

V. BABY BELIEF FROM KNOX TILL THE WESTMINSTER STANDARDS

John Knox had become a Romish priest in the same year that Calvin as a Protestant published the first edition of his *Institutes of the Christian Religion* -- in 1536. Knox's countryman George Wishart, having himself embraced Protestantism, had returned from Switzerland with the *First Helvetic Confession*. It was during the year of Wishart's martyrdom in his native Scotland, that Knox himself became a Protestant -- in 1545.

A decade later, Knox went to Europe. There he studied under Calvin, and helped edit the famous *Geneva Bible*. It was therefore with first-hand knowledge that Knox called Calvin's Geneva "the most perfect school of Christ that ever was on the earth since the days of the Apostles."¹ Thus, long before the time of Calvin's death in 1564, Knox had already become a fully committed Calvinist.

390. John Knox a paidobaptistic Calvinist before leaving Geneva

Knox was one of the Ministers of the English-speaking congregation of Marian refugees -- in Geneva. There they employed the "Form and Prayers and Ministration of the Sacrament *etc.* used in the English Congregation at Geneva and approved by the famous and Godly learned man M. John Calvin."

Thus Knox himself, in the words of the appropriate heading in his later *Works*.² Indeed, Knox's *Genevan Service Book* is derived in almost every respect straight from Calvin -- even as regards Calvin's baptismal services.

In 1557, while in Dieppe and before returning to Scotland, Knox wrote some letters to his brethren and 'lords professing the truth' in Scotland. One such letter was recently edited by Kevin Reed and republished under the title: *A Warning Against the Anabaptists*.³ There,⁴ Knox condemns those who "have separated themselves from the society and communion of their brethren in[to] sects damnable and most pernicious."

Those sectarian Anabaptists, conceded Knox, really do "have a zeal.... But alas, it is not according to knowledge.... This sort of men fall from the society of Christ's little flock, with contempt of His sacraments and holy ordinances by us truly maintained." Indeed, "they require a greater purity than ever was found in any congregation since the beginning."

Knox now immediately went on to insist that the Anabaptists "shall not escape judgment and condemnation." This is so, declared Knox, "because they do despise Christ Jesus and His holy ordinances."

Indeed, the Anabaptists were not at all like the 'apostolic age' Christians who had been ejected from Judaism's "synagogue of Satan." Mark 13:9-13 and Revelation 2:9 & 3:9. Nor were the Anabaptists like the Protestants who had just been removed from the Romish

Neo-Babylon. Revelation 17:5 and 18:4; compare Second Thessalonians 2:3-17f. Rather were the Anabaptists exactly analogous to the Proto-Gnostics -- who opposed the apostolic Christians, and who castigated their infant baptism. Colossians 2:9-23 (*q.v.*).

Just a few paragraphs after writing his above-cited words, Knox wrote that even though "the Papists are busy to espy our offences, faults and infirmities..., they are not the enemies most to be feared. For...of the other [Anabaptist] sort of whom before we have somewhat spoken, the craft and malice of the devil fighting against Christ is more covert and therefore more to be feared."

Just think of it -- Anabaptism "more" to be feared than even Romanism! For the Anabaptists, insisted Knox, were "privy blasphemers of Christ Jesus; supplanters of His dignity; and manifest enemies to the free justification which comes by faith in His blood."

391. After returning to Scotland Knox still heeded Calvin on baptism

Having safely returned to Scotland, Knox communicated with Calvin on 27th August 1559 -- *inter alia* about the administration of baptism.⁵ Calvin then responded⁶ to the baptismal problems mooted by Knox, and told him "it be lawful to admit to the sacrament of baptism the children of [Romish] idolaters and excommunicated persons."

For "the interruption of piety which has prevailed in Popery." explained Calvin, "has not taken away from baptism its force and efficacy.... Offspring descended from holy and pious ancestors belong to the body of the Church, though their fathers and grandfathers may have been apostates" -- Isaiah 59:21 and Romans 11:11-32. Indeed, provided the "conduct of only one parent" was satisfactory -- "we see no reason for rejecting any child for whom a due pledge has been given."

392. Knox's anti-Anabaptist Scottish writings after 1559

In 1560, Knox himself wrote a considerable treatise with the title: *An Answer to a Great Number of Blasphemous Cavillations Written by an Anabaptist and Adversary*. There, he told the Anabaptists that "with the Pelagians and Papists, you have become teachers of free will and defenders of your own justice."

He added: "our poison is more pestilent than that of the Papistry was in the beginning."⁷ Indeed, he added elsewhere: "We damn the error of the Anabaptists who deny baptism to appertain to children."⁸

Once more, Knox had again insisted that Anabaptism is worse than Papism. For the Anabaptist "poison is more pestilent than that of the Papistry was in the beginning."

Soon after Knox's return to Scotland, the Scottish Reform Party -- under the leadership of the six Johns (John Knox, John Spottiswood, John Willock, John Row, John Wynram and John

Douglas) -- began to dominate the national religious scene. At the invitation of the Scottish Parliament, the six Johns offered the *Scots Confession*.

This was subtitled their "*Confession of Faith Professed and Believed by the Protestants within the Realm of Scotland...grounded upon the Infallible Truth of God's Word.*" After ratified and approved by Parliament, it remained the doctrinal standard of the Scottish Church right down till 1647. Only then would it be replaced -- by the *Westminster Confession of Faith*.⁹

393. The First Scots Confession: covenant infants are to be baptized

The Christian Church, explained the *First Scots Confession*,¹⁰ is that body which professes to "believe in one God -- Father, Son, and Holy Ghost. Matthew 28:19.... This Kirk...is universal.... It is therefore called the communion...of saints who, as citizens of the heavenly Jerusalem, have the fruit of inestimable benefits -- one God, one Lord Jesus, one faith, and one baptism. Ephesians 4:5.... We comprehend the children with the believing parents. Acts 2:39."

According to this *First Scots Confession*,¹¹ the "sacraments...were instituted by God...to exercise the faith of His children and...to seal in their hearts the assurance of His promise.... Romans 6:3-5 & Galatians 3:27.... If the recipient does not understand what is being done, the sacrament is not being rightly used."

The language here is very precise. It does not say that as long as the recipient's parent understands the sacrament and believes in the Lord Jesus, his or her infant may forthwith be baptized (even though still without any personal understanding).

To the contrary. It says even in respect of the infant that "if the recipient[!] does not understand what is being done, the sacrament is not being rightly used."

Naturally, the infant could then understand only in a purely infantile way. Yet such an infantile understanding is nevertheless to be presupposed, wherever baptism is "being rightly used"

Indeed, "the fathers under the law...had two chief sacraments -- that is, circumcision and the passover.... Genesis 17:10f & Numbers 9:13.... Now, in the time of the Gospel, we have two chief sacraments..., that is, baptism and the supper.... Matthew 28:19; Mark 16:15f; Luke 22:19f.... These sacraments, both of the Old Testament and of the New, were instituted by God...to make a visible distinction between His people and those who were without."¹²

The *First Scots Confession* then concludes:¹³ "We abandon the teaching of the Roman Church.... They even allow women, whom the Holy Ghost will not permit to preach in the congregation, to baptize...."

"We hold that baptism applies as much to the [infant] children of the faithful as to those who are of age and discretion. And so we condemn the error of the Anabaptists, who deny that [infant] children should be baptized.... Colossians 2:11f; Romans 4:11; Genesis 17:10; Matthew 28:19."

394. The First Book of Discipline and triune baptism

In December 1560, the first Scottish General Assembly of the Reformed Church (Presbyterian) asked the authors of the *Scots Confession* to prepare also a practical supplement. This latter was the *First Book of Discipline*. When ready, it simply endorsed the *Order of Geneva* -- as regards the section on the administration of baptism.¹⁴

So it was the 'form of baptism' used in Switzerland's Geneva that -- by way of the *First Book of Discipline* written by Knox and other Scottish Calvinists -- was incorporated into the *Book of Common Order* for use within the Presbyterian Church of Scotland. The conviction of the writers of that *Book of Common Order*, was thus the Biblical perception that the children of believers are **Christians already, before** being baptized in their infancy.

Indeed, these covenant children were regarded as having been sanctified by the Holy Spirit from their very conception -- and hence from even before their birth.¹⁵ It is precisely because they were deemed to be already federally holy before baptism -- that they were entitled to receive that sacrament.

The *First Book of Discipline* provides that "to Christ Jesus...of necessity it is that His holy sacraments be annexed.... They be two, to wit, baptism and the holy supper.... The *Order of Geneva* which now is used in some of our churches, is sufficient to instruct the diligent reader how that both these sacraments may be rightly ministered....

"In baptism, we acknowledge nothing to be used except the element of water only.... Anabaptists, Arians, or other such [are] enemies of the Christian religion.... Baptism may be ministered whensoever the Word is preached.... Many are deceived, thinking that children be damned if they die without baptism." This is indeed a "gross error."¹⁶

Rev. Dr. J.K. Cameron, Professor of Church History at the University of St. Andrews, makes a valuable comment in respect of this very point in the *First Book of Discipline*. "The doctrine of the mediaeval Church that infants who die without receiving baptism were consigned to limbo," explains Cameron,¹⁷ "was rejected by Calvin and Calvinists."

So, the *First Book of Discipline* endorses the Calvinist Knox's Swiss *Order of Geneva* -- as regards its own section on the administration of baptism.¹⁸ Indeed, this *Order* says that by "baptism, once received, is signified that we (both infants as well as others of age and discretion) -- being strangers from God [previously] by original sin -- are received into His family and Congregation with full assurance."¹⁹

Next year, 1561, the *Preface* to that *First Book of Discipline* appeared. The *Preface* states²⁰ that "our infants appertain to Him [God] by covenant, and therefore ought not to be defrauded of those holy signs and badges whereby His children are known from infidels and pagans. Genesis 17; Colossians 2; Acts 2."

Still describing covenant children, the *Preface* then continues: "They be contained under the name of God's people.... Remission of sins in the blood of Christ Jesus doth appertain unto

them by God's promise.... Paul...pronounceth the children begotten and born (either of the parents being faithful) to be clean and holy. First Corinthians 7....

"The Holy Ghost assure[s] us that infants be of the number of God's people and that remission of sins doth also appertain to them in Christ.... Almighty God [is] their Father." For they are "His children bought with the blood of His dear Son."

395. The Belgic Confession versus the Council of Trent

The whole of the United Netherlands from Friesland to Flanders had been badly attacked by the anarchy of Anabaptism, especially from 1526 to 1546. After that, during Romish persecution, the Belgian Calvinist Guido de Bré s had been a refugee in England --from 1548 till 1554. There, he had greatly been strengthened by the Calvinism of those supporting King Edward VI. He then returned to the Netherlands, where he continued his struggle against the Romanists and especially against the Anabaptists.

This can be seen in his famous 1562 *Belgic Confession*. For it attacks both the Romish and the Anabaptist doctrines of baptism -- and indeed many of the other Anabaptist and Romish doctrines too.

The 1545 Romish Council of Trent had made a very important statement. It had said:²¹ "If anybody denies that by the grace conferred in baptism the guilt (*reatum*) of original sin is remitted; or even asserts that the whole (*totum*) of that...sin is not taken away...or not imputed -- let him be accursed!"

This long-standing Romish heresy of baptismal regenerationism is flatly refuted in the 1562 *Belgic Confession* of the Dutch Reformed Church. The *Belgica* was later adopted as the official doctrinal standard of the Dutch Reformed family of denominations worldwide.

Now the *Belgica* states that "through the disobedience of Adam, original sin is extended to all mankind. Romans 5:12f; Psalm 51:7; Romans 3:10; Genesis 6:3; John 3:6; Job 14:4." This "is a corruption of the whole nature" or character of fallen humanity. Indeed, it is "an hereditary disease wherewith infants themselves are infected even in their mother's womb. Isaiah 48:8 & Romans 5:14.... Nor is it by any means abolished or done away with by baptism."²²

Trent had stated that baptism itself remits the whole (*totum*) of original sin, together with its guilt (*reatum*). Indeed, Trent had further alleged²³ that this is done *ex opere operato* (alias quite mechanically). So the *Belgica* now replied, to the contrary, that original sin is not by any means abolished or done away with by baptism. Thus the 1561 original French-Walloon text.²⁴ Similarly, also the first Flemish-Dutch version.²⁵

After the printing in 1564 of the Romish *Canons of Trent*,²⁶ the Dutch Reformed Synod of 1566 added to its *Belgica* the words 'nor totally eradicated.' The appropriate phrase in this article of the amended *Belgica* thus states about original sin: "Nor is it by any means abolished nor totally eradicated by baptism."²⁷

The official North-Netherlands translation, published in Middelburg in 1611, is in some respects even stronger. That reads: "even by baptism itself it was not totally abolished nor wholly eradicated."²⁸ Taking this together with the Walloon and the Latin texts, the meaning is thus: original sin is not, as indeed taught by the Romanists, either 'totally abolished' or 'wholly eradicated' by baptism.²⁹

Only the blood of Jesus totally abolishes both the guilt and the stain of original sin -- and of all other sins flowing from it. Yet baptism refers to both. This is why it is important to give the exact focus and location of the Romish baptismal error.

Rome does **not** err in **associating** baptism with the washing away of sin. Rome errs in denying that the sins of early-dying unbaptized fetuses are washed away by grace through fetal faith in the cleansing blood of Christ alone. Rome errs in assuming that sin is washed away by baptism itself (rather than only by the blood of Christ to which baptism refers). Indeed, Rome errs yet further: in restricting the significance of baptism to the washing away only of pre-baptismal sin (through the blood of Christ alone) -- instead of the washing away of all sins: past, present and future.

396. The Belgica condemns also the Anabaptist view of baptism

The *Belgica* then further proceeds to attack³⁰ both the Romanist and the Anabaptist doctrines of baptism. It declares that God ordained the "sacraments for us..., to nourish and to **strengthen** our faith. Romans 4:11; Genesis 9:13; 17:11....

"We believe and confess that Jesus Christ..., having abolished **circumcision** which was done with blood -- hath instituted the sacrament of baptism **instead** thereof.... [By] the sacrament of baptism...we are received into the [Visible] Church of God and separated from all other people and strange religions, [so] that we may wholly belong to Him Whose ensign and banner we bear. Colossians 2:11; First Peter 3:21; First Corinthians 10:2.... Therefore He has commanded [not just adults but] all those who are His to be baptized with pure water, in the Name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost. Matthew 28:19....

"This signifies to us that as water washes away the filth of the body when poured upon it, and is seen on the body of the baptized when sprinkled upon him, so does the blood of Christ by the power of the Holy Ghost internally sprinkle the soul...by the sprinkling of the precious blood of the Son.... First Corinthians 6:11; Titus 3:5; Hebrews 9:14; First John 1:7; Revelation 1:6."

Against the submersionism of mediaeval Romanism and the Unitarian Anabaptists, the *Belgica* here hammers home -- the **Biblical mode** of baptism. Thus it insists that the baptismal water is "poured upon" [and "poured upon"] or "sprinkled upon" [and "sprinkled upon"] the believer -- to show how the Holy Spirit does "internally sprinkle" and save the soul "by the sprinkling" of the blood of Jesus *etc.*

Further, continues the *Belgica*: "We believe that every man who is earnestly studious of obtaining life eternal, ought to be but once baptized with this only baptism, without ever repeating the same. Mark 16:16; Matthew 28:19; Ephesians 4:5; Hebrews 6:2. Since we cannot be born

twice. Neither does this baptism only avail us at the time when the water is poured upon us and received by us -- otherwise we would always have our head in the water -- but also throughout the whole course of our life. Acts 2:38 & 8:16.

"Therefore we detest the error of the Anabaptists who are not content with the one only baptism they have once received.... The infants of believers..., we believe, ought to be baptized and sealed with the sign of the covenant, Matthew 19:14 & First Corinthians 7:14 -- as the children in Israel formerly were circumcised upon the same promises which are made unto our children. Genesis 17:11f.... Christ shed His blood no less for the washing of the **children** of the **faithful** than for adult persons. Colossians 2:11f.... What circumcision was to the Jews -- that baptism is to our children."

Only subsequently (namely at or after teenage) are baptizees to be admitted to the Lord's supper. The purpose of the latter is "to nourish and support those whom He hath already regenerated and incorporated into His family. John 3:6.... We detest the error of the Anabaptists and other seditious people and in general all those who reject the higher powers and magistrates, and would subvert justice. Second Peter 2:10." Indeed, such Anabaptists would also "introduce a community of goods, and confound that decency and good order which God hath established among men. Jude 8 & 10."

397. Guido De Brés's 1570 book against the Anabaptists

The author of the *Belgica* -- Guido de Brés -- defended the baptism of covenant children elsewhere too. He did so, and also attacked rebaptism, in his other (1570) work: *The Radical Origin and Foundation of the Anabaptists*.

There he stated:³¹ "These two things we must observe in baptism. Namely, (1) the sign of water used as a seal, and (2) the body of those who have the truth of baptism.... The truth of baptism is also to be recognized in baptism.... That is the internal washing of souls in the blood of Christ...through the fellowship which we have with Him....

"One should note...to whom the sign of baptism applies. Holy Scripture clearly teaches us that it applies to the entire household of God; to the whole body of His congregation; that is, to all of those who are His people, both small and large.... Little **children**...[of the covenant] have the **sproutings of faith**.... One cannot include them among the unbelievers, until they come to their years or understanding....

"Between these two [believers and unbelievers], there is no intermediate position before God.... God regards them as and reckons them to be -- of the number of those who **believe in the Son**.... By grace and through Christ, the little children are regarded and reckoned by God as possessing all the virtues which [believing] adults possess -- by understanding, and through faith in the same Christ."

³²

The little children of the covenant, continued De Brés,³³ "are without contradiction the people of God.... The **little children** are also **regenerated**, by the power of God which is incomprehensible to us." From Luke 1:15 & 1:36 and Jeremiah 1:15 and First Corinthians 7:14

and Matthew 19:14 and Deuteronomy 30:6 and Acts 10:47 and Romans 8:7 -- it can be seen that the Holy Spirit is well able to work in children.

"Although the work of God is hidden to our understanding, notwithstanding, it is still true. Now it is certain and definite that God regenerates even children and make them new creatures -- namely those whom He justifies."³⁴

The Anabaptists essentially say³⁵ that "the small members of the body [alias the Church] are not enlivened by the Spirit of the body -- because they are small." Yet the Apostle says "that those who do not have Christ's Spirit, do not belong to Him [Romans 8:9]. But these little children do belong to Christ. Therefore, they have Christ's Spirit."

All children are indeed under the curse -- "except the children of believers who have been redeemed from such perdition by God's gracious acceptance and through the power of the promise and of the covenant.... Now, it is certain and sure that God even regenerates the little children. I say He makes those whom He saves, into new creatures.... They possess both rebirth and renewal...through Christ the Second Adam in His Spirit.... Regeneration is nothing other than an internal washing and purification."³⁶

Further: "According to the testimonies of God's Word, they [covenant babies] are incorporated and ingrafted into the death of Christ.... Similarly, a cutting is ingrafted into a tree and then draws the power and substance of that tree toward itself and partakes thereof [Romans 11:16]."³⁷

De Brés concluded:³⁸ "The tiny little children receive the sign of regeneration and of renewal (*viz.* baptism). They are separated from the world before they come to years.... They are blessed and elect before the Lord, Who regenerates them and renews them through his Spirit. But when they come to a suitable age..., we teach and instruct them in the doctrine of baptism and get them to know that they should think of this Spirit-ual regeneration all the days of their lives -- of which they receive the sign in their young days....

"The little children are renewed by God's Spirit according to the measure and comprehension of their age. And this divine power, which is hidden within them, grows and gradually increases [*cf.* Luke 1:15f,41f,80].... They are redeemed, sanctified and regenerated from perdition -- even though natural corruption still remains in them. For they possess such regeneration not through their own goodness, but through the sole goodness and mercy of God in Jesus Christ."

398. Ursinus presumed covenant children were regenerated before their infant baptism

Rev. Dr. Zacharias Ursinus was the German Reformed Professor of Theology in Breslau in 1557, and later in Heidelberg. He was personally acquainted with Zwingli, Bullinger, Peter Martyr Vermigli, Calvin and Olevianus. Together with the latter, who had himself studied with Calvin in the Genevan Academy, Ursinus composed the famous *Heidelberg Catechism*.

Ursinus himself wrote³⁹ that "those are not to be excluded from baptism, to whom the benefit of remission of sins and of regeneration belongs. But this benefit belongs to the infants of the Church. For redemption from sin by the blood of Christ, and by the Holy Ghost the Author of faith, is promised to them no less than to the adults....

"We deny the proposition which denieth that infants do believe. For infants of believers regenerated by the Holy Spirit have an inclination to believe, or do believe by inclination. For faith is **[with]in infants** -- potentially, and by disposition.... Godly infants who are in the church, have...an inclination...to godliness -- not by nature indeed, but by the grace of the covenant.

"Infants have the Holy Ghost, and are regenerated by Him.... John was filled with the Holy Ghost, when as yet He was in the womb [Luke 1:15-44f]; and it was said to Jeremiah [1:5], **'Before thou camest out of the womb, I sanctified thee.'**

"If infants have the Holy Ghost -- then, doubtless, He worketh in them regeneration...unto salvation. As Peter saith [Acts 10:47f], 'Who can forbid water -- from them who have received the Holy Ghost as well as we?'

"Therefore, Christ numbered little children amongst believers. He that offendeth one of these little ones which believe in Me" -- it were better for him that a heavy stone were tied round his neck and he were drowned (by total submersion permanently). Matthew 18:6. Consequently, "unto baptism, regeneration by the Holy Ghost and faith or an inclination to faith and repentance sufficeth."

In his own *Small Catechism*, Ursinus stated⁴⁰ that "the first reason why children are to be baptized, is that the Holy Spirit works in them too." Indeed, that Holy Spirit "moves them to believe and to obey God -- even though they are not yet able to believe in an adult way."

The children of believers are themselves Christians, "to whom the benefit of the forgiveness of sin and regeneration belong."⁴¹ Thus, "the Holy Spirit teaches them according to the ability and the manner of their years."⁴² "Infants believe in their own way, or in the way of their age. For they have a tendency to believe. **Faith is a power in infants.** It consists of inclination, and not of action as in adults."⁴³

Indeed, in his *Treasure Book*, explaining the *Heidelberg Catechism* (which he co-authored), Ursinus stated that "one should not admit that children [of the covenant] cannot believe at all.... They **believe** in such a way as agrees with their young age, namely by tending to believe. That tendency is indeed either faith, or a part and a beginning thereof....

"One may not label as 'unfruitful' the tiny little trees which have just been planted, but which bring forth fruit only at the appropriate time -- even though they do not yet yield fruit. Similarly, one must not place the children [of the covenant] among the number of the unbelievers..., but among the believers. For they have the tendency (*inclinatio*) and the ability (*potentia*) to believe. This tendency they have not from the flesh, but from the Holy Spirit and from the grace promised to them."

399. Ursinus: babies not regularly baptizable unless priorly regenerated

At least half of the paedobaptistic rationale for infant baptism well rests on the presumption of regeneration in the babies concerned.⁴⁴ For Ursinus regarded "regeneration" and "the donation of the Holy Spirit" as identical.⁴⁵ Indeed, Ursinus categorically claimed:⁴⁶ "Only the regenerate lawfully⁴⁷ receive baptism. The church administereth baptism [lawfully] to...only those whom she ought to account in the number of the regenerate."

In his work *Concerning the Baptism of Infants*,⁴⁸ Ursinus said that covenant infants "are regenerated and belong to the people of God and to the body of Christ.... The gift of the Holy Spirit applies to the children of believers even before faith and conversion.... In general, it is from the covenant and the divine promise that one judges children to have been gifted with the Holy Spirit.... They are to be regarded as partakers of the Spirit of regeneration, by virtue of their birth in the Church and by power of the promises of God.... The actual reason why anyone should be baptized, is not faith and profession but regeneration...[and] the gift of the Holy Spirit.... All believers are to be baptized; and only believers are to be baptized."

Christ regards the children of believers, as believers. This is seen especially in Matthew 18:6. This is because in such children, "the Holy Spirit certainly works regeneration and good tendencies and new movements and whatsoever else is necessary for salvation." It is not [just] because of their birth from Christian parents, but "because of the infinite mercy of God....that they are regarded as covenanters, and distinguished from the children of Pagans and Moslems."⁴⁹

Indeed, covenant children should be baptized: first, "because all who belong to the covenant, should be"; second, because "remission of sins and regeneration belongs to them; third, because infant baptism "is designed to distinguish the church from all the various sects"; and fourth, because "baptism occupies the place of circumcision."⁵⁰ The sacraments do not confer grace, but we get the sign because it is presupposed we already have the thing signified -- as even children know.⁵¹

400. Olevianus on the prebaptismal presumed regeneration of covenant infants

The German Reformed theologian Caspar Olevianus studied under Calvin at the Geneva Academy, and became a Professor of the Latin School in his birthplace Treves in 1559. Together with his colleague Ursinus, he composed the *Heidelberg Catechism* in 1562. He had a strong influence in the German Palatine, where Datheen later composed his own famous *Baptismal Formula*.

Olevianus regarded [infant] baptism as a means of assuring believers that they had been regenerated by the Spirit of God.⁵² Indeed, Olevianus put covenant children on the same basis as their believing parents, assuming that in the former too both renewal and sanctification unto a godly life had already commenced.⁵³

Stated Olevianus:⁵⁴ "The grace of Christ or the covenant of grace...is offered not just to parents, but to the parents and their children together. The parents...are to accept that the

promises are not just entrusted for their own salvation, but also for the salvation of their seed or their children....

"Thus, our children are holy -- by way of the covenant of grace.... See First Corinthians 7:14 and Ezra 9:2.... The promise of the Gospel has been made expressly to our children, Deuteronomy 30:6.... God consummated internally that which He promises externally. Titus 3:3-8..... Everlasting life is sealed by the testimony of the Holy Spirit and imparted by the Holy Spirit."

401. The 1563 Heidelberg Catechism on unrepeatable baptism

In 1563, the above-mentioned two Calvinists Olevianus and Ursinus of the German Reformed Church produced their famous *Heidelberg Catechism*. It quickly became one of the chief standards in the Presbyterian Church of Scotland.⁵⁵ An early translation of it appears in Dunlop's 1591 *Collection of Confessions of Faith...of Publick Authority in the Church of Scotland*. Indeed, it was repeatedly reprinted in English by public authorities both before and after the 1643^f Westminster Assembly -- namely in 1591, 1601, 1615, 1633, 1645, 1728, 1851 and 1861.

The *Heidelberg Catechism* became a standard in various Northern American Presbyterian denominations. Indeed, it also became one of the fundamental confessions of the Dutch Reformed and the German Reformed family of presbyterial denominations especially in Southern Africa (and indeed world-wide). It has so remained, ever since.⁵⁶

The *Catechism* teaches⁵⁷ that since the fall of Adam and Eve, we are now "so corrupt that we are wholly prone to all wickedness...unless we are born again by the Spirit of God. John 3:5." Consequently, all of the unregenerate will "also be punished with extreme *viz.* everlasting punishment both of body and soul."

The *Heidelberger* clearly presupposes the regeneration of covenant infants prior to their infant baptism. Its chief co-author Zacharias Ursinus himself has commented that this is so. Also its other co-author Caspar Olevianus has made similar claims.

It further states⁵⁸ that "faith proceed[s] from the Holy Ghost Who...confirms [or strengthens] it by the use of the sacraments. Matthew 28:19 & Romans 4:11.... The Holy Ghost...assures us by the sacraments that all our salvation depends upon that one sacrifice of Christ. Romans 6:3 & Galatians 3:27." He does this, by "holy baptism and the holy supper. First Corinthians 10:2-4."

Now this catechism was designed to promote church unification between Calvinists and Lutherans. Also to this end, it asks: "How is it signified and sealed unto you in holy baptism, that you have a part in the one sacrifice of Christ on the cross?" And how are you "assured by holy baptism that you are a partaker of the one sacrifice of Christ?"

The *Heidelberger* then answers that, in baptism, "Christ has appointed the outward washing with water.... Matthew 28:19 & Acts 2:38." Indeed, He has "added the promise that I am

washed with His blood and Spirit from the pollution of my soul (that is from all my sins) -- as certainly as I am washed outwardly with water by which the filthiness of the body is commonly washed away. Mark 16:16; Matthew 3:11; Romans 6:3; Mark 1:4; Luke 3:3."⁵⁹

Thus, to the *Heidelberger*, baptism refers to "the one sacrifice of Christ." In the latter, I am washed -- from all my sins." Accordingly, baptism is to signify and to seal this -- once and for all.

We are next told⁶⁰ that "to be washed in the blood and Spirit of Christ" means "to receive from God the forgiveness of sins...and also to be renewed by the Holy Ghost and sanctified as members of Christ in order that we may more and more die unto sin and lead a godly and unblamable life. Hebrews 12:24; First Peter 1:2; Revelation 1:5; John 1:33; Romans 6:4; Colossians 2:11." For by this baptismal "sign, He [God] may assure us that we are spiritually cleansed from our sins...by the blood and Spirit of Jesus...as truly as we are externally washed with water. Mark 16:16 & Galatians 3:27."

The *Heidelberger* further asks: "Are infants [of believers] also to be baptized?" It then replies that "infants are to be baptized...since they as well as adults are included in the covenant and Church of God.... Genesis 17:7; Acts 2:39; First Corinthians 7:14; Joel 2:16.... The blood of Christ and the Holy Ghost...is promised to them no less than [to] adults.... Matthew 19:14; Luke 1:15; Psalm 22:10; Acts 2:39....

"They also must therefore be incorporated by baptism as the sign of the covenant into the Christian Church and be distinguished from the children of unbelievers -- as was done in the Old Covenant or Testament by circumcision, in the place of which baptism has been instituted in the New Covenant. Acts 10:47; First Corinthians 12:13 & 7:14; Genesis 17:14; Colossians 2:11-13."⁶¹

Throughout, then, according to the *Heidelberg Catechism*, [infant] baptism seals faith in the recipient. It is a **faith** rebuttably presumed to be present **before** baptism in the one about to be baptized. It is a faith to be **strengthened by baptism**. Indeed, it is a **faith** which is to be expected to **increase** thereafter -- both from before baptism and ever since.

402. The 1564 Romish Profession of the Tridentine Faith

Rome responded immediately. Just six months after the death of Calvin, on 13th November and 9th December 1564 the papal bulls of Pius IV appeared. Together, these became known as the (anti-reformed) *Profession of the Tridentine Faith*. This was then made binding upon all Romish priests and teachers. Thereafter, it gradually came to be used as a *de facto* creed for converts to Romanism from Protestantism and from 'Eastern Orthodoxy.'⁶²

The **positive** bearing of this *Tridentine Profession* on baptism, is well stated in its very first article: "I, [name], with a firm faith..., believe in one God the Father Almighty...; and in one Lord Jesus Christ, the only-begotten Son of God...; and in the Holy Ghost.... I acknowledge one baptism for the remission of sins...."

The **negative** bearing which that Romish document has on our present subject, is in its articles 4 and 5 summarizing the *Tridentine Creed*. There it is stated: "I also profess that here are truly and properly seven sacraments...necessary for the salvation of mankind, though not all for every one, to wit: baptism, confirmation, the eucharist, penance and extreme unction, holy orders and matrimony.... I embrace and receive all and every one of the things which have been defined and declared in the holy Council of Trent concerning original sin and justification."⁶³

Here, Protestants can certainly agree with the statements in the *Tridentine Profession* that "I acknowledge one baptism" and that "baptism...cannot be reiterated." For the rest, the above-mentioned (sacramentalistic) sections of that creed -- together with some of its other sections, here uncited, should be rejected *in toto*.

403. Strong baptismal regenerationism in the 1566 Roman Catechism

In 1566, we see the Papists publishing their *Romish Catechism from the Decrees of the Council of Trent* (alias the *Catechismus Romanus ex Decreto Concilii Tridentini*) -- known in short as the *Roman Catechism*. Not Trent but Pope Pius IV himself actually enacted this influential document.

Substantially finished in 1564, it was published in 1566. It was and is intended for teachers -- not for pupils. Copiously does it set out its lavish doctrine of the sacraments. Significantly, it was and is directed especially against Calvin's brand of Protestantism.

Its theology is that of a syncretism between Aquinas and Augustine. Amusingly, it for that reason upset the Jesuits. Omitting the rosary and the Tridentine teaching on indulgences, it also treats of matters not discussed at Trent -- such as papal authority, and limbo for the unbaptized.⁶⁴

The *Roman Catechism* decrees that Romish teachers are to believe and to teach not just that the Roman Catholic Church exists. It insists that people should also put their trust in her.

For "he who has entered into the Church through baptism, can be assured against all danger of everlasting death. But those outside of her, are swallowed up by their misdeeds -- just as happened to those who were not taken up into the ark. This is what God has determined about the Church."⁶⁵

The *Roman Catechism* decrees that a "sacrament...has the power of both signifying and effecting both sanctification and justification." It declares that baptism is "the sacrament of regeneration through water." Consequently, both the "good" and the "bad" enjoy its benefits.⁶⁶

Baptism, continues the *Roman Catechism*, is necessary for salvation. Indeed, "even Jews and unbelievers and heretics -- when necessity impels -- are permitted to do this work." For "perfect conversion is posited -- in a new birth through baptism." Indeed, "baptism is prescribed by the Lord for all men."⁶⁷

The *Roman Catechism* also claims that baptism effects "an infusion of grace," wiping out all taints in the soul. It allegedly engineers an "infusion of virtues" -- such as faith, hope and love.

It brings about "the opening up of the gate of heaven" -- so that those dying immediately after baptism, before they sin afresh, are stated to go straight to glory.

According to this *Catechismus Romanus*, baptism is therefore necessary for justification. Consequently, children dying without baptism are lost, because of original sin inhering in them.⁶⁸

To the *Roman Catechism* even the infants of Roman Catholic parents are regarded as lost -- until those infants themselves get baptized. Shockingly, it declares that "the law of baptism has been prescribed by the Lord for all human beings. Thus, those who are not regenerated by the grace of God's baptism, are brought forth unto everlasting misery and perdition from their parents -- be the latter believers, or unbelievers."⁶⁹ Indeed, even "for the little children, no other way of obtaining salvation is left -- than through the administration of baptism."⁷⁰

404. The Roman Catechism: no salvation without baptism

In just one phrase, according to the *Roman Catechism* -- baptism is essential to salvation. Consequently, it regards even Roman Catholic children dying without baptism as lost -- because of unforgiven original sin inhering in them. Insists the *Tridentine Catechism*: "Unless men" alias human beings "be regenerated to God through the grace of baptism -- they are born to everlasting misery and destruction, whether their parents be believers or unbelievers."⁷¹

Of course, this does not necessarily mean that unbaptized babies go to hell. But it does mean that they, according to the *Roman Catechism*, cannot get to heaven.

Yet Scripture (and therefore also Bible-believing Calvinism) clearly teaches that they can. At least very many of them, certainly do. Indeed, Calvin further taught that all early-dying (baptized and unbaptized) babies of believing parents -- unquestionably go straight to glory.

No wonder that, shortly after the formulation of the *Roman Catechism*, the famous Romish theologian Robert Bellarmine (1542-1621) himself condemned Protestantism! For he believed that after death, all unbaptized children and babies go not to heaven but to limbo.⁷²

Naturally, all this denies the presence of pre-baptismal saving grace and faith in those baptized. Indeed, it would invest the Romish concept of baptism itself with quasi-sorcerous properties. Thus, it would 'transubstantiate' the sacrament of baptism from being (as it is) the Scriptural seal of an already-present faith. It would change baptism into a 'magical mandrake' claimed to create a living faith -- the prior existence of which latter, in the baptizee, Rome wrongly denies.

Only in Calvinism does not just Chalcedonian christology but also sane sacramentology come into its own. There is thus no transubstantiation nor consubstantiation at either baptism or the Lord's supper. For there is: no baptismal regeneration; no rebaptism; and no mass.

Yet even in Romanism, there was some later softening of baptismal regenerationism. Thus Nicholas Malebranche tried to accommodate Romanism with Cartesianism -- -- and to blunten the objections even of Calvinism. For he supposed children, at the time of their infant baptism,

already to possess -- a love for God.^{72a} See N. Malebranche: *Search After Truth*, London, ed. 1700, I p. 56 & II p. 126.

405. The influence of the *First Swiss Confession* on the *Second Helvetica*

In the same year as its own appearance, the baptismal regenerationism of the *Roman Catechism* was decisively repudiated by the *Second Helvetic Confession* of the Swiss Reformed Churches. It was written, as "the most elaborate and the most catholic [alias universal] of the Swiss Confessions" (thus Schaff), chiefly by Calvin's associate the great Reformed theologian Henry Bullinger. However, probably even Peter Martyr Vermigli also played a small part in drawing up this great document.⁷³

The 1536 *First Helvetic Confession* had been composed by Calvin's associates Bullinger, Myconius, Megander, Leo Judae, Bucer and Capito. There, the first Swiss Protestant Reformers had declared⁷⁴ that "these sacraments...are not merely empty signs -- but consist of signs and the things signified. For in baptism, the water is the sign. The signified thing itself, however, is regeneration and adoption in the family of God...."

"In baptism...the Lord exhibits to His elect...a 'bath of regeneration'.... We baptize our children in this holy bath.... It would be unfair if we were to rob those born from us (who are God's people) -- of the fellowship of God's people" (namely the parents of such infants). For "our children...are those whose pious election is to be presumed. Titus 3; Acts 10; Genesis 17; First Corinthians 7; Luke 18."

The above-mentioned *First Swiss Confession* of the Calvinist Bullinger and others, was expanded considerably -- in the *Second Swiss Confessio* of Bullinger and Vermigli. Precisely and particularly in this latter -- once again written largely by Calvin's associate Bullinger -- the baptismal regenerationism of the *Decrees of Trent* and the *Tridentine Profession* and also of the *Catechismus Romanus* was utterly refuted.

This is seen especially where Bullinger's *Second Swiss Confession* faithfully expresses the Calvinistic doctrine of baptism. At the same time, however, it also refutes especially the baptismal heresies not only of Romanism but also of Anabaptism. (Recall Bullinger's major work: *The Origin, Progress and Sects of the Anabaptists.*)

406. The 1566 *Second Helvetic Confession* on covenant infants

Declares the *Second Helvetica*:⁷⁵ "We believe and teach that the Son of God, our Lord Jesus Christ, was from all eternity.... He took flesh of the virgin Mary.... We therefore do abhor...especially the blasphemies of [the Anabaptist] Michael Servetus. Micah 5:2; John 1:1; Matthew 1:25...."

"The sacraments are baptism and the Lord's supper.... The author of all sacraments is not any man, but God alone. Men cannot institute sacraments.... The symbols have God's promises annexed to them, which require faith...."

"There is but one baptism in the Church of God.... It is sufficient to be once baptized.... Baptism, once received, continues for all of life and is a perpetual sealing of our adoption.... To be baptized in the Name of Christ is...to be called after the Name of God; that is to say, to be called a son of God⁷⁶....

"Inwardly, we are regenerated, purified and renewed by God through the Holy Spirit.... Outwardly, we receive the assurance of the greatest gifts -- in the water by which also those great benefits are represented."⁷⁷ So: "We are **baptized**, that is, washed or sprinkled."⁷⁸

"God also separates us from all strange religions and peoples, by the symbol of baptism -- and consecrates us to Himself as His property.... Hence we are enlisted in the holy military service of Christ -- so that all our life long, we should fight against the world [and] Satan and our own flesh.... "Baptism should not be administered in the Church by women or midwives.... For Paul deprived women of ecclesiastical duties, and baptism has to do with these.

"We condemn the Anabaptists, who deny that new-born infants of the faithful are to be baptized."⁷⁹ For, according to evangelical teaching, of such [infants of the faithful] is the Kingdom of God (Luke 18:16)⁸⁰ -- and they are written in the covenant of God (Acts 3:25).... Why, then, should the sign of God's covenant not be given to them? Why should those who belong to God...and are [deemed to be] in God's Church⁸¹ [Invisible] -- not be initiated [into his Visible Kingdom] by holy baptism? We condemn the Anabaptists."⁸²

407. The influence of the Rhaetian Confession on the Second Helvetia

We should perhaps also mention the *Rhaetian Confession*. Though restricted to the more alpine areas of Switzerland, it was directed specifically against Swiss Anabaptism.

According to Rev. Prof. Dr. Curtis,⁸³ "at a Synod of the Reformed Churches in the Rhaetian Alps, approval was given in 1552 to a Confession -- the *Confessio Rhaetica* -- drawn up by Saluz Gallicus, and intended to establish a uniform system of doctrine in place of the existing theological chaos in which Anabaptist...and pantheistic teachings mingled.

"In 1553 it was submitted to Bullinger, who cordially approved of it.... Thereafter for centuries, in spite of the subsequent...recognition of the *Second Helvetic Confession*, it remained the authoritative Rhaetian formula."

Internationally, however, the *Rhaetica* was not well-known. Yet this hardly mattered. For its influence was still internationalized -- *via* the impact of the *Second Helvetic Confession* which roots in it.

408. The influence the Second Helvetica and Beza on the Church of Scotland

At this point, the Swiss-American theologian Rev. Professor Dr. Philip Schaff's comments are seen to be full of wisdom. Declares Schaff:⁸⁴ "The Anglican Church...makes certain the

salvation of all baptized infants dying in infancy, and leaves the possibility of salvation without baptism an open question. The Roman Church makes infant salvation without baptism impossible. The Lutheran Church makes it at least improbable. The Calvinist Churches make it certain in the case of all the elect, without regard to age."

For the classic Swiss Calvinists believed regeneration is usually prebaptismal. It is always effected only by the Sovereign God immediately -- and never through baptism mediately. Romans 4:11f. They asserted that baptism was only for the living, and not for the dying. Romans 6:3-13f. They rejected 'emergency baptisms' for the terminally ill, and deliberately allowed them to die unbaptized. First Corinthians 1:17.

Switzerland's Calvinists indeed upheld the relative necessity for living believers -- whether titanic or tiny -- to receive baptism. Thus they strongly disapproved of Protestants allowing their own healthy infants to remain unbaptized. Genesis 17:14. Indeed, they further disapproved most strongly of any baptizee ever getting himself or herself 'rebaptized' by the Anabaptists (or by anyone else). Hebrews 6:1-6.

Theodore Beza, Professor of Greek in Lausanne, became the famous Genevan successor to Calvin -- after the latter's death. According to Beza,⁸⁵ it is "by means of the faith [with]in pious parents, that children who are born or to be born -- are holy." Yet also such children themselves "are given the ability (*dunamei*) to believe."

Indeed, even such tiny "children...possess...a seed (*semen*) of faith." So "they are regarded as the Lord's inheritance, and filled with the Holy Spirit -- Who, in His time, reveals His power in them." Cf. 139:7f and Luke 1:41-44.

Here are some very pertinent quotations from Beza's 1558 book *The Christian Faith*: "The Anabaptists greatly err by opposing the baptism of infants.... Although they may not have faith with its effects such as those who are of age -- they may, however, have the seed and germ of it [*i.e.*, of faith]; seeing that the Lord has sanctified them from the mother's womb (First Corinthians 7:14)... We presuppose in general that they are children of God -- who are born of a believing father and mother, or when one of the two is a believer (Genesis 17:7)."⁸⁶

Further, "as regards children born in the Church, one should presume the election of all of them, without limitation."⁸⁷ Beza even recommended, to the Presbyterian Church of Scotland, the *Second Helvetic Confession* -- with its teaching anent the "adoption" of covenant children as "sons of God" (who "belong to God" even as "newborn infants").

Significantly, certain 'Superintendents' and Ministers in the Church of Scotland -- were soon writing⁸⁸ to Calvin's successor Beza. They declared that the recently-published doctrine of the 1566 *Second Swiss Confession* was precisely "what we have been teaching constantly these eight years [1558-66] -- and still by the grace of God continue to teach in our churches, in the schools, and in the pulpit."

Furthermore, the Presbyterian Church of Scotland -- on 25th December 1566 -- gave official sanction to the *Second Swiss Confession*. For the Scottish General Assembly then decided to "ordain the same to be printed, together with an epistle sent by the Assembly of the Kirk of

Scotland approving the same." Too, Calvin's *Catechism* was also sanctioned by the Church of Scotland -- and was, subsequently, usually adjoined to the Scottish Presbyterian *Book of Common Order*.⁸⁹

409. Zanchius on presupposed prebaptismal regeneration in infant baptizees

The great Italian Reformer Jerome Zanchi(us) was Professor of Old Testament at Strassburg -- and, from 1568 onward, Professor of Systematic Theology at Heidelberg. Said he:⁹⁰ "The precondition of receiving baptism, is that the baptizees have been gifted with the Spirit of faith....

"There is no doubt about this as regards adults. But what about children?... Augustine and others give...answer to this: 'They are baptized on the faith of the Church and of the parents.'

"However, I would add that they themselves too need to be gifted with the Spirit of faith.... For he who does not have the Spirit of Christ, does not belong to Christ (Romans 8:9)."

So, "elect children of believers," explained Zanchius,⁹¹ "must nevertheless be gifted with the Spirit of faith -- if they are to enter into everlasting life." All covenant children should be regarded as having been born again -- until "by exhibiting continual misdeeds or apostasy from the Church, they demonstrate that they never received a true Christian faith or the Spirit of Christ" at all.⁹²

However, very many covenant "children, just like some adults, are given the Spirit of faith before baptism." By that faith, they: are incorporated into Christ; acquire the forgiveness of sin; and are born again.... He who has received this gift before baptism, receives in baptism not only the sealing and confirmation but also the increase thereof. For the Spirit of Christ works powerfully in the administration of baptism to the elect." Indeed, "we must believe that an infant of faithful parents is already baptized with the baptism of the Spirit -- seeing it is in the covenant."⁹³

410. Peter Datheen on presumed regeneration before infant baptism

Dathenus alias Peter Datheen was born of Romish parents, probably in Flanders. However, he embraced Protestantism -- when only nineteen. In 1550, he went to Britain, where he studied the Bible under Laski and Micron. In 1555, he was appointed Minister of the exiled Dutch Reformed congregation in Frankfort (Germany).

The next year, he met Calvin personally. That led to a lifelong correspondence with the great Genevan Reformer.

Datheen settled down at Franckenthal in the German Palatine, where the influence of Calvin and of Olevianus was already strong.⁹⁴ It was largely Datheen who wrote the *Baptismal Formula* soon to be used by the Dutch Reformed family of denominations ever since.⁹⁵

In his 1571 *Protocol* alias *The Entire Transactions of the Dialogue* with the Anabaptists at Franckenthal, Datheen declared:⁹⁶ "We believe that the children of believers are to be numbered among the believers, and not among the unbelievers.... The children of Christians are children of God...only because adopted...[as] members of the body of which Christ is Saviour." Indeed, if they were "not members of God's [Invisible] Church..., they could not even be saved."

Datheen continued:⁹⁷ "The children of Christians have this blessed fellowship with the eternal and true God -- the Father and Son and Holy Ghost -- unto everlasting life. For this reason, they are called 'holy.' Therefore the children of Christians ought and must rightly be baptized.... They are truly holy [Romans 11:16 and First Corinthians 6:11 & 7:14].... They obtain the cleansing and the forgiveness of sins, through the blood of Jesus."

Even the promise of the baptism of the forgiveness of sins and the gifts of the Spirit, apply to such children. However, in Acts 2:38-39, Peter does not say those children get the promise only "when they grow up and accept the promise.... But he speaks of the present time: the promise is to you and your children!"⁹⁸

Datheen concluded:⁹⁹ "By grace, the children of believers have been accepted as children of God. They have the forgiveness of sins, the Spirit of sanctification, and the testimonies of everlasting salvation.... In First Corinthians 7, Paul says of the children of believers: 'But now, they are holy.'" So too in Acts 10. Inasmuch as our children have just like us received the Spirit of adoption and acceptance: unto childhood [of God]; unto sanctification; unto salvation -- we can just as little refuse to them too the water, as we can to ourselves....

"If the infants who die at that young age are not born again unto children of God by grace through the operation of the Holy Spirit and through the blood of Jesus Christ -- as Christ teaches in John three -- they could not be saved. Consequently, we conclude that children must be born again in order to be saved.... They are regenerated unto everlasting life."

411. Overview of chief baptismal developments in Britain from 1360 till 1707

England herself had clearly seen massive (Pre-)Reformation, under the 1360*f* antipapal Paedobaptist Wycliffe, and later again under the 1526*f* Paidobaptist Tyndale. Under the 'Welsh King' Henry Tudor VIII, England had amalgamated with Wales to form the United Kingdom. She then broke with Rome, and embraced the teachings of Luther. Bucer's friend Thomas Cranmer the Reformed Archbishop of Canterbury (and Thomas Crumwell the English Vicar-General) then steered the Protestant Anglican State Church away from both Romanism and Anabaptism -- and specifically in the direction of Calvinism (alias consistent Christianity).

Continental Reformers like Bucer, de Brés, Laski and Micron for some time resided and promoted Calvinism in England.¹⁰⁰ Indeed, it was especially under Henry's young son King Edward VI and his Regent the Lord Protector Somerset from 1547 onward, that the Church of England was progressively calvinized -- also under the direct influence of John Calvin himself.¹⁰¹

This led to the Protestant *English Confession of Faith*, alias the *Forty-two Articles*. These were drawn up by Archbishop Cranmer and the godly Bishop Ridley in 1551, and apparently

ratified by the King and accepted by the House of Bishops at Canterbury in 1553. Significantly, they attacked both Romanism and Anabaptism. For details, see the end of the previous chapter.

Sadly, Edward soon died. His successor, the fanatical Romanist Queen Mary of England (1553-58), viciously suppressed Protestantism – although many of the Marian exiles were then influenced in Switzerland by Bullinger and Calvin. However, Mary's successor -- the Protestant Queen Elizabeth -- again refavoured Protestantism. So, at the 1562 Synod of London and with the recommendation of the new Archbishop of Canterbury Matthew Parker (a close friend of the Reformer Martin Bucer), the *Forty-two Articles* were shortened. In that form they were adopted (in Latin) as the *Thirty-nine Articles*. Later, they were finally revised and published in English -- in 1571.

They are clearly Calvinistic. They state¹⁰² that "**baptism** is not only a sign of profession and mark of difference whereby Christian men are discerned from others..., but it is also a **sign** of regeneration or new birth whereby -- as by an instrument -- they that receive baptism rightly, are grafted into the Church [Visible].

"The promises of the forgivenesses of sin, and of our adoption to the sons of God by the Holy Ghost, are visibly signed and sealed. Faith is confirmed and grace increased -- by virtue of prayer unto God. The baptism of young children is in any wise to be retained in the Church, as most agreeable with the institution of Christ."

The *Irish Articles* of 1615 would later greatly help puritanize the various churches in the British Isles, and -- after further input from the 1618f 'T-U-L-I-P' Synod of Dordt -- also massively influenced the 1643f *Westminster Assembly*. Then, a half-century later, in 1707, South Britain (alias England and Wales) -- still somewhat Puritan -- would amalgamated with the then Calvinistic Scottish North to form Great(er) Britain.

In that way, over the years, the United Kingdom of Great Britain became proponderantly Paedobaptist and clearly Calvinistic. To understand the details of how this came about, let us now go back to North Britain (alias Scotland), and note especially her ongoing contribution to the promotion of Calvinism throughout the island.

412. Post-Knoxian baptismal views of the early Scottish Presbyterians

We have seen that the Presbyterian Church of Scotland gave official recognition to the *Second Helvetic Confession*. It did the same to the *Heidelberg Catechism*.

The *Heidelberger* was widely used in Scotland. An early translation appears in Dunlop's 1591 *Collection of Confessions of Faith...of Public Authority in the Church of Scotland*. Significantly, that Catechism was repeatedly printed by public authority in Scotland -- right down to and even after the British Civil War, in the later times of Oliver Cromwell.¹⁰³

The *Form of Baptism* used in Geneva, was -- by way of the *First Book of Discipline* of John Knox and others -- soon incorporated into the ever-expanding *Book of Common Order* of the Presbyterian Church of Scotland. Also Calvin's *Catechism* was approved by the Reformed

Scottish Church. It too was usually adjoined -- to the *Book of Common Order*.

Rev. Dr. William McMillan, in his book *The Worship of the Scottish Reformed Church 1550 - 1658*, points out that the conviction of the writers of the *Book of Common Order* is the Biblical view that the children of believers are Christian by conception and birth. It is because they are already federally holy before baptism, that they are entitled to receive that sacrament. Significantly, this same view -- in almost the very same words -- was later reflected by the Westminster divines in their 1645 *Directory for the Public Worship of God (On Baptism)*.

The Presbyterian Church of Scotland also developed further Standards of its own. The *Second Book of Discipline* -- drawn up by Andrew Melville and a Committee of the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland -- was approved without dissent in 1578. In 1581, it was ordered to be recorded.

It states: "Unto the Pastors only, appertains the administration of the sacraments."¹⁰⁴ Yet "it pertains to the Eldership to take heed that the Word of God be purely preached..., the sacraments rightly administered, the discipline rightly maintained."¹⁰⁵

The *Second Book of Discipline* expresses the typical views of mature Presbyterians like Andrew Melville. It was approved without dissent by the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland in 1578.

413. Anti-Anabaptism in the *Second Scots Confession*

The Ex-Dominican priest John Craig became a Protestant, and was later in 1562 appointed Knox's collegiate minister at St. Giles Presbyterian Church in Edinburgh. In 1570, he became Chaplain to James VI of Scotland. The latter himself later became King James I of the United Kingdom of England and Scotland -- and then commissioned the translation of the authorized 'King James Version' of the English Bible.

Craig drafted the first *Scots Catechism* (and was also largely responsible for the 'National Covenant' alias the 1580 *Second Scots Confession*).¹⁰⁶ In his *Catechism*, when referring to the infant children of believing parents, Craig asked the question: "What comfort have we by their baptism?" And he answered: "This, that we rest persuaded they are inheritors of the Kingdom of heaven."¹⁰⁷

Craig's 1580 *Second Scots Confession* was subsequently ratified as a 'National Covenant' by the King and Council and Court and People of Scotland in 1581. There, that *Confession* condemns "that Roman Antichrist" with "his cruel judgment against infants departing without the sacrament: his absolute necessity of baptism."¹⁰⁸

Declares that document:¹⁰⁹ "We abhor and detest all contrary religion and doctrine. But chiefly all kind of papistry in general.... In special, we detest and refuse the usurped authority of that Roman antichrist...; his erroneous doctrine against the sufficiency of the written Word...; the nature, number and use of the holy sacraments; his five bastard sacraments...added to the ministrations of the true sacraments without the Word of God; his cruel judgment against infants

departing without the sacrament; his absolute necessity of baptism."

Here the *Second Scots Confession*, a great document, rightly detests "the Roman antichrist" and condemns Rome for wrongly teaching that unbaptized infants are lost. In 1580 the household of the King of Scotland, and in 1581 and thereafter persons of all ranks, subscribed to this *Second Scots Confession*. Together with an addendum, it was then compounded into the *National Covenant*.

414. The Frisian Alting on the regeneration of covenant babies

Around 1580, the famous Protestant Reformer Menzo Alting recorded the *Protocol or Complete Acts of the Dialogue at Embden in East Frisia* -- about regeneration.¹¹⁰ He defined rebirth as a renewal "which God works in us through His Spirit, whereby He imparts to us...the power of the death and resurrection of Christ."¹¹¹

Alting then gave eight reasons, with prooftexts, for (rebuttably) presuming the regeneration of covenant children. First, Genesis 3:15. Second, First Corinthians 7. Third, Jeremiah 31 and Deuteronomy 30. Fourth, John 3 *cf.* Acts 2 & Isaiah 44. Fifth, Galatians 4. Sixth, Second Corinthians 5. Seventh, John 3 -- because children must be born again, in order to enter into the Kingdom of God. And eighth, First Corinthians 15 -- because those born from the flesh must first be born again to enter the Kingdom.¹¹²

Fruit-trees as such should not be confused with their later fruits -- as if they **only** become fruit-trees when **seen** to be bearing fruit. Nor, in Romans 7, was the regenerate adult Paul any more devoid of sin than tiny regenerate sinners.¹¹³ Indeed, to deny that covenant babies should be deemed already regenerate, is "to voiden God's promises and make them useless --and to regard God as untruthful."

For God "cannot lie. And he who has received a promise from God...yet who may not actually enjoy the promise, has a vain and useless promise."¹¹⁴ Consequently, "as soon as the promise of the Holy Spirit is given to children -- just so soon are even the gifts of the Holy Spirit given to those children."¹¹⁵ "For how can a branch enjoy the power and the life of the vine, if it is not in the vine? Again, how can a twig partake of the sap from the Root -- if it has not yet been engrafted into the tree?"¹¹⁶

Furthermore: "The little children of the covenant also have God as their Father, the Son as their Saviour, and the Holy Spirit as their Sanctifier; and therefore they are entitled to be baptized."¹¹⁷ The Anabaptists "intolerably want to limit the infinite invisible power of the Holy Spirit...to the 'power' of their own external eyes...and blind sight, [by saying that] children have no rational souls, just because we cannot see the[ir] souls with our eyes.... But it can be seen in Acts two that Peter says that 'the promise is to you and your children' simultaneously."¹¹⁸

For: "The Word preached to the parents and thus appropriated by them, is also appropriated by the children too -- through wonderful operations of the Holy Spirit.... The gift of the Holy Spirit produces faith in the children of God, just as a fruit-tree produces fruit. For faith is called a fruit of the Spirit. Galatians five."¹¹⁹

415. Vander Heyden's Anti-Anabaptism in the Dutch Reformed Church

The famous nobleman Caspar vander Heyden, a former associate of the great Polish Calvinist John Laski himself, was Moderator of the great Dutch Reformed Synods of Emden in 1571 and Dordrecht in 1574. In 1580, he shortened the *Baptismal Formula* of Laski-Micron-Datheen. He updated and edited it as his own *Instruction in the Christian Religion Taught and Practised in the Reformed Evangelical Churches and Schools of the Netherlands*.¹²⁰ Thereafter, he published his own Anti-Anabaptist *Short and Clear Proofs of Holy Baptism*.¹²¹

In that latter work, Vander Heyden stated¹²² that "the rebirth...is a power which God works in us by His Spirit in an incomprehensible manner.... One may not exclude children from these receptions of the Holy Spirit and from regeneration.... In Christ, they are engrafted like branches, so that they can participate in His life....

"Again, he who does not have the Spirit of Christ, does not belong to Him.... Just as our children are not just reckoned to be dead in Adam but are actually dead in spirit, so too they are not just reckoned to be alive in Christ but are actually in spirit engrafted into Him, as branches so as to be able to partake of His life....

"How can children become pure and holy..., except through the Holy Spirit and regeneration and ingrafting into Christ...? How can children be in the covenant and in the Church of God, without the Spirit of God and rebirth...? The reception of the Holy Spirit...in tiny children, takes place passively, so that they love and please God. Then He also gives them grace as they grow up, so that in due time they bring forth their fruits....

"Seed rests for a time in the earth, and takes root before one sees from its fruit that it has germinated.... The root of understanding and of reason has been poured into all children, as soon as they receive life.... God has planted a seed and a root of regeneration in the children of the covenant.... In time, the fruits of the Spirit germinate from it. For he who has been baptized with Christ in His death, also grows from Him, like a tender shoot on a vine....

"The chief reasons for baptism are not our...professions or obediences, as the Anabaptists think; but God's covenant, the promises of grace, the forgiveness of sins, the ingrafting and adoption into the Church of God, and the impartation of the Holy Spirit *etc.*.... Whenever children are in the Household and Church of God..., they are then also attested and sealed to have been washed from their sins and renewed by Christ's blood and Spirit."

416. The first part of the Dutch Reformed Baptismal Formula

We now come to the *Baptismal Formula* of the worldwide Dutch Reformed family of denominations. This was first approved at the 1581 Dutch Reformed Synod of Middelburg.¹²³ After being drawn up from that of the London Reformed Refugee Congregation of Laski and Micron, and by Datheen in the German Palatinate,¹²⁴ it was edited by Vander Heyden in 1580 (after being commissioned to do so by the 1574 Synod of Dordrecht which itself shortened it).

Vander Heyden himself stated that Datheen in 1565 had requested him to draw up the ecclesiastical ordinances.¹²⁵ At any rate, this *Baptismal Formula* soon became the standard form used throughout the Germanic Reformed world.

Its first part is derived from the German Reformed Palatinate's *Baptismal Formula* (and, more remotely, from Calvin and Micron). There it states that "we with our children are conceived and born in sin, and therefore are children of wrath -- so that we cannot enter into the Kingdom of God except we are born again. This the dipping in or sprinkling with water teaches us, whereby the impurity of our souls is signified to us.... Holy baptism witnesses and seals to us the washing away of our sins through Jesus Christ.

"Therefore we are baptized in the Name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost. For when we are baptized in the Name of the Father, God the Father witnesses and seals to us that He makes an eternal covenant of grace with us.... When we are baptized in the Name of the Son, the Son seals to us that He washes us in His blood from all our sins, incorporating us into the fellowship of His death and resurrection, so that we are freed from all our sins and accounted righteous before God....

"When we are baptized in the Name of the Holy Ghost, the Holy Ghost assures us by this holy sacrament that He wishes to keep on dwelling in us and sanctifying us as members of Christ, applying to us that which we have in Christ -- namely the washing away of our sins and the daily renewing of our life, till we shall finally be presented without spot or wrinkle among the assembly of the elect in life eternal....

"We are by God through baptism admonished...unto a new obedience, namely that we cleave to this one God -- Father, Son and Holy Ghost; that we trust in Him, and love Him with all our heart, with all our soul, with all our mind, and with all our strength; that we forsake the world, mortify our old nature, and walk in a new and godly life. And if we sometimes through weakness fall into sin, we must not on that account despair of God's mercy, nor continue in sin, since baptism is a seal and undoubted testimony that we have an eternal covenant of grace with God.... Since then baptism has taken the place of circumcision, infants are to be baptized as heirs of the Kingdom of God and of His covenant."

Further, "although our young children do not understand these things" -- that is, although our babies while still tiny cannot yet fully grasp all of this nor confess any of it -- "we may not on that account exclude them from baptism. For, as they are [like us] without their knowledge partakers of condemnation in Adam, so are they again [like us] received unto grace in Christ.... Genesis 17:7.... Acts 2:39.... Mark 10:16.

"Since then baptism has taken the place of circumcision [Romans 4:11f & 6:1f and Colossians 2:11f], infants are to be baptized as heirs of the Kingdom of God and of His Covenant. And parents are in duty bound further to instruct their children herein.... That this holy ordinance of God may now be administered to His glory, to our comfort, and to the edification of His Church -- let us call upon His Holy Name!"

417. The second part of the Dutch Reformed Baptismal Formula

The second part of this *Dutch Reformed Baptismal Formula* now follows. It is a prayer -- to be rendered right before the administration of the baptism. It is derived *via* Micron from Zwingli (and, more remotely, from Luther and the Mediaeval Church).

"There, the baptism of children is compared to the preservation of Noah's family in the ark (*cf.* First Peter 3:18-21) and to the whole Israelitic nation at the Red Sea (*cf.* First Corinthians 10:1-4). And there, God is implored "graciously to look upon these children of Yours [*cf.* Ezekiel 16:20*f*] and incorporate them by Your Holy Spirit into [the Visible Church of] Your Son Jesus Christ."

Here are the opening sentences of this Dutch Reformed prayer: "O Almighty and Eternal God! You Who through Your strict judgment saved and preserved Noah and his household through Your great mercy. You Who drowned the reprobate Pharaoh together with all his men in the Red Sea, but sent [the men and women and children and babies of] Your people Israel through it, as by dry land, by which baptism was depicted for us We beseech You, be pleased of Your infinite mercy graciously to look upon these children of Yours, and incorporate them by Your Holy Spirit into [the Visible Church of] Your Son Jesus Christ!"

The development of this part of the *Dutch Reformed Baptismal Formula* -- from mediaeval times, through Luther and Zwingli, into its Calvinistic form as above -- is very instructive. For this section of the Dutch Reformed *Formula*, comparing household baptism to the experience of Noah's family in the ark, and to that of the Israelitic families at the Red Sea, is derived ultimately from mediaeval formulas. Those latter, however, misinterpreted the Noachic verses and Exodus passages of Holy Scripture -- mistaking them to imply baptismal regeneration.

Since the Middle Ages, those mediaeval formulas underwent improvement in *The Germanized Little Baptism Book* of Martin Luther. He still insisted that regeneration occurred during baptism -- but not because of baptism.

The Zwinglian amendment of those mediaeval baptismal formulas, was rather reactionary. It quite severed baptism from regeneration. It anticipated the latter as a purely later possibility -- to be hoped for only in the future, at some time after the baptism.

Indeed, immediately after the baptism it sometimes even added a petition that God might at some yet later time "be willing to impart the light of faith to the heart" of the baptized -- "so that he might be incorporated into Your Son" at that later time. This latter petition, however, was altogether averse to Zwingli's (and Luther's and Calvin's) own presumption of prebaptismal infant faith.

The post-Zwingli *Zurich Formula* of the Reformed congregation, however, differed from both the Lutheran and the Zwinglian versions of the *Baptismal Formula*. Neither of the latter ever stated that baptism seals regeneration -- a **regeneration** implicitly already accomplished. But the Reformed formula did so emphasize such baptismal sealing -- and still does.

418. The third part of the Dutch Reformed Baptismal Formula

In the *Dutch Reformed Baptismal Formula*, the above prayer before the infant baptism is directly followed by the exhortation to the parents. This was derived by Datheen from Laski. There, before immediately thereafter proceeding to the baptism of the infant, the parents are required first to affirm this exhortation -- and publically to give an affirmative answer to it. Here is the exhortation:-

"Beloved in the Lord Jesus Christ, you have heard that **baptism** is an ordinance of God to seal His covenant to us and to our seed. Therefore it **must** be observed for that end, and not out of custom or superstition. That it may then be manifest that you are thus minded, you are to answer sincerely....

"Do you acknowledge that, although **our children** are conceived and born in sin and therefore are subject to all misery and even to condemnation itself -- they nevertheless have been sanctified in Christ too (Ezekiel 16:20 and First Corinthians 7:14] -- and therefore, as members of His Church, **ought** to be baptized?"

After the parents answer affirmatively before the whole congregation, "the Minister of God's Word, in baptizing, shall say: '**Name** [of the infant], I baptize you in the Name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost. Amen!'"

419. The fourth part of the Dutch Reformed Baptismal Formula

Especially in the final prayer of thanksgiving immediately after the administration of the baptism itself, the post-Zwingli *Zurich Formula* of the Reformed Church clearly implies that the baptism itself had just "sealed" infant faith already deemed to be present pre-baptismally. Compare Luke 1:15-44 & Romans 4:11f.

The last part of the *Dutch Reformed Baptismal Formula* is the prayer of thanksgiving after the administration of the sacrament. The prayer was derived by Datheen immediately from the German Reformed Palatine (where Calvin's student Olevianus laboured), and ultimately from Laski.

It states: "Almighty God and merciful Father! We thank and praise You that You have forgiven us and our children all our sins through the blood of Your beloved Son Jesus Christ, and received us through Your Holy Spirit.... You have adopted us to be Your children, and sealed and confirmed this to us by holy baptism....

"Will You be pleased always to keep on governing these baptized children by Your Holy Spirit, so that they may keep on receiving a Christian and godly education! May they keep on increasing and growing up in the Lord Jesus Christ, so that they may keep on acknowledging Your fatherly goodness and mercy which You **have** shown to them...under our only Teacher...and High Priest Jesus Christ.... May they keep on overcoming sin, the devil and his whole dominion -- in order that they may eternally praise and magnify You and Your Son Jesus Christ, together with the Holy Ghost: the one only true God! *Amen!*"¹²⁶

420. Evaluation of the Dutch Reformed Baptismal Formula

Without doubt, this *Dutch Reformed Baptismal Formula* throughout presupposes that covenant children have already been regenerated before their baptism. It assumes that they are therefore to be expected to serve God after their infant baptism, and indeed increasingly so, for the whole of the remainder of their earthly lives. Cf. Romans 6:1-4,13f,22.

As Rev. Professor Dr. Abraham Kuyper Sr. points out, the exhortation in the *Dutch Reformed Baptismal Formula* states that covenant children "**have been sanctified** in Christ, and should therefore be baptized as those who are Members of His Church.... Our *Formula* expresses this prevenient work of God's grace, with the words: **sanctified in Christ**. These words may not be weakened.... That they **are** Members of His Church, cannot be understood other than that the implantation of the hidden germ of the new life has **already** taken place within them."¹²⁷

"Our **children** do not become Members of Christ's Church only when baptized. But they are Members.... It is in that capacity that they are entitled to be baptized.... It is **as a child of the Church** that this child should be baptized."¹²⁸

Further: "The prayer of thanksgiving is especially beautiful in that it contains such a choice profession about the children of the covenant having been sanctified. The Church does **not** pray that the baptized children might be brought to faith, but it gives praise and thanks that we with our children have been received as Members of Christ and as children of God -- and that this sanctified state of the little children has been sealed in and through baptism....

"In this prayer the congregation does not ask that these baptized children might be brought to Christ -- but that they, as those already brought, may be led further through the grace of God and may always be governed by the Holy Spirit. Not so that they might be ingrafted into Christ, but so that they -- having been ingrafted into Him -- might grow and increase in Him."¹²⁹

"The prayer of thanksgiving...is altogether in agreement with the prior confession: 'baptism now seals...that God has received us and our children as His children'.... The Church has baptized these children, at God's command, in the **presumption** that they belong to His elect.

"Upon that presumption rests the final prayer in this thanksgiving -- that the Lord God 'be pleased always to govern these baptized children with His Holy Spirit, so that they grow up and increase in the Lord Christ.' For naturally, that is something which could never be said of an unregenerate."

421. The 1581 Synopsis of Purer Theology on Infant Faith

The famous *Synopsis of Purer Theology* appeared in 1581. There, the Reformed Theology Professors at Leiden -- Drs. Polyander, Rivetus, Thysius and Walaeus -- declared¹³⁰ that only "believers' children should be baptized." For "only those for whom the signified matter is intended, should also receive the sign of that matter."

The *Synopsis* continued:¹³¹ "We regard as such, children who are born of believing and covenanted parents -- according to God's promise in Genesis 17 ['I will be a God unto you and to your seed'].... Circumcision...was a seal of the same covenant [Romans 4:11].... In its place, baptism succeeded. Colossians 2:11.... The actual sign cannot be denied to those to whom the thing signified belongs -- as the Apostle Peter eloquently testifies. Acts 10:47 & 11:17 [*cf.* 2:38f]....

"From Ephesians 5:26, it is seen the Apostle says that Christ loved His Church and gave Himself over for her -- and cleansed her through the washing of the water in the Word. Hence -- [wrongly] either the little children of believers are not part of the Church for which Christ gave Himself; or [rightly] even the little children are purified by the washing of the water of the Word.

"For nobody can deny that the benefits of Christ's blood and Spirit belong to the children of believers -- unless he wants them excluded from salvation.... Nobody may enter the Kingdom of God, save he who has been born again.... John 3:5.... Nobody is Christ's, who does not have Christ's Spirit. Romans 8:9."

Further: "We do, with the Scripture, pre-require **faith** and repentance in all that are to be baptized, at least according to the judgment of charity.... And that -- also in **infants** that are within the covenant, in whom...we affirm that there is the **seed** and Spirit of **faith** and repentance."¹³²

422. The Belgian Reformed Jean Taffin: covenant infants are believers

The celebrated Walloon theologian Jean Taffin was Librarian of Granvelle -- before becoming a Protestant. Thereafter a warm supporter of Vander Heyden, Taffin served Calvinist congregations first in Germany and then in Belgium -- before also becoming a close personal friend and then the Court Preacher of King William of Orange.

In his 1580*f Instruction Against the Errors of the Anabaptists*, Taffin stated¹³³ that covenant children in the Bible -- "without being taught; and without professing their **faith**; and without production of the fruits of repentance or improvement of their lives -- are Members of Christ, children of God, **justified** and sanctified." Indeed, "salvation in Christ applies to the children of believers -- according to the testimonies of the covenant."¹³⁴

Covenant infants, explained Taffin,¹³⁵ are themselves believers. For three reasons. "First, because they themselves possess the same grace of salvation which adult believers and penitents do. Second, because they have been engrafted into Christ -- to bear the fruits of faith and repentance once they have come to their mature years. Third, because when God speaks of unbelievers and impenitents -- He means those of mature age who do not believe in Christ.... Therefore, the young children of believers, engrafted into Christ by virtue of the covenant -- may not be placed among the number of the unbelievers!"

Continued Taffin:¹³⁶ "The young children of believers belong to Christ.... From this, it follows that they possess the Spirit of Christ.... Romans 8:7." Indeed, "when it is said they are 'holy' (according to First Corinthians 7:14), this is noted as to their second birth. They have been

regenerated by the Spirit of Christ.... They have been born again.... The renewal of the Holy Spirit is in them...even though they themselves do not and cannot yet show this nor bear its fruits."¹³⁷

It is true some of these infants may later backslide and finally prove to be unbelievers. But while they are tiny, concluded Taffin, "there is more reason to **presume their faith in God**.... Christ says 'of such is the Kingdom of heaven' -- more so than adults, who profess their own 'faith'.... Love obliges us to regard the young children of believers as children of God and as born again...until they might reveal the contrary, after coming to their understanding.... Consequently, I conclude they should be baptized" in infancy.

423. The Anti-Anabaptist baptismal views of Francis Junius

The great French Reformed theologian Rev. Professor Dr. Francis Junius studied under Calvin and especially Beza -- before himself becoming Professor of Theology at Heidelberg from 1584 onward, and at Leyden from 1592 onward. After the 1560f appearance of the *Geneva Bible*, Junius furnished its book of Revelation with valuable footnotes. All of this was constantly reprinted in many editions of the English-language *Geneva Bible* -- which so shaped Puritan Britain and the early American Colonies.¹³⁸

Indeed, Junius's *Theological Theses on Paedobaptism*¹³⁹ still remains a classic. This is so, quite apart from his very charitable wish that the early-dying children even of unbelievers might well be wished and perhaps even assumed to have been regenerated before their death.¹⁴⁰

Far more demonstrably, Junius also stated that "faith in its first action...is required [before baptism].... For it is inseparable from the person covenanted or to be baptized.... It is an error to maintain absolutely that children cannot believe. For they have the beginning of possessing faith, because they possess the Spirit of faith (*Spiritus fidei*)....

"Elect infants are born again when they are ingrafted into Christ; and this is sealed to them, when they are baptized." Furthermore: "Nobody positively unbelieving is fit for baptism. But children" are not thus unfit. "For Christ empowers them."¹⁴¹

In his 1592 book *Nature and Grace*, Junius also wrote: "None of us is so wild...as to condemn...infants *simpliciter*.... Although they are in themselves and in our common nature condemnable -- it does not follow that we ought to pass the sentence of condemnation upon them. What then? Will they be saved? We hold that all those will be saved who belong to the covenant and who belong to election. But those infants belong to the covenant who sprang from covenanted parents -- whether immediately (*i.e.* from covenanted father and mother), or...mediately (*i.e.* from covenanted ancestors [*cf.* Isaiah 59:21] even though the continuity has been broken).

"As God says, He 'will shew mercy unto thousands of generations.' Exodus 20[:6].... God sanctifies by the covenant as His Own, some from the number of unbelievers -- for the sake of the covenant, we mean, that ancestors received.

"Some also, however, belong to the election. For God has not cut off from Himself the right and authority to communicate more widely the grace of His own election to those of whom it cannot be said that either their parents or ancestors belonged to the covenant. For just as of old He called into the covenant afresh, according to His election, those who were not in the covenant, in order that they might be in it [Genesis 17:10-27 especially verses 12b & 27b] -- so also in every age the same benefit may be conferred by His most free action....

"Why may this not happen to infants as well as to others?... Out of charity, we [then] presume that those whom He calls to Himself as infants...are rather saved -- according to His election."

424. Trelcatius Sr. and Jr. on infant faith in covenant children

In 1587, (Lucas) Trelcatius Senior became Professor of Reformed Theology at Leyden . He stated that covenant "**infants have the seed of faith**" -- *'fidem habent infantes in sementi'*.¹⁴² He also stated that "the child of believing parents is sanctified, although not [yet] producing the fruits of conversion."¹⁴³

His son, Lucas Trelcatius Junior, also became a Professor of Theology at Leyden. He stated that covenant children have Christian faith "in a passive and imputed sense -- when, from the covenant and promise of God, the 'righteousness of faith' [Romans 4:11] is attributed to the children."

He further stated that "**the children have faith...as a seed** [or *sementi*] -- not as a fruit to be harvested" yet. That seed is deposited in the covenant infant "by the hidden power of the Spirit -- [yet] not by external demonstration" until later . "But the difference in age [between an infant and an adult] does not destroy the unity of **faith**" within both. "For one and the same righteousness of faith is sealed both in the parents as well as in the children."¹⁴⁴

425. Gellius Snecanus on 'imputed faith' in covenant infants

The Frisian Gellius Snecanus of Franeker was a kindred spirit of Laski and Bullinger. His 1588 book *The Basis...of God's Covenant of Grace, of the Sacramental Sign, and of Baptism* -- written especially against the Anabaptists -- still remains a classic . There, he maintained that even Mark 16:16 presupposes an 'imputed faith' within covenantal babies.¹⁴⁵

This, argued Snecanus, is because "Christ is not here dealing only with the profession of faith in particular" -- the actual essence of which, children do not yet possess. "But he is here dealing with the imputation of **faith** and of righteousness, which embraces 'every creature' alias the entire seed of the believers unto a thousand generations" -- both the children as well as the parents. Thus, covenant children too need to have such a faith. "For the imputation of faith and the righteousness of the saved, stretches just as far as does the grace of the evangelical doctrine and the promise of salvation."

Snecanus then gave nine proofs [and hundreds of quotations] to prove that such children are born again. Then he added: "The children may no more be excluded from regeneration, than they could be excluded: from the covenant; from God's mercy; from the power of the death of Christ; yea, from the number of the believers and from the Kingdom of God. These things are the more important attributes, entities and operations of regeneration.... Consequently, the children ought also in no way to be hindered from baptism."¹⁴⁶

426. James Kimedoncius on infant faith within covenant children

The fiery Calvinist James Kimedoncius received his doctoral degree in theology at Heidelberg in 1576 (where Zanchius himself gave the address). After being deprived of his university appointment there by the Gnesio-Lutheran, Prince Louis VI, Kimedoncius became a Professor in the new Belgian Calvinistic seminary at Ghent in 1578. There, he trained many renowned theological students, like the celebrated Old Testamentian William Baudartius (one of the translators of the later 1637 *Dordt Dutch Bible*), and the famous writer of the *Short Compendium* (Herman Faukelius himself).

After being elected Moderator of the 1586 Synod of the Hague, the 1587 Synod of Delft asked Kimedoncius to translate the Bible. Then he was appointed Professor of Theology at Heidelberg, in 1590.

In 1589, the Anabaptist Diereck Philips had published a 'Confession' -- with the title: *Concerning the Baptism of our Lord Jesus Christ*. Against this, Kimedoncius then published an *Answer*.

In his *Answer*, Kimedoncius stated:¹⁴⁷ "The Holy Spirit is promised and also **imparted** to the **children** no less than to adults. Consequently, it follows that the children too are born again.... Were Jeremiah and John not sanctified and filled with the Holy Spirit from their mother's womb? Jeremiah 1:5 & Luke 1:15.... Regeneration, and the childhood and inheritances of the children of God -- cannot be divorced from one another.... If the children cannot be born again -- how then can children even be heirs of God?"¹⁴⁸

As Members of the one spiritual body, continues Kimedoncius, "all are made alive and joined to one another by one and the same Spirit, the Spirit of life, in Christ -- both children and adults -- so that the Spirit of God is not idle or unemployed even in the children."¹⁴⁹ He who alleges that these children do not partake of the Spirit of Christ, "not only slanders the covenant of God which He has erected with us and with our seed [Genesis 17], but would also exclude the children from all salvation -- inasmuch as there is no salvation outside Christ's body, His holy congregation."¹⁵⁰

Kimedoncius concluded that baptism is a visible witness and confirmation of the salvation which they have in Christ. Covenant infants are, "together with their parents, in the covenant of grace and included in the Church -- and therefore possess that which is signified by baptism."¹⁵¹

427. Jeremiah Bastingius on covenant infants' actual faith

The celebrated Jeremiah Basting was trained by Beza, Ursinus and Olevianus. He attained his doctorate at Heidelberg in 1575. Thereafter, he was repeatedly offered professorships at Leyden.

In 1594, he published his *Explanations of the [Heidelberg] Catechism on the Christian Religion*. There, in dealing with Question 74 on infant baptism, he argued¹⁵² that "children are not promised the forgiveness of sins and the Holy Spirit less than adults are....

"The sign and external ceremony can no way be denied those who are promised and given the things signified, such as forgiveness of sins and the Holy Spirit.... The immature little children are promised and given the forgiveness of sins and the Holy Spirit. How then can the element of water fairly be withheld from the young children?"

After next quoting Matthew 19:14 and John 3:5, Basting continued about covenant infants: "Their rebirth cannot be doubted. This is even strengthened by the fact that regeneration is a work of the Holy Spirit.... The Holy Spirit causes faith. They [infants of believers] undoubtedly have the Worker of faith within them."

Basting concluded¹⁵³ it would be arrogant "to say that the children have no ability to believe at all. For we nevertheless have the testimonies that they do possess the Holy Spirit....

"Scripture certifies there are only two kinds of people in the world" -- the believers, and the unbelievers . "The little children of the believers are not numbered among the unbelievers; but, together with their parents, among the believers."

Indeed, "it appears that the little children: not only have forgiveness of sin; and are citizens of the heavenly Kingdom; and have the grace and favour of the heavenly Father from Him through Christ. But they have even been regenerated."

428. Gomarus: the Holy Spirit operates within covenant babies

The well-known Belgian Reformed Flemish theologian Rev. Dr. Francis Gomarus -- the later 'T-U-L-I-P' hero of the 1618-19 Synod of Dort which formulated the famous 'Five Points of Calvinism' -- had studied under Calvin's friends Sturm and Junius and Ursinus and Zanchius in Europe. Gomarus also studied under the learned British Puritan John Rainolds at Oxford, and under William Whittaker and William Perkins at Cambridge from 1582-84 -- before himself becoming Professor of Theology at Leyden in 1594.

Held Gomarus:¹⁵⁴ "Baptism belongs to everybody...in whom the Holy Spirit is operating. That is the case with the tiny little children of believers. Consequently, baptism cannot be denied to them."

In his *Disputations on the Sacraments*, Gomarus added:¹⁵⁵ "The internal covenant is the reciprocal connection between God -- and those who have been gifted with the Spirit of the living God. There, God graciously promises to be and continually to remain their God and Redeemer -- through fellowship with Christ and His benefits, and conversely...by their serving Him in faith

and continual obedience.

"Consequently, circumcision is called not only a sign of the covenant but also a seal of the righteousness of faith (Romans 4:11). Baptism is a seal of spiritual grace to the children. They have the Spirit. **Therefore, they should be baptized.**"¹⁵⁶

429. Ruardus Acronius on born-again babies before their infant baptisms

Ruard(us) Acron(ius) of Leeuwarden was a famous Frisian Reformed theologian. In 1596, Acron 'dialogued' with -- alias debated against -- the noted Anabaptist leader Pieter Van Ceulen. In his own *Protocol or the Entire Acts of the Dialogue Held at Leeuwarden in Friesland*, Acronius insisted¹⁵⁷ that covenant children "had really...been born again." Consequently, "these same children -- for these and other reasons -- ought to be baptized."

Acronius cited many Bible texts in support of this . His passages included: Genesis 3:15 & 17:7 & 22:18; Matthew 19; Mark 10:13; Luke 18:15; John 6:37-39 & 15:5; Romans 6:5; First Corinthians 3:23; and Ephesians 5:23-32. "From all of which," he explained, "is revealed that the children of the covenant are implanted in Christ as living branches -- and have fellowship with Him as His true Members."

This saving implantation of believers into Christ, continued Acronius,¹⁵⁸ takes place usually before baptism. He then gives his reason for so thinking.

For "all adults and also young children of the covenant are first of all actually and internally implanted in the Lord Christ and His Church -- neither through baptism nor through profession, but through that everlasting mercy of God whereby He admits both us and our seed into His covenant.... Through holy baptism, as Paul declares in First Corinthians 12:12f, this acknowledgment is confirmed."

The tiny children of the covenant have truly been born again. To establish this, Acronius here cited: Deuteronomy 30:6; Psalm 22:11; Isaiah 44:3; Jeremiah 31:33; Luke 1:15; John 3:3; Acts 2:39; Romans 6:5 & 8:9 & 8:30; First Corinthians 1:30 & 7:14 & 15:50; Second Corinthians 5:17; and Ephesians 2:10." In addition, Acronius further even cited Sirach 1:16 and Esdras 1:37 -- from the Apocrypha.¹⁵⁹

"From all these and similar [passages]," explained Acronius,¹⁶⁰ "it is clear that the children of the promise possess the Spirit of faith and of power, and that they are sanctified by Him as much as is necessary for their salvation -- even though those same sanctifications do not immediately manifest themselves, on account of the youngness of the children."

After that, covenant children need a strictly Christian education. For, continued Acronius,¹⁶¹ "they must not degenerate -- as old adults can degenerate." Thus, baptized infants "by lawful means, are [to be] daily led to godliness -- more and more." Yet, "if God were not powerful in the children through His Spirit -- education would be useless."¹⁶²

Nevertheless, whenever "the youth increase in evil, it occurs largely through the tardiness or neglect of those who ought to educate them in the fear of the Lord from infancy onward.... Deuteronomy 4:9 & 6:20 and Psalm 78:4.... All of us are by nature inclined to evil....

"We have never said that all children of the covenant must necessarily be born again in their childhood.... However, in agreement with the word of Paul in Second Thessalonians 2:13 and according to the judgment of charity, we ought to hope the best of everybody -- until the matter manifests itself."¹⁶³

430. Some lesser sixteenth-century Reformed theologians on infant faith

There were also many other lesser Reformed theologians in sixteenth-century Europe, who equally presupposed the pre-baptismal regeneration of covenantal infants.¹⁶⁴ Thus Rotterdam's Caspar Grevinchoven, in his 1599 book *A Thorough Study of Baptism and Rebaptism*, said:¹⁶⁵ "Our children are regarded and reckoned to be born-again believers.... Because of the promise, our children have the Holy Spirit."

Middelburg's John Seu, in his 1601 *True and Thorough Proofs...of Child Baptism*, declared:¹⁶⁶ "All those who belong to us...ought to be baptized and regarded as holy...and regenerated by the operations of the Holy Spirit." This presumption should continue at least "until they might prove themselves to be ungodly in profession and works."

Harlem's Peter Bontemps wrote his *Short Proof of the Manifold Errors of the Anabaptists or Mennonites* in the Netherlands. There, after citing Jeremiah 31 and Acts 2, he declared¹⁶⁷ that "the tiny children of the believers have the seed of faith."

Leyden's James Du Bois, in his *Infant Baptism Proved and Defended from the Words of the Apostle in Acts 2:38-39*, made the promise of the Spirit the foundation of infant baptism.¹⁶⁸ Indeed, in his *Certainty About Infant Baptism*, he charitably (though rebuttably) presumed that all tiny covenant children possess "the beginnings of rebirth" and "the good root which the Holy Spirit has wrought in them."¹⁶⁹

Enkhuizen's Abraham Donselaer and Venhuizen's Peter James Austro-Sylvius together wrote a book against the Anabaptists. There they declared that "the Spirit of regeneration by His operations even plants the tree of sanctification in the children, who produce their fruit at the right time when they grow up."

They further insisted that covenant children are "intended among the number of the believers" -- and that such infants possess "the Spirit of regeneration Who works faith [in them] as well as in adults." Indeed, they show that "the children of believers partake of the Holy Spirit by virtue of the covenant."¹⁷⁰

Also Herman Moded, Herman Buschius, John Tay(us), Abraham Costerus, Gerald Nicolai, Francis Lanspergius, John Amsping(ius), and Adrian Vossenholius all took similar positions. So too did especially Herman Faukelius (the writer of the famous *Short Compendium* of the Heidelberg Catechism).¹⁷¹

431. Monolithic opposition of all the Reformers to Anabaptism

Quite the entirety of the first generation, and also the majority of the second generation of Protestant Reformers -- were all infantly-baptized in the Roman Catholic Church. Not one of them was ever subsequently 'rebaptized' in a Protestant Church. In varying degrees, all of them seem to have presumed (rebuttably) the regeneratedness of covenant infants even before their baptism as babies.

Indeed, many of them aggressively assailed the Anabaptist doctrines. Thus: Martin Luther;¹⁷² Ulrich Zwingli;¹⁷³ John Calvin;¹⁷⁴ John Knox;¹⁷⁵ Guido de Bres;¹⁷⁶ Peter Datheen;¹⁷⁷ Menzo Alting;¹⁷⁸ Jean Taffin;¹⁷⁹ Francis Junius;¹⁸⁰ Lucas Trecaultius Sr.;¹⁸¹ Lucas Trecaultius Jr.;¹⁸² Gellius Snecanus;¹⁸³ James Kimedoncius;¹⁸⁴ Peter Bontemps;¹⁸⁵ and many others.¹⁸⁶

Most of them also fulminated against Romanism's false doctrine of baptismal regenerationism -- and Lutheranism's incorrect teaching as to the almost absolute necessity for baptism. Thus Calvin, Beza and Alsted -- as well as the three *Brandenburg Confessions* from 1614 onward.¹⁸⁷

Also the famous Lutheran theologian Rev. Professor Dr. John Gerhard has well understood the position of the Calvinists. In his own 1610-22 *Loci Communi [Theological Common Places]* (ed. 1769 IX: 281), Gerhard explained that the Reformed theologians Calvin and Beza and Sadeel and Ursinus and Gentilis and Musculus all affirmed "the infants of believers all alike -- whether baptized or unbaptized -- are rightly **holy** from their mothers' **womb**."

Indeed, continued Gerhard, Calvinists regard such infants as holy not by baptism but precisely "by the inheritance of the promise." Consequently, he concluded, according to Calvinism such persons -- immediately after an early death even before their infant baptism -- "enjoy eternal salvation in the covenant and company of God."

432. Constant influence of Continental Calvinism on seventeenth-century Britain

In concluding the above survey of the baptismal theology of the sixteenth-century Calvinists, it needs to be re-emphasized that the European Reformers not only massively influenced the Presbyterian Church of Scotland, but also the Anglican Church in England. Both sixteenth- and seventeenth-century British Puritans were massively influenced by the Paedobaptist and Anti-Anabaptistic Reformed theology of the Continent.

Thus, the Scots Wishart and Knox both studied in Switzerland. Not just Peter Martyr Vermigli and Jan Laski but also Micron and Gomarus all studied and worked in England.

Indeed, there was a constant stream of heavy correspondence between the Reformed Churches in Switzerland and both the Anglicans and the Presbyterians in Britain. That was so, especially between Bucer and Calvin and Bullinger and Peter Martyr on the one hand -- and Knox

and Hooper and Jewel and Cranmer and Somerset *etc.* on the other.

As the American, Church History Scholar Rev. Professor Dr. Lewis Bevens Schenck has well stated in his important book *The Presbyterian Doctrine of Children in the Covenant*,¹⁸⁸ Calvin and Bullinger and Beza were well-known in both Elizabethan and Puritan England. In 1587, Calvin's *Catechism* was ordered by statute to be used in the British universities. His *Institutes* became the chief textbook of theology in Oxford and Cambridge. Indeed, the *Decades* of his associate Bullinger were for some time the manual of the clergy in Britain. This was Swiss 'covenant theology' -- and the Britons would soon develop it yet further.

According to the Schaff-Herzog *Encyclopaedia of Religious Knowledge*, the 1548-1595 Lancashire Puritan Theologian Rev. Dr. William Whittaker was a man of great learning -- very staunch in his Protestantism and Calvinism. Whittaker, who was Regius Professor of Divinity at Cambridge, wrote a very important book titled *On Sacraments in General*. There (I:3:15), he insisted: "God renews elect infants by the power of His Spirit.... In the case of infants..., I think sprinkling sufficient" -- when baptizing them. See too his *Pre-Lectures on the Sacrament of Baptism* Q.1. c.2 p. 216 (Frankfurt 1624).

Also the great Puritan Rev. Professor Dr. William Perkins [1558-1602] did not differ. He too, according to Schaff-Herzog, was a High Calvinist -- and indeed an 'Extreme Calvinist' in doctrine. Thus Perkins, in his *How to Live Well* (I:486), maintained: "We are to judge that infants of believing parents dying in their infancy, are justified."

Henceforth, the 'covenant theology' of 'federalism' on the European Continent was even more forcefully expressed in the writings of the English Puritans and other Britons. Compare John Preston's 1629 *Treatise on the New Covenant*. There was also John Ball's *Treatise on the Covenant of Grace*. It was published in 1645 after his death -- and was heartily recommended by the Westminster divines Ashe, Burgess, Calamy, Cawdrey, Hill and Reynolds.

Explains Rev. Dr. A.F. Mitchell in his book on *The Westminster Assembly*: "The doctrine of the covenants...some assert to have been derived from Holland. I think myself now, after careful investigation, entitled to maintain that there is nothing taught in the [Dutch] Confessions which had not been long before in substance taught by Rollock and Howie in Scotland -- and by Cartwright, Preston, Perkins, Ames and Ball (in his two catechisms) in England.... Ball on the *Covenant of Grace*...contained all that has been admitted into the *Westminster Standards* or generally received on this head among British Calvinists."

Rev. Dr. C.G. M'Crie, in his famous book *Confessions of the Church of Scotland*, insists¹⁸⁹ that "with the English Puritans of the seventeenth century, federalism was in general favour and use." Also Dr. William Adams Brown, in his work *The Essence of Christianity*, rightly states¹⁹⁰ that covenant theology is "a characteristic feature of the early English Puritanism -- appearing in the writings of Cartwright, Ball and Ames in England as well as of Rollock and Howie in Scotland."

Thus too Rev. Professor Dr. B.B. Warfield, in his great book *The Westminster Assembly and Its Work*. There, Warfield rightly argues¹⁹¹ that also the 1647 *Westminster Confession* followed the general scheme of federal theology then maintained both in Britain and on the

Continent. This, he insists, was the dominant position and the best presentation of Reformed Thought.

The situation at the end of the sixteenth century was well summarized by the great Anglican baptismal scholar Rev. Dr. William Wall in his famous book *The History of Infant Baptism*, which he wrote about a hundred years later. Even at that later time, observed Wall,¹⁹² "all the National Churches in Europe are paedobaptist.... So are those in Asia."

Thus the "Armenians, Jacobites, Maronites, Christians of St. Thomas [in India] *etc.*....do all baptize infants. The Copts and Abyssinians do both of them baptize their infants forty days after their birth.... Some Dutchmen in England" (as Anabaptist refugees from the Continent) then rejected infant baptism -- "but no Englishmen...in the reigns of Henry VIII, Edward VI, Mary, and Queen Elisabeth" then did so.

433. Infant faith of covenant babies in the early seventeenth-century Church

Coming now to the beginning of the seventeenth century, the events leading to the great international 1618^f Calvinistic Synod of Dordt are of crucial importance. They are also very important indeed in understanding even the later Westminster Assembly of Calvinistic Theologians in Britain.

In 1602, the Synod of South Holland expressed the need for a *Formula for Baptizing Adults*. This was accepted the following year. It began as follows.¹⁹³

"Children of Christian parents, although they understand not this mystery, must indeed be baptized by virtue of the covenant. Yet it is not lawful to baptize those who are come to years of discretion, except they first be sensible of their sins and make confession both of their repentance and their faith in Christ.... Therefore, it is not lawful now to baptize any other adult persons than such as have been taught the mysteries of holy baptism by the preaching of the Gospel, and are able to give an account of their faith by the confession of the mouth."

Significantly, the very language of this *Formula* presupposes the adult baptismal candidate's prior regeneration. Implicitly, it also does the same in respect of covenant infants -- before their baptism in terms of the earlier *Formula* for them.

For the adult candidate is rightly told that baptism "signifies and seals the washing away of sins by Jesus Christ," and that it "warns and obliges" them to yield "a new obedience." The candidate is then asked before baptism whether he or she "believe[s] that Christ has been given you as a Saviour by God?"

He or she is further asked whether "through faith you receive forgiveness of sin in His blood?" Indeed, he or she is also asked whether "you have become a Member of Jesus Christ and His Church, by the power of the Holy Spirit?"

Hereafter, the Calvinists' struggle against the Anabaptists now lessened -- even as their struggles against rising Arminianism increased. Yet also the latter, unintendingly, made them

aware of the absolute nature of predestination -- even in the salvation of infants while still tiny, and especially when dying in infancy before professing their faith.

For the Arminians more and more insisted in a 'free-will' personal profession of faith -- before they would accept that a person had become a Christian. Yet the Calvinists more and more insisted on a 'free-grace' possession of faith. This God alone gives -- to whom He will, and at whatever age He will -- and even in tenderest infancy, before any personal profession is possible!

In 1606, Carolus Gallus published his *Hammer of the Anabaptists*. There he declared:¹⁹⁴ "Who then now scolds the children of our believers, and does not regard them as born-again children of God? They, just as much as the adults, partake of God's covenant of grace....

"They have not only the mere prediction.... But they also truly partake of all the graces of the Spirit of Christ, the Spirit of childship and of regeneration.... Even the little children too certainly have the commencement of these things. Consequently, they are also soon sealed with the covenantal seal and sign of baptism."

In 1607, Reginald Donteclock in his *Thorough Investigation...of Predestination or God's Eternal Election*, declared¹⁹⁵ that the children of the covenant "are to be reckoned among the believers.... They have been called, together with their parents."

Elsewhere he wrote "about the children of believers, who die in their youngness." Here, he explained,¹⁹⁶ "one should judge that, because of God's covenant in which they stand, they were all elected unto salvation -- and shall all together be justified."

William Bucanus added in 1609: "It is not to be denied that the seed even of faith is poured into elect infants."¹⁹⁷ Similarly, Robert Puppilus gave twenty-six reasons in his 1611 *Proof of Infant Baptism*.¹⁹⁸

In his *Protecting Infant Baptism*, Puppilus further roundly declared:¹⁹⁹ "There are even internal fruits of the Holy Spirit in the little children.... For He regenerates them and makes them holy.... By daily attempts, we must arouse the power of the Holy Spirit -- so that they should not degenerate the way adults can."

434. Baby faith in Acronius's and Hommius's Scriptural Conference

In the same year, 1611, the famous Ruardius Acronius and Festus Hommius published their book *Scriptural Conference*. There they insisted²⁰⁰ that "not just adults who believe in Christ ...but also the children of the covenant are to be regarded as elect -- as long as they indeed do not manifest the contrary."

According to the *Heidelberg Catechism*, the Holy Spirit Who works faith is assigned to the children not less than to the adults. "Small children born of believing parents, have received the Holy Spirit of regeneration.... According to the judgment of love, **all** [covenant infants] are to be regarded as **having the Spirit of regeneration** -- as long as they do not publically manifest the

contrary....

"According to the same judgment of love, we are to believe the same of **all** small children born of believing parents -- until such time as they themselves, after growing up, might exhibit themselves differently. For the common promise has been made to these children. Acts 2:39."

435. Alsted and Alting on the presumed regeneration of covenant infants

We now turn to the covenantal views of great German Calvinist Reformer John Henry Alsted. He was Professor of Philosophy from 1610 onward -- and of Theology as from 1619.

In his *Theological Polity*, Alsted declared:²⁰¹ "Some are given faith during their tender youth.... For justifying faith is given only to the elect. Yet it is also given to all of them, by name and by number. As to its seed or root, it is given even to elect **children**....

"Scripture knows of only two classes of men: believers and unbelievers. John 3:5-6. Yet there are indeed two distinguishable kinds of actions of faith.... By the first, faith originates; by the second, it operates. Those elect children who die in infancy, possess faith in the first action [or faith of the first kind]...in seed.... This is why the elect children are baptized."

Similarly, Heidelberg Professor of Theology Henry Alting (the son of the renowned Menzo Alting)²⁰² stated that "children of believers are **born holy**.... By virtue of their birth, they are not heathen but **Christians**.... They are born holy, and are born as covenanters."²⁰³

"They **have** the holiness [of the Spirit] **within** them.... They are capable of being sanctified [further].... They are justified through their **own** faith, which...is a movement of the Holy Spirit suitable to them -- yet hidden to us.

"This Holy Spirit, given to the children, is not idle in them.... The Spirit helps believers with unutterable groanings [Romans 8:26]. Similarly, He works movements in children which are inexplicable to us."²⁰⁴

As Calvinists, "our first position against the Lutherans who teach that [God through] baptism [itself] produces an active faith, is that tiny **little children do not have an active faith**....

"Our second position, against the Anabaptists, is that the tiny little children are implanted with a **seed of faith** from which the later act of faith is born."²⁰⁵

Apparently still discussing the views of Lutherans [and especially of Romanists], Alting stated that "they make salvation dependent on an external thing -- because they imagine that the child is lost eternally if death occurs before the baptism with water has taken place. They do not know that the salvation of the children depends on the grace of election and of the covenant."

In actual fact, however, "infants of believers **have** some seed of faith. At a more mature age, it goes forth to act. It accedes outwardly by human initiation, but inwardly [and priorly] by the Holy Spirit -- with a greater effect."²⁰⁶

436. The anti-Lutheran 1614 Brandenburg Confession on covenant infants

In their Markish or *Brandenburg Confession*²⁰⁷ of 1614, German Reformed Theologians such as Pelargus of Frankfurt and Füssel of Berlin²⁰⁸ sought to defend themselves against hateful attacks from some of the Lutherans. This *Confession* presents a very high view of infant baptism. Yet it also rightly points out that baptism is of no use to unbelieving recipients.

"It helps them just as little as circumcision helped unbelievers. For this reason, the children of faithful Christians who are not able to receive holy baptism on account of the dire danger of death -- are no way to be damned. For the Son of God says: 'he who believes and is baptized, shall be saved; but he who does not believe, shall be damned' [Mark 16:16]."

The *Brandenburg Confession* then approvingly quotes the non-baptistic Luther against the later and baptistic Gnesio-Lutherans. "For Mr. Luther has well written in his *Church Reading*: 'It has always unanimously been agreed in all ages that if anybody has believed, yet died unbaptized -- he will not therefore be damned. For the case may somehow occur that somebody believes, but nevertheless is hurried away by death before he receives the baptism he desires. And this can happen with young children before, during, or after their birth. But they may have been dedicated and entrusted to Christ before that, by the prayer of their parents or by other believers. For [cf. Matthew 19:14] He said in His Word: "Permit the little children to come to Me!"'"

437. The Anti-Anabaptist and Anti-Romish 1615 Irish Articles

Very important are the 1615 *Irish Articles*. For, as Rev. Professor Dr. Philip Schaff and Rev. Professor Dr. Benjamin B. Warfield both rightly claim,²⁰⁹ the *Westminster Confession of Faith* itself was influenced chiefly by these *Articles*.

Already in 1566, the Protestant Church of Ireland had drawn up twelve short articles. After the founding of Dublin University in 1591, the Protestant Irish Church convoked in 1613, and drew up one hundred and four new articles -- largely under the leadership of the godly Puritan, James Ussher (who later became the Episcopalian Archbishop of Dublin).

The *Irish Articles* are strongly Anti-Anabaptistic. They provide²¹⁰ that "the laws of the realm may punish Christian men with death for heinous and grievous offences.... The riches and goods of Christians are not common, as touching the right...and possession of the same -- as certain Anabaptists falsely affirm...."

"Although in the visible Church the evil be ever mingled with the good, and sometimes the evil have chief authority in the ministration of the Word and Sacraments: yet, forasmuch as they

do not the same in their own name, but in Christ's, and minister by His commission and authority, we may use their ministry both in hearing the Word and in receiving the Sacraments.

"Neither is the effect of Christ's ordinance taken away by their wickedness.... It is not lawful for any man to take upon him the office of public preaching or ministering the Sacraments in the Church, unless he be first lawfully called and sent to execute the same."

These *Irish Articles* are also very strongly Calvinistic, and reflect the Puritanism then prevalent in Trinity College Dublin. They are 'presbyterianizing' in character, and are very strong on predestination and reprobation. Indeed, they apparently presuppose regeneration even before infant baptism.

They insist²¹¹ that "baptism is not only an outward sign of our profession and a note of difference whereby Christians are discerned from such as are not Christians. But much more a sacrament of our admission into the Church, sealing unto us our new birth by the communion which we have in Jesus Christ.

"The baptism of infants is to be retained in the Church as agreeable to the Word of God. In the administration of baptism -- exorcism, oil, salt, spittle and superstitious hallowing of the water are for just causes abolished."

438. John Maccovius on infant faith in covenant babies

In the same year the *Irish Articles* were adopted (1615), the Polish Reformed nobleman Jan Makovsky (alias John Maccovius) was appointed Professor of Theology in Friesland. Maccovius had studied under the famous Calvinist Keckermann of Danzig -- and then also successively in Prague, Coblenz, Heidelberg, Marburg, Leipzig, Wittenberg and Franeker. At the latter University he received his doctorate under the Frisian Reformed Calvinist, Professor Lubbertus.

Many Polish and Hungarian as well as Dutch and Frisian theological students soon came to study under Maccovius at Franeker. Even during the last hundred years and down to our present day, Maccovius's influence in the Reformed Churches has been vast -- especially through his warm admirers and propagators Rev. Professor Dr. Abraham Kuyper Sr., Rev. Professor Dr. H.H. Kuyper, and Rev. Dr. Abraham Kuyper Jr.

Wrote Maccovius:²¹² "Actual faith is not the cause of regeneration [but a necessary and an immediate effect thereof].... For, if it were the cause of regeneration -- the children could not be regenerated. And that is ridiculous.... They **are born again**. After all, our regeneration -- just like the infusion of other possessions -- involves our having faith."

Speaking of newly-born covenant children, Maccovius asked and answered:²¹³ "**Do such little children have faith? Yes, they do.** Though they do not have it actively, they do possess **implanted faith**. For **they have been born again** [cf. James 1:17-21]. Thus, they do indeed possess an implanted faith." Hence, "the children are to be baptized."²¹⁴ Indeed, "they are in the covenant as regards their internal fellowship."²¹⁵

Further: "The Kingdom of heaven belongs to the children. According to God's institution, it accompanies justification and regeneration.... Yet the effect...only shows itself in its own time through genuine evidences. For the seed of the Sacraments as well as of the Word remains at rest in the earth for as long as it pleases God" -- before it later germinates.²¹⁶

439. Dordt on baptisms in the Church of the papal antichrist

Hot on the heels of the 1615 *Irish Articles*, and immediately after the appearance of many of the writings of Maccovius, we come to the meeting of the greatest international gathering of Calvinists ever held up to that time. It convened in Holland as the (1618f) *Synod of Dordt* -- of immortal 'T-U-L-I-P' fame.

There at Dordt, international representatives met to hammer out the 'Five Points of Calvinism.' They came from the Republic of the United Netherlands, from French-speaking Wallonia in the south of Belgium, from the Frisian-speaking regions near the borders of Germany and Denmark, from the many various German states, from the Swiss Republics, and from the United Kingdom of Great Britain.

The Synod of Dordt opposed the Arminians with the 'five points' of Calvinism -- '**t-u-l-i-p**' (Viz. total depravity, **u**nconditional election, **l**imited atonement, **i**rrresistible grace, and the **p**erseverance of God in the saints). In its *Preface*, it also denounced "the tyranny of the Romish Antichrist and the terrible idolatry of the papacy." Indeed, it even denied the necessity of baptism for salvation -- and made several important statements of great baptismal importance.

First. Humans are elected unto faith -- and not because of their faith. Thus Dordt stated that "election is the unchangeable purpose of God whereby before the foundation of the world He hath out of mere grace according to the sovereign good pleasure of His will chosen from the whole human race...a certain number of persons...unto redemption in Christ."²¹⁷

Second. Such elect ones also include many babies. For Dordt insisted²¹⁸ that "the children of believers are holy not by nature but by virtue of the covenant of grace in which they, together with the parents, are comprehended. Godly parents have no reason to doubt the election and salvation of those their children whom it pleases God to call out of this life in their infancy. First Corinthians 7:14; Genesis 17:7; Isaiah 59:21; Acts 2:39."

Third. Dordt reminds us of Christ's own words in Holy Scripture about God's revelations to tiny tots within the covenant of grace. For it cited the Saviour's statement: "I praise You, Father..., that You have revealed these things...to the little children.... Matthew 11:25f!"²¹⁹

Fourth. Dordt re-endorsed the Dutch Reformed *Formula for the Baptism of Children* (of Laski, Micron, Datheen and Vander Heyden).²²⁰ This helped standardize the doctrine of prebaptismal presumed regeneration of covenant infants -- throughout the Calvinistic world.

Fifth. The Swiss Reformed theologians at Dordt said there -- in respect of "the children of believers" -- that "by virtue of the covenant" of grace, "God is their God." They said that "Paul calls them 'holy' when...born of a believing father or mother."

They said that "the Lord of heaven declares them to be heirs of the heavenly Kingdom." They further added that "we confidently hope the best about them, whenever they die in their infancy."²²¹

Sixth. The Republic of Bremen's Reformed theologians at Dordt said that "God loves...the children of believers," which is "why they are holy in respect of the covenant." Consequently, "they are incorporated by holy baptism in order to confirm this."²²¹

Last. One of Dordt's articles²²² against the Remonstrants (or Arminians) ascribed both the commencement and the preservation of grace in the elect, to the Word alone. It ascribed to the sacraments only the conservation, continuation and perfection of previously-begun saving grace.²²³

440. The Calvinian *Postscript* in the Deliverance of Dordt on dying infants

Dordt's *Postscript* refuted the Arminian allegations that the Calvinistic view of predestination "is nothing more than the interpolated doctrine of the Stoics, Manichees, Libertines and Turks." Indeed, according to these untruthful allegations of the Arminians, the Calvinists were stated to believe "that many children of the faithful are torn guiltless from their mother's breasts and tyrannically plunged into hell -- so that neither baptism nor the prayers of the church at their baptism can at all profit them."²²⁴

Of course, it is indeed true that Calvinists believe "neither baptism nor the prayers of the church at their baptism" can regenerate either infants or adults. Yet it would also seem the Arminians themselves actually believed that the baptizing of people, and especially the (magical) "prayers of the church at their baptism," perhaps can regenerate people. Significantly, the Arminians easily lapsed either into repeated symbolic rebaptisms -- or alternatively into incipient baptismal regenerationism.

According to Warfield,²²⁵ the language of Dordt's *Postscript* here reveals a very interesting background. From that we learn that Calvin had already sarcastically challenged Castellio: "Put forth now your virulence against God, Who 'hurls innocent babes torn from the breasts of mothers into eternal death [*sic*]!"

Explains Warfield: "The mode of expression is Calvin's *reductio ad absurdam* (or rather *ad blasphemiam*) [not of Calvin's own but] of *Castellio's* opinions. Nevertheless, the Remonstrants [alias the Arminians] allowed themselves, in their polemical zeal, to apply the whole sentiment to the Orthodox [alias against the Calvinists] -- and that, even in still more sharpened form (namely, with reference to **believers'** children.

"This very gross calumny [of the Arminians -- namely, the false allegation that Calvinists teach 'that many children of the faithful are torn guiltless from the breasts of mothers and tyrannically plunged into hell' [and allegedly by God Himself] -- the Synod [of Dordt rightly] repels.

"Its *Deliverance* was [then] subjected to a very sharp and not very candid criticism by Episcopius" the Arminian. Yet the *Deliverance of Dordt* was not altered. Defying the objections of the Arminians, it still stands -- unamendedly.

441. Festus Hommius on infant faith in covenant babies

The Stated Clerk of the Synod of Dordt was Rev. Dr. Festus Hommius. He became Regent of the Leyden State College in 1619.

A fiery opponent of Arminianism, he had been a leading spokesman at the Synod of Dordt. Indeed, as previously pointed out -- together with Acronius, Hommius had already in 1611 made an important declaration about infant regeneration.

Hommius himself wrote the work *Theological Disputations Against the Papists*. This was a work which had an important impact on the later Westminster divine, Rev. Dr. George Gillespie.²²⁶

There,²²⁷ Hommius added that the children of believers "may not be reckoned among the positive unbelievers.... Because they do possess faith in its first actions, at the root and in the seed, and indeed through the internal operations of the Holy Spirit."

Indeed, concluded Hommius, covenant infants and others "that receive the sacraments -- have this grace, before they receive them [the sacraments]. Neither are any to be admitted to the sacrament, who may be justly supposed not to be justified and sanctified."²²⁸

442. Walaeus and Rivetus: infant faith within tiny covenanters

Also in 1619, the famous Flemish Reformed theologian Anthony Walaeus, one of the authors of the former (1581) *Synopsis of Purer Theology*, became Professor of Theology at Leyden. Speaking of covenant children, he himself then said:²²⁹ "Baptism accompanies regeneration, the commencement (*initium*) of which **precedes** it (*antecessit*)."

For baptism assures us of the powerful work of the divine promises within us, and also at the same time of the fulfilment or at least of an increase of the preceding gifts. So "we therefore say that the children must be reckoned among the believers, because the seed or the Spirit of faith is in them.... Some have the acting possession, and other have the inclination of faith."

Sacraments, continued Walaeus,²³⁰ instrumentally confirm and increase faith. But they do not begin nor work faith and regeneration where the latter did not previously there exist.

Similarly, the French Reformed theologian Andre Rivet(us), who co-authored the 1581 *Synopsis of Purer Theology*, also became a Professor at Leyden (in 1620). He said²³¹ that covenant infants have "the beginnings of possessing...the seed of **faith**.... For as the Kingdom of heaven belongs to them, so too does the Spirit of faith (Matthew 19:14)....

"By grace, they are said to incline to faith -- just as by their natural existence they also incline toward sin.... Wherever death overtakes them at birth or before their birth, we believe that God intervenes with His justifying and regenerating grace."

443. The influence of the 1618f Council and Decrees of Dordt upon Britain

We have previously seen²³² that the Stated Clerk of the Synod of Dordt later had a considerable influence upon the leading Westminster Assembly Theologian Rev. Dr. George Gillespie. It also needs to be remembered that James the First of Great Britain -- who authorized commissioning the translation of the King James Bible in 1611 -- himself send British delegates to the Synod of Dordt in 1618.

At least five Britons are known to have attended the Synod of Dordt -- and to have circulated its doctrine in Britain thereafter. They are: Bishop George Landaff of Wales; Rev. Prof. Dr. John Davenant and Rev. Professor Dr. Samuel Ward, both of Cambridge; Rev. Dr. Thomas Goad of London; and Rev. Dr. Walter Balcanqual of Scotland.²³³

Indeed, there is some evidence that the Synod was attended even by the great British Puritan Rev. Dr. William Ames (who soon thereafter became Professor of Theology at Franeker in Friesland). In his work *Bellarmino Unnerved* -- directed against a leading Romish Theologian -- Ames attacked not the validity but indeed the falsely-claimed efficacy of baptism administered in the Church of Rome.

Explained Ames:²³⁴ "Regeneration is a part of the promises, and applies to the children of the believers in a special way.... People are baptized because they are regarded as children of God, and not so that they should begin to become sons. Otherwise, there would be no reason not to baptize the children of unbelievers as well as children of believers."

Indeed, "the infants of the faithful are not to be forbidden this sacrament.... The covenant, and the first seal of the covenant also, does pertain to them.... In the very beginning of regeneration, of which baptism is a seal, man is merely passive.... There is no outward action required, as in the other sacrament [the Lord's supper], but only a passive receiving. Infants are as capable of this sacrament in respect of the chief use of it, as those of age are."²³⁵

The great Rev. Professor Dr. Francis Gomarus and his student Gisbert Voetius had both attended the 1618f Synod of Dordt. Gomarus had taught in Britain toward the end of the previous century, and clearly asserted infant faith in covenant babies.²³⁶

Voetius would soon become the greatest theologian in seventeenth-century Holland. Dr. Kaajan rightly represents Voetius as being "kindred in spirit to the Scottish and English Puritans."²³⁷ Voetius's own doctrine of the prebaptismal regeneration of covenant infants was itself strongly influenced by that of the Englishman Cornelius Burgess -- one of the two Assessors, and indeed often the Acting Moderator, of the later Westminster Assembly itself.

444. Voetius's baptismal agreement with the Englishman Burgess

Rev. Dr. Voetius became the world-famous Professor of Theology and Oriental Languages at Utrecht. Discussing the Dutch Reformed *Baptismal Formula* of 1581, he insisted²³⁸ that covenant infants "are entitled to baptism: not because they are 'regarded' as members of the covenant, but because as a rule they **actually** already **possess**' the first **grace**. And for this reason, and this reason alone, it [the *Formula*] reads 'that our children...**have been sanctified** in Christ, and **therefore** ought to be **baptized**.'"

Voetius also wrote:²³⁹ "In elect children belonging to the covenant, there is a first implantation of regeneration by the Holy Spirit. Thereby, the beginning and the seed of faith is implanted. From this, conversion and vital renewal must later take place at their own time. However, I reject (*improbo*) that regeneration takes place after baptism. For the opinion of our Reformed theologians are well-known. Baptism does not effect regeneration, but it is the sign of a regeneration which has **already** occurred. (*Efficacia baptismi non in producenda regeneratione, sed in iam producta obsignata*)....

"From the seed (*e semine*)..., the actual dispositions and habits are sustained by the ingrafted operation of the Holy Spirit in His Own time.... Just like a seed, the abilities and possession of faith make their appearances by fresh acts of the Holy Spirit in their own time." All born in the covenant, who die before coming to an age of discretion, are believed to partake of heavenly salvation.²⁴⁰

Voetius explained further:²⁴¹ "Those are said to be 'born again' who are born in God's covenant -- having been sanctified by the Holy Spirit from the womb onward.... A certain gift or spiritual grace has been poured out upon or impressed into them by the Holy Spirit. This both inheres and remains in them.... This is the seed and 'root of faith' and its radical beginning (*radicale...principium* or 'wortelbeginsel').

"The very first regeneration (*primo prima regeneratio*) occurs in the children of the covenant as soon as they are **born**" --indeed, even at their congenital *genesis* (alias their conception). Later, when "educated in the fellowship of the Church and through all kinds of *stimuli* from the divine Word, they feel the implanted root of regeneration begin to germinate within them -- under the concurrent arousings of the Spirit." Then, in their maturity, the final stage of 'conversion' breaks forth.²⁴²

"From the covenant, the regeneration and the election of children is to be presumed.... The power of baptism does not consist of producing regeneration, but in sealing regeneration **already** accomplished."²⁴³

Voetius, in his *Disputation on the State of the Elect before Conversion*, stated²⁴⁴ that all elect infants of believers are regenerated in infancy. He gave an affirmative answer -- to the question as to "whether those externally elected or covenanted, have all singularly been internally covenanted and sanctified and regenerated from their mother's womb.

"In elect and covenanted infants, there is a place for the Holy Spirit's initial regeneration -- whereby there is a beginning and a seed of actual conversion and renovation.... The opinion [of Reformed theologians] should be noted, that the efficacy of baptism lies not in producing regeneration -- but in signifying what has been produced **already**.... Daily experience teaches that

faith and piety, in life and in death, is discerned in tiny children before the age of reason."

Paul too "was regenerated in infancy -- to which Galatians 1:15 is perhaps able to be referred." As the son of a godly mother, also Augustine was regenerated and even incompletely converted prior to his years of bondage to heresy and immorality. "One cannot doubt his prior regeneration initially. It is only that the actual conversion was incomplete."

Perhaps most significantly of all, Voetius later publically expressed his own agreement with the 'infant faith' views of the Englishman Rev. Dr. Cornelius Burgess (the Assessor and Acting Moderator of the Westminster Assembly itself). Burgess had published his own views in his 1629 *Treatise on the...Regeneration of Elect Infants*.

Thereafter, Voetius commented:²⁴⁵ "The opinion of the author pleases me.... He insists that in the elect and covenanted infants, there is room for the initial regeneration of the Holy Spirit -- by which is impressed the beginning and seed of actual conversion or renovation, which is to follow in its own time."

445. Further Dutch Reformed theologians on infant faith (after Dordt)

Also Voetius's friend, Rev. Dr. Jan Cloppenburgh of Amsterdam, rightly refuted both Arminians and Anabaptists. Cloppenburgh later became Professor of Theology in Hardewyk, and subsequently even in Franeker.

In his work *The Gangrene of Anabaptist Theology*. Cloppenburgh insisted²⁴⁶ that covenant children "**possess the seed of faith within them**.... It [faith] not merely follows but also precedes [baptism] -- and is accompanied by the fulfilments of the promises....

"From their childhood onward, they have been separated by the Spirit of Christ.... They have the communion of the Holy Spirit Who works faith in them...by infusions of spiritual gifts and abilities of faith and hope and charity."

Indeed, "the matter signified in baptism is...the communion of the Holy Spirit Who preserves them.... We therefore presuppose (*supponimus*) that the infants of believers are ingrafted into Christ by a secret immediate operation of the Holy Spirit."²⁴⁷ Compare too the earlier British Puritan William Perkins' *Golden Chain*.²⁴⁸

There were also many other 1620f Calvinistic theologians in Holland who took similar positions. Here are the views of a few of them.

Thus, the Synod of Dordt Theologian Godfrey Ude-man later said that "**all Reformed Ministers agree that the seed of faith...is in the children of believers**.... They also possess the Spirit Himself.... Conversion is a fruit of regeneration" which, in turn, is "the foundation for holy baptism."²⁴⁹

Similarly, John Kuchlin, in his *Theological Theses Concerning Infant Baptism*, said²⁵⁰ that one should not deny rebirth to children. Again, Cornelius Geselius stated²⁵¹ that "the children of

Christians are born unto everlasting salvation."

Mark Boerhave declared²⁵² that "the children cannot be excluded from the seed of faith and of regeneration." For "it is false that the children not yet have and enjoy the promise."

Also Petrus de Witte insisted²⁵³ that "the seed of faith" is in the covenant children -- otherwise, if they were not born again, they would be lost if they were to die in those years without "the Spirit of regeneration." Indeed: "Of the children of believers it is not to be doubted but that they shall be saved, inasmuch as they belong to the covenant.... The children of unbelievers, we leave...to the judgment of God" -- and to His mercy.

Francis Burmannus spoke specifically about "children's faith." For even in infants, he explained, "the beginnings of regeneration and the seeds of new life" and therefore "the Spirit as the Producer of faith are not lacking."

Burmannus further compared the waters of the Noachic flood with the baptismal water -- as the sign and seal of the death of Christ. He regarded even the floodwater as "a picture of the same preservation and purification." Just as Noah and all his household were saved inside the ark "when the rainwater fell upon the ark" -- declared Burmannus -- "so too does Christ save believers and their children."²⁵⁴

446. Other Continental Reformed theologians on infant faith (after Dordt)

The famous German Reformed theologian Amand Polan(us) of Polansdorf maintained²⁵⁵ that "the Holy Spirit is promised to the children, and He is also truly given to them. He is not idle in them, but they are sanctified and regenerated by Him.... Saving faith is in the heart of those children elected unto everlasting life....

"The Holy Spirit arouses tendencies and movements in them according to the measure of their capacity. When they get older, He gradually increases and strengthens their abilities.... Saving faith is thus present in the children as a commencing possession, and as a seed which the Spirit has sowed in their hearts."

Similarly, the French Reformed Theologian Samuel Desmaret (alias Maresius). He was Professor of Theology at Sedan in 1625, and at Groningen in 1642. Maresius stated²⁵⁶ in respect of covenant children that "the Holy Spirit works regeneration in them unto [everlasting] life.... Consequently, the children of believers...are regarded as temples of the Holy Spirit Who lives in them in His own way."

In 1625, the noted German Reformed Theologian Gerald Voss(ius), having declined an offered professorship at Cambridge, was appointed to the Chair of Greek at Leyden. In his *Disputes Concerning Baptism*, Rev. Professor Dr. Vossius declared:²⁵⁷ "I judge that the fruit of the Holy Spirit is not just such as we exercise..., but that He also unites us with Christ our Head.... Just as [our] children do have rational souls though cannot yet reason, so too do they possess the

Holy Spirit....

"Just as the children (because they possess souls that can reason) are reckoned among the number of humanity -- so too (because they have obtained the Holy Spirit) they are, and are to be regarded as being, among the number of those regenerated: as children of God; as Members of Christ; and as partakers of the fellowship of the saints....

"They are susceptible to the Spirit of faith, from Whom their souls receive a spiritual and supernatural existence.... Without this Spirit, the young children could not be united to Christ...or partake of the privileges of the Church brought to mind by the symbol" of baptism.

In Basel we find the Swiss Calvinist, Rev. Professor Dr. John Wolleb(ius). He was then Professor of Old Testament, and stated²⁵⁸ in 1626 that "baptism, by which the elect are received...and sealed to the remission of sins and rebirth through the blood of Christ and through the Holy Spirit, by external sprinkling (*aspersio*) with water, is the first sacrament of the New Covenant....

That "the word 'baptism' means...'sprinkling' [is] evident from Mark 7:4.... The subject of baptism is all the people of the covenant, including their children who are reckoned among the number of the covenant people.... It is by no means proper to exclude from baptism those whom Christ wished to have brought to Him.

"The words used...in Luke 18:16 [*pais* and *brephos*] -- both are emphatic as designations for 'children'.... The reason added by Christ [Matthew 19:14] -- 'of such is the Kingdom of heaven' -- [shows that] the sign of the covenant belongs to everyone to whom the Kingdom of heaven and the covenant of grace are given. And this covenant is given to the children [Genesis 17:7]....

"Children are not without faith and reason. Although they do not have those things fully developed, yet they have them in seed and root.... If baptism is once received with the essentials of baptism performed, it is not to be repeated. For this reason, our Church accepts Roman Catholic baptism -- not on account of the abuses which are combined with it, but because the child has been baptized into the Name of the Holy Trinity."

On the eve of the Westminster Assembly, the Polish Reformed theologians Nigrinus and Berg drew up the 1645 *Thorn Declaration* for their King (Wladislaw IV). There,²⁵⁹ they insisted that the sacraments "do not work or impart grace through their mere operation.... The power of the promise must be received with true faith....

"Baptism is...to children born in the Church as well as to adults.... We do not regard this necessity as so unconditional that he who leaves this life without baptism, either as a child or as an adult...is therefore necessarily damned.... It is not the lack but the despising of the sacrament which damns." Compare *Westminster Confession* 28:5.

447. James Alting and Jacob Trigland on infant faith

We also mention Rev. Dr. James Alting. He was the son of the great German Reformed theologian Rev. Professor Dr. Henry Alting of Heidelberg University -- who had stated that "children of believers are born holy."²⁶⁰ James was the grandson of the renowned Menzo Alting -- who has compared covenant infants to tiny fruit-trees not yet old enough to bear fruit.²⁶¹

James Alting was ordained in England, where he befriended the British Puritans and Westminster divines Rev. Dr. Twisse (the Moderator) and Rev. Dr. Reynolds (the probable drafter of the baptismal chapters 27 & 28 in the *Westminster Confession*). Thereafter, James Alting was appointed Professor of Theology at Groningen in Holland.

Also in the Netherlands, Rev. Professor Dr. Jacob Trigland, the Leyden Old Testamentian, wrote his famous work *Scourge for Exorcising the Troublesome Spirit of Arminianism* -- in 1634. There, he stated²⁶² that "we embrace all those in love who wear any external and apparent signs of God's grace [such as infant baptism]. According to the judgment of love, we must regard them as God's elect."

In the case of children, continued Trigland, such a sign is also "birth from believing parents." Consequently, such children are to be regarded as being among the elect -- "as long as they do not evidence the contrary."

Trigland asked his Arminian opponents: "Have the young children of believers truly been born again and sanctified by the Holy Spirit? If not -- how can they then have been saved...and why were they then baptized, inasmuch as baptism is 'the washing of regeneration' [cf. Titus 3:5] alias the sign of regeneratedness?"

Together with others, Trigland also wrote a *Contra-remonstrance...against the Remonstrance* -- that is to say, a Protest against the 'Remonstrance' of the Arminians. Therein,²⁶³ he and his fellow Calvinistic co-authors insisted that the Kingdom of heaven belongs to little covenant children too. By virtue of Matthew 19:14 *etc.*

448. Infant faith on the road to Westminster in Britain and America

Before he had died in 1635, the British Puritan Rev. Dr. Richard Sibbes, Professor at Holy Trinity in Cambridge, made some very important statements. Sibbes declared²⁶⁴ that "we must not think if a child die before the sacrament of baptism, that God will not keep His covenant." For "He is the God of our children from their **conception** and birth [First Corinthians 7:14]....

"Can they be the children of wrath and the children of God both at one time? I answer, Yes.... Whence, we see a ground of baptizing infants -- because they are in the covenant.... Good parents may hope for a blessing upon their children -- because God is their God, and the God of their seed....

"Infants that die in their infancy...are within the covenant.... They have the seed of believing, the Spirit of God, in them.... If when they come to years, they answer not the covenant of grace and the answer of a good conscience..., all is frustrate.... [However,] we leave

infants to the mercy of God."

What was the situation in Early Colonial America? There, the French Reformed Presbyterians in Florida in 1562, then the English Reformed Anglicans in Virginia, next the Dutch Reformed Calvinists in New York, thereafter the Congregationalist Pilgrims in New England from 1620 onward, and finally the American Puritans less than a decade later -- all propounded the baby belief of covenant infants before their baptism. See Leland Ryken's book *Worldly Saints*.²⁶⁵

Early Colonial America thus regarded the babies of believers as themselves belonging to God -- born to Him by way of covenant. A typical example is the famous Thomas Shephard, one of the New England Puritans. A Presbyterian, Shephard arrived from England in 1635. As did many of the Early American divines, he promptly wrote a *Catechism*.²⁶⁶

Discussing the wicked heart even of the elect while yet unregenerate, in his writing *The Church Membership of Children*²⁶⁷ Shephard stated that "the Lord promiseth that the seed of His people shall have this heart taken away." Explained Shephard: "Baptism now seals.... Even to infants, the seal is to confirm the covenant...."

"Children of whom you cannot say that they are faithful personally...may lie under God's covenant of begetting faith by some means -- [with] in them.... You are not to cast them out, but accept them as God doth. The children of godly parents...are to be accounted of God's Church -- until they positively reject the Gospel."

Very significantly, it was American Puritans like Shephard -- namely Cotton, Hooker and Davenport²⁶⁸ -- who were invited to attend and to advise the Westminster Assembly in 1643. Only certain circumstances prevented this. For the Americans were later quick to ratify the *Westminster Standards* -- in their own *Cambridge Platform*, at their 1648 Synod of New England Congregationalists in Massachusetts.

449. Baptist Professors on the origin and development of the (Ana)Baptists

The American Rev. Dr. Robert G. Torbet was Professor of Church History at Eastern Baptist Theological Seminary (from 1934-51). In 1950, he made some very important statements in his book *A History of the Baptists*.

According to Torbet,²⁶⁹ the left-wing Professor Dr. "Walter Rauschenbusch, of [Colgate] Rochester Baptist Theological Seminary" in New York State, exhibited a "willingness to identify Baptists with the socially-radical Anabaptists." Similarly, even Rev. Professor Henry C. Vedder, the well-known Baptist and Church Historian at Crozer Theological Seminary from 1894 to 1927, noted the Anabaptists' "aversion to oath-taking and holding public office."

Wrote Payne in the *Baptist Quarterly*: "Baptists cannot be separated from...other...groups of the sixteenth century." For there is indeed a "relationship between the early English Baptists and the Continental Anabaptists.... The Mennonite influence was responsible in part for the first Baptist witness."

Torbet himself admitted that "the false claims made by Thomas M \ddot{u} nzer (1490-1525), a socialist and leader in the Peasants' War of 1525, and the horrors of the M \ddot{u} nster Rebellion ten years later under...Melchior Hofmann and Jan Matthys, combined to bring the Anabaptists into complete disrepute.... The extravagant cruelty and wanton destruction of the visionaries who sought to establish the millennial kingdom in M \ddot{u} nster, made an indelible impression.... The fanatics of M \ddot{u} nster were a potential menace to law and order" -- and "taught resistance, against government, by the sword...."

"Anabaptist teaching was to be found in England quite early in the sixteenth century. Large numbers of this sect came in 1528...until 1573, when...some fifty thousand were in the country.... The earlier Anabaptist refugees were disciples of Melchior Hofmann's fanatical teaching...."

"In 1530...Archbishop Warham at the command of Henry VIII condemned an Anabaptist book.... In 1549, during the reign of Henry's son Edward VI, Bishop Latimer's sermons contained warnings against this 'sect of hereticks.' He accused them of being anarchistic."

With commendable candour, the Baptist Torbet then went on to provide further alarming details: "English Anabaptists known as the 'Family of Love'...were present in the country during the reign of Queen Elizabeth, who came to the throne in 1558. This sect had its origin on the continent with Henry Nicholas (Niklaes), a native of M \ddot{u} nster, who migrated to Amsterdam in 1530.... [In 1546,] he wrote a little book still to be found in the Mennonite library at Amsterdam, entitled *Of the Spiritual Land of Promise*...."

"In this work he advocated and defended 'spiritual marriage,' somewhat akin to Mormon teaching.... On the continent, 'naked-runners,' as they were called, appeared in many cities. These 'naked-runners,' who reputedly were Anabaptist fanatics, seem to have been Nicholas' disciples. The sect, as transplanted to England, was known as 'Familists' -- and gained an unsavory reputation for immorality...."

"Christopher Vitell, a Southwark joiner..., translated many of Nicholas' writings from the Dutch into English.... Bax, an able historian of the Anabaptist movement, admits...the historical connection between the 'Family of Love' and Anabaptists generally."

Fifty years later, concluded Torbet, the exiled English (Ana)Baptist "Smyth's congregation of some eighty persons seems to have had a separate existence [from Robinson's *Pilgrim Father* Congregationalists] in Amsterdam.... He [John Smyth] felt that a Minister should not preach with any manuscript before him, not even a translation of the Scriptures.... Smyth finished a tract against infant baptism, *The Character of the Beast* ['666'], on March 24th 1609.... Smyth, undoubtedly under the influence of the Waterlander Mennonites, became an Anabaptist...."

"He baptized himself.... Since they worship[p]ed in a block of buildings belonging to a Mennonite merchant..., Smyth came increasingly under Mennonite influence." After Smyth's death in Amsterdam in 1610, his colleague and successor Thomas Helwys issued a *Declaration of Faith*, denying that baptism "appertaineth to infants." Then, with his flock, he returned to England -- to establish its first Baptist Church in 1611.

450. Many modern Baptists say their pioneers derive from the Anabaptists

Were we to wish, we could dwell for a long while on some of the quainter views of many of the more sectarian Anabaptists. We could also point to the naked submersions of some, and the forward-leaning triple immersions of others, within groups of German Baptists.²⁷⁰ However, instead of examining those extraordinary eccentricities, we rather proceed straight to the British and Anglo-American Baptists -- who finally adopted the baptismal mode of backward-leaning and fully-clothed onefold submersion.

Yet, in light of all the foregoing, the esteem of certain modern Baptists for the apostate Anabaptists is absolutely appalling. We have already seen²⁷¹ claims to this effect in the writings of the Baptists Torbet, Rauschenbusch and Payne.²⁷² Other specialists in the history of the Baptists agree.²⁷³ Indeed, even the modern British Particular Baptist Erroll Hulse has insisted²⁷⁴ that "we should call the orthodox evangelical Anabaptists of the Reformation 'Baptists' -- and not 'Anabaptists.'"

Speaking specifically of the situation in England and America, Hulse has continued: "The General Baptists...had their origin in John Smyth (d. 1612)... His study of the Scriptures brought him to practise believers' baptism.... In March 1639, [Roger] Williams and eleven others were baptized, and the first Baptist Church in America was constituted."

It should be observed, however, that after Smyth had 'baptized' himself -- or rather 'rebaptized' himself (and rebaptized himself) -- he was 're-re-baptized' by the Dutch Mennonite Anabaptists (by way of pouring). It should also be observed that after Williams was submersed, he later renounced that immersion as invalid -- because administered by one as then not yet himself submersed.

As the Scottish Baptist J.G.G. Norman has reminded us,²⁷⁵ John Smyth, "father of English General Baptists..., baptized himself." This he did in 1609; by affusion; and on foreign soil. Worse yet. After thus become a Mennonite, Smyth personally embraced their heretical christology.²⁷⁶

Even more startlingly, the noted English Baptist Rev. Professor Dr. West has drawn attention to what he regarded²⁷⁷ as "the first statement by an Englishman arguing for believers' baptism. It is Smyth's pamphlet: *Character of the Beast*." Sadly, that is a diatribe -- 666! -- against the historic Christian Church's apostolic practice of infant baptism. The latter must be renounced, held Smyth, as "profanation" and as the baptism of "Antichrist."²⁷⁸

After Smyth's death in Amsterdam while a Mennonite in 1610, his colleague and successor Thomas Helwys in 1611 drew up the first English *Baptist Confession*. At first, he pelagianizingly denied original sin. Always, he maintained an Arminian soteriology.²⁷⁹ Indeed, Helwys's *Baptist Confession* -- while indeed confining baptism only to those who have confessed Christ -- still says nothing about submersion.²⁸⁰ However, he not only identified Romanism with the first beast of Revelation thirteen -- but the Church of England as the second.²⁸¹

Smyth and Helwys were both Arminian (Ana)Baptists. The first so-called 'Calvinistic' or Particular Baptist congregation was formed, in England, only in the 1630s. Yet this new denomination was soon using submersion, by 1638. Then, following that innovation -- in 1641, Edward Barber was the first English Arminian or General Baptist to advocate dipping.²⁸²

Yet the sympathetic Professor Williams of Harvard has made an honest admission. For even he admits²⁸³ that "the adoption by English Baptists of the practice of immersion ultimately derived from the Minor Church of Poland...introduced into Holland by the [unitarian] Socinians."

451. The arrival and expansion of (Ana)Baptists in North America

The famous American-Swiss Church Historian Rev. Professor Dr. Philip Schaff has informed us²⁸⁴ that "in America the Baptists trace their origin chiefly...to Roger Williams.... He was charged with advocating certain opinions supposed to be dangerous."

These included the viewpoints: "that the magistrate ought not to punish offences against the First Table [of God's Law]; that an oath ought not to be tendered to an unregenerate man; [and] that a regenerate man ought not to pray with the unregenerate, though it be his wife or child...."

"He [Roger Williams] was immersed by Ezekiel Hollyman -- and, in turn, immersed Hollyman and ten others. This was the first Baptist church on the American Continent [in 1639]. But a few months afterwards, he renounced his rebaptism -- on the ground that Hollyman was unbaptized [meaning unsubmersed], and therefore unauthorized to administer the rite to him."

Clearly, it never dawned on Roger Williams that nobody had baptized John the baptizer. Yet it was John (and apparently by pouring or sprinkling) who baptized Jesus Christ. And it is the Latter's baptism alone which gives validity to all Christian baptisms.

Incredibly, the doctrinally wayward Roger Williams even pleaded²⁸⁵ for the complete toleration of Islam, Judaism and Paganism. He read Dutch well; knew of the political concepts of the Dutch Anabaptists; and accordingly rejected the British and American Puritans and their christonomic theocracy.²⁸⁷ Unfortunately, the Dutch (Ana)Baptistic heresies of Roger Williams have now massively corrupted especially the United States.

As even the Baptist Hulse has indicated,²⁸⁸ "the Baptist World Alliance has published the statement that in 1975 there were 33,800,000 adherents throughout the world. Over 29,600,000 of these are in North America."

Hulse could and should have added that nearly all of the latter reside in the Southern States (of the U.S.A.). There, Baptists themselves often boast -- there are almost more Baptists than people.

What Hulse indeed has added,²⁸⁹ is that "the statistics might represent nominal Baptists only -- that is, people who have little if any religious conviction but when asked what religion they profess will say 'Baptist.' This is especially so in areas where there is little cost to discipleship.... In some areas, such as the Southern States of America, membership may be almost as nominal as

it is in State Churches of other countries. The great majority may have recorded a decision for Christ, but show no evidence of a saving change."

452. British (Ana)Baptist Confessions of the seventeenth century

Very clearly, the Pro-Mennonite Leonard Verduin was quite wrong in regarding the Anabaptists as the Reformer's stepchildren. The truth is, the Anabaptists were the Romanists' stepchildren --and even more heretical. Yet Baptists like Torbet and Hulse have nevertheless regarded the Anabaptists as the ancestors of the Baptists. This implies that the Baptists are the 'stepchildren' of the Anabaptists -- and therefore also the 'great-stepchildren' of the mediaeval Romanists.

The Baptist Estep has alleged²⁹⁰ that "baptism by immersion was inaugurated by 1641" -- and thus no more than several years prior thereto. He should have conceded that these so-called immersions were not at all then being "inaugurated" -- but were merely a restoration of the mediaeval submersions of baptismally regenerationistic Romanism.

In July 1643, the National Assembly of infant-sprinkling British Puritans had convened at Westminster. Swiftly the (Ana)Baptists reacted. Arising out of their disputation against the leading Anglican Puritan Rev. Dr. Daniel Featley, they quickly produced their 1644 *Confession of the Seven Churches of London*.²⁹¹

Thus they issued their *Confession of Faith of those churches which are commonly...called 'Anabaptist'*.²⁹² This alleged a single submersion to be the only valid form of baptism. Therein, it alleged that the candidate's total submersion (alias dunking or dipping under the water) -- is indeed necessary.

It was, of course, intended purely as an approximate declaration of faith. For it possessed no binding power over British Anabaptists in general -- and not even over those seven submersing congregationalistic congregations in London which framed that document.

Nevertheless, after almost a century of absence from England, the (Ana)Baptists had now returned there in increasing strength. This is evident from the title of Featley's memorable 1645 work *The Dippers Dipped -- or the Anabaptists ducked and plunged, over head and ears, at a disputation in Southwark*.

There Featley explained Featley: "This fire in the reigns of Queen Elizabeth, King James, and our gracious sovereign [Charles I] -- till now was covered in England under the ashes.... But of late...this sect hath rebaptized hundreds of men and women together in the twilight -- in rivulets and some arms of the Thames.... They boast of their great draught of fish...; the Anabaptists, of forty-seven churches."

Many of those British (Ana)Baptists were premillennialists and vegetarians. After the production of the sacramental portions of the British Puritans' *Westminster Confession*, the *London Baptists' Confession* was published again in 1646. This time, however, it appeared with

several additions and alterations.

Held this (Ana)Baptist Confession: "Baptism is an Ordinance of the New Testament...to be dispensed only upon persons professing faith.... The way and manner of the dispensing of this ordinance, the Scripture holds out to be dipping or plunging the whole body under water.... The word *baptizo*, signifying to dip under water -- yet so as with convenient garments both upon the administrator and subject, with all modesty."²⁹³

453. Anti-Anabaptist background of Britain's Westminster Assembly

Rev. Professor Dr. Mitchell of St. Andrews University is the great authority on the theology and literature of the Westminster period. He has demonstrated quite conclusively²⁹⁴ that the order followed by the Westminster divines in their *Westminster Confession of Faith*, is that of the *Irish Articles*.

By 1643, the influence of Calvin was dominant throughout the British Isles. By the latter phrase, is meant: England, Wales, Ireland, Scotland, Cornwall, Cumbria, the Isle of Man, and the Channel Islands.

Britain was already exporting Calvinism -- to Holland, Ireland, North America, and elsewhere. Indeed, also from Continental Europe -- the ongoing influence of Post-Calvinian Calvinism very much further strengthened the already strong native Calvinism of Great Britain herself.

For not just the 1615 *Irish Articles* but also the 1618f Synod of Dordt and its 'T-U-L-I-P' *Decrees* (alias the 'Five Points of Calvinism') had a massive influence on the 1643f Westminster Assembly. Mercifully, Britain in general and the 1643f Westminster Assembly in particular was steered away from heterodox Continental Anabaptism. Indeed, even the belated 'English Baptists' from 1611 onward -- remained only on the fringes of Anabaptism and were then much influenced by British Puritanism.

As Schenck remarks²⁹⁵ in his book *The Presbyterian Doctrine of Children in the Covenant*: "The whole series of Reformed Confessions, as well as the best Reformed theologians, were drawn upon to aid in the task of the Westminster Assembly. There was such interaction between the Continent, Scotland and England in the scholastic maturing of Reformed thought -- that little room was left for the question of relative dependence....

"The theology of the Westminster Standards -- the *Confession of Faith*, the *Larger* and *Shorter Catechisms* -- was Calvinistic. For, by 1643, the influence of Calvin was dominant -- both in England and in Scotland."²⁹⁶

Rev. Professor Dr. B.B. Warfield adds that Westminster's work was done in the light of the whole body of Reformed thought. Rev. Professor Dr. Mitchell insists that Westminster imposes no other 'Calvinistic' doctrines than those explicitly or implicitly in the earliest *Confession* drawn up for the English Reformed Church at Geneva, which Knox pastored and which was adopted at the very beginning of the Scottish Reformation. Indeed, even the 'New School Presbyterian'

leader Rev. Professor Dr. Henry Boynton Smith declared that there is nothing in the *Westminster Standards* not to be found expressly set forth in the writings of Calvin.²⁹⁷

Let us now first note some of the leading theologians at Westminster, and their views on infant faith. Then let us see how certain key texts of Holy Scripture on faith and baptism are understood in the *Westminster Standards*. Then let us systematically look at the *Westminster Standards* themselves on this same subject.

454. Anti-Anabaptist views of the individual Westminster divines

Of the 113 major delegates to the Westminster Assembly, we ourselves know of none who questioned infant baptism. Nor do we know of any who doubted the holiness of covenant children *before* their infant baptism!

Westminster delegates included the famous Robert Baillie, William Bridge, Anthony and Cornelius Burgess, Jeremiah Burroughs, Edmund Calamy, Joseph Caryl, Thomas Coleman, Thomas Gataker, and George Gillespie. They also included Thomas Goodwin, William Gouge, William Greenhill, Alexander Henderson, Joshua Hoyle, John Lightfoot, Stephen Marshall, Philip Nye, Edward Reynolds, Lazarus Seaman, William Spurstow, and William Twisse.²⁹⁸

Also the famous and godly Episcopalian Puritans John Lightfoot and John Selden frequently attended the Westminster Assembly. In addition, the renowned James Ussher, author of the celebrated *Irish Articles*, was a delegate (and thus truly the veritable 'father' of Westminster) -- though not known to have attended the Assembly itself. Similarly, the eminent John Wallis -- author of the book *A Defence of Infant Baptism* -- was chosen to be one of the Secretaries of the Westminster Assembly (though not actually a Member of it).

We have already noted the influence of the Synod of Dort's spokesman Rev. Dr. Festus Hommius on the Westminster divine Rev. Dr. George Gillespie.²⁹⁹ We have also referred to the great Utrecht Professor Rev. Dr. Voetius's agreement with the 'infant faith' views of Westminster's Rev. Dr. Cornelius Burgess.³⁰⁰ We have further adverted to the friendship between Rev. Dr. James Alting, later Professor in Groningen, and the Westminster theologians Rev. Dr. Reynolds and the Assembly's Moderator Rev. Dr. Twisse.³⁰¹ Let us now look at the 'infant faith' views of some of these Westminster theologians themselves.

455. Anti-Anabaptist views of Westminster's Cornelius Burgess

Already in 1629, Rev. Dr. Cornelius Burgess had written his famous work on *The Regeneration of Elect Infants [as] Professed by the Church of England*. Burgess was a leading 'Presbyterian' in the 'Church of England' (and the later Prolocutor of the Westminster Assembly itself).

There, he condemned the views of those who "advance baptism too high" -- as well as the views of those who "depress it as much too low." While rightly insisting that all of God's elect should be baptized, he also insisted that they will still unquestionably be saved -- even if dying

unbaptized, whether as infants, or as adults.

The principal point handled in that work, is "that all elect infants...do ordinarily receive from Christ...the Spirit of regeneration as the...first principle of spiritual life." This they receive, "for their solemn initiation into Christ, and for their future actual renovation in God's good time -- if they live to years of discretion."³⁰²

Regarding baptism, Burgess explained:³⁰³ "Some admit [or profess] the efficacy of it unto remission of sin in infants elect. But any present [*viz.* pre-baptismal] work of the Spirit unto regeneration in them [the infants], they either flatly deny or refuse to acknowledge. Against all these errors, and particularly the last, the Church of England hath justly opposed herself in her public doctrine.... The things on all hands agreed upon, are these.... Some infants may and do receive the Spirit, to unite them unto Christ before baptism....

"All elect infants do ordinarily...receive the Spirit of Christ...as the root and first principle of regeneration.... I speak...with reference only unto such infants as die not in infancy.... As for the rest of the elect who die infants, I will not deny a...work sometimes...before baptism, to fit them for heaven." As Warfield rightly observed: "The relation of this sentence to the statement in the [Assembly's] *Westminster Confession* [10:3], is obvious." (See his *Two Studies in the History of Doctrine*, Christian Literature Co., New York, p. 216.)

According to the great Voetius,³⁰⁴ "the opinion of this author -- Cornelius Burgess, *Tractatus de baptismati regeneratione electorum infantium*, Oxford 1629 -- pleases me.... He insists that in the elect and covenanted infants, there is room for the initial regeneration of the Holy Spirit, by which is impressed the beginning and seed of actual conversion or renovation -- which is to follow, in its own time."

Burgess also preached³⁰⁵ a famous sermon to England's House of Commons on Jeremiah 1:5 (the text where God told that prophet: 'before you came forth from the womb, I sanctified you'). The *Minutes of the Sessions of the Westminster Assembly* show that Burgess led in the debates and processes of that Assembly. He helped draw up the wording of the *Westminster Directory for the Publick Worship of God* (with its statement that covenant children "are Christians and federally holy before baptism"). Indeed, the revision and editing and preparing of the final manuscript of the *Westminster Standards* -- were all entrusted to him.

As Rev. Robert Benn Vincent of Alexandria (La.) wrote in his own study on *The Efficacy of Baptism in the Westminster Confession of Faith*:³⁰⁶ "Burgess affords a wonderful opportunity for ascertaining the full meaning of the efficacy of baptism in the *Confession*.... His work was directed specifically to the question of the efficacy of baptism. It shows Burgess's vast knowledge of a wide spectrum of Reformed theologians...."

"Burgess was one of the most influential members of the Assembly.... Burgess served throughout the Assembly as one of its two Assessors 'to take the place of the Prolocutor' [or Moderator] -- in the event of his absence or illness. In view of the declining health of [the Prolocutor] Dr. Twisse, these positions proved to be of great importance."

Another Westminster divine, Rev. Dr. "Robert Baillie, comments...that 'Dr. Burgess, a very active and sharp man, supplies -- so far as is decent -- the Prolocutor's place'.... Burgess was Chairman of the First Committee (of the three major Committees which drafted the *Confession*).... When the work of the Assembly on the *Confession of Faith* was finished, Burgess was given the task of transcribing it....

"Rogers concludes [in his *Scripture in the Westminster Confession* that] 'Dr. Burgess, an Assessor of the Assembly, transcribed the whole of the *Confession* and, in doing so, reviewed it with the aid of the Drafting Committee of which he was a Member.... He presented it to the Assembly.... Edward Reynolds is the one person who was a Member of all three [Drafting] Committees.... Next to him in importance, ranks Burgess'.... Burgess also views, in charity, all baptized infants as possessing that which baptism signifies." Brilliantly, he argued: 'but the judgment of charity must have a certain foundation to build upon -- else it is not the judgment of charity, but foolish and sinful credulity void of all judgment!'

456. Anti-Anabaptist views of Westminster's George Gillespie

The great Rev. Dr. George Gillespie, one of 'the Scottish Presbyterian Commissioners at Westminster, was accustomed approvingly to cite a whole string of Reformed authorities -- Calvin, Bullinger, Beza, Ursinus, Hommius, the *Belgic Confession*, the *Decrees of Dordt*, Pareus, Walaeus and others. Speaking of **infant baptism**, he himself added³⁰⁷ that "the sacrament is not a converting but a confirming and sealing ordinance..., to seal unto a man that interest in Christ and in the covenant of grace which he **already** hath. The sacraments do not give any grace, but do declare and show what God hath given.

"**Baptism** is intended **only for the redeemed of the Lord**." As regards God's people in Biblical times, "the youngest of their infants were baptized.... Washings in the Old Testament...are mentioned. Ezekiel 16:4; First Corinthians 10:2. Thereof infants as well as aged persons were partakers.... I add another text. Ephesians 5:26. There, the Apostle...saith that Christ 'loved the Church'.... Are not the children of the faithful part of this Church which Christ loved?"

Of course they are! For "the Spirit was also poured out from on high, and there is an influence of grace from above -- according to the good pleasure of God's will upon so many as are ordained to eternal life." Also "baptism...is efficacious to all the Members of Christ, young and old, by virtue of the Word of promise and covenant of grace sealed in that sacrament."³⁰⁸

457. Anti-Anabaptist views of Westminster's John Lightfoot

We have already seen in a previous chapter that the famous Episcopalian Puritan Rev. Professor Dr. John Lightfoot was quite convinced that John the baptizer baptized not just penitent Israelites but also their infants. At the Westminster Assembly, Lightfoot later supported the Presbyterians -- especially as regards the presumed prebaptismal regeneratedness of covenant infants. He was a highly respected Theologian; an outstanding Talmudic and Classical Scholar;

and sometime Vice-Chancellor of Cambridge University.

Discussing the action of those who profess Christ in bringing their infants to Jesus, Lightfoot declared:³⁰⁹ "Their bringing therefore must needs be concluded to be in the name of disciples.... That Christ would so receive them and bless them..., He doth -- and asserteth them for disciples...to whom the kingdom of heaven belonged" even prior to His blessing of them. Indeed, Christ then lays His hands on them precisely "to own [or acknowledge] them as belonging to His Kingdom."

For "those that believe, brought their infants to Christ -- [so] that He might...mark them for His by His blessing.... Christ...favours again that doctrine which He had laid down. Matthew 18.... The infants of believers were as much disciples and partakers of the kingdom of heaven as their parents."

458. Anti-Anabaptist views of Westminster's Stephen Marshall

The Westminster divine Rev. Dr. Stephen Marshall made many similar statements. He was a famous English Presbyterian commissioned by his Parliament to go and meet the Scots and persuade some of them to attend the Westminster Assembly.

Reference is made especially to Marshall's 1644 *Sermon on the Baptizing of Infants*, preached at Westminster Abbey Church. There, he stated concerning covenant babies³¹⁰ that "ever since God gathered a...select number out of the world to be His kingdom..., He would have the infants of all who are taken into covenant with Him to be accounted His -- to belong to Him...and not to the devils....

"He having left all the rest of the world to be visibly the devil's kingdom, will not for His own glory's sake permit the devils to come and lay visible claim to the sons and daughters begotten by those who are the children of the most High.... The covenant be the same.... Children belong to it.... They are to be owned [or acknowledged] as Covenanters, and to be admitted to the distinguishing or discriminating sign betwixt God's people and the devils.... So long as any person is visibly a Member of the Kingdom of Christ, we have no cause to doubt their election and salvation, until they visibly show the contrary....

"God made the covenant with Abraham, and promised for His part to be the God of him and his seed.... We, as Abraham, are tied...to instruct our children and bring them up for God -- and not for ourselves nor for the devil.... If it be said they are not capable of being disciples -- I answer: 'Even as capable as the infants of Jews and proselytes were, when they were made disciples'.... To belong to Christ, and to be a disciple of Christ, or to bear the Name of Christ -- is all one.... Such infants do belong to Christ, and bear the Name of Christ....

"To whom the inward grace of baptism doth belong, to them belongs the outward sign. They ought to have the sign who have the thing signified.... The infants of believers, even while they are infants, are made partakers of the inward grace of baptism.... Therefore they may and ought to receive the outward sign of baptism....

"That the infants of believers even while they are infants do receive the inward grace as well as grown men -- is...plain...by that speech of the Apostle who says they are holy." First Corinthians 7:14. Our Saviour says expressly, Mark 10:14, that to such belongs the Kingdom of God....

"In the working of that inward grace of which baptism is the sign and seal, all who partake of that grace are but mere patients and contribute no more to it than a child doth to its own begetting.... Therefore infants as fit subjects to have it wrought in them...are in on more fitness to receive this grace when it is given them, in respect either of any faith or repentance which they yet have....

"It being the primary intention of the covenant of grace...to show what free grace can and will do to miserable nothing -- to cut miserable man off from the wild olive and graft him into the true olive; to take away the heart of stone; to create in them a heart of flesh; to forgive their iniquities; to love them freely -- what does the most grown man in any of these, more than an infant may do?

"Being only passive in them all..., of this first grace is the sacrament of baptism properly a seal.... Who ever will deny that infants are capable of these things, as well as grown men -- must deny that any infants dying in their infancy are saved by Christ."

459. Marshall on Mark 16:16 and infant faith

Referring to Mark 16:16 -- 'he that believeth and is baptized, shall be saved; but he that believeth not, shall be damned' --against the (Ana)Baptists Marshall would "frame their own argument thus, against the salvation of infants. 'All unbelievers shall be damned; all infants are unbelievers; therefore, they shall be damned'....

"If they say this text is meant of grown men, of the way which God takes for the salvation of grown men, [and that] infants are saved another way, upon other conditions -- the same say we of infant baptism. The text means of the condition of baptizing of grown men. Infants are baptized upon other conditions.

"If they say infants, though they cannot have actual faith, they may have virtual faith, faith in the seed and root -- the same say we. If they say, though infants have not faith, yet they may have that which is analogous to faith -- the same say we. They have somewhat which has analogy to faith -- and as effectual to make them capable of baptism as of salvation.

"Infants may be born again, while they are infants.... Infants have their original sin pardoned; be united to Christ; have His image stamped upon them.... Concerning the exercise of these graces and the augmentation of them in infants..., infants are capable of the [confirmatory] grace of baptism. We are sure."

The above sermon was addressed by Marshall to the Commissioners from Scotland, and also to the rest of the Westminster Assembly at the time it was actually in session. From the Assembly's *Minutes*, one reads of how Marshall presented his book to it (after dedicating the book to the Commissioners). The Assembly's formal motion that Marshall be congratulated, was carried -- and the Prolocutor accordingly thanked him.³¹¹

460. Anti-Anabaptist views of Westminster's Edward Reynolds

The Westminster divine Rev. Dr. Edward Reynolds -- a friend of Rev. Professor Dr. James Alting -- was the Puritan Anglican Bishop of Norwich. He swore allegiance to the *Solemn League and Covenant* in 1644. According to Rev. Prof. Dr. Jack B. Rogers in his book *Scripture in the Westminster Confession*,³¹² Reynolds was the most important single member of the Westminster Assembly.

Reynolds served on the 'Committee of Twenty-Two' which examined Ministers presented by the Parishes. He was -- together with Burgess, Harris, Herle, Hoyle, Gataker and Temple -- one of the seven chief authors of the *Westminster Confession*. Indeed, he was the only person who was a member of all three major Drafting Committees which worked on the preparation of the *Confession*.

More than anybody else, it was probably Reynolds who drafted chapters 27 and 28 (of the *Confession*) on the subject of baptism. Indeed, even earlier, Reynolds himself had already written:³¹³ "The promises and Word of grace, with the sacraments, are all but as so many sealed deeds to make over into all successions of the Church -- so long as they contain legitimate children and observe the laws of their part required --an infallible claim and title....

"The nature of a sacrament is to be representative of a substance; the sign of a covenant; the seal of a purchase; the figure of a body; the witness of our faith; the earnest of our hope; the presence of things distant; the sight of things absent; the taste of things inconceivable; and the knowledge of thing that are past knowledge."

461. Anti-Anabaptist views of Westminster's Samuel Rutherford

Then there is perhaps the best-known Westminster Assembly's Member of all. We refer to the unforgettable University of St. Andrews Professor -- Rev. Dr. Samuel Rutherford (of *Lex Rex* fame).

Explained Rutherford:³¹⁴ "Children must have, from their being born of believing parents, under the New Testament, some covenant privileges.... It is mercy to be born in Zion. Psalm 87:3-6 & Malachi 1:18.... What holiness is it that is called 'federal' or 'covenant' holiness, when it is in infants? Cf. First Corinthians 7:14.

"It is...**holiness of the seed**.... The **faith** required of these to be baptized, Acts 8:37 and Mark 16:16, is real saving faith.... Only these, whether old or young, that are *tali modo visibili federati* -- 'such as...visibly in covenant' and called (cf. Acts 2:39) -- are warrantably baptized....

For they cannot be baptized against their will, Luke 7:29-30.... Anabaptists prove no salvation...for the saving of the infants born of believing parents -- more than for the saving of Pagans and their infants."

Further: "Infants born of covenanted parents, are in covenant with God because they are born of such parents as are in covenant with God. Genesis 17:7.... Positive favours are bestowed on infants.... Christ laid His hands on them and blessed them, making them a fixed copy of the indwellers of His Kingdom... They are clean and holy, by covenant holiness....

"Who they are, who are to be baptized -- it is presumed they give some professed consent to the call.... What ground is there to exclude sucking children? For...there is no Name under heaven by which men [alias human beings] may be saved, but by the Name of Jesus....

"Since Christ prayed for infants and blessed them -- which is a praying for them -- He must own [or acknowledge] them as 'blessed' in Christ in Whom all the nations of the earth are blessed.... It is false that the promise is made only to the aged... It is made to their children [too].... For the way of their believing -- we leave it to the Lord."³¹⁵

462. Anti-Anabaptist views of Westminster's William Twisse

We must also refer to the ailing Moderator of the Westminster Assembly itself. We mean, of course, the pious Prolocutor --Rev. Dr. William Twisse -- the good friend of the renowned presumptive prebaptismal infant regenerationist Rev. Professor Dr. James Alting of Groningen University.

Twisse turned down a Professorship in Theology at Franeker in Friesland. He preferred to be Chaplain to Princess Elisabeth, the daughter of King James himself. To Elisabeth, Twisse expounded John 3:5, on the universal necessity of regeneration --and First Peter 2:2, on the need for even new-born babies to grow in grace."³¹⁶

463. Anti-Anabaptist views of Westminster's James Ussher

To the above, we should also add the name of the Puritan Archbishop James Ussher of Dublin. Regius Professor of Divinity at Trinity College in 1607, it was he who had launched the 1615 Calvinistic *Irish Articles*. According to Rev. Professor Dr. B.B. Warfield³¹⁷ and others, it is especially Ussher's *Irish Articles* which served as the model for the *Westminster Confession* itself. In many cases, the latter follows the very wording of the former.

Ussher became the Episcopalian Archbishop of Armagh, for the Church of Ireland, in 1625. A friend of Rev. Professor Dr. Samuel Rutherford for whom he once preached, Ussher was invited to be one of the Commissioners at the Westminster Assembly. Undoubtedly, he was indeed its real father.

James Ussher himself stated³¹⁸ that "touching the children of Christians, we are taught and account them holy. First Corinthians 7:14.... Sacraments are seals of the promise of God in

Christ...wherein by certain outward signs...Christ...is signified, conveyed and sealed unto the heart of a Christian...to instruct, assure and possess us of our part in Christ... The sin of Adam is imputed to children.... Even so the righteousness of Christ may be, and is -- by God's secret and unknown way -- to elect infants....

"Baptism to every elect infant is a seal of the righteousness of Christ, to be extraordinarily applied by the Holy Ghost -- if it die in its infancy.... Infants baptized...are born in the Church.... Baptism is effectual in infants...and to all those that belong unto the election of grace.... We in the judgment of charity do judge [thus] of every particular infant" so born in the covenant.

"Infants are not capable of the grace of the sacrament by that way whereby the grown are.... Yet it follows not that infants are not capable in and by another way.... It is the application of Christ's righteousness that justifies us, not our apprehending it. God can supply the defect of faith by His sanctifying Spirit Who can do all things on our part which faith should do....

"We have no reason to think but that even before...the act of baptism, the Spirit of Christ does unite the soul of the elect infant to Christ and clothe it with His righteousness and impute unto it the title of a son or daughter by adoption and the image of God by sanctification, and so fit it for the state of glory.... Infants elect have Christ and all His benefits sealed up unto them, in the sacrament of baptism."

464. Anti-Anabaptist views of Westminster's John Wallis

Also Rev. John Wallis was an eminent divine chosen to be one of the secretaries of the Westminster Assembly (though not actually a Member of it). He wrote on the *Westminster Shorter Catechism*. He also authored a very relevant book called *A Defence of Infant Baptism*.

In the latter, he showed³¹⁹ that "we have no reason to doubt but many children very early, and even before their birth, may have the habits of grace infused into them -- by which they are saved.... For as the habits of corruption, which we call Original Sin, by propagation -- so may the habits of grace, by infusion, be inherent in the soul long before (for want of the use of reason) we are in capacity to act."

465. Old Testament passages on baptism cited in the Westminster Standards

Let us now look at the *Westminster Standards* themselves. They naturally reflect the above baptismal views known to have been held by the above-mentioned Westminster divines Burgess, Gillespie, Lightfoot, Marshall, Reynolds, Rutherford, Twisse, Ussher and Wallis -- and others.

First, we note Westminster's use of the relevant passages of Holy Scripture. What do they teach on the subject of infant faith in covenant children?

Genesis 3:15 describes the solidarity between the serpent-hating woman and her seed. The *Westminster Confession of Faith* refers to that text to show that "the Visible Church...consists of

all those throughout the world that profess the true religion, together with their children."³²⁰

Genesis 17:7-14 discusses God's instituting of the sacrament of initiation for believers and their children. The *Confession* explains³²¹ this shows that "the infants of one or both believing parents are to be baptized."

Exodus 4:24-26 describes Moses' one-time non-administration of the sacrament of infant circumcision (as the forerunner of baptism). Here, the *Confession* insists³²² "it be a great sin to contemn or neglect this ordinance."

Ezekiel 16:20f refers to tiny babies slaughtered by their own hypocritical covenant parents. It records that God Himself nevertheless calls those infants "My children." The *Confession* cites this passage to show that "the Visible Church consists of those who profess the true religion, together with their children."³²³

466. Passages on baptism in the Gospels cited in the Westminster Standards

Coming to the New Testament, the *Confession* states that neither unbelievers nor their infants should be baptized. It teaches that only "the infants of one or both believing parents are to be baptized."³²⁴ Indeed, in Luke 7:30, we are told the Pharisees rejected the counsel of God -- in not being baptized by John. To the Westminster divines, this shows "it be a great sin to contemn or neglect this ordinance."³²⁵

In John 3:5-8, Jesus Himself insists no human being can enter or even see the Kingdom of God -- until he or she has been born again by the Holy Ghost. The *Westminster Confession*³²⁶ quotes this passage to prove that "elect infants, dying in infancy, are regenerated...through the Spirit." The *Confession* also cites it to show that "the efficacy of baptism is not tied to that moment of time wherein it is administered."

The *Westminster Standards* repeatedly refer to the incident of Jesus blessing very young covenant children -- in Mark 10:13f and Luke 18:15f. The *Standards* cite this action of His, to prove that "elect infants, dying in infancy, are...saved by Christ." They also quote it to show that infants of one or both believing parents are to be baptized.³²⁷

The *Standards* also refer to the Great Commission in Matthew 28:19. This is cited to prove that baptism contains a promise of benefit to worthy receivers³²⁸ -- and to prove that (infant) baptism seals and signifies substantially the same spiritual things as did (infant) circumcision.³²⁹ It is also quoted to show that the infants of one or both believing parents are to be baptized.³³⁰ For such infants already possess an interest in the covenant of grace -- among the baptized nations (not one of which is devoid of very many infants).

467. Passages on baptism in the Acts cited in the Westminster Standards

In Acts 2:36-39, Peter assures the men of "all the house of Israel" that the promise of salvation was for them and their children. This is quoted in the *Confession* to prove that "elect

infants, dying in infancy, are regenerated and saved by Christ through the Spirit." It is also cited to demonstrate that the Visible Church consists of those that profess Christ, together with their children.³³¹ Indeed, it is further quoted to show that such infants are to be baptized.³³²

This passage is cited also in the *Larger Catechism*. There, it is given as a proof that baptism seals those who are within the covenant of grace³³³ -- and that it is to be administered even to infants.³³⁴

In Acts 8:13f, we learn that the heart of Simon the magician was still not right with God -- even after his reception of baptism. Significantly, the *Westminster Confession* cites this passage when denying³³⁵ "that all that are baptized --are undoubtedly regenerated."

The *Larger Catechism* does the same.³³⁶ It does so to prove that "the sacraments become effectual means [not of justification but] of salvation [alias preservation] -- not by any power in themselves...but only by the working of the Holy Ghost." There is no *opus operatum* in baptism.

The passage Acts 8:36-38, on the baptism of the Ethiopian eunuch, is twice referred to in the *Westminster Standards*. It is quoted there, to prove that those who actually profess faith in Christ are to be baptized. It is also cited there, to show that baptism is not to be administered to any who are outside of the Visible Church till they so profess their Christian Faith.³³⁷ Consequently, it clearly regards covenant children as being inside the Church even before their baptism.

The *Standards* also refer to the baptism of the family of Cornelius. He was called both righteous and faithful, even before his baptism. To Westminster, this shows -- about baptism -- that "grace and salvation are not so inseparably annexed unto it, as that no person can be regenerated or saved without it."³³⁸

468. Passages on baptism in Romans cited in the Westminster Standards

The *Westminster Standards* repeatedly cite Romans 4:11f. That verse describes circumcision as the sign and seal of the righteousness by grace and through faith which Abraham received before being circumcised. The *Confession* quotes this verse to prove: that sacraments are signs and seals of the covenant of grace;³³⁹ that infants of one or both believing parents are to be baptized;³⁴⁰ and that it is not so, that nobody can be saved without baptism.³⁴¹

The same passage Romans 4:11 is also quoted by the *Larger Catechism*. There, it shows: that sacraments are instituted by Christ, and that they seal all other graces;³⁴² that children of professing parents should themselves be baptized;³⁴³ that all other blessings are sealed to us in baptism;³⁴⁴ and that baptism seals the covenant.³⁴⁵

Romans 6:1-5 declares that believers have been buried and resurrected with Christ in baptism, and are to keep on walking in newness of life. Time and again do the *Westminster Standards* refer to this passage.

They cite it to prove that baptism solemnly engages its recipients to serve God.³⁴⁶ For it seals Christians and ingrafts them³⁴⁷ into Christ's body, and gives them an incentive to keep on walking in newness of life.³⁴⁸ It obliges them to keep on obeying Christ.³⁴⁹ Indeed, it seals their adoption and resurrection unto everlasting life.³⁵⁰

Westminster also cites this passage yet further. It does so, to prove that we have a post-baptismal and a life-long duty of "improving our baptism"³⁵¹ -- especially in times of temptation and when we witness baptism being administered to others.³⁵²

It is also quoted to urge baptized Christians to draw strength from Christ's death and resurrection. This is for the mortification of their own sin, and for the quickening of the grace they have previously received. It is also designed to encourage them to keep on walking in holiness and righteousness.³⁵³

Romans 8:9 declares that "if anyone does not have the Spirit of Christ, he is not one of His." This passage is rightly cited in the *Confession* to prove that "elect infants, dying in infancy, are regenerated and saved by Christ through the Spirit."³⁵⁴

Romans 11:16f teaches, regarding the covenant people, that the branches really are holy -- as long as the root is. This is quoted in the *Westminster Standards* to show that the Visible Church includes those who profess the true religion, together with their children.³⁵⁵ It is cited to prove that the children of believers are themselves to be baptized.³⁵⁶ Indeed, it is also quoted to demonstrate that visible churches are made up of visible saints together with their children.³⁵⁷

In Romans 15:8, Paul stated that "Jesus Christ became a Minister of the circumcision on behalf of the truth of God -- unto the confirmation of the promises made to the fathers." The *Westminster Standards* cite this passage to prove that God instituted the sacraments to put a visible difference between church members and the rest of the world.³⁵⁸ They also quote it to show that the benefits of Christ's mediation are sealed to those who are within the covenant of grace.³⁵⁹

469. Passages on baptism in First Corinthians cited in the Westminster Standards

First Corinthians 7:14 clearly teaches that the infant children of at least one believing parent "are holy" already, and apparently even from their very conception onward -- and not that they are unholy, but (hopefully) might yet become holy. The *Westminster Confession* cites this important passage to prove that "the Visible Church...consists of all those throughout the world that profess the true religion, together with their children."³⁶⁰ It also refers to the passage -- to demonstrate that "the infants of one or both believing parents are to be baptized."³⁶¹

The passage is cited also in the *Larger Catechism* -- to prove that "infants descending from parents, either both or but one of them professing faith in Christ and obedience to Him, are...within the covenant and to be baptized."³⁶² Indeed, that *Catechism* again refers to it to show that "baptism is to be administered but once with water, to be a sign and seal of our regeneration and ingrafting into Christ -- and that, even to infants."³⁶³

First Corinthians 12:13 reminds Christians they have all been baptized and drenched with the same Spirit. This important text is cited no less than ten times in the *Westminster Standards*. In the *Confession*, it is quoted to show: that the true religion is professed by baptism; that the efficacy of the sacrament depends upon the work of the Spirit; and that it is intended for the solemn admission of the party baptized into the Visible Church.³⁶⁴

In the *Larger Catechism*, the same text is cited to prove that the Visible Church is made up of those who profess the true religion, and of their children. It further demonstrates that Christ's Spirit alone gives power to the sacrament. It is also cited: to spur Christians unto love and communion with one another; to show that the parties baptized are thereby solemnly admitted into the Visible Church; and to remind them that they have all been baptized by the same Spirit into one body.³⁶⁵

The same text is cited in the *Shorter Catechism*, to refer to the working of the Spirit in those who by faith receive the sacraments.³⁶⁶ Indeed, in the *Westminster Form of Presbyterial Church Government* -- it is further quoted to prove that "there is one general Church Visible held forth in the New Testament."³⁶⁷

470. Passages on baptism in other Epistles cited in the Westminster Standards

Galatians 3:27 states that all who have been baptized into Christ, have put on Christ. This verse is repeatedly cited by the *Westminster Standards*. They do so to prove: that baptism is a seal of one's ingrafting into Christ and all other graces; that baptism solemnly admits into the Visible Church; that it encourages one to live by faith; and that it is a sign and seal of regeneration even to infants.³⁶⁸

In Ephesians 6:1-4, Christian parents are not enjoined to bring their children into Christianity -- but rather to raise them within the Visible Church. For Christian parents are to raise their children "in the teaching and nurture of the Lord." Thus, the children of believers are already "in" or within the covenant -- even from their conception till their birth, and beyond.

Such children -- in the memorable words of the *Westminster Directory for the Publick Worship of God*³⁶⁹ -- "by baptism are solemnly received into the bosom of the Visible Church, [and] distinguished from the world and them that are without" alias outside of the covenant of grace. For "they are Christians and federally holy before baptism, and therefore are they baptized."

Consequently, it is as "Christians" that such covenant infants are to be baptized. And it is still as Christians that, after baptism, those same covenant infants are to be raised and admonished in the nurture of the Lord. Ephesians 6:1-4.

Colossians 2:11-13 teaches that [infant] baptism has now replaced [infant] circumcision. The *Westminster Confession*³⁷⁰ cites this passage to prove that baptism is a seal of regeneration. It also quotes the passage to show that grace really is exhibited therein -- and conferred by the Holy Ghost to His elect in God's appointed time. The *Larger Catechism* quotes it to establish that

children of believers are to be baptized. It also cites it to show that baptism is a seal of God's covenant -- and that we are to improve our own baptism life-long.³⁷¹

First Peter 3:21 refers to the 'baptism' of Noah and his whole family inside the ark. The *Westminster Confession*³⁷² cites this passage to prove that the efficacy of a sacrament does not depend upon the piety or intention of him that administers it. The *Larger Catechism* quotes it³⁷³ to establish: that the sacrament was instituted by Christ's Spirit; that inward and spiritual grace is thereby signified; and that blessings are sealed to us in that sacrament.

The same text is cited by the *Standards*³⁷⁴ also to show that "the sacraments become effectual means [not of justification but] of salvation" alias preservation. Indeed, even this is there said to occur -- "not by any power in [the sacraments] themselves...but only by the working of the Holy Ghost."

First John 5:12 states that "he who has the Son, has life." This is the case also with all elect infants who die before their birth. Consequently, they are justified before their infant deaths -- and often without ever being baptized.

Thus both regeneration and faith always precede baptism -- in the case of fetally-dying elect infants, and also where elect infants die unbaptized (notably within a week after their births as per Genesis 17:12f). Accordingly, the *Confession*³⁷⁵ cites this text to show that "elect infants dying in infancy are regenerated and saved by Christ through the Spirit."

Also Revelation 1:5 declares that Christ "washed us from our sins in His own blood." This text is cited in the *Westminster Larger Catechism*³⁷⁶ to prove that baptism is a sign and seal of the remission of sins solely by the blood of Christ.

471. The Westminster Directory opposes romanizing baptismal regenerationism

The Westminster Assembly's *Directory for the Publick Worship of God* was adopted by the Presbyterian General Assembly of the [Reformed] Church of Scotland on February 3rd 1645. It commends³⁷⁷ "the blessed Reformation" -- and opposes "the Liturgy used in the Church of England" which had so comforted the "Papists" that they were "not a little confirmed in their superstition and idolatry, expecting rather our return to them than endeavouring the reformation of themselves." Consequently, because "God...at this time calleth upon us for further reformation..., we have...resolved to lay aside the former Liturgy...and have agreed upon this following *Directory* for all the parts of publick worship....

"Baptism...is not...to be administered in private places or privately..., and not in the places where fonts in the time of Popery were unfitly and superstitiously placed.... [Covenant] children...are Christians, and federally holy before baptism.... The inward grace and virtue of baptism is not tied to that very moment of time wherein it is administered.... The fruit and power thereof reacheth to the whole course of our life.... Outward baptism is not so necessary that, through the want thereof, the infant is in danger of damnation."

"After reading of the Word..., the Minister who is to preach is...to pray...for the conversion of the Jews, the fulness of the Gentiles, the fall of antichrist, and the hastening of the second coming of our Lord; for the deliverance of the distressed churches abroad from the tyranny of the [Romish] antichristian faction, and from the cruel oppressions and blasphemies of the [Islamic] Turk."

Without question, the baptismal passages of the *Westminster Directory* are strongly directed against Romanism. However, they are directed also against Anabaptism -- and with even greater strength.

472. Anti-Anabaptism in the Westminster Directory for Worship

For we also read³⁷⁷ in the *Westminster Directory* that "the child to be baptized...is to be presented...by the father" -- who must obviously be a professing Christian. For, "in case of his [the father's] necessary absence," the child is alternatively to be presented "by some Christian friend [such as the wife] in his place -- professing his [the father's or the mother's own] earnest desire that the child may be baptized." Acts 8:36f & First Corinthians 7:14.

The *Directory* continues: "Before baptism the Minister is to use some words of instruction...touching the institution...of this sacrament, shewing that...it is a seal of the covenant of grace, of our ingrafting into Christ and of our union with Him; [and] of remission of sins, regeneration, adoption, and life eternal.... Baptizing or sprinkling and washing with water signifieth the cleansing from sin by the blood and for the merit of Christ....

"The promise is made to believers and their seed.... The seed and posterity of the faithful -- born within the Church -- have, by their birth, interest in the covenant, and right to the seal of it..., no less than the children of Abraham in the time of the Old Testament.... The Son of God admitted little children into His presence, embracing and blessing them, saying, 'Of such is the Kingdom of God.'"

Further: "Children by baptism are solemnly received into the bosom of the Visible Church, distinguished from the world and them that are without [or outside], and united with believers.... All who are baptized in the Name of Christ do renounce...the devil, the world and the flesh.... They are **Christians** and federally holy **before baptism**, and **therefore** are they **baptized**."

The Minister "is also to admonish all that are present to look back to their baptism: to repent of their sins against their covenant with God; to stir up their faith; to improve and make right use of their baptism and of the covenant sealed thereby betwixt God and their souls. He is to exhort the parent...to bring up the child in the knowledge of the grounds of the Christian religion and in the nurture and admonition of the Lord....

"He is to baptize the child with water...by pouring or sprinkling of the water on the face of the child.... He is to give thanks and pray...that the Lord would still continue and daily confirm more and more...the infant now baptized.... If he shall be taken out of this life in his infancy, the Lord Who is rich in mercy would be pleased to receive him up into glory."

In debate the previous day, the Westminster Assembly had voted here to exclude 'dipping' as one of the approved modes of baptism -- 'dipping' alongside of the approved "pouring or sprinkling" as above. Thus John Lightfoot's *Journal of the Westminster Assembly*.³⁷⁸ The debate was not, as Baptists often misstate it, on the meaning of the Greek word *baptizō* -- but on the propriety of baptizing by way of dipping at all.³⁷⁹ Hence, dipping was rejected and thereby disallowed in British Calvinistic Puritan baptismal practice.

473. The anti-Romish character of the Westminster Confession

The Calvinistic *Westminster Confession* was completed on December 4th 1646 without proof-texts. The latter were added by April 26th 1647, and the text was approved by the Presbyterian General Assembly of the (Reformed) Church of Scotland on August 27th 1647. Both then and for ever since, it has (beneath the *Supreme Standard* of Holy Scripture) been the *Subordinate Standard* of all Presbyterian Churches everywhere.

It insists that "Popish monastical vows...are superstitious and sinful snares in which no Christian may entangle himself."³⁸⁰ No way "hath the Pope any power or jurisdiction" over the civil magistrates.³⁸¹ "Such as profess the true reformed religion should not marry with infidels, Papists, or other idolaters."³⁸²

For "there is no other head of the church but the Lord Jesus Christ. Nor can the Pope of Rome in any sense be head thereof; but is that antichrist, that man of sin and son of perdition that exalteth himself in the church against Christ and all that is called God."³⁸³ Indeed, "the Popish sacrifice of the mass...is most abominably injurious to Christ's one only sacrifice."³⁸⁴ For "transubstantiation by consecration of a priest or by any other way, is repugnant not to Scripture alone but even to common sense and reason...and is the cause of manifold superstitions -- yea, of gross idolatries."³⁸⁵

Specifically as regards the sacrament of initiation, the *Confession* unequivocally rejects³⁸⁶ the Romish theory of baptismal regenerationism. "The grace which is exhibited in or by the sacraments, rightly used, is not conferred by any power in them.... Romans 2:28f & First Peter 3:21."

Further:³⁸⁷ "Baptism is a sacrament...[and] a sign and seal of the covenant of grace. Matthew 28:19; Romans 4:11; Colossians 2:11f.... Yet grace and salvation are not so inseparably annexed unto it, as that no person can be regenerated or saved without it, or that all that are baptized are undoubtedly regenerated. Romans 4:11; Acts 10:2,4,22,31,45,47 & 8:13,23. The efficacy of baptism is not tied to that moment of time wherein it is administered. John 3:5-8."

474. The anti-Anabaptist character of the Westminster Confession

It was hardly necessary for the *Westminster Confession* to condemn the Anabaptists by name. For earlier, it had already condemned their distinctive doctrines of revolutionism,³⁸⁸ of pseudo-pentecostalism,³⁸⁹ of opposition to oath-taking,³⁹⁰ of anarchy,³⁹¹ of polygamy,³⁹² of adultery,³⁹³ and of their communistic redistribution of private property.³⁹⁴ Thus the *Confession*

had invoked "the power of the civil magistrate" against those who insist on the "publishing of such opinions or maintaining such practices as are contrary to the light of nature or to the known principles of Christianity." Further, it had also insisted that "in matters of weight and moment, an oath...ought to be taken."

It had declared too that God "hath ordained civil magistrates...and...armed them with the power of the sword...for the punishment of evil-doers." It had denied that it is "lawful for any man to have more than one wife, nor for any woman to have more than one husband, at the same time." Indeed, it had also insisted that the communion of the saints does not in any way "infringe the title or property which each man hath in his goods and possessions."

Specifically, the *Confession* now went on rightly to recognize the impropriety of Antipaedobaptism. For it now declared³⁹⁵ that "sacraments are holy signs and seals of the covenant of grace immediately instituted by God to represent Christ and...to put a visible difference -- between those that belong unto the Church, and the rest of the world. Romans 15:8; Exodus 12:48; Genesis 34:14; Romans 6:3f.... The sacraments of the Old Testament...were, for substance, the same with those of the New. First Corinthians 10:1-4." Consequently, Antipaedobaptism is just a grave a sin as was Antircumcisionism.

Particularly as regards baptism, the *Confession* insists³⁹⁶ that it is to be administered precisely "by a Minister of the Gospel, lawfully called thereunto. Matthew 3:11; John 1:33; Matthew 28:19f.... Dipping of the person into the water is not necessary; but baptism is rightly administered by pouring or sprinkling water upon the person. Hebrews 9:10,19-22 & Mark 7:4.... Also the infants of one or both believing parents are to be baptized. Genesis 17:7f; Galatians 3:9f; Colossians 2:11f; Acts 2:38f; Romans 4:11f; First Corinthians 7:14; Matthew 28:19f; Mark 10:13f; Luke 18:15....

The sacrament of baptism is but once to be administered to any person. Titus 3:5." Consequently, all rebaptisms -- such as most of the 'baptisms' administered by the (Ana)Baptists -- are essentially sinful.

475. Specifically baptism in the *Confession of Faith*

The *Westminster Confession* declares³⁹⁷ that "elect infants, dying in infancy, are regenerated and saved by Christ through the Spirit. Luke 18:15f; Acts 2:38f; John 3:3-8; First John 5:12."

It also states³⁹⁸ that "all those that are justified, God vouchsafeth...to make partakers of the grace of adoption. Ephesians 1:5 & Galatians 4:4-5.... They are taken into...the children of God. Romans 8:17 & John 1:12." Accordingly, they "have His Name put upon them. Jeremiah 14:9; Second Corinthians 6:18; Revelation 3:12." For they "receive the Spirit of adoption. Romans 8:15."

Indeed, they "have access to the throne of grace with boldness. Ephesians 3:12." For they "are pitied (like a Father pities His children). Psalm 103:13." Indeed, they are "sealed [un]to the day of redemption. Ephesians 4:30." Consequently -- from the above-mentioned "Name" of God "put" upon them when they were "sealed" -- the rightness also of covenant infants being

baptized as "the children of God" should be obvious.

Certainly also covenant infants are thoroughly capable of exercising a true faith (even if still but an infantile one). As the *Confession* explains,³⁹⁹ the very "grace of faith whereby the elect are enabled to believe to the saving of their souls -- is the work of the Spirit of Christ in their hearts." It is not the work of their own human spirit, whether infantile or adult.

Now that "grace of faith...is ordinarily wrought by the ministry of the Word" -- such as by Bible reading during daily family worship, as regards even prenatal babies. "By the administration of the sacraments and prayer, it is increased and strengthened" -- and hence not initiated. For the initiation of that "grace of faith" already occurs presacramentally, and therefore prebaptismally.

Both before the fall and after Christ's redemption from the fall, explains the *Confession*,⁴⁰⁰ "marriage was ordained...for the increase of mankind...and of the church with a holy seed. Malachi 2:15.... It is the duty of Christians to marry only in the Lord. First Corinthians 7:39. And therefore such as profess the true reformed religion should not marry with infidels, Papists or other idolaters. Genesis 34:14 ('We cannot...give our sister to one that is uncircumcised')."

Nevertheless, the *Confession* also rightly recognizes the validity of 'mixed' marriages between Christians and those of other religions.⁴⁰¹ Consequently, there is a validity and even a holiness in the children even of those believers who are married to unbelievers. First Corinthians 7:14. *A fortiori*, infant baptism was certainly intended also for the babies of mixed paedobaptist and antipaedobaptist Christian parentage.

For, according to the *Confession*,⁴⁰² "the catholick or universal Church which is invisible, consists of the whole number of the elect" -- and "the Visible Church...catholick...consists of all those throughout the world that profess the true religion, together with their children.... Unto this catholick visible Church, Christ hath given the ministry, oracles and ordinances of God.... Matthew 28:19f." Clearly, this means that the ordinance of baptism has been given to be administered also to the infant children of God's covenant people.

The *Confession* teaches that, when approved, a baptismal candidate is to be given "admission" and "ingrafting" into "the Visible Church. First Corinthians 12:13; Romans 4:11; Colossians 2:11f; Galatians 3:27; Romans 6:5." It is "to be unto him a sign and seal of the covenant of grace. Romans 4:11 & Colossians 2:11f."⁴⁰³ This is to be effected by his being "baptized in the Name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost."⁴⁰⁴

Westminster also recognizes that "baptism is rightly administered by pouring or sprinkling water upon the person. Hebrews 9:10-22; Acts 2:41; 16:33; Mark 7:4."⁴⁰⁵ The fact that **baptism** is rightly administered by sprinkling -- clearly implies that it is not rightly administered by submersion.

Yet, although baptism is wrongly administered by submersion -- which submersion is therefore baptismally improper -- the *Confession* nevertheless does not regard baptism by submersion as invalid. Indeed, the *Confession* simply states that "dipping of the person into the water is not necessary." Consequently, one baptized by the irregular and wrong method of

submersion should never later be (re)baptized by the regular and right method of sprinkling.

Further:⁴⁰⁶ "Not only those that do actually profess faith in and obedience unto Christ, but also the infants of one or both believing parents are to be baptized. Mark 16:15*f*; Acts 18:37*f*; Genesis 17:7*f*; Galatians 3:9*f*; Colossians 2:11*f*; Acts 2:38*f*; Romans 4:11*f*; First Corinthians 7:14; Matthew 28:19; Mark 10:13*f*; Luke 18:15....

"It be a great sin to contemn or neglect this ordinance. Luke 7:30 & Exodus 4:24*f*. Yet grace and salvation are not so inseparably annexed unto it, as that no person can be regenerated or saved without it, or that all that are baptized are undoubtedly regenerated. Romans 4:11; Acts 10:2-47; 8:13-23; John 3:5-8."

476. Baptism in the Westminster Larger Catechism in general

In the *Larger Catechism*, which was approved by the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland on July 2nd 1648, God's Commandments certainly have baptismal implications. Thus, the *Catechism* rightly states that the Second Commandment against image worship requires⁴⁰⁷ not only the "preaching and hearing of the Word" but also "the administration and receiving of the sacraments." Significantly, it here cites the baptismal text Matthew 28:19.

The *Larger Catechism* next goes on to state that God's "Third Commandment requires that the...sacraments...be holily and reverently used in thought, meditation, word and writing."⁴⁰⁸ Significantly, the Westminster divines at this very point⁴⁰⁹ quote from the baptismal passage Hebrews 6:1-6.

The *Westminster Larger Catechism* declares:⁴¹⁰ "The sacraments become effectual means [not of justification but] of salvation [alias preservation] -- not by any power in themselves...but only by the working of the Holy Ghost.... First Peter 3:21; Acts 8:13-23; First Corinthians 3:6*f*....

"A sacrament is an holy ordinance instituted by Christ in His Church to signify, seal and exhibit unto those that are within the covenant of grace the benefits of His mediation; to strengthen and increase their faith.... Romans 4:11; 15:8; Exodus 12:48; Acts 2:38; Galatians 3:27."

The *Larger Catechism*⁴¹¹ rightly defines baptism as "a sacrament of the New Testament wherein Christ hath ordained the washing with water in the Name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost to be a sign and seal of ingrafting into Himself..., whereby the parties baptized are solemnly admitted into the Visible Church. Matthew 28:19; Galatians 3:26*f*; Mark 1:43; Revelation 1:5; Titus 3:5; Ephesians 5:25*f*; First Corinthians 15:29; Romans 6:4*f*; First Corinthians 12:13....

"Infants descending from parents, either both or but one of them professing faith in Christ and obedience to Him, are...to be baptized. Genesis 17:7*f*; Galatians 3:9; Colossians 2:11*f*; Acts 2:38*f*; Romans 4:11*f*; First Corinthians 7:14; Matthew 28:19; Luke 18:15; Romans 11:16."

Now both infant baptism and adult baptism are not to be repeated, but are indeed to be 'improved.' In the words of the *Larger Catechism*,⁴¹² "the needful but much neglected duty of improving our baptism is to be performed by us all our life long -- especially in the time of temptation and when we are present at the administration of it to others." That is to be done "by serious and thankful consideration of the nature of it, and of...the privileges....sealed thereby. Colossians 2:11f & Romans 6:3-11."

More specifically, this means we are to be "humbled for our sinful defilement" of the sacrament of initiation -- and also by "our falling short of and walking contrary to the grace of baptism." By way of thankful obedience to the Triune God, we are constantly to reflect on "our solemn vow made therein" -- and to see to it that we and especially our children keep on "growing up to assurance of pardon of sin and of all other blessings sealed to us in that sacrament. Romans 4:11f & First Peter 3:21." For the baptized, are "those that have therein given up their names to Christ" -- having been "baptized by the same Spirit into one body. Acts 2:38 & First Corinthians 12:13f."

For, in the words of the *Larger Catechism*:⁴¹³ "The sacrament...of baptism is to be administered but once, with water, to be a sign and seal of our regeneration and ingrafting into Christ, and that even to infants. Matthew 3:11; Titus 3:5; Galatians 3:27; Genesis 17:7f; Acts 2:38f; First Corinthians 7:14."

477. Baptismal teaching of the Westminster Shorter Catechism

The following magnificent words of the *Westminster Shorter Catechism*⁴¹⁴ are truly unforgettable: "Baptism is a sacrament wherein the washing with water in the Name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost doth signify and seal our ingrafting into Christ, and partaking of the benefits of the covenant of grace, and our engagement to be the Lord's. Matthew 28:19; Romans 6:4; Galatians 3:27.... The infants of such as are members of the visible church, are to be baptized. Acts 2:38f; Genesis 17:10; Colossians 2:11f; First Corinthians 7:14."

This statement in the *Shorter Catechism* was approved on July 28th 1648 by the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland. As such, it represents the last Westminster Assembly document to be adopted by the Scottish Presbyterians.

The modern evaluation of the 1648 *Westminster Shorter Catechism* by the famous Rev. Prof. Dr. B.B. Warfield is very significant. According to Warfield, the *Shorter Catechism* clearly implies the prior 'presumptive regeneration' of the covenant child being catechized -- before his or her first manducation in Holy Communion at teenage.

Explains Warfield:⁴¹⁵ "Only that is given which, in the judgment of its framers, is directly required for the Christian's instruction in what he is to believe concerning God, and what God requires of him.... The *Catechism* proceeds on the presumption that the Catechumen is a child of God."

478. The reply to baptismal regenerationism of the Anti-Romish Westminster Assembly

Let us now collect all the baptismal statements against Romanism and its false doctrine of baptismal regenerationism, from the various *Westminster Standards*. The following picture then emerges.

The *Westminster Directory for the Publick Worship of God* upholds⁴¹⁶ "the blessed Reformation" -- and opposes "Papists" by insisting that "baptism...is not...to be administered in private places" nor "in the places where fonts in the time of Popery were unfitly and superstitiously placed.... [Covenant] children...are Christians, and federally holy before baptism.... The inward grace and virtue of baptism is not tied to that very moment of time wherein it is administered.... Outward baptism is not so necessary that, through the want thereof, the infant is in danger of damnation....

"Before baptism, the Minister is to use some words of instruction...shewing that...the seed and posterity of the faithful born within the church have by their **birth** interest in the covenant and right to the seal of it.... He is to baptize the child...by pouring or sprinkling...without adding any other ceremony." By the latter, is meant the 'salt and spittle' -- as well as the submersions of mediaeval Romanism.

The *Westminster Confession* unequivocally rejects the Romish theory of baptismal regenerationism. "The grace which is exhibited in or by the sacraments, rightly used, is not conferred by any power in them."⁴¹⁷

Once again: "Baptism is a sacrament...[and] a sign and seal of the covenant of grace.... Yet grace and salvation are not so inseparably annexed unto it, as that no person can be regenerated or saved without it, or that all that are baptized are undoubtedly regenerated. The efficacy of baptism is not tied to that moment of time wherein it is administered."⁴¹⁸

Finally, the *Larger Catechism*⁴¹⁹ rightly defines baptism as "a sign and seal of ingrafting into Himself..., whereby the parties baptized are solemnly admitted into the Visible Church." As such, baptism no way admits into the Invisible Church -- as Rome so falsely teaches.

479. The reply to the (Ana)Baptists of the Calvinistic Westminster Assembly

The absurdity of the antipaedobaptistic allegations and the submersional suggestions contained in the 1644 *Baptist Confession* of the seven congregations in London, soon became apparent -- upon the 1646 publication of the *Westminster Confession* of the British Puritans. See Francis Nigel Lee's *I Confess!* (subtitled *Holy Scripture, the Westminster Confession, and the Declaratory Statement -- their Relationship to One Another in the Presbyterian Church of Australia*).⁴²⁰

Of the various Westminster Standards, the *Westminster Directory for the Publick Worship of God* had appeared already in February 1645. "Baptism," it then declared,⁴²¹ "is not unnecessarily to be delayed.... The child to be baptized...is to be presented by the father....

"Before baptism, the Minister is to use some words of instruction...shewing that...the seed and posterity of the faithful born within the church have by their birth interest in the covenant and

right to the seal of it." That is so because "they are Christians and federally holy before baptism, and therefore are they baptized.... He [the Minister] is to baptize the child with water...by pouring or sprinkling of the water on the face of the child."

In December 1646, the text of the *Westminster Confession of Faith* was adopted -- and in April 1647 its Biblical prooftexts. Here, the Westminster Assembly insisted⁴²² that "the first covenant made with man was a covenant of works wherein life was promised to Adam and in him to his posterity. Romans 10:5 & 5:12-20.... God gave to Adam a Law -- as a covenant of works by which He bound him and all his posterity to...perpetual obedience. Genesis 1:26f & 2:17; Romans 2:14f."

Earlier, the (Proto-Anabaptist and Proto-Arminian) Petrobrusians had denied that an infant could demonstrate his own 'worthiness' -- and thus they denied that he could be saved. For the Petrobrusians believed nobody could be justified until he himself had actually demonstrated that he was 'worthy' of being baptized. Accordingly, those Petrobrusians rejected the baptism of babies. So too did their descendants, the Anabaptists. So too do their stepchildren, the Baptists.

However, with one fell swoop, the Calvinistic *Westminster Confession* summarily declares⁴²³ that "elect infants dying in infancy are regenerated and saved by Christ through the Spirit, Who worketh when and where and how He pleaseth. Luke 18:15f; Acts 2:38f; John 3:3,5; First John 5:12; Romans 8:9; John 3:8."

480. The Westminster Confession and Catechisms 'annihilate' Anabaptism

At man's creation, the *Westminster Confession* continues,⁴²⁴ "marriage was ordained...for the increase of mankind with a legitimate issue and of the church with an holy seed. Malachi 2:15.... The catholick or universal church which is invisible, consists of the whole number of the elect....

"The visible church which is also catholick or universal...consists of all those throughout the world that profess the true religion together with their children, and is the family of God. First Corinthians 7:14; Acts 2:39; Ezekiel 16:20f; Romans 11:16; Genesis 3:15 & 17:7.... Unto this catholick visible church Christ hath given the ministry, oracles and ordinances of God.... Matthew 28:19 & Isaiah 59:21." In the last two prooftexts, the baptism also of infants is clearly indicated.

Specifically, the *Confession* goes on,⁴²⁵ "baptism is a sacrament...and seal of the covenant of grace.... Dipping of the person into the water is not necessary; but baptism is rightly administered by pouring or sprinkling water upon the person. Hebrews 9:10-22; Acts 2:41 [cf. vv. 14-18 & 33] & 16:33; Mark 7:4." See too Psalms 77:15-20 & 78:12-16; Joel 2:16,23,28f; First Corinthians 10:1-2; and First Peter 1:2 & 3:20f.

"Also the infants of one or both believing parents are to be baptized. Genesis 17:7-9; Galatians 3:9,14 [& vv. 27f]; Colossians 2:11f; Acts 2:38f; Romans 4:11f; Mark 10:13f; Luke 18:15f.... It be a great sin to contemn or neglect this ordinance. Luke 7:30 & Exodus 4:24-26.... Baptism is but once to be administered to any person. Titus 3:5."

The *Westminster Larger Catechism* was adopted in October 1647. "God doth not leave all men to perish in the estate of sin and misery, but" -- it states⁴²⁶ -- "bringeth them into an estate of salvation by the second covenant...of grace.... Under the New Testament...the same covenant of grace was and still is to be administered in...the administration...of baptism. Matthew 28:19f....

"Baptism is a sacrament of the New Testament wherein Christ hath ordained the washing with water...to be a sign and seal of ingrafting into Himself.... Baptism is not to be administered to any that are out[side] of the visible church.... Infants descending from parents either both or but one of them professing faith in Christ and obedience to Him are in that respect within the covenant and to be baptized. Genesis 17:7f; Colossians 2:11f; Acts 2:38f; Romans 4:11f; First Corinthians 7:14; Matthew 28:19; Luke 18:15f; Romans 11:16.... Baptism is to be administered but once..., and that even to infants."⁴²⁷

Finally, the *Westminster Shorter Catechism* was adopted in November 1647. It insists⁴²⁸ that "baptism is a sacrament wherein the washing with water in the Name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost doth signify and seal our ingrafting into Christ and partaking of the benefits of the covenant of grace and our engagement to be the Lord's. Matthew 28:19; Romans 6:4; Galatians 3:27. Infants of such as are members of the visible church, are to be baptized. Acts 2:38f; Genesis 17:10; Colossians 2:11f; First Corinthians 7:14."

481. Influence of the Calvinistic Westminster Assembly on the Baptists

Only in the *London Baptist Confession of 1677* (reprinted in 1688 & 1689), was a general declaration issued with an abiding authority among Baptists. Its full title was *A Confession of Faith put forth by the Elders and Brethren of many Congregations of Christians baptized upon Profession of their Faith.*⁴²⁹

This document has a deviant doctrine of baptism. For it contains the strange statement that "immersion or dipping of the person in water" is "necessary to the due administration of this ordinance."⁴³⁰

However, almost the entirety of the rest of this *London Confession of 1677* -- is truly excellent. For it was plagiarized almost exclusively from the paedobaptistic Puritans' *Westminster Confession of 1645*.

Of the latter, fortunately only the articles on Church Government and the Sacraments were perverted by the *London Confession* -- which, from 1742 onward, was also known (in North America) as the *Philadelphia Confession*. For the rest -- this Baptist borrowing from the *Westminster Confession*⁴³¹ is indeed quite the sincerest form of flattery.

Based upon the *London Confession of 1677*, the 1693 London General Assembly of the Particular Baptists adopted their *Baptist Catechism.*⁴³² The Particular Baptists and the General Baptists separated from one another from 1691 -- until 1891. Thereafter, the faction of the General Baptists became internationally predominant. Most unfortunately, precious little of the Calvinistic distinctives remains today -- among any brand of Baptists at all.

482. The divines who approved of Westminster's baptismal teaching

It should again be noted that many of the teachings regarding infant faith within covenant children, and anent the infant baptism of covenant children, are contained in all of the Westminster Assembly documents. All those teachings were endorsed and underwritten by the whole body of the godly theologians assembled at Westminster.

These included, in alphabetical order: John Arrowsmith; Simeon Ashe; Theodore Backhurst; Robert Baillie; Thomas Baylie; John Bond; Oliver Bowles; Willian Bridge; Anthony Burgess; Dr. Cornelius Burgess; Jeremiah Burroughs; Adoniram Byfield; and Richard Byfield.

They also included: Edmund Calamy; William Carter; Thomas Carter; Joseph Caryl; Thomas Case; Daniel Cawdrey; Dr. Humphrey Chambers; Dr. Francis Cheynell; Peter Clarke; Richard Cleyton; Thomas Coleman; John Conant; Edward Corbet; Philip Delme; Calibute Downing; Robert Douglas; John Dury; and John Earl.

Also included were: Thomas Ford; John Foxcroft; Hannibal Gammon; Thomas Gataker; John Gibbon; George Gillespie; George Gipps; William Goode; Dr. Thomas Goodwin; Dr. William Gouge; Stanley Gower; John Greene; William Greenhill; Henry Hall; Humphrey Hardwick; Robert Harris; Alexander Henderson; Charles Herle; Richard Heyrick; Gasper Hicks; Thomas Hill; Thomas Hodges; and Dr. Joshua Hoyle.

Further Westminster divines included John Jackson; Sir Archibald Jounston; John Langley; John Ley; John Lightfoot; John Lord Maitland; John De La March; Stephen Marshall; John Maynard; William Mewe; Thomas Micklethwait; Matthew Newcomen; Philip Nye; Henry Painter; Herbert Palmer; Edward Peale; Andrew Perne; John Philips; Henry Philps; Benjamin Pickering; Samuel De la Place; William Price; Nicholas Proffet; William Rathband; William Reyner; Edward Reynolds; Henry Roborough; and Dr. Samuel Rutherford.

Other Westminster divines were: Arthur Solway; Henry Scudder; Dr. Lazarus Seaman; Obadiah Sedgwick; Richard Simpson; Sidrach Simpson; Peter Smith; Dr. William Spurstow; Dr. Edmond Staunton; Peter Sterry; John Strickland; Francis Taylor; Dr. Thomas Temple; Christopher Tesdale; Thomas Thorowgood; Dr. Anthony Tuckney; and Dr. William Twisse.

Finally, there were also: Thomas Valentine; Richard Vines; George Walker; John Wallis; John Ward; John Whincop; John White; Jeremiah Whittaker; Dr. Henry Wilkinson; Thomas Wilson; Francis Woodcock; and Thomas Young.⁴³³ Further appointees included one of the Secretaries, John Wallis; the great John Selden,⁴³⁴ and the incomparable James Ussher.⁴³⁵

This is truly a "great cloud" of Anti-Romish and Anti-Anabaptist paedobaptistic witnesses -- alongside of Noah, Abraham, Isaac, Jacob, Moses and Joshua *etc.* See Hebrews 11:7-29 and 12:1.

483. Summary of baby belief before baptism from Knox till Westminster

In this chapter, we first saw how Calvin's Anti-Anabaptist views anent the baby belief of covenant children before their infant baptism were affirmed by his student John Knox -- and reflected in the latter's writings. These views were reflected also in writings co-authored by Knox -- such as the *First Scots Confession*, and the *First Book of Discipline*.

These same views were also affirmed by Guido de Brés's *Belgic Confession*. That strongly opposed the baptismal regenerationism of Rome's Council of Trent. It also categorically condemned the Anabaptists, and championed the baptism of babies -- and indeed specifically by sprinkling. Also in his book *The Radical Origin and Foundation of the Anabaptists*, De Brés insisted that covenant children received sanctification from a godly parent at their very conception -- like a twig does from a tree (Romans 11:16).

Ursinus and Olevianus both shared this view of presumed prebaptismal regeneration of the covenant child. Indeed, it is reflected in their various writings -- and notably in their *Heidelberg Catechism*. This was constantly re-endorsed by the Presbyterian Church of Scotland -- from its 1563 inception, right through until 1861.

Rome froze her heresy of baptismal regenerationism into her 1564 *Profession of the Tridentine Faith* and her 1566 *Roman Catechism*. So Bullinger re-asserted the Reformed view of presumed prebaptismal regeneration of covenant children (and again condemned the Anabaptists) -- in his *Second Helvetic Confession*. This too was warmly upheld not only by Episcopalian Puritans in England, but also specifically (and repeatedly) by the Presbyterian Church of Scotland.

Both Calvin's successor Theodore Beza and the Italian Reformer Jerome Zanchius insisted that the elect babies of believers have personal faith in Jesus -- before their infant baptisms. So too did the Flemish Calvinist Peter Datheen, in his *Baptismal Formula* (subsequently used by the great Dutch Reformed family of denominations worldwide). Also in England, the Pre-Reformer Wycliffe's rejection of baptismal regenerationism, through Tyndale and Cranmer and the *Forty-two Articles*, greatly influenced Archbishop Ussher's *Irish Articles* -- as the direct ancestor of the *Westminster Confession of Faith*.

In the Church of Scotland, similar baptismal views were derived from Calvin's *Geneva Catechism* and *Form of Baptism*, the *Heidelberg Catechism*, and the *Second Helvetic Confession*. These were reflected in John Craig's *First Scots Catechism* and in his 1580 *Second Scots Confession*. Significantly, the latter condemned "that Roman Antichrist" with "his cruel judgment against infants departing without the sacrament" alias "his absolute necessity of baptism."

The presumed prebaptismal regeneration of the babies of believers was also taught by the Frisian Menzo Alting; by Caspar vander Heyden and his *Dutch Reformed Baptismal Formula*; by the 1581 *Synopsis of Purer Theology* (of Polyander, Rivetus, Thysius and Walaeus); by the Belgian Reformed Jean Taffin; by the French Reformed Francis Junius (author of the later notes on the Book of Revelation in the *Geneva Bible*); by the Dutch Reformed theologians Lucas Trelcatius Sr. & Jr.; by the Frisian Reformed Gellius Snecanus; and by the German Reformed James Kimedoncius and Jeremiah Bastingius.

The great hero of Dordt, the Flemish Reformed Francis Gomarus, also shared this view. So too did the Frisian Ruardus Acronius -- and a whole host of lesser sixteenth-century European Reformed theologians (such as Grevinchoven, Seu, Bontemps, Du Bois, Donselaer, Austro-Sylvius & Moded) -- and all three *Brandenberg Confessions* in Germany, from 1614 onward. All of this Continental Calvinism had an ongoing influence on Britain at the beginning of the seventeenth century -- thus the American scholars B.B. Warfield and L.B. Schenck, and the Scottish scholars A.F. Mitchell and C.G. M'Crie.

The great British Anglican William Wall points out that infant baptism was then the historic and the world-wide practice of the Christian Church -- apart from the dying Anabaptist sects in Eastern Europe, and their struggling stepchildren among the Mennonites in the Netherlands. The latter were stoutly opposed by the Dutch Reformed Church -- and her presumptive regenerationist theologians such as Gallus, Donteclock, Bucanus, Puppius, Hommius, and the Polish Reformed Maccovius in Friesland. Alsted and Alting did the same in Germany -- and so too did the godly Puritan Archbishop Ussher (in his 1614 *Irish Articles*).

The 1618^f international *Decrees of Dordt* not only condemn the papal antichrist, but also clearly teach that "godly parents have no reason to doubt the election and salvation of those their children whom it pleases God to call out of this life in their infancy." For those *Decrees* uphold the words of Jesus in Matthew 11:25^f that His Father had "revealed these things...to the little children." Indeed, the *Decrees of Dordt* also utterly repudiate the Arminian lie -- that Calvinists ever taught that the tiny "children of the faithful are torn guiltless from their mother's breasts, and tyrannical plunged into hell."

Both the *Irish Articles* and the *Decrees of Dordt* had enormous influence on Britain's 1545 *Westminster Standards*. So too did the similar baptismal views of Perkins, Ames, and Voetius. Cf. too the latter's successors Cloppenburgh, Udeman, Kuchlin, Geselius, De Witte, and Burmannus -- and the similar views of Polan, Desmaret, Vossius, Wollebius, the Polish Reformed *Thorn Declaration*, James Alting, Jacob Trigland, Richard Sibbes -- and the Colonial Americans Shephard, Cotton, Hooker and Davenport.

After sporadic outbreaks of heretical Anabaptism in England, only in 1610 did the exiled Englishman Smyth pouringly 'rebaptize' himself -- among the Dutch Mennonites. His pelagianizing colleague, the Arminian Helwys, established the first Baptist Church on British soil. However, it was only in 1641 that his successor Barber first advocated baptizing Englishmen by dipping alone.

A student of Dutch Mennonite and perhaps even Polish Unitarian writings, the American Roger Williams was submersed by Ezekiel Hollyman. Thus started the first Baptist Church in the New World (in 1639) -- even though Williams renounced his own 'baptism' as invalid, just a few months later. From such shaky foundations proceed the American ninety percent of the modern world's Baptists (the vast majority of whom reside exclusively in the Southeastern part of the United States).

In 1643, the *Confession of the Seven Baptist Churches of London* appeared. This was the first known written symbol in the history of the world ever to advocate submersion as the only

valid form of baptism.

Just a few years later, the British Puritans issued their irrefutable antidote -- at the Westminster Assembly. (Significantly, later Baptists 'borrowed' those Westminster Standards for themselves. Fortunately, therein they twisted only such of the Puritans' teachings which uphold Presbyterian church government and paedobaptism.)

Incorporating the very best of both British and Continental Calvinism, the *Westminster Standards* themselves are both Anti-Romish and Anti-Anabaptist. They reflect the mature views of leading presumptive prepaedobaptismal regenerationists -- such as Westminster Fathers like Burgess, Gillespie, Lightfoot, Marshall, Reynolds, Rutherford, Twisse, Ussher and Wallis. Indeed, they accurately explain the paedobaptismal significance of at least twenty-four Bible passages -- from Genesis 3:15 through Revelation 1:5.

The *Westminster Directory* rightly repudiates Romanism. It then claims that covenant children "are Christians and federally holy before baptism and therefore are they baptized." Indeed, it further states that "baptism is not so necessary that, through the want thereof, the infant is in danger of damnation."

The *Westminster Confession* insists that "elect infants, dying in infancy, are regenerated" -- irrespective of their being baptized or not. It condemns the Pope of Rome as "that antichrist" -- yet it also repudiates all rebaptisms (even in respect of converted Ex-Romanists). Indeed, it insists that "baptism is rightly administered by pouring or sprinkling"; that "infants of one or both believing parents are to be baptized"; and that "it be a grave sin to contemn or neglect this ordinance."

The *Larger Catechism* reiterates much of this in greater detail. It regulates the proper administration of infant baptism, in terms of the Second and Third Commandments. Indeed, it also urges all the baptized to 'improve' their baptism -- by "growing up to assurance of pardon of sin, and of all other blessings sealed to us in that sacrament."

Never before had the baptismal beliefs of the Bible been summarized so faithfully as in these *Westminster Standards*. In a very real sense, the subsequent history of baptismal theology is little more than a series of footnotes to Westminster. However, those footnotes are not without importance to the Church today. So, in our subsequent chapter, it is to that 'series of footnotes' that we will next turn.

ENDNOTES

- 1) Schenck: *op. cit.* pp. 35f. There, Schenck cites *inter alia* from J. Knox's *Works* (IV:240).
- 2) Schenck: *op. cit.* pp. 36f.
- 3) K. Reed: *A Warning Against the Anabaptists by John Knox*, Presbyterian Heritage, Dallas, 1984, pp. 1-3.
- 4) Knox's *Works* IV:261-74 (*cf.* IV:257-60), as cited in Reed's *op. cit.* pp. 21f.
- 5) Cited in *Sel. Works of John Calvin* (ed. Bonnet) VII:4 p. 73 n. 1. 6) *Ib.* pp. 74-76.
- 7) *Works* V:121f & 189 (cited in Reed's *op. cit.* pp. 4 & 13)
- 8) *Works* II:117 (cited in Schenck's *op. cit.* p. 38 at n. 121). 9) Schenck: *op. cit.* pp. 37f.
- 10) *First Scots Confession* chs. 16 & 18. In *The Book of Confessions*, Office of the General Assembly of the United Presbyterian Church in the United States of America, Philadelphia, 1967, p. 3.16.
- 11) *Scots Confession* chs. 21-22. 12) *Scots Conf.* ch. 21. 13) *Ib.* chs. 22-23.
- 14) Knox's *Works* II:186 (cited in Schenck's *op. cit.* p. 38).
- 15) W. McMillan: *The Worship of the Scottish Reformed Church 1550 -1638*, Univ. of Glasgow Press, London, 1931, pp. 243-7.
- 16) *First Book of Discipline* ch. II 2nd Hd. 1-3; *cf.* IV 4th Hd. (1) 1-3; *cf.* XI 9th Hd. (1) 4. In F.M. Bradshaw: *Basic Documents on Presbyterian Polity*, Christian Education Committee, Presbyterian Church of Australia, 1984, pp. 11,14,36.
- 17) J.K. Cameron: *The First Book of Discipline*, St Andrews Press, Edinburgh, 1972, *in loco* n. 13.
- 18) Schenck's *op. cit.* p. 38, citing Knox's *Works* II:186.
- 19) Thus *The Liturgy of John Knox Received by the Church of Scotland in 1564*, Univ. Press, Glasgow, 1886, p. 13.
- 20) See C. Calderwood's *History of the Church of Scotland*, Wodrow Soc., Edinburgh, 1843, II, pp. 101f.
- 21) Sess. V:5. Here Trent's original Latin respectively reads: *reatum originalis peccati remitti negat and asserit non tolli totum.*
- 22) *Belgic Confession* art. 15. See too A.G. Honig: *Ref. Dog.*, pp. 639 & 646.
- 23) Sess. VII, cans. 8 & 9 ('On the sacraments in general').
- 24) Art. 15, *n'est pas aboli mesme par le baptisme*. See Gravemeijer's *Sin*, in his *op. cit.* II:9:16 p. 52.
- 25) Art. 15, *wert ook door de doope niet wechghenomen*. See Gravemeijer's *Sin*, in his *op. cit.* II:9:16 p. 53.
- 26) *Viz.* Trent's Sess. V:5. Thus Gravemeijer's *Sin*, in his *op. cit.* II:9:16 p. 54 & n. 1.
- 27) French-Walloon: "*Et n'est pas aboly mesme par le baptesme ou desraciné du tout.*" Thus Gravemeijer's *Sin*, in his *op. cit.* II:9:16 p. 53 & n. 2.
- 28) The official Dutch text reads: *Zij is ook zelfs door den doop niet ganschelijk te niet gedaan noch geheel uitgeroeid*. The official Latin runs: *Neque vero hoc ipsum (cittium haereditarium) per baptismum etiam penitus aboletur aut radicitus evellitur*. Here, even this Dutch text is still not totally beyond improvement. Better yet would have been: *Zij wordt...niet* (alias "It is...not"), instead of *Zij is...niet* (alias "it was...not"). For thus indeed both the Walloon and the Latin texts. Thus Gravemeijer's *Sin* in his *op. cit.* II:9:16 p. 53 n. 3.
- 29) Thus Gravemeijer's *Sin*, in his *op. cit.* II:9:16 p. 55. 30) *Belg. Conf.* arts. 33-36.
- 31) G. de Brés: *The Radical Origin and Foundation of the Anabaptists*, ed. 1608, Bk. III.
- 32) *Ib.* f. 200b,271b,215b,216a. 33) *Ib.* f. 252b,253a,255a.
- 34) *Ib.* f. 257a, *cf.* Kramer's *op. cit.* p. 207, and Kuyper's *Sacraments* (in his *Dict. Dog.* VI p. 140). 35) *Ib.* f. 268a.
- 36) *Ib.* f. 256a-b,257b,258a. 37) *Ib.* f. 260a,245ab. 38) *Ib.* f. 290a.
- 39) Z. Ursinus's *Commentary on the Heidelberg Catechism*, Q. 74 (cited in C. Coleburn's *Scriptural, Confessional and Historical References re the Regeneration of Children, and their Status before the Lord and in the Church*, Brisbane, 1991, p. 10); and his *Christian Religion* Q. 74 (cited in Shedd's *Dogmatic Theology* (1894), Zondervan, Grand Rapids, 1969 ed., III pp. 443f).
- 40) Z. Ursinus: *Small Catechism* (in *Collected Works* I pp. 39f), as cited in Wielenga's *op. cit.* p. 243.
- 41) Z. Ursinus: *Explication of the Catechism*, as cited in P.J.S. De Klerk's *Reformed Symbolics*, Van Schaik, Pretoria, 1954, p. 219.
- 42) Z. Ursinus: *Coll. Works* I p. 254, as cited in Kramer's *op. cit.* p. 182.
- 43) Z. Ursinus: *Coll. Works* II p. 428, as cited in Kuyper's *Sacraments* (in his *Dog. Dict.* VI p. 141). "*Infantes credunt suo modo seu pro modo aetatis, quia habent inclinationem ad credendum; fides est in infantibus potentia et inclinatione licet non actu ut in adultis.*"

- 44) Z. Ursinus: *Treasure Book* (as cited in Gravemeijer's *op. cit.* II p. 62 & III:20:14 pp. 170f, comp. Vander Honert's ed. of Ursinus on Q. 74 of the *Heid. Cat.* as cited in Kuyper's *Sacraments* in his *Dog. Dict.* VI p. 141).
- 45) Z. Ursinus: *Explic. of the Cat.*, as cited in *Coll. Works* I p. 251; compare too his *Treasure Book*, on Q. 70 of the *Heid. Cat.*
- 46) Z. Ursinus: *Thes. theol. (de bapt.)*, th. 12 misc. p. 125. Cited in T. Boston: *Complete Works*, Roberts, Wheaton, 1980 rep., VI pp. 137f.
- 47) Note that Ursinus is speaking only of the situation where baptism is lawfully received. Even where baptism is unlawfully received, it is nevertheless still valid and unrepeatable.
- 48) Z. Ursinus: *Concerning the Baptism of Infants*, in his *Coll. Works* II c. 1701,1700,1687,1694,1697.
- 49) Z. Ursinus: *Defence of the Catechism*, in *Coll. Works* II pp. 165sqq.
- 50) Z. Ursinus: *Commentary on the Heidelberg Catechism*, Amsterdam ed., pp. 365-67.
- 51) Z. Ursinus: *Theological Tracts* p. 350; cited in Gillespie's *Aaron's Rod Blossoming*, London, 1st ed., III ch. 12.
- 52) Südloff p. 399, as cited in Kramer's *op. cit.* pp. 183f. 53) Südloff pp. 553f, in Kramer *op. cit.*
- 54) C. Olevianus: *The Essence of the Covenant of Grace*. Copinga's translation, Groningen, 1739, pp. 497f.
- 55) Schenck's *op. cit.* pp. 30 & 40; Schaff's *Creeds* I p. 537 n. 1; A. Stewart's *Creeds and Churches: Studies in Symbolics*, London, 1916, p. 156; G.C. M'Crie's *The Confessions of the Church of Scotland*, Macniven & Wallace, Edinburgh, 1909, pp. 11 & 78; Coleburn's *op. cit.* p. 15; comp. the *2nd Scots Conf.* at nn. 107f below.
- 56) Northern American denominations upholding the *Heidelberg Catechism* include (listed alphabetically): the CRC; the PCUSA; the PRC; the RCA; and the RCUS. Southern African denominations doing the same include: the AGK, the EGK, the GK, the NGK, the NGKA, the NGSK, the NHK, and the RCA.
- 57) *Heid. Cat.* QQ. & AA. 7-10. 58) *Ib.* QQ. & AA. 65-68. 59) *Heid. Cat.* Q. & A. 69.
- 60) *Heid. Cat.* QQ. & AA. 70 & 73. 61) *Heid. Cat.* Q. & A. 74.
- 62) *The Profession of the Tridentine Faith*. In Schaff: *Creeds* I p. 97, and II pp. 207f; compare art. *Roman-Catholic Church* (in Schaff-Herzog's *op. cit.*, III, p. 205).
- 63) *Ib.* p. 98 (I) & p. 99 (II:4-5). 64) *Ib.* p. 101. 65) *Cat. Rom.* I:10:17f (I ch. X, QQ. 17f).
- 66) *Ib.* II:1:14; II:2:4; I:10:6.
- 67) *Ib.* II:2:18f; II:2:23-33; II:2:38-39,44. Cited in Gravemeijer's *Sacraments*, in his *op. cit.* III:20:19 p. 118 & nn. 1 & 2 and pp. 120f. Cf. too the art. *Catechetics, Catechisms and Catechumens* (in Schaff-Herzog *op. cit.*, I, pp. 417f). 68) *Ib.* II:2,18-19,25-28,38-39,44. 69) *Ib.* II:2:30, in Gravemeijer's *op. cit.* III:20:19 p. 118 n. 2. 70) *Ib.* II:2:23.
- 71) *Ib.* II:2:18f; II:2:25-28. Cf. Warfield's *Dev. Doct. Inf. Salv.* (1891) p. 15.
- 72) R. Bellarmine: *On Purgatory* 2,6.73 Thus P. Toon's art. on *Peter Martyr [Vermigli]*, in ed. Douglas's *op. cit.*, p. 769.
- 74) Art. 20-21 (21-22). 75) *2nd Helv. Conf.* chs. 11,19-22,30.
- 76) Respectively "*nuncupari Nomine Dei*" and "*appellari filium Dei*".
- 77) Namely: "*foris autem accipimus oblationem maximorum donorum in aqua, qua etiam maxima illa beneficia repraesentantur.*"
- 78) Namely: "*baptizamur id est abluimur aut adspergimur*".
- 79) Namely: "*damnamus Anabaptistas, qui negant baptizandos esse infantulos recens natos a fidelibus*".
- 80) Namely: "*horum est regnum Dei*". 81) Namely: "*qui sunt peculium est in Ecclesia Dei?*"
- 82) Namely: "*Damnamus Anabaptistas*" (twice, in arts. 22 & 30). 83) *Op. cit.* p. 206. 84) *Creeds* I p. 644.
- 85) T. Beza: *Questions and Responses*, in *Theological Tracts*, 2nd ed., Geneva, 1575, III pp. 345f & I p. 322: "*Spiritu Sancto perfundo Qui Suo tempore virtutem in illis exerat.*" Thus Beza's tract *Abstersion of the Calumnies of Tilemann Hesshus*. Here Beza defends Calvin against the Gnesio-Lutheran Heshusius's attacks (because Calvin rejected Heshusius's own semi-magical baptismal views). See too Calvin's own treatise against Heshusius (in ch. IV at its nn. 304f above).
- 86) See too Beza's 1558 *The Christian Faith*, Lewes: Sussex: Christian Focus Christian Ministries Trust, ed. 1992, pp. 61-63.
- 87) T. Beza: "*Omnes infantes indefinite sunt electi praesumendi.*" Thus his *Ad Acta Colloqui Montisbelgardensis Respons.*, 3rd ed., Geneva, 1589, II pp. 101sqq.
- 88) Cited in Schenck's *op. cit.* p. 39 (cf. too p. 30 & n. 90); C.G. M'Crie: *The Confessions of the Church of Scotland, Their Evolution in History*, p. 57; and A. Mitchell's *The Scottish Reformation* pp. 103 & 112f.
- 89) *Ib.* p. 30 & n. 90.
- 90) J. Zanchius: *Theological Works on External Worship* IV c. 440. Cited in Kramer's *op. cit.* pp. 277f.
- 91) J. Zanchius: *Concerning the Predestination of the Elect*, VIII, c. 314. 92) *Ib.* VII, c. 318.

- 93) J. Zanchius: *Commentary on the Epistle to the Ephesians* (esp. p. 225 th. 13). Cited in (ed.) De Hartog's *Bib. Ref.*, pp. 300 & 302. Also cited in T. Boston: *Complete Works* Wheaton, 1980 rep., VI pp. 137f. Cf. ch. VI at its nn. 124ff below.
- 94) See Kohlbrugge: *op. cit.* pp. 54f. 95) See nn. 120ff below.
- 96) P. Datheen: *The Entire Transactions of the Dialogue* (with the Anabaptists at Franckenthal), 1571 (Art. XII: Action 31, Q. 7; Action 25, Q. 6; and Action 33, QQ. 7 & 11).
- 97) *Ib.* Art. XII, Action 31, Q. 38; and Action 35, Q. 4. 98) *Ib.* Art. XI, Action 35, Q. 17; and Action 32, Q. 9.
- 99) *Ib.* Art. XII, Action 35, Q. 19; Action 34, Q. 11; Action 36, Q. 36.
- 100) See our text in ch. III above at its nn. 291ff & 316ff.
- 101) See J. Calvin's *Dedication of Commentary on First Peter to Edward VI*; his *Letters to King Edward*; and his 22nd Oct. 1548 letter to the regent Protector Somerset.
- 102) Art. XXVII. See G.F. Maclear and W.W. Williams: *An Introduction to the Articles of the Church of England*, Macmillan, London, 1896, pp. 315f.
- 103) W. McMillan's *The Worship of the Scottish Reformed Church 1550-1638*, Clarke, London, 1931, pp. 243-47; Schenck's *op. cit.* p. 39 nn. 122-24 & p. 30 n. 90; W. Dunlop's *Collection of Confessions of Faith...of Public Authority...in the Church of Scotland* (1591), I-II, Edinburgh, ed. 1709; A.F. Mitchell's *Catechisms of the Second Reformation with Historical Introduction and Biographical Notices*, Nisbet, London, 1886; and eds. A.F. Mitchell & J. Struthers's *Minutes of the Sessions of the Westminster Assembly of Divines while engaged in preparing their Directory for Church Government, Confession of Faith, and Catechism (November 1644 to March 1649). From transcripts of the originals procured by a Committee of the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland*, Edinburgh & London, 1874.
- 104) Ch. V:7. 105) Ch. VII:12. 106) Art. *Craig, John (1512-1600)*, in Douglas's *op. cit.* pp. 268f.
- 107) In Schenk's *op. cit.* p. 40 n. 128. 108) In Schaff's *Creeds* III pp. 480 & 482.
- 109) *National Covenant*. In *Subordinate Standards of the Free Church of Scotland*, pp. 267f.
- 110) M. Altling: *Protocol or Complete Acts of the Dialogue at Embden in East Frisia*, fol. 128f, cited in Kramer's *op. cit.* pp. 215f.
- 111) *Ib.*, art. 58, rat. 8, f. 179. 112) *Ib.*, art. 59, rat. 4, f. 181b *et seq.* 113) *Ib.*, art. 62, rat. 2, f. 189b.
- 114) *Ib.*, art. 63, rat. 9, f. 193a. 115) *Ib.*, art. 63, rat. 9, f. 195a. 116) *Ib.*, art. 66, rat. 3, f. 204b.
- 117) *Ib.*, art. 9, act. 84, rat. 1, f. 249f. 118) *Ib.*, art. 9, act. 90, rat. 1, f. 265. 119) *Ib.*, art. 9, act. 90, rat. 1, f. 267b.
- 120) The full title of C. vander Heyden's work is *Catechism or Instruction in the Christian Religion Taught and Practised in the Reformed Evangelical Churches and School of the Netherlands, Together With the Christian Ceremonies and Prayers*.
- 121) C. vander Heyden: *Short and Clear Proofs of Holy Baptism*, Antwerp, 1582.
- 122) *Op. cit.* p. 38f, cited in Kramer's *op. cit.* p. 220f (and comp. Wielenga's *op. cit.* pp. 14f & 243f).
- 123) H.H. Barger: *Our Church Book*, pp. 190 & 206 (& n.) and 213; cf. Kramer: *op. cit.* p. 186; B. Wielenga: *Our Baptismal Formula*, Kok, Kampen, 1920, pp. 14 (& n.) and 15 (& n.).
- 124) See our main text at nn. 94f above.
- 125) Barger's *op. cit.* p. 209, and Wielenga's *op. cit.* p. 14 & n. and p. 15 & n.
- 126) Dutch Reformed Church of South Africa: *The Doctrinal Standards and Liturgy (Administration of Baptism to Infants of Believers)*, J.H. Rose, Cape Town, 1876, pp. 126-30. Comp. Wielenga's *op. cit.* pp. 15-23 & 20 n. 1 and p. 177 n. 1 and pp. 166f & 191f.
- 127) A. Kuyper Sr.: *E Voto Dordraceno [on the Heidelberg Catechism]*, Wormser, Amsterdam, 1894, III p. 51.
- 128) A. Kuyper Sr.: *Our Divine Service*, Kok, Kampen, 1911, pp. 400f. 129) *Ib.* pp. 407f.
- 130) Polyander and Others: *Synopsis of Purer Theology*, 1581, *Disp.* 44c & 47 v. 9. Cited in H. Heppe's *Reformed Dogmatics*, Baker, 1950 rep., p. 621.
- 131) *Ib.* 44:44f & p. 500, 47f. Cf. in Kuyper's *E Voto*, III pp. 58f.
- 132) *Ib.* p. 609. Cited in T. Boston: *op. cit.* VI p. 137f.
- 133) J. Taffin: *Instruction Against the Errors of the Anabaptists*, 1580f, p. 114; cited in Kramer's *op. cit.* pp. 223f.
- 134) *Ib.* p. 106. 135) *Ib.* p. 116. 136) *Ib.* p. 120. 137) *Ib.* pp. 122f.
- 138) See *The Geneva Bible*, Univ. of Wisconsin Press, rep. 1969. 139) F. Junius: *Theological Works*, I, ed. ca. 1735.
- 140) Thus H. Bavinck: *Reformed Dogmatics*, Kok, Kampen, 4th ed., 1930, IV p. 708 & n. 5.
- 141) Junius: *op. cit.* II c. 287, and his *Nature and Grace*, pp. 83ff (as cited in Warfield's *Two Stud.* p. 203). Cf. too his *On Paedobaptism* 7 & 26.

- 142) Cited in Kuyper's *Sac.*, in his *Dog. Dict.* IV p. 143.
- 143) L. Trelcatius Sr.: *Common Places* p. 382, cited in Kramer's *op. cit.* p. 257.
- 144) L. Trelcatius Jr.: *Scol. et Meth. Loc. Comm. S. Theol. Inst.* p. 169.
- 145) G. Snecanus: *The Basis...of God's Covenant of Grace, of the Sacramental Sign, and of Baptism*, Franeker, 1588, p. 225.
- 146) *Ib.* p. 368. 147) J. Kimedoncius: *Answer to the Anabaptist Diereck Philips's 'Confession'*, p. 104.
- 148) *Ib.* p. 111. 149) *Ib.* p. 132. 150) *Ib.* p. 131. 151) *Ib.* p. 27.
- 152) J. Basting: *Explanations of the [Heidelberg] Catechism of the Christian Religion* (1594), 2nd ed., comp. Rutgers's *Biblical References*, pp. 366f.
- 153) Cited in Kuyper's *Sac.* in his *Dog. Dict.* IV p. 141.
- 154) F. Gomarus: *Collected Works* III p. 130. Cited in Kuyper's *E Voto* III p. 57, and in his *Sac.* [in his *Dogm. Dict.* IV p. 144].
- 155) F. Gomarus: *Disputations on the Sacraments*, in his *Coll. Works* II p. 101a. 156) *Ib.* II p. 105a.
- 157) R. Acronius: *Protocol or the Entire Acts of the Dialogue Held at Leeuwarden in Friesland*, 1596, art. V, 83, f. 253f.
- 158) *Ib.*, art. IV, act. 67, f. 198.
- 159) For Jesus Sirach alias Ecclesiasticus 1:14-16, see the main text in our ch. II above at its n. 11. By "Esdras 1:37" Acronius apparently means II Esdras 1:37. Lange/Bissell in their *Commentary on the Apocrypha of the Old Testament*, however, observe (pp. 39 & 641) that II Esdras does not occur in the Greek Septuagint but only in the Latin Vulgate. They maintain that especially "chapter i-ii and xv-xvi, for instance, are later additions from a Christian hand... They are pervaded by an anti-Jewish spirit."
- 160) *Ib.*, art. V, act. 86, f. 263f. 161) *Ib.*, act. 85, f. 261. 162) *Ib.*, act. 88, f. 268. 163) *Ib.*, act. 84, f. 257.
- 164) See Kramer's *op. cit.* pp. 200 & 238.
- 165) C. Grevinchoven: *A Thorough Study of Baptism and Rebaptism*, 1599, f. 19b,20,20b,25b,26b.
- 166) J. Seu: *True and Thorough Proofs...of Child Baptism*, Middelburg, 1601, arts. 94 & 101.
- 167) Peter Bontemps: *Short Proof of the Manifold Errors of the Anabaptists or Mennonites*, Harlem, p. 550.
- 168) J. Du Bois: *Infant Baptism Proved and Defended from the Words of the Apostle in Acts 2:38-39*, esp. paras. 128,139 & 140.
- 169) J. Du Bois: *Certainty About Infant Baptism*, p. 242.
- 170) A. Donselaer & P.J. Austro-Sylvius: *Thorough and Clear Exhibition [against the Anabaptists] etc.*, ch. 11 p. 233b; ch. 9 p. 175; ch. 18 p. 561.
- 171) Cited in Kramer's *op. cit.* pp. 238-41. 172) See ch. III at its nn. 105f. 173) See ch. III at its nn. 167f.
- 174) See above in Ch. IV. 175) See above at nn. 4f.
- 176) G. de Brés: *The Radical Origin and Foundation of the Anabaptists*, Amsterdam, 1608.
- 177) P. Datheen: *Protocol of the Dialogue with the Anabaptists*, 1571.
- 178) M. Alting: *Protocol of the Dialogue with the Anabaptists*, 1580.
- 179) J. Taffin: *Instruction Against the Errors of the Anabaptists*, 1580f.
- 180) F. Junius: *Theological Theses on Paidobaptism*, ed. 1735. 181) L. Trelcatius Sr.: *Common Places*, 1587.
- 182) L. Trelcatius Jr.: *Scol. et Meth. Loc. Comm. S. Theol. Inst.* 183) G. Snecanus: *The Basis of...Baptism*, 1588.
- 184) J. Kimedoncius: *Answer to the Anabaptist Dirk Philip's 'On the Baptism of our Lord Jesus Christ,'* 1590.
- 185) P. Bontemps: *Manifold Errors of the Anabaptists or Mennonites*. 1602.
- 186) Thus Bastingius, Gomarus, Acronius, Grevinchoven, Seu, Du Bois, Donselaer, Venhuizen, Moded, Buschius, Tayus, Costerus, Nicolai, Langspargius, Amspringius, Vossenholius, and especially Faulkelius the writer of the *Short Compendium* of the Heidelberg Catechism). See in Kramer's *op. cit.* pp. 238-41.
- 187) On Calvin, see our previous chapter. Compare too Calvin's successor Beza's *Abstersion of the Calumnies of Tilemann Hesshus* the Gnesio-Lutheran. Brandenburg is the central province of Prussia, with Berlin as its capital. From the beginning of the seventeenth century onward, its Lutheran Hohenzollern princes embraced Calvinism. They sponsored the three *Brandenburg Confessions*: the 1614 *Confession of Sigismund* (or Siegmund); the 1631 *Leipzig Colloquy*; and the 1645 [Polish Reformed] *Declaration of Thorn*. Like the earlier *Heidelberg Catechism*, all three *Brandenburg Confessions* were moderately Calvinistic and similarly endeavoured to promote the union of German Calvinism and Lutheranism (which was finally effected in 1817). See Schaff's *Creeds* I pp. 554f, and E.G.A. Boeckel's *Confessions of the Evangelical Reformed Churches*, Brockhaus, Leipzig, 1847, pp. 435f.
- 188) *Op. cit.* pp. 42f. See too A.F. Mitchell's *Catechism of the Second Reformation*, p. xlii; and his *The Westminster Assembly, Its History and Standards*, Nisbet, London, 1873, pp. 216 & 235.
- 189) G.G. M'Crie: *Confessions of the Church of Scotland*, p. 70.

- 190) W.A. Brown: *The Essence of Christianity*, p. 107 n. 1.
- 191) B.B. Warfield: *The Westminster Assembly and Its Work*, New York, 1931, p. 56. Cf. Schenck's *op. cit.*, pp. 43f.
- 192) *Op. cit.* p. xlv. 193) *Doct. Stds. & Liturgy of Ref. Dutch Ch.*, p. 130.
- 194) C. Gallus: *Hammer of the Anabaptists*, 1606. Cited in Kramer's *op. cit.* p. 239.
- 195) R. Donteclock: *Thorough Investigation...of Predstination or God's Eternal Election*, 1607, pp. 30f; in Kramer's *op. cit.* p. 261.
- 196) R. Donteclock: *Concerning An Anonymous Writing* p. 50; quoted in the *Spirit of Complaint* p. 26, and cited in Kramer's *op. cit.* p. 262.
- 197) Cited by A. Kuyper's *Sac.* (in his *Dog. Dict.* IV p. 142). 198) R. Puppilus's *Proof of Infant Baptism* (1611).
- 199) R. Puppilus's *Protecting Infant Baptism*, cited in Kramer's *op. cit.* pp. 240f.
- 200) R. Acronius & F. Hommius: *Scriptural Conference*, The Hague, 1611, p. 21; cited in Kramer's *op. cit.* pp. 263f.
- 201) J.H. Alsted: *Theological Polity* IV contr. 5. 202) See our main text at nn. 110f above.
- 203) H. Alting: *Theological Problems* prob. 3, p. 488. 204) H. Alting: *Scriptural Theology*, Heidelberg, III, p. 321.
- 205) H. Alting, cited in Kuyper's *E Voto* III p. 59.
- 206) H. Alting's *Syllabus of Controversies* p. 263; cited by Pieper's *op. cit.* III pp. 279 & 280 n. 42. Also H. Alting's *Theological Problems*; cited by Kuyper's *Sac.* (in his *Dog. Dict.* IV p. 143).
- 207) See at n. 187 above. 208) Böckel's *op. cit.* p. 428 & n.
- 209) See Schaff's *Creeds* III p. 526, and Warfield's *The Westminster Assembly*, 1972 ed., pp. 176f.
- 210) *Irish Articles*, arts. 61f & 64f. 211) *Ib.*, arts. 89-91.
- 212) J. Maccovius: *Theological Polity* p. 141. Cited in ed. Arnold's *Maccovius Resurrected: Noted Works*. Quoted in Kramer's *op. cit.* pp. 261f.
- 213) J. Maccovius: *Theol. Pol.* p. 175. Also his *Theological Questions* loc. 42, c. 20, p. 105. Cited in Kuyper's *E Voto* III p. 57 and in his *Sac.* (in his *Dog. Dict.* p. 142).
- 214) J. Maccovius: *Common Places* p. 831. 215) J. Maccovius: *First Lies* p. 187.
- 216) J. Maccovius: *Common Places* p. 833.
- 217) *Decrees of Dordt* I:7. In C. Vander Waal: *The Decrees of Dordt Do Not Dry Up*, De Jong, Johannesburg, 1973, pp. 32 & 41.
- 218) *Decrees of Dordt* I:17. In Vander Waal's *op. cit.*, p. 53. Comp. too Gravemeijer: *op. cit.* III:20:22 p. 139.
- 219) *Decrees of Dordt*, ch. I, Rejection of Error 8. In Vander Waal's *op. cit.*, p. 65. 220) Barger: *op. cit.* p. 194.
- 221) Cited in H.H. Kuyper's *Hamabdil: On the Holiness of the Covenant of Grace*, Van Bottenburg, Amsterdam, 1907, p. 114.
- 222) Art. 5, sect. 14. 223) Comp. too G. Gillespie's *Aaron's Rod Blossoming*, London ed., III ch. 12.
- 224) See *Conclusion*, in Vander Waal's *op. cit.* pp. 132f. 225) Warfield's *Dev. Doct. Inf. Salv.*, pp. 45ff & n. *.
- 226) Cf. G. Gillespie's *Aaron's Rod Blossoming*, London, 1st ed., III ch. 12.
- 227) F. Hommius: *Theological Disputations Against the Papists*, disp. 44, thes. 3, p. 269.
- 228) F. Hommius: *Ib.*, p. 43; thes. 3. Comp. Gillespie's *Aaron's Rod*, III ch. 12.
- 229) "*Dicimus igitur infantes censendos esse inter credentes, quia semen seu Spiritus fidei in iis inest.*" A. Walaeus: *Religious Reference Handbook*, I p. 487b. See too A. Walaeus: *Collected Works* I p. 493. Cited in A. Kuyper's *Sac.* (in his *Dog. Dict.* IV p. 143).
- 230) *Ib.* I p. 472-77.
- 231) A. Rivet(us): *Disputes* 13, para. 13, p. 306; *Syn. Pur. Theol.* III p. 305a, in *Summa cont. tract.*
- 232) See our text at nn. 226f above. 233) Schaff: *Creeds* III p. 558.
- 234) W. Ames: *Bellarmino Unnerved*, II:1 p. 337.
- 235) W. Ames: *The Marrow of Sacred Divinity*, Griffin, London, p. 181. See too *ib.* I:31:7.
- 236) See our main text at its nn. 154f above.
- 237) H. Kaajan: *Voetius (Gisbertus)*, in *Christian Encyclopedia*, Kok, Kampen, 1929, V p. 616.
- 238) Voetius, as cited in A. Kuyper Sr.'s *The Work of the Holy Spirit*, ET, Eerdmans, Grand Rapids, 1941, p. 300.
- 239) G. Voetius: *Theological Disputations (Biblical Preface* IV pp. 254f). Cited in Kuyper's *E Voto* III pp. 57f.
- 240) *Ib.* II p. 417. 241) *Ib.* pp. 403f. 242) *Ib.* 1.1. 243) *Ib.* pp. 412f.
- 244) G. Voetius: *Selected Disputations*, ed. A. Kuyper, Wormser, Amsterdam, ed. 1887, pp. 253-262.
- 245) G. Voetius: *Selected Theological Disputes*, Utrecht, 1648f, II p. 142.
- 246) J. Cloppenburgh: *The Gangrene of Anabaptist Theology*, II ch. 20 p. 245, cf. III ch. 28 p. 584f.

- 247) J. Cloppenburgh: *Theological Exercises*, Amsterdam 1684, in his *Theologia Opera Omnia*, Boratius, Amsterdam, 1684, I p. 1097. Cited in Kuyper's *E Voto* III p. 58.
- 248) W. Perkins: *Golden Chain*, chs. XIX-XXXI. 249) G. Udeman: *Peace of Jerusalem* pp. 120,123,131,133ab.
- 250) J. Kuchlin: *Theological Theses Concerning Infant Baptism*, cited in Kramer's *op. cit.* p. 255.
- 251) C. Geselius: *Little Proof of Harmful Differences* f. 56a, cited in Kramer's *op. cit.* p. 264.
- 252) M. Boerhave: *Addendum to the Necessary Humiliations* p. 190, cited in Kramer's *op. cit.* p. 320.
- 253) P. de Witte: *Catechizing the Heidelberg Catechism* p. 558 & q. 37, cited in Kramer's *op. cit.* p. 322 and also in Warfield's *Dev. Doct. Inf. Salv.* (1891) p. 43 (also quoting Calvin's *On the Secret Providence of God* in his *Opera* ed. Amst. VIII pp. 644ff).
- 254) F. Burmannus: *Synopsis of Theology* (Amsterdam, 1699 ed., VII:7:21 & VI:4:27); and his *The Law and the Testimony* (on Gen. 9), as cited in Kohlbrugge's *op. cit.* pp. 38f.
- 255) A. Polan(us): *Compendium of Christian Theology*, 1624, p. 1050.
- 256) S. Desmaret (Maresius): *Theological Elencthics* II, cont. 19, pp. 533f. 257) G. Vossius: *Disputes Concerning Baptism*, disp. VI, thes. 7, p. 93; & disp. XIII, thes. 15, p. 174.
- 258) J. Wolleb(ius): *Compendium of Christian Theology*, Basle, 1626, ch. XXIII(1)I to XIX (cited in J.W. Beardslee's *Reformed Dogmatics: Seventeenth-Century Reformed Theology through the Writings of Wollebius, Voetius and Turretin*, Baker, Grand Rapids, 1965, pp. 129-32). See too in Heppes's *op. cit.* pp. 614 & 713.
- 259) J. Berg & B. Nigrinus: *The Thorn Declaration*, 1645, 6:4-8 & 7:1-2. 260) See above at n. 202.
- 261) See above at nn. 110f above.
- 262) J. Trigland: *Scourge for Exorcising the Troublesome Spirit of Arminianism*, 1634, pp. 18f.
- 263) J. Trigland and others: *Contra-remonstance...against the Remonstrance*.
- 264) R. Sibbes: *Works*, Banner of Truth, Edinburgh, 1983 ed., VI pp. 22f, & VII pp. 486f.
- 265) L. Ryken's book *Worldly Saints*, Zondervan, Grand Rapids, 1986, pp. 78f.
- 266) Thus F.N. Lee's *Cat. Bef. Commun.*, 1st ed., n. 458.
- 267) T. Shephard: *The Church Membership of Children*, in *The Reformation of the Church* (Banner of Truth, London, 1965, pp. 386f & 398).
- 268) Westminster Conference: *Anglican and Puritan Theology*, Hunt, Rushden, Northants, 1977, p. 32. See too Westminster Conference: *The Puritan Experiment in the New World*, Hunt, Rushden, Northants, 1976, pp. 86f. Cf. P. Brooks: *The Return of the Puritans*, Whittaker, Springdale Pa., 1976, p. 50.
- 269) R.G. Torbet: *A History of the Baptists*, The Carey Kingsgate Press Ltd., London (1950), 1966, pp. 20-35. Here, compare too Hulse's *op. cit.* (pp. 7,21,25,52 & 89-92.) with: West's *op. cit.* pp. 223f & 265f; A.H. Newman's *A History of Anti-pedobaptism* (Philadelphia, 1897), chs. 7,21,22; J.G.G. Norman's *Smyth, John (c.1565-1612)*, in Douglas's *op. cit.* pp. x & 911; the *Baptist Confession of 1611*, art. 10 (see Schaff's *Creeds* I pp. 857f); A.M. Derham's *Helwys, Thomas (c. 1550 - c. 1616)*, in Douglas's *op. cit.* p. 459; R.S. Ward's *Baptism in Scripture and History*, pp. 58f; the *London Baptist Confession of 1677* (and of 1688) art. 29; and Schaff's *Creeds* I pp. 835f & 849f & 855. See too at nn. 273f below.
- 270) Estep's *op. cit.* p. 231; and R.G. Clouse's *Church of the Brethren*, in Douglas's *op. cit.* p. 228.
- 271) See above at nn. 269ff.
- 272) See Torbet's *op. cit.* pp. 20-35; and Payne's *The Anabaptists of the 16th Century and Their Influence in the Modern World* (London, 1949), pp. 18-21.
- 273) E.B. Bax's *Rise and Fall of the Anabaptists*, London, 1903, chs. 5-9; C.-P. Clasen's *Medieval Heresies in the Reformation* (in Dec. 1963 *Church History*, XXXII:4, pp. 392-414); H.E. Dosker's *The Dutch Anabaptists*, pp. 45f; A.H. Newman's *History of Anti-pedobaptism* (Philadelphia, 1897), chs. 7,21,22; J.H. Shakespeare's *Baptist and Congregational Pioneers*, London, 1905.
- 274) Hulse's *op. cit.* p. 21. 275) J.G.G. Norman's *Smyth, John (c.1565-1612)*, in Douglas's *op. cit.* pp. x & 911.
- 276) Estep's *op. cit.* p. 221. 277) West's *op. cit.* pp. 223f & 265f. 278) *Ib.* p. 220.
- 279) T. Helwys: *Baptist Confession*, 1611, art. 3 reads that "God imposes the necessity of sin on nobody." Compare Estep's *op. cit.* p. 222: "Helwys...in his first confession of faith...was one with Smyth in denying original sin.... Other aspects of an Arminian soteriology were retained."
- 280) A.M. Derham's *Helwys, Thomas (c. 1550 - c. 1616)*, in Douglas's *op. cit.* p. 459. See too the *Baptist Confession of 1611*, art. 10 (in Schaff's *Creeds* I pp. 857f).
- 281) *Ib.* p. 224. 282) R.S. Ward's *Baptism in Scripture and History*, pp. 58f. 283) *Rad. Ref.* p. 788.
- 284) Schaff's *Creeds* I pp. 849f.
- 285) R. Williams: *The Bloody Tenent of Persecution for Cause of Conscience Discussed*, ed. Edward Bean Underhill, Hanserd Knollys Soc., London, 1848, pp. 1-2: "It is the will and command of God that...a permission

of the most Paganish, Jewish, Turkish or anti-christian consciences and worships be granted to all men in all nations and countries." Cited in Estep's *op. cit.* pp. 226 & 235 n. 63.

286) Estep's *op. cit.* p. 228. 287) Cf. J. Cotton's *Abstract of the Laws of New England* (1641).

288) *Op. cit.* p. 7. Cf. too p. 92: "North America...29,681,927." World total = "33,749,228". 289) *Ib.* pp. 89-91.

290) *Op. cit.* p. 229. 291) P.J.S. de Klerk: *Reformed Symbolics*, Van Schaik, Pretoria, 1954, pp. 88f.

292) W.L. Lumpkin: *Baptist Confessions of Faith*, Judson, Philadelphia, 1959, p. 157.

293) Marginal note, in the Particular Baptists' 1644 *Confession of Faith of those churches which are commonly...called 'Anabaptist'*. See too our text at the previous three footnotes.

294) C.G. M'Crie: *Confessions of the Church of Scotland*, MacNiven and Wallace, 1907, pp. 51-52. Cited in Schenck's *op. cit.* p. 50 n. 166.

295) *Op. cit.* pp. 50-51. 296) *Op. cit.* pp. 50, & 50 n. 166, & p. 51. 297) C. Coleborn: *op. cit.* p. 17.

298) J. Reid: *Memoirs of the Westminster Divines*, Banner of Truth, Edinburgh, 1982, I pp. 368 & II pp. 388-90.

299) See our main text at n. 226 above. 300) See our main text at nn. 237ff above.

301) See our main text at nn. 260f above.

302) C. Burgess: *The Regeneration of Elect Infants [as] professed by the Church of England*, Curteyn, Oxford, 1629. See too J. Reid's *Memoirs of the Westminster Divines*, Banner of Truth, Edinburgh, 1982 ed., I p. 96.

303) C. Burgess: *Regen. Elect Inf.*, pp. 4,2-3,19f,62. 304) G. Voetius: *Sel. Theol. Disp.* II:142.

305) J. Reid's *Memoirs Westmin. Divines*, I p. 96; A.F. Mitchell & J. Struthers (eds.): *The Minutes of the Sessions of the Westminster Assembly of Divines, Nov. 1644 to 1649*, Blackwood, Edinburgh, 1874 ed.; and A.F. Mitchell's *The Westminster Assembly, Its History and Standards*, Nisbet, London, 1873, pp. 216 & 235.

306) R.B. Vincent: *The Efficacy of Baptism in the Westminster Confession of Faith*, Alexandria La., 1973, pp. 14-16 & nn. pp. 15 & 30 (n. 41) (citing J.B. Roger's *Scripture in the Westminster Confession*, Grand Rapids, 1967, pp. 175f), & p. 25.

307) Gillespie: *Aaron's Rod*, 1st ed., III ch. XII p. 489.

308) G. Gillespie: *Treatise of Miscellany Questions* (1642), Ogle, Oliver & Boyd, Edinburgh, 1844 ed., II pp. 89-92.

309) J. Lightfoot's *The Harmony, Chronicle and Order of the New Testament*, Miller, London, 1655; and his *Hebrew and Talmudical Exercitation upon the Gospel of St Matthew*, Rawlins, London, 1683 (on Mt. 19:13f).

310) S. Marshall: *A Sermon on the Baptizing of Infants*, Coates, Bowtell, London, 1644, pp. 14,25f,32,26f,39,41f,45f & 51f.

311) Mitchell & Struthers: *Minutes*, Blackwood, Edinburgh, pp. 216f & 442f, Sessions 618 (April 9th 1646). Cited in Coleborn's *op. cit.*, April 1991, p. 24.

312) *Op. cit.* pp. 175f.

313) E. Reynolds: *Meditations on the Holy Sacrament*, London, 1826 (1626?). Cited in Vincent's *op. cit.* pp. 18f & 30 n. 46.

314) 1642 *The Covenant of Life Opened*, Anderson, Edinburgh, 1655, I, chs. 13-14, pp. 72-91f; cf. too his *Triumph of Faith* (in his *Sermons VIII*).

315) *Id.*, cited in Coleborn's *op. cit.* pp. 21f. 316) Reid: *op. cit.* I p. 39. 317) See his *West. Ass.* pp. 176f.

318) J. Ussher: *Body of Divinity or the Sum and Substance of Christian Religion Catechetically Propounded* (1658), 4th ed., 1702 p. 165; and 5th ed., Owsley & Lillicrap, London, 5th ed., pp. 403,416f,426f.

319) J. Wallis: *A Defence of Infant Baptism*, Oxford, 1657. Cited in Coleburn's *op. cit.*, April 1991 ed., pp. 15f.

320) *W.C.F.* 25:2c. 321) *W.C.F.* 28:4m. 322) *W.C.F.* 28:5n. 323) *W.C.F.* 25:2c. 324) *W.C.F.* 28:4m.

325) *Ib.* 28:5n, citing Lk. 7:30. 326) *W.C.F.* 10:3mn and 28:6q.

327) *W.C.F.* 10:3m (citing Lk. 18:15f *etc.*) & 28:4m (citing Mk. 10:13f & Lk. 18:15f); and *W.L.C.* 166o (citing Lk. 18:15f).

328) *W.C.F.* 27:3ik. 329) *W.C.F.* 27:5l. 330) *W.C.F.* 28:4m and *W.L.C.* 166o. 331) *W.C.F.* 10:3m and 25:2c.

332) *W.C.F.* 28:4m compare *W.L.C.* 166o. 333) *W.L.C.* 162w. 334) *W.L.C.* 177s.

335) *W.C.F.* 28:5p (citing Acts 8:13,23). 336) *W.L.C.* 161s (citing Acts 8:13,23).

337) *W.C.F.* 28:4l and *W.L.C.* 166n. 338) *W.C.F.* 28:5o, citing Acts 10:2,4,22,31,45,47.

339) *W.C.F.* 27:1a & 28:1c. 340) *W.C.F.* 28:4m. 341) *W.C.F.* 28:5o. 342) *W.L.C.* 162t & 162y.

343) *W.L.C.* 166o. 344) *W.L.C.* 167s. 345) *W.L.C.* 176o.

346) *West. Conf.* 27:1e and *West. Larg. Cat.* 165m & 167r. 347) *West. Conf.* 28:1d. 348) *West. Conf.* 28:1g.

349) *West. Larg. Cat.* 162z. 350) *West. Larg. Cat.* 165k. 351) *West. Larg. Cat.* 167p.

352) *West. Larg. Cat.* 167q. 353) *West. Larg. Cat.* 167tw.

354) W.C.F. 10:3m, citing Rom. 8:9 (*ei de tis Pneuma Christou ouk echei, houtos ouk estin Autou*).

355) W.C.F. 25:2c. 356) W.L.C. 166o. 357) *Westmin. Form Presb. Church Government* d.

358) W.C.F. 27:1d. 359) W.L.C. 162w. 360) W.C.F. 25:2c. 361) W.C.F. 28:4m. 362) W.L.C. 166o.

363) W.L.C. 177s. 364) W.C.F. 25:2b & 27:3h & 28:1b. 365) W.L.C. 62w, 161s, 162a, 165l, 167pqq.

366) W.S.C. 91w. 367) *W.F.P.C.G* a.

368) W.C.F. 28:1d and W.L.C. 162y, 165fj, 167v, & 177rs which states that "baptism is...a sign and seal of our regeneration...even to infants."

369) *Westminster Directory for the Publick Worship of God*. Of the administration of the sacraments: and first, of baptism.

370) W.C.F. 28:1e & 6r. 371) W.L.C. 166o, 167p & 176o. 372) W.C.F. 27:3g. 373) W.L.C. 161s, 163c & 167s.

374) W.L.C. 161s, compare W.S.C. 91v. 375) W.C.F. 10:3. 376) W.L.C. 165g.

377) *Westminster Directory for the Publick Worship of God*. Of the administration of the sacraments: and first, of baptism, in *The Subordinate Standards of the Free Church of Scotland*, Free Church Offices, Edinburgh, 1933, pp. 288f.

378) J. Lightfoot: *Journal of the Westminster Assembly*, in his *Works* (1834 ed.) XIII p. 301.

379) See Ward's *Bapt. in Script. & Hist.*, p. 56. 380) *West. Conf.* 22:7. 381) *West. Conf.* 23:4.

382) *West. Conf.* 24:3. 383) *West. Conf.* 25:6. 384) *West. Conf.* 29:2. 385) *West. Conf.* 29:6.

386) *West. Conf.* 27:4. 387) *West. Conf.* 28:1,5. 388) *West. Conf.* 20:4. 389) *Ib.* 21:3. 390) *Ib.* 22:2.

391) *Ib.* 23:1. 392) *Ib.* 24:1. 393) *Ib.* 24:5. 394) *Ib.* 26:3. 395) *Ib.* 27:1-3. 396) *Ib.* 28:2-4,7.

397) W.C.F. 10:3. 398) W.C.F. 12:1. 399) W.C.F. 14:1. 400) W.C.F. 24:2-3. 401) *Ib.* 24:3-6.

402) *Ib.* 25:1-2. 403) *West. Conf.* 28:1. 404) *Ib.* 28:2(a), comp. *West. Larg. Cat.* 165. 405) *Ib.* 28:3.

406) W.C.F. 28:4-5. 407) *West. Larg. Cat.* 108r. 408) *Ib.* 112. 409) *Ib.* 113r (the second r).

410) W.L.C. 161-162. 411) *Ib.* 165f. 412) *Ib.* 167. 413) *Ib.* 177. 414) *West. Short. Cat.* 94 & 95.

415) *Op. cit.*, 1972 ed., pp. 66 & n. 112.

416) *Westminster Directory for the Publick Worship of God*. Of the administration of the sacraments: and first, of baptism, in *Sub. Stds.* pp. 288f.

417) *West. Conf.* 27:4. 418) *West. Conf.* 28:1,5. 419) *West. Larg. Cat.* 165f.

420) F.N. Lee: *I Confess! Holy Scripture, the Westminster Confession, and the Declaratory Statement: Their Relationship to One Another in the Presbyterian Church of Australia* (revised ed., Brisbane 1991), pp. 29f.

421) *Westminster Directory for the Publick Worship of God: Of the Administration of the Sacraments -- and first, of Baptism*, in the *Sub. Stand. Free Ch. Scot.* pp. 293f.

422) *West. Conf.* 7:2 & 19:1. 423) *Ib.* 10:3. 424) *Ib.* 24:2 & 25:1-3. 425) *Ib.* 28:1-7.

426) *West. Larg. Cat.* 30 & 35. 427) *Ib.* 165f & 177. 428) *West. Short. Cat.* 94.

429) See De Klerk's *op. cit.* p. 89. 430) Art. 29. 431) Schaff's *Creeeds* I pp. 835f,849f,855f. 432) *Ib.* pp. 88f.

433) Reid's *op. cit.* I pp. 368 & II pp. 388-90 and *The Subordinate Standards of the Free Church of Scotland*, Church Offices, Edinburgh, 1933 ed., pp. 12-13.

434) See F.N. Lee: *The Westminster Divine John Selden on Ancient British Law*, Jesus Saves, Brisbane 1989, p. 1 n. 1; cf. B.B. Warfield's *The Westminster Assembly*, and J.R. de Witt's *Jus Divinum: the Westminster Assembly and the 'Divine Right' of Church Government*, Kok, Kampen, 1969, pp. 25f.

435) See our main text above at its nn. 317-18.