

administered by the ministers of Christ. Both baptisms travelled on in view of one another. If therefore christians excluded infants from their baptism and adopted immersion for their mode, it is strange that we hear nothing of glorying or complaining, of no difference or party collision. The unbelieving Jew might glory over the christian, "Our religion cares for infants, yours does not, and your novel device of immersion is neither more decent nor more expressive than the sprinkling which God commanded of old. The weak believing Jew might complain, "Formerly we had both circumcision and baptism to console us concerning our infants, now we have nothing."—But, if both parties sprinkled adults and infants, there was no occasion of difference on these points, and we hear none.

I have not mentioned circumcision or any of the other arguments commonly urged in favor of infant baptism, not that I undervalue them, but because I write this little book, which must leave out many useful arguments.\* I only insist upon one which I think plainer and more level to common capacities, and which has been too much neglected.

The sum of the argument is this. The law of Moses furnished the Old Testament Church with a plain, positive command to baptize adults and infants by sprinkling. The prophets handed over this sprinkling to the New Testament Church, with promises of suitable alterations. The Evangelists take it, thus altered like the Sabbath according to the spirit of the New Testament, and hand it down to all future generations. And thus I hope the practice will continue till the Son of Man shall appear in the clouds.

IV. I humbly trust that there is not a sentence in the New Testament, if candidly explained, which will be found inconsistent with the view of baptism here given; but I will briefly review the principal passages brought to support the opposite side.

Mark xvi. 16: "He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved."—Hence it is inferred that infants, who cannot believe, should not be baptized; but the inference is not just. The proposition expressed by these words was quite as true all along, from Moses to Christ, when millions of infants were baptized by the positive command of God, as it is now, and therefore it is quite as consistent with infant baptism now as then. Question—What good can baptism do to an infant? Answer—Would God have commanded it, from Moses to Christ, if it could do no good? and what can prevent it from doing good now more than then? It may do great good directly by God's blessing on the ordinance, and indirectly by animating the parents to duty.

John iii. 23: "John was baptizing in Enon near to Salim, because there was much water (were many waters there)." A favorer of immersion readily thinks that the words "because there was much water there," are inserted on purpose to remove a difficulty supposed to attend immersion rather than sprinkling, and thus to decide in its favor. But such a person totally

---

\* The following was contained in the first copies in MS.—"By the covenant of circumcision God, who had blessed Abraham, engaged to be the covenant God of his seed, and gave his male infants the privilege of circumcision. Now the blessing of Abraham comes upon the Gentiles. Baptism is in the place of circumcision, for Paul says in Philippians, "We are the circumcision," and to the Colossians, "In whom (viz., Christ) ye are circumcised—buried with him in baptism;" and therefore it is fairly inferred that the male infants of believers should be baptized, and the females too as in Christ there is no difference of sex. To this agree the words of our Saviour, "Suffer the little children to come unto me—for of such is the kingdom of heaven," and the words of Paul, "Else were your children unclean, but now are they holy." Thus christian baptism succeeds circumcision as an initiating, and divers baptisms as a purifying ordinance."