

*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.

*Ans-*



*Answer.* But these things have no weight: We are inquiring for priviledges which are branches of the *Covenant of Grace*, which every man who is in Covenant with God, might expect from God by vertue of the Covenant, were he a *Few* or a *Profelyte*, not for any particular or *peculiar* favour to a particular *man*, or *woman*, or *family*, or *tribe*: All these forementioned things, and many other of the like kinde (as the *Ministry* of the *Tabernacle* and *Temple*, to belong to one *Tribe*, the *Kingly Office* to one *Family*; such and such men never to lack a man of their house to *stand before God*) proceeded indeed from *Free-grace*, but were no parts of that Covenant of grace which God made to *Abraham*, and all his *Seed*: For could every man in Covenant challenge these things at Gods hand, and that by vertue of the Covenant? Could every one of them promise to himselfe that Christ should be born of his flesh? Or every one of their women that she should be the mother of Christ? Could every one whom God owned to be in Covenant with him, promise by vertue of the Covenant, that their children if cast off by *unbeliefe*, should after many hundred years be again called in? We speak only of such priviledges as were *universall*, and *common* to all who were in Covenant, for which by vertue of the Covenant they might relye upon God; Let any man shew out of the Scripture where our priviledges under the Gospel, are cut short in any of *these* things, and he saith somewhat; and in particular for the case in hand, concerning our Infants right to the Covenant of Grace, and the seale of it, once we are sure the Infant *children* of all *Covenanters* were within the Covenant, and the seale also belonged to them, and by vertue of the Covenant (which is still the same) we plead their interest in it. Let any man shew when and where this was taken away, when the Infant-children of *beleevers* were expunged out of the *Covenant* of grace; certainly whoever will goe about to de-



prive them of it, to cut off such a great part of the comfort of *beleeving parents*, must produce *cleare testimonies*, before they can perswade *beleevers* to part with *either* of them, either their right to the *Covenant*; or to the *seale* of the *Covenant*.

For, first, their Infants interest in the *Covenant*, next to the glory of God, and the salvation of their own soules, is the greatest benefit of the *Covenant* of grace; even this (I say) to have their children belong to Gods Family and Kingdom, and not to the Devils: Certainly, the greatest treasure of Parents is their children, and in them the salvation of their soules: Now how uncomfortable a thing were this to Parents, to take away the very ground of their hope, for the salvation of their children? and I dare affirm it, that we have no ground of hope for any particular person, untill he be brought under the *Covenant of Grace*. All the world, as I have formerly touched, is divided into two kingdoms, the Kingdom of Christ, which is the Church; and the kingdom of Satan, which is the rest of the World; now so long as any person is *visibly* a Member of the kingdom of Christ, we have no cause to doubt their *election* and *salvation*, until they visibly shew the contrary, although we know that there are some *reprobate* among them; so on the other side, although we know Christ hath many of his *Elect* to be gathered out of the Devils kingdom, yet we have no cause or ground to hope that any particular person is any other then a *reprobate*, being a visible professed member of Satans kingdom, untill hee give hope to the contrary: now what a most uncomfortable abridgement were this of the *Covenant of Grace*, thus apparently to cut off the *Seed of Beleevers* from their visible right in the Church of Christ, and to put them in the visible kingdom of Satan?

And, Secondly, as really unwilling must they look to find



find Parents, to part with their childrens right to the *Seale* of the Covenant; this their right to the Covenant being all the ground of hope that *beleeving* Parents can have that their Infants who die in their Infancy, are saved, rather then the Infants of *Turkes*, had need bee sealed, if they live untill they are grown men, and give other signes of grace, they may conceive good hopes of them, though they were not sealed with a Sacramentall seale: This therefore is apparent, that the cutting off our priviledges & comforts in these two were a great abridgment of the priviledges of the new Covenant, and would put the *Seed* of *Abrahams* faith into a farre worse condition in regard of their posterity, then the *Seed* of his flesh were in: And the Jews in *Act. 2. 39.* if this Doctrine had been preached to them, might have replied unto *St. Peter*, when he exhorted them to be baptized for their childrens good; *Nay, Peter, even therefore* we will not be baptized, for as yet we are sure our Children are in Covenant with God, and reckoned to his family; but if we receive your new way, our children must be counted to the kingdom of the Devill; and so might they in *Coloss. 2.* when *Paul* told them they need not be circumcised, because Baptism came in the room of it, they might have replied, that though they need not be circumcised themselves, yet they would still circumcise their children, because Baptism was not to be applyed to them according to these mens Doctrine.

Upon these five Conclusions, 1. That the Covenant of grace is always the same. 2. That the Infants of those in Covenant, are always reckoned Covenanters with their Parents. 3. That our Baptism succeeds in the room and use of their Circumcision. 4. That by Gods expresse order, their Infants were to be Circumcised, as it was a *seale* of the Covenant. And 5. that our priviledges for our selves and our Children are at least as honourable, large, and



*A Sermon of the Baptizing of Infants.*

and comfortable as theirs were; The Conclusion follows undeniably, that therefore *the Infants of beleeving parents are to bee baptized.*

Against this Argument the Anabaptists object many things. They say the Covenant was not the *same*; some of them say, the children of the *Jewes* were not under the Covenant in relation to *spirituall things*: They say *circumcision* and *baptism* served not for the same ends and uses: They say Circumcision was administred as a Nationall badge, and properly *sealed* temporall blessings. They say, whatever priviledges Infants of *Beleevers* had *before* Christs time, they have *now* none at all; and many such like things: All which I have so fully cleared in this former Discourse, that I suppose I need not adde any more; the main and only Objection remaining, which hath any colour of weight in it, is this.

— Object.  
We want a  
command and  
example.

*There is no command, no expresse institution, or clear example in all the New Testament of baptizing of Infants:* And in the administration of Sacraments, we are not to be led by our own reason, or grounds of seeming probability, but by the expresse order of Christ, and no otherwise.

Answer.  
Though there  
bee no expresse  
command or  
example.

If by institution, command and example, they mean an *expresse syllabicall command, &c.* I grant that in so many words it is not found in the *New Testament*; no *expresse* command in the *New Testament*, that they should be baptized; no *expresse* example where Children were baptized; but I also adde, that I deny the consequence, that if *in so many words* it be not commanded in the *New Testament*, it ought not to be done, this is not true divinity, that Christians are not tyed to observe that, which is not expressly and in so many words set down in the *New Testament*; there is no *expresse* reviving of the Laws concerning the forbidden degrees of marriage in the *New Testament*, except of not having a mans fathers Wife, *1 Cor. 8.* no *expresse* Law a-

Which is not  
necessary.

gainst



gainst Polygamy, no expresse command for the celebration of a weekly Sabbath; are therefore Christians free in all these cases? Yea, in the Point of *Sacraments* there is no *expresse command*, no *example* in all the New Testament, where Women received the Sacrament of the Lords Supper; there is no *expresse command* that the children of *Beleever*s when they are grown, should bee *instructed* and baptized, though instructed by their Parents; *expresse command* there is, that they should teach the *Heathen* and the *Jewes* and make them Disciples, and then baptize them, but no command that the children of those that are *Beleever*s should be taught and baptized when they are grown men; nor any example where ever that was done; will any man therefore say, that christian women are not to be partakers of the *Lords Supper*, nor the children of *beleever*s when grown men be *baptized*? I think none will be so absurd as to affirm it. If it be said, though these things be not *expresly* and *interminis* in the New Testament, yet they are there *virtually*, and by *undeniable consequence*: I confesse it is true, so have we *virtually*, and by *undeniable consequence* sufficient evidence for the baptizing of children, both *commands* and *examples*; For, first, we have *Gods command* to *Abraham*, as he was the Father of all Covenanters, that hee should *seale his children with the seale of the Covenant*. Now this truth all our Divines defend against the Papists, that all Gods commands and institutions about the *Sacraments* of the *Jews*, binde us as much as they did them; in all things which belong to the *substance* of the Covenant, and were not *accidental* unto them: as because circumcision is called a *seale of the Covenant*, therefore our Sacraments are *scales of the Covenant*: because circumcision might be administred but once being the *seale* of initiation; therefore baptism being also the *seale* of initiation, is also to be administred but *once*. But that circumcision was to be administred upon the *eighth day*

Yet by good consequence we have command for it. Both in the command given to Abraham which reacheth us.

F



day onely, was an *accidentall* thing, and therefore bindes not us, the Jewish *Passeover* being to be yearly repeated, bindes us to have a *repetition* of the Sacrament of the *Lords Supper*, which came in roome of it, because this belongs to the substance of the Covenant, both of them being Sacraments for *spirituall nourishment, growth and continuance* in the Covenant; (as the other was for birth and entrance) but that their *Passeover* was to be eaten in an *Evening*, and upon one set *Evening* in the yeare, was *accidentall*, and so binds not us. The like instance I give in our *Christian Sabbath*: the fourth Commandement binds us for the substance of it as much as ever it bound the *Jewes*; There God once for all separated one day of seven to be sacred to himselfe, and all the world stood bound in all ages to give unto God that one day of seven, which should be of his own choosung. Now untill Christs time, God chose the last day of the seven to be his Sabbath, and having by the death and resurrection of our Lord Jesus, put an end to the *Saturday Sabbath*, and surrogated the first day of the week instead thereof to be the *Lords day*, we need no new Commandment for the keeping of the *Lords day*, being tyed by the fourth Commandment to keep that day of seven which the Lord should choose, the Lord having chosen this, the fourth Commandment binds us to this, as it did the *Jews* to the former: so in the like manner, I say, in the Sacrament of Baptism.

When God made the Covenant with *Abraham*, and promised for his part to be the God of him and his seed, what God promised to *Abraham*, we claime our part in it, as the children of *Abraham*, and what God required on *Abrahams* part for the substance of obedience, we all stand charged with, as well as *Abraham*; wee as *Abraham* are tyed to beleeve, to love the Lord with all our heart, to have our heart circumcised, to walk before God in uprightnesse, to instruct our Children, and bring them up for God  
and



and not for our selves, nor for the Devill, to teach them to worship God according to his revealed will, to train them up under the Ordinances and institutions of Gods own appointment: All these things Gods Command to *Abraham* charges upon *all* the Children of the Covenant, though there were no *expresse reviving* these Commands in any part of the *New Testament*, and therefore consequently that command of God to *Abraham* which bound *his seed of the Jews*, to train up their children in that manner of worship which was *then* in force, binds the seed of *Abraham*, *now* to train up their children in conformity to such Ordinances as *now* are in force.

And the same command which injoynd *Abraham* to *seale* his children with the *seale* of the Covenant, injoynes *us* as strongly to *seale ours* with the *seale* of the Covenant, and that command of God which *expressely* bound *Abraham* to *seale* his with the sign of *Circumcision*, which was the Sacrament *then* in force, *pro tempore*, doth *virtually* binde us to *seale ours* with the sign of *Baptism*, which is the Sacrament *now* in force, and succeeds in the room of the other by his own appointment.

There is one command by *cleare* consequence, another you shall finde, *Mat. 28.* where our Saviour bids them *Go* and teach all Nations, *Baptizing them in the Name of the Father, and of the Sonne, and of the Holy Ghost*: Where you have two things: First, *What they were to doe*; Secondly, *To whom they were to doe it*. They were to *preach and teach all things which hee had commanded them*, that is, they were to preach the whole Gospel, *Mark. 16. 15.* The whole Covenant of Grace, containing all the promises, whereof this is one, *viz. That God will be the God of beleevers, and of their seed*, that the seed of beleevers are taken into Covenant with their Parents. This is a part of the Gospel preached unto *Abraham*, and they were to *Baptize them*, that is, to ad-

And in *Matth. 28. 19.* opened and explained.



*A Sermon of the Baptizing of Infants.*

minister baptism as a *Seale* of the Covenant to *all* who received the Covenant. Secondly, wee have the *persons* to whom they were to doe this, *all Nations*, whereas before the Church was tyed to *one Nation*, *one Nation* onely were Disciples, now their Commission was extended to make *all Nations* Disciples, every Nation which should receive the *Faith*, should bee to him now, as the peculiar Nation of the *Jewes* had been in time past. In a word, *Nations* here are opposed to the *one Nation* before. Now we know when that *one Nation* of the *Jewes* were made Disciples, and circumcised, their Infants were made Disciples, (made to belong to Gods Schoole) and circumcised with them, when that Nation was made Disciples in *Abrahams* loynes, and circumcised, their seed also was the same when that Nation was taken out of Egypt, and *actually* made Disciples, their children were also with them, and wee know that in every Nation the *Children* make a great part of the Nation, and are alwayes included under *every* administration to the Nation, whether promises or threatnings, priviledges or burthens, Mercies or Judgements, unlesse they bee excepted; so are they in Cities, in Families, it being the way of the Scripture, when speaking *indefinitely* of a People, Nation, City, or Family, to bee either saved or damned, to receive mercies or punishments, expressly to except *Infants* when they are to be excepted, as wee see in the judgement that befell *Israel* in the Wilderness, when all that rebellious Company that came out of *Egypt*, was to perish by Gods righteous doom, their little ones were expressly excepted, *Numb. 14. 31.* and in the Covenant *actually* entred into by the body of the Nation, *Neh. 10.* it is expressly limited to them who had knowledge and understanding. And the Disciples who received this Commission knew well, that in all Gods former administrations, when any Parents were made Disciples, their

*children*

*Numb. 14. 31.*  
*Neh. 10. 28.*



children were taken in with them to appertain to the same schoole, and therefore it behooved the Lord to give them a caution for the leaving out of *Infants* in his new administration, that they might know his minde, had he intended to have them left out, which that ever he did in word or deed, cannot be found in the Scriptures.

Object.

Ans.

If it be said, they are not capable of being Disciples:

I answer, even as capable as the Infants of the Jews, and Profelytes were, when they were made Disciples: and beside, they are devoted to be Disciples, being to be trained up by the *Parents*, who are from their infancy to teach them the knowledge of Christ, and at the present, they are capable of his *owne* teaching: and sure I am, in Christs own dialect, to *belong to Christ*, and to be a *Disciple* of Christ, or to bear the name of Christ, is all one; and that such Infants doe belong to Christ, and beare the name of Christ, I have sufficiently proved already.

Matth. 10. 42.

Mark. 9. 41.

Mat. 18. 5.

And I desire it may be seriously weighed whether that expression, *Act. 10. 15.* Now therefore why tempt ye God to put a yoke upon the necks of the *Disciples*, do not necessitate us, to give the name of *Disciples* to *Infants*, as well as to *grown men*: for I reason thus, All they upon whose necks those false Teachers would have put the yoke of circumcision are called *Disciples*, & to be called Disciples: but they would have put the yoke of circumcision upon *Infants*, as well as *grown men*: therefore Infants as well as grown men are called Disciples and to be called so. The *major* is undeniable, the *minor* I prove thus: They who pressed circumcision to be in force, according to the manner of *Moses Law*, and would put it upon their necks after the manner of *Moses his Law*, they would put it upon Infants of those who were in Covenant with God, as well as upon the necks of those who were grown men, for so *Moses Law* required: but these false teachers pressed circumcision to be so in force, as is apparent, *Act. 15. 1.*



*A Sermon of the Baptizing of Infants.*

Act. 2. 38. 39.

Another command by good consequence for the baptizing of Infants, you shall finde in that forementioned place where the Apostle exhorted them to repent & be baptized, &c. *Because the promise was made to them and to their children,* which, as I shewed you, clearly proves that the Children of such who beleve and are baptized, are taken into Covenant, and therefore by good consequence they also are to receive the seale of the Covenant. The Text not onely shewing that they are within the Covenant, but also that a *right to Baptisme* is a *consequence* of being within the Covenant. Thus for Commands: for Examples, though there should be none, there is no great argument in it, when the rule is so plain, yet we have examples enough, by good consequence, for you shall finde the Gospel took place, just as the old administration, by bringing in *whole families together*; when *Abraham* was taken in, his whole Family was taken in with him; when any of the Gentiles turned Profelytes, ordinarily their Families came in with them: so in this new Administration, *usually* if the Master of the House turned Christian, his whole family came in and were baptized with him; The whole household of *Cornelius*, the first converted Gentile, *Act. 11. 14.* the household of *Stephanus*; the household of *Aristobulus*; the household of *Narcissus*; the household of *Lydia*; the household of the *Gaoler*; these are examples not to be contemned.

And whereas some object against this Argument, taken from whole Families, that the argument is at least as strong to prove that the Jewish Infants did eat the Passeover, because not only severall Families might, but did, and that by Gods appointment, eat the Passeover.

I Answer, by denying the consequence, the argument is not so strong, for the one as for the other, because no other Scripture shews that the Passeover doth belong to Infants; but we have other plain Scriptures proving that Baptisme is



is in the room of Circumcision, which belongs therefore to Infants, as well as grown men: if any can instance of any families of *Gentiles* who were circumcised, the consequence were good, *Therefore Infants were*, if there were any Infants, because other Scriptures shew that circumcision belongs to Infants as well as grown men, but in this case the argument is not good.

So much for my first and main Argument, they are *fœderati*, and therefore must be *signati*, they are under the Covenant of Grace, and therefore are to be signed with the seale of admittance into the Covenant.

The second Argument, to whom the *inward grace* of Baptism doth belong, to them *belongs the outward sign*, they ought to have the *signe*, who have the *thing signified*; the *earthly part* of the Sacrament must be granted to them who have the *heavenly part*: but the *Infants* of beleevers, even while they are Infants are made partakers of the inward Grace of Baptisme, of the heavenly and spirituall part, as well as grown men: therefore they may, and ought to receive the outward sign of Baptism. 2 Argument.

The major Proposition, that *they who are made partakers of the inward grace, may not bee debarred of the outward sign*, is undeniable, it is *Peters* argument, *Act. 10.* Can any man forbid water that these should not bee baptized, who have received the Holy Ghost as well as wee? and again, *Act. 11.* For as much as God gave them the like gifts as hee did unto us, what was I that I could withstand God? And this is so clear, that the most learned of the Anabaptists doe readily grant, that if they knew any Infants to have received the inward grace, they durst not deny them the outward sign, and that the particular Infants, whom Christ took up in his Armes and blessed, might have been baptized. And for the assumption or minor, That the Infants of Beleevers, even while they are Infants, do receive the inward grace, as well as grown men, is as plain,

Acts. 10. 47. &  
11. 17.  
  
Mark. 10.



*A Sermon of the Baptizing of Infants.*

1 Cor. 7. 14.

Mark. 10. 14.

Luk. 18. 17.

plaine, not only by that speech of the Apostle, who saith, *they are holy*, but our Saviour saith expressly, *Mark. 10. That to such belongs the kingdom of God*, as well as to grown men: And whereas some would evade it, by saying that the Text saith not, *to them* belongs the Kingdom of God, but *of such* is the Kingdome of Heaven, *τοῦ τῶν*, of such like, that is, such as are graced with such like qualities, who are *humble and meek*, as children are, and that *Luk. 18. is parallell* to this, in the meaning of it, *Whosoever doth not receive the Kingdome of Heaven as a little childe, hee shall not enter therein.*

But I answer, though it be true that in *other* places this is one use that Christ makes of an Infants age and condition, to shew that such as receive the Kingdom of Heaven, must be qualified with humility, &c. like unto children: yet *here* it cannot be his meaning, because his argument is, *suffer them to come to mee and forbid them not, because of such is the Kingdome of God*, that is, my Church and Kingdom is made up of these as well as of others. This was the very cause why the Disciples rebuked those who brought the children to Christ, because they were *little*, not *fit to bee instructed*, and therefore not fit that Christ should be troubled about them; this Christ rebukes in them, and tels them that the *littlenesse* of children, is no argument why they should be kept from him: *Suffer them*, said he, *to come, and forbid them not, for of such is the Kingdome of God*: and what kinde of argument had this been, if the Text should be interpreted as these men would have it, *Suffer little children to come unto me*, that I may *touch them, take them up in mine armes, put my hands upon them, and blesse them*, because the Kingdom of God belongs to them, who have such like qualities, who resemble children in some select properties? By the very same ground, if any had brought *doves, and sheepe* to Christ, to *put his hands upon them, and blesse them*, the Disciples had been



been liable to the *same reproofe*, because of *such* is the Kingdom of God, such as are partakers of the Kingdom of God, must be indued with such like properties.

Beside, what one thing can be named belonging to the initiation, and being of a Christian, whereof Baptisme is a seale, which *Infants* are not capable of, as well as *grown men*? they are capable of receiving the *Holy Ghost*, of *union* with Christ, of *adoption*, of *forgiveness* of sins, of *regeneration*, of *everlasting life*, all which things are signified and sealed in the Sacrament of baptism: and it is *further* considerable, that in the working of that inward grace, of which baptism is the sign and seal, all who partake of that grace, are but *meere patients*, and contribute no more to it, then a *childe* doth to its own begetting, and therefore *Infants* as fit Subjects to have it wrought in them as grown men, and the most grown men are in no more fitnessse to receive this grace when it is given them, in respect either of any *faith* or *repentance*, which they yet have, then a very little childe, it being the primary intention of the Covenant of Grace, in its first work, to shew what Free Grace can and will do to miserable nothing, to cut miserable man off from the wilde Olive, and graffe him into the true Olive, to take away the heart of stone, to create in them a heart of flesh, to forgive their iniquities, to love them freely, what doth the most grown man in any of these, more then an Infant may do? being *only passive* in them all, and of this *first* grace is the Sacrament of baptism properly a seal: and who ever will deny, that *Infants* are capable of these things as well as *grown men*, must deny that any Infants dying in their Infancy are saved by Christ.

Against this argument severall things are objected: which I shall indeavour to remove out of the way.

First, It is said, that although Infants are capable of these things, and they no doubt are by Christ wrought in many Infants, yet may not we baptize them, because, according

Mat. 3.  
1 Cor. 12. 13.  
Gal. 3. 27.  
Titus 3. 5.  
Mark. 1. 3.

Object. 1.



*A Sermon of the Baptizing of Infants.*

according to the Scripture pattern, both of *Christs command*, *Mat. 28.* in his institution of Baptism, where this was enjoined; and *Fohn* the Baptist, *Christs Disciples*, and *Apostles*, They alwayes taught and made them Disciples by teaching, before they baptized any.

*Answer.* I answer, First, that of *Matth. 28.* is not the institution of Baptism, it was instituted long before, to be the Seale of the Covenant; it is only an enlargement of their Commission, whereas before they were to goe *onely to the lost sheepe of the house of Israel*, now they were to go unto *all the world*. And beside, it is no where said, *that none were baptized*, but such as were *first taught*, and what reason wee have to beleieve the contrary, you have before seen.

Secondly, It is said indeed, that they taught and baptized, and no expresse mention made of any other: but the reason is plain, there was a new Church to be constituted, all the Jews who should receive Christ, were to come under *another administration*, and their Infants were to come in only *in their right*, and the Heathen Nations who were to be converted to Christ, were yet wholly without the Covenant of Grace, and their children could have no right untill themselves were brought in; and therefore no marriage, though both *Fohn*, and *Christs Disciples*, and *Apostles*, did teach before they baptized, because *then* no other were capable of baptism: but when once themselves were instructed and baptized, *then* their children were capable of it, by vertue of the Covenant. If any in the Jewish Church had received Commission, to go and make other Cities, *Profelytes* to them, their Commission must have run thus, *Go teach and circumcise*, would it therefore have followed, that none might bee circumcised; but such as were first taught?

*Object. 2.*

But it is expressly said, *That hee that beleeveth and is baptized, shall bee saved; Faith in Christ* is the Condition, upon which



which men may be baptized: and this is the most common objection among the *Anabaptists*: *Unbelievers may not be baptized, children are unbelievers, therefore they may not be baptized.* We have, say they, cleare evidence, that *Faith* is a condition required in those that are to be baptized, no evidence of any other condition that makes them capable of Baptism. Others of them adde, that under an affirmative command, the negative is to be included, beleeving is the affirmative, unbelieving is the negative, therefore where beleevers are commanded to be baptized, unbelievers are forbidden to be baptized: this objection they much glory in, and some of them dare all the world to answer it.

I Answer first, but if this argument have any strength at all against the *Baptizing of Infants*, it hath much more strength against the *salvation of Infants*; it is said expressly he that beleeueth, and is baptized, shall be saved; but he that beleeueth not, shall be damned: there ye have both the negative and affirmative set down; Hee that beleeves shall be saved, hee that beleeves not shall be damned; now I frame their own Argument thus, against the *salvation of Infants*, *All unbelievers shall be damned, all Infants are unbelievers, therefore they shall be damned*; now look at what doore they will goe out, for the *salvation of infants*, at the same will we go out, for the *baptizing of infants*; how ever they will evade the one, we shall much more strongly evade the other; if they say this Text is meant of *grown men*, of the way which God takes for the *salvation of grown men*, *Infants* are saved another way, upon other conditions; the same say we of infants baptism, the Text means of the condition of baptizing of grown men, infants are baptized upon other conditions, if they say, infants though they cannot have *actuell Faith*, they may have *virtuall Faith*, Faith in the seed and roote, the same say we; if they say, though Infants have not Faith, yet they may have that which is

*Ans.*

Mark. 16. 16.



*A Sermon of the Baptizing of Infants.*

*Analogous* to faith, the same say we, they have somewhat which hath *analogie* to faith, and as effectually to make them capable of baptism, as of salvation.

Secondly, I answer, *it is no where said unbelievers*, (or rather *Non-beleivers* it should be said) *may not bee baptized*; it is said indeed, *Hee that beleeveth and is baptized, shall bee saved*; and it is said, *That he that beleeveth with all his heart, may be baptized*; it is no where said, that he that *beleeveth not, may not be baptized*: Therefore I deny the consequence, if all *beleivers* must be baptized, then no *unbeleivers*, or *non-beleivers* may be baptized; these two are not here intended by way of opposition, Christ excludes *Infants* neither from baptism, nor from salvation for want of Faith, but *positive unbelievers*, and such as refuse the Gospel he excludes from both: The stone upon which these men stumble, is the ignorance in the opposition in the Scripture they bring, which is not between *Beleivers*, and *their Children*, but between *them*, and *unbeleiving and profane persons*, who are shut from the Lords Covenant, *Baptism*, and *Salvation*.

Object. 3.

But suppose they are capable of the inward grace of baptism, and that God doth effectually work it in *some* of the *Infants of beleivers*, is that sufficient warrant for us to baptize *all* the *Infants of Beleivers*? If we *knew* in what *Infants* the Lord did work *this*, we might baptize *those* *Infants*, say *some of them*, but that he doth not make known to us, we cannot know of any *one* *Infant* by any ordinary way of knowledge, that they are inwardly baptized with the Holy Ghost; and therefore we may not baptize any of them, but wait to see *when* and in *whom* God will work the *thing signified*, and then apply the *sign* to them.

Ansiv.

*Answer.* Our knowledge that God hath effectually wrought the thing signified, is not the *condition* upon which we are to apply the *signe*, God no where requires that we should



should know that they are inwardly and certainly converted, whom we admit to the Sacrament of Baptism; the Apostles themselves were not required to know *this* of those whom *they* baptized, if they were, they sinned in baptizing *Simon Magus, Alexander, Hymeneus, Ananias and Saphira,* with others: we are indeed required to know that they have in them *that condition* which must warrant us to *administer the sign*, not *that* which makes them *possess of the thing signified*; *fallible conjectures* are not to be our rule in administering of Sacraments, either to Infants or grown men, but a *known rule of the word*, out of which rule we must be able to make up such a judgement, that our administration may be of *faith*, as well as out of *charity*: In baptizing of grown men, the Apostles and Ministers of Christ administered the signe, not because they *conjectured* that the parties were *inwardly sanctified*, but because they made that *profession* of faith and holiness of which they were *sure*, that whoever had the thing in truth, were received by Christ into *inward* Communion with himself, and that whoever *thus* made it, that Christ would have them *received* into the communion of his Church, though possibly for want of the inward work they were never received into the *inward* communion with Jesus Christ: indeed when such a confession was made, christian *charity* which always hopeth the best, and thinketh no evill, bound them to receive them, and think of them, and converse with them, as with men in whom the inward work was wrought, untill they gave signes to the contrary; but this their *charity*, or charitable conjecture was not the *ground* of their admitting them to the Ordinance, but the profession and confession of the party, made according to the Word, which they were bound to *rest* in; yea, I greatly question, whether in case *Peter* or *Paul* could by the spirit of revelation have known that *Ananias* or *Alexander* would have proved no better then hypocrites, whether they either



would, or ought to have refused them from Baptism, whilst they made that *publike profession and confession*, upon which others were admitted who in the event proved no better then those were. So that I conclude: not our *knowledge* of their *inward Sanctification*, is requisite to the admitting of any to baptism, but our *knowledge of the will of Christ*, that such who are in such and such condition, should by us be received into the communion of the Church: and in this the rule to direct our knowledge, is as plain for *Infants*, as for *grown men*, the rule having been always this, That *grown men*, who were *strangers from the Covenant of God*, Unbelievers, Pagans, Heathens, should upon *their being instructed, and upon profession of their Faith, and promise to walk according to the rule of the Covenant*; be received and added to the Church, and made partakers of the *seale* of their entrance, and their *Infants to come in with them*; both sorts upon their admission to be charitably hoped of, untill they give signes to the contrary, charity being bound from thinking of evill of them, not tyed to conclude certainly of any of them, because they ought to know that in all ages, *all are not Israel who are of Israel, and that many are called, but few are chosen.*

*Object. 4.*

*1 Pet. 3. 21.*

But all who enter into *Covenant*, and receive the *seale* of the *Covenant*, must *stipulate* for *their parts*, as well as *God* doth for *his*, they must *indent* with *God* to perform the *beleevers* part of the *Covenant*, as well as *God* doth to perform *his part*, as even *this Text*, *1 Pet. 3.* requires, That Baptism which saves us must have *the answer of a good conscience to God*: now although it be granted, that *Infants* are capable of receiving the *first grace*, if *God* be pleased to work it in *them*; yet what answer of a good conscience can there be from *Infants* unto *God*? they having not the use of *Reason*, and not knowing what the *Covenant* means?

*Ans.*



Ans<sup>r</sup>. The Infants of the *Jews* were as muchtyed as the Infants of *beleevers* under the Gospel, every one who was circumcised was bound to keep the Law, Gal. 5. and these men professe that *Israelitish* Infants were within the old Covenant, when yet they knew not what it meant, nor could have the same use of it with their Parents and others of discretion. Look what answer they will make for the *Jews* infants, if true, will abundantly satisfie for the Infants of *beleevers* under the Gospel.

Secondly, God seales to them presently, their name is put into the deed, and when they come to years of discretion, to be *adulti*, then in their own persons they stand obliged to the performance of it; in the mean time *Jesus Christ*, Heb. 7, 22. who is the surety of the Covenant, and the surety of all the Covenanters, is pleased to be their surety, we know when severall parties stand obliged in the same bond, they may seale at severall times, and yet be in force afterward together, or even a childe sealing in infancy, may *agnize* and *recognize* that sealing, when they come to years of discretion; if then they will renounce it, as done when they understood not, they may free themselves if they please, if they finde the former act an inconvenience or burden to them: so is it here, God of his infinite mercy is pleased to seale to Infants while they are such, and accepts of such a seale on their parts, as they are able to give in their Infant age, expecting a further ratification on their part, when they are come to riper years, in the mean time affording them the favour and priviledge of being in Covenant with him, of being reckoned unto his kingdom and family, rather then of the Devils; if when they are grown men they refuse to stand to this Covenant, there is no hurt done on Gods part, let them serve another God, and take their lot for time to come.

But what benefit comes to children by *such* kinde of sealing

Object. 5.



ling as this is? it seems then (say they) by your own confession, that this is but a *conditionall sealing* on Gods part, viz that they own it, and ratifie it when they come to age, and if they then refuse to stand to it, all is then nullified, were it not therefore better to defer it to their years of discretion, to see whether they will *then* make it their own voluntary act, yea, or no?

*Answer.*

Ans. 1. This objection lay as strongly against Gods wisdom in requiring the *Jewes* Infants, even in their Infancy thus to seale; and therefore argues no great wisdom or modesty in men, who would thus reason with God about his administrations. 2. God hath other ends and uses of applying the seale of the Covenant to them who are in Covenant with him, then their *present gain*, it's a *Homage, Worship, and Honour* to himself, and it behoves us even in that respect, *to fulfill all righteousness: when Christ was baptized and circumcised*, he was unfit for the Ordinance, through his *perfection*, as Children through their *imperfection*, being as much *above them*, as Children are *below them*.

3. I Answer; The benefit and fruit of it at the present is very much, both to the *Parents* and to the *children*; to the Parents first, whilst God doth hereby honour them; to have their children counted to his Church, to his Kingdom, and Family, to be under his wing and grace, whilst all the other Infants in the world have their visible standing under the Prince, and in the kingdom of darkness, and consequently whilst others have no hope of their childrens spiritual welfare, untill they be called out of that condition, these need not have any doubt of their childrens welfare, if they dye in their *Infancy*, nor if they live untill they shew signes to the contrary: God having both *reckoned* them unto *his people*, and given them *all the meanes of salvation*, which an *Infants* age is capable of.

Second.



Secondly, here is much priviledge and benefit to the children, when as (beside what inward secret work God is pleased to work in them) they being Members of the Church of Christ have their share in the Communion of Saints, are remembred at the throne of Grace, every day by those that pray for the welfare of the Church, and particularly in those prayers which are made for his blessing upon his Ordinances.

And lastly, it's no small priviledge to have that Seale bestowed upon the in their *Infancy*, which they may afterwards plead when they are grown and come to fulfill the condition.

Object. 6.

But if their being capable of the spirituall part, must intitle them to the outward sign, why then doe we not also admit them to the Sacrament of the Lords Supper, which is the seal of the *Covenant of Grace*, as well as the Sacrament of Baptism? And this is urged the rather, because (say they) the *Infants* of the *Jews* did eate of the *Passover*, as well as were circumcised; now if our *Infants* have every way as large a priviledge as the *Infants* of the *Jews* had, then can wee not deny them the same priviledge which their *Infants* had, and consequently they must partake of the one Sacrament, as well as the other.

I answer, that *Infants* are capable of the grace of Baptisme, we are sure, not sure that they are capable of the grace signed and sealed in the Sacrament of the Lords Supper: for though both of them are seales of the New Covenant, yet it is with some difference; Baptisme properly seales the entrance into it, the Lords Supper, properly the growth, nourishment and augmentation of it; Baptism for our birth, the Lords Supper for our food; now *Infants* may bee born again while they are *Infants*, have their Originall sin pardoned, bee united to Christ, have his Image stamp upon them, but concerning the exercise of these graces and the augmentation of them in *Infants*, while they are *Infants*,

Answer.



Exod. 12. 3, 4.  
26, 27.

the Scripture is altogether silent, and for what is said concerning the Infants of the *Jewes* eating the *Passeover*, to which our Sacrament of the Lords Supper doth succeed, there is no such thing mentioned in all the Book of God; it is said indeed that the severall families were to eate their Lambe, if the household were not too little for it, and that when their children should ask them what that service meant, they should instruct them about the meaning of it; but no word *injoyning*, nor any *example* witnessing, that their little children did eat of it. If they say (as some of them doe) that *those* little ones, who were able to *enquire concerning the meaning* of that service, and capable to receive instruction about it, did eat of the *Passeover* with their Parents; I answer, (although the Scripture speaks nothing of their eating, yet if that be granted) it is no prejudice to us, because the Gospel prohibites not *such* yong ones from the Lords Supper, who are able to *examine themselves*, and *discerne the Lords Body*.

1 Cor. 11.

Thus have I according to my poor ability made good this second argument also, and vindicated it from all objections of any weight which I have met withall to the contrary, it remains that I winde up all, with a briefe Application.

*Application.*  
First, for re-  
proof of the  
Anabaptists.

1 Sam. 1.

Mat. 2. 16.

Ephes. 2. 12.

And first it serves for just reproofe of the Anabaptists, and all such as by their rash and bloody sentence condemn Infants, as out of the state of Grace; it's a great sinne to passe sentence upon any particular person for any one act, as was that of *Eli*, concerning *Hannah*, how much more heinous is it to condemne all the Infants of the whole Church of Christ, as having nothing to doe with the Covenant of Grace, or the seale of it? Wee read of *Herod* the Tyrant, that he destroyed all the children in *Bethlehem*, and the Coasts thereof from two years old and under; is not this a farre more cruell sentence, to set these in no better state then Pagans and Infidels, *Without Christ*, *aliens from*



from the Common-wealth of Israel, as strangers from the Covenant of promise, having no hope, and without God in the world? Can any sober Christian think this a small fault? Our blessed Saviour saith, *It is not lawfull to take the Childrens bread and give it to dogs*, but these men take *Children*, and in their judgement, conclude them for no better then *dogs*; *baptism* is the bread of the Lord, which he would have given to his children, and to deny it to them as none of their right, is to make them no better then *dogs*. The Prophet *Elisha* wept when he looked upon *Hazael*, because he foresaw that he would dash the infants of *Israel* against the wall, and even *Hazael* thought himself worthy to be esteemed a *dog* if ever he should do such a thing. But certainly, thus to dash all Infant children of *beleevers* out of the Covenant of Grace, (as much as in them lyeth) & to deprive them of the seale of it, is in a spirituall sense farre more heavy. And I dare appeale to the tender bowels of any beleeving Parents, whether it were not easier for them to think that their *Infants* should be dashed against the stones, and yet in the mean time to die under Christs wing, as visible Members of his Kingdome, Church and Family, rather then to have them live, and behold them to have a visible standing *only* in the Kingdom of the Devill: These men know not how much they provoke Christs displeasure against themselves; Hee was greatly displeased with his own Disciples for forbidding litle children to come unto him; and one day such men will know, that he is much more displeased with them, who with so great violence oppose the bringing of beleevers children unto his holy Sacrament, that with unspeakable wrong, injury, and slander, they prosecute all the Ministers of Christ, who give *Infants* this their due, condemning them for Ministers of Antichrist, and limbes of the Beast; yea, some of them proceeding so farre, as condemning all the Churches of Christ, to bee no Churches,



ches, who cast not their children out of the Covenant of Grace, and the seale of it, and doe cry out upon the Baptizing of *Infants*, as one of those great sinnes which bring and continue all our judgements upon us. The Apostate Emperour *Julian* is justly cryed out upon for his cruelty against the Christians, for denying to their *bodies* humane Sepulture; how much more cruell is it to deny to the souls of *Infants* the just priviledge and benefit of the Covenant of Grace? We know he did it out of hatred to Christianity, which I am farre from charging upon these men; but if we compare the sentence and fact of the one with the other, we shall finde the latter (bee their principle what it will) farre more injurious to the Church of Christ then the other: The Lord in mercy give them to see how unjust that sentence, and how heavy that doom is, which they thus passe, not only upon Infant children, but upon all the Churches of Christ; and seriously to consider, whether the Lord, who once in his displeasure threatned to dash their Infants against the Stones, who had dasht the Infants of the children of *Israel* against the stones, will indure it at the hands of any to expunge the Seed of the faithfull out of his Covenant, and to drive them from his City and Kingdom after this cruell manner.

Psal. 131. 8, 9.

Use 2.  
To Parents.  
I  
For their comfort.

Secondly, how much may this comfort the Soule of every beleeving Parent, to behold this great love and goodnesse of God in his Covenant of Grace to them and their posterity, that not only themselves, but even their Infants for their sakes, should be reckoned to the household of God, put into the Ark, wrapped up in a Covenant of Love, brought under the wing of God? When God had promised to *David*, that hee should have a Son to whom God would bee a Father, and that all his posterity should after such a gracious manner be regarded, his heart was even ravished with it, O Lord God (said hee) *what am I, and what is my house,*



house, that thou hast brought mee hitherto? and this was yet a small thing in thy sight, O Lord God, but thou hast spoken also of thy servants house for a great while to come, and is this the manner of men, O Lord God? And even so should Christian Parents break out into admiration of his goodnesse, in taking their children into that gracious Covenant, which is not onely the womb and vessell, but also the well-head of so many mercies, which are terminated, not in themselves, but flow down to their posterity from generation to generation.

And this is yet more admirable in our eyes, when wee seriously consider, how unclean and filthy, how viperous a brood they are, as proceeding out of our loines, empty of all goodnesse, full of all wickednesse, an unclean Leprosie having bespread them from the crown of the Head to the sole of the Foot, fit onely to bee cast into the open Field, to the loathing of their persons, in the day that they are born, as all the rest of the world are; and that God should set his heart upon such as these, to take them thus neere unto Himself, when he passeth by both Parents and Infants of all the world beside, how would our hearts melt in his praises, if wee could consider these things?

Esa. 16.  
Ezek. 16.5.

2. How should this ingage all Christian Parents to look to the education of their children; to bring them up in the nurture and fear of the Lord? Its a wofull thing to consider the *wretched carelesnesse* of many Parents; yea, not onely carelesnesse, but *ungodlinesse* of many Parents; who prostitute their children to the *Deuill* and his service, after they have consecrated them to *Christ* by baptism; train them up in ignorance, profanenesse, &c. To whom God may say, as hee did to that Harlot, Ezek. 16. *Thou hast taken my Sons and my Daughters, whom thou hast born unto mee, and these thou hast sacrificed unto Devils.* A generation of wretched men, who take more care of their *Hogs* and *Dogs*, then they doe of

2.

For their duty to provokethē to be ashamed for their carelesnesse, &c. in time past.

Ezek. 16. 20.  
Psal. 106. 37.



of their Infants immortall soules, nourishing the former, murdering the latter; that we may say of them, as *Augustus* did of *Herod*, that it is better to bee *Herods* Hog then his Son. I have often heard a sad Story of a wretched Woman, who perswaded her Daughter to yeeld to the lust of a rich man, in hope he would marry her, as hee had promised to doe; which she did, and presently after fell sick and dyed; The wretched mother hereupon grew distracted, and in her madnesse cryed out, *O my Daughters soule, my Daughters soule, I have damned my Daughters soule*: Verily, thus may many Parents cry out upon themselves for murdering their Childrens soules; and their Children may wish that they had been either Dogges, or Swine, rather then their Sons or Daughters; miserable children, of miserable Parents! what will such Parents answer God, when hee comes to demand his children of them? Suppose a Prince or Noble man should put a Childe to Nurse unto some mean man, and pay them well for the education of it; or rather suppose a great man should adopt the child of a poor man to be his own, and should say unto this poore man, as *Pharaohs* daughter said to *Moses* mother, *Bring up this Childe for me, and I will give thee thy wages*; and afterward comming to seethis childe, should find they had lamed the childe, and taught it nothing but to speak evill of them, and to fight against them: think I pray you what they would say, or doe to this wretched man. How much more abominable is the sin of many Parents, who by their own carelesnesse, and vile example, leaven their children with principles, and lead them in wayes quite contrary to the Covenant of grace, tending to nothing, but to dishonour God, and to their own destruction. If any of you have been guilty of it in time past, be deeply humbled for it, crave mercy and pardon; and for time to come, indeavour to doe the part of a nursing Father or Mother for Christ, looking upon thy

Exod. 2.19.

And to nurse  
them up for  
Christ in time  
to come.

Praying for  
them.



thy children, as being Christs more then thine, yea, as not being thine, but Christs, to whom thou hast consecrated them, and therefore (as wise and loving Nurses use to doe) carry them often to their Father for his blessing, and hee will blesse them, and reward thee also; we finde in the second of *Joel*, that in the day of their Fast, they were to *bring their children and set them before the Lord*, that hee might bee moved to compassion for the Childrens sake, whom hee used to call his own; set thou thy Children often before him, intreate him as *Joseph* did his father for his two sonnes, and as they did our Saviour, *Mark. 10.* that *hee would put his hands upon them and blesse them*; Doe it heartily, humbly, frequently, tell him how deare they are to thee, and the dearer, because he is pleased to own them, tell him their wants, and thy own inability to supply them in any thing, and how easie it is for him to doe it by his Spirit and Grace; *Oh that Ishmael might live in thy sight*, said *Abraham*; Say thou so also, Lord let these children live before thee, *thine they are*, and thou gavest them mee to bring up for thee, *Oh blesse my labour among them, and make them such as thou wouldest have them to bee.*

And doe not onely pray for them, but *discipline them and instruct them*, acquainting them with the Scriptures, and Catechising them in the Principles of Religion; as the Mother and Grandmother of *Timothy* did him, *Training him up from his infancy, in the knowledge of the holy Scripture*, and bee assured, if thy children may learn from thee to know their heavenly Father, to beleieve in him, to love him, and feare him betimes, *that being taught the trade in their youth, they may not forsake it when they are old*; they will then more blesse God for thee, then if thou couldest leave them all the world for their inheritance; it was for *this* that *Solomon* gloried in his father and mother, *Prov. 4. 2, 3.* and for *this*

*Joel 2. 6.*

*2 Tim. 1. 5. 3.*

*Prov. 4. 2, 3.*



this will thy children rise up and call thee blessed. Thus shalt thou approve thyself a true son of Abraham; Thus shall thy children be blessed with faithfull Abraham; Thus shall the Covenant, the spirituall part and benefit of it, as well as the outward, rest upon thy posterity from generation to generation.

3.

To all bapti-  
zed ones.

I.

For comfort  
when they be-  
leeve and re-  
pent.

Thirdly, and lastly, This serves for use to all children whom God honours so farre, as in their *Infancy* to bring thus near unto himself, and to use them thus as his owne, and that three severall wayes; First, to *incourage and comfort* them to beleieve in him, and rest upon him, for all the good things which hee hath promised in the Covenant of Grace. The Papists, as in some things they give and ascribe too much to Baptisme, making it to take away originall sinne, *ex opere operato*: So in other things they rob Gods people of the comfortable use of it, because they say that when once wee commit actuall sinnes wee make shipwrack of Baptisme, and then *Penance* must bee *secunda tabula post naufragium*, a Cockboat after our shipwrack; but this blessed Sacrament serves for a more durable and comfortable use, even to bee an *Ark*, as my Text calls it, to carry to Heaven. Know then that whensoever thou findest thyself at a losse, sensible of thy undone condition, findest thy guilt, and filth, and bondage, through sinne, and flyest unto Christ, and thy Conscience witnesseth with thee, that thou wouldest walk for time to come, according to the rule of the Covenant, in uprightnesse, to make God in Christ thy portion, and his word thy guide; So often I say, as thou doest this, mayest thou fly to thy *Baptisme*, and plead it for thy comfort, as wee may plead the *Rainbow* in foule weather against the worlds destruction by water. I have often heard a story of a great Queen, who gave a Ring to a Nobleman, while hee was her Favourite, and willed him to send it to her when hee should stand in great



greatest need of her favour; who afterward falling into her displeasure, sent the Ring, which through the treachery of the bearer was not delivered till it was too late: But it shall never happen so to *thee*, doe thou in all thy extremity, shew or send by the hand of faith thy *Seale*, which God hath given thee, plead it confidently, and to thy dying day, it may be an Ark unto thy soule in all cases of *relapse, desertion, temptation*, or whatever else may betide thee, upon the renewing of thy repentance and faith in Christ Jesus.

Secondly, This great love of God in taking us thus neare into his own Family, as his own Children, should make many of us blush, *to remember our unworthy conversation, in times past*; yea, it might make our very hearts to bleed, and make us not only wish we had been *unbaptized*, but even *unborn*, rather then to pollute the holy Covenant, and the seale of it, as we have done with our unhallowed lives: Can it seem a light thing in our eyes, that when God hath left the greatest part of the world, as strangers from his Family and Kingdom, to be under Satans kingdom, and taken us (no better by nature than they are) to be his peculiar ones, into Covenant with him, that hee should swear unto us, to be our God, and hitherto to train us up under such heavenly Ordinances, and we to walk in the meantime as rebels and enemies unto him, like the unbaptized world? can we think our condemnation not to be greater then theirs? Let me a little reason the case with you, Doe you know into what a Covenant the Lord hath taken you? what he hath done for you, and expects from you? have not your Ministers and Parents instructed you in it? Now tell me what is the reason of your unanswerable conversation, is it because you renounce the Covenant, as being made when you understood it not? if so, that you do indeed renounce it, *Take your course, serve the God you have chosen*, yet tell mee (I beseech you) what iniquity is in the

2.  
To humble  
such as walk  
unworthy of  
this priviledge.



Lords Covenant: what hurt is there in it? what disadvantage have you met withall? or where and how doe you hope to finde better things, then God to be your Father, Christ Jesus to be your Saviour, the Spirit to be your Comforter? to have your sins pardoned and healed, to be adopted, justified, sanctified, and every way comfortably provided for here, and saved for ever? Doe the Gods you have chosen to serve, provide better things then these, that you renounce Christ for their sakes? If you say, God forbid you should renounce Christ; No, you hope to be saved by Christ, as well as any other. Then tell me in good sadness, doe you expect that Christ should stand bound to perform his part of the Covenant, and you left at liberty for your part? that he should love you, and you hate him? that he should be your God, and you remain the Devils servant? that he should provide Heaven for you, and you walk in the way which leads to hell? O how much are you deceived! I tell you he hath sworn the contrary, he hath heaped up tribulation and wrath for every soule which doth evil, for the Jew first, for the baptized first, and you will one day finde, that it had been better you had never lived in his house, nor been trained up under his Covenant, then thus to profane it, and make the blood of it, as an unholy thing.

3.  
To provoke to  
a holy life for  
time to come.

Col. 2. 12.

Thirdly, this great priviledge should ingage us all for time to come, to make our Baptisma continuall motive to an answerable conversation to live as men who are dead unto sin, and alive unto God; to account that it ought to be as strange, to see a baptized man walk in a sinfull course, as to see a *Spectrum*, a walking Ghost. Wee are buried with Christ in Baptisme; and how can wee who are dead to sinne live any longer therein? We are planted into his family, made his Children, have his Spirit dwelling in us, yea, thereby made one with Christ. All this, we lay claim to, by our Baptism, shall not this inforce us to live answerably?



rably? *Luther* tels a Story of a gracious Virgin, who used to get the victory over Satan when he tempted her to any sinne, *Satan I may not doe it*, *Baptizata sum, I am Baptized*, and must walk accordingly: So should we argue, Let base persons live basely, noble and generous men must live nobly; let Turks and Pagans live wickedly, the holy seed must live holily and righteously: keepe it daily in thy thoughts, what thy Baptism ingageth thee unto, and that if thou walk otherwise, it will rise up extreamly to aggravate thy condemnation in the last day. It was a custome in the latter end of the Primitive times, That such as were baptized, did weare a white Stole (a humane Ceremony, to signifie their purity of life which the baptized was to lead, *Fulgentes animas vestis quoque candida signat.*) Now there was one *Elpidophorus*, who after his baptism turned a persecutor; *Muritta* the Minister who baptized him, brought forth in publick the white Stole which *Elpidophorus* had worn at his Baptism, and cryed unto him; *O Elpidophorus! this Stole doe I keep against thy comming to Judgement, to testifie thy Apostasie from Christ*; doe thou in like manner assure thy self, the very Font wherein thou wast baptized, the Register wherein thy name is recorded, will rise up against thee, if thou lead not a holy life: The Covenant is holy, the Seale is holy, let these provoke thee to study to be holy, yea to draw holinesse from them. Consider what I say, *And the Lord give you understanding in all things.*

---

**FINIS.**



