

A
TREATISE
Concerning the
COVENANT and BAPTISM
Dialogue-wise, between
a BAPTIST and a POEDO-BAPTIST,
Wherein is shewed,

That Believers only are the Spiritual Seed of Abraham; Fully
discovering The Fallacy of the Argument drawn from the Birth
Privilege

WITH

Some Animadversions upon a Book Entitled
Infant-Baptism from Heaven and not of men, Defending the
Practice of Baptizing only Believers against the Exceptions of
M. Whiston

By Edward Hutchinson

Πιστεῦσαι γὰρ δεῖ προτερόν εἶτα τῷ βαπτίσματι ἐπισφραγίσασθαι
i.e. It is necessary first to believe, and afterwards to be signed
with Baptism. Basil. 1. 3. contra Eunom.

I beseech you regard not what this or that man says, but enquire
all things of the Scripture. Chrysost. 13. hom. 2 Cor.

If you be Christ's, then are ye Abraham's seed, and heirs
according to the Promise. Gal. iii. 29.

LONDON

Francis Smith at the Elephant and Castle, near the Royall
Exchange in Cornhil. 1676

The Epistle
DEDICATORY

To the spiritual seed of Abraham especially those of the
Baptized Congregations.

BELOVED for the fathers sake, first premising, that they are not all Israel, that are of Israel, I know there is dross mingled with your silver, chaff amongst your wheat, and the Canaanite is still in the land, and troubles you: but to you that are indeed the true seed of Abraham by faith in Jesus Christ, do I dedicate this Treatise. You beloved are of God, and have your father's name written in your foreheads; you are the true Israelites, to whom pertaineth the Adoption, and the glory, the Covenants and Gospel promises; whose are the fathers, and for whom Christ came, who is over all God blessed for ever. You are a chosen generation, a Royal priesthood, a Holy nation, a peculiar people, walking in the steps of your father Abraham, hearkening to that great Prophet whom God hath raised up among your brethren, and have been baptized into the name of the father, son, and Holy Spirit. But the devil (that implacable enemy of souls) hath endeavoured to wreak his malice upon you above all people, opening his floodgates to overwhelm you; the Archers have shot sorely at you, the plowers have made deep furrows upon your backs, yet you are still supported by the rock of Ages, and strengthened by an Everlasting Arm; they have laboured in vain, for the blessings of your father Abraham have prevailed above the blessings of your progenitors.

Your beginning in these nations (of late years) was but small; yet when it pleased the Lord to dispel those clouds that overshadowed us, and scatter some beams of the Gospel amongst us, he gave you so great an increase that Sion may say with admiration, who hath begotten me these! &c.

Nor is it less observable that whereas other Reformations have been carried on by the secular arm, and the Countenance and allowance of the Magistrate, as in Luther's time by several German Princes; the Protestant Reformation in England by King Edward, Q. Elizabeth, &c. The Presbyterian reformation, by a Parliament, Committee of Estates, Assembly of Divines, besides the favour and assistance of great personages; you have had none of these to take you by the hand, but your progress was against the impetuous current of human opposition, attended with such external discouragements as bespeak your embracing this despised truth, an effect of heart-sincerity, void of all mercenary considerations. Yea how active has the Accuser of the Brethren been to represent you in such frightful figures, exposing you by that mischievous artifice to popular Odium, and the lash of Magistracy; in so much that the name of an Anabaptist was crime enough: which doubtless was a heavy obstacle in the way of many pious souls.

And what our dissenting brethren have to answer, upon that account (who instead of taking up, have laid stumbling blocks in the way of Reformation) will appear another day. Yet notwithstanding the strenuous oppositions of those great and learned ones, The mighty God of Jacob hath taken you by the hand, and said be strong.

Besides it has a considerable tendency to the advancement of divine grace, if we consider the way and manner of the Reviving this costly truth. When the professors of these Nations had been a long time wearied with the yoke of superstitious ceremonies, traditions of men, and corrupt mixtures in the worship and service of God; it pleased the Lord to break these yokes, and by a very strong impulse of his spirit upon the hearts of his people, to convince them of the necessity of Reformation. Divers pious and

very gracious people having often sought the Lord by fasting and prayer, that he would shew them the pattern of his house, the goings out, and comings in thereof; &c. Resolved (by the grace of God) not to receive of practice any piece of positive worship, which had not precept or Example from the Word of God. Infant-Baptism coming of course under consideration, after long search and many debates it was found to have no footing in the Scriptures (the only rule and standard to try doctrines by) but on the contrary a mere innovation, yea the profanation of an ordinance of God. And though it was purposed to be laid aside, yet what fears, tremblings, and temptations did attend them lest they should be mistaken, considering how many learned and Godly men were of an opposite persuasion: How gladly would they have had the rest of their brethren gone along with them? But when there was no hopes, they concluded that a Christians faith must not stand in the wisdom of men, and that every one must give an account of himself to God, and so resolved to practice according to their light: The great objection was, the want of an Administrator, which (as I have heard) was removed by sending certain messengers to Holland whence they were supplied. So that this little cloud of Witnesses, hath the Lord by his grace so greatly increased, that it is spread over our Horizon, though opposed and contradicted by men of all sorts.

And now friends I can safely bear you record, that it is not humour, conceitedness or singularity (so often charged upon you) that makes you decline the Baptizing your little ones: For I know they are as dear to you, as children are to any parents under heaven; your sighs and tears, those heart-breaking desires and pathetic, wishes you send to the mercy-seat for them, is a sufficient testimony hereof, and your petitions, that Ishmael may live before God, that your children may be converted, that they may have an Interest in the new Covenant, that the law of God

may be written in their hearts, that their sins may be pardoned, their natures sanctified, and their souls eternally saved. And did you know that Baptism could contribute the least iota hereunto, how readily and zealously would you perform it? besides it is an easy service, that would bring you into the credit and esteem of differing professors, divers of your natural relations, &c. yea 'tis as safe, as easy, nothing of self-denial or the Cross attending it. And it is very remarkable that many have suffered for owning most (if not all other) points of faith and Christianity, yea divers have suffered even unto death for denying, yet none (that ever I heard of) suffered for owning Infants-Baptism.

Yet though your children are dear to you, the word of the Lord, and the purity of his worship is far more dear, and hence you dare not add to his words lest he reprove you, and you be found liars. You dare not offer strange fire to the Lord, which he hath not commanded, nor profane an Ordinance; you know that Baptism (being a part of instituted worship, not found in natures garden) has of itself no virtue, but what it receives from the institutor; For as one well observes moral laws are good, and therefore commanded: but positive worship is commanded, and therefore good. So that your adversaries clamour without ground, and the Lord will judge between us. And if it be questioned why I insist so much upon this subject? I answer, I was weary with forbearing when I saw your affliction, and beheld the reproaches, wherewith your opponents unmercifully persecute you. But brethren as I have gone in and out among you these six and twenty years, so I have had opportunity to know those pious souls among you, whose Conversation is in Heaven, who live above the Clouds, who groan under the body of sin, and remains of corruption. I have known your manner of life, your faith, patience, long-suffering, charity; I have also seen your dark side, and observed your infirmities (which your adversaries view through a

multiplying glass;) But if there be any Society or Community of people that differ from you, that have not their dark side, let them cast the first stone. Yet you dare not allow the least sin in you; your prayers and endeavours for greater measures of mortification, and that you may be sanctified throughout, stand complete in the whole will of God, and be filled with all the fruits of righteousness through Jesus Christ, are famous instances that you are pressing after perfection.

I know you do not desire these Encomium's, but I have the example of the Holy Spirit, whose steps I humbly conceive I may follow. Rev. ii. 2 where these Commendations are given of the Church, I know thy works, thy labour, and thy patience, and how thou canst not bear them that are evil; and for my names sake hast laboured, and hast not fainted, &c. It's true the Lord knows these things in another manner then we do, viz. by searching the heart; we by outward observation: yet so far as we know we judge.

And now what remains, but that you hold on your way, and grow stronger and stronger, being like that shining light, that shines more and more to the perfect day; daily purging your selves from all filthiness of flesh and spirit, perfecting holiness of the fear of God, walking in the steps of your friend Abraham, and in a little time you shall be received into his bosom, where the weary are at rest, and the wicked cease from troubling. And so I commend you to God and the good word of his grace, which is able to make you stand, and give you an inheritance among them that are sanctified, and remain

Your Soul-friend,

E. H.

To the READER

Reader,

IT is a truth too plain to need Demonstration, that the enemy of souls invaded the Church of Christ even in its very infancy, privily bringing in Damnable Heresies, 2 Pet. ii. 1. That the Scarlet whore drew away the Kings of the Earth, peoples, and Multitudes, and Nations, and tongues after her, Rev. xvii. and made them drunk with the wine of her Fornications. That the man of sin, that son of perdition, 2 Thess. ii. erected himself a Monarchy, and sat in the Temple of God, maintaining that station with power, and signs, and lying wonders. So spreading and epidemical were the Incantations of that Glittering strumpet, that few escaped the temptations of her Golden cup. Now amongst those multitudes that wondered after the Beast, what kind entertainment could the ordinances of the meek and self-denying Jesus have? whose kingdom is not of this world, John. xviii. 36. On the contrary, we find the whole Fabric, and Economy of Gospel worship shattered, subverted, and overthrown in most places where it was received; and the kingdom of darkness raised upon its ruins. What fundamental truth, what practical duty of Christianity but was utterly exploded, or so metamorphosed, that nothing of its original form and beauty was left? But when this Mystery of Iniquity came to be gradually revealed; when the voice from heaven said, come out of her my people, Rev. xviii. 4 when the woman was seen drunk with the blood of the Saints, Rev. xvii. 6. How was she bewailed by those that dealt in her wares! How have those Locusts of the bottomless pit pester'd both sea and land to gain her proselytes! making Reformation a hard task, pursuing it with blood, persecution, and massacre. Yet, maugre all the powers of Hell, truth gets ground, and the Lord

with the brightness of his coming, enlightens us more and more every day.

Yet still it is very observable, that when [by quadrating them with the word of God, the only rule of faith and practice] any truths are recovered; or when those carnal and trashy superficials that deform and disguise others, are flung away; Then some malevolent Agent of the grand Deceiver, improves his uttermost craft to obscure and represent it in the most hideous and averting forms, and fasten the blackest calumnies upon such as the Lord makes his Instruments of reformation. The Son of God foretold this, Math. v. 11. All ages since have confirmed it. Our Martyrologies have recorded those worthies that resisted unto blood, those blessed souls under the Altar, that were slain for the word of God, and the Testimony which they held, to whom the white robes were given, Rev. vi. 9, 11 whose blood will one day be avenged upon their Barbarous Assassins.

The ordinance of Baptism [that great and radical duty here contended for] hath been as grossly perverted, mangled, and abused as any Gospel Institution whatever, new matter, new form, nothing left but the bare name, and that too wrested, misinterpreted, and forced to favour and bear symmetry with that Idle and frivolous Pædo-baptism set up in its room.

Nor need we wonder at the stiff opposition and harsh usage the assertors of Believers Baptism have met with from time to time; the error they attack being so necessary to the Antichristian Monarchy, that it is indeed the Basis upon which that pompous, proud superstructure moves, from whose Pinnacle, the man of sin may cast an Imperious glance and say with Nebuchadnezzar,

Vah Babylon, Babylon proprio te robore serva.

For, if a thorough reformation of this point be admitted; if Ministers teach first, then baptize such only as profess faith in the Lord Jesus, and newness of life evidenced by a Holy conversation, (that being the only practice warrantable by, and exemplified in the word of God) It will inevitably follow, that the Papal Monarchy (that great thing Catachrestically call'd a Church) must vanish, and the large Revenues, pomp, and grandeur of its active Janizaries expire with it: since the matter of such a synagogue is the collective body of the nations; which because of its unbelief and profaness the word of God excludes out of the Church, till in God's time and by his power gradually converted: it being evident from the mouth that errs not, that the greatest part of Mankind traverses the broad way to destruction, Math. vii. 13.

Surely this one consideration has a more forcible rhetoric to keep up this pernicious practice, then all the jugglings of its abettors, or the gaudy flourishes or specious Fulcrums its defenders produce to illustrate and support it. It is one of the Popes political (and very necessary) maxims, [and I fear borrowed by many from him,] wanting that power by which the Gospel ministers acted, to principle the emissaries that manage his cause very ripely in school-sophistry, and such other subtle qualifications, that their learned craft, and seeming profoundness of wisdom and parts may amuse and captivate the generality of mankind. And indeed we find them too apt to be gaping after those ornaments, which the Apostle elegantly calls, Πειθους ἀνθρωπίνης σοφίας λόγους, and well translated, the enticing words of man's wisdom; 1 Cor. ii. 4. They are well versed in the perplexing Idle whimsies of Aristotle, Scotus &c. but mere dunces and fools in plain Scripture doctrines: their Heathen Philosophy and the Gospel being at as wide a distance, as the Earth is from the third Heaven. See Job. v. 12, 13 and xxxii. 9; 1 Cor. i. 19.

But what is most lamentable is, that ministers that are separatists from national corruption and profaness, and (in the judgment of charity) in many things orthodox and pious, should be the forwardest opposers of so necessary a reformation; and not only so, but when they find the pretences upon which it was (with a ridiculous retinue) obtruded upon the world rotten and reeling, they must invent new supporters for it, viz. a Covenant right derivative from a believing parent &c. As if spiritual graces would admit of carnal propagations, or that a Christian doth always beget a Christian, a divinity as novel as 'tis absurd. And with this modern auxiliary this otherwise yielding cause is reinforced.

In the judgment of some it may perhaps add to the credit of that fancy that so famous a man as Mr. Baxter is, should patronize it. But he is not the first Theological grandee that has been mistaken. Performances of never so exalted a kind confer not the privilege of Infallible. 'Tis only the great Creator is unerring. A man may preach and write of the most seraphic verities, and yet know but in part; Mr. Baxter is to be honoured as far as he has laid himself out to preach the Gospel, and improve his Talent for the Conversion of souls in this evil day; But when he forgets himself, and instead of promoting practical holiness, fills the nation with notions as uncertain as they are numberless, puzzling such as arrive not to the subtilty of his distinction, creating more doubts than ever he'll be able to resolve, making Christianity a mere riddle which no man understands but he, and liable to as many forms and interpretations as his wavering mind. Then I humbly conceive he may be very safely left. Αφείς τα φανερά μή διώκε τὰ φανῆ, was a golden Aphorism of a heathen poet. Sure as peaceable as he would make us believe he is, that party or person that incurs his displeasure, must expect an unmerciful handling. He is so envenomed an Antagonist, that whoever encounters him

has need of an Antidote. Nor is his reverend new Author Mr. Wills (to whom he is so liberal of his encomiums) much behind in this Excellency: A strenuous satirist that by the flashes of his Academic wit makes some blaze, little of solid heat or warmth.

As for Mr. Baxter it seems he has something prophetic in him, he says in his last book, he knows what can be said in answer, and what he'll reply, and the others rejoinder &c. Belike he knew by the same prophetic faculty the first year of his ministry when he fell into doubts about Infants Baptism, and suspended the practice some year's, as he says, that the Anti-Pæaobaptists would be out of the favour of the times, and so inconsiderable as he (scornfully) says they are, which scared the man to the other side: And to convince the world that he was re-proselyted in good earnest, persecutes them with all the obloquy and slander, a virulent peevish humor could, dictate. So that, poor people! 'tis well their bones are whole from the furious artillery and crushing grasps of so mighty a Polyphemus.

It would startle a man to see what a room he would take up, as if the whole world must become his pupil! How confident a dictator he is to universal mankind! such a reconciler, that he will not be stopped in his career till he brings us to Rome, as if the vast creation must be of his parish! But I doubt the Pope will not be so tamely cog'd to resign up to Mr. Baxter his Regalia Petri. Sure as nimble a Proteus as he is, he'll find himself mistaken in these incongruous Topics. We have the Bible in English (and in the original too) and for all he picks a quarrel with that (in his 20. Queries &c.) because (perhaps) too narrow to confine so boundless a wanderer, yet it shall be our Christian Directory, we'll keep it precious, and leave his rotten and superfluous notions to fill up the vacuums in the Stationers shops. That leaven hath so soured his whole lump, that for fear of sucking some

poison with his honey, we'll be Christians (as well as the Lord shall enable us) without him.

Hold, but he gives you his extremum vale, at the door of eternity: But is very angry that he is importuned to it from some supreme transactions he is hatching in his study. Possibly his next errand may be to send us to Constantinople (nor is the scruple extravagant, considering what he has done already) to have a treaty of reconciliation with the Muphti, and make some part of Mahomet's creed (by his vast Authority) Orthodox. But being so successful in Christendom, he may very well despair of that undertaking. But what's his farewell? why he begins with his old quarrel with Mr. Tombes, rallying his defeated quibbles for a new Combat. But he is full of words, and will lead his reader such a dance, that he may sooner grow giddy, then find the truth, or whereabouts he is; such a continuation of impertinent periphrases (though connect with his wonted Artifice) that Dædalus's Labyrinth may sooner be traversed then the more numerous mazes and perplexities of Mr. Baxter, and all to eclipse a Gospel truth.

His next project is, to take Col. Danvers to task; he thinks it beneath a man of his Talent to let him pass without fixing an Epithet upon him, as might craftily insinuate him no fit person to inform the world of that abuse in Religion. He thinks that worthy Gentleman encroaches upon the prerogative he himself made bold to seize upon, viz. handling cases of Controversy: But he will not part so peaceably with the least aliquantum of it. A Soldier (so he calls him) must not enter the wits with this spiritual Warrior; if he does, he'll fling Ink enough in his face; I have heard some say, that his Soldiership, and Mr. B's Chaplainship were contemporaries in the same service, and that the latter was far

more active. Therefore may not that Eulogy bestow'd by Warlike Ajax upon his opponent, be applicable to our Ulysses?

—Quantumque ego Marte feroci,

Inque acte valeo, tantum valet iste loquendo.

But let me tell him in his ear, that if he re-engage any deeper in this quarrel, and persist in his impenitent obstinacy, he'll receive as shameful a foil as Mr. Tombes gave him. For our Soldier has truth of his side, and ability to manage it, nor does he want an acute and elegant pen, perhaps not inferior to the chaplain, for all his triumphs, and loud applauses of himself, and his attempts to engross as vast an opinion of his accomplishments, as the greatest University graduates (though he never, as they that know him say, was a student at any). 'Tis no miracle to find him a match able to encounter him at Quill-skirmishes in this age.

But as to our querulous master of Arts; Mr. Baxter dealt like a man of war to set him in the Forlorn hope; thinking belike that his confident noise would affright us, or his scoffs jeer us, or his reverence (an epithet he forces upon his modesty) would cog us over to him, as his dexterous epistler inveigled Mr. Lamb and Mr. Allen. In pursuance to which stratagem, the man talks big, brags loudly, and like an Olympic gamester [so he calls himself, and very fitly, for whoever loses, he gets by his divinity games, and may in time learn the Ecclesiastical politicians push-pin Divinity] slings on all sides, traverses every ground, to get us at advantage, that so he may (Comically) insult, and flout us: for his language savours more of frothy scoffs, and Romantic drollery, then of sober, serious, or Christian. But Γελαῖ δ' ὁ μῶρος, κᾶν τι μὴ γελοῖον ἦ.

He thinks he can scarce get over any Anti-Pædobaptist to his party: that indeed is the luckiest conjecture I met with in him, and

I am of that opinion too; for I hope they are a people of more reason and steadfastness in the truths they have learnt, than to be shaken, by so mimic and airy a companion, that by the pedantry of his sceptic style seems fitter for stage-pageantry than serious contests of this kind.

Besides the irreligious artifice, and (I may say) malicious insinuations, we meet with everywhere in his pamphlet, to render the person, parts, and principles, not only of his sober Antagonist, but of all that own his way, ridiculous and hated, so to pre-engage his Reader to partiality, and anticipate his judgment; is so notoriously disingenuous and dishonest, that I question not, but the Intelligent Reader will easily perceive, that the want of a good cause puts him upon those shifts, to fill up a Book with such Sarcasm's instead of truth; as if he had been of the old Woman's mind when she took that impious resolution,

Flectere si nequeo superos, Achcronta movebo.

But is this indeed the man of so clarified intellectuals? that puts a Remora in the progress of truth, to obstruct such as would come over to its Communion? that brags of ransacking the public library? that has his album calculum, &c. (others say, that *Argenteis hastis pugnat*) that has the forehead to charge Mr. Danvers with plagiarism? when he himself has not a single Argument new, but a furtive collection (mostly, for 'tis but now and then he mentions an Author's name) from those that were formerly engaged in that controversy. So that his whole book (had it been worth the while) may be confronted with continued parallels; being only (in his own phrase) such trite and outworn things that they have been in effect trampled upon and confuted again and again. Is he not therefore himself that *Æsop's Crow*, that struts so gaudily in other birds feathers?

I cannot but remark how he treads in his Epistlers steps, I mean Mr. B's idle pamphlet, mis-call'd Plain Scripture proofs for Infant-Baptism, &c. who in plain English, amongst his other envious calumnies, represents the Anabaptists, as guilty of Murder and Adultery, for an Imaginary practice he fathers upon them of dipping naked, or in transparent garments, &c. So this Answerer page 258, &c. But methinks if ingenuous candor and modesty (altogether unpracticed by him, though) so graceful in all their possessors cannot persuade him to treat us civilly; the awful reverence of an All-wise God might keep him from such daring criticisms upon the plain expressions of Scripture, and drawing so impious a consequence from premises pronounced by the unerring creator. For instance, it is said Acts ii. 41, 42. They that gladly received the word (ἐβαπτίσθησαν) were dipt, (so the word is English Luke xvi. 24; John xiii. 26; Rev. xix. 13 &c.) what then? why then they continued stedfastly in the Apostles Doctrine, &c. But Mr. Wills says they that are so dipt are Murderers and Adulterers; a more favourable sense his invective won't bear. 'Tis pity this wise demurrer had not lived in the Apostles days, that he may propose a more taking model for Christian Ordinances then the Holy Ghost could inspire them with: I doubt his carnal and injurious canting would be answered as Simon Magus in another case, thou hast neither part nor lot in this matter. Certainly, if sprinkling the face were the Lords choice, he could express himself by the word ῥαντίζω, being the proper term for sprinkling, (as 1. Pet. i. 2; Heb. ix. 13, 19, 21, and x. 22 and many places of the O. T.) and so put the matter for ever out of doubt. Was not Christ himself so [βαπτισθεὶς that is in English] dipt in Water? were not the converted Thousands we read of so dipt? And durst this audacious man fix such ignominies upon a practice that has so sacred a pattern? the Lord rebuke him.

But, candid Reader, here thou hast them counted out of that fort Royal they fancy so secure, viz their modern pretences to a Covenant hereditary title to Baptism: The substance of what they can say in their own defense is examined and soberly refuted: The vanity of their silly distinctions detected, and the Doctrine of the Covenant cleared, and made familiar to the conscientious peruser. And so the Lord (who will infallibly reckon with Mr. B. and his confederate, unless they repent, for putting such blocks and remora's in the way to his truth) set it home upon thy heart, and give thee a discerning spirit, to own him according to his directions in his word, notwithstanding the Ambushes and attacks of Satan, and his Engines, in despite of whom truth always stood, since the Nativity of time, and shall survive its utmost period and obsequies.

Let it not defer thee from a serious weighing of the Arguments here offered, that some of them may be heretofore presented; that diminishes not their force: Nil dictum est quod non est dictum prius. Yet this wrangler Mr. W. would put us to the trouble of quoting every man's name that has the same sense or like words with us, to avoid his aspersion of plagiaries: A provident shift he has got to escape the edge of any Argument that gravels him. May not men often hit upon the same thing, from necessity of the Argument, or chance, not choice or design? I am certain no man's more guilty in that particular than this Mr. of Arts.

But there's need enough of pressing the same things again and again. When they produce new grounds for their practice (but I presume this from the Covenant is the last shift) we'll address New Arguments to confront them; for the current of the Scripture will afford us variety of Mediums to quash their bold encroachments.

The subject of the Covenant (their celebrated Sanctuary) hath not hitherto been so singly insisted upon as 'tis here; although it has been cleared sufficiently (one would think to candid Readers) by Mr. Blackwood, Tombs, Laurence, Danvers, &c. whose accurate and learned works are enough to satisfy every one that would be found in the serious and impartial investigation of truth: And indeed leave such a reader without excuse.

This Treatise is chiefly calculated for the perusal of some sober friends that importuned the Author to write something upon this subject. And if truth hath any advancement by it, he hath his end. He is careless of popular applause or censure. He hath contributed his Mite for common information, and undeceiving the many souls that still hold fast those Dregs and Remains of Popery.

T. D.

Ad Clerum sic Dictum, præcipue

Triumviratum Novum

Conquerar? an Sileam? Nova tollitis arma Ministri?
Christicolis cur non; pax sit habenda prius?

Oro, reformatæ lucis* aperite fenestras:
Tingere credentes Pagina sacra docet.

Totus ab astutâ Meretrice illuditur orbis?
Fallit imaginibus Bestia docta dolis?

Illecebris fucata suis obscæna triumphat
Roma? propinquantem nescit adulta necem.

Fulta Armis Regum caput altum in prælia tollit:
Ægra repercussis ictibus illa cadet.

Ægracadet, certum est, Agni certamine: rumpet
Sulphurei ignivomas per Phlegetontis aquas.

Pars* convicta θεσιν quondam concesserat; at nunc
In pedis egrediens introeuntis iter!

Hæsit in ambiguum, vano Rantismate nollet
Spargere; at incerto convehit ore sonum!

Tempora mutantur, nos an mutamur in illis?
Sumere tot formas, quæritur, unde licet?

B. mordet, duplex V latrat, garrulat alter;
His opibus tollit gens inimica Caput!

Fit simplex clangor triplici clamore; nec unquam
Causa patrocinio sustinenda Nove est.

Sparsio parvorum Romanâ ab origine, fulcit
Papale Imperium: Castra cruenta Necis!

Lux Evangelii per binos emicat axes,
Occiduos inter lucifluosq; sinus.

Bestia sæva perit, meretrix furibunda peribit,
Obruta flammiferis nam morietur aquis.

Sic raptim Pacis Ecclesiastica
studiosissimus.

T. D.

The PREFACE

Courteous Reader,

THOU must know I do not write this Treatise because I think there are not Books enough extant upon this subject: But because I observe that old books (though never so excellent) are laid by, and seldom looked into, and nothing's relishable with this curious Age but what's contemporary with itself: besides many of the books already written are so large that ordinary persons cannot attain to the price; and some so intricate, and delivered in such a sublimity of phrase, that they are beyond the capacity of divers godly and well-meaning Christians. Therefore I have sent out this without the exterior varnish of human blandishments, that I may recommend this truth to every man's conscience. Eloquence is nothing but Air, fashioned with an Articulate and distinct sound, and when suited to entice and inveigle carnal affections, may do much; but there is a peculiar Majesty and veneration, upon the brow of truth that will not be beholden to those artificial braveries: No ornaments render it more illustrious then its own native plainness. The end of speech is to make our conceptions intelligible; and when our meaning is carried away by towering expressions past the reach of a plain Reader, what is it but a gay piece of vanity, and affected pedantry?

I know the difference between the parties represented in this Dialogue, distracts the minds and troubles the hearts of many that are Godly. Now in this distraction every serious man cannot choose but heartily desire and wish for resolution. And in order to obtain that, the most likely way, is to examine the pretensions and grounds on both hands. In prosecution of which I have selected the most plausible Argument insisted upon by the Pædobaptists of this age (nay the only grand pretence upon which that baffled practice is supported) so that I may say, that all the

Auxiliary considerations that contribute to its reinforcement, will fall in the fate, and live and die with this Cardinal Thesis (drawn from the Covenant) in its savour.

Perhaps it may be said, that I make the Pœdobaptists speak what I please, not what they think, this must be said of course, else they lose their old wont. Nor shall I think it strange, if instead of solid Answers they return their usual Oratory of calumny, and treat me with that severity so liberally dispensed to their opposites [especially by those writers who enter'd the lists for this cause of late years] for their cause requires it. To silence all clamors will be a task of impossibility, and I shall supersede any thoughts of the attempt, but for satisfaction to the tenderhearted and gracious Christian, I say further that I have endeavoured to cull out the strongest enforcements I could find, and have declined nothing of moment I met within their best Authors; if they think otherwise, let them produce their greatest strength, and lay it down in plain propositions (without that incumbrance and perplexity of words and wheeling phrases, as involve their meanings in puzzling ambiguities) and I hope they will find it fairly examined.

The Argumentative part which I put into their Mouths, is such as was first taken from thence, and it is but a piece of justice and restitution to return them thither. They are such as are famously known to be their principles, still the sense, often the very words of their most celebrated Authors.

The reason that I take no more notice of Mr. Will's book is because Mr. D. who hath already worthily defended the Historical part, hath promised also to reckon with him as to the scriptural part, and I would not anticipate him, whose works will praise him in the gate, notwithstanding the disingenuous cavils

and querulous janglings that fill up Mr. Wills' invective Pamphlet.

I hope our Opposites will not disallow the liberty they themselves take, of making use of some pious and learned men, that have trod the paths of this controversy before us of late years. I could wish that the voluminous and accurate Treatises of M. Tombs were epitomized for the information of the ordinary well-meaning Christian, the Arguments of the Pœdobaptists being there learnedly and solidly confuted, and perhaps to the conviction of many of the learned ones, who (had not reputation interposed, having born a signal testimony to some excellent truths, which they fear might be called in question had they subscribed a Recantation of this) would possibly own as much

It is not arrived to the degree of Miracle that even good men are loath to own themselves transgressors, and destroy the things they built. Pezelius reports, that when one from Frankford brought Calvin's institutions to Luther, demanding his opinion of it; he replies profecto non inepte hic Author dixit, indeed this Author hath not said foolishly, meaning that he had spoke right, yet recanted not his (opposite) Doctrine, but privately communicates his mistake to Melanchthon, fearing that a public conviction might discredit all his Doctrine. To conclude, Reader I offer my conceptions of this bandied point to thy candid acceptance, and with this assurance that nothing but a zeal for Gospel reformation should invite me to expose my sentiments to this Censorious age, and if they contribute ought to that end, I have my aim, And so I commend thee to the good spirit of truth, to lead thee into all truth, and remain

Thine in all Christian Respects,

Feb. 10. 1674.

E. H.

A
DIALOGUE

Between

A Baptist and a Pædobaptist

Bap. My Dear Friend, I am glad to see thee, pray what News in the Country?

Pæd. O Sir! the Controversy about Baptism is again renewed, which I fear will occasion great differences amongst Professors; whereas we did hope to live in love and peace together; but I see the point must farther be enquired into, and the people must have more satisfaction, before they will walk in communion and fellowship together.

Bap. Well; but what is your opinion, do you still hold Infant-Baptism?

Pæd. Yes, I am still of that opinion, but am willing to be informed, for I would not practice anything that is not warranted from the Scriptures.

Bap. You say well in that, but have you been at disputes where you might receive satisfaction?

Pæd. Yea, I have been at divers, but their Logical way of discourse does so obscure and hide the truth, that when the Dispute is done, we are no wiser than before; now Sir, is there no way to find out truth but by Logic?

Bap. My Friend, you must know, that there is a natural Logic, which all men have, except fools and Idiots, and it is nothing else but reason methodized: but as for School-Logic which men make a great flourish with, especially amongst women and illiterate persons, though by it also truth may be discovered, if men were

ingenuous, and desired truth more than victory: but alas! it is miserably abused by men of corrupt minds, to the deceiving of the hearts of the simple; but seeing you have mentioned it, I shall give you the opinion of a Learned man about it: Nothing saith he, hath spoiled truth, more than the invention of Logic, it hath found out so many distinctions, that it enwraps reason in a mist of doubts, 'tis reason drawn into too fine a thread, tying up truth in a twist of words; which being hard to unloose carry her away as a prisoner; 'tis a net to entangle her, or an art instructing you, how to tell a reasonable lie: like an overcurious workman, it hath sought to make truth so excellent, that it hath marred it. Vives saith, he doubts not, the devil did invent it, It hath laid on so many Colours that the Counterfeit is more various then the pattern. It gives us so many likes, that we know not which is the same; nature itself makes every man a Logician; they that brought in the art have presented us with one that hath over-acted her; But I speak this of Logic at large, there may be an excellency found in the art, and it is good to retain it, that we may make it defend us against itself, in matters of Religion, we must make faith the means to ascertain, for other matters simple nature is the best reason, and naked reason the best Logic.

Pœd. Sir I thank you for your opinion about Logic, and I think it were better, if our Ministers did less use it and dispute after the same manner as they preach; which is, to lay down a proposition, and to prove it by Scripture, and reason; it would better satisfy the people; but we have gone a little out of our way, my great desire is to discourse with you about Infants-Baptism: and especially concerning the Covenant, made to Abraham, and to his seed; which if you can remove, I resolve to be of your opinion.

Bap. It's true, the Covenant or promise made to Abraham, and to his seed, is the great hinge or Engine upon which the whole

business of Infant's-Baptism moves; now if I prove that the Infants of believing Gentiles are not the seed of Abraham, then Infant Church-membership, under the Gospel, and Baptism falls to the ground.

Pœd. True Sir, and therefore pray let me hear your arguments.

Bap. First then, I argue thus. If none be the Children of Abraham, but those that do the works of Abraham: Then infants are not the seed of Abraham.

But the Antecedent is true, John viii. 39. If ye were the Children of Abraham, ye would do the Works of Abraham. So therefore is the consequent.

Pœd. But our Ministers tells us this is meant of the adult; and not of Infants.

Bap. I know they do so, and they think they had better say something, than nothing, but I proceed.

The Second Argument.

If those that are Christ's, are only Abraham's seed; then Infants are not Abraham's seed.

The Antecedent is true Gal. iii. 3, 19. Ergo, the consequent.

And if you say, Infants are Christ's, I answer, some are so by Election, but the Apostle speaks of such as are Christ's by calling, not Election: which is secret to us.

But 3rdly. If none are blessed with Abraham but those that are of faith, then infants are not the seed of Abraham.

But the Antecedent is true, Gal. iii. 9 so then they that are of faith, are blessed with faithful Abraham.

Ergo the Consequent is true also.

4thly. If the Children of the flesh are not the Children of God, then infants are not now the seed of Abraham.

But the Antecedent is true. Rom. ix. 8, they which are the children of flesh, these are not the children of God, But the children of the promise are counted for the seed: Ergo so is the consequent, I say, the children of the flesh may be the children of God by Election, but they are not so by calling, and so not counted for the seed; and if you still urge, as I know you will, that all these places are meant of the Adult only, then let us read the words as you would have us, and see what absurdity you will father upon the Holy Spirit.

First, from Gal. iii. 9. They that are of faith, are blessed with faithful Abraham: and they also that are not of faith.

Secondly from Gal. iii. 19. They that are Christ's (viz. visibly) are Abraham's seed, and they that are not Christ's, are Abraham's seed.

Thirdly, from Rom. ix. 8. They which are the children of the flesh are not the children of God. (visibly); and they that are the children of flesh are the children of God visibly.

So from John viii. 39. They that do the works of Abraham are the children of God; and they that do not the works of Abraham are the children of God; so we must read the words, if these texts of Scripture be not exclusive.

Pœd. It is very true, if those texts be not exclusive, we must read the words, or at least understand them, as you have, said; but then we should make the Scripture guilty of great absurdity, and contradiction.

Pœd. But our ministers tell us, the promise is to you and your children, and them that are afar off: by which they understand believing Gentiles and their seed.

Bap. But what do you mean by promise? is it the promise and covenant of eternal life and salvation? or the promise of outward ordinances? If you say the first; then we ask you whether that promise be absolute or conditional? If absolute, then all the children of believers must needs be saved. If you say conditional, and faith and repentance, be the condition, then we are agreed: and the controversy is ended.

Pœd. No, we do not say that by promise in the 2nd of the Acts, is meant the promise of eternal life and salvation, for that is not made, much less made good to any, upon the terms of their parent's faith; but upon their own personal belief, and obedience, but we mean the promise of outward ordinances, as to be baptized, &c.

Bap. Very well; if that be Peter's meaning, that believer's infants shall be admitted to outward ordinances, when others shall not: Then consider what a poor promise this is, and what a miserable comforter he is made by you, in making as if this were all his meaning, and all that he intends by this precious word of promise. But you must know Peter's business was to support the Jews smitten down under a sense of sin and the guilt of Christ's blood, which lay heavy upon them; but if this be all he intended, you and your children shall be baptized, &c. then the plaister is not broad enough for the soar; for, pray consider and we will suppose Peter speaking thus to them: you have by wicked hands crucified the Lord of life, and wished his blood to be upon you and your children, but be of good comfort, believe and be baptized, and then you and your children shall stand under the title of the people of God, under right to outward ordinances, when others shall not,

and not only you, but your children shall be baptized. But neither you nor they ever the sooner saved, as born of you, further then together with you they shall believe and obey the Gospel; in which case of faith and obedience, all unbelievers in the world and their children, shall be saved as soon as either you or they. It is as much as to say, the promise of freedom to partake of the ordinances, is to you, and your seed above other; but the promise of the inheritance is as much to all others and their children, as to you and yours. What most comfortless comfort is this, to men cast down under a sense of sin and guilt? what a pitiful plaister is here applied to men pricked at the heart, and smarting under the direful apprehension of God's wrath? besides what exquisite nonsense do you make the Apostle speak, if his words be taken in your sense, for they must run thus, viz. first by way of precept, repent and be baptized you and your children. 2ndly, by way of encouragement, so the privilege of being baptized shall belong to you and your children which unbelievers and their seed shall not enjoy. But the promise of remission of sins, and salvation, is made no more to you then to them; But without doubt it must be otherwise: the promise, take it which way you will, either for the proffer of the promise, or the thing promised. It must needs be of some more excellent matter than outward membership, and ordinances, abstract from remission of sins and salvation: yea, 'tis most evident that the thing here promised is no less than remission of sins and salvation itself, for as no less is expressed in the very text remission of sins, and the Holy Spirit, which, elsewhere is called the earnest of inheritance, So, unless you will divide the children from having a share alike with their parents in that promise, which in the self-same sentence, term and sense, is promised alike to them both, so as to say, the word promise, is to be understood of remission of sins, and salvation, as in relation to the parents; but of an inferior thing, viz. a right to ordinances

only, as in relation to the Infants only, which were great absurdity to utter, it must necessarily be meant of one kind of mercy, to both parents and children: yea and upon the same terms too, and no other than those upon which its tendered to the parents, viz. personal repentance, and obedience, and so consequently of remission and salvation, and not of such a trivial title to external participation only as you talk of, which if it be, then, unless you assert that God hath promised salvation absolutely to all the natural seed of believers, upon those terms only, as they are their seed, which you dare not stand too, the promise, mean which you will, the bare proposal, or the salvation propounded, or both; upon those terms, belongs of right, not only to believers and their posterity, but also to all men, and their posterity, without difference, when at years of capacity to neglect, or perform them; for the glad tidings of salvation are commanded to be preached to all, and proffered to every creature at years, to hear, and understand; though not to infants on terms of their parents faith; so assuredly the terms being performed, the salvation so promised shall be enjoyed: there is no right by birth to salvation, or the promise of it in believers seed, more than in unbelievers; nor no privilege to them more than to others, save the mere hopefulnes of education, and advantage of instruction in the way and means of salvation; which may possibly befall believers children, more than others: though in case it happen (as sometime it doth) that the children of believers, have their breeding amongst unbelievers, and the children of unbelievers amongst believers, in that case these last have not only no less privilege, as to the promise of salvation by bare birth, but a privilege also by that breeding above the other.

That therefore, that the promise of the Gospel covenant in any sense in the world, is made to believers seed (as barely such) more than to the natural seed of unbelievers, can never be proved

by the word; yea the contrary is evident from this place Acts. ii. 38, 39.

For, first neither were these parents believers as yet, when Peter said, the promise is to you, and your children; but only were pricked at the heart upon some measure of conviction; that the person whom they had crucified, was the Lord of life (which the devils believe and tremble at) and in order to begetting that saving faith, (which yet they had not) he spake these words of encouragement.

Secondly, doth Peter make the promise any otherwise to them and their children, then he doth to all others in the world, viz. on condition of their coming in at God's call, 'tis said to you and your children, and them that are afar off; all manner of persons in all nations, and generations, as the Lord our God shall call, viz. as are prevailed with to come when God calls them; which to be the sense of this place, is further illustrated by that parallel place Heb. ix. 15 they that are called, receive the promise of eternal inheritance.

Thirdly, when the parents did believe, and were baptized; were any of their children baptized with them? which they must have been, had that promise been to the Infants, as well as to the parents on that single account of being their seed, but that no Infants were then baptized, appears, because the Scripture recording how many were baptized at that time, it concludes them under such a term, as excludes the Infant from that day's work, while it says, as many, meaning no more (or else we are deceived in the relation) as gladly received the word (this Infants could not do) were then baptized, which number, as they are recorded to be about 3000 might in all likelihood have amounted to three times 3000. If all the Infants of those had been baptized also; so that I conclude, if they had Infants why did they not bring them? or at

least send for them? here being so fit an opportunity, to baptize them; and so (for ever) to put the controversy out of doubt.

But fourthly, neither were there any more enchurched that day, but such as gladly received the word, and were thereupon baptized. For of these only (and not infants) it's said they continued together in the Apostles doctrine, in Fellowship, and in breaking of bread and prayers. But all their Infants must have been Enchurched also, if they had been baptized.

Fifthly, it crosseth the current of all other Scripture to put such a construction upon this, for that the promise of old, I mean the old promise of the law, which was of the Earthly Canaan, and but a Type of this, did pertain unto a fleshly Holy seed, I grant. But that the new Covenant or Gospel promise is made to any man's fleshly seed, that thereupon we may baptize them in token of it, I deny. For sure I am the Scripture holds out no other seed of Abraham to be heirs with him of the heavenly Canaan, but his spiritual seed, i. e. Believers that do his works. Nor doth it own any (but these) to have the right of membership and Fellowship in his family. i.e. the visible Church. For if it should be granted, that the visible Church is Abraham's family, under the Gospel, as well as under the law: yet it is so altered from what it was, so different in its constitution, that it is even turned upside down, and in a manner nothing remains as then it was. For as the covenant is not the same, with that of the law, so neither is there the same Mediator, nor the same Priesthood, nor the same Law, nor the same Law-giver, nor the same promises: That being of an Earthly, this of an heavenly inheritance, nor the same Holy seed, to which the promises are made: that being to the Typical seed, Isaac and his posterity, this to the true seed Christ and believers. Nor the same ordinances, theirs being Circumcision and the Pass-over, ours Baptism and the supper. Nor the same subjects for

those ordinances, those being (by nature) Jews or at least by profession, and their Male seed only; ours Male and female: theirs, whether believing or not, ours only as believing. So that whatever can be said of the Covenant, the promise, the Holy seed; is only this, they were Typical, ceremonial, abiding only to the time of Reformation Heb. ix. 9 and are now all abrogated, and out of date, so that we may say (as he) fuit Ilium, so fuit Canaan, fuit lex, fuit Templum, fuit sacerdotium, fuit sacrosanctum semen. There was indeed a Holy land, a Holy law, a Holy Priesthood, a Holy seed, But all these belonging to a first Covenant which was faulty, are now long since vanished before a better, and whatever was glorious hath now no glory, by reason of a glory that excelleth. 2 Cor. iii. 9, 10, 12, 13.

Pœd, Sir, I thank you for your opinion of this text Acts ii. 39. But though the children of believing Gentiles have no right to the Covenant by virtue of their Parents faith yet may they not have a right by virtue of Abraham's faith?

Bap. In no wise; for the natural posterity of believing Gentiles, are so far from being heirs apparent with Abraham, of Gospel promises and privileges, that even Abraham's own natural seed, (as such only) are not at all his seed, at this day, nor at all Holy with the birth-holiness they once had, nor entailed as heirs of that heavenly Canaan, without faith and Repentance in their own persons; and because this is the very root and knot in the state of this controversy, the unfolding of which will discover the whole mystery of your mistakes, all which arise originally from your erring in it, for error minimus in principio, fit major in medio, maximus in fine. Give me leave therefore to enlarge a little upon this point.

First then let it be considered, that Abraham's own seed, even those that were heirs with him of the earthly Canaan, though born

of his body now (as truly though more remotely) of his body who was the greatest believer in the world (Christ excepted) even these are not his seed in the Gospel account, nor heirs of the Gospel promise; nor (as born of his body) to be admitted to Baptism and Church privileges, which I make appear from Rom. ix. 6, 7, 8 in which pray observe how the Apostle denies Abraham's own Natural Children, the name of Abraham's seed, in the sense of the Gospel.

First he magnifies them exceedingly in the 4th verse, and sets out their dignity and preeminence above all people under the name of Israelites, to whom pertained the Adoption, and the glory, and the Covenants, i.e. both Testaments, the Type, and the Anti-type, unto whom pertained, not only the giving of the law, but also the promises, and that not only of the Earthly Canaan, but of the Gospel Covenant in the first tender of it, not in respect of any right they had to it by birth (whether they received it or not) but as I said in respect of the first tenders of it, which appears because by special order and appointment it was to be offered to them in the first place.

Nor was it carried to the Gentiles till the Jews had slighted it, in proof whereof the Scripture is very plain Math. x. 5, 6, 7. Christ forbids his Disciples to go to any of the Gentiles, or to any save the lost sheep of the House of Israel, yea they were Children at this time, whose Bread, (till they loathed it) was not to be given to dogs except a few crumbs of it.

Hence the Jews were first bid to the wedding Math. xxii. 3 but they would not come. So they are called the Children of the kingdom Math. viii. 12 that were to be cast out because they would not receive the Gospel; for he came unto his own and his own received him not; yea Paul tells the Jews it was necessary the word of God should first be spoken unto them, Acts xiii. 46.

Notwithstanding all which glory and preeminence of this people Israel who were the fathers also, and of whom (as concerning the flesh) Christ came. Paul, after he had shewed their high privileges, comes with Alas! and great sorrow of heart, that he was forced to exclude them, (save a few with whom the Gospel took effect) even from the name of Israelites, and from standing Abraham's Children any longer. For, saith he, (as who should say, the more is the pity) they are not all Israel, that are of Israel, that is all that are Israel after the flesh, are not Gospel Israelites, Abraham's seed are no longer counted his seed, but they that are Christ's by faith, are counted for the seed; and that this is the meaning of the words is evident from them that follow. For, saith he, neither because they are the seed of Abraham, are they all Children; but in Isaac shall thy seed be called, that is, these which are the Children of the flesh, these are not the children of God, but the children of the promise are counted for the seed.

A clear illustration we have of this Gal. iii. 7, 9 where the Apostle urges this term, they which are of faith (that is, which believe) for none else are of faith, the same are the Children of Abraham, and are blessed with faithful Abraham. He saith not, they which be of Abraham's flesh, for such are not accounted his Children as to the Gospel Covenant, much less doth he say or mean, that those which are born of the bodies of them that be of faith are Abraham's children, and so to be signed, as his sons by Baptism, as his own fleshly seed were signed by Circumcision, as heirs with him of the old Canaan. As if because Abraham is the spiritual father of all that believe and walk in his steps, therefore he must be a father to all their natural posterity too, and be the spiritual father not of their persons only, but of their off-spring also.

But let me tell you he is not so much as a father to his own seed, in a Gospel sense, neither can these stand his children, nor the children of God, or heirs of the heavenly blessing and kingdom because they come out of his loins, unless they do as he did. For though his fleshly seed, as a type for the time then being, stood denominated the children of God, and Holy in an outward sense, and heirs according to the earthly promise, yet that account is now gone, and there is no other way whereby the Jews themselves, much less any generations amongst the Gentiles can be styled the children of God, or of Abraham, so as to expect the Gospel portion, but by believing in Christ Jesus, in their own persons, Gal. iii. 26, *ye are all the Children of God by faith in Jesus Christ; and if ye be Christ's then are ye Abraham's seed, and heirs according to the promise.*

Another Scripture that proves that Abraham's own seed, in the old Covenant account are not his seed, in the account of the Gospel, so as thereupon to have right to ordinances is, John viii. 33 to the 40, where Christ being cavilled at by the Jews, for promising freedom from sin, to which they were slaves and servants, notwithstanding the legal freedom they so much boasted of, discovers plainly, the cutting off the Jews from three things.

1. From the repute and denomination of Abraham's children.
2. From any share in the spiritual blessings of the Gospel.
3. From any further right to Church-membership and ordinances.

First they allege that they are Abraham's seed ver. 33, that they were not born of Fornication, ver. 39 (meaning as Ishmael was) but they had one father even God v. 41. To which Christ answers, not by denying of any of all this, for it was all true in that sense in which they meant it, yea they were Abraham's children, and Christ confesses it ver. 37. I know you are Abraham's seed, yea

they were all the Children of God, by an outward and Typical adoption of them unto himself. But Christ overthrows all, by telling them, that Abraham's children are accounted of otherwise now than formerly; not as coming out of his loins, but doing his works, as being allied to him, not so much after the flesh as after the faith. Whereupon not yet believing he denies them to be now Abraham's Children, in the true and substantial sense, and that appears in this Hypothesis ver. 39. If ye were Abraham's children ye would do the works of Abraham. To which do but add the Minor; But ye do not the works of Abraham: And then the conclusion follows; Therefore ye are not the children of Abraham. You see Christ asserts them to be Abraham's children in the old account, so as to stand members of the old house, but denies them to be Abraham's children in the sense of the New.

2ndly. They say they are freemen, and were never in bondage: this Christ also grants: it was so indeed in the outward Typical sense, they were freemen and heirs of that earthly glory that was promised to Abraham in that old Canaan, but denies them to be freemen as to the Gospel, with heavenly freedom of *that Jerusalem which is above*, which is the mother of all believers Gal. iv. 20, yea asserts that they were but servants, and in bondage to sin, which is the greatest slavery of all ver. 34, *he that commits sin is the servant of sin*. So that for all their sonships, in truth they were but servants. He grants their sonship and title to the old inheritance, but denies it to the new.

3rdly. They boast or bless themselves in their standing in the house or family of Abraham, that is the visible Church, as to the ordinances, privileges, and rights whereof, who but themselves had the title. For this indeed was their advantage of old, that to them were committed the oracles of God: To which Christ answers, true; they did stand in the house for a time, yet but for a

time, and though sons and heirs in the law's Typical sense, yet they were but servants in the Gospel's. And being but servants, as Moses, and his house, the old Church were; they must anon be turned out of the house, and abide in the Church, that is Abraham's family no longer; that believers the true sons and heirs may come in, as in the 35th verse. *And the servant (saith Christ) abideth not in the house for ever; but the son abideth for ever. If therefore the son make you free, and that he doth not for all your former freedom, unless you believe in him; then shall you be free indeed, even to the glory, oracles, and blessings of the spiritual house, the Gospel Church, which else, you must be cut off from.*

And so indeed it came to pass within a while, for not believing and repenting, which are the only terms which give right to Gospel ordinances and privileges. So that these Jews though Natural branches still as much as ever (if being the fleshly seed of a believer could help them,) as to a standing there, were yet clean broke from the root Abraham, as he stands a root to all the faithful, because only of unbelief Rom. xi. 20 when such as were wild olives, and no kin at all to Abraham after the flesh, were in their own persons, but not their natural seed with them (save as they believed with them) owned as his Children by believing, and as members of the true Church under the Gospel.

And this was declared by John the Baptist, and the rest of the first Ministers of the Gospel, who would not admit Jews as Jews (though Abraham's own seed) unto Baptism, when they offered themselves upon the aforementioned terms without faith and repentance. See how the Pharisees, Sadducees and whole multitude of Abraham's seed come to be Baptized. Math. iii. 7; Luke iii. 7 pretending and pleading that if Baptism were a Church privilege, it must needs belong to them, who were the children of Abraham; But see how he rejects them, as having no part nor

portion in this matter. *O generation of vipers, who hath warned you to flee from the wrath to come?* as if he should have said, what have you to do with the remission of sins and redemption from wrath, which I preach and baptize in token of, being (notwithstanding your privileges) corrupt and sinful in your lives. *Bring forth therefore,* to the end you may be baptized, fruits answerable to amendment of life; and begin not to say, that we have Abraham to our father, we are the seed of an eminent believer, *for God is able of these stones to raise up children to Abraham.* i. e. God will without being beholden to you, raise a seed to Abraham rather than to want them, from amongst these stones; whether he means stones literally, or the Gentiles, which were as stones in their eyes, it matters not.

But this we gather from it, that even at that very time, when the birth-privilege and holiness of a fleshly seed stood in full force, and un-repealed (as then it did) how much more since the abrogation thereof by faith, Abraham's seed could not, much less can the seed of believing Gentiles, now it is repealed, be admitted to Baptism without Repentance.

The Jews as impenitent and unbelieving as they were, stood uncast out of the Jewish Church, while the Church itself stood: But they could not pass out of that Church into the Gospel Church, nor from their right to circumcision, prove their right to Baptism; yet this they might have done, if what gave right of old to one of those ordinances, doth in like manner in right persons to the other.

So then seeing Abraham's own seed had no right to Baptism, as such, how can you expect it from your seed, who are not Abraham's seed: For Abraham hath but two seeds, as I know of (except Christ) the first is his seed after the flesh, and such were all those that were born of his body, as Ishmael, and his children

by Keturah, and those that come of him, by Isaac and Jacob; which only were heirs with him of the land of Canaan (for Esau sold his birth-right.)

2. His seed after the faith, and they are all those that walk in his steps Rom. iv. 12 and such that do his works John. viii. but to suppose that Abraham hath a third seed, and they are the children of believing Gentiles, is a fancy, for, non datur tertium semen Abrahæ.

Two seeds of Abraham the Scripture mentions, but a third sort cannot be assigned, The first are only these that descend from his loins, as the Midianites, and others by Keturah; the Ishmaelites by Hagar; The Edomites, and Israelites by Sarah; which last only were the Holy seed, and children of promise, in reference to the Hagarens in a type, and sole heirs of the Typical Canaan. All these I say were the first sort, and all believers of what Nation soever, are the second sort; but the natural seed of believers are neither of the one, nor of the other.

Pœd. But were not the proselytes or strangers counted Abraham's seed, and circumcised upon that account?

Bap. No: they were not Abraham's seed, and circumcised on that account; but from a positive instruction, and an expressed command from God, as they were the males in the family of one that was a Jew, at least by devotion, for which see Gen. xvii. 12, 13. *And he that is eight days old shall be circumcised among you, every man child in your generations, he that is born in the house, or bought with money from any stranger, which is not of thy seed. He that is born in thy house, and he that is bought with money, must needs be circumcised;* and in Exod. xii. 48, 49 it is called a law, *When a stranger shall sojourn with thee, and will keep the passover, let all his males be circumcised, and then let him eat the Passover, and he shall be as one that is born in the land, and*

for the stranger. And in Numb. ix. 14 it is called an Ordinance. *Ye shall have one Ordinance for him that is born in the land, and for the stranger.* Shew but so much for Infants-Baptism, that it is called a law, an ordinance, or hath any institution for it, and the controversy is ended. So that you see the proselytes were circumcised by virtue of a law, as they were Males in the family, and not as Abraham's seed: for so they were not, nor heirs either of the temporal, or spiritual Canaan. In the temporal Canaan they had no inheritance, nor any right to the heavenly, unless they were true believers as Abraham was.

So that the sum of what hath been said is:

First the seed of believers, are not Abraham's seed.

Secondly, that Abraham's seed are cut off from all the privileges of the old Covenant, and are not all counted his seed, in the sense of the new.

Thirdly, that Abraham's natural seed have no right to the privileges of the new Covenant, by virtue of Abraham's faith.

Fourthly, that seeing Abraham's own seed, his natural children, have no right to the Gospel-Covenant, or privileges thereof, much less can the children of believing Gentiles lay any claim thereunto, either by virtue of Abraham's faith, or the faith of their own parents.

And so I might here end this matter; but because you shall have full measure, I will add another testimony concerning the Covenant, and the little ground there is to baptize Infants, from that Scripture Gen. xvii. 7.

Know then that the Covenant of grace is to be considered, either of the promise of eternal life and salvation, made to all the elect in Christ, the which remains one and the same in all ages, though

variously administered, in the times of the old and new Testament. Or else of the manner of its Administration, in which sense, it's now (in respect of the old Testament administration) which was a distinct Covenant in itself (for the time being) called the new Covenant, and the other to have waxen old, and to vanish away, Heb. viii. last. Which cannot be said of the promise or Covenant of eternal life, that being an everlasting covenant, and ever remains one and the same. Now it's one thing to be in the Covenant of grace, i. e. to have a right to the promise, which is only proper to the elect: another thing, to be under the administration of the Covenant, which is common to the elect and reprobates, and depends merely upon God's appointment.

Now if the Covenant be understood in the first sense, of the promise of eternal life and salvation, made to the elect in Christ: that did never belong to all the children born of believing parents, as might be instanced in Ishmael and Esau, &c. but only to such as are elected of them, Rom. ix. 7, 8, 9 neither because they are the seed of Abraham, are they all children, &c. The Covenant of grace being first made between God and Christ, and all the elect in Christ. And therefore in Scripture it is called the promise of eternal life which was made to the elect before the world began; who are therefore called the heirs of promise, which promise had its first promulgation to Adam, in the garden of Eden. Where we have also the first discovery of the mystery of the two seeds.

Now the Covenant taken in this sense, is not the ground and reason of administering ordinances to any person whatever. But the law of institution is the ground or reason of visible Administrations. For the administration of ordinances belongs not to the substance of the Covenant; but to its administration as to the persons to whom they shall be administered, and that merely on the law of institution, without any other consideration;

and hence we find, that from the first promulgation of the Covenant to Adam, until God's renewing of it to Abraham, there was no ordinance to be administered to Infants, though some Infants as well as grown persons, both of believers, and unbelievers might be comprehended in the Covenant yet not to be circumcised, and so not to be baptized for want of an institution.

So the promise in Acts ii. 39 is said to be to them afar off, in the present tense, while uncalled, even to as many as shall be called; and yet, not to be baptized before calling, unless you will baptize Gentiles in professed Gentileism; and so the Jews, some not yet born, some not called, have the Covenant of grace made to them, Rom. xi. 27. *For this is my Covenant unto them, when I shall take away their sins*; and yet they are not to be baptized till converted.

Nor can the Covenant, considered in its pure nature, be a minister's rule to administer Ordinances by, seeing it is unknown, who are in the Covenant, and who are not; but that which is their rule, must be something that is manifest.

Secondly, when it is said, that the Covenant of grace belongs to believers children, and that is the ground of their Baptism. If it be meant of its Administration, you have heard, that depends merely on the law of institution, and hath varied in several ages according to the will of the lawgiver. For during all that period of time, from Adam to Abraham, there was no Ordinance to be administered to Infants; but when God renewed the promise to Abraham, he instituted circumcision, which ordinance belongs peculiarly to the old Testament administration, and was part of Moses' law, which is now abrogated and done away: And this was the first ordinance that was administered to Infants and not to all Infants, but only to male Infants living in Abraham's family if they did live to the eight day, otherwise, they had no right to this

ordinance; though many of them doubtless in the Covenant of grace and so saved: so we say of Infants in the days of the Gospel, many of them are in the Covenant of grace, and so saved, by virtue of the free promise: But yet not to be baptized, if they do not live to the time of believing and repenting, the only time appointed for Baptism: so that the Administration of ordinances to Infants, depends upon an Institution, and not upon their being in Covenant.

And as to that place Gen. xvii. 7. *I will be a God to thee, and to thy seed*, that is, say you, the Covenant was made with Abraham, as a believer, and so with all believers and their seed. To which I answer; The Covenant was not made with believers, and their seed; but with Abraham and his seed. Now Abraham is to be considered under a double relation.

First, as the father of the Jews, his fleshly seed.

Secondly, as he is the father of his spiritual seed, both Jews, and Gentiles; Rom. iv. 11, 12. Now to both seeds, doth God promise to be a God, but in a different manner and respect.

First, he promises to be a God to his fleshly seed, in giving to them the land of Canaan for an inheritance, the promise of which is expressly called the Covenant made with Abraham, and his seed as on God's part, Psalm cv. 9, 10, 11, 12 which Covenant he made with Abraham, saying, *unto thee will I give the land of Canaan, the lot of your inheritance, &c.* See also 1 Chron. xvi. 16, 17, 18 and Neh. ix. 8. This, I say, was the Covenant on God's part. And their obedience to circumcision is expressly called the Covenant on their parts, Gen. xvii. 10. *This is my Covenant which ye shall keep between me and you; Every male shall be Circumcised.* So Acts vii. 8. And he gave them the Covenant of Circumcision, and so Abraham begat Isaac, and circumcised him the eighth day. By which they stood engaged to keep all those other

additional ordinances which Moses gave them, when they were about to enter their promised inheritance as Gal. v. 3. *I testify that whoever is Circumcised is bound to keep the whole law.*

Secondly, God promised to be a God to Abraham, and his spiritual seed; such as walk in his steps, that is believers, whether Jews or Gentiles, in giving unto them an eternal inheritance Heb. ix. 15 *incorruptible and undefiled, that fadeth not away,* purchased by the blood of Jesus, and reserved for them in heaven: of which the earthly inheritance in the land of Canaan was but a type.

So, there is a twofold seed of Abraham, a fleshly, and a spiritual, typed out by Ishmael, and Isaac: and a two-fold inheritance, an earthly and a heavenly. But the heavenly inheritance was not given to the fleshly seed, but only in Types offered to them, and confirmed to the spiritual seed, who are therefore called the *heirs of promise*. Heb. vi. 17. Neither was the Covenant made with Abraham, a pure Gospel Covenant, but a mixt Covenant, consisting partly of promises of temporal blessings, of which Isaac, who is said to be born by promise, was the true and proper heir. And partly of promises of spiritual blessings, of an heavenly inheritance; and of these Jesus Christ was the true heir; and Antitypical Isaac: for as Ishmael, the child of the flesh had no right with Isaac, in the outward Typical promise; so Isaac himself, by virtue of his fleshly descent, had no right nor Interest in the heavenly inheritance, and Gospel privileges Rom. ix. 7 any otherwise than he came to have an interest in Christ.

And therefore we find the Apostle in Gal. iii. 16 expounding the word of promise (i. e.) *I will be a God to thee, and thy seed;* sheweth that the Gospel promises of Abraham's Covenant were not made to any one's fleshly seed, no, not with the mere fleshly seed of believing Abraham himself: but the promises did all run

to Christ the inheriting seed to whom they were made; and when Christ was come they all center in him: see and consider the text. *Now to Abraham and his seed were the promises made; he saith not to seeds, as of many but as of one, and to thy seed which is Christ; to Isaac in the type, but to Christ in the Antitype, and in him are all the promises yea and Amen.*

Having thus followed the promises down along from Abraham to Christ, and found them all to center in him; let us now see, to whom they came forth again: And it is not to any one's fleshly seed whatever; but from Christ they all flow forth again to believers, and only to believers, and that by virtue of their union with Christ; and therefore says the Apostle; *If ye be Christ's then are ye Abraham's seed, and heirs according to the promise*, for there is no other way to partake of the promise but by faith in Christ, Gal. iii. 22. *The Scripture hath concluded all under sin, that the promise by the faith of Jesus Christ might be given to them that believe*; where two things are observable; first, to whom the promise is given, viz. *to them that believe*; secondly, by what means, they come to partake of them; and that is, *by the faith of Christ*: so in verse the 26 *you are all the children of God, by faith in Jesus Christ; and if ye be Christ's, (that is by faith) then are ye Abraham's seed, and heirs according to the promise*: So then it seems all promises run to Christ, and from him flow forth again only to believers Which being impartially considered, is a full answer to all Arguments drawn from the Covenants, and the promise made to Abraham, and certainly and unavoidably cuts off Infants Church membership in the days of the Gospel, unless the Pœdobaptists can find a new institution for it. But for a further illustration of this, and that you may see, that this is not my opinion alone, I shall present you with some select passages that the judicious and eminent divine, Dr Owen hath upon this subject, it is in his Exercitations upon the Epistle to the Hebrews, tom. 1.

p. 55. &c. to which the Reader is referred, and which by another hand may be shortly improved; In the meantime take these few instances; Two Privileges did God grant unto Abraham upon his separation to a special interest in the old promise and Covenant.

First, that according to the flesh, he should be the father of the Messiah; the promised seed, who was the very life of the Covenant, the fountain and cause of all the blessings contained in it. That this Privilege was temporary, having a limited season, time and end appointed unto it, the very nature of the thing itself doth demonstrate. For upon this actual exhibition in the flesh, it was to cease. In pursuit hereof, were his posterity separated from the rest of the world, and preserved a peculiar people, that through them the promised seed might be brought forth in the fullness of time, and be of them according unto the flesh, Rom. ix. 8.

Secondly, together with this he had also another privilege granted unto him, namely, that his faith whereby he was personally interested in the Covenant, should be the pattern of the faith of the Church in all generations, and that none should ever come to be a member of it, or a sharer in its blessings, but by the same faith that he had, fixed on the seed that was in the promise, to be brought forth from him in the world. On the account of this Privilege, he became the father of all them that do believe; *for they that are of the faith, the same are the children of Abraham* Gal. iii. 7; Rom. iv. 11 as also *heirs of the world*; Rom. iv. 13 in that all that should believe throughout the world, being thereby implanted into the Covenant made with him, should become his spiritual children.

Answerable unto this twofold end of the separation of Abraham, there was a double seed allotted unto him. A seed according to the flesh, separated to the bringing forth of the Messiah,

according to the flesh; and a seed according to the promise, that is, such as by faith have an Interest in the promise, or all the elect of God. Not that these two seeds were always subjectively divers; so that the seed separated to the bringing forth of the Messiah in the flesh, should neither in whole, or in part be also the seed according to the promise; or on the contrary, that the seed according to the promise, should none of it be his seed after the flesh. Our Apostle declares the contrary in the instances of Isaac and Jacob, with the remnant of Israel that shall be saved, Chap. ix. 10, 11. But sometimes the same seed came under diverse considerations, being the seed of Abraham both according to the flesh and promise, and sometimes the seed itself was divers, those according to the flesh being not of the promise, and so on the contrary. Thus Isaac and Jacob were the seed of Abraham according unto the flesh, separated unto the bringing forth of the Messiah after the flesh, because they were his carnal Posterity, and they were also the seed of the promise, because by their own personal faith they were Interested in the Covenant of Abraham their father. Multitudes afterwards were of the carnal seed of Abraham, and of the number of People separated to bring forth the Messiah in the flesh, and yet were not of the seed according to the promise, nor interested in the spiritual blessings of the Covenant, because they did not personally believe, as our Apostle declares Chap. iv. of his Epistle. And many afterwards, who were not of the carnal seed of Abraham, nor interested in the privilege of bringing forth the Messiah in the flesh, were yet designed to be made his spiritual seed by Faith, that in them he might become heir of the world, and all Nations of the Earth be blessed in him. Now it is evident, that it is the second Privilege and spiritual seed, wherein the Church to whom the Promises are made is founded, and whereof it doth consist, namely in them, who by faith are

interested in the Covenant of Abraham, whether they be of the carnal seed or no.

And herein lay the great mistake of the Jews of old, wherein they are followed by their Posterity unto this day. They thought no more was needful to interest them in the Covenant of Abraham, but that they were his seed according to the flesh, and they constantly pleaded the latter Privilege, as the ground and reason of the former. It is true, they were the children of Abraham according to the flesh; but on that account, they can have no other Privilege then Abraham had in the flesh himself. And this was, as we have shewed, that he should be set apart as a special Channel, through whose loins God would derive the promised seed into the world. In like manner were they separated to be a peculiar people as his Posterity, from among whom he should be so brought forth.

That this separation and privilege were to cease, when the end of it was accomplished, and the Messiah exhibited, the very nature of the thing declares. For to what purpose should it be continued, when that was fully effected whereunto it was designed? but they would extend this privilege, and mix it with the other, contending that because they were the children of Abraham according to the flesh, the whole blessing and Covenant of Abraham belonged unto them. But as our Saviour proved that in the latter sense they were not the children of Abraham, because they did not the works of Abraham; so as our Apostle plainly demonstrates, Rom. 4:9, 10, 11 Chapters. Gal. iii. 4 Chap. That those of them who had not the faith of Abraham, had no interest in his blessings and Covenant; seeing therefore that their other privilege was come to an end with all the Carnal ordinances that attended it, by the actual coming of the Messiah whereunto they were subservient, if they did not by faith in the promised seed attain an Interest in

this of the spiritual blessing, it is evident that they could on no account be considered as actually sharers in the Covenant of God.

We have seen then that Abraham on the account of his faith and not of his separation according to the flesh, was the father of all that believe, and heir of the world. And in the Covenant made with him, as to that which concerns, not the bringing forth of the promised seed according to the flesh, but as unto faith therein; and in the work of redemption to be performed thereby, lies the foundation of the Church in all ages. Wheresoever this Covenant is, and with whomsoever it is established, with them is the Church, unto whom all the promises and Privileges of the Church do belong. Hence it was, that at the coming of the Messiah there was not one Church taken away, and another set up in the room thereof, but the Church continued the same in those that were the children of Abraham according to the faith. The Christian Church, is not another Church, but the very same, that was before the coming of Christ, having the same faith with it, and interested in the same Covenant.

It is true, the former Carnal Privileges of Abraham and his Posterity expiring on the grounds before mentioned, the Ordinances of worship which were suited thereunto did necessarily cease also. And this cast the Jews into great perplexities, and proved the last trial that God made of them. For whereas both these, namely the carnal and spiritual Privileges of Abraham's Covenant, had been carried on together in a mixed way for many generations, coming now to be separated, and a trial to be made (Mal. iii.) who of the Jews had Interest in both, who in one only, those who had only the Carnal privilege of being children of Abraham according to the flesh, contended for a share on that single account in the other also, that is in all the Promises annexed unto the Covenant. But the foundation of their plea was

taken away, and the Church unto which the promises belong remained with them, that were heirs of Abraham's faith only.

It remains then, that the Church founded in the Covenant, and unto which all the promises did and do belong, abode at the coming of Christ, and doth abide ever since in and among those who are the children of Abraham by faith.

And a little further he saith, No individual person hath any interest in the promises, but by virtue of his membership with the Church, which is and always was one and the same, with whomsoever it remains the promises are theirs: and that Not by application or Analogy, but directly and properly. The Church unto whom all the promises belong, are only those who are heirs of Abraham's Faith; believing as he did, and thereby interested in the Covenant.

So far this learned man, whose words need no comment, nor need we draw any inference, but recite his bare words, which are both perspicuous and Orthodox; clearly and fully evidencing our position, That believers only are the children of Abraham, and none but such have an Interest in the Covenant made with him, which unavoidably excludes infants from Gospel-Ordinances, until they believe in their own persons: And then, and not before, they may lay a just claim, that they are Abraham's seed, and heirs according to the promise. And if our opponents think Dr. Owen injured (as they are apt to clamour to that purpose) for our improvement of his words to our advantage, he being for Pedobaptism; we say, that they are at liberty to reconcile his words to his practice if they can, to do which they have need of a considerable stock (but they are seldom unfurnished) of artifice, and distinction, to help at this dead lift. The Dr. treating about the nature of the Covenant and promises made to Abraham, (and perhaps forgetting Infant-Baptism) opens and expounds them

with such spirituality and Orthodoxy, as leaves no room for Infant Baptism, but excludes it beyond all possibility of reconciliation; unless it can be proved, that they, viz. Infants are heirs of Abraham's faith, believing as he did; and that the promises are theirs, not by application or Analogy, but directly and properly, and by their own personal faith, which I despair ever to hear of; though Mr. B. himself, that unparalleled distinguisher, should undertake it.

Pœd. But our Ministers tells us, that when the promises are said to be made to Christ, it is not meant of Christ personally, but of Christ mystically, as in the 1 Cor. xii. 12 and so it's to be understood of the visible Church, of which infants born of believing parents are a part.

Bap. It's true these are your sayings: but, I must tell you, we must not be put off with fancies, and bare affirmations, but we expect solid proof from Scripture. And whereas you say, the promises are to be considered, as made to Christ mystically, that is, to the visible Church; the contrary appears in Gal. iii. 16 where he affirms that Christ was the seed to whom the promises were made. And in verse 19th he saith; *the law was added because of transgression, till the seed should come, to whom the promise was made*: where it is observable that the law (i. e.) the Mosaical administration, is said to be before the seed was come, and was to have its period then. Now, if by Christ the seed be not understood personally, but mystically, for the visible or invisible Church, (take which you will) then the law could not have been before the seed; for God had his Church in Abraham's family 400 years before the law was, of which Christ was the head, and they his mystical body. And so by this interpretation, the seed should have been before the law, contrary to the Apostle who makes the law to have been before the seed, and to have its period, when the

seed to whom the promise was made, was come; and now the promises running to Christ personally, God makes him over for a Covenant to the Elect, and all the promises in him. Isa. xlii. 6. So that in Christ he is our God, and in Christ, he takes us to be his people. In Christ, and a right to the promises; out of Christ, and strangers to the Covenants of promise, Eph. ii. 12. So that it is evident, that the promises, respecting the eternal inheritance, and spiritual blessings were first made to Christ personally, and in him to his mystical body, the Church, who are united to him by faith.

Secondly, as to that Scripture 1 Cor. xii. 12 *for as the body is one, and hath many members, and all the members of that one body being many, are one body, so also is Christ:* It rather seems to be meant of the invisible Church of true believers, than of the visible; for the Apostle there, calls none the body of Christ but such as had received the gifts of the spirit, and such, as by one spirit (as the concurring cause) had been baptized into one body, yea such who had received the spirit to profit withal, such, that had a real sympathy one with another, verse the 26th, *If one Member suffers all the members suffer with it, if one member be honoured, all the members rejoice with it:* All which cannot (in any tolerable sense) be applied to the visible Church, amongst whom there are many hypocrites, that never received the spirit, nor by the spirit could sympathize one with another, &c. But however, it is most certain infants are not called the body of Christ, if it be meant of the visible Church indeed, by virtue of the grace of election, some of them may be members of his mystical body, the invisible Church, but not at all members of the visible, especially from this chapter; for it is said, *if one member suffer, all the members suffer with it;* and the manifestation of the spirit is given to every one to profit withal, which cannot be applicable to infants.

For none in this Chapter are counted the body of Christ, but such as are useful to the body, as an eye, an ear, or a foot, a hand, a head, &c. as verse 21 *the eye cannot say unto the hand, I have no need of thee, nor the head to the feet I have no need of you.* So that I draw these two conclusions.

First every member in a Church stands in need of the help of all the other members.

Secondly that every member in a Church must be useful in his place to the rest of the members. But of what use are infants to the rest of the members in respect to edification?

Now this objection being answered, I hope you see plainly, that all the promises respecting spiritual blessings, and the eternal inheritance, were first made to Christ personally, and in him they are made over to his mystical body, the Church, who are united to him by faith, which being well weighed would put an end to the whole Controversy.

And in the next place you may see to what little purpose, the promise in Gen. xvii. 7 is brought to prove, that God made a Covenant of eternal life with believers and their Children.

The text speaks of a Covenant made with Abraham and his seed, it doth not say with all believers and their seed, or all Church-members and their seed, neither doth it follow by any necessary consequence, that because God made a Covenant with Abraham, and his seed, therefore he hath made a Covenant with believers and their seed; sure I am, the Apostle was of another mind, who when he expounds the Covenant Gen. xvii. 7 understands it to be made to Abraham, (as it contains Gospel blessings) not as a natural father but as the father of the faithful, both Jews and Gentiles, Rom. iv. 11, 12 he received the sign of Circumcision that he might be the father of all them that believe, and walk in

the steps of the faith of our father Abraham, so Gal. iii. 7 *know ye therefore that they which are of faith, the same are the children of Abraham*; And these only are the seed to whom the Covenant was made (in respect to Gospel privileges) and not to the natural seed either of Abraham, or of any other believers, as hath been evidently made appear before, and that beyond all Contradiction: And whoever affirms otherwise preaches another Gospel than Paul knew, and incurs that doom mentioned Gal. i. 8, 9.

Pœd. But we are told that as the Jews and their Children are broken off from the Covenant, so the Gentiles and their Children are ingrafted in, in their room, according to Rom. xi. 20 because of unbelief they were broken off, and thou standest by faith.

Bap. In answer to which, I grant there was a time, when the Jews and their children were broken off, as the Apostle saith, but there are two things to be considered. First, why they were broken off. Secondly, from what they were broken off.

1. Why? Answer. It was not because they had not believing Parents; for Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, were the fathers of them all, and upon whose account they had right to the privileges of the Covenant.

2. Not because they wanted title, for they were Abraham's seed, when they were broken off; but,

3. Because the terms of standing in the Church were now altered; and the Church itself removed: For before the Gospel came they stood members of the old Church, though as much unbelievers for many generations, as they were when they were broken off; and why did not their unbelief break them off before?

But now Abraham's Church state is at an end, and all the privileges and immunities cease; the Jewish Church must give way to the Gospel Church; the Messiah being come, and about to

build him a new house, into which none are (of right) to enter, but professed believers; and the Jews not believing now in that saviour who has the substance of the shadows, and which all their types pointed out, and whom all those ordinances signified, yea for whose sake they did enjoy their ordinances, and to which end were committed unto them the oracles of God, the giving of the law, and the promises; yea therefore was their seed counted Holy, to point out, and keep them in memory of that Holy child Jesus that was to come as the Anti-type of all these things: For the old house, or Jewish Church was not intended to abide for ever, but to the time of reformation; then the law must be changed, the priesthood changed, the privileges and ordinances changed, the seed changed, yea the Covenant changed, which they not believing, being willing to abide in the old house still, and to remain Church members upon a mere fleshly and natural birth; still crying out, Abraham is our father, and we are his seed, and are free, and were never in bondage: and here it seems they are resolved to stand; wherefore they were broken off, and that whether they would or not, by reason of their unbelief, that is, because they would not believe that the old Covenant and all the privileges thereof were ended, and the substance come, the Lord Jesus the Antitype of their types.

The second thing is, from what they were broken off?

I answer, From all the glory they boasted so much of; as the Apostle says; *thou art called a Jew, and makest thy boast of God, and trustest in the law*; but all these things are now gone, yea the Typical Adoption, the glory, and the Covenants, the giving of the law, and the service of God and the promises; all their birth-privileges, Church membership and ordinances; which continued but till the time of reformation; yea from that Covenant, which had also ordinances of divine service, and a worldly sanctuary,

which is now all abolished, as you see Heb. ix. 1, 2, 3, 4 &c. And all because they did not believe in him, who was the Antitype and substance of all their shadows; but were willing to abide in the old house still, and loath to lose their outward privileges, their worldly sanctuary, their ordinances and Church membership upon the account of Abraham's faith, for it was indeed an easy service, a flesh pleasing religion, (if salvation could have been obtained by it) notwithstanding the bondage and laboriousness of some services, yet how willing would the carnal Jew have born all, if he might have been saved by the faith of another, rather than to lose all the righteousness of the law, and to count his circumcision, and Church membership as dung to win Christ, as Paul did when converted, and be found in him only, not having his own righteousness which is of the law, but that which is by faith in Jesus Christ.

Thus you see why the Jews are broken off, and from what. But they are not all broken off from the Gospel Covenant, for there is yet a remnant according to the election of grace, and as many of them as believe, and repent of their sins shall be admitted to the more easy, and more excellent privileges of the Gospel Church membership and ordinances, and *shall be a pillar in the Temple of God, and shall go no more out.*

Besides, we see many of the Jews have been converted, and shall be more generally in the later days.

And if you say, May not the children of the Jews, be broken off from the Gospel Covenant? I answer.

They are no more broken off, then the children of the Gentiles; for those that die in infancy, as many as belong to the election of grace shall be saved: if they live to years of discretion, and then believe they shall be saved, as soon as any children of believing Gentiles.

But if the children of the Jews, be broken off from the Gospel Covenant, it is either because of their parents unbelief, or their own personal unbelief. If it be merely their parents unbelief, then if any do believe in their own persons they cannot be admitted, because of their parents unbelief, for that which cuts them off, will keep them off; and so the parents unbelief keeps the children from the Gospel Covenant, and so, is the cause of their damnation, for *causa causæ, est causa causati*. But where do we find that children shall be damned for the sins of their parents; the Scripture saith, *the soul that sins shall die*.

And if you say the Jews unbelief doth not keep their children from the Covenant of grace, but only from the administrations of it, as Baptism, &c. I answer, that according to your principles, it amounts to the same thing, for you say out of the Church no salvation.

But if you say their parents unbelief keeps them out of the Church, only during their infancy, when they come to years, if they believe, they may be admitted: Then it will follow that such children of the Jews, yea of all unbelievers that die in infancy are in a miserable condition, their case is deplorable, for their parents (*secundum te*) can have no hopes of their salvation. Poor souls! had you lived a while longer, you had been in the Covenant of grace, and enjoyed the privileges thereof, but merely because of your parents unbelief you are cut off while you are infants.

But if this be true, parents have cause to mourn to the breaking of their loins, when their children die. But David was of another mind, who when his child died, rejoiced though it died on the seventh day, the day before circumcision, and that not without hopes of its good estate, as learned men conceive; for he said, I shall go to that, but that shall not return to me; which is not meant

only of going to the grave, but to a state of happiness, for our going barely to the grave, is no cause of comfort.

Pœd. But we are told, that Circumcision was a great privilege, as the Apostle saith Rom. iii. 1. What advantage is there of Circumcision? much every way; and therefore, to be broken off, was their misery.

Bap. It's true the Apostle propounds that question, what profit is there of Circumcision? his meaning is, that there was a time when they had advantage by circumcision, and the main was, that Christ should come of their flesh; *of whom, as concerning the flesh Christ came*. But this and all other advantages are ceased, and now it is a mercy rather than a misery, (though they thought otherwise) to be broken off from the Covenant of Circumcision; and that it is so I shall make appear from these Arguments.

1. If standing in the Covenant of Circumcision, did keep up the expectation of Christ to come, and so deny him to be already come in the flesh, then their breaking off from that Covenant was a mercy not a misery.

But the Antecedent is true, Ergo, so is the consequence.

2. If while the Jew and his seed now stand in the Covenant of Circumcision, Christ did profit them nothing: then to be broken off from that Covenant is a mercy, not a misery.

But the Antecedent is true Gal. v. 2. *If ye be circumcised Christ shall profit you nothing*, (that is if you now continue in the old Covenant) Ergo, so is the consequent.

3. If while the Jew and his seed stand in the Covenant of Circumcision, they go about to establish their own righteousness, and do not submit to the righteousness of God: then to be broken off from the covenant is a mercy not a misery.

But the antecedent is true, Rom. x. 3 &c. Ergo, so is the consequent.

4. If the standing in the Covenant of Circumcision did oblige them to keep the whole Law, then their breaking off is a mercy, not a misery. But the Antecedent is true; Gal. v. 3. *I testify*, says Paul, *that every one that is Circumcised is bound to keep the whole law.*

Ergo, so is the consequent.

5. If while the Jews stand in the Covenant of Circumcision they cannot be justified in the sight of God; then to be broken off is a mercy not a misery.

But the Antecedent is true, Gal. iii. 11. Ergo, so is the consequent.

Thus it appears that though the Jews thought it a misery to be broken off from the old Covenant from Circumcision and Church membership, from the privilege of being Abraham's seed; yet it was indeed their mercy if they did believe and embrace the Gospel; for now they are delivered from all their yokes, and cruel bondage, yea, from the curse of the law; for Christ hath redeemed as many of them as believe from the curse of the law, being made a curse for them.

Obj. And if it be objected, then their unbelief was a mercy.

Answer. It doth not follow that because their breaking off was a mercy, therefore the means by which, was a mercy, for the death of Christ was a mercy, but the means of effecting it was not so; for they did it by wicked hands.

But had the Jews believed, they would willingly have broken off themselves, but because they did not, they were broken off, contrary to their own wills, (though for their good). For though it be not a mercy for any person to be broke off from any mercy

God gives, during the time it is to be enjoyed; But if greater privileges be offered, and they shall adhere to the worse, (and there being a period put to the former) then 'tis their mercy rather than their misery to be forced out whether they will or no: as it is a mercy for a man to live in his own house, and enjoy the benefits and privileges thereof; But if that house be like to fall upon his head, it is his mercy to be forced out of it, whether he will or not. So Lot would willingly have stayed in Sodom, for the text saith he lingered, but God being merciful unto him, forced him out, so the Jews would have stayed longer in the old Covenant, but God being merciful unto them, took away all their privileges, and concluded them all under sin, and made them all as well as Gentiles guilty before God, that he might have mercy upon all.

Pœd. But if Circumcision and all the Jews privileges did hold out Christ to come in the flesh, then they should have been broken off as soon as Christ came, but they were not.

Bap. It's true they were not broken off de facto, but de jure they were; but Christ was yet gracious to them, and tendered the Gospel first to them as you have heard, saying, he was not sent but to the lost sheep of the house of Israel, and a considerable time after the Apostles preached to the Jews, till they contradicting and blaspheming, Paul said; It was necessary the word of God should be first spoken unto them *But seeing you put it from you, and so judge your selves unworthy of eternal life, lo, we turn to the Gentiles*, whence we may observe.

1. How tender the Lord Jesus and his Apostles were to these people, and that because they had all the types of Christ coming in the flesh, and the shadows of good things to come, and it was a great pity that *Israel hath not obtained that which he seeketh for*, and that they which *followed after the law of righteousness have not obtained the law of righteousness*.

2ndly. We may observe that they broke off themselves, yet not all, the Apostle saith, 'tis but some of the branches are broken off, that is, some of Abraham's seed, for *blindness is but in part happened to Israel*; And they also if they abide not in unbelief shall be grafted in again.

So then it is a great mistake to think that all Israel, and their seed are broken off from the Gospel Covenant, and the Gentiles and their seed come in their room, and so their children do enjoy Church privileges, as membership and Baptism. For the Jews, that is the whole lump of Abraham's seed, are not broken off from the Gospel Covenant, but some only that abide in unbelief, but for others of them that do believe, they have still as great a privilege, and us much a right to Gospel ordinances as any believing Gentiles in the world. 'Tis true they are all broken off from the old Covenant, *that could not give life*, that made nothing perfect, which as you have heard is their mercy rather than misery, if they could believe it.

Pœd. But me thinks, believer's Children should have some privilege above the children of heathens, or else they will lose some privilege by the coming of Christ, and the Gospel dispensation will be less than that of the law.

Bap. To which I answer,

1. That it must be proved that Baptism is any privilege at all to infants, for we must understand that ordinances are the hard part of the Covenant; and so, rather a burthen then a privilege, without faith; they are part of Christ's yoke, and though they be made easy to believers from their interest in Christ, and the hope of the recompence of reward, yet they are a burthen to the flesh, both in respect to the performance of them, and the consequences of them; yea rather a burthen and a yoke then a mercy, and a privilege, where there is no faith to make them easy. But,

2ndly. If Circumcision were a privilege, (though the Apostle calls it a yoke) it must be considered, whether our infants are capable of such privileges by Baptism, as theirs were by Circumcision: for,

1. Circumcision did assure them that Christ should be born of their loins.
2. It did inright them to the land of Canaan none of which we can expect.
3. By Circumcision you say they were accounted God's people, and this is the only thing you mean. But,

Is it so great a privilege to have the name without the nature? the shadow without the substance? We use to count that a misery rather than a mercy: and Sardis is blamed for having a name to live and was dead. Is it any benefit for a man to be counted rich when he is poor: we see Naomi's modesty is commended, who would not own the shadow without the substance; call me no more Naomi, but call me Marah.

But in the next place, you say infants unbaptized lose some privilege: I say some things that were counted privileges are lost, for it was a privilege, that all the sons of the priests were born Priests, but it is not so now. But further; It's you your selves make your children lose a privilege since the coming of Christ, and so make the new Covenant narrower than the old: And that because the faith of a believing parent, as you say, admits only your immediate children to Church membership and Baptism, but as to your children's children, they have no benefit by your faith, no admittance to Ordinances upon your account; but it was otherwise of old; the Covenant of circumcision, and the privileges of Church membership, was not only to the next generation flowing from Abraham, *but to his seed after him in their*

generations, Gen. xvii. 7 and that not only to the third and fourth generation, but to Christ's time, they enjoyed the privileges of the Covenant by virtue of Abraham's faith. But now you have narrowed the Gospel dispensation, for you allow Baptism to none but your immediate seed, by virtue of the parents faith: your children's children must come in upon another account, their parents must be actual believers or else no admittance.

But what reason you have for so doing I know not, yea, I challenge any man to give me a substantial ground, why the faith of a believer may not now as well inright his children's children to the 3rd and 4th generation to Church-membership and Baptism, as the faith of Abraham did inright his seed in their generations to the privileges of the old Covenant.

Will you say Abraham was a famous believer, and therefore had this privilege above others? These are indeed your sayings; but must we believe it therefore? where is it so said? or what necessary consequence is there from any Scripture, to enforce belief, that Abraham's personal faith shall inright him and his seed in their generations? But a believers faith in the days of the Gospel (though in some respect more excellent than that of Abraham) viz. (in reference to the Messiah already come, and Redemption completed) shall inright only his immediate children such as are born of his loins: so that you make the Gospel dispensation narrower than that of the law.

And whereas you say, if believers children are not baptized, they have no privilege above the children of heathens. I answer, That had God so appointed, that believers children should have been baptized, and unbelievers children should not, you had ground then to consider it as a privilege; but seeing there is no institution, you cannot say, they are denied a privilege: but if it be a privilege,

then (according to your practice) you run a great hazard of denying Baptism to such to whom it doth belong.

For if I should ask you, what sort of believers they are, whose children have a right to Baptism, here you would be at a loss, and must needs say, such only whom you count believers as your practice evidently proves: but it was not so of old, it was certainly known, what children had a right to Circumcision, and what had not: but if you do (as you do) baptize the children only of such parents as you count believers, then you may leave out many thousands of children that have as great a right to it as yours. For there are no persons called by the name of Christians, but do count themselves believers, yea doubtless there are many believers amongst them to whose children you deny Baptism, for, Let it be considered how many sorts there are, who count themselves believers.

1. The Papists have their believers, and they are such, as own Christ to be the son of God, and believe all the Articles of the Church of Rome, &c. amongst whom surely God hath some people, for it is said, come out of her my people.

2. The Episcopalians have their believers, that is, such whom they count so, and they are such that believe that Christ is the Son of God, that he died for sinners, and that whoever believes in him shall be saved, and so the whole nation owning and professing the faith of Christ, they baptize all their children, amongst whom there are many thousand real believers, and so their children have as much right to Baptism as yours.

3. The Presbyterians have their believers, and they are such (that is, so accounted) who own the faith of Christ, profess regeneration, and are morally righteous in their lives and conversations.

4. The Independents have their believers, and they are such who own the faith of Christ, make a personal manifestation of their faith and repentance, and so are enchurched and become members (by a Covenant) of some particular congregations.

Now pray tell me which of all these sorts of believers have right to have their children baptized? If you say all of them, then you contradict your own practice, it being famously known, that some of you will baptize none but them of your own party. But if you say those children only have right to Baptism, whose parents we count believers, then you run a hazard of denying Baptism to the children of diverse whose parents are as true believers as your selves, and so deny them the privileges of the Covenant, and in as much as in you lies occasion their damnation, as you use to tell the Baptist.

And if you say, so the Baptists themselves may keep persons from Baptism, to whom of right it doth belong, and so are equally guilty.

I answer, that cannot be, for our principles are, that no person hath right to Baptism, but he that desires it upon the profession of his faith and repentance: to such a person we do not deny it, unless his profession be contradicted by an unholy life. By all which it appears,

1. That you (practically) deny the privilege of Baptism to many that have as real a right to it, as your selves.
2. That you count the children of diverse true believers to be in no better condition than heathens.
3. You do extremely narrow the Gospel dispensation, (a fault you use, though unjustly, to charge the Baptists with) and so make the privileges of the Gospel, less than the privileges of the law; for whereas of old all the seed of Abraham, all his numerous posterity

were circumcised, and that whether their parents believed, or not, there was no questioning of their faith, no enquiry into their conversations, &c. But now you, (practically) own no children to have right to Baptism, but those whose immediate parents have given some visible demonstration of their conversion, and manifested their faith and Repentance, who are so few, that were their number reckoned up, it would not amount to one amongst a hundred of them that are true believers, in the world.

But further, if the children of believers only (as you say) have right to the Covenant and Baptism, and that of such believers as you count so; and so, their parents, only, have hope of their salvation; then what shall become of the children of unbelievers, yea of such, whom you count unbelievers? may not they make this appeal to their parents, and say? O wretched and miserable parents, that have brought forth so deplorable an off spring; other children as soon as they are born are in the Covenant of grace, and by virtue of their parents faith, have a right to Church membership and baptism, wherein they are made children of God, heirs of Christ, and inheritors of the kingdom of heaven. But wo and alas to us, that ever we were born of unbelieving parents, or at least of such that were never enchurched, nor members of any Presbyterian or Independent congregation. We are unholy, unclean, dogs that must not meddle with the children's bread, without the pale of the Church, *aliens from the commonwealth of Israel, without hope and without God in the world.* We must not be admitted to the privileges of the Covenant of grace, though diverse of our parents are professed Christians, and believe Christ crucified, &c. yet because they have not made a personal manifestation of their faith and repentance, and so joined to some Church diverse ministers will not admit us to Baptism.

But stay children, there is hope for you for all this: If you die in infancy, as many of you, as belong to the election of grace shall be saved, though ye are not baptized, and if you live to years of discretion, and understanding, if then you believe in Christ and repent of your sins, and obey the Gospel, you shall be saved as soon as they, yea upon those terms, and none other, shall those that are Baptized in their infancy be saved if they live to years of understanding.

Pœd. Well Sir I see, it is a hard matter to prove that the infants of believers have a right to the Covenant, more than the infants of unbelievers, but yet methinks they should have right to the administration of the Covenant.

Bap. In no wise; and that for the want of an institution, as you have heard, and it is answer enough to satisfy any that are willing to be satisfied: for none ever had a right to the administrations of the Covenant any otherwise then by virtue of a law; had it been otherwise of old, then Enoch, Lot, Noah, and their seed had been circumcised; and Ishmael, Esau, and others had not been circumcised: now if the natural branches, the seed of Abraham had not this privilege to be circumcised by virtue of a right, but virtue of a law, how can you expect that your infants should have a right to the administrations of the Covenant by virtue of your faith? Besides you yourselves deny one administration to your infants, but what reason you have for so doing I know not, seeing the same grace is signified in both. Will you say, because your children are not capable to examine themselves? then let them plead their own cause, and suppose they should make this Apostrophe to their parents?

O, our tender and indulgent parents, you have brought us into the visible Church as you say, and admitted us to Baptism and membership; but why must we not partake of the Lords supper,

that soul strengthening and soul-nourishing ordinance? you take care to feed our bodies daily, and that in order to our growth, and have you no pity to our souls? must they starve? the children of the Jews of old were admitted to the passover, all the males were to appear thrice in a year, and very early partook of that Sacrament, and were instructed in the use and end of it, and have we lost this privilege by this coming of Christ? besides the ancient Church did use it, for many years, and must we be kept from it till we be come of age? yea, and not then neither (notwithstanding our Baptism contrary to all Scripture precedent) unless we make a personal manifestation of our faith and repentance. Will you say, it is because we cannot examine ourselves? We answer that Scripture concerns the Adult, not us. You might as well have kept us from Baptism, because we could not believe and repent; but surely the Apostle never intended that infants should examine themselves.

Besides you say we are clean, Holy with a federal holiness, innocent, in the Covenant of grace, Church members, that we have habitual faith, and without any sin (except original) therefore there is no need of self-examination. Why then are we not admitted? will our parents faith serve to admit us to Baptism, and not to the supper? Who will unriddle this? surely we want some Alexander to cut this Gordian knot; for none will ever untie it.

But again; if infants have a right to the administration of the Covenant by virtue of the parents faith, then if the parents turn Atheists, or Apostates, the children lose their right, and are cast out from the said privileges. That it must be so appears, if we consider, Rom. xi. 20 *thou standest by faith*; (that is, say you) thou standest in the Gospel Covenant, and hast right to ordinances by virtue of their own faith; and thy children by virtue of thine.

Now this standing is not unalterable, a state which cannot be fallen from; but a changeable state from which thou mayst fall, for the Apostle adds, be not high minded, but fear. Now if thou fallest by unbelief, and so casts out thy self, thy children must needs be cast out with thee; for *ablatâ causâ tollitur effectus*, take away the cause, and the effect ceaseth: thy personal and actual faith was the ground and cause of thy Children's admittance, so then thy unbelief must disprivilege them, for so it was with the Jews when they were cut off, how many thousands of their infants were cut off with them from membership and ordinances, and remain so to this day by reason of their parents unbelief; And do you expect a greater privilege then the natural branches: the Apostle lays them in an equal balance Rom. xi. 20, 21, 22 and what ground have you to expect better; the unbelief of their parents broke off their Children: By unbelief they were broken off, and thy standing is but conditional, if thou abide in his goodness, otherwise thou shalt be cut off. By which you see what absurdities and contradictions to your own practice, your opinion leads to; if the father be cast out, the children must be cast out with him.

Thus you see that as the children of believers have no right to the Covenant of grace, more than the Children of unbelievers, by virtue of their parents faith; so, they have no right to the administration of the Covenant, for want of an institution, there being no precept nor precedent in the word of God for such a practice.

Pœd. But though there be no precept nor precedent for Infants-Baptism, yet our Ministers tells us, there is no weight in that Argument, for though we do not find it written, that Infants were baptized, (yet perhaps some were,) for a negative Argument don't conclude.

Bap. Indeed Mr. Wills says so, and Mr. Sydenham before him, and diverse of your Ministers, and here they cry, Victoria; this being their beloved Argument they so much boast of; but,

Quisquis amat ranam, ranam put at esse Dianam; but pray stay a while, and let us consider what variety is in this position, a negative Argument don't conclude.

It's true in some cases, it doth not, but in the matter of positive worship, we have the opinion of diverse able and Godly men, who have told us, that what is not commanded in the worship of God, is forbidden, and that every affirmative command of Christ includes a negative. But if it be true that a negative Argument concludes not in matters of Worship; then this had been a good plea for Nadab, and Abihu; Levit. x. who were destroyed for offering strange fire which God had not commanded, they might have said; Lord, its true thou hast not commanded this strange fire, so thou, hast not forbid it, and a negative Argument don't conclude.

So God commanded Abraham to circumcise the eighth day, but he did not forbid the 7th day, And a negative Argument don't conclude.

So in the passover God commanded a Lamb, a male of the 1st year to be eaten; but he did not forbid an ewe, or a Ram of the 2nd or 3rd year, and a negative Argument don't conclude.

So, God smote Uzzah for holding the Ark, but he might have said; Lord thou hast not forbid me to support the Ark, when the Oxen did shake it and a negative Argument don't conclude.

So, when God threatens Idolatrous Israel, for causing their sons and daughters to pass through the fire to Molech, which the Lord commanded not, neither came it into his heart Jer. xxxii. 35. Yet

they might say, though he had not commanded it, so he had not forbidden it, and a negative Argument don't conclude.

So, God hath not forbid Crucifixes, beads, Altars, praying to Saints, Images in Churches, pilgrimages, the Cross in Baptism &c. and a Negative Argument don't conclude.

So God hath not forbid unbelievers children to be Baptized, nor the children of believers to communicate in the Lords supper; and a negative Argument don't conclude.

Lastly, Bells are not forbidden to be Baptized, and a negative Argument don't conclude.

Pœd. But Mr. Wills saith that Bells are not *subjectum capax*, a subject capable.

Bap. I answer wherein lies their incapacity? Cannot a Minister sprinkle a little water upon a Bell, and use the words of Institution in as solemn a manner, as he does, when he Baptizes a child? Or are they incapable for want of an Institution? We say the same of infants.

But if he say they are not capable of the uses and ends of Baptism as men are, I answer.

If God had pleased he could have made them (by an institution) capable of some sacred usefulness, yea, capable of relative holiness, as well as Aarons bells, or the bells mentioned Zec. xiv. 20 upon whom it was written, holiness to the Lord.

But its well-known there are those in the world, who think themselves as wise as Mr. Wills that judge Bells capable subjects of Baptism, and have done so diverse ages.

Thus you see what absurdities follow from that position; But surely God is more jealous of his honour, and tender of his worth worship, then to leave it to the pleasure of superstitious persons;

And that God in all ages hath testified his unlike, yea abhorrency of will-worship, and that because he hath not commanded it. See Jer. vii. 31. *They have built the high places of Tophet,--- which I commanded them not, neither come it into my heart:* See what God never commanded, never came into his heart; and for this he threatens great judgments, in the following verses. So Ezek. xliii. 8 they have set their thresholds by my threshold, and their posts by my posts, *wherefore I have consumed them by mine anger.* But pray let us reason a little about it, and be serious in this matter. Do you think will worship is no sin? when the same person who is to perform the obedience, shall dare to appoint the laws? Implying a peremptory purpose of no further observance then may consist with the allowance of his own Judgment, whereas true obedience must be grounded on the Majority of that power, that commands, not on the judgment of the subject or benefit of the precept proposed. Divine laws require obedience, not so much from the quality of the things commanded, as from the Authority of him that institutes them: We are all servants of God, and servants are but living instruments, whose property is to be governed by the will of those, in whose possession they are. Will-worship and superstition, well may they flatter God, they cannot please him. He that requires us to deny ourselves in his service, doth therein teach us, that his commands stand rather in fear then in need of us; in fear of our boldness, lest we abuse them, not in need of our judgment to polish or alter them.

The conquest of an enemy against the Command of his General, cost a Roman gentleman his life, though his own father were the Judge. Chris. in Rom. Hom. 2.

And the killing of a Lion contrary to the laws of the Kings hunting (though it were only to rescue the King himself) cost a poor Persian his head. Brisson. de Reg. Pers. lib. 1.

So the overwise industry of the Architect in bringing not the same but a fitter piece of timber, than he was commanded to the Romish Consul, was rewarded with nothing but a bundle of rods. So jealous and displeas'd are even men themselves to have their own laws undervalued by the private judgments of those, who rather interpret than obey them.

And therefore we find that those men who erected the Fabrics of superstition and will-worship, yet endeavour'd to derive the original of them from some divine Revelations, And the Roman Captain Scipio, before the undertaking any business, would first enter the Capitol, and pretend a consultation with the God's. And generally in all the Roman sacrifices, the Minister or servant was to attend a command before he was to strike the beast that was offered.

Semper agatne? rogat, nec nisi jussus agit. Ovid.

Horrible then, and more than heathenish, is the impiety of those, who mixing human inventions and appointments of their own with the institutions of God, and imposing them as divine duties, with a necessity of obedience, do by that means take Christ's divine prerogative out of his own hands, and so make themselves joint Authors of his Sacraments; yea rather indeed the destroyers of them; For he that practices an Ordinance otherwise then Christ hath instituted, doth not honour the Ordinance but an Idol of his own making.

This the Apostles durst not do; they tell us they declared unto them the Counsel of God; but nothing else. And Paul tells the Corinthians, he delivered nothing unto them, but what he had received from the Lord, 1 Cor. xi. 23 and sure he did not receive Infants-Baptism from the Lord; for he never declares it unto them.

This therefore should be a boundary to Ministers, that they deliver nothing to the people, but what they have received from the Lord. That faith that was once delivered to the Saints must be preached and contended for, but nothing else: and if Ministers have not received Infants-Baptism from the Lord, and if they cannot prove that it was once delivered unto the Saints, it is not to be preached. It is sad to think how full our pulpits are of vain traditions and human mixtures; as if the all-wise God wanted the help of dimey'd man to mend his worship by mixing their Inventions with God's institutions. But as to mixtures they are useful only for these two purposes; either to slacken and abate something that is excessive; or to supply something that is deficient: And so all heterogeneous mixtures do plainly intimate, either a vitiousness to be corrected, or a defect to be supplied: Now it were great wickedness to charge any of these upon the pure and perfect word of God, and by consequence to use deceit by adulterating of it; either by such glosses as diminish and take away the force of it, or by the addition of human Traditions as argue any defect. So that to stamp any thing (of but an human original) with a divine character, and obtrude it upon the consciences of men; to take any dead child of ours, as the harlot did, and lay in the bosom of the Scripture, and father it upon God; to build any Structure of ours in the road to Heaven, and so stop up the way; is one of the highest, and most daring presumptions that the pride of man can aspire unto: To erect a throne in the consciences of his fellow creatures, and to counterfeit the great seal of heaven for the countenancing his own forgeries, is a sin most severely provided against by God, with special prohibitions and threatenings: see Deut. xii. 32. *What thing soever I command you, observe to do it, thou shalt not add thereunto, nor diminish from it.* So Deut. xviii., xx. *The prophet that shall speak a word in my name, that I have not commanded, even that prophet shall*

die. So Jer. xxvi.: 2 and Prov. xxx. 6. Add not unto his words, lest he reprove thee, and thou be found a liar.

And that will-worship is so great a sin, we have the testimony of that learned man M. Greenhill in his exposition upon Ezekiel, where he hath these Observations, fit to be written with the point of a Diamond, upon the heart of every Christian.

1. That men love to have something of their own in worship, they are not content with what the infinite wise God commands them, but will be adding. The second Commandment shews that man is prone to be meddling, and making something in Worship till he marrs all. Israel provoked God to anger with their Inventions: Psalm cvi. 29.

2. God is not pleased with any thing in worship which is not his own. It is not the works of men's hands, nor their heads that are pleasing to him; that which pleases God must come from God, what he appoints he approves, and nothing else.

3. That will-worship and mixtures of man's inventions with God's pure ordinances, are the great Canons that batter Cities, and the Gunpowder that blows them up.

These bring the Lord of hosts to war against them; it was the Calves that wounded Israel, and laid their Cities wast. Hos. x. 5 *the Inhabitants of Samaria shall fear, because of the Calves of Bethaven.*

4. That false worship doth grieve God Ezek. vi. 9. *I am broken with their whorish heart*, their superstitious and corrupt mixtures, did not simply displease God, but oppressed, afflicted, and broke his heart. Great injuries enter deep, and eat up the spirits of any they are done unto; and what greater wrong can be done to God then to set at nought his Counsels, forsake his worship, and impose that which he never commanded; yea it draws away the

heart of men from God: and therefore they are said to go a whoring from God by their own inventions.

5. Will-worship is a work of darkness Ezek. viii. 12. See what the Ancients of the house of Israel are doing in the dark.

6. Will-worship is that which God will not honour with his presence. Neither Christ nor the Angels will be present at it, as Ezek. ix. 2. The six men in the vision that came into the Temple stood beside the brazen Altar; they had made a golden Altar, thinking that would please God better, but they would not come at it, but stood by the brazen Altar which was of God's appointment. Hæc ille.

Thus you see that will-worship is a horrible sin; and methinks you should examine whether Infant Baptism be not will-worship, as having no institution: and if it be will-worship, it is not only evil in itself, but stands aggravated with this circumstance, that it makes void the commandment of God; for will-worship doth usually oppose some part of God's true worship (as Infants-Baptism doth believers Baptism in these nations) as Christ told the Pharisees; *you make void the Commandments of God by your Traditions.*

Pœd. But these persons you mention in Ezekiel, against whom God threatens such Judgments were Idolaters: And I hope you do not count Infant-Baptism Idolatry.

Bap. That Infant-Baptism is will-worship and Superstition is evident. But whether it be Idolatry? I leave that to enquiry.

But I shall give you the Definition of Idolatry, as we have it from our Protestant Divines; which, say they, is to worship a false God, or the true God in a false manner. And that appears from the Second Commandment, where all kind of Idolatry is forbidden, as all sin is forbidden in the ten Commandments, though not in

express words, yet in the meaning thereof; For it is a received Maxime, That all sins forbidden by the word, are reducible to the 10 Commandments, and fall under the prohibition of one of them, or other: For upon the two tables of the law, hang all the law and the prophets, Math. xxii. 40. Now it is plain, all sins are not contained in the letter of the Commandments; and therefore we must open the later by Synechdoche's, and Metonymies; Synechdoches do comprehend all sins of the like kind, and all the degrees thereof: and Metonymies do comprehend all causes, and means, and occasions thereof; so that for opening the 2nd. Commandment, which forbids both making and the worshipping any image or similitude, it is requisite to consider in what sense or respect Images or similitudes are forbidden.

Images or similitudes then, are forbidden, not as Objects of worship, for all false objects of worship, are the false God's forbidden in the first Commandment: but Images and similitudes are forbidden in the 2nd Commandment, not as false objects or worship, wherein the worship of God is terminated; but as false means of worshipping the true God. The Golden Calf was not considered as the God of Israel, but as an Image of that Jehovah, which brought them out of Egypt; whence it is said that Aaron proclaimed a feast, not to the Calf, but to Jehovah, whereof the Calf was an Image: the Calf then was not the God, but an Image of that God they worshipped, as that which resembled him, and put them in mind of him.

And then further, the Image forbidden in the 2nd Commandment, is, not only a false means of worship devised by man; but a false manner also: and therefore when the Samaritan-strangers knew not the manner of worshipping God in the Calves of Jeroboam, it is said they knew not the manner of the God of the Country, 2 Kings xvii. 26 and one of the Priests was sent to teach them the

manner of fear (or worship) of Jehovah; and so they feared Jehovah after the same manner that was in serving him after their own devising.

So that under this one kind of false worship is forbidden by a Synecdoche not only all worship of God in carved, molten, or painted Images (all bodily representations) of God; but all spiritual Images too, which are the Imaginations and inventions of man, whether they be ordained for worship, as the high places, and the devised feast of the eighth Month 1 Kinga xii. 33. or whether they be brought in, and used as helps and means of worship, as the strange fire of Nadab Lev. x., and David, new Cart to carry the Ark; he did not make a new Ark, but a new cart; which devise of his, there being no command for it, fell under the condemnation of the second Commandment. And so all Images and Imaginations of men, all forms and manner of worship, devised by man, and not ordained by God are forbidden as Idolatrous.

Pœd. But Sir if your way be true, is it not strange, that so many learned men should be of a contrary opinion?

Bap. No, it is not more strange then that there are so many learned men against the Protestant Religion; and especially against your practice of baptizing the children of believers only, and upon those grounds you do it; for the whole Christian world (as it's called) of learned men are against your grounds of baptizing Infants, for they administer Baptism for the taking away of Original sin, and to confer grace, and that not restrained to such believer's Infants, as you do it, but to the Infants of all persons in the nations where they live: so that your opinion is a very novelty.

2. But Secondly, it is not strange if you consider what Christ saith, Math. xi. 25. *I thank thee O father, that thou hast hid these things from the wise and prudent, &c. Even so because it seemed good*

in thy sight. There is the reason given, it is, beneplacitum, his good pleasure.

3. And Thirdly, I answer; we have not been without the testimony of learned men, not only in this, but in former ages; for it is well known that Infant-Baptism was very early opposed, and for any thing I know as soon as it was born, for no Antiquity mentions Infant-Baptism to have any peaceable being in the world any long time before it was opposed; and if it be said it was not opposed at the beginning as soon as we heard of it in the world. It may be so, for Christ saith, *while the servants slept the evil ones sowed tares*; and surely it was a sleepy time amongst Christians when it came in, but when they began to awake, they opposed it.

Besides all this, we have the testimony of some of your own party, whose tongues and pens God hath (at least) so over-ruled, that they have born a famous testimony for our practice.

First Doctor Taylor saith, This indeed is true Baptism, when it is both in the Symbol, and in the mystery; whatsoever is less than this, is but the Symbol only and a mere ceremony, an opus operatum, a dead letter, an empty shadow, an instrument without an agent to manage it.

2ndly, Baptism is never propounded, mentioned, or enjoined as a means of remission of sins, or of eternal life, but something of duty, choice and sanctity is joined with it, in order to the production of the end so mentioned.

3rdly, They that baptize children make Baptism to be wholly an outward duty, a work of the law, a carnal ordinance, it makes us adhere to the letter, without regard of the spirit, and to relinquish the mysteriousness, the substance, the spirituality of the Gospel, which Argument is of so much the more consideration, because under the spiritual Covenant, or the Gospel of grace. If the

mystery goes not before the Symbol (which it doth, when the Symbols are consignations of grace, as the Sacraments are) yet it always accompanies it, but never follows in order of time; and is clear in the perpetual Analogy of Holy Scripture.

4thly. That the words mentioned in St. Peters sermon Acts ii. (which are the only Records of the promises) are interpreted upon a weak mistake: the promise belongs to you and your children, therefore Infants are actually receptive of it in that capacity: That is the Argument, but the reason of it is not yet discovered nor ever will, for (to you and your children) is to you, and your posterity, to you; and your children when they are of the same capacity, in which you are, receptive of the promise, but he that whenever the word children is expressed, understands Infants, must needs believe that in all Israel there were no men but all were Infants, &c.

5thly. From the action of Christ blessing infants, to infer, that they were Baptized, proves nothing so much, as that there is want of better Arguments: for the conclusion would with more probability be derived thus—Christ blessed Children, and so dismissed them, but baptized them not: Therefore Infants are not to be baptized. But let this be as weak as its enemy; yet that Christ did not Baptize them, is an Argument sufficient that he hath other ways of bringing them to heaven than by Baptism. And we are sure God hath not commanded infants to be baptized, so we are sure God will do them no injustice, nor damn them for what they cannot help, viz. if the parents baptize them not.

Many thousand ways there are by which God can bring any reasonable soul to himself; but nothing is so unreasonable, because he hath tied all men of years of discretion to this way, therefore we of our own heads shall carry Infants to him that way without his direction: The conceit is poor and low, and the action

consequent to it bold and venturous. Let him do what he pleases with infants, we must not.

1. Then Mr. Baxter saith, if there can be no example given in Scripture of any one that was baptized without the profession of a saving faith, nor any precept for so doing; then must we not baptize any without it: But the Antecedent is true: therefore so is the Consequent.

2. Christ hath instituted no Baptism but what is to be a sign of present Regeneration; but to men that profess not a justifying faith, it cannot be administered as a sign of present Regeneration; therefore he hath instituted no Baptism to be administered to such.

3. If it be the appointed use of all Christian Baptism to solemnize our Marriage with Christ, or to seal and confirm our union with him; then must we baptize none that profess not justifying faith; but the Antecedent and consequent are evident, Gal. iii. 27, 28, 29.

Doctor Hammond saith, that all men were instructed in the fundamentals of faith anciently before they were permitted to be baptized.

The Lord Brookes saith; That the analogy which Baptism now hath with Circumcision in the old law, is a fine rational Argument to illustrate a point well proved before: But I somewhat doubt, whether it be proof enough for that which some would prove by it, since (besides the vast difference in the ordinance) the persons to be Circumcised are stated by a positive law, so express, that it leaves no place for scruple: But it is far otherwise in Baptism, where all the Designation of persons fit to be partakers, for ought I know are such as believe, &c.

Pœd. But Mr. Wills, and others say, that Doctor Taylor did but personate an Anabaptist, he himself was for Infants Baptism, only he gave some weak Arguments to please the Baptists.

Bap. It's true Mr. Wills and others say so: But must it needs be as they suppose? Does it follow infallibly that the Doctor does prevaricate in his first book? is it not possible that he might be under some measure of conviction, and so receded from the opinion he was once persuaded of, and fell from that truth he so strenuously contended for? The Galatians once received the Gospel, but were so foolish as to fall from it. Besides how frequently do we find divers of the fathers contradict themselves, and to build again the things that they destroyed? But we need not go so far: Mr. Baxter himself is a famous instance: How often does Mr. Baxter contradict Mr. Baxter? and is it impossible Doctor Taylor should do so.

But you'll say he wrote another book, wherein he submitted to the Judgment of the Church in the matter of Baptism. It's very like he did, and perhaps he was of the opinion of a Popish-priest who told me; There was indeed no Scripture for baptizing infants, but yet it ought to be done, because the Church commanded it. He spake what many think.

But suppose the Doctor did, as you say, only personate an Anabaptist, and make use of some weak Arguments to please them. Then,

1. I wonder Mr. Wills or some other have not answered the Doctors weak Arguments all this while; for none that ever I heard of durst enter the lists with the Doctor in the matter. And to say, he did it by his contrary practice, is a frivolous answer.
2. But secondly, grant all to be true that you would have, and that the Doctor was not against baptizing infants (which we grant) nor

Mr. Baxter, nor Doctor Hammond, &c. Yet we make use of their Arguments to a very good purpose, viz. to set off the wisdom, goodness, and power of God, who as he hath the hearts of all men in his hands; so also their tongues, and can, when he pleases, make use of them to bear witness to, and proclaim that truth, they neither owned, nor practiced; as in the case of the High-priest, who prophesied, that it was expedient, one should die for the people: so we say, God hath over-ruled the tongues and pens of Doctor Taylor, Mr. Baxter &c. and made them to bear so famous a Testimony to his truth, and strike so deadly a wound to Infants Baptism, that whoever shall go about to heal it, will prove themselves physicians of no value.

Pœd. But pray Sir what do you say to Rom. xi. 16. *If the first fruit be Holy, the lump is Holy; and if the root be Holy, so are the branches.* From whence, we are told, this inference may be drawn, that as Abraham (considered as a root) was Holy, so were his children and so to be Circumcised. So Believers being Holy, their Children are so, and so to be Baptized.

Bap. There hath been enough said to shew the fallacy of this consequence: But that you may have no cause to complain, I shall speak further to it; first, then you must know, that the Apostles purpose is to shew what Abraham was heretofore, a Holy root to his natural seed; but you will not say, he is so now; and that his children after the flesh are still Holy, for they are cut off: And that he is not a Holy root to the Infants of believing Gentiles, and that they are none of his branches, is abundantly proved: but if you say he is a Holy root to believers, his spiritual seed, and they are Holy; then we are agreed. For surely the Apostle intends nothing else, but that as Abraham was a two-fold father, so he had a two-fold seed; so he is a two-fold root, and hath two sorts of branches.

His first sort of branches were Holy with a typical ceremonial holiness; his second sort are Holy by believing as he did, and walking in his steps. But to pursue your consequence a little further; that a believer (considered as a root) being Holy, so his seed is Holy, as of old it was with Abraham.

Then you must prove, that what was promised to Abraham, and what was his privilege; just so it is with believers and their seed, and herein we expect plain Scripture proof, and not forced consequences, and groundless *non sequiturs*.

But Secondly; If the natural seed of believers be Holy, what kind of holiness is it? surely you do not mean moral holiness which is opposed to sin, and that they have some inward quality, inherent habit, or principle of grace in them, more than unbelievers infants.

Secondly, you do not mean negative holiness, for there is as much also of that in unbelievers infants as in yours. But,

Thirdly, perhaps you mean a Covenant holiness; but what kind of holiness that is, we could never yet learn from you.

But if believer's natural seed be Holy, with a Covenant holiness, as Abraham's were; then you must baptize all their children's children in their several generations (as you have heard) whether their parents believe or not; as it was of old: Abraham's branches, yea all his branches were Holy to the 3rd, and 4th, yea the 10th. generation, and so must yours be, and so to be baptized; If the Grandfather or great-grandfather were, or further removed: he was the root and his posterity are the branches, as well as his immediate infants, and so to be baptized. And if you say 'tis hard to find whether their progenitors were believers so far remote; then 'tis but going a step higher to Noah; and his faith will serve

to Baptize the whole world, for Noah considered as a believer is as well a root as Abraham.

But that there is no kind of holiness in the natural seed of believers more than in the seed of unbelievers now under the Gospel appears from these Arguments.

1. If there be no persons in the days of the Gospel, to be accounted common or unclean, that is unholy (by nature) more than others; then there are no persons to be accounted clean or Holy (by nature) more than others: but the antecedent is true, Acts x. 28. *God hath shewed me that I should not call any man common or unclean:* Ergo so is the consequent.

But they that baptize Infants break the command of God to Peter, by counting the children of unbelievers common and unclean, and the children of believers clean or Holy.

But if the children of believers be Holy with any kind of holiness above others: Then the children of unbelievers are unholy, with some kind of unholiness more than others, and so to be accounted common and unclean.

But this is not so, for believers children are by nature children of wrath as well as others, as your selves confess. Therefore, call nothing, no men, or species of men, common or unclean; *for in every nation, he that fears God and works righteousness shall be accepted.* Observe, divine acceptation comes in upon the account of actual and personal righteousness; no persons nor their seed are now accepted for the holiness of another (rather than others.)

2ndly, If God be now no respecter of persons, then there is no birth holiness, and so no peculiar privileges belongs to believers natural seed by God's appointment, more than to the seed of unbelievers: but the first is true Acts x. *I perceive* saith Peter, *that God is no respecter of persons:* therefore, so is the latter.

And that Peter meant this of birth holiness, and natural privileges is evident, because he mentions this as the result of his vision, where he was forbid to count any man common or unclean that is, more than others by nature, for *God is no respecter of persons*. It's true all men are (by nature) common and unclean, in opposition to moral cleanness, and Gospel-holiness: but no sort of persons are by nature clean, or Holy, with any kind of ceremonial, dedicative, or Covenant holiness above others. But,

3rdly. If there be a Covenant holiness now, in the days of the Gospel, flowing from the root to the branches; then God would rather have continued his Church in the posterity of believers (as of old); but he hath not done so; therefore there is no such holiness.

We read in the Second of the Acts of 3000 baptized, and afterwards 5000. The greatest part of which were believers, and the 7 Churches of Asia; and (as you say) their children Holy, with a Covenant holiness: It is strange then the Church was not continued in their posterity: but it was not, for I suppose it is hard, if not impossible to find any one of their off-spring a member of any true Church in the world.

So the Church of Rome, once a true Church: But you do not count the present Church so, why? they had believing parents, who were in Covenant, and their seed Holy, yet God did not think fit to continue them a true Church any long time; But hath rather raised his Church out of the posterity of unbelievers and longer continued them. As in this nation; our progenitors were all Idolaters as the Britains, Romans, Saxons, Danes, and Normans; The off-spring of some of whom we are: yet God hath continued his Church amongst us a very considerable time. But if we boast of our Covenant holiness and birth privileges, God may soon

unchurch us, and raise up Church members out of stones, as John the Baptist told the Pharisees.

4thly. There is no such Covenant holiness under the Gospel; because that holiness was a Typical Ceremonial holiness, such as was in beasts, birds, Garments, oil, the Altar, temple, yea in the whole land, and therefore called Emanuel's land, and no other kind of holiness was in the seed: (let Pedo-Baptists say what they will) all which holiness is now abolished and done away, and that appears thus.

If all uncleanness, and unholiness that was in some beasts, birds, garments, oil, Altars, Temples, and men &c. be now abolished and done away; then all that cleanness and holiness that was in some beasts, birds, garments, men &c. is also abolished, and done away: But the Antecedent is true Acts x as appears by Peter's vision; *what God hath cleansed, call not thou common or unclean*, Ergo, so is the Consequent.

And that there was an uncleanness, commonness, and unholiness in some men, as well as in beasts, birds &c. is evident: For it was not lawful for a Jew to eat with him that was a Gentile. But now it is not so—If an unbeliever invite thee to a feast, if thou be disposed thou mayest go. 1 Cor. x. 25. And that all this Typical, dedicative denominative holiness is now abolished appears further;

Because that holiness that sanctified the Jews land, City, Temple &c. was Ceremonial only, and so abolished; but that holiness which sanctified the seed was the same and no other, that sanctified the land: therefore that holiness which sanctified the seed is now abolished.

And if it be said, that the holiness of the seed was not typical and Ceremonial, I prove it thus.

1. If all things under the law were but a figure, and shadow of good things to come; then the holiness of the seed was but a figure and shadow of good things to come; And so a type.

But the Antecedent is true, as we find in the 9th and 10th Chapters of the Hebrews; where all things under the law, all the privileges of the old Covenant, all the perquisites, dependences and appurtenances are called by such names, as make them evidently appear to be Typical: as first they are called a figure Heb. ix. 9 which was a figure for the time then present. So verse 24. *For Christ is not entered into the Holy place made with hands, which are the figures of the true.*

They are called a pattern Heb. ix. 23. *It was necessary that the patterns of the things in the heavens &c.*

3. They are called a shadow Heb. x. 1 *for the law having a shadow of good things to come, and not the very Image of the things.*

So then the holiness of the seed being a dependence, an appurtenance, a privilege of the law, or old Covenant was but a figure, pattern, shadow; and so Typical, and abolished.

And if you say, if the holiness of the seed was a Type; what did it typify? I answer:

1. First it typified the holiness of Christ who is called the Holy child Jesus.

2. It was a type of the holiness of all Abraham's spiritual seed under the Gospel, true believers, who are made Holy by believing in Christ.

Pœd. But we have heard that when the Jews were broken off, their natural Children were broken off with them; so when the Gentiles are grafted in, their Children are grafted in with them.

Bap. You have heard that the children of the unbelieving Jews was not so broken off from the Gospel Church and covenant, and excluded with their parents unbelief, for if any of the children of the unbelieving Jews when they come to years (and children when at years are the seed of their parents, I hope) if I say, those unbelieving Jewish children do believe the promise is so made to them, that their parents unbelief cannot exclude them: but if when at years they do not believe, the promise is so made to believers and their seed, as that the parents faith, avails no further than to the ingrafting of himself; but he cannot at all entitle his natural seed, by his single faith to the Gospel Covenant or ordinances: For if it be otherwise, then the natural seed of those thousands of Jews that were converted in the primitive times, have a birth privilege, and are Holy to this day, upon which they may claim admittance unto baptism as well as any; for they may plead as you do and say, Baptism is our right; we are the posterity of those believing Jews mentioned Acts ii. And if the first fruits be Holy, so us the lump, and if the root be Holy, so are the branches. Now we are the lump of these Holy first fruits; and the branches of the Holy root; yet for all this is believe you would not Baptize them, unless they did believe in their own persons. By which you do no less than grant what we contend for, that the faith of Ancestors gives no right to their posterity, to stand at all in the Gospel Church and Covenant, but faith in the particular persons. So that the Jews were broken off by unbelief; and thou and thine (O believing Gentile) must stand by faith. Yet not thy seed by thy faith, but thou, thy self, by thine, and they by their own faith. Faith is that by which (thou standing, and not thy seed) hast right to stand in the Church, and not they. But if thy seed have faith, and thou hast none, they have right to stand in the Church, and thou shalt be kept out. By which it appears, that the root may be Holy (in a Gospel sense) and not the branches, and the branches

may be Holy, and not the root: so that your consequence from Rom. xi. 16 *if the root be Holy, so are the branches*, is false, and the whole Argument vain and empty.

And if you still say (for nothing will satisfy some persons) that the natural seed may be counted Holy, with a denominative, and dedicative holiness: I answer.

1. That then the first born of every creature both of man and beast is still to be called and counted Holy; for these were sanctified and Holy by dedication as well as the seed. *Sanctify unto me all the first born of every creature both of man and beast*, they are still to be called and counted Holy, for these were sanctified, and Holy by dedication as well as the seed. See Exod. xiii. 2. Sanctify unto me all the first born, whatsoever openeth the womb, amongst the children of Israel, both of man and beast, it is mine. So that you may as well dedicate the first born still, and count them holier than therein, yea and that with better warrant than you can count the seed of believers, only, Holy, because (as you say) you dedicate them to God; there being an institution for the first, but none for the last; For God nowhere saith, that believers shall sanctify all their natural seed, whatsoever openeth the womb, for it is mine.

2ndly. If the seed be to be accounted Holy with a dedicative holiness, then you may as well count all things Holy which were dedicated of old, as Temples, Altars, Tables, Garments, Tapers, Candlesticks, yea the very windows, Fonts, Rails, Copes, Surplices, &c. But this you deny, and have laboured hard both by pen and pulpit to make these Holy things unholy: Though those that own this dedicative holiness still have more to say for Infant-Baptism, then you who disown it in all things else but in the natural seed.

But pray Sirs let me ask you a few questions.

1. *Si aliquando, quare non nunc?* If so once, why not now? If under the law, why not under the Gospel? The same question you put to us when we deny any birth holiness in your fleshly seed. So we say concerning Temples, Altars, Garments, &c. *Si aliquando, quare non nunc?* If so of old, why not now?

2ndly, *Si aliquid, quare non quicquid?* If anything Holy with a dedicative ceremonial holiness, why not every thing? yea, *quare non æqualiter?* (if you will Judaize) why not in every thing alike, as it was of old? but I may expect an answer *ad Gracas Calendas*.

Pœd. But Sir may not Infants be capable of the main and principal end of Baptism, which our Ministers tells us is the washing away our sins by the blood of Christ? If so, why may they not then be baptized?

Bap. There are not wanting learned men that are of another opinion, and say that the blood of Christ is not the main thing signified in Baptism, but that Baptism is a sign of our Regeneration; and that is the principal end of Baptism. And herein I will give you the opinion of Judicious and learned Mr. Mede upon that text Tit. iii. 5. By the washing of Water and renewing of the Holy Ghost, and shall beg the Reader's patience to read his entire sense upon that text. He saith thus.

The words, as it is easy to conceive, upon the first hearing are spoken of Baptism, of which I intend not by this choice to make any full or accurate tractation; but only to acquaint you with my thoughts concerning two particulars therein: one, from what propriety, analogy, or use of water, the washing therewith was instituted for a sign of new birth, according as it is here called λουτρὸν παλιγγενεσίας the washing of Regeneration. The other, what is the Countertype or thing which the water figureth in this Sacrament.

I will begin with the last first, because the knowledge thereof must be supposed for the explication and more distinct understanding of the other. In every Sacrament as ye well know, there is the outward Symbol or sign, *res terrena*, and the *signatum* figured and represented thereby, *res Cælestis*. In this of Baptism the sign, or *res terrena*, is washing with water: the question is what is the *signatum*, the invisible and celestial thing, which answers thereunto, In our Catechetical explications of this mystery, it is wont to be affirmed to be the blood of Christ; that as water washeth away the filth of the body, so the blood of Christ cleanseth us from the guilt and pollution of Sin. And there is no question but the blood of Christ is the fountain of all the grace and good communicated to us, either in this or any other Sacrament, or mystery of the Gospel. But that this should be the ἀντίστοιχον, the counterpart, or thing figured by the water in Baptism I believe not, because the Scripture, which must be our guide, and direction in this case, makes it another thing, to wit, the spirit or Holy Ghost; this to be that, whereby the soul is cleansed and renewed within, as the body with water is without; so saith our Saviour to Nicodemus in John. iii. *Except a man be born of water, and the spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God.* And the Apostle in the words I have read, parallels the washing of regeneration, and the renewing of the Holy Ghost, as Type and Countertype. *God (saith he) hath saved us (that is brought us into the state of salvation) by the washing of regeneration, and the renewing of the Holy Ghost:* Where none, I trow, will deny that he speaks of Baptism. The same was represented by that vision at our Saviour's baptism, of the Holy Ghost descending upon him, as he came out of the water, in the similitude of a dove: For I suppose, that in that Baptism of his, the Mystery of all our Baptisms was visibly acted; and that God says to every one, truly baptized, as he said to him, (in a

proportionable sense) *thou are my son, in whom I am well pleased.*

And how pliable the Analogy of water is to typify the spirit, will appear by the figuring of the spirit thereby in other places of Scripture; as in that of I say, I will pour water upon him that is thirsty, and clouds upon the dry ground: I will pour my spirit upon thy seed, and my blessing upon thine off-spring, where the later expounds the former: Also by the discourse of our Saviour with the Samaritan woman, John iv. 14. *Whosoever (saith he) drinketh of the water that I shall give him, shall never thirst, but the water that I shall give him shall be in him a well of water springing up to everlasting life:* By that also, John vii. 37 where on the last day of the great feast, Jesus stood and said, *If any man thirst let him come unto me and drink. He that believeth on me, as the Scripture saith* (that is, as the Scripture is wont to express it, for otherwise there is no such place of Scripture to be found in all the Bible) *out of his belly shall flow rivers of living water. But this* (saith the Evangelist) *he spake of the spirit, which they that believe on him should receive.* Nor did the fathers or ancient Church, as far as I can find suppose any other correlative to the element in baptism, but this; of this they speak often, of the blood of Christ they are altogether silent in their explications of this mystery: many are the allusions, they seek out for the illustration thereof, and some perhaps forced, but this of the water, signifying, or having any relation to the blood of Christ, never comes amongst them, which were impossible, if they had not supposed some other thing figured by the water, then it; which barred them from falling on that conceit.

The like silence is to be observed in our Liturgy, where the Holy Ghost is more hence paralleled with the water in baptism, washing and regeneration attributed thereunto; but us such notion

of the blood of Christ; and that the opinion thereof to navel, may be gathered, because some divines make it peculiar and proper thine, Calvin.

Whatsoever it be, it hath to Stimulation in Scripture, and we must not of our own heads assign significations to Sacramental types without some warrant thence. For whereas some conceive that two expressions of ῥαντισμός or sprinkling of the blood of Christ, and of our being washed from our sins in (or by) his blood, do intimate some such matter, they are surely mistaken; for those expressions have reference not to the water of Baptism in the new Testament, but to the rite and manner of sacrificing in the old; where the Altar was wont to be sprinkled with the blood of the sacrifices, which were offered, and that which was unclean purified with the same blood: Whence is that elegant discourse of S. Paul, (Heb. ix.) comparing the sacrifice of the law, with that of Christ upon the Cross, as much the better. And that whereas in the law, σχεδόν ἐν αἵματι πάντα καθαρίζεται, Almost all things are purified with blood, so much more the blood of Christ, who offered himself without spot to God, cleanseth our consciences from dead works: but that this washing, that is, cleansing by the blood of Christ, should have reference to baptism, where is that to be found? I suppose they will not allege the water and blood, which came out of our Saviours side, when they pierced him; for that is taken to signify the two Sacraments ordained by Christ, that of blood, the Eucharist; of water, baptism; and not both to be referred to baptism: I add, because perhaps some men's fancies are corrupted therewith, that there was no such thing as sprinkling, or ῥαντισμός used in baptism in the Apostles times, nor many ages after them; and that therefore it is no way probable, that ῥαντισμός αἵματος Χριστοῦ in Peter should have any reference to the laver of baptism.

Let this then be our conclusion; that the blood of Christ concurs in the mystery of baptism, by way of efficacy and merit, but not as the thing there figured; which the Scripture tells us not to be the blood of Christ, but the spirit.

And so I come to my other Query, from what property or use of water, the washing therewith is a Sacrament of our new birth, for so it is here called the washing of Regeneration; and our Saviour says to Nicodemus, *except a man be born of water, and the spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God.* For in every Sacrament there some Analogy between what is outwardly done, and what is thereby signified: therefore in this. But what should it be? It is a thing of some moment, and yet in the tractates of this mystery, but little or seldom enquired after; and therefore deserves the more consideration. I answer, this analogy between the washing with water, and regeneration lies in that custom of washing infants from the pollutions of the womb, when they are first born, for this is the first office done unto them when they come out of the womb, if they purpose to nourish and bring them up. As therefore in our natural birth, the body is washed with water from the pollutions where hath it comes into the world: so in our second birth from above one soul is purified by the spirit from the guilt and pollution of sin, to begin a new life to God-ward.

The Analogy you see is apt and proper, if that be true of the Customer whereof there is no cause to make question; for the use at present, any man, I think, knows how to inform himself. For that of elder times, I can produce two pregnant and notable testimonies; one of the Jews and people of God; another of the Gentiles. The first you shall find in the 16th Chapter of Ezekiel, where God describes the poor and forlorn condition of Jerusalem, when he first took her to himself, under the parable of an exposed Infant; *As for thy Nativity, (saith he) in the day thou wast born,*

thy navel was not cut, neither wast thou washed in water, to supple thee; thou wast not salted at all, nor swaddled at all, no eye pitied thee, none to do any of these things unto thee, to have compassion on thee; but thou wast cast out in open field, to the loathing of thy person in the day that thou wast born. Here you may learn what was wont to be done unto infants at their nativity, by that which was not done to Israel, till God himself took pity on her, cutting of the Navel string, washing, salting, swaddling: upon this place, S. Hierome takes notice (but scarce anybody else, that I can yet find) that our Saviour, where speaking of Baptism he says, *Except a man be born of water and the spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God;* alludes to the custom here mentioned of washing Infants at their Nativity.

The other testimony (and that most pertinent to the application we make) I find in a story related by Plutarch, in his *Quæsiiones Romanæ*, not far from the beginning, in this manner.

Among the Greeks, if one that were living were reported to be dead and funeral obsequies performed for him, if afterwards he returned alive, he was of all men abominated, as a profane and unlucky person; No man would come into his company, and (which was the highest degree of calamity) they excluded him from their Temples, and the sacrifices of their Gods: it chanced that one Aristinus being fallen into the like disaster, and not knowing which way to expiate himself there from, sent to the Oracle at Delphos to Apollo, beseeching him to shew him the means whereby he might be freed and discharged thereof; Pythia gave him this Answer.

ὄσσαπερ ἐν λεχέεσσι γυνὴ τίκτουσα τελεῖται, ταῦτα πάλιν τελέσαντα θύειν μακάρεσσι θεοῖσι. What women do, when one in childbed lies, That do again, so mayest thou sacrifice.

Aristinus rightly apprehending what the Oracle meant, offered himself to women, as one newly brought forth to be washed again with water; from which Example it grew a custom among the Greeks, when the like misfortune befell any man, after this manner to expiate them; they called them *Hysteropotmi*, or *Postliminio nati*: How well doth this befit the mystery of Baptism? where those who were dead to God through sin are like Hysteropotmi, regenerate and born again by water, and the Holy Ghost.

These two passages discover sufficiently the Analogy of the washing with water in Baptism, to regeneration or new birth; according as the text, I have chosen for the Scope of my discourse, expesseth it; namely, that washing with water is a sign of spiritual Infancy; for as much as Infants are wont to be washed, when they came first into the world.

Hence the Jews before John the Baptist came amongst them, were wont by this rite to initiate such, as they made Proselytes, (to wit) as becoming Infants again, and entering into a new life and being, which before they had not. That, which here I have affirmed, will be yet more evident, if we consider those other rites anciently added and used in the celebration of this mystery, which had the selfsame end we speak of; to wit, to signify spiritual Infancy. I will name them, and so conclude; as that of giving the new baptized milk and honey, *ad infantandum*, as Tertullian speaks, *ad infantiae significationem*, so S. Hierome; because the like was used to Infants New born; according to that in the 7th of Isaiah of Immanuel's infancy; *A virgin shall conceive and bear a son, butter and honey shall he eat, that he may know to refuse evil and choose good*. Secondly, that of Salt, as is implied in that of Ezekiel, *thou wast not washed with water, nor salted with salt*: That of putting on the white garment, to resemble swaddling: all

these were anciently (especially the first) used in the Sacrament of our spiritual birth, out of reference so that which was done to Infants at their natural birth; who then can doubt but the principal rite of washing with water, the only one ordained by our blessed Saviour, was chosen for the same reason? to be the element of our Initiation; and that those who brought in the other, did so conceive of this; and from thence derived those imitations.

Thus for Mr. Mede. From whom we learn these truths.

1. That it not lawful to assign significations to sacramental Types (of our own heads) without warrant from the Scriptures.
2. That in every Sacrament there is the sign, and the thing signified, *resterrena*, and *rescælestis*.
3. That in Baptism there is an Invisible and celestial thing signified.
4. That though the blood of Christ is the fountain and cause of all that grace and good we receive in Baptism, yet it is not the thing signified by the water in Baptism; but the spirit cleansing the soul from sin in the work of Regeneration, according to Tit. iii. 5.
5. That in the Baptism of Christ the mystery of all our Baptism was visibly acted.
6. That God says (to every one truly Baptized) as he said to Christ (in a proportionable sense) *thou art my beloved son, in whom I am well pleased*.
7. That there is a plain Analogy between water and the spirit, confirmed by divers Scriptures: But not so, between the water in Baptism, and the blood of Christ.
8. That the Fathers and primitive Church did not suppose any other correlative to the water in Baptism, but the spirit, though they did allude to Christ's blood for illustration thereof.

9. That in our Liturgy the water in Baptism, is made to signify the Holy Spirit in our Regeneration: But not the Blood of Christ.

10. That there was no such thing as ῥαντισμός or sprinkling used in the Apostles times, nor many ages after.

11. That the Analogy between washing with water in Baptism, and Regeneration, appears from the custom of washing infants from the pollutions of the womb, when first born, according to the practice of Jews and Gentiles.

12. That the Fathers and ancient Church did use to give the new baptized Milk and honey, and put white garments on them, to signify their spiritual birth, out of reference to that which was done to infants at their natural birth.

From all which you see that baptism is not so much a sign of purging our sins by the blood of Christ; though that concurs by way of merit and efficacy, but is not the thing there signified or figured: and then to what purpose are infants baptized?

Thus you see how this learned man (ere he was aware) hath spoiled Infant-Baptism: for if baptism be a symbol of regeneration (as undoubtedly it is) then unless you say (and that from Scripture grounds) that your infants are regenerated, or seem so to be, baptism doth not at all belong to them.

And it will no ways help you to say, that the Baptists do baptize some persons that are not regenerated; for it is enough to warrant our practice, if they profess so to be; and give us those Scripture characters, i. e. actual faith, and Repentance.

Pœd. But pray Sir what think you of the Covenant made to Abraham and his natural seed, what kind of Covenant was it?

Bap. I confess there are various opinions about it; some say it was a Covenant of grace; others, a Covenant of works, others, a mixt

Covenant: But surely that Covenant made with Abraham, and his natural seed called the Covenant of Circumcision, or Covenant of the Law was not the Covenant of Eternal life and salvation, which was made with all the elect in Christ upon the condition of faith: but a distinct Covenant of itself concerning the worship and service of God, and so may be called a Covenant of works, rather than a Covenant of grace; though there was also grace in it, as there was in all the Covenants that God ever made with men—yet we say, it was a distinct Covenant, and therefore called the old Covenant, and the Covenant of grace the new Covenant.

And if you say the Covenant of grace was the same in all ages under various administrations, we confess it, and say that the Covenant of grace was made to Adam after the fall, to the Patriarchs, and to Abraham, before the Covenant of Circumcision was mentioned, and is the same to us now. But, as ours, it's called new, (or renewed) yet it doth not follow, but this Covenant of Circumcision was a distinct Covenant still; for Abraham and all believers in that age, were in the Covenant of grace before this Covenant was made; and would have been so, if the Covenant of Circumcision had never been. And if you demand then, why the Covenant of works is called the old Covenant, and the Covenant of grace, the new?

1. I answer, because of its priority, it being the first Covenant God made with man before the fall, as Protestant Divines say; that God made a Covenant of works with Adam, concerning perfect obedience, which he had then power to perform. And some think God renewed this Covenant of works after the fall, as appears by the sacrifices that Adam, Abel, &c. offered; and from that Scripture, if thou dost well, shalt not thou be accepted; if not, sin lies at the door. And afterwards this Covenant of works or

Covenant concerning worship is renewed to Abraham, and his posterity.

2. It is called the old Covenant in respect to its deterioration, it being a Covenant found fault with, as the Scripture saith.

3. In respect to its decaying and perishing nature; it was not durable or lasting, as the Apostle saith, that which decayeth and waxeth old is ready to perish, meaning this Covenant.—And the Covenant of grace is called the new Covenant.

First, because of its meliority, or bitterness, it is more excellent, as the new heavens and the new earth that God will make will be more excellent than the old.

2. In opposition to the old, as appears Heb. viii. 8 when God says he will make a new Covenant, he adds, not according to the Covenant, when I brought your fathers out of Egypt, which was by virtue of the Covenant made with Abraham.

3. In respect to its perpetuity and duration, it is the everlasting Covenant: the Covenant made with Abraham and his natural seed is vanished and done away, but this remains, as the Apostle says: if that which was done away was glorious, how much more that which remains. That which was done away was the old Covenant, or Covenant made with Abraham, and his natural seed with all the privileges of it. And that which remains is the new Covenant, or promise of eternal life made in Jesus to all believers.

4. It is called the new Covenant, as to us, because renewed in a more Gospel and glorious manner. So that we are indeed still under the same Covenant of grace made with Adam and all the patriarchs: but not under the same Covenant of works made with Abraham and his natural seed.

But further, that you may know what the Covenant made with Abraham was, take the opinion of a late learned Author

The old Covenant (saith he) was a political Covenant made with the Jews, as Prince's compacts are with their people when they first set up Government: God promises them his protection, and that he would lead them to a fruitful land, overcome all their enemies, &c. with the like blessings. And they promise they will be ruled by him, &c. To this purpose did God in sundry ways appear to them, To Moses, to their elders, to them all in the cloud and fire, and then causes a Tabernacle to be made for him; which was a keeping house amongst them, where the sacrifices and offerings were his provisions, and the Priests his servants that lived on him. And unto that Tabernacle and Ark, might they repair for counsel and Judgment. This people then, being under a Theocracy, which Samuel does in two places expressly signify (at least unto the time of Saul) so that the Church and Commonwealth of the Jews were but one. It is no wonder if Religion be made their laws and so required of them together with other political Ordinances and statutes for their happiness and public peace as a nation.

And though in their ceremonial offerings and Priests appointments there was a remembrance still of sin; yet had they Types of Christ, of remedying mercy, and of the glory to come.

Their sacrifices as I have said serve to the maintenance of this house, the Tabernacle and Temple which he was pleased to keep up amongst them for a time, God indeed making use of these, for Types and representations of other things, that is to say spiritual, and so the law being a Pædagogy under a temporal dispensation, leading men to Christ. So far my Author.

But God hath quite pulled down this house, brake up house-keeping as we say, and turned the servants, Infants and all out of

doors Rom. xi. The natural branches are broken off—and Heb. viii. 13. *That which decayeth and waxeth old is ready to vanish.* And saith the Apostle, *if that which was done away was glorious &c.* what was that but this old house with all the privileges of it?

But now God hath built him a new house into which he hath admitted none as his household servants but believers or such as profess so to be. And these two houses are mentioned Heb. iii. 2, 3, 4 where one is called Moses' house, and the other Christ's house: As Moses was faithful in all his house. *For this man was accounted worthy of more honour than Moses; in as much as he that hath builded the house, hath more honour, than the house.* Moses was faithful *as a servant* but Christ *as a son over his own house, whose house are we, if we hold fast the confidence &c.* where the servants are also described, they are believers, not infants, hence they are also called living stones, and a spiritual house 1 Pet. ii. 3.

And that none but such are of this household appears, in that Christ the great Master of this house is compared to a king travelling into a far Country, who called his servants, (all his servants) and delivered unto them his goods, that is, Certain Talents to improve Math. xxv. 14, 15 which cannot be supposed to be delivered to infants while they want the use of reason; for these talents are presently to be improved and laid out, not laid up.

So again Christ is compared to a house-keeper who made a great supper, and invited his guests, but they were not infants, because the first that were invited made excuses. The next are compelled to come in, which supposes an unwillingness in the parties, and that they were persons capable to consent or deny. The sum of all is, that the old house the Jewish Church, with all the appurtenances and privileges of it, is pulled down, and a new one

built, into which infants are not admitted, because not invited nor appointed by any law. They were of the household of old, but it was by a positive law; shew us the like now, or you say nothing. Sure I am there is no institution that makes infants now fellow Citizens with the Saints, and of the household of God: Neither are they so to be accounted till they believe, and are able to do service in the house.

And if you say, that amongst men, infants are counted of the household though they can do no service; I answer; that comparison does not run upon four feet, it doth not follow, that, because we count our infants of our family, therefore they are to be accounted members of God's family, the Gospel Church, unless God by any institution had made them so. The household of God is called the household of faith; *do good unto all, especially the household of faith*; or a house consisting of believers: now, unless you prove your infants to be believers they are not of this house: For all the servants here must be believers either really, or Historically and professedly, which infants cannot be. And it will not help you to say the Church was (or may be) called the household of faith synecdochally, from the greatest part; for it is evident all the materials of the first Churches were adult persons, and professed believers as appears by the narrative we have in the Acts of the Apostles, the direction of all the Epistles, and divers Scriptures. Besides it may so happen that the infants may be the greatest part of a Congregation, and then where is your household of faith?

Pœd. But Mr. Wills tells us, that Mr. Baxter saith; That Infant Church membership did take place as an ordinance of God, before Circumcision was enjoined, or the Ceremonial law instituted, and why then should it cease with it? It was no part of the typical administration, but a moral institution of God even

from the beginning of the world. God ever made a distinction between the seed of the faithful and the seed of the wicked, as visibly belonging to several kingdoms of God, and of Satan. Mal. ii. 15. Therefore they are called a Holy seed. Wills page. 54.

Bap. Here is *vox* and *præterea nihil*. 'Tis true Mr. Baxter saith so; but if it be warrant enough for Mr. Wills to believe it, it is not for me. It is strange, of what authority some men's words are when they have got the estimation of Orthodox and pious; and we have no great cause to wonder at the implicit faith of the Church of Rome, when an *ipse dixit*, from an English oracle commands such credit, and vassals us to their raw and undigested dictates. But let us examine this assertion.

He saith, that Infant Church-membership did take place as an ordinance of God, before Circumcision &c. But where is that ordinance? why are we not directed to some place of Scripture where we may find it? Did God make Mr. Baxter of his Cabinet Council, and reveal it to him, and nobody else? Or in what Ancient father did he find it? Did anyone ever say so before him?

2. He saith, that it was no part of the typical Administration, but a moral institution of God &c.

I answer; there hath been enough said to prove the fallacy and novelty of this position. Therefore I refer you to what hath been written. But he saith, it is a moral institution.—We still demand, where we shall find that institution, or else we'll say, Mr. Baxter is wise above what is written.

3. He saith God ever made a distinction between the seed of the faithful, and the seed of the wicked.—But what distinction? Did God single them out, and separate them by any visible sign or character before the law of Circumcision? It is evidently known he did not.—Or did God distinguish them by his providential care

of them, or provision for them more than others? The Scripture is silent as to this also.—Or did God love them with a saving love more than the children of unbelievers? This seems to be his meaning, because of his next words—as visibly belonging to several kingdoms, of God, and Satan.

But is it so? Did all the children of believers from Adam to Abraham belong to the kingdom of God? and all the children of unbelievers belong to the kingdom of the Devil? If it be Mr. Baxter's Divinity, or Mr. Wills charity, it shall be none of mine. But he thinks to salve all with the word [visibly]. But pray when the sons of God took the Daughters of men, and all flesh had corrupted its ways, to what kingdom did they belong? Did not the seed of believers grow profane and wicked, and the seed of unbelievers pious and Godly? as appears in divers, even Abraham himself, whose father was an Idolater, as is probably supposed (he himself being bred up in Idolatry) But Mr. Baxter hath some Scripture for his warrant, and it is Mal. ii. 15—that he might seek a godly seed—But he that can find infants Church-membership in this text, and that the seed of believers did always belong visibly to the kingdom of God, and all others to the kingdom of the Devil—*erit mihi magnus Apollo*.

What though God says, he that sought a godly seed, therefore let none deal treacherously with the wife of his youth; implying that children born in lawful wedlock are this Godly seed? Let none, whether believer or unbeliever—unless you hold, that children of unbelievers may not be a godly seed.

But these are such *Non sequiturs*, that it is in vain to spend further time about them.

So that the Morality of Infants Church-membership is a very fancy. And that which Mr. Baxter drives at, can never be proved, viz. that there was a lineal successive conveyance of grace from

the parent to the child: If so, it is strange that all flesh should so soon have corrupted its ways, that God saw cause to bring the flood upon the world of ungodly.

Surely had there been any such Covenant holiness as the Pædo-Baptists dream of, before the flood; there would have been some godly society, some greater number of believers to have been preserved besides Noah and his Family, who were not all godly neither; there was a Ham among them, which would not have been if there were such a conveyance of grace and Covenant holiness from the Father to the son.

So that notwithstanding what hath been said, Infant Church-membership came in with the law of Circumcision, and went out and was repealed with it, as hath been abundantly proved. For when there was a change of the Priesthood, there was a change of the law, which must needs include Circumcision with all the appurtenances and privileges belonging to it.

Pæd. But what think you of that principle that some told, that Infants are Church-members before they are baptized? so Mr. Wills page. 27. saith.

The first and chief end of Baptism is to be the initiating sign and seal of God's Covenant, and favour to us in Christ, and not to give an entrance or admission into the Church. Unless persons are to be reputed members of the Church, they are not to be baptized: For Baptism in its own nature is the seal of our being already ingrafted into Christ, and consequently into the Church. For which he Quotes Dr. Ames. And page. 45. "We deny" saith he, "that Baptism doth give Formality, or make a man a member of a visible Church, though that Orthodox Divines have frequently termed Baptism, the Sacrament of our initiation into the Church, and have ascribed our admission or entrance into it, thereunto," page 46. To which I answer.

Bap. It seems then, that Mr. Wills is wiser than his orthodox Divines.

2. If Baptism be a sign of our being already in Christ, and so members of the Church before they are Baptized; Then I hope our children may be in Christ, and reputed members of the Church, though they are not Baptized. And then what need is there of these clamours against the Baptists for keeping their children out of the Church, and (in as much as in them lies) hindering their salvation, when they are in Christ, and members of his Church before Baptism, by virtue of their parents faith? And if you say, we deny them a privilege that is due to them; We say, we do not: Our great desire is they should be Baptized, and do instruct them in the principles of Christianity for that end; that as soon as they are capable to improve the privilege they may have it. And as for the Circumstance of time your selves say, that is not material, whether it be done on the 8th. 10th. or 20th. day, and why may not the Baptists defer it to the 20th. year, there being as much warrant in Scriptures for the one as for the other, though indeed no positive rule for either, only the time of believing is the most certain time assigned for Baptism.

3. But thirdly Mr. Wills spoils all he has said, and contradicts himself page. 229. where he saith, “that as Circumcision gave entrance into the Church of the Jews, so are believers and their seed by Baptism entered into the Gospel Church.” And it will not help him to say, that Infants by virtue of their parents faith are only members of the universal visible Church (as he calls it) before Baptism, but not of any particular Church: For he himself saith, that he that is a member of the universal Church, may at any time claim his privilege in any particular Church.

What confusion is here! sometimes Baptism gives not admittance into the Church, but they are members of the Church before as

page 27, 28. And then again that believers and their seed are by Baptism admitted into particular Churches; at another place that Baptism only admits them into the Universal visible Church. I think Mr. Wills has little hopes to reconcile the Baptists and the Pædo-Baptists, seeing he is not reconciled to himself.

But as to the principle you mention that persons may be Church members before they are Baptized: Its true Mr. Wills makes a great stir against Mr. Paul and others, whom he calls rigid Anabaptists because they cannot see any ground to admit persons to the supper before Baptism. And therefore labours hard to prove that which he confesses Orthodox divines are against, yet he would be singular, and force this novelty upon the world, which himself and but few others have of late contended for. But what would the man have? suppose a Turk or a Jew should be converted, would he admit them to the supper before Baptism? and so own them Church members, whether ever they were baptized or not? God strictly commanded of old, that no uncircumcised person should eat the passover: And what rule have you that unbaptized persons should be admitted to the supper? But he tells us this is the opinion only of some rigid Anabaptist, and thinks there to shelter himself. Indeed Mr. Jessey, and some other good men were of that opinion, that some persons might be admitted to the supper who were not yet convinced, but that their Infant-Baptism was true Baptism. But why must all others be counted rigid Anabaptists because they cannot see with other men's eyes? But this is one of the many scurrilous reflections in Mr. Wills' Book, to supply the scarcity of Argument. I could tell him of some rigid Independents, and rigid Presbyterians too, who are so far from having Communion with the Baptists, that they would pluck up such Tares (so they account them) out of the field of the world, and that before the harvest, contrary to the express words of our Saviour. Let both grow

together till the harvest: And the reason is very cogent; lest plucking up the tares, you pluck up the wheat also. But Mr. Wills makes amends for this and tells us, that some of the Baptists are godly, liberal men, of Holy and pious conversations and such whom he could have communion with; but this is Joab's curtesy, who salutes Abner friendly, but smote him under the fifth rib. And I may say *Meliora sunt amici vulnera, quam inimici oscula*. The many hard speeches, and uncomely reflections, the so often mentioning the miscarriages of the people in Germany he calls by that denomination on shew what gall his pen was dipt in. But for all these things I say, The Lord forgive him.

Pædo. Sir I thank you for this discourse and the pains you have taken in order to my satisfaction. I confess I find myself more convinced than I was; and do think you are of the surest side, it being most certain that believers were and ought to be baptized; but whether any Infants were or ought, is very uncertain. And surely it is safest (in controverted matters) to adhere to that side that is most certain. Besides there are two things that I am much stumbled at.

The First, is the great ignorance of the members of the Pædo-Baptist congregations in this matter: Not one amongst many, is able to prove Infant-Baptism, or to answer your Arguments, but are forced to refer the matter to their ministers: whereas, hardly any amongst you, but are able to give a satisfactory reason of their hope in this thing; and can presently prove believers Baptism from Scripture precept and example. As of old if a heathen had demanded of any Jew the reason and ground of his circumcision, he could presently turn to the 17th of Genesis, and there prove it from a positive command of God. But if a heathen should ask us, why we baptize our Infants, we that are but ordinary persons know not how to satisfy him; we cannot direct him to any

Scripture where it is written: Which is strange, that a Gospel ordinance should be left so dark and intricate, and the ordinance of circumcision under the law, be so plain and obvious that every child of any reason could presently shew the ground of it. This makes me suspect the truth of it; because the Apostle says he used great plainness of speech, and not as Moses who put a vail upon his face, &c. surely Gospel Ordinances should be so plain, especially as to the subjects, that he that runs may read them.

2ndly. The next thing that offends me is the great difference amongst Ministers, about the ground of Infant-Baptism, as if they knew not where to fasten it, what basis to build it upon, some (as Mr. Danvers observes) draw it from the Universality of grace, and the necessity of Baptism to salvation, as Cyprian and others.

Some from the faith of the Church; some from a supposed seminal faith that may be in the child.

Some from the faith of the parents; others from the faith of the sureties; some (if the immediate parents be not Godly) think the faith of the Grand-father, or great-Grand-father may serve.

Some upon the account of Covenant holiness, or the promise made to Abraham and his seed; others, if both, or one of the parents be a member of a gathered Church. Some think they are born members of the visible Church by virtue of their parents faith, and so may be baptized.

Besides this there is a great difference about baptizing of bastards: some think if the father repent, the child may be baptized; others think otherwise, because a Bastard was not to enter into the Congregation to the 10th generation; and so about the children of excommunicate persons, &c. All which makes us fear that we are out of the way, and our leaders have caused us to err seeing they cannot agree, upon what ground to baptize our

Infants. It's true Mr. Wills pretends to answer this, but very weakly: he tells us the Baptists differ amongst themselves about the ground of their practice; but sure I am there is no such material difference as there is amongst us.

You are all agreed that the profession of faith and Repentance is the ground of Baptism, and if some desire a larger confession than others, and signs of grace, I think it is no great error, but rather an evidence of zeal to God, and good to the party's soul. But what is this to those material and essential differences before mentioned?

These things will put me upon further search, and I hope what you have said will be of advantage to me. In the mean time I take leave and bid you farewell.

CONCERNING UNITY

Our Opponents cry out for Unity, and would fain lay the cause of that hateful Word [*Division*] at our doors, and methinks they might well forbear making such a noise, unless they assign us what kind of the several sorts of Unity they mean; and propound some Mediums to make the same practicable. And I may say, What Unity? so long as that imperious, reflecting, and condemning Spirit remains in them. Some forbidding of their Members to hear our Ministers, or to read their Books; rather allowing them liberty to join with the Multitude, than to appear in our Societies. But if I may spell out their meaning, it seems to be this.

That all the Anti-pædo-Baptists should break up their Societies, and join with them, and own their Ministers for their Pastors, suffer them quietly to Baptize Infants, &c. and so sin against their Consciences; it appearing to them to be gross Superstition, and the profanation of an Ordinance. But should they tell you, they judge there is as good, if not better grounds that you should join with them, and own the Baptism of Believers (the only Scripture Baptism) I know not where a Moderator or Umpire would be found to determine this matter. And how can Two walk together, except they be agreed?

So that the Unity of the Verity is not surely the thing they hope for; for though it be greatly desirable, yet very hard to obtain, because one man thinks this to be truth, and another that, according to the several Lights they have received. And if it be the Unity of Authority they intend, that the Magistrate should set down some Uniform practice, and command all manner of persons to comply thereunto; this looks like divers of them. But were there such a practice attempted and yielded unto; it might

make many Hypocrites in the highest degree of Hypocrisy; but be far from that spiritual Unity they talk of.

Nor can an Unity of persuasion be hoped for, seeing both in Press and Pulpit, and other ways, both Parties have endeavoured to persuade one another, but to little or no Effect.

Nor can it be an Unity of Necessity, now in Times of common danger; for Ties of necessity usually bind no longer than one Side hath need of another.

Nor can any Unity of Covenant do it, for that is forced in many places; and I fear too many say, as the Heathen did, *Juravi Lingua, mentem injuratum gero*, I swore with my tongue, but not with my heart.

Seeing then we cannot find out what kind of Unity is intended, it is best for both parties to continue in the Societies to whom they belong, till God shall convince them otherwise, provided they do not put out their light, and sin against their Consciences, nor neglect any opportunity, better to inform their Judgments.

But there is one kind of Unity yet behind, and that is the unity of Affections; and if you mean this, I am willing to join issue with you, and in this I cannot but blame the whole generation of Professors, who are greatly faulty in this matter.

For my own part, I know the shadows of the everlasting Evening are upon me, and am every day walking upon the Banks of Eternity, and do hope ere long to enter into those sacred Mansions, where all the Saints are of one mind, where we shall possess, not dispute our Unity; wherefore I shall leave my Testimony for the unity of Charity and Affection amongst all that are Godly, though of different persuasions; and shall enforce it from these Considerations.

1. From the work of Regeneration, which some of all differing Professors can experience. Indeed while in a state of unregeneration, nothing is to be expected but Jars and Contentions, for all Division comes from sin, *Scelera dissident*. It is so in the natural body, one affection struggles in the Soul for mastery; Ambition fights with malice, and Pride with Covetousness: the head plots against the heart, and the heart swells against the head. Reason and Appetite, Will and Passion, Soul and Body set the whole frame of Nature into a continual Combustion, one Faculty moves contrary to the Government or Attraction of another, and so as in a confluence of contrary Streams and Winds, the World is turned into a maze of Contentions.

But when once we become Christians, and are made conformable to Christ, it presently maketh of two one; and so worketh peace: It slayeth the hatred and war in the Members of Christ against one another; it reduceth to that primitive harmony, and uniform Spirituality. Yea Conversion lays an obligation upon Christians to love one another: If we love him that Begat, we cannot but love him that is Begotten.

2. Because all things else agree: The beams of the Sun, though divided and distinct from one another, have yet an unity in the same nature of light, because all partake of one Native and Original splendor. The limbs of a Tree, though all several, and spreading divers ways, yet have an unity in the same Fruit; because all are incorporated into one Stock and Root. The streams of a River, though running divers ways, do yet all agree in the unity of sweetness and clearness, because all issuing from the same pure Fountain. Why then should not Christians, though of different Persuasions, agree in the unity of Love and Affection?

3. Because by Division, Discord, and Rebellion the Apostate Angels lost their Heavenly Habitation, and are for ever plunged into endless and remediless Torments. The Devil was Created an Angel of Light, and stood a while in Unity and Harmony until he began to Jar, and enter into Division, and to choose to be an absolute Nature of himself; and would separate and break himself off from Unity, by which he became viler than the vilest of God's Creatures: And so it is possible, for persons by leaving the principles of Harmony, Unity, and Love, to fall from the most glorious state of profession, into endless misery and perdition.

The excellency of the unity of Charity appears further from those *Not a quietis*, or letters of rest naturally imprinted upon the whole Series of Created Beings; for if we survey the particulars of this stately Fabric, we shall find the image of peace and love impressed and imprinted, as the Conservatory principle of their Natures, stamped at first by the Divine Creator, when out (of a confused Chaos) it pleased the Eternal parent, or Radical principle of all things (being not willing that so large a space should be Eternally bereft of his gracious influence, or his bounty any longer frustrated, from Communicating Happiness to so many millions of Creatures as might act upon this Stage) to effect this Creation; for when by his powerful Word he applied himself to Create this sensible World, out of so great disorder and confusion; he effects it with so much symmetry and proportion, that Nature seems to lose itself in the Harmony of such a Being. And as the Crown and perfection of all doth so imprint peace and unity in it, that to attempt the Extirpation of these from the Universe, were to endeavour the reduction of this stately Engine into its Original Chaos and Confusion.

Besides we find when the great Creator began to make a division in this sensible World, it was only of such things as were directly

contrary and opposite to one another, as light and darkness, Gen. i. 4. And God divided the light from the darkness, and God saw that it was good; shewing us that it was never intended there should be any division in the World, but between light and darkness; things directly and essentially contrary.

Therefore in the next Division (which was the Work of the Second day) that was between the Waters and the Waters, things of the same kind and nature, and that work had no Blessing annexed to it, because it was the first breach of Unity; which number, some say is branded with infamy, *Numerus Binarius infamosus est, quia primus ausus est discedere ab unitate*, because it was the first that durst depart from unity. And though there be a kind of war between the Elements, yet some are of Opinion, that it is more imaginary than real; for we find sometimes they will forget their Natural stations and properties, and (to avoid vacuum) will mutually pass into the room of one another; yea, not only lovingly to mix, but to dwell with one another peaceably; as fire and water will sometime dwell together; as we see in Tempests Of Thunder, Rain, and Hail; and also in Spirit of Wine, and other things.

But especially things of the same Tribe and Kind do most earnestly affect one another (from an Innate principle of Union) as Water and Salt do mutually embrace each other.

And as the harmonious assent of things amongst themselves is admirable, so the Heavens with the Lower Region is no less wonderful; for in the whole frame of Nature, there is such an admirable mixture, that all the design is to maintain a Friendly Union and concatenation between themselves; desiring only to gratify the Supreme Ruler, and benefit each other: Nature ordering and disposing all things to be carried about in a most uniform Circulation.

And now is it not strange, when the whole Creation, doth, as it were, study peace and amity, man should continue and practice the contrary? And those that should be led by the Spirit into Unity and Love, should be sent to the meanest Creatures to learn their Lessons of peace and concord?

Lastly, We may consider the Evils that Discord brings upon the Outward man; it was discord, division, and contention that brought, and still brings those Bodily maladies, sicknesses, aches, pains, and weakness upon the Bodies of Men; and at last death itself. For how came those things into the World, but from the rebellious strivings and contentions of the Body with the Soul: For as long as Adam's mind was subject unto God, and stood in Harmony and Union with him, the inferior powers of the Soul were obedient unto Reason, and the Body unto the Soul, and this Union prevents all infirmities and sicknesses; but he no sooner Rebels against God, and breaks himself off from this Union, and enters into Division, but he presently finds Contention raging within him; for now those inferior powers, will be no longer subject unto Reason; but the rebellious pride of the Carnal appetite is such, that the Body ceaseth to be any longer subject to the Soul; upon which strivings and contentions enter, and from thence all manner of Diseases and Distempers upon the Body: for death, and all corporeal infirmities are but the immediate effects of the disobedience of the Body to the Soul; and man is entered into Contrariety, not only with himself, but others also, and hath a property and principle of Contradiction, whereby he opposes, quarrels, divides from, and contends with others. And is so far departed from the unity and harmonious agreement that should be in the minds of men, especially Christians, that now there ariseth passion, anger, and envy; which so disturbs, torments, and disquiets the mind (because others are not like us) that from thence follow in a great measure, diseases, infirmities, and bodily

distempers; because the Soul departs from Harmony, and is in continual vexation and anxiety; so that the Humors of the Body are disquieted, and the radical moisture destroyed. Persons that are of a Choleric Temper, are more subject to Diseases, than those of a more quiet and serene disposition; their passion inflames the inward parts, and disorders the whole frame of Nature, and envious men are subject to Consumptive distempers.

Invidus alterius rebus macrescit Opimis) because his mind is full of dissatisfaction and disquietness, being departed from Unity. And Solomon tells us, The bloody-minded man shall not live out half his days: And we know those Anchorets and Monks that have retired from the World into Dens and Caves of the Earth, that they might live a contemplative Life, and be free from all manner of discord, contention, and division, have lived to an exceeding Old Age, and free from those distempers, and Bodily Infirmities that others meet with; the unity, agreement, and harmony of their minds much conducing to their bodily health. So it is said of Moses, that he was an hundred and twenty years old when he died; his Eye was not dim, nor his natural force abated, Deut. xxxiv. 7. We know of what quiet, serene, and meek Spirit he was of, Numb. xii. 3. *Now the man Moses was very meek above all the men which were upon the face of the Earth*; so that the quietness of his mind did very much contribute to the sanity of his Body. And if Men and Women would more follow the Counsel of the Physician of their Souls, who bids us live in peace, unity, and love; they would not (perhaps) so often want a Physician for their Bodies.

FINIS.

SOME SHORT QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS
for the Younger Sort

Quest. *Were not the Children of Believers Church-Members before Abraham's time?*

Answ. No, the Scripture makes no mention of any such thing; neither was there any visible sign or mark appointed by God to distinguish them from the Children of Unbelievers.

Quest. *Was there no successive conveyance of Grace from Knowing Parents to their Children?*

Answ. No, because the Children of Believers proved as wicked as others; insomuch as all flesh had corrupted its ways, and God brought the flood upon the World of Ungodly.

Quest. *What then became of the Children that died from Adam to Abraham?*

Answ. Those that belonged to the Election of Grace were Saved, though in no outward Covenant, nor signed by any Visible Ordinance.

Quest. *Why then did God make a Covenant with Abraham and his Seed, and distinguish them from all Nations?*

Answ. Because he had a design that the Messiah should come of his Loins, and therefore his Males only are commanded to be Circumcised, to signify that Christ should be a Man-child, and should shed his Blood for the sins of Believers.

Quest. *What other Ends were there of Circumcision?*

Answ. To distinguish them from other Nations, with whom they were not to Marry, lest the Succession should be Interrupted, and so the Messiah not come of Abraham's Loins.

Quest. *What advantage had they of Circumcision besides?*

Answ. They were counted the Visible people of God for a time, had the Laws of God committed to them, and the Land of Canaan, and divers Earthly Blessings bestowed upon them.

Quest. *But had any other People any right to Eternal Life and Salvation?*

Answ. Yea; It being evident that God had divers of his people amongst the Gentiles who belonged to the Election of Grace, as Job, and his Three Friends, and others, which appears by Bildad's appeal to the Ancients, Job viii. 8, 10. For enquire I pray thee of the Former Age, and prepare thy self to the search of their Fathers; and verse 10 shall not they teach thee, &c.

Quest. *But how came it to pass that the Jews became the People of God, and not others?*

Answ. By virtue of a Grant from God to Abraham, who freely made a promise to be a God to him, and his Seed after him.

Quest. *Was this promise made to Abraham because he was better than others, or before, or after he Believed?*

Answ. No, It was freely of Grace, for God found him an Idolater, and these Promise were made to him before he Believed; for we hear nothing of his Faith till Gen. xv. 6.

Quest. *Were his Children then Partakers of those Privileges, merely by being descended from his Loins?*

Answ. Yea; we find no other Reason rendered.

Quest. *But we hear Abraham was a Believer, and received the sign of Circumcision as a token of the righteousness he had by Faith: Is it necessary then that his Children have the like Faith?*

Answ. 'Tis true Abraham Believed after the Promise, and was Circumcised; but it was not Commanded that his Children should Believe in order to Circumcision.

Quest. *But as Abraham was a Believer before his Children had a right to Circumcision, so should it not be known that every Father in Israel were a Believer, before his Child were admitted to Circumcision?*

Answ. No: for all were required to Circumcise their Children, whether the Parent Believed, or not.

Quest. *Were none to be Circumcised but those that Descended from Abraham?*

Answ. Yea, all that were born in his House, or bought with money.

Quest. *But was it not required that those Servants in Abraham's House should profess Faith before they and their Children were Circumcised?*

Answ. No, It was not commanded to be done upon any condition of Faith, in the Parent or Child that was a Servant.

Quest. *Were Abraham's Children Circumcised by virtue of any right they had to the Covenant of Grace above others?*

Answ. No; for some of Noah's Children, &c. had a Right to the Covenant of Grace, yet not Circumcised; and Esau and Ishmael &c. had no right to the Covenant of Grace, and yet Circumcised,

Quest. *Were not Infants Church Members in Abraham's time?*

Answ. Yea; the Church and the Common-wealth being all one, they must needs be Members.

Quest. *When did their Membership cease?*

Answ. When Christ came and had suffered; when the Priesthood was changed, when the Law of Circumcision ceased, when the natural branches were broken off, the old House removed, and a new one built.

Quest. *Are not the Infants of the Gentiles Church-members now in the days of the Gospel?*

Answ. No, there being no Institution or Command for it; besides the Church and the Common-wealth are now divided, and God hath not taken in any one Nation, or sort of people distinct from others to be his Church; but Believers only out of every Kindred, Tongue, and Nation.

Quest. *Have not then the Infants of Believing Gentiles less privilege than the Jews had?*

Answ No; For Circumcision had been no privilege nor duty, had there been no Institution for it: Neither is Baptism a privilege or duty to any, but to those to whom it is Commanded. But the privileges of the Children of Believing Gentiles are greater than the Jews; because the Messiah being come, which is the sum and substance of all their shadows, of Circumcision, of Membership, and all their Typical Ordinances: So that as soon as Infants are capable of Understanding, they are to be brought up in the Nurture and Admonition of the Lord, i. e. the Lord Jesus, the Anti-Type of all their Types; who is to be made known unto them, as being already come, and hath suffered for all that Believe in him. Whereas the Jews could but inform their Children, that Christ would come, and suffer for the sins of men.

Quest. *Have not those that had a right to the privileges of the Old Covenant, a right to the privileges of the new, by virtue of their former right?*

Answ. No; for then the Jews had a right to Baptism without any profession of Faith and Repentance. Besides the Apostle saith, Heb, xiii. 10. *We have an Altar whereof they have no right to eat that serve the Tabernacle:* And so we say, we have a Baptism, that Infants have no right to, as they had to Circumcision; because there is no Institution for it.

Quest. *But may not the Children of the Gentiles be counted Abraham's Seed?*

Answ. No; For Abraham hath but two Seeds, the natural Jew, and professed Believers amongst Jews and Gentiles: a third Seed cannot be assigned him.

Quest. *But may not Infants be counted Christ's Seed?*

Answ. No; for Christ left no natural Issue, (who shall declare his Generation) shewing us that he did not intend to build his Church of Natural Children (as of Old) not of dead, but of living Stones. Besides Believer's Children are Children of Wrath by nature as well as others, and therefore not to be accounted Christ's Seed, or to be Baptized, while so considered.

Quest. *Is not Baptism an Ordinance of the New Testament, and must it not be proved by a New-Testament Institution?*

Answ. Yea.

Quest. *Where is your Institution then for Infant Baptism?*

Answ. It is urged to be Gen. xvii. 7. I will be a God to thee and to thy Seed.

Quest. *Is there any thing concerning Baptism in this Scripture?*

Answ. No, But we draw this Consequence, that as God promised to be God to Abraham and his Seed; so he will be a God to every Believer and his Seed.

Quest. Did God in these words promise to save Abraham and all his Natural Seed?

Answ. No, But the meaning is, that he and his Seed should be the Visible Church; and enjoy the Ordinances, which no other people should.

Quest. And does this promise belong to believing Gentiles, and their natural Seed, that they only shall be the visible Church of God, and their Children only enjoy the Ordinances of God successively from their Parents?

Answ. No; for then these Absurdities would follow.

1. That God has not been as good as his promise, for the Church has not been continued in the posterity of Believers since Christ's time, but often passed out of their Race into the Posterity of Unbelievers.

2. That then, since the first promulgation of the Gospel, there is no such need of Preaching to the Heathen, in as much as these being not of the Posterity of Believers, they are not to be of the Visible Church, nor enjoy the Ordinances: So that it is a fallacy to hold that God hath promised to be a God to Believers and their Natural Seed, as he did to Abraham and his Seed; to continue his Church only in the Posterity of them that first received the Gospel. But he is still gathering his Church out of the posterity of Unbelievers, and therefore before the end of the World the Angel is said to Preach the Everlasting Gospel to every Nation, Kindred, and Tongue, and People, who are not of the posterity of Believers.

Quest. Why do the Pædo-baptists Baptize their Infants?

Answ. Because (they say) they are in the Covenant of Grace.

Quest. How do they know that?

Answ. Because both, or one of the Parents, are in the Covenant of Grace.

Quest. *How does that appear?*

Answ. Because they profess so to be. Then if the Parent be an Hypocrite, the Child is not rightly Baptized.

Quest. *From what Ground do the Baptists Baptize Persons?*

Answ. Because they make a Profession of Faith and Repentance; which is warrant enough from the Scripture.

Quest. *But how if they be Hypocrites, are they rightly Baptized?*

Answ. Yea; because it is not necessary for them to know that the Person is in the Covenant of Grace; but that he professes himself a Disciple of Christ; for which they have Scripture-precedent, and many Examples.

POSTSCRIPT

SOon after I had finished this Treatise, Mr. Baxter's Book came to my Hands: And in regard of his long silence, some great matter was expected: but after my perusal of it, I find no News at all. The first part of his Book (even 180 pages) is nothing else but a Collection of certain Old Letters that passed between him and Mr. Tombs long since: In which, whether he hath dealt Candidly with Mr. Tombs I know not, the contrary is justly feared; if the Reader take notice of those Pieces, Scrips, and Parcels of Letters from Mr. Tombs, but his own Written at large.

As to the matter contained in those Letters, I find it to be nothing but what hath been Answered long since; and it would amount to no other than Superfluity, and Tautology to Answer over again. The truest Verdict I can give of it, is, that it is (like most of his other Controversies) a lump of Logical Superfluity, a System of Syllogistical Vanity, wherein the Man manages his War like some Freshman that is newly Matriculated into the Faculty of Logicising in Mood and Figure, that delights to hear himself Syllogize out every Syllable; and so comes out with a huge heap of Hypotheticals, arguing at a vast difference from the business of Baptism, and sometime times *Ex Suppositis non Supponendis* too, as if he should fetch Infant baptism from far, since 'tis so dark in Scripture (as he has confessed it is) that he cannot have it nigh at hand; proving in a great Circumference of Consequence upon Consequence, Syllogism upon Syllogism; thus, if this, then that; if this, then that; but this, therefore that; when very often neither this, nor that, is true: So that like a Tree, his Book runs out into so many smaller Boughs, and Twigs, and lays itself out at large into such a train of Trivials, so many littles to the purpose; that he will find himself great store of small business that shall throw away so much of his precious time to read his Book.

The next thing I take notice of in his Book is his Answer to Mr. Danvers his Collections, &c. wherein the Reader will find so much Gall and Vinegar, such a proud, austere, magisterial Spirit, such scurrilous, unchristian Language, that it makes me amazed, and to question, whether this be Mr. Baxter or his Coadjutor Mr. Wills. But it seems they are both agreed in their unsavory Dialect. Is this the man that Wrote so much for Love and Unity? and would make the World believe that he is made up of nothing but Charity? Suppose Mr. Danvers should be mistaken in some of his Collections; had it not been better to have shewed him his mistakes in a Mild, Christian, and Brotherly way? And if you say the offence was public, and therefore deserved a public reproof. Grant that also, yet what need these peevish, bitter, and angry reflections? Hath Mr. Baxter forgot that Scripture, Gal. vi. 1. *If any man be overtaken in a fault, ye that are spiritual, restore such a one in the Spirit of meekness:* He contemptuously calls him (Maj. Danvers a Soldier) but why a Soldier? I confess an Officer ought to be a Soldier, but he was a Colonel as well as Mr. B. was a Chaplain, and Mr. B. knows 'tis not civil, nor do Soldiers love to be retrograded, no more than Chaplains. Would he think it kindly done, if he were dwindled from a Chaplain in Folio to a puny Curate in duodecimo, I doubt his ambitious Humor would rather be Pope, but I suppose he means, that he was so once, and perhaps it was when M. Baxter was Chaplain; and surely it is the Chaplain's work with all mildness and gentleness to convince his Officers of any error. But it's like in those days he used better Language, and accommodated himself to the humors of his Officers, or else *Fama mendax*. But perhaps he'll tell us, he looks upon Mr. Danvers as a rigid Anabaptist; whom (with the Independents) he condemns and censures as ignorant silly persons, &c. in his usual Civility, not deserving the least grain of his Charity.

But what does the man mean? do they separate from the Church of Rome? so does Mr. Baxter. Do they separate from the Church of England? so did Mr. Baxter (as constituted by Episcopacy) but what he does now is a hard question. But I shall leave Mr. Danvers to vindicate himself.

Another thing notable, is his 56 Articles of Faith, that he supposes the Anabaptists and others must hold, if they deny his Popish Positions in his Christian Directory, &c. It were no hard matter to Father many grosser absurdities upon Mr. Baxter, were his raw and undigested Notions, and erroneous principles noted, that have passed his Pen (at several times) for above these Twenty years. But leaving his other mistakes, it will be no Injury to tell you, that one Article of Mr. Baxter's Faith is; That all the Children, all the numerous posterity of Unbelievers, yea of such Unbelievers whose immediate Parents or Parent, were not Enchurched, are all in the Kingdom of the Devil, and necessarily damned. Seeing he holds that the Children of Believers only are the Subjects of Baptism, being born within the Covenant of Grace, Children of God, Heirs of Christ, and inheritors of the Kingdom of Heaven. But if Mr. Baxter in these Fifty six Articles (nay in most of his late Writings) hath not more gratified the Papists, and contributed to their Cause, more than any English Protestant Divine ever did, yea at once, (as much as in him lies) thrown away the Protestant Cause, and as far as his Credit goes, spoiled all, that our Famous Champions have done, I am much mistaken; having hereby laid such stumbling blocks in the way of ordinary Christians, far beyond the most crafty Jesuit that ever hath been amongst us.

He tells us he will Write no more, but he hath a mighty Faith that will believe him. I am of Mr. Bagshaw's mind, who told him some time since, when Mr. Baxter told him he would not answer

him; Mr. Bagshaw replies, I know you will not keep your word, for your pride will put you upon Writing, and your guilt will necessitate you to do it; just in as unbecoming a manner as you have done: for an ill Cause must be maintained by Calumny.

And then in a lusory way tells us, That if these Children will after this bawl, and cry, and wrangle, and foul the House (a savory Metaphor!) he is not bound to rock the Cradle, and to make them clean.

From whence may it not follow (1.) That Mr. Baxter owns the Anabaptists as his Children; but whether instead of an indulgent Nurse he has not proved a cruel Stepmother let the World judge.

2. That the Anabaptists are foul, (sweetly spoken!) and all the pains he hath taken in his Writings these Twenty years has been to clean them. But whether he hath not cast more dirt and filth upon them; and made them fouler than ever he found them, is easy to be determined by any that reads his plain Scripture-proof, &c.

The next thing I observe is, How strenuously he strives to have the Fathers on his side; and fearing he should lose the Argument from Antiquity, we see how the sleepy Lion's roused, and roars like a Son of Thunder, fearing the Old worn-out cause of Infant-Baptism should be routed, and never rally again; But he must know we are not so fond of the Fathers from the Third Century, that being as Tully says, *Omissis fontibus consecrari rivulos*, we believe Infant-Baptism is ancient, and so are other Errors more antient; but from the beginning it was not so.

But that which confirms me against this Fallacy of Infant-Baptism, is, that the first that mention it, do also mention the Erroneous Grounds upon which it was practiced, viz. for the washing away Original Sin.; for the conferring of Grace, and

absolute necessity thereof to Salvation, &c. But let Mr. Baxter shew us if he can, that any of the Fathers speaks of Infant-Baptism as to be performed upon the grounds he and others in this Land have practiced it, i. e. the Childs being in the Covenant of Grace by virtue of both or one of the Parents personally manifesting his Faith and Repentance, and being an Enchurched Member of some Congregation, &c. Here I dare say, Mr. Baxter has none of the Fathers of his side, now his Orthodox Fathers are Heterodox; but is it not strange, that if Infant Baptism were an Apostolical Tradition as divers affirmed, and some still dream, that the Apostles had not delivered the true grounds upon which it should be practiced as well as the practice itself. Or did these Holy Fathers only keep the subject, and so soon lose the grounds. So that I must give this short but true Character of Mr. Baxter and his late Book that he hath written, neither with that gravity that became his Age, with that Sobriety that became his profession, nor with that modesty that became any tolerable Education. And since he so much forgets himself, I must tell him that Gentleman Mr. Danvers, whom he so insolently despises, is (to say no more) his Superior, a person of known worth, piety, and integrity, and one whom God hath chosen to bear witness to his truth, at that very time when he a Learned Scribe is shaken with every wind, and scruples not to change his Judgement for and against things, as the stream of outward success doth guide and influence them. I shall now conclude with Mr. Baxter's Opinion of the Anabaptists, when his heat is over; he saith thus [in his last Book,] There two sorts of Anabaptists amongst us, the one are sober Godly Christians, who when they are Re-baptized, to satisfy their Consciences, live amongst us in Christian love and peace. And I shall be ashamed, if I love not them as heartily, and own them not as peaceably as any of them shall do either me, or better men than I, that differ from them.

The other sort hold it unlawful to hold Communion with such as are not of their mind and way, and are Schismatically Troublesome and Unquiet, in labouring to increase their party.

I hope all the pious Anabaptists do virtually, though not actually devote their Children to God, and Consent to their Covenant-relation, while they vehemently plead against it; for surely they have so much natural Affection, that if they did think that God would be a God, in a special Covenant with their Children, and pardon their Original Sin, and give them right to future Life, upon the Parents dedication and consent, they would undoubtedly accept the gift and be thankful: And I believe most of them would say, I would do all that God entrusteth me to do, that my Child may be a Child of God, and accept any Mercy from him, as far as God doth authorize me so to do, page 188, 199.

Indeed my Judgement was and is, that the point of Infant-Baptism hath its considerable difficulties, which may occasion Wise and Good men to doubt, or to be mistaken in it, page 219.

Therefore I never took the point of it to have such weight, as that all that differed from me in it, must be denied either love, liberty, or communion. If I know my own heart, I do as heartily love a sober Godly man that is against Infant-Baptism, as I do such men that differ from me in other Controversies: and much better than one of my own Judgement who hath less Piety and Sobriety.

Nor do I think there is so much Malignity in the bare Opinion which denyeth Infant Baptism, as that all the Anabaptists miscarriages should arise from the nature of that Opinion. Ibid.

I know that in the Ancient Churches men were left at Liberty, both when they would be Baptized themselves, and when their Children should be Baptized, and though Infant-baptism was without any Original since the Apostles, yet it was not a forced

thing. And were it in my power, it should be so still, I would not deny Christian-love, nor Church communion, nor public Encouragements to any pious peaceable man for being an Anabaptist. I am not therefore half so Zealous to turn men from Anabaptistry, as I am to persuade both them and others to live together with mutual forbearance in Love and Church communion, notwithstanding such differences, page 221. I make no question but many of them are far better men than I, and knowing my self liable to Error, &c. I am far more offended at their Separation than their Opinion, page 228.

I know not by any Scripture or Reason that Re-baptizing is so heinous a sin as should warrant us to contemn at our Brethren, page 233.

By which you see Mr. Baxter is not so much offended with the Anabaptists, as their Separation. To which we say; Let Mr. Baxter by his Elaborate Systems, and subtle Distinctions, first convince the Pædo-Baptists of their error herein, as the Independents, and others, and especially his Friend Mr. Wills; who though he hath Written so much for Infant-Baptism, yet ('tis well known) he is a wide Separatist. May not the Church of Rome cry out against Mr. Baxter for his Separation? Might not the Church of England do so formerly? And may they not still, (yea Mr. Baxter also) cry out against Mr. Wills and his party? and say they are Rigid Independents and Separatists? What means then all this Out-cry against the Antipædo Baptists? unless they would have us believe that they are such Universal Dictators as have Authority over Faith, and are Infallibly inspired to propound Rules for all others, that when they Separate we must; and where they have Communion, so must we?

Now if Mr. Baxter will vouchsafe to do Two Things:

1. Tell us of what Church he is of.

2. Prove that Church to be rightly Constituted according to the Primitive Pattern: We will not then Separate from him. In the mean time we judge it our duty, whereunto we have already attained, to Walk by the same Rule. And if any be otherwise-minded, we hope the Lord will in time reveal it unto them. Amen.

FINIS.

ANIMADVERSIONS

Upon a Late Book, Entitled,

INFANT-BAPTISM

From HEAVEN and not of MEN,

In Answer to Mr. Henry Danvers his Treatise of

BAPTISM

WHEREIN

Believers Baptism in Opposition to Infants (pretended) Baptism, is further Vindicated and Confirmed: And, that Believers only are the Spiritual Seed of Abraham, is also further Evidenced, against the Exceptions of Mr. Joseph Whiston.

By E. H.

Non adeo perdite confidens sum, ut ausim aliquid affirmare, quod Sacra Scriptura silentio præterit. Theodoret. i. e.

I am not so desperately confident, that I dare affirm any thing which the Holy Scripture doth pass by in silence.

Grace doth not run in a Blood, neither is the love of God Tied or Entailed upon any Linage of Men: Caryl on Job, cap. 5.

The Preface to the
READER

Courteous Reader:

The Delay of the Fore-going Treatise in the Printer's hands gave me Opportunity to peruse, and briefly to Animadvert upon Mr. Whiston's Book, wherein I find a promising Title, and very little more: To Trace him in all his Meandrous Digressions would be an Argument I want other Business: The main strength of his Objections is in the said Treatise fully Enervated; and I do not think my self concerned to pursue him, when he insists upon matters besides the Question in Debate: His Exceptions touching the matter of Antiquity, are substantially answered by Mr. Danvers, yet shall be briefly glanced upon here.

I shall not now Dispute whether it be Generously done by Mr. Whiston to assail with so much Violence, one that's already beset with such clamorous Adversaries as Mr. Baxter, and Mr. Wills: But he gives the Curious some occasion to question, that either (he thinks) they want Relief, being very near a Defeat; or have not so singular a Talent as himself to set off a bad Cause.

For my part I cannot conjecture what his design is, unless by making up a Triumvirate of Champions, he thinks to carry the Cause by Clamour, and so share of the Applause their admiring Votaries are liberal enough of. But as his Book needs little more Confutation than to be perused, so the infirmity of his Reasoning, serves to illustrate, not foil the Truth he invades.

Our Adversaries themselves are forced to confess that most of those great Fathers (the generality of Christians are so fond of) have been of Corrupt Principles, and tainted with Superstitious

conceits, and unsound Notions; and that there are but very few of them to be found throughly Orthodox, though of great Learning, Zeal, and Industry; which is an Item to us not to lean upon the Authority of man, though never so Celebrated by Ages and Nations, but to have recourse to the Word of truth left for our Instruction, and to seek our Warrant for Religious Duties there.

This consideration satisfies me, That this Triumviri (however acted by confidence, or self-conceit,) may be out of the way, and that their Dictates are no farther to be received, than they agree with the Word of God. The perplexing Systems spun out of man's own brain, nice subtle Distinctions, and longwinded periods, may be taking with such as are firmly Espoused to a Party right or wrong, or such as think him Conqueror that has most words: but the sober enquiring soul, that seeks Truth, not Victory, will easily perceive the Vanity and Error of such a procedure.

Error cannot be disputed against, without giving it its name, and its Abettors cannot be reprov'd, nor admonish'd but in words accommodated to their mistakes, which indeed is not Railing, but plain-dealing; and which I hope is Apology enough for me, if any Expressions should seem to be of too acute an Edge: The Scripture commands us to reprove Errors sharply, or (*αποτόμως*) cuttingly, Tit. i. 13. I love the Godly Pædo-Baptist as one that I know my Master Christ loveth, but having such a Call to Witness to, and Contend for his Truth. I will (as he shall enable me) do it without daubing on the one, and unnecessary sharpness on the other hand. I know how to distinguish between such as by a mistaken Zeal utter provoking rash words; and such as in pursuance to their Duty contend earnestly for the Faith once delivered to the Saints: And that Believers Baptism is such an Ordinance as Christ delivered to his Saints, I never heard

doubted: And that Infant (pretended) Baptism is not such, is our work to manifest.

After all the Clutter our Antagonists kept to find some Evidence for the practice of Pædo-Baptism in Fathers, Councils, &c. (the Scripture as they fully own being silent about it) they are glad to run for refuge at last to their new Invention of a Covenant they imagine to be made with the Carnal Seed of Believers, Gen. xvii. 7 which they say Entitles them to be Baptized, but to no other Ordinance under the New Testament (a most pitiful Paradox) and being ashamed to own the mistaken absurd Mediums, its old and most celebrated Patrons have Insisted upon for its Support in Old Times, they have Centered in a more plausible pretence for it, viz. the aforesaid Covenant, which is their only Reserve at present. And I cannot but admire that Men of any Reason should cry up Antiquity, Antiquity, at the Rate they do, when at the same Instant they reject the Grounds and Reasons the Ancients used for the same. And is it fair to derive the practice from Antiquity, and add Reasons of their Own, when the Old Reasons are found to be indeed Irrational. We know Infant-Baptism has been of an Early Birth, (viz. in the Third or Fourth Century) to save the Child's Soul, and upon a mistake that it might be Damned without it; But Infant-Baptism upon the modern ground of a Hereditary Covenant, is new, and altogether unknown to the Ancient Pædo-Baptists, as by other hands is clearly made good. And how plausible this New Argument is, in the following Pages is examined.

And before I come to a particular Survey of this present Undertakers Book, I would tender to his Christian consideration, hoping him to be a man that Fears God,

1. Whether it be so consistent with his Profession, in so Taunting and proud a manner, to scorn and reproach his Opponent, whereas a meeker way would be (not only his Duty, but) more graceful?

2. Whether it be consistent with the Word of Truth to go about to impose his bare Ipse dixit's upon the World, without any material proof from the Scripture?

3. Whether it be consonant to the plainness of the Gospel, to confound rather than Instruct the ordinary plain Reader with such a variety of needless impertinent Distinctions, Hypothetical, Tedious and rambling Circumlocutions, Preambles, and dark miserable shiftings, to find a Covert for his Iadorantism in the Word of God?

4. Whether it be Ingenuous or Honest to supply the want of Argument with such phrases as these, proceeding from Immodesty to Impudence. Warning his Reader to be wary of crediting any of his (viz. Mr. Danvers') persuasion, can any man think he had any true actual Fear of God before his Eyes. Down-right Falsities, Forgeries, mere Cheats, &c. though not the least Tittle of them proved to be justly chargeable upon Mr. Danvers.

And to all which, I think (as it is the product of an Unruly provoking Spirit, actuated by prejudice, and its ireful concomitants) the best return will be silence. Let him consider Gal. vi. 1; Matt. v. 5.

We shall not Insist upon his uncomely carriage throughout the whole Book, we leave it to his cooler consideration, and the Reader's Observation, and shall present you with a brief account of his Book, and then Select what wants our Reply, and leave all to the judgment of the Reader.

The Book consists of Two parts; 1. An attempt to weaken the Human Authority urged by Mr. Danvers for Illustration of

Believers Baptism, in opposition to Infants Baptism. 2. To Confute him in the Doctrinal part.

About the first he spends 24 pages; his Objections are some scraps of what Mr. B. and Mr. W. have more at large urged, and already Answered by Mr. D. of which nevertheless I shall anon take a brief View.

From p. 25. to 71. he goes about to disprove that Believers Baptism is only Christ's Baptism. 2. To prove that the silence of the Scripture about Infant-Baptism tends more to its establishment than overthrow. 3. To vindicate Tradition, as he defines it. viz. the Discoveries made by the Church Doctrinally and Practically from the Apostles time to us, as a subordinate means whereby we come to know, and are more fully confirmed what's contained in the Doctrine of the Apostles. 4. From page 71. to 129. he considers the Arguments from the Covenant, and Fæderal Holiness. 5. From page 129. to the end, He endeavours to remove the absurdities charged upon their practice and to prove the Validity of Baptism, as Administered by Sprinkling. Of which in Order.

ANIMADVERSIONS

UPON

Mr. Whiston's Book, &c.

HE Entitles his Book, Infant Baptism from Heaven and not of Men: This indeed may raise the Expectation of such as have not Read Mr. Baxter's Plain Scripture proof. I began to think he had lighted upon some Rarity, else he would not Front his Book with such a Title, nor trouble the World especially at this juncture, when such men of Noise are already Engaged against us. But Empty Casks give the greatest sound, and pregnant Mountains bring forth a Mouse. From Heaven? and has he been there then, and searched the Records, and was of the Cabinet Counsel of the Almighty? what if we doubt it? we have but his bare word for it. He must pardon me if I say Infant-Baptism from (Rome or) beneath; for if it had been of Heavens making, the Scriptures (and the Records, and Histories of the purest Primitive times) would not be so silent about it, as the most Learned Pædo-baptists confess, and particularly Mr. B. our keenest Adversary is forced to own they are. But the Author is cunning, and would Decoy the Reader by a specious Title; so the Vintners gaudy sign often Trapans to a costly (though unwholesome) Entertainment. The plain Scripture-proof man himself confesses Infant's baptism has its considerable difficulties; the Ingenious Papist counts it a Miracle to have it proved by Scripture. Most of the Learned Pædo-baptists have recourse to Tradition for help, and how come they to miss of this man's Invention all this while? This Apollo, this Oedipus, this Alexander which you will, might have done good service to unriddle the Enigma, or cut that knot, the

unfolding of which cost so much Debate. Had he brought that from Heaven sooner, (which was never there) he had saved many Learned men the labour of their Elaborate Systems pro and con. But this Author has as dexterous and nimble a way of confuting all Antiquity, as the Junior Sophister in Oxford used with Bellarmine, when he writ in the end of his Works, Bellarmine thou liest; therefore I will make bold to tell him that he stamps his uncertain Conjectures with a Divine Character, and fathers his Forgeries and contrivances upon Heaven; which is a daring piece of Confidence, to say no more. So that I shall say of him, and from just ground, as the Poet of Pigmalion, extremely doting upon the fair Image he made, *Operisq̄ sui concepit amorem, &c.*

He tells us, Mr. Danvers his Book is all Forgery, which he leaves to the Readers Observation, wishing him to have a care of crediting any of his persuasion. But if this be not Inconsistent with the Laws of Ingenuity, Equity, and the Generosity of a Scholastic Education, I know not what is. Had he been as nimble to attack the Cause we maintain, as we find him a keen Satirist against the person he Opposes, who never gave him the least Provocation, it would be more honest and taking. But instead of a fair unprejudiced Examination of our Arguments, lies about him terribly, and deals his strokes unmercifully, charges the whole with Forgery, Falsehood, and what not? without vouchsafing to tell us wherein those Forgeries and Falsehoods lie. [But stay Sir, as lofty a conceit as you have of yourself, we'll not believe you upon your bare word. Have you hit upon that pernicious Knack of assassinating men's credit at a breath? It seems you scorn to be such a petty Chapman's Mr. Ws. (who was to particulars, but) you would knock us town by whole Sale. You leave the Reader to his own observation. And is that all? as if he had stood gaping till you become his, could not the Reader make his Observations without this importing memento?]

Be wary of crediting any of his persuasion.] In this I would appeal to Mr. Whiston's Conscience, or any man of common ingenuity, whether it be just and honest for him to charge the wrote party of is Antipedobaptists at this rate, although Colonel Danvers, (as 'tis possible a Learned man may) had been mistaken in some things among so numerous a Tract of Quotations? of which he has made no significant discovery neither.) Would he think it fair dealing, if we should improve the particular errors or miscarriages of Pædo Baptists to the scandal of all under that denomination? particularly the apparent Injustice, and unchristian Dealings of Mr. B. and Mr. Ws. in their late conspiracy, wrongfully to impeach us, and the truth we profess; and their malicious Contrivances in prosecution thereof, fully detected by another hand.

And whether we have not just ground to conclude his Infant baptism is not from Heaven, not only from the weakness of his Arguments, but from his manner of Arguing also? the Apostles way being to convince in meekness, and confute in terms full of Love, and void of all Opprobrious and Canting Raillery. The Scripture tells us, that *the wisdom that is from Above, is first pure, then peaceable, gentle, and easy to be intreated, full of mercy and good Works, without partiality, and without Hypocrisy*, James iii. 17. Whereas he accosts us in so haughty and domineering an Equipage, as he thinks will crush and disable us from any farther Encounters with so dreadful a Gigas as he takes himself to be. Exposing us to the scorn and odium of the whole World, as if we had not felt enough of its unkindness, till he comes to open the mouth of Calumny wider, and make our Enemies baul louder. But these things we hope our Lord God, whom we desire to serve, will give us patience to endure for his Name and Truths sake.

But to put the better face upon the matter, he pretends to give some instances of Mr. Ds. his unfaithfulness in his Quotations, and of a great many picks out two (with singular judgment) which he thinks he can toss to the purpose, and makes his Reader sport to see how ridiculous he would make them. But to check his triumphant Insultings, we shall join issue with him in the fair Trial of those particulars he impeaches.

1. He charges Colonel Danvers for unfaithfulness in affirming that the Magdeburgs say in the place he cites, That in the first Century, they find they baptized only the Adult or Aged, &c. whereas the Word only is not there. This Exception Mr. Ws. made, and is answered by Mr. D. in p. 31, 32. of his Reply, and I conceive it is no part of ingenuity in Mr. Whiston to be inculcating that which he could not be ignorant was so justly replied to already. But

What if Mr. D. has been in the right, and the falsehood be laid at Mr. Whiston's door? is not Mr. Whiston then the unfaithful man? and that it is so, the Reader is desired to consider, that what we desire to prove from the Magdeburgs is matter of Fact, viz. whether Infants were Baptized in that Age, which in plain terms they tell us they read no Example of, *Exempla annotat a non legator*; and that the Adult of Jew and Gentile were Baptized, as is exemplified Acts ii. 8, 10, 16, 19, &c. and is not this Equivalent with what he alleges, viz. that they Baptized only the Adult, finding examples for the one, and not for the other; any man in his senses may see that there is no more difference between them, than there is between two six pence and a shilling. We confess the Magdeburgs were for Infant-Baptism, and that they cite Origen and Cyprian as Authors, that it was an Apostolical Tradition, in these words, *Sed Origines and Cyprianus and alii Patres Authores sunt Apostolorum etiam tempore baptizatos esse*;

Constat enim hoc ex Apostolorum Scriptis quod Infantes a Baptismo non excludant, nam dum Circumcisionis locum Baptismum supplere Paulus docet, Col. 2. Aique Infantes atque Adultos ad Baptismum admitte ados judicat; that is Origen and Cyprian, and other Fathers, tell us, that in the Apostles time some were Baptized; for this is evident from the Apostles Writings, that they did not exclude Infants from Baptism, and where Paul teaches, Col. 2 that Baptism succeeds in the place of Circumcision, he declares that Infants as well as the Adult are to be admitted to Baptism.

The Reader is desired to note how Craftily Mr. Whiston stops in his Quotation at the words Constat ex Apostolorum Scriptis, i. e. it is evident from the Apostles Writings, to make the Reader believe they mean it (that Infants were Baptized,) whereas it relates to the following part of the sentence, viz. (Quod Infantes a baptismo non excludant, that they did not exclude Infants from Baptism, rendering himself guilty of what he unjustly accuses Mr. D. But to the Quotation:

Wherein we have Three Things urged by them us Arguments for their practice; First the Testimony of Origen and Cyprian Secondly, Arguments from Infants non-exclusion from Baptism Scriptures. Thirdly, an Inference to prove it lawful as succeeding Circumcision.

1. The Testimony of Origen and Cyprian, this I shall say little to, being substantially enervated by Mr. Danvers already in his Rejoinder, where it is made out, (1.) that Origen and Cyprian say no such thing, (2.) that if they had, it's no great matter; the Books being from just grounds judged spurious: (3.) that if the Books were genuine, their Testimonies in the Third Century is not sufficient to prove matter of Fact the First Age.

2. The Arguments from Infants non Exclusion being Mr. Whiston's dear Argument so oft repeated, and made such a flourish withal, and filling a good part of his Book, our Answer shall be referred to the place where he urges it.

3. The Inference from Circumcision; this Mr. Whiston in express terms tells us, is not made any ground of Infant Baptism by them in these words, We plead not for Infants Baptism, merely from the Analogy it bears to Circumcision (and is angry they should be charged with it, (though his practice contradicts the expression very often, as well as the Magdeburgs) therefore I shall not spend time to disprove that which he owns not. The Second Instance he gives of Mr. Ds. unfaithfulness, is, page 7. Mr. D. says thus: As to Baptism in the Second Century, they say Cent. 2. cap. 6. p. 109. that it doth not appear by any approved Author that there was any Variation or Mutation from the former, which Mr. Whiston is angry for, and says, Mr. D. would make people believe he spake this of the subject of baptism, where as it is of the Rites and Ceremonies.

I have Examined what Mr. Danvers says, and that Century, and I find that he mentions neither subject nor rite, but only cites their words, and applies it as fairly; their words are, *Simplicem baptisandi formam unam fuisse retentam ex eo apparet, quod in probatis autoribus nulla insignis reperitur variatio aut mutatio annotata.* It is apparent that the simple (or old) form of baptizing was kept (*viz.* in the Second Age) because no remarkable Variation or Mutation is noted by any approved Author, and that this comprehends both the subject and way of Administration of the first Age, is evident to such as are not critically contumacious and blind; and it is very probable, yea certain, that had the Magdeburg's found any Example for Infant-Baptism in this Age more than in the former, they would not fail to mention it; and

though they say, *Nec usquam legitur Infantes hoc sæculo remotos esse*, that we read not of Infants being excluded in this Age, We may as truly say, *Nec usquam legitur Infantes hoc sæculo baptizari*; We read of no Infants baptized in this Age: So that it is a sure Argument the thing was not in being, because no mention is made of it, as practiced or not practiced. I have read the Story of the Jew, which he upbraids Colonel D for over-looking, who like to die, was upon his earnest request baptized (as they call it) by his fellow Travelers, by flinging Sand upon him, there being no possibility of having Water there. But what advantage this makes for Mr. Whiston, we know not, let him make the best of it; if he had thought it so much for his purpose, why did not he mention it? but he chooses rather to make the Reader believe there is something in it for his advantage, when indeed it signifies nothing for him.

The Second thing he remarks, is the impertinency of his proofs, and of which he gives Five Instances, how proper we are not to enquire. But first, Is it not unjust for Mr. Whiston to charge his Adversary with that Crime whereof he himself is notoriously guilty; as I could instance if I would be impertinent, and for a taste will beg the Reader's pardon to remark one. Is it to Mr. Whiston's purpose, or does the Argument he manages require it, that he should publish in print (first part of his *Infant-Baptism*) that he is a Bachelor, &c. is the World concerned in the changes of his state? or does he think that by the Charms of his Wit and Oratory, some great Cometissa will fall in Love with him? Is not that as impertinent a Proclamation as the Ecclesiastical Politician's publishing his dull and lazy distemper? I would not have said this, but to shew how he that's so nimble to fall upon others in print, should take care first to amend himself.

And as to his Exceptions under this head, they are indeed so frivolous and insignificant, that it is in vain to spend time to refute that which any Reader may do in the very perusing; for what does he more than pick up some scrips here and there, pickeering at a part as the preamble (or that that makes way) to the main thing, wherein all the force is put, and to which these passages he snatches up may be only Circumstantial. So that Mr. Whiston beats the Air, and fights manfully with a Figment of his own brain. For,

1. The piece of the Waldensian Confession, which he says is not to our purpose, is but an Introduction to the 7th. Article in the same page, which says, *That by baptism we are received into the Holy Congregation of the people of God, declaring openly our Faith, &c.* which our Answerer takes no notice of.

That of Vignier is pertinently enough brought, wherein the Waldenses reject all Doctrines which have not their foundation in Scripture, and all Ceremonies and Romish Traditions; because the Baptism of Infants at that time was practiced from that ground. And that he gives testimonial of them, that they denied Infants Baptism in totidem Verbis; See what he says, (viz. Nicholas Vignier in his Book called la Uraue Histoire de l'Eglise, p. 354. upon the year 1136 speaking of the Waldenses and some of their principal Barbs, where he hath these words, Et qu'ils condamnoient le Baptesme de Petits Enfans alleguans que le Baptesme n'aportoient qu' a ceux qui ont foi. i.e. *And they condemned the Baptizing of little Infants, alleging that Baptism belongs to none but those that have Faith.*

As to the agreement between the Donatists and Novatians; it is also properly enough applied, for all Mr. Whiston's hast, as the following words of Mr. Ds. make out, viz. they held, *That none ought to be received into Churches, but such as were visibly true*

Believers, and read Saints, &c. The way of being received into the Church, Mr. W. knows to be Baptism, but he overlooks this also.

As to the Three other Particulars out of the Waldensian Confessions, p. 282, 283, 284. 1 Ed. he Excepts against, as not to our purpose, let the same return serve them as before.

That out of Thuanus from Dr. Usher, viz. that the Beringarians held that Baptism did not profit Children to Salvation is a proper and suitable Argument of their denying Infant Baptism, it being elsewhere evidenced (and which Mr. Whiston nor his Associates never Answered) that that was the only ground of its administration, viz. that it Saved the Child's Soul.

3. As to his Charge of Mr. Ds. perverting Authors sayings, viz. Pædo-baptists in general, it is already fully cleared by himself in his Rejoinder to Mr. Ws. and to him the Reader is referred. 2. Mr. Whiston would have us shew, wherein lies the inconsistency of their words with their practice; which is also fully done. But me thinks it might be a more proper task for themselves to reconcile their Contradictions, which they are loudly called to do, if they can; and so either yield up the Cause, or remove the stumbling blocks they themselves lay in our way.

4. He says, Some of Mr. Ds. Authorities are against himself, and instances Mr. Baxter, (we confess he is sometimes against us to the purpose, but sometimes he is also kind enough, and gave us Twenty good Arguments improved by Mr. Tombs in his *Felo de Se.*) But for the rest 'tis but mere prattle. Chrysostom is instanced, to shew the Erroneous ground upon which Infant-Baptism was practiced, viz. to take away Original Sin; and if it be a proof for Mr. Whiston, let him take it, I'll give him another proof too if that will please him out of his Friend Austin; 23. Epist. ad Bonif. *Nec illud te moveat, quod quidam non ea fide ad Baptismum*

precipiendum parvulos serunt, ut gratia spirituali ad vitam regenerentur Æternam, sed quod eos putant hoc remedio temporalem retinere, ac recipere sanitatem, non enim propterca illi non regenerantur, quia non ab illis hac intentione offeruntur, celebrantur cuim per eos necessaria Ministeria. But he must excuse me if I leave him the pleasure of Translating it, seeing he may perhaps do it to most advantage.

That Peter Bruis and Henricus denied Infants Baptism, we have good ground to believe from many substantial Reasons offered by Mr. D. and if we reject the testimony of Papists (in whose hands most of our ancient Writings have been for some Centuries, which we are well enough satisfied to do) in this, why not in other things?

That Cluniacensis (owned to be a very learned man) disputed with Peter Bruis, and Henry, is evident; he lays down their Position to be this:

Nos vero tempus congruum fidei expectamus, and hominem postquam Deum suum cognoscere, and in cum credere paratus est, non ut nobis imponitis, Rebaptizamus sed Baptizamus, quia nunquam baptizatus dicendus est, qui baptismo quo lavantur peccata, locus non est. i. e. We wait for the fit season of Faith, and when a man knows his God, and believes in him, we baptize him, not rebaptize as you charge us; for he cannot be said to be ever baptized, that is not washed with the baptism that washeth away sins. And then makes this pathetic declamation against them, canmerating the Absurdities he fancies that follow their Opinion; he saith thus: *Itane desipueret præterita sæcula, and tot millibus parvulorum per mille and eo amplius annos illusorium baptisma tribuerent, &c.* which I thus English.

And have past Ages been so foolish, and have given but a mock-baptism to so many thousand Little ones, for this thousand years

and more, and from Christ's time to ours have made them not real, but fantastic (or imaginary) Christians? Was the whole World so blinded and involved in so huge a mist of darkness hitherto, that it must wait for you at length to open its eyes, and to dispel so tedious a Night, that after so many Fathers, Martyrs, Popes, and Princes of the Universal Churches, it must choose Peter Bruis and Henry his Lackey as the last Apostles to correct its long error? What hath all the World perished till the coming of these New Reformers of our Age, and have all things been managed by the Sons of Light and Truth in darkness and falsehood, that whereas all of any Age or Rank having been baptized in Infancy, and received their Christian name then, and in convenient time have been preferred in divers degrees in the Church, no Bishop of the Bishops, no Priest, no Deacon, no Clerk, no Monk, not one as I may say of those innumerable numbers, will be a Christian? for whosoever is not baptized with the Baptism of Christ, hath not Christ, nor can he be of the Clergy, People, or Church And if it be so, what manifest absurdities will follow. For whereas all France, Spain, Germany, Italy, and all Europe for almost three hundred or four hundred years, have none baptized but in Infancy, they have therefore no Christian, if no Christian, then no Church; if no Church, no Christ; and if no Christ, then certainly they are damned. Our Fathers therefore have perished, because they could not be baptized with Christ's baptism in their Infancy; And we that live shall also perish, unless after Christ's Baptism we be Baptized with Henries Baptism also. And innumerable of the Saints shall be plucked down from Heaven to the Infernal Seats, whom though baptized in Infancy, their life by its Holiness, the World by its testimony, and Divinity by Miracles have made famous; they must be made the Collegues of Devils, who were the Companions of Angels; and they that through their pious Labours are arrived to Eternal life, will

suddenly be flung into everlasting death. Our Holy days shall be turned to mourning, our Sabbaths into shame, and our Honour into nothing. Who can bear these? who can hear it? who would not shut his ears, and with all those they labour to damn, would not rise against these Arch Heretics? But come unto me, and repent of so great a Prodigy. You scorn and deride that one should be Saved by the Faith of another, denying it with great Mockery among the Rustics and unlearned Multitude. A brutish and impious Heresy. Petrus Cluniacensis, contra Pætro brusianos heret. p. 1124. Edit Paris 1614.

As to those late Authors, he says, whose testimonies deserve no credit, as to the first Ages, viz. Willifrid, Strabo, Boemus, Lud. Vives. I conceive however they are to be believed as soon as Mr. Whiston. And he that leans so much upon Origen and Cyprian, (though those Books Fathered upon them are judged spurious) to prove matter of Fact in the First Age, though they lived in the Third Century, should clear himself, before he falls foul upon others.

And Lastly, Since he declines all Human Authority as of no weight, so do we, and proceed to examine the Scripture grounds, which we desire only to adhere to, and own it to be our Principle to receive no Article of Faith, however entertained or cried up by Nations, Fathers, &c. that is not made Authentic by the Written Word of God.

And whether Mr. Danvers (the Exceptions here made, being so few, and of so little weight) deserves so severe a Castigation as this Author is pleased to give him, let the World judge.

And therefore we go on to try the opposition he makes as to the Doctrinal part. And first we affirm:

That Believers Baptism is only Christ's Baptism; which Mr. Danvers proved by the order laid down in the Commission, Matt. xxviii. 19 to which Mr. Whiston makes this demur; That this Commission doth not exclude Infants from Baptism, supposing their Baptism elsewhere in Scripture warranted.

That this is a very sorry Evasion, will appear, if you consider that this is the solemn Institution and Commission given to the Apostles, empowering them to Preach the Gospel, and Baptize; and to charge it with darkness and imperfection (as Mr. Whiston doth,) is to reflect upon the Law giver; and for us to observe any Order, but what is here laid down, is to go beyond our Commission, and be wise above what is written. Which is not only our Opinion, but the great Basil's own words upon the place, ὁμῶς ἀνατκαῖον εἶναι, &c. i. e. But we think it necessary to have recourse to the order prescribed by the Lord, viz. first to Teach, then Baptize, page 636. de Baptismo.

2. It has been elsewhere sufficiently proved that Infants (because Unbelievers till Converted, Eph. ii. 3 and so incapable of the qualification pre-required here) are excluded.

3. If it should be urged that Infants have Faith (as several Learned Pædo-baptists affirm, though not so fortunate as to agree what kind of Faith, some being for a Seminal, some a Federal, some an Imputative Faith, &c. verifying the Proverb; Tot capita, tot sensus,) then we may conclude that there's no such thing as Regeneration; for if we be Believers from the Womb, where is there any room for the New Birth? and if that be once admitted, the whole scope and frame of the Gospel is subverted; for it would be an absurd Errand to call such to Believe, who are Believers by a Birth-privilege, and in a state of Regeneration as soon as Born. But common Experience confutes this Childish fancy. And for that distinction (some of them make) of Faith in

actu primo, or Potential Faith not yet grown up to actual, were it admitted (for which there is no Reason, the Maxim being just and safe, *Ubi lex non distinguit, non est distinguendum*; Where the Law distinguishes not, we must not distinguish,) yet it would not serve the turn, since Unbeliever's Children may be as truly said to have Faith in *Actu primo*, or potentially, as Believer's Children, they proving frequently Converts, and precious Saints, whilst Believer's Children often run the broad way of Wickedness. Besides if Children had such a Faith, and that the distinction were (as it is not) good, it would not be enough, because no Faith but an actual personal Faith qualifies for Baptism.

But he says, Supposing their Baptism else-where warranted in Scripture. But why is not that Scripture produced? 'tis much talked of, but we can never see it: which makes us conclude, that men that are so nimble to press Scriptures into their service, that not a whit be friend their Cause, if they could hit upon any such plain Text, would be brisk enough to bring it forth. But alas! if they had their Warrant from Scripture, they would not take such pains to prove that the silence of the Scripture is such an Argument to evince the lawfulness of their practice [a very mad and wild way of reasoning] nor run to the beginning of the World, to find some protection for it among the Jewish Rites. Gospel Ordinances must be evidenced by Gospel Authority. What instruction of the New Testament but is plainly to be proved by New-Testament Scripture? Must Baptism alone (though so plainly, yea in words at length, both as to subject and form of Administration there instituted) be beholden to Circumcision, Gen. xvii. 7 for its Original? though as different and remote from it as the Gospel is from the Law; If so, Why are not the Baptized Infants now admitted to the privileges the Circumcised were of old? viz. to be Members of the Church now, as they were then of

the Common-wealth; to come to the Supper, as they to the Passover, &c. this Riddle we desire may be unfolded.

But he goes on in the same Tune, and tells us, that as here is no express mention of Infants (that's well granted) so no word, phrase, or clause, that can be rationally interpreted to exclude them.

No more is there any word, phrase, or clause excluding Unbelievers Children, nay which is more, not so much as a word, phrase, or clause that (literally) excludes Bells, Church walls, Standards, &c. from Baptism; and if that be ground enough for this Author to Baptize them, let him take the Honor of the Employment.

He says, Christ may have given this Commission only with reference to the Adult (that we believe and contend for; and 'tis now happily granted us,) and may have sufficiently declared his will concerning the Baptism of Infants in other parts of his Word, that's the thing he should prove, and that other part of his Word; if he knows it, he should direct us to, and so end the Controversy. We have read the Bible over and over, and can find no such thing. We guess what he drives at, and believe he'll settle at last in the Old shift of Gen. xvii. 7. But when he comes there, we are prepared to encounter him.

He says page 28. 'Tis not necessary that our Lord Christ should expressly declare his whole mind in any part of his Word, nor not in the Commission itself, for the administration of them. He would do well to forbear charging Christ with Mental Reservations in his Directions and Commissions to his APOSTLES. We think our selves concerned to obey that part of his will he is pleased to reveal to us, and that he exacts our Obedience no further. And if Mr. Whiston durst do things in presumption, that they are that part of his Will he reveals not, so

taking upon him to pry into the Arcana of God, we will not be of his Confederacy, nor Abettors to so desperate a piece of Arrogance. He'll find himself puzzled to answer that Question, Who hath required these things at your hands?

He proceeds, and would make us believe, that the Commission, Matt. xviii. 19 is so intricate and insufficient, that nothing of the principal things therein included, can be made out by it; and the better to make the Reader out of conceit with it, propounds five or six Questions, whether to puzzle, or give us work or shew his dexterity in quibbling, is not much to the matter. It is the discretion of Foxes to raise a dust, that in the Obscurity it makes, they may make an unobserved retreat to their Hole, from the Horseman's pursuit. Our Author has learnt that policy; his meaning is involved in a Labyrinth of Obscurities, and inextricable Meanders.

1. He tells us, if we will believe him, That it is not determinable by the Commission, Whether the Nations were to be Discipled by Teaching or Baptizing. That this is an idle Criticism will appear to any Body that understands the meaning of the Verb μαθητεύσατε, which is to make Disciples by Teaching, (for Baptism cannot make one a Scholar,) and Βαπτίζουτε, the participle of the present-tense holds forth, that immediately upon their being made Disciples by the Word, they are to be added to the Church by Baptism, which is the interpretation that's exemplified by the Apostles, Acts ii. 41.

2. Who among the Nations to whom the Gospel is preached, ought to be accounted Disciples, and as such the proper subjects of Baptism? This he proposes as a knotty point, but as Enigmatical as he would make it, we evidence the Justice of our practice by this Dilemma. Either Christ sent them to Baptize all the World whether they will be Baptized or not, or such only as

receive their Doctrine: The former Mr. Whiston will not, nor dares not avouch; therefore the latter answers his Question. Besides the Scripture plainly Resolves it, (and that he cannot say of his Infant Baptism for the dear sake of which, he makes this clutter,) when it tells us, That they were such as gladly received the Word, Acts ii. 41 and such as professed they believed with all their hearts, Acts viii. 37 &c.

3. Whether the Nations were to be Baptized as Discipled, or as men? the Resolution of the former may be enough for this also; the Text says, (Βαπτίζοντες,) Baptizing, but who? why certainly it must be (μαθητάς,) Disciples, understood in the Verb μαθητεύσατε, which exactly agrees with the Apostles practice, (the best Comment upon the Text) And if you refer the Pronoun αὐτοῦς, to τα ἔθνη, (which is false Syntax too, unless you run for refuge to the figure Synthesis, which is, Oratio congrua sensu non voce) and so conclude that all the Nation whether Discipled or not, are baptizable; 'tis evident you pervert the meaning of Christ, and would make up a Synagogue of Heathens, instead of a Christian Church.

4. What the manner of Baptism is, whether to be administered by Dipping or Sprinkling? this he says is not determinable by the Commission.

But we affirm, and he cannot deny, that the Word properly and natively signifies to dip, or plunge under water; never to sprinkle; and therefore conclude it the safest way to keep to the proper meaning of the Word. If Sprinkling had been Christ's way, he wanted not a fit expression for it: And if he and his party durst play the Critics upon his words, and commit a Rape upon his very expressions, we durst not join with them in it.

5. Whether only Males, or both Males and Females ought to be Baptized αὐτοῦς, being the Masculine gender?

He might as well raise this scruple, whether Females are concerned in most Christian Duties, because the words of the Text are addressed to the Male kind, the Masculine as the most worthy, comprehending the other Gender. Is a Woman excluded from the duty of Self-examination, because the Pronoun ἐαυτόν is in the Masculine Gender, 1 Cor. xi. 28 or from the duty to abide in the Calling whereunto she is called, because ἕκαστος, (1 Cor. vii. 20) is so? Doth not the Article ὅν respect both Man and Woman, ὅν δύο, they two shall be made one flesh. And why we cannot be allowed the same liberty here, I know not.

Having raised this mist, he thinks in the Obscurity he has made about the Commission, he might bring in Infant Sprinkling, that it may lurk there too, telling us that since these Particulars are as difficultly to be made out by the Commission, as Infant-Baptism, he may have recourse to other Revelations to evidence it.

Answ. He might have had that liberty without making so Critical an Invasion upon this grand Commission. (2.) We take it as an instance of the unlikelihood of his producing any other Revelation, because he tampers with the Commission at that rate, and spins out time, never coming to any such Revelation, wearying the Reader, with such a Circuit and Maze of words, that he forgets the beginning, before he comes to the end. But (3rdly.)

Let him from other Scriptures or Revelations make out, That Infant-Baptism is warranted in this Commission as clearly and undeniably as we can Evidence, that those only ought to be Baptized (in pursuance of it) as gladly receive the word, Females, as well as Males (being the thing he would make us believe are so indemonstrable by it) and we shall submit unto it; In the meantime, let him not take it ill, if we take no more notice of him, then of a man under a great and radical mistake, though he may perhaps expect as much Reverence as Delphos.

He says, p. 32. The very not mentioning Infants, does strongly imply his will they should be Baptized.

That's a Consequence I never heard before; and proves the Baptism of a Turks Child, or of Bells, as well as the Baptism he pleads for. But why so? because Mr. Whiston takes it for granted, that Infants were Church members under the Law, and this Commission, nor no other Text in Scripture doth repeal those privileges. Is that it? why then, let us examine whether this be sound Doctrine.

And that it is not so, will appear from Acts xxi. 21 where you have plain Scripture-proof, that Infant-Church membership is repealed. The words are; *And they are informed of thee, that thou teachest all the Jews, which are among the Gentiles, to forsake Moses, saying, that they ought not to Circumcise their Children, neither to walk after the Customs.*

These words were spoken by the Elders of the Church at Jerusalem to Paul; in which are these things to be considered.

1. A Report of a certain new Doctrine, that Paul had Preached among the Jews.
2. The Doctrine itself, that they ought to forsake Moses, &c.

Concerning the first, we are to examine, Whether Paul did Preach such a Doctrine or no? 2. Whether the Doctrine he Preached were true?

For the first, it is evident that Paul did preach so, that they must forsake Moses, and not Circumcise their Children &c. otherwise he need not have consented to purify himself, and so far to Judaize, contrary to the Gospel, and his own light; his denial only, of the matter of Fact, would have been a sufficient Confutation of such a Rumor: But he denies it not (that would be to forsake

his Gospel-Ministry) but in a peaceable condescension, complies to purify himself, that he may appear to be no Condemner of the Law, that removing their prejudice, he may have opportunity to preach Christ the Anti-type of all their Typical Administrations.

2. That also is undoubted, that the Gospel Doctrine he preached, viz. that the Jews and all others ought to forsake Moses, &c. is true, and suitable to the Gospel dispensation. If Mr. Whiston denies it, he is more Jew than Christian.

The next doubt is, What is meant by forsaking of Moses? To which I Answer.

1. To forsake him as a Prophet, or Minister of the Gospel Church, God having now raised up another Prophet, whom we must Hear in all things relating to the matter and manner of Worship in the House of God: For though Moses was faithful in his House, as a Servant, yet he must give way to Christ, the Great Prophet, Heb. iii., and no longer give Laws, or prescribe Rules about the matter or manner of Worship; yea nothing as to the Subject, Time, or Place, is to be received from him; but in all things we must be instructed by that Prophet that God hath raised up from amongst our Brethren: this is the substance of Paul's Doctrine.

2. Not to Circumcise their Children, is to forsake Moses, as the Text particularly makes out; because Circumcision was a Law or Doctrine they had learned from Moses; for though Circumcision was first given to Abraham, yet it is called Moses' Law, John vii. 22. Moses therefore gave unto you Circumcision, &c. But you must forsake this Law or Doctrine of Moses, and not Circumcise your Children any more. This sounds very Harsh, and was very grievous and offensive to them, that it caused such Fear in the Elders, that some Trouble and Hazard to his Person would follow; which was the ground of that Compliance in purifying themselves, to pacify the Jews for the present; they being so

exceeding zealous for the Law, and especially for Circumcising their Children, that Opposition was Death, or severe Punishment. Now had Paul told them, their Children should be Baptized, and that Baptism was come into the room of Circumcision, &c. in all likelihood it would have quieted them. But seeing there is no mention of any such thing, that He preached such Doctrine amongst them (which without Controversy would have been mentioned, had he done so) it plainly appears that Paul knew no such thing, neither had he any Commission to preach such Doctrine, as the Baptizing of Infants amongst them.

And this further is confirmed, if we consider the determination of the First Council, who were met about this very Doctrine of Circumcising Children, &c. that the Jews were still so zealous for, and knew not how to bear the Abrogation of it, (though they did believe in Christ,) and they would have enjoined it upon the Gentiles, as necessary to Salvation, Acts xv. Now if it were a duty to Baptize Children instead of Circumcising of them, then the Apostles were unfaithful in not telling them of it, especially at this time, when there was so fair an opportunity to quiet their Consciences, and to put the matter out of doubt, and for ever to cashier the Doctrine of Circumcision; which we see the Jewish Teachers were afterwards endeavouring to promote. But in regard the Apostles mention no such thing as Baptizing of Infants in their debates in this Council, nor in their Letters they sent to the Churches, it is evident they received no such Commission from Christ. And how any man can Believe otherwise, and not reflect imprudence, yea horrible unfaithfulness upon the Apostles, I cannot imagine.

The next to be considered in this Text is, that the Jews are also forbidden to walk after the custom, that is after the manner, for so the word ἔθος is rendered, Acts xv. (unless ye be Circumcised

after the manner of Moses, &c.) So that this word Custom, or Manner of Moses, prohibits not only all Observation of the Law of Moses, but also all walking after the same way and manner, as the Ordinances of the Law were administered in. Here is not only an Injunction of non-conformity to the Law, but to the manner of it also. They are not only forbidden to Circumcise their Children, but also to walk after the Custom or Manner of Circumcision; and therefore not to Baptize their Children. Paul might have said, indeed to Circumcise your Children was the Custom and Manner of Old; but as for the Baptizing them, we have no such custom, nor the Churches of God.

And hence it is clear, that Infants Church-membership is repealed, and consequently have no right to Baptism. For,

If Infants (as our Modern Pædo-Baptists allege) were virtually Commanded to be Baptized in the Command for Circumcision; and that Infant-Circumcision, and Infant-Baptism were both Instituted together (as they that bring the latter from Gen. xvii. 7 must needs hold;) then they are both uncommanded again, in these very words, Acts xxi. 21, where God by the mouth of Paul forbad them to Circumcise their Children any longer, and to walk after the Old Customs. I say again, if Infant-Baptism was commanded in the Command for Circumcision of Infants, then by Analogic (for *Contrariorum, contraria est ratio,*) Infant-Baptism must needs be abrogated, and remanded, in the abrogation and remanding of Circumcision, And though I do not believe, that the precept to Circumcise Infants, was so much as a Virtual or Consequential Command to Baptize them; yet it is an Argument ad hominem at least; and I hope the Pædo-baptists will be very willing to receive the same measure they give; and rest satisfied in this, that the Countermand to Circumcise Infants is a Consequential and Virtual Countermand to Baptize them. By all

which it appears, that Infant-Church membership is repealed, because the same Law that gave being to it, is repealed. And whether this be not as plain (yea plainer) Scripture-proof, as any Mr. B. hath in his Book so Entitled, is left to the judgement of the Considerate and Impartial Reader.

Now he comes to it, and promises to direct us where those other Revelations of God's will are, that Infants should be Baptized: And reading on very attentively, and going with patience through his preambular Extravagancies, and wide fetches, he brings me at last to the saying of Peter to the Jews, *The promise is to you and your Children*; and the words of Paul to a Gentile, *Believe in the Lord Jesus, and thou shalt be Saved, and thy House*: Which put together, is his other Revelation (he brags so much of) for Infant-Baptism.

Answ. Now we are to encounter with all his strength at once; therefore let us try the force of this mighty Argument. And,

1. If he can spell such a meaning out of it, 'tis more than we can do; and if he had a mind to be understood, he should express himself in more familiar terms. As what this promise was. (2.) Whether absolute, or conditional. (3.) How Extensive? But since he hath left us in the dark, let us a little examine it.

1. What this promise is? And we say, that it must be either of some Temporal Blessing, or the Holy Spirit, as Ephes. i. 13 in this World; or Life and Salvation hereafter. The two first Mr. Whiston will not pretend to, because they have no reference to his Baptism. It is the last then, viz. the promise of Life and Salvation, he insists upon, as p. 34. And then the words of Peter will run thus; the promise (of Life and Salvation) is to you (Jews) and your Children, and to as many as are afar off, which all agree to be the Gentiles, and as many as the Lord your God shall call, (indefinitely without distinction, whether Jew or Gentile.)

Now this promise so paraphrased, is either Absolute, or Conditional: If absolute, then all Jews, Gentiles, and their Children are Saved, whether they Believe or not: If you understand it conditionally, viz. that they first profess Faith in the Messiah, and receive him as their Saviour; then we are agreed.

And if you say, It is Conditional to the Adult, not their Seed: I answer, Then it must be absolute to the Seed; if so, then all their Seed must needs be Saved. And then, How come so many of them to be so vile and wicked? if you say 'tis only to some; then it must follow, that some Believer's Children ought only to be Baptized, viz. the Elect; but 'tis impossible to assign which are Elect, and which non Elect; therefore uncertain from that ground, which ought, and which ought not to be Baptized. And if you say, the Covenant of Grace (or promise of Life and Salvation) be made to Believer's Seed only, and consequently they only have right to Baptism: then it will follow, that the Church is not to be raised out of the Posterity of Unbelievers, which is absurd; for the Gospel is to be Preached to gather in the Elect, viz. such as are in the Covenant of Grace: But if the Children of Believers only are in the Covenant of Grace, then to what purpose is the Gospel preached to the Posterity of Unbelievers, unless it be to harden them? for suppose a Nation of Indians, whose Parents were all Heathens, and who therefore (according to your Opinion) with their present Children, are not in the Covenant of Grace, Will you Preach to them? If you do, I ask you to what purpose? you'll say, To bring them into the Covenant of Grace. Then it seems there are two ways to come into the Covenant of Grace; one by being the Natural Child of a Believer; the other by Actual Faith. But this is ridiculous, for there is no being in the Covenant of Grace, but by Election on God's part; and actual Faith on Man's part.

And if you still say, That Believer's Infants only are in the visible Covenant of Grace, and all the Seed of Unbelievers excluded; then I demand, Whether you do not make two Covenants of Grace, Visible, and Invisible? But if you deny that (for 'tis hard to know where to find you) and say your Children are Visibly in the Covenant of Grace, when others are not, I Answer; you delude us very often with the word (Visible) for sometimes your Infants are, sometimes they are not in the Covenant (visibly;) so that this term is as ambiguous and mystical as words of Cabal. 2. But if you mean by Visibly, that they are plainly and manifestly obvious to the view of all persons that are capable of seeing in the Covenant, then we deny your Visibility. And if you mean, by Visible, that they are in the Covenant, as far as you can judge, since you know nothing to the contrary: We say the same of Unbeliever's Infants; for they may be in the Covenant for any thing we know, nothing appearing in their Infancy to the contrary; and, *Præsumere unum quemq; bonum, nisi constet de malo*; is your own Rule.

3. If by (Visibly) you understand outwardly, or in the outward part of the Covenant, which is Baptism; we answer, That Baptism is no more the outward part of the Covenant, than the Purse that contains money is the outward part of the money; or the Conduit the outward part of the Water; or Aaron's Pot that held the Manna, the outward part of the Manna. &c. For Baptism is a Symbol of Regeneration, viz. Faith, Repentance, Self-denial, &c. and to affirm, that it is the outward part of the Covenant, is a very Fancy, and mere Chimera.

So that you see what a Heap of irregular Jarrings and Absurdities follow the Assertion, that the Believer's Carnal Seed, as such, are to inherit this promise.

And now I am come to the next consideration, which is, The extensiveness of this promise; and this is determined in the Text, it is (to all that are afar off) equal to the Posterity of Abraham; which spoils the pretence from the Birth privilege. But what puts the matter out of doubt, is the next phrase, (Even as many as the Lord your God shall call;) which expounds the former, and proves that calling (or Regeneration) is the condition of the promise, and that only such as are called of Jew, Gentile, and their Children, are Inheritors of it, according to Gal. iii. 29,

As to that expression, *Believe in the Lord Jesus, and thou shalt be Saved, and thy House*. Is it Mr. Whiston's meaning, that all in the House, Servants, Children, &c. are Saved, though Unconverted, by the Faith of the Master? (but that's a conclusion, he durst not stand by:) Or is that promise of Salvation given to him, and his Household, upon the condition of his and the Household's Faith individually? If this latter be his sense, we join with him in it; but renounce the former as absurd, and unsound: For if it were allowed, then one may be Saved by the Faith of another (a Fancy exploded by all Protestants) and so it were enough to Save all England, if every Master of a Family had been a Believer. I would ask Mr. W. if taking himself to be a Believer, he would Baptize his Servant, and believe him Saved, though an Unbeliever, upon that ground? If it be his Religion, his practice shall not be my example.

Besides, if the Covenant promise, they so vehemently affirm to belong to Believer's Children only, must be limited to them, and extend no further; how come Servants that are not so concerned in the Birth-privilege, nor the Seed of Believers, to be pleaded for by this man, to have a right to Baptism and Salvation upon the Master's Faith? We grant they have as much right to it, as the Children (that is none at all till Converted) for the Text says, Thou

and thy House, (and I presume the Servant is one of the House), so that a Believer's Servant has as much right to be Baptized, as the Believer's Child, though the Servant cannot pretend to be the Issue of Faithful Parents: And if so, What's the Reason they Baptize not their Servants, they having the same Title with their Children to it. And indeed if they will grant, that the Master, or Chief Man's Faith, is enough to entitle all his Family, or those under his Government to Baptism and Salvation; then if the King of Spain, or the Pope, or Great Turk be Converted, 'tis enough to Warrant our Pædo-Baptists to Baptize not only all in their great Courts, but all that Inhabit their Territories also; their Subjects being their Servants. And how pure such a Doctrine is, that would force so gross an absurdity upon the Scriptures, let the World judge.

So that I humbly conceive it is very evident, that neither the one nor the other Scripture, jointly, or severally holds forth the promise of Salvation, or a right to Baptism to any one, upon any other account, than the Condition of personal Faith. And that Mr. Whiston's confident boast of other Revelations is an empty flourish.

He says, p. 35. It was very rational, yea necessary, the Commission should be expressed in the Order it is, because those to whom the Apostles were sent, were in a state of darkness, and ignorance, wholly estranged from God and his ways.

That's a certain truth, which we oppose not; but is there not the same necessity still? Are not the Nations in a state of darkness, ignorance, and wholly estranged from God now, as well as then, till Converted? Are not the Infants you Sprinkle, Children of Wrath as well as others? And therefore is it not as necessary that the preaching of the Gospel should be antecedent to Baptism now, as (they confess) it was then? For my part I know no

difference between a Heathen and an Unbeliever; they are both alike distant from God, and both equally capable of his converting Grace. And this serves for an Answer to this, as well as the two following Considerations, being of the same purport.

He affirms, page 37. That the promise of Salvation, and Covenant of Grace, in which the promise is contained, is still extended to the Houses or Families of Believers, as such. To which I say, as before, that his sayings would be more regarded, if he would condescend to prove them. But however, if he means it conditionally, viz. if they believe, they may be Baptized, and Saved, we grant it: But if he intends it positively, that the Master's Faith is enough to Entitle the whole Family to Salvation, the Covenant of Grace and Baptism, without their personal Faith, we absolutely deny it; and he has not yet proved it, nor indeed is he able to do it.

He goes on, still harping upon the same string, and tells us, page 38. That if Mr. Danvers could have produced any one Scripture, wherein the Apostles did exclude Infants, or in their practice did refuse to Baptize them, he had said something to his purpose.

'Tis an unpleasant task to be answering to the very same thing so often; that when this Protæus varies his word, but not his sense, to make the Reader believe it is a new Argument, shall we be obliged to be as impertinent in replying, as he is in enhancing the bulk of his Book by such trifling Repetitions? Have we not over and over again, told him, (his own party with open mouth, affirming the same thing) that for every positive part of God's Worship, there is need of Scripture precept, or example to warrant it? And is not our practice of Baptizing Believers confirmed by both, as all parties confess? Whereas Mr. Baxter (and others) own that Infant Baptism has no express mention in Scripture, nor in

the Records and Histories of the Church. More proofs, p. 279. &c.

2. Have we not again and again affirmed, (and which is no other than pure Protestant Doctrine; Witness Dr. Owen in his answer to Mr. Parker, page 345. where he calls what Mr. W. here urges a captious and sophistical Tale, by which ten thousand things may be made lawful. And a little further says, that every thing (esteemed as any part of Divine Worship) is forbidden, that is not commanded.) That the affirmative Command includes the Negative; and so the command to Baptize Believers, and the constant practice of the Apostolical primitive times to Baptize only such, is enough to warrant the exclusion of Infants from that Ordinance; so that the Scripture indeed excludes them, in as much as it doth not include them: and the command of Baptizing persons upon a profession of Faith, excludes such as cannot, or will not make such a profession. But he would have us tell him, where or when the Apostles refused to Baptize any? But it were more proper for him, to give us some instance when any were brought or offered to them to be Baptized, for we read of none refused, because none offered; and certainly had it been the practice to Baptize Infants, we should have some instance of it in some part of the New-Testament. We never yet found in Scripture that the Apostles refused to Baptize the Children of Unbelievers, shall we therefore conclude they were Baptized. But we read, Mark x. 14 (the Text so often produced for Infant-Baptism, but a pregnant place against it) that the Disciples rebuked such as brought Children to Christ, which surely they would not have done, had it been the practice to Baptize them. Besides the Text says, they brought them only to be touched by our Saviour, and he blest, not Baptized them; and certainly, if any Infants had a right to be Baptized, those Infants had it; for Christ says, of such is the Kingdom of Heaven; he knew if they were of the Elect, and

therefore it would be no Hazard to baptize them, had he allowed it. But this Text indeed informs us, that our Children may be blest, and be of the Kingdom of Heaven, by the application of God's Free Grace without Baptism; which is only a Duty to such as it is commanded to, viz. such as are capable of Faith and Repentance. But,

3. Will Mr. Whiston indeed adventure to practice any thing that is not literally and syllabically forbidden in Scripture (not allowing any Negative consequences?) If so, then the children of Heathens, or Turks, &c. being not, in so many words, forbidden to be baptized, will give him employment enough. And hundreds of the ridiculous inventions of Romish Impostors are not forbidden by name and circumstance, (being indeed not known any more than Infant-baptism in those times:) Will he therefore hold them lawful? and this is the consequence of his Doctrine, utterly exploded by the most Orthodox Protestants.

He proceeds page 40. and would have us believe, That Infants are capable of the ends and uses of Baptism, whereof he mentions two: 1. To seal, confirm, and ratify the Covenant, with the promise there of, unto those with whom it is established. 2. To give those a solemn admission into the Visible Church, who have an antecedent right thereto: and this he takes for granted (which is begging upon begging) concluding, He will not spend time in the proof of that, which no Body can or will deny.

Now he has made quick work on it; but should not he have known our minds before so confident a publication of our assent to his Dictate?

And since that's all, we do here publicly enter our dissent and lay down this as our belief; That Infants (till they grow up and are converted) are not capable of the ends and uses of Baptism, which are; to witness Repentance and Regeneration already wrought, to

represent the Death, Burial, and Resurrection of Christ, the washing away our sins by the blood of Christ, our union with, and putting on Christ, our entrance into, and right to partake of all the privileges in the Visible Church. And as to what Mr. Whiston says, since he only begs, That the Covenant and Promises are established with Infants, and therefore have an Antecedent right to Church membership; We reject it, as unproved, and unscriptural. And he is at liberty to make good his, and disprove our assertion if he can: Which I shall expect, ad Calendas Græcas.

He tells us, page 46. That John did not discharge the Jews from any privilege they afore had, only rectifies a mistake they lay under.

Here he had done honestly if he had acquainted us what their mistake was, since he knows John's mind so well: but alas, he fore-saw that that would spoil his aim; therefore that the Reader may not be at a loss altogether, I have Transcribed it from Dr. Owen's Exercit before-mentioned; and I dare say, the Doctor knows their mistake as well as our Answerer; he (I mean the Doctor) calls it a woeful and fatal mistake, page 55, 56. For they would entail Gospel-privileges upon the old Fæderal right, and would share of the blessings belonging only to Believers, upon the carnal consideration of being Abraham's natural Posterity; They thought (says this Judicious Divine) no more was needful to interest them in the Covenant of Abraham, but that they were Abraham's Seed according to the flesh, pleading the later privilege as the ground of the former: But on that account they could have no other privilege then Abraham had in the flesh himself, viz. that God would derive the promised Seed (the Messiah) through his Loins into the World. And is not this to a tittle, the mistake of our Pædo-baptists, who plead for Infant-baptism from the very same ground of the Birth privilege, and

entailing Church-Ordinances upon the same Fæderal Right they did?

I cannot but note an expression he hath, page 38, viz. Because we know not the time when Infant-baptism was instituted, we may therefore say it is from Heaven, and not of men.

Now I perceive the reason why he bestows so glorious a Title upon his Book. But shall we conclude that the Tares the Enemy sowed, while the Watchmen slept, were from Heaven, and not of men, since the drowsy Watchmen cannot calculate the time they were sown to a minute? Learned Usher gives Malone the Jesuit an answer to this purpose, when he maintained, that the Mass was of Divine institution, because Protestants could not exactly find out its Nativity, or when the fooleries that attend it, had their Original. Must we receive every error, when we cannot assign the critical minute of its broaching? Suppose I know not the time when Mr. Whiston was born, shall I therefore conclude him not to be a man, nor of men, but dropt from Heaven, &c? Is it not enough, if we can tell the time when Infant-baptism was not in the Church? and that Mr. Baxter has (very kindly) done for us, when he says, that it has no express mention in the Records or Histories of the Church, for the first (and purest) Centuries. And if this be the ground of his mock-title, I shall conclude it to be (like Mr. Bs. plain Scripture-proof) of a complexion that cannot blush.

As to what he saith about Tradition, being nothing of weight, and upon which he leans not much, I shall pass it by, only note that Dr. Owen defines Tradition, page 20. Exercit. on the Heb. Tom. 1. to be a general uninterrupted Fame conveyed and confirmed by particular Instances, Records, and Testimonies in all ages. And no other Tradition, the Doctor says, is of any weight. And how far short of making out his Infant sprinkling, by Tradition so

understood this Author hath been, is sufficiently demonstrated already. And so I proceed.

He saith page 75. It is their Covenant-interest that we contend for principally, and design the proof of from the Covenant at first established with Abraham; and again, we plead not for Infant Baptism from the Analogy it bears with or to Circumcision, but from the Command obliging Abraham's Seed in their Generations to keep the token of the Covenant.

This is somewhat odd, he pleads not for Circumcision, but from the token of the Covenant, which in another place he calls Circumcision; which is in plain English that he pleads, and pleads not, from Circumcision: So that I know not how to come at him. This is a new way of distinction, to distinguish Circumcision from Circumcision; he would seem to leave that baffled argument of some of the Ancients, and yet he cannot but be at it again.

We acknowledge there was a Command obliging Abraham's Seed in their Generations to be Circumcised, (which he means by the token of the Covenant,) but that administration came to its period at the coming of Christ; and therefore the command of being Circumcised is not in force now. Nor have we any new Command that Believers and their Seed must be baptized in their Generations; besides the term Generations is frequently used to signify a certain and limited time, the burning of the Kidneys, and the burning of the Fat of Beasts to be Sacrificed, is said to be a perpetual Statute in their Generations, Lev. iii. 17. So the Offerings made by fire, Lev. vi. 18. The Feast of Booths. Lev. xxiii. 41 which nevertheless have their period with the Law. So where God promises to be a God to Abraham and his carnal Seed in their Generations, it is meant during the Legal administration; not but that if Abraham be understood as a Spiritual Father, God will be a God to him, and his Seed, viz. (such as did believe as he

did) without limitation, for ever. Whereas if he be understood as a Political and Natural Parent, the Covenant then must needs be understood (to make any thing for them) absolute and everlasting; but that were absurd, for the Natural Seed of Abraham, viz. the Unbelieving Jews have broken the Covenant, and are now cut off, which they could not have been, if that Position on were true.

But that the Covenant was not absolute (as it respected the Temporal of Spiritual Seed of Abraham,) I evince thus: If (while the Church of the Jews was in being) God denies himself to be their God, and disowns them as his people, because of their transgression, then the promise was Conditional, not absolute, but the Antecedent is true, Hos. i. 9; Exod. xix. 5, 6; Jer. xxiii. 14.

But if you lay so much stress upon that expression, that God should be a God to you and your Seed, what account will it amount unto? for you can apply nothing of the Promise to them, but the bare outward act of Baptizing (or rather Rantizing?) but what of favour or Spiritual saving-mercy is that? or what advantage is it? since the Children that die Unbaptized, are as capable of Salvation, as those you Baptize. For it is the Protestant Doctrine, not to ascribe Salvation *Opere operato*, and therefore Baptism confers not Grace, nor Saves the dying Soul, unless in conjunction with Faith, which applies the blood of Christ.

The Covenant made to Abraham and his Spiritual Seed, respects Salvable Mercies, Grace here, and Glory hereafter; but Baptism of Infants can confer neither, therefore it is not the Covenant made with Abraham.

Nor need we yield to that Opinion that would force us to acknowledge no Covenant but what is mutual, because this Covenant consists of Free Donation, and so rather a Testament than Covenant, as Ames *Mar. Divinity*, lib. 1. cap. 23. affirms. And the word כְּבִדָּה is Translated Διαθήκη in this place by the 70;

and in all places of the Old Testament, except Isai. xxvii. 15 where they render it συνθή and fedus vel pactum inter partes, a Covenant betwixt parties, as Leigh in his Critica sacra. And that Διαθήκη is Englished a Testament, see Matt. xxvi. 28; Mark xiv. 14; Heb. ix. 15, 17; 1 Cor. xi. 25; Luke xxii. 20. So that the most proper expression is, to call it the Testament of Grace; and this name is most agreeable to the nature of the thing, for God doth hereby dispose, convey, and bestow all that Grace which may fit all his Heirs for his Eternal Glory.

By virtue of this Testament, or Covenant of Grace was the Land of Canaan promised to Abraham for his Natural Posterity; which Typified the Heavenly Canaan, which his Spiritual Seed should enjoy, upon the exhibition of the Messiah; and which is indeed the chief Blessing: Not but that some of his natural Seed too should enjoy the later, provided they be his Spiritual Seed by Faith, as well as his Natural Seed by Generation: See Jer. xxxii. 40; Heb. viii. 8, 9, 10, 11, 12 and x. 16, 17; Jer. xxxi. 23 and that same condition of Faith is still required of the Seed of Believers, and without it they have no interest in Christian Ordinances; which Mr. W. takes no notice of, but concludes in contradiction to what he said before, That as Abraham and his Seed were Circumcised, Believers and their Seed must be Baptized; the main thing in doubt betwixt us, and for which he offers no proof.

But he goes on page 77. If the Covenant Believers are now under, be the same with that established with Abraham and his Seed, and that as such: that Circumcision was the sign, token, or seal of the Covenant, and Baptism doth now succeed in the place, room, and use of Circumcision; then Infants ought to be Baptized, as, of old they were Circumcised: (observe his frequent contradictions, just now he renounced what here he concludes:) But if these, or any of these things be not so, but are mere mistakes on our parts, I

must confess we have no sure footing for Infant-Baptism in the Covenant, as at first established with Abraham and his Seed in their Generation.

This is indeed the grand Fabric whereby Infant-Baptism has been of late Years supported; which if we can demolish, the Super structure must needs fall, as now ingeniously acknowledged. Nor need we employ any greater strength against it, than what Dr. Owen lends us, Exercit. 6. page 55. &c. quoted before: where he solidly confutes the Plea from the Birth-privilege, to Christian Ordinances. And therefore to produce Dr. Owen against Mr. Whiston, is a sufficient Confutation, if we had said no more. And this being the Radical Thesis, to which the other Considerations, he wastes his paper and time about, are only subservient as Attendants, (that the number and equipage of the retinue might bespeak its grandeur and port.) If we should take no notice of any thing he says further, but apply our Arguments only to that, it were enough, since if this be once counted, the rest of his Book is cashiered of course.

Which piece of Service the Doctor has excellently done to our hands, proving undeniably that Abraham has but two Seeds, the natural Jew, and actual professing Believers; and that such only as are Heirs of Abraham's Faith, have right to Gospel privileges, the old Fæderal right being insufficient to entitle the Jews thereto; therefore let Mr. Whiston either convince the Doctor if this be an error, or be convinced by him, in case it be a truth: Or let him reconcile that Exercitation to the practice of Baptizing Infants upon a Fæderal Right, or tell us plainly, in what third capacity the Infant seed of Believers now are the children of Abraham, since they are not his natural Seed (as all must own) nor (as the Doctor well words it in the case of the Jews) can they, wanting personal Faith, be counted his Spiritual Seed?

But however a little to examine this foundation-principle, three Things are to be offered to our Enquiry: 1. whether the Covenant Believers are now under, be the same established with Abraham and his Seed. 2. Whether Circumcision be the sign, token, or seal of that Covenant. 3. whether Baptism doth succeed in the place, use, and room of Circumcision.

To the first I say as before, that the Covenant must be considered in a two-fold respect; 1. In respect to Spiritual Blessings, Grace here, and Glory hereafter; so it is and was the same to Abraham's Spiritual Seed in and through all Generations from him to us, viz. such as Believed as he did. 2. In respect to Temporal blessings, and so it was peculiar to his Natural and Spiritual Seed, during the Old-Testament-dispensation, and Typical administrations; and in that respect it is not the same, Believers being now under the former, not the later.

As Abraham is considered under the notion of a double Fatherhood, so there must be a double Sonship to answer that Relation; the Jews were his Sons in one capacity, namely a Carnal Generation, of which they were wont to brag, as appears by the reproof John gave them, Matt. iii. 9. *Think not to say within yourselves, we have Abraham to our Father*; and in the other capacity all Believers, whether Jew or Gentile are his children: This is evidenced Rom. ix. 6, 7, 8. *They are not all Israel that are of Israel; they which are the children of the flesh, these are not the children of God, &c. and v. 7 shews us, that their Carnal Generation gives not the true notion of Sonship.*

The Jew as a Natural Son of Abraham may pretend to Baptism, and New-Testament-Ordinances by a priority in respect of the Offer, Rom. iii. 1, 2. Therefore Christ commanded his Apostles, not to go into the ways of the Gentiles, &c. but *to the lost sheep of the House of Israel*, and Preach the Gospel to them, Matt. x. 5,

6, 7. See Rom. ii. 10 *to the Jew first, and also to the Gentile*; and this gave occasion to the Speech of Peter, Acts ii. 39. *The promise is to you and your Children*, viz. primarily; and to the Gentiles also but secondarily, which they of the Circumcision were astonished at, Acts x. 45. The Gentiles are called afar off, suitable to Eph. ii. 13. *Ye (Gentiles) who sometimes were afar off, are made nigh by the blood of Christ*. Now as it was the preeminence of the Jews to have the Gospel first Preached to them, so we find their carnal prerogative stand them in no stead, Luke iii. 8 where they are informed that Gospel-Ordinances are not bottomed upon Carnal Generation, or privileges; but true Holiness manifested by the fruit it brings forth, viz. Fruits meet for Repentance: He came to his own, but they received him not; and therefore as many as received him, whether Jew or Gentile, to them he gave power to become the Sons of God; and to receive him, is to believe in his Name.

Men are now admitted to Ordinances upon other considerations than legal denominations of clean or unclean, viz. fearing God, and working righteousness, which is not generated or conveyed by Birth, but by the New birth, and the Spirit of the living God. Therefore if the Natural Seed of Abraham could not pretend a right to New-Testament Ordinances by that Title, much less the Adopted Seed, by any such way of Natural Generation. And if their Birth-right could not serve them, how can our Birth-right serve us?

And this may serve as an Answer to the first particular; that the Covenant as it respected Life and Salvation to Believers, is one and the same now as then. But as it respects external administrations, and the qualification of Church-members it is not the same; the legal, typical, fæderal right vanished, and Faith is now the only qualification.

The second, Whether Circumcision be the token, sign, or seal of the Covenant? This needs but a short Reply, for we find it to be called the token of the Covenant, Gen. xvii. 11. And the Apostle, Rom. iv. 11 calls it the sign of Circumcision, a Seal of the righteousness of Faith, &c. intimating by distinguishing between a Sign and a Seal, that Circumcision was to all a Sign, but to Abraham alone a Seal of the righteousness of Faith. And we find Circumcision never called a Seal, but where it speaks of Abraham, which intimates that it was only a Seal to him. And this is suitable to what Chrysostom, Theophilus, and others (quoted upon the place by a very judicious pen) viz. It was called a Seal of the righteousness of Faith, because it was given to Abraham as a Seal and testimony of that righteousness which he had acquired by Faith: Now this seems to be the privilege of Abraham alone, and not to be transferred to others, as if Circumcision, in whom ever it was, were a testimony of Divine righteousness: for as it was the privilege of Abraham, that he should be the father of all the faithful, as well circumcised, as uncircumcised, and being already the father of all uncircumcised, having faith in uncircumcision, he received first the sign of Circumcision, that he might be the father of the Circumcised. Now because he had this privilege in respect of the righteousness which he had acquired by faith, therefore the sign of Circumcision was to him a Seal of the righteousness of Faith, but to the rest of the Jews it was a Sign they were Abraham's Seed, but not a Seal of the righteousness of Faith; all the Jews also were not the Fathers of many Nations. And Jerome upon Gal. iii. saith, Because Christ was to spring from the Seed of Abraham, and many Ages were to pass from Abraham to Christ, the wise God, lest the Seed of beloved Abraham should be mingled with other Nations, and should by degrees be joined more familiarly, distinguished the flock of Israel by a certain mark or Circumcision; then for 40

Years together in the wilderness none were Circumcised, because they were out of the danger of such mixtures, being alone; but as soon as they were past the banks of Jordan, Circumcision prevented the error of mingling with others; where as it is written that they were Circumcised that second time by Joshua, it signifies that Circumcision ceased in the Wilderness, which was rationally used in Egypt.

3. Whether Baptism doth succeed in the room, place, and use of Circumcision?

To answer this doubt, let us consider the great difference between Circumcision, and Baptism. Circumcision was a legal Ordinance appointed to the Jewish Males Reprobate as well as Elect, by a positive command to distinguish them from the rest of the World, as a Token of the Covenant God made with Abraham, viz. that the Messiah should come of his Loins according to the Flesh.

But Baptism is an Evangelical Ordinance, whereby Jew or Gentile, Male or Female, upon a profession of Faith and Repentance is baptized in Water, in token of Regeneration, and to signify the death, burial, and resurrection of Christ, the Messiah already come, and so added to the Visible Church, and admitted to all the privileges thereof, which being not the Office of Circumcision, Baptism cannot be said to succeed in its room, place, and use.

The consideration of the great difference in their institution illustrates this also; for when Christ instituted Baptism, he says, Go teach, and baptize; and in the administration, they confessed and were baptized, Believed and were Baptized; not a word of Infants. And in the Precept of Circumcision, not a word of Teaching, or Faith; but of Infants the command expressly notes the time, age, and sex. The Levitical and Typical Holiness in Abraham's Household, whether natural or adopted, included not

Regeneration, nor heart cleanness, which is our holiness; land, fruit, and trees were Holy, in a typical consideration, when Circumcision was predicated of Trees as well as Men, Lev. xix. 23. And for us to affirm that Trees ought to be now baptized as they were then reputed to be Circumcised, is a wild way of reasoning.

And therefore since things become Ordinances to us by virtue of a word of institution, and no such word is found to make out that Baptism succeeds Circumcision in its room, place, and use, we think it safe to be sober, and advance no further than the Scripture guides. And to make Circumcision institutive of Baptism, is to send us to School to the Law, and that Old first vanishing Covenant, as it is styled, Heb. viii. as if the Law-giver in the New-Testament had not by a positive institution established his Ordinances there, nor left us any Warrant for our Gospel-Duties, without that retrogression to Moses, and assimilating them to the Pædagogy and similitude of Types.

So that these things being found mere mistakes on Mr. Whiston's side, we may conclude (in his own words), that they have no sure footing in the Covenant for the baptizing of Infants.

He saith, page 81. The Covenant Gen. xvii. 7 was made with Abraham in both capacities, viz. as a Natural, and Spiritual Father. What then? This is a mere Ignoratio Elenchi, and Mr. W. has a peculiar Talent to prove that which is not denied. But to this I have spoken before.

He argues, page 89. thus: If Jacob and Esau in their Infant-state, were heirs of the World, through the righteousness of Faith, when they had no personal faith, then the Infant-seed of Believers may be so too. But—Ergo—the Text he grounds upon is Heb. xi. 9 *dwelling in Tabernacles with Isaac and Jacob, heirs with him of the same Promise.*

The vanity of which consequence will appear, if you consider,

1. That there is nothing in that Text to countenance his assertion: We grant Isaac and Jacob were heirs of the same Promise, as well in respect of God's Covenant with their Father Abraham and his Seed, as their own personal faith, when they came to years; but that it should follow, that all the Carnal Seed of Believers should be so too, is that that needs proof, and we deny.

2. I humbly conceive, That to be heirs of the world through the righteousness of faith, and yet have no personal faith, as he words it, is mere contradiction and nonsense.

3. The promise to which Isaac and Jacob were heirs, is, That the Messiah should come of their Loins, according to the Flesh, and how that (being already fulfilled) can be applicable to the children of believers, I cannot tell, nor Mr. Whiston neither: Therefore his Syllogism is vain and empty.

He proceeds page 93. To demand, Whether there be any Original Sin? If so, how came any Infants to be saved, unless through the righteousness of faith? viz. God's non-imputation of guilt to them, &c. Now, says he, if they are capable of the righteousness of faith, why may they not have that righteousness sealed to them by an outward and visible sign?

To wave many things that may be said to shew the childishness of the Query, we say, The same reason may be urged for Unbelievers children; for if they be capable of the grace and mercy of Christ, in order to their salvation, viz. non-imputing sin, and imputing the righteousness of Christ to them as well as the children of Believers; then (at your rate of reasoning) they have as good right to the outward visible Sign. If you deny the former, you impeach the free grace of Christ, and have little of Christian Charity. If you grant it, your Position's overthrown.

In page 101. he tells us (if we'll believe him) That Circumcision was administered to the Adult, considered as believers.

Here I confess, I do not understand, what he means by Believers. I thought the term [Believer] had not been used to have been appropriated to any person, but in respect to Christ; viz. Such as had some knowledge of, and believed in, the Messiah to come, or already come: Otherwise such of the Ethnics, who believe a Deity, but not a Redeemer, must needs be saved. I am sure the Jews are accounted Unbelievers to this day, because they reject Christ, which could not be, if their admission to Circumcision and to be Members of the Commonwealth and the Church of Old, had been upon the account of faith. So that there is no truth in this position; for it doth not appear that the Proselytes, or any others, were informed of the Messiah, before they were circumcised; or that they gave any testimony of their belief in him: but only that they owned the God of Israel to be the true God, and were willing to be joined to that Common wealth. And Mr. W. knows, that that is not sufficient now, there must be faith in Christ, else no believer.

But what would he conclude from hence? Suppose the Adult that were circumcised, were considered as Believers; if he say, So all the Adult that are baptized, are to be so considered (which is the most natural inference that can be drawn hence) we are agreed.

But I perceive the pains he takes here, is to make way for that absurd Position he is now coming to (and which I conceive he is the Protoplast of) page 116. That Circumcision was administered to the Jewish infants, considered as the seed of Believers. By the way, I wonder the man will trouble himself so much about Circumcision, when he professes so gravely, page 75. That he pleads not for Baptism from any Analogy with it. Which would make one suspect, that he is apt to forget himself, or that he thinks

we'll believe any thing; so soon as he pronounces his Magisterial, Thus I say it, &c. But let's hear how he proves it; Why (says he) because the Adult that were circumcised, were considered as the seed of Believers. A worthy proof indeed, but 'tis all we are like to have. He takes it for granted (it seems) that the Adult were circumcised as Believers, and grounds his Argument upon it as his Medium. But Logicians will tell him, that such a way of Argumentation is but a silly *Petitio Principii*; or begging the question. But in order to a further and more particular satisfaction I offer these Considerations.

1. That the Congregative Body of the People, or Jewish Males, were Circumcised in their Infancy; pursuant to the Command of God, being else to be cut off from his people, Gen. xvii. 14 and therefore this Argument being grounded upon a false Hypothesis will vanish. Besides it is a non-sequitur: for will it follow, That if the Adult were circumcised upon their own faith (which is but begged too) therefore Infants were circumcised upon the faith of others?

2. All that the Scripture mentions to be circumcised at Age, are,
 1. Those that were at years at its first Institution.
 2. The Proselytes that were made from time to time.
 3. The Jews in Joshua's time circumcised after 40 years discontinuance of it in the Wilderness.

Now as to the first, We find no other qualification required, to entitle them to Circumcision, but to be Jews, or Abraham's natural Seed; nor any mention made, that Belief was a condition *sine qua non*; nor any excluded for want of it. Yea Ishmael was Circumcised though not in the Covenant, when 13 years of age, for God said, verse 21. My Covenant will I establish with Isaac; which phrase is brought by an Antithesis to Ishmael, excluding him, though born of Abraham's body: and we find the numerous Family of Abraham circumcised immediately, without any

examination of their Faith. And whether Mr. Whiston or the Scripture be to be the sooner believed, is easy to be determined.

2. As to Proselytes, he says he remembers not any particular instance of any such that were circumcised; but concludes some were Circumcised, and that as Believers, because they kept the Passover to the Lord, Exod. xii. 48 which indeed proves that strangers, when Circumcised, may keep the Passover; but not anything to his purpose. For if all that kept the Passover be Believers, how come the Jews that kept (and do still keep) it, to be rejected by Christ's Law for their Unbelief? Or is the Faith he pleads they had, some other Faith, not sufficient in Gospel-days? if so, then that Faith that's insufficient for their admission to Christ, is not sufficient to entitle them to Gospel-Ordinances ordained by Christ. But what does Mr. Whiston think of the 10 Tribes in Jeroboam's days, when they fell to Idolatry, and Worshipped the Calves for 200 Years? Were there no Proselytes all that time? if so, were they (when Circumcised) considered as Believers? Or were the Sechemites (after the Rape of Dinah) Believers when Circumcised, Gen. xxxiv? Were the Servants bought with money Believers? or those Proselytes the Pharisees compassed Sea and Land to gain? Christ says, they made them two fold more the Children of Hell. But this is a fine new Toy, and let Mr. W. take the credit of its first promulgation.

3. Those that were Circumcised in Joshua's time, v. chap. of whose Faith we find no Enquiry; they were Circumcised, because God commanded them so to be, and if they were to be excluded upon the want of Faith, 'tis certain that among such a multitude, there were many Unbelievers. We read of an Achan in the vii. chap. that was stoned, and the xxxvi. that were smitten at Ai for the accursed thing, though Circumcised a little before; and numbers of them fell in Rebellion against the Lord afterwards. So

that upon the whole, the Scripture tells us of no qualification that entitled to Circumcision, save to be a natural Jew, or such as were Proselyted, or bought with money: And to invent others is point blank arrogance.

So that our conclusion is firm, viz. that to be the fleshly Seed of a Jew, or bought with his money, was enough to qualify for Circumcision; no profession of Faith being pre required of either, Gen. xvii. 12. And he that is eight days old shall be Circumcised, &c. not he that believes, or is a Believers Child, &c. And what advantage the extravagant roundabouts (in which Mr. Whiston so abounds) has got him, I cannot yet perceive. I am sure it convinces me that he is in extreme poverty of argument, when he is forced to have recourse to such Foreign and Remote Projects to uphold his tottering cause.

As to the trouble he is in about the promises made to Abraham, Whether they belong to the Covenant of works, nature, or grace, or no Covenant at all, concluding thus; If our Author will help us out here, he shall have hearty thanks for his pains.

To which I say, that I doubt Mr. W. dissembles egregiously, for I cannot conjecture how he can be so ignorant. But the perplexity he involves himself in, is a needless impertinent one; and whoever goes to pluck him out, is as idle as himself. But yet if he be really at a loss, and to deserve his thanks (if it be not a complement) I shall adventure to direct him, where he may learn what the promise made to Abraham was, and how to be understood in relation to both Natural and Spiritual Seed. Let him turn to Dr. Owen's, 6 Exercit. on the Hebrews, page 55, 56. &c. where he will be informed, the Doctor exactly agreeing with us, and fully speaking our sense in that point, and therefore quoted by me at large in my Treatise. And I hope Mr. Whiston cannot suspect the partiality of the Informer.

And for his interpretation of Gal. iii. 29 *Εἰ δεύμεῖς Χριστοῦ*, if ye be of Christ; or appertain to Christ, were it admitted, it is no disadvantage to us, it being the same in sense with our Vulgar Translations: And if Believers Children, as he says, be of Christ, it must be in respect of Calling, or Election, the former is not to be alleged; and the later may be true for ought we know, but that's no ground for any Gospel-administrations which are dispensable only according to appearance; and since no Faith or Signs of Election appears, and that *de non apparentibus, and de non existentibus eadem est ratio*, we, according to Scripture-warrant and example, suspend our Baptizing them, till they can give some evidence of their right to it; and if a supposing them to be Elect be a good ground to baptize, then the children of Unbelievers have a good plea, because some of them are Elect.

As to what he offers in order to remove the absurdities charged by Mr. Danvers' upon the practice of baptizing Infants, and his essay to vindicate the practice of Sprinkling for Dipping, they are fully and clearly, as to the substance of them, already so blasted by Mr. D. himself, that I shall pass them; and shall only conclude that consideration with the words of Dr. Martin Luther in his *Book de Baptismo Tom. 1. p. 71, 72.* speaking of the signification of the word, *Baptismus Græcum est, latine potest verti mersio, cum immergimus aliquid in Aqua, ut totum tegatur Aqua. Et quamvis ille mos jam aboleverit, apud plerosq; debebant tamen prorsus immergi, and statim retrahi.—Et sane si spectes quid Baptismus significet, idem requiri videbis; that is, Baptism is a Greek word, and may be interpreted an Overwhelming, when we plunge any thing into the Water, that it may be covered all over. And although that custom is now out of use with many, yet they ought truly to be dipt, and presently lifted up again. And certainly if you consider the nature of the thing, you will see that to be necessary; which being the true signification of the word, we find*

cause rather to adhere to it, than follow Mr. Whiston's unscriptural Dictates.

As to what he closes withal, that our practice of Dipping is a breach of the Sixth and Seventh Commandments. Let the same return serve his impious insinuation, as is given to Mr. B. and Mr. W. after whose Copies he writes.

And so I shall conclude with an admonition to Mr. Whiston to more Christian moderation; and if he thinks himself concerned to appear farther in this Controversy, that he lay aside all passion and heat, as inconsistent with a Gospel-frame of Spirit, and tending to the extirpation of that Charity and Mutual Forbearance our Lord Jesus expects from us. And let him lay down his Thesis distinctly, and set down his Arguments syllogistically, or in a form more intelligible to all persons, which he will; and directly to the matter in debate: and not to trouble us, nor the world with extraneous and needless rambles, leaving the Cardinal pretence unessayed: (as he hath done) save at a very great distance, and with such timorousness and collateral approaches, as would make one think he has no great confidence in the attempt, however he would carry it in tongue, and confidence. And I can assure him, that if there be any escape or undue reflection in what I have offered, which may tend to the breach of Peace or Charity, I allow not my self in it, and will be willing to receive an admonition if offered in meekness.

I would further advertise Mr. Whiston not to make Mr. Baxter, nor Mr. Ws. his pattern in dealing with us, whose pens run at so licentious a rate, that the most unspotted innocence is not armor enough against their virulence. As for the first, no pencil can portray him better than his own pen: A man of quarrel, sometimes friend, and sometimes foe, to most persuasions; to reject whose poison is to provoke his sting; And to slight his Dictates, how

incongruous soever to truth, and inconsistent among themselves, is to undergo the severe Discipline of his lashing pen. Mankind (it seems) must gape for his Oraculous Dictates, and must believe him as his present Sentiments actuate him, or else take what comes after.

Nor need we express Mr. Ws. in a more averting Character than that he squires it after him; and should we appeal to Mr. Whiston, or any sober man of his persuasion, we doubt not but we may have so much equity as to disallow his late dealing with us. Figuring and Traducing us in his invective reflections upon the person of Colonel Danvers, as if we had been such dangerous persons, &c. in these phrases,—When their hands are tied from fighting,—Exploits done in the time of his Colonelship,—&c. And what is that but to exasperate the world against us, and expose us to the frowns of Authority as much as he can? how does this poisonous insinuation consist with his pretences of respect? This looks like Judas' kiss. Would he think it fair if we should use the engine of Repercussion here? doth it not rather (in his own Oratory) discover the ebullition of a temporizing, waspish spirit? But he loves us Brethren, and desires not our shame. He is as courteous as lightning, that spares the Scabbard, but destroys the blade. After he has represented us as such misshapen Bug bears, and wounded us with his keenest Raillery, he would lick over the place he bit, and make us believe it is all stark love and kindness. Well, he hath shot his Bolt, tells us, our Doctrine is ominous, not fit for any Age of the Church, with a fixation of black characters upon it, leading to blasphemy, and immorality; and yet all this, is not to desire our shame. He may by the same artifice knock a man down, and laugh upon him, and tell him, he does him good service. He must pardon us if we be coy, to so rude a kind of Courtship.

Therefore upon the whole, if Mr. Whiston perseveres in that Intemperate angry frame he began withal, in Imitation of the other two, I shall not think my self obliged to divert myself from more grateful studies to vie tongue with him; knowing that whatever he says, or what hard measure he may give me, Truth will remain always answerless and unconquered.

FINIS

POSTSCRIPT

TO THE READER

Courteous Reader,

IT is now humbly submitted to thine impartial judgment, Whether our practice of Baptizing Believers so fully made out by the Scriptures, the Suffrage of Learned men in every Age of the Church since Christ, owned by our Severest Adversaries to be a Scriptural Baptism, exemplified by the practice of all Antiquity, deserves such sharp Rebukes as our present Opponents dispense to us? And whether that cause we maintain, though under so sacred a Patronage, deserves to be so persecuted, as it is by them, and delineated in such frightful Characters? since on all sides the baptizing of the Adult is granted? but Infant-baptism by one side only, and upon such uncertain grounds too, every distinction or denomination of Pædo-baptists, administering it upon a different pretence, some upon a mistake, that it takes away sin, and saves the Child's Soul; some affirming the Infant to have Faith; some upon the Parents, some upon the Pro-parents, or Gossip's, some upon Abraham's, some upon the Church's Faith: a very uncertain sound! whilst opposed on the other side with such a dint of Reason both from Scripture-Authority, and primitive Antiquity.

And suppose you had been called to decide a matter in controversy betwixt two, and find that what one affirms is granted on both sides, but what the other maintains granted by one only, and rationally opposed by the other, would you not judge his cause best, and most safe, that's allowed by both? And such is our present case. A Queen of England demanded of the Protestant Prelates, whether the Church of Rome was a true Church, and if

Salvation may be had in it? They answered in the affirmative. The Queen replies, that since both sides grant, there may be Salvation in the Church of Rome; and but one only, that there may be Salvation obtainable in the Church of England; therefore it was the safest way to remain on that side that both agreed Salvation may be had in. And though we plead not for the inference as then applied, yet it holds well in other cases. For if one should ask, whether Adult or Infant-baptism be a true Scriptural Baptism? both sides are agreed that Adult baptism is so, and one side only holds Infant's baptism to be lawful. May not the Querist safely and certainly conclude, that side that hath the suffrage of both to be safest. And therefore we hope upon a serious weighing this Consideration, we may have the Justice and Equity of an open Ear, from any denomination of the Christian Religion; and that understanding the reason of our conscientious dissent from the practice of Infant-baptism, they would not condemn us for affirming what the Scripture invincibly makes out, the suffrage of Antiquity ratifies, and they themselves own. Farewell.

A BUCKET of WATER

To Quench the FIRE:

Or a Letter to Mr. Obed. Will's concerning
the Contention between Him and Mr. Danvers.

SIR,

Standers by see more than Gamesters; and the present heat and passion you are in, in your contest with Mr. Danvers' hath occasioned these cooling considerations, and if they may prevail to bring you to your self, I have my end. It is true you, have added in the end of your book, A persuasive to Unity, and to say the truth, you have done excellent well, and have used many Powerful and Cogent arguments to prevail with Christians to love one another; yea, and you have given us you opinion of Mr. Danvers', that he may be a good man; and that you have a charitable opinion of the Anabaptists. But to see you spoil all again by your frequent scurrilous reflections, and dirt you cast upon them in divers places of your gook, as if you would tell the world, that you did not intend any unity with them, or mean as you say: but either to keep up and interest in the affections of some of them, or to quit yourself from the odium of a down-right railer; therefore you first break their head, and then give them a plaister: But do you thin they are all spirit and not flesh, that you thus provoke them, and stir up the remains of corruption in them; did you really intend as you say, to be at unity with them, and reduce them to the truth, from which you suppose they have erred, you would have used more moderation. And had you wrote a letter to Mr. Danvers in a Brotherly way, and showed him his

mistakes in some of his collections, and desired an amicable treatment, how likely would it have been to have produced an acknowledgement, and if occasion had been, a retraction. But Mr. Danvers has little reason to think that you intended his conviction (as a brother,) but to defame his person, and to disgrace the whole party, and that you sought victory more than truth, so the course you take may increase the malady, never heal it; exasperate, but never unite dissenters: I could wish your discourse of unity had been printed by itself, it might then perhaps have done some good, but as joined to your book, it is a plain contradiction, and not like to produce any advantage, unless to discover your hypocrisy.

The character that is given of you (by them that know you) is, that you are a person of a friendly nature, debonaire and courteous to all, given to loquacity, and rather inclined to levity than morosity; so that the gall and wormwood in your book, breeds strange admirations in some, and makes them doubt whether it be yours or no. I have heard of a man that beholding a cat, said, *It's a pity so much cruelty should liege under so mild a countenance.*

But perhaps you'll tell us, there was need of a sharp reproof, and you thought that the best way to convince him; if it were your end (which is much doubted) it has not, nor is it likely to be very successful. Mr. Baxter has been thundering against the Anabaptists these twenty years, (as of late yourself and Mr. Whiston) with the greatest severity, rage, and fury imaginable, loading them with many false and unjust censures, as the Heathens used the Christians, and Papists the Protestants, they the Presbyterians, and so forward: And the name Heretic passes for Orthodox amongst you all, but if you did really intend Mr. Danvers his conviction and the good of his soul; then learn some directions from a late learned author (one of your own party.)

1. Saith he, *He that reproveth another, must be careful that himself be faultless and blameless, as much as may be; the snuffers of the sanctuary were of pure gold: and it behooves that man that will be a snuffer to correct others, to be very upright himself, and circumspect in all things, and then he may admonish with the greater authority and advantage.*

2. *A man must be blameless in reference to that sin he reproveth especially; if thou reprovest heresy, pride, prevarication in others, and art guilty thyself, thou dost but like David in Nathan's parable, pronounce the sentence of thine own condemnation.*

3. *As he must take heed himself to be faultless, so he must be sure his Brother be faulty, for otherwise it is not to reprove him, but to reproach him; he commits a devilish sin, and becomes an accuser of the brethren, instead of a reproveth of them; so that the fault must not be a conjecture, or imagination, or jealousy, or rumor, [and then how Mr. Baxter will clear himself, I know not.]* But Sir, if your Brother's fault must not be a conjecture or imagination only, how can you and your party so reprove the Anabaptists for heresy, Error, &c. and so majestically condemn the whole party, and proudly trample upon all their arguments, (as if the Word of God had come to you only,) and that there was nothing (as you use to say) in all their assertions; and that all their Mediums are such trite and out-worn things that have been trampled upon, and confuted again and again. It seems there are others besides the Pope that sit in Peter's Chair, and would tell the world they are as infallible as he. But you must give us better proof of our infallibility before we believe you, and conclude the Anabaptists mistaken in their principles and assertions.

4. He that reproveth must be sincere in his ends, and take heed that his aims and intentions be right and honest, and that he do not mingle any wild-fire of pride and vain-glory, and of an

ambitious humor of contradicting and controlling others. This heat must be a holy heat, a fire of the Sanctuary purely, for God's glory and the salvation of thy Brother's soul.

5. He must reprove compassionately, with the deepest sense of his own failings and miscarriages. Bernard said of himself, that he never say another man sin, but he was distrustful, and jealous of his own heart: He was faulty yesterday, thou today, and I may be so tomorrow.

6. He must reprove charitably, with the greatest love to men's persons; even then when he shows the greatest zeal against their sins, for it is one thing to be angry with the sins, another with the persons.

Therefore we should consult out brother's credit, and esteem, and honor, while we stab his sin, and not in healing a wound in his conscience or conversation, to leave a scar of reproach upon his person, and a brand of shame and ignominy upon his name; that were to do the work of an enemy under the vizard of a friend.

7. He must reprove meekly, not in rage, passion, and bitterness, but in meekness and sweetness of spirit; this is the Apostles rule, Gal. vi. 1, 2 Tim. ii. 25. Take heed of carrying your teeth in your tongues, take soft words to convince gain-sayers, and gentle reproofs, and solid reasons to reduce offenders. But whether Mr. Wills has at all consulted these rules, (or Mr. Baxter before him, and Mr. Whiston since,) or whether there has been anything of tenderness to their opponents names and persons, anything of compassion, charity, meekness, whether any serious examination of the absolute certainty and verity of their own opinion, lest themselves should be mistaken (as Mr. Baxter confesses it is easy for wise and good men to be mistaken in it, the point is so dark and dubious) or whether they have inquired into the sincerity of their ends, whether their heat has been an holy heat, and purely

for God's glory, and the salvation of their brother's soul: all this is now left at the bat of the reader's judgement, and will shortly be brought before a greater and more impartial tribunal. And truly sir, I must tell you, that your dirty language, your extreme slighting and contemning your opponents, loading them with scandals and reproaches, sometimes charging them with ignorance and insufficiency; proudly and vainly boasting, and trampling over them in your own conceit, has (not a little) spoiled your cause, and given the Anabaptists a great advantage against you in the consciences of sober and pious Christians. I have heard myself some persons of quality and piety to say, alas what difference is there between Mr. Danvers, and Mr. Wills their books! the latter is stuffed with pride, rage, and passion, the first with meekness, tenderness, and humility.

And I suppose were the Books searched that have been Written of late Years on the subject of Baptism, as Mr. Baxter, Sydenham, Cragg, Wills, and Whiston, &c. on the one part, and Mr. Tombes, Blackwood, Byfield, Den, Danvers, Patient, Norcot, &c. on the other part, it would seem to be discovered by what Spirit they wrote; and men would see in the first party a proud, magisterial, scurrilous, abusive, and scornful Spirit; in the other a more humble, gracious, meek, and charitable temper. If any Question it, the Books are Extant, and the matter may soon be brought to an issue; but Sir, you have out-done them all, not only in shooting your envenomed Arrows against the whole party but especially against Mr. Danvers, as appears by your Appeal to the Baptist Churches against him; it seems you have arraigned, condemned, and executed him already, and have said implicitly (though audaciously) as Paul to the Church of Corinth, 1 Cor. v. 3, 4, 5. for though I am absent in the Body, yet have judged him already, that that he be delivered to Satan.

But stay a while Sir, and give Wiser men leave to search out the matter; Will nothing serve your turn but present repentance, or excommunication? What Scripture-rule have you taken to convince him; or must he repent before any conviction hath past upon him? Surely illumination is the first work, and the same organ, that is for weeping, is for Seeing; but a man must see first, as Zach. xii. *They shall look, and then mourn.* But Sir, there are as Wise men as yourself, (and none of his party neither,) that judge that what Mr. Danvers has written, was in the simplicity and sincerity of his heart, according to his knowledge, and as he apprehended the meaning of those ancients he has quoted, and that he had no intention to prevaricate (as you charge him with) or abuse the Fathers, to patronize his opinion. If otherwise, you may think him, *non compos mentis*, considering he could not be ignorant of the prejudice and sedulity of the opponents, who might have advantage enough against him, from the libraries in the Universities, and else-where. It's true indeed some of his friends wish he had not concerned himself with the arguments from the Fathers, they say, they can spare it you very well; & are content with Father Paul, Father Peter, and the rest of those Scripture Fathers; what can be drawn from the three First centuries, is rather for than against them. And in regard the mystery of Iniquity began to work in the Apostle's days, and the apostacy soon came on, they do not value the following centuries, though others think the most part of his collections justifiable, were the matter brought before impartial and indifferent Judges. And though you have so concerned yourself, and screwed your Wits to maintain Infant Baptism, and some of you, as Mr. B. and Mr. Whiston, &c. by such strange absurdities, and ridiculous mediums, altogether unknown to the Fathers, yet wise men judge, you have been all this while bringing brick and mortar towards the repairing of Babel, which else perhaps would have fallen long

since; for they do not think, that the more immediate ministers and factors for Babylon, would have been able to have brought a stone at this day, had not you and others stepped in, and took the Anti-christian party by the hand, and said, Be strong; and in this matter, have said as the adversaries of Judah and Benjamin, Ezra iv. 2. Let us build with you, for we seek your God, as ye do; so we baptize infants as ye do, and though we differ in some circumstances, touching the ground of their baptism, yet we all agree in the subject, and so you have proved the greatest Enemies to Reformation; though it is strange that men who have Covenanted to reform Religion according to the Word of God, and have pretended to cast out all the dirt of Romish superstitions and Traditions of men in the Worship of God, should be the greatest upholders of that Babylonish Building.

But what shall we say? The carpenter encourageth the Goldsmith, Isaiah xli. 7. and it seems God's time is not yet come, when Babylon the Great shall be thrown as a Millstone into the Sea, and rise no more. But Sir, in the meantime, what way is there left, but for Christians diligently to search the Scriptures, to pray for the Holy Spirit,(the promise of the Father) and wherein they differ, modestly to examine the Opinions of one another, and where God reveals more light, to endeavour to convince their Brethren, with a spirit of meekness, concealing the Infirmities, and covering the Imperfections of one another: But those thunder-claps that came from you of late, make your Enemies to rejoice, and your Friends mourn, and standers by cannot hold their peace, but like Craesus his dumb Son, are compelled to speak, when they see the point of Infant Baptism so provoke and enrage your Spirits against a people, who practice the contrary, according to that light and knowledge they have received; and profess, they would be convinced, did they see any solid

Arguments from the Scriptures: in the meantime , it seems they must be exposed to all the calumnies and reproaches a numerous and prevailing party of their Opponents can cast upon them.

But (Brethren)is not the Devil our common Enemy? and surely could we unite amongst ourselves, his Kingdom should soon be divided; and then, and not till then, shall we see Satan fall like Lightning, and what glorious times might we then expect? I desire these Lines may be received in the same Spirit, and for the same end, for which they were Written, which was not to increase our Divisions, but to allay them; for the effecting of which, we shall still pray, and till God removes from us everything that offends, and supplants every Plant that his own right hand hath not planted. Sir, I rest

Your Soul-Friend,

T. B.

BOOKS Treating about the Subject of Baptism, Printed for, and Sold by Francis Smith at the Elephant and Castle near the Royal Exchange in Cornhill

A Treatise of BAPTISM, wherein that of Believers, and that of Infants, is examined by the Scriptures, with the History of both out of Antiquity, making it appear that Infant-baptism was not practiced for near 300 Years after Christ, nor enjoined as necessary, till 400 Years after Christ, &c. With the History of Christianity amongst the Ancient Britains and Waldensians, &c. By H. D.

Innocency and Truth vindicated; or, a Sober Reply to Mr. Ws. Answer; wherein the Authorities and Antiquities for Believers, and against Infant-Baptism, are descended; and the misrepresentations and Forgeries he boasts of, are returned upon himself. With a brief Answer to Mr. Blinman's Essay; by the same Author.

A Second Reply in Defence of the Treatise of Baptism, wherein Mr. Baxter's More Proofs, are found no Proof, in two parts; the First defending the Antiquities against his charge of Forgery. The Second, justifying the charge of Slander, Contradiction, and Popery, against his Writings: As also an Admonition to Mr. B. by the same Author; and some Reflections by Mr. Tombs upon Mr. B's. More Proofs.

With a Rejoinder to Mr. W. his *Vindiciæ*, and an Answer to his Appeal; by the same Author. Together with the Baptists Answer to the said Appeal.

The Book-seller further signifies to the Impartial. Reader, desiring information into that Principle of Baptizing Believers, that he can furnish him with

The Learned Treatises of Mr. John Tombs.

The Works of Mr. Samuel Fisher, in Folio.

A Pious and Learned Piece, by Henry Lawrence, Esq;

A judicious Piece, by Mr. Christopher Blackwood, Entitled the Storming of Antichrist, &c.