

Friedrich Balduin, pages 390-408  
Chapter XI

*Concerning cases of conscience  
regarding the use of the sacraments  
and, in specific, baptism.*

Wade R. Johnston  
Senior Dogmatics  
Semester 1&2 Translation Assignment  
Professors Schuetze and Bivens

## Translator's Foreword

Friedrich Balduin is a man whose presence weighs heavily on the stage of orthodox Lutheranism. One can only pray that it would weigh more heavily on the stage of American Lutheranism, which year after year moves farther from its orthodox fathers. How ill equipped then is an average at best Seminary student like myself to translate the dogmatician's thoughts into English! I have tried to cite the places where alternatives to my translation may be preferable. It is my hope that, inadequate though it may be, at least to some extent my translation may allow the reader to gain a rough understanding of Balduin's views on the topics discussed.

One very taxing issue I faced was the citations Balduin makes from Scripture and the Fathers. Most of the citations Balduin provides, but it is oftentimes uncertain as to what is being quoted and what is Balduin's own paraphrase or commentary on the citation. Here it would serve the reader well to be reminded of the words of Luther Poellot, from his book, *The Nature and Character of Theology: An Introduction to the Thought of J. A. Quenstedt from THEOLOGIA DICTATI-POLEMICA SIVE SYSTEMA THEOLOGICUM*. His words could apply to this translation as well. He writes, "As for Bible quotations, no one English version was used in this work, largely because it was common in the 17<sup>th</sup> century to cite Scripture freely according to the sense, rather than verbatim (the latter usually only when necessary to make a specific point); as a result, Quenstedt and his sources generally speak for themselves, in a sense and so far as possible, also in these passages" (7). This is true of Balduin's work as well.

May this translation serve in some small way to further Lutheran studies in the dogmaticians' writings and thought. It is my fervent prayer that someone more skilled than I, which is most anyone, will one day improve and expand on this translation.

Wade R. Johnston

Christ the King Sunday, 2003

## Friedrich Balduin, pages 390-408

### Chapter XI

*Concerning cases of conscience regarding the use of the sacraments and, in specific, baptism.*

In Augustine,<sup>1</sup> the sacraments are called visible Word and also invisible grace with a visible sign for through them [the sacraments] it is as though that which is heard through the preached word, undoubtedly the promise of grace, is made subject to the eyes. Whatever was in the preached word concerning our salvation is set before those of us who believe.

In this, God generally accommodates himself to our infirmity. For, as Chrysostom writes,<sup>2</sup> if you had been incorporeal, the incorporeal gift itself would have been handed over to you; since, however, your body and soul are truly joined, they are handed over in an intelligible way to your senses.”

Thus, we here presuppose, as elsewhere has been demonstrated, that there are thus two sacraments of the New Testament: baptism and the Lord’s Supper. In respect to the use of these, there are not a few which are able to speak to the doubting consciences of men. Our labor here will occupy itself with explaining these. We will do this chiefly in regard to initiation by baptism.

---

<sup>1</sup> *lib. 19 cont. Faistim cap. 16 que in Levit. Quast. 84*

<sup>2</sup> *hom. 60. ad populum Antiochen. Que hom. 83. in Matth.*

## Casus I.

*Is the use of the sacraments therefore necessary, so that it is not able to be left out without danger to salvation?*

Response: Those men disturb conscience: I. Who, from among the Calvinists and Photinians, argue against the necessity of baptism, and in many cases, who exclude<sup>3</sup> men from the use of the sacraments.

The Photinians<sup>4</sup> deny baptism is necessary for salvation because they say it has not been instituted by Christ nor commanded by the disciples, but rather has only been permitted, since at that time, on account of his wisdom, he [Christ] foresaw it to be advantageous to require it publicly, as Smalcus says.<sup>5</sup>

Calvinists<sup>6</sup> say baptism is something necessary, but not as a means of regeneration. Rather it is necessary, in part, as a sign by which the true Church of God may be distinguished from the false church and, in part, as a testimony to men concerning one's incorporation into the

---

<sup>3</sup> Could also mean to hinder.

<sup>4</sup> I am not sure about their exact teachings concerning baptism. It would seem that they denied Christ commanded baptism, but rather held that he simply required it be done publicly, if it were done. It is known that they baptized only in the name of Christ. They denied Christ was always God, but insisted He took on divine powers at some point in time, although Photius did reject Arianism (see Latourette, *A History of Christianity*, vol. 1, 301-310 for more). *Catholic Encyclopedia* (<http://www.newadvent.org/cathen/02258b.htm>): Other Arian sects, such as the Eunomians and Aetians, baptized "in the death of Christ". Converts from Sabellianism were ordered by the First Council of Constantinople (can. vii) to be rebaptized because the doctrine of Sabellius that there was but one person in the Trinity had infected their baptismal form. The two sects sprung from Paul of Samosata, who denied Christ's Divinity, likewise conferred invalid baptism. They were the Paulianists and Photinians. Pope Innocent I (Ad. Episc. Maced., vi) declares that these sectaries did not distinguish the Persons of the Trinity when baptizing. The Council of Nicæa (can. xix) ordered the rebaptism of Paulianists, and the Council of Aries (can. xvi and xvii) decreed the same for both Paulianists and Photinians. ...In his Trinitarian doctrine he is a Modalist Monarchian, and in his Christology a Dynamistic Monarchian, combining the errors of Theodotus with those of Sabellius.

<sup>5</sup> *Disp. 10. Antifranziaana, ss. 1.*

<sup>6</sup> *Catholic Encyclopedia* (<http://www.newadvent.org/cathen/02258b.htm>): According to Calvin it is necessary for adults as a precept but not as a means. Hence he contends that the infants of believing parents are sanctified in the womb and thus freed from original sin without baptism.

body of Christ, and partly as a declaration and seal, a covenant of grace, into which infants have been born, as Perkinsus shows.<sup>7</sup>

They deny baptism is a necessary organ, through which faith, regeneration, and salvation are conferred, and for that reason Calvin expressly writes,<sup>8</sup> “As much as damned men have attacked this dogma by maliciously expounding that baptism is necessary for salvation, few have paid attention.” In regard to the case of that dictum of Christ, “unless someone has been born again of water and the spirit,” he, nevertheless, in writing concerning baptism in his commentary on John chapter 3, explains it to be inopportune<sup>9</sup> that through water one now knows the Holy Spirit, an explanation with which he is not altogether unfamiliar.<sup>10</sup>

Musculus,<sup>11/12</sup> also, in *L. C. F.* 338., more reprehensibly says “whoever hastens with infants to baptism, and anyone who is receptive to such secular customs, is not a disciple of the teachings of this Nazarene.” He had come to the conclusion that the baptism of little children is to be deferred always until the third year, which draws its origin from the error that baptism is

<sup>7</sup> *In casib. Conscient. Lib. 2 cap. 10. quaest. 1. sect. 1 & Traelcatius in. institut. Lib. 2. part. 1. de baptism, pag. 194.*

<sup>8</sup> *Lib. 4. instit. Cap. 15. ss20.*

<sup>9</sup> Can also mean untimely or unseasonable.

<sup>10</sup> *Sadeel, in resp. ad profess. Fidei monach. Burgedegal. Art. 11. & Perkinsus in cas. Consc. 1. d.*

<sup>11</sup> It seems he taught that, election, not baptism, was necessary for salvation, but that baptism was necessary. I have found evidence that he also insisted on baptism by immersion. He called for paedocommunion as well, which was sometimes practiced by the early church but was frowned upon almost universally by Roman Catholics and reformers alike.

<sup>12</sup> *Who's Who In Christianity: MUSCULUS (MAUSLEIN), WOLFGANG (1497–1563) German Reformer.* A lesser figure of the Reformation, Musculus came from Drieuze, Lothringen. He studied at Schlettstadt, where he met Martin Bucer, the future reformer of Strassburg, who was to play an important role in Musculus's life. In 1512 he joined the Benedictine order at Lixheim and while there was won over to Lutheran teaching through copies of Luther's writings that may have been sent to him by Bucer. In 1527 he left the monastery to join Bucer as his secretary in Strassburg, where he also served in the Cathedral Church. Through Bucer's influence he secured a preaching position in Augsburg in 1531, where, in a tangled situation, he upheld Bucer's position on the Eucharist and church discipline. While at Augsburg he participated in the important discussions at Wittenberg (1536) and Regensburg (1541). He also provided a catechism for the reformation at Donauworth. Forced out by the Augsburg Interim in 1548 he found a friend in Heinrich Bullinger of Zurich, who helped him to a theological professorship at Bern (1549). Here he supported the Bern position on church discipline against Calvin's program in Geneva. Although he himself agreed with Bullinger on eucharistic teaching, Bern would not endorse the consensus of Zurich accepted by the other reformed Swiss churches. Musculus was no polemicist but strongly supported toleration on non-essentials. He wrote several commentaries, a history of the early Reformation in Hungary, and above all *Common Places* (1560), which enjoyed a wide circulation and was soon translated into English.

not necessary for salvation.<sup>13</sup> This, therefore, makes the hearts of men doubtful in regard to baptism.

In regard to the Lord's Supper, many things are also able to occur which deprive men of this sacrament, from which anxiety is incited or deprivation occurs with detriment to salvation.

It ought to be known, then, I. As a rule, baptism and the Lord's Supper are not the same in every way. Baptism is a sacrament of initiation; the Lord's Supper is a confirming sacrament. By the former men are brought into Christ and his mystical body. The latter conserves and confirms men in that mystical body. Just as, then, an initiation<sup>14</sup> in Christ is of greater necessity than a confirmation in him (a confirmation, by the way, which all who have been tempted and are fluctuating in the faith indeed want!), so also, in the baptism is in the same way also more necessary than the Lord's Supper. The latter, infants are most certainly able to go without; the former, however, they are not.

II. It ought to be known, baptism is not absolutely necessary for salvation, so that in that way absolutely no one who would have been ready or about to be baptized but could not be will not be able to be saved. But this is only hypothetical, so long as he had not manifestly<sup>15</sup> opposed it as a case of necessity. For outside of such a case of distress,<sup>16</sup> when God by ordinary means works salvation in us, we are unable to lack baptism. (1.) Because the precept of Christ is clear: "Teach all people, baptizing them..." (Mt 28), and, "Whoever believes and is baptized will be saved" (Mark 16). (2.) The words of Jesus to Nicodemus also are not at all obscure. "No one enters the kingdom of heaven unless he is born again of water and the Spirit," where certainly

---

<sup>13</sup> The Formula of Concord rejects similar teachings in Article XII in points 4 and 5 under "Intolerable Teachings in the Church" (Kolb and Wengert edition, page 520).

<sup>14</sup> Or, "beginning."

<sup>15</sup> Or, "plainly."

<sup>16</sup> "Necessity" in the sense of a lack of the opportunity and, thus, "distress" or "want."

baptism is stated as the ordinary means of regeneration, which Christ commends to Nicodemus, unless he wanted to repeat his words in vain.<sup>17</sup>

(3.) Regeneration is necessary for all infants (John 3:3) and, therefore, so also is baptism, without which regeneration does not ordinarily occur.

(4.) The apostles and other saints have also recognized the necessity of baptism. For when the Jews whom Peter's sermon had affected inquired what must be done, namely, that salvation may be obtained. Peter responded, "Bring forth repentance and be baptized, each and every one, in the name of Jesus Christ" (Acts 2:38). In addition, when Paul went to Ananias after his conversion in order to be forgiven by God, Ananias said to him, "Arise and be baptized and wash your sins away in the name of Jesus (Acts 22:16).

However, the error of the Calvinists arises from this, that out of baptism only an *external seal*<sup>18</sup> of grace is made, by which man is not received into the covenant, but rather the covenant of God, in which he already was, is only sealed and declared, as Perkinsus says in the place having been mentioned. Beza also writes,<sup>19</sup> "Finally, baptism is not, by institution, for receiving infants into the covenant, but for sealing the terms<sup>20</sup> of the covenant." This opinion opposes the Savior himself, who says to us, "Be born again of water and the Spirit," not merely be sealed in the gift of rebirth through water (John 3). This opinion opposes the apostle Paul as well who testified that Christ has cleansed the Church, "by the washing with water in the Word" (Ephesians 5:26) and who also called baptism the washing of regeneration or renewal<sup>21</sup> in Christ" [Titus 3:5]. According to these words of Paul, then, baptism is most definitely not only a sign of something that has been sealed, but it constitutes the organ and means for the conferral of

<sup>17</sup> *nisi verbis ejus, inanem affingere velis tautologian.*

<sup>18</sup> Or, "signet." This word is also used for "small figures" or "images."

<sup>19</sup> *Qu. 118. part. 2. quaest. Que resp.*

<sup>20</sup> Pr, "tablet."

<sup>21</sup> Or, "renovation," which does present an interesting picture.

grace. Whereupon, it follows that whoever does not wish to lack the benefit of regeneration, is also not able to lack baptism.

And, to be sure, they also have this regeneration when God works by ordinary means to work salvation in us. In cases of distress,<sup>22</sup> however, God increases faith and confers salvation outside of baptism. For God, to be sure, has determined<sup>23</sup> to deal with us according to certain means, which he demonstrates in the Word, in order that by them we are yet able to have the saving mercy we would be unable to despise. However, he himself is not at all bound to those means. For that reason, Christ does not expressly damn those who have not been baptized, but rather those who have not believed (Mark 16:16).

It is, moreover, a case of distress, when infants die in the womb of the mother, or a little bit after birth, so that they are not able to be baptized, or, in the case of an adult, when he in his last moment of life is converted, or in the case of someone impeded from baptism, as with the thief on the cross (Luke 22:43). In such a case, indeed, it is not contempt of the sacrament, but deprivation from it, which does not damn someone.

III. Because of what the Lord's Supper pertains to, its use is not necessary for all, but it is only for those who have come to the appropriate age and are able to examine themselves (1 Corinthians 11:28). These, if they are able to have it, make use of it frequently because they frequently face the effect of their spiritual ailment or return frequently in faith on account of spiritual famine. For this reason, in the words of institution, Jesus added, "This do, as often as you will have done it, in commemoration of me."

---

<sup>22</sup> Or, "necessity," "want," "lack," or "need."

<sup>23</sup> Literally, "set," "bind," or "fasten."



While the use of the Lord's Supper is not absolutely necessary, in the pressing need for a sound faith and conscience one is not able to suspend<sup>24</sup> its use. Yet there is a pressing need, for instance, when we have to a certain extent some holy desire for this health-giving medicine for our ailment, but we are not able to obtain it because of either some contagious disease, because some journey<sup>25</sup> concerning the support of a just cause, on account of captivity by barbarians, or some other situation by which one is has been excluded from the sacred assembly. In such cases as these, it is not contempt for the Sacrament, but deprivation from it. For that reason, one finds at one place in Augustine: "Believe and you have eaten."<sup>26</sup>

Certainly, anyone who takes themselves away from this Sacrament without just cause is a despiser, and deprives himself of the benefit of this medicine with great danger to themselves. Neither are those worthy who do not allow the reception of infants into baptism and of other saints into communion.<sup>27</sup>

---

<sup>24</sup> Or, "interrupt," or "let pass."

<sup>25</sup> Or, "pilgrimage."

<sup>26</sup> I have found in research that the idea of spiritual eating was not unheard of among the Reformation theologians, especially in cases where a believer was allergic to, or unable to receive for some other reason, either the bread or wine.

<sup>27</sup> I think the text is missing a negative. The text reads: *neque digni sunt, wui vel ad susceptionem infantium in baptismo, vel ad communion aliorum sacrorum.*

## Casus II

*From where am I able to be certain that faith is conferred to little children in baptism?*

Response: This thing in itself is sufficiently certain, that they (the following) cause doubt.

1) The Anabaptists, who, because of a defect of reasoning, suppose to oppose infant baptism, in which they do not at all believe, and do not admit infants before the age of discretion.

2) Calvinists and Jesuits, who deny that infants have actual faith, but only the *habitus* [disposition], beginning also as a seed or root, as Gregory speaks.<sup>28</sup>

3) Calvinists especially, who make baptism only a seal [sign] of the covenant and instruct parents that they take hold of the covenant both on account of themselves and on account of their children, and teach them that their children believe because the parents believe, as Perkinsus<sup>29</sup>

<sup>28</sup> *Gregor. De Valent. De baptism. Partv. Cap. 3. Beza part. 2. resp. ad act. Trelc. Lib. 2. institut.*

<sup>29</sup> This is who I suspect Balduin is referring to. He is latinizing his English name. From the internet I have gleaned that Perkins was a strict Puritan and that he held rigidly to double predestination. Some followers of Perkins even seemed to encourage rebaptism if someone fell away from the faith so that the covenant would once again be “sealed,” making Baptism not the conferral of grace, but the public acknowledgement of inclusion in the covenant. Thus, his theology would seem to fit with the quote Balduin is citing. Here is some information I have found on him.  
*Who's Who In Christianity.*

**PERKINS, WILLIAM** (1558–1602) *English Puritan scholar*

Born in Marston Jabbet, Warwickshire, Perkins was educated at Christ's College, Cambridge, and was a fellow until his marriage in 1595. His early writings showed pastoral concern and deep psychological insight into the work of God's grace in the human heart. Though one of the leaders of the Puritan movement, he placed his emphasis on the renewal of family and church. He was not a public advocate for Presbyterian polity. Instead he wrote widely read spiritual guides for the laity that popularized Reformed theology and Ramist logic. (His writings were extensively translated throughout Europe.) He was concerned that theology be lived and experienced. This did much to establish the school of English practical divinity, which influenced continental Pietism in the seventeenth century.

As a reputed lecturer and preacher at Great St. Andrew's Church, Cambridge, from 1595 until his death, Perkins exercised a unique influence on students and townsmen alike. His plain and intensely serious preaching profoundly affected the ethos of the Church of England ministry. His theological writings, such as *De Praedestinatione* (*Concerning Predestination*, 1597), were widely used by scholars and ministers. Commentaries on Scripture; writings on patristics, preaching, ministry, ethics and the spiritual life; as well as vigorous polemics against Roman Catholicism, witchcraft, and astrology gave him an international reputation that was unique among Elizabethan churchmen of his day. He continued to be read and quoted throughout the seventeenth century in England and New England, as well as throughout Europe. Disciples like William Ames ensured the continuing vitality of the theological and pastoral tradition Perkins established—with its careful attention to conscience and the rule of the Word of God over every aspect of life.

<http://www.apuritansmind.com/WilliamPerkins/WilliamPerkins.htm>

speaks in the place mentioned above.<sup>30</sup> Whereupon it is that they suppose baptism for infants, even beyond cases of distress, to be less necessary to the extent that they censure those who hasten with infants to baptism, as we heard earlier.

4) Add to these those who, even if they don't have it in mind, nevertheless by their action, leave their children at least days, but even up to several weeks, without baptism, oftentimes on account of frivolous causes. Those who, if they knew how much danger they were placing the salvation of infants in by their own neglect, would without a doubt in general be more cautious in these matters.

Since, therefore, a person must never hope to have salvation without faith, one can teach the value of the work [baptism] by solid argumentation, since through baptism, as the ordinary organ of God, faith is conferred. Whereupon it immediately follows that baptism ought not be either neglected or delayed for a long time.

I. It is certain that even infants of pious parents, outside of baptism, are outside of grace, because in sin we are conceived and born, as David himself confesses in Psalm 51. "Flesh gives

---

Perkins' "Golden Chain" is a basic guide to Puritan theology and preaching. Though not every Puritan Preacher agreed with each detail of Perkins' Chain, it does represent Reformed doctrine as generally interpreted by the Puritans. His analysis and organization of Soteriology is excellent, especially in relating the work of Christ to the elect believer. Perkins considers faith the result of God's effectual call rather than of sinful man's "free will." In examining his chart, you will find that repentance is set at the end of the believer's conversion experience, right before his "new obedience". He considered true repentance a result from sanctification which to lead to complete obedience. Not all the Puritans agreed with this, and it seems to be more unique with Perkins than any others.

Perhaps the most interesting feature of the Golden Chain is the religious zealot whose penitence is only temporary and arises from his sinful heart. The Puritans never considered church members saved just because they met outward requirements like baptism, confession of a creed, or a response to the unorthodox altar call. They preached the perseverance of true believers in obedience and good works as a result of true conversion. They labored carefully not to give people a false sense of assurance.

<http://www.ely.anglican.org/history/talk19990209/patrick.html>

What is most significant is that Patrick adopts the hermeneutical tool of 'covenant' from the very beginning. The early Puritan William Perkins had popularised this notion at the end of the previous century. But Patrick takes pains to use the image of covenant in as inclusive a manner as possible; in other words, the covenant of grace is a covenant into which we are grafted by Christ himself, and sealed at our baptism, a sacrament that performs what it expresses, and which has implications for our whole life. 'God receives us into that covenant of grace, which accepts of repentance instead of innocence, and of amendment of life instead of unerring obedience.'

<sup>30</sup> See the Formula of Concord, Article XII, point 6 under "Intolerable Teachings in the Church" (Kolb and Wengert edition, page 521),

birth to flesh” (John 3). “By nature they are sons of wrath” (Ephesians 2:3). That is, they have been born sons of wrath. Therefore, outside of baptism they are under wrath, not under grace. In baptism, however, they are received in grace and they please God because baptism is the key to the Church through which they enter into the house of God and become members of his household. For that reason, whoever has been converted of either the Jews or the Gentiles has been commanded to be baptized (Acts 2:38; 8:38; 10:48; 22:16). For without faith it is truly impossible to please God (Hebrews 11:6), whereupon it follows that infants who in baptism begin to please God receive faith while they are baptized.

2. Since the kingdom of heaven belongs to infants (Mark 10:13; Matthew 19:14), they too have the means, that is, baptism so that they may enter it. “No one can enter the kingdom of heaven unless he has been born again of water and the Spirit” (John 3:3). For “whoever does not believe, will be damned” (Mark 16:16). Hence, it is therefore most assuredly gathered that faith is conferred to infants in baptism.

3. Baptism is a washing of regeneration (Titus 5:5) through which the sons of God are born, and without which, there is no faith. God indeed gives “the ability to become sons of God who believe in His name” (John 1).<sup>31</sup> And this, in and of itself, is discerned by regeneration from the natural generation, since by natural generation they are infidels or sons of wrath. The sons of God, however, are faithful. Accordingly, then, Christians are not born but ought to be made, as the saying of Tertullian goes.<sup>32</sup> Augustine also writes, “A Christian is not born from a Christian, because a Christian is not made by generation, but, rather, by regeneration a Christian is made.”<sup>33</sup>

4. The Apostle Paul testifies in Galatians 3:28 that we are clothed with Christ in baptism. To be clothed with Christ, however, is to be clothed with the righteousness obtained by Christ,

---

<sup>31</sup> Reference to John 1:12, 13.

<sup>32</sup> *Apolog. C. 17.*

<sup>33</sup> *Lib. 1. de peccat. Merit. C. 9.*

which is the robe of righteousness and the garment of salvation that is called for in Isaiah 6:10.<sup>34</sup>

This is truly through faith that the righteousness of Christ is obtained and made ours.

5. The Hebrew infants, through the sacrament of circumcision, were received in the covenant of God (Genesis 17:10). For that reason, those who were not circumcised had been excluded from the people of God. The same is the basis for baptism which succeeded circumcision. Along that line, it is therefore also called the promise of a good conscience with God (1 Peter 3:21) because it speaks to man with certainty and security in regard to the covenant of God.

The Holy Spirit is not idle in baptism. It is characteristic of his operation in those who are for the first time received into the Church that he kindles faith in them to such an extent that, afterward, a new impulse of love continues into the adult years. Unless, then, we are willing<sup>35</sup> to deny<sup>36</sup> the Holy Spirit to infants in baptism or to imagine that the Holy Spirit himself is idle in baptism, it is necessary to confess that they receive faith in baptism. Hence, Augustine<sup>37</sup> says that the Holy Spirit is said, for that reason, to dwell in infants because he acts in them in a hidden way, so that they are his temple to the extent that he works in the ones he is effecting in order that, by his effecting, they may persevere.

7. Whoever is not baptized when they are able to be baptized is certainly damned because he holds in contempt that which is the ordinary means of his salvation. Therefore, I gather correctly from the contrary idea that those who are baptized through it receive faith, without which salvation is not conferred, and are saved. Augustine<sup>38</sup> attests to this. "Most assuredly," he says, "in no way doubt that, with the exception of those who are baptized in the name of Christ

<sup>34</sup> Balduin cites "*Esai 6:10*." In actuality, it is Isaiah 61:10.

<sup>35</sup> Or, "want."

<sup>36</sup> Or, "refuse."

<sup>37</sup> *Epist. 57*.

<sup>38</sup> *Augustinus ad Petrum Diaconum cap. 30*.

into his blood, no man will be received into eternal life. No man will be received into eternal life who has not here through penitence and faith, and the sacrament of faith, been converted from his evils, that is, who has not been liberated through baptism. For adults it is a necessary thing to receive baptism in order to produce repentance from their evils and in order to have the catholic faith in accordance with the standard [rule] of truth. For little children, who are able neither to believe by their own volition<sup>39</sup> nor to produce repentance from the sin which they bear originally,<sup>40</sup> the sacrament of faith, that is, holy baptism, inasmuch as their reason is not capable at that age, suffices for salvation.” The testimony of Ambrose approves this. He restricts eternal life to those having baptism; therefore restricting faith, without which, he concedes, no one is able to enter eternal life, also to those having been baptized. Therefore he indeed writes,<sup>41</sup> “Neither has it been entrusted to him who has not acquired the sacrament of regeneration to attain to any union<sup>42</sup> of blessedness.” And,<sup>43</sup> “If anyone has not been baptized, let him more securely be converted and receive the forgiveness of sins, since baptism, like some kind of fire, consumes sin, because Christ baptizes in fire and the Spirit.

Since, therefore, the Holy Spirit has conjoined faith, regeneration, and salvation for an individual in connection with baptism, anyone who knows this can consider seriously with how much evil those act who delay infants’ baptisms without cause. These people, if indeed they think that infants are in the covenant and believe by the faith of their parents, err violently [impetuously]. For they feel this way without the support of Scripture, which declares all not yet having been baptized to still be sons of wrath and places them outside the covenant, and which on the contrary names baptism as a stipulation for our relationship with God (1 Peter 3). Also,

---

<sup>39</sup> Or, “according to their own will.”

<sup>40</sup> He is speaking of original sin.

<sup>41</sup> *Lib. 2. de vocat. Gent: cap. 8.*

<sup>42</sup> Or, “community.”

<sup>43</sup> *Lib. de Elia—que jejunio cap. 22.*

just as no one lives a natural life from the soul of parents [i.e. they need their own soul], so also no one is able to live in the presence of God by the faith of parents [i.e. they need their own faith]. Rather, the just will live by faith (Habakkuk 2:4). Indeed, parents reproduce, not by that part of them that is spirit and has been reborn, but from that part which is carnal and has been polluted. Not differently, circumcised Jews produced sons with foreskins, and bare<sup>44</sup> grain having been buried in the ground produces grain with foliage, beards [of the ear], ears, and chaff, which analogy Augustine<sup>45</sup> similarly employs.

Certainly, God says to Abraham (Genesis 17:7): “I will be your God and the God of your seed [descendants] after you.” But it ought to be recognized that this only pertains to the seed of Abraham with the determination of personal faith, in so far as they believe, as it is written in Galatians 3:7, “Those who are of faith, they are the sons of Abraham.” Surely, God does offer the benefits of the pact to all, but the benefits are only conferred to those who are enabled to attain to those benefits through the means he himself instituted.

But concerning these fools, from whose number fools standing idle abound, how dangerous it is to delay the baptism of infants. The Lord certainly wanted to kill Moses in so far as he delayed the circumcision of his own son longer than the allotted<sup>46</sup> time (Exodus 4:24).<sup>47</sup> Oh that these procrastinators of baptism would see,<sup>48</sup> lest they themselves also incur the righteous punishment of God!

---

<sup>44</sup> Or, “naked.”

<sup>45</sup> *Lib. 6. contra Julian. C. 2.*

<sup>46</sup> Or, “right,” “just.”

<sup>47</sup> At a lodging place on the way, the LORD met Moses and was about to kill him. But Zipporah took a flint knife, cut off her son’s foreskin and touched Moses’ feet with it. “Surely you are a bridegroom of blood to me,” she said. So the LORD let him alone. (At that time she said “bridegroom of blood,” referring to circumcision.)

<sup>48</sup> Or, “consider,” in the sense of reconsidering their actions, or lack thereof.

### Casus III

*What if an infant dies before it is baptized without any fault on the parents behalf, has anything been expressed concerning its salvation?*

Reponse: Within the papacy there are four divergent views concerning this for the pitiable infants and the exceedingly sternly afflicted parents, which Bellarmine<sup>49</sup> examines.

First is the view of Ambrose Catharini and Abertus Pighii, who excluded from the kingdom of heaven and eternal life those infants who died in the womb. They, nevertheless, conceived for them eternal life and natural blessedness without either any molestation or pain, outside the kingdom of blessedness and at a distance from the prison of damnation, that is, in a middle place, between heaven and gehenna.

Second is the view of Thomas, Bonaventure, and other Scholastics, who taught that infants were punished in what they called the limbo of children, but that they only suffered *poena damni*, not *sensus*, that is, to be withheld from the vision and presence of God but not feel torment.

Third is the view of Lombard and others, who thought that such infants were freed from the torment of fire and vermin, but not from that pain which follows examination of the everlasting blessedness.

Fourth is Gregory Ariminensis and Johann Driedonis, determining that children falling to sleep without baptism are damned to eternal punishment, not only to feel the fire according to their senses, but also the interior pain of the soul since they themselves know the blessedness of which they have been deprived.

---

<sup>49</sup> ;*ib.* 6. *de amiss. Grat. Que statu peccati cap. 1.*



In the Ratisbon Colloquy,<sup>50</sup> the catholic faith said that infants who died without baptism were not saved, whereupon the custom arose in the papacy that they denied infants the customary ritual of burial and they buried them in them corner of the cemetery.

In addition, one is truly not able to deny that Augustine<sup>51</sup> also was not willing to include infants in the number of people going to be saved. This has quite reasonably tortured pious parents with perpetual anguish. Augustine,<sup>52</sup> however, in another place speaks concerning this. He attributes faith to them who beyond their own blame [fault] are not able to be baptized.<sup>53</sup>

Many also out of the more sane of the papists have contradicted this rigid doctrine. For, although Lombard wrote in the place having been mentioned that infants who die before baptism perish, the Faculty of Paris has written, “Here the teacher is not held,” and in specific, Gerson, chancellor of the College of Paris,<sup>54</sup> says that the virginity of Mary has established that the merciful God of salvation has not in this way bound himself to the sacraments so that, apart from the precedent of that same law, he is able to make holy the same child inside the womb and outside the womb by his grace, either in baptism or by virtue of the Holy Spirit. Thus, for that reason, he [Gerson] admonishes parents to pray on behalf of the infant not yet having been born in case it by chance were to die before baptism. Thus, they do not suppose that all hope of salvation has been lost for the ones dying. Similarly they have other papists.<sup>55</sup>

The sources of the consolation, however, by which pious parents are able to lift themselves up in such cases, must be observed. Formerly, those men went astray most grievously who sprinkled the womb of the mother with water when the life of the infant in the womb was at

---

<sup>50</sup> *Sess. 1. p. 35.*

<sup>51</sup> *Epist. 28. 29. que 106. que lib. de nat. que grat. Cap. 8. de fid. Ad Petrum cap. 27.*

<sup>52</sup> *Lib. 1. de peccat. Meritis que remiss. Cap. 15. lib. 8. de orig. animae cap. 18.*

<sup>53</sup> Text adds, “as in *lib. 4. de baptis. Contr. Donatist. 22.23.23.25. lib. 3 quaest. in Levit. Cap. 84.*”

<sup>54</sup> in *serm. De nativity*

<sup>55</sup> *Gabr. Biel. In 4. sent. Dist. 4. q. 2. art. 3. Cajetanus in p. 3. Thom. Ad quaest. 68. are. 11. Albertus Pighius in contrav. 1.*

risk. Augustine<sup>56</sup> refutes this error and Hieronymus says that no one is able to be baptized in the mother's womb even if the mother is baptized. No less do those err who, when the life of the infant is in danger, moisten the hand or foot of the infant with water for he who is not yet born is not able to be born again. For that reason, Luther<sup>57</sup> disapproves of the custom as does Augustine.<sup>58</sup> There is nothing here for the consolation of parents, and so other sources of consolation ought to be examined.

First, therefore, it ought to be held most certainly that the promise having been made to Abraham (Genesis 17:17), "I am your God and the God of your descendants after you," may also pertain to us, so that it is allowed we may also be the family of Abraham. Gentiles indeed "have been engrafted into the olive tree of the grace of God, and have been made sharers in the roots and the abundance of the olive tree" (Romans 11;17). Whereupon, they are also called sons of Abraham (Galatians 3:7). In addition [it is written], to you "the promise has been made, and to your sons, and to all who are long off" (Acts 2:19). Without faith, however, no one is able to be either a son of Abraham or a sharer in the olive tree. Whereupon, it follows that infants of Christians, who are not able to be baptized in cases of distress, are able to have faith.

They do not, however, have this faith out of their natural descent from parents; God gives the ability to become his sons neither from blood, nor the will of flesh, nor out of the will of men, but they are born from God (John 1:13).<sup>59</sup> God indeed, therefore, confers faith to those infants ordinarily through baptism. Outside of ordinary means, however, he also [confers faith] in the absence of baptism by other means known to him. In this way he enlightened John by faith

---

<sup>56</sup> *Lib. 6. contra Julian. Pelagian. Cap. 5.*

<sup>57</sup> *Tom. 3. Jenens. In libro de abortientibus mulieribus.*

<sup>58</sup> *Epist. 57. ad Dardan.*

<sup>59</sup> John 1:12, 13: Yet to all who received him, to those who believed in his name, he gave the right to become children of God— children born not of natural descent, nor of human decision or a husband's will, but born of God.

when he was hidden in his mother's womb (Luke 1). Augustine<sup>60</sup> employs this example. In addition to John, the thief on the cross was also enlightened without having been baptized. Augustine<sup>61</sup> also employs this example as well. Indeed, God certainly ties the ordinary means of regeneration only to baptism (John 3:5), and indeed before infants have been born, they are surely not able to be regenerated. In this manner, however, God has surely not bound himself so that he is not able to work regeneration in the infants in the absence of baptism. For if without circumcision, which was omitted for a total of forty years in the desert travels on account of the difficulty, Israelites were freely received into the covenant, although it ordinarily happened by circumcision, why can't it serve as well in this day also in cases of distress without baptism. Also how many thousand catechumens were accepted into the early Church having suffered martyrdom? Are all to be considered damned for final rashness? Should pious parents, therefore, not consider their own seed to be the seed of Abraham, to whom the promise has also been made? May they also not consider that God will have concern for that seed, lest it perish, especially if it has been deprived chiefly of the ordinary means of salvation? May they not consider that some other reason or mode of procuring our salvation may be prescribed by God.

Finally, Christian parents know their children to be "the gift of God and the work of his hands" (Psalm 127:3). In this same way, therefore, Job, in his ultimate anguish, begged God, whose hands had fashioned this, and from whose hands also he hoped confidently for protection, to work special consolation out of this (Job 10:8)<sup>62</sup>. In this way, pious parents ought to trust more confidently that God is not going to cast their children away from his face as [they are] uniquely

---

<sup>60</sup> *Epist. 58. ad Dardan.*

<sup>61</sup> *Lib. 4. cont. Donat. C. 23.*

<sup>62</sup> "Your hands shaped me and made me.  
Will you now turn and destroy me?"

his work and his gift, although they are known to lack baptism, as it were, which is the ordinary means of regeneration and apart from all their guilt.

(Third) Furthermore, although no one is saved outside of Christ, nevertheless, pious parents are able to be certain that infants whose baptism has been prevented by death may not be outside of Christ, although they have not been able to be brought in through baptism. For Christ is also the Savior of infants. For this reason, he has been made a sharer in flesh and blood, just as the children (Hebrews 2:14),<sup>63</sup> who were conceived in the womb of their mother, and having been fed by the mother's milk, as children. Therefore, he is also the redeemer of infants situated in the womb of the mother, whose polluted nativity he has made holy by his immaculate conception.<sup>64</sup> Concerning which Irenaeus very clearly says, "He has come to deliver all through his very self. For that reason, he has come through all ages, and for the infants has been made an infant, making infants holy."<sup>65</sup> Bernard<sup>66</sup> also states, "He who has been born and first chosen the eyes of a child this day also does not exclude children from grace, since it is neither incongruous with piety nor difficult in his majesty, so that his gracious hand supplies what is less possible for them to have by nature."<sup>67</sup>

+*It has been memorably said by Augustine*<sup>68</sup> that this joy pertains to us all, because Christ came to all. Sadness is not appropriate, when there is the birth of joy. The saint may be glad, since he receives remuneration! The sinner may rejoice, since he is invited into grace! The gentile may rejoice, since he is sent to life! Be joyful holy children, for

---

<sup>63</sup> Since the children have flesh and blood, he too shared in their humanity so that by his death he might destroy him who holds the power of death—that is, the devil.

<sup>64</sup> "Nativity" and "conception" are different rendering of the same word, "*nativitas*," at the discretion of the translator.

<sup>65</sup> *Que c. lib. 2. cap. 39.*

<sup>66</sup> *In sermo. 1. in ramis palmar.*

<sup>67</sup> qui natus est, que primam parvuloru elegit aciem, hodie quoque parvulus a gratia no excludit, quia nec pietati incongruum, nec maiestati eius difficile est, ut suppleat manus gratia, quod minus in eis habet natura possible.

<sup>68</sup> Serm. 3. de nativ.

the child has been born! Be joyful virgins, because the virgin has given birth! Be joyful righteous ones, it is the birth of the one who justifies! Be joyful weak and sick ones, it is the birth of the deliverer [Savior]! Be joyful captives, it is the birth of the redeemer. Be joyful servants, it is the birth of the Redeemer. Be joyful free ones, it is the birth of the one setting free! Be joyful all Christians, it is the birth of CHRIST! [Balduin has the text indented, in smaller type, and italicized as it is here]

Thus he is said to bear all the sin of the world. He is also called the Savior of all the world. Infants, moreover, have not been excluded from the world. And, although they lack the ordinary means of obtaining faith (through which the Savior is apprehended), yet they are not lacking faith itself, which God, by extraordinary means, may devise to work in them, as the aforementioned has said and as we have demonstrated by the examples given.

To this end, in the fourth place, pertains the examples of those concerning which the Scriptures testify, who had been given grace in the womb of their mother.<sup>69</sup> Although David certainly bewailed [complained] in Psalm 51, “In sin have been conceived,” yet he confesses in Psalm 22:10, “From the womb I have been cast upon you, from the belly of my mother you have been my God.”<sup>70</sup> And in Psalm 139:13, “You created my inmost being,<sup>71</sup> you guarded<sup>72</sup> me in [*de*] the womb of my mother.” To Jeremiah, God said, “Before I formed you in the womb I knew you, and before you were born<sup>73</sup> I consecrated you” (Jeremiah 1:15). Such, however, are not able to be protected in God and made holy without faith. These examples, to be sure, do not exhibit how God ordinarily grants [faith] to all, yet they do show that God is able and may be

---

<sup>69</sup> Latin: *quod in utero matris gratia Dei fuerint donati*. I believe Mark Lotito, who has forgotten more Latin than I know, once told me that such a construction signifies a heightened sense of certainty as pertains to the action.

<sup>70</sup> From birth I was cast upon you; from my mother’s womb you have been my God.

<sup>71</sup> Latin is “*renes*” which is the seat of the emotions.

<sup>72</sup> Or, “received,” “accepted,” “protected,” “lifted up.”

<sup>73</sup> Latin is literally “went out.”

accustomed to granting [faith] sometimes even without the ordinary means, since he is a most free agent, not suffering limitation to certain means, so that in cases of distress, on account of the lack of those means, he may be able to work in other ways.

Fifth, examples are not wanting in *terminis termantibus*, so that they speak of them plainly who before they received the sacrament of initiation had held good hope for their salvation. Among these there are included all those infants and adults having been born in the desert and having died in that same place, circumcision having been omitted for them for forty years (Joshua 5:5).<sup>74</sup> They had not received circumcision and yet he did not damn any of them. Also included are those Hebrew males who by the command of Pharaoh, scarcely having been born, were cast into running water (Exodus 1:22).<sup>75</sup> Also the infants of the Israelites most cruelly murdered in the time of Antiochus (1 Maccabees 1:51-64).<sup>76</sup> Also included are the infants of Bethlehem, the first flowers of martyrdom in the New Testament, who by the decree of Herod were annihilated (Matthew 2:16). Was it willed for all to be disposed of to eternal damnation or at least to be separated from the presence of God by Herod's great tyranny and impiety. Here is referred to as well that infant having been conceived out of the adultery of David who died on

---

<sup>74</sup> "All the people that came out had been circumcised, but all the people born in the desert during the journey from Egypt had not."

<sup>75</sup> Then Pharaoh gave this order to all his people: "Every boy that is born you must throw into the Nile, but let every girl live."

<sup>76</sup> In such words he wrote to his whole kingdom. He appointed inspectors over all the people and commanded the towns of Judah to offer sacrifice, town by town. <sup>52</sup> Many of the people, everyone who forsook the law, joined them, and they did evil in the land; <sup>53</sup> they drove Israel into hiding in every place of refuge they had.

<sup>54</sup> Now on the fifteenth day of Chislev, in the one hundred forty-fifth year, they erected a desolating sacrilege on the altar of burnt offering. They also built altars in the surrounding towns of Judah, <sup>55</sup> and offered incense at the doors of the houses and in the streets. <sup>56</sup> The books of the law that they found they tore to pieces and burned with fire. <sup>57</sup> Anyone found possessing the book of the covenant, or anyone who adhered to the law, was condemned to death by decree of the king. <sup>58</sup> They kept using violence against Israel, against those who were found month after month in the towns. <sup>59</sup> On the twenty-fifth day of the month they offered sacrifice on the altar that was on top of the altar of burnt offering. <sup>60</sup> According to the decree, they put to death the women who had their children circumcised, <sup>61</sup> and their families and those who circumcised them; and they hung the infants from their mothers' necks.

<sup>62</sup> But many in Israel stood firm and were resolved in their hearts not to eat unclean food. <sup>63</sup> They chose to die rather than to be defiled by food or to profane the holy covenant; and they did die. <sup>64</sup> Very great wrath came upon Israel (NRSV).

the seventh day (since they discerned concerning the seventh day from birth), undoubtedly before he was able to be circumcised according to the law (2 Samuel 12:18). Yet the parent did not doubt that he may have been saved, because David hoped himself to be coming to him [his child] at last (verse 23). Moreover, David had found peace in hope (Acts 2:26), in the hope namely of the joyous resurrection to eternal life. Job also wondered why he couldn't have died in his mother's womb so that he would have been sleeping and have rested in that slumber of his (Job 3:13).<sup>77</sup> Since Baptism has therefore succeeded circumcision, for that reason, comfort is able to be given to pious parents whose children, not by the will of the parents but by the swiftness of time, have been cheated of baptism.

Finally, that God is not only able but also wills to work faith and regeneration in infants in cases of distress consists in three arguments: 1) Indeed to those who believe and are baptized salvation is attributed. However, when speaking of the ones to be damned, there is not a mention of them not being baptized, but only of unbelief. Mark 16:10, "Whoever has not believed, is damned." 2) Although God does not will that any of these little children be lost (Matthew 18:14), one ought not doubt that it is necessary for those who do not believe to perish, unless faith is granted them extraordinarily. 3) The promises of God are certain concerning his favorable hearing of prayer, especially where two or three are gathered (Matthew 18:19, 20, 22).

Therefore, while an infant is still gestating in the womb, let parents know the gift with which their marriage has been blessed, that very clear honor that has been granted to them as a mother and father. Let them avoid all external things through which something detrimental may be brought forth for the infant. First of all, however, let them invoke God with most ardent prayers so that he himself may have concern for the work of his hands and guard the infant in the womb and that he may by means of sanctification cleanse well from its sin that infant who has

---

<sup>77</sup> For now I would have lain still and been quiet, I would have been asleep; Then I would have been at rest.

been conceived in sin, making it his son, receiving it in grace into his covenant, and effecting for it the eternal life for which it has been created.

God does not permit these prayers to be void. In fact, he himself commands them and promises to hear them favorably (Psalm 50:15; 145:18; Matthew 18:19, 21, 22; John 16:23). They are, so to speak, the hand by which infants are offered to God. For this reason, Ambrose<sup>78</sup> wrote concerning the younger Valentine, that he had been washed by faith and consecrated by prayer. Certainly, the prayer of parents may effect faith for the son when baptism has been deprived, not by the will of the parents, but by time. Concerning Monica, the mother of Augustine, it is said that she freed him from the Manichean heresy by her vigorous prayers for him, which had been given over the span of nine years. For that reason, Ambrose had consoled her, having said, “It is impossible that a son of so many tears may perish.” It is also probable that Job had brought such patience in regard to the sad fate of his children, because one by one he had offered to God the sacrifice of prayer for them (Job 1:21)<sup>79</sup>, which he had known not to have lacked fruit for them.

These and similar things are most certainly able to lift up pious parents, in the premature death of their children, before they are able to be baptized, provided that they themselves had not dealt with contempt for the sacrament or with some sort of negligence in other respects, or by excessive procrastination cheat their children of baptism. It is not as though the pious parents had not been conscientious in this matter. For there is also the opinion of Augustine that he who lacks<sup>80</sup> baptism may come upon faith and the conversion of the heart if he steadfastly desired it, but was not able to be hastened to the aid of it due to the lack of time. See also, “Indeed the

---

<sup>78</sup> *Serm. De obitu ejus.*

<sup>79</sup> “Naked I came from my mother’s womb, and naked I will depart. The LORD gave and the LORD has taken away; may the name of the LORD be praised.”

<sup>80</sup> Latin word implies lacking or failing to receive, but it would seem Augustine is speaking of one who desires the Sacrament but does not have the opportunity to receive it.



article of the necessity [of baptism] excludes<sup>81</sup> those of conscientiousness who have not been contemptuous of the mystery of baptism.”<sup>82</sup> A little earlier we heard that, although it was kept from baptism by the swiftness of time, God may not have wanted<sup>83</sup> to deprive that infant of faith and salvation. Bernard<sup>84</sup> appeals to this testimony of the two fathers (Ambrose and Augustine). [In the Latin all the following is italicized. It seems, however, that it may not all be a direct quote.] *He [Augustine] shows plainly enough that the faithful and converts are not deprived of the benefits of baptism if they are unable to be baptized, but rather if they have despised baptism. I believe it is difficult to separate myself from these two pillars (Augustine and Ambrose). With them, I say, allowing myself to err or to be correct,<sup>85</sup> believing also that man is able to be saved by faith alone, with the desire of receiving the sacrament, that nevertheless if a pious one is anticipating death or whatever way he or she will meet the invincible power, and is filled with the desire for baptism, consider also, whether perhaps on account of this the Savior, when he said, “whoever believes and is baptized will be saved,” cautiously and vigilantly did not repeat, whoever truly has not been baptized, but only, “‘whoever truly,’ I say to you, ‘does not believe, will be condemned.’” Undoubtedly hinting that now and then faith alone<sup>86</sup> [without baptism] is able to suffice for salvation, and without faith nothing suffices. In the same epistle Bernard writes, “The will is reckoned in place of the deed, where distress [necessity] excludes the deed.”*

All of this is able to suffice to give a tranquil conscience to pious parents, who are concerned concerning their children in such undesirable cases.

---

<sup>81</sup> In the sense they are exempted from the articles demand for baptism.

<sup>82</sup> *Lib. 4. de bapt. Con. Donat. Cap. 22. and de Ambrosio.*

Latin, “*Nam mysterium baptismi non contemptus religionis, sed articulus necessitatis excludit.*”

<sup>83</sup> Or future perfect indicative active: “will not have wanted.”

<sup>84</sup> *Epist. 77.*

<sup>85</sup> In essence, “admitting that I could be wrong, but may be right.”

<sup>86</sup> Without baptism implied.

## Casus IV

*How is one to consider those who have been baptized by the papists in rites other than those which the orthodox are accustomed to using and those who have been baptized into the papal faith, who have nevertheless not agreed with them in adulthood, if these are later grievously vexed by that name, or doubt concerning their baptism??*

Response: When the truth of baptism is discussed, one must always distinguish its substance from its ceremonies. The substance is recognized from the words of institution, since one is undoubtedly to baptize with water in the name of the Father and the Son and the Holy Spirit. Ceremonies are either usurped from those of the apostles or added after the apostolic times; the former called apostolic, the latter ecclesiastical. The apostolic are prayers, actions of grace, and exhortations to the people of this kind which are indeed rites having been added by the apostles, existing from Acts 2:38.<sup>87</sup> The ecclesiastical perhaps are useful in and of themselves, since they reinforce the dignity and necessity of baptism and render illustrations pertaining to the doctrine of piety and the adornment and beauty of the church, and because they serve for edification. Such are the three aspersions of water, the imposition of the name, the clothing in a white vestment, the confession of the sponsors in the place of the infant, the exorcism, etc. However, these are superstition and ineptitude when joined also with impiety and when they do not have a strongly impressed usefulness, but rather are likened to empty games and transformed into some sort of theatrical spectacle, including some sort of peculiar power and efficacy from the superstition of men, as is the case with the exorcisms of water in the baptism of

---

<sup>87</sup> Peter replied, "Repent and be baptized, every one of you, in the name of Jesus Christ for the forgiveness of your sins. And you will receive the gift of the Holy Spirit.

the papists, the *exsufflatio*,<sup>88</sup> the adjuration of demons, in which one invents the power to expel a certain demon, the taste of salt, saliva with which one touches the nostrils and eyes to wash<sup>89</sup> them, oil on the chest, or on the shoulders, etc.

Concerning ceremonies in general it is held that they are not necessary for the integrity and essence of baptism, but they are regarded as adiaphora. For as Lombard has said,<sup>90</sup> “the Word and element are the substance of this sacrament, the rest pertain to its solemnity and are called sacramental.

Since, nevertheless, the administration of baptism is not a dumb action but a special part of the divine worship, it is not able to be without all ceremonies altogether; the best of which in this case are those which proceed either from the apostles or from the men of the apostles<sup>91</sup> and are free from every impiety and superstition.

If indeed it should happen that someone in the papacy had been baptized with impious ceremonies and superstitions, it is necessary to distinguish between the substance of baptism and the rites. The substance, by the great benevolence and remarkable providence of God, has been unharmed in the apostasy of the papacy, inasmuch as they baptize with water in the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, which is the substance of baptism and which the addition of rites and superstition is able to detract nothing from.

And although an infant has been baptized into the papal faith out of the intention of the priest, since the efficacy of the sacraments does not yet depend upon the intention of the one baptizing, it is not a reason for one who has been thus baptized to doubt concerning the validity of his baptism, even if they become alienated from the papal doctrine in adulthood. They have

---

<sup>88</sup> “blowing out”

<sup>89</sup> or baptize

<sup>90</sup> *lib. 4. sent. dist. 3.*

<sup>91</sup> *viris Apostolicis*

certainly not been baptized into the faith of this or that particular church, which is able to err, but into that of the catholic Church, which professes the faith of the apostles; in the same way formerly those who received the sacrament of circumcision in the time of the Pharisees were admitted to circumcision out of a certain intention of the Pharisees into the faith of the Pharisees, yet were nevertheless truly circumcised into the faith of the church of Israel or into the doctrine of their fathers Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, and into that people which was the property of God, and they were received out of the ordinance of God, many of whom in adult age opposed the self-imposed piety<sup>92</sup> of the Pharisees, among whom were Zechariah, John, Simeon, and others, the same kind of men of which the Evangelical history also consists.

---

<sup>92</sup> Balduin uses the Greek word *evqeloqrhski,ouj*, used in Colossians 2:23: *a[tina, evstin lo,gon me.n e;conta sofi,aj evn evqeloqrhski,a| kai. tapeinofrosu,nh| Îkai.Ð avfeidi,a| sw,matoj( ouvkv evn timh/| tini pro.j plhsmonh.n th/j sarko,j* <sup>Å</sup>

NIV: Such regulations indeed have an appearance of wisdom, with their self-imposed worship, their false humility and their harsh treatment of the body, but they lack any value in restraining sensual indulgence.