

BAP
T739σ

Library of the Theological Seminary,

PRINCETON, N. J.

Presented by Mr. Samuel Agnew of Philadelphia, Pa.

Agnew Coll. on Baptism, No.

5C8
10415

Wm Vernon

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2011 with funding from
Princeton Theological Seminary Library

1100

1944-1945

Imprimatur.

Ex Aedib. Lamb.
Apr. 10. 1686.

*Johannes Battely RR^{mo} P. ac
D^{no} D^{no} Wilhelmo Archiep. Can-
tuariensi à Sacris Domesticis.*

OF THE
SACRAMENT
OF
BAPTISM,

In Pursuance of an
EXPLICATION
OF THE
CATECHISM
OF THE
CHURCH of ENGLAND.

BY *sk.* C
GABRIEL TOWERSON, D.D.
and Rector of *Welwynne* in *Hartfordshire*.

L O N D O N,
Printed for *Richard Chiswell*, at the *Rose and Crown*
in *S. Paul's Church-Yard*. MDCLXXXVII.

THE

MENT

PARLIS

EXPLI

CAT

CH

DO

DO

DO

DO

TO THE
Right Reverend
FATHER in GOD
FRANCIS
Lord Bishop of ELY,
AND
LORD ALMONER
TO
His Majesty.

My Lord,

YOUR Lordship's
favourable accep-
tance of my Dis-
course of the Sacraments
in General, with the desire

A 3 I

The Epistle Dedicatory.

I have, if it may be, to put an end to the whole, hath prompted me to make the more hast to present your Lordship, and the World with this of Baptism in particular.

Two things there are in it, which I thought my self most concern'd to clear, and which therefore I have employ'd all requisite diligence on, the Doctrine of *Original Sin*, and *Infant-Baptism* : The former being in my opinion the
foun-

The Epistle Dedicatory.

foundation of Christiani-
ty, the latter of our inte-
rest in it. For if there
be no such thing as *Ori-
ginal Sin*, I do not see
but some persons here-
tofore might, and may
hereafter live with such
exactness, as not at all
to stand in need of a
Saviour. And I see as
little, if *Infant-Baptism*
be null, what interest
any of us can have in
him, according to the
ordinary dispensation of
the Gospel, who have
for the most part been
A 4 baptized

The Epistle Dedicatory.

baptized in our Infancy ,
or at least have been
baptized by those that
were.

Throughout the whole
Treatise I have endea-
vour'd to retrace the
antient notion of Bap-
tism, to shew what ad-
vantages are annexed to
it ; and what duties it
either involves , or obli-
geth to. To either of
which if I have given
any light , or strength ;
I shall hope I have
done some small service
to the Church , and
which

The Epistle Dedicatory.

which your Lordship in
particular will take in
good part from

Your Lordship's

Wellwyne
Aug. 23.
1686.

Most obliged

Most obedient, and

Most humble Servant.

GABRIEL TOWERSON.

THE

The Epistle Dedicatory.

which your Lordship in
particular will take in
good part from

Your Lordship's

Most obliged

and obedient

Most humble servant

CARRIE TOWNSON

THE

THE
CONTENTS
OF THE
FIRST PART.

Of the Rite of *Baptism* among the
Heathen, and the *Jews*.

THe *Heathen* themselves not
without the knowledge of an-
other World, and of the in-
sufficiency of natural Religion to
bring them to the happiness there-
of. Occasion taken by them from
thence to enquire after other ways of
obtaining it, and by the Devil to sug-
gest the mysteries of their respective
Deities as the only proper means of
compassing it. Those mysteries every
where initiated into by the Rite of
Baptism; partly through Men's con-
sciousness of their past sins, and which
they

The Contents.

they judged it but meet they should be some way purged from, and partly through the policy of the Devil, who thereby thought to procure the greater veneration to them: That as it was a Rite, which was in use among God's own people, so naturally apt to represent to Mens minds their passing from a sinful to a holy Estate. Of what Service the Heathens use of this Rite is toward the commendation of the Christians Baptism, and a transition from thence to the use of it among the Jews. Which is not only prov'd at large out of the Jewish Writings, and several particulars of that Baptism remark'd, but that usage farther confirm'd by several concurring proofs; such as is in particular the no appearance there is otherwise of any initiation of the Jewish Women, the Baptizing of the whole Nation in the Cloud, and in the Sea, and a remarkable allusion to it in our Saviour's Discourse to Nicodemus. The silence of the Old Testament concerning that Rite shewn to be of no force, because though it take notice of the first Jews being under the Cloud, and passing through the Red Sea,

The Contents.

Sea, yet it takes no notice at all of their being Baptized in them, or of their Eating, and Drinking that spiritual Repast whereof S. Paul speaketh. The Baptism of Christians copied by our Saviour from that of the Jews, and may therefore, (where it appears not, that he hath made an alteration) receive an elucidation from it.

P. I.

The Contents of the Second Part.

Of the Baptism of the Christians,
and the Institution of it.

THe Institution of the Christian Baptism more antient, than the Command for it in S. Matthew 28. 19. though not as to the generality of the World, nor it may be as to the like explicit Profession of the Trinity. As is made appear from Christ, or his Disciples baptizing in Judea, not long after his own Baptism by S. John. Enquiry thereupon made, whether it were not yet more antient, yea as antient as Christ's execution

The Contents.

execution of his Prophetical Office. Which is rendred probable from our Saviours making Disciples before, and the equal reason there appears to have been for his making them after the same manner with those of Judea; From Christ's representing to Nicodemus the necessity of being born again of water, and the Spirit, which is shewn at large to be meant of a true and proper Baptism; As, in fine, from Christ's telling S. Peter, when he ask'd the washing of his Hands, and Head, as well as Feet, that he, who had been washed, needeth not save to wash his feet. An answer to the supposed silence of the Scripture concerning so early a Baptism, and that shewn to be neither a perfect silence, nor an unaccountable one. p. 23.

The Contents.

The Contents of the Third Part.

Of the outward visible Sign of Baptism.

THe outward visible Sign of the Christian Baptism shewn to be the Element of Water, and enquiry thereupon made wherein it was intended as a Sign; Which is shewn, in the general, to be as to the cleansing quality thereof, more particularly as to the use it was put to toward newborn Infants, and that application of it which was first in use, even by an immersion, or plunging the Party baptized in it. Occasion taken from thence to enquire farther, how it ought to be applyed, more especially whether by an immersion, or by that, or an aspersion, or effusion. Evidence made of an immersion being the only legitimate Rite of Baptism, save where necessity doth otherwise require; And enquiry thereupon made, whether necessity may justifie the Application of it by an Aspersion, or Effusion, and,

The Contents.

and, if it may, whether the case of Infants be to be look'd upon as such a necessity. What is to be thought of those additions; which were antiently made, or continue as yet in being in the outward solemnities of Baptism. Where the sign of the Cross in Baptism is more particularly considered; and answer made to those Exceptions that are made against it as a Ceremony, as an addition of Men to the Institution of Christ, and as a supposed Relique of Popery, or giving too much countenance to the Papists abuses of it. p.43.

A Digression concerning Original Sin, By way of Preparation to the following Discourses.

The Contents.

OF the ground of the present Digression concerning Original Sin, and enquiry thereupon made, what Original Sin is. Which is shewn in the General to be such a corruption of
of

The Contents.

of the Nature of every Man, that is naturally engendered of the offspring of Adam, whereby it becomes averse from every thing, that is good, and inclinable to every thing, that is evil. The nature of that corruption more particularly enquir'd into, and shewn by probable Arguments to be no other, than a Privation of a Supernatural Grace. That there is such a thing, as we have before described, evidenced at large from the Scripture, and that evidence farther strengthened by the experience we have of its effects, and the acknowledgments of the wiser Heathen. Enquiry next made from whence it had its beginning, which is shewn to have been not from any evil Spirit, or Dæmon, the pravity of matter, or the evil habits the Soul contracted in a praeexistent state, but from the pravity of our first Parents. This last at large confirm'd out of the Doctrine of the Scripture, and followed by some light reflections upon the means, by which it is conveyed. A more just account from the Scripture of its being truly, and properly a sin, partly from its having

(a)

the

The Contents.

the title of a sin, but more especially from its being represented as such, upon the account of our Obligation to the contrary. A consideration of those Objections, which are commonly made against the Doctrine of Original Sin; Which are shewn either not to be of that force, whereof they are esteem'd, or however not to be a sufficient bar to what the Scripture hath declar'd concerning it. p. 89

The Contents of the Fourth Part.

Of the things signified by Baptism on the part of God, or its inward and spiritual Grace.

THE things signified by Baptism are either more general, or particular: More general, as that Covenant of Grace, which passeth between God, and Man, and that body of Men, which enter into Covenant with him; More particular, what the same God doth, by vertue of that Covenant, oblige himself to bestow upon the Baptized, and what those Baptized

The Contents.

Baptized ones do on their part undertake to perform. These latter ones proposed to be considered, and entrance made with the consideration of what God obligeth himself to bestow upon the Baptized, called by the Church, An inward, and spiritual Grace. Which inward, and spiritual Grace is shewn to be of two sorts, to wit, such as tend more immediately to our spiritual, and eternal welfare, or such as only qualifie us for those Graces, that do so. To the former sort are reckon'd that inward, and spiritual Grace, which tends to free us from the guilt of sin, called by the Church forgiveness of sin; That which tends to free us from the pollution of sin, called by our Catechism A death unto it; And that, which tends to introduce the contrary purity, and hath the name of a New birth unto righteousness. To the latter sort is reckoned our union to that Body, of which Christ Jesus is the Head; and by means whereof he dispenseth the former Graces to us. Each of these resum'd, and considered in their order, and shewn to be, what they are

(a 2) usually

The Contents.

usually stild, the inward, and spiritual Graces of Baptism, or the things signified by the outward visible Sign thereof.

p. 185

The Contents of the Fifth Part.

Of Forgiveness of sin by Baptism.

OF the relation of the sign of Baptism to its inward, and spiritual Grace, and particularly to Forgiveness of sin; Which is either that of a means fitted by God to convey it, or of a pledge to assure the Baptized person of it. The former of these relations more particularly considered, as that too with respect to Forgiveness of Sin in the general, or the Forgiveness of all Sin whatsoever, and Original Sin in particular. As to the former whereof is alledged first the Scriptures calling upon Men to be Baptiz'd for the remission, or forgiveness of sin, Secondly the Church's making that Forgiveness a part of her Belief, and Doctrine, Thirdly the agreeing opinions or practices of those,

The Contents.

those, who were either unsound members of it, or Separatists from it, And Fourthly the Calumnies of its enemies. The like evidence made of the latter from the Scripture's proposing Baptism, and its Forgiveness as a remedy against the greatest guilts, and in special against that wrath, which we are Children of by Nature. From the premises is shewn, that the sign of Baptism is a pledge to assure the Baptized of Forgiveness, as well as a means fitted by God for the conveying of it.

p. 203

The Contents of the Sixth Part.

Of Mortification of sin, and Regeneration by Baptism.

OF the relation of the sign of Baptism to such inward, and spiritual Graces, as tend to free us from the pollution of sin, or introduce the contrary purity; And that relation shewn to be no less than that of a means, whereby they are convey'd.

(a 3)

This

The Contents.

This evidenced as to the former, even our death unto sin (which is also explain'd) from such Texts of Scripture, as make mention of our being baptiz'd into it, and buried by Baptism in it, or from such as describe us as cleansed by the washing of it. The like evidenc'd from the same Scripture concerning the latter, even our new birth unto righteousness; As that again farther clear'd as to this particular by the consentient Doctrine, and practice of the Church, by the opinion the Jews had of that Baptism, which was a Type, and exemplar of ours, and the expressions of the Heathen concerning it. The Doctrine of the Church more largely insisted upon, and exemplified from Justin Martyr, Tertullian, and S. Cyprian.

P. 217

The Contents.

The Contents of the Seventh Part.

Of our Union to the Church
by Baptism.

OF the relation of the sign of Baptism to our Union to the Church, and that relation shewn to be no less than that of a means; whereby that Union is made. This evidenc'd in the first place from the declarations of the Scripture, more particularly from its affirming all Christians to be baptiz'd into that Body, as those, who were first baptiz'd after the descent of the Holy Ghost upon the Apostles, to have been thereby added to their company, and made partakers with the rest in the Apostles Doctrine, and fellowship, in breaking of Bread, and in Prayers. The like evidence of the same Union to the Church by Baptism from the declarations of the Church it self, and the consequences of that Union shewn to be such, as to make that also to be accounted one of the inward, and spi-

The Contents.

*ritual Graces of that Baptism, by
which it is made.* P. 237

The Contents of the Eighth Part.

Of the Profession that is made by
the Baptized Person.

THE *things signified by Baptism on
the part of the baptized brought
under consideration, and shewn from
several former discourses (which are
also pointed to) to be an Abrenunci-
ation of sin, a present belief of the
Doctrine of Christianity, and par-
ticularly of the Trinity, and a re-
solution for the time to come to
continue in that belief, and act a-
greeably to its Laws. Our reso-
lution of acting agreeably to the Laws
of Christianity more particularly con-
sider'd, and the Profession thereof
shewn by several Arguments to be the
intendment of the Christian Bap-
tism. What the measure of that
conformity is, which we profess to
pay to the Laws of Christianity, and
what are the consequences of the
Violation of that Profession. p. 249*
The

The Contents.

The Contents of the Ninth Part.

Of the right Administration of Baptism.

After a short account of the Foundation of the Baptismal relation, and reference made to those places from which a larger one may be fetch'd; Enquiry is made touching the right Administration of Baptism, as therein again, First, Whether Baptism ought expressly to be made in the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, Secondly whether Schismatics, and Hereticks are valid Administratours of it, Thirdly, to what, and what kind of persons it ought to be administered, Fourthly, Whether it may be repeated. The two first of these spoken to here, and first, Whether Baptism ought to be expressly administered in the form propos'd. Which is not only shewn to be under obligation from the express words of the Institution, but answer made to those
Texts,

The Contents.

Texts, which seem to intimate it to be enough to baptize in the name of the Lord Jesus only. The Baptism of Schismatics, and Hereticks more largely shewn to be valid, unless where they baptize into a counterfeit Faith, and the several objections against it answer'd. p. 265

The Contents of the Tenth Part.

Of the Baptism of those of riper Years.

TO what, and what kind of persons Baptism ought to be administered; Which, as to those of riper years, is shewn to be unto all, that come duly qualified for it. What those qualifications are, upon that account enquir'd into, and Repentance, and Faith shewn from the Scripture, as well as from our own Catechism to be they. That Repentance, and Faith more particularly considered, the definitions given of them by our Church explain'd, and established.

The

The Contents.

The former whereof is effected, by shewing what Repentance doth presuppose, what it imports, and to what it doth naturally dispose us : The latter by shewing what those promises are, which by the Catechism are made the object of our Faith, or Belief, what that Belief of them doth presuppose, what is meant by a steadfast Belief of them, and what evidence there is of that being the Faith, or Belief requir'd to the receiving of Baptism.

p. 287

The Contents of the Eleventh Part.

Of the Baptism of Infants.

W*Hat ground Infant-Baptism hath in Scripture, and particularly in what it suggests concerning Christ's commanding his Disciples to suffer little Children to come unto him. S. Paul's giving the Children of the faithful the title of Holy, and the Circumcision of Infants. The*

con-

The Contents.

concurrence of Antiquity therein with the Doctrine of the Scripture, and that concurrence farther strengthened by the Pelagians so freely admitting of what was urg'd against them from thence. A brief account of that remission, and regeneration, which Infants acquire by Baptism, and a more large consideration of the Objections, that are made against it; More particularly of what is urg'd against the Regeneration of Infants in Baptism, or their ability to answer what is prerequir'd to it on the part of persons to be baptiz'd, or is to be performed by them in the reception of it. Where the Regeneration of Infants is more largely considered, and what is promis'd for them by others shewn to be both reasonable, and sufficient.

P. 309

The

The Contents.

The Contents of the Twelfth Part.

Whether Baptism may be repeated.

WHat the true state of the present question is, and that it is not founded in any suppos'd illegitimateness of the former Baptism, but upon supposition of the baptized persons either not having before had, or forfeited the regeneration of it, or fallen off from that Religion, to which it doth belong. Whereupon enquiry is made, whether if such persons repent and return, they ought to be baptiz'd anew, or received into the Church without. What there is to persuade the repeating of Baptism, and what the Church hath alledg'd against it. The Churches arguments from Eph. 4. 4. and John 13. 10. proposed, but wav'd. The Churches opinion more firmly established in the no direction there is
in

The Contents.

in Scripture for re-baptization in those cases, but rather the contrary, and in the no necessity there is of it. The Arguments for rebaptization answer'd.

p. 365

Errata.



ATTENTION

1982

(Faint, illegible text at the bottom of the page)

1. 1. 1. 1.

[illegible]

219515M

[illegible]

ERRATA.

In the Title over the Pages.

Pag. 253. for *Baptism*, r. *Baptized*.

TEXT.

Pag. 57. l. 16. after *do* add *not*. p. 134. l. 11. after of
add *that*. p. 228. l. 17. *corruption*. p. 244. l. pen. *embodied*.
p. 262. l. 22. *violaters*. p. 306. l. 14. for *boyl* r. *bogle*.
p. 324. l. 7. for *force* r. *face*. p. 330. l. 24. *faithful*. p. 354.
l. 18. r. *as was*.

Margent.

Pag. 6. l. penult. Μολωσ' p. 7. l. 17. ἀγνισὺς. p. 16. l.
1, 2. *Exo*. 16. 32. p. 61. l. 8. for *Sacramentum*. r. *incre-*
menta. p. 235. l. antep. παρεισώθει. ib. l. ult. ἐλυτρά-
σατο. p. 291. l. 6. ἀίειν. p. 335. l. 4. ἐμαθ' ητεύθησαν.

OF THE
SACRAMENT
OF
BAPTISM.

PART I.

Of the Rite of Baptism among the
HEATHEN, *and the* JEWS.

The Contents.

*The Heathen themselves not without
the knowledge of another World,
and of the insufficiency of natural Re-
ligion to bring them to the happiness
thereof. Occasion taken by them
from thence to enquire after other
ways of obtaining it, and by the De-
vil to suggest the mysteries of their*
B *respe-*

respective Deities as the only proper means of compassing it. Those mysteries every where initiated into by the Rite of Baptism; partly through Men's consciousness of their past sins, and which they judged it but meet they should be some way purged from, and partly through the policy of the Devil, who thereby thought to procure the greater veneration to them: That as it was a Rite, which was in use among God's own people, so naturally apt to represent to Mens minds their passing from a sinful to a holy Estate. Of what Service the Heathens use of this Rite is toward the commendation of the Christians Baptism, and a transition from thence to the use of it among the Jews. Which is not only prov'd at large out of the Jewish Writings, and several particulars of that Baptism remark'd, but that usage farther confirm'd by several concurring proofs; such as is in particular the no appearance there is otherwise of any initiation of the Jewish Women, the Baptizing of the whole Nation in the Cloud, and in the Sea, and a remarkable allusion to it in our Saviour's Discourse

among the *Heathen*, and the *Jews*!

3

Discourse to Nicodemus. The silence of the Old Testament concerning that Rite shewn to be of no force, because though it take notice of the first Jews being under the Cloud, and passing through the Red Sea, yet it takes no notice at all of their being Baptized in them, or of their Eating, and Drinking that spiritual repast, whereof S. Paul speaketh. The Baptism of Christians copied by our Saviour from that of the Jews, and may therefore, (where it appears not, that he hath made an alteration) receive an elucidation from it.

THough the *Baptism of Christians* be my proper business, and ought accordingly to be made the subject matter of my *Discourse*; yet I think it not amiss to premise something concerning the use of the like *Rite* among the *Heathen*, and (which is of much more consideration) among the people of the *Jews*: Partly because Christianity may seem to have borrowed her Baptism from the Baptism of the latter, and we therefore may bor-

row some light from it toward the clearing of our own; And partly because it may appear both from the one, and the others Baptism, that Christianity hath laid no other imposition on us, than what the general reason of Mankind, or a more early Tradition prompted others to the imbracing of.

For the understanding whereof we are to know, that as the Heathen themselves were not without a pre-sension of another World, wherein the Souls of Men should be treated according to their demeanour here; So they alike saw, or at least suspected, that they could not expect a happy *futurity* by a bare compliance with those rules, which natural Religion suggested to them: Partly, because they saw but too well that they could never arrive at a perfect compliance with them, by which means they should always stand in need of the divine favour, and forgiveness; And partly, because they knew it to be in the power of their offended Deities to prescribe what ways, and means they thought good for Men's obtaining

ing a reconciliation with them. This therefore being the general, and indeed natural sense of Mankind, and not a little quickned at the first by what they might learn from God's own people concerning the Sacrifices, and other Rites, whereby he appointed them to atone him; Men began to look out every where for proper means to obtain the favour of their Gods, and the Devil, who was willing by all means to precipitate them into destruction, did either by himself, or his Agents suggest such, as might gratifie those their hopes, but withal not only no way profit them, but debauch their minds so much the more. Only lest too gross a deceit should come to be discern'd, he took care, among other things, that what he suggested should be concealed from the generality of Men, and indeed even from those, who were desirous to understand them, till they had approv'd themselves by a long expectation, and the undergoing of all those things, which were preparatory to them. From hence it was, that the *mysteries* of the several Hea-

then Deities came to have their beginning, and name; Those of the *Mother of the Gods* in *Samothracia*, and of *Hecate* in many places. Hence those famous ones of *Ceres* and *Proserpina* at *Eleusis* in *Attica*, of *Bacchus* in *Bæotia*, and of *Mithras* in *Asia*. In fine, hence those of *Orpheus* almost all over *Greece*, and of *Isis* in *Ægypt*, and many other places: They*, who were not without a due esteem of piety and vertue making the end of those mysteries to have been the procuring to those that were initiated into them a possibility of living happily in the other World, whilst nothing but extremest miseries attended the neglecters of them.

* Cicero de leg. lib. 2. Mihi autem cum multa eximia, divinaque videntur Athenæ tuæ peperisse, atque in vitam hominum attulisse, tum nihil melius illis mysteriis, quibus ex agresti immanique vita

exculti ad humanitatem, & mitigati sumus, initiaque, ut appellantur, ita revera principia vitæ cognovimus, neque solùm cum lætitiâ vivendi rationem accepimus, sed etiam cum spe meliore moriendi.

Sophocles—ὡς τεύχεα

Κεῖνος βροτῶν οἱ ταῦτα δερχθέντες τέλη
Μόλως ἐς αἶδ'· τοῖσδε γὰρ μόνοις ἐκεῖ
Ζῆν' ὄει· τοῖς δ' ἄλλοισι πάντ' ἐκεῖ κακός.

But because mysteries of this nature were not to be communicated to all, no nor yet to any before they were

were purged from their past sins ;

Therefore care was taken first of all (as we learn from *Clemens Alexandrinus* †) that they should pass through certain purgations, or washings, and which though

(as *Tertullian* * speaks)

perform'd *viduis aquis*,

that is to say, with such,

as had not the incubati-

tion of God's Spirit,

yet were, as he after-

wards (a) affirms, both

administred, and receiv'd

as effectual Symbols of a *new Birth*,

and a freedom from the punishment

of their offences. It was thus in

particular, that Men were initiated

into the mysteries of *Eleusis*, even

the *lesser* ones, and such as were pre-

paratory to the greater, and he who

initiated them into them entitled

ῥδρανός (b) or the Waterer. It was thus, (b) *Hesych.*

as we learn from *Tertullian* (c), that ῥδρανός, ὁ

they initiated Men into the rites of ἀγνιστὴς ἢ

Ἐλευσινίω.

(c) *De Bapt. c. 5.* Nam & sacris quibusdam per lavacrum initiantur
Istis alicujus, & *Mithras*.

† *Strom. lib. 5. p. 424.*

Οὐκ ἀπεινώτως ἄρα καὶ
ἢ μυστηρίων ἢ παρ' Ἑλ-
λησιν ἀρχεῖ μὲν τὰ καθαρί-
σιν, καὶ ἀπὸ καὶ τοῖς βαρ-
βάροις τὸ λουτρὸν μετὰ
ταῦτα δ' ὅτι τὰ μικρὰ μυσ-
τήρια, &c.

* *De Baptismo. c. 5.*

(a) *Ibid.* Certe ludis Apollinari-
bus, & Eleusiniis tinguntur,
idque se in regenerationem, &
impunitatem perjuriorum suorum
agere præsumunt.

(d) *Mileſ. II.*
citat. à Seldeno
de ſucceſſ. ad
leg. Hebr. c.
26.

Mithras, and ſo too into thoſe of *Isis* : The Chief Priest of that Goddeſs (as *Apuleius* (d) deſcribes his own initiation) leading the party, that was to be initiated, in the Company of that Religious band to the next Bath. Where having firſt delivered him to the uſual waſhing, and aſk'd pardon of the Goddeſs, he ſprinkled him all about, and bringing him back to the Temple, after two parts of the day were ſpent, plac'd him before the feet of the Goddeſs.

How this way of initiation by Baptiſm came to prevail ſo generally, is hard to ſay, and I will not therefore be over poſitive in defining. That, which ſeems to me to be the moſt probable, is, that thoſe myſteries, to which this way of initiation belonged, came all out of the ſame forge, even the contrivance of the Devil, and his dependants, to whom, though ignorantly, the Heathen offered (f) Sacrifice; That he ſuggeſted ſuch an initiation to them, partly in imitation of thoſe Baptiſms, or waſhings, which God had appointed among his own people, and partly

(f) 1 Cor.
 10. 20.

ly as a *Symbol*, which did most naturally represent to their minds their passing from a sinful to a holy Estate : Sin, by reason of the odiousness thereof, coming to have both the esteem, and name of *Pollution*, and that therefore, which professed to do it away, best represented by that Element, which was most proper to purge away the natural one ; In fine, that they, to whom that form of initiation was propos'd, being thereby possess'd with a good opinion of the sacredness of those mysteries, to which it led, and a hope of its also purging them from their former guilt, greedily embraced it, and made it as sacred in their own esteem, as it seemed to be in the design of those, that instituted it. Which moreover they were more easily persuaded into, because they found it much more easie thus to wash away their Sins, than to purge their Conscience (g) from dead (g) Heb 9. 14. works by repentance, and amendment. By these degrees, I suppose, it was, that Baptism came, even among the Heathen, to be the general form of initiating them into their respec-

respective mysteries ; And had those mysteries been as sacred, as their initiation into them was specious, it might have serv'd to them for a perpetual monument of that inward, and far better purity, which it becomes all those to put on, who hope for approbation from the Divine Majesty. But as that initiation of their's had for its Institutor some false God, or other, or rather some Evil Spirit, who acted the part of one ; As it was moreover an Introduction into abominable mysteries, as well as into unprofitable ones ; Witness in particular those so much talk'd of mysteries of *Eleusis* (h), and which I will favour chaste Ears in concealing : so I have insisted on it for no other reason, than to shew, how willing the Devil was to procure credit to his mysteries by it, and how easily Men were prevailed upon by the speciousness thereof to engage themselves in the pursuit of them. Which, though it were no commendation to those mysteries, to which it was apply'd, yet is a sufficient one of the Rite it self, and will add yet more lustre to that

Baptism

(h) *Arnob.*
adv. Gent. li.
S. & Clem.
Alex. Περὶ
ἡρώδ. πρὸς
Ἑλλήνας
p. 10.

Baptism of *ours*, which leads to a Religion, that is as spotless as it self.

From the Baptism of the *Heathen* pass we to that of the *Jews*, and so much the rather, because if such a Baptism can be prov'd, it will not only be a farther commendation to our own, but it may be also give light to it: He, who came not to destroy the Law, and the Prophets, but to fulfill them (as Christ himself declar'd (i) in the very entrance upon his Ministry) being likely enough to have had a regard to their Baptism also, and to have copied out his own Baptism by it. And indeed if any credit may be given to the most Authentick writings the *Jews* now have, and to one (k) of the most sober *Rabbins*, which that Nation hath ever produc'd, there will be no reason to doubt of the *Jews* having, even from Antient times, the same way of initiating Men into their Religion, which Christianity doth now prescribe. For from their Writings it hath been observ'd, (and the express words of their respective *Authors* alledged (l) for it) that

(i) Mat. 5.
17.

(k) *Maimonides.*

(l) *Seld. de Jure Nat. & Gent. li. 2. c. 2. &c. Ham. in his Quer. concern. Inf. Baptism.*

Of the Rite of Baptism

that the Males of the native *Jews* were of Old initiated into that Religion by Baptism, or washing of the whole body, as well as by Circumcision, and an Oblation, and the Females by Baptism, if not also by an Oblation; That the Males of their Profelytes of Justice (suitably to the Males of those native *Jews*, into whose Religion they were admitted) were initiated by Baptism, and an Oblation, as well as by Circumcision, and the Females by Baptism, and an Oblation; That the Baptism of Profelytes was to be perform'd in a natural receptacle of Waters, as in a River, a Pool, or a Fountain, and the whole body washed in it; That there were three Men appointed to preside over their Baptism, and who, as the Baptised persons stood in the water, were to lean over them, and twice explain to them some of the more weighty, and lighter precepts of the Law; That where the Profelyte was a Female, she should be encompassed with other Women to preserve her from being seen by the *Triumviri*, and they to depart, when she was to come out of the water; That

That this Baptism being rightly perform'd was not to be repeated, and that in what condition Profelytes were baptiz'd, that is to say, whether in a servile or free condition, (for that was then to be profess'd) in that they were to abide; That, from the time of their being thus profelyted, they were for the main accounted of as *Jews*, and had the title of such, that they were accounted of as persons new born, yea so far, that after that time they were not to own any of their former Relations; In fine, that that new birth was look'd upon as so singular, that it gave occasion to their Cabalistical Doctors to teach, that the old Soul of the Profelyte vanished, and a new one succeeded in its place. For all these particulars have been observ'd concerning that Baptism whereof we speak, and the Baptism it self not only made as antient as *Moses*, but deduced by them from that command of God(*m*), whereby *Moses* was enjoyn'd to sanctifie the *Israelites*, and cause them to wash their Cloaths, against the time that God declar'd from Mount *Sinai* that legal Covenant,

which

(*m*) *Exod.* 19.
10.

which they were then to enter into.

Whether the *Jewish* Writers might not somewhat overlash in making their Baptism so very ancient, or err in assigning the former Command as the Original thereof, is a thing I mean not to dispute, and much less will I concern my self so far in it, as to vindicate them against all opposers. But as it is hard to believe, they would attribute so great an antiquity to that, which was not at least somewhat antienter than our Saviour's time, which is all we are concerned to assert; So it will be much more hard to detract altogether from their testimony, if it hath any concurring proofs, and be otherwise fairly defensible against the adversaries thereof. Now that the testimony of the Jewish Writers is not without some concurring proofs, and such as will at least add to the probability thereof, will appear if we consider *first*, that though Circumcision both was, and was intended as a means of initiating the *Jews*, yet it was such a form of initiation, as was competible only
to

to the *Males*. By which means, if there had been no other form of initiation, all of the *Female Sex*, who were undoubtedly as much in Covenant with God, as those of the other, must have been debar'd of any visible Sacrament to assure them of their interest in it. Which though it be not so great an inconvenience, as to enforce altogether the use of somewhat beside Circumcision, because the Females might be initiated in their Fathers, yet will make it reasonable enough to believe, that God, with whom there is no respect of Sexes, appointed some form of initiation, by which they might be alike admitted. I say *Secondly*, that as Circumcision was not competitive to those of the Female Sex, and not unlikely therefore that there might be some other ceremony for their initiation; So it is apparent from S. Paul (*n*), that how-
 ever God might deal with the *Jews* before, or after, yet all of them, in their passage from *Ægypt* unto *Canaan*, were baptized into Moses in the Cloud, and in the Sea. For being so, it is not difficult to believe, that
 the

(*n*) 1 Cor. 10.

(o) Exod. 32.
16. &c.

the same form of initiation might afterwards have force in those, who were not capable of Circumcision, yea even in them, that were capable of it, after the Rite of Circumcision was over, if it were only to put them in mind, of that deliverance they receiv'd by it : Especially, when their Eucharistical Manna, though thence forward not enjoyn'd to be us'd, because it ceased from among them, was yet laid up in the Ark of God (o) to put them in mind of God's nourishing them by it. I say *Thirdly*, that though Baptism might not be enjoyn'd at the first, or at least enjoyn'd only for the use of those, who were not capable of Circumcision, yet it might by the advice of their Governors, and the approbation of those Prophets whom God raised up among them, be afterwards added to Circumcision, both upon the account of their Fore-fathers being commanded to sanctifie themselves, and wash their Cloaths when they appear'd before God at Mount *Sinai*, and as a farther declaration to them of the impurity of their Nature, and of that pure, and holy

holy estate, which they entred into. For if their forefathers were, even by the command of God, to sanctifie themselves with washings toward their entring into Covenant with God at Mount *Sinai*, what should hinder such of their posterity, as presided over that Nation, to make an addition of the like Baptism? Especially, when all was little enough to admonish them of their own natural impurity, and of the necessity that lay upon them of purging themselves from it. I observe *Fourthly*, that though there be not any express mention in the Scripture of that Baptism whereof we speak, nor indeed of any like it beside that of *John* the Baptist, which being immediately from *Heaven* ought not to be drawn into example; yet is it sufficiently intimated by our Saviour, where, upon *Nicodemus's* wondring how a Man could be born of Water, and the Spirit, he with equal wonder demanded (p), *Art thou a Master of* (p) Joh. 3. 10. *Israel, and knowest not these things?* For as that is a sufficient indication, that the notion our Saviour advanc'd was no stranger to the *Israelites*,

C and

and therefore neither such a Baptism, as was the subject of it ; So it became yet more clear by the Jewish Writers representing the Baptism of a Profelyte as giving a new birth unto him : That as it is the same in effect with the product of Christ's Baptism, so making it yet more reasonable to believe, that our Saviour had an eye to it, when he wondred so much at *Nicodemus* for stumbling at that property in his. All which put together, because tending toward the same thing, will make it yet more reasonable to believe, that the Jewish Writers spake not at adventure, when they represented the Rite of Baptism as a Rite of their own Nation, and by which both themselves, and their Profelytes had been of old initiated, no less than by the Rite of Circumcision. If there be any thing to hinder the admission of it, it must be the silence of the *Old Testament* concerning it, or at least concerning the Institution of it. But as we find no great mention, even of Circumcision it self after the five Books of *Moses*, and may therefore the less wonder at the
no


no mention of Baptism, especially if, as it might be, instituted after his time; As we find as little mention, even where it might have been more reasonably expected, of the first *Jews* being *baptized into Moses in the Cloud, and in the Sea*, or of their *Eating, and Drinking* that *spiritual* repast, whereof *S. Paul* speaketh (q): So there is as little reason therefore to wonder at its silence concerning this Rite, especially considering, what is notorious enough from thence, that God from time to time rais'd up Prophets among them. For their Authority, and Preaching might suffice to constitute, or confirm a matter of greater moment, than the Rite of Baptism, as added to Circumcision, can be supposed to have been.

(q) 1 Cor. 10.
3, 4.

There being therefore no great doubt to be made of a Baptism among the *Jews* antecedent to that of *John the Baptist*, and our Saviour, it will not be difficult to believe *first*, that our Saviour had an eye to it, when he appointed the same Rite to initiate Men into his Religion: Partly because it was his avowed Profession,

that he came rather to reform, than destroy their former Oeconomy; and partly because he might the more reasonably hope to bring them over to that faith, which it was an initiation into. It will be as easie to believe, *Secondly*, upon the score of the same condescension, and compliance, that Christ departed as little as might be from their manner of Administration of it, or from the ends, which it was appointed for among them; such a compliance being equally necessary to carry on his design of bringing them over to his Religion. The consequence whereof will be *thirdly*, that where it doth not very plainly appear that Christianity hath made an alteration in it, we interpret the Baptism thereof conformably to that of the *Jews*, from whence it appears to have been transcrib'd. How much more then, where there are any fair hints in Christianity of its symbolizing with the Doctrine of the other? The result of which will be *fourthly*, our having recourse upon occasion to the Baptism of the *Jews* for the better clearing, or establishing the Doctrine of our own. Which

Which as I shall therefore not fail to do as often as their Writings shall furnish matter for it ; so having said thus much concerning their Baptism, and that of the Heathen, I will pass on to the Baptism of the Christians, and confine my self yet more strictly to the consideration of it.



PART II.

Of the Baptism of the Christians, and the Institution of it.

The Contents.

*The Institution of the Christian Baptism more antient, than the Command for it in S. Matthew *, * Mat. 28. 19. though not as to the generality of the World, nor it may be as to the like explicit Profession of the Trinity. As is made appear from Christ, or his Disciples baptizing in Judea, not long after his own Baptism by S. John. Enquiry thereupon made, whether it were not yet more antient, yea as antient as Christ's execution of his Prophetical Office. Which is rendred probable from our Saviours making Disciples before, and the equal reason there appears*

Of the Baptism of the Christians,

to have been for his making them after the same manner with those of Judea ; From Christ's representing to Nicodemus the necessity of being born again of water ; and the spirit, which is shewn at large to be meant of a true, and proper Baptism ; As, in fine, from Christ's telling S. Peter, when he ask'd the washing of his Hands, and Head, as well as Feet, that he, who had been washed, needeth not save to wash his feet. An answer to the supposed silence of the Scripture concerning so early a Baptism, and that shewn to be neither a perfect silence, nor an unaccountable one.

NOW the first thing to be enquired after is the Institution of it, and so much the rather, because though there is no doubt as to the thing it self, yet there is as to the first beginning of it. For there are, who have thought this Sacrament to have been first instituted by our Saviour immediately before his Ascension, and when he gave command to his Disciples * to go, and teach, or disciple all Nations, baptizing

* Matt. 28.19.

baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost. And I willingly grant (because our Saviour was sent only † to the lost sheep of the House of Israel) that that was the first institution of it, as to that more general extent it was to have in the World, and it may be too as to that clear, and explicit profession of the Trinity, into the Names of which our Saviour afterwards commanded to baptize : Because such Doctrines as that were to be poured into the Disciples by degrees, and according as they should be able to receive them. But that the Sacrament it self had a more early Institution, will appear from the mention there is of our Saviour's baptizing long before, or at least of his Disciples doing it by his Commission, and Appointment.

For the clearing whereof we are to know, that whatsoever he may be thought to have done, before he first passed into *Judaea* after his own Baptism by *John* the Baptist, yet there he †, or his Disciples (a) baptized; yea to so great a number, † *John* 3. 22. (a) --- 4. 2. that

- (b) Joh. 3. 26. that *John's* Disciples (b) affirmed to their Master, that *all men came to him*, and it; and news was afterwards brought to the *Pharisees* (c), that he made, and baptized more Disciples, than *John* himself. Into what profession is not difficult to conjecture from our Saviour's being said to *make* (d) Disciples by it, and from the Baptist's affirming in allowance of our Saviour's Baptism, that he that believed on the Son (e), should have everlasting Life, but he, *that believed not the Son, should not see life, but*, on the contrary, have the *wrath of God abiding on him*. For what could that assertion have signified toward the legitimating of our Saviour's Baptism, especially when *John* himself admonish'd Men by his *to believe on him, that should come after him* (f), *that is, on Christ Jesus*? Were it not, that our Saviour, or his Disciples did expressly baptize Men into the belief of him, and of that August Authority, and saving power, which was vested in him as the Messiah. Which makes me wonder so much the more, that *Tertullian* (g) should make
- (c) --- 4. 1.
- (d) --- 4. 1.
- (e) --- 3. 36.
- (f) Acts 19.
- (g) De Bapt. c. 11.

make that Baptism of the Disciples but of the same nature with that of *John*, but above all at his asking, how *Christ* could be supposed to baptize into himself, when he at that time made it his business to conceal who, and what he was. For as *John* the Baptist was not wanting (b) to discover what he was; so our Saviour was so far from being reserv'd as to that particular, that the very first of those Disciples, that came to him, did both acknowledge him (i) as the *Messiah* immediately, and represent him as such to other Men.

But let us rise yet higher, than *Christ's* baptizing in *Judaea*, though that be not far remov'd from his first setting up for Disciples, because whilst *John* was yet † baptizing, which is the time, from whence the Scripture (k) makes our Saviour's preaching to commence. Not that there are any express proofs before that time of his baptizing any Disciples, but that it may be some probable proofs may offer themselves for it, and such as we cannot reasonably refuse. Of which nature I reckon first his making Disciples before

(b) Joh. 1.
29, &c.

(i) ---41. 45.

† ---3.22,23.

(k) Act. 1. 22.
— 10. 37.

fore that time, and particularly those Disciples, whom he made use of to baptize in the Land of *Jury*. For if our Saviour made Disciples before, why not after the same manner, wherein he made those of *Judaea*? He had to induce him to it the custom, that then prevail'd among the *Jews*, of making Disciples by that solemnity, as appears both by their so admitting Profelytes, and the Baptism of his Forerunner. He had to induce him to it the greater likelihood there was thereby of inviting others to the same Baptism, than if those, who were the first, and chief, and moreover made use of by himself to baptize, had not first been baptiz'd themselves: Because so there could have been no pretence to refuse the Baptism he propos'd, whereas otherwise they might have rejected it as a thing unnecessary to be had, or scrupled it as proceeding from incompetent Administrators of it. In fine, he had to induce him to it that, which prevail'd with himself (1) to receive the Baptism of *John*, even their *fulfilling all righteousness*, who were not only the first of his Disciples,

(1) Matt. 3.
Es.

Disciples, but ordained by himself to be a pattern unto others. Which inducements as they are of no small force to perswade his baptizing from the beginning, because but suitable to his own proceedings, or the common reasonings of Mankind; so will no doubt be accounted such, if there be not equal probabilities to the contrary, as which are the only things, that can take off the edge of them. Now what is there of that nature, that can perswade Christ's omission of Baptism, unless it be either the Scripture's silence, which shall be afterwards considered, or his willingness thereby to intimate, that he had not so tied his own Graces to an external Rite, but that he could, and would upon occasion conferr them without it? But beside that there was a like fear thereby of Men's neglecting his appointments upon a presumption of their receiving his Graces as the Apostles did; This may seem to have been too early a season for such an intimation, because before Men were well confirm'd in his Authority, or ability to conferr them, even by the ordinary solemnities. For if they
were

(m) Matt. 21.
26.

were not as yet well confirm'd in that, how should they dream of a greater power, yea not rather be thereby tempted to question altogether his Authority, because departing so far even from the example of *John the Baptist*, whom all Men (m) accounted as a Prophet?

(n) Joh. 3. 3.

(o)-----5.

But beside that our Saviour made Disciples before, and may therefore not improbably be thought to have made them after the same manner; We find yet farther, that before he baptiz'd those of *Judaea*, he represented the solemnity of Baptism as a thing necessary to enter Men into that Kingdom of God, to which he invited them: Our Saviour not only telling *Nicodemus*, that except a Man were born again (n), he could not see the Kingdom of God, but yet more plainly, that except he were born again of Water (o), and of the Spirit, he could not possibly enter into it. For how could Christ represent that as necessary, which he himself had not afforded to his first, and chiefest Disciples, nor, for ought that doth appear, ever after did? For if he did, he would certainly have done it before

fore he made use of them to baptize others ; Partly because they were the first Disciples he had, and partly because so they would have been more apparently qualified to have administred the same Baptism unto others. If therefore Christ represented Baptism as necessary, even before his baptizing in *Judea*, it is not unreasonable to think he had both instituted, and administred it before : Especially, when the Disciples he before had cannot well be thought to have had it afterwards, as in reason they must have had it, if it were so necessary as our Saviour affirm'd it. And possibly neither would they, who are otherwise perswaded, have in the least suspected the force of this argument, had it not been for an opinion of theirs, that our Saviour spake not in this place of Baptism, but of Men's being born again of that spirit of God, which hath the same cleansing quality with water : So making that speech of our Saviour to be that, which the *Rhetoricians* call an *ἐν δυνάμει*, and consequently resolvable into a *watery, or cleansing Spirit,*

(p) Matt. 3.
11.

Spirit, as Virgil's *pateris libamus & auro*, is into *pateris aureis*, or golden Dishes. Even as they suppose the Scripture (p) meant when it affirm'd, that Christ should baptize *with the Holy Ghost, and with fire*, that is to say, with that Holy Ghost, which hath the *purifying*, and *warming* qualities of that Element. I will not now say, though I might, that that *figure* might have been more allowable here, if that speech of Christ could have been so fairly resolv'd into a *watery Spirit*, as *pateris & auro* may be into *pateris aureis*; Which that it cannot be is sufficiently evident from Gold's being the proper Material of those Dishes, whereof the Poet speaks, which *water* to be sure is not of the other. But neither will I any more than say, that Christ's baptizing *with the Holy Ghost, and with fire* doth not make at all for this *figure*, because it is certain that at the day of *Pentecost*, which was the most notorious descent of the Holy Ghost, and particularly referr'd to by that Baptism (q), Christ baptized his Disciples with a material fire, as well as that.

(q) Act. 1. 5.

that. But I say, which is more material, that there is great reason to understand our Saviour *here* of *that* Baptism by water; which we have affirmed his words to import. For so first (as Mr. Hooker (r) did long since observe) the Letter of the Text perswades, and which we are not lightly to depart from, unless we will make the Scripture a very uncertain Rule, and indeed to prove any thing, which wanton wits would have it. So secondly (as the same Hooker (s) observes) the *Antients* * without exception understood it, yea he †, who makes the Baptism now under consideration, even the Baptism of Christ before his Ascension, to be but of the same nature with S. John's. So thirdly, we have cause to understand Christ here, because expressing what he here intended by a *new birth from water*, which is the property (t) of that Baptism, he afterwards commanded the Apostles to administer. In fine, so several circumstances both of the Text, and Context perswade, and some too, that are not so ordinarily taken notice of. Of which nature

(r) Eccl. Pol.
li. 5. §. 59.

(s) Ibid.
* Justin Mart.
tyr. Apol. 2.
p. 94. Tertul.
de Bapt. c. 13.
Cyprian Epist.
73.
† Tertul. ubi
supra.

(t) Tit. 3. 5.

I reckon as none of the least that, which gave occasion to them, even *Nicodemus's coming to Jesus by night* (u) and there, and then acknowledging to him, that he was a *teacher come from God*, and that he himself was induced to believe it by the *miracles* our Saviour wrought. For that *secret* confession of his being not only not agreeable to that more publick one (w), which our Saviour requir'd, but (as appears by the answer he return'd to it) intimated by him to be insufficient, because letting him know, that *except he was born again of water, and the spirit*, he could not enter into the Kingdom of God; Nothing can be more agreeable to our Saviour's mind, than to understand those *Words* of his of Men's making a more publick confession of him in order to their Salvation, if the *Words* can with any reason be thought to admit of it. Which that they may is evident from hence, that, whatever our Saviour now understood by them, the like expression (x) became afterwards an usual *periphrasis* of Baptism, which was a publick confession

on

(u) Joh. 3. 2.

(w) Matt. 10.
32.

(x) Tit. 3. 5.

on of our Saviour. I say secondly, that as the occasion of the words doth naturally lead to such a sense, as will make them import a more publick Confession of our Saviour ; So it will consequently prompt us to understand them of such a new Birth, as is perform'd by Water, and the Spirit, rather than of that, which is perform'd by the Spirit alone : That, as it is a Birth, which manifests it self to the Eyes of others, which this cannot be supposed to do, so being a Birth therefore, which may publickly declare our Confession of him, by whose appointment we are born again. Agreeable hereto thirdly is the sense of the words themselves, if those *Jewes*, of whom *Nicodemus* was sometime a Ruler, may be listned to in this affair ; They not only affirming their own Profelytes to have been admitted by Baptism, but that Baptism also represented as a thing, which gave them a new birth, yea so far, as to make them put off their old relations by it. For what then can be more reasonable, than to think, that our Saviour, when he spake to a *Jew*, spake the same

(y) Joh. 3.
10.

(z) ---- 12.

(*) ---- 22.

Language with them, and consequently, that, as he spake of being born of Water, as well as the Spirit, he meant a like Baptism by it. Especially, when it is observable, fourthly, that our Saviour ask'd *Nicodemus*, not without some amazement, (y), *Art thou a Master in Israel, and knowest not these things?* For what was this, but to intimate yet more, that the new Birth, whereof he spake, was no stranger to themselves, and consequently, because he spake of being born of Water, that he meant a Baptism by it? Add hereunto, fifthly, our Saviour's affirming himself in the former Discourse to have spoken of *earthly* (z) things, and (as one would think) therefore of such a Birth, which though influenced by God's Spirit, yet had something of earthly, as that is oppos'd to heavenly, adhering to it: As, in fine, the Evangelist's subjoining to this Discourse of a *new Birth by Water* the mention of our Saviour's (*) passing into *Judea*, and *there baptizing*; There being not a fairer account either of that connexion, or our Saviour's proceedings, than

than that, agreeably to what he had said concerning the necessity of Men's being *so born again*, he went into *Judea*, and *baptized*, and so made way for their *entrance into God's Kingdom*. Such evidence there is of our Saviour's meaning a proper Baptism, when he spake of the necessity of Men's being *born again of water, and of the Spirit*; And if our Saviour meant such a Baptism, there is as little doubt of his having before both instituted, and administered it, yea even from the time of his setting up for Disciples; There being not the least appearance of Christ's baptizing those first Disciples afterwards, which yet he must have done, considering the necessity thereof, if they had not been baptiz'd before.

I will conclude what I have to say concerning the earliness of our Saviour's Baptism, when I have added from a passage of Christ to *S. Peter* the farther probability there is of *his*, and the *other Apostles* having receiv'd it, and therefore, if they did so, of their having receiv'd it from the beginning of their Discipleship:

† John 13. 10.

plethip : That I mean, whereupon S. Peter's begging of Christ to wash not only his feet, but his hands, and his head, if (as our Saviour had told him) he could have no part in him, unless he wash'd him, Christ is said to have made answer †, that he, that had been wash'd, even by a more general washing, needed not save to wash his feet. For as our Saviour intimates by that expression, that he, and the rest had passed under the former washing, and consequently did not need such a general washing a second time; so he may not improbably be thought to have meant the washing of Baptism, and which though in it self an outward purification, yet was attended with an inward, and spiritual one : Partly, because it is certain that our Saviour had before this time made use of the Baptism of Water to purifie Men unto himself, and may therefore be well enough supposed to allude unto it; And partly, because that Baptism, or washing will be more directly opposed to that, which our Saviour intended, and which though design'd

design'd by him to signifie a more spiritual purgation, even that of the affections; or actions, yet was performed by him by an outward washing. For why then should we not think, that the Apostles had that more general washing of Baptism? Especially when we know that about this time Christ administred to them the Sacrament of the Eucharist, and which as it is in order of nature after that of Baptism, and may therefore not unreasonably be thought to have been preceded by theirs, so is an evidence that Christ meant, in some measure at least, to conduct them by the same Rites, and Ceremonies, wherewith he intended to bring other Men unto himself.

One only thing there is, which can any way prejudice the former Discourse, even the *silence* there is in the *New Testament* of any Baptism by Christ before that in *Judea*, yea the silence there is of it in that very *Evangelist*, who takes such particular notice of the other. And surely such a silence would have been of no small force, if it had been either a perfect silence, or an unac-

countable one. But as that story cannot be look'd upon as perfectly silent, which affords so many probable proofs of what it is pretended to be silent in ; so there may be reason enough given of its ascending no higher in its account of Christ's administration of Baptism, than that, which was performed by him in *Ju-
dea* : Partly, because the *Author* of it had before acquainted his Readers with Christ's representing it as generally necessary † to Salvation, and from which, and the following practice of our Saviour in making Disciples, Men might reasonably enough collect his having so made the former ones ; And partly because he knew, that what was defective in his account of our Saviour's Baptism, might be abundantly supplied to posterity (to whom he, and the other Evangelists principally wrote) by what those other Evangelists (a) had said concerning Christ's giving command to his Apostles of *baptizing all Nations in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost*. For that, together with his own account of our Saviour's Baptism,

† Joh. 3. 5.

(a) Matt. 28.
19.
Mark 16. 15,
16.

Baptism , was enough to let them know (and therefore enough for their own purpose) that as Christ himself initiated Men by Baptism, yea represented it as necessary to Salvation, so it was his absolute will , and pleasure, that those , to whom his Apostles , and their Successors published his Gospel, should be initiated by the same means, if they meant to enter into the Kingdom of God.

PART

[illegible]

PART III.

Of the outward visible Sign of Baptism.

The Contents.

The outward visible Sign of the Christian Baptism shewn to be the Element of Water, and enquiry thereupon made wherein it was intended as a Sign; Which is shewn, in the general, to be as to the cleansing quality thereof, more particularly as to the use it was put to toward new-born Infants, and that application of it which was first in use, even by an immersion, or plunging the Party baptized in it. Occasion taken from thence to enquire farther, how it ought to be applyed, more especially whether by an immersion, or by that, or an aspersion, or effusion. Evidence

Of the outward visible Sign

dence made of an immersion being the only legitimate Rite of Baptism, save where necessity doth otherwise require ; And enquiry thereupon made, whether necessity may justify the Application of it by an Aspersión, or Effusion, and, if it may, whether the case of Infants be to be look'd upon as such a necessity. What is to be thought of those additions, which were antiently made, or continue as yet in being in the outward solemnities of Baptism. Where the sign of the Cross in Baptism is more particularly considered, and answer made to those Exceptions that are made against it as a Ceremony, as an addition of Men to the Institution of Christ, and as a supposed Relique of Popery, or giving too much countenance to the Papists abuses of it.

Question.

What is the outward visible sign or form in Baptism :

Answer.

Water, wherein the person is baptiz'd in the name of the Father, &c.

BUT because whatever doubt there may be of the first Institution of the Christian Baptism, yet there neither is, nor can be any doubt of our Saviour's instituting it then, when he was about to take his leave of his Disciples ; Therefore pass we on to the Sacrament it self, which (agreeably to the procedure of

of our own Catechism, and the method before observed, when I entreated of the nature of a Sacrament in the general) I will consider,

I. As to its outward and visible Sign.

II. As to its inward and Spiritual Grace, or the thing signified by it.

III. As to that relation, which its outward, and visible Sign bears to its inward, and Spiritual Grace.

IV. As to the Foundation of that Relation. For as the nature of the Sacrament of Baptism will be found to lie within these *four*, so I no way doubt we shall be able to reduce to one, or other of these generals whatsoever is any way necessary to be known concerning it.

Now there are four things to be enquir'd concerning the first of these, even the outward and visible sign of Baptism. First, what that outward and visible sign is. Secondly, wherein it was intended as a sign. Thirdly, how it ought to be applied. Fourthly, what is to be thought of those additions,

additions, which were anciently made, or continue as yet in being in the outward solemnities of Baptism.

I. As touching the outward, and visible sign of Baptism, there is no doubt it is the Element of Water, as is evident from the native signification of the word *Baptism*, which signifies an *immersion*, or *dipping into some liquid thing*, from the matter of those Baptisms, which were in use among the *Jews*, and which our Saviour (because making use of the same word to express his own Baptism by) is in reason to be suppos'd to have so far conform'd it to, but more especially from the account we have of the Administration of it, both whilst our Saviour continu'd here, and after his Ascension into Heaven. For thus after S. *John* had said *, that our Saviour, presently after his entring upon his Prophetick Office, came into the Land of *Judea*, and there baptized, he immediately subjoyn'd †, that *John* the Baptist also was then baptizing in *Enon* near to *Salim*, because there was much water there. For
as

* Joh. 3. 22.

† ----23.

as it is evident from thence, as well as from other places *, that the Baptism of *John* was a Baptism by Water; so the Evangelist mentioning *John* the Baptist as practising the same thing with our Saviour, shews the Baptism of our Saviour to have been so far like it, and consequently to have had Water for the Instrument thereof. The same is yet more evident as to the practice of our Saviour's Disciples, after his more general Command (a) of Baptism, and his own Ascension into Heaven. For thus we find *Philip* and the *Eunuch* going down into a certain water (b); by which they pass'd in order to the Baptism of the latter; As that too, after the *Eunuch* had admonish'd him (c), *see here is water, what doth hinder me to be baptized.* And thus too we find *S. Peter* (d), before he gave order for *Cornelius*, and his companies being baptized in the name of the Lord, demanding of those of the Circumcision, that came with him, whether any Man could forbid water, that these should not be baptized, which had receiv'd the Holy Ghost, as well as themselves; Thereby

* Matt. 3. 6.
-----13.

(a) ---28. 19.

(b) Act. 8. 38.

(c) -----36.

(d) ----10. 47.
48.

by intimating, or rather expressly declaring, that our Saviour's Baptism was, as to the outward, and visible sign, the same with that of *John* the Baptist, and other the Baptisms of the *Jews*.

2. Water therefore being no doubt the outward and visible sign of Baptism, and so declared to be by the manner of its Administration; The next thing to be enquir'd into is, wherein it was intended as a sign, which will appear to have been in these three particulars: First in respect of that cleansing quality, which is natural to it, secondly in respect of that use which it was put to about new-born Infants, thirdly in respect of that manner of Application of it, which was first us'd, and no doubt generally intended, I mean the dipping of the Party baptized in it.

That the Water of Baptism was intended as a sign in respect of the first of these, will need no other proof, than *Ananias's* admonishing *Paul* to arise and be baptized, and
 (c) *Akt. 22. 16.* wash (e) away his sins, calling upon the name of the Lord. For it appearing,

pearing, on the one hand, that the Baptism, to which *Paul* was invited, even the Christian one, was a Baptism by Water, and, on the other hand, that it was at least ordained for the *remission* (f) of *sins*, and so the putting away their guilt; Nothing can be more reasonable, than to think, that when *Ananias* subjoyn'd to the precept of *being baptiz'd* that of *washing away his sins*, he meant his washing them away by Baptism, and consequently that the Water of Baptism was both a sign of something relating to the putting away of his sins, and a sign too in particular in respect of that cleansing quality, which is natural to it, because that Baptism, to which it belongs, is describ'd as *washing away* the other. (f) Act. 2. 38.

But beside that Water was intended as a sign in respect of that cleansing quality, which is natural to it; There is equal reason to believe, that it was also intended as such in respect of the use it was then put to about *new-born Infants*, even the washing away of those impurities, which they contracted from the Womb. We have (as

E

Mr.

(g) Disc. on
Tit. 3. 5.

(h) Exe. 16. 4.

(i) Ubi supra.
(k) Hesych. in
utramque vo-
cem.

(*) Plutarch
Quæst. Rom.
statim ab ini-
tio. Τὸν ἔν
᾿Αεισίνορ εὖ
φρονήσαντα
παρεχρῆν ἐ-

αὐτὸν ὥσπερ ἐξ ἀρχῆς πεπλεγμένον ὅ γυναιξὶν ἀπολούσαι, καὶ σπαρ-
γανῶσαι, καὶ δηλὴν ἐπαχεῖν, ἔτω τε δρᾶν, καὶ τὸ ἄλλους ἀπαν-
τας ὑπερπότημους παροτρυνόμενας. Ἐνιοὶ δὲ καὶ πρὸ τῆς ᾿Αει-
σίνορ ταῦτα γίνεσθαι πρὸ τῶν ὑπερπότημας, καὶ τὸ ἔδος εἶναι
παλαιόν.

the

Mr. Mede did long since observe (g) an allusion to this custome in the description, which God gives of the poor and forlorn condition of *Jerusalem*, when he first took her unto himself, under the parable of an exposed Infant. For *as for thy Nativity*, saith he, (h) *in the day that thou wast born, thy Navel was not cut, neither wast thou washed in water to supple thee, thou wast not salted at all, nor swaddled at all*: Thereby intimating what was then done to Infants in their Nativity, and particularly the washing them from their impurities. And how generally receiv'd this custom was, even among the Heathen, may appear (as the same Mr. Mede (i) hath observed from what was done to the ὑπερπότεμοι, or δευτερόπότεμοι, who were persons (k), to whom the Rites of Burial had been perform'd as dead, but did afterwards appear again in the World. For as these were look'd upon as born anew (*) into

the World, so like new-born Infants they were to be wash'd with Water before they could be admitted to the conversation of Men, or allowed to enter into the Temples of their Gods. But so that the Water of Baptism was intended for a sign, is evident from its being stil'd the *laver* (l) of regeneration, or a *new Birth*, and from the addition, that was made to it in after times of giving *milk* * and *hony* to the new-baptized persons, as that too to declare their *Infancy* †. For this evidently shews this *second Birth* to relate to the *first*, and consequently, that the Element of Water, and the Regeneration by it, though borrowed more immediately from the Baptism of the *Jews*, yet was intended by our Saviour (as I no way doubt it was also by the *Jews*) as of like use with that, which was apply'd to new-born Infants, and to represent a like washing away of natural pollutions.

One other particular there is, wherein I have said the Water of Baptism to have been intended as a sign, and that is in respect of that

E 2 manner

(l) Tit. 3. 5.

* Tertul. de
Coronâ c. 3.
Inde [nempe
post immersionem] suscepti,
lactis & mellis
concordiam
præ gustamus.
† Idem adv.
Marcion. li. i.
c. 14. Sed ille
quidem usque
nunc nec aquam
reprobavit cre-
atoris qua suos
abluit, nec ole-
um quo suos un-
guat, nec mellis
& lactis socie-
tatem, quos
suos infantat,
&c.

- manner of application, which was sometime us'd, I mean the *dipping*, or *plunging* the party baptized in it. A signification, which S. Paul will not suffer those to forget, who have been acquainted with his Epistles. For with reference to that manner of Baptizing we find him affirm-
- (m) Rom. 6.4. ing (m), that we are *buried with Christ by Baptism into death, that like as Christ was raised up from the dead, by the glory of the Father, even so we also should walk in newness of life;*
- (n) ----- 5. And again (n), that if we have been *planted together in the likeness of his death, we shall be also in the likeness of his resurrection.* To the same purpose, or rather yet more clearly, doth that Apostle discourse, where
- (o) Col. 2.12. he tells us (o), that as we are *buried with Christ in Baptism, so we do therein rise also with him through the faith of the operation of God, who hath raised him from the Dead.* For what is this but to say, that as the design of Baptism was to oblige Men to conform so far to Christ's Death, and Resurrection, as to die unto Sin, and live again unto Righteousness, so it was perform'd by the ceremony of immer-

immersion, that the person immers'd might by that very ceremony, which was no obscure image of a Sepulture, be minded of the preceding death, as in like manner, by his coming again out of the Water, of his rising from that death to life, after the example of the Instituter thereof? For which cause, as hath been elsewhere (*p*) observ'd, the Antient Church added to the Rite of immersion the dipping of the party three several times to represent the three days Christ continued in the Grave (for that we find to have been the intention of some) and made the *Eve of Easter* one of the solemn times of the Administration of it.

(*p*) Expl. of the Creed, in the words, *And Buried.*

3. The third thing to be enquir'd concerning the outward visible sign of Baptism is, how it ought to be apply'd, where again these two things would be considered. First, whether it ought to be applyed by an immersion, or by that, or an aspersion, or effusion. Secondly, whether it ought to be applyed by a threefold immersion, or aspersion, answerably to the names into which we are baptiz'd, or either by that, or a single one.

Of the outward visible Sign

The former of these is, it may be, a more material question, than it is commonly deem'd by us, who have been accustomed to baptize by a bare effusion, or sprinkling of water upon the party. For in things, which depend for their force, upon the meer will, and pleasure of him, who instituted them, there ought, no doubt, great regard to be had to the commands of him, who did so; As without which there is no reason to presume, we shall receive the benefit of that ceremony, to which he hath been pleased to annex it. Now, what the command of Christ was in this particular, cannot well be doubted of by those who shall consider first the words of Christ (q) concerning it, and the practice of those times, whether in the Baptism of *John*, or of *our Saviour*. For the words of Christ are, that they should *Baptize*, or *Dip* those, whom they made Disciples to him (for so, no doubt, the word βαπτίζεν properly signifies) and, which is more, and not without its weight, that they should baptize them *into* the name of the Father, and of the Son, and

(q) Matt. 28.
39.

of
of

of the Holy Ghost : Thereby intimating such a washing, as should receive the party baptized within the very body of that Water, which they were to baptize him with. Though, if there could be any doubt concerning the signification of the words in themselves, yet would that doubt be remov'd by considering the practice of those times, whether in the Baptism of *John* or of our Saviour. For such as was the practice of those times in Baptizing, such in reason are we to think our Saviour's command to have been concerning it, especially, when the words themselves incline that way ; There being not otherwise any means either for those, or future times to discover his intention concerning it. Now what the practice of those times was as to this particular, will need no other proof than their resorting to *Rivers*, and other such like *receptacles* of waters for the performance of that ceremony, as that too because there was *much Water* there. For so the Scripture doth not only affirm concerning the Baptism of *John* (r), but both intimate con-

(r) Matt. 3. 5,
6. 13.
John 3. 23.

cerning that, which our Saviour administered in *Judea* (because making *John's* Baptism, and *his* to be so far forth of the same sort (*f*)) and expressly affirm concerning the Baptism of the *Eunuch*, which is the only Christian Baptism the Scripture is any thing particular in the description of: The words of *S. Luke* (*t*) *Act. 8. 38.* (*t*) being, that both *Philip* and the *Eunuch* went down into a certain water which they met with in their journey, in order to the baptizing of the latter. For what need would there have been either of the Baptist's resorting to great confluxes of Water, or of *Philip*, and the *Eunuch's* going down into this, were it not that the Baptism both of the one, and the other was to be performed by an immersion? A very little Water, as we know it doth with us, sufficing for an effusion, or sprinkling. But beside the words of our Blessed Saviour, and the concurrent practice of those times, wherein this Sacrament was instituted; It is in my opinion of no less consideration, that the thing signified by the Sacrament of Baptism, cannot otherwise be well represented,

ted, than by an immersion, or at least by some more general way of purification, than that of effusion, or sprinkling. For though the pouring, or sprinkling of a little Water upon the Face may suffice to represent an internal washing, which seems to be the general end of Christ's making use of the Sacrament of Baptism; yet can it not be thought to represent such an *entire* washing, as that of new-born Infants was, and as Baptism may seem to have been intended for, because represented as the *laver* (*u*) of our regeneration: (*u*) Tit. 3. 5. That, though it do require an immersion, yet requiring such a *general* washing at least, as may extend to the whole Body; As other than which cannot answer its type, nor yet that general, though internal purgation, which Baptism was intended to represent. The same is to be said yet more upon the account of our conforming to the Death, and Resurrection of Christ, which we learn from S. Paul to have been the design of Baptism to signify. For, though that might, and was well enough represented by the baptized

tized persons being buried in Baptism, and then rising out of it; yet can it not be said to be so, or at least but very imperfectly by the bare pouring out, or sprinkling the Baptifmal Water on him. But therefore as there is so much the more reason to represent the Rite of immersion, as the only legitimate Rite of Baptism, because the only one, that can answer the ends of its Institution, and those things, which were to be signified by it; so especially if (as is well known, and undoubtedly of great force) the general practice of the Primitive Church was agreeable thereto, and the practice of the *Greek Church* to this very day. For who can think either the one, or the other would have been so tenacious of so troublesome a Rite, were it not that they were well assured, as they of the Primitive Church might very well be, of its being the only instituted, and legitimate one.

How to take off the force of these Arguments altogether, is a thing I mean not to consider; Partly, because

cause our Church (w) seems to persuade such an immersion, and partly, because I cannot but think the forementioned Arguments to be so far of force, as to evince the necessity thereof, where there is not some greater necessity to occasion an alteration of it. For what benefit can Men ordinarily expect from that, which depends for its force upon the will of him, that instituted it, where there is not such a compliance at least with it, and the Commands of the Instituter, as may answer those ends, for which he appointed it? And indeed, whatever may have been done to Infants, which I no way doubt were more or less baptized from the beginning, the first mention we find of *Aspersio* in the Baptism of the Elderfort, was in the case of the *Clinici*, or Men who receiv'd Baptism upon their sick Beds; and that Baptism represented by S. *Cyprian* * as legitimate upon the account of the necessity, that compel'd it, and the pre-

(w) See the Rubrick in the Office of Baptism before the words, *I baptize thee, &c.*

* *Epist. ad Magn. 76. In Sacramentis salutaribus, necessitate co-*

gente, & Deo indulgentiam suam largiente, totum credentibus conferunt Divina compendia.

sumption

sumption there was of God's gracious acceptation thereof because of it. By which means the lawfulness of any other Baptism, than by an immersion, will be found to lie in the necessity there may sometime be of another manner of Administration of it; and we therefore only enquire, whether the necessity of the party to be baptiz'd can justifie such an alteration, and what is to be look'd upon as such a necessity. And indeed though that *Magnus*, to whom *S. Cyprian* directed the forementioned Letter, seemed to question the lawfulness of such a Baptism, and that Father, as his manner is, spake but modestly concerning it; yet there is not otherwise any appearance of the Antient Churches disapproving the Baptism of the *Clinicks*, because they were not *loti*, but *perfusi*, as *S. Cyprian* expresseth it. For even he himself doth there intimate, that they †, who liked not the Baptism of the *Clinicks*, did not yet care to

† Aut si aliquis existimat eos nihil consecutos, eo quod

aquâ salutari tantum perfusi sunt, &c. non decipiantur, ut si incommodam languoris evaserint, & convalescerint, baptizentur. Si autem baptizari non possunt, qui jam Baptismo Ecclesiastico sanctificati sunt, cur in fide sua, & Domini indulgentiâ scandalizentur? Cypr. ubi supra.

baptize

baptize them again. He adds farther, that they who had been so baptiz'd, were known to have been delivered there-

by from that unclean spirit, which before possess'd them *, and after their recovery, gave as good proof, as any, by their holy living, of their being san-

ctified by that Baptism. In fine, that they, who differ'd from him, as to the rebaptization of Hereticks, (which was the sounder part of the Church in that particular) did, without any difference, admit those, who had been baptiz'd by Hereticks †, neither were scrupulous in enquiring, whether they were wash'd or sprinkled, Clinicks or Peripateticks. Which passages alone are a sufficient proof, that the generality of the Church look'd upon sprinkling as enough, where there was any just necessity to constrain it. But so (to omit other proofs) we may be satisfied even by that Canon (x), which was made against some of the forementioned Clinicks; The utmost, that Canon pretended

* Denique & rebus ipsis experimur, ut necessitate urgente, in egritudine baptizati, & gratiam consecuti, careant immundo spiritu, quo antea movebantur, & laudabiles ac probabiles in Ecclesiâ vivant, plusque per dies singulos in augmentum celestis gratiæ per fidei Sacramentum proficiant. Cypr. ibid.

† Et tantus honor habeatur hereticis, ut inde venientes non interrogentur, utrumne loti sint, an persusi, utrumne Clinici sint, an Peripatetici. Cypr. ibid.

(x) Cod. Eccl. Univ. can. 57. cum not. Just.

(y) De Pœnit.
cap. 8.

(z) 1 Pet. 3.
21.

pretended to do against them, being *the hindring them from being promoted to the Priesthood*, as that too, not because of any unlawfulness in the manner of their Baptism, but because there was sometime a *presumption, that that Baptism proceeded rather from necessity, than choice*, or that *they had* (as Tertullian (y) speaks, *deferr'd the receiving of it, that they might in the mean time indulge to their sins, as nothing doubting, but their future Baptism would wipe off all.* There being therefore no doubt to be made (so far as the judgment, or practice of the Church can warrant us) that necessity doth justify a bare *Aspersio* in Baptism; Enquire we, for our farther confirmation in it, what there was in the Scripture to induce them to it, or establish us in the belief of it. Which I conceive to be their understanding from thence (z), that though Baptism was the thing, that *sav'd*, yet it was not so much by its *washing away the filth of the flesh*, as from that *answer of a good Conscience*, which it did involve; That, though the external washing was also necessary

fary in its kind, and, where it might be had, in those circumstances also, wherein it was instituted, yet since God had declar'd *, That *he would* * *Matt. 12. 7.* *have mercy, and not sacrifice*, there was reason enough to believe, that he requir'd no farther a compliance in this particular, than was consistent with the safety of Mens lives to afford; especially, when what was wanting in the application of the outward visible sign might be made up by the form of words, wherewith it was administered, and Men admonished thereby of those significations of Baptism, which the visible solemnities thereof did not suggest. For, the several ends of Baptism being thus secur'd, there was still the less reason to be scrupulous about the means, or think God would be rigorous in exacting them. But so they might be yet more assur'd (as it appears St. Cyprian † was) by what the Prophet *Ezekiel* * brings in God as speaking concerning the times of the *Messiah*; Even that he would *sprinkle clean Water upon them, and they should be clean from all their filthiness; and* from

† Ubi supra.

*Ezek. 36.
25.

from their Idols. For as it appears from what follows (a), even that God would give the persons there spoken of a new heart, and a new Spirit, take away their stony heart from them, and put his own spirit within them, that this whole passage was spoken more particularly with reference to the times of the Messiah, Maimonides himself

(b) *Explic.*
Tract. Sanh. c.
10. apud Po-
cock. Port.
Mosis, p. 160. 1.

(b) so applying this, and the like passages; So we cannot therefore better interpret the *sprinkling of clean Water* upon them in order to it, than of the Water of Baptism, and which the Spirit of God expressing by the term of *sprinkling of Water* shews it to have foreseen a necessity of its being so administred oftentimes, and his own allowance of it. All which things whosoever shall consider, will, I doubt not, see reason enough to think, that necessity may justify an *Aspersio* in Baptism, and nothing more therefore left to enquire upon this Head, than what may be look'd upon as such a necessity, which will bring the question yet nearer to our selves. Now as there can be no doubt of *sickness* being

ing such, and particularly such a sickness, as fastens Men to their *Beds*; So we shall therefore have nothing more to consider of, than the case of *Infants*, and to whom as Baptism is generally administred, so it is also perform'd by an effusion, or sprinkling. With what necessity, is the thing we are to enquire, and so much the rather because the *Greek Church* useth immersion, or dipping to this very day, and the *Muscovitch Church* after its example. For if the coldness of any *Clime* may be thought to make that Rite dangerous to such tender Bodies, one would think they of the *latter* should find it to be such, and therefore see a necessity of changing it. For the clearing whereof we are to know, that as they, who use the Rite of immersion, even in warmer Countries, are so sensible of the tenderness of Infant Bodies, that they make use of warm Water to baptize them; So the *Muscovites* making use of it without any danger (if yet they always do so) will not make it cease to be such to Infants of other Countries: There being, as every

one knows, no small difference between the Bodies of Infants, as well as those of Men, and to some of whom therefore, and in some Countries that may be exceeding dangerous, which Infants of other Countries find no such inconvenience by. And indeed as such an Immersion of Infants, especially in these Northern parts, cannot generally be thought to be without its hazard, how warily and carefully soever managed; As it may be yet more hazardous to weaker Infants, and whom, as it would not be thought fit to deny Baptism to, so as little, to do any thing to send them out of the World; so I am apt to believe upon second thoughts (for I have *elsewhere* (c) spoken more harshly concerning it) that that Rite came to be disused here after a sufficient proof of the inconveniencies thereof; Because (as *E-*

rasmus notes (d), it was in use among us, even in his time, and the *Liturgies*, that have been in force since, not excepting the present one, seem rather to perswade the use of it. For our Fore fathers being so strangely tenacious of that Rite, and both they, and

(c) Expl. of
the Creed, in
the Words,
And Immu-
ried.

(d) Vid. *Pamel.*
in not. ad *Cypr.*
epist. ad Mag-
nim.

and their posterity not without a venerable opinion of it, it cannot well be thought they should come at length so generally to disuse it, but that they found by experience, that it was not without its hazard, and so more prudently omitted. However it be, our Church hath acquitted it self from all blame, because manifestly licensing (e) the *sprinkling* of Infants with respect to the weakness of their State; And I have the more carefully noted both that, and the ground of our practice, the better to defend our selves from a retort of the Romanists, when we charge them with Sacrilege in the matter of the *Eucharist* for taking away the *Cup* from the Laity. For why not (as they sometime answer) as well as change the Rite of *Immersion* in *Baptism* into that of *sprinkling*? Especially, when a great part of the Symbolicalness of that Sacrament lies in the manner of the application of its sign. Which Answer of theirs were not in my opinion easie to be repel'd, were it not, that we have that necessity to justify our practice, which they cannot pretend for their own.

(e) See the Rubr. of Bapt. before the Words, I baptize thee, &c.

Having thus said enough concerning the applying of the outward sign of Baptism, whether by an Immersion, or Asperſion, which was the firſt thing I had to conſider; Enquire we in the next place how often that application ought to be made, that is to ſay whether as many times as there are perſons in the God-head, into which we baptize, or once for all into the three. The ground of which queſtion is not only that *diſtinct* profeſſion of the *Trinity*, which Baptiſm was intended to declare, but the appearance there is of the Churches uſing a threefold immersion from the beginning. For, not to mention any other proofs, *Tertullian*, who flouriſhed within an hundred years after the laſt of the Apoſtles, doth not only mention the threefold immersion, as a thing in uſe in his time, but as a thing which was derived to them from * Tradition, and which,

* *Tert. de Coronâ, c. 3.*

Ergo queramus, an & Traditio niſi ſcripta non debeat recipi. Place negabimus

recipiendam, ſi nulla exempla præjudicent aliarum obſervationum, quas ſine ullius ſcripturæ inſtrumento, ſolius traditionis titulo, & exinde conſuetudinis Patrocinio vindicamus. Denique, ut à Baptiſmo ingrediar, Aquam adiuturi ibidem, ſed & aliquanto prius in Eccleſiâ ſub Antiſtitis manu conteſtamur, nos renunciare Diabolo, & pompe, & angelis ejus. Dehinc ter mergitamur, amplius aliquid reſpondentes, quàm Dominus in Evangelio determinavit. Item adv. Praxeam-c. 26.

conſider-

considering the time wherein he liv'd, cannot well fall short of an Apostolical one. And thus much certainly ought to be allow'd to this, and other testimonies, that in or near the Apostolical Age, the more fully to express that distinction of persons, into the Faith of which Christ commanded to baptize, Men were with the command, or allowance of those who presided in the Church, plunged into the Baptifmal Water at the mention of each person's name. But as that threefold immersion cannot be collected from the command of Christ, because simply enjoyning to baptize into the Faith of the Trinity, and which one immersion may declare as well as a threefold one; As there is as little appearance of such a threefold immersion from the account we have in the Scripture of the administration of it: So it is but reasonable to think, that as ancient as it was, yet it was postnate to the single one, and had its rise from some Men's beginning to call the Doctrine of the Trinity in question (as we find by *Tertullian* they did very early) and, the better to colour

their own errour, as well as to overthrow the other, admonishing Men from *St. Paul*, that Baptism was peculiarly intended to baptize Men into *Christ's death*. For beside that they, who consider the primitive face of Christianity, will need no other proof than that to perswade them to believe, that the more simple any Rite is, so much the more

ancient it ought to be thought to be; That *Apostolick Canon* †, which commands the *deposing of him, who should not use a threefold immersion; but a single one*, doth not so much as prefer the threefold immersion to the single one *simply*,

† Ἐἰ τις ἐπίσκοπος, ἢ πρεσβύτερος μὴ τρία βαπτίσματα μᾶς μύσεως ὀπιλέσῃ, ἀλλ' ἐν Βάπτισμα εἰς τὸ θάνατον τοῦ κυρίου διδόμενον, καὶ θάψει· ὡς ἔδ' ἔπεν ὁ κύριος· εἰς τὸ θάνατον με βαπτίσατε, ἀλλὰ πρὸς ζῆντες, &c. βαπτίζοντες εἰς τὸ ὄνομα τοῦ πατρὸς, καὶ τοῦ υἱοῦ, καὶ τοῦ ἁγίου πνεύματος. Can. 50.

and *absolutely* considered, but as *opposed* to that *single one*, which was made use of to baptize Men *into the death of our Lord*, and not into the Faith of the Trinity. Thereby not only not condemning the single immersion considered in it self, but also intimating the triple one to have been rather instituted at first to obviate that here-

heretical opinion. And if this were the rise of the triple Immersion, as is probable enough from the premises ; The single one, abstracting from any command of the Church to the contrary, will at least be as lawful as that, and nothing therefore left to us to enquire, but what is to be thought of those additions, which were anciently made, or continue as yet in being in the outward solemnities of Baptism.

4. As touching the additions, which were anciently made in this particular, and concerning which they, who desire an account, may meet with an ample one in Dr. Cave's *Primitive Christianity* (f) ; They (f) Part I. c. 10. were either such, as they thought more peculiarly warranted to them by an Apostolical Tradition, of which nature till better information I must needs think the triple Immersion to have been, or such as were brought into the Church by those, who presided in it, the more effectually to declare the intention of that Sacrament, to which they were added by it. Which they thought they might most assuredly do, if

they made use of such farther Rites, as did represent yet more to their senses what that Sacrament was intended to declare. And indeed, as that way of Instruction was in part warranted by the Sacraments themselves, because professing by sensible things to teach Men Spiritual ones ; As it became yet more necessary by the grossness of the Vulgar sort, and that infinity of Ceremonies, to which they had been before accustomed : So that, which afterwards made them faulty, was either the exceeding *multitude* thereof (and which experience assures us doth rather obscure, yea overwhelm the thing signified by them, than help toward the declaration of it) or their advancing by degrees into the same repute, or necessity with the signs of Christ's own Institution. Which is so true, that they came in fine to be represented, as means, and conveyers of Grace, as well as significative thereof ; Thereby making them Sacraments, rather than appendages of such ; and which whosoever goes about to do, must necessarily usurp the place of God, and Christ, as to whom alone

it doth belong (because the only givers of Spiritual Graces) to make any ceremony the conveyer of them. But as that Church, whose Catechism I explain, hath been so far from multiplying Rites in Baptism, that she hath contented her self with one single one, even the Sign of the *Cross* ; So she hath so explain'd her own meaning in it, both in that form of words (g), wherewith she appointeth it to be made, and in a Canon (h) devised expressly for that purpose, that it will not be easie for considerate Men to believe, that she represents it as a Sacrament, or indeed that she may not require the conformity of her Children to it. Only, because they, who separate from the Church, have made the injunction of that Ceremony one of the particular reasons of their separation, and occasion may well be taken from thence to shew the ground both of that, and others, which are as yet retained in the Church of *England*, I will set my self to consider the exceptions, that have been made against it, and return a particular answer to them.

(g) In the Office of Bapt.

(h) Can. 30.

Now there are three sorts of charges,

ges, which are brought against this Ceremony, and which therefore it will be necessary to consider; Its being a Ceremony, and so less agreeable to a spiritual, and substantial Religion; Its being an addition to the Institution of Christ, and therefore implying something of imperfection in that; As lastly, its being a relique of Popery, or giving too much countenance to the errors of it.

The first of these is certainly one of the most unreasonable charges, that were ever advanced against our Church by the Adversaries thereof. As will appear if we consider the nature of those, for whose edification that, and the like Ceremonies were intended, The use such things are of to procure respect to those Institutions, to which they are annexed, And the nature of that Religion, with whose Offices they are intermixed.

That I alledge as one ground of this, and the like Ceremonies the very nature of those Men, for whose edification they were intended, is their being composed of Flesh, as well as Spirit, and consequently the need they stand in of such sensible helps
to

to awaken their understandings to consider, and their affections to embrace what they were designed to represent. For being so fram'd, it is not easie to believe, that, if there were not somewhat in all actions of moment to affect Men's sense, they would intend them as they ought, or be duly affected with them. Of which yet if any doubt be made, we have the constant practice of the World to justify it, because rarely, if ever, suffering that; which was such (though there wanted not words to express their meaning) to pass without some visible solemnities. Thus, as Mr. *Hooker* (i) did long since observe, *Abraham* proceeded with his Servant, because not only obliging him to take a Wife for his Son out of his Kindred, but to accompany that *Oath* of his, with the putting of his Hand (k) under his Master's Thigh. And thus too *Israel* made *Joseph* swear (l), that he would not bury him in *Egypt*: Both of them, as is not unlikely, from some received custom of that time, because as they say (m), yet observed in some of the Eastern parts, and as a token

(i) Eccl. Pol.
li. 4. S. I.

(k) Gen. 24.
2---9.

(l) ---47. 29.

(m) Vatabl.
in Gen. 24. 2.

of

of the homage the Party swearing ow'd to those to whom they fwore, and of their readines to execute it in the thing sworn to by them. In like
 (n) *Ubi supra.* manner, as the same Mr. Hooker (n) hath also observ'd, it was an *Ancient manner in Israel concerning redeeming, and exchanging* for the Man, who refus'd to redeem, to *pluck off his Shoe,*
 (o) Ruth 4. 7. and (o) give it to him, that would; As among the *Romans*, when they made any Man *Free*, not only to declare before the Magistrate, that they intended to make him such, but to strike him on the Cheek, to turn him round, and have his Hair shav'd off, the Magistrate, after that, touching him with a White Rod, and bestowing a Cap, and a White Garment on him. Of which, and infinite other instances, that might be produced, what account can be given, but that Men have generally thought such solemnities but requisite to imprint the things, to which they were annexed, upon the minds of those, that were concern'd, and procure a due estimate thereof? But so it appears, that they themselves were in a great measure perswaded,
 who

who shew'd themselves the greatest Enemies of the Ceremonies of the Church ; Because obliging those, that took their *solemn League, and Covenant*, to swear to the Contents thereof with their *hands lift up to the most High God*, as is expressed in the very entrance of it. For why that Ceremony of *lifting up of the hands*, especially in a *Covenant*, that was intended to beat down the supposed superstition of the *Church of England*, were it not that they themselves found it in a manner necessary to awaken the minds of Men to intend the Religion of it ?

But beside that humane nature doth, by the very contexture of it, require such kind of solemnities to awaken their minds, and affections ; It is not a little to be considered of *what use they are to procure respect to those Institutions, to which they have been at any time annexed*. For may not Men observe that usefulness in the solemnities of all *civil affairs*, and particularly in those solemnities, which are observ'd in *Courts of Judicature* ? Doth not the very *raising high* of those *Benches*, on which
the

the Judges sit, admonish Men of their Superiority over them? Do not those Robes, whereby they are differenced from other Men, draw the Eyes of the Vulgar to them, yea mind them of that greater difference there is between the Judges, and themselves, as to that power, wherewith they are also invested? Have not the same persons therefore (whatever clamour hath been rais'd against things of that nature) kept up them, and the like solemnities among them? Have they not done it in those very instances, which have been scrupled at in the Church? For how superstitious a thing in a Bishop, or other Clergy Man hath the use of that Cap been, which these earthly Gods the Judges, and when they are about their great Master's work, do not only not scruple at, but diligently retain? As knowing, that such *marks of distinction* do naturally lead Men to consider those persons, or things, to which they are apply'd, as of a peculiar nature, and accordingly, if they deserve it, to respect them. And if such be the usefulness of external solemnities in other matters, why

why should they be excluded from our Religion? Nay, why should they not (considering the momentousness thereof) be rather applied to it?

Especially if we consider thirdly *the nature of that Religion*, with whose Offices they are intermixed by us. For though that do more peculiarly call us to the intending of spiritual things; Though it do loudly proclaim the abrogation of the Ceremonial Law of *Moses*, and not obscurely condemn the substituting of any the like burdensome one: Yet as it no where condemns such a number of Ceremonies, as may serve the better to lead Men to the contemplation, and regard of spiritual things, so it gives a sufficient countenance to them by the Sacraments I am now upon, and by those other usances, which were in vogue with the first Professors of it. For how can that Religion be look'd upon as an enemy to Ceremonies, which requires Men to be initiated into it by the *water, and immersion of Baptism*? Yea to keep up their interest in it by partaking of the *Bread, and Wine of the Eucharist*,

(p) Mark 6.
11.

(q) Acts 13.
51.

(r) ---18. 6.

Eucharist, those signs of our Saviour's Crucified Body, and of the spiritual benefits we reap by it? And though we do not find that our Saviour instituted any other Ceremonies, or at least not with a design of giving them the same lasting obligation; Yet as we find our Saviour giving command to his Disciples, when he first sent them out to Preach, *to shake off the dust of their Feet* (p) against those that would not hear them, as a testimony of their contempt of God's word, and of their own resolution not to have to do with them in the like kind, which was a kind of Excommunication of them; So we find that *Paul*, and *Barnabas* (though under no obligation from the former command, because but a temporary one) *shook off the dust of their feet* (q) against those *Jews of Antioch*, that rejected, and expelled them, as the same *S. Paul* after that, when the *Jews of Corinth* opposed themselves, and blasphem'd, *shaking his raiment* at them (r), as a testimony of his rejecting them, in like manner, and leaving them to go unto the Gentiles.

For

For what was this but to declare by a significant Ceremony, that as they had rejected the Counsel of God toward themselves, so God had rejected them in like manner, neither would that his Ministers should make the like proposals to them? The same is yet more to be said upon the account of *Imposition of hands*, and which, though from no Command of Christ, was either used, or approved by the Apostles themselves, both in the *Ordination* of Ministers (*f*), and *receiving penitent* Sinners to Absolution (*t*), and pardon. For these being noted Acts of that Religion, which we profess, and yet by the allowance of the Apostles themselves transacted by the Ceremony of Imposition of Hands, make it evident, that our Religion doth rather commend, than reject such visible solemnities, where they are sparingly, and discreetly apply'd.

(*f*) 2 Tim.
1. 6.

(*t*) 1 Tim. 5.
22.

That first charge against the sign of the Cross being thus wip'd off, even that which pretends to discard it upon the account of its being a Ceremony; Let us see, whether it be likely to suffer any more by

G

the

the pretence of its being *an addition of Men to the Institution of Christ*, yea to one, *that is not without visible solemnities of his own appointment*: Such additions seeming to imply the *imperfection* of that, to which they are made, and which there is the less reason to believe in the present affair, because care hath been taken by our Saviour as to the outward form of its Administration, as well as to more material things. And surely so such *Additions* might very well be thought to do, if either they were represented as of the *Essence* of the Sacrament, or our Saviour had professed to *prescribe*, or direct the *whole form* of the Administration of it. But as it is notorious enough, that the Church of *England* doth not represent the sign of the *Cross* as pertaining to the *Essence* of the Sacrament, because administering it after Baptism first given, yea after the mention of the Minister's *receiving* the baptized person into the *Congregation of Christ's flock*; So our Saviour is so far from prescribing the whole external form of its Administration, that he hath left us to the
 general

general tenour of his Doctrine, and the directions of our own reason, even for those things that are more material, yea for such as are directed (*u*) by those very Men, who cry out against us for adding to Christ's Institution. For where, I beseech you, is there any prescription of other words concerning Baptism, than what is imply'd in that short belief, into which he commands to Baptize? Where to admonish all, that are present, to look back to their own Baptism, and to repent of the violations of the Covenant they made with God in it? Where any directions for requiring the Parent of the Child to bring him up in the nurture of the Lord, yea to require the Parents solemn promise for the performance of it? Nay where, which is of all others the most material, any Prayer to Almighty God for the sanctifying of the Water he is going to make use of, and which I no way doubt is necessary to the Consecration of it? All, that the *Institution* of Baptism represents to us, being the baptizing those, that offer themselves to it, in the name of the Fa-

(*u*) See the Directory in the Administration of Baptism.

ther, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost. Now if our Saviour hath not professed to prescribe, even as to the things before directed, but left Men to the general conduct of his Doctrine, and the guidance of their own reason; What appearance is there as to his prescribing after what external form, and order, all these things were to be done, and which if he hath not, there is no doubt the Governours of the Church may order, as they shall see fit, yea do so without any fear of being thought to charge his Institutions with imperfection? They being not to be thought to do so, who prescribe rules concerning those things, which the Institutions of Christ profess not to give perfect directions in. The only thing, which hath occasion'd Men's misapprehensions first, and then their passing so severe a Censure upon humane prescriptions in this kind, is an hasty opinion they have taken up of *Christ's* being as particular in directing the external management of sacred Duties, as *Moses* appears to have been as to the services of the Law. For which yet they have had no other

ther pretence, than a misapplied Text of the *Author to the Hebrews* (w), (w) Heb. 3.2. even *Christ's* being as *faithful in that house of God*, which was committed to his charge, as *Moses was in his*. But beside that there appear not any such particular directions from God to our *Saviour*, as there were sometime given to *Moses*, and our *Saviour* therefore not to be look'd upon as unfaithful, for not reaching out such particular directions to us; Besides that, if our *Saviour* did not furnish such particular directions, yet he hath furnished his Church with a far greater portion of his Spirit, and which may serve to it as a guide to fit those Services for its respective members; Beside lastly that the Services he enjoyn'd, because to be exercised among people of several Nations, and humours, were not capable, as to circumstances, of such strict limitations, as that, which was to be exercised in one single Nation only: There is nothing more evident to those, that read the Scriptures, than that *Christ* hath given no such particular directions, and all Arguments from *Christ's fidelity* therefore of no

more avail in this affair, than those, which the *Papists* are wont to draw from the *wisdom* and *goodness* of *God*, toward the proving of an *Infallible* Guide. For as no wise Man will be perswaded by such Arguments against the Testimony of his own senses, which assure him of the errors of those, whom they would have to be Infallible; So no considering Man will be perswaded by the other into a belief of those particular directions, which are not any where to be seen, nor which they themselves, who maintain those directions, have yet been able to shew. For when they have said all they can toward the evincing of their Conclusion, the utmost they are able to prove is, that *Christ* hath given some general directions concerning the Administration of religious Offices, and which as it doth not prejudice the giving of more particular ones, so doth much less make them to reflect any imperfection upon the Institution of *Christ*, because pretending not to concern it self about them.

One other Charge there is, which is more peculiar to the sign of the
Cross,

Cross, and that is its being a *relique* of *Popery*, or giving too much countenance to the *Papists* abuses of it. But as they, who advance the former of these, make *Popery* much more Antient, than it is for the advantage of *Protestantism* to allow ; It being certain from *Tertullian* (x), that this Ceremony was in use in his time in almost all the actions they set about : So our Church hath taken care to prevent in its own Members all misapplications of it, or the giving the least encouragement to those, that are made of it by others ; Partly by confining the use of it to the Administration of Baptism, and partly by representing it as only a *token* of Men's being not ashamed to own the Faith, and reproaches of him, who suffered upon it. Which is certainly a more proper course to discountenance *Popery*, than it can be thought to be to remove the use of it altogether : Because at the same time we disavow the errors of that, we shew by our Practice our allowance of the Ceremony it self, and, together therewith, our accordance

(x) *De Coronâ*
cap. 3.

with the *Primitive Church*, which is the only plausible thing the *Papists* have to bolster up their own cause, or reproach us with the neglect of.

A
 DIGRESSION
 Concerning
 ORIGINAL SIN,
 By way of
 PREPARATION
 TO THE
 Following Discourses.

The Contents.

Of the ground of the present Digression concerning Original Sin, and enquiry thereupon made, what Original Sin is. Which is shewn in the General to be such a corruption of the Nature of every Man, that is naturally engendered of the off-spring of Adam, whereby it becomes averse from every thing, that is good, and inclinable to every thing, that is evil.

evil. The nature of that corruption more particularly enquir'd into, and shewn by probable Arguments to be no other, than a Privation of a Supernatural Grace. That there is such a thing, as we have before described, evidenced at large from the Scripture, and that evidence farther strengthned by the experience we have of its effects, and the acknowledgments of the wiser Heathen. Enquiry next made from whence it had its beginning, which is shewn to have been not from any evil Spirit, or Dæmon, the pravity of matter, or the evil habits the Soul contracted in a præexistent state, but from the pravity of our first Parents. This last at large confirm'd out of the Doctrine of the Scripture, and followed by some light reflections upon the means, by which it is conveyed. A more just account from the Scripture of its being truly, and properly a sin, partly from its having the title of a sin, but more especially from its being represented as such, upon the account of our Obligation to the contrary. A consideration of those Objections, which are common-

ly made against the Doctrine of Original Sin ; Which are shewn either not to be of that force, whereof they are esteem'd, or however not to be a sufficient bar to what the Scripture hath declar'd concerning it.

AN account being thus given of the outward visible Sign of Baptism, which is the first of those things I propos'd to entreat of ; Reason would, (as well as the method before laid down), that I should consider the things signified by it : Which, on the part of God, and Christ, are an *inward and Spiritual Grace*, as, on the part of the baptized, an *Abrenunciation of their former sins*, and a *resolution to believe, and act, as Christianity obligeth them to do*. But because both the one, and the other of these suppose the baptized persons to have been before in a sinful Estate, and our Catechism in particular to have been *born* in it, and by that, as well as by the sins they afterward contracted, to be made the *Children of wrath* ; Therefore it will be but necessary for us to premise something

con-

Question.

What is the inward, and spiritual Grace ?

Answer.

A death unto Sin, and a new birth unto Righteousness. For being by nature born in Sin, and the Children of wrath, we are hereby made the Children of Grace.

concerning that sinful Estate, as which Baptism both presupposeth, and professeth to provide a remedy for.

Now as that sinful State, whereof we speak, is best known by the name of *Original Sin*, and will therefore most commodiously be described by it; So I will make it my business to enquire *What that is, and what appearance of the being of it, from whence it had its beginning, and by what means it is conveyed, whether, as it hath for the most part the name of a Sin, so it be truly, and properly such, and what is to be said to the Objections, that are made against it.*

I. To begin with the *first* of these, even what *Original Sin* is, and which, in the general, may be defin'd to be such a *Corruption of the nature of every Man, that is naturally ingendred of the off-spring of Adam, whereby it becomes averse from every thing, that is good, and inclin'd to every thing, that is evil.* I call it a *Corruption of nature* to distinguish it from *nature* considered in it self, and as it was in the first formation of it: Partly, because Nature being, as such, the

the work of God, cannot be supposed to be corrupt; And partly because the Scripture assures us, that whatsoever it now is, God made it upright*, and so free from all corruptions whatsoever. But so also do I entitle it the Corruption of the Nature of *every Man, that is naturally ingendred of the off-spring of Adam*: Partly, because the Scripture, where it entreats of it, represents *all Men* as under the Contagion of it, and partly to exempt our *Lord, and Saviour* from it, who was ingendred after another manner, and whom the same Scripture assures to have been *free† from all sin*, yea to have been *so* from his Birth*. I call it lastly such a Corruption of humane Nature, whereby it is *averse from every thing, that is good, and inclin'd to every thing, that is evil*. Which I do upon the account of the Scripture's representing it as a *sinful (a) one*, and which, as such, (a) Psa. 51. 5. will make those in whom it is, *averse from good*, as well as *inclinable to evil*, yea *averse from all*, that is good, and *inclinable to all evil*: Because good, yea. all good is opposite

* Eccl. 7. 29.

† 2 Cor. 5. 21.

* Luk. 1. 35.

to such an estate, and evil, yea all evil connatural to it. If they, in whom that corruption of nature doth as yet abide, be not always actually prevail'd upon to reject that good, from which we have affirm'd them to be so averse, or to pursue that evil, to which we have affirm'd them to be inclinable, it is not because they want any averfeness for the one, or inclination to the other, but for some other collateral considerations: Such as is, for example, the reputation, or advantage, that may accrue to them from the espousing of any thing, that is good, or the omission of any thing, that is evil. For all good, and all evil being of one uniform nature, because becoming good or evil by the conformity they bear to the divine Laws, or by their deviation from them; where there is an inclination to any thing, that is good, there must be an inclination to all, that is of the same nature; as on the other side where an averfeness from any thing, that is evil, an averfeness for all that, which is alike a transgression of the Divine Laws. But as therefore nothing can
hinder

hinder us from representing natural corruption as making Men averse from all that is good, and inclinable to every thing that is evil ; So neither can any thing oblige us to extend the force of it so far, as to make it to determine them in all their actions, and accordingly to carry them to an actual rejection of all, that is good, or a pursuance of all, that is evil : Partly because Men may, and often do act contrary to their natural aversions, or inclinations, where there is hope of temporal advantage, or fear of any temporal evil ; And partly, because we do not only find few natural Men proceeding to the extremity of Impiety, but find also great variety among them in the omission of good Actions, or the commission of those that are evil. Of which variety what account could be given, when the Corruption of Nature is, and must be equal, because all Men were alike in, and are alike descended from *Adam*, were it not that even that Corruption leaves place for the performance of many good, and the avoiding of many things, that are evil ? For to ascribe that variety either

ther wholly, or principally to the different degrees of God's restraining Grace, is not only to speak without all Authority, that I know of, but to take away all diversity between the evil demerits of natural Men, and, together therewith, all different degrees of punishment; yea to make the Corruption of Nature the only proper ground of punishment. For as, if there be nothing but God's restraining Grace to take off natural Men from falling into the worst of sins, the greatest actual sinner cannot deserve more punishment, than he who offends in a far less degree; Because all demerit ariseth from the pravity of the will, which is not more or less for the meer absence, or presence of God's restraining Grace: So the greatest actual sinner cannot become obnoxious to punishment upon the score of any other Corruption than that of Nature; That as it makes all his actual sins to be necessary, and therefore in reason to bear the whole blame, and punishment, so receiving no new aggravation from the want of that restraining Grace, which might

might have withheld the party from them, in as much as that want (if it be a fault) is no less the result of his natural corruption, than his actual offences are. But therefore also as we cannot look upon natural corruption as determining Men to all their actual errors, without taking away all diversity between the demerits of natural Men, yea making natural Corruption the only proper ground of their punishment; so they, who do so, will be found to contradict the declarations of the Scripture, as well as the allowed practice of the World. For why, if there be no difference between the demerits of natural Men, should those, that are in Authority, mete out different punishments to them according to the different degrees, or kinds of those offences, which they commit? Nay, why should the Scripture affirm, that it shall be *more tolerable* for some sinners (b), than for others at the great day of judgment? That, as it is a judgment of righteousness, so being consequently to mete out equal punishments to all sinners, if there be but an equality in their de-

H

merits.

(b) Matt. 11: 22, 24.

merits. Again, if natural Corruption be upon the matter the only proper ground of punishment, as it must of necessity be, if it be the unavoidable cause of actual sins; How comes the Scripture to declare, that God will reward every Man according to his works (c), yea the wicked (d) according to his works, as well as the righteous according to theirs? For if natural Corruption be the only proper ground of punishment, the works of Men *in propriety of Speech* can have no concernment in it, and much less (as the Scripture declares) be the principal object of judgment, and therefore of that punishment, which it shall award. The utmost in my opinion, that can be said in this particular, is that as Men by the Corruption of their Nature are averse from every thing, that is good, so that averfeness will indispose those, in whom that Corruption abides, to all good actions whatsoever, and infallibly take them off from them, where either some work of God upon their minds doth not thrust them on to them, or the comeliness, or profitableness thereof shall not more strongly

(c) Rom. 2.6.

(d) — 8.

strongly impel them to the practice of them. The *former* whereof will make the consent of such persons even to those good actions, which they perform, incomplete, and imperfect, and indeed a consent to them rather as expedient, than good; whence it is that our Church (*e*) (*e*) Art. 13. represents them as *having the nature of sins*: The *latter* cause them to neglect all such, as are not in a manner thrust upon them by God, or have not one of the former motives to incite them to the practice of them, yea present to their minds, when they ought to make use of them. Which will occasion such persons for the most part to neglect all good actions, where there is not place for serious thoughts, as in cases of surprise, or where they have not been habituated to the practice of vertue, or to the consideration of the comeliness or profitableness thereof. But as where there is place for serious thoughts, there may be place also for the former motives to impel Men to the practice of that, from which they are otherwise sufficiently averse; So it is not unlikely

that the minds of those, who have been before habituated to the practice, or contemplation of Vertue, may be thrust on by the former motives to pursue many things, that are good, yea acquit themselves singularly in them. Of which yet if any doubt be made, we have the laudable example of several Heathens to convince us thereof, and who, because Heathen, cannot be supposed to be free from the power of natural Corruption, or to be thrust on by other motives, than the former, to the doing of such actions, from which they are naturally so averse. In like manner, As Men by the Corruption of their Nature are inclin'd to every thing that is evil, as well as averse from every thing that is good; So that inclination will dispose those, in whom it is, to an allowance of all evil actions, and infallibly betray them, into them, where God's restraining Grace doth not withhold them, or the indecency, or dangerous consequences of the other do not alike keep them back. The *former* whereof will make their abstaining even from those evil actions, which they

they avoid, to be but an imperfect abstinence from them, and indeed an abstinence from them rather as inexpedient, than evil; The *latter* cause them to fall into all such, from which they are not restrain'd by God, or by a present, and intense consideration of the indecency, or danger of them. Which will occasion such persons for the most part to fall into all evil actions, where there is not room for serious thoughts, as in cases of surprise, or where they have not been habituated to the avoiding of vice, or the consideration of the indecency, or dangerousness thereof. But as, where there is room for serious thoughts, there may also be place for the former reasons to take them off from the practice of that, to which they are otherwise sufficiently inclin'd; So it is not unlikely, that the minds of those, who have been before habituated to the avoiding of Vice, or the consideration of the indecency, or dangerousness thereof, may be taken off by the former reasons from the pursuit of evil things, yea acquit themselves

singularly in it. As is farther evident from the resistance, that hath been made by several Heathens to all the temptations of sin, and who, because Heathen, cannot be suppos'd either to have been free from natural Corruption, or to have been taken off by other means, than the former, from the doing of those evil actions, to which they were so strongly inclin'd.

But because what we have hitherto said concerning the Corruption of our Nature doth rather tend to shew *what effects* it hath upon us, than what that Corruption is; And because that *word*, whereby we have chosen to express it, is but a *Metaphorical* one, and will therefore serve yet less clearly to declare the thing intended by it; Therefore it may seem but reasonable to enquire yet farther, *what it is*, and *wherein* it doth consist, as without which we shall discourse but imperfectly concerning it. Now as that question cannot otherwise be solv'd, than by the knowledge of that *Estate*, of which it is affirm'd to be a Corruption; So I shall therefore

therefore enquire again what that *Estate* was, and then what *relation* this *Corruption* beareth to it. As touching that estate, wherein God did at first create our Nature, most certain it is first (for so *Solomon* (f) (f) Eccl. 7. 29. affirms it to be) that it was an estate of *uprightness*, that is to say such an estate as fitted Man for the obedience of all those Laws, which God had obliged him to perform. That, as it is the most usual signification of the word we render *upright*, and accordingly rendred by the *Chaldee* Paraphrast *right, and innocent* before God, so best answering the account before given concerning the depravation of humane Nature, and particularly in those of the Female Sex. For *Solomon* speaking in the 26th verse of the deceitfulness of that Sex, and of the influence that deceitfulness of theirs would have upon sinful Men; Affirming afterwards because representing the event of his search as contrary to the desires of his Soul, that though he could find one Man among a thousand of a better temper, yet he could not find One such Woman among them all; He must confe-

quently, when he comes to say that he found only that *God made Man upright*, be thought to mean such an uprightness, - as was opposite to that general depravation, whereof he before complain'd. There being therefore no doubt to be made that God created our Nature in a state of *uprightness*, even in such a one as fitted Man for the obedience of all those Laws, which he was obliged to comply with ; Enquire we in the second place wherein that state of uprightness consisted, but which we shall not find to be of so easie a resolution, as the former : Because there is some presumption of its consisting in a right disposition of our natural faculties ; And there is some presumption of its consisting in a supernatural Grace over-ruling, and directing those natural faculties to those pious purposes, for which they were chiefly design'd. We have to persuade the former of these the natural ability of the understanding to discern the invisible things of God by the things, which he hath made, and the natural propension of the Will to embrace that, which is good, and

and therefore also the chiefest good, where that is clearly apprehended, and where there is no depravation in the Will (as to be sure there was not at first) to draw it to lesser ones. In fine, we have to perswade it the power the superiour faculties of the Soul have even now over the Inferiour ones, and which we may well believe in that state of Innocency to have been of sufficient force to keep them within those bounds, which God, and Nature had set them. This, I say, we have to perswade that uprightness, wherein our first Parents were Created, to have consisted in a right disposition of their natural faculties; And we are not without reason on the other hand to perswade the same uprightness of Nature to have consisted in its being over-ruled, and directed by a supernatural Grace: Because without such a supernatural Grace our first Parents could not have come to the knowledge of God, but by the knowledge of Created Beings, and the excellencies thereof, and (what that knowledge would have produc'd) a love, and affection for them. Which would

would not only have made God to be lov'd after his Creatures, who as being the first, and chiefest good ought to have the precedency thereof, but endangered also the diminution of our affections to him by the prepossession of them by the other. To which of these two reasonings to give the preeminency is hard to say, and I will not therefore be over positive in determining concerning the force of them, nor therefore, whether Original Righteousness were a right disposition of our natural faculties, or a supernatural Grace over-ruling, and directing them. But as how equal soever those reasonings may be in themselves, yet nothing will hinder our inclining rather to the one, than the other, if the Scripture, which is the best judge of things of that nature, seem to favour such an inclination; So I must needs say that the Scripture (g) seems to favour those reasonings, which makes Original Righteousness to be a Supernatural Grace: Because not only representing *Adam* as imbued from the very first with the knowledge of God, which yet he could not be without

(g) Gen. i.
28, &c.
—2. 15, &c.

without a revelation from him, but as moreover freely conversing with God, and receiving both Laws, and priviledges from him. For as it appears from thence, that God did immediately shine upon his mind, and so far forth therefore influenced him by a supernatural Grace, so it is not unlikely that he, who so shone upon his mind, did as immediately influence his will, and affections, and so dispose him to a compliance with those Laws he impos'd upon him : That, as it was but agreeable to the immediate illumination of his understanding, so becoming yet more necessary by the different inclinations of his Flesh, and Spirit, and which the presence of a Supernatural Grace may seem but requisite to bring to a due compliance with each other, and with those Laws, which God had impos'd upon them both. And I shall only add, that if that uprightness, wherein our Nature was at first Created, were no other than a Supernatural Grace, as is at least highly probable from the former reasonings, and the declarations of the Scripture ; We shall need to assign no other relation

relation of that Corruption of Nature, whereof we speak, than that of a *simple privation* of the other. For if the desires of the Flesh could so far prevail even under a supernatural Grace, as to carry our first Parents to the eating of that fruit, which God had so severely forbidden them; The *simple privation* of that supernatural Grace may well suffice to give birth to all our evil inclinations, and consequently pass for a sufficient account of that Corruption of our Nature, whereby, as I said before, we become inclinable to Evil, as well as averse from Good, and which what evidence we have of the *being* of, is in the next place to be enquir'd.

II. Now as we cannot certainly better inform our selves concerning the present state of our Nature, than from him who, as he was the Author of it, so is intimately present to it; So I will therefore begin with that account, which he hath given us of it, and which we shall find to bear an ample Testimony to that Corruption, whereof we speak. For the evidencing whereof I will shew
First,

First, that it affirmeth all Men whatsoever to be under sin, yea under a perpetual course of it. Secondly, that it affirmeth them to be so from the time they begin to be in a capacity to offend. Thirdly, that they are so from a principle bred in them, and derived to them from their birth.

1. That all Men are under sin *S. Paul* doth so fully declare, that we shall need no other Testimony than his to evince it ; More particularly, where he affirmeth that *both Jews and Gentiles (h) are all under sin ;* (h) Rom. 3. 9. That though the *former* may seem of all others to have been most free from it, yet the Law (i) had not (i) ---- 19. stuck to affirm, that *there was none (k) righteous, even among them, no (k) ---- 10. &c. not one ;* That *there was none that understood, none that sought after God ;* That they were *all gone out of the way, they were altogether become unprofitable, that there was none, that did good, no not one ;* In fine, that *all the World must thereby (l) be look'd upon as (l) ---- 19. guilty before God, because, as he afterward (m) speaks, all have sinned, (m) ---- 23. and come short of the glory of God.*

But

But so the same Scripture did long before declare, with an addition of all Men's being under a perpetual course of sin, as well as in some measure tainted with it; It being not only the voice of God concerning that part of Mankind, that liv'd before the flood, that *every*

(n) Gen. 6. 5. *imagination (n) of the thought of their heart was only evil continually*, but a-

like intimated by him concerning that part, which was to follow, even to the end of the World. For

(o) ---8. 21. affirming, as he doth (o), that he

would *not any more drown the World*, because *the imagination of Man's heart is evil from his youth*, he both supposeth that Mankind would again give occasion to it by their evil imaginations (as without which otherwise there could be no occasion for God's suspending it) and that Mankind would do so also in every individual, and Generation of it: The *former*, because he speaks of the imaginations of Mankind in the general, and which are therefore to be extended to all the individuals of it; The *latter*, because if any Generation of Men were likely to be free from those

those imaginations, there would *so far forth* have been no need of his declaring, that he would not drown the World, because no ground for bringing it on the Inhabitants thereof. But therefore, as we have reason to believe from the places before, recited, that the World always was, and will be under sin, yea under a constant course of it; So we shall be yet more confirmed in it, if we compare the latter place with the former, as the likeness, that is between them, will oblige us to do: There being not a more apt sense of that latter Speech of God, than that he would not again drown the Earth, because he knew the imaginations of Men would be as evil as they had before been, and he therefore, if he were dispos'd to take that vengeance, to bring a flood often upon it, to the no profit of those, that inhabited it, as well as to the defacing of the Earth it self. Which will make the condition of Man to be so sinful, that it cannot be otherwise, unless by some powerful means delivered from it.

2. But so also may we infer from thence, which was the *second* thing
to

to be prov'd, that all Men are under sin from the time they begin to be in a capacity to offend: That, as it affirms *the imagination of Men's heart to be evil*, so to be evil *from their Youth*, and, as I should therefore think, from the time they begin to be in a capacity to be guilty of it. Not that that Age, to which we are wont to give the denomination of *Youth*, is the first wherein Mankind begins to be in a capacity to offend (for there is but too much evidence of that in the riper years of *Childhood*) but that we cannot well understand that Text of any other *youthful Period*, than that wherein Mankind begins to be in a capacity to reason, and consequently also to offend: Partly, because the *word* we render *Youth* is sometime us'd even for infancy (*p*), and ought not therefore without manifest reason to be removed too far from it; But more especially because it is the manifest design of God in the place we speak of to aggravate the evil of Men's imaginations from the earliness thereof, and that *earliness* therefore to be carried as high, as the capacity Men

are

(*p*) Judges
13. 7.
Exod. 2. 6.

are in to *imagine evil* will suffer the doing of it.

3. Now as nothing therefore can be wanting toward the proof of Original Corruption, than that they, who are so universally, and so early under sin, are so also from an inward principle, and such an inward principle too, as was derived to them from their birth; so we shall not it may be need any other proof of that, than their being so universally, and early under the other: The *former* of these perswading Men's being under sin from some inward principle, the *latter* from such an inward principle, as is deriv'd to them from their Birth. That I make Men's being so universally under sin, an argument of their being so from some inward principle, is because as so general an effect must be supposed to have some general Cause, so no external Cause, how general soever, can be supposed to produce it without the assistance of the other. As will appear if we consider the force of *example*, and which as it is the most general, and the most effectual external Cause, that can be assign'd,

so is that, into which they who deny the Corruption of Nature, are wont to resolve the universality of sin. For neither first is even *Example* of so great force, as infallibly, and universally to draw Men to the imitation of it; For some Men are Vertuous, even when they have an ill example before them, and others as Vitious, where they have a good. Neither secondly hath it any force, but what it receives from Men's aptness to imitate those, with whom they converse. Which as it will make it necessary for us to have recourse to an inward principle, even for those effects, which are produc'd by the mediation of example, so make our very aptness to imitate the evil examples of others, a branch of that inward principle, which we affirm to be the cause of so universal an impiety. Only because we are yet upon Scripture proofs, and which the more express they are, so much the more convictive; Therefore I shall yet more particularly endeavour to evince from thence, that as all Men are under sin, so they are so by an innate principle. But so *S. Paul* gives

gives us clearly enough to understand, because both asserting such a principle, and that all actual sins are the issues of it: The *former*, where he represents even the Man, who was under the conviction of the *Law* (and who therefore might be suppos'd to be most free from the contagion of sin) as *Carnal*, yea *sold under it* (q), as one, who had *sin* (q) Rom. 7: 14. dwelling in him (for so he affirms no less than twice (r)) and as one too, (r)-----17. who had *a law in his members* (s) -----20. that warred against the law of his (s)-----23. mind, or (as he afterwards entitles it) *a law of sin*; The latter, where he represents that *carnality*, and *sinful captivity*, under which the Jew was, as the cause of his *doing what he would not* (t), and *omitting what he would*, (t) -----15. That *sin, which dwelt in him*, as *doing all the evil* (u) *he committed*, (u) ----17.20. And that *law, that was in his members*, as *warring against the law of his mind* (w), and *bringing him into Captivity unto the law of sin*. (w)-----23. For what more could be said on the one hand to shew the thing S. Paul there speaks of to be an *inward evil principle*, and which, because even in those, who were un-

der the Law, is much more to be supposed in the Gentiles? Or what more on the other to shew that evil principle to be the *parent of our actual sins*, yea that which gives being to them all. And I know nothing to take off the force of it, but a supposition of *St. Paul's* speaking in that place of *Evil habits*, and which as they must be confessed to be of the same pernicious efficacy with Original Corruption, so to have been for the most part the condition both of *Jew*, and *Gentile*, before they came to be overtaken by the Gospel. But how first supposing the *Apostle* to have spoken *only of evil habits* (for nothing hinders us from assigning them a part in that *Body of sin*) How first, I say, doth that agree with the account he before gave concerning sins *entring in* (x) *by Adam*, and our being *constituted* (y) *sinners* by him. For though Original Corruption may come from him, yet evil habits can be only from our selves, and consequently those sins, that flow from them? How secondly supposing none but evil habits to be here intended, can we make that *Body*, or *law of sin*,

(x) Rom. 5.

12.

(y)-----19.

sin, whereof S. Paul speaks, to be the portion of all, that are under an obligation to Baptism, as that Apostle plainly supposeth, when he makes the design of Baptism (2) to be *the* (3)----6. 6. *destruction* of it? For to say nothing at present concerning the case of Infants, because the best evidence of their Obligation to Baptism is the Corruption of their Nature, and that Obligation therefore rather to be prov'd from Natural Corruption, than Natural Corruption from it; Neither can it be deny'd, even from the Commandment *, that our Saviour gave concerning Baptism, that all adult persons are under an Obligation to it, nor therefore but that they carry about them that *body of sin*, which Baptism was intended for the destruction of. But so all adult persons cannot be supposed to do, if that *body of sin* be no other, than evil habits; Because it must be sometime after that maturity of theirs before they can come to those evil habits, or therefore to be under an Obligation to that *Sacrament*, which is to destroy it. In fine, how supposing none but evil habits to be

* Mat 28.19.

† Rom. 7. 9.

intended by that *body*, or *law of sin*, whereof the Apostle speaks, can we give an account of *so holy, and just a Law*, as that of *Moses* is, *stirring* † *Concupiscence* in those, that are under it, and not rather hindring it from coming to effect. For as nothing hinders the proposing of that Law before such persons come to any evil habits, and therefore also before there is any thing in them to stir them up to such a *Concupiscence*; So nothing can hinder that Law, when duly proposed to them, from preventing all such *Concupiscence*, as it was the design of the Lawgiver to forbid: Because as the persons we speak of must be supposed to be without any contrariety in their Nature to the matter of that Law, which is propos'd; So they must also be suppos'd to be in that state, wherein God had set them, and (because God cannot be thought to place Men in any other estate, than that of uprightness) in such a state, as will make them willing to listen to the divine Laws, and receive their directions from them. By which means the divine Laws shall rather keep
Men's

Men's Concupiscence from coming to effect, than give any occasion for the stirring of it. I conclude therefore from that, as well as the former arguments, that the evil principle spoken of by *S. Paul* cannot be evil habits, and consequently nothing more left to us to demonstrate, than that it is derived to us from our Birth, or rather from our Conception in the Womb, which is all, that is affirmed concerning Original Corruption. Now that that evil principle, whereof we speak, is derived to us from our Birth, will become at least probable from what was before said concerning the *earliness* of Men's being under sin, yea their being so, as the Scripture instructs us, even *from their Youth*. For as it is hard to believe, that all Men should be so early under sin, if it were not from some inward principle, that was antecedent to that Age (For what should otherwise hinder some of them at least from preserving their integrity for some time, especially supposing, (as that tender Age maketh it reasonable to suppose) a more peculiar watchfulness of the

Divine Providence over it?) So it will be much more hard to believe, supposing that evil principle to be antecedent to their Youth, that it should not be derived to them from their Conception, and Birth : The Ages preceding that being not in a capacity to produce in themselves such an evil principle, and therefore to be suppos'd to have had it transmitted to them together with their Nature, and so also by the same means, and from the same time, in which that their Nature was. And indeed, as even the tenderest age falls under death, and not unreasonably therefore concluded to be some way, or other under sin, if (as

† Rom. 5. 12. S. Paul † speaks) *death enter'd by it, and so pass'd upon all Men, for that all have sinned* ; So there want not some places of Scripture, which do yet more directly evince, that the first beginnings of our Nature are tainted with that, of which we speak.

(a) Job. 14. 4. Of this sort I reckon that of Job (a), which is so commonly apply'd to this affair, even his demanding of God ,

(b) ~~and~~ I, &c. with reference to himself (b), and all other Men, who could *bring a clean*

clean thing out of an unclean? and thereby therefore intimating that it was not to be done. For as it is manifest from his alledging that the better to countenance his own expostulation concerning God's *bringing him into judgment*, that by the unavoidable *uncleanness* there intimated must be meant a sinful one, as which alone could either dispose him to such actions, as could be a proper matter for judgment, or be alledged in bar to a severe one: So it is alike manifest from *Job's* asking, *who can bring a clean thing out of an unclean*, that Men are not only so unclean in their Nature, but that they become so by those evil principles, out of which they are *brought*, and so also from the time that they were separated from them. Of the same Nature is that of our Saviour, where he asserts the necessity of Men's being *born again of water, and the Spirit*, upon the account of their being before but *flesh(c)*, because *born of flesh*. (c) Joh. 3. 6. For as we cannot well understand our Saviour of any other *flesh*, than *flesh corrupted*, or rather of the whole Nature, that is so; Partly because
of

(d) *Ibid.*(e) Rom. 7.
18, 25.
Gal. 5. 19, 24.

(f) Psal. 51. 5.

(g) *Ham.*
Annot. in lo-
cum.

of the opposition, that is there made (d) between a fleshly, and spiritual temper, and partly because that is the most usual notion of it in the New (e) Testament: So neither therefore but conclude all Men to become such *flesh* by those *fleshly* persons, from whom they are born, and so also from the time that they receive their being from them. But of all the Texts of Scripture, which are commonly alledged in this affair (even the earliness of that evil principle, wherewith we have said all Men to be imbued) there is certainly none of greater force, than the profession, that *David* makes (f), that he was *shapen*, or born *in iniquity*, and *conceiv'd by his Mother in sin*; That, if it entreat of the Corruption of humane Nature, making it as early as the first beginnings of it, because speaking as manifestly of its Conception (g), and Birth. And indeed as we have no reason to believe from any thing the Scripture hath said concerning *David*, or his *Parents*, that what he spake of his own formation was to be understood of that alone; so we have much less

rea-

reason to believe, that he intended any other thing by the *sin*, and *iniquity* thereof, than that Original Corruption, whereof we speak. For beside that the letter of the Text is most agreeable to that notion, and not therefore without manifest reason to be diverted to another; Beside that that sense is put upon it by the most eminent *Fathers* (h) of the Church, and the Doctrine contained in it confirm'd by the *concordant* (i) *testimonies* of them all; Beside that that sense hath the suffrage of one of the most learned (k) of the *Jewish* Writers, as the thing it self the consentient belief of all the rest; *Aben Ezra* resolving the meaning of the *Psalmist* to be, that *in the hour of his Nativity the evil figment was planted in his heart*, even that *Concupiscence* (as he afterward interprets himself) *by which he was drawn into sin*: Beside all these, I say, it is no less agreeable to the scope of the whole Psalm, and particularly to the care he takes in the Verse before to condemn himself for his offences, and so justify the severity of God, if he should think good to take vengeance

of

(h) *Voss. Pelag. Hist. l. 2.*
Part. 1. Thes. 1.
 (i) *Ibid. Thes. 6.*

(k) *Ham. ubi. supra.*

of them. For what could be more suitable to that, than to lay open, together with his actual sins, that polluted Fountain from whence they came, and so shew himself to be vile upon more accounts, than one, and God to have as many reasons to chastise him? And I shall only add, that as that sense cannot therefore be fairly refus'd, because conformable to the *design* of the *Psalmist*, as well as to the *letter* of the Text it self, and to the interpretation of the *Antients*, as well as either; So *they* seem to me to add no small confirmation to it, who can find no other means to elude it, than by making the words of the same sense with that *hyperbolical* expression of the same Author, where he affirms (1), that *the wicked are estranged from the Womb, and that as soon as they are born, they go astray speaking lies*. For as it cannot be deny'd that there is a very wide difference between Men's *being conceived, and born in sin*, and their *going astray from their Mother's Womb, and their own birth*; This latter expression importing that iniquity, which follows after

(1) Psal. 58 3.

ter it, whereas the *former* denotes the condition of the Conception, and Birth it self : So it is evident from what the Psalmist adds in the place alledged concerning the wicked's *speaking lies*, that he there entreats of *actual sins*, which as no Man denies to require a more mature Age for the perpetration of, so make it necessary to allow an *Hyperbole* in it ; Whereas the place we insist upon hath not the least umbrage of actual sins, and is therefore under no necessity of being interpreted conformably to it.

But because it can hardly be imagin'd, but if there be such a thing as Original sin, it will produce *sutable effects* in those, in whom it is ; And because it can as little be thought, but that those effects will lye open to the observation of all, that shall take the pains to reflect upon them ; Therefore enquire we in the next place, whether that Original Sin, whereof we speak, doth not discover it self by *sutable effects*, and so add yet farther strength to what the Scripture hath affirm'd concerning it. A thing not to be doubted of,
if

(m) *Ibid.*

if we reflect upon the behaviour of Children, as soon as they come to have any use of reason. For do not some of those, as the *Psalmist* speaks (m), *go astray from their Mothers Womb, speaking lies?* Do not others discover in their actions as much of malice, and revenge? Are not a third sort as refractory to the commands of their Superiours? Doth not a fourth equally pride it self in all it's supposed excellencies? Now from whence, I beseech you, proceeds all this untowardness of behaviour, but from as untoward a principle, and such a one too, as is interwoven with their very Being, and derived to them with it? For shall we say from the force of Example? But experience assures us of the contrary, because visible in such Children, as have no such examples before them, and who moreover do not want a severe education to prevent, or correct it. Shall we then say from some previous habits? But the same experience assures us of the contrary, because it is antecedent to any evil habits, and therefore not imputable to them. Shall we say lastly (and more than that

that we cannot say) that it proceeds from their natural temperament? But as I no way doubt, and shall not therefore stick to confess, that the Corruption of our Nature runs out that way, which our natural temperament leads it; So I see no necessity to grant, that that natural temperament hath any other interest in our untowardness, than by inclining our natural Corruption to that *particular* evil, to which we are carried. For to make it any other way the cause of that untowardness is to charge it upon God, because he must be confess'd to be the Author of all that is purely natural in us. Only if it be said, that that natural temperament may incline Children, before they have any free use of reason, to those untowardnesses, whereof we speak, and so at length by the means of those untowardnesses produce such an habitual inclination to them, that their more free reason, when they come to it, shall not be able to surmount it; I answer, that that indeed might well enough be granted, if we had no reason to believe, that God would
so

so watch over them by his providence, as to hinder their natural temperament from having such an influence upon them. But as we have reason enough to believe, from the love God bears to his own Workmanship, as well as to Piety, and Vertue, that he would not be wanting in that particular to the estate of Children, if it were no other than such as he himself had plac'd them in; So we must therefore believe also, that that temperament of theirs is not the cause of their miscarriages, but somewhat else that is not from God, and which, because not from him, he doth not think himself under any necessity to provide against.

And indeed though some, who call themselves Christians, have notwithstanding the former evidences, oppos'd themselves against that, which we have offered as the Original cause thereof; Yet have the more sober Heathen, though ignorant of the occasion of it, both acknowledg'd, and lamented it, and so furnish'd us with a farther argument for the belief of it. For thus (as Dr. Jackson (n) did long since observe) we find one
of

(n) *Coll. of his Works, Book 10. Ch. 8.*

of them affirming that *the nature of Man is prone to lust, and another, that nature cannot separate just from unjust.* Thus a third (as the fore-mentioned Author remarks) that to Man of all the creatures is sorrow given for a p^ortion, to him luxury in innumerable fashions, and in every Limb; To him alone ambition, and avarice, to him alone an unmeasurable desire of living; In fine, that whilst it is given to other creatures, yea the most savage ones, to live peaceably, and orderly together, Man is naturally an enemy to those of his own stock. To the same purpose are those, which are quoted by Grotius (o), if they are not also yet more worthy of our remark; Such as are, that among the other incommodities of mortal nature there is the darkness of Men's minds, and not only a necessity of erring, but a love of errors; That we have all sinned, some in weightier instances, others in lighter, some of set purpose and design, others it may be carried away by other Men's wickedness; That we do not only offend, but we shall offend to the end of our lives, and although some one may

(o) De jure
Bell. ac. Pac.
li. 2. c. 20.
sect. 19. & in
Annot. in locum.

A Digression concerning

have so purg'd his mind, that nothing shall any more disturb, or deceive him, yet he comes to innocency by offending ; That this evil disposition is so natural to Men, that, if every one be to be punished, that hath it, no Man shall be free from punishment ; That there is therefore a necessity upon those, who are entrusted with the power of Chastisement, to wink at some errors ; He, who punisheth Men, as if they could be free from all sin, exceeding the measure of that correction, which is according to nature, or (as another hath expressed it) shewing himself injurious to the common infirmity of Men, and forgetful of that infirmity, which is humane, and universal. For as it is evident from these, and the like passages, that they, from whom they fell, had the same opinion of the State of Nature, which Christianity obligeth us to take up ; So that opinion of theirs cannot but add to the confirmation of our own, and to the belief of that depravation, which it is the design of this Discourse to evince : Because not taken up either in whole, or in part from prejudices imbib'd from Books, but from

from the experience they had of its effects, and which as they themselves could not but feel, and acknowledge, so we have no reason to question, because conscious of the like effects of it in our selves.

III. There being therefore no doubt to be made, but that there is such a thing as Original Sin, because sufficiently attested by the Doctrine of the Scripture, and our own, and other Men's experience; It cannot but be thought reasonable to enquire, *from whence it had its beginning*, and so much the rather because both Scripture, and reason assure us, that it cannot be thought to have had its Original from God. Now there are but four things, from whence it can be supposed to proceed, and within the consideration whereof therefore this Enquiry of ours will necessarily be bounded; some evil *Demon*, or *Spirit*, which concurs with God to our production, or the *natural pravity* of that matter, which God makes use of in order to it; Some *evil habits*, which Souls contracted, before they were sent

into their present bodies, or some *pravity in those from whom they first descended*, and which is transmitted from them to particular souls, and persons. The *first* of these opinions is attended with this great inconvenience among many others, that it chargeth God either with malignity, or impotency; With malignity, if willingly suffering any evil spirit to mix it self in his productions; With impotency, if not able to hinder it, though he would. The *second*, as it is alike injurious to the power of God, because subjecting that power of his to the indisposition of the matter, so it makes Original Sin to be natural, and unavoidable, and consequently also those actual sins, that flow from it. By which means it not only renders all our endeavours against them useless, but casts a blemish upon those divine Laws, which pretend to forbid them, and upon those divine judgments, which pretend to punish them. For neither can God without great unreasonableness forbid what is not to be avoided, nor punish it without the imputation of injustice. But it
may

may be though Original Sin had not its beginning either from some evil spirit, or the *pravity of the matter*, which are the two first opinions, which pretended to give an account of it; yet it might, as is suggested in the *third*, arise from such *evil habits*, as Men's souls contracted before their descent into this World, and into those bodies, wherewith they are invested. That indeed might yet more reasonably be believ'd, that I say not also (abstracting from the Authority of the Scripture) much more reasonably, than the account, that is given of it from *Adam*, if there were but equal reason to believe, that Men's Souls had any separate existence antecedently to their conception in the Womb. But as that is a thing for which there is not any solid ground either in reason, or Scripture, and the supposition of it therefore the meer issue of fancy, and conjecture; So it is sufficiently confuted by the ignorance Men's Souls are under of any such previous estate. For why, if Men's Souls had any such previous existence, should they not be conscious of it,

and of the things, that were performed by them in it? Nay, why should not God take care to fix such a remembrance in them, that so what was wanting in their former estate might be supply'd by them in their following one? For as it is not easie to suppose, that the corruptible body should so far stupefie the Soul, as to hinder it from emerging in time out of sleep, in which it may seem to have been cast, and accordingly from calling to mind what had been before transacted within it; Because though the Body may be some hindrance to the faculties of the Soul, yet it doth not hinder them from coming in time to exert their proper operations: So it is much less easie to suppose, that God should not however bring to it's memory its past State, and Actions, by which it offended against him; Partly to make it sensible of its former guilt, and God's choosing to punish it by thrusting it into a Body, and partly to make it so much the more careful to break off from those sins, by which it had before offended him; These, as they are the only imaginable

nable ends, why God should thrust an offending Soul into such a Body, so being perfectly lost to that Soul, in which there is no consciousness of it's former state, and of those enormities, which were contracted in it. I conclude therefore, that whatever may be said as to this particular concerning Original Sin, yet it did not take its rise from the evil acts, or habits of the Soul in any præexistent estate, and nothing therefore left to us to resolve it into, but the *depravedness of those, from whom we all descended*, and from whom it is transmitted to particular Souls, and Persons.

I deny not indeed, that even this Account is not without its difficulties, and such as it will be hard, if not impossible perfectly to assioile. I deny not farther, that those difficulties are much enhanc'd by the ignorance we are under concerning the Original of humane Souls, and which whilst we continue under, it will not be easie for us to shew, how that depravedness of Nature should pass from them to us. But as those difficulties are no ways comparable to the difficulties of two of the former, even

those, which resolve Original Sin into the malignity of some evil spirit, or the pravity of matter ; So they can much less be thought to be of force against the testimony of the Scripture, if that (as I shall afterwards shew) favour its arising from the pravity of our first Parents : Partly because the thing in question is a matter of fact, and therefore to be determin'd rather by testimony, than the force of reason, and partly because the testimony of Scripture is the most Authentick one, as being no other than the testimony of God. Now that there wants not sufficient evidence from thence, that that Original Sin, whereof we speak, ariseth from the pravity of those, from whom we first descended, will appear if these three things can be made out ; First, that the sin of all mankind enter'd in by *Adam* ; Secondly, that it enter'd in by *Adam* not meerly as the first that committed it, or tempted other Men by his ill example to do the like, but as more, or less the cause of all their sins by his own ; Thirdly that he became the cause of all their sins through his,

his, by depraving thereby his own Nature, and then communicating that depravation to those, that descended from him.

That the Sin of all Mankind enter'd in by *Adam*, will need no other proof, than that known Text of *S. Paul* (*p*), (p) Rom. 5. 12. even that *by one Man sin enter'd in- to the World, and death by sin, and so death passed through unto all Men, for that all have sinned.* For as we cannot well interpret the word *sin* of any other, than the sin of all Men, because there is nothing in the Text to limit it to any particular Man's, so much less, when *S. Paul* doth afterwards affirm, that that *death*, which enter'd in by it, passed thorough unto all Men, *for that*, or because *all had sinned* by the means of him; That as it makes death to pass upon all Men with respect to their several sins, and consequently their several sins to be the immediate door by which it enters, so making those several sins therefore to be included in that sin, which he before affirmed to be the cause of that death, and, together with it, to have enter'd in by *Adam*.

But

But because among those at least, by whom the Scripture is acknowledged, the question is not so much, whether all sin enter'd by *Adam*, but after what manner it enter'd by him; And because, till that be known, we cannot speak with any certainty concerning the derivation of the corruptness of our Natures from that of our first Parents or Parent; Therefore pass we on to shew, according to the method before laid down, that as the sin of all Mankind enter'd in by *Adam*, so it enter'd in by him, not (as some have vainly deem'd) meerly as one, who first committed it, or tempted others by his example to do the like, but as one also, yea especially, who by the malignant influence of his sin was more or less the cause of all those sins, that followed it. That the sin of all Mankind enter'd not in by *Adam* either meerly, or principally as one, who first committed it, will need no other proof than his being not the first committer of sin even in this sublunary World, but that *Serpent*, who tempted our first Parents to it. For as he, and his fellow Angels sinned before

before them in those glorious seats, in which they were first bestow'd; So he sinned also before them here by that temptation, which he suggested to them, and without which they had not fallen from their integrity. Which as it is an evidence of sin's not entring in by *Adam* in that sense, and consequently that that was not the sense intended by *S. Paul*; So is the more to be considered, because *S. John* attributes this entrance of sin to the *Devil* (q), yea (q) 1 Joh. 3. 8. makes all the committers of sin to be therefore of him. But besides that *Adam* was not the first of those that sinned, and we therefore not so to understand *S. Paul*, when describing sin as entring by him; Neither was he the first of humane kind that sinned, which will be a yet farther prejudice to the former surmise. For (as we learn from the story of the Fall (r), (r) Gen. 3. 6. yea from this very Apostle elsewhere) (s) *Adam* was not deceiv'd, that is (s) 1 Tim. 2. 14. to say, was not the first that was so, but the *Woman* being deceiv'd was in the transgression. Which what is it but to say, that sin did not enter in by *Adam* in that sense, and consequently

requently that that was not the sense intended by the Apostle in it? Only if it be said (and more than that cannot be said in it) that we are not so to understand *S. Paul*, when describing sin as entring by *Adam*, as not also to suppose him to connote the Partner both of his Bed, and of his transgression; As I will not be forward to deny the suggestion altogether, because believing them both to have contributed to the production of our transgressions, as well as Nature, so I cannot forbear to say upon the account of that which follows, that we ought to consider *Adam* as the more especial instrument in it. Because *S. Paul* not only represents him (t) in particular as the Type, or Figure of him, that was to come, but both describes him all along under the notion of *one Man* (u), yea makes a great part of the likeness, that was between him and Christ to consist in it. Which could by no means have been proper, if he had meant no other by sin's entring in by *Adam*, than entring in by him as one of the first committers of it. For in this sense

(t) Rom. 5. 14.

(u) ----- 12.
15, 16. &c.

sense *Eve* must necessarily have had the preeminence, because not only offending before her Husband, but tempting even him to do the same. From that first sense therefore pass we to the second, and which indeed is both more antient, and plausible, than the former. For as it is as old as that *Pelagius* (w), who first call'd Original Sin in question, so it allows the sin of *Adam* to have had an influence upon other Men's sins, as well as to have given beginning to the being of it. But that it hath as little solidity, or pertinency to the words, whereunto it is apply'd, will appear if we reflect upon the sequel of S. *Paul's* Discourse, or the subject matter of that, which is offered as the interpretation of it. For is there any reason to think (without which that interpretation can be of no avail) that *Adam* by his sin tempted all his posterity to offend? Nay, is there not reason enough to believe, that that example of his contributed little to Men's following sins, yea contributed nothing at all to many of them? For how many Men have there been,

to

(w) *Vid. Voss.
Hist. Pelag.
li. 2. parte 2.
Thes. I.*

to whom the knowledge of his sin never reach'd? How many are there yet, who are under the same ignorance, or may hereafter be? And must not these therefore be look'd upon as exempted from the influence of his ill example, and consequently, if their sins entred in by *Adam*, be acknowledged to have entred some other way? And though the same be not to be said of those, to whom the Scriptures have come, because those are not without the knowledge of his sin, nor incapable of being influenc'd by his example; Yet is there as little reason to think, that that example of his contributes much to their sins, or indeed ever did to theirs, who lived nearer to him, and so were more likely to have been inflicted by him. For beside that a sin so chastis'd, as that was, was not very likely to draw their thoughts towards it, and therefore as little likely to tempt them to the imitation of it; Beside that many of them might have no actual consideration of it, as no doubt many now have not, even when they offend in the like kind; They might have been influenc'd, and no doubt were by other sins of his,

his, as much, or more than by his first transgression, or by the ill examples of those, that were nearer to them, rather than by any of his. In fine they might have been, and no doubt often were influenced by the baits of pleasure, or profit, and thereby drawn aside from their integrity; These having been as apt to influence them, as the example of that sin, by which their several offences are suppos'd to have entred into the World. And I shall only add, that as that sense cannot therefore be reasonably impos'd, if we regard, as no doubt we ought, the subject matter of it; So we shall find as little encouragement for it from the sequel of his Discourse, whose words are now under consideration. For beside that he himself may seem sufficiently to obviate it by affirming presently after (x), that there were many of those, that sinned, that did not, nor well could sin *after the similitude of Adam's transgression*, because knowing nothing at all of any such positive law, as he transgress'd; It is the main design of his Discourse to compare the good,
that

(x) Rom. 5.
14.

that Christ brought by his obedience, with the hurt which that type of his did by his transgression. Which comparison had been but a *frigid* one, if all the hurt, that *Adam* did us, was by the force of his ill example: Because it is certain that Christ's obedience was of a much more efficacious influence in the kind of it, as well as in the degree, and would therefore rather have been vilified, than any way illustrated, or commended by the comparison, if the malign influence of *Adam's* sin had reach'd no farther, than that of an example. I conclude therefore, that what ever was meant by sin's entring in by *Adam*, yet something more was meant by it, than its entring by him either as the first committer of it, or as one, who by his ill example tempted others to do the like. And indeed as the instance but now alledg'd, even the likeness, that is between *Adam's* sin, and Christ's obedience, makes it but reasonable to look upon all sin as entring also by *Adam*, as more, or less the cause of it, so it stands yet more confirm'd by what *S. Paul* affirms in the nineteenth verse, especially

especially as it lies in the *Original*: The purport thereof being, that Men are *constituted* sinners by his disobedience, yea that they are so *constituted* sinners by it, as Men are constituted righteous by the obedience of Christ. For though the words κατεσάθησαν ἁμαρτολοί may in themselves be capable of a softer sense, and accordingly signify no more, than Men's being reputed, and us'd as sinners upon the account of that transgression, which *Adam* committed; Yet I see not how that sense can be thought to fit them here, or indeed any other than that of constituting, or making Men sinners: Partly because their being constituted sinners by *Adam*'s disobedience is rendred by *S. Paul* (y) as the reason of their condemnation by it, and ought therefore to be distinguished from it; And partly because they are said to be constituted sinners by *Adam*'s disobedience, as they, who belong to Christ, are constituted righteous by his obedience. For the obedience of Christ procuring Men's being really righteous, as well as their being reputed such, yea procuring their being really righteous in some measure, that they may be so

(y) Rom. 5.
18, 19.

accounted of, and us'd; What can be more reasonable than to think, that that disobedience of *Adam*, which is affirmed to be like it, is of the same *causality*, and accordingly constitutes, or makes Men sinners, as well as accounted of as such.

One only thing remains towards the clearing of the matter in hand, even the derivation of the corruptness of our Nature from that of our first Parent, or Parents; And that is, that as all sin entred in by *Adam* as more, or less the cause of it by his own, so he became the cause of it by his own by thereby depraving his own Nature first, and then communicating that depravation to those, that descended from him. Of the former whereof as there cannot well be any doubt, considering the hainousness of that sin, which he committed (That as it could not but occasion the withdrawing of the Divine Grace from *Adam*, so neither but draw after it the depravation of his Nature, as which receiv'd all its rectitude from the other) so there will be as little doubt of the latter, if we compare what *S. Paul* here

here faith concerning *Adam's* being the cause of all our sins by his own, with what he afterward faith * concerning Men's falling into actual sin by vertue of an *evil principle*, that *dwelleth* in them. For if all actual sin proceed immediately from such an evil principle, that evil principle must be also from *Adam*, as without which otherwise he could not be the cause of our sins by his own, nor constitute us sinners by it.

* Rom. 7. 17.
20.

IV. I will not be over positive in defining by *what means this evil principle is convey'd*, because I am not well assur'd how our very *Nature* is. It shall suffice me to represent (what may tend in some measure toward the clearing of it) *That* Original sin, cleaving to our nature from the first beginnings of it, must consequently be conveyed to us by the same general means, by which our nature is, even by *natural generation*, yea that the Scripture teacheth us so to reason, where it affirms Men to be *conceiv'd in sin* (2), to become *flesh* by being *born* † of *flesh*, and *unclean* * by being *brought out*

(2) Psal. 51. 5.
† Joh. 3. 6.
* Job. 14. 4.
1.

of those Parents, *that are so*; *That*, though the more particular means, by which Original Sin is convey'd, cannot with any certainty be assign'd, because it is alike uncertain, whether those Souls, in which it is most reasonable to place it, be either traduced, or immediately created, yet there would not be any uncertainty as to this particular, if we believ'd the Souls of Men to be traduc'd, as several of the Antients †, and not a few of the Moderns have believ'd (For so it would not only not be difficult to apprehend the particular means of the others conveyance, but almost impossible to overlook them, because making it to pass together with those Souls, to which it adheres, and diffuse it self from thence to those Bodies, to which they are united) *That*, though the traduction of Souls be not without its difficulties, and such as I shall not be so vain as to attempt the solution of, yet it is in that particular but of the same condition with the immediate Creation of them, that I say not also less exceptionable, as to the business of Original Sin; In fine, *That*,

as

† *Vid. Vossz.
Hist. Pelag.
Lib. 2. Parte
3. Thes. 1.*

(a) *Hotham's*
 Introd. to the
Trent. Philoso-
 phy.

as it hath nothing from Scripture to prejudice the belief of it, as appears by the solutions, which have been long since (a) given to the Objections from it ; So it seems to me much more agreeable to that account, which it gives of the *Creation*, and indeed to the Nature of a *Parent*. For what can be more clear from the Story of the *Creation*, than that God designed once for all to Create all the Beings, which he intended, leaving them, and particularly Man, to carry on the Succession by those productive principles, which he had planted in them ? For if so, what should hinder us from believing, but that Men produce their like after the same manner, that other Creatures do, and by the same Divine Benediction, and concurrence. Sure I am, as they will otherwise fall short of the powers of inferiour beings, as well as be an *anomalie* in the *Creation*, so they will be but very imperfectly in the condition of *Parents*, because contributing only to that part, which is the least considerable in their Posterity. Only as I list not to contend about any thing, of which

I my self am not more strongly persuaded ; So I shall leave it to those, whom the immediate creation of Souls better pleaseth, to make their advantage of it, and satisfie themselves from it concerning the means of Original Sin's conveyance. Which if they do, they shall do more, than the great S. *Augustin* could after all his travails in this Argument ; Because professing that he *could not find either by reading or praying, or reasoning (b), how Original Sin could be defended with the opinion of the Creation of Souls.*

(b) Ep. 157.
ad Optatum.

V. I may not dismiss the Argument that is now before us, or indeed so much as attend to the consideration of those *Objections*, that are made against it, before I have also enquir'd, *whether that, which hath the name of Original Sin, be truly, and properly such, and not rather so stiled in respect of that first sin, from which it proceeded, or in respect of those sins, to which it leads.* For beside that that *Church*, whose *Catechism* I have chosen to explain, leads us to the consideration of it, because both there, and else-

(c) Art. of
Relig. 6.

elsewhere (c) affirming it to have the *nature* of a Sin, to make us the *Children of Wrath*, and to *deserve God's Wrath and Damnation*; The resolution of it is of no small moment toward the right stating of our duty, and the valuableness of that remedy, which Christianity hath provided for it. For neither otherwise can we look upon Original Sin as any proper matter for our Repentance, whatsoever it may be for our lamentation, nor upon Baptism as bringing any other pardon to Infants, than that of the Sin of their first Parents, and which they who look upon Original Sin as rather our unhappiness, than fault, are generally as far from charging them with. This only would be premis'd for the better understanding of it, that by *Sin* is not meant any actual transgression of a Law (for no Man was ever so absurd, as to affirm that concerning Original Sin) but that which is contrary to a Law in the nature of an *evil habit*, and both imports an absence of that Righteousness, which ought to be in us, and an inclination to those evils, from

which we ought to be averſe ; This, as it is no leſs the tranſgreſſion of a Law, than any actual ſin is, ſo making the perſon, in whom it is, as obnoxious to puniſhment, and conſequently to be look'd upon as yet more properly a ſin. Now that that, which we call Original Sin, is really ſuch in this latter notion, will appear if theſe two things be conſidered ; Firſt, that the Scripture gives it the title of ſin, Secondly, that it repreſents it as ſuch upon the account of our being obliged by the Law of God to have in us a contrary temper. That the Scripture gives that, whereof we ſpeak, the title of ſin, is evident from thoſe Texts, which we before made uſe of to prove the being of it ; More particularly from that (d), which repreſents *David* as *conceiv'd, and born in ſin*, and thoſe (e), which repreſent us all as having *ſin dwelling in us*. For theſe having been before ſhewn to ſpeak of Original Sin make it evident that the Scripture gives it the title of *Sin*, becauſe in the former places repreſenting it under that notion. And though I will not from that only *To-
pick*

(d) Pſa. 51. 5.

(e) Rom. 7. 17-
20.

pick conclude it to be properly such, because the Scripture makes use of figurative expressions, as well as proper, yea doth so in this very particular whereof we speak (for thus it sometimes gives the title of *sin* to that, which is intended only as the punishment thereof) yet as we may lawfully infer from thence, that there is more cause to believe Original Sin to be *properly*, than *figuratively* such, till the contrary thereof be made appear, The proper sense being otherwise to be preferr'd before the figurative; So that there can be no place for the *figurative* sense, if that, which is there represented as a *sin*, be elsewhere represented as such upon the supposition of our being obliged to have in us the contrary temper. Which that it is will appear from such Texts, as do more immediately affirm it, or such as affirm those things, from which it may by good consequence be deduced. Of the former sort I reckon that, which is immediately subjoyn'd by *David* to the mention of his being *conceiv'd in sin, and brought forth in iniquity* (f). (f) Psa. 51. 5.

Behold thou requirest truth in the inward

ward parts, and shalt, or rather hast made me to understand wisdom secretly. For as we cannot but look upon what is there said concerning God's *requiring truth in the inward parts* as spoken with relation to that *sin*, whereof he before complains, and to the mention whereof he subjoyns the mention of the other; So neither (considering it to have been his intent to aggravate his sinfulness before God) but look upon it as also his intent to aggravate the sinfulness of his frame by that piety which God required of him. Which suppos'd, Original Sin will not only be found to be so entituled by the Scripture, but to have had that name bestowed upon it upon the account of Men's obligation to the contrary, and consequently to be truly and properly such. And though there be not it may be many more Texts of *that nature*, or which therefore can be thought so directly to affirm, that it becometh the sin of those, in whom it is, upon the account of their obligation to the contrary; Yet will it not be difficult to find others, which do as clearly assert those things,
from

from which it may by good consequence be deduced. Such as are those which make Original Sin to be a proper matter for *confession*, yea to induce a guilt upon the person, in whom it is. But so the Prophet *David* doth plainly suppose in that very Psalm, which we but now made use of; Because not only *confessing* (g) the sinfulness of his *Nature* together with that of his external actions, but begging of God, immediately after that confession of his, that he would *purge him* (h) *with Hyssop from it*. For as we have no reason to exclude that from the matter of the desired purgation, which immediately precedes the Prayer that is put up for it; So much less reason to doubt, after that Prayer for the purgation of it, of its inducing a guilt upon the person, in whom it is: The use of *Hyssop* in the Old Law (as appears by several places (i) in it, and a consentient Text in the Epistle to the *Hebrews* (k)) being to sprinkle the Blood of the Sacrifices upon those, who were any way obnoxious to its censures, and so deliver them from the severity thereof,

(g) Psa. 51. 5.

(h) Psa. 51. 7.

(i) Exo. 12.

22.

Lev. 14. 6.

(k) Heb. 9.

19, &c.

thereof. For what other then could the Psalmist mean by that Prayer of his, than that God would purge him from that, and his other sins by the blood of an expiatory Sacrifice? Or so meaning be thought to intimate more clearly, than that that, from which he desir'd to be purg'd, stood in need of such a Sacrifice, and consequently was no more without its guilt, than his actual transgressions were. Only, if that notion may not be thought to be of sufficient clearness to build so important a Conclusion on, it will not be difficult to strengthen it yet more by the word the *Hebrew* makes us of for *purge*, and those Prayers, which the Psalmist subjoyneth to it; By the former because literally (l) signifying a *purification from sin*, by the latter, because importing it to be his desire (m), that God would *wash him from it*, that he would *cause those bones, that had been broken by it, to rejoyce*, and in fine, that he would *hide his face from his sins*, and *blot out all his iniquities*: These, as they are known and usual expressions for the *remission of sins*, and consequently im-

(l) תְּהַרְהֵרִי

(m) Psal. 51.
7, 8, 9.

importing the *guilt* of those, to whom they are apply'd, and their *purification* from it, so with this farther reason to be so taken here, because the Psalmist afterwards begs (*n*), that God would (*n*) Psal. 51.
purifie him from the *filth* of them, 10.
and *renew a right spirit within him*.

V I. Now though from what hath been said it be competently evident, that the Doctrine of Original Sin is not without good Authority to warrant it, yet because that Doctrine hath been impugned by the *Pelagians* of Old, and since that by the followers of *Socinus*, therefore it may not be amiss for the farther clearing of it to consider their Objections against it; and either return a direct, and satisfactory answer to them, or at least shew, that they ought not however to be admitted as a bar against what the Scripture hath said concerning it. To begin with those Objections which respect the being of it, or rather tend to shew that it hath no being in the World; Which are either such, as consider it as a *simple corruption* of humane Nature, or such

as do also consider it as a *sinful* one. Of the former sort are those, which represent it as a thing unconceivable, how it should come into humane Nature, which the better to persuade, they alledge plausible reasons against all those means, whereby it may be suppos'd to find admittance. For these being destroy'd, they think they may lawfully infer, that there is indeed no such depravation upon humane Nature. Of what force those reasons are will be then more seasonable to enquire, when I consider what is objected against the fountain of Original Corruption, or the means by which it is convey'd. At present it may suffice to say, that of what force soever they may be thought to be, yet they are not of sufficient force to destroy the being of Original Corruption, which is the thing for which they are here alledg'd; Partly, because many things may be, yea be assur'd to us, of the original, or conveyance whereof we our selves are perfectly ignorant (for who doubts of the being of humane Souls, though he neither knows, nor well can, whether they be traduc'd,
or

or infus'd) and partly because the testimony of Scripture, with the experience we have of its effects, is a much more forcible argument of the being of it, than all the former reasons are of the other : These being direct, and immediate proofs of its existence, whereas the other are only indirect, and mediate. From such objections therefore as consider Original Sin as a simple Corruption of humane Nature, pass we to those, which consider it also as *sinful*, and which indeed seem most hardly to press upon it : Such as are, that all sin is the transgression of a Law, which Original Sin seems not to be ; That it requires the consent of the will of him, in whom it is, which cannot well be affirm'd of that ; As in fine, that the Scripture it self may seem to make that, which we call Original Sin, rather the *Parent* of Sin, than sin it self, because making sin to arise (o) from the *conception*, and *parturition* of it. As to what is objected from the forementioned Scripture, it is either nothing at all to the purpose, or very much against the purpose of those, that alledge it :

(o) James i.
13. &c.

it: Partly because by the *sin* there spoken of can be meant no other, than *actual* sin, and nothing therefore to be concluded from thence, but that all actual sin is the product of Men's *Lust*, and partly because that *Text* makes even actual sins to be the product of Men's *Lust*, yea of such a lust as *draweth them aside*, and *enticeth* them. For who can well think the Parent of such Children to be of a better Nature, than the Children themselves, especially when she is described as giving birth to them by false, and deceitful Arts? Such Arts as those reflecting no great honour upon the Mother, but on the contrary making her to be altogether as criminal, as the other. If therefore they, who impugn Original Sin as such, would do it with any advantage, it must not be by Arguments drawn from Scripture, which will rather hurt, than profit them, but by Arguments drawn from reason, and particularly by such as represent Original Sin as no transgression of a Law, and therefore no sin properly so call'd, or as a thing which hath not the consent of the will of him,
in

in whom it is, and therefore yet farther removed from it. As concerning the former of these, even that which represents Original Sin as no transgression of a Law, I answer that they, who so speak, must deny it to be such, either because it is no Act, or because there is no Law, which it can be suppos'd to be a transgression of. If the former of these be their meaning, I willingly grant what they alledge, but I say withall, that it will not from thence follow, that it is no sin at all. For if Men are obliged by the divine Law to a pious, and innocent temper, as well as not to swerve from it in their actions, the want of that happy temper, or the having a contrary one will be as much the transgression of a Law, as the want of the same piety in their actions. Which will consequently devolve the whole force of that Objection upon the supposition of there being no such Law of God, which requires the former temper, or which therefore Original Sin can be thought to be a transgression of. But as I have already made it appear in some measure;

M

sure, that there is in truth such a Law, as requires a pious, and innocent temper, so I shall now endeavour to strengthen it by some more particular proofs, and by answering those exceptions, that are made against it.

In order to the former whereof we are to know, that as the *Law* we speak of must be supposed to have been given to *Adam*, as that too not only in his *private*, but *publick* capacity, and as he may be thought to have been the *representative* of all Mankind (there being no other Law, which can be suppos'd to concern us, before we come to be in a capacity to apprehend, and obey it) so I shall endeavour to make it appear first, that there was such a Law given to *Adam*, and then that it was given to him not only in his *private*, but *publick* capacity, and as he may be thought to have been the *representative* of all Mankind. Now that there was a Law given to *Adam*, requiring a pious, and innocent temper, as well as the preserving that piety and innocency in his actions, will

will need no other proof than God's creating him in it, and the love he may be supposed to bear unto it. For as we cannot think God would have ever intrusted such a Jewel with *Adam*, if it had not been his intention that he should preserve, and exercise it, so much less, when the *holiness* of the *divine Nature* persuades his love to it, as well as the declarations of his word. For what were this, but to make God indifferent, what became of his most excellent gifts, which no wise person, and much less so hearty a lover of them can be supposed to be? If therefore there can be any doubt concerning the *Law* we speak of, it must be as to its having been given to *Adam* in his *publick* capacity, and as he may be suppos'd to have been the *representative* of all Mankind. Which I shall endeavour to evince first by shewing what I mean by his *publick* capacity, secondly by shewing that *Adam* was set in such a capacity, and thirdly that the *Law* we speak of was given to him as considered in it. By the *publick* capacity of *Adam* I mean such a one, whereby as he

was design'd to be the Father of all Mankind, so God made him a kind of Trustee for it; In order thereunto both giving him what he did for their benefit, as well as his own, and obliging him for their sakes, as well as his own, to see to the preservation of it, and act agreeably to it. Which if he did, his Posterity as well as himself should have the benefit thereof, and God's favour together with it, but if not, forfeit together with him what God had so bestow'd upon him, and incur the penalty of his displeasure. Now that *Adam* was set in such a capacity (which is the second thing to be demonstrated) will appear from the Scriptures making him the cause of all Men's death by his offence, and disobedience. For the effects of another disobedience being not otherwise chargeable upon any Man, than as that other may be suppos'd to be appointed to act for him; If the effects of *Adam's* disobedience were to fall upon all his Posterity, he also must be supposed to have been appointed to act for them, and consequently to have been set in that *publick*

lick capacity, whereof I speak. Which will leave nothing more for us to shew upon this Head, than that that Law, which requires a pious and innocent temper was given to *Adam* in that capacity. But as we can as little doubt of that, if his contracting a contrary temper was as fatal to his Posterity, as to himself; So that it was, will need no other proof than his producing the like temper in them, and that temper's proving as deadly to them. The former whereof is evident from what I before said to shew, that *Original Sin* had its beginning from *Adam*, the latter from *S. Paul's* (p) calling it a *Body of Death*, or a Body that brings it: The *Genitive Case* (q) among the *Hebrews*, and *Hellenists*, being usually set for such *Adjectives*, as betoken a causality in them; Even as the *Savour of Death* is us'd for a deadly one, or that which bringeth death, and the *Tree of Life* for a life-giving one, or that which was apt to produce, or continue it.

(p) Rom. 7.
24.

(q) Grot. in
loc.

I deny not indeed (that I may now pass to those Exceptions that are commonly made against it) that it

may seem hard to conceive how *Adam* should be set in such a *capacity*, as to involve all mankind in happiness, or misery, according as he either continued in, or fell from that integrity, wherein God created him. I deny not therefore, but that it is equally hard to conceive how God should give him such a *Law*, the observation, or transgression whereof on his part should redound to the account of his Posterity. But as every thing, that is hard to be conceiv'd, is not therefore to be deny'd, if it be otherwise strengthen'd with sufficient proofs; So it would be consider'd also, whether it be not much more hard to conceive, how God should otherwise involve Infants, and Children in those calamities, into which they often fall, especially in National Judgments: It being certainly more agreeable to the divine Justice, to conceive those to have some way, or other offended, and consequently thereto to have fallen under the displeasure of it, than to conceive them to suffer it without any offence at all. For why then should we not think, especially when
the

the Scripture hath led the way, that God oblig'd them in *Adam* to a pious, and innocent temper, and which they losing in him, they became obnoxious with him to the same sad effects of his displeasure? And though it be true, that there is this great imparity between the cases, that the effect of God's displeasure upon occasion of *Original Sin* is made to reach to eternal misery, as well as to a temporal one, whereas the case we before instanc'd in concerns only a temporal punishment: Yet as they do thus far agree, that a punishment is inflicted, where there is no actual sin to deserve it, which is sufficiently irreconcilable with the understanding we otherwise have of the divine Justice; So that great imparity may be much abated by considering, that God hath provided a Plaster as large as the Sore, (even by giving his Son to dye for all Mankind) and appointed the Sacrament of Baptism to convey the benefit of it. For as the consequents of *Original Sin* will be thereby taken off from so many Infants at least, as are admitted to that Sacrament, so that mercy of his

to those, and the assurance we have from the Scripture of his giving his Son to dye for all may perswade us to believe, that though he hath not reveal'd the particular way to us, yet he hath some other way to convey the benefit of that death to those, who are not admitted to the other.

But it will be said it may be (which is a no less prejudice against the being of Original Sin) that all sin, to make it truly such, must have the consent of the will of those, in whom it is, as well as be the transgression of a Law. A thing by no means to be affirm'd concerning that, which we call Original Sin, because not only contracted before we had a being, and therefore also before we had so much as the *faculty* of *willing*, but moreover conveyed to us, when we had neither reason to apprehend it, nor any power in our *wills* either to admit, or reject it. And indeed how altogether to take off the force of that Objection is beyond my capacity to apprehend, or satisfy the understandings of other Men : Because as I cannot see how any thing can be a sin, which

which hath not also the consent of the will of those, in whom it is, so I am as little able to conceive how Original Sin should have the consent of ours, either when it was first contracted, or when it was transmitted to us. But as I am far less able to conceive how Infants, and Children should come to be so severely dealt with without any offence at all, or therefore without having some way, or other consented to one; So I think first, that that difficulty may well be laid in the ballance against the other, yea alledged as a bar to the supposed force of it. For why should my inability to apprehend how Infants, and Children could consent to Original Sin, prevail with me to deny the being of it, when a far greater inability to apprehend how the same persons should come to be so severely dealt withal without it, doth not prevail with me to deny that severe usage of them? Neither will it avail to say (which is otherwise considerable enough) that we have for the belief of this last the testimony of our senses, which is not to be alledged as to the other.

For

For the question is not now whether the severe usage of Infants, and Children may not more reasonably be believ'd, than their Original Sin, upon the account of the greater evidence there may be of it; But whether we can any more deny the Original Sin of Infants, and Children upon the account of our inability to apprehend, how they should consent unto it, than we can deny the severe usage of the same persons upon the account of our inability to apprehend, how they should come to be so dealt with without the other. Which that we cannot is evident from hence, that we are equally at a loss in our apprehensions about the one, and the other, that I say not also more at a loss about the latter, than about the former. And indeed, as we find it necessary to believe many things notwithstanding our inability to apprehend how they should come to pass, and ought not therefore to deny the being of any one thing upon the sole account of that inability; So our apprehensions are so short as to the modes of those things, of the being whereof we are most

most assured, that it will hardly be deemed reasonable to insist upon the suggestions of them, against the affirmations of the Scripture: Partly because of the Authority of him, from whom it proceeded, and partly because we cannot so easily fail in our apprehension concerning the due sense of the affirmations of it, as in the deductions of our own reason concerning the things affirmed; Nothing more being required to the understanding of the one, than a due consideration of the signification of the words, wherein they are expressed; whereas to the right ordering of the other, there is requir'd a due understanding of the Nature of those things about which we reason, which is both a matter of far greater difficulty, and in many cases impossible to be attain'd. Whatever difficulty therefore there may be in apprehending how Original Sin could have the consent of those, in whom it is supposed to be, and consequently how it should be truly and properly a sin; Yet ought not that to be a bar against our belief of it, if the Scripture hath represented it as
such,

such, and which whether it hath, or no, I shall leave to be judg'd by what I have before observ'd from it.

From such Objections, as are level'd more immediately against the *being* of Original Sin, pass we to those which impugne the derivation of it from *Adam*, and from whom we have affirmed it to proceed. Which Objections again do either tend to shew, that it had its Original from something else, or that it cannot be suppos'd to have its Original from *Adam*. An opinion hath prevail'd of late years, that that, which we call Original Sin, took its rise from the sins of particular Souls in some *praxistent* estate, and from those *evil habits*, which they contracted by them. And certainly the opinion were reasonable enough to be embrac'd, if the *praxistence* of Souls were but as well prov'd, as it is speciously contriv'd. For, that suppos'd, it would be no hard matter to give an account of the rise of that Corruption, which is in us, nor yet of God's afflicting those on whom no other blame appears: That corruption, as it is no other than what particular

particular Souls have themselves contracted, so making them as obnoxious to the vengeance of God, as any after sins can be supposed to do. But do they, who advance this *hypothesis*, think the plausibleness thereof a sufficient ground to build it on? Or are *problems* in *Divinity* no other way to be determin'd, than those of *Astronomy*, or other such *conjectural* Arts are? I had thought that for the resolution of these we ought rather to have had recourse to that *word* of God, which was design'd to give us an understanding of them, to have examin'd the several assertions of it, and acquiesced in them, how difficult soever to be apprehended. I had thought that we ought to have done so much more, where the Scripture professeth to deliver its opinion, and doth not only not wave the thing in question, but speaks to it. Which that it doth in the present case will need no other proof than the account it gives of the Original of Mankind, and then of the Original of Evil. For as it professeth to speak of *Adam* not only as created by God, but as appointed by him(r) to give being by the way of (r) Gen. 1. 28.
natural

(f) Rom. 5.

12.

1 Cor. 15. 21,

22.

natural Generation to all, that after him should replenish the Earth (which how he should be thought to do, if he were only to be a means of furnishing them with a Body, who had the *better* part of their being before, is past my understanding to imagine) so it professeth to speak of the same *Adam* as one by whom *sin*, and *death* (f) enter'd into the World, as well as the persons of those, on whom it seizeth. And can there then be any place for a precarious *hypothesis* about the Original of Mankind, or the evils of it? Can there be place for advancing that *hypothesis* not only beside, but against the determinations of the Scripture? Do not all such *hypotheses* proceed upon the *uncertainty* of the matter, about which they are conversant? Do they not come in as a relief to the understandings of Men, where they cannot be satisfied any other way? But how then can there be place for such a one, where the Scripture hath determin'd? How can there be any place even for the most specious, and plausible? For as that cannot be suppos'd to be *uncertain*, which the

the Scripture hath determin'd; So no plausibility whatsoever can come in competition with the determinations of God, such as those of the Scripture are. But such it seems is the restlessness of some Men's minds, that if they cannot satisfy their scruples from what the Scripture hath advanced, they will be setting up other *Hypotheses* to do it by. Wherein yet they are for the most part so unlucky, as to advance such things themselves, as have nothing at all of probability in them. For who can think it any way probable, that, if mens Souls had an existence antecedent to their conception in the Womb, they should not in the least be conscious of it, nor of any of those things, which were transacted by them in it? Is it (as one hath observ'd, who seems to have been the first broacher of it in this latter Age) is it, I say, for want of opportunity of being reminded of their former transactions, as it happens to many, who rise confident that they slept without dreaming, and yet before they go to bed again recover a whole series of representations by something that occurs

curr'd to them in the day? But who can think, when the Souls of Men must be supposed to carry in them the same evil tendencies, and inclinations, that they should never light upon any one thing, which might bring back to their minds what they had formerly transacted, or but so much as that they had a being antecedent to their present one? For whoever was so forgetful of his dreams, as not to remember he was sometime in a dreaming condition; yea that he actually dreamed in it? Is it secondly (as the same Learned Man goes on) by a defuetude of thinking of their former actions; and whereby it sometimes comes to pass, as he there observes, that what we have earnestly meditated, labour'd for, and pen'd down with our own hands, when we were at School, becomes so lost to our memories, that if we did not see our own handwriting to it, we should not acknowledge it to be our own? But doth this come home to the present case? Doth it persuade such a forgetfulness in the Souls of Men; as not only not to remember their
par-

particular actions, but not so much as that they were in a condition to act any thing, or acted any thing under it? For though a Man may forget the particular exercise he did at School, yet can any Man (though he slept an Age, and never so much as dream'd in all that time of being at School, or any other thing, be supposed, if he awoke in his right wits, to forget he was sometime in such a place, and performed some exercises in it? Is it lastly by means of some distemper, that happens to the Soul by coming into an earthly Body, and by which the foremention'd person conceives the Soul may suffer in its memory, as we see it sometime doth in its present state by casualties, and diseases, yea so far as to make the person forget his own name? But though the Soul should be supposed to fall into such a forgetfulness by entring into a body (as we see it is a long time before it comes to exercise its respective faculties) yet is there any reason to think it should continue in it after it hath gotten above the infirmities of the other, yea so far as to reason with that clearness,

N

where-

wherewith this Author doth in many things, and with great plausibility in all others? For though Men may happen to be so stricken by a disease, as to forget even their own names, yea have undoubtedly suffered in that nature; yet is there no evidence from story that I know of, or indeed presumption for the supposition of it, that though the parties did again recover the free use of their faculties, yet they were unable to look back to their pristine state, or call to mind any of the passages thereof. So much more specious, than strong are the reasons that Author alledgeth to shew the Soul to be in a natural incapacity to call to mind its pristine state, and actions. And yet if they prov'd what they intended, they would hardly make it credible, that it should be without all knowledge of them: God, who thrusts it down into its present state by reason of its former errors, being likely enough to bring them to its mind, though it should be otherwise ignorant of them. Otherwise he should neither make it sensible of its own guilt, and his choosing thus

thus to punish it, which is one supposed end of his thrusting it down, nor careful to break off from it, which is another. And I shall only add, that as we cannot therefore be in any great danger from those Objections, which pretend to derive Original sin from another principle; So shall we not now be much incommoded by the force of those Objections, which profess more directly to impugn the derivation of it from *Adam*. For as those Objections are principally founded upon the incompetency of *Adam* to involve all mankind in the guilt of his transgression, so I have not only made it appear already, that *Adam* was no way incompetent for that purpose, because appointed by God as the representative of all mankind, but said enough, though not to answer, yet to silence what is objected against it from the supposed want of our consent to his transgression. Which will leave nothing more for us to do, than to consider what is objected against the *means*, we have before assign'd of the conveying of that Original Sin whereof we speak. But as I

have not been positive in assigning the *particular* means of its conveyance, and must therefore be the less concern'd to answer what is objected against them ; So I shall oppose to all those Objections the assurance we have from the Scripture of our having it in us from our Conception, and Birth, yea contracting it from those fleshly, and unclean persons, from whom we are descended : That, as it is enough to shew that it is conveyed to us by the same general means, by which our very nature is, so making it at least probable that it passeth from them to us together with our Souls, and from thence diffuseth it self unto our Bodies. And how far a probability so founded ought to prevail against all the Arguments, which are oppos'd to the traduction of Souls, especially when the Scripture seems to favour that traduction also, will be no hard matter for him to judge, who shall consider on the one hand the shortness of our own reasonings, and on the other what difficulties attend the Creation, and Infusion, as well as the traduction of Souls. For as those very dif-

dif-

difficulties will oblige us to sit down after all with a probable assent in this affair, so the shortness of our own reasonings to guide that assent rather by probable testimonies of Scripture, than by probable arguments from Reason: Because as we are more assur'd of the truth of those testimonies, than we can be of the truth of any of those arguments, which we ground our selves upon in this affair; So we cannot so easily fail in our apprehensions concerning the other; Nothing more being requir'd toward the apprehending the force of the former, than the due consideration of the sense of the words, wherein they are expressed, whereas to the apprehending of the force of the latter we must have a clear knowledge of the nature of those things, about which they are conversant, which is certainly a matter of far greater difficulty, and wherein therefore we may more easily mistake. Only if what is said in this particular may not be thought to be satisfactory, because rather a bar to what is objected against the traduction of Souls

(and consequently of Original Sin) than any direct answer to it ; I shall desire those, who are dissatisfi'd with it, to give such an answer, as they themselves demand to what is objected by the other party against the immediate Creation, and infusion of them : It seeming not so easie to imagine (that I may not now press them with any other inconveniencies) that God should create a Soul on purpose to infuse it into such incestuous conceptions, as he himself cannot but be thought to abhor. For my self, as I can with equal ease digest the traduction of Souls with all its inconveniencies, or rather acquiesce in that evidence, which the Doctrine of the Scripture, and the simple nature of a generation do seem to suggest ; So I shall hardly think it reasonable to quit it, till they, who assert the Creation of Souls, free it from the former inconvenience, and other such difficulties, wherewith it is alike encumbered. For till that be done, the traduction of Souls will not only be of greater probability, but serve more

more clearly to declare how that corruption, which our first Parents contracted, passed from them unto their Children, and so on to succeeding Generations.

N 4 PART

199

442-10000

and will only be visible when
the light is turned on. The
light is turned on by the
switch. The switch is located
on the wall. The switch is
marked "ON" and "OFF".

PART IV.

Of the things signified by Baptism on the part of God, or its inward and spiritual Grace.

The Contents.

The things signified by Baptism are either more general, or particular: More general, as that Covenant of Grace, which passeth between God, and Man, and that body of Men, which enter into Covenant with him; More particular, what the same God doth, by vertue of that Covenant, oblige himself to bestow upon the Baptized, and what those Baptized ones do on their part undertake to perform. These latter ones proposed to be considered, and entrance made

made with the consideration of what God obligeth himself to bestow upon the Baptized, called by the Church, An inward, and spiritual Grace. Which inward, and spiritual Grace is shewn to be of two sorts, to wit, such as tend more immediately to our spiritual, and eternal welfare, or such as only qualifie us for those Graces, that do so. To the former sort are reckon'd that inward, and spiritual Grace, which tends to free us from the guilt of sin, called by the Church forgiveness of sin; That which tends to free us from the pollution of sin, called by our Catechism A death unto it; And that, which tends to introduce the contrary purity, and hath the name of a New birth unto righteousness. To the latter sort is reckoned our union to that Body, of which Christ Jesus is the Head, and by means whereof he dispenseth the former Graces to us. Each of these resum'd, and considered in their order, and shewn to be, what they are usually stil'd, the inward, and spiritual Graces of Baptism, or the things signified by the outward visible Sign thereof.

But

BUT to return to that, from which I have diverted, even the *things signified* by the outward visible sign of Baptism, which are either more general, or particular: More *general*, as that *Covenant* of Grace, which passeth between God, and Man, and that Body of Men, which enter into Covenant with him; More particular, what the same God doth by vertue of that Covenant oblige himself to bestow upon the Baptized, and what those Baptized ones do on their part make profession of. Of those more *general* things I have given some account already *, and shall have occasion, as I go, to add yet farther light to them; I will therefore proceed forthwith to the consideration of the more particular ones, such as are on the part of God an *inward and Spiritual Grace*, and on the part of the Baptiz'd an *abrenuntiation of their former sins*, and a resolution to believe, and act, as Christianity obligeth them to do. —

* Of the Sacraments in general,
Part 2.

Now

Now the *inward and Spiritual Grace* of Baptism is of two sorts, to wit, such as *tend more immediately to our spiritual, and eternal welfare*, or such as *only qualifie us for those Graces*, that do so. Of the former sort again is that inward and Spiritual Grace, which tends to free us from the guilt of sin, best known by the name of *forgiveness*, or that which tends to free us from the pollution of sin, called by our Catechism *a death unto it*, or lastly that which tends to introduce the contrary purity, and hath the name of *a new birth unto Righteousness*. Of the latter sort is our *union to that body*, of which Christ Jesus is the head, and by means of which he dispenseth the former Graces to us. For that each of these is signified on the part of God by the outward visible sign of Baptism, and consequently is a part of its inward and Spiritual Grace, will appear if we descend to particulars, which therefore I will now set my self to do.

To begin with those inward, and Spiritual Graces, which *tend more immediately* to our spiritual, and eternal welfare; Among which as I assign'd the first place to *forgiveness of sin*, so I shall make it my business to shew first, that that is a Grace which is signified by the outward visible sign of Baptism, and Secondly give a more particular account of the nature of that forgiveness, which I have said to be signified by the other.

That *forgiveness of sin* is a Grace signified by the outward visible sign of Baptism, will appear if these two things can be made out; First, that the outward visible sign of Baptism hath a relation to the forgiveness of sin, and Secondly that it hath the relation of a sign unto it. For if the outward visible sign of Baptism hath the relation of a sign to the forgiveness of sin, Forgiveness of sin, as being its *correlatum*, must be look'd upon as signified by it. That the outward visible sign of Baptism hath a *relation* to the forgiveness of sin, S. Peter will not suffer us to doubt, because admonishing † the Jews to
be

† Act. 2. 38.

* Of the Sacraments in general,
Part 2.

(a) Acts 22.
16.

be baptiz'd for the remission of sins ;
And as little doubt can there well
be of its having the relation of a
sign unto it, which is the only thing
we are at present to consider : Part-
ly, because Baptism hath been be-
fore * shewn to have been intended
by God as a sign of many things ,
and why then not as a sign of that
forgiveness, to which I have shewn
it equally to relate, and partly be-
cause it is propos'd to us as *washing*
away (a) *the sins* of those, that are
sprinkled with it. For as if the Wa-
ter of Baptism be to be considered
as *washing away Men's sins*, it must
be upon the account of its being a
sign of that inward Grace thereof ,
that doth so, as which alone can be
a just foundation of attributing such
a property to it (for neither can
the Water of Baptism put away
Men's sins, but by means of that
Grace, which it conveys, nor with
any propriety even so be said to *wash*
them away , but upon the account
of the likeness there is between its
own natural property, and that of
the divine Grace, which will make the
Water of Baptism a sign, or represen-
tation

tation of it) So if the Water of Baptism be to be considered as *washing* away Men's sins, it will equally lead us to believe, that it ought to be considered in particular as a sign of that forgiveness, whereof we speak : Partly, because that forgiveness is an undoubted *correlatum* of Baptism, and partly because the term of *washing* away Men's sins is most frequently made use of to denote the forgiveness of sins, and that outward sign therefore, to which such a washing is attributed, intended as a sign of the forgiveness of them. I conclude therefore that whatever else may be thought to be excluded from the signification of the Water of Baptism, yet it hath the relation of a sign to the forgiveness of sin, and that forgiveness therefore to be look'd upon as one of the *Graces* signified by it. And I shall only add, that this was always so acknowledged in the Church, that even the *Pelagians* themselves, though they deny'd all sin in Infants, and consequently left no place for the forgiveness of sin in them, yet did allow of their being *Baptiz'd for the remission*

(b) Vid. Voff.
Hist. Pelag.
li. 2. part. 2.
Thes. 4.

sion of sins according to the rule of the Universal Church, and the tenour of the Gospel, as appears from the words of Pelagius himself (b), and those of his Scholar *Cælestius*.

There being therefore no doubt to be made, that forgiveness of sin is one of those inward, and Spiritual Graces, which are signified by Baptism, it may not be amiss for the farther clearing of that Grace, to say somewhat concerning the nature of it, both as to those sins it pretends to assoile, and the measure of its forgiveness. But because I have else-

(c) Expl. of
the Creed.
Art. of
The for-
giveness of
sins.

where (c) given no contemptible account thereof, and shall have occasion to resume it, when I come to shew what farther relation the outward visible sign of Baptism bears to this, and its other inward Graces; I shall content my self to observe at present, that as that forgiveness, which is signified by it, hath a relation to all our past sins, so it relates in particular to Original Sin, and consequently tends alike to the cancelling of its Obligation. Witness not only the Churches applying this sign of it to Infants, as that too, as was
before

before noted for the remission of sins, but S. Paul's making that quickening (d), which we have by Baptism, to save us as well from that *wrath*, which we were the *Children of by Nature*, as from our own *vain conversation*; and the punishment thereof. For other sense than that as the generality of the *Latins* (e) did not put upon the Apostles words, so neither is there indeed any necessity for, or all things considered any probability of: Partly because the Apostle might intend to aggravate the sinfulness of Men's former estate from their natural, as well as contracted pollutions (even as *David* aggravated his (f) where he deplores his Adultery, and Murther) and partly because there is sufficient evidence from other Texts of Men's being sinful by their birth, as well as practice, and which as S. Paul's *Children of wrath by Nature* is more strictly agreeable to, so is therefore more reasonable to be interpreted of. And I have insisted so much the longer both upon this *particular*, and the Text I have made use of to confirm it, because as Original Sin is one

O

main

(d) Ephes. 2.
1. &c.

(e) Vid Voss.
Pelag. Hist.
li. 2. part. 1.
Thes. 2.

(f) Psal. 51.
5.

main ground of Baptism, and accordingly in this very *Catechism* of ours represented by our Church as such, so she may seem to make use of that very Text to evidence the being of Original Sin, and the efficacy of Baptism toward the removing of it: Her words being, that as *we are by nature born in sin, and the Children of wrath, so we are by Baptism made the Children of Grace.*

From the Grace of forgiveness of sin pass we to that, which tends to free us from its pollution, entitled by our Church a death unto it. A grace, which as the corruption of our Nature makes necessary to be had, so cannot in the least be doubted to be signified by the outward sign of Baptism: It being not only the affirmation of *S. Paul* that all true Christians are *dead (g) to sin*, but that they are *buried by Baptism (h) into it*, that they are by that means *planted together into the likeness (i) of Christ's death*, and that their *Old Man, even the Body of sin, is crucified (k) with Christ in it*. For as that, and other such like Texts *(l)* of Scripture are a sufficient proof of Baptism's

(g) Rom. 6.

(h) — 4.^{2.}

(i) — 5.

(k) — 6.

(l) Col. 2. 12.

tisms having a relation to our death unto sin, as well as unto the death of Christ; So they prove in like manner, that it had the relation of a sign unto it, and consequently make the former death to be one of the Graces signified by it: Because not only describing the Rite of Baptism under the notion of a *death*, and *Burial*, which it cannot be said to be, but as it is an image of one, but representing it as a *planting* of the Baptized person into the *likeness* of that death of Christ, which is the *exemplar* of the other. For what is this but to say, that it was intended as a sign, or representation of them both, and both the one, and the other therefore to be look'd upon as signified by it. The same is to be said upon the account of those Texts of Scripture, which represent the Water of Baptism as *washing* (m) (m) Acts 22. 16. *away the sins of Men*, or (if that expression may not be thought to be full enough, because referring also to the forgiveness of them) as *sanctifying*, and *cleansing* (n) (n) Eph. 5. 26, 27. *the Church, to the end it may be holy, and without blemish*. For as that shews the

Water of Baptism to have a relation to that grace, which tends to free the Church from sinful blemishes, so it shews in like manner, that it was intended as a sign of it, and of that inward cleansing, which belongs to it: There being not otherwise any reason why the freeing of the Church from sin by means of the Baptismal water should have the name of *cleansing*, but upon the account of the analogy there is between the natural property thereof, and the property of that Grace, to which it relates.

One only Grace remains of those, which tend more immediately to our spiritual welfare, even that which our Catechism entitles a *new birth unto righteousness*. Concerning which I shall again shew (because that will be enough to prove, that it is a Grace signified by it) that the Water of Baptism hath a relation to it, and then that it hath the relation of a sign. I alledge for the former of these *S. Paul's* entitling it the *laver of regeneration* (o), as our Saviour's affirming (p) before him, that we are *born again* of that, as well as *of the Spirit*; For the latter what hath

(o) Tit. 3. 5.

(p) Joh. 3. 5.

hath been before shewn in the general concerning its having been intended as a sign of the things, to which it relates. For if the Water of Baptism were intended as a sign of those things, to which it relates, it must consequently have bin intended as a sign of our new birth, because by the former Texts as manifestly relating to it. But so we shall be yet more fully perswaded, if it carry in it a representation of that new birth, to which it doth relate. Which that it doth will need no other proof, than its being an apt representation of that spiritual purity, which the Soul puts on at its first conversion, and wherein indeed its new birth (q) consists. For so it is in part by that cleansing quality, which is natural to it, and which induceth a purity in those bodies, to which it is applied; But especially by the use that was formerly made of it toward the washing of new-born Infants from those impurities, which they contracted from the Womb: This last serving to set forth the first beginnings of our spiritual purity, as well as the former doth that

(q) Eph. 4.
24.

purity it self. And I shall only add, that as a resurrection from the Dead is also a kind of new Birth, and accordingly so represented by the Scriptures themselves (witness their entitling our Saviour upon the account of his Resurrection *the first-begotten* (r) Col. 1. 18. (r) *from the dead*, yea making that Resurrection of his to be a completion (s) of that signal prediction of God (t) *Thou art my Son this day have I begotten thee*) So the same Scriptures do not only represent our new birth unto Righteousness under the notion of a Resurrection, but sufficiently intimate that whether Birth or Resurrection to be a Grace signified by it : Because not only admonishing us to look upon our selves as *a live unto God* by Baptism (u), as well as *dead unto sin* in it, but as (w) Col. 2. 12. *risen* (w) *with Christ therein through the faith of the operation of him, who raised him from the dead*. For how come Men by reason of their being alive unto God through Baptism to be affirmed to have risen with Christ in it, but upon the account of that Baptism of theirs being a representation of that new life, or birth,

birth, which we have by the means of it, as well as of the Resurrection of our Saviour?


I will conclude what I have to say concerning the inward, and Spiritual Grace of Baptism, when I have taken notice of that, which though it do not immediately tend to our spiritual, and eternal welfare, yet qualifies us for those Graces, that do; Even our *union to that Body*, of which Christ Jesus is the Head, and by means of which he dispenseth the other graces to us. For that that is also signified by the outward visible sign of Baptism, will appear if we consider that visible sign as having a relation to it, and then as having the relation of a sign. Of the former whereof as *S. Paul* will not suffer us to doubt, because affirming all (x) whether (x) 1 Cor. 12.
Jews or *Gentiles* to be baptiz'd into that body; So there will be as little doubt of the other from the general design of its institution, and from what *S. Paul* intimates in the former place concerning it: That expression of being *baptized into the body of Christ* importing our being
 O 4 ing

ing receiv'd by Baptism within it, as the body of the Baptized is within those waters, wherein he is immersed. Which will consequently make that Rite a true, and proper sign of Our Union to Christ's Body, and that union therefore a thing signified by it.

Such are the things, which are by Baptism signified *on the part of God, and Christ*, or (that I may speak in the language of our Church) the *inward, and spiritual Graces* thereof. It remains that I also shew the things signified by it *on the part of the Baptized*, even an Abrenunciation of their former sins, and a resolution to believe, and act, as Christianity obligeth them to do. But because both the one, and the other of these will be more clearly understood, if they be handled apart, and whatsoever is to be known concerning each of them laid as near together as may be; Therefore having begun to entreat of the inward and spiritual Grace of Baptism, I will continue my Discourse concerning it, and accordingly go on to enquire *what farther*

ther relation the outward visible sign
of Baptism hath to its inward and
Spiritual Grace, or Graces, and first
of all to Forgiveness of sin.

PART



PART V.

Of Forgiveness of sin by Baptism.

The Contents.

Of the relation of the sign of Baptism to its inward, and spiritual Grace, and particularly to Forgiveness of sin ; Which is either that of a means fitted by God to convey it, or of a pledge to assure the Baptized person of it. The former of these relations more particularly considered, as that too with respect to Forgiveness of Sin in the general, or the Forgiveness of all Sin whatsoever, and Original Sin in particular. As to the former whereof is alledged first the Scriptures calling upon Men to be Baptiz'd for the remission, or forgiveness of sin, Secondly the Church's

Church's making that Forgiveness a part of her Belief, and Doctrine, Thirdly the agreeing opinions or practices of those, who were either unsound members of it, or Separatists from it, And Fourthly the Calumnies of its enemies. The like evidence made of the latter from the Scripture's proposing Baptism, and its Forgiveness as a remedy against the greatest guilts, and in special against that wrath, which we are Children of by Nature. From the premises is shewn, that the sign of Baptism is a pledge to assure the Baptized of Forgiveness, as well as a means fitted by God for the conveying of it.

NOW as the outward visible sign of Baptism hath, beside that of a sign, the relation of a *means* fitted by God to convey the inward, and spiritual Grace, and of a *pledge* to assure the Baptized person of it; So being now to entreat of its relation to that of the *Forgiveness of sins*, we must therefore consider it under each of them, and first as a *means* fitted by God for the conveying of it.

In

In the handling whereof I will proceed in this method ; First, I will shew that it hath indeed such a relation to Forgiveness in the general, Secondly, that it hath such a relation to the Forgiveness of *all sins* whatsoever, and particularly of Original.

That the outward visible sign of Baptism hath such a relation to Forgiveness in the general, will appear from the ensuing *Topicks*.

I. From the plain, and undoubted Doctrine of the Scripture.

II. From the consentient Doctrine, and Belief of the Church.

III. From the whether practices, or opinions of the unsound members of it, or Separatists from it.

IV. From the Calumnies of the open Enemies thereof.

I. What the Doctrine of the Scripture is in this affair cannot be unknown to any, who have reflected upon what *S. Peter* said to those *Jews*, who demanded of him, and his fellow Apostles *what* they should do to avert the guilt they had contracted,

cted, and what *Ananias* said to *Paul*, who was remitted to him upon the same account. For to the former *S. Peter* made answer among other things that they should be baptiz'd * *for the remission of sins*; Which shews what Baptism was intended for, and what therefore, if they were duly qualified, they might certainly expect from it: To the latter *Ananias*, that he should *arise, and be baptized*, † *and wash away his sins*. Which effect as it cannot be thought to referr to any thing but the preceding Baptism, and therefore neither but make that Baptism the proper means of accomplishing it; So can much less be thought to exclude, or rather not principally to intend the washing away the guilt of them: Partly because (as was before observ'd) that is the most usual sense of *washing away sins*, and partly because most agreeable to the disconsolate condition *Paul* was then in, as well as to the foregoing declaration of *S. Peter*.

II. To the Doctrine of the Scripture subjoyn we the consentient Doctrine, and belief of the *Church*,
as

as which though it cannot add to the Authority of the other, yet will no doubt conferr much to the clearing of its sense, and of that Doctrine, which we have deduced from it. Now what evidence there is of such a consent will need no other proof than the Doctrine of her Creed †, and the use she made of the simple *Baptism of Infants* to establish against the *Pelagians* the being of that *Original Sin* they call'd in question. For how otherwise could the Church call upon Men to declare, that they believ'd *one Baptism for the remission of sins*? Yea, though she thought it otherwise necessary to inculcate *Baptism*, as well as *remission*, and the *single administration* of it, as well as either. For beside that both the one, and the other might have been declar'd by themselves, as well as in the tenour, wherein they are now exhibited; Had it not been a thing otherwise certain that remission of sins was an effect of Baptism; to have subjoyn'd it to Baptism, as it is now, would have been a means to render it uncertain, and consequently all the hopes of a

Chri-

† Creed in
the Commu-
nion-serv.

(a) Voss. Hist.
Pelag. li. 2.
Part 2. Ar-
tithes. 4.

Christian together with it. Again, if there had been any the least doubt in the Church concerning this relation of Baptism, I mean as a *means* to convey remission of sins to the Baptized party; How could she have made use of the simple *Baptism* (a) of *Infants* to establish against the *Pelagians* the being of that Original sin, which they call'd in question? For that Argument of hers proceeding upon the supposition of remission of sins by Baptism, as that again upon the supposition of something to be remitted in the party baptized, which in Infants could be no other than that Original Sin, which she asserted; If Baptism had not been certainly intended for the remission of sins, that argument of hers had been of no force, yea rather weakened, than any way strengthened that Original Sin, which she maintain'd: Especially, when it was a like certain, and accordingly reply'd by the *Pelagians*, (b) that Baptism had other uses, and for which it might be suppos'd to have been conferr'd upon Infants, though they had nothing at all of sinful in them.

(b) Voss. *ibid.*
Thes. 4.

III. But beside the suffrage of the Church of God, which both publish'd this Doctrine in her *Creed*, and argued others from it ; It is farther to be observ'd, that those, who were none of the *soundest* members of it, nor indeed as yet *perfect* ones, confirm'd it by their opinions, and practices, as *they* also did in some measure, who yet separated from it in this affair. Witness, for the former, their deferring their Baptism to their *death beds* ; Whether (as the *Fathers* (c) sometime charg'd them) that they might sin so much the more securely in the meantime, or (as I rather think for the most part) because they were not well assur'd of the like efficacious means for the forgiveness of them. For which soever of these two were the occasion of that delay, manifest it is even from thence, that they had a high opinion of the forgiveness of sin by Baptism, but much more from the hazard they ran of going out of the World without it, and the contrariety of that their delay to the practice of the first Christians (d), as well as to the

P senti-

(c) *Tertul. de Pœnitent. c. 2.*

(d) *Acts 2. 41.*

(e) *Cod. Eccl.*
Univ. can. 57.

(f) *Expl. of*
Bapt. Part 4.

(g) *Voss. Hist.*
Pelag. li. 2.
Part. 2. Thes. 4.

sentiments (e) of their own times concerning it. It being not to be thought, that Men of ordinary prudence would run upon so great an irregularity, as well as danger, unless they also believ'd, that if they hapned to obtain Baptism, they should obtain together with it so plentiful a forgiveness, as would make ample amends for the other. And though we cannot so reasonably expect the like evidence from *Hereticks*, and much less from those, whose business was in a great measure to depretiate the value of Baptism, as it is certain the *Pelagians* was; Yet as even they (as was before (f) observ'd) allow'd the Baptizing of Infants into the same rule of Faith with those of riper years, and consequently into remission of sins; So they denyed not, as to Men of riper years (g), that Baptism was efficacious toward it, and that as they were baptiz'd into the belief of remission of sins, so they receiv'd that remission by it.

IV. In fine, so notorious as well as prevalent was the Doctrine of forgiveness of sin by Baptism, that the
 adver-

adversaries of the Church, and of Christianity took occasion from thence to calumniate them for it, and made that Doctrine of theirs one of their greatest crimes. Of which, to omit others, we have a remarkable proof in *Julian* (h), who makes *Constantinus*, or rather Christianity in him, thus to bespeak the World. *Whosoever is a corrupter of Women, or a Murtherer, or impure, or abominable; let him come with confidence. For having wash'd him with this water, I will make him presently clean; And though he be afterward guilty of the like crimes, yet I will take care to cleanse him from them, if he will but smite his breast, and knock his head.* The former part whereof is a manifest allusion to Baptism, and its effects, the latter to the penitential discipline of the Church. And it ought the rather to be taken notice of, because as it bears witness to that forgiveness of sin by Baptism, which hath been hitherto our design to advance, so it will contribute in part toward the proving, what comes next in order, even

(h) *Orat. cui tit. Καίσαρος*
p. 53.

(i) Expl. of
the Creed.
Art. The
forgiveness
of sins.

(k) Acts 2.

38.

(l) -----23.

(m) Acts 22.

16.

(n) 1 Tim. 1.

13.

That the outward visible sign of Baptism hath that relation, whereof we speak, to the forgiveness of *all sins* whatsoever, and particularly of *Original Sin*: There being little doubt as to the former of these, if (as Christianity is there made to speak) *adultery, and murther were wash'd away by the waters of it*. But so that Christianity it self taught, as well as was affirmed by this its adversary to do, is not only evident from what hath been elsewhere said (i) concerning its tendering forgiveness of sins *indefinitely*, and particularly in the *laver of Baptism*, but from the quality of those criminals, whom it invited to forgiveness by it. For thus we find it to have done those *Jews* (k), whom it before charg'd (l) with the murther of our Lord, and him in particular (m), who elsewhere (n) confesseth himself to have been a *blasphemer, a persecuter, and injurious*, yea was intent upon that execrable employment at the time he was first invited to forgiveness. But therefore as I cannot either conceive, or allow of any other abatement in this forgiveness, than that which is

to

to be made upon account of the *sin against the Holy Ghost*, and which what it is, hath been elsewhere (o) declar'd; So I shall need only to take notice of the reference it hath to that *Original Sin*, which is the unhappy parent of all the rest. Not that there can be any great doubt as to the pardon of that, where it appears that the most *heinous actual* sins are pardoned, but because Baptism hath been thought by our *Church* (p) to have a more peculiar reference to it, and because if it can be prov'd to have such a reference to its forgiveness, it will be of signal use to shew the necessity of baptizing Infants, in whom that sin doth alike predominate. Now though it be hard to find any one Text of Scripture, where that forgiveness, whereof we speak, is expressly attributed to Baptism; Yet will it not be difficult to deduce it from that (q), which I have before shewn to entreat of our becoming the *children of wrath by nature*, as well as by the wickedness of our conversations. For opposing to the corruption, or rather *deadness*, which accrues by both, *the quickning we have*

(o) Expl. of the Creed. Art. The forgiveness, &c.

(p) See the Office of Bapt. and the Catechism.

(q) Eph. 2. 1. &c.

(r) Col. 2. 12. *together with Christ, and which quick-*
ning he elsewhere (r) as expressly af-
 firms to be accomplished in us by
 Baptism ; Affirming moreover that
 (s) Eph. 2. *quickning* to bring *salvation* (s), and
 5-8. *peace* (t), and reconciliation (u) (for
 (t)---14-17. *to* he discourseth of it in the follow-
 (u)-----16. ing Verses of that Chapter) he must
 consequently make that *quickning*, and
 the *means* of it to tend to the forgive-
 ness of both, and particularly of *na-*
tural corruption : Because as that
quickning is by him oppos'd to
 both, so it must in this particular
 be look'd upon as more peculiarly
 opposed to the latter, because that
 is more peculiarly affirm'd to make
 Men *the Children of wrath*, and ven-
 geance.

Such evidence there is of the out-
 ward visible sign of Baptism being
 a *means* fitted by God to convey that
 forgiveness, whereof we speak ; And
 we shall need no other proof than
 that of its being also a *pledge* to as-
 sure the baptized person of it. For
 since God cannot be suppos'd to fit
 any thing for an end, which he doth
 not on his part intend to accomplish
 by it ; He, who knows himself to par-
 take

take of that, which is fitted by God to convey forgiveness of sin, may know alike, and be assur'd as to the part of God of his receiving that forgiveness, as well as the outward means of its conveyance. For which cause in my Discourse of its other inward, and spiritual Graces I shall take notice only of that outward, and visible sign as a *means* fitted by God to convey them, because its being also a *pledge* may be easily deduced from it.

[illegible]

PART VI.

Of Mortification of sin, and Regeneration by Baptism.

The Contents.

Of the relation of the sign of Baptism to such inward, and spiritual Graces, as tend to free us from the pollution of sin, or introduce the contrary purity ; And that relation shewn to be no less than that of a means, whereby they are convey'd. This evidenced as to the former, even our death unto sin (which is also explain'd) from such Texts of Scripture, as make mention of our being baptiz'd into it, and buried by Baptism in it, or from such as describe us as cleansed by the washing of it. The like evidenc'd from the same Scripture concerning the latter, even

OUR

our new birth unto righteousness ; As that again farther clear'd as to this particular by the consentient Doctrine, and practice of the Church, by the opinion the Jews had of that Baptism, which was a Type, and exemplar of ours, and the expressions of the Heathen concerning it. The Doctrine of the Church more largely insisted upon, and exemplified from Justin Martyr, Tertullian, and S. Cyprian.

I Have considered the sign of Baptism hitherto in its relation to *Forgiveness*, that Grace, which tends to free men from their guilt, and is for that purpose convey'd by Baptism to us ; I come now to consider it in its relation to those, which either tend to free them from the pollution of sin, best known by the name of a *Death unto it*, or to introduce the contrary righteousness, and is call'd a *new birth unto it*. Where again I shall shew in each of them, that as the outward work of Baptism hath the relation of a *sign* unto them, so it hath equally the relation of a *means* fitted by God to convey

convey them, and where it is duly receiv'd, doth not fail to introduce them.

To begin (as is but meet) with that, which hath the name of a *Death unto sin*, because sin must be first subdu'd, before the contrary quality can be introduc'd; Where first I will enquire what we are to understand by it, and then what evidence there is of the sign of Baptism's being fitted to convey it.

For the better understanding the former whereof we are to know, that as Men by the corruption of their nature are inclined unto sin, and yet more by the irregularity of their conversations, so those inclinations are to the persons in whom they are, as a principle of life to a living Creature, and accordingly do both dispose them to act suitably thereto, and make them brisk, and vigorous in it. Now as it cannot well be expected, that where such inclinations prevail, Men should pursue those things, which piety, and vertue prompt them to, so it was the business of Philosophy first, and afterwards of Religion, if not wholly to destroy those inclinations, yet at least
to

to subdue them in such sort, that they should be in a manner dead, and the persons, in whom they were, so far forth dead also; They neither finding in themselves the like inclinations to actual sin, nor hurried on by them, when they did. How little able Philosophy was to contribute to so blessed an effect is not my business to shew, nor indeed will there be any need of it, after what I have elsewhere * said concerning the necessity of the divine Grace in order to it. But as Christianity doth every where pretend to the doing of it, and (which is more) both represents that effect under the name of a *death unto sin*, and compares Men's thus dying with that natural death, which our Saviour underwent, so it may the more reasonably pretend to the producing of it, because it also pretends to furnish Men with the power of his Grace, to which such an effect cannot be suppos'd to be disproportionate. The only thing in question as to our present concernment is, whether as the outward work of Baptism hath undoubtedly the relation of a sign unto it, so it hath al-

so

* Exult. of the
Creed. Art.
I believe in
the Holy
Ghost.

so the relation of a *means* fitted by God for the conveying of it, and what evidence there is of that relation.

Now there are two sorts of Texts, which bear witness to this relation, as well as to its having that more confessed relation of a sign. Whereof the former entreat of this Grace under the title of a *death unto sin*, the latter of a *cleansing* from it. Of the former sort I reckon that well known place to the *Romans*, where *S. Paul* doth not only suppose all true Christians † to be *dead to sin*, and accordingly argue from it the unsuitness of their *living any longer* therein, but affirm *all, that are baptized into Jesus Christ* *, *to be baptized into that death*, * ————3.
 yea to be *buried by Baptism* (a) *into* (a) - ————4,
it; *to be planted together* (b) *by* (b) - ————5,
 that means *in the likeness of Christ's death*, and to have *their old Man* (c), (d) - ————6.
 or the body of sin crucified with him. For shall we say that *S. Paul* meant no more by all this, than that the design of Baptism, and the several parts of it was to represent to us the necessity of our dying, and being buried as to sin, and that accordingly all, that are baptized into Christ, make profes-

profession of their resolution so to do, but not that they are indeed buried by Baptism as to that particular. But beside that we are not lightly to depart from the propriety of the Scripture phrase, which must be acknowledged rather to favour a real death, than the bare signification of it; That Apostle doth moreover affirm those, whom he before describ'd as

(d) ---- 7. 18. *dead, to be freed (d) from sin, yea so*

(e) ----- 18. *far (e) as to have passed over into another service, even that of righteousness, and to have obeyed from the*

(f) ----- 17. *heart (f) that form of Doctrine, into which they had been delivered.*

Which suppos'd (as it may, because the direct affirmation of S. Paul)

will make that death, whereof we speak, to be a death in reality, as well as in figure, and accordingly

(because Men are affirmed to be baptized into it) shew that Baptism to

be a means of conveying it, as well as a representation of it. Agreeable

hereto, or rather yet more express is that of the same Apostle to the Co-

(g) Col. 2. 11. *lossians (g) though varying a little*

from the other, as to the manner of expression. For having affirmed them

through

through Christ to have put off the body of the sins of the flesh by a circumcision not made with hands, and consequently by a spiritual one, he yet adds (lest any should fancy that spiritual Circumcision to accrue to them without some ceremonial one) in the *Circumcision of Christ*, even that *Baptism*, which, conformably to the circumcision of the *Jews*, he had appointed for their entrance into his Religion by, and wherein he accordingly affirms, as he did in the former place, that they were not only *buried with him*, but had *risen together with him by the faith of the operation of God, who raised him from the dead*. From whence as it is clear, that the putting off the body of the sins of the flesh (which is but another expression for a death unto them) is though accomplished by a spiritual Grace, yet by such a one, as is conveyed to us by Baptism, so it becomes yet more clear by what he adds concerning Men's *rising with him* in the same Baptism, even to a life contrary to what they had before deposited, *through the faith of the operation of God*. For as we cannot conceive of
that

that *rising with Christ* as other than a real one, because there would not otherwise have needed such a *faith*, as that, to bring it about ; So neither therefore but think the like of that *death*, which it presupposeth , and consequently that that Baptism , to which it is annex'd , is a means of conveying it, as well as a representation of it. But so we may be yet more convinc'd by such Texts of Scripture, as speak of this *death unto sin* under the notion of a *cleansing from it*. Of which nature is that so often alledged one (b) concerning

(b) Eph. 5.
26, 27. Christ's *sanctifying, and cleansing his Church with the washing of water by the word*. For as it appears from what is afterwards subjoyn'd as the end of that *cleansing*, even that the Church *might not have any spot, or wrinkle, but that it should be holy, and without blemish* ; As it appears, I say, from thence, that the Apostle speaks in the verse before concerning a *cleansing from the filth of sin*, which is but another expression for *the putting off the body of sin*, or a *death* unto it ; So it appears in like manner from S. Paul's attributing

ting that *cleansing* to the *washing of water*, that the outward sign of Baptism is by the appointment; and provision of God; a means of conveying that spiritual Grace, by which that cleansing is more immediately effected, and that death unto sin procur'd.

From that *death unto sin* therefore pass we to our *new birth unto righteousness*, that other inward, and spiritual Grace of Baptism, and the complement of the former. A Grace of whose conveyance by Baptism we can much less doubt; if we consider the language of the Scripture concerning it, or the Doctrine, as well as practice of the Church; The opinion the *Jews* had of that, which seems to have been its type, and exemplar, or the expressions even of the Heathen concerning it.

For what less can the Scripture be thought to mean, when it affirms us to be *born of the water* (i) of it, as (i) Joh. 3. 5. well as *of the spirit*; yea so, as to be as truly *spirit* (k), as that, which is (k)--- -----6. *born of the flesh*, is *flesh*? What less can it be thought to mean, when it entitles it the *laver of* (l) Regenera-

(l) Tit. 3. 5.

Q

tion;

- tion, and which is more, affirms us to be *saved* by it, as well as by *the renewing of the Holy Ghost*? What less, when it requires us to look upon our selves as *alive* (m) unto God. (m) Rom. 6. 11.
- (n) ----- 4. by it, as well as *buried* (n) by it into the former death, or (as the same Apostle elsewhere expresth it) as *risen with Christ in it* (o) *through the faith of the operation of God, who raised him from the dead*? In fine, what less when it affirms us to be sanctified with the *washing* (p) of it, as well as it elsewhere doth by the influences of God's Spirit. For these expressions shew plainly enough, that Baptism hath its share in the producing of this new birth, as well as the efficacy of God's Spirit; And consequently that it is at least the conveyer of that Grace, by which it is more immediately produc'd.
- (p) Eph. 5. 26.

And indeed as, if men would come without prejudice, they would soon see enough in those *expressions* to convince them of as much as I have deduced from them; So they might see yet more (if they pass'd so far) in the *doctrine, and language* of the Church, to confirm them in that Interpretation

terpretation of them. For who ever even of the first, and purest times spake in a lower strain concerning Baptism? who ever made less of it, than of a means, by which we are regenerated? I appeal for a proof hereof to their so *unanimously* (q) understanding of Baptism what our Saviour spake to *Nicodemus* concerning the necessity of men's being *born again of water, and of the spirit*. For as all men whatsoever interpret that of our *new birth unto righteousness*, and, so far, as the spirit of God is concerned in it, of the means, by which it is produc'd; So they must therefore believe, that if the Antients understood it of Baptism, they allotted that its share in it, and consequently made it at least a conveyer of that Grace, by which this new birth is produc'd. I appeal farther to the particular declarations of some of the most eminent among them; and which whosoever shall seriously consider, will wonder how it should come to fall back to a naked, and ineffectual sign. For *Justin Martyr* (r) speaking concerning those, who had prepar'd themselves for Baptism,

(q) See Part 2.

(r) Apolog. 2.
p. 93, 94.

Q. 2

affirms

affirms them to be brought by the brethren to a place, where water is; and there to be regenerated after that way of regeneration, wherewith they themselves were. Which what it was, and of how great force he afterwards shews, by affirming them thereupon to be wash'd in the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, as that too conformably to what our Saviour spake concerning the necessity of men's being born again, To what the Prophet Isaiah meant, when he said, Wash you, make you clean, put away wickednesses from your souls; And in fine, to procure their deliverance from that, whether natural, or habitual corruptions they were under the power of. For these things shew plainly enough, that as he spake of the Baptismal regeneration, so he spake of it too as a thing, which procur'd, as well as figur'd the internal regeneration of them. To the same purpose doth Tertullian discourse, and particularly in his Tract de Baptismo; Witness his calling it, in the very beginning thereof, that happy Sacrament of our water, wherewith being wash'd from the faults of our present blindness, we are freed

freed into eternal life His affirming presently after, that *we the lesser fishes*, according to that *ixd's*, or greater one *Jesus Christ*, are born in the water, neither can continue safe, unless we abide in it; That we ought not to wonder, if the waters of Baptism give life, when that Element was the first, that brought forth any living creature; That, as the Spirit of God moved at the beginning upon the face of waters, so the same spirit of God, after the invocation of his name, doth descend from Heaven upon those of Baptism, and having sanctified them from himself gives them a power of sanctifying others. For these and the like passages shew as plainly, that that *Authour* look'd upon the outward sign of Baptism as contributing in its place to the production of our new birth, or sanctification, as well as to the representation of it. But of all the Antient Fathers, that have entreated of this affair, or indeed of that Sacrament, which we are now upon the consideration of, there is no one, who hath spoken more, or more to the purpose than *S. Cyprian*, or whose words therefore will be

(f) Epist. ad
Donat.

more fit to consider. Only, that I may not multiply testimonies without necessity, I will content my self with one single one, but which indeed for the fulness thereof will serve instead of many, and be moreover as clear a testimony of our dying un-
to sin by Baptism, as of our regeneration by it. For when (saith he (f)) I lay in darkness, and under the obscurity of the Night; When uncertain and doubtful I floated on the Sea of this tossing World, ignorant of my own life, and as great a stranger to truth, I thought it exceeding difficult, as the manners of Men then were, that any one should be born again, as the divine mercy had promis'd, and that being animated to a new life by the laver of salutary water, he should put off that which he was before, and whilst the frame of his body continu'd the same, become a new Man in his heart, and mind. For how (said I) is it possible, that that should be suddenly put off, which either being natural is now grown hard by the natural situation of the matter, or contracted by a long custom hath been improv'd by old Age, &c. To these, and the like purposes I often discour's'd

cours'd with my self; For as I was at that time entangled with many errors of my former life, which I did not then think it was possible for me to put off; So I willingly gave obedience to those vices, that stuck to me, and through a despair of better things, I favour'd my evils, as though they had been my proper, and domestick ones. But after that through the assistance of this generating water the blemishes of my former life were wash'd off, and my mind thus purged had a light from above poured into it; After that the second birth had chang'd me into a new Man through the force of that spirit, or breath, which I suck'd in from above; Then those things, which were before doubtful, became exceeding certain, and manifest; things, which were before shut, were then laid open, and dark things made light. Then that, which before seemed difficult, appear'd to help, rather than hinder, and that, which sometime was thought impossible, as possible to be done. So that it was not difficult to discern, that that was earthly, which being carnally born did before live obnoxious to faults, and that that began to be God's, which the Holy Ghost

now animated. You your self verily know, and will as readily acknowledge with me, what was either taken from, or bestow'd upon us by that death of crimes, and life of vertues. Which as it is an illustrious testimony of the force of Baptism in this particular, and with what reason we have affirm'd it to be a means of procuring the former death, and birth; So I have the more willingly taken notice of it, because it comes so near even in its expression to what our *Catechism* hath represented as the *inward* and *spiritual* Grace thereof: There being no great difference between a death of crimes, and life of vertues, which is the expression of that *Father*, and a death unto sin, and a new birth unto righteousness, which is the *other's*. And I shall only add, that as the Doctrine of the Church must therefore be thought to bear sufficient testimony to Baptism's being a means of our regeneration; So its practice is in this particular answerable to its Doctrine, and though in another way proclaims the same thing. Witness what hath been elsewhere observ'd concerning its giving Milk, and Honey (t) to the new

(t) See Part 3.

new Baptized person, as to an *Infant* new-born, its requiring him presently after Baptism to say (u) *Our Father*, &c. as a testimony of his Son-ship by it; And in fine its making use of the word *regenerated* to signifie Baptized: As is evident for the *Greek* Writers from what was but now quoted out of *Justin Martyr*, and from *Sulpitius Severus* among the *Latins*. Which things put together make it yet more clear, that whatever it may be now accounted, yet the Church of God ever look'd upon the Sacrament of Baptism as a mean of our internal regeneration.

(u) Expl. of the Lord's Prayer in the words *Our Father*.

De vitâ B. Martini c. 1. Necdum tamen regeneratus in Christo agebat quendam bonis operibus Baptismatis candidatum.

And indeed as it is hard to believe, that it ought to be otherwise esteem'd, considering what hath been alledg'd either from Scripture, or the declarations of the Church; So it will appear to be yet harder, if we consider the opinion of the *Jews* concerning that, which may seem to have been both its *Type*, and *exemplar*. For as I have made it appear before (w), (w) Part I. that even they were not without their Baptism, and such a one, as was moreover intended for the same general

(x) *Ibid.*

general ends, for which both their *Circumcision* was, and our *Baptism* is ; So I have made it appear also (x), that the persons so baptiz'd among them were accounted as persons new-born, yea so far, that after that time they were *not to own any of their former relations* ; In fine, that that new birth was look'd upon as so singular, that it gave occasion to their *Cabbalistical* Doctors to teach, that the old soul of the Baptized Profelyte vanished, and a new one succeeded in its place. For if this was the condition of that *Type* of Christian Baptism, how much more of the Antitype thereof ? Especially when it is farther probable (as hath been also (y) noted from the discourse of our Saviour to *Nicodemus*) that he both alluded in it to that Baptism of theirs, and intimated the conformity of his own Baptism to it in that particular.

(y) Part 2.

And though after so full an evidence of this relation of Baptism to regeneration it may seem hardly worth our while to alledge the expressions of the Heathen concerning it ; Yet I cannot forbear, for the conformity

formity thereof to the present argument, to take notice of one remarkable one of *Lucian* (2),

who brings in one *Triepho* thus discoursing after his scoffing manner.

But when (saith he) that Galilean lighted upon me, who had a bald Pate, a great Nose, who ascended up to the third Heaven, and there learn'd the most excellent things (mean-

ing, as is suppos'd S. Paul) he renewed us by water, made us to tread in the footsteps of the blessed, and deliver'd us from the Regions of the ungodly. In which passage under the title of renewing men by water he personates the Christian Doctrine concerning their being regenerated, or renewed by Baptism, and accordingly makes it the subject of his reproach.

(2) *Lucian. Philopatr. p. 999.*

Ἡνίκα δὲ μοι γαλιλαῖος
ἐνέπυχεν ἀναφαιαντίας, ὁππότε
ρίνθ, ἐς τείτον οὐρανὸν
ἀερεβατήσας, καὶ τὰ χάλισα
ἐκμεμαθηκώς, δι' ὕδατος
ἡμᾶς ἀνεκαίνισεν, ἐς τὰ τοῦ
μακάρων ἵχνια παρειώσε,
καὶ ἐν τοῦ ἀσεβῶν χωρῶν
ἡμᾶς ἐλυτρώσατο.

[illegible]

PART VII.

Of our Union to the Church by Baptism.

The Contents.

Of the relation of the sign of Baptism to our Union to the Church, and that relation shewn to be no less than that of a means, whereby that Union is made. This evidenc'd in the first place from the declarations of the Scripture, more particularly from its affirming all Christians to be baptiz'd into that Body, as those, who were first baptiz'd after the descent of the Holy Ghost upon the Apostles, to have been thereby added to their company, and made partakers with the rest in the Apostles Doctrine, and fellowship, in breaking of Bread, and in Prayers. The like evidence of the same Union to the

the Church by Baptism from the declarations of the Church it self, and the consequences of that Union shewn to be such, as to make that also to be accounted one of the inward, and spiritual Graces of that Baptism, by which it is made.

HAVING thus given an account of such inward, and spiritual Graces of Baptism, as tend more immediately to our spiritual, and eternal welfare; It remains that I say somewhat of that, which though of no such immediate tendency, yet is not without all, because qualifying us for the reception of the other: That *Union* I mean, which we thereby obtain to Christ's mystical *body* the Church, and by which we, who were before Aliens from it, as well as from God, and Christ, become members of the Church, and partakers of the several priviledges thereof. Which *Union* if any Man scruple to reckon among the inward, and spiritual Graces of Baptism properly so call'd, I will not contend with him about it; Provided he also allow of it as a thing

thing signified by it on the part of God, and Christ, and as moreover a Grace, and favour to the person, on whom it is bestow'd. For as that is all I ask at present concerning the Union now in question ; So what I farther mean by it's being an inward, and spiritual Grace shall be clear'd in the process of this Discourse, and receive that establishment, which it requires. In order whereunto I will shew the outward and visible sign of Baptism to be a *means*, whereby that Union is made, and then point out the *consequences* of that Union.

That the outward visible sign of Baptism is in the nature of a *means*, whereby we are united to the Church, will appear if we reflect upon what the *Scripture* hath said concerning it ; or the agreeing declarations of the Church it self. For what else (to begin with the former) can *S. Paul* * be thought to mean, where he * 1 Cor. 12.
affirms all whether *Jews*, or *Gentiles*, or of what ever other outward differences, to have been baptiz'd by one spirit into one body ? 13.
For as it is plain from the foregoing † verse, † ~~1 Cor. 12.~~ 12,
or

or verses, that *S. Paul* entreats of *Christ's Body* the Church, and consequently that the baptizing here spoken of must be meant of our *Baptizing into it*; So it is alike plain from what it was designed to prove, as well as from the natural force of the expression, that it was set to denote also our being *united* to it thereby. For as we cannot impose a more natural sense upon *Baptized into that body*, than our being receiv'd by Baptism into it, as the Baptized person is within the water, and consequently some way united to it; So much less if we consider what it was intended to prove, even* that Christians, how many soever; are but that *one body*. For how doth their being *baptiz'd into it* prove them to be that one Body; but that that visible sign, by which they are so, unites them to one another, and to the whole? A *meer* sign of Union, though it may shew what the partakers thereof ought to be; yet being no just proof of what they are; and much less (as *S. Paul* seems to argue) that they are so by the means of it. And indeed, as it will therefore

fore be hard to make the sign here spoken of to be any thing less than a means of our Union to the Church ; So especially, if we consider what is elsewhere said concerning those, who first after the descent of the Holy Ghost, were baptized in the name of Christ : *S. Luke* not only affirming of those new baptiz'd ones, that they were *added to (a)* the Apostles, and their other company, (which he afterwards expresseth *(b)* by *added to the Church*) but that they were partakers *(c)* with the rest in the *Apostles Doctrine, and fellowship, and in breaking of bread, and in Prayers*. For this shews their having an interest in all the priviledges of that Body, and therefore much more their being united to it. But so it appears that the Antient Church esteemed of it, whose determination is of the more force, because it is only about the supposed means of Union to its own Body ; *Justin Martyr*, after he had spoken of the baptizing of such as offer'd themselves to the Christian Church (which he himself expresseth, when so baptiz'd, by *συγκατατίθειν* ; or *conjoynd with themselves*)

(a) Acts 2.41.

(b) -----47.

(c) -----42.

R affirming

affirming that *they were immediately brought where the brethren were assembled*, there to partake with them of the *common Prayers*, that were then offer'd up, of the *kiss of peace*, and of the *Lord's Supper*. Which last particular I have the more confidently represented the new baptized persons as then admitted to, because the same Father doth not only make no distinction between them, and the other brethren in it, though he subjoins the business of the *Eucharist* to the former Prayers, and *kiss of peace*, but affirms the same Eucharist presently after to be *lawful to none to partake of, but those that believ'd their Doctrine, receiv'd the laver of regeneration, and liv'd as Christ delivered*. For as he intimates thereby the admission of those that believ'd, and were baptiz'd, if they were also such as liv'd as Christ deliver'd, which the new baptized were in reason to be accounted, till they had given proof to the contrary; So there is reason to believe from the use of *Excommunication* in the Church, that that addition of *living as Christ deliver'd* was not made to
 bar

bar the new baptized from it, till they gave farther proof of such a life, but to intimate the exclusion of those, who, after they had been admitted to it, liv'd otherwise, than Christianity prescrib'd : So making the persons excluded the *unbaptiz'd*, or *ill living Christians*, and consequently the contrary thereto admitted. I deny not indeed, that the Rite of *Confirmation* did very antiently come between the receiving of Baptism, and the Eucharist. I deny not farther, because of what was before (d) quoted from *Justin Martyr* concerning the *particular Prayer* that was made for the new baptized person, that the substance thereof was then in use, even *prayer for grace for him* to live as he had but now profess'd. But as the design of Confirmation appears to have been to procure for the new baptiz'd a more plentiful effusion of God's Graces, which is no intimation at all of his having been before no perfect Christian, or not perfectly united to the Church, so Baptism may for all that be look'd upon as the means of our Union to the Church, which is all, that I have

(d) Expl. of
the Sacrament
in general.
Part 4.

(e) De Bapt.

c. 6.

taken upon me to assert. For the farther evidencing whereof I will in the next place alledge a passage of *Tertullian* (e), which will, though not so directly, prove the same thing; That I mean where he saith, that *when the profession of our faith, and sponson of our salvation are pledged under the three witnesses* before spoken of, *there is necessarily added thereto the mention of the Church, because where those three are, even the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, there is also the Church, which is the body of the Three.* For as it is evident from thence, that Men were even from his time baptiz'd expressly into the belief of the *Church*, as well as into the belief of the *Trinity*; So it will not be difficult to infer, that they were also baptiz'd into the unity thereof, and made members of the Church by it: Because as he affirms the *Trinity* to become Sponsors of our Salvation in Baptism, as well as either Witnesses, or objects of our Profession; So he affirms those Sponsors to be as it were employed in the Church, and consequently to exert their saving influences with-

within it, which supposeth Men's being united to it by Baptism in order to their partaking of the salutariness of the other. And indeed, though in that form, which our Saviour prescrib'd (f) for Baptism, there is mention only of baptizing in the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, yet inasmuch as he prescrib'd that very form for the *making of Disciples* (g) by, he must consequently be suppos'd to propose it for the aggregating them to that body, which he had already begun to frame, and making them alike members of it. (f) Matt. 28. 19. (g) *Ibid.*

There being therefore no doubt to be made of the outward visible sign of Baptism being a *means of our Union to Christ's mystical body the Church*, it may not be amiss (if it were only to manifest the great advantages thereof, as to that particular) to shew the *consequences of that Union*. Which we shall find in the general to be a right to all those priviledges, which Christ hath purchas'd for it; More particularly to the partaking of its *Sacred Offices*, and in, and through the means of them of those *inward, and spiritual Graces*, which those Sacred Offices

were intended to procure, or convey. For every member of a Society being by that membership of his entituled to all the priviledges, that belong to it as such; He, who becomes a member of Christ's Body, the Church (as every Man, who is united to it by Baptism, doth) must in his proportion be entituled to all those priviledges, which Christ hath purchas'd for it, and particularly to the priviledge of partaking of its sacred Offices, and in, and by the means of them, of those inward and spiritual Graces, which those sacred Offices were intended to procure, or convey. Which how great a commendation it is of our *Union to that Body*, and consequently of that Baptism, by which it was made, will need no other proof than the Scripture's assuring us that Christ is the *Saviour (h) of that Body*, and the promises it makes to those Prayers *(i)*, that are made by it, and to that Eucharist *(k)*, which is administred in it; The purport of those promises being no other, than the granting what is asked by it, and particularly all those benefits, which Christ's
Body

(h) Eph. 5. 23.

(i) Matt. 18.


19, 20.

(k) Matt. 26.

26, &c.

Body and Blood were intended for the procuring of. And if these be, as no doubt they are, the consequences of our union to the Church by Baptism, yea so far (as I have elsewhere (1) shewn) that they are not ordinarily to be attained out of it; That very Union may not improperly be stil'd one of its inward and spiritual Graces, because leading to those, that are most strictly such, and indeed the only ordinary means of obtaining them.

(c) Expl. of
the Creed,
Art. of
The forgiveness of
sins.



PART VIII.

Of the Profession that is made
by the Baptized person.

The Contents.

The things signified by Baptism on the part of the baptized brought under consideration, and shewn from several former discourses (which are also pointed to) to be an Abrenunciation of sin, a present belief of the Doctrine of Christianity, and particularly of the Trinity, and a resolution for the time to come to continue in that belief, and act agreeably to its Laws. Our resolution of acting agreeably to the Laws of Christianity more particularly consider'd, and the Profession thereof shewn by several Arguments to be the intendment of the Christian

stian Baptism. What the measure of that conformity is, which we profess to pay to the Laws of Christianity, and what are the consequences of the Violation of that Profession.

HAVING thus consider'd the things signified by Baptism *on the part of God, and Christ,* best known by the name of its *inward, and spiritual Graces*; It remains that I give the like account of the things signified by it on the part of the baptiz'd, *or the things the baptized person maketh Profession of by it.* Which, as was before observ'd, are an *Abrenunciation of sin, a present belief of the Doctrine of Christianity, and a resolution for the time to come to continue in that belief, and act agreeably to its Laws.*

That something is signified by Baptism on the part of the *baptized,* as well as on the part of *God, and Christ,* is evident from what was before said * concerning the nature of a *Sacrament* in the general, and Baptism's † relating as well to something to be perform'd by the baptiz'd, as to those divine Graces, or pri-

* Of the Sacrament in general, Part 2.
† *Ibid.*

priviledges which we expect from the other.

That the *things* before mentioned are the things thus signified by it, hath also been elfewhere * declar'd, and fo, that it would not be difficult for a diligent Reader to fatisfie himfelf from thence. But becaufe what I have faid concerning them lies difperfedly in my former Difcourfes, and would therefore require more pains, than I ought to impofe upon my Reader, to find it out, and apply it to the prefent Argument; I will here, though very briefly, confider them anew, and if not (which would be too tedious) repeat all that I have faid concerning them, yet point him as I go to the particular places, from whence they may be fetch'd.

* Expl. of the
Apostles
Creed.

That *Abrenunciation of fin* is one of the things signified by Baptifm is not only evident from the manner of adminiftring it in the Primitive times, and which together with the form of their Abrenunciation, and our own are fet down in my account of the *Preliminary questions, and answers* of the Catechifm, but alfo from
the

the general tenour of that Religion, which Baptism is an initiation into; That requiring the renouncing of all sin, and wickedness, and therefore supposing the baptized person to do so, when he takes that Religion upon him. For which cause as an express Abrenunciation was heretofore requir'd, and continues so to be to this very day; So it was signified, as by other Rites, and particularly by the baptized persons *putting off his cloaths* in order to his Baptism, as putting off together with them the *Old Man*, and *his deeds*, so by the Rite of Baptism it self: He, who submits to that, implying thereby his looking upon *sin* as a Moral impurity, and which therefore for the future he would not have any thing to do with.

The second thing signified by Baptism on the part of the baptized is his *present belief of the Doctrine of Christianity*, more especially of the Doctrine of the *Trinity*. As is evident from that Baptism's being commanded by our Saviour to be made *in, or into the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost*.
For

For to be baptiz'd *into the name* of those persons importing the owning of those persons as our *Masters* (a), and our selves as the *Disciples* of them; To be so baptized moreover importing the owning of those persons as *alike* (b) *Masters* of us, and consequently, because the Father cannot be own'd in any lower relation, as partakers of the same divine Nature, and Authority; Lastly, to be so baptiz'd importing the owning of them in particular by a *belief* of the Christian Doctrine, that being the most signal instance of that Discipleship, we receive by it; The belief of the Doctrine of Christianity, and of the *Trinity* in particular must be look'd upon as signified by Baptism on the part of the baptized, and those baptized ones consequently as making profession of that belief by it. For which cause as the *rule of Faith*, or the *Creed* (c) was given to those to learn, who were willing to be initiated into Christianity, so they were particularly interrogated (d) as to their belief of the Articles thereof, and then, and not till then baptiz'd into it, and the priviledges thereof.

The

(a) Expl.
of the
Creed. Art.
I believe in
the Holy
Ghost.
(b) *Ibid.*

(c) Introd.
concerning
Catechising,
&c.

(d) Expl. of
the Prel.
Quest. and
Answers.

(e) *Ibid.*

The third and last thing signified on the part of the baptized is a *resolution for the time to come to continue in the belief of Christianity, and act agreeably to its Laws.* Both which will receive a sufficient confirmation from S. Peter's affirming Baptism to be the *Answer, or stipulation of a good conscience toward God*, and from what I have elsewhere (e) said concerning it. For as it is evident from thence, that Baptism signifies on the part of the baptized a stipulation, or promise of somewhat to be done by him; So it will not be difficult to infer from thence, that it signifies also a stipulation, or promise to continue in that belief of Christianity, into which he is baptized, and act agreeably to its laws. As will appear, whether we consider that stipulation as having *a good conscience toward God* for the object of it (in which sense I should think S. Peter ought to be understood) or, as I find many others to do, as *proceeding from such a conscience.* For a *good conscience* having a due regard to the several parts of that Religion, which it makes profession to espouse; He, who

who with relation to Christianity stipulates *from a good conscience*, or makes that good conscience the object of his stipulation, must consequently be thought to stipulate, or make a promise of answering the several parts of it, and therefore also (because they are parts of Christianity) of continuing in its Faith, and acting agreeably to its Laws. And hence, (as was before (f) observ'd) this, and the other Institution of our Religion had of old the name of *Sacraments*, as importing a Vow, or promise to Christ of believing in him, or obeying him. And hence also, that the Antients argued (g) the *unlawfulness of superinducing an humane, or military Sacrament upon a divine one, and answering to another Master after Christ*. Which we shall the less need to wonder at, if we remember that that Baptism, whereof we speak, was copyed from the Baptism of the *Jews* (h), and particularly from that of *John the Baptist*. For concerning the former of these it hath been observ'd (i), that *those three men, that presided over it, lean'd over the baptized persons as they stood in the*

(f) Expl.
of the Sa-
crament in
general,
Part I.

(g) Ibid.

(h) Expl.
of Baptism,
Part I.

(i) Ibid.

the water, and twice explain'd to them some of the more weighty, and lighter precepts of their Law. For what reason think we, but to let them know, that they were baptiz'd into the obedience of the one, and the other, and that they accounted that Baptism of their's as a Profession of it? And though we do not find the like affirm'd concerning the Baptism of *John the Baptist*, which because an extraordinary one, and immediately *from Heaven*, I have distinguished from the other; Yet, which will come all to one, we find it entituled the *Baptism of Repentance* (k), and (which is more) that Baptist enjoining upon those *Publicans* (l), who came to be baptized by him, *to exact no more than was appointed them*, as upon those *Souldiers*, that came upon the like errand, *to do violence to no man, to accuse no man falsely, and to be content with their wages*: Such affirmations as these being pregnant proofs, that a resolution of living piously, and vertuously was a thing signified on the part of the baptized, and that their taking upon them the former Baptisms was a profession of it. Now if that Profession

(k) Mark 1.

Acts 13. 14.

(l) Luk. 3. 12,
&c.

fession were the intendment of the former Baptisms, and particularly of that of *John the Baptist*, why not also of the Baptism of *Christ*? Especially, when *John's* Baptism of *Repentance* was to prepare men for the *Kingdom of Christ*, and to which therefore we may suppose a stricter piety to belong, and they, who were baptiz'd into that Kingdom, plung'd more deeply into the Profession of the other. I will conclude this affair, when I have added, that it appears from the Institution of Baptism, that the design, and end of it was to make Disciples (*m*) unto Christ. For it appearing from other words of his, that they, and they alone can be his *Disciples*, who take up their Cross (*n*); and follow him; forsake all (*o*) for him, and in fine abide (*p*) in his words; If the design, and end of Baptism were to make men Disciples unto Christ, it must consequently oblige those, who take it upon them, to take upon them also the performance of the other, as to which that Discipleship obligeth them.

(*m*) Matt. 28.
19.

(*n*) Luk. 14.
27.
(*o*) ——— 33.
(*p*) Joh. 8. 31.

S

Now

(q) Expl. of
the Lords
Prayer in the
words, *Our
Father,*
&c.

Now though therefore there can be no great doubt concerning the baptized person's making profession of acting agreeably to the Laws of Christ, yet there may be as to the measure of that conformity to them, to which his Baptifmal Profession obligeth him ; That imperfect state , wherein we are , and the baptized person's being from the beginning (q) taught to pray *for the forgiveness of his Trespasses* seeming to require an abatement of it ; And because too I have more than once oblig'd my self to enquire , what *keeping of God's holy Will, and Commandments*, is incumbent upon us from our Baptifmal Profession, and that Christianity, which it enters us into ; Therefore for the farther clearing this part of our Baptifmal Profession, as well as for the answering my own obligations, I will now set my self to enquire, what the *measure* of that conformity is, which we *profess* to pay to the Laws of Christ , and what are the *consequences of the violation of that Profession*.

As concerning the *former* of these I shall not doubt to affirm it to be
adæ

adequate for the matter of it to the several *species* of those Laws, which Christianity obligeth us to; S. Paul having expressly told us (r), that *that Grace, which bringeth salvation, teacheth men to deny all ungodly, and worldly lusts, and to live righteously, godly and soberly in the present World.* I shall not stick to affirm, Secondly, that that Conformity, which we make profession of, ought to answer so far as we can carry it, the several *particularities* of the Christian Laws, as well as the several species thereof: Less than that being not to be suppos'd to be the Profession of those, who make profession of a good Conscience toward God; A good Conscience, as such, prompting him in whom it is to conform so far as he can to every particular of his Law, to whom he professeth an obedience. But neither Thirdly shall I stick to affirm, that that conformity, which we make profession of, ought to be so entire, and full, as not to be interrupted at any time by a *wilful violation* of any Law; or a violation of them in *scandalous instances*; Such as those are, concern-

(r) Tit. 2. 11,
12.

(f) Gal. 5 21.

ing which S. Paul hath affirm'd (f), that *they, which do such things, shall not inherit the Kingdom of God*: He answering not the divine law, so far as he can, who proceeds to either of those, because the Grace of Baptism, with a moderate care, must be suppos'd to be of sufficient force to preserve men both from the one, and the other. Such I take to be the Conformity, which Christianity obligeth us to, and which consequently the baptized person must be suppos'd to make profession of. And I would to God, that as all Christians make profession of such a one, so their lives, and conversations were more answerable to it, than the experience both of our selves and others assures us it is. But as the contrary thereof is too apparent to need any farther proof, so I think it therefore but reasonable, for the better awaking of those baptized ones, to set before them in the next place the *consequences of the violation of their profession*.

Whereof the first, that I shall assign, is, that so far as they depart from that Profession of theirs, so far
forth

forth they sin against that very Baptism of theirs, which was intended for their recovery from sin, and against that saving Religion, into which it admits them: That Baptism, which enjoyns upon them the making profession of a good Conscience, enjoyning consequently the answering that profession by a suitable piety, as without which that Profession would be but an hypocritical one. From whence as it will follow, that there will be little reason to believe, that they shall enjoy the benefits of Baptism, who answer not the Profession of it; So much less if we consider what that was, that made their Profession to be of any avail at the first, even the *presumption* it gave, that the person, that made it, would (as occasion offer'd it self) give suitable demonstrations of it. For if that presumption were the thing, which made the Profession of a good Conscience to be of any avail at the first; Those demonstrations failing, those benefits must be suppos'd to fail, which were collated upon the presumption of them. But from thence it

will follow Thirdly, that they, who answer not their former profession, can much less promise to themselves farther spiritual blessings here, or an interest in the other World; They, who could not be admitted to the first priviledges of Baptism but upon a presumption of their future piety, being much less likely to be admitted to the participation of others, after that presumption appeareth to be null. It will follow Lastly, that they who answer not the Profession of Baptism by a piety sutable to it, must consequently fail altogether of the benefits thereof, if that Christianity, into which it entred them, had not provided them of a remedy against the violations of their Profession. Which, though it will not make the case of those violatiors desperate, yet will shew it to be so dangerous, as to oblige all, who have a care of their Salvation, to prevent what they may such violations of it, or endeavour to repair them afterwards by a speedy, and severe repentance, and a more fixed, and settled piety: Left, as it may sometime

time happen, they be cut off before they can make use of the remedy propos'd, or by reason of their former violations have not the grace given them to do it.

S 4 P A R T

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO
LIBRARY
540 EAST 57TH STREET
CHICAGO, ILL. 60637

PART IX.

Of the right Administration of Baptism.

The Contents.

After a short account of the Foundation of the Baptismal relation, and reference made to those places from which a larger one may be fetch'd; Enquiry is made touching the right Administration of Baptism, as therein again First, Whether Baptism ought expressly to be made in the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, Secondly whether Schismatics, and Hereticks are valid Administratours of it, Thirdly, to what, and what kind of persons it ought to be administred, Fourthly, Whether it may be repeated. The two first of these spoken to here,
and

and first, *Whether Baptism ought to be expressly administred in the form propos'd. Which is not only shewn to be under obligation from the express words of the Institution, but answer made to those Texts, which seem to intimate it to be enough to baptize in the name of the Lord Jesus only. The Baptism of Schismatics, and Hereticks more largely shewn to be valid, unless where they baptize into a counterfeit Faith, and the several objections against it answer'd.*

I Have hitherto entreated of the *outward visible sign* of Baptism, of its *inward and spiritual Grace*, or the things signified by it, and the *farther relation* that outward sign beareth to them. It follows that I entreat of the *foundation* of that relation, the *Fourth* thing propos'd to be consider'd.

Now as the *Foundation* of that relation hath been shewn * to be no other, than the *Institution* of Christ, as that again not so much as deliver'd by him, as appli'd to that *water* in which it is subjected; So I have in the same discourse said † so much

* Expl. of
the Sacrament
in general,
Part 2.

† *Ibid.* Part
2. 3.

much concerning the Institution of this, and the application of that Institution to the outward visible sign thereof, that I shall need to say the less here. It may suffice briefly to observe from thence, that when the Minister hath prepar'd the water of Baptism by a declaration of the end of its Institution, and by imploring the Holy Spirit on it, Christ, who hath promised to be with him in that ministrations of his, gives it the relation of the Sacrament of Baptism, and consequently makes it apt to convey the several graces thereof to those, who are to partake of it. Which will leave little more for us to consider, as to the Sacrament of Baptism, than the right Administration of it, or what may without any violence be reduced to it.

Now there are *Four* things, which are especially to be enquir'd in order to the clearing of that, which is now before us.

- I. Whether Baptism ought expressly to be administer'd in the name of the *Father*, and of the *Son*, and of the *Holy Ghost*.

II. Whe-

II. Whether Schismaticks, and Hereticks are valid Administrators of it.

III. To what, and what kind of persons it ought to be administered.

IV. Whether it may be repeated.

I. The ground of the first of these, even whether Baptism ought expressly to be administered *in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost*, is not any the least doubt of those being the express words of the Institution, or of their not admitting, consider'd in themselves, of any variation from it, but the accounts we have from the Scripture of the administration of that Sacrament either by the hands, or at the command of the Apostles, and other such inspired men: Those seeming to intimate it to be enough to baptize *in the name of the Lord Jesus*, as comprehending within it an acknowledgement of the other two persons, and indeed of all other the substantial Articles of his Faith, in whose name we are so baptiz'd. For thus when those *Jews*, to whom

S. Peter

S. Peter Preach'd on the day of *Pentecost*, were wrought upon so far, as to ask what they ought to do in order to their Salvation; S. Peter's answer was † that they should be baptiz'd in the name of the Lord Jesus: Which accordingly we may believe to have been done by those, that gladly receiv'd the word, because it is afterwards (a) said of them, that (a) — 41. they were baptiz'd, that is; as one would think, in that, and that only name, which had been prescrib'd. Thus again it is said (b) of those, (b) Acts 8. 16. who had been baptiz'd by Philip at Samaria, that they were baptiz'd in the name of the Lord Jesus, without any the least hint of their being baptized in any other name: As in like manner (c), that S. Peter gave order (c) — 10. 47. for the baptizing of Cornelius, and his company, after that the Holy Ghost had by his preaching descend-ed upon them. In fine thus we find, that the Disciples of Ephesus (d) were, (d) — 19. 53 who it seems till that time had not only no gifts of the Holy Ghost upon them, but not so much as any knowledge, whether there were any Holy Ghost, or no. Which place is the

the more to be stood upon, because those Disciples having before so little knowledge of a Holy Ghost, one would think he that told the story of their taking upon them the Christian Baptism at the hearing of what was said to them by S. Paul, should have express'd that Baptism of theirs by their being baptiz'd into the belief of the Trinity, and particularly of that *Holy Ghost*, which they seem before to have been ignorant of. But as we are not lightly to think, nor indeed without an irrefragable reason, that those first Disciples of Christ made use of, or countenanc'd any other form of Baptism, than what their Master had so clearly, and expressly prescrib'd; So there is nothing of any such moment in the places before alledg'd to persuade their making use of, or giving countenance to any other. On the contrary the Text last mention'd, if taken in all its parts, seems rather to persuade those Disciples having been baptiz'd in the very words of the Institution, than only *in the name of the Lord Jesus*. For S. Paul asking, as by way of wonderment, unto what

what they had been before baptiz'd, if they had not (as they said) so much as heard of any Holy Ghost, seems to intimate that all, that then receiv'd the Christian Baptism, could not but know from the very form of it, that there was such a thing as a Holy Ghost. Neither will it avail to say, as was before objected, that if that had been *S. Paul's* intention, or the certain form of Baptism, *S. Luke*, who tells the story, should in reason have express'd it by their being baptiz'd into the Trinity, and particularly into the name of him, whom they were before so ignorant of. Because *S. Luke's* business was not so much to give an account of the form of their Baptism, as to acquaint us, that whereas before they had been only baptiz'd into *John's* Baptism, upon their understanding from *S. Paul*, that *John* himself directed those, that came to it, *to believe on him that should come after him, that is on Christ Jesus*; they were then expressly baptiz'd into the Baptism of Christ, or (as *S. Luke* there expresseth it) into the name of Jesus Christ: So opposing the baptizing
into

into the name of *Jesus Christ* not to the baptizing in any other form; and particularly into the name of all the three persons, but to the Baptism of *John* only, and as the name of *Jesus Christ* might discriminate their present Baptism from it. And though it be true, that the like is not to be said as to the foregoing Texts, because there is no opposition in them between the Baptism of *John*, and that of *Christ*. Yet may a fair account be given, without supposing that to have been the form of Baptism, of the Scriptures expressing those primitive Baptisms by baptizing into the name of *Jesus* only; Because our Saviour was the immediate Author of that Religion, into which those Baptisms were made, and the baptizing into his name therefore no improper expression of a baptizing into the whole of it, and into every part, and particle thereof. I will conclude this affair, when I have added

* Ἐπ' ἐν ὀνόματι
ματρὸς καὶ τοῦ
πατρὸς καὶ τοῦ
ἁγίου πνεύματος

ὅλων, καὶ δεσπότου θεῶν, καὶ τοῦ σωτῆρος ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ χριστοῦ, καὶ
πνεύματος ἁγίου τὸ ἐν τῷ ὕδατι τότε λεγόμενον ποιῆντα. Apolog.
2. p. 94.

one of the Antientest Writers the Church hath, that Baptism was in his time administred in the name of the three persons; So all, that have mentioned the Creed, have represented it as a thing given to those, who were to be baptized, and into which therefore we are to think, that if men were not minutely, and particularly baptiz'd, yet they were at least into the *capital* Articles thereof.

II. It appearing from the premises, that Baptism ought expressly to be administred in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost, which is the first of those things we proposed to consider; Pass we on to enquire, who are valid Administrators of it, or rather whether Schismatics, and Hereticks are. A question which will best be voided by considering the force of those Arguments, which the condemners of their Baptism have produc'd, and particularly which *3. Cyprian* their chiefest Champion hath. Now those are, that *Schismatics* and Hereticks, *are by that their*

T

Schism;

† Quis autem potest dare quod ipse non habeat? aut quomodo potest spiritualia agere, qui ipse amiserit spiritum Sanctum? Ad Januarian. Ep. 70.

* Nam cum dicimus, Credis in vitam eternam, & remissionem peccatorum per Sanctam Ecclesiam, intelligimus remissionem peccatorum non nisi in Ecclesia dari, apud Hereticos autem ubi Ecclesia non sit, non posse peccata dimitti. Cypr. ubi supra, & alibi passim.

* Sed & Baptizato quam precem potest facere sacerdos sacrilegus, & peccator? Cum scriptum sit, Deus peccatorem non audit, sed qui eum coluerit, & voluntatem ejus fecerit, illum audit. Cypr. Ib.

* Vid. Cypr. ad Jubaian. Ep. 73.

that Hereticks in particular deprave that Faith*, into which Baptism is requir'd to be made, and consequently must be suppos'd to baptize into a false, and counterfeit one. But how little force there is in these Arguments, as to the invalidating the Baptism of Schismatics, or Hereticks, will appear upon a more narrow inspection into them.

For

For be it first that Schismatics and Hereticks are by that Schism, or Heresie of theirs deprived of the Spirit of God themselves ; Be it that they cannot therefore be suppos'd to confer it upon others ; Yet will it not from thence follow , but they may be valid Administratours of Baptism, and they, who receive it from them, receive the Spirit of God with it. Because that Spirit of God, which goes along with Baptism, is not conferred by them, but by him, whose Institution Baptism is, and consequently no way depending upon their having the Spirit of God themselves. All, that the Minister confers on his part toward the procuring of that Spirit, is to prepare that Baptismal Water, which it is by the Institution of Christ to accompany, and to administer it, when so prepar'd, to those who are to be baptized with it. Which if the Minister doth according to the Institution of Christ, there is no doubt the Spirit of God will follow of course, whether he, who administers Baptism, partake of that Spirit, or no. Otherwise a sinful Minister would be as invalid an Admini-

nistrator of Baptism, as the most Schismatical, or Heretical one.

But it may be there is more of weight in Schismatics, and Hereticks being *out of the Church*, and as such in no condition either of enjoying in themselves those priviledges, that belong to it, or being instrumental toward the procuring of them for others. And so no doubt there would, if they were fully, and perfectly out of the Church, nor retain'd in any measure to it. But how first, if Schismatics, and Hereticks were fully, and perfectly out of the Church, could S. Cyprian (e) himself allow the receiving of such without a new Baptism, who had after their Baptism in the Church fallen into Schism, or Heresie? These, as they were no less Schismatics, and Hereticks than those, that were baptiz'd by Hereticks, and consequently alike out of the Church; So being, if to be receiv'd again, to be receiv'd after the same manner, that is to say by a new Baptism. Neither will it avail to say (as that *Father* (f) pleads for himself.) that those, who have been baptiz'd in the Church, are to be

(e) *Ad Quintum*, Ep. 70.

(f) *Ibid.*

be look'd upon as *wandering sheep*, and as such, when they return, to be receiv'd into the Fold, whereas the other are wholly *aliens*, and *profane*. For if Schismatics, and Hereticks be fully, and perfectly out of the Church, those also, what ever they before were, must cease to be look'd upon as Sheep, and consequently, if admitted, be admitted as *aliens*, and *profane*, as well as those, who were baptiz'd out of the Church. And indeed as it appears by the same *Father* (g), that those who oppos'd him, and the Bishops that took part with him, argued the validity of the Baptism of Hereticks from the Churches receiving those without a new one, who had fallen after her Baptism into Schism or Heresie; So if we will allow the Baptism of the latter, we must allow the Baptism of the former, or find out some other reason to overthrow it. For if the rightly baptized Schismatick, or Heretick were a *Sheep*, though a *wandering* one, notwithstanding his Schism, or Heresie; The Schismatick, or Heretick, whom that *wandering Sheep* ran after, might as well

(g) *Ad Quintum, Ep. 71.*

be a *Pastor*, though a *wandering* one too, and consequently be in a condition, following the order of the Institution, to bring new Sheep to the great Shepherd, and Bishop of our Souls. That, which I suppose occasion'd that *Father's* mistake (for so I hope I may now have leave to call it, because the Church of God hath generally done so since) but that I say, which occasion'd *S. Cyprian's* mistake, was his not distinguishing between being fully, and perfectly out of the Church (which I should think none but Apostates can be, if they also are) and being only partly, and imperfectly so, as Schismatics, and Hereticks are. For as Schismatics, and Hereticks must be suppos'd to retain so far to the Church, as they do not separate from it in Communion, or belief; So it is but a just piece of charity to think that Christ who knows men's infirmities, and prejudices, will not invalidate such acts of theirs, as are purely charitable ones, and wherein moreover they consent with the Church of God (whatever they may do as to other things) and with
his

his own blessed Institution. I deny not indeed, but that to be even so out of the Church, as Schismatics, and Hereticks are, is a very dangerous thing, and doth without a special mercy of God make them liable to Damnation. But as I do not therefore think, that we ought to look upon it as a desperate one; So there may be so much of honest simplicity of mind even in them, and a readiness to embrace the truth, whenever they are convinced of it, that Christ, who laid down his life for the worst of men, may so far at least consider them, as to give his blessing to those acts of theirs, which are both charitable in themselves, and manag'd with a just consent to his own institution, and the practice too of that Church, from which in other things they have departed.

And this answer, with a little variation, will furnish one to that objection, which represents Schismatics and Hereticks as *sinners* before God, and whom therefore we cannot suppose God will hear for the person to be baptiz'd. For though I grant that such persons are sinners

before God, yea that whatever they do by way of separation from the Church is to be look'd upon as of the same nature, and consequently that their very baptizing also may be; Yet as I do not think that every thing, that is sinfully done, is therefore invalid (for so far ought I know many true Churchmens good actions also might be) So Christ may hear even such persons, when they act agreeably to his own Institution, both for the regard he bears to that, and for that honest simplicity, and good meaning, which is, if not in them that administer Baptism, yet in those that joyn with them, and whose Minister I have before said (b) the Consecrator to be in that affair.

(b) Expl. of
the Sacram.
ingen. Part. 3

One only Objection remains on the part of Hereticks, and that is their depraving that Faith, into which Baptism is requir'd to be made, and consequently thereto, as is suppos'd, baptizing into a false, and counterfeit one. And I no way doubt that, if Hereticks baptize into a false, and counterfeit Faith, their Baptism is null, because contrary to that

that Institution, which gives validity to all. Upon which account we must look upon the Baptism of those persons as null, who have baptiz'd in any other form, than in the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost. Of which sort was that of the Hereticks spoken of by *Irenaus* (i), who instead of baptizing according to the form of the institution, did baptize their Disciples *into the name of the unknown Father of all things, into truth the Mother of all things, into him that descended into Jesus for the union, and redemption, and communion of powers.* To which others it seems added certain *Hebrew* names, the better to amuse those, that were initiated by them. The like may reasonably enough be thought of the Baptism of many other of the Antient *Hereticks*, although we have not it may be so certain grounds from Antiquity for their depraving the very form of Baptism. For being, as appears from their tenents, Christians in name, rather than in reality, and beside that advancing such uncouth, and monstrous ones, it is not easie to think they should have
such

(i) *Adv.*
Heres. li. 1. c.
13.

such a regard to Christ, or his Institution, as to keep to that form, which he prescrib'd. Which suppos'd,

there is not the least dif-

* Ἐπίσκοπον, ἢ πρεσβύτερον αἰρετικῶν δεξαμένους βάπτισμα, ἢ θυσίαν κηδαιρεῖν αὐτοὺς ποιεῖν. Τίς γὰρ συμφώνησις χριστῷ πρὸς βελίαν; ἢ τίς μετὰ πᾶσιν μετ' αὐτοῦ;

† Ἐπίσκοπος, ἢ πρεσβύτερος ἢ κατ' ἀλήθειαν ἔχοντα βάπτισμα ἐὰν ἀνωθεν βαπτίσῃ, ἢ τὸ μεμολυσμένον παρὰ τοῦ ἀπεβῶν ἐὰν μὴ βαπτίσῃ, κηδαιρεῖτω, &c.

ficulty in giving an account of those 46 * and 47 †. Canons of the Apostles, which do so far reprobate the Baptism of Hereticks, as to require a reiteration of it. For if the Hereticks there intended were such as are before described (as is not unreasonable

to believe even from the words of the Canons themselves) there is no doubt their Baptism was, and ought to be look'd upon as null, because deviating from that Institution, which gives vali-

dity to all. But because it appears from a passage of *S. Augustine* (k), that whatever the antienter Hereticks did, yet later ones, or at least for the most part kept to the words of the Institution; There-

(k) *Ceterum quis nescit non esse Baptismum Christi, si verba Evangelica, quibus symbolum constat, illic defuerint? Sed facilius inveniuntur heretici, qui omnino non baptizant, quam qui illis verbis non baptizant. De Bapt. contra Donat. li. 6. c. 25.*

fore we must go on to enquire, whether

ther Hereticks may not however, be presum'd to baptize into a false, and counterfeit Faith, even that which they themselves advance, and consequently give such a Baptism as is null, and void. And to speak my mind freely, though with submission to better judgments, I conceive such Hereticks may be presum'd to do it, who advance a Heresie, that directly, and manifestly contradicts the Faith of Baptism, and particularly the Faith of the Holy Trinity. Which I do in part upon the Authority of the *Nicene Council* (1), and (1) Can. 19. in part also upon the Authority of Reason. For though there be not the least presumption, that the followers of *Paulus Samosatenus* made use of any other form of Baptism, than the Catholicks did; Though there be some presumption on the contrary, that they made use of the very same form, because though they deny'd a Trinity of Persons, yet they asserted one, and the same God to be rightly entitled by the names of Father, Son, and Holy Ghost; Yet did the *Nicene Council* notwithstanding, (because of their direct, and

and manifest denial of the Trinity, and their affirming Christ to be a meer Man) so far disallow their Baptism, as to require the reiteration of it. As indeed why should it not, when those *Paulianists* did so directly and manifestly contradict the sense of that form, whereby they pretended to proceed? That direct, and manifest contradiction of theirs proclaiming to the World, that though they baptiz'd in the same form of words with the Orthodox, yet in a perfectly different sense, and consequently departed alike from that Institution, which was to give force to it. I say not the same of the Baptism of the *Arians*, where they made use

* De Arianis, qui propria sua lege utuntur, ut baptizentur placuit. Si ad Ecclesiam aliqui de hac heresi venerint, interrogent eos fidei nostre sacerdotes symbolum. Et si perviderint in Patre, Filio, & Spiritu sancto eos baptizatos, manus eis tantum imponatur, ut accipiant spiritum sanctum, &c. Concil. Arel. c. 8.

of the same form of words, which the Institution prescrib'd, as it is certain that many * of them did ; Partly because the Church receiv'd those, that had been so baptized by them without any new Baptism ; And partly because neither so directly, and manifestly contradicting the Doctrine of the Trinity by

by their own, nor varying from the prescribed form, as some other of them did, they may be reasonably presum'd to have left the form by them us'd to its proper sense, whatever that was, and to what he, who prescrib'd it, did intend it. Which suppos'd, what should hinder Christ from giving force to that Baptism, which is so administred by them? These, as they do not at all vary from the Institution of Christ, so in this particular, even in the application of the Baptismal water to the Baptized parties, acting not in their own, or in their peoples names, but in the name of Christ, and who therefore may the rather be supposed to give force and vertue to it. The result of the premises is this. A Heretick is indeed oblig'd to baptize into the truly Christian Faith, neither can any man otherwise promise force from that act of his. But if he baptize into that faith (as he may even whilst he continues such) his Baptism is valid, neither can any man doubt of a blessing from it, who comes prepared for it, and, when he comes to know in what company he hath been

been engag'd, renounceth that, and their Heresie, and both submits himself to the discipline of the Church, and keeps to the communion of it.

PART

PART X.

Of the Baptism of those of
riper years.

The Contents.

*To what, and what kind of persons
Baptism ought to be administred;
Which, as to those of riper years,
is shewn to be unto all, that come
duly qualified for it. What those
qualifications are, upon that account
enquir'd into, and Repentance, and
Faith shewn from the Sripture, as
well as from our own Catechism to
be they. That Repentance, and
Faith more particularly considered,
the definitions given of them by our
Church explain'd, and established.
The former whereof is effected, by
shewing what Repentance doth pre-
suppose, what it imports, and to
what*

what it doth naturally dispose us : The latter by shewing what those promises are, which by the Catechism are made the object of our Faith, or Belief, what that Belief of them doth presuppose, what is meant by a stedfast Belief of them, and what evidence there is of that being the Faith, or Belief requir'd to the receiving of Baptism.

Question.
What is
required of
persons to
be baptized:

Answer.
Repentance
whereby
they forsake
Sin, and
Faith,
whereby
they sted-
fastly be-
lieve the
promises
made to
them in
that Sa-
crament.

III. **B**Eing now to enquire, according to the method before laid down, to what, and what kind of persons the Sacrament of Baptism ought to be administred, for my more advantageous resolution thereof I will consider it first as to those of riper years, and then as to Infants, and Children.

That I give the precedency to those of riper years, though such Baptisms as those are little known among us, is because there is no doubt Baptism began with them, and could not indeed have found any other entrance into the World ; The Baptism of Infants, in the opinion of those, who do most strongly

ly assert it, depending upon the Baptism of their Parents, or of those, who are in the place of them. Of whom, if some had not been baptiz'd in their riper years, those Infants, that claimed by them, could not with reason have pretended to it. Of those of riper years therefore I mean first to entreat, and shew to *what*, and *what kind* of persons among them the Sacrament of Baptism ought to be administred.

Now as it is clear from our Saviour's injunction * of *discipling*, and *baptizing* all Nations, that none of what condition soever are to be excluded from it, who are qualified, as Christianity requires, for the receiving of it; So the only thing therefore farther necessary to be enquir'd into on this Head, is how men ought to be *qualified* for it, or (as our *Catechism* expresseth it) what is *required* of them. For supposing those *prerequisites* of Baptism, he who enjoyns the *discipling*, and baptizing all Nations, must consequently be suppos'd to enjoyn the administring of it to all such, in whom those *prerequisites* are.

* Matt. 28. 19.

U

Now

Now there are two things again, as our *Catechism* instructs us, which are requir'd of all those, that are to be baptized; *Repentance*, whereby they forsake sin, and *Faith*, whereby they stedfastly believe the promises made to them in that Sacrament. And for these two things at least it hath the attestation of the *Scripture*, and I may add also of that *Profession*, which is made by the baptized person in Baptism, and which having before establish'd, I may now the more securely argue from. Witness, for the *Scripture*, S. Peter's † enjoying those *Jews*, (who demanded of him, and the rest, what they ought to do in order to their salvation) to *repent, and so be baptiz'd in the name of the Lord Jesus*; And Philip's replying upon the *Eunuch*, who ask'd *what did hinder him to be baptiz'd*, that *if he believ'd* with all his heart, he might*: Thereby more than intimating that, if he did not, he could not be baptiz'd at all, though all other things concurred to the receiving of it. And indeed, what less can be suppos'd to be requir'd of such persons, when (as was before † observ'd) the baptized

† Acts 2. 38.

*-----8. 37.

† Expl. of
Bapt. Part 8.

baptized person makes Profession in his Baptism of *renouncing* all sin, and wickedness, and of a *belief* in that Jesus, into whose Religion he is admitted? That Profession of his supposing Repentance, and Faith to have been before in him, as without which otherwise he could not there make a sincere Profession of renouncing sin, or of believing in the name of the Lord Jesus. But so (that I may add that by the way) the Antient Church appears to have requir'd, before she admitted men to the participation of Baptism; *Justin Martyr*, where he professeth to give a sincere account of her doings in this affair, telling those he wrote his *Apology* to, that *such as were persuaded, and believ'd that the things taught and said by the Christians were true* (a) *and moreover took upon them so to live, were taught to pray, and ask of God with fasting the forgiveness of their former sins; and then, and not till then brought by them to the*

(a) Ὅσοι ἂν παιδῶσι, καὶ πρεσβύσιν ἀληθῆ ταῦτα τὰ ὑφ' ἡμῶν διδασκόμενα, καὶ λεγόμενα εἶναι, καὶ βίῃ οὕτως δύνασθαι ὑποχθόνται, εὐχεσθῆτε καὶ ἀπεινῶν νηστεύοντες παρὰ τοῦ θεοῦ ἡμάρτημένων ἀφέναι διδύσκονται, ἡμῶν συνευχομένων, καὶ συννηστεύοντων αὐτοῖς. ἔπειτα ἄρῶνται ὑφ' ἡμῶν, ἐνθα ὕδως ἐστὶ, καὶ τέρπον ἀναγνῆσθαι, ὃν καὶ ἡμεῖς αὐτοὶ ἀναγνῆθημεν ἀναγνῶνται. *Apol. 2. p. 93.*

place of Baptism, and there regenerated after the same manner with themselves. Which is so clear a proof of the Antients believing *Repentance*, and *Faith* to be prerequisites of Baptism, that nothing need to be added to it.

For the clearing of the *first* of which we are to know, that though *Repentance*, in strict speech, be nothing else than a sorrow of mind for those sins we stand guilty of before God; Yet as even so it presupposeth a right apprehension of those sins, as without which we could never be brought to a due sorrow for them, so taking *Repentance* (as our *Catechism*, and the Scripture also sometime doth) as one of the two prerequisites of Baptism (For S. Paul in one place (b) makes that *Repentance*, and *Faith* the sum of his Preaching to the Jews, and Greeks, and in another (c) the foundation of our Christianity) it will be found to imply in it whatsoever that sorrow for sin doth naturally dispose men to, as well as that sorrow it self: The same S. Paul elsewhere professing that he shewed both to the Jews, and Gentiles, that they should turn unto God, as well as Repent; and

(b) Acts 20.
21.

(c) Heb. 6.1.

and *do works meet for Repentance*, as well as either. To attain therefore a due understanding of this Repentance, as well as to clear that definition of it, which our Catechism hath given us, it will be necessary for us to enquire what this Repentance doth *presuppose*, what it *imports*, and to what it doth *dispose us*.

That, which Repentance doth most manifestly presuppose, is a right apprehension of that *sin*, about which it is to be conversant; And may be fetch'd in part from the dictates of our own reason, but more especially from the declarations of Christianity concerning it. Such as are, that sin is the transgression of a Law, and particularly of that of God, and that, as such, it justly exposeth us to his wrath, and indignation: Partly, as it is a violation of his Authority, to whom we are naturally subject, and partly as an equal affront to his goodness, who gives us our being, and all things else, and who therefore ought more diligently to have been attended to. In fine, that it hath for its wages Death both temporal, and eternal, and under

each of which, without the mercy of God in Christ, the sinner must necessarily fall. For as these are known in part, from the dictates of our own reason to be the properties of that sin, whereof we speak; So they are much more known to be so from the Doctrine of Christianity, and consequently to be known by us toward a right apprehension of that, which ought to be the matter of our sorrow.

But from hence it will be easie to collect, what that sorrow for sin doth *import*, which is requir'd of all those, that take upon them the Profession of Christianity. Even that it importeth such a sorrow of mind, as hath a regard to the violation of God's Authority and Goodness by it, as well as to the evils which are like to arise to it from our selves; Our sorrow being in reason to be suited to that, which is most considerable in the object of it. And indeed, as otherwise it will be rather a sorrow for punishment, than sin, because sin, as such, is a transgression of God's Law, and consequently our sorrow for it to have a more especial regard to the affront, that

that is offer'd him thereby; So it will much less deserve those titles, which are given it by the Scripture of being a sorrow, or *repentance toward* (d) *God* (for so it is sometime stil'd.) and a *sorrow* (e) *according to God*, or a *Godly* one, as it also is: That being neither *toward God*, nor *according to God*, which hath not a regard to that affront, which is offer'd to him by sin, as well as to the evils, which are like to accrue unto our selves.

(d) Acts 20.

21.

(e) 2 Cor. 7. 9.

But because even such a sorrow will not qualifie us for Baptism, unless we add thereto what the same sorrow doth *naturally dispose* us to; Therefore to make out more fully the true nature of Repentance, as well as to clear our Churches definition of it, I will proceed to that, and shew what those things are. Of which nature I reckon first an ingenuous *confession of sin*, and earnest *prayer* to God for the pardon of it; Sorrow for sin, when considered only with reference to its appendant punishment, being likely enough to dispose us so to confess, and ask pardon of it, if it were only to unburthen our selves, and free our selves by that, and pray-

er from the punishment we have deserv'd. How much more then, when consider'd as a sorrow for that affront, which we have by means of our sin offer'd to God's both Authority, and Goodness? He, to whom such an affront is matter of sorrow, being likely enough to be thereby dispos'd so far to acknowledge that Authority, and goodness, as to own them upon the postfact by confession, and prayer for pardon: He who *confesseth*, and *asketh pardon* of God, acknowledging that God had, and hath an Authority to command, and punish him, as he, who doth the *latter*, that God is of equal goodness, as of whom otherwise it would be in vain for him to ask pardon for his offences. Whence it was, that when the Church proceeded by strict, and safe measures, she not only taught those, that offer'd themselves to Baptism, *to ask of God with fasting the forgiveness* of their forepast offences, but (as we learn from

(f) *Ubi supra.* Justin Martyr (f) added *her own prayers, and fasts* to theirs, so the better to encourage, and give force unto the others. I reckon of the same nature

nature secondly, a *resolution to forsake sin*, and pursue the contrary vertues. Which I do not only upon the Authority of the foremention'd Father, who reckons that (g) *also* (g) *Loco prius citato.* as a prerequisite to Baptism, but as it is a thing, to which sorrow for sin, doth alike naturally dispose us; He, to whom sin is so irksome, needing no other motive, than that irksomeness, to oblige him to forsake it, and pay a more perfect submission to that Authority, and goodness of God, which he hath before so shamefully violated. I reckon thirdly, as a thing, to which sorrow for sin doth equally dispose us, a *present forsaking* of those sins, which we are under a temptation to commit, as well as a resolution to do so for the time to come; There being the same force in a due sorrow for sin to dispose men to that, as there is to a resolution of afterward forsaking it. For which cause the Antient Church did not only refuse such persons Baptism, as were of any *unlawful Profession* (h), till they actually abandon'd it, but made proof (i) also for a considerable time of the resolutions of others, and, till they had given

(h) *Introd. concern. Cath. &c.*
(i) *Ibid.*

ven her such proofs, did not admit them to it. They finding no doubt by manifold experience, that many that offer'd themselves to Baptism, made little Conscience afterward of avoiding those sins, which they had before so solemnly resolv'd against, and made publick profession of abandoning. And though it do not appear, that the Apostles themselves took this course, they baptizing men immediately upon the bare profession of their Repentance, and a resolution afterward to bring forth fruits meet for it : Yet as the reason of that possibly might be, either because of that exuberance of Grace, which was then bestow'd upon their new Converts or because, by means of their Ambulatory life, they could not well deferr the Baptism of those, that offer'd themselves, till they had made some considerable trial of them (which will exempt such Churches from their example, where there is no such exuberance of Grace, and where moreover they have settled Pastors to intend the affairs of them) So we cannot think the Apostles would have ever given Baptism to
such

such persons, as should before that Baptism of theirs have fallen into those sins, which they erewhile made profession of abandoning : Sorrow for sin, where it is hearty, and real, no doubt disposing men as well to a present forsaking of it, as it doth to a resolution concerning it. Which will make the *Repentance* pre-required to Baptism to be (as our *Catechism* expresseth it) a *Repentance*, whereby as occasion offers, we actually *forsake sin*, as well as resolve for the future to abandon it.

An account being thus given of the *first* thing pre-requir'd to Baptism, and our Churches definition of it both explain'd, and established ; Pass we on to that, which is alike pre-required to it, even that *Faith*, whereby we stedfastly believe the promises made to us in that Sacrament. Where again I will enquire,

- I. What those promises are, which we are so to believe.
- II. What that belief of them doth pre-suppose.
- III. What is meant by a stedfast belief of those promises.

I V.

IV. What evidence there is of that being the Faith, or belief, which is pre-requir'd by Christianity to the receiving of that Sacrament.

I. Now though that *Catechism*, which I have chosen to explain, give no other account of those Promises, than that they are such as are made to us in that Sacrament; Yet is it not difficult to collect from thence, and from what is before said concerning the *Parts* of a Sacrament, that the *Catechism* means no other promises, than those which make a tender of its *inward*, and *spiritual Graces*. For a Sacrament being before divided into an outward, and visible sign, and an inward, and spiritual Grace as the only proper parts of it; And the outward, and visible sign being in like manner represented in it as no farther of value, than as conducing to possess us of the other: No other promises can be suppos'd to be intended here, than such as make a tender of those inward, and spiritual Graces, as which indeed are the only things considerable in it. Which will

will consequently make the promises here intended to be those, which make a tender for the present of remission of sins, and sanctification, and in the end of everlasting life.

II. Those therefore being the promises, which are to be the object of the *Catechumens* Faith, and which accordingly he is stedfastly to believe; It will not be difficult to shew, what that belief of them pre-supposeth, which is the second thing to be enquir'd into. For that belief of them must at least pre-suppose a belief of all that, which is necessary to bring us to the belief of the other. More particularly it pre-supposeth, *as to our selves*, that we believe our selves to be naturally under a state of sin, and death, as without which there could be no place for that sanctification, and remission, which is promised in Baptism; And that we are yet farther off from any title to Everlasting life, as which if we had, there would have been no need of a Promise in Baptism of it. It pre-supposeth again *as to Christ*, in whom all the promises of God are Yea, and Amen, a like stedfast belief that there

was

was such a person as Jesus Christ, and that he was appointed by God to convey such graces to us; That, agreeably to the predictions of the Scripture, and the will of God concerning him, he took upon him our nature, and suffer'd in it to purchase those Graces, and that he ever since intends the exhibiting of what he hath so purchas'd; The belief of these, and the like Articles of our Faith being as manifestly presuppos'd to the belief of those Promises, which in this place we are required to intend.

III. That which will it may be more concern us to enquire, is what our *Catechism* means by a *stedfast belief* of them. For my more orderly resolution whereof I will enquire first what it means by *belief*, and then by a *stedfast* one.

Now by belief may be meant either a *simple assent of the mind*, and in which sense there is no doubt it is oftentimes taken in Christian Writers; Or there may be meant also a belief with *affiance*, and such as beside the assent of the mind, or understanding to them, doth also connote a trust in them, or in God because

cause of them. By vertue of which (as I have elsewhere discours'd (k) concerning the grace of trust) the heart, or will is prompted to desire, as well as assent to the matter of the divine promises, and acquiesce in those for the obtaining of it. And indeed if we may judge any thing by our *Homilies*, (to which the Articles (l) of our Church do also particularly referr us in the point of justifying Faith) this latter belief must be here intended; Because a belief, which hath for its end the remission of sins in Baptism, and consequently a justifying one. For *the right, and true Christian Faith* (saith one of our (m) *Homilies*) *is not only to believe that the Holy Scripture, and all the fore-cited Articles of our Faith, are true, but also to have a sure trust, and confidence in God's merciful promises to be saved from everlasting damnation by Christ. And it is not only, saith another (n), the common belief of the Articles of our Faith, but it is also a sure trust, and confidence of the mercy of God through our Lord Jesus Christ, and a stedfast hope of all good things to be receiv'd at God's hands. In*

(k) Expl. of the Decal. Com. 1. Part 3.

(l) Art. 11.

(m) Homily of Salvation. Part 3.

(n) Hom. of Faith.

fine,

(o) *Ibid.*

fine, saith the same (o) Homily, *the very sure, lively Christian faith is not only to believe all things of God, which are contained in holy Scripture, but also to have an earnest trust, and confidence in God, &c.* Which suppos'd (as we may, because we can have no more *Authentick* interpretation of it) to be the sense of the *belief* here intended, it will not be difficult to shew, what our *Catechism* means by a *stedfast* one.

For considering the belief of these Promises as an Assent of the mind to them, so a stedfast belief will imply that, which is free from all doubts, and which the mind of man gives to those Promises without any the least fear of their being any Collusion in them; Which the mind of man may well give, considering whose those Promises are, and that they have both God, and Christ for the Authors of them. On the other side, if we consider the belief intended as *including* in it also an *affiance*, or *trust*, and by vertue of which the *heart*, or *will* is prompted to desire, as well as believe the matter of those Promises, and acquiesce in those Promises

mises for the attaining of it ; So this *stedfast* belief will also imply such a one, as is firmly rooted in the *heart*, or *will*, and can no more be rooted out of it by the force of temptations, than the other by doubts, or scruples. And indeed, as I do not see how any other belief, than that, can answer such glorious promises as are made to us in the Sacrament of Baptism ; so I see as little reason to doubt,

IV. What evidence there is of *that* being the Faith, or belief, which is pre-requir'd by Christianity to the receiving of it. For though S. *Luke* may seem to intimate by the account he gives of the Baptism of the *Samaritans* (p), that they were baptiz'd (p) Acts 8. 12. upon a simple belief of what *Philip* preach'd concerning the things of the Kingdom of God ; Yet he doth much more clearly intimate afterward , that Christianity requir'd another sort of belief, and such as was accompani'd with an adherence of the *will* unto them : He making it the condition of the Eunuch's Baptism afterward, that he should believe *with*

- (q) — 37. *all his heart* (q); Which is an expression, that in the language of the Scripture refers rather to the *will*, and *affections*, than to the *understanding*, but however cannot well be thought not to include them there, where the believing with *all* the heart is requir'd. And indeed, as I do not see, considering the Doctrine of our *First Reformers*, why this notion of *Faith* should be so exploded, as it seems to me lately to have been; As I do much less see why men should so boyle at that *Justification*, which was wont to be attributed in an especial manner to it: So, if I live to finish the work I am now upon, I will in a *Comment* upon the Epistle to the *Philippians* (which I have almost gather'd sufficient materials for) endeavour to clear both the one, and the other, that men may neither take occasion from thence to discard good works as unnecessary, nor yet stay themselves upon any other, than the promises of Christ, and on which the holiest men upon earth, when they have been approaching near God's tribunal, have found themselves oblig'd to cast them-

themselves. In the mean time a little to repress the youthful heats of those, who can hardly forbear smiling at such *antiquated* notions, I will set before them the *advice*, which was order'd to be given to sick persons, when good works to be sure were not without their just repute. It is among the Interrogatories, which are said (r) to have been prescribed by *Anselme* Archbishop of *Canterbury*, and particularly after that, which prompts the Priest to ask, *Dost thou believe, that thou canst not be sav'd, but by the death of Christ*, and the sick persons Answer, that *he did so*. Go too therefore (as the Priest was taught to proceed) and whilst thy soul remaineth in thee, place thy confidence in this death alone, and in no other thing, commit thy self wholly to it, cover thy self wholly with it, immerse, fix, and wrap thy self wholly in it. And if the Lord God will judge thee, say, I put the death of our Lord Jesus Christ between me, and thy judgment, otherwise I contend not with thee. And if he say that thou art a sinner, say, Lord I put the death of our Lord Jesus Christ

(r) Field of the Church, Append. to the 3d. Book pa. 303.

between me, and my sins. If he say to thee thou hast deserv'd damnation, say, Lord, I put the death of our Lord Jesus Christ between me, and my evil deserts, and I offer the same death for that merit, which I ought to have had, and have not. If he continue as yet to say, that he is angry with thee, say, Lord, I oppose the death of our Lord Jesus Christ between me, and thy displeasure. Words, which shew what kind of Faith was sometime thought to be a justifying one, and what stress was laid upon it, before ever Fanaticism, or any thing of that nature was heard of in the World.

PART XI.

Of the Baptism of Infants.

The Contents.

What ground Infant-Baptism hath in Scripture, and particularly in what it suggests concerning Christ's commanding his Disciples to suffer little Children to come unto him. S. Paul's giving the Children of the faithful the title of Holy, and the Circumcision of Infants. The concurrence of Antiquity therein with the Doctrine of the Scripture, and that concurrence farther strengthened by the Pelagians so freely admitting of what was urg'd against them from thence. A brief account of that remission, and regeneration, which Infants acquire by

X 3 Baptism,

Baptism, and a more large consideration of the Objections, that are made against it; More particularly of what is urg'd against the Regeneration of Infants in Baptism, or their ability to answer what is pre-requir'd to it on the part of persons to be baptiz'd, or is to be performed by them in the reception of it. Where the Regeneration of Infants is more largely considered, and what is promis'd for them by others shewn to be both reasonable, and sufficient.

Question.

Why then are Infants baptized, when by reason of their tender age they cannot perform them?

Answer.

Because they promise them both by their sureties, which promise, when they come to age, themselves are bound to perform.

FROM the Baptism of those of riper years, pass we to that of Infants, or Children; the only Baptism upon the matter now celebrated, and therefore so much the more carefully to be clear'd and establish'd. In order whereunto I will enquire,

- I. What ground it hath in Scripture.
- II. What countenance from Antiquity.
- III. What Infants acquire by it.
- IV.

IV. What the principal objections against it are, and how they are to be solv'd.

I. Now as it is plain to me both from *Tertullian's* * arguing against that *Text*, and the *Apostolical* † *Constitutions* alledging it, that the Antient Church grounded the Baptism of Infants upon *Christ's* * commanding his Disciples to *suffer little Children to come unto him*, and *blessing those*, that came; So I am yet more confirmed in it by the unprofitable pains *Tertullian* took to take off the force of that *Text*, or rather the pitiful evasion he made use of in order to it. For had not the Church laid great stress upon that passage of the Scripture, why did not he, as the World hath since learn'd to do, wholly omit the mention of it, as a *Text* no way pertinent to the business of Infant-Baptism? Or, if he thought good to take notice of it, why did he not turn the force of it another

* *De Baptismo* c. 18. Ait quidem Dominus, Nolite illos prohibere ad me venire. Veniant ergo, dum adolescent, veniant dum discunt, dum quo veniant doceantur. Fiant Christiani, quum Christum nosse potuerint.

† Βαπτίζετε δὲ ὑμῶν καὶ τὰ νήπια, καὶ ἐκτερέφετε αὐτὰ ἐν παιδείᾳ, καὶ ἐν θείᾳ χάριτι. * Ἀφετε ἡ, φησι, τὰ παῖδια ἔρχεσθαι πρὸς με, καὶ μὴ κωλύετε αὐτά. li. b. c. 15.

* *Mark* 10. 13. &c.

way, and say, as others have, that nothing more was intended by it, than to let men know they must put on the property of little Children, if they meant to enter into Christ's Kingdom? For either of these certainly had been more proper, than what we find him to alledge *in these words*, as to the *delaying* of the Baptism of Infants. *The Lord indeed saith, Forbid not Children to come unto me. Let them come therefore; when they are grown; let them come when they may learn, and when they may be taught whither they are to come. Let them be made Christians, when they may be able to know Christ.* For what is this to the purpose of our Saviour, who checked his Disciples for hindering *those* from coming to him, who were brought to him before they were in a *condition* to learn, who in all probability were brought to him in their Parents arms, and were both taken by him into his own, and blessed by him even then? For if the Disciples were check'd for going about to hinder such Children, his meaning was that they should suffer *such* to come unto him, and not keep them back from
com-

coming, till they *ceased* to be *such*. But of such force it seems was that Text then thought, that some reply however must be made to it ; Or the deference men had for the Church , that urged it , would have spoil'd his device of delaying the Baptism of them , till they came of years. Which will make it so much the more reasonable to enquire , what there is in the Text it self, which might justify the confidence of the one, or give occasion to the impertinent answer of the other.

For the better discovery whereof we are to know, that when certain persons not named, but it seems who look'd upon our Saviour as a man of God , brought their Children to Christ, that he might *touch* them , that is to say, as our Saviour expounded their meaning, that he might *lay his hands upon them, and bless them* ; His Disciples , whether as looking upon it as no way befitting their Master to concern himself about Children, * or that he had greater

* Aret. in locum. Primum rem Christo indignam judi-

cave videntur ; nam iudicio, & ratione carent , Christum non intelligunt. Deinde maiora sunt , quæ agat ; adsunt enim turbæ, quas docere debet. Major hic fructus, major etiam & dignitas, & labor.

business

business then in hand, even the instructing of the Elder sort, rebuked those that brought them for that their

† *Aret. ubi supra. Sed expendi debet Christi officium, qui pro omnium salute natus est in hunc mundum. Deinde infantes etiam ad fœdus dei pertinent; Nam Abraamo dixit, Ero & tui, & seminis tui post te, Deus. Et quia una est ratio salutis, unum ostium, una janua, debuit etiam infantum haberi ratio.*

suppos'd unreasonable desire, and offer. But as our Saviour who better understood † his own salutary office, and Childrens pertaining to the Covenant, did with as much, or more displeasure rebuke them for that their

rebuke, and signified it both by his countenance, and voice; So he charged them, that they should by no

* *Aretius iterum. Est enim ratio cur arcendi à Christo non sint: Quia talium est regnum cœlorum, hoc est, sunt heredes vitæ æternæ; ergo à Christo, qui janua est ad vitam, non debent arceri. Deinde cum talium sit regnum dei, ergo horum magis est, ad quorum similitudinem alii, ut accipiant, iidem redire debent.*

means hinder Children from coming unto him*, because the Kingdom of God belong'd to such as they: Thereby intimating, that even those Children had a right unto it, and were not therefore to be hindred from

coming to him, who was the way, or rather the gate into it. For if the Kingdom of God belong'd to such as they, much more to those Children, to whom elder persons ought to become like, that they might

might be in a capacity of obtaining it. As indeed otherwise, what force is there in the reason alledg'd for the suffering, and no way forbidding young Children to come unto him? For they, who have in *purpose of heart* what the other have only *naturally*, may both be invited to tend toward, and be possess'd of the Kingdom of Heaven, though the other be no way brought to Christ, nor receive any blessing from him. In as much as their humility, and innocency is the result of God's spirit, and of their own will, and consequently more likely to be acceptable, whereas the other's is only the result of their constitution, and age. And I cannot therefore but think, that the true reason of our Saviour's making use of the word *τῶν*, or *such*, instead of *τῆς*, or *these* (for *of such*, saith our Saviour, *is the Kingdom of heaven*) was not in the least to exclude Children from having a right to the Kingdom of Heaven, as who alone were directly, and immediately concern'd in the present Argument; But to let the
World

World know at the same time *,

* *Aret. in Matt. 19. 13, &c. Nec juvat quod aliqui hic urgent τῶν τῶν, & non τῶν, talium, & non horum. Nam communem ostendit modum justificationis, &c. Amplius igitur aliquid dicere voluit, & hos pueros vitæ heredes esse, & ad illorum similitudinem nobis etiam redeundum esse.*

(a) Mark 10. 15.

that elder men ought to put on the properties of Children to make them partakers of it. As he afterward (a) more expressly signifies, when he tells them, that *whosoever shall not receive the Kingdom of God as a little Child, he shall not*

enter therein. Which suppos'd a way is opened for the inferring of that Baptism of Infants, which, this passage both now, and of old was made use of to evince. For it appearing from the premises, that Infants have a right to the Kingdom of Heaven, and upon, and by vertue of that right to be brought to Christ also; They must consequently have a right also to those *means*, which are by the same Christ appointed to put them into the possession of his Kingdom. Which Baptism certainly being, and so, that, ordinarily at least, none can enter into that Kingdom without (b) being *born again* by it, it cannot without injustice be withheld from those Children, to whom the

(a) Joh. 3. 5.

the other doth appertain. Neither will it avail to say, though the Objection be not to be despis'd, that by this rule our Saviour should either himself have baptiz'd, or order'd his Disciples to baptize those Children, that were now brought unto him for his blessing. For beside that one Argument will not solve another, and much less hinder the matter thereof from being true, or conclusive; There might be reason enough, though the premises be allow'd, for our Saviour's not baptizing, or requiring his Disciples to baptize those Children, who were now brought unto him for his blessing: Partly upon the account of the incompetency of those, that brought them, and who being not Disciples themselves, but as is probable, of the *multitude* (c) that followed him, could not claim from our Saviour, nor he so regularly bestow Baptism upon their Children; And partly to let the World see, that he was not ti'd to any methods himself in the dispensing of the graces of that Kingdom. For that our Saviour, by that blessing which he gave them, gave those

(c) Mark 10.
16.
Matt. 19. 2.

those Children *rem Sacramēti*, or the Graces of Baptism, and so shew'd yet more the title Children have to it, cannot well be doubted of by any, who shall consider how zealous he was for their being brought to him, as that too upon the account of the title they had to the Kingdom of Heaven. For considering that zeal of his, and the ground of it, what can be more reasonable than to think, that our Saviour agreeably thereto did by his blessing conferr upon them that Evangelical regeneration, which was to fit them for the Kingdom of Heaven, and without which considering the impurity of their nature, and the necessity of being thus born anew, they could not regularly obtain it. And I have been the more particular in deducing, and pressing the present argument; Partly because led thereto by the meer force of the Text it self, and the Authority of the Church that imployed it, till by accident I fell upon those things I have before quoted out of *Aretius*; And partly because I think it a better service to the Church of God to strengthen one old Argument, than devise

devise many new ones : Such a course procuring the more respect to the Church's both opinion, and practice, as shewing it to proceed upon substantial Arguments, and such as in themselves are not lightly to be refus'd.

My *second* Argument for the Baptism of Infants shall be taken from that *holiness*, which S. Paul (a) (d) 1 Cor. 7. 14. attributes to the *Children of Christian Parents* (yea where only one of them is such) upon the account of their descent from them. For S. Paul having before perswaded the *believing party* to continue with the *unbelieving one*, supposing that *unbelieving one* to be as willing to continue with the believer, as a *motive* to the doing of it alledgeth, that the *unbelieving party is sanctified by the believing*, and proves that *sanctification* again by the *holiness of the Children*, that come from them, as which otherwise those Children could not have in them, but the *contrary*. Now I demand what that *holiness* is, which S. Paul supposeth to be the property of those, who come from such a sanctified couple, that is to say, whether an *inward holiness*, or an *outward one*?

If

If they, who would avoid the force of this Text as to the Baptism of Infants, say an *inward* holiness, they say more than we desire, or can with truth be affirmed, because though *Original Sin* be traduc'd from the Parents, yet inward holiness is not, as being the product of the Spirit of God, and his instrument Baptism. But if they do however attribute such a holiness to those Children, they say enough to evince, that Baptism ought not to be deny'd to them. For *who* (as S. Peter spake

(e) Acts 10.

47.

(e) upon another occasion) *can forbid the water of Baptism to those, who have receiv'd the Holy Ghost*, as to be sure all, that are internally holy, have? It remains therefore, that if the Children of such matches be not *internally* holy, they are *externally* so, and that external holiness therefore, if it may be, to be investigated by us. Now I demand First, what external holiness can be imagin'd in those Children, but such by which they come to belong to God in a more peculiar manner, than the Children of other matches do? This being the nature of all things, that
are

are externally holy, whether by the voluntary consecration of men, or the Institution, or choice of God. I demand secondly, supposing those Children to belong more to God, than the Children of other matches, whether by their thus becoming the peculiar property of God, they may not be suppos'd to be more dear to him, than the Children of other matches are? Every one naturally having an affection to such, as belong to him, suitably to that nearness, wherein they belong to him. I demand Thirdly, supposing the Children of such matches to be more dear to God than the Children of others, whether we are not to think he will take a more particular care of them, than of others? The care of any person being always suitable to the affection he bears to those, who are the object of his care. I demand Fourthly, whether, supposing such a particular care of the Children of such matches; he will not take a more particular care of them as to their eternal welfare, than he doth of the Children of other men; All other care, without this, being of

little value to the party cared for, and, beside that (as experience shews) equally extended by God to the Children of other matches, as well as to the descendants of Christians. I demand Fifthly, supposing such a particular care as to their eternal welfare, whether he will not also allow them more means toward the compassing of it, than he can be suppos'd to allow to the Children of other Parents? All care, where it is reasonable, and just, employing futable means to bring that care of its unto effect. Now what peculiar means doth, or can God allow to the Children of Christian Parents, as to the procuring of their eternal welfare, supposing them to die before they come of years, as the generality of them do, unless it be the Sacrament of Baptism? For as these, no more than other Children, are capable of the benefits of the Gospel by the graces of Faith, and Repentance; So they have no other way therefore, save the Sacrament of Baptism, either to be deliver'd from the guilt of Original Sin, or enstated in Christs heavenly Kingdom.

dom. I conclude therefore, that the Children of Christian Parents, or of either of them being holy, they do by that holiness of theirs acquire a right to a greater holiness, I mean the holiness of Baptism. And indeed however *Tertullian* could in his book (f) *De Baptismo* argue the delay of Infants Baptism, as that too upon their no need of it, or not being qualified for it; Yet as he could see enough elsewhere to make him believe, that *every soul is reckoned in Adam, till he be anew enrolled in Christ* by the receipt of the Sacrament of Baptism (g), so he could see enough too in the *Text* I am now upon, to make him acknowledge, that the Children of the (h) faithful are *holy by the prerogative of their seed*, as well as *by the discipline of their Institution*; and by that holiness of theirs *design'd*, or *mark'd out* for a better holiness, and so for salvation. Which as it is the holiness, that I

(g) (h) De animâ c. 39. Hinc enim & Apostolus ex sanctificatione alterutro sexu sanctos procreari ait, tam ex seminis prerogativa, quam ex institutionis disciplinâ. Caterum, inquit, immundi nascerentur, quasi designatos tamen sanctitati, ac per hoc etiam salutis intelligi volens fidelium filios, ut hujus spei pignore matrimoniis, quæ retinenda censuerat, patrocinaretur. Alioquin meminerat Dominicæ definitionis, Nisi quis nascetur ex aqua, & spiritu, non ibit in regnum dei, id est, non erit sanctus. Ita omnis anima eoque in Adam censetur, donec in Christo recenseatur, &c.

have been all along enforcing, and endeavouring to evince from thence Children's right unto another; So of what force it is toward the inferring of it, will need no other light, than that, which we have from *Tertullian*. For with what force can any man deny them the *holiness* of Baptism, who are *design'd*, or mark'd out for it by the *prerogative of their birth*, and (as it may happen, and often doth) can no other way attain that *holiness*, or that *salvation*, which is consequent upon it? But because some men have advanc'd *another*, and a more *improper holiness*, even that by which Children become the issue of a lawful marriage, and not of an *unlawful mixture*; And because too they have in part advanc'd that holiness upon the difficulty of comprehending, how the unbeliever can otherwise be sanctified by the believer, than by making the match between them two to be lawful; Therefore I will both set my self to shew, that the unbeliever may be otherwise sanctified by the believer, than by making him, or her to be a lawful match to the believer, and that the holiness,

ness, which *S. Paul* attributes to the Children of such a match, cannot be understood of such a holiness, whereby they become a lawful, or legitimate Issue. And I alledge for the former of these the unbelieving Husband's, for instance, being so sanctified by the believing Wife, as not only to become a *lawful* Husband to her, but a *Christian* one, and so, as to entitle the Issue of them both to the common priviledges of Christianity. Which is brought about by the unbelieving Husband's becoming *one flesh*, not any longer with an unbelieving Wife, but with a believing, and *Christian* one, and from whom that sanctification is derived to him. Even as the same *S. Paul* affirms (i) (i) 1 Cor. 6. 16. *him, that converseth with an Harlot, to become one flesh with that Harlot, with whom he doth so converse, and so receive pollution from her. Neither will it avail to say (as possibly it may be) that the believing Wife is as much one flesh with the unbelieving Husband, as the unbelieving Husband is with her, and may therefore be as unclean by him, as he can be suppos'd to be sanctified by*

her. For neither first is the believing Wife *as much* one flesh with the unbelieving Husband, as the unbelieving Husband is with her, unless it be as to the use of, or power over one another's Bodies: Partly, because, where there is so great an inequality in the match, the denomination is in reason to be taken from the better party, which to be sure the believer is; And partly, because that consent of mind from which this union proceeds, and by which it is to be upheld, is more entire, and full upon the part of the unbelieving Husband, than it is upon the part of the believing Wife. For whilst she consents to dwell with him meerly as the Partner of her Bed, and conformably to the offices of such a one, of which she gave a sufficient proof by abandoning him as to his Religion, and continues to do the like by the continuance of that abandoning; The unbelieving Husband, on the other side, by being (as *S. Paul* expresth it) *(k)* *well pleased* to live with her notwithstanding, consents in some measure to dwell with her as a Christian, and gives no contemptible

(k) 1 Cor.
7. 12, 13.
συνευσθαι
οἰκίσιν.

tible indication of a farther consent with her in that *Religion* : There being otherwise no great likelihood of his continuing his *Complacency*, as well as cohabitation to her, who had abandon'd him as to *his*. But therefore as the believing Wife is not so much *one* with the unbelieving Husband, as he is with her, and cannot therefore be so likely to be polluted by him, as he is to be sanctified by her ; So she becomes yet less likely to be polluted by him, because communicating with him in such *Acts*, or *Acts*, as are not only lawful in themselves, but moreover the indispensable duties of that marriage, which she had contracted, and which, whilst he is thus pleas'd to dwell with her, she is by our Apostle himself obliged to maintain. And indeed as from such a match there is more reason to expect sanctification to the unbeliever, than there is of any fear of pollution to the other ; So there will be yet less doubt of it, if we consider the *sanctification* here spoken of, not as an *inward*, but an *outward* one, and such an outward one too, by which the party

sanctified attains only the priviledge of being accounted of as a *Christian* Husband, and accordingly of conveying to those Children, that descend from them both a right to the Sacrament of Baptism. For what less can be expected from a merciful God, where the unbeliever, though continuing such, yet takes pleasure notwithstanding that in his Christian Consort? And she, on the other side, though abominating his Infidelity, yet in compliance with that marriage, wherein Christianity found her, cohabits with him notwithstanding, and no doubt both doth, and will employ all her kindness, and endeavours to gain him to a farther approbation both of her, and of the Religion she hath espous'd? Which suppos'd, a way will be open to give a clearer account of the thing intended, and withal of the force it is of to persuade the believing Wives continuing with the unbelieving Husband, if he (as is suppos'd in the present case) is as willing to dwell with her: The force thereof lying in this, that the believing Wife should in that case be so far from being polluted by the

the

the converse of the unbelieving Husband (which was no doubt these *Corinthians* fear , when they put this case to *S. Paul*) that on the contrary the unbelieving Husband should be so far sanctified by her, as to be to her in the place of a Christian one, and enjoy all the priviledges of such ; The unbelieving Husband by becoming one flesh with the believing Wife becoming so far Christian also, and so accounted of both by God, and the Church. Of which they had this undeniable proof, that the Children of those matches were not look'd upon as *unclean*, or *heathen* (which they must have been in part, if the unbeliever had not been someway *sanctified* , as well as the believer) but accounted of as so far *holy*, or *Christian*, as to be admitted to those priviledges , to which the Children of Christian Parents were, and particularly to that Baptism, by which a better holiness is convey'd. This I take to be a fair, and clear account of the *Apostle's* words, and particularly of that *holiness*, which he attributes to those Children, that descend from the forementioned Parents.

rents. And I am yet more confirmed in it by the fondness of that *notion*, which hath been set up to supplant it, and by which the Children of such matches become the issue of a *lawful marriage*, and not of an *unlawful mixture*. For beside that they, who advance this notion, make the words *Else were your Children unclean*, &c. to referr rather to the precept of the believer's cohabiting with the unbeliever, than to the unbeliever's being sanctified by the believer, to which last yet it apparently refers, and is assign'd by *S. Paul* as a proof of; They suppose that in this notion of theirs, which there is not the least ground for, and which indeed this very place doth sufficiently confute. For who ever said, or could say that the marriages of the Heathen were unlawful, which yet they must have been, if there needed the cohabitation of the faithful to make them lawful, and the Children that were born of them to be legitimate? Nay who seeth not that *S. Paul* supposeth those marriages to be lawful, when he requires the believing party to cohabit with the unbeliever? For otherwise no
doubt

doubt he would rather have advis'd to break off all commerce with the Infidel, or proceed to a new contract. Both which yet he is so far from, that he seems to me not very willing to allow of a perfect breach, even when the unbeliever doth depart from the believer. For though he saith (l) that *a brother, or sister is not in bondage in such a case*, and may therefore, if they please, look upon themselves as loos'd from the unbeliever; Yet he tells them (m) withall that *God hath called us to peace*, and therefore, (as I understand him) that breaches of that nature would be avoided as much as might be; And he tells them too (n), that if they would not be overforward to make use of that liberty, which the unbeliever gave them by *deserting* them, there might be hopes of the *unbelieving Wife*, or *Husband* being wrought upon by the *believer's* patience, and forbearance, and reconcil'd both to them, and their Religion. However as there is no pretence from this place of the believer's making the marriage between the unbeliever and themselves to be

(l) 1 Cor. 7.
15.

(m) Ibid.

(n) ----- 16.

a lawful one, as which was so before; Nor therefore for making the *holiness* of their Children to be no other than a *civil* one, and by which they only became a legitimate issue; So there is the more reason still to understand the *holiness* of that match, and the issues of it, as one that entitles them to the *outward privileges* of Christianity, and by which the unbelieving whether Husband, or Wife comes to be accounted of as a Christian one, and the Children of both parties as having a right to that Sacrament, by which all are to be initiated into Christianity, and partake of its Regeneration and Remission.

My third and last argument for the baptizing of the Infants, or Children of Christian Parents shall be taken from the *Circumcision* of those Infants, or Children, which descended from the posterity of *Abraham*, and after which I do not see what doubt can be well made of the other: Partly, upon the account of the Analogy there is between *Circumcision*, and *Baptism*, and partly upon account of the Children of Christian Parents having as good a right to the blessings

sings exhibited in them, as the Children of those, who were of the posterity of *Abraham*. For supposing (as was before (o) shewn, and may hereafter (p) be farther clear'd) that *Circumcision* relates to the same spiritual blessings with *Baptism*, and particularly to the righteousness of Faith ; And supposing farther that the Children of Christian Parents have as good a right to those *blessings*, and that *righteousness*, as the Children of those, that were of the posterity of *Abraham* ; By the same reason that the Children of *these* were intitled to that *Circumcision*, which was intended to exhibit those blessings, and that righteousness among them, the Children of the other shall be admitted to that *Baptism*, which was intended to exhibit them among us : Those Children, which have an equal right to the blessings exhibited, having an equal right to those means, which were intended for the exhibition of them. Now that the Children of Christian Parents have as good a right to the former blessings, and righteousness, as the Children of the Posterity of *Abraham*, will appear

(o). Expl. of the Sacram. in general.
Part 4.
(p) Answ. to the object. against Infants Baptism.

(q) Rom. 4.

1^h.

pear from those Parents of theirs being equally the *Children* (q) of *Abraham* with those, that were of his posterity. For being equally *his Children*, they must consequently be suppos'd to give their Children as good a right to the former *blessings* , and the *means* that was intended to exhibit them among us, as the posterity of *Abraham* did their Children to the *like blessings* , and *that means* which among them was intended for the exhibition of them:

II. The Baptism of Infants being thus made out from the *Scripture* , and by such passages thereof also, as cannot be easily avoided; Pass we on to enquire, what countenance it hath from *Antiquity* , as which if it be any thing considerable, will the more firmly establish it. Where the first, that I shall take notice of, is a passage of *Justin Martyr* , I do not mean what is commonly quoted out of his *Questions* , and *Answers* , *ad Orthodoxos* (r), it being questionable enough (s) whether that Book were his, or at least as we now have it, but what may be found in

(r) *Quest. 56.* (s) *Vid. Coci* *Censur. quorund.* *Script. in* *Script. Just.* *Martyr.*

in his second *Aplogy* (t), and concerning which there is

not any the least contro-
versie in the Church. In
which *Apology* speaking
of the excellency of the
Christian Law above
that of any humane ones,
in setting bounds to the
carnal desires of men he
hath these words. *And
there are many men, and
women of sixty, and seven-
ty years of Age, who ha-
ving from their Childhood
been disciplined unto Christ,*

(t) Pag. 62. Καὶ πολλοὶ πινες,
καὶ πολλὰ ἐξηκοντῶται, καὶ
ἐβδομηκοντῶται, οἱ ἐκ παίδων
ἐμαθηταῖσιν τῷ Χριστῷ,
ἀφ' οὗτοι διαμένοντες· καὶ ἔυχου-
μαι ὅτι πᾶν γένος ἀνθρώπων
ποιήσας δεῖξαι. Τί γὰρ καὶ
λέγουμαι τὸ ἀναείδμητον
πλήθος ὅτι ἐξ ἀκολασίας
μεταβαλόντων, καὶ ταῦτα μα-
θόντων; Ὅτι γὰρ τὰς δικαίας,
ἐδὲ τὰς σώφρονας εἰς μετάνοιαν
ἐκάλεισεν ὁ Χριστὸς,
ἀλλὰ τὰς ἀσεβεῖς, καὶ ἀκα-
λάς, καὶ ἀδίκας.

*have all their time continued uncor-
rupt, or Virgins; And I boast that
I can shew such among all sorts of
men. For why should we also speak
of that innumerable multitude of men,
who have chang'd from intemperance,
and so have learnt these things? For
Christ called not the just, or temperate
to repentance, but the ungodly, and
intemperate, and unjust. Which words
to an unbiast Reader cannot well
signifie less, than Childrens being
then baptiz'd into Christianity; That
Father not only making mention of
certain*

certain persons, who had *from their childhood* been *discipled unto Christ*, which we know from our Saviour
 (u) *Matt. 28.* (u) to have been effected by Baptism,
 19. *and continu'd too all their time uncor-*
rapt, or Virgins (which yet is a com-
 tent proof of their being baptiz'd ;
 when Children) but opposing them
 to such persons as *had chang'd from*
intemperance, and rather learnt that
 purity afterward, than been discipled
 into it at the very first : *That oppo-*
sition of his making it yet more evi-
 dent, that he meant such persons as
 were *discipled to Christ* from their
 very childhood, and before they
 were in a capacity of *learning* him,
 and his doctrine by instruction. To
 this of *Justin Martyr* subjoyn we an-
 other of *Irenaeus*, which is yet more

(w) *Omnes enim venit per semet-*
ipsum salvare : Omnes, inquam,
qui per eum renascuntur in Deum,
infantes, & parvulos, & pue-
ros, & juvenes, & seniores. I-
deo per omnem venit aetatem, &
infantibus infans factus, sancti-
ficans infantes, & in parvulis
parvulus sanctificans hanc ipsam
habentes aetatem. Adv. haes. li.
 2. c. 39.

clear for the Baptism of
 Infants. For Christ (saith
 that Father (w)) came
 to save all persons by
 himself ; All I say, who
 by him are born again to
 God; Infants, and little
 ones, and Children, and
 Young Men, and Old.
 Therefore he came in every Age, and
 was

was made an Infant to Infants, sanctifying Infants, and a little one among little ones, sanctifying those of that age, &c. Where we have him not only affirming *Christ to have come to save Infants*, as well as others, yea to have been *made an Infant himself to sanctifie them*, which shews them in his opinion to have had a *general right* to the blessings of Christianity, but speaking of several of them as *born again unto God by Christ*, which is as much as to say *baptiz'd*: That as it is the way, by which all are to be so *born*, even by the Doctrine of (x) our *Saviour*, (x) Joh. 3. 5. so the way too, by which the *Antients* apprehended it to be effected. For thus where *Justin Martyr* intreats of the Baptism of those of his time, he tells us (y) that they, (y) Apolog. 2. P. 93. 4. who were to partake of it, were *brought by the Christians to a place where water was, and there regenerated after that manner of regeneration, wherewith they themselves had been.* And to the same purpose also this very *Irenæus* (z), because not only attributing the same *regeneration* to it, but representing it as the Doctrine (z) Adv. heres. li. 1. c. 18.

Z

of

of the *Gnosticks*, as to that *Baptism* which they set up against our Saviour's, that *it was necessary for those, who had received perfect knowledge, to be so regenerated into that virtue, or power, which is above all things.* Which passage, with the former one, makes it yet more manifest that *Irenaeus* meant by such *Infants*, as were *born again by Christ unto God*, such as had been regenerated by *Baptism*, and consequently that the *Baptism* of such was no stranger in his days. I think I shall not need to insist upon the days of *Tertullian*, because what the practice of that time was is evident from his disputing against Infant Baptism, or at least advising to delay it: There being no place for such a dispute, or advice, if the thing it self had not been then in use, and in use too (as he himself intimates) in obedience to that precept of our Saviour, which enjoyn'd the *suffering little Children to come unto him* in order to their partaking of his *blessing*, and *Kingdom*. And indeed as *Origen*, who liv'd not long after him, doth not only assert the same practice of Infant

fant Baptism, but affirm * *the Church* * In Rom. 16.
to have receiv'd it as a Tradition from
the Apostles ; So Tertullian's Scholar,
and great admirer S. Cyprian † gives † Epist. 59.
 such an ample testimony to it, that
 I know not what need to be added
 to it. For one *Fidus* having questi-
 on'd him concerning the cause of
 Infants, who he thought ought not
 to be baptiz'd till the *eighth* day ac-
 cording to the law of *Circumcision* ,
 S. Cyprian in a *Council of sixty six*
Bishops made this following Answer
 to his demand ; That *he, and the*
whole Council that was with him, had
quite other thoughts of that affair, they
universally judging that the mercy,
and grace of God was to be deny'd to
none, that was born of men. And
again, that if remission of sins were
upon the faith of the parties given to
the greatest Offenders, neither was any
of them debar'd from Baptism, and
grace, how much less ought a new-born
Infant to be debarred of it, who had
no other sin to answer for, but what
he drew from Adam, and who came
so much the more easily to receive par-
don of sin, because it was not his own
proper sins, but those of others, that
 were

were to be forgiven him ? For which cause the opinion of the Council was, that no one ought to be debar'd by them from Baptism, and the Grace of God, and that, if that were to be observ'd, and retain'd as to all persons whatsoever, it was much more to be observ'd, and retain'd as to Infants, and new-born persons, whose very tears wherewith they enter'd the World, seem'd more to deserve it both from them, and the divine mercy. I omit for brevity sake the many testimonies of S. Augustine to the same purpose, and his affirming † in particular, that the Church always had it, always retain'd it, and receiv'd it from the faith of it's predecessors ; And shall content my self, as to this particular, with his, and the Church's pressing the Pelagians † with the practice of Infant Baptism, and those Pelagians, how much soever straitned by it, yet choosing rather to evade the force of it, than to deny in any measure the truth of the thing alledg'd : It being not to be thought, that, if there had been any the least suspicion of the Antiquity of Infant Baptism, or indeed of its being

† Aug. Serm.
10. de verbis
Apost.

* Voss. Hist. Pelag. li. 2.
part. 1 Thes. 5.

being derived to the Church from the Apostles, either the Catholicks would have so confidently alledged it against the *Pelagians*, or the *Pelagians* so easily, and without any the least opposition have admitted it.

III. Now as if we allow Infants to be capable of Baptism, we must consequently allow them the *graces* of that Sacrament, because Baptism was intended to convey them ; So I must needs say, I do not see why (supposing *Original sin*, which hath been before sufficiently establish'd) we should scruple to attribute to them the *graces* of that Sacrament, and particularly *remission*, and *regeneration*. For if Infants are naturally under the *guilt* of *Original sin*, there is so far forth place for, and a necessity of *remission* ; And if the same Infants are naturally under the pollution of it, or (as our *Catechism* expresseth it) are *by nature born in sin, and the children of wrath*, they are alike capable by Baptism of being regenerated, or made the *children of grace*. Not that there is, or can be even in baptiz'd Infants any *actual*

perception of, or *adhesion to* that, which is *spiritually good*, but a *disposition* to both, and by vertue whereof the soul is fitted, and inclin'd to each, when years, and opportunity invite: As the same soul is to *reason*, and *will*, when it arrives at years of maturity, by vertue of those natural faculties, that are from the beginning in it. Which is a sort of regeneration, that is most suitable to the state of Infancy, and beyond which therefore, whilst they continue in that state, we are not reasonably to expect; But is withal as true a regeneration as that, which is wrought in those of riper years, and by which the souls of the parties regenerated actually perceive, and cleave to that good, which the other is only disposed to: That actual perception, and *adhesion* being not so much any part of their regeneration, or new birth, as the effects, or issues of it.

IV. But because how clear soever Infant Baptism may thus far seem, yet it cannot be deny'd to be encumbered with many, and great difficulties,

ties, or at least such as appear so to men of prejudiced minds ; Therefore it will be but necessary , before I leave this head, to select such of them as seem to be most pressing , and return a satisfactory Answer to them : Whether they be such as relate to the *grounds*, on which I have endeavour'd to establish it, or such as strike more directly at the *thing* itself.

That, which is most to be consider'd of the former sort , is that (a) which pretends to evacuate the Argument from the *Circumcising* of the Infants of *Abraham's* posterity to the Baptizing of the Children of Christians. Which it endeavours *in part* from *Circumcisions* being but a *Type* , or figure of Baptism, and so either proving nothing at all without some express to signify such a thing to be its purpose, or after the nature of such things, directing us rather to a spiritual childhood in order to Baptism, than shewing a natural childhood to be a due subject of it ; And *in part* also from *Circumcisions* being not in all things a rule to the Christians Baptism, and particularly

(a) See *Jer. Tayl. Liberty of Proph. Sect.* 18. *num.* 13.

not in the *persons*, that are to be baptized (Women as well as Men being confessedly the subject of the latter) nor in the time of their receiving of it. For if Circumcision be a sufficient direction for the baptizing of Infants, why not also a like direction for the confining of it to the *Males*? And if it were to be a direction as to the baptizing of Infants, why not also as to the baptizing of them upon the eighth day (which was the day of administering Circumcision) as that *Fidus*, whom *S. Cyprian* answer'd, seem'd to be persuaded, and accordingly argued it from the like administration of Circumcision.

As to what is objected concerning Circumcisions being but a type of Baptism, and so either proving nothing at all without some express to signify such to be its purpose, which is not pretended in the present case, or if proving any thing as to the matter of childhood, yet directing rather to a spiritual, than a natural one; I answer that as I see not why Circumcision should be look'd upon as only a type of Baptism, nor indeed

as

as any type at all, unless it be in a general sense, and as a thing that is like unto another may be look'd upon as a type of that, to which it is so, in which sense I my self have also us'd the *word*, and allow it so to be, so we do not at all argue from Circumcision, as it may be supposed to be a type of Baptism, but as a sign of the same righteousness of Faith, of which Baptism is, and of the same gracious Covenant, that assures it. And in this sense as nothing hinders us to argue from Circumcisions being bestowed upon Infants then, that that which is a sign of the same righteousness of faith under the Gospel is in reason to be extended to the same persons; So there is this in particular to enforce it, that Christian Parents would otherwise fall short, in the account of God, of the priviledges of the natural descendants of *Abraham*. Of which what account can be given, when *Abraham*, from whom they both claim, is declared to be the Father of them both, yea is said by *S. Paul* to have receiv'd the sign of Circumcision, not only as a *seal*, or assurance

assurance to himself of *that righteousness of faith*, which he before had, but a seal, or an assurance also of his being to the same purposes a Father (b) of those that believe, though they be not circumcised, as well as a Father of those that were.

(b) Rom. 4.
II.

There is as little reason to be stagger'd by what is alledged in the second instance, that if Circumcision be a sufficient direction for the baptizing of Infants, it may as well be a direction for the confining of it to the Males, and for the confining of it too to the eighth day after the Infants birth. Because first the Sacrament of Baptism hath nothing in it to confine it to the Males, as Circumcision had, but on the contrary is equally fitted to be administered to both Sexes. And secondly because it appears from what was before said (c) concerning the *Rite* of Baptism among the *Jews*, that the want of Circumcision was afterwards suppli'd to the Females by Baptism, and they thereby even in their Infancy initiated into the same Covenant with the other. For this shews yet more, how little reason there is to

(c) Part 1.

to argue from Circumcisions being confin'd to the Males, that therefore Baptism ought to be so; Or rather how much more reason there is to extend it both to Male, and Female, and so to all of the same Infant estate. If therefore there be any thing to hinder our arguing from Circumcision in this particular, it must be its not being pretended by our selves to be a direction as to the day of its administration, as well as to the persons, to whom it ought to be administered. But beside that there is a vast difference between the persons, to whom any Sacrament is to be given, and the precise day, on which it is to be so, and therefore not the like reason for Circumcision's directing as to this, as there is for its directing as to the other; What Circumcision directs as to the case of Infants is more a favour, than a command, whereas what is directed as to the *precise day* is rather a command, than a favour. Now it being a rul'd case, That Favours are rather to be enlarg'd, than restrain'd, especially under a Dispensation, which is so manifestly gracious, as that of
the

the Gospel is, there may be reason enough for our interpreting what is said concerning the Circumcision of Infants to the equal, or rather greater benefit of Infants now, and consequently that Sacrament, which came in place of it, to be rather hastned, than deferred to a day, to which possibly they may not arrive, but however to be given them as soon, as a convenient opportunity presents it self. Add hereunto the difference there is between Circumcision, and Baptism as to the trouble, or danger, which may attend the administration of them to such tender bodies, as those of Infants are. For there being a greater trouble, and danger to Infants from the Rite of Circumcision, than there is from the Rite of Baptism; There might be greater reason for the deferring of that to the eighth day, than there is for the deferring of this. And what is therefore, as to that particular, directed concerning Circumcision, not to be drawn into example in the matter of Baptism, though other more material, and more advantageous circumstances are.

But

But leaving what is commonly urg'd against the Argument from the Circumcising of Infants, because, as I suppose, sufficiently assail'd by the foregoing discourse. Let us take a view of such Objections as strike more directly at Infant Baptism, or at least of the more material ones. Such as I take to be first the want of an express command, or direction for the administering of Baptism to Infants; Secondly, their being incapable of that regeneration, which is the great intent and end of Baptism, or giving no suitable indications of it afterwards; Thirdly, their being as incapable of answering what is prerequired to it on the part of the persons to be baptized, or is to be performed by them in the receiving of it.

That which seems to stick much with the Adversaries of Infant Baptism, and is accordingly urg'd at all turns against the Friends, or Asserters of it, is the want of an express command, or direction for the administering of Baptism to them. Which objection seems to be the more reasonable, because Baptism,

as

as well as other Sacraments, receiving all its force from Institution, they may seem to have no right to, or benefit by it, who appear not by the institution of that Sacrament to be intitled to it, but rather, by the qualifications which it requires, to be excluded from it. And possibly more might be of the opinion of the Objecters, if there had not been before an exprefs Law for admitting Infants to that righteousness of Faith, of which Baptism is a sign, and a means of conveyance, and for admitting them too by such an outward sign, as that of Baptism is. But such an exprefs law having been before given by God, and that law as notorious as any law in either Testament, there was no reason (d) for God to give any such exprefs law for the so administering of Baptism, or for us to expect it from him: It being easie to collect from the Analogy there is between the two Sacraments, and the great graciousness of the present dispensation, that what was communicated to the Children of *Abraham's* posterity by the sign of Circumcision, which was then the standing

(d) See Stillingfleet's *Irenicum*. Part 1. cap. 1. §. 3.

standing way of administering it, was alike intended for the Children of those, who were to as good, or better purpose the Children of the same *Abraham*, and intended too to be transmitted to them by their particular Sacrament, and to which (as was before observ'd) the great graces of the Gospel were annex'd by our Saviour (e) himself. Which (e) Joh. 3 5.

Argumentation is so much the more reasonable, because it appears by what was but now suggested, that our Saviour, whose Institution Baptism was, gave a sufficient indication of his own kindness to that tender estate, yea of his owning those, that were of it, to have a right to that Kingdom of Heaven, to which Baptism by his own appointment was intended to admit men.

The next great Objection against the Baptism of Infants is their suppos'd incapacity of that regeneration, which is the great end, and intent of Baptism, or giving no suitable indications of it, when they begin to be in a natural capacity to exert it. The former whereof the Anabaptists argue from the Scripture's speaking

(f) 1 Pet. 1. 23. speaking of it (f) as produced by the *word of truth*, and other such rational means; As the latter by the little appearance there is of it in many of those, that are baptiz'd, after they arrive at the years of discretion: Especially where, as it often happens in the Dominion of the *Turks*, they are taken away from their Parents, before they come to be of any years, and bred up in the *Mahumetan* Religion. For under this they are so far from giving any indications of a *Christian regeneration*, that our *Religion* hath no greater, or more implacable enemies, than they.

As to what is argu'd toward the proof of Infants incapacity of regeneration from the Scriptures speaking of it as produc'd by the word of truth, and other such rational ways of procedure, I must needs say I do not see why it should be alledg'd in this particular, unless it any where intimated, that there was no other way of producing it, no not in the Souls of Infants. For the Scripture speaking *to*, and *of men* converted from Judaism, or Heathenism to Christianity, and consequently brought

to it in a rational way; What is spoken of their regeneration, is not to be drawn into example here, unless the same Scripture did any where intimate that there was no other way of regeneration than that; or it could not be otherwise produced. Which beside the affront it offers to the omnipotency of God's spirit; and which even in *men* must be supposed to have the chiefest stroke, will need no other confutation, than Gods creating man at first after his own image without any concurrence of his, and producing in our Saviour, even in his conception, that perfect *holiness*, which was in him. For why may not God produce in an Infant that imperfect regeneration, whereof we speak, as well as he did that more perfect Righteousness, and true Holiness, wherewith our first Parents were created, or that more excellent, as well as more durable one; which he did in our Saviour from the very beginning, and which the Scripture it self attributes to the Holy Ghost's *overshadowing* his Mother's Womb? But it may be, though Infants are not incapable of regeneration, and so

far forth cannot with reason be de-
barr'd the Sacrament of it; Yet there
is evidence enough upon the *postfact*,
that no such thing is collated in their
Baptism, and that Baptism of theirs
therefore not to be look'd upon as
a legitimate one. For if the rege-
neration we speak of were collated
in the Baptism of Infants, it would,
(because all Infants are alike qualifi'd
for that Sacrament) be collated in
some measure **upon** all of them,
which yet the future behaviour of
many of **them** doth render justly que-
stionable: Many of them being un-
toward enough, when they first come
of years, though advantaged by a sut-
able education, and others (as before
said) taken away early from their Chri-
stian Parents, and both educated in a
contrary Religion, and made zealous
Profelytes of it. Which things how
they should be consistent with that re-
generation, whereof we speak, is at least
very difficult to apprehend. And pos-
sibly these two things have stuck more
with considering men than most of
the other Arguments that have been
brought against Infant Baptism, and
have perhaps given as much trouble to
all

all those, who have duly consider'd them. But whether they are in truth of that force, which they seem to be of, may well be doubted by those, who shall consider this regeneration as the state of Infants requires, or at least makes it reasonable enough to do; I mean as a weak, and imperfect thing, and rather as the seed of a more strong, and perfect regeneration, than a thoroughly form'd, and well settled one. For so if we conceive of it, we shall find no great difficulty to apprehend first, that where there is not only nothing of a Christian education to excite, and improve it, but a contrary one from the very beginning, and such a one in particular as Christian Children have from the *Turks*; So, I say, it will not be difficult to apprehend, but it may be perfectly overwhelm'd, and choaked by it: As that seed in the Parable was, that was sown among Thorns, or as that may be suppos'd to be, that is covered over with rubbish; and hindred by it from sprouting forth. And though I cannot say the same of the regeneration of such persons, as have af-

terwards had a Christian, and it may be a careful education to excite it (for here one would think it should every where more forcibly exert it self) yet this I may, which will be of equal force, that in that case it may equally fail for want of those persons exciting it, in whom that seed is sown, or of their answering by their care, and endeavour that education, which is made use of in order to it. For Baptism (as hath been often said) being in the nature of a stipulation, or Contract, where somewhat is to be perform'd by the party Baptized, as soon as he is in a capacity to do it, as well as by him, with whom the contract is made; No wonder if, when the baptized person comes to be in a capacity to perform his part, and doth not, he with whom the Contract is made, do first withdraw his blessing from that, which he hath before sown in him, and afterward the seed it self. For in either of these cases we cannot expect such indications, or effects of the Baptismal regeneration, as otherwise we might, and as do actually shew themselves in many of those,

those, who have been made partakers of it. It may be enough that God hath furnish'd such persons with a regeneration, which during their minority will qualifie them for, and secure them to his Kingdom, and a regeneration too which, if well improv'd, will grow into a more complete, and effectual one, and in fine bring them to a due holiness, and unto God. If the baptized persons will, when they are in a capacity to do better, neglect to excite it, or will oppose it, they must thank themselves, if they miscarry, and not lay the blame upon any failure on Christ's part, and much less deny his having conferred it on them.

The third, and last great Objection against the Baptism of Infants is their being incapable of answering what is preredquired to it on the part of the persons that are to be baptized, or is to be performed by them in the receiving of it. Which incapacity they argue, as to the former of these, from the Scripture's pre-requiring Faith, and Repentance to it, as the latter from that stipulation, which Baptism involves, and which Infants are equally incapacitated to make.

The Answer, which our Catechism makes to these difficulties, or at least to the former, is, that *they promise them both by their sureties, which promise, when they come to Age, themselves are bound to perform.* And possibly this Answer might be better digested than it is, if the minds of those, who argue against Infant-Baptism, were more free, and unprejudic'd, than they commonly appear to be. Because first what is urg'd against Infant-Baptism upon the account of its being a stipulation, or Contract is equally of force against the Circumcision of Infants, because that was equally a Covenant, or rather a sign of it, and a means of entring into it. Which notwithstanding, the Infants of *Abraham's* posterity were by the Command of God himself admitted to it, and thereupon reckon'd as in Covenant with him. Now if the Infants of *Abraham's* posterity were by the Command of God admitted into Covenant with him; What should hinder the Infants of Christians from Covenanting in like manner with him, and so far forth from being

being admitted to the participation of that Sacrament, which is a sign of the same gracious Covenant, and a means of entering into it? Again Secondly, though Infants cannot in strictness Covenant with God, because neither having *reason* enough to apprehend the terms of it, nor *will* to determine themselves to the performance of them; Yet as they may *by favour* be admitted to a partnership in a Covenant, and where God, or Christ is the person, with whom they contract, obliged when they come of years to answer their part in it, so by the same favour of him, with whom they contract, what is done to them, or for them, may be interpreted as a promise on their part for the performance of it. By which means though they should not be capable of a strict, and proper stipulation, yet they may of that, which is interpretatively such. The only farther doubt in this affair is, whether God accepts of such a stipulation, which his accepting of it under the Covenant of Circumcision, and from the Children of *Abraham's* natural posterity will easily remove.

For the Covenant of Baptism being no way inferior in it self to (or rather but the same Covenant in a different dress with) the Covenant of Circumcision, nor the Children of *Abraham's* spiritual seed inferior to those of the natural one; What was accepted of under the Covenant of Circumcision, and from the Children of *Abraham's* natural seed may as reasonably be presum'd to be accepted of under Baptism, and from the Children of his spiritual. How much more, when (as was before shewn) his Son, and our Saviour Christ (g) hath commanded

(g) Mark 10.
14. Children to be brought to him for his benediction, and grace, and his Apostle and our great Instructor *S. Paul* declar'd the Children of Christians to be *holy*, yea where but one of the Parents is so? Thus we may rationally answer what is objected against the stipulation of Infants, and consequently against their taking upon them what is requir'd of them in the receiving of Baptism; Which will leave nothing to us to make answer to, but their supposed incapacity for that faith, and repentance, which

which seem to be pre-required to it, and which one would think they, that are to be baptiz'd, should bring with them in some measure, as well as make a promise of. But beside that those Texts (*b*), which speak of these prerequisites, do all manifestly relate to adult persons, and such as are brought to Baptism by the preaching of the Gospel, and therefore not lightly to be urg'd in the case of Infants; There are these three substantial reasons to make a difference between Infants, and Men as to this particular. First, that Infants are not admitted to Baptism, and the graces of it upon the account of any right in themselves, but of the right of their Parents. Secondly, that they are admitted for the present to a lesser portion of the Divine graces, than adult persons are, and such as are rather the seeds of them, than any thoroughly form'd, or well settled ones. Thirdly, that what right they receive by their Baptism to future, and more perfect priviledges, depends for their actually attaining them upon their exhibiting that faith, and repentance, which at the time of their Baptism

(*b*) Mark 16.

15, 16.

Acts 2. 38.

-----8. 37.

Baptism they only made a promise of. For if (as is alledged in the first reason) Infants are not admitted to Baptism and the Graces of it, upon the account of any right in themselves, but of the right of their Parents; What should

* *Accommodat illis mater Ecclesia aliorum pedes ut veniant, aliorum cor ut credant, aliorum linguam ut fateantur, ut quoniam quod acri sunt alio peccante pregravantur, sic cum hi sani sunt alio pro eis confitentes salventur.* Aug. de Verb. Apost. Serm. 10.

hinder the Church from lending*, or Infants from borrowing from it the feet of other men, that they may come, the heart of others that they may believe, the tongue of others that they may confess, that because, in that they were sick, they were pressed down by anothers sin, they may, when they are made whole, be saved by the confession of another? If again (as is alledged in the second reason, and prov'd before in the matter of regeneration) Infants are admitted for the present to a lesser portion of the divine Graces, than adult persons are, and such as are rather the seeds of them, than any thoroughly form'd, or well settled one; Who can think but that a like difference ought to be between them as to the pre-requisites of their Baptism, and that therefore

not

not to be urg'd as to the case of Infants, which was prerequired of the other? In fine if (as is alledged in the third reason) what right Infants receive by their Baptism to future, and more perfect priviledges, depends for their attaining of them, upon their exhibiting that Faith, and Repentance, which at the time of their Baptism they only made a promise of; It may be time enough, when that right is to be actuated, to exhibit that Faith, and Repentance, and so make way for it, as they, who are of years, do. Otherwise more shall be suppos'd to be requir'd of Infants, than is of adult persons themselves; Because that Faith and Repentance is not requir'd of the latter, till the full priviledges of Baptism are to be bestow'd upon them. And I shall only add, that if care were taken that the Faith, and Repentance of those, who were baptiz'd in their Infancy, were as well enquir'd into, and prov'd as their knowledge in the *Catechism* is, before they were allow'd to be confirm'd; The Church would not only better discharge the trust, that is reposed

fed in her as concerning those persons, whose Faith and Repentance were not before prov'd, nor could be, but more effectually stop the mouths of the Anabaptists, than all the Arguments she, or her Sons offer for Infant Baptism, will ever be able to do. For so she would make it appear, that though she contented her self in their Baptism with the promise that was made for them, or rather with that tacit stipulation, which their very Baptism involves; Yet she was as mindful, when they came of years, to oblige them to the performance of it, and to give due proofs in their own persons of all those things, which Baptism in adult persons doth either pre-suppose, or oblige to the performance of.

PART XII.

Whether Baptism may be repeated.

The Contents.

What the true state of the present question is, and that it is not founded in any suppos'd illegitimateness of the former Baptism, but upon supposition of the baptized persons either not having before had, or forfeited the regeneration of it, or fallen off from that Religion, to which it doth belong. Whereupon enquiry is made, whether if such persons repent and return, they ought to be baptiz'd anew, or received into the Church without. What there is to perswade the repeating of Baptism, and what the Church hath alledg'd against it. The Churches arguments from Eph.

4. 4. and Joh. 13. 10. proposed, but wav'd. The Churches opinion more firmly established in the no direction there is in Scripture for rebaptization in those cases, but rather the contrary, and in the no necessity there is of it. The Arguments for rebaptization answer'd.

IV. **T**HE fourth, and last question relating to the right Administration of Baptism is *whether it may be repeated.* Which question is not founded in any suppos'd illegitimacy of the former Baptism (for that is here taken for granted to have been good, and valid) but upon supposition of the baptized persons either having not before receiv'd, or forfeited the regeneration he acquir'd by it, or fallen off altogether from that Religion, into which he was baptized. In which cases, supposing the person to repent of his former either impiety, or Apostasie, it is enquir'd whether he may be baptiz'd anew, or receiv'd into the Communion of the faithful without it.

Now though, if Men would abide by the Doctrine of the Church, this
que-

question would be of easie resolution ;

S. Cyprian * himself, who was so fierce for the rebaptizing of those, who had been baptiz'd by Hereticks, yet advancing not that Assertion of his upon a belief of Baptism's being to be repeated,

provided it were a legitimate one, but on supposition of the former Baptisms being no true, and genuine one ; Yet will it not be of so easie a resolution, if that Authority be laid aside, and the thing in question weigh'd rather by Arguments, than suffrages. For what do they differ in effect from Heathen, or Infidels, who either never before had, or have fallen quite off from the regeneration, or faith of Baptism ? And if they differ not at all from them, why should they not, if they repent, and return, be received as Heathen, or Infidels, I mean by the Sacrament of Baptism ? Especially, when in the ordinary dispensation of God the graces of the Sacrament are annexed to the Sacrament, nor can be expected without it. For, that suppos'd, why should

* Epist. 71. Ad Quintum. Nos autem dicimus eos, qui inde veniunt, non rebaptizari apud nos, sed baptizari. Neque enim accipiunt illic aliquid, ubi nihil est, sed veniunt ad nos, ut hic accipiant, ubi gratia, & veritas omnis est, quia & gratia & veritas una est.

not

not these men, being to begin their Christianity a-new, come a second time under that Sacrament, which is to enter beginners into it, and give them the regeneration, and remission of it?

Of what force these Objections are, shall be afterward considered; The only reason of my present mention of them is to shew, that the question is not without its difficulty, and that if we will satisfy our understandings so, as to be able to satisfy others, we must enquire into the grounds of the Churches opinion, as well as be satisfied, that the Church hath been so persuaded. Which we shall find the more reason for, because one principal Text, which hath been alledged, seems not to come up to it, nor indeed to have any relation to that affair; That I mean, which suggests

† Eph. 4. 5. } *one Baptism* † as well as *one Lord*, and *one Faith* in him. For the design of the Apostle in that place being to persuade the *Ephesians* to unity, and peace among themselves, as that too, among other things by there being *one Lord*, *one Faith*, and *one Baptism*, cannot so reasonably be thought to mean

mean any other, than that they all had one *common Lord*, to whom they related, one *common Faith* in that Lord, and one *common Baptism*, or mode of initiating into it:

That unity, as it best agrees with that *one hope of their calling*, by which they are also prest, because declared to be *one* †, *in which they were all called*;

† Eph. 4. 4.

So most naturally, and most immediately enforcing that agreement with one another, for the inculcating whereof they are all suggested. I say

not the same, nor can of that unity of Baptism, which imports only a single administration of it to one, and the same person; That unity,

though it may oblige the person to stick close to his Religion, and to the profession he hath made of it in that *one Baptism* of his, yet perswading

not any adhesion to, or unity with other Baptized persons, than as they may be suppos'd to partake *in common* with him in it. But it may be there

is more force in what is alledged from our Saviour, where he saith (a), that *he, that is washed*, even by a more general washing, *needeth not save to wash his feet*. And so no doubt there

(a) Joh. 13.
10.

(b) Part 2.

is, if by the former *washing* be meant the *washing* of *Baptism*, as some of the Antients conceiv'd, and as I have elsewhere (b) made it probable. But there is this exception against it, as to the thing we are now about, that it seems to suppose the more general purity procured by it to abide, and mens affections, or actions only to have some pollution in them. Whereas those, concerning whose rebaptization we intreat, either never had, or have forfeited their baptismal regeneration, or fallen off altogether from that Religion to which it belongs.

Now that, which in my opinion ought to have the first place in our thoughts is the no direction there is in Scripture for the repetition of Baptism, where the like Apostasie, or impiety hath happened, but rather a direction to a contrary course. And I instance for the proof thereof in *Simon Peter*, after he had deny'd, and forsworn his Master; And in *Simon Magus*, after he had proceeded to so great a degree of impiety, as to offer the Apostles money for the gift of the Holy Ghost. For to the former of these, even *S. Peter*, we find no other

other washing directed, save that (c) (c) Luk. 22.
of *penitential tears*; Nay we find 61.
him admonished (d), as well as li- (d)-----22.
censed after that *conversion* of his to
set himself to the *strengthening of his*
brethren. Which in all probability he
would not have been without a fore-
going Baptism, if our Saviour had
meant for the future, that nothing
but a new Baptism should be able to
convert such Apostates to himself :
His passing over so great an Aposta-
sie in a prime disciple of his upon his
bare repentance being apt to encour-
age other men to presume of the
same unto themselves. Neither will
it avail to say, that this instance will
not reach the case, because it doth
not appear, that *S. Peter* was baptiz'd
before. For supposing that he were
not, which yet (as was heretofore
(e) observ'd) in all probability he (e) Part 2.
was, the case of the Rebaptizers will
not be render'd better, but rather so
much the worse for it. For if he was
not baptiz'd before, there was the
more reason he should be baptized
now, if nothing but a new Baptism
generally can wash away Apostasie.
The instance of *Simon Magus* is yet
more

more clear, and unexceptionable, where the regeneration of Baptism hath not been before receiv'd, or forfeited after the receiving of it. For that *Simon Magus* either never receiv'd, or had now lost the Baptismal regeneration, is evident from the words of *S. Peter* to him; That holy man not only cursing him (f) for his offer of money, but telling him in exprefs terms, that he had neither lot, nor part in the matter (g) of Christianity, and that his heart was not right in the sight of God, in fine that he perceiv'd, that he was in the gall of bitterness (h), and in the bond of iniquity. Which notwithstanding, the same *S. Peter* directed him only (i) to repent of that his wickedness, and pray God, if perhaps the thought of his heart might be forgiven him. Which how could *S. Peter* have done, especially in so notorious a case, if a second Baptism had been necessary to wash away that sinful estate, which the former Baptism had not purg'd, or at least which had returned after it.

My second Argument against the repetition of Baptism is the necessity of it in either of the forementi-
on'd

on'd instances. As will appear whether we consider it as a means of obliging us to that piety, which our Religion requires, or as a means of conveying the graces of it. For in the former notion it is as really, and effectually an obligation to a Christian life in an unsincere person, or one who afterwards apostatizeth, as if it had been never so heartily intended; The obligation thereof arising not from the secret sentiments of the person, that is baptized, or his constancy to his profession, but from the nature of the thing it self, and the Institution of God, that prescrib'd it. Provided therefore we take upon us the Sacrament it self, we tie our selves by it without remedy, neither can there therefore be any need of our obliging our selves by it a second time, unless he, who instituted it, should require it of us. It is true indeed so far as we have departed from it whether by Apostasie, or impiety, so far it will concern us to own it again to our Lord and Master, by our repentance of the breaches of it, and a repetition of the same vows unto him; And it will concern us too, if the Church requires

requires it, to satisfie that also, that we do so repent, and will amend. But as both the one, and the other may be done without the repetition of our Baptism, so a frank acknowledgment with our mouths, together with the receipt of the Lord's Supper, may very well serve for those purposes, because serving a like to declare them. But it may be the principal difficulty in this affair lies in what concerns Baptism as a means of conveying the graces of it, and particularly our regeneration, and new birth. And I must confess I was for some time at a loss what to think in it, till I consider'd that the Sacrament of Baptism was not either a physical cause, or conveyer of Grace, that we should think the grace of it could not be in the receiver of Baptism, unless it were either presently produced in him, or conveyed to him, but a moral instrument thereof, or a means to which God hath annexed the promise of it. For such a one by the favour of that God, who hath annexed the promise of his Grace unto it, may operate at a distance, as well as in presence, and accordingly may convey it to the receiver of Baptism,


tism, as well after his Baptism, as together with it, yea convey it after the baptized person hath lost it, as well as it did at first. Which suppos'd, the only remaining difficulty will be, whether we may reasonably expect it from God, supposing the baptized person to return, and repent. A thing, which they have little reason to question, who believe God to allow a second Baptism upon it, and we shall have far less, if we reflect upon the former instances of *Peter*, and *Simon Magus*. For if God will allow of the remedy of a second Baptism upon repentance, why not also allow the first Baptism to be the means of conveying his graces, and our health, and soundness? Especially, when the breaches of it come to be acknowledged, and the vow thereof renewed. And if God accepted of *S. Peter* upon his bare repentance, and directed *Simon Magus* to no other remedy, than that, and prayer; We may as well suppose, that if he accept us at all, he will accept us upon that, and our old Baptism, and so make that co-operate to the respective graces of it.

These

These I take to be sufficient Arguments against the repetition of Baptism, and the more, because they also suggest as satisfactory answers to what hath been before alledged for it. For neither can they be look'd upon as Heathen, and consequently as standing in need of a new Baptism, who however they may have renounc'd the old, whether by their Impiety, or Apostasie, yet ever were, and ever will be under the obligation of it. And much less after their repentance, and return can they be thought to want it toward the producing of that regeneration, which they are without : Their former Baptism, through the favour of him who annex'd the promise of regeneration to that Sacrament, being as effectual for that purpose, as any new Baptism what soever. Baptism is indeed generally necessary to regeneration, it is so necessary that no man living can promise it to himself without it ; But if it be of as much value, as necessity, it may, and no doubt will induce him, who is the dispenser of his own graces, to confer it upon a former, as well as upon any new administration of it.

F I N I S.





1000

