most, is very precarious and uncertain; besides, John had not, at this time, such vast multitudes that followed him; those followed Christ, and not him: he was decreasing: Christ made and baptized more disciples than he. See verses 26, 30 and chapter 4:1.

(4.) Supposing that vast multitudes still followed him, and were baptized by him, this affords no argument against dipping in baptism; and especially since this was performed in a place where there was much water. Nor was the baptizing of such great multitudes by immersion so great an undertaking, as that he could not survive it without a miracle; admit the work to be hard and laborious, yet as his day was, his strength was; according to the divine promise. We have had instances in our own nation, in our climate, of persons that have baptized great multitudes in rivers, and even in the winter time, and that for many days successively, if credit is to be given to our own writers. Mr. Fox the martyrologist, relates,[69] from Fabian, that Austin, archbishop of Canterbury, baptized ten thousand in one day, in the river Swale; and observes upon it, that whereas he then baptized in rivers, it followeth, there were then no use of fonts. And the same, Ranulph, the monk of Chester affirms, in his history,[70] and says, it was on a day in the middle of winter; and, according to Fox, it was on a Christmas-day. And our historian Bede says,[71] that Paulinus, for six and thirty days successively, did nothing else, than instruct the people, which from all parts flocked unto him, and baptized them that were instructed in the river Glen; and who also baptized in one day vast numbers in the river Trent, King Edwin being present.

(5.) Though, this writer says, here is no appearance of dipping, in the case referred to in the text, yet there are several Paedobaptists, who are of another opinion, and think there was. Calvin, on the text, thus writes; "from these words, we may gather, that baptism was performed by John and Christ, by a plunging of the whole body under water." Piscator, on the place, has there words; "this is mentioned, to signify the rite of baptism which John used; namely, plunging the whole body of the man, standing in the river; hence, Christ, being baptized of John in Jordan, is said to come up out of the water (Matthew 3:16). The same mode Philip observed" (Acts 8:38). Aretius, on the passage, writes in the following manner; "but, why did John stay here? He gives a reason, because there was much water here; wherefore penitent persons might be commodiously baptized; and, it seems to intimate, that a large quantity of water was necessary in baptizing, that they might, perhaps, immerse the whole body." To which, I shall only add the words of Grotius, on the clause, much water: "Understand, says he, not many rivulets, but, simply, a plenty of water; such, namely, in which a man's body could easily be immersed: In which manner baptism was then performed."

3. Another text, produced in favor of dipping in baptism, is Matthew3:16. And Jesus, when he was baptized, went up straightway out of the water. To which is objected, that "there is no more in the original, than that our Savior went up straightway απο, from the water; which Greek preposition always naturally signifies from, but never out of, and therefore, this instance can stand in no stead." But if the preposition never signifies out of, it is strange that our learned translators should so render it here, as also the Vulgate Latin, Syriac, Persic, and Ethiopic versions; and so it is rendered in the New Testament in several places, as in Mark 16:9; Luke 4:35, 41; Acts 2:9; 17:2 and 28:23, and in others. And, moreover, it should be observed, that this preposition answers to the Hebrew מך Min, which signifies out of, as well as from; and which the Syriac version uses here: And, as a proof of both, let Psalm 40:2 be consulted, and the Septuagint version of it, where David says, the Lord brought him up out of an horrible pit, αρ απο πηλου ιλυος , and out of the miry clay. And, if

our Lord came up out of the water, it is a clear case, that he must halve been in it; that he went down into it, in order to be baptized; and that he was baptized in it: And, is it reasonable to think, he should be baptized in the river Jordan, in any other way, than by immersion? See the note of Piscator, upon the preceding text.

4. Acts 8:38, 39 goes in company with the former; and they went down both into the water—and when they were come up out of the water. And the following remark is made; "there can be no more proved from this text, than that Philip and the Eunuch went down to the water, and came up from it. The preposition ειϖ, rendered into, naturally signifies unto, and is commonly so used in the New Testament and the preposition εκ, rendered out of, properly signifies from—so that there is no evidence from this text, that the Eunuch was baptized by dipping." Here our author seems to have in view, a very false piece of criticism, frequently used upon this text; as if the going down into the water signified no more, than going down to the bank of the water, to the water-side: And, to support which, his sense of the preposition εις , which he would have rendered unto, is calculated. But, it should be observed, that the historian relates in verse 36 that, before this, they were come to a certain water, to the water-side; and, therefore, this, their going down, must be into it. Wherefore, as it cannot be denied, but that this preposition frequently signifies into, it must have this signification here; and this determines, and settles the sense of the other preposition, and shews, that that must be rendered, as it is, out of; seeing, whereas they went down into the water, when they came up, it must be out of it: All which gives evidence, that the Eunuch was baptized by dipping. Calvin thought so, who, on the text, has there words; "hic perspicimus, etc. Here we see, what was the manner of baptizing with the ancients, for they plunged the whole body into water."

5. The last text, mentioned in the debate, is Romans 6:4. We are buried with him by baptism into death. Where baptism is called a burial; a burial with Christ, a representation and resemblance of his; which it cannot be, unless it is administered by dipping. But this writer observes, it is also said, we are baptized into Christ's death; and asks, "What resemblance is there in baptism to Christ's dying upon the cross, if we are baptized by dipping? Was there any thing like dipping in our Savior's crucifixion? —would you have such a manner of death resembled in baptism, by drowning men when you baptize them? And affirms, that this text has no reference at all to the imitation either of Christ's death or burial, or to any particular mode of administering that ordinance; but the scope is to shew us our obligation, by baptism, unto a conformity to the death and resurrection of Christ:, by dying unto sin, and rising again unto newness of life." But, we have seen already, that there is a resemblance between the crucifixion and death of Christ and baptism, as administered by dipping. The overwhelming sufferings of Christ are fitly signified, by a person's being plunged into water; and a great likeness there is between the burial of Christ and baptism, as performed by immersion: And, indeed, there is no other mode of administering that ordinance, that can represent a burial, but immersion. And be it so, that the scope of the place is to shew us our obligation, by baptism, unto a conformity to the death and resurrection of Christ, by dying unto sin, and rising again to newness of life; then that ordinance ought to be so administered, that it may represent unto us, the death and resurrection of Christ, and our dying unto sin, and rising unto newness of life; which are done, in a most lively manner, by an immersion into water, and an emersion out of it. And, that there is an allusion, in this passage, to the primitive mode of baptizing by dipping, is acknowledged by many divines and annotators; too many to recite: I will just mention two or three. The Assembly of divines, on this place, say, "in this phrase, the apostle seemeth to allude to the ancient manner of baptism; which was to dip the parties 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."

Dr. Hammond's paraphrase of the words, is this; "it is a thing, that every Christian knows, that the immersion 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 signifies our undertaking in baptism, that we will give over all the sins of our former lives (which is our being 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." So Piscator, on the text, "videtur respicere ad veterem ritum, etc. It seems to respect the ancient rite, when, in the whole body, they were plunged into water, and so were, as if they had been buried; and immediately were drawn out again, as out of a grave." But,

Fourthly, This writer thinks, it is not probable, from the instances of administering this ordinance in scripture, that it was performed by dipping. And,

1. He observes, "that in Acts 2:41. there were three thousand baptized in Jerusalem, in one day; most certainly, adds he, towards the close of the day; and asks, was there any probability (I had almost said possibility) that they should all be baptized by dipping, in so short a time? Or, is it probable that they could so suddenly find water sufficient in that city, for the dipping of such a multitude; especially while they were so firmly attached to the ceremonial institution, which made it unlawful for two persons to be dipped in the same vessel of water." To which I reply,

(1.) That though three thousand were added to the church on one and the same day, it does not necessarily follow from the text, that they were all baptized in one day, the words do not oblige to such a sense; I am indeed willing to allow it, and am of opinion they were baptized in one day; though it does not appear that it was most certainly at the close of the day, as this writer affirms; for it was but the third hour, or nine o'clock in the morning, when Peter began his sermon, which does not seem to be a long one; and when that was ended, after some discourse with the converted persons, and exhortations to them, this ordinance was administered. And if Austin, as we have seen from our historians, could baptize ten thousand in a short winter's day, it need not seem improbable, and much less impossible, that three thousand should be baptized, even at the close of a day; when it is considered that there were twelve apostles to administer baptism to them, and it was but two hundred and fifty persons apiece; and besides, there were the seventy disciples, who were administrators of this ordinance; and supposing them all employed, they would have no more than six or seven and thirty persons apiece to baptize; and as for the difference between administering the ordinance by dipping, and by sprinkling, it is very inconsiderable; for the same form of words must be pronounced in administering it one way as another; and a person being ready, is very near as soon dipped into water, as water can be taken and sprinkled or poured on his face. And,

(2.) Whereas a difficulty is made of finding suddenly water sufficient in the city of Jerusalem, for the dipping of such a multitude; it should be observed, that besides baths in private houses, for purification by immersion, in case of menstrua's, gonorrhaea's, etc. there was in the temple an apartment called the dipping-room, for the high-priest to dip himself in, on the day of atonement; and there were ten layers of brass, each of which held forty baths of water, sufficient for the

immersion of the whole body of a man; and there was the molten sea, for the priests to wash in, which was done by immersion; and there were also several pools in the city, as the pools of Bethesda, Siloam, etc. where persons bathed or dipped themselves, on certain occasions: So that there were conveniences enough for baptism by immersion in this place. And,

(3.) As for what this author says, that according to the ceremonial institution, it was unlawful for two persons to be dipped in the same vessel of water: I must own my ignorance of it, till some proof is given; the laver in the temple was in common for the priests.

2. The narrative of Paul's baptism, he says, makes it appear to be administered in his bed-room (Acts 9:9, 18), but that he was in his bed-room when Ananias came to him, is not so clear; however, certain it is, that he arose, and was baptized. Whether he arose off of his bed, or off of his chair, cannot be said; but be that as it will, had the ordinance been to have been performed by sprinkling or pouring a little water on him, he need not have rose up from either; but he arose, and went either to a bath that might be in Judas's house, fit for such a purpose, or to some certain place without doors, convenient for the administration of the ordinance.

3. The words of the text, Acts 10:47, Can any man forbid water, that these should not be baptized? he says, seem plainly to contradict the dipping of Cornelius and his household, But why so? there is nothing in the text contradicts it; for the sense is, "Can any man forbid the use of his river or bath, or what convenience he might have, for the baptizing of those persons?" Which shews, that it required a place of some quantity of water, sufficient for baptizing by immersion; otherwise it would not have been in the power of any man to hinder them having a little water, to be sprinkled or poured on the face. And what follows confirms it; And he commanded them to be baptized in the name of the Lord; besides, the words of the text may be rendered, Can any man forbid that these should be baptized with water? See Erasmus on the place. Wherefore, what this writer says, that the apostle did not speak of forbidding the water to run in the river, or to remain in any other receptacle or reservoir of water, and therefore must speak of bringing water for their baptism, is very impertinent and ridiculous.

4. He observes, that "the Jailer and his household were baptized in the dead of the night, in the same hour of his conversion by the earthquake; and therefore, there was no probability (nor indeed possibility) of their going to any depth of water for that purpose" (Acts 16:33). But where is the impossibility, or improbability of it? Grotius thinks it probable, that there was a pool in the prison, where he washed the stripes of the apostle and here the ordinance might be administered; but, if nor, it is not unreasonable to suppose, that they went out of the prison, to the river near the city, where the oratory, or place of prayer was, verse 13 and there administered the ordinance, and then returned to the prison again, before morning, unobserved by any: compare verses 30 and 34 together. And now let it be considered, whether there instances, as our author says, are sufficient to convince an unprejudiced person, that the ordinance was not administered by dipping, in the apostolic times.

5. He concludes, that seeing sprinkling was the greatest purification among the Jews, and the blood of Christ, and the influences of the holy Spirit, are frequently represented by sprinkling, but never by dipping; therefore, it must be the most proper mode of administration. But,

1. It must be denied, that sprinkling was the greatest purification among the Jews; their principal purifications, and which were most frequently used in cases of ceremonial uncleanness, were performed by immersion, and therefore they are called washings, or baptisms, in Hebrews 9:10 and even the purification by the ashes of the red heifer, which this writer instances in, was not performed without bathing the person all over in water (Num. 19:19), and which was the closing and finishing part of it.

2. It is not fact, that the blood of Christ, and the influences of the Spirit, are never represented by dipping. The bloody sufferings of Christ:, and the large abundance of his blood-shed, are called a baptism, or dipping (Luke 12:50). And his blood is represented, as a fountain opened to wash in, for sin, and for uncleanness (Zech.13:1). And the donation of the Spirit, on the day of Pentecost, is also called a baptism, or dipping (Acts 1:5). But, it is not on those allusive expressions, that we lay the stress of the mode of the administering this ordinance, though they are only such, this author attempts to mention, in favor of sprinkling. Wherefore, upon the whole, let the reader judge, which is the most proper and significant rite, used in the administration of the ordinance of baptism; whether immersion, which is the proper and primary sense of the word baptism, and is confirmed to be the rite used, by the places in which baptism was administered; and by several scriptural instances and examples of it, as well as by allusive expressions; and which fitly represents the death, burial and resurrection of Christ; or, sprinkling, which the word baptism never signifies; and is not confirmed by any of the said ways; nor does it represent any thing for which baptism is administered. Let it be, therefore, seriously considered, what a daring thing it is to introduce into this ordinance subjects which Christ never appointed, and a mode of administering it never used by him or his apostles. In matters of worship, God is a jealous God. The case of Nadab and Abihu ought to be remembered by us, who offered strange fire, the Lord commanded not. In things relating to religious worship, as this ordinance of baptism is a part of a precedent: And we ought to keep to the rule, both as to matter and manner, and not dare to innovate in either, left it should be said to us, hath required this at your hands? worship, and with teaching for doctrines, the commandments of men.

The

ARGUMENT FROM APOSTOLIC TRADITION,

In Favor Of Infant Baptism

With OTHERS,

advanced in a late Pamphlet, called,

The Baptism of Infants a reasonable Service, etc. considered;

It is with reluctance I enter again into the controversy about baptism; not from any consciousness either of the badness or weakness of the cause I am engaged in; but partly on account of other work upon my hands, which I chose not to be interrupted in; and partly because I think there has been enough written already, to bring this controversy to an issue; and it is not our fault that it has not been closed long ago; for there has been scarce any thing wrote by us these *fifty* years past, but in our own defense; our Paedobaptist brethren being continually the aggressors, and first movers of the controversy; they seem as if they were not satisfied with what has been done on their fide, and therefore are always attempting either to put the controversy upon a new foot, or to throw the old arguments into a new form; and even say the same things over and over again, to make their minds, and the minds of their people easy, if possible. If persons are content to search the scriptures, and form their judgment of this matter by them, there has been enough published on both sides of the question to determine themselves by; and we are willing things should rest here: but this is our care; if we reply to what is written against us, then we are litigious persons, and lovers of controversy; though we only rise up in our own vindication, for which surely we are not to be blamed; and if we make no reply, then what is written is unanswerable by us, and we are triumphed over.

No less than half a dozen pamphlets have been published upon this subject, within a very little time; without any provocation from us., that I know of. Some of them indeed are like mushrooms, that rise up and die almost as soon as they live; it has been the luck of the pamphlet before me, to live a little longer; and which is cried up as an unanswerable one, for no other reason, that I can see, but because it has not yet been answered in form; otherwise the arguments advanced in it, have been answered before it was in being; for there is nothing new throughout the whole of it. Is there any one argument in it, but what has been brought into the controversy before? not one. Is the date of infant-baptism, as it appears from the writings of the ancients, from antiquity, for which this performance is mostly boasted of, carried one year, one month, one day, one hour, or moment higher, than it was before? not one. Is there any one passage of the ancients cited, which has not

been produced and been under consideration before? not one. What then has this Gentleman been doing? just nothing at all. However an answer would have been made to him before this time, had not some things in providence prevented. My late worthy friend, the Reverend Mr.. *Samuel Wilson*, intended to have drawn up one, as he signified to me; for which reason, I did not give myself the trouble to read this pamphlet: His view was first to publish his *Manual*, and then to take this under consideration; but he dying before the publication of the former, prevented his design; nor did he, as I could ever find, leave any materials behind him relating to this affair. Some time after Mr. *Killingworth* published an answer to Dr. *Foster* on the subject of communion, and added some remarks upon this pamphlet; when I ordered my Bookseller to get me that, and the strictures on it; upon reading of which, I found that Mr. *Killingworth* expected a formal answer to it was preparing, and would be published by a Gentleman he represents as the occasion of its being written; which for some time I have been waiting for: but hearing nothing of it, and the boasts of the party increasing, because of no answer, determined me to take it under examination in the manner I have done; but whether after all I am not too *forward*, I cannot tell; but if any thing is preparing or prepared by another hand, I hope what I have written will not hinder the publication of it.

Infant-baptism is sometimes put upon one footing, and sometimes on another; as on the covenant of grace; on circumcision; on the baptism of Jewish proselytes; on scripture consequences; and by our author it is rested on *apostolic tradition*. This he says is *an argument of great weight*;[1] and that it is principally for the sake of this, that his performance appears in the world;[2] for which reason, I shall chiefly attend unto it. Whatever weight this argument may be thought to have in the present controversy, it has none in others; not in the controversy with the Papists, nor with the church of *England* about rites and ceremonies, this Gentleman himself being judge; who I understand is the author of *The dissenting Gentleman's answer to Mr*. White's *Three Letters*. In his controversy with him, Christ is the *only* lawgiver and head of the church, and no man upon earth, or body of men, have authority to make laws, or prescribe things in religion, or to set aside, alter or new-make any terms fixed by him; and apostolical authority, or what is directed to by the apostles, as fallible and unassisted men, is no authority at all, nor obligatory as a law on men, they having no dominion over their faith and practice; and the scriptures are the *only*, *common*, *sufficient* and *perfect* rule: but in the controversy about infant-baptism, apostolic tradition is of great weight; if the dispute is about sponsors and the cross in baptism, then fathers and councils stand for nothing; and the testimonies of the ancients for these things, though *clear* and *indubitable*, and about the sense of which there is no contest, and are of as *early* antiquity as any thing can be produced for infant-baptism, are not allowed sufficient; but if it is about infant-baptism itself, then fathers and councils are called in, and their testimonies produced, insisted upon, and retained, though they have not one syllable of baptism in them; and have senses affixed to them, strained and forced, contrived to serve an hypothesis, and what the good old fathers never dreamed of; is this fair dealing? can this be said to *be sincerity*, *integrity* and *honesty*? no surely.

This Gentleman should know that we, who are called Anabaptists, are Protestants, and the Bible is our religion; and that we reject all pretended apostolic tradition, and every thing that goes under that name, not found in the Bible, as the rule of our faith and practice.

The title of the pamphlet before me is, *The baptism of Infants a reasonable service*, *founded upon Scripture*, *and undoubted Apostolic Tradition*; but if it is founded upon scripture, then not upon tradition; and if upon tradition, then, not on scripture; if it is a scriptural business, then not a

traditional one; and if a traditional one, then not a scriptural one: if it can be proved by scripture, that is enough, it has then no need of tradition; but if it cannot be proved by that, a cart-load of traditions will not support it.—This put me in mind of what I have heard, of a countryman offering to give the Judge a *dozen* reasons why his neighbor could not appear in court; in the *first* place, my Lord, says he, *he is dead*; that is enough, quote the Judge, I shall spare you the trouble of giving me the rest: so prove but infant-baptism by scripture, and there will be no need of the weighty arguments from tradition. However, by putting the care as it is, we learn that this author by *apostolic tradition*, means *unwritten* apostolic tradition, since he distinguishes it from the scripture; and not apostolic tradition, delivered in the scriptures, which is the sense in which sometimes *tradition* is used, both in the word of God (1 Cor. 15:3; 2 Thess. 2:15), and in ancient writers.[3] So we are not at a loss about the sense of it; it is *unwritten*, uninspired apostolic tradition; tradition not *in*, but *out* of the scriptures; not delivered by the apostles in the sacred writings, but by word of mouth to their successors, or to the churches.

It is pretty much that infant-baptism should be called an *undoubted* apostolic tradition, since it has been *doubted* of by some learned Paedobaptists themselves; nay, some have affirmed that it is not observed by them as an apostolic tradition, particularly *Curcellaeus*,[4] and who gives a very good reason for it: his words are these; "Paedobaptism was unknown in the two first ages after Christ; in the third and fourth it was approved by a few; at length, in the fifth and following ages it began to obtain in divers places; and therefore this rite is indeed observed by us as an *ancient custom*, but not as an *apostolic tradition*."

Bishop *Taylor*[5] calls it a *pretended* apostolical tradition; and says, that the tradition cannot be proved to be apostolical, we have very good evidence from antiquity. Since then the Paedobaptists disagree about this point among themselves, as well as it is called in question and contested by others; one would think, this writer should not be so confident as to call it an *undoubted* apostolic tradition.

Besides, apostolic tradition, at most and best, is a very precarious and uncertain thing, and not to be depended on; we have a famous instance of this, in the controversy that arose in the second century, about the time of keeping *Easter*; whether it should be observed on the 14th day of the first moon, let it fall on what day of the week it would, or on the Sunday following; the former was observed by the churches of *Asia*, and the latter by the church of some; both pleaded the custom and usage of their predecessors, and even ancient apostolic tradition;[6] the Asiatic churches said, they had it by tradition from *Philip* and *John*; the Roman church from *Peter* and *Paul*; but not being able to fettle this point, which was in the right, *Victor*, the then bishop of *Rome*, excommunicated the other churches that would not fall in with the practice of him and his church; this was in the year 196; and even before this, in the year 157, this same controversy was on foot; and *Polycarp* bishop of *Smyrna*, who had been a hearer and disciple of the apostle *John*, made a journey to some, and conversed with *Anicetus* bishop of that place, about this matter; they talked it over candidly, parted friendly, but without convincing each other, both retaining their former customs and tradition;[7] if now it was so difficult a thing to fix a tradition, or fettle what was an apostolic tradition, about the middle of the second century, fifty or sixty years after the death of the apostle *John*, and when some of the immediate successors of the apostles were living; what judgment can we form of apostolic traditions in the eighteenth century?

Moreover, it is *doubtful* whether there ever was any such thing as apostolic tradition; or that ever any thing was delivered by the apostles to their successors, or to the churches, to be observed by them, which was not delivered in the sacred writings; and I defy this Gentleman, and demand of him to give me one single instance of any apostolic tradition of this nature; and if no such instance can be given, it is in vain to talk of *undoubted apostolic tradition*; and upon what a miserable foundation must infant baptism stand, that relics upon this? unwritten apostolic tradition is a *non-entity*, as the learned *Alting*[8] calls it; it is a mere chimaera; a refuge of heretics formerly, and of papists now; a favorite argument of theirs, to prove by it what they please. But be it so, that there is such a thing as *apostolic tradition*; let it be proved that infant-baptism is such; let the apostles be pointed out that delivered it. Were they all the apostles or only some of them that delivered it? let them be named who they were, and to whom they delivered it, and when, and where. The apostles *Peter* and *Paul*, who were, the one the apostle of the circumcision, and the other the apostle of the uncircumcision, one would think, should be the most likely to hand down this tradition; the one to the Christian Jews, and the other to the Christian Gentiles; or however, to their successors or companions: but is there any proof or evidence that they did so? none at all; though there are writings of persons extant that lived in their times. If *Clemens Romanus* was a successor of *Peter*, as the papists say, it might have been expected, that it would have been delivered to him, and he would have published it; but there is not a word of it in his epistles still in being. *Barnabas* was a companion of the apostle *Paul*; and had it been a tradition of his, it might be justly thought, it would be met with in an epistle of his now extant; but there is not the least hint of it in it, but on the contrary, several passages in favor of believers-baptism. Perhaps, as *John was* the last of the apostles, and outlived them all, it was left with him to transmit it to others; and had this been the care, it might have been hoped it would have been found in the writings of *Polycarp*, a hearer and disciple of the apostle *John*; but not a syllable of it is to be found in him. Nay *Papias*, bishop of *Hierapolis*, one that was a hearer of *John* the elder *of Ephesus*, and a companion *of Polycarp*, and who had conversed with those who were familiar with the apostles, and made it his business to pick up sayings and facts, said or done by the apostles, not recorded in scripture, has not a word of this; which *childish* business would have been a very pretty thing for that weak-headed man, as *Eusbius*[9] represents him, to have gone prattling about with; here is an apostolic tradition then, which no body knows by whom it was delivered, nor to whom, nor when and where: the companions and successors of the apostles say nothing of it. The[10] Jews talk of a Mosaic tradition and oral law, delivered from one to another for several thousand years running; they tell you by whom it was first given and received; and can name the persons to whom it was transmitted in succeeding ages; this is something to the purpose; this is doing business roundly; but here is a tradition no body can tell from whence it comes, nor who received it, and handed it down; for there is not the least mention of it, nor any pretended to in the first century or apostolic age. But let us attend to what evidence is given of it, in the next or second century.

Two passages are produced out of the writers of this age, to prove this *undoubted* apostolic tradition; the one out of *Justin Martyr*; the other out of *Irenaeus*. That from *Justin* is as follows;[11] "several persons among us, men and women, of sixty and seventy years of age, οι εκ παιδων εμαθητευθησαν τω Χρισο, *who from their childhood were instructed in Christ*, remain incorrupt:" for so the phrase on which the whole depends should be rendered, and not *discipled* or *proselyted to Christ*; which rendering of the words, as it is unjustifiable, so it would never have been thought of, had it not been to serve a turn; and is not agreeable to *Justin's* use of the word, who frequently makes use of it in the sense of instruction and teaching; as when he

speaks of persons being μαθητευθηνας , *instructed* into divine doctrines;[12] and of others being μαθητευομενους , *instructed* in the name (person or doctrine) of Christ, and leaving the way of error;[13] and of Christ's sending his disciples to the Gentiles, who by them εμαθητευσαν, *instructed* them:[14] nor should εκ παιδων, be rendered *in infancy*, *but from childhood*; and is a phrase of the same signification with that in Timothy 3:15. where *Timothy* is said απο βρεφους , *from a child* to know the holy scriptures; and *Justin's sense* is, that notwithstanding the strict and severe commands of Christ in *Matthew* 5:28, 29, 30, 44 as they might seem to be, and which he cites; yet there were several persons of the age he mentions, then living, who had been instructed in the person, offices, and doctrines of Christ, or had been trained up in the Christian religion from their childhood, who had persevered hitherto, and were incorrupt in their practices, and in their principles; and which is no other than a verification of what the wise man observes, Proverbs 22:6. Train up a child in the way he should go, and when he is old, he will not depart from it: and we are able in our day, to point out persons of an age that *Justin* mentions, who have been trained up in the Christian religion from their childhood; and who in riper years have made a public profession of it, and have held fast their profession without wavering, and lived unblemished lives and conversations; and yet never were baptized in their infancy.

Behold, here the first proof and evidence of infant-baptism being an *undoubted apostolic tradition*; when there is not a word of baptism in it, much less of infant-baptism; nor any hint of it, or reference unto it. Can the most sanguine Paedobaptist sit down, and in cool reflection conclude, upon reading and considering this passage, that it proves infant-baptism to be an *undoubted apostolic tradition*? *s*urely he cannot. The other passage is out of *Irenaeus*, and stands thus;[15] "He (Christ) came to save all; all I say, qui per eum renascuntur in Deum, *who by him are born* again *unto God*, infants, and little ones, and children, and young men, and old men."

For so the words are to be rendered, and not *baptized unto God*; for the word *renascor* is never used by *Irenaeus*, or rather by his translator, in such a sense; nor had it as yet obtained among the ancients to use the words *regenerated* and *regeneration*, for *baptized* and baptism. Likewise, it is certain that *Irenaeus* speaks elsewhere of regeneration as distinct from baptism, as an inward spiritual work, agreeable to the scriptures; which never speak of it but as such, no not in John 3:5, Titus 3:5. And what reason can there be to depart from the literal and scriptural sense of the word, and even the sense which *Irenaeus* uses it in; and especially, since infants are capable of regeneration in such a sense of it? besides, to understand *Irenaeus* as speaking of baptism, is to make him at least to suggest a doctrine which is absolutely false; as if Christ came to save all and only such, who are baptized unto God; when it is certain, he came to save the Old-Testament-saints, who never were baptized, as well as New-Testament saints; and no doubt many now are fared by him, who never were baptized with water at all: and on the other hand, nothing is more true than that he came to save all and only those, who are regenerated by the Spirit and grace of God, of whatsoever age they he. And after all, when it is observed that the chapter out of which this passage is taken, is thought by some learned men to be none of *Irenaeus*', but a spurious piece; and if it is his, it is only a translation, as almost all his works be, and a very foolish, uncouth and barbarous one, as learned men observe; so that it is not certain that there are his words, or are a true translation of them; what wise and considerate man will say, that this is a proof of infant-baptism being an *undoubted apostolic tradition*? *s*eeing the passage is so much contested, and so much is to be said against it; seeing, at most and best, the sense of it is doubtful; and seeing it is certain that *Irenaeus* uses the word *regeneration* in a different sense from baptism;[16] who can be sure he uses it

of baptism here? Upon the whole, what thoughtful man will affirm from hence, that infant-baptism is an *undoubted* apostolic tradition? And seeing these two testimonies are the only ones produced in favor of infant-baptism in the second century; and the latter Dr. *Wall*[17] confesses, "is the first express mention that we have met with of infants baptized;" though there is no mention at all made of it in it, any more than in the former; he must have a strong faith to believe, and a good assurance upon such evidence to assert,[18] "that the baptism of infants was the *undoubted* practice of the Christian church in its purest and first: ages; the ages immediately succeeding the apostles." Let us now proceed to the third century.

Tertullian is the first man that ever made mention of infant-baptism, that we know of; and as he was the first that spoke of it, he at the same time spoke against it, dissuaded from it, and advised to defer it; and though he was quire *singular*, as our author says, in this his advice; it should be observed, that he is also quite *singular* in his mention of the thing itself; there being no writings of any contemporary of his extant, from which we might learn their sense of this affair. We allow that infant-baptism was moved in the third century; that it then began to be talked of, and became matter of debate, and might be practiced in the African churches, where it was first moved. We do not deny the *probability* of the practice of it then, though the *certainty* of it does not appear; it is probable it might be practiced, but it is not certain it was; as yet it has not been proved. Now here we stick, by this we abide, that there is no mention made of it in any authentic writer before *Tertullian's* time. And this writer himself elsewhere[19] observes, that "by *his* time, it is well known, a great variety of superstitious, and ridiculous, and foolish rites were brought into the church." The date of infant-baptism cannot, we apprehend, be carried higher than his time; and we require of any of our learned Paedobaptist brethren, to produce a single passage out of any authentic writer before *Tertullian*, in which infant-baptism is expressly mentioned, or clearly hinted at, or plainly supposed, or manifestly referred unto. This being the care, as we own it began in this century, and might be practiced by some, it might be needless in a good measure to consider after-testimonies; however, I shall not think fit wholly to neglect them.

Origen is next quoted, and *three* passages out of him; shewing that the baptism of infants is a tradition of the apostles, and an usage of the church for the remission of sins; but it should be observed, that these quotations are not from the Greek of *Origen*; he wrote much in that language, and there is much still extant in it; and yet nothing is produced from thence, that can fairly be construed in favor of infant-baptism; though many things may be observed from thence, in favor of adult-baptism. The three passages are quoted out of some Latin translations, greatly interpolated, and not to be depended on. His Homilies on *Leviticus*, and exposition of the epistle to the *Romans*, out of which *two* of them are taken, are translated by *Ruffinus*; who with the former, he himself owns, he used much freedom, and added much, and took such a liberty in both of adding, taking away, and changing, that, as *Erasmus s*ays,[20] whoever reads there pieces, it is uncertain whether he *reads Origen or Ruffinus*; and *Vossius* observes,[21] that the former of these was interpolated by *Ruffinus*, and thinks therefore, that the passage cited was of the greater authority against the *Pelagians*, because *Ruffinus* was inclined to them. The Homilies on *Luke*, out of which is the other passage, were translated by *Jerom*, of whom *Du Pin* says,[22] that "his versions are not more exact than *Ruffinus's*." Now both there lived at the latter end of the fourth century, and it looks very probable, that these very passages, are additions, or interpolations of these men, tinct (the color of) the language agrees with those times, and no other; for no contemporary of *Origen's*, nor any writer before him or after him, until the times *of Ruffinus*, *Jerom* and *Austin*, speak of infant-baptism as an

usage of the church, or an apostolical tradition; in short, as bishop *Taylor* observes,[23] "a tradition apostolical, if it be not consigned with a fuller testimony than of one person (*Origen*,) whom all after-ages have condemned 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 determined by so weak a probation, in a matter of so great concernment."

Cyprian, with his council of sixty-six bishops, are brought as witnesses of infant-baptism, a little after the middle of the third century. We allow that as infant-baptism was moved for *in Tertullian's* time, so it obtained in the *African* churches in *Cyprian's* time; but then by *Fidus* the country bishop, applying to the council to have a doubt resolved, whether it was lawful to baptize infants until they were eight days old; it appears to be a novel practice; and that as yet it was undetermined, by council or custom, when they were to be baptized, whether as soon as born, or on the eighth day, or whether it was to be left to every one's liberty: and it should also be observed, that in this age, infant communion was practiced as well as infant, baptism; and very likely both began together, as it is but reasonable, that if the one be admitted, the other should. But of this more hereafter.

The *Clementine Constitutions*, as they are called, are next produced, as enjoining infant-baptism; but why does this Gentleman call them the *Clementine Constitutions*, unless he is of opinion, and which he suggests by this title of them, that *Clemens Romanus* was the compiler of them from the mouths of the apostles? and if so, he might have placed the passage out of them with greater advantage, at the head of his testimonies; but he must know, that there writings are condemned as spurious, by almost all learned men, excepting Mr. *Whiston*; and were not heard of till the times of *Epiphanius*, in the latter end of the fourth century, if so soon: and it should be observed, that these same *Constitutions*, which direct to the baptizing of infants, injoin the use of godfathers in baptism; the form of renouncing the devil and all his works; the consecration of the water; trine immersion; the use of oil, and baptizing, fasting; crossing with the sign of the cross in the forehead; keeping the day of Christ's nativity, *Epiphany*, the *Quadragesima* or *Lent*; the feast of the passover, and the festivals of the apostles; falling on the fourth and sixth days of the week; praying for saints departed; singing for the dead, and honoring their relics; with many other things foreign enough from the simplicity of the apostolic doctrine and practice. A testimony from such a work, can be of very little credit to the cause of infant-baptism.

And now we are come to a very remarkable and decisive testimony, as it is called, from the writings of *Austin* and *Pelagius*; the sum of which is, that there being a controversy between these two persons about original sin, the latter, who denied it, was pressed by the former, with an argument taken from the baptism of infants for the remission of sins; with which *Pelagius* seemed exceedingly embarrassed, when it greatly concerned him to deny it if he could; and had it been an innovation, so acute, learned, and sagacious a man as he was, would have discovered it; but on the contrary, when he was charged with a denial of it as the consequence of his opinion, he warmly disclaims it, and complains of a slander; and adds, that he never heard that even any impious heretic denied it, or refused it to infants; and the same says *Austin*, that it never was denied by any man, catholic or heretic, and was the constant usage of the church; for all which vouchers are produced. To which may be replied,

1. However embarrassed *Pelagius* might be with the argument, it did not lead to a controversy about the subject, but the end of baptism, and about the latter, and not the former was the dispute; nor was he under so great a temptation, and much less necessity, nor did it so greatly concern him to deny the baptism of infants, on account of his tenet; since he was able upon his principles to point out other ends of their baptism, than that of remission of sin; and particularly, their receiving and enjoying the kingdom of heaven; and as a late writer[24] observes, this proposition "*baptism ought to be administered to children*, *as well as to the adult*; was not inconsistent with, nor repugnant to his doctrine; for though he denied original sin, he allowed baptism to be administered even to children, but only for their sanctification."

2. It should be known and observed, that we have no writings of *Pelagius* extant, at least under his name, only some passages quoted by his adversaries, by which we can judge what were his sentiments about infant-baptism; and it is well known that a man's words often are misquoted, or misunderstood, or misrepresented by an adversary; I will not say that this is the case of *Pelagius*; I would hope better things of his adversaries, particularly *Austin*, and that he has been used fairly; I am willing to allow his authorities, though it would have been a greater satisfaction to have had there things from himself, and not at second hand. Nor,

3. Would I detract from the character of *Pelagius*, or call in question his acuteness, sagacity, and learning; yet two doctors of the age in which he lived, are divided about him in this respect, *Austin* and *Jerom*; the former speaks of him as a very considerable man, and of great penetration; but the latter, as if he had no genius, and but very little knowledge;[25] it must be owned, that *Austin* was the most candid man, and *Jerom* a sour one, who seldom spoke well of those he opposed, though he was a man of the greatest learning, and so the best judge of it: but however acute, learned, and sagacious *Peliagius* was, yet falling in with the stream of the times, and not seeing himself concerned about the subject, but the end of baptism, might give himself no trouble to inquire into the rise of it; but take it for granted, *as Austin* did; who perhaps was as acute, learned and sagacious as he, that it had been the constant usage of the church, and an apostolic tradition; as he had many other things, in which he was mistaken, as will soon appear.

4. Though *Pelagius* complained that he was defamed, and slandered by some who charged him with denying infant-baptism; yet this, *Austin* observes, was only a shift of his, in order to invert the state of the question, that he might more easily answer to what was objected to him, and preserve his own opinion. And certain it is, according to *Austin*;[26] that the Pelagians did deny baptism to some infants, even to the infants of believers, and that for this reason, because they were *holy*; what others made a reason for it, they make a reason against it.

5. *Pelagius s*ays no such thing, that he never heard, no not even any impious heretic, who denied baptism to infants. His words indeed are[27] *nunquam se vel impium aliquem haereticum audisse*, *qui hoc*, quod proposuit, *de parvulis diceret*; that "he never heard, no not any impious heretic, that would say concerning infants, what he had proposed or mentioned:" the sense depends upon the meaning of the phrase, *quod proposuit*, "what he had proposed or mentioned," of whom, and what that is to be understood; whether of *Austin*, and the state of the case as proposed and set down by him; so our author seems to understand it, since by way of explanation, he adds, *viz*. "that unbaptized infants are not liable to the condemnation of the first man; and that they are not to be cleansed by the regeneration of baptism:" but this gentleman has not put it as *Austin* has stated it,

which is thus; "it is objected to them (the Pelagians) that they will not own that unbaptized infants are liable to the condemnation of the first man; & *in eos tranfisse originale peccatum regeneratiane purgandum*, and that original sin has passed upon them to be cleansed by regeneration:" and according to this sense the meaning cannot be, that he never heard that any heretic denied baptism to infants; but either that he never heard that any one should say, that unbaptized infants are not liable to the condemnation of the first man, and that original sin had not passed upon them to be cleansed by regeneration; but then this is to bring the wicked heretics as witnesses against himself, and to make himself worse than they: or the meaning is, that he never heard that any of them should say, that unbaptized infants are liable to the condemnation of the first man, and that original sin has passed upon them to be cleansed by regeneration, which is most likely: but then this makes rather against, than for the thing for which it is brought; since it makes the heretic as never saying that infants flood in need of being cleansed by baptism: or else, *quod proposuit*, "what he had proposed or mentioned," refers to *Pelagius*, and to the state of the question as he had put it; representing that he was charged with promising the kingdom of heaven to some, without the redemption of Christ; and of this he might say, he never heard the most impious heretic to say; and this seems to be the sense by what he subjoins; "for who is so ignorant of what is read in the gospel, not only as to attempt to affirm it, but even lightly mention it, or even imagine it?

Moreover, who so impious that would exclude infants from the kingdom of heaven, *dum eos baptizari & in Christo renasci putat*? whilst he thinks, or is of opinion that they are baptized and regenerated in Christ?" for so it is in my edition[28] of *Austin*; *putet*, and not *vetat*, as Dr. *Wall* quotes it; and after him this Gentleman: and *Pelagius* further adds, "who so impious as to forbid to an infant, of whatsoever age, the common redemption of mankind?" but this, *Austin* says, like the rest is ambiguous; what redemption he means, whether from bad to good, or from good to better: now take the words which way you will, they cannot be made to say, that he had never heard that any heretic denied baptism to infants, but that they denied the kingdom of heaven to them; and indeed every one must: allow, whoever is of that opinion, that infants are by baptism really regenerated in Christ; which was the prevailing notion of those times, and the light in which it is put; that they must belong to the kingdom of heaven, and share in the common redemption by Christ.

6. *Austin* himself does not say, that he had never heard or read of any catholic, heretic, or schismatic, that denied infant-baptism; he could never say any such thing; he must know, that *Tertullian* had opposed it; and he himself was at the council of *Carthage*, and there presided, and was at the making of that canon which runs thus; "also it is our pleasure, that whoever denies that new-born infants are to be baptized—let him be anathema:" but to what purpose was this canon made, if he and his brethren knew of none that denied infant-baptism? To say that this respects some people, who were still of the same opinion with *Fidus*, an African bishop, that lived 150 years before this time, that infants were not to be baptized until they were eight days old, is an idle notion of *Dr. Wall*:[29] can any man in his senses think, that a council, consisting of all the bishops in *Africa*, should agree to *anathematize* their own brethren, who were in the same opinion and practice of infant-baptism with themselves; only they thought it should not be administered to them as soon as born, but at eight days old? *Credat Judaeus Apella*, believe it who will; he is capable of believing any thing, that can believe this. *Austin* himself makes mention of some that argued against it, after this manner:[30] "men are used to ask this question, says he, of what profit is the sacrament of Christian baptism to infants, seeing when they have received it, for the most part they die before they know any thing of it?" and as before observed, he brings in the Pelagians[31] saying,

that the infants of believers ought not to be baptized: and so *Jerom*,[32] who was a contemporary of his, speaks of some Christians, *qui dare noluerint baptisma*, "who refused to give baptism to their children;" so that though infant-baptism greatly obtained in those times, yet it was not so general as this author represents it. *Austin* therefore could not say what he is made to say: but what then does he say, that he never remembered to have read in any catholic, heretic, or schismatic writer? why, "that infants were not to be baptized, that they might receive the remission of sins, but that they might be sanctified in Christ:" it is of this the words are spoken, which our author has quoted, but are not to be found in the place he refers to; having through inadvertence mistaken Dr. *Wall*, from whom I perceive he has taken this, and other things. This, and not infant-baptism itself, was what was transiently talked of at *Carthage*, and cursorily heard by *Austin* some little time ago, when he was there: this was the novelty he was startled at, but did not think it seasonable to enter into a debate about it then, and so forgot it: for surely it will not be said, that it was the denial of infant-baptism that was defended with so much warmth against the church, as he lays this was; and was committed to memory in writing; and the brethren were obliged to ask their advice about it; and they were obliged to dispute and write against; for this would prove the very reverse of what this gentleman produces it for. Now, though *Austin* could not say that he never remembered to have heard or read of any catholic, schismatic, or heretic, that denied infant-baptism; yet he might say he never remembered to have heard or read of any that owned and practiced infant-baptism, but who allowed it to be for the remission of sin; which is widely different from the former: it is one thing what *Austin* says, and another, what may be thought to be the consequence of his so saying; and in the same sense are we to understand him, when he says,[33] "and this the church has *always* had, has *always* held." What? why, that infants are diseased through *Adam*; and stand in need of a physician; and are brought to the church to be healed. It was the doctrine of original sin, and the baptism of infants for the remission of it, he speaks of in there passages; it is true indeed, he took infant-baptism to be an ancient and constant usage of the church. and an apostolic tradition;[34] which perhaps he had taken up from the Latin translations of *Origen* by *Jerom* and *Ruffinus* before-mentioned; since no other ecclesiastical writer speaks of it as such, before those times: but in this he was deceived and mistaken, as he was in other things which he took for apostolic traditions; which ought to be equally received as this, by those who are influenced by his authority; and indeed every *honest* man that receives infant-baptism upon the foot of tradition, ought to receive every thing else upon the same foot, of which there is equally as *full*, and as *early*, evidence of apostolic tradition, as of this: let it then be observed,

1. That the same *Austin* that asserts infant-baptism to be an apostolic tradition, affirms infant-communion to be so likewise, as Bishop *Taytlor*[35] observes; and thus Austin says,[36] "if they pay any regard to the apostolic authority, or rather to the Lord and Matter of the apostles, who says, that they have no life in themselves, *unless they eat the flesh of the son of man*, *and drink his blood*, which they cannot do unless baptized; will sometimes own that unbaptized infants have not life;"—and a little after, "no man that remembers that he is a Christian, and of the catholic faith, denies or doubts that infants, not having the grace of regeneration in Christ, and without eating his flesh, and drinking his blood, have no life in them; but are hereby liable to everlasting punishment;" by which he means the two sacraments of baptism, and the Lord's supper; the necessity of both which to eternal life he founded upon a mistaken sense of John 3:5 and John 6:53 as appears from what he elsewhere says;[37] where having mentioned the first of those passages, he cites the latter, and adds; "let us hear the Lord, I say, not indeed speaking this of the sacrament of the holy laver, but of the sacrament of the holy table; whither none rightly come, unless baptized. *Except ye eat my flesh*, *and*

drink my blood, *ye shall have no life in you*; what do we seek for further? what can be laid in answer to this, unless one would set himself obstinately against clear and invincible truth? will any one dare to say this, that this passage does not belong to infants; and that they can have life in themselves, without partaking of his body and blood?" And of the necessity of this, as well as of baptism to eternal life, he says[38] the *African* Christians took to be an ancient and apostolic tradition. *Innocent* the first, his contemporary, was also of the same mind; and the giving of the Eucharist to infants generally obtained; and it continued fix hundred years after, until transubstantiation took place; and is continued to this day in the Greek church: and if we look back to the times before *Austin*, we shall find that it was not only the opinion of *Cyprian*, but was practiced in his time; he tells[39] a story which he himself was a witness of; how that "a little child being left in a fright by its parents with a nurse, she carried the child to the magistrates, who had it to an idol's sacrifice; where because the child could not eat flesh, they gave it bread soaked in wine: some time after, the mother had her child again; which not being able to relate to her what had passed it was brought by its parent to the place where *Cyprian* and the church were celebrating the Lord's-supper; and where it shrieked, and was dreadfully distressed; and when the cup was offered it in its turn by the deacon, it shut its lips against it; who forced the wine down its throat; upon which it sobbed, and threw it up again." Now here is a plain instance of infant-communion in the third century; and we defy any one to give a more early instance, or an instance so early, of infant-baptism: it is highly probable that infant-baptism was now practiced; and that this very child was baptized, or otherwise it would not have been admitted to the Lord's-supper; and it is reasonable to suppose, they both began together; yet no instance can be given of infant-baptism, so early as of infant-communion; wherefore whoever thinks himself obliged to receive the one upon such evidence and authority, ought to receive the other; the one has as good a claim to apostolic authority and tradition, as the other has.

2. The sign of the cross in baptism was used by the ancients, and pleaded for as an apostolic tradition. *Basil*, who lived in the fourth century observes,[40] that some things they had from scripture; and others from apostolic tradition, of which he gives instances; and, says he, "because this is the first and most common, I will mention it in the first place; as that we *sign with the sign of the cross* those who place their hope in Christ; and then asks who taught this in scripture?" *Chrysostom*, who lived in the same age, manifestly refers to it, when he says,[41] "how can you think it fitting for the minister to make *the* sign *on its* (the child's) *forehead*, where you have besmeared it with the dirt?" which *Cyril*[42] calls the *royal seal* upon the forehead. *Cyprian* in the middle of the third century relates the custom of his times;[43] "what is now also in use among us is, that those who are baptized, are offered to the governors of the church; and through our prayers and imposition of hands, they obtain the holy Spirit, and are made compleat *signaculo Dominico*, with the seal of the Lord:" and in another place[44] he says, "they only can escape, who are regenerated *and signed* with *the sign of Christ*." And *Tertullian*, in the beginning of the same century, speaking of baptism says[45] "the flesh is washed, that the soul may be unspotted; the flesh is anointed, that the soul may be consecrated; *caro signatur*, "the flesh is signed," that the soul also may be fortified." Now this use of the cross in baptism, was as early as any instance of infant-baptism that can be produced; higher than *Tertulian's* time it cannot be carried: what *partiality* then is it, I know to whom I speak, to admit the one upon the foot of tradition, and reject the other? The same *Tertullian*[46] also speaks of *sponsores*, sponsors, or godfathers, in baptism; which this writer himself has mentioned, and thus renders; "what occasion is there—except in cases of necessity, that the sponsors or *godfathers* be brought "into danger;" not to take notice of the *Clementine*

Constitutions, as our author calls them, which enjoin the use of them; and which appear to be as early as infant-baptism itself; and indeed it is but reasonable that if infants are baptized, there should be sponsors or sureties for them.

3. The form of "renouncing the devil and all his works," used in baptism, is also by *Basil*[47] represented as an apostolic tradition; for having mentioned several rites in baptism, received upon the same foot, he adds; "and the rest of what is done in baptism, as to renounce the devil and his angels, from what scripture have we it? is it not from this private and secret tradition?" *Origen* before the middle of the third century relates the usage of his times;[48] "let every one of the faithful remember when he first came to the waters of baptism; when he received the first seals of faith, and came to the fountain of salvation; what words there he then used; and what he denounced to the devil, *non se*, *usurum pompis ejus*, "that he would not use his *pomps*, nor his *works*, nor any of his service, nor obey his pleasures:" and *Tertullian*[49] before him; "when we enter into the water, we profess the faith of Christ, in the words of his law; we protest with our mouth that *we renounce the devil*, *and his pomp*, *and his* angels;" and in another place[50] in proof of unwritten tradition, and that it ought to be allowed of in some cases, he says; "to begin with baptism; when we come to the water, we do there, and sometimes in the congregation under the hand of the pallor, protest that we *renounce* the devil, and his pomp, and angels; and then we are thrice immersed; answering something more than the Lord has enjoined in the gospel:" now this is as early as any thing can be produced in favor of infant-baptism.

4. Exorcisms and exsusslations are represented by *Austin*[51] as rites in baptism, *prisae traditionis*, "of ancient tradition," as used by the church every where, throughout the whole world. He frequently presses the Pelagians with the argument taken from thence, and luggers, that they were pinched with it, and knew not how to answer it; he observes, that things the most impious and absurd, were the consequences of their principles, and among the rest there:[52] "that they (infants) are baptized into a Savior, but not saved; redeemed by a deliverer, but not delivered; washed in the laver of regeneration, but not washed from any thing; exorcised and exsusslated, but not freed from the power of darkness:" and elsewhere he says,[53] that "notwithstanding their craftiness, they know not what answer to make to this, *that infants* are *exorcised* and *exsusslated*; for this, without doubt, is done in mere show, if the devil has no power over them; but if he has power over them, and therefore are not *exorcised* and *exsusstated* in mere show, by what has the prince of sinners power over them, but by sin?" And *Gregory Nazianzen* before him, as he exhorts to confession of sin in baptism, so to exorcism; "do not refuse, says he,[54] the medicine of exorcism—for that is the trial of sincerity, with respect to that grace (baptism)." And says *Optatus* of *Milevis*,[55] "every man that is born, though born of Christian parents, cannot be without the spirit of the world, which must be excluded and separated from him, before the salutary laver; this exorcism effects, by which the unclean spirit is driven away, and is caused to flee to desert places." *Cyprian*, in the third century, speaking of the efficacy of baptism to destroy the power of Satan, relates what was done in his day;[56] "that by the exorcist the devil was buffeted, distressed, and tortured, with an human voice, and by a divine power." *And Cornelius* bishop *of Rome*, a contemporary of his, makes mention[57] of the same officers in the church; and this is also as early as the practice of infant-baptism.

5. Trine immersion is affirmed to be an apostolic tradition, nothing is more frequently asserted by the ancients than this. *Basil*,[58] among his instances of apostolic tradition, mentions this; "now a man is thrice immersed, from whence is it derived?" his meaning is, is it from scripture or apostolic

tradition? not the former, but the latter. And *Jerom*,[59] in a dialogue of his, makes one of the parties say after this manner, which clearly appears to be his own sense; "and many other things which by tradition are observed in the churches, have obtained the authority of a written law; as to dip the head thrice in the laver," etc. And so *Tertullian* in the third century as above, in support of tradition, mentions[60] this as a common practice; "we are thrice immersed;" and elsewhere speaking[61] of the commission of Christ, he says, "he commanded them to dip into the Father, and the Son, and the holy Ghost; not into one, for not once, but thrice are we dipped, at each name, into each person;" and he is the first man that makes mention of infant-baptism, who relates this as the then usage of the church: and *Sozomen*[62] the historian observes, that it was said, that: "Eunomius was the first that dared to assert, that the divine baptism should be performed by one immersion; and so corrupted the apostolic tradition, which till now had been every where observed."

6. The consecration of the water of baptism is an ancient rite, and which[63] *Basil* derives from apostolic tradition; "we consecrate, says he, the water of baptism, and the anointing oil, as well as the person that receives baptism, from what scripture? is it not from private and secret tradition?" by which he means apostolic tradition, as he in the same place calls it; which was done, not only by the prayer of the administrator over the water, but by signing it with the sign of the cross; which rite was in use in the times of *Austin*,[64] who says, "baptism is signed with the sign of Christ, that is, the water where we are dipped;" and *Ambrose*, who lived in the same age, relates, that exorcism was also used in consecration: he describes the manner of it thus:[65] "why did Christ descend first, and afterwards the Spirit, seeing the form and use of baptism require, that first the font be consecrated, and then the person that is to be baptized, goes down? for where the priest first enters, he makes an exorcism, next an invocation on the creature of the water, and afterwards prays that the font may be sanctified, and the eternal Trinity be present." *Cyprian*, in the middle of the third century, makes mention of this ceremony of consecrating the baptismal water; he says,[66] "the water must first be cleansed and *sanctified* by the priest, that it may, by his baptizing in it, wash away the sins of the man that is baptized." And *Tertullian*[67] before him, though he makes no difference between the water of a pool, river or fountain, *Tyber* or *Jordan*, yet supposes there is a sanctification of it through prayer; "all waters," he says, from their ancient original prerogative, (referring to Genesis 1:2) "obtain the sacrament of sanctification, *Deo invocato*, God being called upon;" for immediately the Spirit comes down from heaven, and rests upon the waters, sanctifying them of himself; and so being sanctified, they drink in together the sanctifying virtue." This also is as high as the date of infant-baptism can be carried.

7. Anointing with oil at baptism, is a rite that claims apostolic tradition. *Basil*[68] mentions it as an instance of it, and asks; "the anointing oil, what passage in scripture teaches this?" *Ausin*[69] *speaks* of it as the common custom of the church in his time; having quoted that passage in Acts 10:38, "*how God anointed him* (Jesus) *with the holy Ghost*; adds, not truly with visible oil, but with the gift of grace, which is signified by the visible ointment, *quo baptizatos ungit ecclesia*, "with which the church anoints those that are baptized:" several parts of the body were wont to be anointed. *Ambrose*[70] makes mention of the ointment on the head in baptism, and gives a reason for it. *Cyril*[71] *sa*ys, the oil was exorcised, and the forehead, ear, nose and breast, were anointed with it, and observes the mystical signification of each of there; the necessity of this anointing is urged by *Cyprian*[72] in the third century; "he that is baptized must needs be anointed, that by receiving the chrysm, that is, the *anointing*, he may be the anointed of God, and have the grace of Christ." And *Tertullian*, in the beginning of the same century, says,[73] as before observed, "the flesh is anointed,

that the soul may be consecrated;" and in another place,[74] "when we come out of the laver, we are anointed with the blessed ointment, according to the ancient discipline, in which they used to be anointed with oil out of the horn, for the priesthood;" this was the custom used in the times of the man that first spoke of infant-baptism.

8. The giving a mixture of milk and honey to a person just baptized, is a rite that was used in the churches anciently through tradition; *Jerom*[75] makes mention of it, as observed upon this footing, and as an instance, among other things which obtained authority in that way: "as to dip the head thrice in the laver, and when they *came out* from thence, *to taste of a mixture of milk and honey*, to signify the new birth;" and elsewhere he says,[76] it was a custom observed in the western churches to that day, to give *wine and milk* to them that were regenerated in Christ. This was in use in *Tertullian's* time; for, speaking of the administration of baptism, he says,[77] we come to the water—then we are thrice dipped—then being taken out from thence we taste a mixture of *milk and honey*; and this, as well as anointing with oil, he observes, was used by heretics themselves, for so he says of *Marcion*;[78] "he does not reject the water of the creator, with which he washes his disciples; nor the oil with which he anoints his own; *nor the mixture of milk and honey*, by which he points them out as newborn babes;" yea, even *Barnabas*, a companion of the apostle *Paul*, is thought to refer to this practice, in an epistle of his still extant;[79] not to take notice of the white garment, and the use of the ring and kiss in baptism, in *Cyprian* and *Tertullian's* time.[80]

Now these several rites and usages in baptism, claim their rise from *apostolic tradition*, and have equal evidence of it as infant-baptism has; they are of as early date, have the same vouchers, and more; the testimonies of them are clear and full; they universally obtained, and were practiced by the churches, throughout the whole world; and even by heretics and schismatics; and this is to be said of them, that they never were *opposed* by any within the time referred to, which cannot be laid of infant-baptism; for the very first man that mentions it, dissuades from it: and are there facts which could not but be *publicly* and perfectly known, and for which the ancient writers and fathers may be appealed to, not as reasoners and interpreters, but as historians and witnesses to public standing facts; and all the reasoning this gentleman makes use of, concerning the apostles forming the churches on one uniform *plan* of baptism, the *nearness* of infant-baptism to their times, from the testimony of the ancients, the difficulty of an innovation, and the easiness of its detection, may be applied to all and each of these rites.

Wherefore whoever receives infant-baptism upon the foot of apostolic tradition, and upon such proof and evidence as is given of it, as above, if he is an honest man; I say again, if he is an honest man, he ought to give into the practice of all those rites and usages. We do not think ourselves indeed obliged to regard these things; we know that a variety of superstitious, ridiculous, and foolish rites, were brought into the church in there times; we are not of opinion, as is suggested, that even the authority of the apostles a hundred years after their death, was sufficient to keep an innovation from entering the church, nor even whilst they were living; we are well assured, there never was such a set of impure wretches under the Christian name, so unfound in principle, and so bad in practice, as were in the apostles days, and in the ages succeeding, called the *purest* ages of Christianity. We take the Bible to be the only authentic, perfect and sufficient rule of faith and practice: we allow of no other head and lawgiver but one, that is, Christ; we deny that any men, or let of men, have any power to make laws in his house, or to decree rites and ceremonies to be observed by his people, no not apostles themselves, uninspired: and this gentleman, *out of this*

controversy, is of the same mind with us, who asserts the above things we do; and affirms, without the least hesitation, that what is "ordained by the apostles, without any precept from the Lord, or any particular direction of the holy Spirit, is not at all obligatory as *a law* upon the consciences of Christians;—even *the apostles* had no *dominion* over the *faith* and *practice* of Christians, but what was given them by the special presence, and Spirit of Christ, the only Lawgiver, Lord, and Sovereign of the church: they were to teach *only* the things which he should command them; and whatever they enjoined under the influence of that Spirit, was to be considered and obeyed as the injunctions of Christ; but if they enjoined any thing in the church, without the peculiar influence and direction of this Spirit, that is, as merely fallible and unassisted men, in that case, their injunctions had no authority over conscience; and every man's own reason had authority to examine and discuss their injunctions, as they approved themselves to his private judgment, to observe them or not: should we grant thee what you ask.—lays he to his antagonist—that the church in the present age, has the same authority and power, as the church in the apostolic age, considered, as not being under any immediate and extraordinary guidance of the holy Ghost what will you gain by it? This same authority and power is you see, Sir, really no power nor authority at all."[81]

The controversy between us and our brethren on this head, is the same as between Papists and Protestants about tradition, and between the church of *England* and Dissenters, about the church's power to decree rites and ceremonies namely, whether Christ is the sole head and lawgiver in his church; or whether any let of men have a power to set aside, alter, and change any laws of his, or prescribe new ones? if the latter, then we own it is all over with us, and we ought to submit, and not carry on the dispute any further: but since we both profess to make the Bible our religion, and that only the rule of our faith and practice; let us unite upon this common principle, and reject every tradition of men, and all rites and ceremonies which Christ hath not enjoined, us; let us join in pulling down this *prop* of *Popery*, and remove this *scandal* of the Protestant churches, I mean infant-baptism; for lure I am, so long as it is attempted to support it upon the foot of apostolic tradition, no man can write with success against the Papists, or such, who hold that the church has a power to decree rites and ceremonies.

However; if infant baptism is a tradition of the apostles, then this point must be gained, that it is not a scriptural business; for if it is of tradition, then not of scripture; who ever appeals to tradition, when a doctrine or practice can be proved by scripture? appealing to tradition, and putting it upon that foot, is giving it up as a point of scripture: I might therefore be excused from considering what this writer has advanced from scripture in favor of infant-baptism, and the rather, since there is nothing produced but what has been brought into the controversy again and again, and has been answered over and over: but perhaps this gentleman and his friends will be displeased, if I take no notice of his arguments from thence; I shall therefore just make some few remarks on them. But before I proceed, I must congratulate my readers upon the blessed times we are fallen into! what an enlightened age! what an age of good sense do we live in! what prodigious improvement in knowledge is made! behold! *tradition* proved by *Scripture*! *apostolic tradition* proved *by Abraham's covenant*! *undoubted apostolic tradition* proved from writings in being *hundreds* of years *before* any of the *apostles* were born! all extraordinary and of the marvelous kind! but let us attend to the proof of there things.

The *first* argument is taken from its being an *incontestable fact*, that *the infants of believers* were received with their parents into covenant with God, in the former dispensations or ages of the

church; which is a great privilege, a privilege still subsisting, and never revoked; wherefore the infants of believers, having still a right to the same privilege, in consequence have a right to baptism, which is now the only appointed token of God's covenant, and the only rite of admission into it.[82]

To which I reply, that it is not an incontestable loci:, but a *fact contested*, that the *infants of believers* were with their parents taken into covenant with God, in the former dispensations and ages of the church; by which must be meant, the ages preceding the *Abrahamic* covenant; since that is made, to furnish out a *second* and distinct argument from this; and so the scriptures produced are quite impertinent (Gen. 17:7, 10-12; Deut.29:10-12; Ezek. 16:20, 21), seeing they refer to the Abrahamic and *Mosaic* dispensations, of which hereafter. The first covenant made with man, was the covenant of works, with *Adam* before the fall, which indeed included all his posterity, but had no *peculiar* regard to the infants of believers; he standing as a federal head to all his feed, which no man since has ever done: and in him they all finned, were condemned, and died. This covenant, I presume this Gentleman can have no view unto: after the fall of *Adam*, the covenant of grace was revealed, and the way of life and salvation by the Messiah; but then this revelation was only made to *Adam* and *Eve* personally, as interested in there things, and not to their natural feed and posterity as such, as being interested in the same covenant of grace with them; for then all mankind must be taken into the covenant of grace; and if that gives a right to baptism, they have all an equal right to unto it; and so there is nothing *peculiar* to the infants of believers; and of whom, there is not the least syllable mentioned throughout the whole age or dispensation of the church, reaching from *Adam* to *Noah*; a length of time almost equal to what has run out from the birth of Christ, to the present age. The next covenant we read of, is the covenant made with *Noah* after the flood, which was not made with him, and his immediate offspring *only*; nor were they taken into covenant with him as the *infants of a believer*; nor had they any sacrament or rite given them as a token *of Jehovah* being their God, and they his children, and as standing in a peculiar relation to him; will any one dare to say this of *Ham*, one of the immediate sons of *Noah*? The covenant was made with *Noah* and all mankind, to the end of the world, and even with every living creature, and all the beasts of the earth, promising them security from an universal deluge, as long as the world stands; and had nothing in it *peculiar* to the infants of believers: and these are all the covenants the scripture makes mention of, till that made with *Abraham*, of which in the next argument.

This being the case, there is no room nor reason to talk of the greatness of this privilege, and of the continuance of it, and of asking when it was repealed, since it does not appear to have been a fact; nor during there ages and dispensations of the church, was there ever any *sacrament*, *rite*, or *ceremony*, appointed for the admission of *persons adult*, or *infants*, into covenant with God; nor was there ever any such rite in any age of the world, nor is there now: the covenant with *Adam*, either of works or grace, had no ceremony of this kind; there was a token, and still is, of *Noah's* covenant, the rainbow, but not a token or rite of admission of persons into it, but a token of the continuance and perpetuity of it in all generations: nor was circumcision a rite of admission of *Abraham's* feed into his covenant, as will quickly appear; nor is baptism now an *initiatory rite*, by which persons are admitted into the covenant. Let this Gentleman, if he can, point out to us where it is so described; persons ought to appear to be in the covenant of grace, and partakers of the blessings of it, the Spirit of God, faith in Christ, and repentance towards God, before they are admitted to baptism. This Gentleman will find more work to support his first argument, than perhaps he was aware of; the premises being bad, the conclusion must be wrong. I proceed to,

The *second* argument, taken from *the Abrabamic* covenant, which stands thus: The covenant God made with *Abraham* and his seed, Genesis 17: into which *his infants* were taken together with himself, *by the rite of circumcision*, is the *very same* we are *now* under, the same with that *in* Galatians 3:16, 17 still in force, and not to be disannulled, in which we believing Gentiles are included (Rom. 4:9-16, 17), and so being Abraham's seed, have a right to all the grants and privileges of it, and so to the admission of our infants to it, by the sign and token of it, which is changed from circumcision to baptism.[83] But,

1. though *Abraham's* seed were taken into covenant with him, which designs his adult posterity in all generations, on whom it was enjoined to circumcise their infants, it does not follow that his infants were; but so it is, that wherever the words seed, *children*, etc. are used, it immediately runs in the heads of some men, that infants must be meant, though they are not necessarily included; but be it so, that *Abraham's* infants were admitted with him, (though at the time of making this covenant, he had no infant with him, *Ishmael* was then *thirteen* years of age) yet not as *the infants of a believer*; there were believers and their infants then living, who were left out of the covenant; and those that were taken in successive generations, were not the infants of believers only, but of unbelievers also; even all the natural feed of the Jews, whether believers or unbelievers.—

2. Those that were admitted into this covenant, were not admitted *by the rite of circumcision*; *Abraham's* female feed were taken into covenant with him, as well as his male feed, but not by any *viable rite* or ceremony; nor were his male feed admitted by any such rite, no not by circumcision; for they were not to be circumcised until the eighth day; to have circumcised them sooner would have been criminal; and that they were in covenant from their birth, this gentleman, I presume, will not deny.—

3. The covenant of circumcision, as it is called (Acts 7:8), cannot be the same covenant we are now under, since that is abolished (Gal. 5:1-3), and it is a *new* covenant, or a new administration of the covenant of grace, that we are now under; the old covenant under the *Mosaic* dispensation is waxen old, and vanished away (Heb. 8:8, 13), nor is the covenant with *Abraham* (Gen. 17), the same with that mentioned in Galatians 3:17 which is still in force, and not to be disannulled; the distance of time between them does not agree, but falls short of the apostle's date, four and twenty years; for from the making of this covenant to the birth of *Isaac*, was one year (Gen. 17:1; 21:5), from thence to the birth of *Jacob*, sixty years (Gen. 25:26), from thence to his going down to *Egypt*, one hundred and thirty years (Gen. 47:9), where the Israelites continued two hundred and fifteen;[84] and quickly after they came out of *Egypt*, was the law given, which was but four hundred and fix years after this covenant. The reason this gentleman gives, why they must be the same, will not hold good, namely, "this is the only covenant in which "God ever *made* and *confirmed* promises to *Abraham*, and to *his seed*;" since God made a covenant with *Abraham* before this, and confirmed it to his seed, and that by various rites, and usages, and wonderful appearances (Gen. 15:8-18), which covenant, and the confirmation of it, the apostle manifestly refers to in Galatians 3:17 and with which his date exactly agrees, as the years are computed by *Paraeus*[85] thus; from the confirmation of the covenant, and taking *Hagar* to wife, to the birth of *Isaac*, fifteen years; from thence to the birth of *Jacob*, sixty (Gen. 25:26), from thence to his going down to *Egypt*, one hundred and thirty (Gen. 47:9), from thence to his death, seventeen (Gen. 47:28), from thence to the death of *Joseph*, fifty three (Gen. 1:26), from thence to the birth *of Moses*, seventy-five; from thence to the going out of *Israel* from *Egypt*, and the giving of the law, eighty years; in all four hundred and thirty years.—

4. It is allowed, that the covenant made with *Abraham* (Gen. 17), is of a mixed kind, consisting partly of temporal, and partly of spiritual blessings; and that there is a twofold seed of *Abraham*, to which they severally belong; the temporal blessings, to his natural seed the Jews, and the spiritual blessings, to his spiritual seed, even all true believers that walk in the steps of his faith, *Jews or Gentiles* (Rom. 4:11, 12, 16), believing Gentiles are Abraham's spiritual seed, but then they have a right only to the spiritual blessings of the covenant, not to *all* the grants and privileges of it; for instance, not to the land of *Canaan*; and as for their natural feed, there have no right, as such, to any of the blessings of this covenant, temporal or spiritual: for either they are the natural, or the spiritual seed of Abraham; not his natural seed, no one will say that; not his spiritual seed, for only believers are such; *they which are of faith* (believers) *the same are the children of Abraham*; *and if ye be Christ's*, (that is, believers) *then are ye Abraham's seed*, *and heirs according to the premise*; and it is time enough to claim the promise, and the grants and privileges of it, be they what they will, when they appear to be believers; and as for the natural seed of believing Gentiles, there is not the least mention made of them in *Abraham's* covenant.

5. Since *Abraham's* seed were not admitted into covenant with him, by any visible rite or token, no not by circumcision, which was not a rite of admission into the covenant, but a token of the continuance of it to his natural seed, and of their distinction from other nations, until the Messiah came; and since therefore baptism cannot succeed it as such, nor are the one or the other seals of the covenant of grace, as I have elsewhere[86] proved, and shall not now repeat it; upon the whole, this second argument can be of no force in favor of infant-baptism: and here, if any where, is the proper time and place for this gentleman to ark for the *repeal* of this *ancient privilege*, as he calls it,[87] of infants being taken into covenant with their parents, or to shew when it was repealed; to which I answer, that the covenant made with *Abraham*, into which his natural feed were taken with him, so far as it concerned them as such, or was a national covenant, it was abolished and disannulled when the people of the Jews were cut off as a nation, and as a church; when the *Mosaic* dispensation was put an end unto, by the coming, sufferings, and death of Christ:, and by the destruction of that people on their rejection of him; when God wrote a *Loammi* upon them, and said, Ye are not my people, and I will not be your God (Hosea 1:9) when he took his staff, beauty, and cut it asunder, that he might break his covenant he had made with this people (Zech. 11:10), when the old covenant and old ordinances were removed, and the old church-state utterly destroyed, and a new church-state was set up, and new ordinances appointed; and for which new rules were given; and to which none are to be admitted, without the observance of them; which leads me to The *third* argument, taken from the commission of Christ for baptism (Matthew 28:19), and from the *natural* and *necessary* sense in which the apostles would understand it;[88] though this gentleman owns that it is delivered in such general terms, as not certainly to determine whether adult believers only, or the infants also of such are to be baptized; and if so, then surely no argument can be drawn from it for admitting infants to baptism. And,

1. The rendering of the words, *disciple* or *proselyte all nations*, *baptizing them*, will not help the cause of infant-baptism; for one cannot be a proselyte to any religion, unless he is taught it, and embraces and professes it; though had our Lord used a word which conveyed such an idea, the evangelist *Matthew* was not at a loss for a proper word or phrase to express it by; and doubtless would have made use of another clear and express, as he does in Matthew 23:15.—

2. The suppositions this writer makes, that if, instead of *baptizing them*, it had been said *circumcising them*, the apostles without any farther warrant would have naturally and justly thought, that upon proselytizing the Gentile parent, and circumcising him, his infants also were to be circumcised: or if the twelve patriarchs of old had had a divine command given them, to go into *Egypt*, *Arabia*, *etc*. *and teach them the God of Abraham*, *circumcising them*, they would have understood it as authorizing them to perform this ceremony, not upon the parent only, but also upon the infants of such as believed on the God of *Abraham*. As these suppositions are without foundation, so I greatly question whether they would have been so understood, without some instructions and explanations; and betides the cases put are not parallel to this before us, since the circumcision of infants was enjoined and practiced before such a supposed commission and command; whereas the baptism of infants was neither commanded nor practiced before this commission of Christ; and therefore could not lead them to any such thought as this, whatever the other might do.—

3. The characters and circumstances of the apostles, to whom the commission was given, will not at all conclude that they apprehended infants to be actually included; some in which they are represented being entirely false, and others nothing to the purpose: Jews they were indeed, but men that knew that the covenant of circumcision was not still in force, but abolished: men, who could never have observed that the infants of believers with their parents had always been admitted into covenant, and passed under the same initiating rite: men, who could not know, that the Gentiles were to be taken into a joint participation of all the privileges of the Jewish church; but must know that both believing Jews and Gentiles were to constitute a new church, state, and to partake of new privileges and ordinances, which the Jewish church knew nothing of:—men, who were utter strangers to the baptism of Gentile proselytes, to the Jewish religion, and of their infants; and to any baptism, but the ceremonial ablutions, before the times of *John* the Baptist:—men, who were not tenacious of their ancient rites after the Spirit was poured down upon them at Pentecost, but knew they were now abolished, and at an end:—men, though they had seen little children brought to Christ to have his hands laid on them, yet had never seen an infant baptized in their days:—men, who though they knew that infants were sinners, and under a sentence of condemnation, and needed remission of sin and justification, and that baptism was a means of leading the faith of adult persons to Christ for them; yet knew that it was not by baptism, but by the blood of Christ, that there things are obtained:—men, that knew that Christ came to set up a new church-state; not national as before, but congregational; not consisting of carnal men, and of infants without understanding; but of spiritual and rational men, believers in Christ; and therefore could not be led to conclude that infants were comprehended in the commission: nor is Christ's silence with respect to infants to be construed into a strong and most manifest presumption in their favor, which would be presumption indeed; or his not excepting them, a permission or order to admit them: persons capable of making such constructions, are capable of doing and saying any thing. I hasten to The *fourth* argument, drawn from the evident and clear consequences of other passages of scripture;[89] as,

1. From Romans 11:17 and *if some of the branches be broken off*, etc. here let it be noted, that the *olive tree* is not the Abrahamic covenant or church, into which the Gentiles were grafted; for they never were grafted into the Jewish church, that, with all its peculiar ordinances, being abolished by Christ; signified by the shaking of the heaven and the earth, and the removing of things shaken (Heb. 12:26, 27) but the gospel church-state, out of which the unbelieving Jews were left, and into

which the believing Gentiles were engrafted, but not in the stead of the unbelieving Jews: and by the *root and fatness* of the olive-tree, are meant, not the religious privileges and grants belonging to the Jewish covenant or church, which the Gentiles had nothing to do with, and are abolished; but the privileges and ordinances of the gospel-church, which they with the believing Jews jointly partook of, being incorporated together in the same church-state; and which, as it is the meaning of Romans 11:17 so of Ephesians 3:6 in all which there is not the least syllable of baptism; and much less of infant, baptism; or of the faith of a parent grafting his children with himself, into the church or covenant-relation to God, which is a mere chimera, that has no foundation either in reason or scripture.

2. From Mark 10:14. *Suffer little children to come unto me*, etc. and John 3:5. *Except any one is born of water*, etc. from there two passages put together, it is said, the right of infants to baptism may be clearly inferred; for in one they are declared actually to have a place in God's kingdom or church, and yet into it, the other as expressly says, none can be admitted without being baptized. But supposing the former of these texts is to be understood of infants, not in a metaphorical sense, or of such as are compared to infants for humility, etc. which sense some versions lead unto, and in which way some Paedobaptists interpret the words, particularly *Calvin*, but literally; then by *the kingdom of God*, is not meant the visible church on earth, or a gospel church-state, which is not national, but congregational; consisting of persons gathered out of the world by the grace of God, and that make a public profession of the name of Christ, which infants are incapable of, and so are not taken into it: betides, this sense would prove too much, and what this writer would not choose to give into, *viz*. that infants, having a place in this kingdom or church, must have a right to all the privileges of it; to the Lord's supper, as well as to baptism; and ought to be treated in all respects as other members of it. Wherefore it should be interpreted of the kingdom of glory, into which we doubt not that such as these in the text are admitted; and then the strength of our Lord's argument lies here; that since he came to save such infants as these, as well as adult persons, and bring them to heaven, they should not be hindered from being brought to him to be touched by him, and healed of their bodily diseases: and so the other text is to be understood of *the kingdom of God*, or heaven, in the same sense; but not of water-baptism as necessary to it, or that without which there is no entrance into it; which mistaken, shocking and stupid sense of them, led *Austin*, and the *African* churches, into a confirmed belief and practice of infant-baptism; and this sense being imbibed, will justify him in all his monstrous, absurd and impious tenets, as this writer calls them, about the ceremony of baptismal water, and the absolute necessity of it unto salvation: whereas the plain meaning of the words is, that *except a man be born again* of the grace of the Spirit of God, comparable to water, *he cannot enter into the kingdom of God*, or be a partaker of the heavenly glory; or without the regenerating grace of the Spirit of God, which in Titus 3:5 is called *the washing of regeneration*, *and renewing of the holy Ghost*, there can be no meetness for, no reception into, the kingdom of heaven; and therefore makes nothing for the baptizing of infants.

3. A distinction between the children of believers and of unbelievers, is attempted from 1 Corinthians 7:14 as if the one were in a visible covenant-relation to God, and the other not; whereas the text speaks not of two sorts of children, but of one and the same, under supposed different circumstances; and is to be understood not of any federal, but matrimonial holiness, as I have shewn elsewhere,[190] to which I refer the reader. As for the *Queries* with which the argument is concluded, they are nothing to the purpose, unless it could be made out, that it is the will of God that infants should be baptized, and that the baptism of them would give them the remission of sins,

and justify their persons; neither of which are true: and of the same kind is the *harangue* in the *introduction* to this treatise: and after all a poor, slender provision is made for the salvation of infants, according to this author's own scheme, which only concerns *the infants of believers*, and leaves all others to the uncovenanted mercies of God, as he calls them; seeing the former are but a very small part of the thousands of infants that every day languish under grievous distempers, are tortured, convulsed, and in piteous agonies give up the ghost. Nor have I any thing to do with what this writer lays, concerning the moral purposes and use of infant-baptism in religion; since the thing itself is without any foundation in the word of God: upon the whole, the baptism of infants is so far from being a *reasonable service*, that it is a *most unreasonable one*; since there is neither precept nor precedent for it in the sacred writings; and it is neither to be proved by *scripture* nor *tradition*.

An

ANSWER TO A WELSH CLERGYMAN'S TWENTY ARGUMENTS

In Favor of Infant-Baptism

With Some STRICTURES on what the said AUTHOR has advanced concerning the Mode of BAPTISM.

A BOOK some time ago being published in the *Welch* language, entitled,

"A Guide to a saving Knowledge of the Principles and Duties of Religion, *viz*. Questions and Scriptural Answers, relating to the Doctrine contained in the Church Catechism," etc.

Some extracts out of it respecting the ordinance of baptism, its subject, and mode, being communicated to me, with a request from our friends in *Wales* to make some *Reply* unto, and also to draw up some *Reasons* for dissenting from the church of *England,* both which I have undertook, and shall attempt in the following manner.

I shall take but little notice of what this author says, part 5, page 40 concerning sponsors in baptism, but refer the reader to what is said of them in the *Reasons* for dissenting, hereunto annexed. This writer himself owns, that the practice of having sureties is not particularly mentioned in scripture; only he would have it, that it has in general obtained in the churches from the primitive times, and was enacted by the *powers which God has appointed,* and whole *ordinances are to be submitted to,* when they are not contrary to those of God;[1] and must be allowed to be of great service, if the sureties fulfilled their engagements. The answer to all which is, that since it is not mentioned in scripture, it deserves no regard; at least, this can never recommend it to such, who make the Bible the rule of their faith and practice; and as to its obtaining in primitive times, it is indeed generally ascribed to Pope *Hyginus,* as an invention of his; but the genuineness of the epistles attributed to him and others, is called in question by learned men, and are condemned by them as spurious; but were they genuine, neither his office nor his age would have much weight and authority with us, who are not to be determined by the decrees of popes and councils; the *powers* spoken of in the scriptures referred to, were Heathen magistrates, who surely had no authority to enact any thing relating to gospel-worship and ordinances; nor can it be reasonably thought they should; and submission and obedience to them, are required in things of a civil nature, not ecclesiastical, as the scope of the passages, and their context manifestly shew; nor has God given power and authority to any let of men whatever, to enact laws and ordinances of religious worship; nor are we bound to submit to all ordinances of men in religious matters, that are not contrary to the appointments of God, that is, that are not expressly forbidden in his word; for by this

means, all manner of superstition and will worship may be introduced. *Oil* and *spittle* in baptism are no where forbidden, nor is the baptizing of *bells;* yet there ordinances of men are not to be submitted to, and a multitude of others of the like kind: we are not only to take care to do what God has commanded, but to reject what he has not commanded; remembering the care *of Nadab* and *Abihu,* who offered *strange fire* to the Lord, which he commanded not. And whereas it is suggested, that this practice would be very serviceable were the engagements of sureties *fulfilled,* it is not practicable they should; it is impossible to do what they engage to do, even for themselves, and much less for others, as is observed in the *Reasons,* before referred to.

But passing these things, I shall chiefly attend to the *twenty* arguments, which this writer has advanced in favor of infant-baptism, pages 41-45.

The *first* argument runs thus: "Baptism, which is a seal of the covenant of grace, should not be forbid to the children of believers, seeing they are under condemnation through the covenant of works; and if they are left without an interest in the covenant of grace, they then would be, to their parents great distress, under a dreadful sentence of eternal condemnation, without any sign or promise of the mercy of God, or of an interest in Christ; being by *nature children of wrath as others,* and consequently *without any hope* of salvation, if they die in their infancy."

In which there are some things true, and others false, and nothing that can be improved into an argument in favor of infant-baptism.

1. It is true that the infants of believers, as well as others, are by nature the children of wrath, and under condemnation through the covenant of works; so all mankind are as considered in *Adam,* and in consequence of his sin and fall (Rom. 5:12, 18). But,

2. It is not baptism that can save them from wrath and condemnation; a person may be baptized in water, and yet not saved from wrath to come, and still lie under the sentence of condemnation, *being* notwithstanding that, *in the gall of bitterness, and bond of iniquity,* as the case of *Simon Magus* shews. Though this writer seems to be of opinion, that baptism is a saving ordinance, and that a person cannot be fared without it; and indeed he expressly says, p. 27. that "in general it is necessary to salvation;" as if salvation was by it, (which is a popish notion) and there was none without it; but the instance of the penitent thief, is a proof to the contrary: the text does not say, *he that is baptized shall be saved,* but *he that* BELIEVETH *and is baptized;* nor is it any where suggested, that a person dying without baptism shall be damned. It is CHRIST only, and not baptism, that fares from *wrath and condemnation.*

3. Being unbaptized, does not leave without an interest in the covenant of grace, or exclude from the hope of salvation, or the mercy of God, or an interest in Christ; persons may have an interest in all these, and yet not be baptized. See the strange contradictions men run into when destitute of truth; one while the covenant of grace is said to be made with believers, and their seed, as in the next argument, and so their infants being in it, have a right to baptism; at another time it is baptism that puts them into the covenant; and if they are not baptized they are left without interest in it, and, to the great grief of their parents, under a dreadful sentence of eternal condemnation. But,

4. as the salvation of an infant dying in its infancy is one of *the secret things which belong unto the Lord,* a judicious Christian parent will leave it with him; and find more relief from his distress, by hoping in the grace and mercy of God through Christ, and in the virtue and efficacy of his blood and righteousness, which may be applied unto it without baptism, than he can in baptism; which he may observe, may be administered to a person, and yet be damned. For,

5. baptism is no seal of the covenant of grace, nor does it give any person an interest in it, or seal it to them; a person may be baptized, and yet have no interest in the covenant, as *Simon Magus* and others, and to whom it was never sealed; and on the other hand, a person may be in the covenant of grace, and it may be sealed to him, and he assured of his interest in it, and not yet be baptized: the blood of Christ is the seal of the covenant, and the Spirit of Christ is the sealer of the saint's interest in it. And, after all, if baptism has such virtue in it, as to give an interest in the covenant of grace, to be a sign and promise of mercy, and of our interest in Christ, and furnish out hope of salvation, and secure from wrath and condemnation, why should not compassion be shewn to the children of unbelievers, who are in the same state and condition by nature? for, I observe all along, that in this and the following arguments, baptism is wholly restrained to the children of believers; upon the whole, the argument from the state of infants to their baptism is impertinent and fruitless; since there is no such efficacy in baptism, to deliver them from it.[2]

The second argument is: "The children of believers should be admitted to baptism, since as the covenant of works, and the real of it belonged to *Adam* and his children, so the covenant of grace, and the real thereof belongs, through Christ, to believers and their children:" to which it may be replied,

1. That it is indeed true, that the covenant of works belonged to Adam and his posterity, he being a federal head unto them; but then it does not appear, that that covenant had any seal belonging to it, since it needed none, nor was it proper it should have any, seeing it was not to continue. And if the tree of life is intended, As I suppose it is, whatever that might be a sign of, it was no real of any thing, nor did it belong to *Adam's* children, who were never suffered to partake of it.

2. There is a great disparity between *Adam* and believers, and the relation they stand in to their respective offspring: *Adam* stood as a common head and representative to all his posterity; not so believers to theirs: they are no common heads unto them, or representatives of them; wherefore though the covenant of works belonged to Adam and his posterity, it does not follow, that the covenant of grace belongs to believers and their children, they not standing in the same relation he did. There never were but two covenant-heads, *Adam* and CHRIST, and between them, and them only, the parallel will run, and in this form; that as the covenant of works belonged to *Adam* and his seed, so the covenant of grace belongs to Christ and his seed.

3. As it does not appear there was any real belonging to the covenant of works, so we have seen already, that baptism is not the real of the covenant of grace; wherefore this argument in favor of infant-baptism is weak and frivolous; the reason this author adds to strengthen the above argument, is very lamely and improperly expressed, and impertinently urged; "for we are not to imagine, that there is more efficacy in the covenant of works, to bring condemnation on the children of the unbelieving, through the fall of Adam; than there is virtue in the covenant of grace, through the

mediation of the son of God, the second Adam, to bring salvation to the seed of those that believe" (Rom. 5:15, 18).

For the covenant of works being broken by the fall of *Adam,* brought condemnation, not on the children of the unbelieving only, but of believers also, even on all his posterity, to whom he stood a federal head; and so the covenant of grace, of which Christ the second *Adam* is the mediator, brings salvation, not to the seed of those that believe, many of whom never believe, and to whom salvation is never brought, nor they to that; but to all Christ's spiritual seed and offspring, to whom he stands a federal head; which is the sense of the passages of scripture referred to, and serves no ways to strengthen the cause of infant baptism.

The third argument runs thus: "The seed of believers are to be baptized into the same covenant with themselves; seeing infants, while infants, as ha-aural parts of their parents, are included in the same threatenings, which are denounced against wicked parents, and in the same promises as are made to godly parents, being branches of one root" (Rom. 11:16; Deut. 4:37, 40; 28:1-4; 30:6, 19; Ps. 102:28; Prov. 11:21; 20:7; Jer. 32:38, 39; Ex. 20:5; 34:7; Deut. 28:15, 18, 45, 46; Ps. 21:10; 19:9, 10; Isa. 14:20, 21; Jer.22:28; 36:31). Here let it be observed,

1. that it is pleaded that infants should be baptized into the same covenant with their parents, meaning no doubt the covenant of grace; that is, should by baptism be brought into the covenant as it is expressed in Argument 7th, or else I know not what is meant by being baptized into the same covenant; and yet in the preceding argument it is urged, that the covenant of grace belongs to the infants of believers, that is, they are in it, and therefore are to be baptized: an instance this of the glaring contradiction before observed.

2. Threatenings indeed are made to wicked parents and their children, partly to shew the heinousness of their sins, and to deter them from them; and partly to express God's hatred of sin, and his punitive justice; and also to point out original sin and the corruption of nature in infants, and what they must expect when grown up if they follow the examples of their parents, and commit the same or like sins; but what is all this to infant-baptism; Why,

3. In like manner promises are made to godly parents and their children, and several passages are referred to in proof of it; some of these are of a temporal nature, and are designed to stir up and encourage good men to the discharge of their duty, and have no manner of regard to any spiritual or religious privilege; and such as are of a spiritual nature, which respect conversion, sanctification, etc. when these take place on the seed of believers, then, and not till then, do they appear to have any right to Gospel-ordinances, such as baptism and the Lord's supper; wherefore the argument from promises to such privileges, before the things promised are bestowed, is of no force.

The fourth argument is much of the same kind with the foregoing, namely, "There are many examples recorded in scripture wherein the infants of ungodly men are involved with their parents in heavy judgments; therefore as the judgment and curse which belong to the wicked, belong also to their seed, so the privileges of the faints belong also to their offspring, unless they reject the God of their fathers. The justice and wrath of God, is not more extensive to destroy the offspring of the wicked, than his grace and mercy is to fare those of the faithful; therefore baptism, the sign of the

promises of God's mercy, is not to be denied to such infants" (Num. 14:33; 2 Kings 5:27; Josh. 7:24, 25; Jer. 22:28). The answer given to the former may suffice for this: to which may be added,

1. That the inflicting judgments on the children of some wicked men, is an instance of the sovereign justice of God; and his bellowing privileges on the children of some good men, is an instance of his sovereign grace, who punishes whom he will, and has mercy on whom he will: for,

2. God does not always proceed in this method; he sometimes bellows the blessings of his grace on the children of the wicked, and inflicts deserved punishment on the children of good men; the seed of the wicked do not always inherit their curses, nor the seed of the godly their blessings; wherefore such dispensations of God can be no rule of conduct to us; and particularly with respect to baptism. And,

3. Whatsoever privileges belong to the seed of believers, we are very desirous they should enjoy; nor would we deprive them of any; let it be shewn that baptism belongs to them as ruth (compassion, ed.), and we will by no means deny it to them. But,

4. Whereas it is said that the privileges of faints belong to their offspring, adding this exceptive clause, "unless they reject the God of their fathers;" it seems most proper, prudent and advisable, particularly in the care before us, to wait and see whether they will receive or reject, follow or depart from the God of their fathers.

The fifth argument is formed thus: "The children of believers are to be baptized now, as those of the Jews were circumcised formerly; for circumcision was then the real of the covenant, as baptism is now, which Christ has appointed in lieu thereof. *Abraham* and his son *Ishmael,* and all that were born in his house, were circumcised the same day; and God commanded all *Israel* to bring their children into the covenant with them, to give them the real of it, and circumcise them" (Gen. 17; Deut. 29:10-12; Col. 2:11, 12). To all which I reply,

1. that circumcision was no real of the covenant of grace; if it was, the covenant of grace from *Adam* to *Abraham* was without a real. It is called *a sign* in Genesis 17: the passage referred to, but not a real: it is indeed in Romans 4:11 said to be *a seal of the righteousness of the faith,* not to infants, not to Abraham's natural seed, only to himself; assuring him, that he should be the father of many nations, in a spiritual sense, and that the righteousness of faith he had, should come upon the Gentiles: wherefore this mark or sign continued until the gospel, in which *the righteousness of God is revealed from faith to faith,* was preached unto the Gentiles, and received by them; to which may be added, that there were many living who were interested in the covenant of grace, when circumcision was appointed, and yet it was not ordered to them; as it would have been, had it been a seal of that covenant; and on the other hand, it was enjoined such who had no interest in the covenant of grace, and to whom it could not be a real of it, as *Ishmael, Esau,* and others. And,

2. it has been shewn already, that baptism is no seal of the said covenant. Nor,

3. is it appointed by Christ in lieu of circumcision, nor does it succeed it; there is no agreement between them in their subjects, use, and manner of administration; and what most clearly shews that baptism did not come in the room of circumcision, is, that it was in force and use before

circumcision was abolished; which was not till the death of Christ; whereas, years before that, multitudes were baptized, and our Lord himself; and there-tore it being in force before the other was out of date, cannot with any propriety be said to succeed it. This writer, p. 28. has advanced several things to prove that baptism came in the room of circumcision.

1st, He argues from the Lord's supper being instead of the paschal lamb, that therefore baptism must be in the room of circumcision, which is ceased; or else there must be a deficiency. But it does not appear that the Lord's supper is in the room of the passover; it followed that indeed, in the institution and celebration of it by Christ, but it was not instituted by him to answer the like purposes as the passover; nor are the same persons admitted to the one as the other; and besides, was the Lord's supper in the room of the passover, it does not follow from thence that baptism *must* be in the room of circumcision: but then it is said there will be a deficiency; a deficiency of what? all those ceremonial rites, the passover and circumcision, with many others, pointed at thrift, and have had their fulfillment in him; he is come, and is the body and substance of them; and therefore there can be no deficiency, since he is in the room of them, and is the fulfilling end of them: nor can any other but he, with any propriety, be said to come in the room of them. And there can be no deficiency of grace, since he is full of it, nor of ordinances, for he has appointed as many as he thought fit.

2dly, This author urges, that it is proper there should be *two s*acraments under the gospel, as there were *two* under the law, one for adult persons, the other for their children, as were the paschal lamb and circumcision. But if every thing that was typical of Christ, as those two were, were sacraments, it might as well be said there were two and twenty sacraments under the law, as two; and, according to this way of reasoning, there should be as many under the gospel. Moreover, of these two, one was not for adult persons only, and the other for their children; for they were, each of them, both for adult persons and children too; they that partook of the one had a right to the other; all that were circumcised might eat of the passover, and none but they; and if this is a rule and direction to us now, if infants have a right to baptism, they ought to be admitted to the Lord's supper.

3dly, Baptism, he says, is appointed for a like end as circumcision; namely, for the admission of persons into the church, which is not true; circumcision was appointed for another end, and not for that: the Jewish church was national, and as loon as an infant was born, it was a member of it, even before circumcision; and therefore it could not be admitted by it; nor is baptism for any such end, nor are persons admitted into a visible church of Christ by it; they may be baptized, and yet not members of a church: what church was the eunuch admitted into, or did he become a member of, by his baptism?

4thly, This writer affirms, that "the holy Spirit calls baptism circumcision, that is, *the circumcision made without hands,* having the same spiritual design; and is termed the *Christian* circumcision, or that of Christ; it answering to circumcision, and being ordained by Christ in the room of it." To say that baptism is ordained by Christ in the room of circumcision, is begging the question, nor is there any thing in it that answers to circumcision, nor is it called the circumcision of Christ, in Colossians 2:11, which I suppose is the place referred to; for not that, but internal circumcision, *the circumcision of the heart* is meant, which Christ by his Spirit is the author of, and therefore called his; and the same is the circumcision *made without hands,* in opposition to circumcision in *the flesh;* it being by the powerful and efficacious grace of God, without the assistance of men; nor can

baptism with any shew of reason, or appearance of truth, be so called, since that is made with the hands of men; and therefore can never be the circumcision there meant.

5thly, He infers that baptism is appointed in the room of circumcision, from their signifying like things, as Original corruption, regeneration, or the circumcision of the heart (Deut. 30:6; Titus 3:5), being seals of the covenant of grace (Ezek. 16:21; Matthew 16:26), initiating ordinances, and alike laying men under an obligation to put off the body of sin, and walk in newness of life (Rom. 4:11) and also being marks of distinction between church-members and others (Rom. 6:4, 6). But baptism and circumcision do not signify the like things; baptism signifies the sufferings, death, burial, and resurrection of Christ, which circumcision did not; nor does baptism signify original corruption, which it takes not away; nor regeneration, which it does not give, but pre-requires it; nor is baptism meant in the passage referred to, Titus 3:5, nor are either of them seals of the covenant of grace, as has been shewn already; nor initiating ordinances, or what enter persons into a church-state: Jewish infants were church-members, before they were circumcised; and persons may be baptized, and yet not be members of churches; and whatever obligations the one and the other may lay men under to live in newness of life, this can be no proof of the one coming in the room of the other. Circumcision was indeed a mark of distinction between the natural seed of *Abraham* and others; and baptism is a distinguishing badge, to be wore by those that believe in Christ, and put him on, and are his spiritual seed; but neither of them distinguish church-members from others; the passages referred to are impertinent. But I proceed to consider—

The sixth argument in favor of infant-baptism, taken from "the sameness of the covenant of grace made with Jews and Gentiles, of which circumcision was the seal; from the seal and dispensation of which, the Jews and their children are cut off, and the Gentiles and their seed are engrafted in" (Gal. 3:14; Acts 15:11; Rom. 4:11; 11:15, 17). In answer to which, let it be observed,

1. That the covenant of grace is indeed the same in one age, and under one dispensation, as another; or as made with one sort of people as another, whether Jews or Gentiles; the same blessings of it that came upon Abraham, come upon all believers, Jews or Gentiles; and the one are saved by the grace of our Lord Jesus Christ, as the other; but then,

2. The covenant of grace was not made with Abraham and his natural seed, or with all the Jews as such; nor is it made with Gentiles and their natural seed as such; but with Christ and his spiritual seed, and with them only, be they of what nation., or live they in what age they will.

3. Circumcision was no seal of the covenant of grace, nor does Romans 4:11. prove it, as has been shewn already; and therefore nothing can be inferred from hence with respect to baptism.

4. The root or stock from whence the unbelieving Jews were cut off, and into which the believing Gentiles are engrafted, is not the covenant of grace, from which those who are interested in it can never be cut off; but the gospel church-state, from which the unbelieving Jews were rejected and left out, and the believing Gentiles took in, who partook of all the privileges of it (Rom. 11:17-25): though no mention is made throughout the whole of the passage of the children of either; only of some being broken off through unbelief, and others standing by faith; and therefore can be of no service in the cause of infant-baptism.

The seventh argument is taken from "the extent of the covenant of grace being the same under the New Testament, as before the coming of Christ, who came not to curtail the covenant, and render worse the condition of infants; if they were in the covenant before, they are so now; no spiritual privilege given to children or others can be made void" (Rom. 11:29; Jer. 30:20). To which may be replied,

1. That the extent of the covenant, as to the constitution of it, and persons interested in it, is always the same, having neither more nor fewer; but with respect to the application of it, it extends to more persons at one time than at another; and is more extensive under the gospel-dispensation than before; it being applied to Gentiles as well as Jews: and with respect to the blessings and privileges of it, they are always the same, are never curtailed or made void, or taken away from those to whom they belong; which are all Christ's spiritual seed, and none else, be they Jews or Gentiles. But,

2. It should be proved that the infant-seed of believers, or their natural seed as such, were ever in the covenant of grace; or that any spiritual privileges were given to them as such; or it is impertinent to talk of curtailing the covenant, or taking away the privileges of the seed of believers.

3. If even their covenant-interest could be proved, which it cannot, that gives no right to any ordinance, or to a positive institution, without a divine direction; there were many who were interested in the covenant of grace, when circumcision was appointed, who yet had nothing to do with that ordinance.

4. baptism not being allowed to infants, does not make their condition worse than it was under the former dispensation; for as then circumcision could not save them, so neither would baptism, were it administered to them; nor was circumcision really a privilege, but the reverse; and therefore the abrogation of it, without substituting any thing in its room, does not make the condition of infants the worse; and certain it is, that the condition of the infants of believing Gentiles, even though baptism is denied them, is much better than that of the infants of Gentiles before the coming of Christ; yea, even of the infants of Jews themselves; since they are born of Christian parents, and so have a Christian education, and the opportunity and advantage of hearing the gospel preached, as they grow up, with greater clearness, and in every place[3] where they are. The text in Romans 11:29 regards not external privileges, but internal grace; that in Jeremiah 30:20 respects not infants, but the posterity of the Jews; adult persons in the latter day.

The eighth argument is taken from the everlastingness of the covenant of grace, and runs thus; "The example of *Abraham* and the Israelites in circumcising their children according to the command of God, should oblige us to baptize our children; because circumcision was then a real of the everlasting covenant, a covenant that was to last for ever, and not cease as the legal ceremonies; which God hath confirmed with an oath; and therefore can have suffered no alteration for the worse in any thing with respect to infants" (Gen. 7:17; Heb. 6:13, 18; Micah 7:18, 20; Gal. 3:8.) The answer to which is,

1. That the covenant of grace is everlasting, will never cease, nor admit of any alteration, is certain; but the covenant of circumcision, which is called an everlasting covenant, Genesis 17:7, was only to continue during the Mosaic dispensation, or unto the times of the Messiah; and is so called for

the same reason, and just in the same sense as the covenant of the priesthood with *Phinehas* is called, *the covenant of an everlasting Priesthood* (Num. 25:13). Though the covenant of grace is everlasting, and whatever is in that covenant, or ever was, will never be altered; yet it should be proved there is any thing in it with respect to infants, and particularly which lays any foundation for, or gives them any claim and right to baptism.

2. Though circumcision was a sign and token of the covenant made with Abraham, and his natural seed, it never was any real of the covenant of grace. And,

3. The example of *Abraham* and others, in circumcising their children according to the command of God, lays no obligation upon us to baptize ours, unless we had a command for their baptism, as they had for their circumcision.

The ninth argument is formed thus: "baptism is to be administered to the seed of believers, because it is certainly very dangerous and blameworthy, to neglect and despise a valuable privilege appointed by God from the beginning, to the offspring of his people."

But it must be denied, and should be proved, that baptism is a privilege appointed by God from the beginning, to the offspring of his people; let it be shewn, if it can, when and where it was appointed by him. This argument is illustrated and enforced by various observations; as that "that soul was to be cut off that neglected circumcision; and no just excuse can be given for neglecting infant-baptism, which is ordained to be the seal of the covenant instead of circumcision:" but we have seen already, that baptism does not come in the room of

circumcision, nor is it a real of the covenant of grace; and there is good reason to be given for the neglect of infant-baptism, because it never was ordained and appointed of God. Moreover it is said, "that the seed of believers were formerly, under the Old Testament, in the covenant together with their parents; and no one is able to shew that they have been cast out under the New, or that their condition is worse, and their spiritual privileges less, under the gospel, than under the law:" but that believers with their natural seed as such, were together in the covenant of grace under the Old Testament, mould not be barely affirmed, but proved, before we are put upon to shew that they are cast out under the New; though this writer himself, before in the *sixth* argument, talks of the Jews and their children being cut off from the real and dispensation of the covenant; which can never be true of the covenant of grace; nor do we think that the condition of infants is worse, or their privileges less now, than they were before, though baptism is denied them, as has been observed already. It is further urged, that "it is not to be imagined, without presumption, that Christ ever intended to "cut them off from an ordinance, which God had given them a right unto;" nor do we imagine any such thing; nor can it be proved that God ever gave the ordinance of baptism to them. As for what this writer further observes, that had Christ took away circumcision, without ordaining baptism in the room of it, for the children of believers; the Jews would have cried out against it as an excommunication of their children; and would have been a greater objection against him than any other; and would now be a hindrance of their conversion; and who, if they were converted, would have baptism or circumcision to be a seal of the covenant with them and their children, it deserves no answer; since the clamors, outcries, and objections of the Jews, and their practice on their legal principles, would be no rule of direction to us, were they made and gave into, since they would be without reason and truth; for though Christ came not to destroy the moral law, but to

fulfill it (Matthew 5:17); yet he came to put an end to the ceremonial law, of which circumcision is a part, and did put an end to it[4]: the text in Jeremiah 30:20 respects the restoration of the Jews in the latter day, but not their old ecclesiastical polity, which shall not be established again, but their civil liberties and privileges.

The tenth argument stands thus: "Children are to be baptized under the covenant of grace, because all the covenants which God ever made with men were made not only with them, but also with their children;" and instances are given in *Adam, Noah, Abraham, Isaac* and *Jacob, Levi, Phinehas,* and *David.* The covenant of works was indeed made with Adam and his seed, in which covenant he was a federal head to his offspring; but the covenant of grace was not made with him and his seed, he was no federal head in that; nor is that made with all mankind, as it must, if it had been made with Adam and his seed: this is an instance against the argument, and shews that *all* the covenants that ever God made with men, were not made with them and their seed; for certainly the covenant of grace was made with Adam, and made known to him (Gen. 17:19-21), and yet not with his seed with him; nor can any instance be given of the covenant of grace being made with any man, and his natural seed. There was a covenant made with *Noah* and his posterity, securing them from a future deluge, but not a covenant of grace securing them from everlasting destruction; for then it must have been made with all mankind, since all are the posterity of *Noah;* and where then is the distinction of the seed of believers and of unbelievers? Besides *Ham,* one of *Noah's* immediate offspring, was not interested in the covenant of grace. As for the covenant made with Abraham, his son *Ishmael* was excluded from it"; and of *Isaac's* two sons one of them was rejected (Rom. 9:10-13) and all were not *Israel* that were of *Israel,* or of *Jacob,* verse 6. The covenant of the priesthood was indeed made with *Levi* and *Phinehas,* and their posterity; and though it is called an *everlasting* one, it is now made void; nor is there any other in its room with the ministers of the word and their posterity; and yet no outcry is made of the children of gospel-ministers being in a worse condition, and their privileges less than those of the priests and Levites: and as for *David,* the sad estate of his family, and the wicked behavior of most of his children, shew, that the covenant of grace was not made with him and his natural offspring; and whatever covenants those were that were made with there persons, they furnish out no argument proving the covenant of grace to be made with believers and their carnal seed, and still less any argument in favor of infant-baptism.[5]

The eleventh argument is: "The seed of believers ought to be baptized under the covenant of grace, otherwise they would be reckoned pagans, and the offspring of infidels and idolaters, to whom there is neither a promise nor any sign of hope; whereas the scripture makes a difference, calling them holy on account of their relation to the holy covenant, when either their father or mother believe (1 Cor. 7:14), *disciples* (Acts 15:10); reckoning them among them that *believe,* because of their relation to the household of faith (Matthew 18:6) styling them *the seed of the blessed,* and their offspring with them (Isa. 115:23); accounting them *for a generation to the Lord* (Ps. 22:30) as *David* says; who, verse 10 observes, that God was his God from his mother's belly; and also calling them the *children of God* (Ezek. 16:20, 21); therefore they ought to be dedicated to him by that ordinance which he has appointed for that purpose." To all which may be replied,

1. That the children of believers are by nature *children of wrath even as others;* and are no better than others; and were they baptized, they would not be at all the better Christians for it. Though,

2. It will be allowed that there is a difference between the offspring of believers, and those of infidels, pagans and idolaters; and the former have abundantly the advantage of the latter, as they have a Christian education; and consequently as they are brought up under the means of grace, there is hope of them; and it may be expected that the promise of God to such who use the means will be accomplished. But,

3. the characters mentioned either do not belong to children, or not for the reason given; and those that do, do not furnish out an argument for their baptism. Children are said to be *holy,* born in lawful wedlock (1 Cor. 7:14); not on account of their relation to the holy covenant, but on account of the holiness of a believing parent, which surely cannot be a federal holiness, but a matrimonial one; the marriage of a believer with an unbeliever being valid, or otherwise their children muff be *unclean* or illegitimate, and not holy or legitimate. The disciples in Acts 15:10 are not young *children,* but adult persons, the converted Gentiles, on whom the false teachers would have put the yoke of the ceremonial law, and particularly circumcision. The little ones reckoned among those that believe in Christ, Matthew 18:6 were not infants in age, but the apostles of our Lord, who were little in their own account, and in the account of others, whom to offend was criminal, highly provoking to Christ, and of dangerous consequence. The text, Isaiah 65:23, speaks of the spiritual seed of the church, and not the carnal seed of believers,[6] and therefore are the same who are *accounted to the Lord for a generation;* even a spiritual seed that shall serve him, Psalm 22:30 and the words in verse 10 are the words, not of *David,* but of Christ. And the sons and daughters born to God, and whom he calls his children, Ezekiel 16:20, 21 were so, not by grace or by covenant, but by creation. And from the whole there is not the least reason why the children of believers should be dedicated to God by baptism, which is an ordinance that never was appointed by him for any such purpose.

The twelfth argument is: "The seed of believers are to be baptized, because church-relation belongs to them, as citizenship belongs to the children of freemen; and it is by baptism that they are first admitted into the visible church, and there is neither covenant nor promise of salvation out of the church, for the church of Christ is his kingdom on earth, and Christ says this belongs to the children" (Mark 10:13, 14). In answer to which.

1. There is a manifest contradiction in the argument. Church-relation belongs to infants, that is, they are related to the church, and members of it, and therefore should be baptized; and yet they are first admitted into the church by baptism; what a contradiction this! in it, and out of it, related, and not related to it, at one and the time.

2. Church-membership does not pass from father to son, nor is it by birth, as citizenship, or the freedom of cities; the one is a civil, the other an ecclesiastical affair; the one is of nature, the other of grace; natural birth gives a right to the one, but the spiritual birth or regeneration only entitles to the other.

3. Church-membership gives no right to baptism, but rather baptism to church-membership, or however is a qualification requisite to it; persons ought to be baptized before they are church-members; and if they are church members, and not regenerate persons and believers in Christ, for such may be in a church, they have no right to baptism.

4. To talk of there being no covenant or promise of salvation out of the church, smells rank of popery. The covenant and promise of salvation are not made with and to persons as members of churches, or as in a visible church-state, but with and to the elect of God in Christ, and with persons only considered in him; who have an interest in the covenant and promise of salvation, though they may not be in a visible church-state; and doubtless many are saved who never were members of a visible church.

5. The kingdom of God, in Mark 10:13, 14 be it the church of Christ on earth, or eternal glory in heaven, only belongs to such persons who are like to little children for their meekness and humility, and freedom from malice and rancor, as verse 15 shows.

6. Could infants in age, or the seed of believers as such be here meant, and the kingdom of God be understood of Christ's visible church, and they as belonging to it, it would prove more than this writer chooses; namely, that they have a right to all church-privileges, and particularly and especially to the Lord's supper.

The thirteenth argument is: "Children are the lambs of Christ's flock and sheep; and the lambs ought not to be kept out of Christ's fold, nor hindered from the washing that is in his blood; he particularly promises to be their shepherd; and his Spirit has declared, that little children should be brought to him under the gospel, in the arms, and on the shoulders of their parents" (Isa. 40:11; 49:22; Song of Sol. 6:6; John 21:15). On which may be observed,

1. That there is indeed mention made of the lambs of Christ in Isaiah 40:11 and John 21:15 which he gathers in his arms, and ordered *Peter* to feed; yet not infants in age are intended in either place, but adult persons, weak believers, who, in comparison of others, because of their small degree of knowledge and strength, are called *lambs;* and are to be gently and tenderly dealt with; and such as these are not kept out of Christ's fold, but are received into it, though weak in the faith, but *not to doubtful disputations;* and are fed with knowledge and understanding, which infants in age are not capable of.

2. The infant-seed of believers are no where called the sheep of Christ, nor has he promised to be the shepherd of them; let the passages be directed to, if it can be, where this is said.

3. Those who are truly the lambs and sheep of Christ, am not hindered from the washing of his blood; though that is not to be done, nor is it done by baptism; persons may be washed with water, as *Simon Magus,* and yet not warned in the blood of Christ: Song of Solomon 6:6 does not intend washing in either sense; but either the regenerating grace of the spirit, or the purity of conversation, and respects not infants at all.

4. Nor is it declared by the Spirit of God, that parents should bring their children to Christ in their arms, and on their shoulders; the passage in Isaiah 49:22 brought in support of it, speaks of the spiritual seed of the church, and not of the carnal seed of believers; and of their being brought, not in the arms and on the shoulders of their natural parents, but of the Gentiles; and not to Christ, but to the church, through the ministry of the word in the latter day, in which the Gentiles would be very assisting.

The fourteenth argument runs thus: "The seed of the faithful ought to be baptized, because they were partakers of all the former baptisms mentioned in scripture, as the children of *Noah* in the ark (1 Pet. 3:20); the Israelites at the Red Sea, and in the cloud (1 Cor. 10:1, 2; Ex.12:37); Several children were baptized with the baptism of the Spirit, for several were filled with the holy Ghost from their mother's womb; all the children of *Bethlehem* under two years old, with the baptism of martyrdom (Matthew 2:1); and many children with *John's* baptism, since he baptized the whole country." But,

1. It unhappily falls out, for the cause of infant-baptism, that *Noah's* children in the ark were all adult and married persons (Gen. 7:7).

2. That there were children among the Israelites when they were *baptized in the cloud, and in the sea,* is not denied; but then it should be observed, that *they did all eat the same spiritual meat, and did all drink the same spiritual drink;* and therefore, if this does not give a sufficient claim to infants to partake of the Lord's supper, neither will the other prove their right to baptism: moreover, if any arguments can be formed from this and the former instance, for the administration of baptism under the New Testament, they will clearly shew, that it ought to be administered by immersion; for, as in the former, when the fountains of the great deep were broke up under them, and the windows of heaven were opened over them, they were as persons immersed in water; so when the waters of the Red Sea stood up on each side, and the cloud was over the Israelites, they were, as it were overwhelmed in water.

3. Though this writer says, that several children were filled with the holy Ghost from their mother's womb, yet we read but of one that was so, *John* the Baptist, a very extraordinary person, and extraordinarily qualified for extraordinary work, an instance not to be mentioned in ordinary cases; betides, it is a rule in logic, *a particulari ad univer-salem non valet consequentia,* "from a particular to an universal, the consequence is not conclusive." Moreover, in what sense *John* was filled with the holy Ghost so early, is not easy to say; and be it what it will, the same cannot be proved of the seed of believers in general; and could it, it would give no right to baptism, without a positive institution; it gave no right *to John* himself.

4. That the infants at *Bethlehem* were murdered, will be granted, but that they suffered martyrdom for Christ, will not easily be proved; since they knew nothing of the matter, and were not conscious on what account their lives were taken away.

5. That many or any children were baptized with *John's* baptism we deny, and call upon this writer to prove it, and even to give us one tingle instance of it; what he suggests is no evidence of it, as that the whole country in general were baptized by him, who could not be all childless; but I hope he does not think, that every individual person in the country of *Judea* was baptized by *John;* it is certain, that there were many even adult persons that were refused by him, and such as were baptized by him, were such as *confessed their sins,* which infants could not do (Matthew 3:5-7) and as to the probability of the displeasure of Jewish parents, suggested if their children had not been baptized by *John,* since they were used, and under a command of God, to bring their children to the covenant and ordinances of God (Gen. 17; Deut. 29:10, 13; Joel 2:16), it deserves no regard, since whatever probability there was of their displeasure, though I see none, there could be no just

ground for it; since in the instances given, they had the command of God for what they did, for this they had none.

The fifteenth argument is: "It is contrary to the apostle's practice, to leave any unbaptized in Christian families; for they baptized whole families when the heads of them believed; as the families of *Lydia,* the Jailor, and *Stephanas;* and it is evident, that the words, family and household, in scripture, mean chiefly children, sons, daughters, and little ones."[7]

To which I reply, that whatever there words signify in some places of scripture, though in the passages mentioned they do not chiefly intend new-born infants, but grown persons; it should be proved, that there were infants in families and households that were baptized, and that there were baptized together with the head of the family; for it is certain, there are many families and households that have no little children in them; and as for those that are instanced in, it is not probable that there were any in them; and it is manifest, that such as were baptized, were adult persons and believers in Christ. It is not evident in what station of life *Lydia* was, whether married or unmarried, and whether one had young children or not; and if one had, it is not likely they should be with her, when at a distance from her native place, and upon business; it is most probable, that those that were with her, called her household, were her servants, that assisted her in her business; and it is certain, that when the apostles entered her house, those that were there, and who doubtless are the same that were baptized, were called *brethren,* and such as were capable of being *comforted* (Acts 16:15, 40) and the Jailor's household were such as had the word of God spoken to them, and received it with joy, took pleasure in the company and conversation of the apostles, and believed in God together with him, and so were adult persons, believers, and very proper subjects of baptism (Acts 16:32-34). *Stephanas* is by some thought to be the same with the Jailor; but if he was another person, it is plain his household consisted of adult persons, men called by grace, and who were made use of in public work; they were *the first-fruits of Achaia,* and addicted themselves to the ministry of the saints.[8]

The sixteenth argument is: "None that truly fear God, can seriously and with certainty say, that there were not many infants among the three thousand baptized by the apostles at once; for the Jews were not content with any ordinances without having their children with them. The apostle directs those who were at age to repent, but he commands every one of them to be baptized, and objects nothing against their children; because, as he says, the promise was unto them and their children also; and this is a plain command for infant-baptism to all that will judge impartially." But,

1. A man that carefully reads the account of the baptism of the three thousand, having the fear of God before his eyes, may with the greatest seriousness and strongest assurance affirm, not only that there were not many infants, but that there were not one infant among the three thousand baptized by the apostles; for they were all of them such as *were pricked to the heart, and cried out, Men and brethren what shall we do? they gladly received the word of the gospel, joined to the church, and continued stedfastly in the apostles doctrine, in fellowship, and in breaking of bread and prayer;* all which cannot be said of infants.

2. What this author suggests, agreeable to what he elsewhere says, that the Jews were not pleased with any ordinance unless they had their children with them, is without foundation; what discontent did they ever shew at a part of their children being left out of the ordinance of circumcision, and no

other appointed for them in lieu of it? And had they been discontented, what argument can be formed from it?

3. The distinction between those that were of age, whom the apostle directed to repent, and the *every one of them* whom he commanded to be baptized, has no ground nor reason for it, yea is quite stupid and senseless; and even, according to this writer himself, is a distinction without any difference, since the *every one* to be baptized are supposed by him to have children, and so to be at age; since he adds, "and objects nothing against their children." And a clear case it is, that the self-same persons that were exhorted to be *baptized,* were exhorted to *repent,* and that as previous to their baptism; and therefore must be adult persons, for infants are not capable of repentance, and of giving evidence of it.

4. Those words, *the promise is unto you and to your children,* are so far from being a plain command for infant-baptism, that there is not a word of baptism in them, and much less of infant-baptism; nor do they regard intents, but the posterity of the Jews, who are often called *children,* though grown up, to whom the promise of the Messiah, and remission of sins by him, and the pouring out of the holy Ghost, was made; and are spoken for the encouragement of adult persons only, to repent and be baptized; and belong only to such as are called by grace, and to all truth, whether Jews or Gentiles.

The seventeenth argument is: "The seed of believers should be baptized, be-cause the privileges and blessings which are signified and sealed in baptism are necessary to their salvation, and there is no salvation without them; namely, an interest in the covenant of grace, the remission of original sin,. union with Christ, sanctification of the holy Spirit, and regeneration, without which none can be saved" (John 3:5). The answer to which is,

1. That the things indeed mentioned are necessary to salvation, and there can be none without them; but then baptism is not necessary to the enjoyment of these things, nor to salvation; a person may have an interest in these blessings, and be saved, though not baptized; there are things necessary to baptism, but baptism is not necessary to them; and indeed a person ought to have an interest in these, and appear to have one, before he is baptized. Wherefore,

2. There things are not signified in baptism, and much less sealed by it; other things, such as the sufferings, death, and the resurrection of Christ, are signified in it; there, as regeneration, etc. are prerequisites unto baptism, and are not communicated by it, or sealed up to persons in it, who may be baptized, and yet have no share and lot in this matter, witness the care of *Simon Magus.*

The eighteenth argument is: "The children of the faithful ought to be baptized, because this lays them under strong obligation to shun the works of Satan; and many have received much benefit from hence in their youth. Comfortable symptoms, or signs of a work of grace, have appeared very early in several, though perhaps bad company has afterwards corrupted them. Betides infant-baptism keeps up a general profession of faith and religion, and makes the word and means of grace of more virtue and efficacy, than if men had utterly renounced Christianity, and declared themselves infidels; and further, it says a powerful obligation on their parents and others, to teach them their duty, which is a main end of all the ordinances God has instituted" (Ps. 78:5, 6). But,

1. Is there nothing betides baptism, that can lay persons under strong obligation to shun the works of the Devil? certainty there are many things: if so, then it is not absolutely necessary on this account; besides, though the baptism of adult persons does lay them under obligation to walk in newness of life (Rom. 6:4), yet the baptism of infants can lay them under no such obligation as infants, and while they are such, because they are not conscious of it, nor can it take any such effect upon them.

2. What that much benefit or advantage is, that many have received from infant-baptism, I am at a loss to know, and even what is intended by this writer, unless it be what follows, that signs of a work of grace have appeared very early in several, which may be, and yet not to be ascribed to baptism; baptism has no such virtue and influence, as to produce a work of grace in the soul, or any signs of it; betides, a work of grace has appeared very early in several, and has been carried on in them, who have never been baptized at all.

3. Infant-baptism keeps up no public or general profession of faith or religion, since there is no profession of faith and religion made in it by the person baptized; nor is it of any avail to make the word and means of grace powerful and efficacious, which only become so by the Spirit and grace of God; and a wide difference there is between the diffuse of infant-baptism, and renouncing Christianity, and professing infidelity; these things are not necessarily connected together, nor do they go together; persons may deny and disuse infant-baptism, as it is well known many do, and yet not renounce the Christian faith, and declare themselves infidels.

4. Parents and others, without infant-baptism, are under strong obligations to teach children their duty to God and men, and therefore it is not necessary on that account.

The nineteenth argument is: "The seed of believers are to be baptized, though they have not actual faith, since Christ speaks not of there but of adult persons, Mark 16:16. And certain it is they have as much fitness for baptism as for justification and eternal life, without which they must all perish; the Spirit of God knows how to work this tithers in them, as well as in grown persons: *Jeremiah, John* the Baptist, and several others, were sanctified from their mother's womb" (John 3:8, 9; Eccl. 11:5; Luke 1:15, 44; Jer. 1:5; Isa. 44:3; Ps. 8:2). To which may be returned for answer,

1. That if the text in Mark 16:16 speaks not of infants, but of adult persons only, as it certainly does, I hope it will be allowed to be an instruction and direction for the baptism of adult believers, and to be a sufficient warrant for our practice.

2. If the infants of believers have no more fitness for baptism than they have for justification and eternal life, they have none at all, since they are by *nature children of wrath, even as others;* and therefore can have none, but what is given them by the Spirit and grace of God.

3. We dispute not the power of the Spirit of God, or what he is able to do by the operations of his grace upon the fouls of infants; we deny not but that he can and may work a work of grace upon their hearts, and clothe them with the righteousness of Christ, and so give them both a right and meetness for eternal life; but then this should appear previous to baptism; actual faith itself is not sufficient for baptism, without a profession of it; the man that has it ought to declare it to the satisfaction of the administrator, ere he admits him to the ordinance (Acts 8:36, 37).

4. Of the several children said to be sanctified from their mother's womb, no proof is given but of one, *John* the Baptist, who was filled with the holy Ghost from thence, which has been considered in the answer to the *fourteenth* argument; as for *Jeremiah,* it is only said of him that he *was sanctified,* that is, set apart, designed and ordained, in the purpose and counsel of God to be a prophet, before he was born; and is no proof of internal sanctification so early, Isaiah 44:3 speaks of the Spirit of God being poured down, not upon the carnal seed of believers, but upon the spiritual seed of the church; and Psalm 8:2. is a prophecy, not of new-born infants, but of children grown up, crying *Hosanna* in the temple (Matthew 21:15,16) no argument from a particular instance or two, were there more than there are, is of avail for the sanctification of infants in general; it should be proved, that all the infant-seed of believers are sanctified by the Spirit of God; for if some only, and not all, how shall it be known who they are? let it first appear that they are sanctified, and then it will be time enough to baptize them.

The twentieth argument is: "The children of believers are to be baptized, because their right to the covenant and church of God is established from the first, much clearer than several other necessary ordinances; there is no express command nor example of women receiving the Lord's supper; no particular command in the New Testament for family-worship, and for the observation of the first day of the week as a sabbath; and yet none dare call them in question; and there is no objection against infant-baptism, but the like might formerly have been made against circumcision; and may now be objected against many other ordinances and commands, of God." To which I reply,

1. That with respect to women, receiving the Lord's supper, it is certain, that not only they were admitted to baptism (Acts 8:12), and became members of churches (Acts 1:14, 15; 4:37; 5:9, 14; 1 Cor. 11:5, 6, 13; Acts 14:34, 35). but there is an express command for their receiving the Lord's supper in 1 Corinthians 11:29 where a word is used of the common gender, and includes both men and women; who are both on in Christ, and in a gospel church-state, and have a right to the same ordinances (Gal. 3:28).

2. As to family-worship, that is not peculiar to the New Testament-dispensation, as baptism is; it was common to the saints in all ages, and therefore needed no express command for it under the New; though what else but an express command for it is Ephesians 6:4? for can children be brought up in the nurture and admonition of the Lord, without family-worship?

3. As to the observation of the first day, though there is no express command for it, there are precedents of it; there are instances of keeping it (John 20:19, 26; Acts 20:7; 1 Cor. 16:1, 2): now, let like instances and examples of infant-baptism be produced if they can: though no express command can be pointed at, yet if any precedent or example of any one infant being baptized by *John,* or Christ, or his apostles, can be given, we should think ourselves obliged to follow it.

4. That the same objections might be made against circumcision formerly, as now against infant-baptism, is most notoriously false; it is objected, and that upon a good foundation, that there is neither precept nor precedent for infant-baptism in all the word of God; the same could never be objected against circumcision, since there was such an express command of it to *Abraham*, Genesis 17, and so many instances of it are in the sacred writings; let the same be shewn for infant-baptism, and we have done.

5. What the other ordinances and commands of God are, to which the same objections may be made as to infant-baptism, is not said, and therefore no reply can be made. I have nothing more to do, than to take some little notice of what this writer says, concerning the mode of administering the ordinance of baptism, page 33. We are no more fond of contentions and strifes about words, than this author, and those of the same way of thinking with himself can be; but surely, modestly to inquire into, and attempt to fix the true manner of administering an ordinance of Christ, according to the scriptures, and the instances of it; according to the signification of the words used to express it, and agreeable to the end and design of it; can never be looked upon as a piece of impertinence, or be traduced as cavil and wrangling. And,

1st, Since this writer observes, that he does not find that either the sacred scripture or the church of *England,* have expressly determined, whether baptism is to be performed by plunging or sprinkling, but have left the one and the other indifferently to our choice; I hope he will not be displeased, that we choose the former, as most agreeable to the sacred writings, and the examples of baptism in them; as those of our Lord and others in *Jordan* (Matthew 3:6, 16) and in *AEnon,* where *John* was baptizing, because there was much water (John 3:23) and of the Eunuch (Acts 8:36-38) and as best representing the death, burial, and resurrection of Christ (Rom. 6:4; Col. 2:12), as well as best suits with the primary sense of the Greek word, βαπτιζω, which signifies to plunge or dip. And,

2dly, Since, according to this writer, one mode is not more essential to the ordinance than another, but a *reverential* receiving of the sign; it may be asked, what of this nature, namely, a reverential receiving of the sign, the application of the water to the body, signifying the spiritual application of Christ and his gifts to the soul, can be observed in an infant when sprinkled, which is not conscious of what is done to it?

3dly, Whereas, he says, "it is not improbable but the apostles baptized by sprinkling, since several were baptized in their houses, Acts 9:17, 18 and Acts 16:33 and others, in former times, sick in their beds:" it may be replied, that it is not probable that the apostle *Paul* was baptized by sprinkling (Acts 9:17, 18) since had he, he would have had no occasion to have *arose* in order to be baptized, as he is said to do, Acts 9:18. It is most probable, that when he arose off of his bed or chair, he went to a bath in *Judas's* house; or out of the house, to a certain place fit for the administration of the ordinance by immersion; and since there was a pool in the prison, as *Grotius* thinks, where the Jailor washed the apostles' stripes, it is most probable, that here he and his household were baptized; or since they were brought out of the prison, and after baptism brought into the Jailor's house, verses 33, 34, it is most likely they went out to the river near the city *where prayer was wont to be made,* and there had the ordinance administered to them, verse 13. As for the baptism of sick persons in their beds, this was not in the times of the apostles, but in after-times, when corruptions had got into the church; and so deserves no regard.

4thly, In favor of sprinkling, or pouring water in baptism, he urges that "it is a sign of the pouring or sprinkling of the holy Ghost, and of the blood of Christ" (Ezek. 36:25; Heb. 12:24), but it should be observed, that baptism is not a sign or significative of the sprinkling of clean water, or the grace of the Spirit in regeneration, or of the blood of Christ on the conscience of a sinner, all which ought to precede baptism; but of the death, and burial, and resurrection of Christ; which cannot be represented in any other way than by covering a person in water, or an immersion of him.

5thly, "Water in baptism, he says, is but a sign and seal; a little of it is sufficient to signify the gifts which Christ has purchased, as a small quantity of bread and wine does in the other sacrament, and as a small seal is as much security as a larger one." But as baptism is no sign of the things before-mentioned, so it is no seal, as we have seen, of the covenant of grace; wherefore these similitudes are impertinent to illustrate this matter: and though a small quantity of bread and wine is sufficient in the other sacrament, to signify our partaking of the benefits of the death of Christ by faith; yet a small quantity of water is not sufficient to signify his sufferings and death, with his burial and resurrection, themselves. (*The Sermon is incomplete beyond this point . . . ed*.)

Antipaedobaptism;

or

INFANT-BAPTISM AN INNOVATION:

Being a Reply

To A Late Pamphlet, Entitled, PAEDOBAPTISM;

Or, A Defence of Infant-baptism, in point of Antiquity, etc.

A pamphlet being published some time ago by a nameless author, entitled, *The baptism of Infants a reasonable Service*, etc. I wrote an answer to it, chiefly relating to the antiquity of infant-baptism, called, *The argument from Apostolic tradition, in favor of Infant-baptism, etc. considered*; and of late another anonymous writer has started up in defense of the antiquity of it, from the exceptions made by me to it; for it seems it is not the same author, but another who has engaged in this controversy; but be he who he will, it does not greatly concern me to know; though methinks, if they judge they are embarked in a good cause, they should not be ashamed of it, or of their names, and of letting the world know who they are, and what share they have in the defense of it: but just as they please, it gives me no uneasiness; they are welcome to take what method they judge most agreeable, provided truth and righteousness are attended to.

In my answer, I observe that apostolic tradition at most and best is a very uncertain and precarious thing, not to be depended upon; of which I give an instance so early as the second century, which yet even then could not be settled; and that it is doubtful whether there is any such thing as apostolic tradition, not delivered in the sacred writings; and demand of the Gentleman, whole performance was before me, to give me one single instance of it; and if infant-baptism is of this kind, to name the apostle or apostles by whom it was delivered, and to whom, when, and where; to all which no answer is returned; only I observe a deep silence as to *undoubted apostolic tradition*, so much boasted of before.

The state of the controversy between us and the Paedobaptists, with respect to the antiquity of infant-baptism, lies here; and the question is, whether there is any evidence of its being practiced before the third century; or before the times of Tertullian. We allow it began in the third century, and was then practiced in the African churches, where we apprehend it was first moved; but deny there was any mention or practice of it before that age; and affirm that Tertullian is the first person known that spoke of it, and who speaks against it: I have therefore required of any of our learned Paedobaptists to produce a single passage out of any authentic writer before Tertullian, in which infant-baptism is expressly mentioned, or clearly hinted at, or plainly supposed, or manifestly referred to: if this is not done, the controversy must remain just in the same state where it was, and

infant-baptism carried not a moment higher that it was before; and whatever else is done below this date, is all to no purpose. How far this Gentleman, who has engaged in this controversy, has succeeded, is our next business to inquire.

The only Christian writers of the first century, any of whose writings are extant, are Barnabas, Clemens Romanus, Hermas, Polycarp, and Ignatius; nothing out of Barnabas, Polycarp, and Ignatius, in favor of infant-baptism, is pretended to. "The most ancient writer that we have (says this Gentleman, in the words of Mr. Bingham) is Clemens Romanus, who lived in the time of the apostles; and he, though he doth not directly mention infant-baptism, yet says a thing that by consequence proves it; for he makes infants liable to original sin, which is in effect to say that they have need of baptism to purge it away, etc." The passage or passages in Clemens, in which he lays this thing, are not produced; I suppose they are the same that are quoted by Dr Wall, in neither of which does he say any such thing; it is true, in the first of them he makes mention of a passage in Job 14:4. according to the Greek version, no man is *free from pollution, no not though his life is but of one day*; which might be brought indeed to prove original sin, but is not brought by Clemens for any such purpose, but as a self-accusation of Job; shewing, that though he had the character of a good man, yet he was not free from sin: and the other only speaks of men coming into the world as out of a grave and darkness, meaning out of their mother's womb; and seem, not to refer to any moral death and darkness men are under, or to the sinful state of men as they come into the world: but be it so, that in these passages Clemens does speak of original sin, what is this to infant-baptism, or the necessity of it? is there no other way to purge away original sin, but baptism? nay, is there any such virtue in baptism as to purge it away? there is not; it is the blood of Christ, and that only, that purges away sin, whether original or actual. Should it be said that this was the sense of the ancients in some after-ages, who did ascribe such a virtue to baptism, and did affirm it was necessary to be administered, and did administer it to infants for that purpose, what is this to Clemens? what, because some persons in some after-ages gave into this stupid notion, that baptism took away original sin, and was necessary to infants, and ought to be given them for that reason, does it follow that Clemens was of that mind? or is there the least hint of it in his letter? What though he held the doctrine of original sin, does it follow therefore that he was for infant-baptism? how many Antipaedobaptists are there who profess the same doctrine? will any man from hence conclude that they are for and in the practice of infant-baptism? It follows in the words of the same writer; "*Hermes pastor* (Hermas I suppose it should be) lived about the same time with Clemens; and hath several passages to shew the general necessity of water, that is, baptism, to save men:" the passages referred to are those Dr Wall has produced. Hermas had a vision of a tower built on *water*; inquiring the reason of it, he is told, it was "because your life is, and will be saved by water:" and in another place, "before any one receives the name of the Son of God, he is liable to death; but when he receives that seal, he is delivered from death, and is assigned to life; and that seal is water."

Now by *water* Hermas is supposed to mean baptism; but surely he could not mean real material water, or the proper ordinance of water-baptism, since he speaks of the patriarchs coming up through this water, and being sealed with this seal after they were dead, and so entering into the kingdom of God: but how disembodied spirits could be baptized in real water, is not easy to conceive; it must surely design something mystical; and what it is, I must leave to those who better understand these visionary things: but be it so, that baptism in water is meant, salvation by it may be understood in the same sense as the apostle Peter ascribes salvation to it, when he says, that *baptism saves by the resurrection of Christ from the dead*; that is, by directing the baptized person

to Christ for salvation, who was delivered for his offenses, and rose again for his justification; of which resurrection baptism by immersion is a lively emblem; and Hermas is only speaking of adult persons, and not of infants, or of their baptism, or of the necessity of it to their salvation: in another place indeed he speaks of some that were as infants without malice, and so more honorable than others; and, adds he, all infants, are honored with the Lord, and accounted of first of all; that is, all such infants as before described: but be it that infants in age are meant, they may be valued and loved by the Lord; he may shew mercy to them, choose, redeem, regenerate, and save them, and yet not order them to be baptized; nor has he ordered it: however Hermas has not a word about the baptism of them, and therefore these passages are impertinently referred to.

Now these are all the passages of the writers of the first century brought into this controversy; in which there is so far from being any express mention of infant-baptism, that it is not in the least hinted at, nor referred unto; nor is any thing of this kind pretended to, till we come to the middle of the next age; and yet our author upon the above passages concludes after this manner: "thus—we have traced up the *practice* of infant baptism to the time of the apostles;" when those writers give not the least hint of infant-baptism, or have any reference to it, or the practice of it. It is amazing what a *face* some men have!

Let us now proceed to the second century. The book of *Recognitions*, this writer seems to be at a loss where to place it, whether after or before Justin; however, Mr. Bingham tells him, "it is an ancient writing of the same age with Justin Martyr, mentioned by Origen in his *Philocalia*, and by some ascribed to Bardesanes Syrus, who lived about the middle of the second century." It is indeed mentioned by Origen, though not under that name, and is by him ascribed to Clemens, as it has been commonly done; and if so, might have been placed among the testimonies of the *first* century; but this Gentleman's author says it is ascribed by some to Bardesanes Syrus: it is true, there is inserted in it a fragment out of a dialogue of his concerning fate, against Abydas an astrologer; but then it should rather be concluded from hence, as Fabricius observes,[1] that the author of the Recognitions, is a later writer than Bardesanes: but be it so that it is him, who is this Bardesanes? an arch-heretic, one that first fell into the Valentinian heresy; and though he seemed afterwards to change his mind, he was not wholly free, as Eusebius says,[2] from his old heresy; and he became the author of a new sect, called after his name Bardesanists; who held that the devil was not a creature of God; that Christ did not assume human flesh; and that the body rises not.[3] The book of *Recognitions*, ascribed to him, is urged by the Papists, as Mr. James observes[4] to prove the power of exorcists, free-will, faith alone insufficient, the chrysm in baptism, and Peter's succession; though the better sort of writers among them are ashamed of it. Sixtus Senensis says[5] that "most things in it are uncertain, many fabulous, and some contrary to doctrines generally received." And Baronius[6] has these words concerning it: "Away with such monstrous lies and mad dotages, which are brought out of the said filthy ditch of the *Recognitions*, which go under the name of Clemens:" but all this is no matter, if infant-baptism can be proved out it; but how? "This author speaks of the necessity of baptism in the same stile as Justin Martyr did—was undeniably an assertor of the general necessity of baptism to salvation:" wherever this wretched tenet, this false notion of the absolute necessity of baptism to salvation is met with, the Paedobaptists presently smell out infant-baptism, one falsehood following upon another; and true it is, that one error leads on to another; and this false doctrine paved the way for infant-baptism; but then the mystery of iniquity worked by degrees; as soon as it was broached infant-baptism did not immediately commence: it does not follow, because that heretic asserted this notion, that therefore he was for or in the practice of

infant-baptism; besides this book, be the author of it who will, is not made mention of before the third century, if so soon; for the work referred to by Origen has another title, and was in another form; he calls it the *circuits of Peter*, an apocryphal, fabulous and romantic writing; and though the passage he quotes is in the Recognitions, which makes some learned men conclude it to be the same with that; yet so it might be, and not be the same with it. But I pass on to a more authentic and approved writer of the second century: Justin Martyr, who lived about the year 150; and the first passage produced from him is this:[7] "We bring them (namely, the new converts) to some place where there is water, and they are regenerated by the same way of regeneration by which we were regenerated; for they are washed with water in the name of God the Father and Lord of all things, and of our Savior Jesus Christ, and of the holy Spirit." In this passage, it is owned, "Justin is describing the manner of adult baptism only; having no occasion to descend to any farther particulars; nor is it alleged, it is said, as a proof of infant-baptism directly; but only to shew, that this ancient writer used the word *regeneration* so as to connote *baptism*—yet his words cannot be thought to exclude the baptism of infants in these days:" but if infant-baptism had been practiced in those days, it is not consistent with that sincerity and impartiality which Justin sets out with, when he proposed to give the Roman Emperor an account of Christian baptism, not to make any mention of that; for he introduces it thus: "We will declare after what manner, when we were renewed by Christ, we devoted ourselves unto God, lest omitting this we should seem to act a bad part (prevaricate or deal unfairly) in this declaration;" whereas it was not dealing fairly with the Emperor, and not giving him a full and fair account of the administration of the ordinance of baptism to all its proper subjects, if infants had used to be baptized; which he could easily have introduced the mention of, and one would think could not have omitted it: betides, as Dr. Gale[8] observes, he had an occasion to speak of it, and to descend to this particular, had it been used; since the Christians were charged with using their infants barbarously; which he might have removed, had this been the case, by observing the great regard they had to them in devoting them to God in baptism, and thereby initiating them into their religion, and providing for the salvation of their souls: but Justin is so far from saying any thing of this kind, that he leaves the Emperor and every body else to conclude that infants were not the subjects of baptism in this early age; for as the above writer observes, immediately follow such words as directly oppose infant-baptism; they are these: "And we have been taught by the apostles this reason for this thing; because we being ignorant of our first birth, were generated by necessity, etc. that we should not continue children of that necessity and ignorance, but of will (or choice) and knowledge; and should obtain forgiveness of the sins in which we have lived, by water:" so that in order to obtain these things by water or baptism, which Justin speaks of, there must be free choice and knowledge, which infants are not capable of: but it seems the main thing this passage is brought to prove, is, that the words *regenerated* and *regeneration* are used for *baptized* and *baptism*; and this agreeing with the words of Christ in John 3:5 shews that this construction of them then obtained, that baptism is necessary to salvation. Now, it should be observed, that the persons Justin speaks of are not represented by him as regenerated by baptism, because they are spoken of before as converted persons and believers; and it is as clear and plain that their baptism is distinguished from their regeneration, and is not the same thing; for Justin uses the former as an argument of the latter; which if the same, his sense must be, they were baptized because they were baptized; whereas his sense, consistent with himself, and the practice of the primitive churches, is; that there persons, when brought to the water, having made a profession of their regeneration, were owned and declared regenerated persons; as was manifest from their being admitted to the ordinance of water-baptism; and from hence it appears, that, then no such construction of John 3:5 obtained, that baptism is necessary to

salvation: and this now seems to be the passage referred to, in which Justin is said to speak of the necessity of baptism, in a stile the author of the *Recognitions* agreed with him in; but without any reason.

The next passage out of Justin is in his dialogue with Trypho the Jew; where he says that "concerning the influence and effect of Adam's sin upon mankind, which the ancient writers represent as the ground and reason of infant-baptism—" The words, as cited by Dr Wall, to whom our author refers us, are there: Justin, speaking of the birth, baptism, and crucifixion of Christ, says[9] "he did this for mankind, which by Adam was fallen under death, and under the guile of the serpent; beside the particular cause which each man had of sinning."

Now, allowing that this is spoken of original sin, as it seems to be, what is this to infant-baptism? I have already exposed the folly of arguing from persons holding the one, to the practice of the other. It is added by our author, "in the same book, he (Justin) speaks of baptism being to Christians in the room of circumcision, and so points out the analogy between those two initiatory rites." The passage referred to is this:[10] "We also who by him have had access to God, have not received this carnal circumcision, but the spiritual circumcision, which Enoch, and those like him, have observed; and we have received it by baptism by the mercy of God, because we were sinners; and it is enjoined to all persons to receive it the same way." Now let be observed, that this spiritual circumcision, whatever Justin means by it, can never design baptism; since the patriarch Enoch, and others like him, observed it: and since Christians are said to receive it by *baptism*, and therefore must be different from baptism itself: nor does Justin say any thing of the analogy between baptism and circumcision, or of the one being in the room of the other; but opposes the spiritual circumcision to carnal circumcision; and speaks not one word of infants, only of the duty of adult persons, as he supposes it to be. The last passage, and on which this Gentleman intends to dwell awhile, is this:[11] "Several persons (says Justin) among us of both sexes, of sixty and seventy years of age, οι εκ παιδων εμαθητευθη σαν τω Χρισω, "who were discipled to Christ in their childhood, etc." which I have observed should be rendered, "who from their childhood were instructed in Christ;" and which I have confirmed by several passages in Justin, in which he uses the word in the sense of instruction; and from whom can we better learn his meaning than from himself? all which this author takes no notice of; but puts me off with a passage out of Plutarch, where Antiphon the son of Sophilus, according to his version, is said to be *discipled* or *proselyted* to his father: I leave him to enjoy his own sense; for I do not understand it; and should have thought that μαθητευσαϖ δε τω πατρι, might have been rendered more intelligibly, as well as more truly, "instructed by his father;" since, as it follows, his father was an orator. He thinks he has catched me off of my guard, and that I suppose the word *disciple* includes baptism; because in my commentary on Acts 19:3 I say, "the apostle takes it for granted that they were *baptized*, since they were not only believers, but *disciples*;" but had he read on, or transcribed what follows, my sense would clearly appear; "such as not only believed with the heart, but had made a profession of their faith, and were followers of Christ:" nor is the sense of the word *disciple*, as including the idea of baptism, confirmed by Acts 14:21 where it is said, *when they had preached the gospel to that city*, κι μαθητευσαντες , "and taught many, or made them disciples;" which may be interpreted without tautology, and yet not include the idea of baptism; since the first word, *preached*, expresses the bare external ministry of the word; and the latter, *taught*, or made disciples, the influence and effect of it upon the minds of men; the former may be where the latter is not; and both, where baptism is not as yet administered. The reason why εκπαιδων must be rendered *in*, and not *from* their

childhood, because the baptism of any persons being not a continued, but one single transient act, to speak of their being baptized from their childhood would be improper, is merry indeed; when Justin is not speaking of the baptism of any person at all; but of their being trained up in the knowledge of Christ, and the Christian religion from their childhood, in which they had persevered to the years mentioned. Upon the whole, in all there passages of Justin quoted, there is no express mention of infant-baptism, nor any hint given of it, nor any reference unto it. Proceed we now to the next writer in this century, brought into this controversy:

Irenaeus; who lived towards the close of it, and wrote about the year 180; the only passage in him, and which has been the subject of debate a hundred years past, is this; speaking of Christ, he says,[12] "he came to save all, all I say, *qui per eum renascuntur in Deum*, "who by him are *born again* unto God;" infants, and little ones, and children, and young men, and old men." Now not to insist upon the works of Irenaeus we have being mostly a translation, and a very poor one, complained of by learned men; nor upon this chapter wherein this passage is, being reckoned spurious by others; which weaken the force of this testimony, and will have their weight with considering persons; I shall only take notice of the sense of the phrase, born again unto God; and the injury done to the character of Irenaeus, to make it signify baptism, or any thing else but the grace of regeneration. Our author begins his defense of this passage in favor of infant-baptism, with a remark of the learned Feuardentius, as he calls him; "that by the name of regeneration, according to the phrase of Christ: and his apostles, he (Irenaeus) understands *baptism*, clearly confirming the apostolical tradition concerning the baptism of infants." As for the learning of this monk, I cannot discern it, unless his lies and impudence against the reformers, which run through his notes, are to be so called. Whether our author is a junior or senior man, I know not; by his writing he seems to be the former, but the advice of *Rivet*, who was without doubt a man of learning, is good; only, says he,[13] "I would have the younger, that shall light on the works of Irenaeus advised, to beware of those editions, which that most impudent monk Feuardentius, a man of large assurance, and uncommon boldness, and of no faith nor faithfulness, has in many things foully corrupted and defiled with impious and lying annotations:" and a false gloss this of his is, which is quoted; for Christ and his apostles no where call baptism by the name of the new birth. I have observed, that as yet, that is, in Irenaeus' time, it had not obtained among the ancients, to use the words *regenerated* or *regeneration* for *baptized* or *baptism*; nor is this author able to prove it. The passage in Justin before-mentioned falls short of it, as has been shewn; and the passages in Tertullian and Clemens of Alexandria, concerning being born in water, and begotten of the womb of water, are too late; and beside, the one is to be interpreted of the grace of God compared to water; this is clearly Tertullian's sense; for he adds[14] "nor are we otherwise safe or saved, than by remaining in water;" which surely can never be understood literally of the water of baptism and as for Clemens,[15] he is speaking not of regeneration, but of the natural generation of man, as he comes out of his mother's womb, naked, and free from sin, as he supposes; and as such, converted persons ought to be.

To have recourse to heathens to ascertain the name of Christian baptism, is monstrous; though this, it is said, there is no need of, "since *several* Christian writers, who lived *with* or *before* Irenaeus, speak the same language, as will be seen hereafter:" and yet none are produced but Barnabas and Justin; the latter of which has been considered already, and found not to the purpose; and his reasoning upon the former is beyond my comprehension; for whatever may be said for the giving of milk and honey to persons just baptized, being a symbol of their being born again, it can be no proof of the words *regeneration* and *regenerated* being used for *baptism* and *baptized*; when there

words neither the one nor the other are mentioned by Barnabas; so that I have no reason to retract what I have said on that point. And now we are returned to Irenaeus himself; and two passages from him are produced in proof of the sense of the word contended for; and one is where he thus speaks[16] "and again giving the power of regeneration unto God to his disciples, he said unto them, *Go and teach all nations, baptizing them, etc*." By which power or commission is meant, not the commission of baptizing, but more plainly the commission of teaching the doctrine of regeneration by the Spirit of God, and the necessity of that to salvation, and in order to baptism; and which was the first and principal part of the apostles commission, as the order of the words shew; and it is molt reasonable to think, that he should so call the commission, not from its more remote and less principal part, but from the first and more principal one. The other passage is where Irenaeus mentions[17] by name "*the baptism of regeneration to God*:" but this rather proves the contrary, that baptism and regeneration are two different things, and not the same; just as the scriptural phrase, the *baptism of repentance*, and which seems to have led the ancients to such a way of speaking, means something different from repentance, and not the same: baptism is so called, because repentance is a prerequisite to it, in the subjects of it; and for the same reason it is called the *baptism of regeneration*, because regeneration is absolutely necessary in order to it: to all which I only add, that Irenaeus not only uses the word *regeneration* in a different sense from baptism elsewhere,[18] but most clearly uses it in another sense in this very passage; since he says, Christ came to save all who *by him* are born again unto God; who are regenerated by Christ, and not by baptism; and which is explained both before and after by his *sanctifying* all sorts of persons, infants, little ones, young men, and old men; which cannot be understood of his baptizing them, for he baptized none; and therefore they cannot be said to be regenerated by him in that sense: and I say again, to understand Irenaeus as speaking of baptism, is to make him speak what is absolutely false; that Christ came to save all and only such who are baptized unto God. It seems LeClerc is of the same sentiment with me, an author I am a stranger to; whom this writer lets pass without any reasoning against him, only with this chastisement; "he should have understood (being an *ecclesiastical historian*) the sentiments and language of the primitive fathers better;" but what their language and sentiments were, we have seen already; and let them be what they will, Irenaeus must express a downright falsehood, if he is to be understood in the sense contended for: on the one hand, it cannot be true that Christ came to save all that are baptized; no doubt but Judas was baptized, as well as the other apostles, and yet it will not be said Christ came to save him; Simon Magus was certainly baptized, and yet was in the *gall of bitterness, and bond of iniquity*, and by all the accounts of him continued so till death; there were many members of the church at Corinth, who doubtless were baptized, and yet were unworthy receivers of the Lord's supper, and eat and drank damnation to themselves, for which reason there were many weak, sickly, and asleep;[19] and it is to be feared, without any breach of charity, that this has been the case of thousands besides: and on the other hand, it cannot be with truth suggested, that Christ came to save only such as are baptized; he came to die for the transgressions that were under the First Testament, or to save persons under that dispensation, who never received Christian baptism; he said to one and to another, unbaptized persons, *thy sins are forgiven thee*; (Matthew 9:5; Luke 7:48) and no doubt there are many saved, and whom Christ came to save, who never were baptized in water; and the Paedobaptists themselves will stand a bad chance for salvation, if this was true; for they will find it a hard task to prove that any one of them, only sprinkled in infancy, was ever truly baptized; and yet as uncharitable as we are said to be, we have so much charity to believe that every good man among them, though unbaptized, shall be saved. And now since the words of Irenaeus taken in this sense contain a manifest falsehood, and they are capable of another sense, agreeable to truth,

without straining them; as that thrift: came to save all that are regenerated by himself, by his spirit and grace, we ought in a judgment of charity to believe that this latter sense is his, and not the former; and the rather, since his words in their proper and literal sense have this meaning; and since they are expressed with so much caution; lest it should be thought it was his meaning that Christ came to save *all* men, good and bad, he describes the patrons he came to save, not by their baptism, which is a precarious and uncertain evidence of salvation, but by their regeneration, which is a sure proof of it; and since this sense of his words is agreeable to his use of the phrase elsewhere, and to the context likewise, and is suited to all sorts of persons of every age here mentioned; and indeed to depart from this clear literal sense of his words, which establishes a well-known truth, and fix a figurative, improper one upon them, which makes him to say a notorious untruth, to serve an hypothesis, is *cruel* usage of the good old father, and is contrary to all the *rules* of *honor, justice, truth*, and *charity*. To put our Lord's words in Mark 16:16 upon a level with the false sense of Irenaeus, is mean and stupid; they need no qualifying sense; the meaning is plain and easy; that every baptized believer shall be saved, and leave no room to suggest that unbaptized believers shall not; but that every unbeliever, be he who he will, baptized or unbaptized, shall be damned. And now what a wretched cause must the cause of infant-baptism be, that requires such managing as this to maintain it? what a wretched cause is it, that at its first setting out, according to the account of the advocates of it; for Dr Wall says,[20] "this is the first express mention that we have met with of infants "baptized?" I say again, what a wretched cause must this be, that is connected with lies and falsehood at its first appearance, as pleaded for; is established upon downright injustice to a good man's character, and supported by real injury to it? and yet notwithstanding all this, our author has the *front* to say, "so much then for the testimony, the *plain, unexceptionable* testimony, of Irenaeus, for the practice of infant-baptism."

And now we are come to the close of the second century; but before we pass to the next, we must stop a little, and consider a passage our author, after Dr. Wall, has produced out of Clemens of Alexandria, who lived at the latter end of this century, about the year 190; and it is this: speaking of rings worn on the fingers, and the seals upon them, advises against every thing idolatrous and lascivious, and to what is innocent and useful; "let our seals," says he,[21] "be a dove, or a fish, or a ship running with the wind, or a musical harp—or a mariner's anchor,—and if any one is a fisherman, Αποσολου μεμνησεται κι ταν εξ υδατοϖ ανασπωμενων παιδιων, let him remember the apostle, and the children drawn out of the water."

This passage was sent by two Gentlemen from different places to Dr Wall, after he had published two editions of his history; and he seems to have been ashamed of himself for not having observed it, and fancies that this refers to the baptizing of a child, and the taking, drawing, and lifting it out of the water. Now, though I do not pretend to support my conjecture by any manuscript or printed copy, nor do I think it worth while to search and inquire after it, whether there is any various reading or no, but shall leave it to others who have more leisure and opportunity; yet I persuade myself my conjecture will not be condemned as a groundless one by any man of sense and learning, especially out of this controversy: my conjecture then is, that it should be read not παιδιων, "children," but ιχθυων, "fishes;" for who ever heard of a *draught of children*; when a *draught of fishes* is common? and why should a fisherman, more than any other, remember an apostle and a draught of children? surely a draught of fishes is more proper to him: the words I think therefore should be read, "let him remember the apostle, and the fishes drawn out of the water;" and the sense is, let him remember the apostle Peter, and the draught of fishes taken by him, recorded either in

Luke 5:6, 9 or in John 21:6, 8, 11; for the words manifestly refer to some particular and remarkable fact, which should be called to mind, and not to a thing that was done every day; which must be the case, if infant-baptism now obtained: besides, the word used cannot with any decency and propriety be applied to the baptizing of a child; a wide difference there is in the expression, between taking and lifting a child out of the font, and a drawing or dragging it out of the water; the word is expressive of strength and force necessary to an action (Luke 14:15; Acts 11:10), and well agrees with the drawing or dragging of a net full of fishes. However, if this instance is continued to be urged, I hope it will be allowed that baptism in those early times was performed by immersion; since these children are said to be drawn out of the water, and therefore must have been in it: moreover, let it be what it will that Clemens refers unto, it must be something that was not common to every man, but peculiar to a fisherman; as he afterwards says, a sword or a bow are not proper for those that pursue peace; nor cups for temperate persons; and I insist upon it, that it be said what that is which is peculiar to such a one, except it be that which I have suggested: and after all, he must have a warm brain, a heated imagination, and a mind prepossessed, that can believe that infant-baptism is here referred to. Upon the whole, it does not appear from any authentic writer of the second century, that there is any express mention of infant-baptism in it, nor any clear hint of it, or manifest reference to it; and therefore it must be an innovation in the church, whenever it afterwards took place. I proceed now to,

The third century, at the beginning of which Tertullian lived; who is the first person that ever gave any hint of infant-baptism, or referred unto it, or made express mention of it, that is known; and he argued against it, and that very strongly, from the more usual delay of the administration of it, according to every one's age, condition, and disposition; from the danger sureties might be brought into by engaging for infants; from the necessity of first knowing and understanding what they were about; from their innocent age, as it comparatively is, not being yet conscious of sin, standing in no need of the application of pardoning grace, which the ordinance of baptism leads adult believers to; from the propriety of their first asking for it; and from a different method being taken in worldly affairs: his words are these, and as they are translated by Dr. Wall himself; "therefore according to every one's condition and disposition, and also their age, the delaying of baptism is more profitable, especially in the case of little children; for what need is there that the godfathers should be brought into danger? because they may either fail of their promises by death, or they may be mistaken by a child's proving of a wicked disposition. Our Lord says indeed, *Do not forbid them to come to me*: therefore let them come when they are grown up: let them come when they understand: when they are instructed whither it is that they come: let them be made Christians when they can know Christ; what need their guiltless age make such haste to the forgiveness of sins? Men will proceed more warily in worldly things; and he that should not have earthly goods committed to him, yet shall have heavenly. Let them know how to desire this salvation, that you may appear to have given to one that asketh."[22]

It is observed by our author, after Dr Wall, that in the clause about sponsors, in the older editions, there words come in, *si non tam necesse*, which are rendered, *except in case of necessity*. But these *older editions* are but one Gagnaeus, whose reading is rejected by Rigaltius as a foolish repetition; censured by Grotius, as affording no tolerable sense;[23] received by Pamelius for no other reason that he gives, but because it softens the opinion of the author about the delaying of baptism to infants;[24] and it is for this reason it is catched at by the Paedobaptists; and yet they do not seem to be quite easy with it, because of the nonsense and impertinence of it; "*what need is there, except*

there is a need?" wherefore our author attempts an emendation, and proposes to read *tamen* for *tam*, which does not make it a whit the better, but rather increases the nonsense; "what need is there, except notwithstanding there is need?" but what is of more importance is, it is said, "these words of Tertullian seem fairly to imply that infant baptism was not only moved for, but actually practiced in his time:" to which I answer, that they neither do imply, nor *seem* to imply any such thing, at least not necessarily; for supposing the baptism of infants moved for, and sureties promised to be engaged for them, which seems likely to be the case as soon as mentioned, the better to get it received; Tertullian might say all that he does, though as yet not one infant had ever been baptized, or any sureties made use of: and indeed it would have been very strange, if nothing of this kind had been said previous to the observance of them; the bare motion of these things was sufficient to bring our the arguments against them: and what though Tertullian might have some odd notions and singular opinions, about which he talked wrong and weakly, does it follow that therefore he so did about these points? Nor is there any reason to interpret his words of the infants of infidels, since he makes no distinction in the passage, nor gives the least hint of any; and what he elsewhere says of the children of believers being holy, he explains of their being *designed for holiness*;[25] and says men are not *born*, but *made* Christians:[26] nor does he any where allow of the baptism of infants, in case of necessity, which is only established upon that impertinent reading before-mentioned: and with respect to his notion of the necessity of baptism to salvation, it is sufficient to observe what he says; "if any understand the importance of baptism, they will rather fear the having it, than the delaying it: true faith is secure of salvation."[27] And the reason why he does not produce infant-baptism among his unwritten customs, is very easy to observe, because as yet no such custom had obtained, and as yet the apostolical tradition of it had never been heard of: the first that speaks of that, if he does at all, is the following person;

Origen, who flourished about the year 230, and comes next under consideration: and three passages are usually cited out of him in favor of infant-baptism; shewing not only that infants should be baptized; but that this was an ancient usage of the church, and a tradition of the apostles. Now there things are only to be met with in the Latin translations of this ancient writer; and though there is much of his still extant in Greek, yet in these his genuine works there is not the least hint of infant-baptism, nor any reference to it; and much less any express mention of it; and still less any thing did of it, being a custom of the church, and an apostolical tradition: This has justly raised a suspicion, that he has not been fairly used

in the translations of him by Ruffinus and Jerome: and upon inquiry, this is found to be the truth of the matter; and it is not only Erasmus, whom Dr. Wall is pleased to represent as angrily saying, that a reader is uncertain whether he reads Origen or Ruffinus; for Scutetus[28] says the same thing; and it is the observation of many others, that it was the common custom of Ruffinus to interpolate whatever he translated. The learned Huctius, who has given us a good edition of all Origen's commentaries of the scripture in Greek, and who was as conversant with his writings, and understood them as well as any man whatever, was very sensible of the foul play he has met with, and often complains of the perfidy and impudence of Ruffinus; he says of him, that whatever he undertook to translate, he interpolated; that he so distressed and corrupted the writings of Origen by additions and detractions, that one is at a loss to find Origen in Origen: that whereas he undertook to translate his commentary on the Romans, at the instance of Heraclius, yet he asks, with what faithfulness did he do it? namely, with his own, that is, which is the worst; and when Huetius produces any thing out of there translations, it is always with diffidence, as not to be depended

upon and sometimes he adds when he has done, "but let us remember again the perfidy of Ruffinus;" and speaking particularly of his commentaries on the Romans, he says; "Let the learned reader remember that Origen is not so much to be thought the author of them, as Ruffinus, by whom they are not so much interpreted, as *new coined* and *interpolated*."[29]

But what need I produce these testimonies? Ruffinus himself owns, not only that he used great freedom in translating the homilies on Leviticus, and added much of his own to them, as I have observed; but also in his translation of the commentary on the Romans, he grants the charge against him, "that he added some things, supplied what was wanting, and shortened what were too long;"[30] and it is from there two pieces that the two principal passages which assert infant-baptism to be the custom of the church, and an apostolical tradition, are taken: and now of what use is this Gentleman's quotation from Marshall? it is good for nothing. The other passage, which stands in Jerome's translation of Origen's homilies on Luke, speaks indeed of the baptism of infants, and the necessity of it; but not a word of its being a custom of the church, and an apostolical tradition, as in the other; and betide, his translations being no more exact than Ruffinus', and which appears by his other versions; in which he takes the same liberty as Ruffinus did, are no more to be depended upon than his. And now, where is his highest *probability* and *moral certainty*, that there are no additions and interpolations in Origen? I appeal to the whole world, whether such fort of writings as there, so manifestly corrupted, so confessedly interpolated, would be admitted an evidence in any civil affair in any court of judicature whatever; and if not, then surely these ought not to be admitted as an evidence in religious affairs, respecting an ordinance of our Lord Jesus Christ. But it is said, "supposing all this, what does it signify in the present case, unless it could be proved that the particular passages under consideration were additions or interpolations?"

To which I answer; since the whole is so *interpolated*, and so deformed, that it can scarcely be known, as has been observed, what dependence can there be on any part of it? I have observed, that the passage in the homilies on Leviticus, is by Vossius thought to be of the greater authority against the Pelagians, because of the interpolations of Ruffinus. This Gentleman says, I have *unluckily* observed this; I do not see any *unluckiness* in it; it is *lucky* on my side, that Vossius, a Paedobaptist, should suggest that this passage is interpolated, however unlucky Ruffinus was in doing it; and it is no. unusual thing for a writer to infect that in his works, which makes or may be improved against himself: beside, what makes these very passages suspected of interpolation, is, not only that no contemporary of Origen's, nor any writer before him, nor any after him, till the times of Ruffius and Jerome, ever speak of infant-baptism as a custom of the church, or an apostolic tradition; but neither Cyprian who came after him, and pleaded for infant-baptism, ever refers to Origen as saying these things, or uses such language as he is said to do; nor does Austin, who made such a bluster about infant-baptism being an apostolical tradition, ever appeal to Origen's testimony of it; which one would think he would have done, had there been any such testimony: our author, because I have said that many things may be observed from the Greek of Origen in favor of adult-baptism, hectors most manfully; "the assertion, he says, is either *false*, or very *impertinent*;" but surely he must be a little too premature to pass such a censure before the things are produced. I greatly question whether he has ever read the writings of Origen, either the Latin translations of him, or his works in Greek; and indeed there are scarce any of his quotations of the fathers throughout his whole work, but what seem to be taken at second hand from Dr Wall, or others: I say more than I should have chose to have said, through his insulting language. I am quite content he should have all the credit his performance will admit of; only such a writer, who knows his own

weakness, ought not to be so *pert* and *insolent*: however, to stop the mouth of this *swaggering blade*, whoever he is, I will give him an instance or two out of the Greek of Origen, in favor of adult-baptism, to the exclusion of infant-baptism, and as manifestly against it. Now, not to take notice of Origen's[31] interpretation of Matthew 19:14 as not of infants literally, but metaphorically; which, according to his sense, destroys the argument of the Paedobaptists from thence, in favor of infant-baptism: "It is to be observed, says Origen, that the four evangelists saying that John confessed he came to baptize in water, only Matthew adds *unto repentance*; teaching, that he has the profit of baptism who "is baptized of his own will and choice:"

Now if the profit of baptism is tied to "a person baptized of his own will and choice,' according to Origen, then baptism mutt: be unprofitable and insignificant to infants, because they are not baptized of their own will and choice: and a little after he says; "The laver by the water is a symbol of the purification of the soul washed from all the filth of wickedness; nevertheless also of itself it is the beginning and fountain of divine gifts, because of the power of the invocation of the adorable Trinity, "to him that gives up himself to God;"[32] which last clause excludes infants, since they do not and cannot give up themselves to God in that ordinance. Let this Gentleman, if he can, produce any thing out of those writings of Origen, in favor of infant-baptism; the passage Dr. Wall[33] refers to has not a syllable of it, nor any reference to it; and though he supposes Jerome must some where or other have read it in his writings, what Jerome says[34] supposes no such thing; since the passage only speaks of Origen's opinion of sins in a pre-existent state, being forgiven in baptism, but not a word of the baptism of infants, or of their sins being forgiven them in their baptism: and now where is the clear testimony of the great Origen, not only for the practice of infant-baptism in his own days, but for the continual use of it all along from the time of the apostles? and where is our author's vaunt of the superior antiquity of infant-baptism to infant-communion? which, as we shall see presently, began together.

Cyprian is the next, and the only remaining writer of this century, quoted in favor of infant-baptism; who lived about the middle of it, and is the first pleader for it that we know of. We allow it was practiced in his time in the African churches, where it was first moved; and at the same time infant-communion was practiced also, of which we have undoubted and incontestable evidence; and it is but reasonable that if infants have a right to one ordinance, they should be admitted to the other; and if antiquity is of any weight in the matter, it is as early for the one as for the other: but though infant-baptism now began to be practiced, it appears to be a novel business; not only the time of its administration, being undetermined; which made Fidus, a country bishop, who had a doubt about administering it before the eighth day, apply to the council under Cyprian for the resolution of it; but the exceeding weakness of the arguments then made use of for baptizing new-born infants, of which the present Paedobaptists must be ashamed, shew that Paedobaptism was then in its *infant-state*: the arguments used by Cyprian, and his brethren for it, were taken from the grace of God being given to all men; and from the equality of the gift to all; and this proved from the spiritual equality of the bodies of infants and adult persons; and both from the prophet Elisha's stretching himself on the Shunamite's child; they argue the admission of all to baptism from the words of Peter, who says he was shewn, that *nothing is to be called common or unclean*; and reason, that infants ought to be more easily admitted than grown persons, because they have less guilt; and their weeping and crying are to be interpreted praying; yea, they suggest that baptism gives grace, and that a person is lost without it: but that it may appear I do not wrong them, I will transcribe their own words; and that as they are translated by Dr. Wall, so far as they relate to this

matter: "All of us judged that the grace and mercy of God is to be denied to no person that is born; for whereas our Lord in his gospel says, *the Son of Man came not to destroy men's souls*, (or lives) but to save them; as far as lies in us, no soul, if possible, is to be lost. The scripture gives us to understand the equality of the divine gift on all, whether infants or grown persons: Elisha, in his prayer to God, stretched himself on the infant-son of the Shunamite woman, that lay dead, in such manner, that his head, and face, and limbs, and feet, were applied to the head, face, limbs, and feet of the child; which, if it he understood according to the quality of our body and nature, the infant would not hold measure with that grown man, nor his limbs fit to reach to his great ones; but in that place a spiritual equality, and such as is in the esteem of God, is intimated to us by which persons that are once made by God are alike and equal; and our growth of body by age, makes a difference in the sense of the world, but not of God; unless you will think that the grace itself which is given to baptized persons, is greater or less according to the age of those that receive it; whereas the holy Spirit is given, not by different measures, but with a fatherly affection and kindness, equal to all; for God, as he accepts no one person, so not his age; but with a just equality shews himself a Father to all, for their obtaining the heavenly grace—so that we judge that no person is to be hindered from the obtaining the grace by the law that is now appointed; and that the spiritual circumcision ought not to be restrained by the circumcision that was according to the flesh; but that all are to be admitted to the grace of Christ; since Peter, speaking in the *Acts of the Apostles*, says, *the Lord has shewn me, that no person is to be called common or unclean*. If any thing could be an obstacle to persons against their obtaining the grace, the adult, and grown, and elder men, would be rather hindered by their more grievous sins. If then the graceless offender, and those that have grievously sinned against God before, have, when they afterwards come to believe, forgiveness of their sins; and no person is kept off from baptism and the grace; how much less reason is there to refuse an infant, who, being newly born, has no sin, save the being descended from Adam according to the flesh: he has from his very birth contracted the contagion of the death anciently threatened; who comes, for this reason, more easily to receive forgiveness of sins, because they are not his own, but others sins that are forgiven him. This therefore, dear brother, was our opinion in the assembly, that it is not for us to hinder any man from baptism and the grace of God, who is merciful and kind and affectionate to all; which rule, as it holds for all, so we think it more especially to be observed in reference to infants, and persons newly born; to whom our help, and the divine mercy, is rather to be granted; because by their weeping and wailing, at their first entrance into the world, they do intimate nothing so much as that they implore compassion."[35]

Every one that compares what Cyprian and his colleagues say for infant-baptism, and what Tertullian says against it, as before related, will easily see a difference between them, between Tertullian the Antipaedobaptist, and Cyprian the Paedobaptist; how manly and nervous the one! how mean and weak the other! no doubt, as is known, being railed about infant-baptism at this time, or any objection made to it, does not prove it then to be an ancient custom; since the same observation, which may be made, would prove infant-communion to he equally the same. Now as we allow that henceforward infant-baptism was practiced in the African churches, and prevailed in,

The fourth century, here the controversy might stop: and indeed all that we contend for in this century, is only that there were some persons that did call it in question and oppose it; and if this will not be allowed, we are not very anxious about it, and shall not think it worth while to contest it. This writer would have it observed, that I have given up the greatest lights of the church in this century as vouchers for infant-baptism, and particularly St Jerom, Ruffinus, and Augustin; they are

welcome to them; they have need of them to enlighten them in this dark affair: we do not envy their having them, especially that persidious interpolater Ruffinus; nor that arch-heretic Pelagius, whom this Gentleman takes much pains to retain, as ignorant as he either was, or would be, or is thought to be; as that he never heard that any one whatever denied baptism to infants, and promised the kingdom of heaven without the redemption of Christ, or refused that unto them. This ignorance of his was either affected or pretended, in order to clear himself from the charge of those things against him; as men generally do run into high strains and extravagant expressions, when they are at such work; or it was real ignorance, and who can help that? It does not follow that therefore none had, because he had never heard of it; one would think his meaning rather was, that he had never heard of any that denied the kingdom of heaven and the common redemption to infants, who *think* they ought to be baptized, *dum putat*, while he is of opinion, that in baptism they are regenerated in Christ; but about this I shall not contend; truth does not depend upon his hearing and knowledge, judgment and observation. I think it is not insisted upon that Austin should say, he never heard or read of any catholic, heretic, or schismatic, that denied infant-baptism; however, it seems he *could* say it if he did not, and that notwithstanding the reasons I alledged; as,

1. Austin must know that Tertullian had opposed it. Here our author quibbles about the terms *opposing* and *denying*, and distinguishes between them; and observes, that whatever Tertullian said *against* it, he did not properly deny it. He may say the same of me, or any other writer against infant-baptism, that though we speak against it, contradict and oppose it, and use arguments against it, yet we do not deny it. Dr Wall indeed thinks neither Austin nor Pelagius had seen Tertullian's book of baptism, or they could not have said what he thinks they did.

2. Austin presided at the council of Carthage, when a canon was made that anathematized those who denied baptism to new-born infants; and therefore mull know there were some that denied it. This Gentleman says, it is demonstrably certain, that this canon was not made against persons that denied infant-baptism, because it was made against Pelagius and Celesius. It is true, the latter part of the canon was made against them; but the former part respected a notion or tenet of some other persons, who denied baptism to new-born infants. Dr Wall saw this, and says, this canon mentions the baptism of infants, condemning two errors about it; the one respecting the baptism of new-born infants; the other the doctrine of original sin, and the baptism of infants for forgiveness of sins, denied by the Pelagians; but the former he supposes was the opinion of Fidus, embraced by some persons now, which he had vented a hundred and fifty years before, that infants should not be baptized till they were eight days old; whereas Fidus is represented as having been alone in his opinion; and if he retained it, which is doubtful, it does not appear he had any followers; nor is there any evidence of there being any of his sentiment in this age;[36] and were there, it is unreasonable to imagine, that a council of all the bishops in Africa should agree to anathematize them, because they thought proper to defer the baptizing of infants a few days longer than they did; and besides, infants only eight days old may be properly called newly-born infants; and therefore such could not be said to deny baptism to them; and it would have been a marvelous thing, had they been anathematized for it: though this writer says, wonder who will; a council, consisting of all the bishops of Africa, did in fact agree to anathematize their own brethren, who were in the same opinion and practice of. infant-baptism with themselves." It is true, they did anathematize the Pelagians, who were in the same opinion and practice of infant-baptism with themselves in general; though I question whether they reckoned them *their own brethren*; but then not on account of any difference about the time of baptism, a few days odds between them, the thing to be wondered at;

but their denial of original sin, and the baptism of infants to be on account of that: and now since the Pelagians are distinct from those in the canon that denied baptism to new-born infants; and it is unreasonable to suppose any who were of the sentiments of Fidus are intended; it remains, that there must be some persons different both from the one and the other, who denied baptism to babes, and are by this canon anathematized for it, which Austin must know.

3. It is observed by me, that Austin himself makes mention of some that argued against it, from the unprofitableness of it to infants; since for the most part they die before they have any knowledge of it. These men our author does not know what to make of; sometimes it is questionable whether they were Christians, and suggests that they were men of atheistical principles; and then again they are supposed to be Christians, and even might be Paedobaptists, notwithstanding this their manner of arguing. I am content he should reckon them what he pleases; but one would think they could not be any good friends to infant-baptism, that questioned the profitableness of baptism to infants, and brought so strong an objection to it.

4. It is further observed by me, that according to Austin the Pelagians denied baptism to the infants of believers, because they were holy. This is represented by this Gentleman as a mistake of mine, understanding what was spoken *hypothetically*, to be *absolutely* spoken. I have looked over the passage again, and am not convinced upon a second reading of it, nor by what this writer has advanced, of a mistake: the words are absolutely expressed and reasoned upon; "but, says the apostle, your children would be unclean, but now they are holy; therefore, say they (the Pelagians) the children of believers ought not now to be baptized." The observation our author makes, though he does not insist upon it, is very impertinent; that not infants but children are mentioned, and so may include the adult children of believers, and consequently make as much against adult-baptism as infant-baptism; since children in the text, on which the argument is grounded, are always by themselves understood of infants. Austin wonders that the Pelagians should talk after this manner, that holiness is derived from parents, and reasons upon it, when they deny that sin is originally derived from Adam: it is true, indeed, he presses them with an argument this Gentleman calls *ad hominem*, taken from their shutting up the kingdom of God to unbaptized infants; for though they believed that unbaptized infants would not perish, but have everlasting life, yet not enter the kingdom of God; absurdly distinguishing between the *kingdom of God*, and *eternal life*. What they were able to answer, or did answer to this, it is not easy to say; "it is a disadvantage, as our author says, that we have none of their writings entire, only scraps and quotations from them:" Perhaps as they had a singular notion, that the infants of believers ought not to be baptized, though the infants of others should; they would, in answer to the above argument, say, that the infants of believers unbaptized enter the kingdom, though the unbaptized infants of others do not. I only guess this might be their answer, consistent with their principles: however, if I am mistaken in this matter, as I think I am not, it is in company with men of learning I am not ashamed to be among. The learned Daneus says[37] "the Pelagians deny that baptism is to be administered to the children of *believers*," having plainly in view this passage of Austin's; and the very learned Forbesius[38] brings in this as an objection to his sense of 1 Corinthians 7:14, "the Pelagians abused this saying of the apostle, that they might say, that the infants of believers ought not to be baptized, as we read in Augustin."[39]

5. The words quoted by me out of Jerome, I own, are spoken by way of supposition; but then they suppose a case that had been, was, and might be again; and it should be observed, that the supposition Jerome makes, is not a *neglect* of the baptism of infants, as this Gentleman suggests,

but a denial of it to them, a *refusing* to give it to them; which is expressive of a rejection of it, and of an opposition to it. So that from all there instances put together, we cannot but conclude that there were some persons that did oppose and reject infant-baptism in those times, and think it may be allowed, which is all we contend for; however, as I have said before, we are not very anxious about it. Mr. Marshall[140] a favorite writer of our author's, says, some in those times questioned it (infant-baptism) as Augustin grants in his sermons *de verbis Apostol*, but does not refer us to the particular place; it seems to be his fourteenth sermon on that subject, entitled, *Concerning the baptism of infants, against the Pelagians*; where Austin tells us how he was led to the subject; and though he had no doubt about it, "yet some men raised disputes, which were now become frequent, and endeavored to subvert the minds of many;"[141] by whom he seems to mean persons distinct from the Pelagians, since he represents them as having no doubt about it: and this is further confirmed by a passage out of the same discourse; "that infants are to be baptized, *let no one doubt* (which is an address to others, and implies, that either they did doubt of infant-baptism, or were in danger of it) since they doubt not, who in some respect contradict it;" which our author has placed as a motto in his title-page.

Austin, we allow, in this age, frequently speaks of infant-baptism as an ancient usage of the church, and as an apostolical tradition; but what proof does he give of it? what testimonies does he produce? does he produce any higher testimony than Cyprian? not one; who, it is owned, speaks of infant-baptism, but not as an apostolical tradition; Cyprian uses no such language: those phrases, which were understood and believed *from the beginning*, and what the church *always thought*, or anciently, held, are Austin's words, and not Cyrian's; and only express what Austin inferred and concluded from him: and betides, his testimony is appealed to, not so much for infant-baptism, the thing itself, as for the reason of it, original sin, which gave rise unto it in Cyprian's time: and it is for the proof of this, and not infant-baptism, that Austin himself refers to the *manifest faith of an apostle*; namely, to shew that not the flesh only, but the soul would be lost, and be brought into condemnation through the offense of Adam, if not quickened by the grace of Christ, for which he refers to Romans 5:18 and yet our author insinuates, that by this he did not consider the baptism of infants for original sin as a novel thing in Cyprian's time, but refers it to the authority of an apostle: and by the way, since Cyprian, the only witness produced by Austin, speaks not of infant-baptism as an ancient usage of the church, or an apostolic tradition, there is no agreement between his language and that of Origen, he is made to speak in his Latin translations, as this author elsewhere suggests; and it confirms the proof of his having been dealt unfairly with, since Cyprian, coming after him, uses no such language, nor does Austin himself ever refer unto him.

I have observed that there are many other things, which by Austin; and other ancient writers, are called apostolic traditions; such as infant-communion, the sign of the cross in baptism, the form of renouncing the devil and all his works, exorcism, trine immersion, the consecration of the water, anointing with oil in baptism, and giving a mixture of milk and honey to the baptized persons: and therefore if infant-baptism is received on this foot, these ought likewise; since there is as early and clear proof of them from antiquity, as of that: and my further view in mentioning these, was to observe, not only how *early*, but how *easily* these corruptions got into the church, as infant-baptism did.

This writer has thought fit to take notice only of one of these particulars, namely, infant-communion; and the evidence of this, he says, is not so full and so early as that of infant-baptism.

Now, let it. be observed, that there is no proof of infant-baptism being practiced before Cyprian's time; nor does Austin refer to any higher testimony than his for the practice of it for original sin; and in his time infant-communion was in use beyond all contradiction: there is an instance of it given by himself, which I have referred to; and that is more than is or can be given of infant-baptism, which can only be deduced by consequences from that instance, and from Cyprian and his colleagues reasoning about the necessity of the administration of it to new-born children, he suggests that Austin expresses himself differently, when he is speaking of the one and of the other as an apostolic tradition; but if he does, it is in higher strains of infant-communion; for thus begin the passages, "if they pay any regard to the *apostolic authority*, or rather to the *Lord and Master of the apostles*, etc. and no man that remembers that he is a Christian, and of the catholic faith, *denies* or *doubts* that infants, without eating his flesh, and drinking his blood, have no life in them, etc:"

The *Punici Christiani*, which Austin speaks of, are not to be restrained, as they are by our author, to the Christians of Carthage, but take in other African Christians, particularly at Hippo, where Austin was bishop, and where they spoke the Punic language, and in many other places: and surely if Austin is a good witness for an apostolical tradition, who lived at the latter end of the *fourth* century; he must know what was the sense of the African Christians in his time, among whom he lived, and upon what they grounded their practice of infant-communion; which he says was upon an ancient and apostolic tradition.

The other rites and usages, he says, I make mention of, are spoken of by Basil as *unwritten traditions*; and infant-baptism is not mentioned among them, and so was considered as standing upon a better evidence and testimony: now, not to observe that I produce earlier authorities than Basil, for there apostolical traditions so called, even as early as Tertullian, the first man that spoke of infant-baptism; neither are infant-communion, sponsors at baptism, exorcism in it, and giving milk and honey at that time, mentioned by Basil among them; does it therefore follow that they stand upon a better foot than the rest? besides, since Apostolic tradition is distinguished from Scripture, by the author of *The baptism of infants a reasonable Service*, with whom I had to do; it can be considered in the controversy between us, no other than as an *unwritten tradition*. This writer further observes, that it does not appear that there unwritten traditions were ever put to the test, and stood the trial, particularly in the Pelagian controversy, as infant-baptism: it is manifest that the exorcisms and exsufflations used in baptism, and the argument from them, as much pinched, puzzled, and confounded the Pelagians, as ever infant-baptism did: and it is notorious, that signing with the sign of the cross has stood the test in all ages, from the beginning of it, and is continued to this day; and prevails not only among the Papists, but among Protestant churches. Upon the whole then, it is clear there is no *express mention* of infant-baptism in the *two first* centuries, no nor any *plain hint* of it, nor any *manifest reference* to it; and that there is no evidence of its being practiced till the *third* century; and that it is owned, it prevailed in the *fourth*: and so rests the state of the controversy.

A REPLY TO

A DEFENSE OF THE DIVINE RIGHT OF INFANT BAPTISM,

By

Peter Clark, A.M. Minister at Salem

In A Letter To A Friend At Boston In New-England. To Which Are Added, Some Strictures On A Late Treatise, Called, A Fair And Rational Vindication Of The Right Of Infants To The Ordinance Of Baptism.

Written by David Bostwick, A.M.

Late Minister of the Presbyterian Church in the City of New-York

The Preface

It is necessary that the reader should be acquainted with the reason of the republication of the following treatise. In the year 1746, a pamphlet was printed at *Boston* in *New England*, called, "A brief Illustration and Confirmation of the Divine Right of Infant-baptism," written by Mr.. *Dickinson*; which being industriously spread about in great numbers, to hinder the growth of the Baptist-Interest in those parts, it was sent over to me by some of our friends there, requesting an answer to it; which I undertook, and published in the year 1749, entitled, "The Divine Right of Infant-baptism examined and disproved." Upon which *Peter Clark*, A.M. Minister at *Salem* in *New England*, was employed to write against it, and which he did; and what he wrote was printed and published at *Boston* in 1752, called, "A Defense of the Divine Right of Infant-baptism." This being sent over to me, I wrote a Reply, in a letter to a friend at *Boston*, in the year 1753, as the date of my letter shews, giving leave to make use of it, as might be thought fit; and which was printed and published at *Boston* in 1734, together with a Sermon of mine on Baptism preached at *Barbican*, 1750. The controversy lying beyond the seas, I chose it should continue there, and therefore never reprinted and republished my Reply here, though it has been solicited; but of late Mr. *Clark's* Defense has been sent over here, and published, and advertised to be sold; which is the only reason of my reprinting and republishing the following Reply; to which I have added some scriptures on a treatise of Mr. *Bostwick's* on the same subject, imported from *America*, with the above Defense, and here reprinted. The Paedobaptists are ever restless and uneasy, endeavoring to maintain and support, if possible, their unscriptural practice of Infant-baptism; though it is no other than a pillar of Popery; that by which antichrist has spread his baneful influence over many nations; is the basis of national churches, and worldly establishments; that which unites the church and the world, and keeps them together; nor can there be a full separation of the one from the other, nor a thorough

reformation in religion, until it is wholly removed: and though it has so long and largely obtained, and still does obtain; I believe with a firm and unshaken faith, that the time is hastening on, when Infant-baptism will be no more practiced in the world; when churches will be formed on the same plan they were in the times of the apostles; when gospel-doctrine and discipline will be restored to their primitive luster and purity; when the ordinances of baptism and the Lord's supper will be administered as they were first delivered, clear of all present corruption and superstition; all which will be accomplished, when *the Lord shall be king over all the earth*, *and there shall be one Lord*, *and his name one*.

A REPLY, ETC.

IN A LETTER TO A FRIEND.

SIR,

I Acknowledge the receipt of your Letter on the 22d of last *March*, and with it Mr. *Clark's Defense of the Divine Right of Infant-baptism*, etc. which I have since cursorily read over; for I thought it a too great waste of time to give it a second reading. Nor will my engagement in a work of greater importance permit me to write a set and labored answer to it; nor am I willing to bestow so much time and pains as are necessary to cleanse that Augean stable, and remove all the dirt and rubbish this writer has collected together. The remarks I made in reading, I here send you. At first setting out, I soon found I must expect to be dealt *rudely* and *roughly* with, and accordingly prepared myself for it; and I assure you, Sir, I was not disappointed.

The first chapter of my book, which the above Gentleman has undertook to answer, is short, and only an *introduction*, observing the author's title, method, and occasion of writing the pamphlet before me. In Mr. *Clark's* Reply to which I observe;

1. That he is displeased at calling the ordinance of baptism as truly and properly administered, Believer's-baptism, and the pretended administration of it, to infants, Infant-sprinkling; whereas this is calling things by their proper names: it is with great propriety, we call baptism as administered to believers, the proper subjects of it, Believer's-baptism; and with the same propriety we call that which is administered to infants, Infant-sprinkling; from the nature of the action performed, and the persons on whom it is performed. Does this Gentleman think, we shall be so complaisant to suit our language and way of speaking to his mistaken notion and practice? though indeed we too often do, through the common use of phrases which obtain.

2. He is unwilling to allow of any increase of the Baptist interest in *New England*, either at *Boston* or in the country; whereas I am credibly informed, and you, Sir, I believe, can attest the truth of it, that there have been considerable additions to the Baptist interest at *Boston*; and that many hundreds in the country have been baptized within a few years

3. He says, it is an egregious mistake, that the ministers of *New England* applied to Mr. *Dickinson* (the author of the pamphlet I wrote against) to write in favor of Infant-sprinkling; and he is certain that not one of the ministers in *Boston* made application to him, (which was never affirmed,) and is persuaded it was not at the motion of any ministers in *New England*, that he wrote his Dialogue, but of his own mere motion; and yet he is obliged to correct himself by a marginal note, and acknowledge that it was wrote through ministerial influence.

4. This writer very early gives a specimen of his talent at reasoning; from the rejection of Infant-baptism, as an human invention, he argues to the rejection of baptism itself, as such; that if Infant-baptism is entirely an human invention, and a rite not to be observed, then baptism itself is an human invention, and not to be observed: this is an argument drawn up *secundum artem*, like a master of arts; and to pretend to answer so strong an argument, and set aside such a masterly way of reasoning, would be weakness indeed!

5. It being observed of the Dialogue-writer, "that he took care, not to put such arguments and objections into the mouth of his antagonist as he was not able to answer;" this Gentleman rises up, and blusters at a great rate, and defies the most zealous, learned, and subtle of the Antipaedobaptists to produce any other arguments and objections against Infant-baptism, for matter or substance, different from, or of greater weight, than those produced in the Dialogue; but afterwards lowers his topsail, and says, that the design of the author of that pamphlet was to represent in a few plain words, the most material objections against Infant-baptism, with the proper answers to them; and at last owns, that a great deal more has been said by the Antipaedobaptists.

The *second* chapter, you know, Sir, treats of "the consequences of embracing Believer's-baptism; such as, renouncing Infant-baptism, vacating the covenant, and renouncing all other ordinances of the gospel;" that Christ must have forsaken his church for many ages, and not made good the promise of his presence, and that there now can be no baptism in the world. In Mr. *Clark's* Reply to what I have said on those heads, I observe the following things.

The first consequence is the renunciation of Infant-baptism; which consequence, to put him out of all doubt and pain, about my owning or not owning it, I readily allow, follows upon a person's being sprinkled in infancy, embracing adult-baptism by immersion; in which he is to be justified, the one being an invention of man's, the other according to the word of God; nor is there any thing this Gentleman has said, that proves such a renunciation to be an evil.

1. He is very wrong in supposing it must be my intention, that the age of a person, or the time of receiving baptism, are essential to the ordinance. The Antipaedobaptists do not confine this ordinance to any age, but admit old or young to it, if proper subjects; let a man be as old as *Methuselah*, if he has not faith in Christ, or cannot give a satisfactory account of it, he will not be admitted to this ordinance by reason of his age; on the other hand, if a little child is called by grace, and converted, and gives a reason of the hope that is in it, of which there have been instances; such will not be refused this ordinance of baptism. The essentials to the right administration of baptism, amongst other things, are, that it be performed by immersion, without which it cannot be baptism; and that it be administered upon a profession of faith; neither of which are to be found in Infant sprinkling.

2. It is in vain and to no purport in this writer to urge, that infants are capable of baptism; so are bells, and have been baptized by the Papists. But it is said, infants are capable of being cleansed by the blood of Christ; of being regenerated; of being entered into covenant, and of having the seal of it administered to them. And what of all this? are they capable of understanding the nature, design, and use of the ordinance, when administered to them? are they capable of professing faith in Christ, which is a pre-requisite to this ordinance? are they capable of answering a good conscience towards God in it? are they capable of submitting to it in obedience to the will of Christ, from a love to him, and with a view to his glory? they are not. But,

3. It seems, in baptism, infants are dedicated unto God; wherefore to renounce Infant baptism, is for a man to renounce his solemn dedication to God; and much is said to prove that parents have a Right to dedicate their children to him. It will be allowed, that parents have a right to devote or dedicate their children to the Lord; that is, to give them up to him in prayer; or to pray for them, as *Abraham* did for *Ishmael*, that they may *live in his light*; and it is their duty to *bring them up in the nurture and admonition of the Lord*; but they have no direction to baptize them, nor warrant to dedicate them by baptism; nor is baptism an ordinance of dedication, either of a man's self, or of others; a dedication ought to be previous to baptism; and Believers first give up themselves to the Lord, and then are baptized in his name.

4. After all, a renunciation of baptism in infancy must be a matter of great impiety, because witches are solicited by the Devil to renounce it, in order to their entering into confederacy with them. I thought, Sir, your country of *New-England* had been cured of these fooleries about witchcraft, and diabolical confederacies long ago, but I find the distemper continues. This argument, I own, is unanswerable by me; I must confess myself quite a stranger to this dark business.

5. What the story of Mr. *Whiston* is told for, is not easy to say; since it seems, he did not renounce his Infant-baptism: it looks, by the reference, as if it was intended to suggest, that an Antitrinitarian could not so well shelter himself among a people of any denomination, as the Baptists; whereas the ordinance as administered by them, as strongly militates against such a principle, as it does by being administered by Paedobaptists: but it may be, it is to recommend a spirit of moderation among us, to receive unbaptized persons into our communion by this example; but then unhappy for this writer, so it is, that the congregation Dr. *Foster* was pastor of, and Mr. *Whiston* joined himself to, is, and always was of the Paedobaptist denomination, and have for their present minister one of the Presbyterian persuasion. The *second* consequence of receiving the principle of adult-baptism, and acting up to it, is, vacating the covenant between God and the person baptized in infancy, into which he was brought by his baptism. Now you will observe, Sir,

1. That Mr. *Clark* has offered nothing in proof of infants being brought into covenant with God, by baptism; and indeed I cannot see how he can consistently with himself undertake it; since he makes covenant relation to God, the main ground of infants right to baptism; and therefore they must be in it before their baptism, and consequently are not brought into it by it; wherefore since they are not brought into covenant by it, that cannot be vacated by their renouncing of it.

2. It being observed, that no man can be brought into the covenant of grace by baptism, since it is from everlasting, and all interested in it were so early in covenant, and consequently previous to their baptism; this writer lets himself with all his might and main to oppose this sentiment, that the

covenant of grace was from everlasting; this, he says, is unscriptural, irrational, and contrary to scripture. But if Christ was set up from everlasting as mediator; for only as such could he be set up (Prov. 8:12); if there was a promise of eternal life made before the world began, and this promise was in Christ, who then existed as the federal head and representative of his people, in whom they were chosen so early, to receive all promises and grace for them (Titus 1:2; 2 Tim. 1:1); and if grace was given to them in him before the world was, and they were blessed with all spiritual blessings in him so early (2 Tim. 1:9; Eph. 1:3, 4); then, surely, there must be a covenant transaction between the Father and the Son on their account so early; for could there be all this and no covenant subsisting? The distinction between a covenant of redemption and a covenant of grace, is without any foundation in the word of God. Nor is this notion irrational; two parties were so early existing, when the covenant was made; *Jehovah the Father* was one, and *the Son of God* the other, in the name of his people; who, though they had not then a personal, yet had a representative being in Christ their head; and this was sufficient for them to have grace given them in him before the world was.

His metaphysical arguments from eternal acts being imminent, will equally militate against eternal election, as against an eternal covenant; and perhaps this writer has as little regard to the one, as he has to the other: nor is this notion contrary to scripture; for though the covenant is called a *new* and *second* covenant, yet only with respect to the former administration of it, under the legal dispensation; and both administrations of it, under the law and under the gospel, are only so many exhibitions and manifestations of the covenant under different forms, which was made in eternity. The scriptures which promise the *making* of a covenant, only intend a clearer manifestation and application of the covenant of grace to persons to whom it belongs; things are said in scripture to be *made*, when they are made manifest or declared (Acts 2:36): it is a previous interest in the covenant of grace that gives persons a right to the blessings of it; and the application of there blessings, such as pardon of sin, etc. flows from this previous interest: nor does this notion render the ministry of the word and the operation of the Spirit for that end useless, and superfluous; but on the contrary so early an interest in the covenant of grace is the ground and reason of the Spirit being sent down in time to make the word effectual to salvation. Nor is the state of unregeneracy, the elect of God are in by nature, inconsistent with this eternal covenant; since that covenant supposes it, and provides for, promises, and secures the regeneration and sanctification of all interested in it; assuring them that *the heart of stone shall be taken away*, *and an heart of flesh* given them; *a new heart and a new Spirit*, yea the Spirit of God shall be put into them, and the laws of God written in their minds.

The text in Ephesians 2:12. describes the Gentiles only, who were strangers from the covenants of promise; the covenant of circumcision, and the covenant at *Sinai*; covenants peculiar to the Jews; as well as strangers to the scriptures, which contain the promise of the Messiah; all which might be, and was, and yet be interested in the covenant of grace. If this is to be an Antinomian, I am quite content to be called one; such bug-bear names do not frighten me. It is not worth while to take notice of this man's Neonomian rant; of the terms and conditions of the covenant; of its being a rule of moral government over man in a flare of unregeneracy, brought hereby into a state of probation; which turns the covenant into a law, and is what the Neonomians call a *remedial* law, (as this writer calls the covenant a *remedial* one) a law of milder terms; nor of his Arminian strokes in making the endeavors and acts of men to be the turning point of their salvation, and conversion, as being foreign to the controversy, in hand.

3. This writer makes a distinction between a man's being in covenant in respect of the spiritual dispensation of the grace of it, and in respect of the external administration of it: by the spiritual dispensation of it, I apprehend, he means the application of spiritual blessings in the covenant to persons regenerated and converted, by which they must appear to be in it; and in this sense, all the persons, I have instanced in, must be manifestly in the covenant of grace, previous to baptism: and consequently not brought into it by it. By the external administration of it, I suppose, he means the administration of the ordinances of the gospel, particularly baptism; and then it is only saying a man is not baptized before he is baptized; which no body will contest with him.

4. No man, I observe, is entered into the covenant of grace by himself, or others; this is an act of the sovereign grace of God, who says, *I will be their God*, *and they shall be my people*; which this writer owns, though not exclusive of human endeavors; as if God could not take any into his covenant without their own endeavors; such wretched divinity deserves the utmost contempt. Since the above phrase, *I will be their God*, etc. is a proof of the sovereign grace of God in bringing men into covenant; he hopes it will be allowed that a like phrase, *I will be the God of thy seed*, will be admitted as strongly to conclude the reception of the Infant-children of believers into covenant. I answer, whenever it appears that there is such an article in the covenant of grace, that so runs, that God will be the God of the natural Seed of believers as such, it will be admitted; and whereas I have observed, that the phrase of *bringing into the bond of the covenant*, which the Paedobaptists often make use of, is but once mentioned in scripture, and then ascribed to God; this, as it no ways contradicts a being in covenant from everlasting, so it fails not of being a proof of the sovereign grace of God in that act. By the *bond of the covenant*, is not meant faith and repentance on man's part; which some stupidly call the terms and conditions of the covenant, when they are parts and blessings of it; but the everlasting love of God, which is the force and security of it, and which says men under obligation to serve their covenant-God; and to be brought into it, is to be brought into a comfortable view of interest in it, and to an open participation of the blessings of it; which is all according to, and consistent with the eternal constitution of it.

5. The covenant of grace can never be vacated, since it is everlasting, *ordered in all things and sure*: this is owned by our author in respect of its divine constitution, and of the immutability of the divine promise, to all under the spiritual dispensation of it; but there are others who are only in it by a visible and baptismal dedication; and these may make void the covenant between God and them; and this it seems is the case of the greatest part of infants in covenant. Now let me retort this Gentleman's argument upon himself, which he makes use of against the covenant being from everlasting. "Those, whom God admits into the covenant of grace, have an interest in the benefits of that covenant, pardon of sin, the gift of the Spirit, reconciliation, adoption, etc. for it is a sort of contradiction to say, that any man is admitted into the covenant, and yet debarred from an interest in all the privileges of it." Now, either infants are admitted into the covenant of grace, or they are not; if they are, then they have an interest in the benefits of it, pardon of sin, and the other blessings, and so shall all certainly be saved with an everlasting salvation, and not apostatize, as it seems the greatest part of them do; for to say they are in the external, but not in the spiritual part of the covenant, is to make a poor business of their covenant-interest indeed. The instance of *Simon Magus*, which he thinks I have forgot, will not make for him, nor against me; it is a clear proof, that a man is not brought into covenant by baptism; since though baptism was administered to this person in the pure, primitive way, by an apostolic man, yet he was *in the gall of bitterness and bond of iniquity*.

3dly, The other *three* consequences following upon the renouncing of Infant-baptism, as renouncing all other ordinances, the promise of Christ's presence not made good, and no baptism now in the world, are in some fort given up, and are allowed not to be clear, at least not alike clear; and are only adverted to in a general way, and some expressions of mine catched at, and remarked upon, and these mistaken or perverted.

1. I observe, this author repeats his former mistake, that we make age essential to baptism, which is but circumstantial; and then uses an argument from the lesser to the greater, as he thinks, that if a defect in such a circumstance nullifies the ordinance, then much more the want of proper administrators: but it is not age that we object to, but a want of understanding, and faith, and an incapacity to make a profession of it, as well as the mode of administration; things of greater importance in this ordinance; at least they are so with us. However, it is kind in this Gentleman to direct us how we may avoid this inconvenience his argument has thrown us into, by exercising a little more moderation and charity for Infant-baptism; and upon this foot he seems to be willing to compound the matter with us.

2. As to the presence of Christ with his church and ministers, it is sufficient to make that good, that he grants it where his Church is, and wheresoever he has a people, be they more, or fewer, and wheresoever his ordinances are administered according to his direction; but he has no where promised, that he will have a continued succession of visible congregated churches. Certain indeed it is, that he will have a number of chosen ones in all ages; that his invisible church, built on Christ the rock, shall not fail; and he will have a seed to serve him, or some particular persons, whom he will reserve to himself from a general corruption; but that there shall be gathered always into a visible gospel church-state, is no where promised; and for many hundreds of years it will be hard to find any one such church, unless the people in the valleys of *Piedmont* are allowed to be such.

3. This writer is not willing to admit such a supposition, that any of the laws and institutions of Christ have failed, ceased, or been annulled in any one age, and much more for several ages together; but, besides the ordinance of baptism, which through the change of mode and subjects, together with the impure mixtures of salt, oil, and spittle, and other superstitious rites, which became quite another thing than what was instituted by Christ, and practiced by his apostles; the ordinance of the Lord's-supper was so sadly perverted and corrupted, as to be a mere *mass* indeed of blasphemy and idolatry; in the communion of which the gracious presence of Christ cannot be thought to be enjoyed: and yet this continued some hundreds of years; only now and then some single persons rose up, and bore a testimony against it, who for a while had their followers.

4. He seems to triumph from Dr. *Wall's* account of things, that there never was, nor is, to this day, any *national church* in the world but Paedobaptists, either among the Greeks, or Roman Catholics, or the Reformed; and that Antipaedobaptism never obtained to be the established religion of any country in the world. We do not envy his boast; we know that national churches are good for nothing, as not being agreeable to the rule of the divine word; one small church or congregation, gathered out of the world by the grace of God, according to gospel-order, and whole principles and practices are agreeable to the word of God, is to be preferred before all the national churches in the world.

5. According to this Gentleman's own account of the English Antipaedobaptists, there could be none to administer the ordinance to them in their way; since those that came from *Holland*, it seems, gained no proselytes, but were soon extinct, being cruelly persecuted and destroyed; so that it was necessary they should send abroad for an administrator, or make use of an unbaptized one: but which way soever they took, they are able to justify their baptism on as good a foundation as the Reformers are able to justify theirs received from the Papists, with all the fooleries, corruptions, and superstitious rites attending it.

My *third* chapter, you will remember, Sir, is concerning *The Antiquity of Infant-baptism*, and the practice of the Waldenses.

I. The enquiry is, whether Infant-baptism constantly and universally obtained in the truly primitive church, which truly pure and primitive church must be the church in the times of Christ and his apostles; since towards the close of those times, and in the two following Ages, there arose such a see of impure men, both for principle and practice, under the Christian name, as never were known in the world: now by an induction of particular instances of churches in this period of time, it does not appear, that Infant-baptism at all obtained. In Mr. *Clark's* reply to which, I observe,

1. That he says, the evidence of Infant-baptism is not pretended to lie in the history of fact, or in any express mention of it in the New Testament. That the penman of the *Acts of the Apostles* did not descend to so minute a particular, as the baptizing of infants,—and that the baptism of the *adult* was of the greatest account to be recorded.

2. Yet he thinks there are pretty plain intimations of it in most of the characters instanced in, and particularly in the church at *Jerusalem*; which he endeavors to make good by a criticism on Acts 2:41. And it is pleasant to observe, how he toils and labors to find out an antecedent to a relative not expressed in the text; for the words, *to them*, are not in the original; it is only *and the same day there were added about three thousand souls*; or, the same day there was an addition of about three thousand souls; and all this pains is taken to support a whimsical notion, that this addition was made, not to the church, but to the new converts; and by a wild fancy he imagines, that infants are included among the three thousand souls that were added: his argument from verse 39. and the other instances mentioned, as well as some other passages alleged, such as Luke 18:16; Acts 15:10 and 1 Corinthians 7:14 as they come over in the debate again, are referred to their proper places. But,

3. It must not be forgotten, what is said, that this may be a reason why Infant-baptism is so sparingly mentioned, (not mentioned at all) because the custom of the Jews to baptize the children of proselytes to their religion with their parents, was well known; and there can be little doubt, that the apostles proceeded by the same rule in admitting the infants of Christian proselytes into the Christian covenant by baptism. This is building Infant-baptism on a bog indeed; since this Jewish custom is not pretended to be of divine institution; and so a poor argument in *the Defense of the Divine Right of Infant-baptism*; and at most and best, is only a tradition of the elders, which body of traditions was inveighed against by Christ and his apostles; and besides, this particular tradition does not appear to have obtained so early among the Jews themselves, as the times of the apostles, and therefore could be no rule for them to proceed by; and about which the first reporters of it disagree, the one affirming there was such a custom, and the other denying it; and had it then

obtained, it is incredible the apostles should make this the rule of their procedure in administering an ordinance of Christ and after all, was this the case, this would be a reason for, and not against the express mention of Infant-baptism by the divine historian; since it is necessary that in agreement with this Jewish custom, some instance or instances of Christian proselytes being baptized with their children should be recorded, as an example for Christians in succeeding ages to go by. But,

4. A supposition is made of some Paedobaptists sent into an heathen country to preach, and giving an account of their success, declaring that some families were baptized, such a man and all his, such another and his household; upon which a question is asked, who could raise a doubt whether any infants were baptized in those several families? To which I answer, there is no doubt to be made of it, that Paedobaptists would baptize infants; and if the apostles were Paedobaptists, which is the thing to be proved, they no doubt baptized infants too; but if no other account was given of the baptizing of households, than what the apostles give of them, Infant-baptism would still remain a doubt. For who can believe, that the brethren in *Lydia's* house whom the apostles comforted, and of whom her household consisted, or that the Jailor's household, that believed and rejoiced with him, or the household of *Stephanas*, who addicted themselves to the ministry of the saints, were infants? however it seems, as there is no evidence of fact for Infant-baptism in the New Testament, it is referred to the testimony of the ancient fathers; and to them then we must go.

II. The testimony of the fathers of the three first centuries is chiefly to be attended to; and whereas none in the first century are produced in favor of Infant-baptism, we must proceed to the second. In it, I observe, there is but one writer, that it is pretended speaks of Infant-baptism, and that is *Irenaeus*, and but one passage in him; and this is at best of doubtful meaning, and by some learned men judged spurious; as when he says, Christ "came to save all, all, I say, who are regenerated (or born again) unto God; Infants, and little ones, and children, and young men, and old men." Now, admitting the chapter in which this passage stands, is genuine and not spurious, which yet is not a clear case; it is objectionable to, as being a translation, as the most of this author's works are, and a very foolish, uncouth and barbarous one it is, as learned men observe; wherefore there is reason to believe that justice is not done him; and it lies not upon us, but upon our antagonists that urge this passage against us, to produce the original in support of it: but allowing it to be a just translation, yet what is there of Infant-baptism in it? Not a word. Yes, to be *regenerated*, or *born again*, is to be baptized; this is the sense of the ancients, and particularly of *Irenaeus*, it is said; but how does this appear? Dr. *Wall* has given an instance of it out of Lib. 3 chap. 19 where this ancient writer says, "when he gave the disciples the commission of regenerating (or rather of regeneration) unto God, he said unto them, *Go*, *teach all nations*, *baptizing them in the name of the Father*, *and of the Son*, *and of the Holy Ghost*," where the commission of regenerating, adds Dr. *Wall*, plainly means the commission of baptizing; whereas, it more plainly means the commission of teaching the doctrine of regeneration by the spirit, and the necessity of that unto salvation, and in order to baptism; and which was the first and principal part of the apostles' commission, as the very order of the words shews; and certain it is, that *Irenaeus* uses the word *Regeneration* in a different sense from baptism,[1] as an inward work, agreeable to the scriptures; and besides, such a sense of his words contended for, is to make him at least to suggest a doctrine which is absolutely false, as if Christ came to save all, and only such, who are baptized unto God; whereas he came to save baptized and unbaptized ones, Old and New Testament saints; and many no doubt are saved by him who never were baptized at all, and some baptized not saved; but on the other hand nothing is more true than

that he came to save all, and only those, who are regenerated by the spirit and grace of God, of whatsoever age; and which is clearly this ancient writer's sense, and so no proof of Infant-baptism. To support this notion of regeneration signifying baptism so early, our author urges a passage cited by me from *Justin*; who, speaking of converted persons, says, "they are brought by us where water is, and they are regenerated in the same way of regeneration as we have been regenerated; for they are then washed in water *in the name of the Father*, etc."

Now, it is evident, that those persons are not represented as regenerated by baptism; because they are spoken of before as believers and converted ones; and it is as clear, that their baptism is distinguished from their regeneration, and not the same thing; for *Justin* uses the former, as an argument of the latter; which, if the same, his sense must be, they were baptized, because they were baptized; which is making him guilty of what Logicians call proving *Idem per Idem*: whereas, *Justin's* sense, consistent with himself, and the practice of the primitive churches, is, that those persons when brought to the water, having made a profession of their regeneration, were owned and declared regenerated persons, as is manifest from their being admitted to the ordinance of water-baptism: and that *Justin s*peaks of the baptism of the *adult*, is owned by this writer; though he thinks it is unquestionable, that he speaks only of such who were converted from Heathenism; and is sure of it, that there were none among them born of Christian parents; this he will find a hard talk, with all his confidence, to prove. And he has ventured to produce a passage out of *Justin*, as giving suffrage to Infant-baptism in the second century; and it is this from Dr. *Wall*; "We also, who by him have had access to God, have not received this carnal circumcision, but the spiritual circumcision, which *Enoch* and those like him observed; and we have received it by baptism, by the mercy of God, because we were sinners, and it is enjoined to all persons to receive it the same way."

Now let it be observed, that this spiritual circumcision, whatever *Justin* means by it, can never design baptism; since the patriarch *Enoch*, and others like him, observed it; and since with Christians it is received *by* baptism, he says; and therefore must be different from it: and, after all, not a word of infants in the passage; nor is baptism called a spiritual circumcision; nor, as our author elsewhere stiles it, Christian circumcision, in Colossians 2:11 since the circumcision there spoken of, is called *a circumcision made without hands*, which surely cannot be said of baptism. In short, I must once more triumph, if it may be so called, and say, this is all the evidence, the undoubted evidence of Infant-baptism from the fathers of the two first centuries. Proceed we to

The third century; and the fathers of this, brought into the controversy about baptism are *Tertullian*, *Origen*, and *Cyprian*. The first of these, is the first writer we know of that ever made mention of Infant-baptism; and he dissuades from it, and advises to defer baptism to riper years; and is therefore claimed on our side of the question: nor can he be made to unsay what he has said; and therefore is traduced as a man of heterodox notions, and of odd and strange opinions; and, it seems, afterwards turned Montanist; and all this is said, to weaken the credit of his testimony, when not a word is said of *Origen's* gross errors and monstrous absurdities: the reason is, because it seems he was a Paedobaptist, and *Tertullian* an Antipaedobaptist; though it is some comfort to this writer, that he was not quite so bad as the present Antipaedobaptists are. As to *Origen*, there are *three passages* quoted out of him; to which we object, not only, that they are *translations*, the fidelity of which cannot be depended upon, when there is much of this writer still extant in the language in which he wrote, and yet nothing from thence produced; but that there are *interpolated*, and

confessedly so. His homilies on *Leviticus* and exposition of the epistle to the *Romans*, from whence two of the passages are taken, were translated by *Ruffinus*, who owns he took liberty to *add* of his own to them; so that, as *Erasmus*[2] *observes*, it is uncertain whether one reads *Origen* or *Ruffinus*; and *Scultetus*[3] says the same thing; and *Huetius*, who has given us a good edition of the Greek commentaries of this father, and well understood him, says,[4] that "his writings are so corrupted by him, that you are at a loss to find *Origen* in Origen, and so deformed and unlike the original, they can scarce be known;" and one of there particular passages *Vossius*[5] takes to be an interpolation, and so of the greater force against the Pelagians, because *Ruffinus* the translator and interpolator was inclined to them: the homilies on *Luke*, out of which is the other passage, are said to be translated by *Jerom*, of whom *Du Pin* says,[6] that his versions are not more exact than the other's; so no credit is to be given to them, nor are they to be depended on. *Cyprian* is the next that is produced, and it will be allowed that Infant-baptism began to be practiced in his time in some churches, though it seems to be an upstart notion; since it was not till then determined at what time it should be administered; and also at the same time, and in the same churches, Infant-communion was practiced; of which *Cyprian* gives an instance; and that is more than is, or can be given of the practice of Infant-baptism so early; and if his testimony is of any weight for the one, it ought to be of the same for the other; and if infants are admitted to baptism, it is but reasonable they should partake of the Lord's-supper, and especially as there is as early antiquity for the one as for the other.

The quotations out of *Gregory Nazianzen*, *Optatus*, *Ambrose*, *Chrysostom*, and *Austin*, fathers of the fourth century, which Mr. *Clark* has collected from Dr. *Wall*, might have been spared; seeing this does not come into his own account of the truly primitive church; and since it is not denied, Infant-baptism obtained in it; and yet it is certain, there were persons in this age against it, as will be observed hereafter; nor was *Pelagius*, in this age, so pressed and puzzled with the argument taken from it in favor of original sin; since it was not contrary to his doctrine, who allowed baptism to be administered to them "on account of the kingdom of God, but not for forgiveness of sin;" and the controversy did not lead to dispute about *the subject*, but the *end* of baptism.

The next thing, you will remember, Sir, brought into the controversy, is, whether the practice of Infant-baptism was called in question before the mad-men *of Munster* let themselves against it. As to the troubles in *Germany*, and in *Mun*ster itself, it is certain beyond all contradiction, that they were begun by Paedobaptists, and whilst they were such; and as for the German Anabaptists, as they are called, who joined with them, they were Sprinklers, and not Baptists, and so belong rather to this writer's party, than to us; but be this as it will, nothing in the controversy, depends upon that; the state of the case is, whether Infant-baptism was called in question, or made matter of doubt of before there men opposed it; and here I observe,

1. That it is allowed there were debates about Infant-baptism before the affair of *Munster*, and between that and the reformation; by which it appears that it was quickly opposed after the reformation begun.

2. The letter to *Erasmus* out of *Bohemia* shews, that there were a people there near one hundred years before the reformation, who baptized anew, in mere water, such as came over to their sect: this those people did, as our author would have it, not because they judged baptism in infancy invalid, but what was received in the corrupt way of the church of *Rome*. This he says after Dr.

Wall, (though with the Doctor it is uncertain which was the case) inclining to the latter. But it should be observed, that there is no proof from any ancient history, that these people, or any Protestants and reformers that retained Infant-baptism, did, upon leaving the church of *Rome*, reject the baptism of that church, and receive a new one; and besides, *Thomas Waldensis*,[7] who lived and wrote at this very time, affirms, that there were a people in *Bohemia* then, that maintained that "believers children were not to be baptized, and that baptism was to no purpose administered to them;" to which I would add the testimony *of Luther*,[8] who says, "the *Waldenses* in *Bohemia*, ground the sacrament of baptism upon the person's faith; and for that reason, they annihilate the baptizing of children; for they say, children must be taught before they be baptized."

2. This Gentleman is not well pleased with Dr. *Wall* in making this concession, that the Petrobrusians were Antipaedobaptists; though it is some comfort to him, that he tells him, that their opinion seems to have been in a short time extinguished and forgotten. But this opinion of theirs not only continued among *Henry* and his followers, who succeeded the Petrobrusians, but among the people afterwards called Waldenses; who to this day own *Peter Bruis* for one of their Barbs or Parrots, as will be seen hereafter. However, that we may have no credit from these people, they are branded as denying the other ordinance of the Lord's Supper; and as saying, it is not to be administered since Christ's time. But what Dr. *Wall*[9] afterwards cites from the abbot of *Clugny*, will serve to explain this, and shew, that their meaning is only, that the real presence of Christ in the supper, was only at the time when it was administered by him to the disciples; who makes them to say, "the body of Christ was only once made by himself the supper, before his passion, and was only, namely at this time, given to his disciples; since that time it was never made by any one, nor given to any one;" or as it is expressed from the same popish writer by Dr. *Allix*,[10]

"The fourth (article ascribed by the abbot to the Petrobrusians) consisted not only in denying the truth of the body and blood of our Lord, which is offered up every day, and continually by the sacrament of the church; but also in maintaining, that it was nothing, and ought not to be offered." Upon which the Doctor makes this remark: "The fourth heresy is expressed in very odious terms, and after the popish manner, who own nothing to be real in the sacrament, if the flesh of Jesus Christ and his blood be not there in substance; and who do not believe he is present at the sacrament upon any other account, but as he is offered up to God before he is eaten." It was the *real presence* in the supper, and not that itself, these people denied; so that they were brave champions for the purity of both ordinances, equally rejecting Infant-baptism and the doctrine of transubstantiation.

3. As for the other instances of persons denying Infant-baptism after *Peter Bruis*, produced by me; this writer, from Dr. *Wall*, would fain fasten the charge of Manicheism upon them, and so as denying all water-baptism; I say, from Dr. *Wall*, for what he here says, and indeed there is scarce any thing in this whole chapter about the antiquity of Infant-baptism, but what is borrowed from him, this Gentleman having no stock of his own; that, in fact, instead of answering Mr. *Clark*, I am answering Dr. *Wall*. As for those *Evervinus* writes of to *Bernard*, about the year 1140, there he observes, from Dr. *Wall*, held a tenet which shews them to be Manichees; though *Evervinus*[11] distinguishes them from the Manichees, namely, "all marriage they call fornication, except that which was between two virgins;" but this was not one of the principles of the Manichees, who condemned all marriage; whereas these allowed of the marriage of persons who had never been married before; they only condemned second marriage; a notion which had prevailed with some of

the Christian fathers before the Manichees were in being; and this was the notion of some of the *apostolics*, and very probably of them all, the same *Bernard* makes mention of; and who, very likely, as I have observed, were the followers of *Henry*; and against these, this author has nothing of Manicheism: Here Dr. *Wall* fails him; and here it may be remarked what *Mezeray* says, "in the year 1163, there were two sorts of heretics; the one ignorant and loose, who were a sort of Manichees; the other more learned, and remote from such filthiness, who held much the same opinions as the Calvinists, and were called Henricians;" so that the followers of *Henry* were a distinct people from the Manichees; but as for those the Bishop of *Arles* takes notice of, our author's remark upon them is, "it *may be s*aid, these heretics *might be* some of "the Manichean sect;" fine proof indeed! what he farther adds is more probable, "as perhaps they were some remains of the Petrobrusians;" so that it appears, that their opinion, which seems to have been in a short time extinguished and forgotten, continued however to the year 1215. As for the Gascoiners, that came over into *England* in the year 1158, and asserted, that infants ought not to be baptized till they come to the age of understanding; this, our author says, is no more than what a Manichee might say then, and a Quaker *now*; though they both disown all water-baptism. What! to say, that infants ought not to be baptized *till* they come to the age of understanding? is this talking like a Manichee or a Quaker? Does not this suppose that they may be baptized, when they come to the age of understanding, and know what they do? But this writer adds, it appears that these rejected both the sacraments of the New Testament, detecting *holy baptism*, and the *Eucharist*: so they did, they detested Infant-baptism as an human invention, and transubstantiation as an idol of the Pope of *Rome*.

4. To what I have said concerning *Bruno* and *Berengarius*, and their opposition to Infant-baptism 100 years before the Petrobrusians, I would only add; that *Peter Bruis* was not the author of a new sect, though his followers were so called by the Papists, to suggest that they were so; whereas, they were the same with the Berengarians, and held the same principles as the Berengarians did, both with respect to baptism and the Lord's-Supper; and what were their sentiments concerning these are well known.

5. *Gundulphus* and his followers, another instance of persons denying Infant-baptism as early as the year 1025, are represented as Manichees and Quakers, in the point of baptism; and both Mr. *Stennett* and myself are charged with great unfairness, partiality and disingenuity, in leaving out what Dr. *Allix* has said concerning these men, namely, "that in the same examination, being further interrogated, these men confessed, that they thought water-baptism of no use or necessity to any one, infants or adult."**[12]** This is cited from Dr. *Wall*, an author not always to be depended upon, and particularly here; for Dr. *Allix* gives no account of any further interrogation of these men, by *Gerard* bishop of *Cambray*, as is suggested; nor are these words to be found in him; for though the men at their first, and only interrogation, speak of the non-necessity and unavailableness of baptism to salvation; and, as Dr. *Allix* observes, said some things slightly of baptism, in opposition to the prevailing notions of those times, about the absolute necessity and efficacy of baptism to salvation; yet he is quite clear, that they were for the thing itself: "It is easy to judge, says he,**[13]** that they looked upon baptism only as a mystical ceremony, the end of which was to express the engagement of him who is baptized, and the vow he makes to live holy." *Gundulphus*, adds he, "seeing them, (the popish priests) assert, that whosoever was baptized could never be damned, falls to an indifference for baptism; thinking it sufficient to keep to the essentials of that sacrament." From

whence it is plain, he did not deny it, nor disuse it; and upon the whole it is evident, Dr. *Wall* has abused Mr. *Stennett*, and this Gentleman both him and myself.

6. It is observed, that a large stride is taken by me from the *Eleventh* to the *Fourth* century, not being able in the space of more than 600 years to find one instance of an opposer of Infant-baptism: this will not seem so strange to those who know what a time of ignorance this was; partly through the prevalence of popery, and partly through the inundation of the barbarous nations, which brought a flood of darkness upon the empire; and very few witnesses arose against the superstitions of the church of some; yet there were some in the valleys of *Piedmont*, even from the times of the apostles, and during this interval, as learned men have observed, that bore their testimony against corruptions in doctrine and practice; among which, this of Infant-baptism must be reckoned one; and whole successors, as we have seen already in the Berengarians, and the Petrobrusians, and will be seen again in the Waldenses, bore witness against this innovation.

7. Though I did not insist upon the Pelagians and others being against Infant-baptism, which some have allowed; this writer is pleased to reproach me with a good-will to admit such heretics, as our predecessors; and this is not the only instance of this sort of reflection; whereas truth is truth, let it be espoused by whom it will; and it might be retorted, that Infant-baptism has been practiced by the worst of heretics, and retained by the man of sin and his followers in all the Antichristian states; and this writer thinks it worth his pains to rescue the above heretics and schismatics out of our hands; and yet, after all, some of the followers of Pelagius at least argued, that the infants of believers ought not to be baptized; and that for this reason, because they were holy, as[14] *Austin* affirms; and who also observes,[15] that some other patrons argued against it, and the unprofitableness of it to infants, who for the most part died before they knew any thing of it; and *Jerom*,[16] his contemporary, supposes it, and reasons upon it, that some Christians refused to give baptism to their children. So that even in *the fourth* century, though Infant-baptism greatly prevailed, yet it was not so general, as that not one man contemporary with *Austin* can be produced, as setting himself against it, as our author avers; nay *Stephen Marshall*, a great stickler for Infant-baptism, in his famous sermon on this subject,[17] owns, that some in the times of *Austin* questioned it, and refers to a discourse of his in proof of it; and the canon of the council at *Carthage*, produced by me, notwithstanding all that this writer says, is a full proof of the same. For surely, no man in his senses can ever think, that a council consisting of all the bishops in *Africa*, should agree to anathematize their own brethren, who were in the same opinion with them about Infant-baptism; only thought it should not be administered to them as soon as born, but be deferred till they were eight days old; they that can believe this, can believe any thing; and besides, is not a child of eight days old a child newly born? Lastly, after all, *Tertullian*, in the beginning of the *third* century, as he was the first we know of that made mention of Infant-baptism, did oppose it, and dissuade from it; so that it must be once more said, it was called in question, debated and opposed twelve or thirteen hundred years before the madmen of *Munster*, as well as in some of the intervening centuries. It remains now, Sir, to defend what I have said concerning the Waldenses; and it should be observed,

1. That these people had not their name from *Waldus*, as the first founder of their sect: this Dr. *Allix* has undertook to make out beyond all possible contradiction, and he has done it. These people were before his time called Vaudois, Vallenses or Wallenses, from their inhabiting the valleys; which name was afterwards changed to Waldenses, when the design was said to make men believe that

Valda or *Waldus* was their first founder, that they might be taken for a new and upstart people; whereas they were in being long before *Waldus*, who received his light and doctrine from them, and whose followers joined them; and this observation sets aside the exceptions of our author to the testimonies of *Peter Bruis*, their confession of faith in 1120, and their noble lesson 1100, as being before the times of the Waldenses; that is, before the times of *Waldo*, more properly speaking; and by how much the more ancient these testimonies are, by so much the greater is their evidence in point of antiquity, as to these peoples denial of Infant-baptism; and more strongly prove that the ancient Vallenses, afterwards corruptly called Waldenses, were against it, and for *adult baptism*. These people were not divided into various sects, but were a body of people of one and the same faith and practice, which they retained from father to son, as their usual phrase is, time out of mind.

2. It is true, they were called by different names, by their adversaries; some given them by way of reproach, others from their leaders and teachers, as Petrobrusians, Henricians, Arnoldists, Waldensians, Etc. from *Peter Bruis*, *Henry*, *Arnold*, *Waldus*; but still they were the same people; just as the Papists, at the Reformation, made as many heads of distinct parties, as these were men of note in that work. Thus for instance, the Petrobrusians were not a distinct sect of this people, but the very people called Vallenses, afterwards Waldenses; and the same may be said of the rest: nor were there any sect among them of the Manichean principle, or any of them tinctured with that heresy, as Dr. *Allix* has abundantly proved. The care, as he makes it appear, was this; that there were Manichees in the places where the Valdenses and Albigenses lived, but not that joined them; their enemies took the advantage of this, and called them by the same name, and ascribed the same opinions to them, especially if they could find any thing in them familiar to them: thus for instance, because they denied Infant-baptism, therefore they were against all Water-baptism, and so Manichees; for as *Dr. Allix*[18] observes, "in those barbarous and cruel ages, a small conformity of opinions with the Manichees, was a sufficient ground to accuse them of Manicheism, who opposed any doctrine received by the church of some: Thus would they have taken the Anabaptists for downright Manichees, says he, because they condemned the baptism of infants:" and Mr. *Clark* cannot object to this observation, since he himself argues from the denial of Infant-baptism, to the denial of baptism itself; and has represented me as a Manichee, or a Quaker, for no other reason, but for the denial of Infant-baptism; and if his book lives to the next age, and is of any authority, and can find people foolish enough to believe it, I must be set down for a Manichee or a Quaker. Indeed I must confess, I once thought, giving too much credit to Dr. *Wall*, that there were different sects among the Waldenses, and some of them Manichees, and of other erroneous principles, which I now retract.

3. It is not true what this writer from Dr. *Wall* affirms; "This is certain, that no one author, that calls the people he writes of Waldenses, does impute to them the denial of Infant-baptism;" for *Claudius Couffard*, writing against them, under this name, gives an extract of their errors out of *Raynerius*, and this is one of them; "They say, then first a man is baptized, when he is received into their sect; some of them hold that baptism is of no advantage to infants, because they cannot yet actually believe;" and concludes this extract thus, "from whence you may see, courteous reader, that this sect of the Waldenses, and the chief, yea almost all heretics now in vogue, are not of late invention, etc." and were this true, yet it is a mere evasion, and a foolish one; since the names of Henricians, Arnoldists, Cathari, Apostolici, etc. under which they are represented, as opposers of Infant-baptism, are the names of the Waldenlses, as *Perrin*[19] observes, a writer whom our author says he has read.

4. It is a most clear case, that the ancient barbs or pastors of the Waldensian churches, so called, were opposers of Infant-baptism. Sir *Samuel Moreland*, as I have observed, reckons *Peter Bruis* and *Henry* among their ancient pallors; to does *Perrin* likewise, though he is mistaken in making them to follow *Waldo*; and these are allowed to be Antipaedobaptists by several Paedobaptists themselves. *Arnoldus*, another of their parrots, according to the above writer, from whence they were called Arnoldists, was out of all doubt a denier of Infant-baptism, for which he was condemned by a council, as Dr. *Wall* owns. *Lollardo* was another of their pastors, according to the same authors, and from whole name, *Perrin* says, the Waldenses were called Lollards; and so *Kilianus* says,[20] a Lollard is also called a Waldensian heretic. These were not the followers of *Wickliff*, as our author wrongly asserts; for they were, as Dr. *Allix*[21] observes, more ancient than the Wicklifites; and though this name was afterwards given to the latter, *Lollardo* was here in *England*, and had his followers before *Wickliff's* time; and so he had in *Flanders* and *Germany*; and of the Lollards there, *Trithemius*[22] says, they derided the sacrament of baptism; which cannot be understood of their deriding baptism in general, but of their deriding Infant-baptism; which was common among the Papists to say; and the same is the sense of the Lollards in *England*, who are charged with making light of the sacrament of baptism. Now since these were the sentiments of the ancient pastors of the Waldenses, it is reasonable to believe the people themselves were of the same mind with them; nor are there any confessions of their faith, which make any mention of Infant-baptism; nor any proofs of its being practiced by them until the sixteenth century, produced by our author, or any other.

5. The Albigenses, as *Perrin*[23] says, differ nothing at all from the Waldenses, in their belief; but are only so called of the country of *Albi*; where they dwelt, and had their first beginning; and who received the belief of the Waldenses by means of *Peter Bruis*, *Henry* and *Arnold*; who, as it clearly appears, were all Antipaedobaptists; and Dr. *Allix*[24] observes, that the Albigenses have been called Petrobrusians; owned to be a sect of the Waldenses, that denied Infant-baptism: and that the Albigenses denied it, at least some of them, yea the greatest part of them, is acknowledged by some Paedobaptists themselves. *Chassanion* in his history of these people says;[25] "some writers have affirmed, that the Albigeois approved not of the baptism of infants. —I cannot deny that the Albigeois for the *greatest part* were of that opinion. —The truth is, they did not reject this sacrament, or say it was useless, (as some, he before observes, asserted they did) but only counted it unnecessary to infants, because they are not of age to believe, or capable of giving evidence of their faith." Which is another proof of the ancient Waldenses being against Infant-baptism, these being the same with them. Upon the whole, if I have been too modest, in saying that the ancient Waldenses practiced Infant-baptism, wants proof, I shall now use a little more boldness and confidence, and alarm, that the ancient Vallenses, or as corruptly called Waldenses, were opposers of Infant-baptism; and that no proof can be given of the practice of it among them till the sixteenth century; and that the author of the dialogue had no reason to say, that their being in the practice of adult baptism, and denying Infant-baptism, was a mere chimaera and a groundless figment.

My *fourth* chapter, you know, Sir, respects the argument for Infant-baptism, taken from the covenant made with *Abraham*, and from circumcision. Here our author runs out into a large discussion of the covenant of grace, in his way; in which he spends about fourscore pages, which I take to be the heads of some old sermons, he is fond of, and has taken this opportunity of publishing them to the world, without any propriety or pertinence. For, 1. not to dispute the point with him, whether there are two distinct covenants of redemption and grace, or whether they are

one and the same, which is foreign to the argument; be it that they are two distinct ones, the spiritual seed promised to Christ, or the people given him in the one, are the same that are taken into the other; they are of equal extent; there are no more in the one, than there are concerned in the other; and this writer himself allows, "that the salvation of the spiritual *seed of* Christ is promised in both covenants." Now let it be proved, if it can, that there are any in the covenant of grace but *the spiritual seed of Christ*; and that the natural seed of believers, and their infants as such, are the spiritual seed: and if they are, then they were given to Christ, who undertook to save them, and whose salvation was promised to him, and to whom in time the communications of grace according to the covenant are made; then they must be all of them regenerated, renewed, and sanctified, justified, pardoned, adopted, persevere in grace, and be eternally saved; all which will not, cannot be said of all the infants of believers; and consequently cannot be thought to be in the covenant of grace.

2. As to what he says concerning the conditionality of the covenant, it is all answered in one word; let him name what he will, as the condition of this covenant, which God has not absolutely promised, or thrift: has not engaged to perform, or to see performed in his people, or by them. Are the conditions, faith and repentance? These are both included in the *new heart*, and *spirit*, and *heart of flesh*, God has absolutely promised in the covenant, Ezekiel 36:26. Is new, *spiritual*, and *evangelical* obedience, the condition? This is absolutely promised as the former, verse 27. Or is it actual consent? *Thy people shall be willing* (Ps. 110:3). And after all, if it is a conditional covenant, how do infants get into it? Or is it a conditional covenant to the *adult*, and unconditional to them? If faith and repentance are the conditions of it, and these must be, as this author says, "the sinner's own voluntary chosen acts, before he can have any actual saving interest in the privileges of the covenant;" it follows, that they cannot be in it, or have interest in the privileges of it, till they repent and believe, and do these as their own voluntary chosen acts; and if "man's consent and agreement bring him into covenant with God," as this writer says; it should be considered, whether infants are capable of this consent, or no; and if they are not, according to this man, they stand a poor chance for being in the covenant.

3. Whereas the covenant of grace, as to the essence of it, has been always the same, as is allowed, under the various forms and administrations of it, both under the Old and New Testament; so the subjects of it have been, and are the same, the spiritual seed of Christ, and none else; and not the carnal seed of men as such: and if the conditions of it are the same, faith and obedience, as our author observes, then infants must stand excluded from it, since they can neither believe nor obey.

4. That the covenant of grace was made with *Abraham*, or a revelation and application of it to him; that the gospel was revealed to him, and he was justified in the same way believers are now; and that he had spiritual promises made to him, and spiritual blessings bestowed upon him; and that *gospel-believers*, be they Jews or Gentiles, who are the spiritual seed of *Abraham*, are heirs of the same covenant-blessings and promises, are never denied; —this man is fighting with his own shadow. What is denied and should be proved, is, that the covenant of grace is made with *Abraham's* carnal seed, the Jews, and with the carnal seed of gospel-believers among the Gentiles; and that spiritual promises are made to them; and that they are heirs of spiritual blessings, as such: and let it be further observed, that the covenant in Genesis 17 is not the covenant referred to in Galatians 3:17 said to be *confirmed of God in Christ*, and which *could not be disannulled by the*

law 430 years after; since the date does not agree, it falls short twenty-four years; and therefore must refer, not to the covenant of circumcision, but to some other covenant, and time of making it.

5. It is false, that children have been always taken with their parents into the covenant of grace, under every dispensation. The children of *Adam* were not taken into the covenant of grace with him, which was made known to him immediately after the fall; for then all the world must be in the covenant of grace. The covenant made with *Noah* and his sons, was not the covenant of grace; since it was made with the beasts of the field as well as with them; unless it will be said, that they also are in the covenant of grace. Nor were all Abraham's natural seed taken into the covenant of grace with him. *Ishmael* was by name excluded, and the covenant established with *Isaac*; and yet *Ishmael* was in the covenant of circumcision; which by the way proves, that, that and the covenant of grace are two different things: nor were all Abraham's natural seed in the line of *Isaac* taken into the covenant of grace, not *Esau*; nor all in the line of *Jacob* and *Israel*; for as the apostle says, they are not all Israel which are of Israel; neither because they are the seed of Abraham, are they all children; but in Isaac shall thy seed be called; that is, they which are the children of the flesh, these are not the children of God, but the children of the promise are counted for the seed (Rom. 9:6-8). The covenant at *Horeb* was indeed a national covenant, and took in all, children and grown persons; and which was no other than a civil contract, and not a covenant of grace, between God and the people of *Israel*; he asking, and they as subjects; he promising to be their protector and defender, and they to be his faithful subjects, and obey his laws; which covenant has been long ago abolished, when God wrote a *Loammi* upon them: nor is there any proof of infants under the New Testament being taken into covenant with their parents. Not Matthew 19:14, 1 Corinthians 7:14 which make no mention of any covenant at all, as will be considered hereafter; nor Hebrews 8:8 since the house of *Israel*, that new covenant is said to be made with, are the *spiritual Israel*, whether Jews or Gentiles, even the whole household of faith, and none but them nor are their infants spoken of, nor can they be included; for have they all of them the laws of God written on their hearts? Do they all know the Lord? or have they all their sins forgiven them? which is the care with all those with whom this covenant is made, or to whom it is applied. Nor are there any predictions of this kind in the Old Testament. Deuteronomy 30:6, Psalm 22:30, Isaiah 9:21 speak only of a succession of converted persons, either in the gospel-church among the Gentiles, or in the same among the Jews, when that people shall be converted in the latter day.

6. The distinction of an *inward* and *outward* covenant, is an *Utopian* business, mere jargon and nonsense; it has no foundation in scripture, reason, nor common sense. And here I cannot but observe what Mr. *Baxter*, a zealous Paedobaptist, says on this subject.**[26]** "Mr. *Blake's* common phrase is, that they are in the *outward* covenant, and what that is, I cannot tell; in what sense is that (God's covenant-act) called outward? It cannot be, as if God did as the dissembling creature, *Oretenus*, with the mouth only, covenant with them, and not with the heart, as they deal with him. I know therefore no possible sense but this, that it is called outward from the blessings promised, which are outward; here therefore, I should have thought it reasonable for Mr. *Blake* to have told us what these outward blessings are, that this covenant promiseth; and that he would have proved out of the scriptures that God hath such a covenant distinct from the covenant of grace. I desire therefore that those words of scripture may be produced, where any such covenant is contained. And let Mr. *Clark* tell us what he means by the *outward covenant*, or the outward part of it, in which infants are; if any thing can be collected from him, as his meaning, it is, that it designs the outward administration of the covenant by the word and ordinances: but if it means the outward

ministry of the word, newborn infants are not capable of that to any profit; if it designs the administration of baptism and the Lord's supper, then they should be admitted to one as well as the other; and if baptism only is intended by this outward covenant, or the outward part, here is the greatest confusion imaginable; then the sense is, they are under the outward administration of the covenant, that is baptism; and this gives them a right to be baptized, that is to be baptized again, or in other words to be made Anabaptists of; and after all it is a poor covenant, or a poor part of it assigned for infants, in the bond of which, as this author says, are many real hypocrites.

7. That covenant-interest, and an evidence of it, give right to the real of the covenant, which was circumcision formerly, and baptism now, is false; and this writer has not proved it, nor infants covenant-interest, as we have seen already. He should have first proved that circumcision was a seal of the covenant of grace formerly, and baptism the real of it now, before he talked of covenant-interest giving a right to either. Admitting that circumcision was a real of the covenant of grace formerly, (though it was not) yet interest in that covenant and evidence of interest in it, did not give right to all in it to the seal of it, as it is called; since there were many who had evidently an interest in the covenant of grace, when circumcision was first appointed, and yet had no right to it; as *Shem*, *Arphaxad*, *Lot*, and others; and even many who were in the covenant made with Abraham, as this writer himself will allow, who had no right to this seal, even all his female offspring: to say, they were *virtually circumcised in the males*, is false and foolish; to have a thing virtually by another, is to have it by proxy, who represents another; but were the males the proxies and representatives of the females? had they been so, then indeed when they were circumcised, the females were virtually circumcised with them; and so it was all one as if they had been circumcised in their own persons; which to have been, would have been unlawful and sinful, not being by the appointment of God: as for its being unlawful for uncircumcised persons to eat of the passover, this must be understood of such who ought to be circumcised, and does not affect the females, who ought not, and so might eat, though they were really uncircumcised; nor had the males themselves any right to it till the eighth day; and so it was not covenant-interest, but a command from God, that gave them a right; and such an order is necessary to any person's right to baptism.

Again, admitting for argument-sake, that baptism is a seal of the covenant, does not this Gentleman also believe, that the Lord's-supper is a seal of it likewise? and if covenant-interest gives a right to the seals, why not to one seal as well as the other? and why are not infants admitted to the Lord's table, as well as to baptism? Moreover, it is *evidence* of interest, this writer says, that gives a right to the seal; and what is that evidence? Surely if faith and repentance are the conditions of the covenant, as before asserted, they must be the evidence? and therefore, according to his own argument, it should first appear, that infants have faith and repentance as the evidence of their covenant interest, before they are admitted to the seal of it; and such only according to the injunction of Christ, and the practice of his apostles, were admitted to baptism; as the passages below shew (Matthew 28:19; Mark 16:16; Acts 2:38, 39; 10:47), which our author refers us to. And now, Sir, after a long ramble, we are come to *Abraham's* covenant itself, and to the questions concerning it; as, of what kind it is; with whom made; and whether circumcision was the real of the covenant of grace; and whether baptism is come in its room, and is the seal of it. Now as to the

I. First of these, of what kind was the covenant with *Abraham*, Genesis 17? I have asserted, that it was not the pure covenant of grace, but of a mixed kind; consisting partly of promises of temporal things, and partly of spiritual ones; and you will easily observe, Sir, that the exceptions of this

writer to the arguments I make use of in proof of it, are for the most part founded on his mistaken notions of the conditionality of the covenant of grace, and on that stupid and senseless distinction of the *inward* and *outward* covenant, before exploded; wherefore since these are groundless conceits and sandy foundations, what is built upon them must necessarily fall.

II. The same may be observed with respect to that part of the question, which relates to the covenant being made with all *Abraham's* seed according to the flesh, as a covenant of grace; by the help of which unscriptural and irrational distinction, he can find a place in the covenant of grace for a persecuting *Ishmael*, a profane *Esau*, and all the wicked Jews in all ages, in all times of defection and apostasy; but if he can find no better covenant to put the infants of believers into, nor better company to place them with, who notwithstanding their covenant-interest, may be lost and damned, it will be a very insignificant thing with considerate persons, whether they are in this *Utopian* covenant or no.

III. As to that part of the question which relates to the natural seed of believing Gentiles being in *Abraham's* covenant, or to that being made with them as a covenant of grace, it is by me denied. This writer says, I add a stroke, as he calls it, that at once cuts off all *Abraham's* natural seed, and all the natural seed of believing Gentiles, from having any share in the covenant; since I say, "That to none can spiritual blessings belong, but to a spiritual seed, not a natural one." But he might have observed, that this is explained in the same page thus, "not to the natural seed of either of them as such." He says, it is not requisite to a person's visible title and claim to the external privileges of the covenant, that he should be truly regenerate, or a sincere believer;" and yet he elsewhere says, "that to repent and believe must be the sinner's own voluntary chosen acts, before he can have any actual saving interest in the privileges of the covenant:" let him reconcile these together. He has not proved, nor is he able to prove, that the natural seed of believing Gentiles, as such, are the spiritual seed of *Abraham*; since only they that are Christ's, or believers in him, or who walk in the steps of the faith of *Abraham*, are his spiritual seed; which cannot be said of all the natural seed of believing Gentiles, or of any of them as such. That clause in *Abraham's* covenant, *A father of many nations have I made thee* (Gen. 17:4, 5) is to be understood only of the faithful, or of believers in all nations; and not of all nations that bear the Christian name, as comprehending all in them, grown persons and infants, good and bad men; and only to such who are of the faith of *Abraham* does the apostle apply it (Rom. 4:16); the stranger, and his male seed, that submitted to circumcision, may indeed be said to be in the covenant of circumcision; but it does not follow, that these were in the covenant of grace; there were many of *Abraham's* own natural seed that were in the covenant of circumcision, who were not in the covenant of grace; and it would be very much, that the natural seed of strangers, and even of believing Gentiles, should have a superior privilege to the natural seed of *Abraham*. Those, and those only, in a judgment of charity, are to be reckoned the spiritual seed, who openly believe in Christ, as I have expressed it; about which phrase this man makes a great pother, when the sense is plain and easy; and that it designs such who make a visible profession of their faith, and are judged to be partakers of the grace of the covenant; which certainly is the best evidence of their interest in it; and therefore it must be best to wait till this appears, before any claim of privilege can be made; and is no other than what this writer himself says in the words before referred to. Though, after all, I stand by my former assertion, that covenant-interest, even when made out clear and plain, gives not right to any ordinance without a positive order or direction from God; and he may call it a conceit of mine if he pleases; he is right in it, that according to it, no person living is capable of (that is, has a right unto) the ordinances and

visible privileges of the church upon any grounds of covenant-interest, without a positive direction from God for it; as there was for circumcision, so there should be for baptism; as, with respect to the former, many who were in the covenant of grace had no concern with it, having no direction from the Lord about it; so though persons may be in the covenant of grace, yet if they are not pointed out by the Lord, as those whom he wills to be the subjects of it, they have no right unto it. To say, that *Lot* and others were under a former administration of the covenant, on whom circumcision was not enjoined, is saying nothing; unless he can tell us what that former administration of it was, and wherein it differed from the administration of it to *Abraham* and his seed; to instance in circumcision, would be begging the question, since that is the thing instanced in; by which it appears that covenant-interest gives no right to an ordinance, without a special direction; and the same holds good of baptism. His sense of Mark 16:16 is, that infants are included in the profession of their believing parents, and why not in their baptism too? and so there is no necessity of their baptism; the text countenances one as much as it does the other, and both are equally stupid and senseless.

IV. The next inquiry is, whether circumcision was the *seal* of the covenant of grace to *Abraham*'*s* natural seed. It is called a *token* or *sign*, but not a seal; this writer says, though a token, simply considered, does not necessarily imply a seal, yet the token of a covenant, or promise, can be nothing else: if it can be nothing else, it does necessarily imply it; unless there is any real difference between a token simply considered, and the token of a covenant, which he would do well to shew circumcision was nothing else but a sign or mark in the flesh, appointed by the covenant; and therefore that is called *the covenant in their flesh*; and not because circumcision was any confirming token or seal of the covenant to any of *Abraham*'*s* natural seed: it was a sign and seal of the righteousness of faith to *Abraham*; that that righteousness which he had by faith before his circumcision, should come upon the uncircumcised Gentiles; but was no seal of that, nor any thing else, to any others: and according to our author's notion of it, it was neither a seal of *Abraham*'*s* faith, nor of his righteousness; then surely not of any others; and yet in contradiction to this, he says, it is "a seal of the covenant of grace, wherein this privilege of justification by faith is confirmed and conveyed to believers;" and if to believers, then surely not to all *Abraham*'*s* natural seed, unless he can think they were all believers; though his real notion, if I understand him right, is, that it is no confirming sign, or seal of any spiritual blessings to any; since the subjects of it, as he owns, may have neither faith nor righteousness; but of the truth of the covenant itself; that God has made one; but this needs no such sign or seal; the word of God is sufficient, which declares it and assures of it.

V. The next thing that comes under consideration, is, whether baptism succeeds circumcision; and is the seal of the covenant of grace to believers, and their natural seed.

1. This author endeavors to prove that baptism succeeds circumcision from Colossians 2:11, but in vain; for the apostle is speaking not of corporal, but of spiritual circumcision, of which the former was a typical resemblance; and so shewing, that believing Gentiles have that through Christ which was signified by it; and which the apostle describes, by the manner of its being effected, *without hands*, without the power of man, by the efficacy of divine grace; and by the substance and matter of it, which lay in *the putting off the body of the sins of the flesh*; and without a tautology, as this writer suggests, by the author of it, Christ, who by his Spirit effects it, and therefore is called the *circumcision of Christ*; and is distinguished from baptism, described in the next verse: and as weak

and insignificant is his proof from the analogy between baptism and circumcision; some things said of baptism and circumcision are not true; as that they are sacraments of admission into the church: Not so was circumcision; not of the Gentiles, who had it not, nor were admitted by it, and yet were in the church; nor even of the males, for they were not circumcised till eight days old, yet were of the Jewish church, which was national, as loon as born; and persons may be baptized, and yet not be entered into any visible church: Nor are they badges of relation to the God of *Israel*; since on the one hand, persons might have one or the other, yet have no spiritual relation to God; and on the other hand, be without either, and yet be related to him: nor are either of them seals and signs of the covenant of grace, as before shewn: nor is baptism absolutely requisite to a person's approach to God with confidence and acceptance in any religious duty, private or public. Baptism serves not to the same use and purpose in many things that circumcision did; it is not the middle wall of partition; nor does it bind men to keep the whole law, as circumcision; and though there may be some seeming agreement, arguments from analogy are weak and dangerous: so from the priest's offering a propitiatory sacrifice, wearing the linen ephod, and one high priest being above all other priests, the Papists argue for a minister's offering a real propitiatory sacrifice, for wearing the surplice, and for a Pope, or universal Bishop; and others from the same topic argue for tithes being due to ministers, and for the inequality of bishops and presbyters, there being an high priest and inferior ores: and to this tends our author's third argument, that either baptism succeeds circumcision, or there is nothing at all instituted in its room; nor is there any necessity that there should, any more than that there should be a Pope in the room of an high priest, or any thing to answer to Easter, Pentecost, etc. all which, as circumcision, had their end in Christ nor does the Lord's-supper come in the room of the passover; what answers to that is, *Christ the passover sacrificed for us*; and did it, by this argument from analogy, infants ought to be admitted to the Lord's-supper, as they were to the passover: by this way of arguing, and at this door, may be brought in all the Jewish rites and ceremonies, under other names: and after all, what little agreement may be imagined is between them, the difference is notorious in many things; some of which this author is obliged to own; as in the subjects of them, the one being only males, the other males and females; the one being by blood, the other by water; and besides they differ as to the persons by whom, and the places where, and the uses for which, they are performed; wherefore from analogy and resemblance is no proof of succession, but the contrary. My argument from baptism being in force before circumcision, to prove that the one did not succeed the other, is so far from being allowed by our author a proof of it, that he will not allow it to be a bare probability, unless I could prove they had been all along contemporary: but if I cannot do it, he and his brethren can, who give credit to the Jewish custom of baptizing their proselytes and children; and which they make to be a practice, for which the Jews fetch proof as early as the times of *Jacob*; and I hope, if he will abide by this, he will allow that baptism could not come in the room of circumcision.

2. He next attempts to prove that baptism is a real of the covenant of grace to believers and their seed, by a wretched perversion of several passages of scripture (John 3:33; Mark 16:16; Matthew 28:19; 1 Pet. 3:21; 1 Cor. 12:13), in which no mention is made of the covenant of grace, and much less of baptism as a real of it; and which only speak of believers, and not a syllable of their infants; and all of them clear proofs, that believers, and they only, are the proper subjects of baptism; as may easily be observed by the bare reading of them.

3. My sentiment of the ordinances of baptism and the Lord's supper not being seals of the covenant of grace, he thinks, is borrowed from the Socinians. These have no better notion or' the covenant of grace than himself, nor of the efficacy of the blood of Christ for the ratification of it, nor of the sealing work of the spirit of God upon the hearts of his people. My sentiment is borrowed from the scriptures, and is established by them; the blood of Christ confirms and ratifies the covenant, the blessings and promises of it, and is therefore called *the blood of the everlasting covenant*; the blessed spirit is the sealer of believers interest in it, or assures them of it (Heb. 13:20; Eph. 1:13) So that there are not two seals of the covenant of grace, as he wrongly observes. The blood of Christ makes the covenant itself lure, and is in this sense the seal of that; the spirit of God is the seal of interest in it to particular persons; and in neither sense do or can ordinances seal.

4. Upon the whole, what has this author been doing throughout this chapter? has he proved that the natural seed of believers, as such, are in the covenant of grace? he has not. The covenant he attempts to prove they are in, according to his own account of it, is no covenant of grace. Does it secure any one spiritual blessing to the carnal seed of believers? it does not. Does it secure regenerating, renewing, sanctifying grace, or pardoning grace, or justifying grace, or adopting grace, or eternal life? it does not. And if so, I leave it to be judged of by such that have any knowledge of the covenant, if such a covenant can be called the covenant of grace; or what spiritual Caving advantage is to be had from an interest in such a covenant, could it be proved. He would have his readers believe, that the covenant, he pleads infants have an interest in, is the same under all dispensations, and in all ages: the covenant of grace is indeed the same, but the covenant he puts the infant-seed of believers into, is only an external administration; and this, he himself being judge, cannot have been always the same. This external administration, according to himself, was first by sacrifices, and then by circumcision, and now by baptism; for what else he means by an external administration, than an administration of ordinances, cannot be conceived; and then by infants being in the covenant, is no other than having ordinances administered to them; and so their being in the covenant now, is no other than their being baptized; and yet he says, "the main foundation of the right of infants to baptism, is their interest in the covenant;" that is, the external administration they are under, or the administration of baptism to them, is the main foundation of their right to baptism. They are baptized, therefore they are and ought to be baptized; such an account of covenant-interest, and of right to baptism from it, is a mere begging the question, and proving *idem per idem*, yea is downright nonsense and contradiction: and so, when baptism is said to be the seal of the covenant, that is, of the external administration, which administration is that of baptism, the sense is, baptism is the seal of baptism. This senseless jargon is the amount of all the reasonings throughout this chapter: Such mysterious stuff, such glaring contradictions, and stupid nonsense, I leave him and his admirers to please themselves with.

5. From hence it appears, that the clamorous out-cry of cutting off infants from their covenant-right, and so abridging and lessening their privileges, is all a noise about nothing; since it is in vain to talk about cutting off from the covenant of grace, when they were never in it; as the natural seed of believers, as such, never were, under any dispensation whatever; and even what is pleaded for, is only an external administration, which neither conveys grace, nor secures any spiritual blessings; wherefore what privileges are infants deprived of by not being baptized? Let it be shewn if it can, what spiritual blessings infants said to be baptized have, which our infants unbaptized have not; to instance in baptism itself, would be begging the question; it would still be asked, what spiritual privilege or profit comes to an infant by its baptism? If our infants have as many, or the same

privileges under the gospel-dispensation, without baptism, as others have with it; then their privileges are not abridged or lessened, and the clamor must be a groundless one. To say, that baptism admits into the Christian church, as circumcision into the Jewish church, are both false, as has been proved already; our author, it seems, did not know, that a national church was a carnal one; whereas a national church can be no other, since all born in a nation are members of it, and become so by their birth, which is carnal; for, *whatsoever is born of the flesh is flesh*. Whereas a gospel-church, gathered out of the world, does, or should consist, only of such who are born again, and have an understanding of spiritual things. This writer seems to suggest, that if infants are not admitted to this external administration, and real of the covenant he pleads for, their condition is deplorable, and there is no ground of hope of their eternal salvation; and does their being admitted into this external administration make their condition better with respect to everlasting salvation? not at all; since, according to our author, persons may be in this, and yet not in the covenant of grace, as hypocrites may be; and he distinguishes this visible and external administration from the spiritual dispensation and efficacy of the covenant of grace; so that persons may be in the one, and yet be everlastingly lost; and therefore what ground of hope of eternal salvation does this give? or what ground of hope does non-admission into it deprive them of? Is salvation inseparably connected with baptism? or does it ensure it to any? How unreasonable then, and without foundation, is this clamorous outcry? And now, Sir, we are come to

The *fifth* chapter of my treatise, which considers the several texts of scripture produced in favor of Infant-baptism; and the first is Acts 2:38, 39. Now, not to take notice of this author's foolish impertinencies, and with which his book abounds, and would be endless to observe; for which reason I mention them not, that I might not swell this letter too large, and impose upon your patience in reading it; you will easily observe, Sir, the puzzle and confusion he is thrown into to make the exhortation to *repent*, urged in order to the enjoyment of the *promise*, to agree with infants; and which is mentioned as previous to baptism, and in order to it. That this passage can furnish out no argument in favor of Infant-baptism, will appear by the plain, clear, and easy sense of it; *Peter* had charged the Jews with the sin of crucifying Christ; their consciences were awakened, and loaded with the guilt of it; in their distress, being pricked to the heart, they inquire what they should do, as almost despairing of mercy to be shewn to such great sinners; they are told, that notwithstanding their sin was so heinous, yet if they truly repented of it, and submitted to Christ and his ordinances, particularly to baptism, the promise of life and salvation belonged to them, nor need they doubt of an interest in it: and whereas they had imprecated his blood, not only upon themselves, but upon their posterity, more immediate and more remote, for which they were under great concern; they are told this promise of salvation by Christ reached to them also, provided they repented and were baptized; and which is the reason that mention is made of their children; *yea*, *even to them that were afar off*, their brethren the Jews in distant countries, that should hear the gospel, repent and believe, and be baptized; or should live in ages to come in the latter day, and should *look on him whom they have pierced*, *and mourn*; and so has nothing to do with the covenant with *Abraham* and his natural seed, and much less with the Gentiles and theirs: and be it so, that the Gentiles are meant by those *afar off*, which may be admitted, since it is sometimes a descriptive character of them; yet no mention is made of their children; and had they been mentioned, the limiting clause, *even as many as the Lord our God shall call*, plainly points at, and describes the persons intended; not among the Gentiles only, but the Jews also, as agreeable to common sense and the rules of grammar; and is to be understood only of the Jews that are called by grace, and of their children, that are effectually, called, and of the Gentiles called with an holy

calling, as the persons to whom the promise belongs; and which appears evident by their repentance and baptism, which this is an encouraging motive to; and therefore can be understood only of adult persons, and not of infants; and of whole baptism not a syllable is mentioned, nor can it be inferred from this passage, or established by it.

II. The next passage of scripture produced in favor of Infant-baptism, and to as little purpose, is Matthew 19:14 it is owned by our author, that these children were not brought to Christ to be baptized by him; and that they were not baptized by him; these things, he says, they do not affirm. For what then is the passage produced? why, to shew, that infants become proselytes to Christ by baptism; and is not this to be baptized? what a contradiction is this? And afterwards another self-contradiction follows: he imagines these infants had been baptized already, and yet were commanded to become proselytes by baptism, and so Anabaptists; but how does it appear that it was the will of Christ they should become proselytes to him this way? from the etymology of the Greek word, which signifies *to come to*; so, wherever the word is used of persons as coming to Christ, it is to be understood of their becoming proselytes to him by baptism: it is used in Matthew 16:1 the *Pharisees also with the Sadducees*—προ σελθοντες , "*came tempting him*." Did they become proselytes to him by baptism? what stupid stuff is this? nay the Devil himself is said to come to him, *and when the Tempter*— προσελθων, *came to him*, *he said*, etc. Matthew 4:3. our author surely does not think he became a proselyte to him. That it was the custom of the Jews, before the times of Christ, to baptize the children of proselytes, is not a fact so well attested, as is said; the writings from whence the proof is taken, were written some hundreds of years after Christ's time; and the very first persons that mention it, dispute it; one alarming there was such a custom, and the other denying it; and were it far, since it was only a tradition of the elders at best, and not a command of God, it is not credible that our Lord should follow it, or enforce such a practice on his followers: the coming of these children was merely corporal, whatever it was for, and temporary; there is no other way of coming to Christ, or becoming proselytes to him, but by believing in him, embracing his doctrines, and obeying his commands; and when children are capable of these things, and do them, we are ready to acknowledge them the proselytes of Christ, and admit them to baptism: nor does the reason given in the text, *for of such is the kingdom of heaven*, prove their right to baptism; for not to insist on the metaphorical sense of these words, which yet *Calvin* gives into; but supposing infants literally are meant, the *kingdom of heaven* cannot be understood of the gospel-church-state; which is not national but congregational, consisting of men gathered out of the world by the grace of God, and who make a public profession of Christ, which infants are not capable of, and so not taken into it; and were they, they must have an equal right to the Lord's supper as to baptism, and of which they are equally capable; for does the Lord's supper require in the receivers of it a competent measure of Christian knowledge, the exercise of reason and understanding, and their active powers, as this writer says, so does baptism. But by the *kingdom of heaven*, is meant the heavenly glory; and we deny not, that there are infants that belong to it, though who they are, we know not; nor is this any argument for their admission to baptism; it is one thing what Christ does himself, he may admit them into heaven; it is another thing what we are to do, the rule of which is his revealed will: we cannot admit them into a church-state, or to any ordinance, unless he has given us an order so to do; and besides, it: is time enough to talk of their admission to baptism, when it appears they have a right unto, and a meetness for the kingdom of heaven.

III. Another passage brought into this controversy is Matthew 18:16; this is owned to be less convictive, because interpreters are divided about the sense of it; some understanding it of children in knowledge and grace, others of children in age, to which our author inclines, for the sake of his hypothesis; though he knows not how to reject the former: my objections to the latter sense, he says, have no *great weight* in them; it seems they have some. I will add a little more to them, shewing that not little ones in a literal, but figurative sense, are meant, even the disciples of Christ, that actually believed in him: the word here used is different from that which is used of little children, verse 3. and is manifestly used of the disciples of Christ (Matthew 10:42), and the parallel text in Mark 9:41, 42 most clearly shews, that the little ones that believed in Christ, which were not to be offended, were his apostles, that belonged to him; quite contrary to what this writer produces it for; who has most miserably mangled and tortured this passage: Moreover there was but one little child, Christ took and set in the midst of his disciples, whereas he has regard to several little ones then present, and whom, as it were, he points unto; one of which to offend, would be resented; and plainly designs the apostles then present, who not only had the principle of faith, but exercised it, as the word used signifies; and who were capable of being scandalized, and of having stumbling-blocks thrown in their way, and taking offense at them; which infants in age are not capable of: that senseless rant of cutting off infants from their right in the covenant of salvation, and from the privileges of the gospel, (I suppose he means by denying baptism to them) being an offense and injury to them, and the whining cant upon this, are mean and despicable: his reasons, why the apostles of Christ cannot be meant, because contending for pre-eminence, they discovered a temper of mind opposite to little children, has no force in it; for Christ calls them *little ones*, partly because they ought to be as little children, verse 3, and in some sense were so; and partly to mortify their pride and vanity, as well as to express his tender affection and regard for them, see verse 10, and since infants are not meant, it is in vain to dispute about their faith, either as to principle or act, and what right that gives to baptism; and especially since profession of faith, and consent to be baptized, are necessary to the administration of that ordinance, and to the subjects of it.

IV. Next we have his remarks on the exceptions to the sense of 1 Corinthians 7:14 contended for: the sense of internal holiness derived from parents to children is rejected by him; but there is another, which he seems to have a good will unto: he says there are some reasons to support it, and he does not object to it; yet chooses not to adhere to it, though if established, would put an end to the controversy; and that is, that the word s*anctified s*ignifies *baptized*, and the word *holy*, Christians *baptized*; and then the sense is, "the unbelieving husband is baptized by the believing wife, and the unbelieving wife is baptized by the believing husband; else were your children unbaptized, but now they are baptized Christians;" the bare mention of which is confutation sufficient. The sense our author prefers is a visible federal holiness: but what that holiness is, for any thing he has said to clear it, remains in the dark: covenant-holiness, or what the covenant of grace promises, and secures to all interested in it, is clear and plain, internal holiness of heart, and outward holiness of life and conversation flowing from that (Ezek. 36:25-27); But are the infants of believers, as such, partakers of this holiness? or is such holiness as this communicated unto, or does it appear upon all the natural seed of believers? This will not be said; experience and facts are against it; they *are born in sin*, *and are by nature children of wrath*, *as others*; and many of them are never partakers of real holiness, and are as profligate as others; and on the other hand, some of the children of unbelievers are partakers of true holiness: if it be said, and which seems to be our author's meaning, that it is such a holiness the people of the Jews had in distinction from the *Heathens*, and therefore are called an *holy seed*; this cannot be, since the holiness of the Jewish

seed lay in the lawful issue of a Jewish man and a Jewish woman: if a Jewish man married an Heathen woman, their issue was not holy, as appears from *Ezra* and *Nehemiah*; whereas, according to the apostle, if a Christian man married an Heathen woman, or a Christian woman an Heathen man, their issue were holy: should it be said, as it is suggested by our author, that so indeed it was in *Ezra's* times, according to the Jewish law; but now, since the coming of Christ, the national difference is abolished; which he makes to be the sense of the apostle, and therein betrays his ignorance of the apostle's argument and method of reasoning; for the particle *now*, as *Beza* observes, is not in this place an adverb of time, but a conjunction, which is commonly used in assumptions of argument, which destroys our author's argument, and lets aside his method of reasoning, which he seems fond of, and afterwards repeats: it remains therefore, that only a matrimonial holiness is here intended; and surely marriage may be said to be *holy*, as it is by the apostle *honorable*, and for that reason (Heb. 13:4), without savoring strong of popery, or savoring the notion of marriage being a sacrament, as this writer insinuates; who has got a strange nose, and a stranger judgment: whether he is a single or a married man, I know not; he appears to have a bad opinion of marriage. That infants born in lawful wedlock cannot be called holy, being legitimate, without favoring of popery. As he is not able to set aside the sense of the word *sanctified* given by me, as signifying *espoused*; he requires of me to prove that the word holy means *legitimate*; for which I refer him to Ezra 9:2 where those born of parents, both Jewish, are called *an holy seed*; that is, a lawful one; in opposition to, and in distinction from a spurious and illegitimate issue, born of parents, the one Jewish and the other Heathen: and this is the same with the *godly seed*, in Malachi 2:15. which *Calvin* interprets legitimate, in distinction from those that are born in polygamy: nor will any other sense suit with the care proposed to the apostle; nor with his answer and manner of reasoning about it; who says not one word era covenant whereby an unbelieving yoke-fellow is sanctified to a believing one, or of the federal holiness of the children of both; but argues, that if their marriage, being unequal, was not valid, which was their scruple, their children *must be unclean*, as bastards were accounted (Deut. 23:2); whereas it being good, their children were legitimate, and so might be easy, and continue together as they ought.

The passage out of the *Talmud*, which he has at second-hand from Dr. *Lightfoot*, designs by *Holiness*, Judaism, and not Christianity, and is quite impertinent to the purpose; nor can it be thought to be alluded to, since the holiness the Jews speak of, respects the parents, as both proselytes to Judaism; whereas the apostle's case supposes one an Heathen, and the other a Christian: and he might have observed by a tradition quoted by the Doctor, in the same place, that such a marriage the apostle was considering, is condemned by the Jews as no marriage, and the issue of it as illegitimate; which asserts, that *a son begotten of a Heathen woman is not a son*, his lawful son; just the reverse of what the apostle suggested: and after all, our author himself seems to make this holiness no other than a civil holiness, and which secures a civil relation, by which "the unbelieving yoke-fellow is sanctified, so far as concerns the believing party; that is, for lawful cohabitation, conjugal society, and the propagation of a holy covenant-seed;" for all which purposes, lawful marriages may be allowed to sanctify, if only instead of *a holy covenant-seed*, a legitimate feed is put. So that upon the whole, this passage does not furnish out the least shew of argument for Infant-baptism. Come we to

V. The next passage produced in favor of Infant-baptism, which are the words of the commission in Matthew 28:19, 20, one would think there should be no difficulty in understanding these words; and that the plain and easy sense of them is, that such as are taught by the ministry of the word,

should be baptized, and they only; and if there was any doubt about this, yet it might be removed by comparing the same commission with this, as differently expressed in Mark 16:15, 16 from whence it clearly appears, that *to teach all nations*, *is to preach the gospel to every creature*; and that the persons among all nations, that may be said to be taught, or made disciples by teaching, are believers, and being so, are to be baptized; *he that believeth and is baptized*, *shall be saved*. It is observed by this writer, that the acts of discipling and baptizing are of equal extent: it is agreed to, provided it be allowed, as it ought, that the word, *teach*, or *make disciples*, describes and limits the persons to be baptized; for such only of all nations are to be baptized, who are made disciples by teaching; not all the individuals of all nations; no, not even where the gospel comes, and is preached; for many hear it, and more might, who are not taught by it; and even when the seventh trumpet shall sound, and *all nations shall serve the Lord*, this will not be true of every individual of all nations, only of such, who are qualified for, and capable of serving the Lord; and so of adult persons only, and not of infants at all: and was this the care, that all nations in the commission are under no limitation and restriction, then not only the children of Pagans, Turks, and Jews, but even all adult persons, the most vile and profligate, should be baptized; wherefore the phrase, *all nations* to be baptized, must be restrained and limited to those who are *made disciples* out of all nations; who are the antecedent to the relative, *them* that are to be baptized, and not all nations; and though there is a frequent change of gender in the Greek language, which is owned; yet as *Piscator*, a learned Paedobaptist, on the text observes, "the syntax *(of them)* is referred to "the sense, and not to the word, since *nations* went before;" and the same observation he makes on the passage our author has produced as parallel (Rom. 2:14), but in order to bring infants to this restrictive and qualifying character for baptism, it is said, they are made disciples with their parents, when they become so, as parts of themselves: and why may they not be said to be baptized with them, when they are baptized, as parts of themselves, and so have no need of baptism? No doubt, if Christ had continued the use of circumcision under the New-Testament, and had bid his apostles *to go and disciple the nations*, *circumcising them*, they would have needed no direction as to infants, as is suggested; and that for this plain reason, because there had been a previous express command for the circumcision of them; but there is no such command to baptize infants previous to the commission, and therefore could not be understood in like manner. But it seems the known custom of the Jews to baptize the children of proselytes with them, was a plain and sufficient direction as to the subjects of baptism, and is the reason why no express mention is made of them in the commission: But it does not appear there was any such custom among the Jews, when the commission was given; had it been so early, as is pretended, even in the times of *Jacob*, it is strange there should be no hint of it in the Old Testament: nor in the apocryphal writings; nor in the writings of the New Testament; nor in *Josephus*; nor in *Philo* the Jew; nor in the Jewish *Misnah*; only in the *Talmud*; which was not composed till five hundred years after Christ; and this custom is at first reported by a single *Rabbi*, and at the same time denied by another of equal credit and authority: and admitting that this was a custom that then obtained, since it was not of divine institution, but of human invention, had our Lord thought fit (which is not reasonable to suppose) to take it into his New Testament ordinance of baptism; yet it would have been necessary to have made express mention of it, as his will that it should be observed, in order to remove the scruple that might arise from its being a mere Jewish custom and tradition. But to proceed: though this writer may be able to find in the schools within his knowledge, such ignorant disciples and learners, that have learned nothing at all; CHRIST has none such in his school: Christ says, none can be a disciple of his, but who has learned *to deny himself*, *take up his cross*, *and follow him* (Luke 14:26, 27, 33), and forsake all for him; and this man says, they may be called disciples, that have learned nothing, and be enrolled among the

disciples of Christ, who are incapable of outward teaching: but who are we to believe, Christ, or this man? He suggests, that it would be impracticable to put the commission in execution, if none but true disciples and believers are to be baptized, since the heart cannot be inspected, and man may be deceived; and observes, that the apostles baptized immediately upon profession, and waited not for the fruits of it, and some of which are not true disciples, but hypocrites: this is what he often harps upon; and to which I answer, the apostles had no doubt a greater spirit of discerning, and so could observe the signs of true faith and discipleship in men, without long waiting; but they never baptized any whom they did not judge to be true disciples and believers, and who professed themselves to be such: and though they were in some few instances mistaken; this might be suffered, that ministers and churches might not be discouraged, when such instances should appear in following times; and this is satisfaction enough in this point, when men keep as close as they can to the divine rule, and make the best judgment of persons they are able; and when, in a judgment of charity, they are thought to be true disciples of Christ, baptize them; in which they do their duty, though it may fall out otherwise; and in which they are to be justified by the word of God; which they could not, were they to administer the ordinance to such who have no appearance of the grace of God, and the truth of it in them. The text in Acts 15:10 is far from proving infants disciples; they are not designed in that place, nor included in the character; for though no doubt the Judaizing preachers were for having the Gentiles, and their infants too, circumcised; yet it was not circumcision, the thing itself, that is meant by the intolerable yoke, attempted to be put upon the necks of the disciples; for that was what the Jewish fathers and their children were able to bear, and had borne in ages past; but it was the doctrine of the necessity of that, and other rites of *Moses* to salvation; and which could not be imposed upon infants, but upon adult persons only. Next we proceed to

VI. The passages concerning the baptism of whole households, as an explanation of the commission, and of the apostles understanding it: Now since Infant-baptism, as we have seen, cannot be established by *Abraham's* covenant, nor by circumcision, nor by any command of Christ, nor by his commission, nor by any instances of infants baptized in the times of *John* the Baptist, or of Christ; if any instances of infants baptized by the apostles are proposed, they should be clear and plain: Since there is no express precept, which might justly be demanded; if any precedent is produced, it ought to be quite unexceptionable; if it is expected, such a practice should be given into by thinking people. Three families or households we read of, that were baptized, and these are the precedents proposed; yet no proof is made of any one infant in these families, or of the baptism of any in them; which should be done, if the former could be proved: but instead of this, the advocates for this practice are drove to this poor and miserable shift, to put us on proving the negative, that there were no infants in them. Our author thinks it utterly incredible, that in three such families there should be no infants, when, in so large a country as Egypt, there was not a family without a child (Ex. 12:30); and is so weak as to believe, or however hopes to find readers weak enough to believe, that all the first-born of the Egyptians that were slain were infants; whereas there might be many of them twenty, thirty, or forty years of age; so that there might be hundreds and thousands of families in *Egypt* that had not an infant in them, and yet not an house in which there was not a dead person.

But let us attend to these particular families: as for *Lydia* and her household, so far as a negative in such a care as this is capable of being proved; this is certain, that no mention is made of any infants in her family; it is certain, that there were brethren in her house, who were capable of being

comforted by the apostles, and were; for it is expressly said, that *they entered into the house of Lydia*, *and comforted the brethren*; which is a proof of what, he says, cannot be proved, that they law the brethren at her house; and nothing appears to the contrary, but that they were of her household; and if there were any other besides them, that were baptized by the apostles, it lies upon those that will affirm it, to prove it; without which, this instance cannot be in favor of Infant-baptism. As for the Jailor's family, it is owned by our author, that there were some adult persons in it, who believed, and were baptized at the same time with the Jailor; but he asks, how does this argue that there were no others baptized in it, who were in the infantile state? It lies upon him to prove it, if there were: The word of God was spoken to all that were in his house, and all his house believed in God, and rejoiced in the conversation of the apostles, who must be *all* of them adult persons; and if he can find persons in his house, besides those *all* that were in it, I will see him down for a cunning man. Who those expositors are, that reader the words, *believing in God*, *he rejoiced all his house aver*, I know not, any more than I understand the nonsense of it. *Erasmus* and *Vatablus* join the phrase *with all his house*, with *believing*, as we do, and *Pricaeus* makes it parallel with Acts 18:8 but however, this writer has found a text to prove, that the children of believers are in their infancy accounted believers, and numbered with them, it is in Acts 2:44 if he can find any wise-acres that will give credit to him. As to the household of *Stephanas*, he says, that it seems probable that it was large and numerous, which renders it more likely that there were some infants in it: how large and numerous it was, does not appear; but be those of it more or fewer, it is a clear case they were adult persons, that we have any account of; since they *addicted themselves to the ministry of the saints*: and now upon what a tottering foundation does Infant-baptism stand, having no precept from God for it, nor any one single precedent for it in the word of God? Come we now,

VII. To the last text in the controversy, Romans 11:17, 24 and which is the decisive one, and yet purely allegorical; when it is an axiom with divines, that symbolical or allegorical divinity is not argumentative: there is nothing, says Dr. *Owen*,[27] "so sottish, or foolish, or contradictious in and to itself, as may not be countenanced from teaching parables to be instructive, and proving in every parcel, or expression, that attends them;" of this we have an instance in our author, about engrafting buds with the cyon, and of breaking off and grafting in branches with their buds, which he applies to parents and their children; though the apostle has not a word about it: and indeed he is speaking of an engrafture, not according, but contrary to nature; not only of an engrafture of an olive-tree, which is never done, but of engrafting a wild cyon into a good stock; whereas the usual way is to engraft a good cyon into a wild stock. The general scope and design of the allegory is to be attended to which is to shew the rejection of the unbelieving Jews from, and the reception of the believing Gentiles into the gospel-church; for though God did not call away the people among the Jews whom he foreknew; or the remnant according to the election of grace, of which the apostle was one; yet there was a calling-away of that people as a body politic and ecclesiastic, which now continues, and will till the fullness of the Gentiles are brought in; and then there will be a general conversion of the Jews, of which the conversion of some of them in the times of Christ and his apostles were the root, first-fruits, pledge, and earnest; and which led on the apostle to this allegorical discourse about the olive-tree; which I understand of the gospel church-state, in distinction from the Jewish church-state, now dissolved. This writer will not allow, that the Jewish church, as to its essential constitution, is abolished, only as to its outward form of administration: but God has wrote a *Loammi* upon that people, both as a body politic and ecclesastic (Hosea 1:9); he has unchurched them; he has broke his covenant with them, and their union with each other in their church state, signified by his breaking his two staffs, beauty and bands (Zech. 11:10, 14); and

if this is not the care, the people of the Jews are now the true church of God, notwithstanding their rejection of the Messiah; and if the Gentiles are incorporated into that church, the gospel-church is, and must be national, as that was, and the same with it; whereas it differs from it, both as to matter and them, consisting of persons gathered out of the world, and enjoying different ordinances, the former being utterly abolished. Our author objects to my interpretation of the good olive-tree being the gospel church state, from the unbelieving Jews being said to be *broken-off*, and the olive-tree called their own *olive-tree*, and they *the natural branches*: to which I answer, that the breaking of them off, verse 17 is the same with the carting away of them, verse 15 and the allegory is not to be stretched beyond its scope. The Jewish church being dissolved, the unbelieving Jews lay like broken, withered, scattered branches, and so continued, and were not admitted into the gospel church state, which is all the apostle means: if I have used too soft a term, to say they were *left out* of the gospel-church, since severity is expressed, I may be allowed to use one more harsh, and severe; as that they were cast away and rejected, they were cut off from all right, and excluded from admission into the gospel church, and not suffered to partake of the ordinances of it: and as to the gospel church being called *their own olive-tree*, that is, the converted Jews in the latter day, of whom the apostle speaks; with great propriety may it be called their own, not only because of their right of admission to it, being converted, but because the first gospel-church was set up in *Jerusalem*, was gathered out from among the Jews, and consisted of some of their nation, which were the first-fruits of those converted ones; and so in other places, the first gospel churches consisted of Jews, into which, and not into the national church of the Jews, were the Gentiles engrafted, and became *fellow-heirs with them*, and of the same body, partaking of gospel-ordinances and privileges: and the *natural branches* are not the natural branches of the olive-tree, but the natural branches or natural seed of Abraham, or of the Jewish people, who in the latter day will be converted, and brought into the gospel-church, as some of them were in the beginning of it. This sense being established, it is a clear and plain case, that nothing from hence can be concluded in favor of Infant-baptism; of which there is not the least hint, nor any manner of reference to it.

This chapter, you will remember, Sir, is concluded with proofs of women's right to the ordinance of the Lord's supper: and which are such, as cannot be produced, and supported, to prove the right of infants to baptism. It is granted by our author, that my arguments are in the main conclusive, and he "must be a wrangler that will dispute them;" and yet he disputes them himself, and so proves himself a wrangler, as indeed he is nothing else throughout the whole of his performance. However, he is confident, there are as good proofs of the baptism of infants; as, from their being accounted believers and disciples (Matthew 8:6; Acts 2:44; 15:10); from their being church-members (Luke 18:16; 1 Cor. 7:14; Eph. 5:15, 26); from the probability of some infants baptized in the whole households mentioned; all which we have seen are weak, foolish, impertinent, and inconclusive. This author does wonderful feats in his own conceit, in his knight errantry way; he proves this, and confutes that, and baffles the other; and though he brings the same arguments, that have been used already; as he owns, and I may add, baffled too already, to use his own language; yet he has added fume *new illustration* and *enforcement* to them, and such as have not occurred to him in any author he has seen; so that he would have his reader believe, he is some extraordinary man, and has performed wonderful well; and in this vainglorious shew, I leave him to the ridicule and contempt of men of modesty and good sense, as he justly deserves, and proceed to The *sixth* and last chapter of my treatise, which is concerning the mode of administering the ordinance of baptism, whether by immersion, or sprinkling; and here, Sir, I observe,

1. That our author represents the controversy about this as one of the most trifling controversies that ever was managed: but if it is so trifling a matter, whether baptism is administered by immersion or sprinkling, why do he and his party write with so much heat and vehemence, as well as with so much scorn and contempt against the former, and so heavily load with calumnies those that defend it, and charge them with the breach of the *sixth* and *seventh* commands, as it has been often done? But if it is so indifferent and trifling a matter with this writer, it is not so with us, who think it to be an affair of great importance, in what manner an ordinance is to be administered; and who judge it essential to baptism, that it be performed by immersion, without which it cannot be baptism; nor the end of the ordinance answered, which is to represent the burial of Christ; and which cannot be done unless the person baptized is covered in water.

2. It is allowed that the word βαπτιζω, with the lexicons and critics, signifies *to dip*; but it is also observed, that they render it *to wash*: which is not denied, since dipping necessarily includes washing; whatever is dipped, is washed, and therefore in a consequential sense it signifies washing, when its primary sense is dipping. Our author does not attempt to prove, that the lexicons and critics ever say it signifies *to pour or sprinkle*; which ought to be done, if any thing is done to purpose: indeed he says, with classical writers, it has the signification of *persuasion*, or *sprinkling*; but does not produce one instance of it. He charges me with partiality in concealing part of what Mr. *Leigh* says in his *Critica Sacra*; which I am not conscious of, since my edition, which indeed is one of the former, has not a syllable of what is quoted from him; and even that is more for us than against us. Hence with great impertinence are those passages of scripture produced (Mark 7:3, 4; Luke 11:30; Heb. 9:10), which are supposed to have the signification of washing; since these do not at all militate against the sense of dipping, seeing dipping is washing; and to as vain a purpose are those scriptures referred to (Eph. 5:26; Titus 3:5; 1 Cor. 6:11; 2 Pet. 1:9; Acts 22:16), which call baptism *a washing of water*, and *the washing of regeneration*, etc. even supposing they are to be understood of baptism; which, at least in several of them, is doubtful; since nobody denies, that a person baptized, may be said to be washed, he being dipped in water.

3. It is affirmed that we do not read of one instance of any person who repaired to a river, or conflux of water, purely on the design of being baptized therein. But certain it is, that *John* repaired to such places for the convenient administration of that ordinance; and many repaired to him at those places, purely on a design of being baptized by him in them; and particularly it is said of Christ, *then cometh Jesus from Galilee to Jordan unto John*, *to be baptized of him* (Matthew 3:13); and I hope it will be allowed, that he repaired to *Jordan*, on a pure design of being baptized in it; and though it was in a wilderness where *John* was, yet such an one in which were many villages, full of inhabitants, as our author might have learned from Dr. *Lightfoot*;[28] where *John* might have had the convenience of vessels for bringing water, had the ordinance been performed by him in any other way, than by immersion.

4. The use of the words, *baptize* and *baptism*, in scripture, comes next under consideration; and,

(1.) the word is used in Acts 1:5 of the extraordinary Gifts of the Spirit to the apostles on the day of Pentecost, which is called a *being baptized with the holy Ghost*; and the house in which the apostles were, being *filled with it*, had in it a resemblance to baptism by immersion; and hence the use of the phrase. The main objection our author makes to this, is, that the disciples were in the house before it was filled with the holy Ghost; whereas it should have been first filled, and then they enter into it,

to carry any resemblance in it to immersion: but it matters not, whether the house was filled before or after they entered, inasmuch as it was filled when they were in, whereby they were encompassed and covered with it; which is sufficient to support the allusion to baptism, performed by immersion; or covering the person in water: it is represented as dissonant from common sense, to say, *Ye shall be poured with the holy Ghost*? and is it not as dissonant from common sense to say, *Ye shall be poured with the Holy Ghost*?

(2.) The sufferings of Christ are called a baptism (Mark 10:38; Luke 12:50); and a very apt word is used to express the *abundance* of them, as that signifies an immersion into water; and though the lesser sufferings of men, and God's judgments on them, may be expressed by the *pouring out* of his wrath, and the vials of it on them; yet since the holy Ghost has thought fit not to make use of such a phrase, but a very peculiar word to express the greater sufferings of Christ, this the more confirms the sense of the word contended for. The phrase in Psalm 22:14. *I am poured out like water*, doth not express the sufferings of Christ, but the effect of them, the faintness of his spirits under them. The passages in Psalm 69:1, 2 which represent him as *overwhelmed* with his sufferings, as in water, do most clearly illustrate the use of the word baptism in reference to them, and strongly support the allusion to it, as performed by immersion, which this writer has not been able to let aside.

(3.) Mention is made in Mark 7:4 of the Jews washing, or baptizing themselves, when they come from market, before they eat; and of the washing, or baptizing of their cups, pots, brazen vessels, tables or beds; all which was done by immersion. This writer says, I am contradicted by the best masters of the Jewish learning, when I say, that the Jews upon touching common people, or their clothes, at market, or in any court of judicature, were obliged by the tradition of the elders to immerse themselves in water, and did. To which I reply, that *Vatablus* and *Drusius*, who were great masters of Jewish learning, affirm, that according to the tradition of the elders, the Jews washed or immersed the whole body before they ate, when they came from market; to whom may be added the learned *Grotius*, who interprets the words the same way; and which seems most reasonable, since washing before eating, verse 4 is distinguished from the washing of hands, verse 3. But not to rest it here; *Maimonides*,[29] that great matter of Jewish learning, assures us, that "if the Pharisees touched but the garments of the common people, they were defiled, all one as if they had touched a profluvious person, and needed immersion," and were obliged to it: and though Dr. *Lightfoot*, who was a great man in this kind of learning, yet not always to be depended upon, is of opinion, that the plunging of the whole body is not here understood; yet he thinks, that plunging or immersion of the hands in water, is meant, done by the Jews being ignorant and uncertain what uncleanness they came near unto in the market; and observes, the Jews used the washing of the hands, and the plunging of the hands; and that the word *wash* in the Evangelist, seems to answer to the former, and *baptize* to the latter; and *Pococke*[30] himself, whom this writer refers to, confesses the same, and says, that the Hebrew word מכל to which βαπτιζεθαι answers in Greek, signifies a further degree of purification, than גטל or χερνιπτειν (the words used for washing of hands) though not so as necessarily to imply an immersion of the whole body; since the greatest and most notorious uncleanness of the hands reached but to the wrist, and was cleansed by immersing or dipping up to it; and though he thinks the Greek word used in the text does not only and necessarily signify immersion, which yet he grants, specially agrees to it, as he thinks appears from Luke 11:38. To this may be opposed what the great *Scaliger*[31] says; "the more superstitious part of the Jews, not only dipped the feet but the whole body, hence they were called Hemerobaptists, who every day before they sat down to food, dipped the body; wherefore the Pharisee, who had invited Jesus to

dine with him, wondered he sat down to meat before he had washed his whole body, Luke 11," and after all, be it which it will, whether the immersion of the whole body, or only of the hands and feet, that is meant in these passages; since the washing of either was by immersion, as owned, it is sufficient to support the primary sense of the word contended for: and so all other things, after mentioned, according to the tradition of the elders, of which only the text speaks, and not of the law of God, were washed by immersion; particularly brazen vessels; concerning which the tradition is,[32] "such as they use for hot things, as cauldrons and kettles, they heat them with hot water, and scour them, and *dip* them, and they are fit to be used." This writer says, I am strangely besides my Text, when I add, that "even beds, pillows, and bolsters, when they were unclean in a ceremonial sense, were to be washed by immersion, or dipping them into water;" but I am able to produce chapter and verse for what I affirm, from the traditions of the Jews, which are the only things spoken of in the text, and upon which the proof depends: for beds, their canons run thus; "a bed that is wholly defiled, if a man *dips* it part by part, it is pure."[33] Again, if he *dips* the bed in it, (a pool of water) though its feet are plunged into the thick clay, (at the bottom of the pool) it is clean."[34] As for pillows and bolsters, thus they say; "a pillow or a bolster of skin, when a man lifts up the mouth of them out of the water, the water which is in them will be drawn; what shall we do? he must *dip* them, and lift them up by their fringes."[35] Thus, according to the traditions of the elders, our Lord is speaking of, these several things mentioned were waffled by immersion; which abundantly confirms the primary sense of the word used.

(4.) The passage of the Israelites through the Red-sea, and under a cloud, is represented as a baptism, 1 Corinthians 10:1, 2 and very aptly, as performed by immersion; since the waters stood up on both sides of them, and a cloud covered them; which very fitly represented persons immersed and covered with water in baptism: but what our author thinks will spoil this fine fancy, and some others, as he calls them, is, that one observation of *Moses* often repeated; that *the children of Israel went on dry ground through the midst of the sea*. To which I reply, that we are not under any necessity of owning that the cloud under which the Israelites were, let down any rain: it is indeed the sentiment of a Paedobaptist, I have referred to, and therefore am not affected with this observation; besides, it should be considered, that this equally, at least, spoils the fine fancy of the rain from the cloud bearing a much greater resemblance to *sprinkling* or *affusion*, as is asserted by the writer of the dialogue; and out author says, there was a true and proper ablution with water from the cloud, in which the Israelites were baptized, and concludes that they received baptism by sprinkling or affusion; how then could they walk on dry ground?

(5.) The last text mentioned is Hebrews 9:10 which speaks of *diverse washings* or baptisms of the Jews, or *different dippings*, as it may be rendered without any impropriety, as our author asserts; though not to be understood of different sorts of dipping, as he foolishly objects to us; nor of different sorts of washing, some by sprinkling, some by affusion, others by bathing or dipping, as he would have it; but the Jewish washings or baptisms are so called, because of the different persons, or things washed or dipped, as *Grotius* on the place says; there was one washing of the Priests, another of the Levites, and another of the Israelites, when they had contracted any impurity; and which was done by immersion; nor do any of the instances this writer has produced disprove it. Not Exodus 29:4 *thou shalt wash them with water*; but whether by immersion or affusion he knows not. The Jews interpret it of immersion; the *Targum* of *Jonathan* is, "thou shalt *dip* them in forty measures of living water:" nor Exodus 30:19 which mentions the washing of the priest's hands and feet at the brazen laver of the tabernacle; the manner of which our author describes from Dr.

Lightfoot, out of the *Rabbins*; but had he transcribed the whole, it would have appeared, that not only washing the hands and feet, but bathing of their whole body, were necessary to the performance of their service; for it follows, "and none might enter into the court to do the service there, till he hath bathed; yea, though he were clean, he must bathe his body in cold water before he enter." And to this agrees a canon of theirs;[36] "no man enters into the court for service, though clean, till he has dipped himself; the high-priest dips himself five times on the day of atonement." And the Priests and Levites, before they performed any part of the daily service, dipped themselves: nor 2 Chronicles 4:6 which says, the molten sea in *Solomon's* temple was *for the priests to wash in*; where they washed not only their hands and their feet, but their whole bodies, as Dr. *Lightfoot* says;[37] "and for the bathing of which; they went down into the vessel itself; and to which agrees the *Jerusalem Talmud*,[38] which says, "the molten sea was a *dipping-place* for the priests:" Nor Numbers 8:6, 7 which, had the passage been wholly transcribed, it would appear, that not only the water of purifying was sprinkled on the Levites, but their bodies were bathed; for it: allows: "and let them shave all their flesh, and wash their clothes, and so "make themselves clean;" that is, by bathing their whole bodies, which, as *the Targum* on the place says, was done in forty measures of water. Sprinkling *the water of purification* was a ceremony preparatory to the bathing, but was itself no part of it; and the same is to be observed of the purification by *the ashes of an heifer*, on the third and seventh days, Numbers 19:19 which was only preparatory to the great purification by bathing the body, and washing the clothes on the seventh day, which was the closing and finishing part of the service; for that it was the unclean person, and not the priest, that was to wash his clothes, and bathe himself in water, verse 19 is clear; since it is a distinct law, or statute, from that in verse 21 which enjoins the priest to wash his clothes, but not to bathe himself in water; and indeed, the contrary sense is not only absurd, and interrupts and confounds the sense of the words; but, as Dr. *Gale* also observes, it cannot be reasonably imagined that the priest, by barely purifying the unclean, should need so much greater a washing and purification than the unclean himself; this sprinkling of the ashes of the heifer, therefore, was not part of the Jewish washings, or baptisms, or any exemplification of them; so that from the whole, I see no reason to depart from my conclusion, that "the words *baptize* and *baptism*, in all the places mentioned, do from their signification make *dipping* or *plunging* the necessary mode of administering the ordinance of baptism." I proceed now,

6. To vindicate those passages of scripture, which necessarily prove the mode of baptism by immersion. And, The first passage, is in Matthew 3:6 *and were baptized of him in Jordan, confessing their sins*. We argue from hence, not merely from these persons being *baptized*, to their being *dipped*; though this is an argument that cannot be answered, seeing those that are *baptized*, are necessarily *dipped*; for the word *baptize s*ignifies always to *dip*, or to wash by dipping, and never to pour or sprinkle; but the argument is frill more forcible from these persons being baptized *in* the river *Jordan*: for either the persons said to be baptized were in the river, or they were not; if they were not in the river, they could not be baptized in it; if they were in it, they went in it in order to be baptized by immersion; since no other end could be proposed, agreeable to the common sense of mankind: to say they went *into* it to have a little water sprinkled or poured on them, which could have been done without it, is ridiculous, and an imposition on common sense; wherefore this necessarily proves the mode of baptizing by immersion; since no other mode is compatible with this circumstance. The instances of the blind man's washing in *Siloam*, and the layers of the temple being to wash in, as disproving the necessity of immersion, I say, are impertinent; since the word *baptize* is used in neither of them; and besides, there is nothing appears to the contrary, that the

blind man dipped himself in *Siloam*, as *Naaman* the *Syrian* did in *Jordan*; and the things that were washed in the layers, were dipped there, since they held a quantity of water sufficient for that purpose. The author of the *dialogue* asks, "Do not we commonly wash our face and hands in a basin of water without dipping in it?" But common practice proves the contrary; men commonly dip their hands into a basin, when they wash either hands or face; the instance of *Elisha* pouring water on the hands of *Elijah*, doth not prove it was common to wash hands by pouring water on them; since this is not said to be done to wash his hands with; and some interpreters have thought that washing of hands is not intended, but some miracle which followed the action of pouring water, which gave *Elisha* a character, and by which he is described.

The second passage, is John 3:23. *John was baptizing in Enon near Salim*, *because there was much water there*. Here is not the least hint of *John's* choosing of this place, and being here, for any other reason, but for baptizing; not for drink for men and cattle, as suggested; besides, why did he not fix upon a place where the people could be provided with food for themselves, and provender for their cattle? Why for drink only? This is a wild fancy, a vain conjecture. The reason of the choice is plain, it was for the convenience of baptizing, and that *because there was much water*, suitable to the manner of baptizing used by *John*; and if this reason given agrees with no other mode of baptizing, but by immersion, as it does not, since sprinkling or pouring requires not much water; it follows, that this necessarily proves the mode of baptism by immersion.

The third text is Matthew 3:16. And *Jesus*, *when he was baptized*, *went up straightway out of the water*. The author of the dialogue suggested, that the Greek preposition απο, always signifies *from*, never *out of*: our author is obliged to own, that it may sometimes admit to be rendered *out of*: a great condescension to the learned translators of our Bible! Well, if Jesus came up out of the water, he must have been in it, where it is certain he was baptized; and the evangelist *Mark s*ays, he was *baptized into Jordan*; not into the banks of *Jordan*; but into the waters of *Jordan*; now seeing such an expression as this will not suit with any other mode of baptism but immersion, and it cannot be said with any propriety, that Christ was sprinkled into *Jordan*, or poured into *Jordan*, but with great propriety may be said to be *dipped* or *plunged* into *Jordan*; it follows, that this necessarily proves the mode of baptism as administered to our Lord, to be by immersion.

The fourth passage, is concerning *Philip's* baptizing the Eunuch in Acts 8:38, 39. *they went down both into the water*, *and he baptized him*; *and when they were come up out of the water*, etc. The dialogue writer would have it, that this proves no more than that they went down *to* the water, and *came from it*: but that this was not the case, I have observed, that previous to this, they are said to *came to a certain water*, to the water-side; and therefore after this, it cannot be understood of any thing else, but of their going *into* it; and so, consequently, the other phrase, of their coming *out of it*. Here our author has got a new fancy in his head; that turning *to a certain water* is not coming to the water-side, or to the water itself, but to the sight of it; which sense he does not pretend to confirm by any parallel place, either in sacred or profane writings, and is very absurd, improper and impertinent; since a person may come to *the sight* of a water, when he is at a great distance from it, and cannot be said with any propriety to be come so it: what he thinks will add strength to this fancy, and destroy the observation I made, is, that after this, the chariot is still going on, and several questions and answers passed before it was bid to stand still: all which is easily accounted for, supposing them to be come to the water itself; since the road they were now in, might be by the water-side, and so they traveled along by it, while the questions and answers passed, till they came

to a proper and convenient place for baptism, at which they alighted; besides, why should the *sight* of a certain water, or confluence of water, put the Eunuch in mind of baptism, if it was not performed by immersion, of the mode of which he was doubtless acquainted? It is highly probable, that this treasurer was provided both with wine and water for his journey, which, mixed, was the usual drink of those countries; and a bottle of his own water would have done for sprinkling, or pouring, had either of them been the mode of baptism used; nor would there have been any occasion for going out of the chariot and to the water, and much less into it, which the text is express for; and seeing these circumstances of going down into the water, and coming up out of it, at the administration of baptism, agree with no other mode than that of immersion, not with sprinkling, nor pouring water, it necessarily proves immersion to be the mode of baptism.

The last text is Romans 6:4 *we are buried with him by baptism into death*; where baptism is called a burial, a burial with Christ, and a resemblance of his; which only can be made by immersion: but our author says, if it is designed to represent it, there is no necessity it should be a resemblance of it; but how it can represent it without a resemblance of it, is not easy to say: he suggests, that though the Lord's supper represents the death of Christ, it is no resemblance of it. Strange! that the breaking of the bread should not be a resemblance of the body of Christ broken, and the pouring out of the wine not a resemblance of his blood shed. Baptism by immersion, according to our author, is no resemblance of the burial of Christ; since his body was laid in a sepulcher cut out of a rock on high, and not put under ground, or covered with earth: this arises from a mistaken notion of the Jewish way of burial, even in their sepulchres, hewed out of rocks; for in every sepulcher of this kind, according to the nature of the rock, there were eight graves dug, some say thirteen, and which were dug seven cubits deep:**[39]** in one of these graves, within the sepulcher, lay the body of our Lord. So that it had a double burial, as it were, one in the sepulcher, and another in one of the graves in it: besides, how otherwise could our Lord be said to be three days and nights in the heart of the earth? (Matthew 12:40). Again, our author says, "there is no more resemblance of a common burial in baptism by immersion, than by sprinkling, or pouring on water; since a corpse above ground may be properly said to be buried by having a sufficient quantity of earth cast upon it."

True; but then a corpse can never be said to be buried, that has a little dust or earth sprinkled or poured on its face; from whence it is evident, that sprinkling or pouring cannot bear any resemblance of a common burial. In short, seeing no other mode but immersion, not sprinkling, nor pouring, has any resemblance of a burial, this passage necessarily proves the mode of baptism by immersion: and yet, after all, this writer inclines to that opinion, that both modes were used in scripture-times; though it appears by all accounts that the manner was uniform, one and the same word being always used in the relation of it; and yet he wrangles at every instance of immersion, and will not allow of one; what must be said of such a man! that he must be let down for a mere wrangler; a wrangler against light and conscience; a wrangler against his own opinion and sentiment; and what a worthless writer must this be! I go on,

7. To consider the instances, which, it is said, shew it improbable that the ordinance of baptism was performed by dipping. The first is the baptism of the three thousand, Acts 2:41 which, to be done by immersion, is represented as improbable; from the shortness of the time, and the want of convenience on a sudden, for the baptizing of such a multitude. As to the time, I shall not dispute it with our author, whether *Peter's s*ermon was at the beginning of the third hour, or nine o'clock, or at the close of it, and about noon: I am willing to allow it might be noon before the baptism of these

persons came on; nay, I will grant him an hour longer if he pleases, and yet there was time enough between that and night for the twelve apostles, and seventy disciples, in all fourscore and two, to baptize by immersion three times three thousand persons. I pass over his foolish remarks on a person's being ready for baptism, as I have done many others of the same stupid kind, as deserving no notice, nor answer: As to the want of convenience for the baptizing such a number, I have observed the great number of baths in private houses in *Jerusalem*, the several pools in it, and the many conveniences in the temple: this writer thinks, the mention of the last is a piece of weakness in me, to imagine that the Jewish priests, in whose hands they were, the mortal enemies of Christ, should be on a sudden so good-natured as to grant the use of their baths for such a purpose: but how came they to allow the Christians the use of their temple, where they met daily? And besides, it is expressly said, they *had favor with all the peop1e* (Acts 2:46, 47).

The *second* instance, is the baptism of *Paul* (Acts 9:18); here only the narrative is directed to, as representing his baptism to be in the house of *Judas*: but there is nothing in the account that necessarily concludes it was done in the house, but rather the contrary; since he *arose* from the place where he was, in order to be baptized: and supposing it was done in the house, it is not at all improbable that there was a bath in this house, where it might be performed; since it was the house of a Jew, with whom it was usual to have baths to wash their whole bodies in, on certain occasions: So that there is no improbability of *Paul's* baptism being by immersion; besides, he was not only bid to *arise and be baptized*, which would found very oddly, *be sprinkled* or *poured* (Acts 22:16); but says himself, that he was *buried by baptism* (Rom. 6:4).

The *third* instance, is the baptism of *Cornelius* and his household (Acts 10:47). The sense of the words given, "can any man forbid the use of his river, or *bath*, or what convenience he might have, for baptizing;" is objected to, as not being the apostle's words, but a strained sense of them: the same objection may be made to this writer's sense, that the phrase imports the forbidding water to be brought; since no such thing is expressed, or hinted at: the principal thing, no doubt, designed by the apostle, is, that no one could, or at least ought, to object to the baptism of those who had so manifestly received the holy Ghost: but what is there in all this account, that renders their baptism by immersion improbable, for which it is produced?

The *fourth* instance is the baptism of the Jailor and his household; (Acts 16:33) in the relation of which, there is nothing that makes it probable, much less certain, that it was performed by sprinkling or pouring water on them; nor any thing that makes it improbable that it was done by immersion: according to the account given, it seems to be a clear case, that the Jailor, upon his conversion, took the apostles out of prison into his own house, where they preached to him and his family, verse 32, and that after this, they went out of his house, and were baptized; very probably in the river without the city, where the oratory was, verse 13, for it is certain, that after the baptism of him and his household, he brought the apostles into his house, and set meat before them (Acts 16:33, 34), nor is it any unreasonable and incredible thing, that he with his whole family should leave the prison and prisoners, who no doubt had servants that he could trust, or otherwise he must have been always little better than a prisoner himself: and whether the earthquake reached any farther than the prison, to alarm others, is not certain, nor any great matter of moment in this controversy to be determined; and the circumstances of the whole relation shew it more likely, that the Jailor and his family were baptized without the prison, than in it, and rather in the river without the city, than with the water out of the vessel, with which the Jailor had washed the apostle's

stripes: upon the whole, these instances produced fail of shewing the improbability of the mode of baptism by immersion; which must appear clear and manifest to every attentive reader, notwithstanding all that has been opposed unto it.

There remains nothing but what has been already attended to, or worthy of regard; but the untruth he charges me with, in saying that "the dialogue writer only attempts to mention allusive expressions in favor of sprinkling:" our author will be ashamed of himself, and his abusive language, when he looks into the dialogue again; since the writer of that never mentions the words of the institution, for any such purpose, and much less argues from them; nor does he ever shew that the word *baptize* is in the sacred pages applied to sprinkling, or that it so signifies; nor does he any where argue from the good appearance there is of evidence, that in the apostles times, the *mode of sprinkling was used*; he never attempts to prove that the word βαπτιζω, signifies to sprinkle, or is so used; nor mentions any one instance of sprinkling in baptism; what he contends for is, that the signification of the word, and the scripture instances of baptism, do not make *dipping* the necessary mode of administering that ordinance; and what he mentions in favor of *sprinkling*, are only resemblances, and allusive expressions.

There, Sir, are the remarks I made in reading Mr. *Clark's* book; which I have caused to be transcribed, and here send you for the use of yourself and friends, either in a private or in a public way, as you may judge necessary and proper.

I am with all due respects, Yours, etc.

JOHN GILL

LONDON, July 26, 1753.

Some

STRICTURES ON MR. BOSTWICK'S

FAIR AND RATIONAL VINDICATION

OF THE RIGHT OF INFANTS

TO THE ORDINANCE OF BAPTISM

Along with Mr. Clark's Defense of the divine Right of Infant-baptism, to which what is written above is a Reply, there has been imported from America a treatise called, A fair and rational Vindication of the Right of Infants to the Ordinance of Baptism; being the substance of several discourses from Acts 2:39, by David Bostwick, A.M. late minister of the Presbyterian church in the city of New York, which has been reprinted and published here; and as it comes in company with the former, it is but a piece of civility to take some notice of it, and make some few strictures (severe criticisms, ed.) upon it, though there is nothing in it but what is answered in the above Reply; to which I shall greatly refer the reader. There is scarce a single thought through the whole of it, that I can discern, is new; nothing but crambe repetita, old stale reasonings and arguments, which have been answered over and over; and yet this, I understand, has been cried up as an unanswerable performance; which I do not wonder at, that any thing that has but an appearance of reasoning, candor, and ingenuity, as this will be allowed to have, should be so reckoned by those of that party; when the most miserable pamphlet that comes out on that side of the question, has the same epithet bellowed upon it. And,

First, This Gentleman has mistook the sense of his text, on which he grounds his discourse concerning the Right of infants to baptism (Acts 2:39), for the promise is unto you, and to your children; and to all that are afar off; even as many as the Lord our God shall call; by which promise, he says, p. 14, 15, must be understood," the covenant-promise made to Abraham, which gave his "infant-children a right to the ordinance of circumcision;" when there is not the least mention made of Abraham, nor of any covenant-promise made to him in it; nor was ever any covenant-promise made to him, giving his infant-children a right to the ordinance of circumcision, but the covenant of circumcision; and that can never be meant here by the promise; since this is said to be to all that are afar off; by whom, according to this Gentleman, Gentiles are meant; to whom the covenant of circumcision belonged not; nor did it give to them any right to the ordinance of circumcision, except they became proselytes to the Jewish religion: besides, be the promise here what it may, it is observed, not as giving any right or claim to any ordinance whatever; but as an encouraging motive to persons in distress under a sense of sin, to repent of their sin, and declare their repentance, and yield a voluntary subjection to the ordinance of baptism; when they might hope that remission of sin would be applied to them, and they should receive a larger measure of the grace of the Spirit; and therefore can only be understood of adult persons; and the promise is no other than the promise of life and salvation by Christ, and of remission of sins by his blood, and of

an increase of grace from his Spirit: and whereas the persons addressed had imprecated the blood of Christ, they had shed, upon their posterity, as well as on themselves, which greatly distressed them; they are told, for their relief, that the same promise would be made good to their posterity also, provided they did as they were directed to do; and to all their brethren the Jews, in distant parts; and even to the Gentiles, sometimes described as afar off, of the same character with themselves, repenting and submitting to baptism; yea, to all, in all ages and places, whom God should now, or hereafter call by his grace; see my Reply to Mr. Clark, p. 50, 51.[1] This text is so far from being an unanswerable argument for the right of infants to baptism, as it is said to be, that there is not the least mention of Infant-baptism in it; nor any hint of it; nor any thing from whence it can be concluded. The baptism encouraged to by it is only of adult persons convinced of sin, and who repented of it. The passage in Acts 3:25, brought for the support of the author's sense of his text, is foreign to his purpose; since it refers not to the covenant of circumcision made with Abraham (Gen. 17), but to the promise of the Messiah of Abraham's seed, and of the blessing of all nations in him (Gen. 22:18), and which was fulfilled in the mission and incarnation of Christ, and in the ministration f his gospel to Jews and Gentiles; which same promise of Christ, of life and salvation by him, is meant in Acts 13:26, 32, 33, and which is also a proof, that the children to whom it belongs, are to be understood, not of infant-children, but of the adult posterity of the Jews; since the apostle says, God hath fulfilled the same to us their children; for surely the apostle Paul must not be reckoned an infant-child.

Secondly, The ground on which the right of infants to baptism is founded by this author is a false one; which is the covenant made with Abraham, that which gave his infant-children a right to circumcision, and is said to be the covenant of grace, the same under which believers now are. This he looks upon to be the grand turning point, on which the issue of the controversy very much depends; that it is the main ground on which the right of infants to baptism is asserted; and he freely confesses, that if this covenant is not the covenant of grace, the main ground of infants right to baptism is taken away, and consequently, that the principal arguments in support of the doctrine are overturned (pp. 18, 19). Now that this ground and foundation is a false and sandy one, and will not bear the weight of this superstructure laid upon it, will appear by observing,

1. That the covenant of grace gives no right to any positive institution; either circumcision or baptism: not to circumcision; the covenant of grace was in being, was made, manifested, and applied to many, from Adam to Abraham, both before and after the flood, who had no right to circumcision, nor knowledge of it; the covenant of grace did not give to Abraham himself a right to circumcision; he was openly interested in it, it was made, manifested, and applied unto him, many years before circumcision was enjoined him; and when it was, it was not the covenant of grace, but the express command of God, that gave him and his male seed a right to circumcision; I say his male seed, for his female seed, though no doubt many of them were interested in the covenant of grace, yet their covenant-interest gave them no right unto it: as there were also many, at the same time that circumcision was enjoined Abraham and his natural seed, who were interested in the covenant of grace, and yet had no right to circumcision; as Shem, Arphaxad, Lot, and others: and on the other hand, it may easily be observed, that there were many who had a right to circumcision, and on whom it was practiced, who, without any breach of charity, it may be concluded, had no interest in the covenant of grace; not to mention particular persons, as Ishmael, Esau, etc. many of the idolaters and rebels among the Israelites in the wilderness, of those that bowed the knee to Baal in the times of Ahab, and of the worshippers of Jeroboam's calves; those that are called the rulers of

Sodom and Gomorrah in the times of Isaiah, and that worshipped the queen and host of heaven in the times of Jeremiah; and those whose characters are given in the prophecy of Malachi, as then living; with the Scribes and Pharisees, who committed the unpardonable sin in the times of Christ; these cannot be thought to be in the covenant of grace.

In short, all were not Israel that were of Israel, and circumcised: it is therefore clear to a demonstration, that interest in the covenant of grace did not give right to circumcision, but the special, particular, and express command of God: nor does it give right to baptism; it gave the Old Testament-saints no right unto it, who were four thousand years without it, and yet in the covenant of grace; and since baptism is enjoined as an ordinance of the New Testament, a person may be in the covenant of grace, and yet not known to be so by himself or others; and while he is in such a state, and in such circumstances, he cannot be thought to have any right to baptism. It is a command of God, that those that repent and believe, be baptized; the covenant of grace provides faith and repentance for those interested in it, and bestows them on them; whereby they are qualified for baptism according to the divine command. But it is not the covenant of grace, nor these qualifications, that give the right to baptism; but the command of God to persons so qualified, to profess the same, and be baptized: for men may have faith and repentance, yet if they do not make a profession of them, they have no right to baptism, nor a minister any authority to administer it to them. No doubt but the apostle Peter was satisfied that the three thousand pricked in their hearts were truly penitents; yet insisted on the profession of their repentance, as antecedent to baptism; and Philip, I make no question, was satisfied of the Eunuch's being a believer in Christ by the conversation he had with him; yet required a confession of his faith in him, in order to his baptism; for with the mouth confession is to be made unto salvation. Nor even according to our author's sentiment does the covenant of grace give a right to baptism; since, according to him, persons are not in covenant before they are baptized; for he expressly says, pp. 12, 30. that by baptism they enter into the covenant, and are taken into the covenant by baptism; and therefore baptism rather gives them a right to the covenant, than the covenant a right to baptism, according to this Gentleman: so far is it from being true what he elsewhere says (p. 32), that the covenant of grace gave Abraham and his children a right to circumcision under the law; and that this it is that gives parents and children a right to baptism under the gospel.

2. The covenant of circumcision, or the covenant which gave Abraham's infant-children a right to circumcision, is not the covenant of grace; for the covenant of circumcision must be most certainly, in the nature of it, a covenant of works, and not of grace. It will be freely allowed, that the covenant of grace was at certain times made, and made manifest, and applied to Abraham, and he interested in it; and that God was the God of him, and of his spiritual seed; and that the spiritual seed of Abraham, both among Jews and Gentiles, are interested in the same covenant; but not his carnal seed, nor theirs as such: and that Abraham was justified by faith, as believers now are; and that the same gospel was preached to him as now; and that at the same time the covenant of circumcision was given unto him, there was an exhibition of the covenant of grace unto him: the account of both is mixed together; but then the covenant of circumcision, which was a covenant of peculiarity, and belonged only to him and his natural male seed, was quite a distinct thing from the covenant of grace, since it included some that were not in the covenant of grace, and excluded others that were in it: nor is that the covenant that was confirmed of God in Christ 430 years before the law was; since the covenant of circumcision falls 24 years short of that date, and therefore it refers not to that, but to an exhibition of the covenant of grace to Abraham, about the time of his call out of

Chaldea; besides the covenant of circumcision is abolished, but the covenant of grace continues, and ever will; see my reply (pp. 35, 36). Now as this covenant, which gave Abraham's infant-children a right to circumcision, is not the covenant of grace, the main ground on which the right of infants to baptism is asserted, is taken away, and so no foundation left for it; and consequently the principal arguments in support of the doctrine are overturned, as this Gentleman freely confesses; and as everyone should, who is in the same way of thinking and reasoning. If the covenant of circumcision is not the covenant of grace, here of right the controversy should be closed, since this is the turning point on which the issue of it very much depends; for if this be false, all that follows as argued from it, must be so too; for,

Thirdly, If the covenant of circumcision is not the covenant of grace, then circumcision is not the seal of the covenant of grace it is said to be (p. 22). If it was, the covenant of grace must be without such a seal near two thousand years, before the covenant of circumcision was given; and why not then always without one? besides, it must be with a seal and without a seal at one and same time, which is absurd; for there were some interested in the covenant of grace as before observed, on whom circumcision was not enjoined, and so without this seal, when it was enjoined on Abraham and his natural seed, and there were such afterwards; and circumcision also must have been the seal of itself, which is another absurdity. Circumcision was a token and sign, or mark in the flesh, which Abraham's natural posterity were to bear until the coming of the Messiah; but is never called a seal throughout the whole Old Testament; and much less is it any where said to be a seal of the covenant of grace: and indeed what blessing of grace could it seal, assure of, and confirm, to any of Abraham's natural seed as such, or any other man's natural seed? It is indeed in the New Testament called a seal of the righteousness of the faith which Abraham had, being yet uncircumcised (Rom. 4:11.) but then it was no seal of that, nor of any thing else to others, but to Abraham only; namely, that that righteousness which he had by faith before he was circumcised, would come upon, or be imputed to the uncircumcised Gentiles; and accordingly this mark continued in the flesh of his posterity, until the gospel, publishing justification by the righteousness of faith, was ordered to be preached to the Gentiles.[2] Wherefore,

Fourthly., Seeing circumcision was no seal of the covenant of grace, baptism, which it is pretended was instituted in the room of it, can be no seal of it neither, and so not to be administered as such to the children of professed believers, as is said (p. 25). The text in Colossians 2:11, falls short of proving that baptism is instituted in the room of circumcision; since the apostle is speaking, not of circumcision in the flesh, but in the Spirit; and by which he means not the outward ordinance of baptism, that is distinguished from it,[3] but an inward work of grace upon the heart; spiritual circumcision, called the circumcision of Christ; which to understand as the same, is not to make an unreasonable tautology; it makes none at all, and much less nonsense, as this writer suggests; but beautifully completes the description the apostle gives of spiritual circumcision; first, by the manner of its performance, without hands; then by the matter and substance of it, the putting off the body of the sins of the flesh; and lastly, by the author of it, Christ, who by his spirit produces it. The argument from analogy is weak and insufficient; though some little agreement between circumcision and baptism may be imagined, and seem to be in the signification of them, yet the difference between them is notorious; they differ in their subjects, uses, manner of administration, and the administrators of them; nor is it true, what is suggested, that they are both sacraments of admission into the church; nor are they badges of relation to God or Christ, nor signs and seals of the covenant of grace. Nor need we be under any concern about any ordinance coming in the room

of circumcision, and answering to that Jewish rite. Nor is there any necessity of any, no more than of a pope in the room of an high priest, or of any festivals to answer to those of the Passover, Pentecost, and Feast of Tabernacles; nor does the Lord's supper answer to the passover, and come in the room of it; it is Christ that answers to it, and is the passover sacrificed for us: but what makes it quite clear and plain, that baptism does not succeed circumcision, or come in the room of it, is, that it was in force and use before circumcision was abolished, which was not until the death of Christ, whereas John administered baptism, and Christ himself was baptized, and many others, some years before that time; and therefore baptism cannot be said, with any propriety, to succeed circumcision, when it was in force before the other was out of date: besides, if it did, it is no seal of the covenant of grace, nor to be administered to infants for such an use; for what spiritual blessing, what blessing of grace in the covenant, does baptism seal, or can seal, assure of, and secure unto the carnal seed of believers? Let it be named if it can.[4]

Fifthly, It is not indisputably evident, as this Gentleman says (p. 29), but indisputably false, that the apostles acknowledged and allowed the covenant-relation and interest of children, under the gospel, as well as under the law; by which I take it for granted he means, their relation and interest in the covenant of grace: that relation and interest, the natural seed of Abraham, as such, had not under the law; nor have the natural seed of believers, as such, the same under the gospel. This is not to be proved from his text, as has been shown already: nor from Romans 11:16, 17, where by the root and branches, are not meant Abraham and his posterity, or natural seed; nor by the olive-tree the Jewish church; but the gospel church-state in its first foundation, out of which were left the Jews that believed not in Christ, meant by the branches broken off; and which church was constituted of those that believed in him; and these were the root and first-fruits, which being holy, are the pledge and earnest of the future conversion and holiness of that people the apostle is speaking of in the context; and into which church state the Gentiles that believed were received, and are the branches grafted in, which partook of the root and fatness of the olive-tree; that is, of the goodness and fatness of the house of God, the ordinances and privileges of it: and in this passage not a word is said of the covenant-relation, and interest of children under the gospel; not a syllable about baptism, much less of Infant-baptism; nor can anything in favor of it be inferred from it;[5] nor can anything of this kind be proved from 1 Corinthians 7:14, real internal holiness is rejected by our author, as the sense of this and the preceding passage; but he pleads for a federal holiness; but what that is, as distinct from real holiness, let it be said if it can: the only holiness which the covenant of grace promises and provides for, and which only is proper federal holiness, is real holiness of heart and life:[6] no other than matrimonial holiness, or lawful marriage, can be meant in the Corinthian text; it is such a holiness with which the unbelieving parent is sanctified, husband or wife; and if it is a federal holiness, the unbeliever ought to be allowed to be in covenant; and if this gives a right to baptism, ought to be baptized, as well as their carnal issue; and have as good a right to it, surely, as they who have their holiness from them, and which even depends upon the sanctification of the unbelieving parent. I am able to prove, from innumerable instances in Jewish writings, that the words sanctify and sanctified, are used for espouse and espoused, and the apostle, being a Jew, adopts the same language; and let men wriggle and wrangle as long as they can, no other sense can be put upon the words, than of a legitimate marriage and offspring; nothing else will suit with the case proposed to the apostle, and with his answer and reasoning about it; and which sense has been allowed by many learned Paedobaptists; and I cannot forbear transcribing, what I have elsewhere done, the honest confession of Musculus: "Formerly, says he, I have abused this place against the

Anabaptists, thinking the meaning was, that the children were holy for the parents faith, which, though true, the present place makes nothing for the purpose."[7]

Sixthly, From what has been observed, it is not proved, as our author asserts (p. 32), that the apostles looked on the children of believing parents as having an interest in the covenant of grace; and false is it, to the last degree of falsehood, what he infers from thence, that "then we have undeniable evidence that "they did in fact baptize the children of all professing believers; and that they "understood their commission as authorizing them so to do" (Matthew 28:19). Let one single fact be produced, one undeniable instance of the apostles baptizing an infant of any, professor or profane, and we will give up the cause at once, and say no more. Nor did the apostles, nor could the apostles understand the commission as authorizing them to baptize infants. What this Gentleman observes, that the word teach is in the original to make disciples, or learn: Be it so, it is not applicable to newborn babes, who are not capable of learning anything, and much less of divine and spiritual things, of Christ and his gospel, and the doctrines of it; of which kind of learning only can the commission be understood: nor are the children of believing parents called disciples (Acts 15:10), adult persons are meant; and by the yoke attempted to be put on their necks, not circumcision, which was not intolerable, but the doctrine of the necessity of that, and other Mosaic rites, and even of keeping the whole law in order to salvation; this was intolerable.

This author further observes, that children must be included in the words all nations, mentioned in the commission. If they are included so as to be baptized, and if this phrase is to be understood without any limitation or restriction, then not only the children of Christian parents, but the children of Pagans, Jews, and Turks; yea, all adult persons, be they who they may, ever so vile and profligate, since these are included in all nations; but the limitation is to those that are taught, and learn to become the disciples of Christ, and believe in him, as appears from Mark 16:15, 16.[8] Nor does it appear from the scripture-accounts, that there is any probability, and much less the highest probability, as this writer says (p. 33), that it was the general practice of the apostles to baptize infants, and which he concludes from Lydia, the Jailor, and Stephanas; which instances do not afford the least probability of it.[9] To make it probable that there might be infant-children in those families, he observes, we read, when God smote the first-born in Egypt, there was not an house in which there was not one dead, consequently not an house in Egypt in which there was not a child: but he did not consider, that all the first-born of Egypt slain, were not infant-children; but many of them might be men grown, of twenty, or thirty years of age, or more; and of these, with those under such an age, and in infancy, it is not strange that there should be found one in every house.[10] Our author adds, "suppose it had been said of one proselyted to the Jewish religion, that "he and his household, or that he and all his were circumcised, would any doubt "whether his infant-children were circumcised? I believe not:" and so do I too; but not for the reason given, which is a false one; for it never was a practice, either before or since Abraham's covenant, to receive children with their parents into a covenant-relation, if by that relation is meant relation to, and interest in the covenant of grace; but for this very good reason, because the Jews and their proselytes were commanded to circumcise their Infant-children; but God has no where commanded any to baptize their Infant-children; and therefore when households are said to be baptized, this cannot be understood of infants, and especially when those in these households are represented as hearers of the word, believers in it, and persons possessed of spiritual joy and comfort.

Seventhly, The evidence this author gives of the practice of Infant-baptism, from those that lived in the first, second, and third centuries (pp. 34-40), comes next. He produces no evidence from any writer of the first century, though there are several whose writings are extant, as Barnabas, Clemens Remanus, Hermas, Polycarp, and Ignatius. He begins with Irenæus, as he is twice called; Irenaeus is meant, of whom he says, that he only mentions Infant-baptism transiently; but he does not mention it at all: it is not once mentioned in all his writings, as corrupted as they be; being some spurious, and for the most part translations, and these barbarous, and but few original pieces: the passage produced for his use, of the word regeneration for baptism, is not to the purpose; since by the command of regenerating, Christ gave to his disciples, is not meant the command of baptizing, but of teaching the doctrine of regeneration, and the necessity of it to salvation, and in order to baptism, the first and principal part of the commission of the apostles, as the order of the words shows. The other testimony which, he says, is plain for the baptism of infants, there is not a syllable of it in it: Irenaeus only says, "Christ came to save all; all I say, that "are born again unto God; infants, and little ones, and children, and young "men, and old men." Which is most true; for Christ came to save all of every age that are regenerated, and of which persons of every age are capable; but to interpret this of Christ's coming to save all that are baptized, is false; and is to make this ancient writer to speak an untruth: to prove that regeneration is used by him for baptism, a passage is produced out of Justin Martyr, said to be his contemporary, though Justin lived before him, in the middle of the second century, and should have been first mentioned; but will not serve his purpose: for Justin is speaking of the manner of adult-baptism, and not a word of infants; and of adult persons, not as regenerated by or in baptism; for he speaks of them before as converted and believers, and consequently regenerated; and their baptism is plainly distinguished from regeneration. Of the sense of the passages of these two writers, see more in the Reply, p. 16-18. The argument from apostolic Tradition (pp. 13, 14). Antipaedobaptism (pp. 9-20).

The next testimony produced is Origen, placed in the beginning of the third century, though it was rather towards the middle of it that he wrote and flourished in, and should have been mentioned after Tertullian. The passages quoted from him are, the first out of his eighth homily on Leviticus, though the last clause in it does not belong to that, but is in the fourteenth homily on Luke, and the other is out of his epistle to the Romans: Now these are all taken out of Latin translations, full of interpolations, additions, and detractions; so that, as many learned men observe, "one knows not when he "reads Origen, and is at a loss to find Origen in Origen." Now whereas there are genuine works of his still extant in Greek in them there is not the least hint of Infant-baptism, nor any reference to it, much less any express mention of it, not even as an apostolical tradition, as in the last passage produced; for so it should be rendered, not order, but tradition; on which I shall just observe what Bishop Taylor says: "A tradition apostolical, if it be not consigned with a fuller testimony than of one person (Origen) whom all after-ages have condemned of many errors, will obtain so little reputation among 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 determined by so weak a probation in a matter of so great concernment."**[11]** Tertullian is the next writer quoted as giving plain proof that Infant-baptism was the constant practice of the church in his day: he is the first person known to have made any mention of it; who, as soon as he did, argued against it, and dissuaded from it; and though it will be owned, that it was moved in his day, and debated; yet that it was practiced, and much less constantly practiced, has not yet been proved.

The next evidence produced is Cyprian, who lived in the middle of the third century; and it will be allowed that it was practiced in the African churches in his time, where it was first moved, and at the same time Infant-communion was practiced also; of the practice of which we have as early proof as of Infant-baptism; and this furnishes with an answer to this author's questions (p. 42). When Infant-baptism was introduced, and by whom? It was introduced at the time Infant-communion was, and by the same persons. As for the testimonies of Ambrose, Austin, and Pelagius, they might have been spared, since they wrote in the fourth century, when it is not denied that Infant-baptism very much prevailed; of Austin, and particularly of what Pelagius says, see Argument from apostolic tradition (pp. 19-26). Antipaedobaptism (pp. 33-37). And from hence it appears, that it is not true what this author suggests (pp. 42, 52), that infant-baptism was the universal practice of the primitive churches in the three first centuries, called the purest times; when it does not appear to have been practiced at all until the third century, when sad corruptions were made in doctrine and practice.

Eighthly, This author proposes to answer some of the most material objections against Infant-baptism (p. 43), etc. as,

1. "That there is no express "command for it in scripture, and therefore unwarrantable." To which the answer is; that if there is no express command, there are virtual and implicit ones, which are of equal force with an express one, and no less than four are observed; one command is enough, this is over-doing it, and what is overdone is not well done: but let us hear them; the first is God's command to Abraham to circumcise his infant-children, which is a virtual and implicit command to believers to baptize theirs! The reason is, because they are Abraham's spiritual seed, and heirs according to the promise; but the command to Abraham only concerned his natural, not his spiritual seed; and if there is any force in the reason given, or the command lays any obligation on the latter, their duty is not to baptize, but circumcise their children; since the sacramental rite commanded, it seems, has never been repealed, and still remains in full force. The next virtual and implicit command is in Matthew 19:14, but Christ's permission of children to come, or to be brought unto him, there spoken of, was not for baptism, or to be baptized by him, but for him to pray for them, and touch them, in order to cure them of diseases.[12] Another implicit, if not express command, to baptize infants, is in Matthew 28:19. This has been considered, and disproved already; (see p. 99). The fourth and last implicit command, the author mentions, is the exhortation in his text, Acts 2:38, 39, in which, as has been shown, there is not the least hint of Infant-baptism, nor anything from whence it can be concluded.

This author observes, that since virtual and implicit commands are looked on as sufficient to determine our conduct in other things, then why not in this? such as keeping the first-day-sabbath, attendance on public worship, and the admission of women to the Lord's-Supper. To which I reply, he has not proved any virtual and implicit command to baptize infants; and as to the cases mentioned, besides implications, there are plain instances in scripture of the practice of them; and let like instances of Infant-baptism be produced, and we shall think ourselves obliged to practice it. As to what this author says of an express, irrepealable command to children, to receive the seal of the covenant, and the constant practice of the church to administer the seal of it to them; if by the covenant is meant the covenant of grace, it never had any such seal as is suggested, which has been proved; nor has it any but the blood of Christ, called the blood of the everlasting covenant.

2. Another objection to Infant-baptism is; there is no express instance in all the history of the New-Testament of an Infant-child being baptized, and therefore is without any scripture-example. To which is replied, by observing that whole households were baptized; as there were, and which have been already considered; and these were baptized, not upon the conversion of the parent, or head of the family, but upon their own faith; and so were not infants, but adult persons; though this author thinks that such accounts would easily be understood to include children, had the same been said of circumcision. They might so, when circumcision was in force and use; for this very good reason, because there was a previous express command extant to circumcise children, when there is none to baptize infants. He further observes, that from there being no express mention of Infant-baptism in the New Testament, it should not be concluded there was none, anymore than that the churches of Antioch, Iconium, of the Romans, Galatians, Thessalonians and Colossians, were not baptized, because there is no express account of it in the history of the New Testament: but of several of those churches there is mention made of the baptism of the members of them, of the Romans, Galatians and Colossians (Rom. 6:3, 4; Gal. 3:27; Col. 2:12), but what this author might imagine would press us hard, is to give a scripture-example of our own present practice. Our present practice, agreeable to scripture-examples, is not at all concerned with the parents of those baptized by us, whether believers or unbelievers, Christians or not Christians, Jews or Heathens, this comes not into consideration; it is only concerned with the persons themselves to be baptized, what they are. It seems, if we give a scripture-example of our practice, it must be of a person born and brought up of Christian or baptized parents, that was baptized in adult years; but our present practice is not limited to such persons. We baptize many whose parents we have no reason to believe are Christians, or are baptized persons; and be it that we baptize adult persons, who are born and brought up of Christian or baptized parents, a scripture-example of such a person might indeed be required of us with some plausible pretext, if the history of the Acts of the Apostles, which this writer says continued above thirty years, had given an account of the yearly or of frequent additions of members to the churches mentioned in it, during that space of time; whereas that history only gives an account of the first planting of those churches, and of the baptism of those of which they first consisted; wherefore to give instances of those that were born of them, and brought up by them as baptized in adult years, cannot be reasonably required of us: But, on the other hand, if Infant-children were admitted to baptism in those times, upon the faith and baptism of their parents, and their becoming Christians; it is strange! exceeding strange! that among the many thousands that were baptized in Jerusalem, Samaria, Corinth, and other places, that there should be no one instance of any of them bringing their children with them to be baptized, and claiming the privilege of baptism for them upon their own faith, or of their doing this in any short time after; this is a case that required no length of time; and yet not a single instance can be produced.

3. A third objection is, that "infants can receive no benefit from baptism, "because of their incapacity; and therefore are not to be baptized." To which our author answers; that they are capable of being entered into covenant with God, of the seal of the covenant, of being cleansed by the blood of Christ, and of being regenerated by his Spirit: And be it so; what of all this! as I have observed in the Reply (p. 4). Are they capable of understanding the nature, design, and use of the ordinance of baptism? Are they capable of professing faith in Christ, which is a prerequisite to it, and of exercising it in it? Are they capable of answering a good conscience to God in it? Are they capable of submitting to it in obedience to the will of Christ, from love to him, and with a view to his glory? They are not: what benefit then can they receive by baptism? and to what purpose is it to

be administered to them? If infants receive any advantage, benefit, or blessing by baptism, which our infants have not without it, let it be named, if it can; if none, why administered? why all this zeal and contention about it? A mere noise about nothing.

4. A fourth and most common objection, it is said, is, that "faith and repentance, or a profession of them at least, are mentioned in the New Testament as the necessary prerequisites of baptism, of which children are incapable, and therefore of the ordinance itself." To this it is answered; that children are capable of the habit and principle of faith: which is not denied, nor is it in the objection; and it is granted by our author, that a profession of faith is a prerequisite to baptism in adult persons, who embrace Christianity; but when they have embraced it, and professed their faith, in the apostles times, not only themselves, but their households, and all that were theirs, were baptized. It is very true, those professing their faith also, as did the household of the Jailor, of whom it is said, that he was believing in God with all his house: His family believed as well as he, which could not have been known, had they not professed it. The instance of a professing stranger embracing the Jewish religion, in order to his circumcision, which, when done, it was always administered to his family and children, makes nothing to the purpose; since it is no rule of procedure to us, with respect to a gospel-ordinance.

Ninthly, The performance under consideration is concluded with observing many absurdities, and much confusion, with which the denial of Infant-baptism, as a divine institution, is attended. As,

1. It is saying the covenant made with Abraham is not an everlasting one; that believers under the gospel are not Abraham's seed, and heirs of his promise; that the engrafted Gentiles do not partake of the same privileges in the church, from which the Jews were broken off; and that the privileges of the gospel-dispensation are less than those of the law: all which are said to be flat contradictions to scripture. To all which I reply, that the covenant of grace made with, and made known to Abraham, is an everlasting covenant, and is sure to all the seed; that is, the spiritual seed; and is not at all affected by Infant-baptism, that having no concern in it. The covenant of circumcision, though called an everlasting covenant (Gen. 17:7), was only to continue unto the time of the Messiah; and is so called, just in the same sense, and for the same reason, the covenant of priesthood with Phineas has the same epithet (Num. 25:13). Believers under the gospel are Abraham's spiritual seed, and heirs of the same promise of spiritual things; but these spiritual things, and the promise of them, do not belong to their natural seed as such; the believing Gentiles, engrafted into the gospel church-state, partake of all the privileges of it, from which the unbelieving Jews are excluded, being for their unbelief left out of that state. The privileges of the gospel-dispensation are not less, yea far greater than those of the law; to believers, who are freed from the burdensome rites and ceremonies of the law, have larger measures of grace, a clearer ministration of the gospel, and more spiritual ordinances; nor are they less to their infants, who are eased from the painful rite of circumcision, have the advantage of a Christian education, and of hearing the gospel as they grow up, in a clearer manner than under the law; which are greater privileges than the Jewish children had under the former dispensation; nor are all, nor any of these affected, or to be contradicted, by the denial of Infant-baptism.

2. It is observed, that to deny the validity of Infant-baptism, is saying that "there was no true baptism in the church for eleven or twelve hundred years after Christ; and that the generality of the present professors of Christianity "are now a company of unbaptized heathens" (p. 52, so p. 10). To

which I reply, that the true baptism continued in the church in the first two centuries; and though Infant-baptism was introduced in the third, and prevailed in the fourth, yet in both these centuries there were those that opposed it, and abode by the true baptism. Besides, in the valleys of Piedmont, as many learned men have observed, there were witnesses from the times of the apostles, who bore their testimony against corruptions in doctrine and practice, and among whom Infant-baptism did not obtain until the sixteenth century; so that the true baptism continued in the church till that time, and it has ever since; (see the Reply, pp. 31, 32). As for the generality of the present professors of Christianity, it lies upon them to take care of their character, and remove from it what may be thought disagreeable; and clear themselves of it, by submitting to the true baptism according to the order of the gospel. As to the salvation of persons in or out of the visible church, which is the greater number, this author speaks of, I know nothing of; salvation is not by baptism in any way, but by Christ alone.

3. It is said, if Infant-baptism is a divine institution, warranted by the word of God, then they that are baptized in their adult age necessarily renounce a divine institution, and an ordinance of Jesus Christ, and vacate the former covenant between God and them. If it be; but it is not a divine institution, nor an ordinance of Jesus Christ, as appears from all that has been said about it in the foregoing pages; wherefore it is right to renounce and reject it, as an human invention: and as for any covenant between God and them vacated thereby, it will not, it need not give the renouncers of it any concern; being what they know nothing of, and the whole a chimerical business. Nay, it is farther observed, that renouncing Infant-baptism, and making it a nullity, is practically saying there are no baptized persons, no regular ministers, nor ordinances, in all professing churches but their own, and as elsewhere (p. 41), no gospel-church in the world; and that the administrations of the ministers of other churches are a nullity, and the promise of Christ to be with his ministers in the administration of this ordinance to the end of the world, must have failed for hundreds of years, in which Infant-baptism was practiced. But be it so: to whom is all this owing? to whose account must it be put? to those who are the corrupters of the word and ordinances. Is it suggested by all this, that "God "in his providence would never suffer things to go such lengths?" Let it be observed, that he has given us in his word reason to expect great corruptions in doctrine and worship; and that though he will always have a seed to serve him, more or fewer, in all ages, yet he has no where promised that these shall be always in a regular gospel-church-state; and though he has promised his presence in his ordinances to the end of the world, it is only with those ministers and people among whom the ordinances are administered according to his word; and there was for some hundreds of years, in the darkness of popery, such a corruption in the ordinances of baptism, and the Lord's supper, in the administration of which the presence of God cannot be thought to be; nor were there any regular ministers, nor regular ordinances, nor a regular gospel-church, but what were to be found in the valleys of Piedmont; and with whom the presence of God may be supposed to be; who bore a testimony against all corruptions, and among the rest, against Infant-baptism.[13]

This writer further urges, that "if Infant-baptism is a nullity, there can be now no regular baptism in the world, nor ever will be to the end of it; and so the ordinance must be lost, since adult baptism cannot be traced to the apostles times, and as now administered, is derived from those that were baptized in infancy; wherefore if Infant-baptism is invalid, that must be so too" (so in p. 42)." To which it may be answered, that the first English Antipaedobaptists, when determined upon a reformation in this ordinance, in a consultation of theirs about it, had this difficulty started about a proper administrator to begin the work, when it was proposed to send some to foreign churches, the

successors of the ancient Waldenses in France and Germany; and accordingly did send some, who being baptized, returned and baptized others: though others were of opinion this too much favored of the popish notion of an uninterrupted succession, and a right through that to administer ordinances; and therefore judged, that in an extraordinary case, as this was, to begin a reformation from a general corruption, where a baptized administrator could not be had, it might be begun by one unbaptized, otherwise qualified to preach the word and ordinances; which practice they were able to justify upon the same principles the other reformers justified theirs; who without any regard to an uninterrupted succession, let up new churches, ordained pastors, and administered ordinances. Nor is it essential to the ordinance of baptism, that it be performed by one regularly baptized, though in ordinary cases it should; or otherwise it could never have been introduced into the world; the first administrator of it must be an unbaptized person, as John the Baptist was. All which is a sufficient answer to what this writer has advanced on this subject.**[14]**

INFANT BAPTISM:

A PART & PILLAR OF POPERY

Being called upon, in a public manner, to give proof of what I have said concerning infant-baptism, in a preface to my reply to Mr. Clarke's Defense, etc. or to expunge it, I readily agree to the former, and shall endeavor to explain myself, and defend what I have written; but it will be proper first to recite the whole paragraph, which stands thus: "The Paedobaptists are ever restless and uneasy, endeavoring to maintain and support, if possible, their unscriptural practice of infant-baptism; though it is no other than a pillar of popery; that by which Antichrist has spread his baneful influence over many nations; is the basis of national churches and worldly establishments; that which unites the church and world, and keeps them together; nor can there be a full separation of the one from the other, nor a thorough reformation in religion; until it is wholly removed: and though it has so long and largely obtained, and still does obtain; I believe with a firm and unshaken faith, that the time is hastening on, when infant-baptism will be no more practiced in the world; when churches will be formed on the same plan they were in the times of the apostles; when gospel-doctrine and discipline will be restored to their primitive luster and purity; when the ordinances of baptism and the Lord's Supper will be administered as they were first delivered, clear of all present corruption and superstition; all which will be accomplished, when "The Lord shall be king over all the earth, and there shall be one Lord and his name one." Now the whole of this consists of several articles or propositions, which I shall reconsider in their order.

That infant-baptism is a part and pillar of popery; that by which Antichrist has spread his baneful influence over many nations: I use the phrase infant-baptism here and throughout, because of the common use of it; otherwise the practice which now obtains, may with greater propriety be called infant-sprinkling. That unwritten traditions with the Papists are equally the rule of faith and practice as the holy Scriptures will not be doubted of by any conversant with their writings. The Council of Trent asserts that "Traditions respecting both faith and manners orally delivered and preserved successfully in the Catholic church, are to be received with equal affection of piety and reverence as the books of the Old and New Testaments;" yea the Popish writers prefer traditions to the Scriptures. Bellarmine says, "Scriptures without tradition, are neither simply necessary, nor sufficient, but unwritten traditions are necessary. Tradition alone is sufficient, but the Scriptures are not sufficient." Another of their writers asserts, that "The authority of ecclesiastic traditions is more fit than the scriptures to ascertain anything doubtful, even that which may be made out from scripture, since the common opinion of the church and ecclesiastical tradition are clearer, and more open and truly inflexible; when, on the contrary, the scriptures have frequently much obscurity in them, and may be drawn here and there like a nose of wax; and, as a leaden rule, may be applied to every impious opinion." Bailey the Jesuit, thus expresses himself, "I will go further and say, we have as much need of tradition as of scripture, yea more; because the scripture ministers to us only the dead and mute letter, but tradition, by means of the ministry of the church, gives us the true sense, which is not had distinctly in the scripture; wherein, notwithstanding, rather consists the word of God than in the alone written letter; it is sufficient for a good Catholic, if he understands it is tradition, nor need he to inquire after anything else;" and by tradition, they mean not tradition

delivered in the Scripture, but distinct from it and out of it; unwritten tradition, apostolical tradition, as they frequently call it, not delivered by the apostles in the sacred Scriptures, but by word of mouth to their successors, or to the churches; that we may not mistake them. Andradius tells us, "That of necessity those traditions also must be believed, which can be proved by no testimony of scripture:" and Petrus a Soto still more plainly and openly affirms: "It is," says he, "a rule infallible and catholic, that whatsoever things the church of Rome believeth, holdeth and keepeth, and are not delivered in the scriptures, the same came by tradition from the apostles; also all such observations and ceremonies, whose beginning, author, and original are not known, or cannot be found, out of all doubt they were delivered by the apostles." This is what is meant by apostolic tradition.

Now the essentials of popery, or the peculiarities of it, are all founded upon this, even upon apostolic and ecclesiastic tradition; this is the Pandora from whence they all spring; this is the rule to which all are brought, and by which they are confirmed; and what is it, be it ever so foolish, impious and absurd, but what may be proved hereby, if this is admitted of as a rule and test? It is upon this foot the Papists assert and maintain the observation of Easter, on the Lord's Day following the 14th of March, the fast of Quadragesima or Lent, the adoration of images and relics, the invocation of saints, the worship of the sign of the cross, the sacrifices of the mass, transubstantiation, the abrogation of the use of the cup in the Lord's Supper, holy water, extreme unction or the chrism, prayers for the dead, auricular confession, sale of pardons, purgatory, pilgrimages, monastic vows, etc.

Among apostolical traditions infant-baptism is to be reckoned, and it is upon this account it is pleaded for. The first person that asserted infant-baptism and approved it, represents it as a tradition from the apostles, whether he be Origen, or his translator and interpolator, Ruffinus; his words are, "For this (i.e., for original sin) the church has received a tradition from the apostles, even to give baptism unto infants." Austin, who was a warm advocate for infant-baptism, puts it upon this footing, as a custom of the church, not to be despised, and as an apostolic tradition generally received by the church; he lived in the fourth century, the same Ruffinus did; and probably it was from his Latin translation of Origen, Austin took the hint of infant-baptism being an apostolic tradition, since no other ecclesiastical writer speaks of it before as such; so that, as Bishop Taylor observes, "This apostolical tradition is but a testimony of one person, and he condemned of many errors; so that, as he says, to derive this from the apostles on no greater authority, is a great argument that he is credulous and weak, that shall be determined by so weak a probation, in a matter of so great concernment.;" and yet it is by this that many are determined in this affair: and not only Popish writers, as Bellarmine and others make it to be an apostolical tradition unwritten; but some Protestant-Paedobaptists show a good will to place infant-baptism among the unwritten sayings and traditions of Christ or His apostles, and satisfy themselves therewith. Mr. Fuller says, "We do freely confess that there is neither express precept nor precedent in the New Testament for the baptizing of infants;" yet observes that St. John saith, (21:25), "And there are also many other things, which Jesus did, which are not written; among, which for ought appears to the contrary, the baptizing of these infants (those whom Christ took in his arms and blessed) might be one of them." In like manner, Mr. Walker argues, "It doth not follow our Savior gave no precept for the baptizing of infants, because no such precept is particularly expressed in the scripture; for our Savior spoke many things to his disciples concerning the kingdom of God, both before his passion, and also after his resurrection, which are not written in the scriptures; and who can say, but that among those many unwritten sayings of his, there might be an express precept for infant-baptism?" And Mr.

Leigh, one of the disputants in the Portsmouth-Disputation , suggests, that though infant-baptism is not to be found in the writings of the apostle Paul extant in the scriptures, yet it might be in some writings of his which are lost, and not now extant; all which is plainly giving up infant-baptism as contained in the sacred writings, and placing it upon unwritten, apostolical tradition, and that too, conjectural and uncertain.

Now infant-baptism, with all the ceremonies attending it, for which also apostolical tradition is pleaded, makes a very considerable figure in the Popish pageantry; which according to pretended apostolical tradition, is performed in a very pompous manner, as by consecration of the water, using sponsors, who answer to the interrogatories, and make the renunciation in the name of the infant, exorcisms, exsufflations, crossings, the use of salt, spittle, and oil. Before the party is baptized, the water is consecrated in a very solemn manner; the priest makes an exorcism first; three times, he exsufflates or breathes into the water, in the figure of a cross, saying, "I adjure thee, O creature of water;" and here he divides the water after the manner of a cross, and makes three or four crossings; he takes a horn of oil, and pours it three times upon the water in the likeness of a cross, and makes a prayer, that the font may be sanctified, and the eternal Trinity be present; saying, "Descend from heaven and sanctify this water, and give grace and virtue, that he who is baptized according to the command of thy Christ, may be crucified, and die, and be buried, and rise again with him." The sponsors, or sureties, instead of the child, and in its name, recite the creed and the Lord's prayer, make the renunciation of the devil and all his works, and answer to questions put in the name of the child: the form, according to the Roman order, is this:

"The name of the infant being called, the presbyter must say, Dost thou renounce Satan? A. I do renounce; and all his works? A. I do renounce; and all his pomps? A. I do renounce: three times these questions are put, and three times the sureties answer." The interrogations are sometimes said to be made by a priest, sometimes by a presbyter, and sometimes by an exorcist, who was one or the other, and to which the following question also was added: "Dost thou believe in God the Father Almighty, creator of heaven and earth, etc.? A. I believe." Children to be baptized are first exsufflated or breathed and blown upon and exorcised, that the wicked spirit might be driven from them, that they might be delivered from the power of darkness, and translated into the kingdom of Christ: the Roman order is, "Let him (the minister, priest, deacon or exorcist) blow into the face of the person to be baptized, three times, saying, Go out thou unclean spirit, and give place to the Holy Ghost, the Comforter." The form, according to St. Gregory, is, "I exorcise thee, O unclean spirit, in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost, that thou go out and depart from this servant of God." Salt also is put into the mouth of the infant, after it is blessed and exorcised, as a token of its being seasoned with the salt of wisdom; and that it might be preserved from the corruption and ill savor of sin: the priest first blesses the salt after this manner: "I exorcise thee, O creature of salt; and then being blessed, it is put into the mouth of the infant saying, Receive the salt of wisdom unto life everlasting." The nose and ears of infants at their baptism are touched with spittle by the priest, that they may receive the savor of the knowledge of God, and their ears be opened to hear the commands of God; and formerly spittle was put upon the eyes and upon the tongue, though it seems now disused as to those parts; and yet no longer than the birth of King James the First, it seems to have been in use; since at his baptism his mother sent word to the archbishop to forbear the use of the spittle, saying, "She would not have a pocky priest to spit in her child's mouth,;" for it seems the queen knew that the archbishop, who was Hamilton, Archbishop of St. Andrews, then had the venereal disease . And so in the times of the martyrs in Queen Mary's

days; for Robert Smith, the martyr, being asked by Bonner, in what point do we dissent from the word of God? meaning as to baptism; he answered, "First, in hallowing your water, in conjuring of the same, in baptizing children with anointing and spitting in their mouths, mingled with salt, and many other lewd ceremonies, of which not one point is able to be proved in God's word." All which he calls a mingle mangle. Chrism, or anointing both before and after baptism, is another ceremony used at it; the parts anointed are the breast and shoulders; the breast, that no remains of the latent enemy may reside in the party baptized; and the shoulders, that he may be fortified and strengthened to do good works to the glory of God: this anointing is made in the form of a cross; the oil is put on the breast and beneath the shoulders, making a cross with the thumb; on making the cross on the shoulders, the priest says, "Flee, thou unclean spirit, give honor to the living and true God;" and when he makes it on the breast, he says, "Go out, thou unclean spirit, give place to the Holy Ghost:" the form used in doing it is "I anoint thee with the oil of salvation, that thou mayest have life everlasting." The next ceremony is that of signing the infant with the sign of the cross: this is made in several parts of the body, especially on the forehead, to signify that the party baptized should not be ashamed of the cross of Christ, and not be afraid of the enemy Satan, but manfully fight against him. After baptism, in ancient times, honey and milk, or wine and milk, were given to the baptized, though now disused; and infants were admitted to the Lord's Supper, which continued some hundreds of years in the Latin church, and still does in the Greek church. Now for the proof of the use of these various ceremonies, the reader may consult Joseph Vicecomes, a learned Papist as Dr. Wall calls him, in his Treatise de Antiquis Baptismi Ritibus ac Ceremoniis, where and by whom they are largely treated of, and the proofs of them given. All which are rehearsed and condemned by the ancient Waldenses in a treatise of theirs, written in the year 1120. It may be asked to what purpose is this account given of the ceremonies used by Papists in the administration of baptism to infants by them, since they are not used by Protestant-paedobaptists? I answer, it is to show what I proposed, namely, what a figure infant-baptism, with these attending ceremonies, makes in popery, and may with propriety be called a part of it; besides though all these ceremonies are not used, yet some of them are used in some Protestant-paedobaptist churches, as sureties, the interrogations made to them, and their answers in the name of infants; the renunciation of the devil and all his works, and signing with the sign of the cross; and since these and the others, all of them claim apostolic authority, and most, if not all of them, have as good and as early a claim to it as infant-baptism itself; those who admit that upon this foot, ought to admit these ceremonies also. See a treatise of mine, called The Argument from Apostolic Tradition in Favor of Infant-baptism Considered. Most of the above ceremonies are mentioned by Basil, who lived in the 4th century, and as then in use, and which were had from apostolic tradition as said, and not from the scriptures; and says he, "Because this is first and most common, I will mention it in the first place, as that we sign with the sign of the cross; —Who has taught this in Scripture? We consecrate the water of baptism and the oil of unction as well as him who receives baptism; from what scriptures? Is it not from private and secret tradition? Moreover the anointing with oil, what passage in scripture teaches this? Now a man is thrice immersed, from whence is it derived or delivered? Also the rest of what is done in baptism, as to renounce Satan and his angels, from what scripture have we it? Is not this from private and secret tradition?" And so Austin speaks of exorcisms and exsufflations used in baptism, as of ancient tradition, and of universal use in the church. Now whoever receives infant-baptism on the foot of apostolic tradition, ought to receive those also, since they stand upon as good a foundation as that does.

The Papists attribute the rise of several of the above ceremonies to their popes, as sponsors, chrisms, exorcisms, etc., though perhaps they were not quite so early as they imagine, yet very early they were; and infant-baptism itself, though two or three doctors of the church had asserted and espoused it, yet it was not determined in any council until the Milevitan Council in 418, or thereabouts, a provincial of Africa, in which was a canon made for Paedobaptism and never till then: So says Bishop Taylor , with whom Grotius agrees , who calls it the Council of Carthage; and who says in the councils no earlier mention is made of infant-baptism than in that council; the canons of which were sent to Pope Innocent the First , and confirmed by him: And Austin, who must write his book against the Donatists before this time, though he says the church always held it (infant-baptism) and that it is most rightly believed to be delivered by apostolic tradition; yet observes that it was not instituted, or determined and settled in or by councils; that is, as yet it was not, though it afterwards was in the above council confirmed by the said pope; in which council Austin himself presided, and in which is this canon, "Also it is our pleasure, that whoever denies that new-born infants are to be baptized, --- let him be anathema," and which is the first council that established infant-baptism, and anathematized those that denied it; so that it may justly be called a part of popery: besides baptism by immersion, which continued 1300 years in the Latin church, excepting in the case of the Clinicks, and still does in the Creek church, was first changed into sprinkling by the Papists; which is not an indifferent thing, whether performed with much or a little water, as it is usually considered; but is of the very essence of baptism, is that itself, and without which it is not baptism; it being as Sir John Floyer says, no circumstance, but the very act of baptizing; who observes that aspersion, or sprinkling, was brought into the church by the Popish schoolmen , and our dissenters, adds he, had it from them; the schoolmen employed their thoughts how to find out reasons for the alteration to sprinkling, brought it into use in the 12th century: and it must be observed, to the honor of the Church of England, that they have not established sprinkling in baptism to this day; only have permitted pouring in case it is certified the child is weakly and not able to bear dipping; otherwise, by the Rubric, the priest is ordered to dip the child warily: sprinkling received only a Presbyterian sanction in times of the civil war by the Assembly of Divines; where it was carried for sprinkling against dipping by one vote only, by 25 against 24, and then established by an ordinance of Parliament, 1644: and that this change has its rise from the authority of the Pope, Dr. Wall himself acknowledges , and that the sprinkling of infants is from popery. "All the nations of Christians," says he, "that do now, or formerly did, submit to the authority of the Bishop of Rome do ordinarily baptize their infants by pouring or sprinkling; and though the English received not this custom till after the decay of Popery, yet they have since received it from such neighbor-nations as had began it in the times of the pope's power; but all other Christians in the world, who never owned the pope's usurped power, do, and ever did, dip their infants in their ordinary use;" so that infant-baptism, both with respect to subjects and mode, may with great propriety be called a part and branch of popery.

But it is not only a part of popery, and so serves to strengthen it, as a part does the whole; but it is a pillar of it, what serves greatly to support it; and which furnishes the Papists with one of the strongest arguments against the Protestants in favor of their traditions, on which, as we have seen, the essentials of popery are founded, and of the authority of the church to alter the rites of divine worship: they sadly embarrass Paedobaptist Protestants with the affair of infant-baptism, and urge them either to prove it by scripture, both with respect to mode and subjects, or allow of unscriptural traditions and the authority of the church, or give it up; and if they can allow of unwritten traditions, and the custom and practice of the church, as of authority in one point, why not in

others? This way of arguing, as Mr. Stennet observes , is used by Cardinal Du Perron, in his reply to the answer of King James the First, and by Mr. John Ainsworth, against Mr. Henry Ainsworth, in the dispute between them, and by Fisher the Jesuit, against Archbishop Laud; a late instance of this kind, he adds, we have in the controversy between Monsieur Bossuet, Bishop of Meaux, and a learned anonymous writer, said to be Monsieur de la Roque, late pastor of the Reformed church at Roan in Normandy. The Bishop, in order to defend the withholding the cup in the Lord's Supper from the laity, according to the authority of the church, urged that infant-baptism, both as to mode and subject, was unscriptural, and solely by the authority of tradition and custom, with which the pretended Reformed complied, and therefore why not in the other case; which produced this ingenuous confession from his antagonist, that to baptize by sprinkling was certainly an abuse derived from the Romish church, without due examination, as well as many other things, which he and his brethren were resolved to correct, and thanked the bishop for undeceiving them; and freely confessed, that as to the baptism of infants, there is nothing formal or express in the gospel to justify the necessity of it; and that the passages produced do at most only prove that it is permitted, or rather, that it is not forbidden to baptize them. In the times of King Charles the Second, lived Mr. Jeremiah Ives, a Baptist minister, famous for his talent at disputation, of whom the king having heard, sent for him to dispute with a Romish priest; the which he did before the king and many others, in the habit of a clergyman: Mr. Ives pressed the priest closely, showing the whatever antiquity they pretended to, their doctrine and practices could by no means be proved apostolic; since they are not to be found in any writings which remain of the apostolic age; the priest, after much wrangling, in the end replied, that this argument of Mr. Ives was as of much force against infant-baptism, as against the doctrines and ceremonies of the church of Rome: to which Mr. Ives answered, that he readily granted what he said to be true; the priest upon this broke up the dispute, saying, he had been cheated, and that he would proceed no further; for he came to dispute with a clergyman of the established church, and it was now evident that this was an Anabaptist preacher. This behavior of the priest afforded his majesty and all present not a little diversion: and as Protestant Paedobaptists are urged by this argument to admit the unwritten traditions of the Papists; so dissenters of the Paedobaptist persuasion are pressed upon the same footing by those of the Church of England to comply with the ceremonies of that church, retained from the church of Rome, particularly by Dr. Whitby; who having pleaded for some condescension to be made to dissenters, in order to reconcile them to the church, adds: "and on the other hand", says he, "if notwithstanding the evidence produced, that baptism by immersion, is suitable both to the institution of our Lord and his apostles; and was by them ordained to represent our burial with Christ, and so our dying unto sin, and our conformity to his resurrection by newness of life; as the apostle doth clearly maintain the meaning of that rite: I say, if notwithstanding this, all our dissenters (i.e. who are Paedobaptists, he must mean) do agree to sprinkle the baptized infant; why may they not as well submit to the significant ceremonies imposed by our church? for, since it is as lawful to add unto Christ's institutions a significant ceremony, as to diminish a significant ceremony, which he or his apostles instituted; and use another in its stead, which they never did institute; what reason can they have to do the latter, and yet refuse submission to the former? and why should not the peace and union of the church be as prevailing with them, to perform the one, as is their mercy to the infant's body to neglect the other?" Thus infant-baptism is used as the grand plea for compliance with the ceremonies both of the church of Rome and of the church of England.

I have added in the preface referred to, where stands the above clause, that infant-baptism is "that by which Antichrist has spread his baneful influence over many nations;" which is abundantly

evident, since by the christening of children through baptism, introduced by him, he has made whole countries and nations Christians, and has christened them by the name of Christendom; and thereby has enlarged his universal church , over which he claims an absolute power and authority, as being Christ's vicar on earth; and by the same means he retains his influence over nations, and keeps them in awe and in obedience to him; asserting that by their baptism they are brought into the pale of the church, in which there is salvation, and out of which there is none; if therefore they renounce their baptism, received in infancy, or apostatize from the church, their damnation is inevitable; and thus by his menaces and anathemas, he holds the nations in subjection to him: and when they at any time have courage to oppose him, and act in disobedience to his supreme authority, he immediately lays a whole nation under an interdict; by which are prohibited, the administration of the sacraments, all public prayers, burials, christenings, etc., church-doors are locked up, the clergy dare not or will not administer any offices of their function to any, but such as for large sums of money obtain special privileges from Rome for that purpose: now by means of these prohibitions, and particularly of christening or baptizing children, nations are obliged to comply and yield obedience to the bishop of Rome; for it appears most dreadful to parents, that their children should be deprived of baptism, by which they are made Christians, as they are taught to believe, and without which there is no hope of salvation; and therefore are influenced to give-in to anything for the sake of what is thought so very important. Once more, the baneful influence spread by Antichrist over the nations by infant-baptism, is that poisonous notion infused by him, that sacraments, particularly baptism, confer grace ex opere operate, by the work done; that it takes away sin, regenerates men, and saves their souls; this is charged upon him, and complained of by the ancient Waldenses in a tract of theirs, written in the year 1120, where speaking of the works of Antichrist, they say, "the third work of Antichrist consists in this, that he attributes the regeneration of the Holy Spirit unto the dead, outward work, baptizing children in that faith, and teaching that thereby baptism and regeneration must be had; and therein he confers and bestows orders and other sacraments, and groundeth therein all his Christianity, which is against the Holy Spirit": and which popish notion is argued against and exposed by Robert {Smith} the martyr; on Bonner's saying "if they (infants) die, before they are baptized, they be damned;" he asked this question, "I pray you, my lord, shew me, are we saved by water or by Christ?" to which Bonner replied, "by both;" "then," said Smith, "the water died for our sins, and so must ye say, that the water hath life, and it being our servant, and created for us, is our Savior; this my lord is a good doctrine, is it not?" And this pernicious notion still continues, this old leaven yet remains, even in some Protestant churches, who have retained it from Rome; hence a child when baptized is declared to be regenerate; and it is taught, when capable of being catechized to say, that in its baptism it was made a child of God, a member of Christ, and an inheritor of the kingdom of heaven, which has a tendency to take off all concern, in persons when grown up, about an inward work of grace, in regeneration and sanctification, as a meetness for heaven, and to encourage a presumption in them, notwithstanding their apparent want of grace, that they are members of Christ, and shall never perish; are children and heirs of God, and shall certainly inherit eternal life. Wherefore Dr. [John] Owen rightly observes "That the father of lies himself could not easily have devised a doctrine more pernicious, or what proposes a more present and effectual poison to the minds of sinners to be drank in by them."

The second article or proposition in the preface is, as asserted by me, that infant-baptism "is the basis of national churches and worldly establishments; that which unites the church and world, and keeps them together;" than which nothing is more evident: if a church is national, it consists of all

in the nation, men, women, and children; and children are originally members of it, either so by birth, and as soon as born, being born in the church, in a Christian land and nation, which is the church, or rather by baptism, as it is generally put; so according to the order of the Church of England, at the baptism of a child, the minister says, "We receive this child into the congregation of Christ's flock." And by the Assembly of Divines, "Baptism is called a sacrament of the New Testament, whereby the parties baptized are solemnly admitted into the visible church." And to which there is a strange contradiction in the following answer, where it is said, that "baptism is not to be administered to any that are out of the visible church;" but if by baptism the parties baptized are solemnly admitted into the visible church, then before baptism by which they are admitted, they must be out of it: one or other must be wrong; either persons are not admitted into the visible church by baptism, or if they are, then before baptism they are out of it, and have baptism administered to them in order to their being admitted into it; and Calvin says, according to whose plan of church-government at Geneva, that of the Scotch church is planned, that baptism is a solemn introduction to the church of God. And Mr. Baxter argues, that "if there be neither precept nor example of admitting church-members in all the New Testament but by baptism; then all that are now admitted ought to come in by baptism; but there is neither precept nor example in all the New Testament of admitting church members but by baptism; therefore they ought to come in the same way now." So then infants becoming members of a national church by baptism, they are originally of it; are the materials of which it consists; and it is by the baptism of infants it is supplied with members, and is supported and maintained; so that it may be truly said, that infant-baptism is the basis and foundation of a national church, and is indeed the sinews, strength, and support of it: and infants being admitted members by baptism continue such when grown up, even though of the most dissolute lives and conversations, as multitudes of them are; and many, instead of being treated as church members, deserve to be sent to the house of correction, as some are, and others are guilty of such flagitious crimes that they die an infamous death; yet even these die in the communion of the church; and thus the church and the world are united and kept together till death doth them part.

The Independents would indeed separate the church and the world according to their principles; but cannot do it, being fettered and hampered with infant-church-membership and baptism, about which they are at a loss and disagreed on what to place it; some place it on infants' interest in the covenant of grace; and here they sadly contradict themselves or one another; at one time they say it is interest in the covenant of grace that gives infants a right to baptism, and at another time, that it is by baptism they are brought and entered into the covenant; and sometimes it is not in the inward part of the covenant they are interested, only in the external part of it, where hypocrites and graceless persons may be; but what that external part is no mortal can tell: others not being satisfied that their infant-seed as such are all interested in the covenant of grace, say, it is not that, but the church-covenant that godly parents enter into, which gives their children with them a right to church membership and baptism: children in their minority, it is said, covenant with their parents, and so become church members, and this entitles them to baptism; for according to the old Independents of New England, none but members of a visible church were to be baptized; though Dr. [Thomas] Goodwin is of a different mind: hence only such as were children of members of churches, even of set members , as they call them, were admitted, though of godly and approved Christians; and though they may have been members, yet if excommunicated, their children born in the time of their excommunication might not be baptized; but those children that are admitted members and baptized, though not confirmed members, as they style them, till they profess faith

and repentance; yet during their minority, which reaches till they are more than thirteen years of age, according to the example of Ishmael, and till about sixteen years of age, they are real members to such intents and purposes, as, that if their parents are dismissed to other churches, their children ought to be put into the letter of dismission with them; and whilst their minority continues, are under church-watch, and subject to the reprehensions, admonitions, and censures thereof for their healing and amendment as need shall require; though with respect to public rebuke, admonition, and excommunication, children in their minority are not subject to church-discipline, only to such as is by way of spiritual watch and private rebuke. The original Independents, by the covenant-seed, who have a right to church membership and baptism, thought only the seed of immediate parents in church-covenant are meant, and not of progenitors. Mr. Cotton says infants cannot claim right unto baptism but in the right of one of their parents or both; where neither of the parents can claim right to the Lord's Supper, there their infants cannot claim right to baptism; though he afterwards says it may be considered whether the children may not be baptized where either the grandfather or grandmother have made profession of their faith and repentance before the church, and are still living to undertake for the Christian education of the child; or if these fail, what hinders but that if the parents will resign their infant to be educated in the house of any godly member of the church, the child may be lawfully baptized in the right of its household-governor, But Mr. Hooker, as he asserts, that children as children have no right to baptism, so it belongs not to any predecessors, either nearer or farther off removed from the next parents to give right of this privilege to their children; by which predecessors, he says, he includes and comprehends all besides the next parent; grandfather, great grandfather, etc.. So the ministers and messengers of the congregational churches that met at the Savoy declare "that not only those that do actually profess faith in, and obedience unto Christ, but also the infants of one or both believing parents are to he baptized, and those only": and the commissioners for the review of the Common Prayer, in the beginning of the reign of King Charles the Second; those of the Presbyterian persuasion moved on the behalf of others, that "there being divers learned, pious, and peaceable ministers, who not only judge it unlawful to baptize children whose parents both of them are Atheists, Infidels, Heretics, or unbaptized; but also such whose parents are excommunicate persons, fornicators, or otherwise notorious and scandalous sinners; we desire, say they, they may not be enforced to baptize the children of such, until they have made open profession of their repentance before baptism.": but now I do not understand that the present generation of dissenters of this denomination adhere to the principles and practices of their predecessors, at least very few of them; but admit to baptism, not only the children of members of their churches, but of those who are not members, only hearers, or that apply to them for the baptism of their infants, whether gracious or graceless persons: and were only the first sort admitted, children of members, what are they? No better than others, born in sin, born of the flesh, carnal and corrupt, are of the world, notwithstanding their birth of religious persons, until they are called out of it by the effectual grace of God; and as they grow up, appear to be of the world as others, and have their conversation according to the course of it; and many of them are dissolute in their lives, and scandalous in their conversation; and yet I do not understand, that any notice is taken of them in a church-way, as to be admonished, censured, and excommunicated; but they retain their membership, into which they were taken in their infancy, and continue in it to the day of their death: and if this is not uniting and keeping the world and church together, I know not what is.

Moreover all the arguments that are made use of to prove the church of Christ under the gospel-dispensation to be congregational, and against a national church, are all destroyed by the baptism

and membership of infants. It is said in favor of the one, and against the other, that the members of a visible church are saints by calling, such, as in charitable discretion may be accounted so; but are infants who are admitted to membership and baptized, such? The holiness pleaded for as belonging to them, is only a federal holiness, and that is merely chimerical: are they called to be saints, or saints by effectual calling? Can they in charitable discretion, or in rational charity be thought to be truly and really holy, or saints, as the churches of the New Testament are said to be? and if they cannot in a judgment of charity, be accounted real saints, and yet are admitted members of churches, why not others, of whom it cannot be charitably thought, that they are real saints? Besides, it is said by the Independents, "that members of gospel churches are saints by calling, visibly manifesting and evidencing by their profession and walk their obedience to that call; who are further known to each other by their confession of faith wrought in them by the power of God; and do willingly consent to walk together according to the appointment of Christ, giving up themselves to the Lord and to one another by the will of God, in professed subjection to the ordinances of the gospel": now are infants such? Do they manifest and evidence by a profession and walk their obedience to a divine call? And if they do not, and yet are admitted members, why not others, who give no more evidence than they do? Do they make a confession of faith wrought in them? Does it appear that they have such a faith? and in a confession made, and so made as to be known by fellow-members? and if not, and yet received and owned as members, why not others that make no more confession of faith than they do? Do infants consent to walk with the church of Christ, and give up themselves to the Lord and one another, and profess to be subject to the ordinances of the gospel? and if they do not, as most certainly they do not, and yet are members, why may not others be also members on the same footing? It is objected to a national church, that persons of the worst of characters are members of it; and by this means the church is filled with men very disreputable and scandalous in their lives. And is not this true of infant members admitted in their infancy, who when grown up are very wicked and immoral, and yet their membership continues? and why not then national churches be admitted of, notwithstanding the above objection? So that upon the whole, I think, I have good reason to say, "that there cannot be a full separation of the one from the other, that is, of the church from the world, nor a thorough reformation in religion, until it (infant-baptism) is wholly removed."

In the said preface, I express my firm belief of the entire cessation of infant-baptism, in time to come: my words are, "though it (infant-baptism) has so long and largely obtained (as it has from the 4th century till now, and over the greater part who have since borne the Christian name) and still does obtain; I believe with a firm and unshaken faith, that the time is hastening on, when infant-baptism will be no more practiced in the world," I mean in the spiritual reign of Christ; for in His personal reign there will be no ordinances, nor the administration of them; and this is explained by what I farther say, "when churches will be formed on the same plan they were in the times of the apostles; when gospel-doctrine and discipline will be restored to their primitive purity and lustre; when the ordinances of baptism and the Lord's Supper will be administered as they were first delivered; all which will be accomplished, when 'the Lord shall be king over all the earth, and there shall be one Lord and his name one;"' that is, when there shall be one Lord, one faith, and one baptism, acknowledged by all Christians; and they will be all of one mind with respect to the doctrines and ordinances of the gospel. And as it becomes every man to give a reason of the faith and hope he has concerning divine things, with meekness and fear; the reasons of my firm belief, that infant-baptism will be no more practiced in the latter day and spiritual reign of Christ, are, some of them suggested in the above paragraph, and others may be added, as

FIRST, Because churches in the time referred to, will be formed on the plan churches were in the time of the apostles; that this will be the case, see the prophecies in Is. 1:25,26; Jer. 30:18,20; Rev. 11:19. Now the apostolic churches consisted only of baptized believers, or of such who were baptized upon profession of their faith; the members of the first Christian church, which was at Jerusalem, were first baptized upon their conversion, and then added to it; the next Christian church at Samaria, consisted of men and women baptized on believing the gospel, preached by Philip; and the church at Corinth, of such who hearing, believed and were baptized; and on the same plan were formed the churches at Rome, Philippi, Colosse, and others; nor is there one single instance of infant-baptism and of infant-church-membership in them; wherefore if churches in the latter day will be on the same plan, then infant-baptism will be no more practiced.

SECONDLY, Because, then the ordinances of the gospel will be administered, as they were first delivered, clear of all present corruption and superstition; this is what is meant by the temple of God being opened in heaven, on the sounding of the seventh trumpet (Rev. 11:19 and 15:5), which respects the restoration of worship, discipline, doctrines and ordinances, to the free use of them, and to their original purity; when, as the ordinance of the Lord's Supper will be administered clear of all corruptions and ceremonies introduced by Papists and retained by Protestants; so likewise the ordinance of baptism both with respect to subject and mode, which as it was first delivered was only administered to persons professing faith and repentance, and that by immersion only; and if this will be universally administered in the latter day, as in the first ages of Christianity, infant sprinkling will be practiced no more.

THIRDLY, Because Christ will then be king over all the earth in a spiritual sense; one Lord, whose commands will be obeyed with great precision and exactness, according to His will revealed in His Word; and as baptism is one of His commands He has prescribed, as He is and will be acknowledged the one Lord and head of the church, and not the pope, who will be no more submitted to; so there will be one baptism, which will be administered to one sort of subjects only, as He has directed, and in one manner only, by immersion, of which His baptism is an example; and therefore, I believe that infant sprinkling will be no more in use.

FOURTHLY, At this same time the name of Christ will be one, that is, His religion; which will be the same, it was at first instituted by Him. Now it is various, as it is professed and practiced by different persons that bear His name; but in the latter day, it will be one and the same, in all its branches, as embraced, professed, and exercised by all that are called Christians; and as baptism is one part of it, this will be practiced in a uniform manner, or by all alike, that shall name the name of Christ; for since Christ's name or the Christian religion in all its parts, will be the same in all the professors of it; I therefore firmly believe, that baptism will be practiced alike by all, according to the primitive institution, and consequently, that infant-baptism will be no more: for

FIFTHLY, As at this time, the watchmen will see eye to eye (Is. 52:8), the ministers of the gospel will be of one mind, both with respect to the doctrines and duties of Christianity; will alike preach the one, and practice the other; so the people under their ministrations will be all agreed, and receive the truths of the gospel in the love of them, and submit to the precepts and institutions of it, without any difference among themselves, and without any variation from the word of God; and among the rest, the ordinance of baptism, about which there will be no longer strife; but all will agree that the proper subjects of it are believers, and the right mode of it immersion; and so infant-

sprinkling will be no more contended for; saints in this as in other things will serve the Lord with one consent (Zeph. 3:9).

SIXTHLY, Another reason why I firmly believe, infant-baptism will hereafter be no more practiced, is, because Antichrist will be entirely consumed with the spirit or breath of Christ's mouth, and with the brightness of His coming (2 Thess. 2:8), that is, with the pure and powerful preaching of His word, at His coming to take to Himself His power, and reign spiritually in the churches, in a more glorious manner; when all Antichristian doctrines and practices will be entirely abolished and cease, even the whole body of Antichristian worship; not a limb of Antichrist shall remain, but all shall be consumed. Now as I believe, and it has been shown, that infant-baptism is a part and pillar of popery, a limb of Antichrist, a branch of superstition and will-worship, introduced by the 'man of sin, when he shall be destroyed, this shall be destroyed with him and be no more.

SEVENTHLY, Though the notion of infant-baptism has been embraced and practiced, by many good and godly men in several ages; yet it is part of the wood, hay and stubble, laid by them upon the foundation; is one of those works of theirs, the bright day of the gospel shall declare to be a falsehood; and which the fire of the word will try, burn up, and consume, though they themselves shall be saved; and therefore being utterly consumed, shall no more appear in the world: for

EIGHTHLY, When the angel shall descend from heaven with great power, and the earth be lightened with his glory, which will be at the fall of Babylon and ruin of Antichrist (Rev. 18:1,2), such will be the blaze of light then given, that all Antichristian darkness shall be removed, and all works of darkness will be made manifest and cast off, among which infant-baptism is one; and then the earth will be full of the knowledge of the Lord as the waters cover the sea (Is. 11:9), even of the knowledge of the word, ways, worship, truths, and ordinances of God, and all ignorance of them vanish and disappear; and then the ordinance of baptism will appear in its former lustre and purity, and be embraced and submitted to in it; and every corruption of it be rejected, of which infant-baptism is one.

NINTHLY, Whereas the ordinances of the gospel, baptism and the Lord's Supper, are to continue until the second coming of Christ, or the end of the world (Matt. 28: 19,20; 1 Cor. 11:26), and whereas there have been corruptions introduced into them, as they are generally administered, unless among some few; it is not reasonable to think, that those corruptions will be continued to the second coming of Christ, but that they will be removed before, even at His spiritual coming, or in His spiritual reign: and as with respect to baptism particularly, there must be a mistake on one side or the other, both with respect to subject and mode; and as this mistake I firmly believe is on the side of the Paedobaptists; so, I as firmly believe for the reason given, that it will be removed, and infant-sprinkling for the future no more used.

TENTHLY, the Philadelphian church-state, which answers to and includes the spiritual reign of Christ in His churches, is what I refer unto in the preface, as the time when the practice of infant-baptism will cease; in which I am confirmed, by the characters given of that church and the members of it; as that it kept the word of Christ; that is, not only the doctrines of the gospel, which will be then purely preached and openly professed, but the ordinances of it, baptism and the Lord's Supper; which have been (particularly baptism) sadly corrupted in almost all the periods of the churches hitherto, excepting the apostolic one; but will in this period be restored to their pristine

purity and glory; hence it is promised to this church, and that it represents, that because it kept the word of Christ's patience, truly and faithfully, it should be kept from the hour of temptation that should come on all the earth; and is exhorted to hold fast what she had, both the doctrines and ordinances, as they were delivered by Christ and His apostles, and as she now held them in the truth and purity of them. These are the reasons why I believe with a firm and unshaken faith, that the time is coming, and I hope will not be long, when infant-baptism will be no more practiced in the world.

Since, now at this time, we are greatly and justly alarmed with the increase of popery; in order to put a stop to it, let us begin at home, and endeavor to remove all remains of it among ourselves; so shall we with the better grace, and it may be hoped, with greater success oppose and hinder the spread of it.

POSTSCRIPT

The writer who lately appeared in a newspaper, under the name of Candidus, having been obliged to quit his mountebank-stage on which he held forth to the public for a few days; has, in his great humility, condescended to deal out his packets, in a less popular way; under the title of, The True Scripture-Doctrine of the Mode and Subjects of Christian Baptism, etc., in six letters. It is quite unreasonable that we should be put, by every impertinent scribbler, to the drudgery of answering, what has been answered over and over again in this controversy. However I shall make short work of this writer, and therefore I have only put him to, and shall only give him a little gentle correction at the cart's tail, to use the phrase of a late, learned professor, in one of our universities, with respect to the discipline of a certain Bishop.

The first and second letters of Candidus, in the newspaper, are answered in marginal notes on my sermon upon baptism, and published along with it. His third letter is a mean piece of bufoonery and scurrility; it begins with a trite, vulgar proverb, in low language, fit only for the mouth of a hostler or a carman; and his friends seem to have spoiled one or other of these, by making him a parson. He goes on throughout the whole of the letter, as one that is in great haste, running after his wits, to seek for them, having lost them, if ever he had any; and it concludes with a poor, pitiful, foolish burlesque, mixed with slander and falsehood, on an innocent gentleman; quite a stranger to him, and could never have offended him, but by a conscientious regard to what he believed was his duty. However, by this base and inhumane treatment, it appears that his moral character is unimpeachable, or otherwise it would have been nibbled at. His fourth letter begins with representing the sermon published, as so mangled, changed, altered and added to, that it has scarce any remains of its original; in which he must be condemned by all that heard it: and he has most unluckily charged one clause as an addition, which, there cannot be one in ten but will remember it; it is this, "if any man can find any others in his (the jailer's) house, besides all that were in it, he must be reckoned a very sagacious person;" and he himself, in his first letter published before the sermon was, has an oblique glance at it; calling me, in a sneering way, "the sagacious doctor." What he says in the following part of the letter, concerning the subjects of baptism, and what he intended to say concerning the mode in another letter, which was prevented, I suppose are contained in a set of letters now published; and which are addressed, not to Mr. Printer, who cast him off, but to a candid Anti-paedobaptist, and indeed the epithet of candid better agrees with that sort of people than with himself, of which he seems conscious, if he has any conscience at all; for it

looks as if he had not, or he could never have set out with such a most notorious untruth, and impudent falsehood; affirming that I said in my sermon, that "the ten commandments, styled the moral law, were not binding on Christ's disciples:" a greater untruth could not well have been told: my writings in general testify the contrary, and particularly two sermons I have published, one called "The Law Established by the Gospel," and the other, "The Law in the Hand of Christ;" which are sufficient to justify me from such a wicked calumny; and the paragraph with which my sermon begins, attacked by him, and which I declare, are the words I delivered in the pulpit, that "the ten commandments, are the commands of God, and to be observed by Christians under the present dispensation;" for which I quoted 1 Cor. 9:21, this I say, must stare him in the face, and awaken his guilty conscience, if not seared as with a red hot iron; which I fear is his case. As for his flings at eternal justification, which he has lugged into this controversy, and his grand concluding and common argument against it, that it is eternal nonsense, I despise; he has not a head for that controversy: and I would only put him in mind of what Dr. [John] Owen said to [Richard] Baxter, who charged him with holding it, "What would the man have me say? I have told him, I am not of that opinion; would he have me sware to it, that I am not? but though I am not, I know better and wiser men than myself that do hold it."

Somebody in the newspaper observing that this man was froward and perverse, and fearing he should do hurt to religion in general, in order to divert him from it, and guide him another way; complimented him with being a man of wit, and of abilities; and the vain young man fancies he really is one: and being a witty youth, and of abilities, he has been able to produce an instance of infant-baptism about 1500 years before Christian baptism was instituted; though he must not have the sole credit of it, because it has been observed before him: the instance is of the passage of the Israelites through the sea, at which time, he says, their children were baptized, as well as they: come then, says he, in very polite language, this is one scripture-instance; but if he had had his wits about him, he might have improved this instance, and strengthened his argument a little more; by observing that there was a mixed multitude, that came with the Israelites out of Egypt, and with them passed through the sea, with their children also. And since he makes mention of Nebuchadnezzar's baptism, it is much he did not try to make it out that his children were baptized also, then or at some other time. This is the true scripture doctrine, of the subjects of Christian baptism, according to his title.

That the Jews received their proselytes by baptism, before the times of Christ, he says, I know; but if I do, he does not. I observe, he is very ready to ascribe great knowledge of things to me, which he himself is ignorant of; I am much obliged to him: the great names he opposes to me, don't frighten me; I have read their writings and testimonies, and know what they were capable of producing, and to what little purpose; though I must confess, it is amazing to me, that any men of learning should give into such a notion, that Christian baptism is founded upon a tradition of the baptism or dipping of proselytes with the Jews; of which tradition there is not the least hint, neither in the Old nor in the New Testament; nor in the Apocryphal writings between both; nor in Josephus; nor in Philo the Jew; nor in the Jewish Misnah, or book of traditions; compiled in the second century, or at the beginning of the third, whether of the Jerusalem or Babylonian editions. I am content to risk that little reputation I have for Jewish learning, on this single point; if any passage can be produced in the Misnah, mentioning such a tradition of the Jews, admitting proselytes by baptism or dipping, whether adult or children. I own it is mentioned in the Gemara, both Jerusalem and Babylonian, a work of later times, but not in the Misnah; though Dr. Gale has allowed it without examination. The

only passage in it which Dr. Wall refers to from Selden, though not fully expressed, is this "a female stranger, a captive, a maiden, which are redeemed and become proselytes, and are made free; being under (the next paragraph is above) three years and one day old, are allowed the matrimonial dowry;" i.e., at marriage: but not a tittle is here or anywhere else in the Misnah, of receiving either minors or adult as proselytes by baptism or dipping: and supposing such a Jewish tradition, five hundred, or three hundred, or two hundred years after Christ; or even so many years before Christ, of what avail would it be? He must be strangely bigoted to an hypothesis, to believe that our Lord, who so severely inveighed against the traditions of the Jews, and particularly those concerning their baptisms or dippings; should found His New Testament ordinance of baptism, on a tradition of theirs, without excepting it from the other traditions, and without declaring His will it should be continued, which He has not done; and yet this, as Dr. Hammond suggests, in the basis of infant-baptism: to what wretched shifts must the Paedobaptists be driven for a foundation to place infant-baptism on, as to place it on such a rotten one; a tradition of men, who at other times, are reckoned by them, themselves, the most stupid, sottish, and despicable of all men upon the face of the earth? For the farther confutation of this notion, see Sir Norton Knatchbull on 1 Pet. 3:20,21; Stennett against Ruffen, p. 61; Gale's Reflections on Wall's History of Baptism, letters 9 and 10; Rees on Infant-Baptism, P. 17-29.

I shall not pursue this writer any farther, by giving particular answers to his arguments, objections, and queries, such as they are; but shall only refer the reader to the answers that have been already given to them: as to the threadbare argument, from Abraham's covenant, and from circumcision; for Old Testament times and cases, are chiefly dealt in, to settle a New Testament ordinance, see Ewer's Answer to Hitchin, Rees against Walker, and my answers to Dickinson, Clarke, and Bostwick. Of the unreasonableness of requiring instances of the adult baptism of children of Christian parents, in the scriptures, see my Strictures on Bostwick's Fair and Rational Vindication, etc., p. 106. Of the testimonies of the ancient Christian writers, in favor of infant-baptism, see Gale's Reflections, etc., letters 11, 12, 13; Rees on Infant-baptism, p. 150 and etc.; some treatises of mine, The Divine Right of infant-baptism Examined, etc., p. 20-25; The Argument from Apostolic Tradition, etc.; Antipaedobaptism; Reply to Clarke, p. 18-23; Strictures on Bostwick, p. 100-103.

I called upon this writer, in the notes on my sermon, to name any lexicographer of note, that ever rendered the word baptize by "perfundo" or "aspergo," "pour" or "sprinkle;" and behold! Leigh's Critica Sacra, is the only book quoted! and he the only lexicographer mentioned, if he may be so called! a book which every one of our illiterate lay-preachers, as they are called, are capable of quoting, and of confronting this writer with it; by observing that Leigh says, that "the native and proper signification of the word, is to dip into water, or to plunge under water, Jn. 3:22,23; Matt. 3:16; Acts 8:38." In proof of baptism by immersion, and of the true signification of the word, see Gale's Reflections, etc., letters 3 and 4;

Rees on Infant-baptism, p. 121; and my treatises of The Ancient Mode of Baptizing and the Defense Of It, with The Divine Right of Infant-baptism Examined, etc., p. 90, etc.

I bid this writer adieu: God give him repentance for his sins, and the pardon of them; and this I am sure he cannot charge, neither with uncharitableness, nor with Antinomianism.

When the Paedobaptists write again, it may be expected they will employ a better hand; or should they choose to fix upon one of their younger sort again; let them take care, first to wring the milk well out of his nose, before they put a pen in his hand.

A Dissertation Concerning the BAPTISM OF JEWISH PROSELYTES

Thou hast given a standard to them that fear thee; that it may be displayed because of the truth

Psalm 60:4

CONTENTS

- **Chapter 1**

Of the various sorts of Proselytes among the Jews.

- **Chapter 2**

The occasion of this Dissertation.

- **Chapter 3**

The proof of the Baptism of Jewish Proselytes inquired into; whether there is any proof of it before, at, or quickly after the times of John and Christ.

- **Chapter 4**

The proof of this custom only from the Talmuds and Talmudical writters.

- **Chapter 5**

The reasons why Christian Baptism is not founded on, and taken from, the pretended Jewish Baptism of Israelites and Proselytes.

CHAPTER 1

OF THE VARIOUS SORTS OF PROSELYTES AMONG THE JEWS

Intending to treat of the admission of proselytes into the Jewish church by baptism, or dipping; it may be proper to consider the different sorts of proselytes among the Jews, and which of them were thus admitted, as is said. The word "proselyte" is originally Greek, and is derived, as Philo[1] observes, apo tou proselhluyenai, "from coming to", that is, from one sect or religion to another, as from heathenism to the Jewish religion; and so Suidas[2] says, proselytes are they oi proselhluyotev, "who come from" the Gentiles, and live according to the laws of God; and such an one is called by the Septuagint interpreters of Exodus 12:19, Isaiah 14:1, and by the Greek writers following them, geiwrav, which is rightly interpreted by Hesychius, such of another nation who are called proselytes to Israel; and which word comes near to the Hebrew word rg and nearer still to the Chaldee word arwyg used for a proselyte; and is, by Eusebius, interpreted epimiktouv[3], such as were mixed with Israelites.

There were two sorts of proselytes with the Jews, some say three; a proselyte of the gate; a mercenary proselyte; and a proselyte of righteousness; the first and last are most usually observed.

I. First, One sort was called r[ç rg "a proselyte of the gate"; and in scripture, "the stranger that is in thy gates", (Deut.14:21, 24:14) being a sojourner, and permitted to dwell there; hence such an one had also.the name of bwçt rg "a proselyte inhabitant" (see Ex. 12:15; Lev. 25:45,47); one who was allowed to dwell among the Jews on certain conditions; and is generally distinguished from another sort, called a "proselyte of righteousness", of whom more hereafter. Though the Jews, not always consistent with themselves, and so not in this matter, sometimes interpret "the stranger in the gate", of a proselyte inhabitant, or a proselyte by inhabitation, and sometimes of a proselyte of righteousness. So Nachmanides[4], having explained the stranger in the gate of a proselyte inhabitant, or one who obliged himself to keep the seven precepts of Noah, according to the usual interpretation of it, observes; "Our doctors interpret it differently, for they say, ‘thy stranger within thy gate’, simply denotes, a ‘proselyte of righteousness’." So that according to them, such a stranger may be taken both for the one and for the other, in different respects; but commonly the proselyte inhabitant is only understood; who in general was obliged to promise, that he would not be guilty of idolatry, or worship any idol[5]; this he was to promise before three witnesses, for it is asked, "who is Ger Toshab; that is, a proselyte allowed to dwell in Israel? (the answer is) Whoever takes upon him, in the presence of three neighbours, that he will not commit idolatry." It follows, "R. Meir, and the wise men say, whoever takes upon him the seven precepts which the sons of Noah obliged themselves to observe." Others say, "these do not come into the general rule of such a proselyte. Who then is one? He is a proselyte who eats what dies of itself; (or) who takes upon him to keep all the commandments in the law, except that which forbids the eating of things which die of themselves[6];" but the usual account of such a proselyte is, that he agrees to observe the seven precepts enjoined the sons of Noah[7]; six of which were given to Adam, the first man, and the seventh was added to them, and given to Noah, and are as follow[8]:.a. Concerning idolatry; by this a son of Noah was forbid to worship the sun, moon, and stars, and images of any sort; nor might he erect a statue, nor plant a grove, nor make any image. b. Concerning blaspheming the name of God. Such an one might not blaspheme, neither the proper name of God, Jehovah; nor any of his surnames, titles, and epithets. c. Concerning shedding of blood, or murder, the breach of which command he was guilty of, if he slew one, though an embryo in his mother’s womb; and one who pursued another, when he could have escaped from him with the loss of one of his members, etc. d. Concerning uncleanness, or impure copulations; of which there were six sorts forbidden a son of Noah; as, with an own mother, with a father’s wife (or stepmother), with another man’s wife, with

his sister by the mother's side, with a male, or with mankind, and with a beast. e. Concerning rapine, or robbery and theft; of which such were guilty, whether they robbed a Gentile or an Israelite, or stole money, or men, or suppressed the wages of an hireling; and the like. f. Concerning the member of a living creature, taken from it while alive, and eating it: this is the command, it is said, which was to Noah, and his sons, and of which the Jews interpret Genesis 9:4. g. Concerning judgments or punishments to be inflicted on those who broke the above laws: this command obliged them to regard the directions, judgment, and sentence of the judges appointed to see the said laws put into execution, and to punish delinquents.

Now such Gentiles, who laid themselves under obligation to observe these commands, had leave to dwell among the Israelites, though not in everyone of their cities; not in Jerusalem particularly[9]; wherefore those devout men and proselytes said to dwell in Jerusalem, Acts 2:5,10 were not proselytes of the gate, but proselytes of righteousness. Nor are such sort of proselytes now received, only while the Jews lived in their own land, and were not under the jurisdiction of another people; or as they express it, while jubilees were in use and observed[10]. This sort of proselytes, though they did not enjoy the privileges the proselytes of righteousness did, yet some they had; they might worship and pray in the court of the Gentiles, though not in the temple; they might offer burnt offerings, though not other sacrifices; their poor were fed with the poor of Israel, their sick were visited by Israelites, and their dead were buried with them[11].

Such proselytes as these, as they were not obliged to circumcision, nor to other commands peculiar to the Jews; none but those before observed; so neither were they baptized, or dipped, when made proselytes, which is said of others. Maimonides[12] affirms of such a proselyte, that he is neither circumcised nor dipped. Bishop Kidder[13] is therefore mistaken in saying, that proselytes of the gate were baptized, but not circumcised.

II. Secondly, there was another sort of proselytes, which are taken notice of, at least, by some as such; who were called µyrkç "mercenary" ones, and are reckoned as between proselytes of the gate and Gentiles. In Exodus 12:44,45 a mercenary, or "hired servant", is distinguished from a servant bought with money; he being hired only for a certain time, as for six years; and also from a foreigner, a stranger in the gate, a proselyte of the gate; and both of them are distinguished from the servant bought with money, who was circumcised, and might eat of the passover, when neither of the other might, being both uncircumcised; and therefore R. Levi Barzelonita[14] is thought to be mistaken when he says, "a mercenary is a proselyte, who is circumcised, but not dipped; for so the wise men explain it:" but if a stranger or proselyte of the gate was not circumcised, much less a mercenary, who was far below him; besides, if he was circumcised, he might eat of the passover; which is denied him: and so Ben Melech observes[15] of these two, the foreigner and the hired servant; they are Gentiles, and uncircumcised: and Abendana, in his notes upon him, from the Rabbins, says, the former is a proselyte inhabitant, or a proselyte of the gate, who takes upon him the seven precepts of the sons of Noah; the latter is a servant whose body is not possessed, that is, is not in the possession of his master, not being bought with his money, is only an hired servant, and so not circumcised. But perhaps Jarchi's note will reconcile this to what Barzelonita says; "Toshab, a foreigner, this is a proselyte inhabitant; and Shacir, or hired servant, this is a Gentile;" but what is the meaning? are they not uncircumcised? (that is, both of them) and it is said, "No uncircumcised person shall eat thereof": but they.are as a circumcised Arabian, and a circumcised Gabnunite, or Gabonite[16], though circumcised yet not by Israelites, but by Gentiles, which gave no right to the

passover. Hottinger[17] thinks these mercenary proselytes, and with him Leusden[18] seems to agree, were mechanic strangers, who left their own country, and came among the Jews for the sake of learning some mechanic art; and who, conforming to certain laws and conditions, prescribed by the Jews, were permitted to sojourn with them until they had learnt the art. There are but few writers who speak of this sort of proselytes. However, it seems agreed on all hands, that whether circumcised or not, they were not baptized, or dipped.

III. Thirdly, There was another sort of proselyte, called qdx rg a "proselyte of righteousness"[19]; see Deuteronomy 16:20 a stranger circumcised, and who is so called when he is circumcised; and sometimes tyrb ˆb rg "a proselyte, the son of the covenant"[20], the same as an Israelite; see Acts 3:25. This sort of proselytes were the highest, and had in greatest esteem; who not only submitted to circumcision, but embraced all the laws, religion, and worship of the Jews; and were in all respects as they, and enjoyed equally all privileges and immunities, civil and religious, as they did; except being made a king, though one might if his mother was of Israel[21]; and being members of the great Sanhedrim, yet might be of the lesser, provided they were born of an Israelitish woman[22]; nay, even such have been in the great Sanhedrim, as Shemaiah and Abtalion, who were of the posterity of Sennacherib[23]; but their mothers being Israelites, it was lawful for them to judge, that is, in the great Sanhedrim; for one was the prince, and the other the father of that court[24]. So the Jews say[25], the posterity of Jethro sat in Lishcat Gazith, that is, in the great Sanhedrim, which sat in that room; and for which they quote 1 Chronicles 2:55 yet it has been a question, whether a proselyte should be made a public minister, or president of the congregation, called rwbx jylç; but the common opinion was, that he might be one[26]: of this sort of proselytes, of whom they boast, some were persons of note for learning, or wealth, or worldly grandeur[27]; but without sufficient ground. Some, they own, were not sincere who became proselytes, either through fear, or to gratify some sensual lust, or for some sinister end or another. Some were called "proselytes of lions"[28], who became so through fear; as the Samaritans, because of the lions sent among them, and that they might be freed from them, embraced the worship of God, though they retained also the worship of their idols. Others were called "proselytes of dreams"; who were directed and encouraged to become proselytes by such who pretended to skill in dreams, as being omens of good things to them. Though some, in the place referred to, instead of twmlj "dreams", read "windows", and render the words "proselytes of windows", so Alting[29], meaning the windows of their eyes, who, to gratify the lust of the eyes, became proselytes; as Shechem, being taken with the sight of Dinah, submitted to circumcision for the sake of her; and others were called "proselytes of Mordecai and Esther", who were like those who became Jews in their times (Esther 8:17) through fear of the Jews, as there expressed. Others were true and sincere proselytes, who cordially embraced the Jewish religion, and from the heart submitted to the laws and rules of it; these were called µyrwrg µyrb "drawn proselytes"[30], who were moved of themselves, and of their own good will, without any sinister bias, and out of real love and affection to the Jewish religion, embraced it. Compare the phrase with John 6:44. And such, they say[31], all proselytes will be in the time to come, or in the days of the Messiah; and yet sometimes they say, that then none will be received[32]: and when persons propose to be proselytes, the Jews are very careful to ask many questions, in order to try whether they are sincere or not; and such as they take to be sincere they speak very highly of; they say[33], "Greater are the proselytes at this time, than the Israelites when they stood on mount Sinai; because they saw the lightning, heard the thunder, and the sound of the trumpet; but these saw and heard none of these things, and yet have taken upon them the yoke of the kingdom, and are come under the wings of the Shechinah" though elsewhere,

and in common, they speak but slightly of them, and say; "They are as grievous to Israel as a scab in the skin, or as a razor to it[34], because they often turn back again, and seduce the Israelites, and carry them off with them; yea, they say they stop the coming of the Messiah[35]." However, they have a saying[36] which shows some regard to them; "A proselyte, even to the tenth generation, do not despise a Syrian, or an heathen before him, he being present, or to his face; because till that time their minds are supposed to incline towards their own people;" and so it is said[37], the daughter of a proselyte may not be married to a priest, unless her mother is an Israelitess, even unto the tenth generation. And there is another saying[38] of theirs, Do not trust a proselyte until the twenty fourth generation, that is, never; not only priests, Levites, and Israelites, but even bastards, and the Nethinim, or Gibeonites, were preferred to proselytes[39]. Some of these sayings do not seem so well to agree with the words of Christ (Matthew 23:15) to reconcile which, it is thought[40], that while the temple was standing, the desire of making proselytes was stronger than after it was destroyed by the Romans; resenting that, they became indifferent about making proselytes, and were unconcerned about the salvation of the Gentiles, and contented themselves with receiving such only who freely came over to them. It never was deemed so honourable to be the descendants of proselytes, as of original Hebrews. Hence the apostle Paul gloried that he was an Hebrew of the Hebrews, both his parents being Hebrews. A Rabbi of note among the Jews, whose parents were both proselytes, or Gentiles, is called not by his proper name, Jochanan, but Ben Bag-Bag; that is, the son of a Gentile man, and the son of a Gentile woman; and for the same reason he is called in a following paragraph, Ben He-He, numerically He being the same with Bag; though it is said, these abbreviations were used from reverence to him, and a regard for him[41]; and, indeed, the Jews were not to reproach and upbraid proselytes with what they and their ancestors had been, or had done; they were not to say to a proselyte, Remember thy former works; nor were they to say to the sons of proselytes, Remember the works of your fathers[42]; for this is the affliction and oppression of them, as they understand it, they are cautioned against (Ex. 22:21; Lev. 19:33), nay, they were to love them as themselves, because the Lord God loved the stranger (Lev. 19:34; Deut.10:18), for of proselytes of righteousness they interpret these passages[43].

Now it is of this sort of proselytes, proselytes of righteousness, that it is said, they were admitted into covenant, and into the Jewish church, as the Israelites were; the males by circumcision, by tlybj "baptism", or dipping, and by sacrifice; and the females by baptism, or dipping, and by sacrifice; and it is the baptism or dipping of these proselytes, that will be inquired into, and be the subject of the following Dissertation.

[TO CONTENTS]

CHAPTER 2

THE OCCASION OF THIS DISSERTATION

I. Several learned men, and some of our own nation, whom I shall chiefly take notice of, have asserted, that it was a custom or rite used by the Jews before the times of John the Baptist, Christ, and his apostles, to receive proselytes into their church by baptism, or dipping, as well as by

circumcision; and these both adult and infants; and that John and Christ took up the rite of baptizing from thence, and practised, and directed to the practice of it, as they found it; and which, they think, accounts for the silence about infant baptism in the New Testament, it being no new nor strange practice. The writers among us of most note, who make mention of it are, Broughton, Ainsworth, Selden, Hammond, and Lightfoot; men justly esteemed for their learning and knowledge in Jewish affairs. Mr. Hugh Broughton is the first of our nation I have met with who speaks of it. He says[44], "The Babylonian Talmud, and Rambam (Maimonides) record, that in the days of David and Solomon, when many thousands of heathens became proselytes, they were admitted only by baptism, without circumcision. So now, when the New Testament was to be made for the many, that is, for all nations, baptism was not strange; neither is John an astonishment for that; but demanded whether he be Elijah or Christ, or that special prophet named in Deuteronomy." A little after he observes, that "Christ from baptism used of them (the Jews) 'without commandment, and of small authority', authorizes a seal of entering into the rest of Christ, using the Jews' 'weakness' as an allurement thither." Where, by the way, he makes this usage to be "without commandment", that is, of God, and to be but of "small authority", even from men, and a piece of "weakness" of the Jews, and yet authorized by Christ; which seems incredible. Mr. Henry Ainsworth is the next I shall mention, who takes notice of this custom. His words are[45], "That we may the better know how they (the Jews) were wont to receive heathens into the church of Israel; I will note it from the Hebrew doctors:" and then gives a large quotation from Maimonides; the substance of which is, that as by three things Israel entered into the covenant, by circumcision, and baptism, and sacrifice; in like manner heathen proselytes were admitted; on which he makes this remark: "Whereupon baptism was nothing strange unto the Jews when John the Baptist began his ministry (Matthew 3:5,6), they made a question of his person that did it, but not of the thing itself (John 1:25)." Dr. Hammond, another learned man, speaks of this same custom or rite with the Jews: he says[46], that "proselytes born of heathen parents, and become proselytes of justice, were admitted by the Jews, not only by circumcision, (and while the temple stood) by sacrifice; but also with the ceremony or solemnity of washing, that is, ablution of the whole body, done solemnly in a river, or other such great place or receptacle of water." So he says, Jethro, Moses's father-in-law, was made a proselyte in this way; and that this ceremony of initiation belonged not only to those, which being of years, came over from heathenism to the Jews' religion, but also to their children infants, if their parents, or the consessus (the sanhedrim) under which they were, did in the behalf of their children desire it; and on condition that the children, when they came to age, should not renounce the Jewish religion; nay, he says, the native Jews themselves were thus baptized; for all which he refers to the Talmud, Tr. Repud. by which I suppose he means the tract Gittin, concerning divorces. But I have not met with anything relating thereunto in that treatise. For the same purposes it is quoted by Dr. Wall, who, I suppose, goes upon the authority of Dr. Hammond, since he acknowledges he was not so well acquainted with the books to be searched for such quotations. Now Dr. Hammond observes, that. "having said thus much of the custom among the Jews, it is now most easy to apply it to the practice of John, and after of Christ, 'who certainly took this ceremony from them';" and further observes, that by this it appears, how little needful it will be to defend the baptism of Christian infants from the law of circumcising the infants among the Jews; "the foundation being far more fitly laid" in that other of Jewish baptism. Yea, in another of his works he suggests that this custom is the "true basis of infant baptism"[47]. The very learned Mr. Selden is more large in his quotations in various parts of his works[48], from both Talmuds and other Jewish writers, concerning this rite and custom; which authorities produced by him, and others, will be given and considered hereafter. At the close of which he makes these remarks[49]; that the

Jewish baptism was as it were a "transition" into Christianity, or however, a shadow of a transition, not to be passed over in silence; and that it should be adverted to, that the rite or sacrament of baptism, used at the beginning of Christianity, and of the gospel by John, and by the apostles, was not introduced as a "new action", and as not before heard of, "even as a religious action", but as well known to the Hebrews, as a rite of initiation, from the use and discipline of their ancestors, and as joined with circumcision. Dr. Lightfoot, who must be allowed to be well versed in Jewish literature, has produced the same authorities Selden has, if not more, in support of the said rite or custom, as in early use with the Jews, and exults and triumphs abundantly over the Antipaedobaptists in favour of infant baptism, on account thereof: he asserts, that "baptism had been ‘in long and common use’ among them (the Jews) many generations before John the Baptist came; they using this for admission of proselytes into the church, and baptizing men, women, and children for that end:—hence a ready reason may be given why there is ‘so little mention’ (no mention at all) of baptizing infants in the New Testament; and that there is neither ‘plain precept’ nor ‘example’ for it, as some ordinarily plead; the reason is, because there needed none, baptizing infants having been as ‘ordinarily used’ in the church of the Jews, as ever it hath been in the Christian church:—that baptism was no strange thing when John came baptizing; but the rite was known so well by everyone, that nothing was better known what baptism was, and therefore there needed not such punctual and exact rules about the manner and object of it, as there had needed, if it had never been seen. before:—that Christ took up baptism as it was ‘in common and known use’, and ‘in ordinary and familiar practice’ among that nation; and therefore gave no rules for the manner of baptizing, nor for the age and sex of persons to be baptized, which was well enough known already, and needed no ‘rule’ to be prescribed:—observing how very known and frequent the use of baptism was among the Jews, the reason appears very easy, why the Sanhedrim, by their messengers, inquired not of John, concerning the reason of baptism, but concerning the authority of the baptizer; not what baptism meant; but whence he had a licence so to baptize (John 1:25). Hence also the reason appears why the New Testament does not ‘prescribe’, by some more ‘accurate rule’, who the persons are to be baptized:—the whole nation knew well enough that little children used to be baptized; there was no need for a precept for that, which had ever by common use prevailed[50]." Dr. Wall, upon these authorities, has thought fit to premise an account of this Jewish baptism, to his history of infant baptism, as serving greatly the cause of it, and as throwing light upon the words of Christ and his apostles, concerning it, and the primitive practice of it; and, animated by such authorities, every puny writer, who does not know his right hand from his left in this matter, takes it up, and swaggers with it. And, indeed, scarce any will now venture in the defence of infant baptism without it. This is the last refuge and dernier resort of the Paedobaptists; and, indeed, a learned baronet[51] of our nation says, he knows not of any stronger argument in proof of infant baptism than this is.

Now since so great a stress is laid upon it, and it is made a matter of such great importance, as to be a "transition" into Christianity, and to be "closely connected" with Christian baptism; that from whence it is taken, and is the "rule" to direct how to proceed, both with respect to the manner and objects of it; yea, is the "basis and foundation" of infant baptism, and the "strongest argument" in proof of it; and which makes other arguments, heretofore thought of great weight, now "unnecessary": it is highly proper to inquire what proof can be given of such a rite and custom being in use among the Jews, before the times of John Baptist, Christ, and his apostles; and if so, what force and influence such a custom can and ought to have on the faith and practice of Christians. The proof of which will next be considered.

[TO CONTENTS]

CHAPTER 3

THE PROOF OF THE BAPTISM OF JEWISH PROSELYTES INQUIRED INTO; WHETHER THERE IS ANY PROOF OF IT BEFORE, AT, OR QUICKLY AFTER THE TIMES OF JOHN AND CHRIST

The inquiry to be made is, whether there are writings or records before the times of John, Christ, and his apostles, or at or near those times, or in the third and fourth century from the birth of Christ, or before the Talmuds were written; which make any mention of, or refer to any such rite and custom in use among the Jews, as to admit proselytes to their religion by baptism, or dipping, along with other things. Now upon search it will be found,

I. First, That nothing of this kind appears in the writings of the Old Testament, which chiefly concern the Jewish nation. We read of many who either were, or are supposed and said to be made proselytes; as the Shechemites in Jacob's time, the multitude that came out of Egypt with the Israelites[52], Jethro, Moses's father in law[53], Shuah[54], Tamar[55], Rahab[56], and Ruth[57]; and many in the times of Mordecai and Esther, who became Jews[58], Esther 8:17 but not a word of their being admitted proselytes by baptism. Dr. Lightfoot indeed says[59], that Jacob admitted the proselytes of Shechem and Syria into his religion by baptism, but offers no proof of it; the Jews[60] pretend, that Pharaoh's daughter was a proselytess, and the Babylonian Talmud[61], quoting the passage in Exodus 2:5. "And the daughter of Pharaoh came down to wash herself"; R. Jochanan says, she came down to wash herself from the idols of her father's house, and the Gloss on the place is, "to dip on account of proselytism;" but then the Gloss is the work of Jarchi, a writer in the twelfth century; and was it so said in the Talmud itself, it would be no sufficient proof the fact. Dr. Hammond says, that Jethro was made a proselyte this way; but produces no scripture for it; but refers to the Talmud, Tr. Repud; but there it is not to be found, as before observed: and Schindler[62] asserts the same, as said by the Jews, and seems to refer to the same Tract in general, without directing to any particular place: and from him Hammond seems to have taken it upon trust, and some other writers also, without examination; since no such passage is to be found in that Tract. Pfeiffer[63], in proof of it, refers to a book called Zennorenna, a commentary on the law, written in Hebrew-German, in the seventeenth century, by R. Jacob Ben Isaac, a German Jew[64]. Indeed, in the Talmud[65], Jethro is said to become a proselyte, but no mention is made in what manner he was made one; and elsewhere[66] explaining these words, djyw "and Jethro rejoiced", says Rab, he made a sharp sword to pass over his flesh; that is, according to the Gloss, he circumcised himself, and became a proselyte; but not a word of his baptism, or dipping; and so the Targum on Exodus 18:6,7 is, "And he said to Moses, I Jethro, thy father-in-law, am come unto thee 'to be made a proselyte'; but if thou wilt not receive me for myself, receive me for the sake of thy wife, and her two children, who are with her; and Moses went out from under the clouds of glory to meet his father-in-law, and bowing himself, kissed him, and he made him a proselyte; but nothing is said of the manner of doing it." Mr. Broughton also, as before quoted, says, that the Babylonian Talmud, and Rambam record, that in the days of David and Solomon, many thousands of heathens

were made proselytes, and admitted by baptism only; but this instance is not to be met with in the Babylonian Talmud; yea, that expressly denies it in two different places[67]; and in which it is asserted that they did not receive proselytes neither in the days of David, nor in the days of Solomon; Solomon's wife, Pharaoh's daughter, is indeed excepted; because the reason for which they say, proselytes were not then received; namely, because they might be desirous of being made proselytes, that they might be admitted to the king's table, could have no influence on her, since she was the daughter of a mighty king; and yet it is said[68] by some, that though it was Solomon's intention to make her a proselyte, yet he was not able to do it; and she became one of his troublers; and by what is said of her, in 2 Chronicles 8:11 it looks as if she did not become a proselyte; Rambam, or Maimonides, indeed, to reconcile what later writers have said, with those words of the Talmudists, have contrived a distinction between the Sanhedrim and private persons; as if proselytes, though not received in those times by the former, were by the latter. He says[69], there were many proselytes in those times who were made so before private persons, but not before the Sanhedrim; he owns the Sanhedrim did not receive them, and though they were dipped, yet not by their order, and with their consent; but he produces no passage of scripture to support this private dipping; nor do the scriptures any where speak of such numbers of proselytes in those days, and much less of their baptism; and the strangers, who in the Greek version are called proselytes, whom Solomon numbered and employed at the building of the temple (2 Chron. 2:17), at most could only be proselytes of the gate, not of righteousness, and so there can be no pretence for their admission by baptism, or dipping; nor is there anything of this kind with respect to any persons to be found in the writings of the Old Testament. There is a plain and express law for the admission of proselytes to the Jewish religion, and for what, as a qualification, to partake of the ordinances and privileges of it; particularly to eat of the passover; and that is the circumcision of them, with all their males; and on this condition, and on this only, they and theirs were admitted without any other rite annexed unto it, they were obliged unto; nor does it appear that ever any other was used; no, not this of baptism; there was but one law to the stranger or proselyte, and to the home born Israelite (see Exodus 12:48,49). There were proselytes in the times of Hezekiah (2 Chron. 30:25) who came out of the land of Israel, to eat the passover at Jerusalem, who therefore must be circumcised, according to the said law; but there is no reason to believe they were baptized. There was a law concerning the marriage of a captive woman taken in war (Deut. 21:10-14), previous to which she must become a proselytess; and the law enjoins various particular rites to be observed in order to it, as shaving her head, paring her nails, and putting off the raiment of her captivity; but not a word of her baptism; which one would think could never be omitted, had such a custom prevailed as early as the times of Moses and Jacob, as is pretended. There were various bathings, baptisms, or dippings incumbent on the Israelites, and so upon such proselytes who were upon an equal footing with them, and equally under obligation to obey the ceremonial law; which consisted of various washings, baptisms, or dippings, yet none of them for proselytism; but for purification from one uncleanness or another, in a ceremonial sense: these seem to be what a learned writer[70] calls "aquilustria", "lustrations by water"; which he thinks it is clear the captive Jews in Babylon observed, from having their solemn meetings by rivers (Ezek. 3:15; Ezra 8:15,21), but it is not so clear they had their abode in such places, whether for a longer or shorter time, on account of them; and it is still less clear what he further says, that these lustrations had a promise of grace annexed to them, were sacraments of the Old Testament, and a type of our baptism. However, though he supposes the returning Jews and proselytes were circumcised, he does not pretend they were baptized; nor does he attempt to prove proselyte baptism from hence. Among the ten families said[71] by the Jews to come out of Babylon, the proselytes are one sort; but they say nothing of

their baptism (see Ezra 6:21). As for those scriptures of the Old Testament the Rabbins make use of to justify this custom of theirs, they will be considered hereafter.

II. Secondly, whereas there are several books called Apocrypha, supposed to be written between the writing of the books of the Old Testament and those of the New, and are generally thought to be written by Jews, and to contain things which chiefly have respect to them; and though there is sometimes mention made in them of proselytes to the Jewish religion, yet not a syllable of any such rite or custom, as of baptism or dipping at the admission of them; particularly of Achior the Ammonite, in the times of Judith; upon her cutting off the head of Olophernes it is said, that "he, seeing all that the God of Israel did, strongly believed in God, and circumcised the flesh of his foreskin, and was added to the house of Israel unto this day;" that is, he and his posterity continued in the Jewish religion. Now here is mention made of his being circumcised, previous to his addition, or his being proselyted to the Jewish church; but not a word of baptism, or dipping, in order to it; see Judith 14:6 in the Apocrypha.

III. Thirdly, mention is made of proselytes in the New Testament (Matthew 23:15; Acts 2:10, 6:5, 13:43), but nothing is said concerning their admission, and the manner of it. Indeed, in the Ethiopic version of Matthew 23:15 the words are rendered, "They baptize one proselyte"; which seems to have respect to the custom under consideration; but then this is but a translation, and not a just one. The Ethiopic version is not only reckoned not very good, but of no great antiquity. Ernestus Gerhard says[72] of the antiquity of it, he dare not affirm anything certain. And Ludolph, in his history of Ethiopia, relates[73], that he could find nothing certain concerning the author and time of this version but thinks it probable it was made at the time of the conversion of the Habessines, or a little after, but not in the times of the apostles, as some have affirmed; and in the margin, a little after, he observes, that in an Ethiopic martyrology, St. Frumentius, called abbot of Salama, is said to be the author of it; who, according to another place in the said history[74], seems to have lived in the fourth century, in the times of Athanasius, and is thought to be the first founder of the Christian religion in Ethiopia, and the first bishop in it. Scaliger takes the Ethiopic version to be a recent one; and Deuteronomy Dieu[75], from what the author or authors of the version of the evangelist Matthew, add at the end of it, suspects that they were of the Maronites, who became subject to the pope of Rome A. D. 1182, and so this version is too late a testimony for the antiquity of such a custom; and the closing the translation of some of the epistles with desiring the prayers of Peter and others, shows what sort of persons they were who translated them, and in what times they lived. The title of the book of the Revelation in this version, is, "The vision of John, which John was bishop of the metropolis of Constantinople, when he suffered persecution;" by which it appears not to be ancient. Hence Dr. Owen[76] calls it a "novel" endeavour of an illiterate person; and the translation of the clause itself in Matthew 23:15 is censured by Ludolphus[77] as ridiculous; the word by which it is rendered being used in the Ethiopic language to convert a man to Christianity, or to make a man a Christian; which is by it absurdly attributed to the Scribes and Pharisees.

IV. Fourthly, as there are no traces of this custom in the writings before, at, or about the times of John, Christ, and his apostles; so neither are there any in those which were written in any short time after; as, not in Philo the Jew, who lived in the first century; who, though he is said by some to be ignorant of Jewish customs, yet one would think he could not be ignorant of such as were used at the admission of proselytes; since he lived at Alexandria, where it may be supposed many proselytes were, more than in Judea, and of the manner of their admission he could not but have

knowledge, both then and in former times; and he makes mention of proselytes, and of them as equally partakers of the same privileges, and to be treated with the same honour and respect as home born citizens[78], and as they were admitted by Moses; but is altogether silent about this custom of baptizing, or dipping them; nor is there the least trace or hint of this custom in any Rabbinical books, said by the Jews to be written a little before, or after; such as the books of Bahir, Zohar, the Targums of Onkelos on the Pentateuch, and of Jonathan Ben Uzziel on the prophets.

V. Fifthly, Josephus, the Jewish historian, lived in the same age, a little after Philo, was well versed in the affairs of the Jews, even in their religious rites and ceremonies, having been a priest among them. He not only observes, that many of the Gentiles came over to their religion[79], but even speaks of whole nations who became Jews, and that they were made so by circumcision; as of the Idumaeans, whom Hyrcanus conquered, and suffered to remain in their own land, on condition that they would be circumcised, and conform to the laws of the Jews; and who, out of love to their country, did comply with circumcision, and so became Jews[80], and of the Ituraeans, whom Aristobulus fought against, and added part of their country to Judaea, and obliged the inhabitants, if they would remain in their country, to be circumcised, and live after the laws of the Jews; and quotes Strabo, who, upon the authority of Timogenes, says, that he enlarged the country of the Jews, and made part of the country of Ituraea theirs, joining them to them by the bond of circumcision[81]. By which accounts it appears, that both these people were made Jews, or were proselyted to them by circumcision; but not a word is said of their baptism, or dipping; which, according to this custom, as is said, must have been of men, women, and children, which, had it been practised, could not have been well omitted by the historian. He also speaks[82] of Helena, queen of Adiabene, and of her son Izates, embracing the Jewish religion; and relates how desirous Izates was of being circumcised, that he might be a perfect Jew, without which he could not; but for a time he was dissuaded from it by his mother, and a Jew merchant, who instructed them; but afterwards, being exhorted to perfect the work by one Eleazer, who was more skilful in Jewish affairs, he submitted to circumcision: but neither Josephus nor Eleazer say a word about his baptism, or dipping; which yet, according to the pretended custom as then prevailing, was necessary, as well as circumcision, to make him a complete proselyte. Nor is any mention made of the baptism or dipping of Helena; which, had it been at this time, would not have been omitted by the historian; since it was by that only, according to this notion, that females were then made proselytes. He also speaks[83] of another son of Helena, Monbaz, embracing the Jewish religion; but says nothing of his baptism.

VI. Sixthly, it may be inquired, whether or no any mention is made of this custom of receiving proselytes among the Jews by baptism, or dipping, in the Targums, or Chaldee paraphrases. The most ancient ones extant are those of Jonathan Ben Uzziel of the prophets, and of Onkelos of the Pentateuch; the one at the beginning, the other toward the end of the first century; in which nothing is met with concerning the admission of Jewish proselytes by dipping. The other paraphrases are by uncertain authors, and of an uncertain age. The Targum of the Megillot, or five books of Ruth, Ecclesiastes, Canticles, Lamentations, and Esther, is written by an unknown author; it is the latest of all the Targums. In that of Esther only the phrase became Jews (Esther 8:17), is rendered, became proselytes; but nothing is said of their manner of becoming such. In that of Ruth 1:16 the requisites of a proselyte are particularly observed; where Ruth is introduced, saying, that she desired to be made a proselyte; when Naomi informs her what commands the Jews were obliged to observe; as to keep the Sabbaths and festivals, and not to walk beyond two thousand cubits (on the

Sabbath day); not to lodge with Gentiles; to observe the three hundred and thirteen commands; not to worship an idol, etc. to all which Ruth is made to agree; but not a syllable is said about baptism, or dipping; whereas, that, with a sacrifice along with it, before the building of the temple, and while the temple stood, and since, without it, is the only thing, according to this notion, by which females were admitted proselytes. In the Targum of Jonathan of Genesis 9:27 the sons of Japheth are said to be made and to dwell in the school of Shem. In the Jerusalem Targum, and in that of Pseudo-Jonathan, the souls that Abraham and Sarah got in Haran (Gen. 12:5), are said to be the souls who were made proselytes by them; and In the same Targum of Genesis 21:33 at Beersheba, where Abraham planted a grove, he is said to make proselytes, and teach them the way of the world, of the world to come; but nothing more is said of the way and manner in which they were made such. In the Targum of Pseudo-Jonathan of Genesis 38:2 Judah is said to make the daughter of a Canaanite a proselytess, and then married her; and in the same Targum of Numbers 11:4 the mixed multitude who came with the Israelites out of Egypt, are interpreted proselytes; and no doubt but many of them were such; and Jarchi thinks the son of the Israelitish woman, whose father was an Egyptian, was a proselyte, since he was among the children of Israel (Lev. 24:10). And Africanus affirms[84], that the Jews genealogical tables, in which an account was kept of original Jews and of proselytes; as of Achior the Ammonite, and Ruth the Moabitess, and those who came out of Egypt mixed with the Israelites; and which continued to the times of Herod, who burnt them, that his family might not be known. But to return to the Targums; in the Pseudo-Jonathan's of Exodus 18:6,7, Jethro is made to say to Moses, as before observed, that he was come to be made a proselyte; and Moses is said to make him one; but in what manner it is not said; and so the rest before mentioned; indeed, the same Targum of Exodus 12:44 is, "And every stranger who is sold for a servant to an Israelite, bought with money, then thou shalt circumcise him, and thou shalt 'dip him', and so shall he eat of it," the passover. Now in this Targum of Exodus 26:9 not only mention is made of the Misnah, but it abounds with Talmudic fables and traditions, and so must be written after both the Misnah and Talmud; and in the Targum of Numbers 24:19 mention is made of the city of Constantinople, which shows it to be not ancient, and that it is not the work of the true Jonathan. And besides all this, the case of the servant refers not to a proselyte, who became so of choice, but to a bought servant, who, according to the original law in Genesis 17:12,13, was obliged to be circumcised; and so, according to the Rabbinic custom, to be dipped; but then, according to these writers, baptism, or dipping for servitude, was a different thing from baptism, or dipping for proselytism; the one was on a civil, the other on a religious account; the one was repeated when a servant was made a free man, and the other never[85]. The same Pseudo-Jonathan in his Targum of Deuteronomy 21:13, to the conditions required of a beautiful captive, in order to be married to an Israelite, this is added, that she should dip herself, and become a proselytess in his house; but the text has nothing of it, nor the Targum of Onkelos; nor is this custom to be met with in the paraphrases of the true Jonathan; only in this, which was written after the Talmud, and does not come within the time under consideration.

VII. Seventhly, nor is there any mention of such a custom in the Jew's Misnah, or Book of Traditions; which is a collection of all the traditions among the Jews, which had been handed down from age to age, and were collected together from all parts, and written in a book of this name, in order to be preserved. This was written by R. Judah Hakkadosh, in the middle of the second century, A. D. 150 or as others in the beginning of the third century, reckoning the date of it one hundred and fifty years from the destruction of the temple; which brings it to the year 220 and here, if anywhere, one might expect to meet with this rite or custom; but no mention is made of it. Dr.

Gale[86] seems to allow it upon what Dr. Wall has transcribed from Selden, which he granted without examination. The doctor says[87], It is not only mentioned in the Gemara, but in the text of the Misnah itself; which, as he suggests, speaks of a child becoming a proselyte by baptism, or dipping; but the passage he has from Selden[88] says no such thing; which runs thus[89]; "A she stranger, a captive, and a maiden, who are redeemed and become proselytes, and are made free, being 'under' (or, as in the following section, above) three years and one day old, are allowed the matrimonial dowry;" that is, when they come to age, and are married; but not a word is here of their being made proselytes by baptism, or dipping; indeed, the tradition shows, that minors may be proselyted, and that a man's sons and daughters may become proselytes with him; but there is no need to have recourse to a tradition for this; the law is express, that a stranger who desires to be a proselyte to the Jewish religion, and to eat of the passover, must be circumcised, and all his males, and then he and all his children, males and females, may be admitted to eat of it, Exodus 12:48,49 only the circumcision of the males is required, but no baptism, or dipping of any. There is a passage in the Misnah[90], which perhaps some may think countenances this custom; which is this, "A stranger who is made a proselyte, on the evening of the passover, the house of Shammai say, he 'dips' and eats his Passover in the evening; but the house of Hillell say, he that separates from uncircumcision, is as he that separates from a grave." Now it should be observed, 1. That here is a division about this matter, be it what it may; Shammai, and his party, assert, that a proselyte newly made, might dip and eat his passover that evening; but Hillell, and his party, dissent, for a reason given; and the determination, in all cases, was generally according to Hillell, as it was in this; so we learn from Maimonides[91]. 2. This baptism, or dipping, was not on account of proselytism, but for ceremonial uncleanness; for it goes along with cases of that kind, instanced in before. The canon begins thus, "A mourner (who was unclean according to the ceremonial law) dips and eats his passover in the evening; but eats not of the holy things: he that hears tidings of the death of his (friend or relation), and who gathers to him bones, dips, and eats of the holy things:" and then it follows, "A stranger who is made a proselyte, etc." 3. This rule, according to Shammai, was concerning one already made a proselyte, and therefore the dipping, or baptism, he prescribes to him, in order to his eating the passover that evening, was not to make him a proselyte; but for some other reason. Wherefore, 4. This strongly makes against admission of proselytes by baptism, or dipping, at that time; for if he had been made a proselyte that way, there would have been no reason for a second dipping to qualify him for the passover. 5. The case of such an one, according to Hillell, is, that being just come out of heathenism, he was unclean, as one that touched a dead man, a bone, or a grave; and therefore could not eat of the passover that evening, but must wait seven days, until he was purified according to the law in Numbers 19:11-19. 6. After all, the view of Hillell, in putting such a person off from eating the passover the evening he became a proselyte for the reason given, was with respect to the next year, and by way of caution; fearing that should he be then in any uncleanness, which required purification, he would say, Last year I did not dip, or purify myself from any uncleanness, and yet I eat, and now I must dip and eat; not considering that the last year he was an heathen, and incapable of uncleanness, according to the law, but now he was an Israelite, and capable of it; and so it is explained in the Gemara[92] and Gloss on it, and by other interpreters[93]. Besides, this baptism, or dipping, was not on account of proselytism, but was common to, and obligatory upon, a circumcised Israelite, in order to eat of the passover; as is acknowledged by all. There were several in the times of the Misnic doctors, and before the Misnah was compiled, who were persons of eminence, and said to become proselytes; as Onkelos the Targumist, who, it is said, was made a proselyte in the days of Hillell and Shammai[94], hence he is called Onkelos the proselyte[95]; some say[96] he was a sister's son of Titus the emperor, and by

whom three Roman troops, sent one after another, to take him, were made proselytes also[97]; and Aquila, the author of the Greek version of the Bible, became, as is said[98], a proselyte in the times of Adrian and so the emperor Antoninus Pius, and Ketiah, a nobleman in Caesar's court, as before observed: yea, the famous R. Akiba, a Misnic doctor, was a proselyte[99]; and so was R. Meir[100]. And of the circumcision of most of these we read; but nothing of their baptism; neither in the Misnah, nor in any other Jewish writings. Not to take notice of those very early masters of tradition Shemaia and Abtalion, before observed, who were proselytes of righteousness[101]; there were also women of note within this time, who became proselytes; as queen Helena[102], with her two sons, of whom mention is made in the Misnah[103]; and Beluria, the proselytess, who had a discourse with R. Gamaliel[104]; and the wife of Turnus Rufus, whom R. Akiba married, after she was proselyted[105]. Now though female proselytes were admitted by baptism only, as is pretended, yet nothing is said of the baptism of these women. And as there is no mention of this custom in the Misnah, so neither have I observed any notice taken of it in the Rabbot, which are commentaries on the Pentateuch and five Megillot, before named; and which were written by R. Bar Nachmoni, about A. D. 300, according to Buxtorf[106] in one of which the text in Genesis 12:5 is commented on; "And the souls they had gotten in Haran"; which the Targums of Pseudo-Jonathan and Jerusalem, interpret of the souls they proselyted, before observed; and here it is said[107], "These are the proselytes which they made:—R. Hona said, Abraham proselyted the men, and Sarah proselyted the women;" but not a word is said about the baptism or dipping of either. Yea, Abraham and Sarah are said to be proselytes[108] themselves; but it is not suggested that they were baptized. In these commentaries mention is made of the circumcision of proselytes, particularly of king Monbaz, and his brother, said to be the sons of king Ptolemy[109]; and of Aquila, the Greek translator[110]; but nothing is said of their baptism.

VIII. Eighthly, nor is this rite or custom of receiving Jewish proselytes by baptism, or dipping, once spoken of by any of the Christian fathers of the first three or four centuries; which they could not be ignorant of, if from hence Christian baptism was taken, and especially such who were Jews, or had any connection with them, or were acquainted with them, and with their affairs, as some of them were. Barnabas was a Jew, and an apostolic man, contemporary with the apostles; there is an epistle of his still extant, in which he treats chiefly of Jewish rites, and of their being typical of evangelic things, and of their having their fulfilment in them; and yet says not a word of this initiating baptism, which he could not have failed making mention of had he known anything of it; yea, he sets himself to find out what was beforehand said concerning the ordinance of baptism; he says[111], "Let us inquire whether the Lord has taken any care to make manifest beforehand anything concerning the water;" that is, concerning baptism: and then he adds, "Concerning the water, it is written to Israel, how the baptism that leads to the remission of sins, they would not; but appointed for themselves;" meaning their superstitious worship, our Lord inveighs against; but says not a word here, nor elsewhere, of the baptism of proselytes, for which he had a fair opportunity, had he known anything of it. Justin Martyr, who lived in the second century, was a Samaritan, and had knowledge of Jewish affairs; and had a dispute with Trypho the Jew, the same with Tarphon, a Jewish doctor, frequently mentioned in the Misnah; yet neither he nor Trypho say anything of this custom. In answer to a question put by Justin, what was necessary to be observed; Trypho replies[112], "To keep the Sabbath; to be circumcised; to observe the new moons; to be baptized, or dipped, whoever touches any of these things forbidden by Moses;" meaning, that such should be baptized, or dipped, who touched a dead body, or bone, or grave, etc. but not a syllable is here of the baptism, or dipping of proselytes. And Justin himself makes mention of Jewish proselytes, and

calls them circumcised proselytes[113], but not baptized; by which it seems he knew nothing of any such custom, as to baptize them; yea, he does, in effect, deny there was any such custom of baptizing any, that universally obtained among the Jews, since he speaks of a certain sect, whom he will not allow to be truly Jews, called by him Baptists[114]. Whereas, if it was the practice of the whole nation to receive proselytes by baptism, or dipping, a particular sect among them, would not be stigmatized with such a name, since they must be all Baptists, both original Jews and proselytes, if they were all admitted into the Jewish church by baptism, as is affirmed. Origen, who lived in the beginning of the third century, in the city of Alexandria, where were great numbers of Jews, with whom he was acquainted, and must know their customs, says of Heracleon, an heretic, he opposes[115], "That he was not able to show that ever any prophet baptized;" meaning, a common and ordinary one; and if none of these ever baptized, what foundation could there be for the baptism of proselytes before the times of Christ? Epiphanius, in the fourth century, was born in Palestine, lived some time in Egypt, had great knowledge of the Jews, and of their affairs; but seems to know nothing of this custom, as used neither in former nor in later times: he says[116], neither had Abraham baptism, nor Isaac, nor Elias, nor Moses, not any before Noah and Enoch, nor the prophet Isaiah; nor those who were after him and he speaks of the Samaritans, that when they came over to the Jews, they were circumcised again; and gives an instance in Symmachus, who, when he became a proselyte, was circumcised again. So likewise be speaks of Theodotion being proselyted to Judaism[117], and of his being circumcised; but not a word of the baptism, or dipping, of either of them. He also speaks of Antipater[118], the father of Herod the king, that when he became procurator of Judaea, he was made a proselyte, and was circumcised, both he and Herod his son; but says nothing of their baptism, or dipping; so Herod is called by the Jews a Proselyte[119]; and his reign, and that of his posterity, µyrgh twklm "the reign of the proselytes"[120], who became so by circumcision, and that only, for ought appears. And of him, as a proselyte, but not of his baptism, speaks Jerome[121]; he lived in the same century, and great part of his time in Judaea, was acquainted with several Jews he had for his teachers, and with their traditions, of many of which he makes mention, but never of this of admitting proselytes by baptism, or dipping. He speaks of proselytes, and of their circumcision; and says[122], that "if strangers received by the law of the Lord, and were circumcised, and were eunuchs, as was he of the queen of Candace, they are not foreign from the salvation of God;" but not a word of their baptism or dipping. The instances given by Dr. Wall[123], from Tertullian, Cyprian, Gregory Nazianzen, and Basil, only respect either the figurative baptism of the Israelites at the Red Sea; or their baptisms and bathings by immersion, for their purification from ceremonial uncleanness; but not for proselytism. So when the same writer[124] quotes Arrianus, an heathen Stoic philosopher of the second century, as speaking of tou bebammhnou, "a baptized Jew"[125], or one that was dipped; by whom the doctor thinks is meant one made a proselyte by baptism; no other may be designed than either a Jew who bathed his whole body, to purify himself from legal pollutions; or an Hemero-baptist, a sect of the Jews, who bathed themselves every day; or rather a Christian, as many learned men are of opinion[126]; since it was not unusual with heathen writers to call Christians, who were baptized, Jews; because the first Christians were Jews, and came from Judaea, into other parts of the world, and were reckoned by the heathens a sect of the Jews[127], and were often confounded with them. Now since it appears there is no mention made of any such rite or custom of admitting Jewish proselytes by baptism, or dipping, to the Jewish religion in an writings and records before the times of John the Baptist, Christ, and his apostles; nor in any age after them, for the first three or four hundred years; or, however, before the writing of the Talmuds; it may he safely concluded there was no such custom, which had obtained in that interval of time. It remains

therefore to be considered, what is the true ground and foundation of such a notion and from whence it sprung, which will be done in the following chapter.

[TO CONTENTS]

CHAPTER 4

THE PROOF OF THIS CUSTOM ONLY FROM THE TALMUDS AND TALMUDICAL WRITTERS

Seeing the rite of receiving proselytes by baptism, or dipping among the Jews, is nowhere mentioned in any writings before the times of John and Christ, nor in any after, nearer than the third and fourth centuries; it is next to be inquired, when and where we first hear of it; and upon inquiry it will be found, that the first mention of it, for ought as yet appears, is in the Jewish Talmuds. The testimonies from thence concerning it, and the whole evidence, as there given of it, will now be laid before the reader. There are two Talmuds, the one called Jerusalem, the other Babylonian; the one written for the Jews at Jerusalem, and in Judaea, after the destruction of the city and temple, and in the Jerusalem dialect. The other for the use of the Jews in Babylon, and in those parts, and in their style. The former is the most ancient, and therefore I shall begin with it, being finished, as generally supposed, in the year 230; but if the Misnah was not compiled till the year 220, being one hundred and fifty from the destruction of Jerusalem, there must be a longer space of time than that of ten years between the one and the other. David Nieto, lately belonging to a Jewish synagogue here in London, says[128], the Jerusalem Talmud was written near a hundred years after the Misnah; but other Jews make it later still, and make a difference of two hundred and thirty three years between the finishing of the one and the other; the one being finished in 189, and the other in 422[129], which is much more probable; and so this Talmud was not earlier than the beginning of the fifth century; nay, sometimes they place it in the year 469, the latter end of that century[130]. Scaliger places[131] it in the year 370. Mr. Whiston[132] in 369. And so Elias Levita[133] writes, that R. Jochanan compiled it three hundred years after the destruction of Jerusalem; but Morinus[134] will have it to be after the year 600, which is carrying it down too low. The passages I have met with in it any way relating to the case under consideration; for it will be allowed there are some; and therefore it will be owned, that Mr. Rees[135] was mistaken in saying it was not pretended to be found in it. The passages are as follow. In one place[136], a certain Rabbi is represented as saying to another, "Wait, and we will ‘dip’ this proselytess tomorrow. R. Zera asked R. Isaac Bar Nachman, Wherefore? because of the glory of that old man, or because they do not dip a proselyte in the night. He replied to him, Why do not they dip a proselyte in the night? Abda came before R. Jose (and said), What is the meaning then of not dipping a proselyte in the night?" And a little after, in the same column, a saying of R. Hezekiah is reported; "A man finds an infant cast out (an exposed infant), and he dips it in the name of a servant;" or for a servant, on account of servitude; but then dipping for servitude, and dipping for proselytism, were two different things with the Jews, as before observed; and yet this is the only clause produced by Dr. Lightfoot out of this Talmud, for the above purpose; or by any other that I have seen. However, there are others which speak of the dipping of adult proselytes; which became a matter of controversy. In another treatise, in the same

Talmud[137], mention is made of a proselyte circumcised, but not dipped; (and it is added) all goes after circumcision; that is, that denominates a proselyte. "R. Joshua says, yea, dipping stays (or retards) it; and Bar Kaphra teaches, that he who is not dipped, this is right (a true proselyte); for there is no proselyte but dips for accidents;" that is, for accidental and nocturnal pollutions; and it seems such a dipping sufficed for proselytism. Of so little account did these Rabbins make of dipping for proselytism, who first mention it, not only make it insignificant, but as a delay of it, and what was an obstruction and hindrance of it: and further on it is said[138], "A proselytess less than three years of age and one day, she has not knowledge for dipping (or when she is dipped); and afterwards returns and is dipped for the name of the Holy One of Israel; every one is a proselytess, and she is a proselytess." This looks like Anabaptism, or rebaptization for want of knowledge when first dipped. And a little further still[139], "A stranger or a proselyte who has children, and says, I am circumcised, but I am not dipped; he is to be believed, and they dip him on the Sabbath."

In another treatise[140], a mention is made of a proselyte who dipped after the illumination of the East, that is, after sunrising. These are all the places I have met with in the Jerusalem Talmud any way relating to this custom. Dr. Wall[141] refers to two or three other passages in this Talmud, through mistake for the Babylonian Talmud; in which he may be excused, because, as he himself says, he was not well acquainted with these books; but he cannot be excused of inadvertency in transcribing from his authors, unless they have led him wrong.

The Babylonian Talmud is next to be considered; from whence testimonies may be brought relating to the custom under consideration. This Talmud was finished, as is usually said, about A. D. 500; according to the account of the Jews it was finished three hundred and sixteen years after the Misnah, and eighty three after the Jerusalem Talmud[142]. Though Morinus thinks it did not appear until the seventh or eighth century. According to the Jewish doctors, as related in this Talmud, the Israelites, and the proselytes, were admitted into covenant in the same way and manner; and which they conclude from Numbers 15:15 "As ye are, so shall the stranger be, before the Lord": on which they thus descant[143]: "As your fathers entered not into covenant but by circumcision and dipping, and acceptance of blood or sacrifice; so they (the proselytes) enter not into covenant, but by circumcision, and dipping, and through acceptance of blood," or sprinkling of blood, as the Gloss is; or by sacrifice, as it is sometimes expressed, which is favourably accepted of God; and without both circumcision and dipping, none were reckoned proper proselytes; this is said two or three times in one leaf[144]; "A man is not a proselyte unless both circumcised and dipped." R. Chiyah Bar Abba went to Gabla, it is said, and he saw the daughters of Israel pregnant by proselytes, who were circumcised but not dipped; he went and told R. Jochanan, who declared their issue bastards, and not children of the law, or legitimate: about this a controversy was raised, related in the same place; "A stranger that is circumcised and not dipped, R. Eliezer says, lo, this is a proselyte; for so we find by our fathers, that they were circumcised, but not dipped; one that is dipped, and not circumcised, R. Joshua says, lo, this is a proselyte; for so we find by our mothers (not maids, or maidservants, as Dr. Lightfoot[145] translates it) that they were dipped and not circumcised." Had the account stopped here, the decision must have been against dipping: for it is a rule with the Jews, that when R. Eliezer and R. Joshua dissent, the decision is according to R. Eliezer[146], whom they often call Eliezer the Great[147], and say many extravagant things of him; particularly, that if all the wise men of Israel were put into one scale, and Eliezer the son of Hyrcanus, into the other, he would weigh them all down[148]; yet here the wise men interpose, and say, "He that is dipped and

not circumcised, circumcised and not dipped, is no proselyte, until he is both circumcised and dipped; for R. Joshua may learn from the fathers, and R. Eliezer from the mothers."

And so in this way they reconciled both; but R. Eliezer continued in the same sentiments, which he afterwards declared for, and affirms, that a proselyte that is circumcised, and not dipped, awh ayl[m rg "he is an honourable proselyte"[149]; so that according to him, dipping was not necessary to one's being a proselyte; and R. Barzelonita[150] says, of a sort of proselytes which have been taken notice of, he is a proselyte who is circumcised and not dipped. So that the Jews are not agreed among themselves about this point. The manner of receiving a proselyte, and dipping him, when circumcised and healed of his wound, and of the dipping of women also, is related in the same treatise of the Babylonian Talmud[151]; "A stranger when he comes to be made proselyte, "at this time", they say unto him, What dost thou see, to become a proselyte? Dost thou not know that the Israelites "at this time" are in distress, and in sorrowful circumstances, driven about and scattered, and are reproached, and chastisements come upon them? If he says, I know this, and I am not worthy (to be joined with them), they receive him immediately; and make known unto him some of the light, and some of the heavy commands (the particulars of which follow); if he receives them, they immediately circumcise him; and if there be anything remains, which hinders circumcision, they return and circumcise him a second time, and when he is healed, they dip him immediately, and two disciples of the wise men stand by him, and make known to him some of the light and some of the heavy commands; then he dips, and goes up, and he is an Israelite. If a woman, the women set her in water up to her neck, and two disciples of the wise men stand by her without, and make known some of the light and some of the heavy commands." Maimonides[152] adds, "After that she 'dips' herself before them, and they turn away their faces, and go out, so that they do not see her when 'she goes up out of the water'." Of a woman big with child when she is dipped they have this rule[153], "A stranger pregnant, who is made a proselytess, her child has no need of dipping, that is, for proselytism, as the Gloss; is because sufficient for it is the dipping of its mother; and a woman that is dipped as unclean, according to the doctors, that is sufficient to make her a proselytess." Says R. Chiyah Bar Ame, "I will dip this heathen woman, in the name or on account of a woman;" that is, as the Gloss is, for the dipping of uncleanness, she being a menstruous woman, and not for the dipping of proselytism. Says R. Joseph, "I will make it right;" that is, pronounce that she is a perfect proselytess; for though she is not dipped for proselytism, yet being dipped for uncleanness, it serves for proselytism; for a stranger or a heathen is not dipped for uncleanness[154]. There are various circumstances observed in the same treatise concerning the dipping of proselytes; as the place where they are dipped; "In a place it is said[155], where a menstruous woman dips, there a proselyte and a freed servant dip;" that is, as the Gloss is, in a quantity of forty seahs of water: the time of its being done is also signified; as that they do not dip in the night; and it is disputed whether it should be done on the Sabbath day: three witnesses also were required to be present; and where there are three, he (the proselyte) "dips" and goes up, and lo, he is as an Israelite[156]. It is said[157], "It happened in the house of R. Chiya Bar Rabbi, where were present R. Oschaia Bar Rabbi, and R. Oschaia Bar Chiya, that there came a proselyte before him who was circumcised, but not dipped; he said unto him, Wait here till tomorrow, and we will dip thee. Three things are to be learnt from hence. 1. That three persons are required (at the dipping of a proselyte). 2. That he is not a proselyte unless he is circumcised and dipped. 3. That they do not dip a proselyte in the night;" to which may be added, 4. That they must be three Rabbins who are promoted, that is, are famous and eminent ones, who are witnesses, as it seems these three were. There is but one instance in this Talmud, that I have met with, of the dipping of a child or a minor,

made a proselyte; and a male is so called until he is thirteen years of age and one day; of such an one it is said[158], "A proselyte, a little one (a minor), they dip him by the decree of the Sanhedrim;" that is, as the Gloss is, one that has no father, and his mother brings him to the Sanhedrim, to be made a proselyte, and there are three at his dipping; and they are a father to him, and by their means he is made a proselyte. And in the same place it is observed of a stranger, whose sons and daughters are made proselytes with him, and acquiesce in what their father has done, when they are grown up, they may make it void. There is another instance of the dipping of a minor; but not for proselytism, but for eating the Trumah, or the oblation of the fruits of the earth. So a certain one says[159], "I remember when I was a child, and was carried on my father's shoulders, that they took me from school, and stripped me of my coat, and dipped me, that I might eat of the Trumah in the evening;" but this was not a proselyte, but an Israelite, the son of a priest, who, it seems, was not qualified to eat of the oblation without dipping. This as one of their various baptisms, or dippings.

This now is the whole compass of the evidence from the Talmuds for the rite of admitting proselytes among the Jews by baptism, or dipping. I have not omitted anything relating to it in them that has fallen under my observation. As for the quotations usually made from Maimonides, who lived in the twelfth century, in proof of this custom; whatever may be said for him as an industrious and judicious compiler of things, out of the Talmud, which he has expressed in purer language, and digested in better order; he cannot be thought to be of greater and higher authority than those writings from whence he has derived them; for his work is only a stream from the Talmudic fountain. And as for later writers; as the authors of Lebush, Schulchan Aruch, and others, they derive from him. So that the Talmuds appear to be the spring and source of what is said of this custom, and from whence the proof and evidence of it is to be fetched; but whether the reasonings, decisions, and determinations therein concerning it, can be judged a sufficient proof of it, without better testimonies, especially from the scriptures, deserves consideration.

It must not be concealed, that it is pretended there is proof of it from scripture; which I shall attend unto. The proof of the Jewish fathers entering into covenant by baptism, or dipping, is fetched from Exodus 19:10 where, two or three days before the giving of the law, the Israelites were ordered to "wash" their clothes; hence it is said in the Talmud[160], to prove that dipping was used at the entrance of the Israelites into covenant, according to which the baptism, or dipping of proselytes, is said to be; "From whence is it (or a proof of it?) From what is written Exodus 19:10 where there is an obligation to wash clothes, there is an obligation to dip." And again (Ex. 24:8), "Moses 'took it (the blood) and sprinkled it on the people'; and there is no sprinkling without dipping." And in another place[161], "Sprinkling of blood (or sacrifice, by which also the Israelites, it is said, were admitted into covenant) of it, it is written, 'And he sent young men of the children of Israel, which offered burnt offerings', etc. But dipping, from whence is it? From what is written; 'And Moses took half of the blood, and sprinkled it on the people'; and there is no sprinkling without dipping."

This is the proof, which surely cannot be satisfactory to a judicious mind; dipping is inferred from sprinkling; but though the blood was sprinkled upon the people, they were not dipped into it surely; nor even into water, from what appears; and though dipping and sprinkling are sometimes used together, as in the cleansing of the leper, and in the purification of one unclean, by the touch of an unclean bone, etc. (Lev. 14:7; Num. 19:19), yet the one was not the other. From washing of clothes dipping is also inferred, without any reason; for these two, in the above places, and in others, are

spoken of as two distinct acts, and are expressed by different words; and yet it is upon this single circumstance the proof depends. Now, as Dr. Owen[162] observes, "this washing of clothes served that single occasion only of showing reverence of the divine presence, at the peculiar giving of the law; nor did it belong to the stated worship of God; so that the necessity of the baptism of bodies, by a stated and solemn rite for ever, should arise from the single washing of garments, and that depending upon a reason, that would never more recur; of the observation of which no mention is made, nor any trace is extant in the whole Old Testament, and which is not confirmed by any divine command, institution, or direction, seems altogether improbable" And he elsewhere[163] says, "From this latter temporary occasional institution (ceremonial washing at Sinai) such as they (the Jews) had many granted to them, while they were in the wilderness, before the giving of the law, the Rabbins have framed a baptism for those who enter into their synagogue; a fancy too greedily embraced by some Christian writers, who would have the holy ordinance of the church's baptism to be derived from thence. But this "washing of their clothes", not of their bodies, was temporary, never repeated; neither is there anything of any such baptism or washing required in any proselytes, either men or women, where the laws of their admission are strictly set down." And it may be further observed, that the Talmudists give this only as a proof of the admission of Israelites into covenant; whereas, the solemn admission of them into it, even of the whole body of them, men, women, and children, and also of the proselytes who were in their camp, as all the Targums and the Greek version have it, when on the plains of Moab, at Horeb, before their entrance into the land of Canaan (Deut.29:10-12), was not by "any" of the "three" things they say the admission was, that is, by circumcision, baptism, and sacrifice; of the two latter not the least hint is given, and the former was not practised while the Israelites were in the wilderness, not till Joshua had introduced them into the land of Canaan. The Jews seem to be conscious themselves that the baptism or dipping of proselytes, is no command of God; since at the circumcision of them, in the form of blessing they then use, they take no notice of it, which runs thus[164]. "Blessed art thou, O Lord God, the King of the world, who has sanctified us by his precepts, and has 'commanded' us 'to circumcise proselytes', and to fetch out of them the blood of the covenant; for if it was not for the blood of the covenant the heaven and earth would not be established; as it is said, 'If my covenant with day and night', etc. Jeremiah 33:25."

Dr. Lightfoot[165] carries this custom of admitting proselytes by baptism, or dipping, higher than the Jews themselves do. He ascribes the first institution and use of it to Jacob, when he was going to Bethel to worship, after the murder of the Sechemites by his sons; when, the doctor says, he chose into his family and church, some of the Shechemites and other heathens. But some learned men of the Paedobaptist persuasion, have thought the notion is indefensible, and judged it most prudent to leave it to himself to defend it, or whomsoever may choose to undertake it[166]; and he himself was in doubt about the first institution of this sort of baptism; for he afterwards says, "We acknowledge that circumcision was of divine institution; but by whom baptism, that was inseparable from it, was instituted, is doubtful." Certain it is, it has no foundation in what Jacob did, or ordered to be done, when he was about to go to Bethel, and worship there; previous to which he ordered his family to "put away the strange gods" that were among them, which they had brought with them from Shechem; and he likewise ordered them to be "clean", and "change their garments"; which cleanness, whether to be understood of abstaining from their wives, as some interpret it; or of washing of their bodies, as Aben Ezra, as a purification of them from the pollutions of the slain, as the Targum paraphrases it, and after that Jarchi: and which change of garments, whether understood of the garments of idolaters, which the sons of Jacob had taken and put on, when they

stripped them; or of their own garments, defiled with the blood of the slain; or of their meaner or more sordid garments, for more pure and splendid ones. All that can be concluded from hence is, and is by the Jews concluded, that when men come before God, they should come with clean bodies, and with clean garments; as an emblem of the more inward purity of their minds, which is necessary to every religious service and act of devotion, such as Jacob and his family were now about to perform, and which the very heathens themselves had a notion of; "Casta placent superis, pura cum veste venito"[167]. But not a word is here of any covenant Jacob and his family entered into, and much less of any proselytes from Shechem and Syria being brought into it with them, by baptism, or dipping, as is pretended.

I have met with another learned man[168], who carries up this custom higher still; and asserts, that Jacob did not feign out of his own brain this practice of washing the body, and of change of garments; but took it from the history of Adam, and from his example; and he supposes that Adam, at the solemn making the covenant with him, was washed in water, before he put on the garments given him of God; and that as he was the first who sacrificed, he was the first who was baptized by the command of God; and so baptism was the most ancient of all the sacred rites. But let the history of Adam be carefully read over by any man, and he will never find the least hint of this, nor observe the least shadow or appearance of it; but what is it that the imagination of man will not admit and receive, when once a loose is given to it? Pray, who baptized Adam, if he was baptized? Did God baptize him? Or did an angel baptize him? Or did Eve baptize him? Or did he baptize himself?

Since then this rite or custom of admitting into covenant, whether Israelites or proselytes, by baptism or dipping, has no foundation but in the Talmuds; and the proof of it there so miserably supported from scripture, surely it can never be thought that Christian baptism was borrowed from thence; or that it is no other which is continued in the Christian church, being taken up as it was found by John the Baptist, Christ, and his apostles; the folly and falsehood of which will be evinced in the following chapter.

[TO CONTENTS]

CHAPTER 5

THE REASONS WHY CHRISTIAN BAPTISM IS NOT FOUNDED ON, AND TAKEN FROM, THE PRETENDED JEWISH BAPTISM OF ISRAELITES AND PROSELYTES

Having traced the admission of the Jewish proselytes by baptism, or dipping, to the spring head of it, the Jewish Talmuds; I shall now proceed to give reasons, why Christian baptism cannot be thought to be taken from such a custom; nor that to be a rule according to which it is to be practised.

I. First, the Talmuds are of too late a date to prove that such a custom obtained before the times of John and Christ, since they were written some centuries after those times, as has been shown; and besides, there is in them a plain chronological mark, or character, which shows that this custom took place among the Jews since they were driven out of their own land, and scattered among the nations, and suffered reproach and persecution; for among the interrogatories put to persons who came to them to be made proselytes, this question was asked[169], "What dost thou see to become a proselyte? dost thou not know, or consider, that the Israelites are 'now' hzh ˆmzb 'at this time', in sorrowful circumstances, driven about and scattered, and loaded with reproaches and afflictions? If he says, I know this; and I am not worthy (that is, to be joined to them) they receive him immediately." Many are the surmises and conjectures of learned men concerning the original and rise of this custom. It is scarce worth while, to take notice of the notion of Grotius[170], that this custom was taken up on account of the flood, and in commemoration of the world's being purified by it: nor of Sir John Marsham's[171], that it was taken up by the Israelites, in imitation of the Egyptian's manner of initiating persons into the mysteries of their goddess Isis, by washing them; for which he cites Apuleius. A goodly pattern of Christian baptism this! it is much it never entered into the thoughts of these learned men, or others, that the Jews took up this rite of dipping their proselytes, as they found it among the Medes and Persians, when they lived in their countries, and so brought it into Judaea, some hundreds of years before the coming of Christ, and his forerunner John the Baptist; since of the eighty rites the Persians used in the initiation of men into the mysteries of Mithras, their chief deity, the first and principal was baptism. They "dipped" them in a "bath", and "signed" them in their "foreheads", and had a sort of an "Eucharist", an oblation of bread, as Tertullian has it, and an image of the resurrection (that is, in their baptism); promising the expiation of sins by the laver; and also had an imitation of martyrdom[172]. Some say[173], this custom of the Jews was taken up by them out of hatred to the Samaritans, and was added to circumcision, to distinguish them from them: but if so, it is very much that Symmachus the Samaritan, when he came over to the Jews, was not only circumcised again, as he was, but also baptized, or dipped; of which Epiphanius, who gives an account of his becoming a proselyte to them, and of his being circumcised, but not of his being baptized, as before observed. Dr. Owen thinks[174] this custom was taken up by some Antemishnical Rabbins, in imitation of John the Baptist; which is not very probable, though more so than anything before advanced. To me it seems a clear case, that this custom was framed upon a general notion of the uncleanness of heathens, in their state of heathenism, before their embracing the Jewish religion; and therefore devised this baptism, or dipping, as a symbol of that purity, which was, or ought to be, in them, when they became Jews, of whom they might hope to gain some, they being now dispersed among the nations; and of some they boast, even of some of note: and this was first introduced when they digested the traditions of the elders into a body, or pandect of laws; and were finishing their decisions and determinations upon them, to be observed by their people in future time. Since I wrote the preceding chapters, I have met with a quotation; for I will not conceal anything that has occurred to me in reading, relative to this custom of dipping Jewish proselytes; I say, I have met with a quotation by Maimonides[175], out of a book called Siphri, an ancient commentary on Numbers and Deuteronomy, which has these words: "As the Israelites did not enter into covenant but by three things, by circumcision, dipping, and acceptation of sacrifice; so neither proselytes likewise." Now if this is the ancient book of Siphri, from whence this passage is taken, as may seem, which is a book of an uncertain author and age; and is allowed to be written after the Misnah[176]; yet if it is the same that is referred to in the Babylonian Talmud[177], it must be written before that was published, though it might be while it was compiling, and it may be, by some concerned in it; since

the rite referred to is expressed in the same words in the one as in the other[178]; and is founded upon and argued from the same passage of scripture (Num. 15:15), and seems to be the language and reasoning of the same persons. However, "if" the passage quoted by Maimonides stands in that book, which is a book I never saw, though printed; "if", I say, these several things can be made plain; it is indeed the earliest testimony we have of this custom; especially if the book was written before the Jerusalem Talmud, which yet is not certain: but be it as it may, it is a testimony of the same sort of persons, and of no better authority than what has been before produced, and serves to confirm, that this custom is a pure device of the Jewish doctors, and is merely "Rabbinical"; and besides, at most, it can only carry up this custom into the "fifth" century, which is too late for John Baptist and Christ to take up the ordinance from it; and on account of these testimonies not being early enough for such a purpose, the late Dr. Jennings[179] has given up the argument from them, in favour of infant baptism, as insufficient. His words are, "After all, it remains to be proved, not only that Christian baptism was instituted in the room of proselyte baptism; but that the Jews had any such baptism in our Saviour's time: the earliest accounts we have of it, are in the Mishna (but in that we have none at all) and Gemara." And again he says, "here wants more evidence of its being as ancient as our Saviour's time, than I apprehend can be produced to ground an argument upon it, in relation to Christian baptism."

II. Secondly, this custom, though observed as a religious action, yet has scarce any appearance of religion and devotion in it; but looks rather like a civil affair, it being in some cases under the cognizance and by the direction of the Sanhedrim, or court of judicature. There was no divine solemnity in the performance of it. It was not administered in the name of the God of Israel, whom the Jews professed; nor in the name of the Messiah to come, expected by them, as was the baptism of John; nor in the name of the Three divine Persons in the Trinity, which yet the ancient Jews believed. They dipped their proselytes indeed, according to their account, µçb "in the name" of a proselyte, or as one; and a servant, "in the name" of a servant, or on account of servitude; and a free man, "in the name" of a free man; but neither of them in the name of any divine Person, or with the invocation of the name of God; so that it had no appearance of a religious solemnity in it. To which may be added, that this custom gave a licence to things the most impure and abominable, things contrary to the light of nature, and not to be named among the Gentiles, and which must make it detestable to all serious persons. According to the Jews, it dissolved all the ties of natural relations, which before subsisted among men; for according to them, "As soon as a man is made a proselyte, a soul flies out of a (celestial) palace, and gets under the wings of the Shechinah, (or divine Majesty) which kisses it, because it is the fruit of the righteous, and sends it into the body of a proselyte, where it abides; and from that time he is called a proselyte of righteousness[180]; so that now he has a new soul, and is a new man, another man than he was before;" not a better man, but, to use our Lord's words, he is made "twofold more the child of hell". For, according to them, all his former connections with men are broken, and all obligations to natural relations are dissolved; and he may, without any imputation of crime, be guilty of the most shocking incest, as to marry his own mother or his own sister. But hear their own words, "When a Gentile is made a proselyte, and a servant made free, they are both as 'a newborn babe'; and all the relations which they had when a Gentile or a servant, are no more relations to them;" or their kindred and relation by blood is no more; as brother, sister, father, mother, and children, these are no more to be so accounted; insomuch, that, "when one becomes a proselyte, he and they (his quondam kindred) are not guilty, by reason thereof, on account of incest, at all; so that it is according to law (the civil law of the Jews) that a Gentile may marry his own mother, or his sister, by his mother's side (his own sister),

when they become proselytes." But though they allow it to be lawful, they have so much modesty and regard to decency, or rather to their own character, that it is added; "But the wise men forbid this, that they (the proselytes) may not say, we are come from a greater degree of holiness to a lesser one; and what is forbidden today is free tomorrow; and so a proselyte who lies with his mother or his sister, and they are in Gentilism, it is no other than if he lay with a stranger[181]." Now can any man, soberly thinking, judge that the New Testament ordinance of baptism was taken up by John and Christ from such a wretched custom, which gave licence to such shocking immorality and uncleanness; or that Christian baptism is built on such a basis as this?

III. Thirdly, to suppose that John took up the practice of baptizing as he found it among the Jews, and from a tradition and custom of theirs, greatly detracts from the character of John, his divine mission, and the credit of baptism, as administered by him; and is contrary to what the scriptures say concerning him. They represent him as the first administrator of baptism, and, for a while, the sole administrator of it; for, for what other reason do they call him the Baptist, and distinguish him by this title, if it was then a common thing, and had been usual in time past, to baptize persons? The scriptures say he was a man sent of God, and sent by him "to baptize with water" (John 1:6,33). But what need was there of a mission and commission to what was in common use, and had been so time out of mind? The Jews hearing of John's baptizing persons, sent messengers to him, to know who he was that took upon him to baptize; who asked, "Why baptizest thou, if thou art not that Christ, nor Elijah, nor that prophet?" As if it was a new thing; and that it was expected he should be some extraordinary person who baptized. But why should such questions be put to him, if this was in common use, and if any ordinary person, however any common doctor or Rabbi, had then, and in former times, been used to baptize persons[182]? The scriptures speak of John's baptism as the "counsel of God": but according to this notion, it was a device and tradition of men; and had this been the case, the Jews would not have been at a loss, nor under any difficulty, to answer the question Christ put to them, nor indeed, would he ever have put such an one; "The baptism of John, whence was it? from heaven, or from men?" for his putting the question thus, supposes the contrary, that it was not from men, but from God: and if it was not of God, but a tradition of men, they could have readily said, "Of men"; without being confuted by him, or exposed to the people; but being thrown into a dilemma, they took the wisest way for themselves, and answered, "We cannot tell". Dr. Wall[183] says, If John had been baptizing proselytes, and not natural Jews, the Pharisees would not have wondered at it, it being so well known to them; and he suggests, that the wonder was, that natural Jews should be baptized: but why so! for according to this notion, the original natural Jews were received into covenant by baptism; they as the proselytes, and the proselytes as they; the case, according to them: was similar. But let us examine this affair, and see how the fact stands. When John first appeared baptizing, the Pharisees and Sadducees, who were natural Jews, came to his baptism, and were not admitted to it, but rejected from it, as unfit and improper persons; and others of the same nation and profession, in their turn, "rejected the counsel of God against themselves, not being baptized by John" (Matthew 3:7; Luke 7:30). On the other hand, publicans, the Roman tax gatherers, of whom some indeed were Jews, others heathens, both equally odious, and therefore joined together, these "justified God", being baptized with the baptism of John; and these "went into the kingdom of God", into the gospel state, before the Pharisees, and embraced its doctrines, and submitted to its ordinances (Luke 7:29, 3:12; Matthew 21:31), and even soldiers, Roman soldiers, for no other soldiers were then in Judea, were among the multitude who came to be baptized by him, to whom he gave good instructions, but did not refuse to baptize them (Luke 3:7,14), and our Lord Jesus Christ, whose forerunner John was in his

ministry and baptism, gave orders to his disciples to baptize indiscriminately persons of all nations, Jews and Gentiles, who believed in him; and who accordingly did baptize them: so that baptism, in those early times of John, Christ, and his apostles, was not confined to natural Jews; the wonder and the question upon it, as above, were not about the persons baptized, whether Jews or Gentiles, but about baptism itself, and the administrator of it, as being altogether new. The account which Josephus[184], the Jewish historian, who lived soon after the times of John, gives of him, and his baptism, agrees with the sacred scriptures; and which testimony stands not only in the common editions of that historian, but is preserved by Eusebius[185], as a choice piece of history; in which, he not only says John was a religious and good man, but, with the scriptures, that he was surnamed the Baptist, to distinguish him from others; and that he ordered the Jews who lived righteous and godly lives to come to baptism, and such only did John admit of; and that baptizing was acceptable to God, when used not for removing some sins (by which his baptism is distinguished from Jewish baptisms, which were used to purge from sin in a ceremonial sense) but for the purity of the body, the soul being before purified by righteousness. Also he observes, with the scriptures, that multitudes flocked to him; and that Herod, fearing that by his means his subjects would be drawn into a revolt, put him to death. But why such flockings to him, if baptism had been a common thing? And what had Herod to fear from that? He might reasonably conclude, that if this was no other than what had been usually practised, the people would soon cease from following him. Nay, Josippon Ben Gorion[186]; the Jew's Josephus, the historian whom they value and prefer to the true Josephus, says of that hlybj hç["he made", instituted, and performed baptism, as if it was a new thing, founded by him; and for which later Jews express their resentment at him. One of their virulent writers says[187], "Who commanded John to institute this baptism? in what law did he find it? neither in the old nor in the new." Now this would not be said by the Jews, if John had taken up his baptism from a custom of theirs; nor would they speak of the ordinance of baptism in such a scandalous and blasphemous manner as they do, and in language too shocking to transcribe[188].

IV. Fourthly, the Jews will not allow that any proof of baptism can be produced out of the writings of the Old Testament, nor out of their Talmuds. Such passages in the Old Testament which speak of washing, and in which men are exhorted to "wash" and be "clean", as Isaiah 1:16 it is said, are to be understood of men cleansing themselves from their sins, and not of plunging in water; "To plunge a man in water, is no where written; why therefore did Jesus command such baptism," or dipping[189]? and whereas the passage in Ezekiel 16:9 "Then washed I thee with water", is by some interpreted of baptism; the Jew observes[190] the words are not in the future tense; "I will wash thee": but in the past tense; "I have washed thee"; and so cannot refer to baptism. And whereas the promise in Ezekiel 36:25 "I will sprinkle clean water upon you, and ye shall be clean from all your filthiness", etc. is brought by some, I suppose he means some popish writers, as another proof of baptism the Jews replies[191], "What sin and uncleanness does baptism take away? and what sin and uncleanness are there in newborn babes? Besides, says he, you do not do so; you do not sprinkle, but you are plunged into water:" which, by the way, shows that sprinkling was not used in baptism when this Jew wrote, which was in the twelfth century, as Wagenseil, the editor of his work, supposes. The same Jewish writer[192] asks, "If the law of Jesus, and his coming, were known to the prophets, why did not they observe his law? and why did not they 'baptize themselves', according to the law of Jesus?" And he represents[193] David as praying (it must be supposed, under a prophetic spirit) for those who should, in this captivity of the Jews, be forced, against their wills, to baptism, and that they might be delivered from it, Psalm 69:1,15 144:7. Nor does this writer take any notice of receiving proselytes by baptism; though he makes

mention of receiving men proselytes[194], yet by circumcision only; and also of women proselytes, but not a word of baptism of either; and had he thought the baptism their Talmud speaks of, had any affinity with our baptism, and was the ground of it, he would not have been so gravelled with an objection of the Christians, as he was; which is put thus[195], "We baptize male and female, and hereby receive them into our religion; but you circumcise men only, and not women:" to which he appears to be at an entire loss to answer; whereas he might have readily answered, had the case been as suggested, that we baptize women as well as men, when they are received proselytes among us. But that the Jews had no notion that Christian baptism was founded upon any prior baptism of proselytes, or others, among them, as related in their Talmud, is manifest from a disputation had between Nachmanides, a famous Jew, and one brother Paul, a Christian, in the year 1263[196]. Brother Paul affirmed, that the Talmudists believed in Jesus, that he was the Messiah, and was both God and man: the Jew replied, after observing some other things, "How can brother Paul say so, that they believed in him; for they, and their disciples, died in our religion? and 'why were they not baptized', according to the command of Jesus, as brother Paul was? And I would be glad to hear," says he, "'how' he learned baptism from them (the Talmudists) and 'in what place' (of the Talmud)? did not they teach us all our laws which we now observe? and the rites and customs they gathered together for us, as they were used when the temple was standing, from the mouths of the prophets, and from the mouth of Moses, our master, on whom be peace? And if they believed in Jesus, and in his law, they would have done as brother Paul has; does he understand their words better than they themselves?"

V. Fifthly, to say, as Dr. Lightfoot does, that Christ took baptism into his hands as he found it, that is, as practised by the Jews, is greatly to derogate from the character and authority of Christ; it makes him, who came a Teacher from God, to teach for doctrines the commandments of men, which he himself condemns. It makes that "all power in heaven and in earth", said to be given him, in consequence of which he gave his apostles a commission to "teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost"; I say, it makes it to dwindle into this only, a power to establish a tradition, and commandment of men long in use before he came. Again, who can believe that Christ, who so severely inveighed against the traditions of the Jews, could ever establish any one of them, and make it an ordinance of his; and particularly, should inveigh against those, respecting the baptisms, or dippings of the Jews then in use among them; and especially without excepting that of their baptism of proselytes from the rest, and without declaring it his will that it should be continued and observed; neither of which he has done.

VI. Sixthly, such a notion as this highly reflects dishonour on the ordinance of baptism; that one of the principal ordinances of the New Testament, as that is, should be founded on an human tradition, an invention of men; it must greatly weaken the authority of it, as well as disparage the wisdom of the Lawgiver; and must have a tendency to bring both the author and the ordinance into contempt. Nothing can make an ordinance a Christian ordinance, but its being instituted by Christ. If baptism is an institution of men, and received and retained from men, and regulated according to their device, it is no Christian ordinance: and, as Witsius says[197], "Whatever may be said of the antiquity of that rite (proselyte baptism, which yet with him was dubious and uncertain) there can be no divine institution of it (of baptism) before John, the forerunner of Christ, was sent of God to baptize; for to him that was expressly commanded; 'The word of God came unto John', Luke 3:2 John 1:33, etc."

VII. Seventhly, if it was the custom of the Jews before the times of John and Christ, to receive young children as proselytes by baptism, or dipping, and this was to be as a rule according to which Christian baptism was to be practised; then most surely we should have had some instances of children being baptized by John, or by the apostles of Christ, if "baptizing infants had been as ‘ordinarily used’ in the church of the Jews, as ever it hath been in the Christian church," as Dr. Lightfoot says; and yet we have not one instance of this kind; we no where read of any children being brought to John to be baptized, nor of any that were baptized by him; nor of any being brought to the apostles of Christ to be baptized, nor of their being baptized by them; from whence it may be concluded there was no such custom before their times; or if there was, it never was intended it should be observed by Christians in later times; or otherwise there would have been some precedents of it, directing to and encouraging such a practice: many things would follow on such a supposition, that Christian baptism is borrowed from and founded on proselyte baptism, and the latter the rule directing the practice of the former; for then,

VIII. Eighthly, Self-baptizing, or persons baptizing themselves, without making use of an administrator, might be encouraged and established; which is what the Paedobaptists charge, though wrongly, some of the first reformers of the abuses of baptism with; since it is plain, from the quotations before made, that though it is sometimes said, "they", that is, the doctors or wise men, "baptize", or "dip", yet it is also said, both of men and women, that they "dipped themselves"; as of a man lkj awh "he dipped himself", and went up from the water; and of a woman, being placed by women in the water, lkj "she dipped", that is, herself; and so Leo of Modena says[198], of a Jew proselyte, that after he is circumcised, and well of his sore, "he is to wash himself all over in water", in the presence of three Rabbins, or other persons in authority, and from thenceforth he becomes as a natural Jew; and, indeed, all the Jewish baptisms, or bathings, commanded in the law, were done by persons themselves (see Lev. 14:8,9; Num.19:7,8). And Dr. Lightfoot[199] thinks that John’s baptism was so administered; he supposes, that men, women, and children came unto it; and that they standing in Jordan, were taught by John, that they were baptized into the name of the Messiah, ready to come, and into the profession of the gospel, about faith and repentance; and that "they plunged themselves into the river", and so came out.

IX. Ninthly, if this Jewish custom is to be regarded as a rule of Christian baptism, it will tend to establish the Socinian notion, that only the first converts to Christianity in a nation, they and their children are to be baptized, but not their posterity in after ages; for so both Lightfoot and Selden, with others, say, who were sticklers for Christian baptism being taken from the custom of baptizing, or dipping Jewish proselytes, and their children; that only the children of proselytes, born before their parents became such, were baptized, or dipped; but not those born afterwards: baptism was never repeated in their posterity; the sons of proselytes, in following generations, were circumcised, but not baptized[200]; and, as Dr. Jennings[201] rightly observes, "it was a maxim with the Rabbins, ‘Natus baptizati, habetur pro baptizato’." This "restriction of baptism to children born before their parents’ proselytism, rests on the same authority as the custom of baptizing any children of proselytes." So that if the one is to be admitted, the other is also; and so the children of Christian parents are not to be baptized, only the converts from another religion; and these the first, and their then posterity, but not afterwards.

X. Tenthly, if this custom, said to be practised before the times of John and Christ, is the rule to direct us in Christian baptism, there were several circumstances attending that, which should be

observed in Christian baptism, to make it regular; it must be done before three witnesses, and these men of eminence; but who, of such a number and character were present at the baptism of the apostle Paul? (Acts 22:16, 9:18). Nor was it to be performed in the night; what then must be said of the baptism of the jailor, and his family? (Acts 16:33) nor on a Sabbath day; nor on a feast day; yet Lydia, and her household, were baptized on a Sabbath day (Acts 16:13,15), and the three thousand Christian converts were baptized on the day of Pentecost? and which was also the first day of the week, the Christian Sabbath (Acts 2:1,41). Wherefore, if this Jewish custom was the rule of baptism, and from whence it was taken, and by which it should proceed; (for if in one case, why not in others?) these instances of Christian baptism were not rightly performed.

XI. Eleventhly, if the Ethiopian eunuch Philip baptized, was a proselyte, as Grotius and others say, he must be either a proselyte of the gate, a proselyte inhabitant, or a proselyte of righteousness; not the former, for he was no inhabitant in any part of Judea; but most probably he was the latter, since he was a very devout and religious man, had an high opinion of the worship of God among the Jews, and had travelled from a far country to worship at Jerusalem; and so Dr. Jennings**[202]** justly observes, that "he seems to be rather a proselyte of the covenant, or completely a Jew; not only from his reading the scripture, but because he had taken so long a journey to worship at Jerusalem at the feast of Pentecost, one of the three grand festivals; when all the Jewish males, who were able, were, according to the law, to attend the worship of God at the national altar." He appears to have thoroughly embraced the religion of the Jews, even their whole law, and was conversant with their sacred writings; he was reading in one of their prophets when Philip joined his chariot, and was taken up into it by him: whereas a son of Noah, as the Jews called a proselyte of the gate, might not study in the law, according to their canons**[203]**, which they say he had nothing to do with; only with the seven precepts of Noah; and, indeed, no Gentile or uncircumcised person**[204]**. And if the eunuch was a proselyte of righteousness, according to the pretended custom of dipping such, he must have been baptized, or dipped, when he became a proselyte; and since, according to this notion, he must have been baptized with a baptism which John and Christ took up as they found it among the Jews, and which is the basis and foundation of Christian baptism, and the rule to direct in the performance of it, it is much he should desire baptism again! and that Philip, who is thought to be a proselyte also (Acts 6:5), and must know the custom of making proselytes, should administer it to him: and if he had been baptized before, must he not then be an Anabaptist? And so the proselytes in Acts 2:10 were, as Drusius and others think, proselytes of righteousness, who had embraced the Jewish religion, and were circumcised, and, according to this notion, baptized. Besides, none but proselytes of righteousness might dwell in Jerusalem; as has been observed, Chap. 1. And also proselytes of the gate were never called Jews, as these were; only proselytes of righteousness: and if any of these were among the three thousand converted and baptized by the apostles, which is not improbable, must not they be also Anabaptists? The Grecians, or Hellenists, whose widows were neglected in the daily ministration, are thought by Beza, and others, to be widows of Jewish proselytes, and therefore it is highly probable, that their husbands had been members of the Christian church at Jerusalem, and so must have been rebaptized; and most certain it is, that Nicholas of Antioch, who was one of the seven appointed to take care of these widows, was a proselyte, and as Grotius truly thinks, a proselyte of righteousness; and so, as he must have been baptized according to this notion, when he became a proselyte, he must have been rebaptized when he became a member of the Christian church at Jerusalem, of which he most certainly was, being chosen out of it, and appointed to an office in it (Acts 6:1,5).

XII. Twelfthly, it may be observed, in a quotation before made, that if a proselytess big with child was baptized, or dipped, her child needed not baptism, or dipping, the mother's baptism, or dipping, was sufficient for it: but this is not attended to by Paedobaptists; it seems, in the beginning of the fourth century, there were some of the same opinion with the Jews; but a canon in the council of Neocaesarea was made against it; which, as explained, declared that the child of such a person needed baptism, when it came to be capable of choosing for itself[205]; which canon should not have been made, if this Jewish custom is to be regarded as a rule.

XIII. Lastly, As an argument "ad hominem", it may be observed, that if this custom is to be considered as a rule of Christian baptism, then sprinkling ought not to be used in it; for the baptism of Jewish proselytes, men, women, and children, was performed by dipping; as all the above quotations show. To which may be added, that one of their rules respecting proselyte baptism is, that a proselyte must dip in such a place (or confluence of water) as a menstruous woman dips herself in[206], or which is sufficient for such an one; and that, as the Gloss is, was what held forty seahs of water; and to this agrees the account Maimonides[207] gives of such a confluence of water, that it must be "sufficient for the dipping of the whole body of a man at once; and such the wise men reckon to be a cubit square, and three cubits in depth; and this measure holds forty seahs of water." And he further says[208], "that wherever washing of the flesh, and washing of clothes from uncleanness, are mentioned in the law, nothing else is meant but the dipping of the whole body in a confluence of water—and that if he dips his whole body, except the top of his little finger, he is still in his uncleanness:—and that all unclean persons, who are dipped in their clothes, their dipping is right, because the waters come into them (or penetrate through them) and do not divide," or separate; that is, the clothes do not divide, or separate between the water and their bodies, so as to hinder its coming to them; so the menstruous woman dipped herself in her clothes; and in like manner the proselyte. Let such observe this, who object to the baptism of persons with their clothes on. Again, as an argument of the same kind, if baptism was common in all ages, foregoing the times of John, Christ, and his apostles, as is said, then it could not succeed circumcision, since it must be contemporary with it. Upon the whole, what Dr. Lightfoot[209], and others after him, have urged in favour of infant baptism from hence, is quite impertinent; that "there was need of a plain and open prohibition, that infants and little children should not be baptized, if our Saviour would not have had them baptized; for since it was most common in all ages foregoing, that little children should be baptized, if Christ had been minded to have had that custom abolished, he would have openly forbidden it; therefore his silence, and the silence of the scripture in this matter, confirms Paedobaptism, and continues it unto all ages" But first, it does not appear that any such custom was ever practised before the times of John, Christ, and his apostles, as to admit into the Jewish church by baptism, proselytes, whether adult or minors. No testimony has been, and I believe none can be given of it. And, as some very learned men have truly observed[210], and as Dr. Owen[211] affirms, there are not the least footsteps of any such usage among the Jews, until after the days of John the Baptist, in imitation of whom, he thinks, it was taken up by some Ante-Mishnical Rabbins; and, as he elsewhere says[212], "The institution of the rite of baptism is no where mentioned in the Old Testament; no example is extant; nor during the Jewish church, was it ever used in the admission of proselytes; no mention of it is to be met with in Philo, Josephus, nor in Jesus the son of Syrach; nor in the evangelic history." What testimony has been given of this custom, falls greatly short of proving it; wherefore Christ could have no concern about abolishing a custom which had not obtained in his time; nor was there any room nor reason for it, since it had never been practised, for ought appears: his silence about what never existed, can give no existence

to it, nor to that which is founded on it, Paedobaptism; and which is neither warranted and confirmed by any such custom, nor by the word of God, in which there is an high silence about both. This custom of baptizing little children was so far from being common in all ages foregoing the times of John, Christ, and his apostles, that not a single instance can be given of anyone that ever was baptized; if there can, let it be produced; if not, what comes of all this bluster and harangue? With much more propriety and strength of reasoning might it be retorted; that since it is plain the children of the Jews, both male and female, did eat of the passover, which was not an human custom and tradition; but an ordinance of God, common in all ages foregoing the times of John, etc. and since, according to the hypothesis of the Paedobaptists, the Lord's supper came in the room of the passover; for which there is much more reason in analogy, than for baptism coming in the room of circumcision; it should seem, if our Saviour would not have had children eat of the Lord's supper, as they did of the passover, he would have openly forbidden it. A plain and open prohibition of this was more needful than a prohibition of the baptism of infants, if not his will, had there been such a custom before prevailing, as there was not; since that could only be a custom and tradition of men; and it was enough that Christ inveighed against those of the Jews in general, which obtained before, and in his time; and against their baptisms and dippings in particular. And after all, it is amazing that Christian baptism should be founded upon a tradition, of which there is no evidence but from the Rabbins, and that very intricate, perplexed, and contradictory, and not as in being in the times referred to; upon a tradition of a set of men blinded and besotted, and enemies to Christianity, its doctrines and ordinances; and who, at other times, reckoned by these very men, who so warmly urge this custom of theirs, the most stupid, sottish, and despicable, of all men upon the face of the earth! If this is the basis of infant baptism, it is built upon the sand, and will, ere long, fall, and be no more.I conclude this Dissertation in the words of Dr. Owen[213], "That the opinion of some learned men concerning transferring the rite of Jewish baptism, by the Lord Jesus, which, indeed, did not then exist, for the use of his disciples, is destitute of all probability." And after all, perhaps, the Paedobaptists will find their account better in consulting the baptism of the ancient heathens, and its rites, than that of the Jews; said[214] to be in use before the times of Moses, and in ages since, and that among all nations; and being more ancient than Christian baptism, a learned writer referred to, says, it is as a sort of preamble to it. And from whom the Paedobaptists may be supplied with materials for their purpose.

[TO CONTENTS]