

Apology — Robert Barclay — 373

infant baptism

extract from Proposition XII § x

§ x. . . . As for the last part of the thesis, which denies the use of infant baptism, it logically follows from what has already been said. If water baptism has ceased, then surely the baptism of infants cannot be defended. Those who decide to oppose us in this matter will have a lot to do to oppose this last part of the thesis, because after they have done what they can to prove water baptism, they still have to prove that infants ought to be baptized. He who proves that water baptism has ceased proves that infant baptism is worthless at the same time. But he who tries to prove that water baptism continues, has not yet proved that infant baptism is necessary.

Sources: Robert Barclay, *Apology for the True Christian Divinity*, Proposition XII § x (Glenside PA: Quaker Heritage Press, 2002) p. 373 and Roberti Barclaii, *Teologiae verè Christianae apologia*, facsimile (Amsterdam: Jacob Claus, 1676) pp. 286-287.