

A N  
EXERCITATION  
ABOUT  
INFANT-BAPTISME;

Presented in certaine Papers, to the  
Chair-man of a COMMITTEE of the  
ASSEMBLY of DIVINES,

Selected to consider of that ARGUMENT,  
in the yeers, 1643, and 1644.

With some few Emendations, Additions, and an  
*Answer* to one new *Objection*.

Translated out of *Latine*, by the Author.

*John Tombes*  
Published according to Order.



LONDON,

Printed by M. S. for George Whittington, 1646.

An Exercitation about Infant-Baptisme

John Tombes, 1646

©2008 New Orleans Baptist Theological Seminary & Lloyd A. Harsch

Row  
2 65. 14  
752

EXERCITATION  
ABOUT

Practised in certain Points to the  
Glorious of a Christian  
Selected to contain all this Argument

Which is the only way to the  
Glorious of a Christian

Practised in certain Points to the  
Glorious of a Christian

Selected to contain all this Argument

Which is the only way to the  
Glorious of a Christian

Practised in certain Points to the  
Glorious of a Christian

Selected to contain all this Argument



AN  
EXERCITATION  
CONCERNING  
Infant-Baptisme.



He present Tenent, according to which Infant-Bap-  
tisme is practised, is, that the Infants born of a  
Believer, are universally to be baptized.

This Doctrine and Practice conformable is made  
doubtfull to me, by these Arguments.

Arg. 1. That which hath no testimony of Scrip-  
ture for it is doubtfull.

But this Doctrine of Infant-Baptisme, hath no testimony of Scrip-  
ture for it; Ergo, it is doubtfull.

The Minor is proved by examining the places that are brought for  
it, which are these: Gen. 17. 7, 8, 9. Acts 2. 38, 39. 1 Cor. 7. 14. Mark. 16.  
14-16. Acts 16. 15, 32. 1 Cor. 1. 16. The Argument from Gen. 17. 7, 8, 9.  
is almost the first and last in this business; and therefore is the more  
accurately to be examined; but it hath so many shapings, that I may here  
take up that Speech, *With whom knovst thou I hold shape-changing Pro-  
gram?* But in the issue, it falls into one or other of these forms:

The first thus: To whom the Gospel-covenant agrees, to them the  
sign of the Gospel-covenant agrees also. But to the Infants of Believers

g. 1. The first  
Argument for  
Infant-bap-  
tisme exami-  
ned from the  
interest in the  
promise.  
Gen. 17. 7.

An Exercitation about Infant-Baptisme

John Tombes, 1646

the Gospel-covenant agrees; therefore to them the sign of the Gospel-covenant agrees, and consequently Baptisme. The *Abrahams* is proved from *Gen. 17. 7.* where God promitteth to *Abraham*, *I will be a God to thee, and to thy seed after thee.*

Answer, That we may meet with this Argument, divers things are to be examined, which are taken for granted:

First, Whether the Gospel-covenant, and the Covenant made with *Abraham* be the same: Secondly, what feed of *Abraham* it is, of which it is said, *I will be a God to thee and to thy seed*: Thirdly, whether there be the same reason of circumcision and of baptisme in signing the Gospel-covenant: Fourthly, whether these terms be convertible [*Federate, and to be signed*].

Of these, I say: 1. The Covenant made with *Abraham*, is not a pure Gospel-covenant, but mixt, which I prove:

The Covenant takes its denomination from the promises; but the promises are mixt, some Evangelicall, belonging to those to whom the Gospel belongeth, some are Domestique, or Civill promises, specially respecting the House of *Abraham*, and policy of *Israel*. Ergo.

That was Evangelicall, which we read, *Gen. 17. 5. I have made thee a father of many nations*; and that which we find, *Gen. 15. 5. so shall thy seed be*; in which it is promised, that there shall be of the Nations innumerable that shall be *Abraham*'s children by believing. *Rom. 4. 17. 18.* It was Evangelicall, which we find, *Gen. 15. 3. & Gen. 15. 18.* and in this feed shall all the kindreds of the earth be blessed, for in these is promised blessing to Believers, of whom *Abraham* is father, *Gal. 3. 8. 9.* and by Christ, who is the feed of *Abraham*, *Gal. 3. 16. All 3. 25.*

Domestique and Civill promises were many, of the multiplying the seed of *Abraham*, the birth of *Isaac*: of the continuation of the Covenant with *Isaac*, of the coming of Christ out of *Isaac*: the bondage of the *Israelites* in Egypt, and deliverance thence; of possessing the Land of *Canaan*, *Gen. 15. 13. 18. Gen. 17. 7. 8. 15. 16. All 7. 4. 5. 6. 7. 8.* and many other places.

Yea, it is to be noted, that those promises which were Evangelicall, according to the more inward sense of the Holy Ghost, do point at the privileges of *Abraham*'s House, in the outward face of the words; whence it may be well doubted, whether this Covenant made with *Abraham*, may be called simply Evangelicall, and so pertain to Believers; as such, although there be Evangelicall promises in that Covenant; pertaining to all Believers, as Believers. There were annexed to the

## concerning Infant-Baptisme.

the Covenant on Mount Sinai, sacrifices pointing at the Gentiles of Christ, and yet we call not that Covenant simply Evangelicall, but in some respect.

Secondly, The feed of *Abraham* is many wayes so called: First, Christ is called the feed of *Abraham*, by excellency, *Gal. 3. 16.* Secondly, all the Elect, *Rom. 9. 7.* all Believers, *Rom. 4. 11. 12. 16. 17. 18.* are called the feed of *Abraham*, that is, the spiritual feed. Thirdly, there was a natural feed of *Abraham*, to whom the inheritance did accrue; this was *Isaac*, *Gen. 21. 12.* Fourthly, a natural feed, whether lawfull, as the sons of *Keturah*, or bane, as *Ismael*, to whom the inheritance belonged not, *Gen. 15. 5.* But no where do I find, that the Infants of Believers of the Gentiles are called *Abraham*'s feed, of the three former kinds of *Abraham*'s feed; the promise rected, is meant, but in a different manner thus: that God promitteth he will be a God to Christ, imparting in him blessing to all nations of the earth, to the spirituall feed of *Abraham* in Evangelicall benefits, to the natural feed inheriting in domestick and politicall benefits.

3. That the promise of the Gospel, or Gospel-covenant, was the same in all ages, in respect of the thing promised, and condition of the covenant, which we may call the substantiall and essentiall part of that covenant, to wit, Christ, Faith, Sanctification, Remission of sin, Eternal life; yet this Evangelicall covenant had divers forms in which these things were signified, and various sanctities by which it was confirmed: To *Adam*, the promise was made under the name of the feed of the woman, building the head of the Serpent; to *Noah*, in other forms; otherwise to *Abraham*, under the name of his feed, in whom all nations should be blessed; otherwise to *Moses*, under the obscure shadows of the Law; otherwise to *David*, under the name of a successor in the kingdom; otherwise in the New Testament, in plain words, 2 Cor. 3. 6. *Heb. 8. 10.* It had likewise divers sanctities. The promise of the Gospel was confirmed to *Abraham* by the sign of circumcision, and by the birth of *Isaac*; to *Moses* by the Paschal Lamb, and the sprinkling of blood on the book of the rain of Manna, and other signs; to *David* by an oath; in the New Testament, by Christ's blood, 1 Cor. 11. 25. Therefore circumcision signified and confirmed the promise of the Gospel, according to the form and sanction of the covenant with *Abraham*, Baptisme signifies and confirms the same promise according to the form, sanction and accomplishment of the new Testament: Now these forms and sanctities differ many

## An Exercitation about Infant-Baptisme

John Tombes, 1646

many ways, as much as concerns our present purpose in these: First, circumcision confirmed not only Evangelical promises, but also Political; and it we may believe Mr. Cameron, in his *Theses* of the threefold Covenant of God, *Thes. 78*. Circumcision did primarily separate the seed of Abraham from other nations, (sake with them the earthly promise.) Secondly, it did signify sanctification: But Baptism signifies only Evangelical benefits. Secondly, circumcision did confirm the promises concerning Christ to come out of Isaac; Baptism assures Christ to be already come, to have been dead, and to have risen again. Thirdly, circumcision belonged to the Church as constituted in the House of Abraham; Baptism to the Church gathered out of all nations; whence I gather, that there is not the same reason of circumcision and baptism, in signing the Evangelical covenant; nor may there be an argument drawn from the administration of the one in the like manner of administering the other.

That some there were circumcised, to whom no promise in the covenant made with Abraham did belong; of himself, God had said, that his covenant was not to be established with him, but with Isaac; and yet he was circumcised, *Gen. 17. 20, 21. 25. Rom. 2. 28, 29. Gal. 4. 29. 30*. the same may be said of Elam: All that were in *Abrahams* house, whether strangers, or born in his house, were circumcised, *Gen. 17. 12, 13*. of whom nevertheless, it may be doubted, whether any promises of the covenant made with Abraham, did belong to them; there were other persons, to whom all, or most of the promises in the covenant pertained, that were not circumcised; this may be affirmed of the Females, coming from Abraham, the Infants dying before the eighth day of their time, living out of *Abrahams* house, as *Melchisedech*, *Levi*. If any say, that the female were circumcised in the circumcision of the Males, he saith it without proof; and by like, perhaps greater, reason it may be said, that the children of Believers are baptized in the persons of their parents, and therefore are not to be baptized in their own persons. But it is manifest that the *Jews* comprehended in the covenant made with Abraham, and circumcised, were nevertheless not admitted to Baptism by *John Baptist*, and Christs Disciples, all that professed repentance, and faith in Christ. Hence I gather, first, that the right to Evangelical promises was not the adequate reason of circumcising these or those, but Gods precept, as is expressed, *Gen. 17. 23. Gen. 21. 4*. Secondly, that those terms are not convertible, [*fulfillment and its signification*].

Where-

## concerning Infant-Baptism.

Whereupon I answer to the Arguments: First, either by denying the *Major*, if it be universally taken, otherwise it concludes nothing; or by granting it with this limitation, it is true of that sign of the covenant which agrees universally in respect of form and sanction, to them that receive the Gospel, but it is not true of that sign of the covenant, which is of a particular form or sanction, of which sort is circumcision.

Secondly, I answer by denying the *Minor* universally taken, the reason is because those children only of believing *Gentiles*, are *Abrahams* children, who are his spiritual seed, according to the election of grace by faith, which are not known to us, but by professions, or special Revelation.

The second Argument is thus formed:

To whom circumcision did agree, to them Baptism doth agree, but to Infants Circumcision did agree, therefore also Baptism.

The *Major* is thus proved: If the baptism of Christ succeeded into the place of circumcision, then Baptism belongs to them that circumcision belonged to; but the Antecedent is true, therefore also the Consequent. The *Minor* is proved to be true, because, *Coloss. 2. 11, 12*, it is said the *Colossians* were circumcised, because they were buried with Christ in Baptism.

For Answer: This Argument supposeth Baptism to succeed in the place of Circumcision, which may be understood many ways.

1. So as that the sense be, that those persons be to be baptized, which heretofore by Gods command were to be circumcised, and in this sense the Argument must proceed, if it conclude to the purpose; but in this sense it is false, for no females were to be circumcised, which yet are to be baptized, *Acts 16. 14, 15*. and Believers out of *Abrahams* house, as *Levi*, *Melchisedech*, *Jah*, were not to be circumcised, but believing *Gentiles* are universally to be baptized.

2. It may be so understood, as if the rite of Baptism then began, when the rite of circumcision did, or was of right to end; but this is not to be said: For *John Baptist* and the Disciples of Christ baptized, *Joh. 4. 1, 2*. before circumcision of right ceased, and they who first were circumcised, were after baptism being converted to the faith, as is manifest concerning *Paul*, *Phil. 3. 5. Acts 9. 18*.

3. It may be understood, as if Baptism did succeed into the place of circumcision, in respect of its signification, which is true in some things: First, it is true that both signified the righteousness of faith,

Rom. 4.

## An Exercitation about Infant-Baptism

John Tombes, 1646

Rom. 4. 11. Rom. 6. 3. Gal. 3. 27. 1 Pet. 3. 21. Secondly, it is true, both signified sanctification of the heart, and this is all that may be concluded out of the place alledged, Gal. 2. 11, 12. to which I think meet to add; that if the Text be looked into, that place speaks not of any Circumcision, but of Christs Circumcision in whom we are compleat, and by whose Circumcision we are said to put off the body of the sins of the flesh; nor doth the Text say, we are circumcised, because we are baptized; but we are compleat in Christ, because we are circumcised in him, and buried with him in Baptisme, in which, or in whom, ye are also risen together through the faith of the operation of God that raised him from the dead.

In some things Baptisme doth not succeed into the place of Circumcision, in respect of signification: For, first Circumcision did signifie Christ to come of *Jesse*, according to the flesh, Gen. 17. 10. 21. but Baptisme doth not signifie this, but points at the Incarnation, death, and resurrection of Christ. Secondly, Circumcision was a sign that the *Israelites* were a people separated from all nations, Rom. 3. 1. but Baptisme signifieth, that all are one in Christ, Gal. 3. 28. Thirdly, Circumcision signified that *Moses* Law was to be observed, Gal. 5. 3. Doctrine of Christ to be retained, Acts 10. 37. Fourthly, Circumcision did sign the promise of the Land of *Canaan*, Baptisme eternal life by Christ.

From hence I answer to the Argument: First, by denying the *Major* of the fore Syllogisme. Secondly, to the conditional Syllogisme, by denying the Consequencie of the *Major*, if the Antecedent be understood of succellon, in the third sense, in respect of some signification granted; but if the succellon be understood in the first, second, or third sense, in respect of other significacions, the *Minor* is denied; the proof from Col. 2. 11, 12, is already answered.

And indeed, if this Argument be not warily, and restrainedly understood, an Egge is laid, out of which manifest *Judaisme* may be hatched, time and Circumcision, no more follows thence, but that Baptisme plainly said of *Nobis* blood, 1 Pet. 3. 21. of the red Sea, and time succellon into their place, much lesse do we inferre any rite to be instituted in their stead, respecting the same persons; yea verily it is to be seriously thought on.

1. That

1. That by such Arguments drawn from Analogies, not conceived by the holy Spirit, but drawn out of our wit, a new kinde of instituting Rites, to wit, from Analogies, is brought in, besides our Lords Precepts and the Apostles examples.

2. This being once laid, by like manner of argumentation, it will be lawfull to bring into the Christian Church under other names and forms, the whole burthen of *Jewish* Rites; yea, almost, out of what you will, to conclude what you will; for who shall put a bound to mens wits faining Analogies, when they go beyond the Lords Precepts, and the Apostles examples? It is well known, that the divine appointment of tythes to be paid, and many other things, in the writings of Divines, are asserted by this kinde of Argument, besides the rule of the Lords Precept and the Apostles example.

3. Hereby will the opinion of *Papists* be confirmed, who affirm from 1 Cor. 10. 11. the Sacraments of the *Jewes*, to be types of the Sacraments of *Christians*, which is rejected by Divines that dispute against *Kellianism*.

4. This manner of arguing will countenance the Arguments of the *Papists* for an universall Bishop, because there was a High Priest amongst the *Jews* for Sacrificing Priests, because the *Jewes* had such for a linen garment at Mass, because there was such among the *Jewes* for holy water, purification of women, *Eggs*, *Pentecost*, and many more such ceremonies, for which the *Papists* do in like manner argue, as appears out of *Darmidus* Rationales, and other Interpreters of Rituals among the *Papists*; yea, what hindreth, but we may give children the Lords Supper, if we argue this way, with *Samuel*, Jesus Christ under appeare partakers of the Passover, and of right, all the males were to appeare thrice in the year, before the Lord; and therefore it is certain they did eat the Passover; and it shall be after shewed, that the place, 1 Cor. 11. 28. will not avoid this inconvenience, if the Text, *Matth.* 28. 19. may be twisted off, as *Pedobaptists* use to do. Let any man take this for a light suggestion, I will add, that graves, godly and learned men, have often warned, that we are to take heed, that we do not rashly frame arguments from Analogies among others in their late writings, in the *Englishe* tongue, *John Packer*, in his *Dissertation of Church-government*, part. 1. chap. 3. pag. 8. and elsewhere; *John Ball* in his *Reply to the Answer of the New-England Elders*, unto the 9. Propositions, Polit. 2. pag. 14.

Lastly, it is to be considered again and again, how by the Arguments

B

## An Exercitation about Infant-Baptisme

John Tombes, 1646

mentations, consciences may be freed from the danger of wil-worship and polluting so remarkable an Ordinance of Christ as Baptisme is, specially this care lies on them, who by Prayers, Sermons, Writings, Covenants and Oaths, do deterre *Christians* from humane inventions, in Gods worship diligently, and as is to be hoped sincerely.

§ 3. The third Argument from the parity of grace in the new Testament, or that in the old examined,

The third Argument is thus framed. If Baptisme be not granted to the Infants of Believers, then the grace of God will be more restrained in the new Testament than in the old: but this is not to be affirmed; therefore Baptisme is to be granted to Infants of Believers.

*Ans.* 1. If this Argument be of any weight, it will prove that the grace of God is straitened, because we give not the Lords Supper to children; to whom the Passover was given, as appears by that which was above said.

2. The grace of God is not tied to Sacraments, neither do Sacraments give grace by the work done, and therefore grace is not restrained, though Sacraments be never granted, grace is not denied to an excommunicated person, who is inhibited the Lords Supper, the Grace of God is free, whether we understand it of the divine affection, or the effects of it: nor can be made larger or narrower by our act.

3. Yet it is not absurd to say that in respect of some privileges, the Grace of God is more contracted in the new Testament than in the old: For instance, no family hath now the privilege that was granted to *Abrahams* family, that out of it Christ should be born; no man besides *Abraham* is called *The Father of the faithful*; no woman besides *Mary* is called *The Father of the faithful*; never the less, simply the grace of God is said to be larger in the new Testament, by reason of the revelation of the Gospel imparted to all nations, the more abundant communication of the holy Spirit, and more plain manifestation of the myserie of the Gospel: I would have it weighed, whether those phrases of the Apostle, *Rom. 1.2.1. as the natural branches*, *Jer. 2.2. The wild Olive by nature, were't grafted contrary to nature. Those which be natural branches*, do not sufficiently imply, that the *Jewes* children by their birth had a privilege beyond the *Gentiles* children.

Thereupon I answer to the Argument: First, by denying the consequence of the *Major*, for the reason given: Secondly, by denying the *Minor*, if it be understood of straitning the grace of God, in respect of some privileges, although the Assumption may be granted, if under-

stood of the straitning Gods grace simply.

The summe of the Answer to the Arguments, drawn from *Gen. 17.* is this: The Sacraments are not to be administered according to rules taken from our reasonings, but Gods appointment. Rightly doth Mr. Ball forenamed, in the Book forenamed, *Epist. 3. § 4. pag. 38.* say, *But in what sense Circumcision and Baptisme, do agree or differ, we must look to the institution, and neither search it wider, nor draw it narrower than the Lord hath made it, for be it the institution of the Sacraments according to his own good pleasure; and it is our part so learn of him, both to whom, how, and for what end the Sacraments are to be administered, how they agree, and wherein they differ, in all which we must affirm nothing, but what God hath taught us, and as he hath taught us.*

The Argument from *Acts 2.38.39.* may be thus formed: To 5.4. The Argument from *Acts 2.38.39.* for Infants-baptisme examined.

The *Minor* is proved from the words of *vers. 39.* for the promise is made to you and to your children.

That an Answer may be fitted to this Argument:

1. It is to be observed, that the promise made, is the sending of Jesus Christ, and blessing by him, as it is expounded, *Acts 3.25.26. Acts 13.32.33. Rom. 15.8.9.*

2. That the Text faith, the promise was made to them he spake to, and their children, then to them that are alive off, whoso, whether they be *Gentiles*, who are said to be aware of, *Epist. 2.12.40. Jewes*, in future ages and generation, as *Beza* thinks, are limited by the words closing the verse, *as many as the Lord our God shall call*, which limitation plainly enough shewes the promise to appertain to them not simply as *Jewes*, but as called of God, which is more expressly affirmed, *Acts 3.26. To you, God having raised up his Son Jesus, sent him to bless you, in turning away every one of you from his iniquity*; or, as *Beza*, Every one of you turning your selves from your iniquities; therefore the promise here is not said to be made but with condition of calling, and faith, which may be confirmed abundantly from *Rom. 1.13. 14.16. Gal. 3.9.14.22.*

3. That *Peter*, *vers. 38.* doth exhort to repentance and Baptisme together, and in the first place perfwades to *Repentance*, then *Baptisme*, which shewes *Repentance* to be in order before *Baptisme*.

## An Exercitation about Infant-Baptisme

John Tombes, 1646

4. That mention is made of the promise, not as of its self, yielding right to *Baptisme* without *Repentance*, but as a motive, inciting together to *Repentance* and *Baptisme*. Whereupon it is answered :

1. That the *Major* is to be limited, to whom the promise is made, they may be baptized, *now*, when they are called, and have shewed signes of repentance ; If it be taken without limitation, it is to be denied.

2. By denying the *Minor*, if it be universally taken of all Infants of Believers, of whose Baptisme the question is ; as for the Text, it speaks not expressly of Infants, but of children indefinitely, nor of the children of the *Genitals* at all, (of whom we are) but of the children of the *free*, and therefore, if that promise be extended to Infants, which doth not appear, the promise is to be expounded so, as to note something peculiar to the *free* Infants.

5. f. The Argument from 1 Cor. 7. 14. for Infant-Baptisme examined.

The Argument from the place, 1 Cor. 7. 14. may be thus formed : They who are holy with Covenant-holiness, may be baptized : But the Infants of a Believer are holy, with a Covenant-holiness ; for it is said in the Text, *but now they are holy* ; therefore they may be baptized. I answer :

1. The *Minor* is not true, universally understood, as is manifest from Rom. 11. 16. where it is said, *If the first fruits be holy, so is the lump : if the root be holy, so are the branches.* The sense is, that *Abraham* is the first fruit, and holy root ; the elect *Israelites* are the branches and lumps ; so that it follows, that the elect of the *Israelites* are the branches called, are holy in respect of the Covenant, and are not yet therefore to be baptized ; for although they are and are not yet therefore of the Covenant, of old entered into with *Abraham*, and the gracious respect of God to them to be baptized, unless we would have the branches broken off to be grafted into the Church ; and therefore, although the sense were in the place of 1 Cor. 7. 14. your children are holy with Covenant-holiness, by reason of Gods gracious favour to be manifested in due time, yet it will not follow, that they are to be baptized, who have not yet yielded any shewes of divine grace.

2. The *Minor* is not proved from the place alleged : For it doth not speak of federal holiness, but of holiness, that I may so call it, Matrimoniall, so that the sense is, your children are holy, that is, legitimate.

itimate. Whether any in the ages before, the age last past, expounded it, of federal holiness, as they call it, I am not yet certain : as for the exposition of that place, of that holiness, I called Matrimoniall, of it the place is expounded by *Aquinas*, in his *Commentary* upon the place, and perhaps by others, whom I have not yet had time to look into, but I think best to set down the words of *Joachim Camerarius*, about this matter, in his *Commentary* on the new Testament, lately printed at Cambridge ; (for the unbelieving husband hath been sanctified) an usual change of the Text, that it is sanctified, in the lawfull use of marriage, for without this (he saith) it would be, that their children should be unclean, that is, infamous, and not legitimate, who *is* holy, that is, during the marriage are without all blot of fornication : Moreover, *Melancthon* in his *Commentary* on the place, therefore Paul answers, that the marriages are not to be pulled asunder, for their unlike opinions of God, if the impious person do not cast away the other ; and for comfort he adds as a reason, the unbelieving husband is sanctified by the believing wife, of which Speech divers interpretations are made, but the true and natural is this, as elsewhere, he saith, *Meat is sanctified, for that which is holy in use, that is granted to Believers from God, so here he speaks the use of marriage to be holy, and to be granted of God, [else were] the interpretation of the Sept. so speaks unclean, it calls unclean that which is prohibited ; as was say Swine flesh was unclean by the Law of Moses, that is, prohibited, or a woman brought to bed, is unclean, that is, whose touching is forbidden. The connection of the Argument is this : If the use of marriage should not please God, your children would be bastards, and so unclean ; but your children are not bastards, therefore the use of marriage pleases God : How bastards were unclean in a peculiar manner, the Law saith, Deut. 23. Let not a bastard enter into the Congregation of the Lord, to the tenth generation, that is, Let him be admitted to no function in the Church ; therefore this is the most plain meaning, children are not bastards, nor to be kept away, at the Law of Moses kept them away ; therefore also the use of marriage pleases God. Musculus Comment. on 1 Cor. 7. 14. hath these words ; [it is sanctified] this expresseth the reason of that which he saith ; Let him not put her away ; perhaps, the more unskillfull Christians thought such dwelling together to be unclean and unlawful ; and they did fear, lest they should be made one body with the yoke-fellow that was an Idolater, as he that is joined to an Harlot, is made one body with the Harlot, and so of the members of Christ, should make them members of*

## An Exercitation about Infant-Baptisme

John Tombes, 1646

an Idolater, which hath more sin then if they should make them the members of an Harlot for this cause, he saith, for the unbeliever is sanctified, &c. that is, for the unbelieving husband in the wife, that is, in the conjunction of the wife, which is by marriage, even long ago hath been cleansed by virtue of marriage: so that his conjunction and copulation, hath nothing unclean: so in like manner also, the unbelieving wife, by reason of lawfull wedlock, in which she is joined to the man, even long ago is cleansed, that the believer is not defiled, if she lies together with him; for the word holiness here, is taken for the cleanness of the marriage-bed, which he hath by the tradition of God, therefore he saith, else your children should be unclean, but now they are holy, he should have said, but now they are clean, if to be holy, and clean, in this place were not the same.

Therefore the most plain understanding of this place is, first, in that we understand not the word holiness, of that holiness which is by the covenant of God, or the Spirit of faith, by which Believers are sanctified, as a people of God, but of the holiness of the conjugall bed, otherwise it will bring forth a troublesome dispute, how an unbelieving husband may be said to be sanctified. Then, that we attribute this sanctification that is cleanness, not to the faith of the believing yoke-fellow, but to the marriage, by reason of the appointment of God; with Hierome, who saith, because by Gods appointment, marriage is holy; and Ambrose, who hath it thus, the children are holy, because they are born of lawfull marriage; therefore, that in the wife and in the husband, is not to be read with the addition of Believer, or the old Interpreter hath it, but simply, as the Greek hath it; if any thing be to be added, it is better to be added, the lawfull wife or husband, than we may understand, that the unbelieving husband is cleansed in his lawfull wife, that is, by virtue of their lawfull marriage, is not unclean, but clean, as far as appertains to the law of cohabitation of marriage, although he be impure so far as appertains to the commerce of Religion, of which the word of Diogen in the Church was, Lea the prophane deport, the holy draw near. [else your children] Ambrose so expands this particle [else] that is, if thou the believing husband shouldst put away thy unbelieving wife, and marry another, your children should be unclean, because you should be made Adulterers; but [now] that is, if thou retain thy unbelieving wife, they are holy, because they are born of a lawfull marriage. But it is more plain, that we understand the Apostle, to have respect to the sanctimony of marriage, even of them who without the faith of Christ, are conjoined in marriage, as if he had said,

which

unless marriage were holy and clean, even between unbelievers, what other thing would follow, then that all the children of Infidels are bastards, and unclean? but far be it from us to say so; they are holy, for they are born of lawfull marriage. Ambrose looks to that which he said, Let him not put her away; for another Exposition to that which he said, the unbelieving husband, is sanctified in the wife. I have sometimes abused the present place against the error of Anabaptists, keeping back Infants of Christians from Baptisme; thinking that, surely, but now they are holy, to be the same, as, they are the people of God, by reason of the believing parents; but although it be so in it self, that the children of believers, are both holy, and pertaining to the people of God, by reason of the participation of the Covenant, and so are partakers of Baptisme, or the sign of the Covenant, yet the present place makes nothing to this cause, in which the sanctimony of the Covenant and people is not meddled with; but the cleanness of lawfull marriage even of Infidels: for not only to children, to whom perhaps, the holiness of a believing parent, may so appertain, that for it they may be partakers of the Covenant, but also to unbelieving husbands and wives in sanctimony ascribed, although they oppose the Christian faith; nor is any other holiness or cleanness of children meddled with, then that which appertains also to unbelieving parents, for to those no other agree, then that which is by lawfull marriage. There be other testimonies out of Scriptures, from whence the Anabaptists may be convinced of error; so that there is no need to use this place against them. Thus far Cameronius, Melancthon, Musculus.

Perhaps some one will object, that no where is *holy*, the same which legitimate: to which I answer, That holiness is put for Chastity, is manifested from 1 Thes. 4. 3-7 and the word [sanctified] in this place, what doth it found else, then [it is lawfully conjoined] and [it sanctified] 1 Tim. 4. 5. what else doth it signifie, then [it is lawfully wedd] at which place Beza hath these words, Therefore men are said to be sanctified, which wife lawfully, and with Gods good leave: he alludes to legal purifications, and the difference between clean and unclean meats: And why may not by a like allusion, unclean, be put for Bastards, and holy for legitimate? for the Bastard is among the unclean, Dent. 23. 2. To which I may adde what John Calvin hath on Mal. 2. 15. Wherefore hath God made one? to wit, seeking a seed of God; a seed of God is here taken for legitimate, as the Hebrewes do name that divine whatsoever with oath, yea, they call that divine which is pure from any fault and sin: therefore he singeth a seed of God, that is, appointed marriage; from whence

should

## An Exercitation about Infant-Baptisme

John Tombes, 1646

should be born a legitimate and clean offspring. Surely therefore doth the People here show, that they are all bastards, that shall be born by polygamy, because they neither can, nor ought to be counted legitimate sons, but they who are begotten according to Gods institution, but whose the husband violates the faith given to the wife, and takes to himself another, as he perverts the order of marriage, so also he cannot be a lawful father. Thus Calvinists, and in like manner Cameron prelate in Mar. 19.5. interprets that Text.

Lastly, if the words of the Text be weighed, this will seem the only and genuine sense; for the question which the Apostle resolves was, whether the conjunction was to be retained of the believing yoke-fellow, with the unbelieving? The reason of doubting was, because that conjunction seems impure, by reason of the impurity of the unbelieving husband hath been sanctified in the wife. To draw out the sense of this place, it is to be noted, that [the unbelieving husband] sounds the fame, as if he had said, [the husband, though he be an unbeliever]; for the scope requires that this be the sense, the Husband, though he be an unbeliever, yet is sanctified in the wife.

2. That it is not said, in the believing wife, nor in the believing husband (though I deny not Beza observed some such thing in the *Gloss* copy, and elsewhere): For the copies do not so read, and it seems the Apostle of purpose so to speak, that the reason of Sanctification may be intimated to be taken, not from the faith of the yoke-fellow, but conjugal relation.

3. [It is] not rightly rendered, [by] in the vulgar and our English translation, as if the sense were, that the faith of the wife, were the cause of sanctifying the unbelieving husband, for this sense cannot be fastened to this place: for no man will say, the faith of the unbelieving wife, sanctifies the unbelieving husband federally; so that the unbelieving husband should be capable of Baptisme by his wives faith, (which yet, by the good leave of such men be it said, doth as well follow from this place, as that the *son* is federally holy, and capable of Baptisme, for the faith of the parent) neither can it be said, that the parent is sanctified with spiritual sanctification by the faith of the wife; for how ever it be determined that faith is the cause of inward sanctification, yet it is certain that the faith of one is not the cause of the sanctification of another, I mean, the next and effectual cause. Nor doth this sense pertain higher, the unbelieving husband is sanctified by the wife, that is, is renewed in the spirit of his mind, by the diligence

of his wife, instructing him in the faith, as it is said to five, *verf. 16.* For this sanctification being put, the children may remain impure, and not holy; the contrary whereof is here asserted: and this sanctification is contingent, it may be, or it may not be, as is manifest from *verf. 16.* For how knowest thou? But in this place the sanctification is certain and necessary, else it should not take away the doubt, about the remaining the conjunction; nor doth the sense pertain hither, the unbelieving husband is sanctified in the wife, that is, the wife, because she hath faith, hath used the unbelieving husband without all scruple of conscience; for the contrary was the occasion of this Discourse; nor doth this belong a whit to the impurity or holiness of the children; therefore more rightly [it is *verf. 16.*] is rendered in *Latin*: In the *Dative*, to the wife [for the particle *in*, is often so used, as *Gal. 1.16.* *Mar. 17.11.* *is* *in* *me*, *2 Pet. 1.5.* *is* *in* *me*, to faith, *Act. 1.12.* *is* *in* *apostolo* to men; and *1 Cor. 7.15.* *is* *in* *te* *signo*, is rendered by Beza unto peace: the sense then is, that the unbelieving husband is sanctified in the wife, that is, is not coupled as an unclean fornicator, but as a lawful husband, and that copulation is holy, that is, remains chaste, the unbeliever remaining a husband; for an unbeliever is a husband, and therefore the use of him is chaste; [else] the Apostle proves what he had said, of the sanctification of the unbelieving husband, to the wife, and the order being turned, by an argument from an absurdity, which may be reduced unto this form:

If the unbelieving husband be not sanctified to the wife, and the order turned, when your children should be unclean; but your children are not unclean, but holy; *Expo.* [it is *verf. 16.*] plainly shews, that absurdity would follow, if this were not granted, that the unbelieving husband is sanctified to the wife, *verf. 16.* otherwise certainly, as Beza renders it, your children are unclean, that is, your children which you have have hitherto begotten, should be unclean, that is, bastards, but now they are holy: [but now] Beza rightly notes it, is not an *Adverb* of time, but a *Conjunction*, that is wont to be used in the *Assumptions* of Arguments, and the sense is, [that now] that is, but for as much as the unbelieving husband is sanctified to the wife, that is, in respect of the use of the wife, your children are holy, that is, lawfully begotten and born; but if it be granted the sanctification is understood of lawful and chaste use, (which is necessarily to be yielded) and yet the uncleanness and holiness be understood of that which they call federal, then this will follow, that the children born of wives furnished to the first, incestuous, concubines and harlots are not with-

## An Exercitation about Infant-Baptisme

John Tombes, 1646

in the Covenant, neither to be circumcised nor baptized, whereas not only *Ishmael* by *Abraham*, but also many sons of *Isaac*, the sons of *Jacob*, *Pharez* and *Zarah* by *Thamar*, were circumcised; nor doth custome or canon put such back children from Baptism, but in very deed, this cannot be the sense, for only holiness, which I call Matrimoniall of the children, followeth from Matrimoniall lawfull copulation, which is here asserted, and only uncleanesse opposite to legitimation, follows illegitimate, and polluted copulation, and of these alone there was doubt amongst the *Corinthian* Christians, and therefore the Apostles resolution.

Nor yet, as *Beca* infers, if this sense be put, should the Apostle draw an argument from civil Law, to pacifie conscience, but he using his Apollitical authority, resolves the doubts in this Chapter, and teacheth, that according to Gods Law, and Christs Precept, the marriage is not dissolved by the infidelity of either yoke-fellow, but that they may lawfully dwell together, and couple, according to Gods institution of Marriage. As for that which *Beca* saith, *No man hath ever said* that marriage is holy between two unbelievers, and that their children are holy, *fish their meats are unclean to them, as being to be sanctified by the Word, and giving of thanks*: It is true, if we speak of the sanctification of the heart, but it is manifest from that which is before said, that the Apostle speaks of the sanctification and sanctity, that is in chastity, and legitimation, and in respect of it *Beca* grants the marriage of Infidels not to be accounted before God for fornication; for marriage is honourable amongst all, even unbelievers, and the bed undefiled, but Whoremongers and Adulterers God will judge, *Heb. 13.4.* but honour and holiness found the same, 1 *Thes. 4.4.*

s. 6. The Arguments from *Mat. 19. 15.* for Infant-Baptisme examined.

**T**He Argument from *Mat. 19. 15.* *Mat. 10. 14. 16.* *Luke 18. 15, 16,* baptized, whom Christ commands to be brought to him, being moved with indignation towards his disciples, that repelled them. But Christ commands Infants to be brought to him. Ergo. That this Argument may be examined, it is to be considered:

1. Who they were that brought these children.
2. What little children they were that were brought.
3. Upon what motives.
4. To what end.
5. What time.
6. In what place they brought them.
7. For what cause the Apostles did repel them.
8. For what cause Christ being angry with the Apostles, commanded them to be brought.

In

In many of these, we have scarce any thing beside conjectures, which we may follow, neither have I leisure or books to look into all things which *Comment. 2001.* have discoursed concerning these heads.

As for the first, it is supposed that the bringers were either parents, or other believers, who at least willed well to the little children, which is probable from the end for which they brought them, to wit, that he might bless them, and pray for them, for this shewed faith and love.

As for the second, it is probable they were children of *Jews*, because this was done in the coast of *Judea*, *Mat. 19. 1.* *Mat. 10. 1.* But whether the parents of the children believed in Christ or otherwise, is not manifest.

As for the third, concerning the motive, there is little certain, whether it were upon the sight, or hearing of that which Christ did, *Mat. 18. 2.* or from a custome among the *Jews*, of seeking the blessing of Prophets and holy men, for their little ones, as *Rebecca* for *Isaac*, *Joseph* for his sons, or from the fane of things done upon the praises of Christ; or an insinuation from God, that occasion might be given of teaching the things that Christ taught upon this matter; or some other motive.

As for the fourth, the end is expressed by *Matthew*, that he might put on hands and pray; by *Mark* and *Luke*, that he might touch them, which tends to impart a blessing.

As for the fifth, *Matthew* points at the time, by the particle *then* and both *Mark* and *Matthew*, put it after the dissertation, with the *Pharisees* concerning divorce, and the answer to the Disciples exceptions, which *Mark* testifies was made in the house; *Luke* puts it after the parable of the *Parable* and the *Pharisees* but he is wont to relate things out of their right place. But what the holy Spirit doth intimate, by noting the time precisely, I guess not, unless perhaps he would have it noted, that an occasion was opportunely ministered, of amplifying the argument concerning making a mans self an Eunuch for the kingdom of heaven, though this reason doth not very much like me.

As for the sixth, the place is intimate, *Mat. 19. 1.* *Mat. 10. 1.* in the *coasts of Judea*, beyond *Jordan*, in *Matthew*, by the farther side of *Jordan*, in *Mark*; about which it availeth not to our present purpose to inquire.

As for the seventh, the reason of repelling, is not known, but by conjecture, it is probable this bringing of little children, was troublesome to them, either because it did interrupt Christs Speech about marriage, and finetness to the Kingdom of heaven, or because they sought rest in the house, or because they did think this bringing would be in vain.

As for the eighth, Christ without doubt, was angry with the Disciples,

C 2

cles,

## An Exercitation about Infant-Baptisme

John Tombes, 1646

ple, because they hindered the occasion of doing good to men, whereas Christ went about doing good; *Mat. 10. 35.* And in this business the faith of the bringers was to be certified, and the power of blessing in Christ was to be manifested, & the excellent doctrine to be delivered, concerning little children being capable of the Kingdom of heaven, of the quality of them who receive the Kingdom of heaven; but whether Christ would that this fact should remain, as a perpetual rule for baptizing the Infants of Believers, is yet a question. It seems scarce probable it should be so.

1. Because Baptisme of Infants, being merely positive, so obscure and doubtful an institution, is without example and reason.

2. Because we find no practice or hint in Scripture, which may expound this fact to this sense.

3. Because, if he had given a command to the Apostles of baptizing Infants, he had rather said, bring the little children to me, then suffer them to be brought to me.

4. He had declared whose Infants he would have baptized, and not have spoken so indefinitely. It is certain, before the command, *Mat. 23. 15, 16.* There is no Precept extant, concerning baptizing Gentiles, much less concerning baptizing the Infants of the Gentiles.

5. The words, *Jesus & forbid not, & c. mat. 23. these little children*, as *Bernard* reads, show that Christ's words are meant only of those children.

6. If this fact pertain to Baptisme, then we must say, that Christ baptized the contrary whereof is said, *Job. 4. 2.* As for that which is objected, that three Evangelists rehearse this fact, that thence a perpetual rule may be drawn, of bringing Infants to Christ by an outward Ordinance, which is not done but by Baptisme, it is weak: For,

1. Three Evangelists rehearse the bringing of the pallie man to Christ, the access of the leprous person to Christ, and many other things, from which yet no perpetual rule is formed.

2. If any rule be hence to be formed, that is to be perpetually observed, this relation will serve more fitly to establish Episcopall confirmation, by laying on hands, and praying, then Presbyteriall baptism. Secondly, we must distinguish concerning bringing to Christ: there is a bringing to Christ, by locall aduocation; there is another bringing to Christ by spirituall instruction; this bringing to Christ, is the cause of Baptisme, not the other: for many were brought by the command of Christ, Christ as the blind fool of *Timothy*, and others, of whose baptism, or conversion we read not; for not all that were corporally healed by Christ, were also spiritually healed, as we are to say of the nine Lepers, *Matth. 9.* and others.

3. The

3. The Argument supposeth they may be baptized, whom Christ commands to be brought; but neither is this true of spirituall bringings; for not those whom he commands to be brought (spiritually, are to be baptized, but those whom he hath brought; as for that which is said, they are repelled from Christ, they are repelled from Baptisme, it is a light thing, for Baptisme doth not bring men to Christ, unless the persons be first in Christ; neither is therefore any man repelled from Christ, because he is not baptized, but when he is kept back, being fit for baptism.

To the Argument therefore answer is made, by denying the *Major* universally taken.

Secondly, the Argument is thus formed:

*Arg.* Those whom Christ embraced, laid his hands on, blessed, may be baptized; But Christ embraced Infants, &c. *Ergo.*

*Ans.* I answer, this argument supposeth these acts of Christ, to have been all one, as if he had baptized, but this is said without proof, in very deed, that act of blessing was more then Baptisme, and yet it had not the same reason with Baptisme; it is manifest out of *Job. 4. 2.* that Baptisme was an act of ministry, which Christ did not exercise by himself, but his Disciples, but that blessing was an act, by which he obtained some singular gift from God by prayer for those Infants, upon whom he had laid his hands; nor is this benefit said to be bestowed on them for the faith of their parents, but out of singular favour which Christ bestowed upon many, as *Lazarus*, with his sisters, *John* the Apostle and others, therefore the *Major* Proposition is to be denied, for there is no connexion between this act, which is extraordinary, and the act of ordinary ministry, which is to be fulfilled according to the Lords prescription.

The third Argument is thus formed.

*Arg.* They may be baptized, whose is the Kingdom of heaven; but of Infants is the Kingdom of heaven; &c. *Ergo.*

*Ans.* I answer, the *Major* Proposition is true, if it be understood of those whose is the Kingdom of heaven, when it appears that the Kingdom of heaven belongs to them, otherwise it is not true. Secondly, it is not said in the Text [*of Infants is the kingdom of heaven*] but, [*of such is the kingdom of heaven*]; and Christ expounds what he means, *Mat. 10. 18. Luke 18. 17.* to wit, of them who in humility of mind are like little children, as it is *Mat. 18. 3. 4.* but it [*of such*] be to be expounded, as *Beza* would, *Armin.* in *Mat. 19. 14.* of these and the like, as above, 18. it is not proved from thence, that the kingdom of heaven pertains to all Infants of Believers, but to them whom he then blessed, and to those persons who either are so blessed, or are converted and humble as little children.

Whence

## An Exercitation about Infant-Baptisme

John Tombes, 1646

§ 7. The Argument from *Act 16. 16.* & *Cor. 1.* Infant-Baptism examined.

Whence it is answered, first by denying the *Major* if it be expounded universally and unrestrainedly: secondly, by denying the *Minor*, as it is put indefinitely, for the reasons above put.

The Argument from the place, *Act 16. 15. 32. 33. Act 18. 8. 1 Cor. 1. 16.* is thus formed: If the Apostle baptized whole households, then Infants; but the Apostle baptized whole households, *Exgr.* *Ans.* This Argument rests on a slight conjecture, that there were Infants in those houses, and that those Infants were baptized, whereas the words of the Text evince not these things, yea, those things which are said, *Act 16. 32.* He spake the Word of the Lord to him, and to all in his house; and ver. 33. He rejoined, believing God with all his house. *Act 18. 8.* Crispus believed the Lord with his whole house, do plainly prove, that under the name of the whole house, are understood those only that heard the Word of God and believed. Whence it is answered by denying the consequence of the *Major* Proposition.

§ 8. The Argument from general promises for Infant-baptism examined.

Some other arguments occur, which make a number without strength. First, it is argued from general promises, made to the godly and their seed, *Exod. 20. 6. Psal. 112. 2. &c.* Whence it is gathered, that God makes a difference between the children of the godly and the wicked, that he promiseth blessing to those, not to these, therefore the children of the godly are to be baptized, not the other.

*Ans.* The promises recited, are first general and indefinite; secondly, for the most part concerning corporal good things; thirdly, with the exception of free election; fourthly, to be understood with the implied condition of faith and repentance, and so they serve not to this purpose.

§ 9. The Argument from *Isa. 49. 22.* for Infant-Baptism examined.

Secondly, from *Isa. 49. 22.* it is foretold that *Gentiles* should bring their sons in their arms, and their daughters on their shoulders, therefore the Prophet foretold in spirit, the baptism of the little ones of the *Gentiles*.

*Ans.* First, little ones might be brought for other ends than baptism, as *Mat. 19. 15.*

Secondly, I will use the words of *Francis Junius* in his *Anno*, on the place, All these things are said Allegorically, of the spiritual amplification of the kingdom of Christ, as the Prophets are wont, they are fulfilled in the persecutions in which the *Gentiles* exhorted their children to embrace Christ.

§ 10. The Argument from *1 Cor. 10. 2.* for Infant-Baptism examined.

Thirdly, from *1 Cor. 10. 2.* All our fathers were baptized, therefore also Infants.

I answer, first, if this verse prove that Infants were baptized, the verses following will prove that they received the Lords Supper.

2. The

2. The sense is not that they were formally baptized, with the rite of Baptism, begun by *John Baptist*, and ordained by Christ; but that by a like representation, the sea and the cloud signified salvation to them by Christ as baptism doth to us, and that they were in a like condition, as if they had been baptized.

Fourthly, from *Ephes. 5. 26.* where it is said, that Christ cleansed the Church, with the washing of water through the Word, therefore Infants either belong not to the Church and so are excluded from the benefit of Christ's death, or they are to be baptized.

*Ans.* If this Argument be of force, the thief crucified with Christ, and repenting on the cross, Infants, *Catechumens*, Martyrs, and others, dying before baptism, are excluded out of the Church, and from the benefit of Christ's death; we are therefore to say, that either the Church is taken for the more famous part of the Church, or that purification is to be understood of that, which is for the most part.

Fifthly, from *1 Pet. 2. 9.* Believers are called a chosen generation, a holy nation, which things are said of the *Israelites*, *Exo. 19. 5. 6.* therefore Believers of the nations obtain the same birth-privileges, which the *Israelites* had, and therefore their children are within the Covenant, and to be baptized as the children of the *Israelites* were to be circumcised.

*Ans.* 1. If this Argument proceed, it will follow, that there is some national-church among the *Gentiles*, as of old among the *Jews*, which is not to be granted, which I would have understood in this sense, there is now no such national-church, as amongst the *Israelites*, so as that a person should be accounted a member of a church, in that he is an *Englishman*, *Scott*, *Dutchman*, &c. In this speech I oppose not them which affirm the outward government of the Church should be subject to national Synods. 2. *Exod. 19. 5. 6.* God speaks not of a privilege flowing from birth, but obedience. 3. The Epistle was written to the dispersed *Jews*, and therefore the Argument lies liable to exception, when it is drawn from that which is said of the *Jews*, as if it were said of the *Gentiles*. 4. But letting these things pass, the sense is, ye which believe, as it is ver. 7. whom God hath called out of darkness, are a holy nation, whether *Jews* or *Gentiles*, by spiritual regeneration, as Believers are called a family or kindred, *Ephes. 3. 15.* the household of faith, *Gal. 6. 10.* the house of God, *1 Tim. 3. 15.* a people, *1 Pet. 2. 10.* wherefore in this family, kindred, house, people, are only believers, whom not carnal birth, but spiritual causeth to be reckoned in, that number.

Sixthly, the Church of God fails not, but we must say, the Church of God hath failed, if baptism of Infants be not lawful, *Exgr.*

*Ans.* 1. The

§ 11. The Argument from *Eph. 5. 26.* for Infant-Baptism examined.

§ 12. The Argument from *1 Pet. 2. 9.* for Infant-baptism examined.

§ 13. The Argument from the

## An Exercitation about Infant-Baptism

John Tombes, 1646

churches  
failing, if  
infant-bap-  
tisme be  
not lawfull  
examined.

§ 14. The  
Argument  
from Heb. 6.  
2. for in-  
fant-bap-  
tisme ex-  
amined.

*Answer.* 1. The Church of God may consist without baptisme, as in the crucified converted thiefs. Secondly, neither perhaps, is it necessary to be said, that the baptisme of Infants, because not lawfull, is therefore null. Thirdly, there was in the Church baptisme of persons grown in all ages: *Ladus, Vives in his Comment. upon Aug. de Civit. Dei. lib. 1. cap. 27.* hath these words, *Nemo of old sen brought was* &c. the place of holy baptisme unless it be were of grown age already; and when the same person knew what that mysticall water meant, and desired to be washed in it, and that more then once, on the age of which thing we yet see in our baptisme of Infants: for as yet the Infants, though born the same day, or the day before, are asked, whether he would be baptized, and that thrice: for whom the sweetest answer, that he would. *There in some cities in Italy, that the old custom, for a great part is yet preserved.*

Secondly, Heb. 6.2. the Apostle speaks of the doctrine of baptisms, and of laying on of hands; now this is not likely to be understood of laying on of hands in healing sick persons, or bestowing the Holy Ghost, for these were extraordinary or miraculous, and therefore not to be put in the number of the principles or the oracles of God, the foundation, milk for babes, for that, though ordinary, yet not likely to be put among the principles, the foundation, milk for babes, therefore it remains, that it was the laying on of hands on children formerly baptized in infancy, which though conferred from the abuse were very useful, as being an Apostolical ordinance, from this Text; and manifests that there was Infant-baptisme in the Apostles dayes, which is confirmed, because it is coupled with baptisme, and therefore seeme to be a consequent upon it.

*Answer.* 1. There is great incertainty, what this imposition of hands mentioned, Heb. 6.2. served for, the reason to prove that it could not be either extraordinary, or giving the Holy Ghost, because they were miraculous or ex-powers, yet were they frequent in those times, and might well be put among the elements to be in those days first learned: nor is the reason cogent to him that is certain was still in use, and to continue to be used, and therefore it was needfull to be taught younglings, as well as the doctrine of baptisms: is then laying on of hands for confirmation of baptisme, of which there is no certainty (though pretended examples) in Scripture, be brought to give some colour to it; nor is imposition of hands in ordination usefully coupled to baptisme, both being ordinances for initiation, the one into the pro-

posed, and both also common to several functions.

2. But

2. But if it were supposed that this imposition of hands, ment *Heb. 6.2.* were on the baptized; yet this proves not the baptisme of Infants in the Apostles dayes, unless it could be proved that this was used after the baptisme of Infants only, for a confirmation either of the baptisme, or baptized. On the contrary, it is apparent out of *Tertul. de corona militis, c. 3.* that in the primitive times the baptized did make his confession at baptisme, *sub manu antiphis*, that is, the Minister laying hands on him. And to save labour in reciting testi-monies, *Chamier* may be seen, who in his *Panf. Catholica, tom. 4. l. 6. c. 11. sec. 14.* at large proves out of the Ancients, that the imposition of hands, which after was made a distinct Sacrament, called Con-firmation, was either a part or appendice of Baptisme: and many pas-sages he cites to shew, that it was when the baptized was to con-fesse the faith, and to renounce Satan. And if *Hierom, tom. 2.* in his Dialogue against the *Luciferians*, do alsert that use of Imposition of hands from Scripture, yet he alledgeth not *Heb. 6.2.* for it, but the examples of giving the Holy Ghost by laying on of hands, in the *Acts of the Apostles*.

The second Argument followeth: That which agreeth not with the Lords institution of Bap-tisme, that is deviously doubtful.

But the rite of Infant-Baptisme agrees not with the Lords insti-tution of Baptisme, *Ergo.*

The *Major* is proved, because Institution is the rule of exhibiting worship to God.

The *Minor* is proved from the words of Instituti-  
*Mat. 28. 19.*  
Going therefore, *discipule* ye all nations, baptizing them.

Whence I gather thus:

That rite agrees not with the Lords institution of Baptisme, according to which they are baptized, whom the Lord appointed not to be baptized.

But after the rite of Infant-Baptisme, they are baptized whom the Lord appointed not to be baptized, *Ergo.*

The *Major* is manifest of it self.

The *Minor* is proved: The Lord appointed not Infants to be bap-tized, *Ergo.* The Antecedent is proved;

Those, and no other, the Lord appointed to be baptized, who have been made disciples.

*Arg. 2.*  
§ 15. The ar-gument from the institution of Christ, *Mat. 28. 19. 22.* gainst Infant-baptisme, confirmed.

But

# An Exercitation about Infant-Baptisme

John Tombes, 1646

But this cannot be said of Infants. *Ergo.*

The argument is confirmed from *John* 4. 2. where it is said that *Jesus made more disciples*; her, that he baptized: first it is said that he made disciples, then baptized.

Some one perhaps will say that Baptisme of Infants is elsewhere instituted, although not here.

To which is answered, Let he that can, bring forth that institution, and the doubt will be loosed.

But infants may be sanctified; for they may be sanctified by the Spirit?

*Ans.* It is true, Infants may be sanctified by the Spirit of God, purged by the blood of Christ, saved by the grace of God, my minde abhors from the doctrine of them that assert, that Infants not baptized, necessarily perish, or are deprived of the Kingdom of God, nor do I doubt, but that the Elect Infants dying in infancy are sanctified, yea if it should be made known to us that they are sanctified, I should not doubt that they are to be baptized, remembering the saying of Peter, *Act.* 10. 47. *Can any man forbid Water, that these should not be baptized, who have received the Holy Ghost as we?*

Then you will say [make disciples] in that place, may be so expounded, as that it may include infants?

*Ans.* It follows not; but this only follows, that in case extraordinary, we may depart from the ordinary rule: But the ordinary rule is, make disciples, that is, by preaching the Gospell, make disciples, as appears from *Mark* 16. 15. and baptize them, to wit, whom you have made disciples, and in the ordinary course of ministry, we must follow the ordinary rule.

Perhaps some one will except, that Christ teacheth that such disciples should be baptized, but that the speech is not exclusive.

*Resur.* But it is meet he remember, who shall thus except, if institution be the rule of worship, it is necessary that he that shall administer the worship, binde himself to the rule, otherwise he will divide will-worship, and arrogate the Lords authority to himself: Surely the Apostle in the business of the Lords Supper, intimates this, when he bring to correct the aberrations of the *Corinthians*, concerning the Lords Supper he brings forth these words, *1 Cor.* 11. 23. *For I have received of the Lord, that which I also have delivered unto you.*

Besides that Christ *Mat.* 19. 4. 8. argues from the institution of Marriage,

### concerning Infant-Baptisme.

Marriage, is against Divorce for a light cause, and Polygamie, because it is said, Two, not more than two shall be one flesh; so in like manner it may be here argued, Christ said Baptizing them, and not others, therefore these and not others are to be baptized.

But as for him who gathers from this place, infants are to be baptized, because Christ commands all Nations to be baptized, verily he is faulty. 1. In casting away that restriction that Christ hath put. 2. By determining that all men whatsoever are to be baptized, so that this is not a privilege of believers and their children, but common with them, to all Infidels and their children.

And in very deed, however assertors of Infant-baptisme, crack of a privilege of believers and their off-spring, not only the usual practice of baptizing any little children offered, but also sayings prove, that men have gone far, not only from Christ's institution, but also from the principles, upon which men at this day are busie to establish Infant-baptisme. I shall prove this by some instances. In the 59. Epistle of *Cyprian to Fidus*, from which *Augustine* is wont in his disputations against the *Pelagians* to take his proof for Infant-baptisme, and to which *Water's* attribute much, although that I may say no worse, without cause, this reason is pure, why he was not silent to *Bishop Fidus*, who thought that an Infant was not to be baptized, afore the eighth day, according to the Law of ancient Circumcision, *We all rather judge, that the mercy and grace of God is to be denied to none, that is born of men.*

By the answer of *Augustine to Bonifacius*, *Tom.* 2. *Epist.* 23. Enquiring concerning the truth of *Suetetis*, in affirming the unknown faith of little ones, and promising for them, it will appear to the Reader, that the baptism of any little ones offered to baptism, is defended by him. Although they were not brought, that they might be regenerated to eternal life, by spiritual grace, but because they think by the remedy [I use the words of *Augustine*] to retain or receive temporal health; *John Gerhard, Loc. Theolog.* *Tom.* 4. de Baptis. Cap. 7. *Secl.* 4. defends the practice of the Ancients baptizing the Children of unbelievers: And the words of *Mr. Samuel Butler*, *Secl.* in his Booke lately put forth in the *English* tongue, intitled *A peaceable and temperate plea*, &c. *12.* arg. 7. seems to me to exceed too much to this opinion, The words are these, *If then the fever in Pauls time were holy by Covenant,*  
D 2  
best

## An Exercitation about Infant-Baptisme

John Tombes, 1646

himself for the present the *Sons* were branches broken off, for unbelief, much more seeing God hath chosen the race and nation of the Gentiles, and is become a God to us and to our seed, the seed must be holy, with holiness of the chosen nation, and holiness external of the Covenant, notwithstanding the Father and Mother were as wicked as the Jews, who slew the Lord of glory.

And the grave confutation of *Brennifer*, by *Rathband*, Part. 3. Page 50. Fourthly, Children may be lawfully admitted to Baptisme, though their *Idol* Parents be profane, if those who are instead of Parents to them do require Baptisme for them, and give their promise to the Church for their religious Education, seeing they may lawfully be accounted within Gods Covenant, if any of their Ancestors in any Generation were faithful. *Exod.* 20. 5.

Lastly, if this Argument be not of force, Christ commandeth first to Disciple, and then to baptize those that are Discipled; to exclude Infants from Baptisme; neither will the argument be of force, from *1 Cor.* 11. 28. *Let a man examine himself, and so let him eat*, to exclude infants from the Lords Supper, for by the like elusion this argument may be rejected by saying, that the speech of the Apostle is not exclusive, and is to be understood of receiving the Lords Supper by persons grown only, yea, verily, neither will the argument be of force from the institution of the Supper, *Mat.* 26. 26, 27, therefore only believers are to be admitted to the Lords Supper. If any reply. But the Apostle *1 Cor.* 10. 8. 11. hath declared, that the institution is exclusive, the same may be said of the institution of Baptism, from the following Argument.

**Arg. 3.**  
§ 16. The argument from *John Baptis* and the Apostles practice against infant-baptism confirmed.

**T**HE third Argument is taken from the practice of the Apostles and *John Baptis*, which is the best interpreter of our Lords institution, from whence the Argument is thus formed:

That tenet and practice, which being put: Baptisme cannot be admitted as *John Baptis* and the Apostles did administer it, agrees not with the practice of *John Baptis* and the Apostles.

But the tenet and practice of Infant-baptisme being put: Baptism cannot be administered, as *John Baptis* and the Apostles administered it. *Ergo*.

The *Major* is of it self manifest.

The *Minor* is proved; Before the Baptisme of *John* even the Jews did confesse sine, the Apostles before baptism did require shewes

shewes of faith and repentance, but this cannot be done in the baptisme of Infants: The *Major* is proved by looking on these places, *Mat.* 3. 6. *Luk.* 3. 10. *Al.* 2. 38. *Al.* 8. 12, 13. and *ver.* 37. when the Eunuch had said to Philip, *What letteth me to be baptized?* Philip answered, *If thou believest with thy whole heart thou mayst*; he implies the defect of faith to be an impediment of Baptisme, *Al.* 9. 18. *Al.* 20. 47. *Al.* 11. 17, 18. *Al.* 16. 15, 33, 33. *Al.* 18. 8. *Al.* 19. 5. *Al.* 22. 16.

This Argument is confirmed, for if it be rightly argued from *1 Cor.* 11. 28. That the Lords Supper is not to be granted to Infants, because full-examination is pre-required, by like reason we may say Baptisme is not to be yielded to infants, because repentance and faith are pre-required, *Al.* 2. 38. *Al.* 8. 37. and that of those who are defended from *Abraham*, and to whom the promise was.

**T**HE fourth Argument is taken from the practice of the next Age after the Apostles.

That tenet and practice is doubtful of which it cannot be proved that it was in force or use, in the next Age after the Apostles.

But it cannot be proved that the tenet or practice of Infant-baptisme was in force or use in the Age next after the Apostles, *Ergo*.

The *Major* is of it self manifest.

The *Minor* is proved by the testimony of *Eusebius* *Yves* above recited, to which *Yves* in his *Historia Theologica*, of Infant-baptisme, joynes the testimony of *Valerianus Strabo*, and by the examining of places brought to that purpose, and by the continuation of questions propounded to the Baptized in Ages following, and other tokens from Councils and Ecclesiasticall writers, which in Historiall business are wont to beget credit.

The words of *Valerianus Strabo*, who lived about the year 840, in his book de *rebus Ecclesiasticis*, Chap. 26. are these, We are also to note, that in the first times the grace of Baptisme was wont only to be given to them, who by integrity both of body and minde were already come to this, that they could know and understand what profit is to be obtained in baptism, what is to be confessed and believed, what lastly, is to be observed of them that are born again in Christ.

**Arg. 4.**  
§ 17. The argument from the practice in the Age next the Apostles against infant-baptism confirmed.

Arg. 4.  
§ 17. The ar-  
gument from  
the wrong  
original of  
Infant-bap-  
tism, confir-  
med against  
it.

The fifth Argument:

That which in succeeding Ages, in which it was in use, was in force, 1. as a Tradition not written. 2. Out of imitation of Jewish Circumcision; 3. Without universall practice; 4. Together with the error of giving Infants the Lords supper, and many other humane inventions, under the name of Apostollicall traditions; That is defectively doubtful.

But in some ages after the first from the Apostles, the tenet and practice of Infant-Baptism was in use, 1. as a tradition not written, as appears from *Origen*, *Hem* on *Rem. 6*. Of which book I will not write the life me add the censure of *Erasmus* on the Homilies of *Origen* upon *Leviticus*, But he that reads this Work, and the enarration of the *Epistle to the Romans*, is uncertain whether he read *Origen* or *Rufinus*. And the testimony fetched from these books for Infant-Baptism, is so much the more to be suspected, because *Augustine*, *Hierom*, &c. rely (so far as yet is manifest to me) on no other testimony, then of *Cyprian* and his fellow-Bishops in the Council, of which mention is made *Epist. 59. ad Fidum*.

Secondly, out of imitation of Jewish Circumcision, as the doubt of *Fidus*, in the 59. Epistle of *Cyprian* to *Fidus*, intimates, though there were also other reasons of Infant-baptism; as the opinion of the necessity of Baptism to salvation, and the greediness to increase the number of Christians, and perhaps the imitation of heathenish superstition of little ones; and some other.

Thirdly, without universall practice: for it is manifest that *Constance*, although born of *Helena* his mother, a Christian, was not baptized till aged, as *Eusebius* in the life of *Constantine* written by him. The same is manifest from the book of Confessions of *Augustine*, concerning *Augustine* himself, whose mother *Monica* was a Christian. The things which may be drawn out of *Theodoret*, *Augustine*, and others, concerning *Theodosius*, *Alipius*, *Aleodatus*, and many others (although my books and notes out of them are wanting to me, by reason of the injury of the times) unless I be deceived will evince that (though in the Churches of those times, little ones were baptized, yet) many were not baptized; whose baptism is likely the Church would sooner have dispatched, if the opinion of Baptism that now obtains, had then obtained.

Fourthly, together with the error of giving the Lords supper to Infants, as is manifest out of the book of *Cyprian* de lapsis, and others.

thers. And that many other Inventions of men under the name of Apostollicall tradition, out of a wrong liking of Iudaisme, did then prevail, as the *Pajchall solemnity*, &c. is so obvious to him that reads Fathers and Ecclesiasticall writers, that no man will need proofe, *Ergo*.

And in very deed, as of old, because the rite of Infant-baptism seemed to be of so great moment against the *Plagian* heresie, and for the authority of the Council under *Cyprian*, the Council of *Milevis*, *Augustine*, *Hierom* and others, rather then from any solid argument out of Scripture, in former ages, Infant-baptism prevailed; so in this last age, some modern men seem to embrace this tenet of Infant-baptism, out of horror of misse, lest they should go headlong into the pernicious errors of former Anabaptists, and their mad furries, or lest they should seem to desert the leading men of the Reformed Churches, or move troubles in the Church; rather then from perspicuous foundation in the Scriptures. Which they will think that I have not said as one that dreams, who shall read what *Robert Lord Brook* hath in the end of his Treatise concerning Episcopacie, *Daniel Rogers* in his treatise of Baptism, and others elsewhere.

The sixth Argument follows:

That which hath occasioned many humane inventions, partly by which Infant-baptism is self may be under propped, partly the defect in the policy of the Church, which in very deed is to be supplied by the lawful life of B-pism. Of that it is self-doubtful whether it be not in itself weak and insufficient for its proper work.

But the matter is for in the business of Infant-baptism,

*Ergo*.

The Minor is proved by instances: they are,

1. The use of lutes in Baptism, which is an humane invention, for a shadowy supplement, and I had almost said sporting, of that profession of faith which at first was made by the baptized in his own person.

2. Episcopall confirmation, in which the Bishop layes hands or anoints the catechized, that B-pism, or the baptized may be confirmed, and they made capable of the Lords supper.

3. The reformed union, by examination, confession, subscription, of the received doctrine in the Church, before the communion of the

Arg. 6.  
§ 19. Because  
giveness a  
gainst Infant-  
baptism.  
from humane  
inventions oc-  
casioned by it  
confirmed.

## An Exercitation about Infant-Baptisme

John Tombes, 1646

the Eucharist, of which *Parker of Eccles. polities*, l. 3. c. 16.

4. The Church-covenant, as they call it, afore the admission of members into Church-fellowship p. 16 which the *New-England Elders* in the little book in English, call'd *Church-Covenant*, which in very deed are devised to supply the place of Baptisme; for by Baptisme, according to Christs institution, a person is exhibited a member of Christ and the Church, 1 *Cor.* 12. 13. *Gal.* 3. 27. *Eph.* 4. 5.

Arg. 7.  
§. 10. The argument against Infant-baptism, from the Errors occasioned by it, confirmed.

The seventh Argument:

That which hath occasioned many errors, that is deservedly doubtfull, whether it be right,

But the practise of Infant-baptisme hath occasioned either the birth or fostering of many errors. *Ergo*.

It is proved by instances:

1. That Baptisme confers grace by the work done.
2. That Baptisme is Regeneration.
3. That Infants dying, are saved by the faith of their parents, faith of surerets, of the Church receiving into her lap: which is to be ascribed alone to the grace of God by Christ.
4. That some regenerate persons may utterly fall from grace.

Arg. 8.  
§. 11. The argument against Infant-baptism, from many abuses caused by it, confirmed.

The eighth Argument:

That which hath caused many abuses and faults in Discipline, and Divine worship, and Conversation of men, that is deservedly doubtfull.

But Infant-Baptisme is such, *Ergo*.

It is proved by enumeration.

1. Private baptisme.
2. Baptisme by women.
3. Baptisme of Infants not yet brought into light.
4. Baptisme of Infants of uncertain progeny, whom we call children of the earth and world.
5. They are baptized in the name of the Lord, who know not the Lord, nor have ever consented, or perhaps will consent to the confession of the name of our Lord.
6. It hath brought in the admission of ignorant and profane men into the communion of the Church, and to the Lords supper: for who can deny rightly, the right of the Church to the baptized?

7. It

concerning Infant-Baptisme.

7. It perverts the order of discipline, that first a man be baptized and after among the catechized.

8. The Sacrament of baptisme is turned into a meer Ceremony, yea into a profane meeting to feast together.

9. Men forget Baptisme, as if they were never baptized, so that it hath the force of a carnall rite, not of a spirituall Institution.

10. It takes away, or at least diminisheth zeale, and industry in knowing the Gospel.

THE ninth Argument.

That is deservedly doubtfull. that yeeldeth occasion to many unnecessary disputes, fostering only contention, and which cannot be determined by any certain rule.

But the tenor or rite of Infant-baptisme is such,

*Ergo*.

It is proved by instances.

1. Of baptizing the Infants of Excommunicated persons.
2. Of baptizing the Infants of Apostates.
3. Of baptizing the Infants of such Parents as are not members in a gathered Church.
4. Of baptizing the Infants of those, whole Ancestors were believers, the next Parents remaining in unbelief; These things shew that men have departed from the Rule, when they know not where to stay.

Arg. 9.  
§. 12. The argument against Infant-baptisme, from unnecessary disputes caused by it against Infant-baptisme, confirmed.

THE tenth reason of doubting is,

That in the midst of the darknesse under the Papacye the same men §. 13. The ar-  
opposed Infant-baptisme, who opposed invocation of Saints, prayer generall against Infant-  
for the dead, adoration of the Croise, and such like; This is manifest baptism from  
out of the 66. Sermon of *Bernard*, on the *Canticles*, where of the He- the opposition  
retiques (as he calls them) who he said boasted themselves to be Suc- to be in the  
cessors of the Apostles, and name themselves Apotitiques, he hath middle of  
these words, *They deserve us, because we baptize Infants, because we Doper, com-  
pray for the dead, because we ask the suffrages of the Saints, and in his firmed.*  
140. Epistle to *Hildefronse*, Earl of Saint Giles, he complains of *Hem- ricus* the Heretique, formerly a Monk, that *He took away holy- dayer, Sacraments, Churches, Priests, that the life of Christ is stopped*  
to the little ones of Christians, while the grace of Baptisme is denied, and they are not suffered to draw near to salvation.

Arg. 10.  
§. 14. The argument against Infant-baptisme, from the many abuses caused by it, confirmed.

E

From

An Exeritation about Infant-Baptisme

John Tombes, 1646

©2008 New Orleans Baptist Theological Seminary & Lloyd A. Harsch

From the Epistle of Peter Abbat. Cluniacense, to three Bishops of France, against Peter de Bruis, and Henricus, holding errors, digested into five heads.

1. That little ones are not to be baptized.
2. That Churches or Altars ought not to be made.
3. That the Croſſe of our Lord is not to be adored or Worſhipped, but rather to be broken and trodden under feet.
4. That the Maſſe is nothing, nor ought to be celebrated.
5. That the good deeds of the living, nothing profit the dead; That we are not to chaunt to God. He ſaith, that the heretic of the Petro-bruſians was received in the Cities of Gallia Narbonenſis.

And from Lucas Oſander his Epitome of the Eccleſiaſticall Hiſtory, C. 13. l. 1. c. 4. at the year 1207, where he accuſeth the Albigeſes as conſenting with the Albigeniſts.

To which I adde, That in the ages next the Apoſtles, Tertullian and Gregory Nazianzen diſſuade the baptiſme of Infants, unleſſe the danger of death preſent. The words of Tertullian are in his book of Baptiſme, c. 18. Therefore for the condition and diſpoſition, alſo age of each perſon, the delaying of Baptiſme is more profitable: For chiefly about little ones; for what need that the Sacrament be alſo caſt upon ſinners, who themſelves may by mortality be wanting to their promiſes, and be deceived by the cunning ſmith of an evil diſpoſition. The Lord ſaith indeed, Do not prohibit them to come to me; let them come when they are grown, let them come when they are young, let them be taught when they come, let them be made Chriſtians when they can know Chriſt. Why deſt innocent age hoſten to the remiſſion of finnes? ſhall it be done more warily in things ſecular, that to whom earthly ſubſtance is not committed, ſhould? Let them know how to aſk ſafety, that thou maieſt learn to give it him that aſketh.

Gregory Nazianzen, in his 40. Oration of holy Baptiſme:

For who have are to ſee all diſcrepancy, that we miſſe not the common grace. Some one will ſay, let this thing be concerning them that ſeek Baptiſme: but what may you ſay concerning them that are yet babes, and neither perceive loſſe, nor grace? ſhall we alſo baptiſe them? Yes by all means; if any danger urges; for it is better that they be ſanctified without receiving it, then to go away unſealed or unaccompliſhed. And the preſent of this, to wit, is Circumciſion on the eighth day, being a certain typical ſeal or offered to them that had not yet the uſe of reaſon, as alſo the anointing of the poſt, which by things without feeling pre-

ſerved

ſerved the firſt born. And for others, I give my opinion that they ſtill three years, or a little within this, or beyond it, when they may be able to hear and underſtand ſome myſticall points, if they cannot underſtand perfectly, yet being thus ſealed, they ſhall ſanctiſie both ſoules and bodies with the great myſtery of conſecration.

THE eleventh reaſon of doubting, is, Becauſe the Affectors of Infant-Baptiſme little agree among themſelves, upon what foundation they may build Infant-Baptiſme. Cyprian and others of the Ancients draw it from the univerſality of divine grace, and the neceſſity of Baptiſme to ſalvation. Auguſtine, Bernard, and others, bring the faith of the Church as the reaſon of baptizing Infants: Others, among whom is the Catechiſme in the Engliſh Language, put as the reaſon of Infant-Baptiſme, the poſſeſſion of the Sacrament, in the place of the faith and repentance of the baptized. The Lutherans, the faith of the Infant; others, the holineſſe of a believing Nation; others, the faith of the next parents; others, the faith of the next parent in covenant in a gathered Church. This difference of the maintainers of Infant-Baptiſm, deſervedly cauſeth doubt concerning the thing it ſelf.

THE laſt, and that a weighty reaſon of doubting, is, becauſe Infant-Baptiſme ſeemes to take away one, perhaps the primary end of Baptiſm; for many things argue that it was one end of Baptiſm, that it ſhould be a ſigne that the baptized ſhews himſelf a diſciple, and confeſſeth the faith in which he hath been inſtructed.

1. The requiring of confeſſion by John Baptiſt and the Apoſtles, the caſtend was wont to be before Baptiſm, Luk. 3. 16. Mat. 23. 35. Mat. 16. 21. of Baptiſm, 2. The frequent manner of ſp-aking in the new Teſtament, which puts Baptiſm for D. C. rime, Mat. 10. 37. Mat. 19. 23. ſhews this, in his Annot. on Mat. 19. 23. The author is moſt appoſite, in which they ſignifie that they profeſſed in Baptiſm the doctrine propounded by John, and confirmed by uſe of Baptiſme with which they had been baptized, whereby they had acknowledged Chriſt but very ſenderly.

3. The form of Chriſts inſtitution, Mat. 28. 19. compared with the phraſe as it is uſed 1 Cor. 1. 13. Or, were you baptized into the name of Paul? implies the ſame. On which place Beza,

The third reaſon is taken from the form and end of Baptiſme, in which we give our name to Chriſt, being called upon, With the Father and Holy Spirit.

## An Exercitation about Infant-Baptiſme

John Tombes, 1646

Ar.  
§. 10. T.  
gunent  
gainst I.  
baptism,  
the first  
catholic  
doctrine

Ar.  
§. 11. T.  
gunent  
gainst I.  
baptism,  
the first  
catholic  
doctrine

*An Exercitation, &c.*

4. That which is said, *Job. 4. 2. He made and baptized more disciples.* And *Mat. 28. 19. Going, make disciples in all nations, baptizing them;* Intimate this. And if, as some affirm, Baptism was in use with the Jews, in the initiating of proselytes into the profession of Judaism; this opinion is the more confirmed. But in Infant-Baptism the matter is so carried, that Baptism serves to confirm a benefit, not to signify a profession made: and so one, Perhaps the chief end of Baptism is voyded. And here I think it is to be minded, that the usual description of a Sacrament, and such as are like to it, that it is a *visible signe of invisible grace*; hath occasioned the misunderstanding of both Sacraments, as if they signified a divine benefit, not our duty, to which in the first place the Institution had respect.

It seems to some, that Infant-baptism should be good, because the Devil requires Witches to renounce it. Which reason, if ought worth, might as well prove Baptism of any Infants, Baptism by a Midwife, good; because these the Devil requires them to renounce as well that which is of the Infants of believers, by a lawfull Minister. But the true reason why he requires the Baptism of Witches to be renounced by them, is not because the Baptism is good in respect of the administration of it, but because the Faith mentioned in the form of Baptism, is good; and they that renounce not their baptism, do shew their adherence to that faith in some sort, which cannot stand with an explicate covenant with the Devil. Nor is the assuming of baptism in ripe yeares by those who were walled in infancy, a renouncing of baptism, as some in their grosse ignorance conceit; but indeed a firmer avouching of baptism according to Christs command.

This more likely might be inferred from the Devils practise in requiring Witches to renounce their baptism; That the profession of Faith is the main business in Baptism, which should be before Baptism, if it were rightly administered after the first pattern.

FINIS

An Exercitation about Infant-Baptisme

John Tombes, 1646

©2008 New Orleans Baptist Theological Seminary & Lloyd A. Harsch