

# An Answer to a Welsh Clergyman's Twenty Arguments in Favor of Infant-Baptism.

by John Gill

---

*John Gill argues against infant baptism, citing the Bible's teachings on salvation, the covenant of works, and the covenant of grace.*

**Scripture:** Matthew 3:6-16, Matthew 28:19, Mark 16:16, John 3:5, Acts 2:38, Romans 5:12, Romans 6:4, 1 Corinthians 7:14, Galatians 3:14, Colossians 2:11-12

**Topics:** "Baptism", "Covenant of Grace"

---

## Description

John Gill addresses the arguments presented by a Welsh clergyman in favor of infant baptism, systematically refuting each point by emphasizing that baptism does not confer salvation or an interest in the covenant of grace. He argues that the covenant of grace is made with Christ and His spiritual seed, not with the natural offspring of believers, and that baptism is not a necessary ordinance for infants. Gill highlights the importance of personal faith and the necessity of understanding the significance of baptism, which is not merely a ritual but a representation of Christ's death and resurrection. He concludes that the practice of infant baptism lacks biblical support and that the spiritual condition of children should be entrusted to God's mercy rather than ritualistic observance.

---

## Transcript

An

ANSWER TO A WELSH CLERGYMAN'S TWENTY ARGUMENTS

In Favor of Infant-Baptism

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

A BOOK some time ago being published in the Welch language, entitled, "A Guide to a saving Knowledge of the Principles and Duties of Religion, viz. Questions and Scriptural Answers, relating to the Doctrine contained in the Church Catechism," etc. Some extracts out of it respecting the ordinance of baptism, its subject, and mode, being communicated to me, with a request from our friends in Wales to make some Reply unto, and also to draw up some Reasons for dissenting from the church of England, both which I have undertook, and shall attempt in the following manner.

I shall take but little notice of what this author says, part 5, page 40 concerning sponsors in baptism, but refer the reader to what is said of them in the Reasons for dissenting, hereunto annexed. This writer himself owns, that the practice of having sureties is not particularly mentioned in scripture; only he would have it, that it has in general obtained in the churches from the primitive times, and was enacted by the powers which God has appointed, and whole ordinances are to be submitted to, when they are not contrary to those of God;[1] and must be allowed to be of great service, if the sureties fulfilled their engagements.

The answer to all which is, that since it is not mentioned in scripture, it deserves no regard; at least, this can never recommend it to such, who make the Bible the rule of their faith and practice; and as to its obtaining in primitive times, it is indeed generally ascribed to Pope Hyginus, as an invention of his; but the genuineness of the epistles attributed to him and others, is called in question by learned men, and are condemned by them as spurious; but were they genuine, neither his office nor his age would have much weight and authority with us, who are not to be determined by the decrees of popes and councils; the powers spoken of in the scriptures referred to, were Heathen magistrates, who surely had no authority to enact any thing relating to gospel-worship and ordinances; nor can it be reasonably thought they should; and submission and obedience to them, are required in things of a civil nature, not ecclesiastical, as the scope of the passages, and their context manifestly shew; nor has God given power and authority to any let of men whatever, to enact laws and ordinances of religious worship; nor are we bound to submit to all ordinances of men in religious matters, that are not contrary to the appointments of God, that is, that are not expressly forbidden in his word; for by this means, all manner of superstition and will worship may be introduced.

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

But passing these things, I shall chiefly attend to the twenty arguments, which this writer has advanced in favor of infant-baptism, pages 41-45. The first argument runs thus: "Baptism, which is a seal of the covenant of grace, should not be forbid to the children of believers, seeing they are under condemnation through the covenant of works; and if they are left without an interest in the covenant of grace, they then would be, to their parents great distress, under a dreadful sentence of eternal condemnation, without any sign or promise of the mercy of God, or of an interest in Christ; being by nature children of wrath as others, and consequently without any hope of salvation, if they die in their infancy."

In which there are some things true, and others false, and nothing that can be improved into an argument in favor of infant-baptism. 1. It is true that the infants of believers, as well as others, are by nature the children of wrath, and under condemnation through the covenant of works; so all mankind are as considered in Adam, and in consequence of his sin and fall (Rom. 5:12, 18). But, 2. It is not baptism that can save them from wrath and condemnation; a person may be baptized in water, and yet not saved from wrath to come, and still lie under the sentence of condemnation, being notwithstanding that, in the gall of bitterness, and bond of iniquity, as the case of Simon Magus shews.

Though this writer seems to be of opinion, that baptism is a saving ordinance, and that a person cannot be fared without it; and indeed he expressly says, p. 27. that "in general it is necessary to salvation;" as if salvation was by it, (which is a popish notion) and there was none without it; but the instance of the penitent thief, is a proof to the contrary: the text does not say, he that is baptized shall be saved, but he that BELIEVETH and is baptized; nor is it any where suggested, that a person dying without baptism shall be damned.

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

But, 4. as the salvation of an infant dying in its infancy is one of the secret things which belong unto the Lord, a judicious Christian parent will leave it with him; and find more relief from his distress, by hoping in the grace and mercy of God through Christ, and in the virtue and efficacy of his blood and righteousness, which may be applied unto it without baptism, than he can in baptism; which he may observe, may be administered to a person, and yet be damned. For, 5. baptism is no seal of the covenant of grace, nor does it give any person an interest in it, or seal it to them; a person may be baptized, and yet have no interest in the covenant, as Simon Magus and others, and to whom it was never sealed; and on the other hand, a person may be in the covenant of grace, and it may be sealed to him, and he assured of his interest in it, and not yet be baptized: the blood of Christ is the seal of the covenant, and the Spirit of Christ is the sealer of the saint's interest in it.

And, after all, if baptism has such virtue in it, as to give an interest in the covenant of grace, to be a sign and promise of mercy, and of our interest in Christ, and furnish out hope of salvation, and secure from wrath and condemnation, why should not compassion be shewn to the children of unbelievers, who are in the same state and condition by nature? for, I observe all along, that in this and the following arguments, baptism is wholly restrained to the children of believers; upon the whole, the argument from the state of infants to their baptism is impertinent and fruitless; since there is no such efficacy in baptism, to deliver them from it.[2] The second argument is: "The children of believers should be admitted to baptism, since as the covenant of works, and the real of it belonged to Adam and his children, so the covenant of grace, and the real thereof belongs, through Christ, to believers and their children:" to which it may be replied, 1.

That it is indeed true, that the covenant of works belonged to Adam and his posterity, he being a federal head unto them; but then it does not appear, that that covenant had any seal belonging to it, since it needed none, nor was it proper it should have any, seeing it was not to continue. And if the tree of life is intended, As I suppose it is, whatever that might be a sign of, it was no real of any thing, nor did it belong to Adam's children, who were never suffered to partake of it. 2.

There is a great disparity between Adam and believers, and the relation they stand in to their respective offspring: Adam stood as a common head and representative to all his posterity; not so believers to theirs: they are no common heads unto them, or representatives of them; wherefore though the covenant of works belonged to Adam and his posterity, it does not follow, that the covenant of grace belongs to

believers and their children, they not standing in the same relation he did.

There never were but two covenant-heads, Adam and CHRIST, and between them, and them only, the parallel will run, and in this form; that as the covenant of works belonged to Adam and his seed, so the covenant of grace belongs to Christ and his seed. 3. As it does not appear there was any real belonging to the covenant of works, so we have seen already, that baptism is not the real of the covenant of grace; wherefore this argument in favor of infant-baptism is weak and frivolous; the reason this author adds to strengthen the above argument, is very lamely and improperly expressed, and impertinently urged; "for we are not to imagine, that there is more efficacy in the covenant of works, to bring condemnation on the children of the unbelieving, through the fall of Adam; than there is virtue in the covenant of grace, through the mediation of the son of God, the second Adam, to bring salvation to the seed of those that believe" (Rom. 5:15, 18).

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

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

Here let it be observed, 1. that it is pleaded that infants should be baptized into the same covenant with their parents, meaning no doubt the covenant of grace; that is, should by baptism be brought into the covenant as it is expressed in Argument 7th, or else I know not what is meant by being baptized into the same covenant; and yet in the preceding argument it is urged, that the covenant of grace belongs to the infants of believers, that is, they are in it, and therefore are to be baptized: an instance this of the glaring contradiction before observed. 2.

Threatenings indeed are made to wicked parents and their children, partly to shew the heinousness of their sins, and to deter them from them; and partly to express God's hatred of sin, and his punitive justice; and also to point out original sin and the corruption of nature in infants, and what they must expect when grown up if they follow the examples of their parents, and commit the same or like sins; but what is all this to infant-baptism; Why, 3. In like manner promises are made to godly parents and their children, and several passages are referred to in proof of it; some of these are of a temporal nature, and are designed to stir up and encourage good men to the discharge of their duty, and have no manner of regard to any spiritual or religious privilege; and such as are of a spiritual nature, which respect conversion, sanctification, etc. when these take place on the seed of believers, then, and not till then, do they appear to have any right to Gospel-ordinances, such as baptism and the Lord's supper; wherefore the argument from promises to such privileges, before the things promised are bestowed, is of no force.

The fourth argument is much of the same kind with the foregoing, namely, "There are many examples recorded in scripture wherein the infants of ungodly men are involved with their parents in heavy judgments; therefore as the judgment and curse which belong to the wicked, belong also to their seed, so the privileges of the faithful belong also to their offspring, unless they reject the God of their fathers. The justice and wrath of God, is not more extensive to destroy the offspring of the wicked, than his grace and mercy is to spare those of the faithful; therefore baptism, the sign of the promises of God's mercy, is not to be denied to such infants" (Num. 14:33; 2 Kings 5:27; Josh. 7:24, 25; Jer. 22:28).

The answer given to the former may suffice for this: to which may be added, 1. That the inflicting judgments on the children of some wicked men, is an instance of the sovereign justice of God; and his bestowing privileges on the children of some good men, is an instance of his sovereign grace, who punishes whom he will, and has mercy on whom he will: for, 2. God does not always proceed in this method; he sometimes bestows the blessings of his grace on the children of the wicked, and inflicts deserved punishment on the children of good men; the seed of the wicked do not always inherit their curses, nor the seed of the godly their blessings; wherefore such dispensations of God can be no rule of conduct to us; and particularly with respect to baptism.

And, 3. Whatsoever privileges belong to the seed of believers, we are very desirous they should enjoy; nor would we deprive them of any; let it be shewn that baptism belongs to them as rath (compassion, ed.), and we will by no means deny it to them. But, 4. Whereas it is said that the privileges of faithfuls belong to their offspring, adding this exceptive clause, "unless they reject the God of their fathers;" it seems most proper, prudent and advisable, particularly in the care before us, to wait and see whether they will receive or reject, follow or depart from the God of their fathers.

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

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

And, 2. it has been shewn already, that baptism is no seal of the said covenant. Nor, 3. is it appointed by Christ in lieu of circumcision, nor does it succeed it; there is no agreement between them in their subjects, use, and manner of administration; and what most clearly shews that baptism did not come in the room of circumcision, is, that it was in force and use before circumcision was abolished; which was not till the death of Christ; whereas, years before that, multitudes were baptized, and our Lord himself; and therefore

it being in force before the other was out of date, cannot with any propriety be said to succeed it.

This writer, p. 28. has advanced several things to prove that baptism came in the room of circumcision. 1st, He argues from the Lord's supper being instead of the paschal lamb, that therefore baptism must be in the room of circumcision, which is ceased; or else there must be a deficiency. But it does not appear that the Lord's supper is in the room of the passover; it followed that indeed, in the institution and celebration of it by Christ, but it was not instituted by him to answer the like purposes as the passover; nor are the same persons admitted to the one as the other; and besides, was the Lord's supper in the room of the passover, it does not follow from thence that baptism must be in the room of circumcision: but then it is said there will be a deficiency; a deficiency of what? all those ceremonial rites, the passover and circumcision, with many others, pointed at Christ, and have had their fulfillment in him; he is come, and is the body and substance of them; and therefore there can be no deficiency, since he is in the room of them, and is the fulfilling end of them: nor can any other but he, with any propriety, be said to come in the room of them.

And there can be no deficiency of grace, since he is full of it, nor of ordinances, for he has appointed as many as he thought fit. 2dly, This author urges, that it is proper there should be two sacraments under the gospel, as there were two under the law, one for adult persons, the other for their children, as were the paschal lamb and circumcision. But if every thing that was typical of Christ, as those two were, were sacraments, it might as well be said there were two and twenty sacraments under the law, as two; and, according to this way of reasoning, there should be as many under the gospel.

Moreover, of these two, one was not for adult persons only, and the other for their children; for they were, each of them, both for adult persons and children too; they that partook of the one had a right to the other; all that were circumcised might eat of the passover, and none but they; and if this is a rule and direction to us now, if infants have a right to baptism, they ought to be admitted to the Lord's supper. 3dly, Baptism, he says, is appointed for a like end as circumcision; namely, for the admission of persons into the church, which is not true; circumcision was appointed for another end, and not for that: the Jewish church was national, and as soon as an infant was born, it was a member of it, even before circumcision; and therefore it could not be admitted by it; nor is baptism for any such end, nor are persons admitted into a visible church of Christ by it; they may be baptized, and yet not members of a church: what church was the eunuch admitted into, or did he become a member of, by his baptism? 4thly, This writer affirms, that "the holy Spirit calls baptism circumcision, that is, the circumcision made without hands, having the same spiritual design; and is termed the Christian circumcision, or that of Christ; it answering to circumcision, and being ordained by Christ in the room of it."

To say that baptism is ordained by Christ in the room of circumcision, is begging the question, nor is there any thing in it that answers to circumcision, nor is it called the circumcision of Christ, in Colossians 2:11, which I suppose is the place referred to; for not that, but internal circumcision, the circumcision of the heart is meant, which Christ by his Spirit is the author of, and therefore called his; and the same is the circumcision made without hands, in opposition to circumcision in the flesh; it being by the powerful and efficacious grace of God, without the assistance of men; nor can baptism with any shew of reason, or appearance of truth, be so called, since that is made with the hands of men; and therefore can never be the circumcision there meant. 5thly, He infers that baptism is appointed in the room of circumcision, from their signifying like things, as Original corruption, regeneration, or the circumcision of the heart (Deut. 30:6; Titus 3:5), being seals of the covenant of grace (Ezek. 16:21; Matthew 16:26), initiating ordinances, and alike laying men under an obligation to put off the body of sin, and walk in newness of life (Rom. 4:11) and also being marks of distinction between church-members and others (Rom. 6:4, 6).

But baptism and circumcision do not signify the like things; baptism signifies the sufferings, death, burial, and resurrection of Christ, which circumcision did not; nor does baptism signify original corruption, which it takes not away; nor regeneration, which it does not give, but pre-requires it; nor is baptism meant in the passage referred to, Titus 3:5, nor are either of them seals of the covenant of grace, as has been shewn already; nor initiating ordinances, or what enter persons into a church-state: Jewish infants were church-members, before they were circumcised; and persons may be baptized, and yet not be members of churches; and whatever obligations the one and the other may lay men under to live in newness of life, this can be no proof of the one coming in the room of the other.

Circumcision was indeed a mark of distinction between the natural seed of Abraham and others; and baptism is a distinguishing badge, to be wore by those that believe in Christ, and put him on, and are his spiritual seed; but neither of them distinguish church-members from others; the passages referred to are impertinent. But I proceed to consider-- The sixth argument in favor of infant-baptism, taken from "the sameness of the covenant of grace made with Jews and Gentiles, of which circumcision was the seal; from the seal and dispensation of which, the Jews and their children are cut off, and the Gentiles and their seed are engrafted in" (Gal. 3:14; Acts 15:11; Rom. 4:11; 11:15, 17).

In answer to which, let it be observed, 1. That the covenant of grace is indeed the same in one age, and under one dispensation, as another; or as made with one sort of people as another, whether Jews or Gentiles; the same blessings of it that came upon Abraham, come upon all believers, Jews or Gentiles; and the one are saved by the grace of our Lord Jesus Christ, as the other; but then, 2. The covenant of grace was not made with Abraham and his natural seed, or with all the Jews as such; nor is it made with Gentiles and their natural seed as such; but with Christ and his spiritual seed, and with them only, be they of what nation., or live they in what age they will. 3.

Circumcision was no seal of the covenant of grace, nor does Romans 4:11. prove it, as has been shewn already; and therefore nothing can be inferred from hence with respect to baptism. 4. The root or stock from whence the unbelieving Jews were cut off, and into which the believing Gentiles are engrafted, is not the covenant of grace, from which those who are interested in it can never be cut off; but the gospel church-state, from which the unbelieving Jews were rejected and left out, and the believing Gentiles took in, who partook of all the privileges of it (Rom. 11:17-25): though no mention is made throughout the whole of the passage of the children of either; only of some being broken off through unbelief, and others standing by faith; and therefore can be of no service in the cause of infant-baptism.

The seventh argument is taken from "the extent of the covenant of grace being the same under the New Testament, as before the coming of Christ, who came not to curtail the covenant, and render worse the condition of infants; if they were in the covenant before, they are so now; no spiritual privilege given to children or others can be made void" (Rom. 11:29; Jer. 30:20). To which may be replied, 1. That the extent of the covenant, as to the constitution of it, and persons interested in it, is always the same, having neither more nor fewer; but with respect to the application of it, it extends to more persons at one time than at another; and is more extensive under the gospel-dispensation than before; it being applied to Gentiles as well as Jews: and with respect to the blessings and privileges of it, they are always the same, are never curtailed or made void, or taken away from those to whom they belong; which are all Christ's spiritual seed, and none else, be they Jews or Gentiles.

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

curtailing the covenant, or taking away the privileges of the seed of believers. 3. If even their covenant-interest could be proved, which it cannot, that gives no right to any ordinance, or to a positive institution, without a divine direction; there were many who were interested in the covenant of grace, when circumcision was appointed, who yet had nothing to do with that ordinance. 4. baptism not being allowed to infants, does not make their condition worse than it was under the former dispensation; for as then circumcision could not save them, so neither would baptism, were it administered to them; nor was circumcision really a privilege, but the reverse; and therefore the abrogation of it, without substituting any thing in its room, does not make the condition of infants the worse; and certain it is, that the condition of the infants of believing Gentiles, even though baptism is denied them, is much better than that of the infants of Gentiles before the coming of Christ; yea, even of the infants of Jews themselves; since they are born of Christian parents, and so have a Christian education, and the opportunity and advantage of hearing the gospel preached, as they grow up, with greater clearness, and in every place<sup>[3]</sup> where they are.

The text in Romans 11:29 regards not external privileges, but internal grace; that in Jeremiah 30:20 respects not infants, but the posterity of the Jews; adult persons in the latter day. The eighth argument is taken from the everlastingness of the covenant of grace, and runs thus; "The example of Abraham and the Israelites in circumcising their children according to the command of God, should oblige us to baptize our children; because circumcision was then a real of the everlasting covenant, a covenant that was to last for ever, and not cease as the legal ceremonies; which God hath confirmed with an oath; and therefore can have suffered no alteration for the worse in any thing with respect to infants" (Gen. 7:17; Heb. 6:13, 18; Micah 7:18, 20; Gal. 3:8.)

The answer to which is, 1. That the covenant of grace is everlasting, will never cease, nor admit of any alteration, is certain; but the covenant of circumcision, which is called an everlasting covenant, Genesis 17:7, was only to continue during the Mosaic dispensation, or unto the times of the Messiah; and is so called for the same reason, and just in the same sense as the covenant of the priesthood with Phinehas is called, the covenant of an everlasting Priesthood (Num. 25:13).

Though the covenant of grace is everlasting, and whatever is in that covenant, or ever was, will never be altered; yet it should be proved there is any thing in it with respect to infants, and particularly which lays any foundation for, or gives them any claim and right to baptism. 2. Though circumcision was a sign and token of the covenant made with Abraham, and his natural seed, it never was any real of the covenant of grace. And, 3. The example of Abraham and others, in circumcising their children according to the command of God, lays no obligation upon us to baptize ours, unless we had a command for their baptism, as they had for their circumcision.

The ninth argument is formed thus: "baptism is to be administered to the seed of believers, because it is certainly very dangerous and blameworthy, to neglect and despise a valuable privilege appointed by God from the beginning, to the offspring of his people." But it must be denied, and should be proved, that baptism is a privilege appointed by God from the beginning, to the offspring of his people; let it be shewn, if it can, when and where it was appointed by him. This argument is illustrated and enforced by various observations; as that "that soul was to be cut off that neglected circumcision; and no just excuse can be given for neglecting infant-baptism, which is ordained to be the seal of the covenant instead of circumcision:" but we have seen already, that baptism does not come in the room of circumcision, nor is it a real of the covenant of grace; and there is good reason to be given for the neglect of infant-baptism, because it never was ordained and appointed of God.

Moreover it is said, "that the seed of believers were formerly, under the Old Testament, in the covenant together with their parents; and no one is able to shew that they have been cast out under the New, or that their condition is worse, and their spiritual privileges less, under the gospel, than under the law:" but that believers with their natural seed as such, were together in the covenant of grace under the Old Testament, mould not be barely affirmed, but proved, before we are put upon to shew that they are cast out under the New; though this writer himself, before in the sixth argument, talks of the Jews and their children being cut off from the real and dispensation of the covenant; which can never be true of the covenant of grace; nor do we think that the condition of infants is worse, or their privileges less now, than they were before, though baptism is denied them, as has been observed already.

It is further urged, that "it is not to be imagined, without presumption, that Christ ever intended to "cut them off from an ordinance, which God had given them a right unto;" nor do we imagine any such thing; nor can it be proved that God ever gave the ordinance of baptism to them. As for what this writer further observes, that had Christ took away circumcision, without ordaining baptism in the room of it, for the children of believers; the Jews would have cried out against it as an excommunication of their children; and would have been a greater objection against him than any other; and would now be a hindrance of their conversion; and who, if they were converted, would have baptism or circumcision to be a seal of the covenant with them and their children, it deserves no answer; since the clamors, outcries, and objections of the Jews, and their practice on their legal principles, would be no rule of direction to us, were they made and gave into, since they would be without reason and truth; for though Christ came not to destroy the moral law, but to fulfill it (Matthew 5:17); yet he came to put an end to the ceremonial law, of which circumcision is a part, and did put an end to it[4]: the text in Jeremiah 30:20 respects the restoration of the Jews in the latter day, but not their old ecclesiastical polity, which shall not be established again, but their civil liberties and privileges.

The tenth argument stands thus: "Children are to be baptized under the covenant of grace, because all the covenants which God ever made with men were made not only with them, but also with their children;" and instances are given in Adam, Noah, Abraham, Isaac and Jacob, Levi, Phinehas, and David. The covenant of works was indeed made with Adam and his seed, in which covenant he was a federal head to his offspring; but the covenant of grace was not made with him and his seed, he was no federal head in that; nor is that made with all mankind, as it must, if it had been made with Adam and his seed: this is an instance against the argument, and shews that all the covenants that ever God made with men, were not made with them and their seed; for certainly the covenant of grace was made with Adam, and made known to him (Gen. 17:19-21), and yet not with his seed with him; nor can any instance be given of the covenant of grace being made with any man, and his natural seed.

There was a covenant made with Noah and his posterity, securing them from a future deluge, but not a covenant of grace securing them from everlasting destruction; for then it must have been made with all mankind, since all are the posterity of Noah; and where then is the distinction of the seed of believers and of unbelievers? Besides Ham, one of Noah's immediate offspring, was not interested in the covenant of grace. As for the covenant made with Abraham, his son Ishmael was excluded from it"; and of Isaac's two sons one of them was rejected (Rom. 9:10-13) and all were not Israel that were of Israel, or of Jacob, verse 6.

The covenant of the priesthood was indeed made with Levi and Phinehas, and their posterity; and though it is called an everlasting one, it is now made void; nor is there any other in its room with the ministers of the word and their posterity; and yet no outcry is made of the children of gospel-ministers being in a worse

condition, and their privileges less than those of the priests and Levites: and as for David, the sad estate of his family, and the wicked behavior of most of his children, shew, that the covenant of grace was not made with him and his natural offspring; and whatever covenants those were that were made with these persons, they furnish out no argument proving the covenant of grace to be made with believers and their carnal seed, and still less any argument in favor of infant-baptism.[5] The eleventh argument is: "The seed of believers ought to be baptized under the covenant of grace, otherwise they would be reckoned pagans, and the offspring of infidels and idolaters, to whom there is neither a promise nor any sign of hope; whereas the scripture makes a difference, calling them holy on account of their relation to the holy covenant, when either their father or mother believe (1 Cor. 7:14), disciples (Acts 15:10); reckoning them among them that believe, because of their relation to the household of faith (Matthew 18:6) styling them the seed of the blessed, and their offspring with them (Isa. 115:23); accounting them for a generation to the Lord (Ps. 22:30) as David says; who, verse 10 observes, that God was his God from his mother's belly; and also calling them the children of God (Ezek. 16:20, 21); therefore they ought to be dedicated to him by that ordinance which he has appointed for that purpose."

To all which may be replied, 1. That the children of believers are by nature children of wrath even as others; and are no better than others; and were they baptized, they would not be at all the better Christians for it. Though, 2. It will be allowed that there is a difference between the offspring of believers, and those of infidels, pagans and idolaters; and the former have abundantly the advantage of the latter, as they have a Christian education; and consequently as they are brought up under the means of grace, there is hope of them; and it may be expected that the promise of God to such who use the means will be accomplished.

But, 3. the characters mentioned either do not belong to children, or not for the reason given; and those that do, do not furnish out an argument for their baptism. Children are said to be holy, born in lawful wedlock (1 Cor. 7:14); not on account of their relation to the holy covenant, but on account of the holiness of a believing parent, which surely cannot be a federal holiness, but a matrimonial one; the marriage of a believer with an unbeliever being valid, or otherwise their children must be unclean or illegitimate, and not holy or legitimate.

The disciples in Acts 15:10 are not young children, but adult persons, the converted Gentiles, on whom the false teachers would have put the yoke of the ceremonial law, and particularly circumcision. The little ones reckoned among those that believe in Christ, Matthew 18:6 were not infants in age, but the apostles of our Lord, who were little in their own account, and in the account of others, whom to offend was criminal, highly provoking to Christ, and of dangerous consequence.

The text, Isaiah 65:23, speaks of the spiritual seed of the church, and not the carnal seed of believers,[6] and therefore are the same who are accounted to the Lord for a generation; even a spiritual seed that shall serve him, Psalm 22:30 and the words in verse 10 are the words, not of David, but of Christ. And the sons and daughters born to God, and whom he calls his children, Ezekiel 16:20, 21 were so, not by grace or by covenant, but by creation. And from the whole there is not the least reason why the children of believers should be dedicated to God by baptism, which is an ordinance that never was appointed by him for any such purpose.

The twelfth argument is: "The seed of believers are to be baptized, because church-relation belongs to them, as citizenship belongs to the children of freemen; and it is by baptism that they are first admitted into the visible church, and there is neither covenant nor promise of salvation out of the church, for the church

of Christ is his kingdom on earth, and Christ says this belongs to the children" (Mark 10:13, 14). In answer to which. 1. There is a manifest contradiction in the argument.

Church-relation belongs to infants, that is, they are related to the church, and members of it, and therefore should be baptized; and yet they are first admitted into the church by baptism; what a contradiction this! in it, and out of it, related, and not related to it, at one and the time. 2. Church-membership does not pass from father to son, nor is it by birth, as citizenship, or the freedom of cities; the one is a civil, the other an ecclesiastical affair; the one is of nature, the other of grace; natural birth gives a right to the one, but the spiritual birth or regeneration only entitles to the other. 3.

Church-membership gives no right to baptism, but rather baptism to church-membership, or however is a qualification requisite to it; persons ought to be baptized before they are church-members; and if they are church members, and not regenerate persons and believers in Christ, for such may be in a church, they have no right to baptism. 4. To talk of there being no covenant or promise of salvation out of the church, smells rank of popery. The covenant and promise of salvation are not made with and to persons as members of churches, or as in a visible church-state, but with and to the elect of God in Christ, and with persons only considered in him; who have an interest in the covenant and promise of salvation, though they may not be in a visible church-state; and doubtless many are saved who never were members of a visible church. 5.

The kingdom of God, in Mark 10:13, 14 be it the church of Christ on earth, or eternal glory in heaven, only belongs to such persons who are like to little children for their meekness and humility, and freedom from malice and rancor, as verse 15 shows. 6. Could infants in age, or the seed of believers as such be here meant, and the kingdom of God be understood of Christ's visible church, and they as belonging to it, it would prove more than this writer chooses; namely, that they have a right to all church-privileges, and particularly and especially to the Lord's supper.

The thirteenth argument is: "Children are the lambs of Christ's flock and sheep; and the lambs ought not to be kept out of Christ's fold, nor hindered from the washing that is in his blood; he particularly promises to be their shepherd; and his Spirit has declared, that little children should be brought to him under the gospel, in the arms, and on the shoulders of their parents" (Isa. 40:11; 49:22; Song of Sol. 6:6; John 21:15). On which may be observed, 1. That there is indeed mention made of the lambs of Christ in Isaiah 40:11 and John 21:15 which he gathers in his arms, and ordered Peter to feed; yet not infants in age are intended in either place, but adult persons, weak believers, who, in comparison of others, because of their small degree of knowledge and strength, are called lambs; and are to be gently and tenderly dealt with; and such as these are not kept out of Christ's fold, but are received into it, though weak in the faith, but not to doubtful disputations; and are fed with knowledge and understanding, which infants in age are not capable of. 2.

The infant-seed of believers are no where called the sheep of Christ, nor has he promised to be the shepherd of them; let the passages be directed to, if it can be, where this is said. 3. Those who are truly the lambs and sheep of Christ, am not hindered from the washing of his blood; though that is not to be done, nor is it done by baptism; persons may be washed with water, as Simon Magus, and yet not warned in the blood of Christ: Song of Solomon 6:6 does not intend washing in either sense; but either the regenerating grace of the spirit, or the purity of conversation, and respects not infants at all. 4.

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

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

But, 1. It unhappily falls out, for the cause of infant-baptism, that Noah's children in the ark were all adult and married persons (Gen. 7:7). 2. That there were children among the Israelites when they were baptized in the cloud, and in the sea, is not denied; but then it should be observed, that they did all eat the same spiritual meat, and did all drink the same spiritual drink; and therefore, if this does not give a sufficient claim to infants to partake of the Lord's supper, neither will the other prove their right to baptism: moreover, if any arguments can be formed from this and the former instance, for the administration of baptism under the New Testament, they will clearly shew, that it ought to be administered by immersion; for, as in the former, when the fountains of the great deep were broke up under them, and the windows of heaven were opened over them, they were as persons immersed in water; so when the waters of the Red Sea stood up on each side, and the cloud was over the Israelites, they were, as it were overwhelmed in water. 3.

Though this writer says, that several children were filled with the holy Ghost from their mother's womb, yet we read but of one that was so, John the Baptist, a very extraordinary person, and extraordinarily qualified for extraordinary work, an instance not to be mentioned in ordinary cases; besides, it is a rule in logic, a *particulari ad univ-ersalem non valet consequentia*, "from a particular to an universal, the consequence is not conclusive." Moreover, in what sense John was filled with the holy Ghost so early, is not easy to say; and be it what it will, the same cannot be proved of the seed of believers in general; and could it, it would give no right to baptism, without a positive institution; it gave no right to John himself. 4.

That the infants at Bethlehem were murdered, will be granted, but that they suffered martyrdom for Christ, will not easily be proved; since they knew nothing of the matter, and were not conscious on what account their lives were taken away. 5. That many or any children were baptized with John's baptism we deny, and call upon this writer to prove it, and even to give us one tingle instance of it; what he suggests is no evidence of it, as that the whole country in general were baptized by him, who could not be all childless; but I hope he does not think, that every individual person in the country of Judea was baptized by John; it is certain, that there were many even adult persons that were refused by him, and such as were baptized by him, were such as confessed their sins, which infants could not do (Matthew 3:5-7) and as to the probability of the displeasure of Jewish parents, suggested if their children had not been baptized by John, since they were used, and under a command of God, to bring their children to the covenant and ordinances of God (Gen. 17; Deut. 29:10, 13; Joel 2:16), it deserves no regard, since whatever probability there was of their displeasure, though I see none, there could be no just ground for it; since in the instances given, they had the command of God for what they did, for this they had none.

The fifteenth argument is: "It is contrary to the apostle's practice, to leave any unbaptized in Christian families; for they baptized whole families when the heads of them believed; as the families of Lydia, the Jailor, and Stephanas; and it is evident, that the words, family and household, in scripture, mean chiefly children, sons, daughters, and little ones." [7] To which I reply, that whatever these words signify in some places of scripture, though in the passages mentioned they do not chiefly intend new-born infants, but grown persons; it should be proved, that there were infants in families and households that were baptized, and that there were baptized together with the head of the family; for it is certain, there are many families and households that have no little children in them; and as for those that are instanced in, it is not probable that there were any in them; and it is manifest, that such as were baptized, were adult persons and believers in Christ.

It is not evident in what station of life Lydia was, whether married or unmarried, and whether one had young children or not; and if one had, it is not likely they should be with her, when at a distance from her native place, and upon business; it is most probable, that those that were with her, called her household, were her servants, that assisted her in her business; and it is certain, that when the apostles entered her house, those that were there, and who doubtless are the same that were baptized, were called brethren, and such as were capable of being comforted (Acts 16:15, 40) and the Jailor's household were such as had the word of God spoken to them, and received it with joy, took pleasure in the company and conversation of the apostles, and believed in God together with him, and so were adult persons, believers, and very proper subjects of baptism ( Acts 16:32-34).

Stephanas is by some thought to be the same with the Jailor; but if he was another person, it is plain his household consisted of adult persons, men called by grace, and who were made use of in public work; they were the first-fruits of Achaia, and addicted themselves to the ministry of the saints. [8] The sixteenth argument is: "None that truly fear God, can seriously and with certainty say, that there were not many infants among the three thousand baptized by the apostles at once; for the Jews were not content with any ordinances without having their children with them.

The apostle directs those who were at age to repent, but he commands every one of them to be baptized, and objects nothing against their children; because, as he says, the promise was unto them and their children also; and this is a plain command for infant-baptism to all that will judge impartially." But, 1. A man that carefully reads the account of the baptism of the three thousand, having the fear of God before his eyes, may with the greatest seriousness and strongest assurance affirm, not only that there were not many infants, but that there were not one infant among the three thousand baptized by the apostles; for they were all of them such as were pricked to the heart, and cried out, Men and brethren what shall we do? they gladly received the word of the gospel, joined to the church, and continued stedfastly in the apostles doctrine, in fellowship, and in breaking of bread and prayer; all which cannot be said of infants. 2.

What this author suggests, agreeable to what he elsewhere says, that the Jews were not pleased with any ordinance unless they had their children with them, is without foundation; what discontent did they ever shew at a part of their children being left out of the ordinance of circumcision, and no other appointed for them in lieu of it? And had they been discontented, what argument can be formed from it? 3. The distinction between those that were of age, whom the apostle directed to repent, and the every one of them whom he commanded to be baptized, has no ground nor reason for it, yea is quite stupid and senseless; and even, according to this writer himself, is a distinction without any difference, since the every one to be baptized are supposed by him to have children, and so to be at age; since he adds, "and objects nothing against their children."

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

The seventeenth argument is: "The seed of believers should be baptized, be-cause the privileges and blessings which are signified and sealed in baptism are necessary to their salvation, and there is no salvation without them; namely, an interest in the covenant of grace, the remission of original sin,. union with Christ, sanctification of the holy Spirit, and regeneration, without which none can be saved" (John 3:5). The answer to which is, 1. That the things indeed mentioned are necessary to salvation, and there can be none without them; but then baptism is not necessary to the enjoyment of these things, nor to salvation; a person may have an interest in these blessings, and be saved, though not baptized; there are things necessary to baptism, but baptism is not necessary to them; and indeed a person ought to have an interest in these, and appear to have one, before he is baptized.

Wherefore, 2. There things are not signified in baptism, and much less sealed by it; other things, such as the sufferings, death, and the resurrection of Christ, are signified in it; there, as regeneration, etc. are prerequisites unto baptism, and are not communicated by it, or sealed up to persons in it, who may be baptized, and yet have no share and lot in this matter, witness the case of Simon Magus. The eighteenth argument is: "The children of the faithful ought to be baptized, because this lays them under strong obligation to shun the works of Satan; and many have received much benefit from hence in their youth.

Comfortable symptoms, or signs of a work of grace, have appeared very early in several, though perhaps bad company has afterwards corrupted them. Besides infant-baptism keeps up a general profession of faith and religion, and makes the word and means of grace of more virtue and efficacy, than if men had utterly renounced Christianity, and declared themselves infidels; and further, it says a powerful obligation on their parents and others, to teach them their duty, which is a main end of all the ordinances God has instituted" (Ps. 78:5, 6).

But, 1. Is there nothing besides baptism, that can lay persons under strong obligation to shun the works of the Devil? certainly there are many things: if so, then it is not absolutely necessary on this account; besides, though the baptism of adult persons does lay them under obligation to walk in newness of life (Rom. 6:4), yet the baptism of infants can lay them under no such obligation as infants, and while they are such, because they are not conscious of it, nor can it take any such effect upon them. 2.

What that much benefit or advantage is, that many have received from infant-baptism, I am at a loss to know, and even what is intended by this writer, unless it be what follows, that signs of a work of grace have appeared very early in several, which may be, and yet not to be ascribed to baptism; baptism has no such virtue and influence, as to produce a work of grace in the soul, or any signs of it; besides, a work of grace has appeared very early in several, and has been carried on in them, who have never been baptized at all. 3.

Infant-baptism keeps up no public or general profession of faith or religion, since there is no profession of faith and religion made in it by the person baptized; nor is it of any avail to make the word and means of grace powerful and efficacious, which only become so by the Spirit and grace of God; and a wide difference there is between the diffuse of infant-baptism, and renouncing Christianity, and professing infidelity; these things are not necessarily connected together, nor do they go together; persons may deny and disuse infant-baptism, as it is well known many do, and yet not renounce the Christian faith, and declare themselves infidels. 4.

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

To which may be returned for answer, 1. That if the text in Mark 16:16 speaks not of infants, but of adult persons only, as it certainly does, I hope it will be allowed to be an instruction and direction for the baptism of adult believers, and to be a sufficient warrant for our practice. 2. If the infants of believers have no more fitness for baptism than they have for justification and eternal life, they have none at all, since they are by nature children of wrath, even as others; and therefore can have none, but what is given them by the Spirit and grace of God. 3.

We dispute not the power of the Spirit of God, or what he is able to do by the operations of his grace upon the fowls of infants; we deny not but that he can and may work a work of grace upon their hearts, and clothe them with the righteousness of Christ, and so give them both a right and meetness for eternal life; but then this should appear previous to baptism; actual faith itself is not sufficient for baptism, without a profession of it; the man that has it ought to declare it to the satisfaction of the administrator, ere he admits him to the ordinance (Acts 8:36, 37). 4.

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

The twentieth argument is: "The children of believers are to be baptized, because their right to the covenant and church of God is established from the first, much clearer than several other necessary ordinances; there is no express command nor example of women receiving the Lord's supper; no particular command in the New Testament for family-worship, and for the observation of the first day of the week as a sabbath; and yet none dare call them in question; and there is no objection against

infant-baptism, but the like might formerly have been made against circumcision; and may now be objected against many other ordinances and commands, of God."

To which I reply, 1. That with respect to women, receiving the Lord's supper, it is certain, that not only they were admitted to baptism (Acts 8:12), and became members of churches (Acts 1:14, 15; 4:37; 5:9, 14; 1 Cor. 11:5, 6, 13; Acts 14:34, 35). but there is an express command for their receiving the Lord's supper in 1 Corinthians 11:29 where a word is used of the common gender, and includes both men and women; who are both on in Christ, and in a gospel church-state, and have a right to the same ordinances (Gal. 3:28). 2.

As to family-worship, that is not peculiar to the New Testament-dispensation, as baptism is; it was common to the saints in all ages, and therefore needed no express command for it under the New; though what else but an express command for it is Ephesians 6:4? for can children be brought up in the nurture and admonition of the Lord, without family-worship? 3. As to the observation of the first day, though there is no express command for it, there are precedents of it; there are instances of keeping it (John 20:19, 26; Acts 20:7; 1 Cor. 16:1, 2): now, let like instances and examples of infant-baptism be produced if they can: though no express command can be pointed at, yet if any precedent or example of any one infant being baptized by John, or Christ, or his apostles, can be given, we should think ourselves obliged to follow it. 4.

That the same objections might be made against circumcision formerly, as now against infant-baptism, is most notoriously false; it is objected, and that upon a good foundation, that there is neither precept nor precedent for infant-baptism in all the word of God; the same could never be objected against circumcision, since there was such an express command of it to Abraham, Genesis 17, and so many instances of it are in the sacred writings; let the same be shewn for infant-baptism, and we have done. 5.

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

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

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

3dly, Whereas, he says, "it is not improbable but the apostles baptized by sprinkling, since several were baptized in their houses, Acts 9:17, 18 and Acts 16:33 and others, in former times, sick in their beds:" it may be replied, that it is not probable that the apostle Paul was baptized by sprinkling (Acts 9:17, 18) since had he, he would have had no occasion to have arose in order to be baptized, as he is said to do, Acts 9:18.

It is most probable, that when he arose off of his bed or chair, he went to a bath in Judas's house; or out of the house, to a certain place fit for the administration of the ordinance by immersion; and since there was a pool in the prison, as Grotius thinks, where the Jailor washed the apostles' stripes, it is most probable, that here he and his household were baptized; or since they were brought out of the prison, and after baptism brought into the Jailor's house, verses 33, 34, it is most likely they went out to the river near the city where prayer was wont to be made, and there had the ordinance administered to them, verse 13.

As for the baptism of sick persons in their beds, this was not in the times of the apostles, but in after-times, when corruptions had got into the church; and so deserves no regard. 4thly, In favor of sprinkling, or pouring water in baptism, he urges that "it is a sign of the pouring or sprinkling of the holy Ghost, and of the blood of Christ" (Ezek. 36:25; Heb. 12:24), but it should be observed, that baptism is not a sign or significative of the sprinkling of clean water, or the grace of the Spirit in regeneration, or of the blood of Christ on the conscience of a sinner, all which ought to precede baptism; but of the death, and burial, and resurrection of Christ; which cannot be represented in any other way than by covering a person in water, or an immersion of him. 5thly, "Water in baptism, he says, is but a sign and seal; a little of it is sufficient to signify the gifts which Christ has purchased, as a small quantity of bread and wine does in the other sacrament, and as a small seal is as much security as a larger one."

But as baptism is no sign of the things before-mentioned, so it is no seal, as we have seen, of the covenant of grace; wherefore these similitudes are impertinent to illustrate this matter: and though a small quantity of bread and wine is suffi

---

Source:

<https://sermonindex.net/speakers/john-gill/an-answer-to-a-welsh-clergymans-twenty-arguments-in-favor-of-infant-baptism/>

# *Grow in Your Walk with Christ*

---

Listen and read messages that will stir your heart for Christ and point you to deeper repentance and devotion.

- 50,000+ Sermons from speakers past and present
- 3,900+ Classic Christian Books freely readable online
- 1,200+ Bible Translations and Commentaries
- Over 450k forum posts — Join our vibrant online Christian forum

**[www.sermonindex.net](http://www.sermonindex.net)**