



A
S E R M O N
OF THE
BAPTIZING of INFANTS;

PREACHED
In the Abbey-Church at *Westminster*, at
the Morning Lecture, appointed by the
Honorable House of COMMONS.

BY
Stephen Marshall, B.D. Minister of Gods Word,
at *Finching-field* in *Essex*. *J. H. C.*

ACT. 2. 39.

The Promise is unto you and to your Children, and to all that are as farre off,
even as many as the Lord our God shall call.

ROM. 11. 16.

If the roote bee holy, so are the branches.

1 COR. 7. 14.

The unbelieving husband is sanctified by the wife, and the unbelieving
wife is sanctified by the husband, else were your children unclean, but
now they are holy.

LONDON,

Printed by Richard Cotes, for Stephen Bowtell, and are to be sold at
the signe of the Bible in Popes-head Alley, 1645.



T O

The Reverend and Learned the
Prolocutor, Assessors, the Commis-
sioners of the Church of Scotland, and the
rest of the Assembly of Divines, now
sitting in Westminster.

Some few of us who are of your number,
freely bestowing our Labours in the Ab-
bey-Church, every Morning; we agreed a-
mong our selves to instruct our Auditors
in all the necessary Truths of that Doctrin, which is
according to godlinesse; One taking for his Subject,
the Articles of Faith; Another the Ten Comman-
dements; Another the Lords Prayer, &c. My lot
of late hath been to handle the Doctrin of the Sacra-
ments, and coming in order to this Point, I inde-
voured to cleere it as fully as I could in one Sermon,
and was thereby compelled to borrow a little more
time then is usually allotted to that Exercise.

Importunity of many Friends, who conceived it
might give some light to that which is now made a
great controversy, and might through the blessing of
God,

The Epistle Dedicatory.

God, bee a meanes to reclaime some deceived Soules,
or prevent the deceiving of others, hath brought it
thus into Publick view.

And although I know my self the unworthiest and
unablist of many, yet because I am assured that it is
Gods Truth which I have Preached, and which bee
will blesse, I was the more easily overcome by that im-
portunity; if it may contribute any thing to the help-
ing forward of the great work now under your hands
and may ease you of any part of that Labour which
so exceeding presseth you, therein I shall rejoyce; And
in the opportunity I have by Dedicating this to your
Names, to testify that I am

Your unworthy Brother
and Servant in the Lords work,

STEPHEN MARSHALL.



A
SERMON
OF THE
BAPTIZING of INFANTS.

I PET. 3. 21.

The like figure whereunto, even Baptisme, doth also now save us, (not the putting away of the filth of the flesh, but the answer of a good conscience towards God) by the Resurrection of Jesus Christ.

IN this Morning Lecture, I have formerly in my course out of severall Scriptures handled the Doctrine of the Sacraments in *Generall*, and then proceeded to speak of the Sacraments of the *Old Testament*, and therein their *number*, their *agreement*, and *disagreement*, with those of the *New Testament*; And now lately have begun to open the Sacraments of the *New Testament*.

The first of them is now in hand; And I have already out of this Text, made four or five Sermons, concerning the nature and use of the Sacrament of Baptisme, wherein I have

A Sermon of the Baptizing of Infants.

12
have cleared unto you: First, Who was the *Author* and *Institutor* of it: Secondly, Who is to be the *Minister* of it: Thirdly, the *Essence* of it, the matter and forme of it; both the *res terrena*, and the *res Cœlestis*, the earthly, and the spirituall part: and now Fourthly, it remaines, that I treat of the *subject* of it, or the persons who are to be Baptized; and they are of two sorts; either *grown men*, who being instructed in the Doctrine of Christ, and professing their Faith in him, and their willingnes and readines to live according to his will, and do desire to be partakers of this blessed Sacrament; these whether Jews or Gentiles, Male or Female, bond or free, are to be admitted to the participation of this Ordinance; of the Baptizing of such as these there is no question. The other sort are *Infants*, of whose right to this Sacrament, I shall (by Gods assistance) treat this day.

The Question
stated.

And concerning these, there are two sorts of questions: First, Whether any Infants at all are to be Baptized? Secondly, Supposing some have right to it, yet it's greatly disputed, *whose* Infants may be baptized? *viz.* Whether the Infants of *Excommunicate* persons, of *Hereticks*, of *Profane* men, of meerly *civilly Righteous*, whether *Bastards*, whether the Infants of *Heathens*, *who are to bee brought up by Christians*; and whether these may not be baptized, with some *caution* used, thereby to make distinction betwixt the pure and the impure? I shall for the present baulk all these latter questions, and handle only the former, *viz.* *Whether any at all are to bee baptized?* or, as the Question uses to be stated:

whether the Infants of beleeving Parents, the Infants of Saints, are to be admitted to this Holy Sacrament? And here also ariseth another question, Who are to bee meant by *Beleevvers* and *Saints*, whether only such as have the *inward vertue* of faith and holinesse, who are *really* beleevvers and

A Sermon of the Baptizing of Infants.

3

and Sanctified ones, or whether by *Beleever*s and *Saints*, may be meant such a faith and Sanctity as is *outwardly professed*, although possibly the inward grace it selfe (which only God can judge of) be altogether wanting?

Concerning which question, although for my own part I beleeve we are to understand it of that which man may judge of, and that God hath not made that the condition of his servants applying his Ordinances, which can be infallibly known to none but himselfe, and that therefore the profession of faith and holinesse, is sufficient to make men passe for Beleevers and Saints, in the Churches judgement, yet I shall at the present baulk the handling of this also, and will take it in the surest sense, in the Apostles sense; what the *Apostle* means by Beleevers and Saints, when he writes unto the Churches, that I will take to be the state of the Question: if by Beleevers and Saints the *Apostle* mean *visible* professors of faith and holinesse; then the Question is, whether *their Infants are to bee baptized*; if the *Apostle* by Beleevers and Saints mean such only as are *inwardly* holy, *inwardly* beleevers, then the question is, whether *their Infants are to bee Baptized*; in a word, whether the Infants of such as were or might have been stiled Beleevers and Saints in the *Apostles* daies and writings, are to be admitted to the Sacrament of Baptisme.

The Infants of Beleevers ought to bee Baptized.

This priviledge of the Baptizing of such Infants the Christian Church hath been in possession of, for the space of fifteen hundred years and upwards, as is manifest out of most of the Records that we have of antiquity, both in the Greek and Latine Church; which I the rather mention in the beginning, because many of the Anabaptists blush not to say, that the Antients, especially the Greek Church, rejected it for many hundred years: *Iustine Martyr*, who lived about Anno 150 (in a Treatise which goes under his name) *Question 56*, disputes the different condition of those children,

The Primitive Church owned it.

B

who

A Sermon of the Baptizing of Infants.

who dye baptized, and of them who dye unbaptized.

Ireneus, who lived in the same Century, *Lib. 2. cap. 39.* saith, *Christus venit per seipsum omnes salvare, omnes inquam, qui per eum renascuntur in Deum, Infantes & parvulos & pueros, &c.* Now it is well known, say the Glossers upon that Text, *renascentia nomine, Dominica & Apostolica phrasi, Baptismum intelligi.*

Origen, who lived in the beginning of the third Century, in his Treatise upon *Rom. 6. Lib. 5.* saith, *The Church received this Tradition of Baptizing of Infants from the Apostles: and Homily 8. upon Leviticus, Secundum Ecclesie observantiam, Baptismum parvulis dari concedit, Hom. 14. in Lucam, Parvuli baptizantur in remissionem peccatorum:* he calls it indeed a Tradition, according to the expression of the Ancients, who ordinarily called the greatest points of Faith, by the name of Traditions received from the Apostles. Traditions being onely such things as are delivered from one to another, whether written or unwritten. And so did the Apostle himselfe, *2 Thess. 2. 15.* when he charged them to hold the Traditions which they had been taught, either by word or Epistle. However his calling it a Tradition received from the Apostles gives us a sufficient prooffe, that time out of mind, it had been received in the Church, that it was delivered over to the Church in his time, and was of antient use in the Church before his time.

Gregory Nazianzen, Orat. 40. in Baptismum, calls Baptism *signaculum vite cursum incuntibus,* and commands children to be baptized, though afterward he seemed to restrain it to case of necessity.

Cyprian, one of the antientest Writers amongst the Latines, handles it at large, in *Epist. 56. Ad Fidum,* upon this occasion, *Fidus* denyed not the baptism of Infants, but denyed that they ought to be baptized before the eighth day; *Cyprian* assures him that by the unanimous content of 66.

Bishops

A Sermon of the Baptizing of Infants.

Bishops gathered together in a *Councell*, Baptisme was to be administred to *Infants*, as well as to grown men, and not to be restrained to any time; and proves it by such Arguments as these: They are under originall sinne, they need pardon, are capable of grace and mercy, God regards not age, &c. This testimony of *Cyprians* is cited and approved by *August. Epist. 28. & Lib. 3. de merit. & Remiss. pecca. cap. 5. & lib. 3. contra Pelag.* and by *Hierom contra Pelag. lib. 3.* Of the same judgement was *Ambrose, lib. 2. cap. 11. De Abraham Patriarcha*, and many others of the ancients, which I relate not to prove the truth of the thing, but onely the practise of it: and indeed, although some in those times questioned it, as *August.* grants in his Sermon, *De Verbis Apostol.* yet the first that ever made a head against it, or a division in the Church about it, was *Baltazar Pacommitanus* in Germany in *Luthers* time, about the year 1527. and since that time multitudes in Germany have imbraced his opinion, who because they opposed *Pado-Baptisme*, were forced to reiterate their own Baptisme, and thence were called *Anabaptists*, and soon proved a dangerous and turbulent Sect against the Reformation; not onely working a world of mischief about *Munster* and other parts of Germany, but have with this opinion, drunk in abundance of other dangerous Heresies and Blasphemies, and quickly grew into such divisions, and sub-divisions among themselves, that *Bullen-gier* notes that they were grown to no lesse then fourteen severall Sects in his time: Which in truth is the common lot of all Sectaries; who when once they have departed from the Church, upon every small occasion they come to be divided again among themselves, and one from another: As the Ecclesiasticall Story lets us see in the *Novatians, Macedonians, Ennomians, Arrians, &c.* which divisions also opened a way to their totall destruction in the end: their mutuall bickerings among themselves, being as the beating

When the Sect
of the Anabap-
tists began.

Niceph. 1235.

Niceph. 1230.

of the waves of the Sea, one against another, till all were changed, as the Historian notes of them. And because this Opinion, and divers others which depend upon it, begins unhappily to take place and spread among our selves in this Kingdom; and so the work of Reformation (without Gods mercy) likely to be much hindred by it; I shall (God willing) handle this Question more largely, then I have done any other in this place; and the rather because of three other great mischiefs which go along with it.

And the danger of their opinions.

First, I see that all who reject the Baptizing of Infants, do and must upon the same ground reject the Religious observation of the Lords day, or the Christian Sabbath, viz. because *there is not* (say they) *an expresse institution or command* in the New Testament. Verily, I have hardly either known, or read, or heard of any one who hath rejected this of Infants, but with it they reject that of the Lords day: now God hath so blessed the religious observation of the Lords day in this Kingdom above other Churches and Kingdoms, that such as indeavour to overthrow it, deserve justly to be abhorred by us.

Secondly, the teachers of this Opinion, where-ever they prevaile, take their Profelytes wholly off from the Ministry of the Word and Sacraments, and all other acts of Christian communion, both publick and private; from any, but those who are of their own opinion, condemning them all as limbs of Antichrist, worshippers, and followers of the Beast: And so not only labour to cast the godly Ministers out of the hearts of those people whom they have wonne to Christ; but leave the people whom they insnare without any hope of recovery, whilest they impose upon their consciences, to hear none but such as may confirme them in their errors; An old trick of *Satan*, which hee taught the Papists long agoe, a meere politick device to keep their Disciples fast unto themselves: which unchristian course, how

A Sermon of the Baptizing of Infants.

how prosperous soever it may seem to be at the first, cannot be blessed by God, nor indeed is it, the Lord giving them up almost every where, to other most dangerous, vile, and abominable opinions. I deny not but some few who are of this opinion are otherwise minded, but all our experience teacheth us that the generality of them do runne this way.

Thirdly, this opinion puts all the Infants of all *Belevers* into the self-same condition with the Infants of *Turks*, and *Indians*, which they all readily acknowledge; and from thence, unavoidably one of these three things must follow. 1. Either all of them are damned who die in their Infancy, being without the Covenant of Grace, having no part in Christ. Or, 2. All of them saved, as having no originall sinne, and consequently needing no Saviour; which most of the Anabaptists in the world doe own, and therewith bring in all *Pelagianism*, *Universall grace*, *Free-will*, &c. Or, 3. That although they bee tainted with Originall corruption, and so need a Saviour, Christ doth *pro beneplacito*, save some of the Infants of *Indians* and *Turkes*, dying in their Infancy, as well as some of the Infants of *Christians*; and so carry salvation by Christ out of the Church, beyond the Covenant of Grace, where God never made any promise: That God hath made a promise to bee the God of *Belevers*, and of *their Seed*, we all know, but where the promise is to be found, that he will be the God of the seed of such Parents who live and die his enemies, and their seed, not so much as called by the preaching of the Gospel, I know not. These men say the Covenant of Grace made to the *Jews*, differs from the Covenant of Grace made with *us*; but I desire to know whether in the *one*, or in the *other*, they find any promise of salvation by Christ to any Infants dying in their Infancy, whose Parents no way belonged to the Family of God, or Covenant of Grace.

A Sermon of the Baptizing of Infants.

The matter then being of such consequence, and many amongst us in such danger of being seduced, further then is easie to imagine, through the subtilty, activity, and diligence of such as with a great shew of Scriptures, and under a pretence of zeale, doe creep into Houses; yea, proclaim these things openly in Pulpits: I take my self bound upon this occasion to shew you upon what grounds the Orthodox Church hath hitherto retained this practise, and shall bring all that I intend to speak of it under two arguments, and under them shall indeavour to answer whatsoever I have found of any moment objected to the contrary.

First Argument
they are under
the Covenant
of grace, and
therefore must
have the seale
of the Cove-
nant.

My first Argument is this, *The infants of beleeving Parents are foederati, therefore they must bee signati; they are within the Covenant of grace, belonging to Christs body, kingdom, family; therefore are to partake of the seale of his Covenant, or the distinguishing badge between them who are under the Covenant of grace, and them who are not.*

*As males
included in
circumcision
on a lye.*

The ordinary Answer to this Argument is, by denying that Infants are under the Covenant of Grace; only some few deny the consequence, that although they were within the Covenant, yet it follows not that they must bee sealed, because (say they) the *Women* among the Jewes were under the Covenant, yet received not Circumcision, which was the seale of the Covenant; but this receives an easie answer, the *Women* were Circumcised in the *Males*, else could not God have said, that the whole house of *Israel* were Circumcised in the flesh, else could not the whole Nation of the Jewes bee called *the Circumcision*, in opposition to all the world beside, who were called *the Uncircumcision*.

This Argument
made good by
five Conclu-
sions.

But for the better clearing of this whole Argument; I shall indeavour to make good these five Conclusions.
First, that the Covenant of Grace hath alwayes, for substance, been one and the same.

Second.

A Sermon of the Baptizing of Infants.

Secondly, God will have the Infants of such as enter into Covenant with him, bee counted his, as well as their Parents.

Thirdly, God hath ever since *Abrahams* time, had a Seale to bee applyed to such as enter into Covenant with him.

Fourthly, by Gods own order, the Seed, or Infants of Covenanters before Christs time, were to bee sealed with the seale of admission into his Covenant, as well as their Parents.

Fifthly, the priviledge of such as are in Covenant since Christs time, are as honourable, large, and comfortable, both to themselves and their children, as they were before Christs time: and these five Propositions made good, the Argument will bee strong and undeniable.

The first is, *That the Covenant of Grace, for substance, hath alwayes been one and the same, both to the Jewes and to the Gentiles.* Which to understand, know, that the new and living way to life was first revealed to *Adam*, immediately after his fall, and that blessed promise concerning the Seed of the woman was often renewed, and the Patriarchs faith therein, and salvation thereby, recorded plentifully in the Scripture: but the first time that ever it was revealed under the expresse name of a League or Covenant was with *Abraham*, and therefore wee shall need look no higher then his dayes: who because he was the first explicite Covenanter, is called the father of the faithfull, and ever since clearly hath all the World been divided into two distinct bodies, or families; the one called the Kingdome, City, Household of God, to which all who own the way to life, were to joyn themselves; and these were called the *Children of God*, the *Sons of Abraham*, the *Children of the Kingdom*: All the rest of the World, the kingdom of the *Devil*, the *Seed of the Serpent*, *Strangers from the Covenant of Grace*, without God

I Conclusion.
The Covenant
of grace always
the same for
substance.

A Sermon of the Baptizing of Infants.

Wherein lies
the substance
of the Cove-
nant.

Gen. 17. 1. &c.
Gal. 3. 15.
Rom. 4. 3.
Joh. 8. 56.

Gal. 3. 6.
Gen. 17. 1.
Gen. 18. 19.
Gal. 3. 17. 19.

Though not
the same for
manner of ad-
ministration.

in the world, &c. Now, I say that this Covenant of Grace hath for substance been alwayes the same; for substance I say, for we must distinguish betwixt the Covenant it self, and the manner of administration of this Covenant: The substance of the Covenant on Gods part was, to bee *Abrahams God*, and the God of his seed, to bee an *Al-sufficient portion*, an *Al-sufficient reward* for him, to give *Jesus Christ* to him, and *Righteousnesse with him*, both of *Justification* and of *Sanctification*, and *everlasting life*. On *Abrahams* part the substance of the Covenant was, to *beleeve* in the promised *Messiah*, to walk before God with a perfect heart, to *serve* God according to his revealed wil, to *instruct* his family, &c. The manner of administration of this Covenant at the first, was by *types*, and *shadows*, *sacrisfees*, &c. And foure hundred and thirty years after, the Law was added with great terrour upon Mount *Sinai*, not as a part of this Covenant, but as the *Apostle* saith expressely, it was added because of *Transgressions*, to bee a *Schoolemaster* to whip to *Christ*: Plainly in that giving of the Law, there was something of the Covenant of works made with *Adam* in *Paradise*; yet in order to the Administration of the Covenant of grace, there was a *rehearsall* of the Covenant of workes, under which all men lie by nature, untill they be brought under the Covenant of Grace: and this was delivered with great terrour, and under most dreadfull penalties, that they who were prone to seek justification in *themselves*, by finding the *πρόβλημα τῆ νόμου*, the impossibility of their keeping the Law, might be driven to seek for a better Mediator, even the Lord *Jesus Christ*, as was excellently shadowed out, *Exod. 20. 18, 19, 20. Deut. 5. 24.* when they cryed out to *Moses*, that they might no more heare this dreadfull voyce, which would kill them, but that they might be spoken unto by a Mediator: and God said, they *had well spoken*, and presently accepted *Moses* for their *typicall* mediator, and by him gave

gave them the Gospel in their *Tabernacle Ordinances*. And there was also something of the *administration* of the *Covenant of grace*; partly, because all the threatning and cursing part of it was intended as a preparative and means to fit them for Christ; and partly, because the directing part of it contains that *very rule* whereby *Abraham*, and all his *seed* were ordered to walk in obedience towards God.

To conclude this, all their externall promises in case of obedience, all outward blessings which were to bee enjoyed by them, the Land of *Canaan*, and all the good things in it, all outward punishments and threatnings, losse of their Countrey, going into captivity, all their Sacrifices, their Washings, their Sprinklings, their holy persons, holy Feasts, and holy things, were all of them but so many *Administrations* of the *Covenant of Grace*: Earthly things *then*, were not only promised or threatned more distinctly and fully, then now they are to them who are in *Covenant*, but were figures, signes, types, and Sacraments of spirituall things, to bee enjoyed both by them and by us, as might bee cleared by abundance of particulars: Take but that one instance of the Land of *Canaan*, which albeit in it self it was but like other Lands, yet was it by the Lord sanctified to spirituall ends, where hee would have his *Tabernacle* pitched, and *Temple* built, out of which land, when the ten Tribes were carried captive, hee is said to have put them out of his sight: the very Land being figuratively ho-
2 King. 17. 18.
ly, and a signe of Gods presence, the resting of Gods people there, a signe of their eternall rest in Heaven, into which not *Moses* the Law-giver, but *Joshua*, or *Jesus*, the type
Heb. 3. 1 & 4. 5.
of their true *Jesus*, was to bring them: neither did the Lord
promise them entrance into, or continuance in that Land,
but upon the same conditions upon which hee promiseth
Heb. 3. 17. 18.
eternall life, as true Faith in the Gospel, with the love and
19. with 4. 2.
feare of God, and obedience of his Commandements:

C

God-

Levit. 20. 2. &c.
26. 36.
Deut. 10. 12.
13. with 11. 1.
8. 9. 22. &c.
1 Cor. 10. 5. 6. 7

Godlineſſe having then, as it hath now and alwayes, the promise of good things for this life, and the life to come, of earthly things, then more distinctly and fully, and typically, but of heavenly things more generally and sparingly; whereas now on the contrary, there is a more cleare and full revelation and promise of heavenly things, but the promise of things earthly, more generall and sparing: Now this externall *Administration* of the Covenant, is not the same with *us*, as it was with *them*, but the Covenant is the same; they were under the same *miserie* by *Nature*, had the same *Christ*, the Lambe slaine from the beginning of the World, the same *conditions* of *Faith* and *Repentance*, to bee made partakers of the Covenant, had the same *graces* promised in the Covenant, Circumcising of their heart, to love the Lord, &c. Theirs was dispensed in darker Prophecies, and obscurer Sacrifices, types, and Sacraments, ours more *gloriously* and *clearely*, and in a greater measure: the cloathes indeed doe differ; but the body is the same in both.

The identity of
the Covenant
to Jews and
Gentiles pro-
ved.

Jer. 31. 33.
Esa. 59. 21.
Joel 2. 32.
Luk. 1. 54. &c.

As is apparent, if, first, you look but into the Prophecies that were made, *Jer. 31. 33. Isa. 59. 21. Joel 2. 52.* and many other places, where the same things are promised to the Gentiles, when the Gospel should bee preached unto them which were first promised to *Abraham*, and to his seed; but more fully, if you look into the New Testament, where you shall finde, *Luk. 1. 54. 55. 69. 70. 72. 73. Luk. 2. 31. 32.* that *Christ*, and the Kingdom of grace by him, is acknowledged to bee the summe of the Oath and Covenant, which God had promised to *Abraham*, and to his seed: So *Matth. 21. 41. 43.* the same Vineyard that was let to the Jews, should afterward bee let to the Gentiles: the same Kingdom of God which was formerly given to the Jewes, should bee taken from them, and given to the Gentiles: So *Rom. 11.* the Gentiles were to bee ingrafted into the same stock

stock in which formerly the *Jewes* had grown, and from which they were now to bee cut off, and *into* which in the end they should bee ingrafted again: So *Gal. 3. 8. 14. 16.* *Abraham* had the same Gospel preached to him, which is now preached to us, the same blessing bestowed upon *Abraham*, comes on the Gentiles through *Jesus Christ*, that they (as well as he) might receive the promise of the Spirit through Faith; they who receive the promise of the Spirit through Faith, have the blessing of *Abraham* come upon them: as cleare is that, *Ephes. 2. 13.* to the end of the chapter, the partition wall which severed us from the *Jewes*, is now broken down, and the Gentiles who formerly were as farre off, are now taken in, and made Inter-Commoners with the *Jewes*: the Apostle alluding to the manner of the Jewish worship, where beyond the Court wherein the *Jewes* did worship, there was another Court divided from it by a sept or wall, which was called, *Atrium gentium & immundorum*, the Court of the Gentiles and of the unclean, nearer then which none of them might approach unto the Temple; but now, saith hee, *The partition wall is broken down, and wee are no more strangers and Forainers; but made fellow-Citizens with the Saints, and of the household of God; and with them grow up into an holy Temple in the Lord;* all which shews that the very selfe-same priviledges formerly made peculiar to the Jews, are now through *Christ* communicated to the Gentiles. And this will yet more fully appeare, if wee consider how *St. Paul* to the *Galatians*, shewes that the same seed of *Abraham*, so much spoken of in the Covenant made with him, is now found among the Gentiles, as it was formerly among the Jews; there you shall finde three sorts of *Abrahams* seed: First, *Christ*, *Gal. 3. 16.* the root and stock, the head, and elder brother of all the rest. Secondly, all true beleevvers are *Abrahams* seed, *cap. 3. 29.* these onely are made partakers of the spirituall part of the Covenant.

Luk. 2. 31.
Mat. 21. 41. 43.
Rom. 11.
Gal. 3. 8. 14. 15.
16.
Eph. 2. 13. &c.

Rom. 10. 3.

Thirdly, you shall finde another seed of *Abraham*, who were only circumcised in the *flesh*, and not in the *heart*, who though they were either *born of Abrahams seed*, or *professed Abrahams faith*, and so were *Jewes facti*, though not *nati*, made, though not *born Jewes*, becomming *Profelytes*, never came to make *Abrahams God* their All-sufficient portion, but placed their happinesse in somewhat, which was not *Christ*, either by seeking justification by the workes of the *Law*, being ignorant of Gods righteousness, and going about to establish their own righteousness did not submit themselves unto the righteousness of God, or placed their happinesse, in satisfying the lusts of the *flesh*, going a whoring after the *Creature*, and so though they were *Abrahams seed by profession* and outward cleaving to the *Covenant*, yet were to bee cast off with the rest of the uncircumcised, of whom *Ishmael* and *Esau* were types, *Gal. 4. 22. &c.* Even so it is now in the times of the *Gospel*, we have now *Jesus Christ*, the Elder brother, the first-borne of the *Covenant*, wee have also true beleevers, who are brethren and Co-heires with him, who are properly the heires by promise, and wee have also some who are onely a holy seed by externall profession, *Gal. 4. 29.* who either with the false teachers, which *Paul* there speaks of, mingle justification by the *Law* and *Gospel* together, or with others, *2 Tim. 3. 5.* though they have a forme of godlinesse, yet deny the power of it in their lives and conversations. So much for the first Conclusion, that the *Covenant of grace*, for substance, was alwayes one and the same.

2 Conclusion.
Infants taken
into Covenant
with their Pa-
rents.

Ever since God gathered a distinct, select number out of the world, to bee his Kingdom, City, House-hold, in opposition to the rest in the world, which is the kingdom, city, house-hold of *Satan*, hee would have *The Infants of all who are taken into Covenant with him*, to bee accounted his, to belong to him, to his Church and Family, and not to the Devils. As it is in other Kingdoms, Corporations, and Families, the children

dren of all Subjects born in a Kingdome, are born that Princes Subjects, where the Father is a *Free-man*, the childe is not born a *slave*; where any are *bought to bee servants*, their children born in their Masters house, are born his *servants*. Thus it is by the Laws of almost all Nations, and thus hath the Lord ordained it shall bee in his Kingdom and Family; the *children* follow the Covenant-condition of their *Parents*, if hee take a Father into Covenant, hee takes the children in with him; if hee reject the Parents out of Covenant, the children are cast out with them; Thus without all question it was in the time of the Jews, *Gen. 17.9.* *&c.* and when any of any other Nation, though a *Canaanite* or *Hittite*, acknowledged *Abrahams* God to bee their God, *they* and their *children* came into covenant together.

Hosea. 2. 2.
Exod. 12. 48.
49.

And so it continues *still*, though the Anabaptists boldly deny it: *Act. 2. 38, 39.* when *Peter* exhorted his hearers, who were pricked in their hearts, to repent and bee baptized for the remission of sins, hee useth an argument to perswade them, taken from the benefit which should come to their posterity; for the *Promise* (saith hee) is unto you and unto your children, and to all that are *afarre off*, even as many as the Lord our God shall call: if once they obey the call of God, as *Abraham* did, the promise was made to *them* and to their children, whether they who obey this call were the present Jews to whom hee spake, or were *afarre off*: whether by *afarre off*, you will mean the *Gentiles*, who as yet worshipped *afarre off*, or the Jews, or any who as yet were *unborn*, and so were *afarre off* in *time*, or whether they dwelt in the remotest parts of the world, and so were *afarre off* in *place*, the Argument holds good to the end of the world, Repent and be baptized for the remission of sins, and yee shall receive the Holy Ghost; For the *Promise* is made to you and to your children, they shall bee made free of Gods City, according to *Abrahams* Copy, I will bee thy God, and the God of thy seed. Let

Act. 2. 38, 39.
opened and
cleared.

A Sermon of the Baptizing of Infants.

Luk. 19.

Zacheus the Publican once receive Christ *himself*, bee hee a *Gentile*, as some think hee was; bee hee a *great sinner*, esteemed as a heathen, as we all know hee was, let him professe the faith of Christ, and the Covenant of salvation comes to his house; for now hee is made a *sonne of Abraham*: that is, *Abrahams promise now reacheth him*.

Object.
Answ.

Neither can the evidence of this place bee eluded by saying, the promise here meant, is of the *extraordinary gifts of the Holy Ghost*, to *speak with tongues, &c.* For wee all know that all who then beleevd and were baptized, did not receive *those extraordinary gifts of the Holy Ghost*; and beside, this Argument remains still in force to bee used to the end of the World, *Who ever beleevs and is baptized, shall receive remission of sins, and the gift of the Holy Ghost*: Which was not true, if by the Holy Ghost was meant *only those extraordinary gifts*.

Object.
Answ.

Nor, secondly, can it bee avoided by that shift of others who interpret it thus; *To you and your children, as many of them as the Lord shall call*: that is, (say they) whether *your selves*, or *your children*, or any other whom the Lord shall call, if they repent and bee baptized, they shall receive the gift of the Holy Ghost; for it is plaine, that the strength of this Argument lieth in this, That if they did repent and were baptized, the promise should bee made good to *them*, and to their *children*, and what comfortable argument can this bee taken from respect to their *children*, if the Apostle must be interpreted as these men would have him? *viz. You and your Children have hitherto been an holy seed, but now if you beleve in Christ your selves, your children shall be in no better condition then the rest of the Pagan world, strangers from the Covenant of God; but if afterward any of them, or any of the Heathen shall for their parts beleve and be baptized, their particular persons shall bee took into Covenant, but their children still left out*: had this think you been a comfortable

table Argument to perswade them to come in, in relation to the good of their children after them? The plaine strength of the argument is, *God hath now remembered his Covenant to Abraham, in sending that blessed seed, in whom hee promised to bee the God of him and his seed; do not you by your unbeliefe, deprive your selves, and your posterity of so excellent a gift.* And except in relation to the Covenant, there was no occasion to name their children, it had been sufficient to have said, a promise is made to *as many as the Lord shall call.*

As plain it is out of the 11 of the *Rom. 16.* &c. where the Apostles scope is to shew that wee Gentiles have now the same grafting into the true Olive which the Jewes formerly had, and our present grafting in, is answerable to their present casting out, and their taking in in the latter end of the World, shall bee the same grafting in (though more gloriously) as ours is now: Now all know that when they were taken in, *they* and their Children were taken in, when they were broken off, *they* and their children were broken off, when they shall bee taken in, in the latter end of the world, *they* and their children shall bee taken in, and that because the roote is holy, that is, Gods Covenant with Abraham, Isaac and Jacob, extends yet unto them when their unbeliefe shall bee taken away. The roote being like Nebuchadnezzars tree, the tree hewen down, and the roote bound with a band of iron untill seven times were passed over it, and then the bands should be broken, and the roote should spring, and the tree should grow again: So their present Nation like this tree, is cut down, and this holy roote the Covenant made with their forefathers, is suspended, bound with an iron barre of unbeliefe, blindness being come upon them, untill the fulnesse of the Gentiles bee come in, and then all Israel shall bee saved. And mark that in all this discourse, the holinesse of the branches there spoken of, is not meant of a

Rom 11.16.
opened.

perfo-

personall inherent holinesse, but a derivative holinesse, a holinesse derived to them from their Ancestors; *The first fruite is holy, the lumpe holy, the roote holy, the branches holy*, that is, *the Fathers holy accepted in Covenant with God, the children beloved for their fathers sake*; and when the vaile of unbelief shall bee taken away, the children and their posterity shall be taken in again, *because beloved for their Fathers sakes*. Now then if our grafting in, bee answerable to theirs in all, or any of these three particulars, wee and our children are grafted in together.

Ob. But here is no mention made of our Infants grafting in.

Ans. Wee must not teach the Lord to speak, but with reverence search out his meaning, there is no mention made of casting out the *Jewish Infants*, neither here nor elsewhere: when hee speaks of taking away the Kingdome of God from them, and giving it to the *Gentiles* who would bring forth fruite, no mention of the *Infants* of the one, or of the other, but the one and the other for these outward dispensations, are comprehended in their parents, *as the branches in the roote, the Infants of the godly in their parents*, according to the tenor of his mercy, the infants of the wicked in their Parents, according to the tenor of his justice.

And yet plainer, (if plainer may bee) is that speech of the Apostle, in *1 Corin. 7.14.* *The unbelieving husband is sanctified by the wife, and the unbelieving wife is sanctified by the husband, else were your children uncleane, but now they are holy*; the plaine scope and meaning whereof is this; the believing *Corinthians*, among other cases of conscience which they had sent to the Apostle for his resolution of, had written this for one, whether it were lawfull for them who were converted, still to retaine their Infidell wives, or husbands: their doubt seemes to arise from the *Law of God*, which was in force to the Nation of the *Jewes*; God had not onely forbidden such marriages to his people, but in

1 Cor. 7.14.
opened and
vindicated.

in *Ezra's* time, they put away not onely their wives, but all the children that were borne of them, as not belonging to the Common-wealth of Israel; and it was done according to the *Law*, and that *Law* was not a particular Edict which they did agree upon, but according to the standing *Law of Moses*, which that word there used signifieth; and in *Nehemiahs* time, the children who were borne of such marriages, were accounted a Mungrell kind, whom *Nehemiah* cursed. Now hereupon these *Corinthians* doubted whether their children, as well as their wives, were not to be accounted *uncleane*, and so to be put away according to those examples; to which the *Apostle* answers, No, *they were not to be put away*: Upon what speciall reason soever, that *Law* was in force to the *Jewes*, beleeving *Christians* were not in that condition, the unbelieving wife was sanctified in the beleeving husband, *quoad hoc*, so farre, as to bring forth an *holy seed*; were it with them as when both of them were *unbelievers*, so that neither of them had a prerogative to intitle their children to the Covenant of grace, their children would be an unclean Progeny; or were the children to be reckoned in the condition of the *worser* parent, so that the *unbeliever* could contribute more to *Paganisme*, then the *beleever* to *Christianity*; it were so likewise: but the case is otherwise, the beleeving husband hath by Gods ordinance a sanctified use of his unbelieving wife, so as by Gods speciall promise made to beleevers and their *Seed*, they were invested, in, and to the *most spirituall end* of marriage, the *continuance of a holy seed*, wherein the Church is to be propagated to the worlds end; and the case is *here* in relation to the posterity for *spirituall* priviledges, as in *other* marriages, for *civill* priviledges, as suppose a *Prince*, or *Nobleman* marry with a woman of *base* or *meane* birth, though in generall it be true, that the children of those that be *base*, are born *base*, as well as the children of *Nobles* are borne

תורה

Nehem. 13. 14.
&c.

Mal. 2. 5.

A Sermon of the Baptizing of Infants.

Noble, yet here the issue hath *honour* from the *Father*, and is not accounted *base* by the baseness of the *Mother*. This I take to be the plaine meaning of the Apostles answer: But because the *Anabaptists* do very much endeavour to weaken the evidence of this Argument, I shall endeavour to cleare it from their acceptions. They utterly deny that this place is meant of any *Fæderall holinesse*, but of *legitimation*, which they call *civill holinesse*, and so interpret the *Corinthians* doubt to be, *whether their marriage with Unbelievers were not now a nullity*, and their children thereupon to bee *spurious*, illegitimate, or Bastards, and the Apostles answer to be, that *because the Unbelieving wife is sanctified to the believing husband*, that is, *their marriage remains lawfull*, therefore their children are not *spurious*, but lawfully begotten. But that *this* cannot be the meaning, I clearly prove by these four Arguments.

I. Argument

Because un-
cleannesse and
holinesse no
where taken
for civilly law-
full.

First, uncleannesse and holinesse, when opposed one to the other, are never taken for *civilly* lawfull or unlawfull; uncleannesse indeed, when opposed to cleannesse, may be taken in severall senses, an uncleane vessell, an uncleane cloth, an uncleane garment; when opposed to cleane, may signifie nothing but *dirty* or *spotted*: but when uncleanes is opposed to *holinesse*, it is alwayes taken in a *sacred* sense, referring to a *Tabernacle use*, to a right of admission into, or use in, the *Tabernacle* or *Temple*, which were types to us of the visible Church: and *holinesse* is alwaies taken for a *separation of persons or things from common to sacred uses*: Even the *meats and drinckes of beleevers sanctified* to them, serve for a *religious end and use*, even to refresh them, who are the *Temples* of the holy Ghost; so that they have not onely a lawfull, but an *holy use* of their meat and drinke, which *Unbelievers* have not, to whom yet their meat and drinke is *civilly* lawfull.

1 Tim. 4. 5.

And

And whereas some say, 1 *Thess.* 4. 3, 4, 5. that chastity a morall vertue found among Heathens, is called by the name of *Sanctification*. Let everyone possesse his vessell, not in the lust of concupiscence, but in *Sanctification* and honour.

I Answer, Chastity among Heathens, is never cald *Sanctification*, but among beleevers it may well bee called so, being a part of the New creation, a branch of their sanctification, wrought by the Spirit of God, a part of the inward adorning of the Temple of the holy Ghost. So that the meaning cannot be, your children are holy, that is, now they are not bastards, but rather, whereas before, both you and they were unclean, and might have nothing to doe with the Temple of God, now both you and your children are a holy seed, according as was shewed to Peter in his vision, where God shewed him, that the Gentiles formerly no better then unclean beasts, and creeping things, should upon their conversion to Christ bee no longer esteemed common or defiled.

Secondly, this being so, had this been the meaning, else were your Children unclean, but now they are holy, else had your children been Bastards, but now they are legitimate, the Apostles answer had not been true, because then if one of the Parents had not been a Beleever, and so by his being a beleever, sanctified his unbelieving Wife, their children must have been Bastards: whereas wee know their children had been legitimate, being borne in lawfull Wedlocke, though neither of the Parents had been a beleever. Marriage being a second Table duty, is lawfull (though not sanctified) to Pagans as well as to Christians, and the legitimation or illegitimation of the issue depend not upon the Faith, but upon the marriage of the Parents; let the marriage be lawfull, and the issue is legitimate, whether one, or both, or neither of the Parents be beleevers or infidels: take but away lawfull marriage, betwixt the Man and the Woman,

2. Argument.
The Apostles answer had not contained a truth.

man, and the issue is illegitimate, whether one or both, or neither of the Parents are beleevvers or infidels: withall, if the children of *Heathens* be Bastards, and the marriage of Heathens no marriage, then there is no adultery among heathens, and so the seventh Commandement is altogether in vaine in the words of it as to them.

3. *Argument.*
Nor had the Apostles argument had any reason in it, if interpreted as they would have it.

Besides *St. Pauls* reason had no strength in it, supposing the Text were to be interpreted as these men would have it; Their doubt (say they) was, that their marriage was an unlawful wedlocke, and so consequently their children Bastards; now mark what kinde of answer they make the Apostle give, *Were yee not lawfull man and wife, your children were Bastards, but because the unbelieving wife is sanctified in the husband, &c. because your marriage is a lawfull marriage, your children are legitimate.* What strength of reason is in this: if this had been their doubt or question, whether then marriage were not a nullity, the Apostle by his *Apostolick authority* might have definitively answered, *without giving a reason, your marriage is good, and your children legitimate;* but if *Paul* will go about to satisfy them by reason, & prove them to be mistaken, it behoved him to give such a reason, which should have some weight in it, but this hath none; let their doubt (as these men frame it) and the Apostles answer (as these men interpret him) together, and you will easily see the invalidity of it; *We doubt, say the Corinthians, we are not lawfull man and wife; and that therefore our children are Bastards. No, saith Paul, you are mistaken, and I prove it thus, Were yee not lawfull man and wife, your children were bastards; but because yee are lawfull man and wife, your children are not bastards.* Is there any argument or prooffe in this?

4. *Argument.*
Nor could have satisfied their doubt.

Fourthly, according to *this* their interpretation, the Apostles answer could no wayes have reached to the quieting of their *consciences*; their doubt was, whether according to

to the example in *Ezra*, they were not to put away their wives and children, as *not belonging to God*, as being a Seed whom God would not own among his people; now what kind of quiet would this have given them, to tell them that their children were not Bastards? We know the *Jews* did not put away their Bastards, as not belonging to the Covenant of God; *Phares*, and *Zarah*, and *Jephthah*, and innumerable others, though bastards, were circumcised, and not cut off from the people of God.

And whereas some object out of *Deut. 23.2.* that bastards did not belong to the Covenant among the *Jews*, because God there forbade a bastard to come into the Congregation of the Lord.

I Answer, that is meant *onely* of bearing office in the Church, or some such like thing, and not of being under the Covenant, belonging to the Church: as is manifest, not onely by what hath been now said of *Jephthah* and others, who were circumcised, and offered sacrifices, and drew nigh to God, as well as any other; but the very text alledged gives sufficient light, that it cannot be meant otherways; because in that place, *who ever is an Eunuch, or wounded in his stones*, hath the same exclusion from the congregation of the Lord: and I hope no man will dare to say, that *none* such are holy to the Lord; if they should, the Scripture is full enough against them: that putting away of *Ezra* was of an higher nature then bare illegitimation; and therefore it behooved the Apostle to give another manner of satisfaction to their doubtfull consciences, then to tell them their children were not Bastards: Therefore I conclude, that *this holinesse being the fruits of one of the Parents being a beleever, must be meant of some kinde of holinesse, which is not common to the seed of them whose Parents are both Unbeleevers, and that is enough for our purpose.*

Yet their remaines two Objections to bee answered, which

which are made against this our interpretation.

Object.

First, the *Unbelieving wife*, is here said to be *sanctified*, as well as the *Child* is said to be *holy*, and the Originall word is the same for both, one the *verb*, the other the *noun*: if then the *child* is *holy*, with a *fæderall holinesse*, then is also the *unbelieving wife* *sanctified* with a *fæderall Sanctification*, and so the *wife*, although remaining a heathen, may be yet counted to belong to the Covenant of grace.

Answer.

E^y, the Greek preposition signifying *to as* well as *in*, as Gal. 1. 16. 2 Pet. 1. 5 Ad. 4. 12. 1 Cor. 7. 15

I Answer, Indeed there would be weight in this objection if the Apostle had said the *Unbelieving Wife* is sanctified, and no more, as he simply says, the children are *holy*; but that he doth not say, he saith indeed the *Unbelieving wife* is sanctified *in the believing husband*, or to the *believing husband*: that is, *to his use*, as all other creatures are, as the *bed* he lies on, the *meat* hee eats, the *cloaths* hee weares, the *beast* he rides on, are sanctified to him, and so this *sanctifiednesse* of the wife is not a sanctification of *state*, but only of *use*, and of *this use* to be sanctified *to the believing husband*; whereas the holines and sanctification that is spoken of the children, is a holinesse of *state*, and not only a sanctification to the parents *use*.

2. Object.

That holinesse of the Children is *here* meant, which could not be, unlesse one of the Parents were sanctified to the other, which is the force of the Apostles arguing, the *unbeliever* is sanctified to the *believer*, else were not the children *holy*, but *uncleane*: but *fæderall holinesse* of children may be where the Parents are not sanctified, one *in* or *to* the other, as in *bastardy*, *Dauids* child by *Bathsheba*, *Phares* and *Zarah*, *Judahs* children by *Thamar*; the *Israelites* children by the *Concubines*, *Abrahams* sonne *Ishmael* by *Hagar*, &c. in which cases the children were *fæderally holy*, and accordingly were circumcised, and yet the *Harlot* not sanctified *in* or *to* the *Adulterer* or *Fornicator*, though a *believer*.

I answer, we must attend the Apostles scope, ^{which} is to shew Answ. that the children would be *unholy*, if the *faith* and *beleever-ship* of one of the Parents could not remove the *barre*, which lies in the other, being an *unbeleever*, against the producing of an holy seed, because one of them was a *Pagan*, or *unbeleever*, therefore the child would not be an holy seed, *unlesse* the *faith* or *beleevership* of the other Parent could remove this bar. Now this can have no place of an Argument, in any case, where one of the Parents is not an *Infidell*: but this was not the case among the *Jewes*, *Hagar*, and *Thamar*, and the *Concubines*, however *sinfull* in those acts, yet themselves were *beleevers*, belonging to the Covenant of God, and that *barre* lay not against their children, as did in the *unbeleaving wife*: indeed if a *beleaving* man or woman should *adulterously* beget a childe upon a *Pagan*, a *Heathen*, or *Unbeleever*, there this objection deserves to bee further weighed, but here it comes not within the compasse of the Apostles Argument.

Before I passe from this second conclusion, let me further shew you why the Lord will have the children of beleaving Parents reckoned even in their Infancy, to belong to him. First, his own *beneficium*, his free grace and favour which moves him to shew mercy to whom he will, is a sufficient answer to all: But secondly, he will have it for his own glory. It is the honour of other Princes, that all who are born in their kingdome should bee accounted borne their Subjects, and the honour of great Masters, that the children of their servants born in their houses, should be borne their servants: Solomon counts it a piece of his glory, that he had servants born in his house. And on the other side, it is a dishonour to a King not to be able legally to lay claim to those born in his kingdome, but that another King, yea, an enemy might legally challenge them to be his Subjects. So is it with the Lord, he having left all the rest of the world, to be visibly the devils kingdome, will not for his own glories sake permit

Reason why
God will have
such Infants
accounted his.

Eccles. 2. 7.

mit the Devil to come and lay visible claime to the sonnes and daughters, begotten by those who are the children of the most High. And thirdly, he doth it both for the *comfort and duty* of those who are in Covenant with him, partly I say, for their comfort and priviledge, while they may see their children visibly to be provided for by a better Father, under a Covenant of Grace, to whose care, and under whose wing they may leave them, when themselves shall faile; and partly to bee an obligation to bring them up for God, not to *themselves*, much lesse to the *devil*, but ever to look upon themselves in the education of their children, to be but *nursing Fathers and Mothers, to train them up in the nurture and feare of the Lord*, unto whose kingdom, family, and Covenant they thus belong.

I have been the larger upon these two first conclusions, because indeed the proving of *these*, gains the *whole cause*, if the Covenant be the same, and children belong to it, then they are to be owned as *Covenanters*, and to be admitted to the distinguishing or discriminating sign betwixt Gods people and the devils; and this the most learned of the *Anabaptists* doe professe, that if they knew a Child to be holy, they would baptize it. In the other Conclusions I shall be more brieve.

3. *Conclusion* The Lord hath appointed and ordained a Sacrament or seale of initiation to be administred unto *them who enter into Covenant with him*, Circumcision for the time of that administration which was before Christs incarnation, *baptisme* since the time of his incarnation; both of them the same sacrament for the *spirituall* part, though differing in the outward Elements; both appointed to bee *distinguishing signes*, betwixt Gods people, and the Devils people; both of them the way and meanes of solemne entrance & admission into the Church; both of them to be administred but *once*, and none might be received into the *Communion* of the Church of the *Fewes*,
untill

untill they were *circumcised*, nor into the *Communion* of the Church of the Christians untill they be *Baptized*, none but the circumcised might eat of the *Paschall Lamb*, none may but those who are baptized, be admitted to eat the *Lords Supper*, which succeeds in the room of the *Passover*, and this our *Lord himself* taught us by his own example, who was *circumcised*, as a professed member of the Church of the Jewes, and when he set up the new Christian Church he would be initiated into it, by the Sacrament of *Baptisme*.

Of this Conclusion there is no great doubt, but because some of the Anabaptists doe deny the Sacrament of Baptisme to succeed in the room, place, and use of Circumcision, bee pleased to observe how plain the Apostle makes it, *Coloss. 2. 8, 9, 10, 11, 12.* where the Apostles scope is to dissuade the beleeving Christians from the rudiments of the world, and Jewish Ceremonies, and observations upon this ground, that we are *complete in Christ*, and that in him as in the head, the Church hath all perfections, and because he would take them wholly off from Circumcision, the use wherof ingaged them to the use of the rest of Jewish Ceremonies, he tels them, that in *Christ wee are circumcised* Gal. 5. 3. *with a Circumcision made without hands* (a better circumcision then the Jewes was) *in putting off the body of the sinnes of the flesh by the circumcision of Christ*. And whereas the Jewish teachers would be ready to object that the receiving of the inward grace of Circumcision, did not make them so compleat as *Abraham* and his seed was, because they also had an outward sensible signe whereby they might bee farther perswaded, comforted, and confirmed, to this he answers ver. 12. That neither is this priviledge wanting to *Christians* who have as excellent and expresse a Sacrament of it, *being buried with Christ in Baptisme*, the effect whereof he there sets down, and therefore they needed not Circumcision,

Col. 2. 11, 12.
opened.

Gal. 5. 3.

as their false teachers insinuated, thereby directly teaching that our baptisme is instead of their circumcision. And the Analogy lies between two Sacramentall types of the same substance [*regeneration*] to both *Jews* and *Gentiles*. And in truth had not baptisme come in the room of it, the Apostle could not have pitched upon a worse instance then that of Circumcision, which was so much valued by them, and was so great and usefull a priviledge unto them: Nor had there been any reason to have here named baptisim, but that he meant to shew baptisim to Christians, was now in the room of circumcision to the Jews.

4. Conclusion.
Gen. 17.

That by Gods own expresse order, Infants as well as grown men, were in the time of the *Jews* to bee initiated and sealed with the signe of Circumcision: Whether *Jews* by nature, or Proselytes of the *Gentiles*, one law was for them all, if they receive the Covenant, they and their children receive circumcision: and although, as I touched before, this signe was actually applyed only to the males, yet the females were virtually circumcised in them, as is apparent both because the whole Church of the *Jews* were called the Circumcision, and because by Gods expresse order, no uncircumcised person might eat of the Pascheover, which wee are sure the women did as well as the men. And whereas some

Exod. 12. 48.

Object.

who see which way the strength of this Conclusion bendeth, do alledge, that though Circumcision was to bee applyed to their Infants, yet it was not as a seale of the spirituall part of the Covenant of Grace, but as a national badge, a seale of some temporall and earthly blessings and priviledges, as of their right to the Land of *Canaan*, &c. and that *Ishmael* though he was circumcised for some temporall respects, yet hee was not thereby brought under the Covenant of grace, which was expressly said to be made with *Abraham*, in relation to *Isaac* and his seed.

Gen. 17. 18. 19,
20, 21.

Answer.

I answer, there is nothing plainer then that the Covenant where-

whereof Circumcision was the signe, was the *Covenant of Grace*; *Abraham received Circumcision* a signe of the rightcouſneſſe of Faith, and the *Jewes* received it not as a Nation, but as a Church, as a people ſeparated from the world, and taken into Covenant with God: It is true indeed, that Circumciſion bound them who received it, to conform to that manner of adminiſtration of the Covenant which was carryed, much, by a way of Temporall bleſſings and puniſhments, they being types of ſpiritual things; but no man can ever ſhew that any were to receive the Sacrament of Circumciſion in relation to theſe *outward things onely*, or to them *at all*, further then they were adminiſtrations of the Covenant of Grace; ſure I am, the *Proſelytes* and their children could not be circumciſed in any relation at all to the temporall bleſſings of the Land of *Canaan* as they were temporall, becauſe notwithstanding their Circumciſion they were not capable of receiving, or purchaſing any inheritance at all in that Land; ſojourne there they might, as other ſtrangers alſo did, but the inheritance of the Land, no, not one foote of it could ever bee alienated from the ſeverall Tribes to whom it was diſtributed as their poſſeſſion by the moſt High: For all the Land was divided unto twelve Tribes, and they were not any one of them allowed to ſell their lands longer then till the year of Jubilee, *Levit. 25. 13. &c.* Yea, I may boldly ſay, that their Circumciſion was ſo farre from ſealing to them the outward good things of the land, that it occaſioned and tyed them to a greater expence of their temporall bleſſings by their long, and frequent, and chargeable journeys, to worſhip at *Hieruſalem*. And as for what was alledged concerning *Iſhmael*, the answer is eaſie; God indeed there declares that *Iſaac* ſhould be the type of *Chriſt*, and that the Covenant of Grace ſhould bee eſtabliſhed and continue in his family; yet both *Iſhmael* and

Rom. 4. 11.

Deut. 32. 8.
Lev. 25. 13. &c.

A Sermon of the Baptizing of Infants.

the rest of *Abrahams* Family were really taken into Covenant, untill afterward by Apostasie they discovenanted themselves, as also did *Esau* afterward, though he were the Son of *Isaac*, in whose family God had promised the Covenant should continue.

5 *Conclusion.*

Fifthly and lastly, the priviledges of *beleevers* under this last and best administration of the Covenant of grace, are many wayes *inlarged*, made more *honorable*, and *comforable*, then ever they were in the time of the Jews administration; many Scriptures speake of the *inlargement* of their priviledges, not one for the *diminishing*, or *depressing*, or *extenuating* of them; that yoke, that hard and costly way of administration, which neither they nor their Fathers were able to beare, is taken off from our shoulders; our Covenant is laid to be established upon *better promises*, the glory of *theirs* had no glory in respect of *ours*, they were under the bondage of *Infants* under age, in comparison of our *freedom*, we as well as they are called a *holy Nation*, a *peculiar people*, a *chosen generation*, separated to him from all other people; to whom, as well as to them, belongs the *adoption*, the *Covenant*, the *promises*; we as well as they, injoy him to be our Father, and with his dearest Son our Lord, are made *Cohi*res of the *Kingdom* of glory; we have all these things with advantage, not only in the clearnesse of the administration, but in some sense in greater extent to persons with us, there is neither male nor female.

Heb. 8.6.
2 Cor. 3. 10.
Gal. 4. 1. &c.

Object.

Some indeed goe about to shew, that in some things the Jew had greater priviledges then wee have, as that *Abraham* had the priviledge to be called the *Father of the Faithfull*; that *Christ* should be born of his flesh; *Mary* had the priviledge to be the *Mother of Christ*, and the whole Nation this priviledge, that God will call in their seed again, after they had been cast off for unbelief many hundred yeers; which priviledges, say they, none of the *Gentiles* have, or can have.

An-