

not only those who believe among the *Jews* shall be happy, but all the Kindreds in the Earth shall be equally blessed upon believing, forasmuch as under the Gospel God maketh no difference between *Jew* and *Gentile* when the Heart is purified by faith, Acts 25. 9.

One Mystery I would have unfolded if he write, that is, that sometimes 'tis said Infants are baptized, because they are in Covenant, at other times its said, they are baptized to bring them into Covenant.

And in his calling a Church of Christ a Schism, and the Minister thereof the Head of an Overgrown Schism, he considered not how he hath made himself obnoxious to the Censure of others, I may be sorry he is now to learn that every Separation is not a Schism, for in this doth he not condemn *Calvin* and *Luther* and many others, who separated from the Church of *Rome*, yea and the Church of *England* also; oh how many of the generation of the righteous doth he here condemn. Moreover doth he not condemn himself and all the godly Independants and Presbyterians who did conscientiously separate from the Church of *England*. Men that write had need consider well before hand what they put forth into the World, and not let crude, undigested matter be the Object of their Eye, he knows how the Papists condemn the Church of *England* for Schism, and the Church of *England* all the Dissenters for Schism, and is it not very hard we should condemn each other who have suffered together from the same common Enemy.

Thus I have done with my Answer unto Mr. *Mence* and now Reader I have one Request to thee, if there be any Answer made to this Book, be not put off with Shadows instead of Substance, with Words instead of Arguments; you have reasonable Souls, do not suffer yourselves therefore to be imposed upon, but be like the noble *Bereans*, to search the Scriptures, to see whether the thing be so or no: And this I have to say to Mr. *Mence*, that if he shall respond, I do expect not only an Epitomizing of my Book of Baptism, and this, &c. as he tells you he may do, but I expect an Answer to all my Arguments, or to the Argumentative Part of my Books, Paragraph after Paragraph, as I have done to his, and who ever else shall undertake to answer me, if this aforesaid be not done, I shall not reckon my self obliged to make any Reply, or to take any considerable Notice of it,

and that this may be done, the Respondent is to consider that both the Church and the World will have the sight of it, and therefore it will be to no Mans Honour to give the go by to the Arguments levelled against Baby-Baptism.

The Substance of Mr. Michael Harrison's Book, Entituled Infant-Baptism God's Ordinance, hath been Answer'd in the Answer to Vindiciæ Fœderis, and now I shall Answer what remains.

MR. *Harrison* in page 3d. tells us, that this Abrahamic Covenant in *Gen. 17. 7.* is an Everlasting, perpetual and eternal Covenant, a Covenant to last for evermore, so the Hebrew Word *עולם* *Gnolam* properly signifieth saith he, but I suppose this Gentleman knows, that this very Hebrew Word is often used by the Holy Ghost to signify a certain Period of Time, and not Eternity always, and therefore it doth his cause no Service; the legal Oeconomy and Priesthood is called *Gnolam*, an Everlasting Priesthood, *Exod. 40. 15.* Which he believes is put an End to by the great High-priest Jesus Christ, it is the same Everlasting that the *Jews* Possession of *Canaan* was to be, *Gen. 17. 8.* Which is now inhabited by the *Mahumetans*, yea, its the same *Gnolam*, Everlasting, that Circumcision had, *Gen. 17. 13.* and as he believes Circumcision is abolished, tho' called Everlasting, and the *Jews* disinherited of *Jerusalem*, tho' given for an Everlasting Possession, for the same reason he may conclude the *Gnolam*, Everlasting, in the 7th. v. hath an End also and that Covenant of Peculiarity broken with *Abraham's* Natural Seed, which was signified by the breaking the Staff of Beauty and Bands, *Zach. 11. 10, 11, 12.*

In page 4. he gives us the nature of the Covenant of Grace, wherein he tell us, "its Gods gracious Promise of delivering from a state of Sin and Death, and bringing into a state of Salvation by Jesus Christ, all that by faith fly to and lay hold on him." Surely the Gentleman hath forgot himself in the definition of the Covenant.

venant of Grace, for this makes as much for the Children of Unbelievers as Believers, if they fly to him by faith, and lay hold on him, then they are equally delivered from a state of Sin and Death, and brought into a state of Salvation by Jesus Christ; surely all the Children of Believers are not in this Covenant of Grace, from his own definition I argue, *all* that are in the Covenant of Grace have a Promise of Deliverance from a state of sin and death, and brought into a state of Salvation by Christ, but *all* the Infants of Believers are not in this state, *Ergo*, they are not all in the Covenant of Grace.

For his 1st. *Argu.* in page 13. Let me give an Argument *ad hominem*, "If God doth own the Infant Seed of Unbelievers, as Pagans, &c. as his, then they ought to receive the Token of his so owning them, but that the former is true, appears from *Ezekiel* 18. 4. *All souls are mine*, &c. Therefore the Consequence follows, the Children of Pagans and Infidels ought to be baptized, as the Token of his so owning them.

So in page 14. From the Argument for a federal Holiness, as some call it, Baptism is inferred, if the Children are to be baptized because said to be holy, then the Pagan Husband or Wife ought to be baptized also, because they are said to have the same Sanctification the Child hath, *1 Cor.* 7. 14.

In page 18. he asserts Infant Church-membership not repealed, tho' I have spoken to it already, I shall say something to it here, and prove it to be repealed.

1. The Covenant with Abraham and his Natural Seed is broken, *Ergo*, that Covenant is repealed, that its broken for disowning and Crucifying Christ, read *Zac.* 11. 10, 11, 12.

2. The Children of the Flesh are not the Children of God, *ergo*, the Covenant of Circumcision is repealed, *Rom.* 9. 8. tho' they were once so owned, yet now they are cast off, and are the Off scouring of the World.

3. "None are Christs Disciples but such as take up his Cross and follow him, *ergo*, Infant-incovenanting is repealed, *Luke* 14. from hence we may see what the Disciples are in *Mat.* 28. 18. and *Acts* 15. 10, 11. they are such as are capable of being taught, and believe, and can take up Christs Cross and follow him.

Argu. 4. "None are accounted Abraham's seed under a Gospel Dispensation but actu-

al Believers in Christ, *ergo*, the Abrahamic Covenant of Peculiarity is repealed, see *Gal.* 3. ult.

Argu. 5. "The Branches are broken off, *ergo*, Infant-incovenant is repealed, *Rom.* 11. this breaking off could not be from the Covenant of Grace, for that is immutable, *ergo*, it must be that temporary Covenant with Abraham and his Natural Offspring.

For his *Argu.* pag 23, 27. "If an Infant was Head of a visible Church, then an Infant may be a Member of a visible Church. First, Its no good way of arguing from the Creator to the Creature. Secondly, Its an Argument serves for all Infants in the World, then they may be all Members of the Church. Thirdly, He might better argue from Christs being a Member of a visible Church, as he was, that therefore Infants may be, ay, the Infants of Pagans and Infidels, from the same Argument; so that this Argument cannot answer his End, being to prove Believers Infants only Church-members, because the Argument runs universal, when intended to a particular People.

And for what he saith of *Irenaeus*, lib. 2. adv. her. c. 39. his Words are wrested, is the Opinion of the Learned Mr. *Tombs*, the Words being these, "Christ did sanctifie every age by his own Susception of it, and Similitude to it, all I say who by him are born again to God. In all which there is not one Word of Infant-Baptism, neither can it be concluded, because then he would not consist with himself, for *Grotius* on *Mat.* 28. 19. proves the profession of Faith before Baptism, out of *Justin Martyr*, *Irenaeus*, *Tertullian*; and by *renascuntur*, are born again, cannot be understood he meant Baptism, is proved by the Words and scope, which are *per eum renascuntur*; by him, that is Christ, are born again, cannot be meant baptized by Christ, for he baptized none, *John* 4. 1. but his Disciples, neither did they baptize any Infant at all: Christ was not in his Age an Example of every age in his baptism, as by it he did sanctifie every age, for then he should have been baptized in every age; but in respect of the Holiness of his Humane Nature, every age was capable of Holiness by Conformity unto his Example. If Christ came to save all baptized by him, or his Appointment, then he came to save *Simon Magus*, *Judas*, if baptized, but in that sense *Irenaeus* his Proposition would be false, therefore this sense is not to be attributed to his Words, but are wrested by *Pseudo-baptists*, against his meaning, to prove a use of

of *Pedo-baptism*. And whereas Mr. Harrison saith, "for Infants Christ was made an Infant sanctifying Infants, in little Children being a little Child sanctifying them: This is an Argument for the sanctification of all Children in Infancy and Childhood, as well as some as aforesaid, and so is fallacious and impertinent for what it is brought.

As for your *Argu.* pag. 27. wherein you assert, "that it hath been the constant Custom of the Church of Christ all along from the Apostles days to baptize Infants, none ever denying till some hundreds of Years after, for the Proof of which you mention *Irenaeus*, who had seen *Polycarpus*, St. *John's* Disciple, and *Tertullian*, who lived about the year of Redemption, say you, two hundred. Let us make a little Enquiry into this Argument, and see if we cannot prove the contrary practice maintained, by the very persons he brings, and many others of great Credit.

And whereas Mr. Harrison saith, as aforesaid, in p. 27. "It hath been the constant custom of the Church all along from the Apostles, to baptize Infants, the contrary appears from the *Magdeburgenses History*, Cent. 1. l. 2. p. 496. of the Edit. of *Basil*, in seven Tomes, in this Age they find they baptized only the Adult, whether *Jews* or *Gentiles*; whereof they say we have Instances in the 2, 3, 10, 16. Chap. of the *Acts*. But as to the baptizing of Infants they confess they read of no Example, *De infantibus baptizatis Exempla non leguntur*. And as to the place of Baptism, they find it was as Occasion offered; where Rivers and Fountains and other Conveniences for baptizing were, and which was done as well privately, where only two Persons, as *Phillip* and the Eunuch were, as in a great Congregation, *Acts* 2. And as to the manner of baptizing, it was by dipping or plunging in the Waters in the Name of the Father, Son and Holy Ghost, which was, they say, so agreeable not only to the sense of the Word, which signifies immersion in the Water, but to the Allegory of Death, Burial and Resurrection, to which the Apostle so properly alludes, *Rom. 6. Col. 2. Sec.* So the *Waldenses* and *Albigenses* did in this age profess and practise the baptizing Believers, See Doct. *Balthazar Lidius* in his Treatise of the Church, p. 2. Col. 2. out of *Renarius*; the Ancient *Britains* did the same, who received the Gospel by the Evangelist, sent from the Apostles under *Tiberius* the Emperor, saith *Gildas* in his Book called *de vi-*

Gloria aurelij Ambrosij. See *Dan.* on Baptism, p. 48.

Justin Martyr, who its believed was converted unto Christ within thirty years after the Apostle *John*, Mr. *Baxter* mentioneth him from Dr. *Preson*, in his *Saints Everlasting Rest*, p. 179. 3d. Edit. In the primitive Times whereinto they renounced the World, Flesh and Devil, and engaged themselves to Christ, and promised to obey him, as you may see in *Tertullian*, *Origen*, *Cyprian*, and others at large, I will, saith he, cite but one for all, who was before the rest, and this is *Justin Martyr*, speaking of baptizing the aged, saith, as many as being persuaded, do believe those things to be true which we teach, and do promise to live according to them; they were first by Prayer and Fasting to beg pardon of God for their former sins, we our selves joyning along with them, then they are brought to the Water, and are born again, or baptized, &c. *Apol. 2.* And in the close of the Paragraph you see, saith Mr. *Baxter* this is no new over-strict way. *Tertullian* will make as little for Mr. *Harrisons* cause as *Irenaeus* before, see his Book *de baptismo*, Chap. 18. For the Condition and Disposition, also Age of every person, the delaying of Baptism is more profitable, yet chiefly about little Ones, what need is there of Sureties to be brought in danger, who even themselves may break their Promises through Mortality, and be deceived by the Increase of an Evil Disposition. Indeed the Lord saith, do not ye hinder them to come unto me, let them come therefore, while they grow to years, let them come while they learn, and while they come let them be taught, let them become Christians when they are enabled to know Christ: Why doth innocent Nature and Age hasten to the Remission of Sins, Men will deal more warily in worldly affairs, so that they who are not trusted with an Earthly Inheritance are trusted with an Heavenly; let them know to ask for Salvation, that thou mayest appear to have given it them who desire it, Doct. *Du Veil* on the *Acts*, p. 280. *Tombs* full Review, p. 788, 789. And *Tertullian* in his Book of Repentance calls Baptism the Sealing Repentance; and we are not baptized, because we should cease from Sin, but because we have ceased. *Dal-*le on the *Fathers*, 2 Book, p. 72. *Tertullian*, saith he, is so far from pressing Men to baptize their Children while young, which are yet the present Custom of those times, that he allows and pleads the contrary, counselling

selling them to defer it, not only in Children but them of Riper Age, Counselling them to desire it every Man according to his Condition, Disposition and Age, and saith *Dalle*, his Opinion is not much different from the *Anabaptists* of our Time, and the *Magdeburgenses* tell us that *Tertullian* in his book *de baptismo* opposed himself by several Arguments at large to some that asserted Infant-baptism: Mr. *Baxter* you have heard confesse that *Tertullian*, *Origen*, *Cyprian* and *Justin Martyr*, who lived in the second and third Centuries, held that none were baptized without an expresse Covenanting, and *Gregory Nazianzen* in his 40th. Oration, which is upon holy Baptism, treating of those who dye without Baptism, gives us an Instance in those to whom Baptism was not administered by reason of Infancy, *Du Veil* 279. And Doct. *Barlow* in a printed Letter saith, I do believe and know that there is neither Precept nor Example in Scripture for *Pedobaptism*, nor any just Evidence for it above two hundred years after Christ, that *Tertullian* condemns it as an unwarrantable Custom, and *Nazianzen* a good while after him dislikes it; sure I am in the Primitive Times they were *Catechumini*, then *Illuminati* or *Baptizati*, and that not only *Pagans* and Children of *Pagans* converted, but Children converted of Christian Parents, the Truth is, I do believe *Pedobaptism*, how nor by whom I know not, came into World the 2d. Century, and in the 3d. and 4th. began to be practised tho' not generally, and was defended from the Text as lawful, *John* 3. 5. tho' grossly understood, supposing no Baptism, no Salvation, and upon the like gross Mistake for many Centuries communicated Infants, or gave them the Lords Supper from *John* 6. 53. And I confess, saith the Bishop, they might do both as well as either, for that of communicating Infants, continued about six hundred years, as *Maldonate* confesseth. *Fer. Taylor* Bishop of *Down* in his Liberty of Prophecy, p. 237. 238. saith, and the Truth of the Business is, as there was no Command of Scripture to oblige Children to the Susception of it, so the necessity of *Pedobaptism* was not determined in the Church, till in the fifth Age after Christ in the *Milevitan Council* a Provincial of *Africa*, there was a Canon made for *Pedobaptism*, never till then. I grant it was practised in *Africa* before that time, and they or some of them thought well of it, and tho' that be no Ar-

gument for us to think so, yet none of them did ever before pretend it to be necessary, none to have been a Precept of the Gospel, *Austin* was the first that ever preached it to be absolutely necessary and it was in his Heat and Anger against *Pelagius*, who had warmed and chafed him so in that Question about Original Sin, that it made him innovate in other Doctrines possibly of more Concernment than this; and that tho' this was practised antiently in *Africa*, yet that it was without an Opinion of Necessity, and not often there, not at all in other places, we have, saith he, the Opinion of a Learned *Pedobaptist*, *Ludovicus Vives*, who in his Annotations upon *St. Austin de civit. dej. l. 1. c. 27.* affirms none except grown to Men or Womens Estate were wont to be baptized; See *Du Veil* upon the *Affs*, p. 281. But besides, saith the Bishop, that the Tradition cannot be proved to be apostolical we have very good Evidence from Antiquity, that it was the Opinion of the Primitive Church that Infants ought not to be baptized, and this is clear in the sixth Canon of the Synod of *Neocaesarea*, the Words are as follows, concerning a Woman with Child, that she may be baptized when she please, for her Baptism Concerns not her Child, for every one is to give a Demonstration of his own choice in a confession, *Dr. Du Veil* on the *Affs* p. 279. saith, to this purpose are the Words of *Balsamo in compen. Can. lib. 4.* The unborn Babe cannot be baptized, because it is not come into light, neither can it have a choice of making Confession which is required in holy Baptism, when it can chuse the Babe will need Baptism, saith *Zonarus*, the Bishop farther adds, p. 239. *Tertullian* gives Advice, that the baptism of Infants should be deterr'd till they could give an account of their Faith; for a close with what *Mr. Tombes*, *Dr. Du Veil* and the Bishop of *Down* saith, *Nazianzen*, *Basil*, the great *John* of *Antioch* called afterwards *Chrysostom*, *Constantine*, *Theodosius* and *Austia*, *Hierom*, *Ambrrose*, most whose Parents were godly, yet not baptized till came to Mans age, this consideration is of great Efficacy for destroying the supposed necessity of *Pedobaptism* its derivation from the Apostles.

Curcelaeus saith in his dissertation of Original Sin, Numb. 56. That the Custom of baptizing Infants was brought in without the Commandment of Christ, and did not begin before the third Age after Christ was born in

in the former ages no sign of it did appear,
See Dr. *Du Veil* on the *Acts* of the Apostles,
p. 282.

Tertullian gives advice that the baptism of
Infants should be deferred until they could
give an account of their Faith and the same
also is the Council of *Gregory Nazianzen* al-
tho' saith Dr. *Taylor* he allows them to hasten
it in case of Necessity, for tho' his Reason
taught him what was fit, yet he was overborn
with the Practice and Opinion of his Age,
which began to bear too violently upon him;
and tho' the same should be said of *Tertulli-
an*, yet we see both their settled Judgments
were that the Adult only were the proper
Subjects of Baptism. *Tertullian* again in *lib.
de baptismo*. He knew no such danger from In-
fants Original Guilt as to drive them to a
Laver of which in that age of Innocence they
had no need as he conceived, Dr. *Taylor's lib.
Proph.* p. 230.

In page 34. he saith, "Our Doctrine is just-
ly to be abhorred as a false Doctrine, be-
cause it leaves no well-grounded hope of
the Salvation of any Infants dying in Infancy.
But in page 35. gives himself a foul box on the
Ear by contradicting himself, "for he confess-
eth the *Anabaptist*, as he calls them, asserts the
"Salvation of all Infants, which smells strong
of his holding the Damnation of some.

In page 46. He chargeth us with Murder
and breach of the sixth Commandment, if
there were any thing in this Charge, its level-
led against God, the Legislator, more than
against us the Obeysers. Moreover, in Mur-
der the Persons are said to contrive and de-
sign Death, which I suppose this Gentleman
tho' he be very censorious, yet hardly con-
cludes that Murder is designed, we are there-
fore in his own Conscience clear from the
Charge, tho' he could not forbear Writing to
shew his Malice, but suppose he should be
called before a Seat of Judicature to prove the
Charge, I fear he would come off with shame;
and what if the proof of the Charge shall be
required at Gods Bar, then I fear it would be
worse, but I hope God will give him Repen-
tance before that day come.

Its well he is so ingenious as to confess that
the Word *βαπτίζω*, is derived from *βάπτω*,
to dip or plunge, but doth it not argue abun-
dantly of Ignorance or sinful Confidence to as-
sert, page 48. "It was never yet proved that
Persons were dipp'd by the Apostles? no Sir,
what shall their Commission be to dip by
your own Confession from the Propriety of

the *Greek* Word, and were they not faithful in
it, its very strange he should suggest that dip-
ping was not the Custom of the Primitive
Times, when we have whole Jewries of the
Learned against him.

In page 48. He asserts it was never yet pro-
ved that the Apostles baptized by dipping,
and he labours as in the fire for very Vanity
to shew the contrary, and that from the *Greek*
Preposition *εἰς* in *Act. 8. 38.* which he saith doth
not necessarily signify going into, but rather
unto the Water, I fear Mr. *Harrison* did not
consider how, in this he doth reflect either
upon the Learning or Honesty of our Transla-
tors or Annotators, and labours to advance his
own Learning or Faithfulness above theirs, a
very ill thing let it be which it will; and I can-
not but think how Scholars smile in their sleeve
to see this published to the World, tho' Mr.
Harrison would have justified our, and have a
divine Precept and Presedent governed by a
little *Greek* Preposition, and tho' he is either
not so honest or so learned as to govern pre-
positions by the Scope and Design of the place,
Blessed be God our Learned Translators and
Annotators have had both the Learning and
Honesty to do it, tho' probably not so agree-
ing with their own Sentiments, but let God
have the Glory, Mr. *Pool* on *Acts 8. 38.* saith
in hot Countries this was usual to baptize by
dipping the Body in the Water, so *Rom. 6. 4.*
he seems here to allude to the manner of bap-
tizing in those warm Eastern Countries which
was to dip or plunge the party baptized, and as
it were bury him for a while under Water,
&c. So Dr. *Hammond* on the same Text saith,
"tis a thing that every Christian knows that
the Immersion in Baptism refers to the Death
of Christ, the putting the Person baptized into
the Water denotes and proclaims the Death and
Burial of Christ, &c. See the Dr's Annotations
on *Rom. 6. 4.* so *Erasmus* in his Annotations up-
on *Mat. 28.* saith, the Apostles were to go teach
all Nations, dipping them, &c. And this was
the sense you see of *Ignatius*, *Justin Martyr*, *Ba-
sil*, the great *Basil of Selucia*, *Chrysostom*, *Am-
brose*, *Lactantius*, *Bernard*, &c. and our late Bi-
shop of *Canterbury*, and our present Bishop of
York, with innumerable more which might
be added, therefore this Gentleman must have
much Ignorance or a great stock of Confi-
dence to reflect upon so many Learned Men.
I hope Mr. *Harrison* doth not pretend to un-
derstand the *Greek* Text better than themselves
their own Language, who always practised bap-
tism by dipping even to this day. And this is like

what he saith in the same page, that *Αἶνον*, *Enon*, *John* 3: 23. is but *Oculus* an Eye, a very little Fountain, not enough in probability to *dlp* a multitude in. In the first place, this is strange that this Gentlemen should contradict the very Spirit of God, for the Holy Ghost gives this as the Reason, why that place was commodious for the use of Baptizing, because there was much Water there; no, saith Mr. *Harrison*, 'tis nothing so, there was not much water where *John* was baptizing, in so many Words he knows the Commination against all that add or take from the book of God. Moreover, the Learned are against him, here also Dr. *Lighfoot* and Dr. *Hammond* saith the *Greek* signifies many Waters, and saith Dr. *Hammond* in his Annotations on *John* 3: 23. a place chosen by *John* as commodious for that purpose, by reason of the Pools of Water, and thither the People came and were baptized of him there. *Erasmus's* Annotations upon the Text saith, that *Enon* in the *Syrians* Tongue signifies gushing Streams of Water, by reason whereof saith he, there was plenty of Water to baptize the People withall; and Mr. *Poole* in his Annotations on the place saith, it is from this apparent that both Christ and *John* baptized by dipping the body in the Water, else they need not have sought places where had been a great plenty of Waters. And I suppose he knows that the *Greek* Preposition *ἐν* is variously used according to the Scope of the Place, as Dr. *Owen* in some place speaketh that all prepositions are to be governed according to the Scope of the place.

Elquire *Boyl* in his Stile of the Holy Scriptures *pa*. 64, 65. tells us that the *Hebrew* conjunction copulative *ו* or *vav* tho' it do primarily signify *and*; yet hath also (I speak within compass) four or five and twenty other significations, (as that, or, but, for, when, therefore, yet, then, because, now, as, though, &c.) and that the Sense only gives it the great diversity of Acceptations.

For further clearing the right Mode of baptism, I shall here transcribe what the Learned Dr. *Du Pin* transcribed from Sir *Norton Knatchbull's* Annotations on *2 Pet* 3: 20, 21. Whole Words tho' long I cannot saith *Du Pin* but transcribe, they are so full of Truth and Weight; the Sense and Meaning of *Peter* is saith he; that baptism which now saves as by Water, and is antitypical to the Ark of *Noah*, doth not signify the laying down the filth in the Water, but the Covenant or Promise of a good Conscience toward God while we are plunged in the water, which

is the true use of water in baptism, thereby to testify our Belief in the Resurrection of Jesus Christ, so that there is a manifest Analogy between these words by Water and by the Resurrection, nor is the elegance of it displeasing; as if he should say, the Ark of *Noah*, not the Flood was the Type of Baptism, and Baptism was an Antitype of the Ark, not as baptism is a washing away the filth of the flesh by water, wherein it answers not at all to the Ark, but as it is a Covenant of a good Conscience towards God by the Resurrection of Christ, in the belief of which Resurrection we are saved, as they were saved in the Ark of *Noah*, for the Ark and baptism were both a Type of the Resurrection, so that the proper end of Baptism ought not to be understood, as if it were a sign of the washing away of sin, altho' it be oftentimes thus taken Metonymically in the New Testament and by the Fathers, but a spiritual sign of the Resurrection by Faith in the Resurrection of Christ, of which Baptism is a Lively and Emphatical Figure, as also was the Ark, out of which *Noah* returned forth as from a Sepulchre to a new Life; and therefore not unaptly called by *Philo* the Captain of the New Creation, and then the Whales belly, out of which *Jonas* after a Burial of three days was set at Liberty, and the Cloud and the Red Sea in which the People of *Israel* were said to have been baptized, that is, not washed but buried; for they were all Types of the same thing as Baptism, not of the washing away of sin, but of the Death and Resurrection of Christ and our own, to which Truth the Apostles, the Fathers, the Scholasticks and all Interpreters agree. That Christ the Mediator should become *ὁ Θεὸς ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ Θεοῦ*, *Theanthropos*, God and Man, to be declared Man in that he died, and God in that he rose again from the dead; this was a Mystery beyond all Philosophical Speculation, therefore there was need of some Type and Figures, which might make so impenetrable a Notion familiar and perceptible to the sense of man; to which purpose nothing seemed more fit and easie in the Wisdom of God, then the burying of our Bodies in Water by baptism, from whence they do receive an immediate Resurrection, and tho' the thing be so apparent as to need no Testimonies, yet because there be not a few who teach otherwise, led thereunto by Example and Vulgar Error, it will not be superfluous to produce some of those innumerable Testimonies

monies, and that I may not speak without Book let us first begin with St. Paul in Rom. 6. 3, 4. Know ye not that so many of us as were baptized into Christ, were baptized into his death, therefore were buried with him by baptism into death, that likewise Christ was raised up from the dead by the glory of the Father, even so we should walk in newness of life. Col. 2. 12. 1 Cor. 15. 29. Else what shall they do that are baptized for the dead if the dead rise not. As if he had said, if there be no Resurrection why are we baptized? In vain doth the Church use the Symbol of Baptism if there be no Resurrection; the like Testimonies frequently occur among the Fathers, that believing in his Death we may be made partakers of his Resurrection by Baptism, Baptism given in the remembrance of the Death of our Lord, we perform the Symbols of his Death and Resurrection in baptism, *Ignat. Epist. ad Tral. id Epist. ad Philadelph.* We know but of one saving baptism, in regard there is but one death for the World, and one Resurrection from the dead, of which baptism is an Image, *Justin Martyr*; saith *Basil* the great, hear what Saint *Paul* saith, they were all baptized in the cloud and sea, he calls their passage through the Sea baptism, for it was an Escape from death; *Basil of Seleucia*, to be baptized and plunged, and so return up and rise up out of the Water, is a Symbol of the descent into Hell and return from thence. *Chrysostom*, Baptism is a pledge and representation of the Resurrection. *Ambrose*, Baptism is an Earnest of the Resurrection; *Lactant.* Immersion is a representation of Death and Burial; *Bernard*, we are buried in the Element of Water; *Anselm*, see Sir *Nortons* book translated p. 302. Baptism is performed more laudably, more safely and more commonly by dipping, for by dipping the figure of Christ his burial is represented. *Tho. Aquin.* the Word baptism doth signifie the dipping under the Water, and it is evident the ancient Church used the Ceremony of dipping, *Calvin*. Baptism is a Greek word, and signifies properly Immersion into the Water, and this signification doth properly agree with our Baptism, and hath an Analogy to the thing signified; for by baptism we are buried together, and as it were drowned with Christ, being dead to sin, &c. *Zanch. Eptius* speaks to the same purpose, see Sir *Nortons* book p. 304. Now saith Dr. *Du Veil* which things if they be so (speaking Sir *Nortons* Words) I beseech you what affinity is to be seen between a burial and washing, that Christian

Baptism should be thought to draw its Original from Jewish Lotions and Washings of the Jews. For if it were true that the end of our baptism were to signifie a washing or ablution, or if it were true that the Jews of old did admit their Children or Profelytes into their Church by the administration of any diving, as it is asserted by many Learned Persons of late days, I confess it might be a probable Argument that our baptism was fetched from the diving of the Jews, but to prove that our baptism is indeed an Image of death and resurrection, not of washing, enough hath been said, but as to their Arguments who would have our baptism to be derived from the Jewish Lotions, as there is nothing of Certainty in it, so it is so far from being grounded upon any authority of Scripture, that there are hardly any Footsteps to be found thereof in the Old Testament, they deduce the Original of baptism from the Hebrew word וָוַו, which signifies to wash or cleanse but the Rabbins, if I am not deceived, make use of the word טָבַל which signifies Immersion thereby making it appear that they owe the Notion of that word to the Greeks or rather to the Christians, for what affinity is there between Lotion and Immersion, but the thing it self is so uncertain that the Rabbins themselves differed about this very matter, for in the very Text they urge which is cited out of the Talmud, Rabbi *Eliezer* doth expressly contradict Rabbi *Joshua*, who was the first that I know of who asserted this sort of baptism among the Jews; for Rabbi *Eliezer* who was contemporary with Rabbi *Joshua*, if he did not live before him, asserts that a Profelyte circumcised and not baptized was a true Profelyte, for so we read of the Patriarch *Abraham*, *Isaac* and *Jacob*, that they were circumcised not baptized, but Rabbi *Joshua* affirms that he who was baptized not he who was circumcised was the true Profelyte; to whom shall I give Credit, to *Eliezer* who asserts what the Scripture confirms, or to *Joshua* who affirms what is no where to be found in Scripture? but the Rabbins upheld *Joshua's* side, and what wonder was it, for it was their Interest so to do, that is for the honour of the Jewish Religion, that the Christians should be said to borrow their Ceremonies from them, but when I see Men of great Learning in these times fetching the Foundation of Truth from the Rabbins, I cannot but wonder at it: From whence was the Talmud sent unto us? they

are the Words of Buxtorf in his *Synagoga Judaica*, that we should give so much Credit thereto, that from thence we should believe that the Law of Moses either can or ought to be understood, much less the Gospel, to which they were professed Enemies; for the *Talmud* is called a Labyrinth of Errors, and the Foundation of Jewish Fables; it was brought to perfection, and held for Authentick five hundred years after Christ, therefore it is unreasonable to rest upon the Testimony of it: And that which moves me most, *Iosephus* to omit all the Fathers that lived before the *Talmud* was finished, who was also a Jew, and contemporary with *Rabbi Eliezer*, who also wrote in particular of the Rites, Customs and Acts of the Jews, is altogether silent in this matter; so that it is an Argument to me, next to a demonstration, that two such eminent Persons, both Jews, and living at the same time, the one should positively deny, and the other makes no mention of Baptism. Besides, if Baptism in the modern sense were in use among the Jews in Ancient Times, why did the Pharisees ask *John Baptist*, John 1. 25. *Why dost thou baptize, if thou art not Christ, nor Elias, nor that Prophet?* Doth this not plainly intimate that Baptism was not in use before, and that it was a relieved Opinion among them, that there should be no Baptism till either Christ, or *Elias*, or that Prophet came? how then there should be so much affinity between Baptism and the Washing of the Jews, that the one should be successive of the other by any Right or Pretence, is altogether I confess beyond my Faith: This is a very unlikely thing, that our Lord should follow the Traditions of the Elders, which he so often condemns, neither would he have avowed the Baptism of *John* to be from Heaven, if only in Conformity unto a Jewish Custom: How few of the Millions of Christians and Ministers of Christ in the World, who have not heard, much less read the Jewish Rabbins, *Du Veil* on the *Acts*, pa. 78, to 83. And saith the same *Du Veil* in his literal Explanation of the *Acts* of the Apostles, pa. 75, 76, 77. 'The sacred Ceremony of Baptism is not to be performed by the sprinkling on, or pouring on of Water, but by the plunging of the whole Body of those that are to be baptized, as first the proper signification of the Greek Word *βαπτίζω*, baptizo declares. Thus saith *Causabon* upon Mat. 3. 6. Was the Rite of baptizing, that the Persons were plunged into the Water, which the Word baptizo sufficiently demonstrates,

which as it doth not extend so far as to sink down to the Bottom to the Hurt of the Person; so it is not to swim upon the Superfices, therefore we are apprehensive that it is not without some cause what some have disputed, that Baptism ought to be administered by plunging the whole Body into Water. 2d. The Example of Christ, whence the Synod of *Chyrb*, An. Dom. 816. Can. 11. Where *Wolfrid* the Arch-bishop of *Canterbury* presided, let, saith he, the Presbyters beware that when they administer the Sacrament of Baptism they do not pour water upon the Heads of the Infants, but let them be alway plunged in the Font according to the Example of the Son of God himself, who was thrice plunged into the Waters of *Jordan*; thus must this Ceremony be performed according to Order. 3dly. The constant Practice of the universal Church, till the time of *Clem. 7.* who was crowned Pope Anno 1305. under whom first of all the second Synod of *Ravenna* approved the abuse entered into some Churches, about an hundred years before: That Baptism without any Necessity should be administered by aspersion; hence it came to pass that contrary to the Analogy or intended Mystical Signification of this Sacrament, all the West for the most part has in this Age the use of *Ranisms* instead of Baptism, as *Zepher* speaks, to the great Scandal of the *Greeks* and *Russians*, who to this day plunge into the Water those whom they baptize, and deny any one to be rightly baptized who is not plunged into the Water, according to the Precept of Christ, as we may find in *Sylvester*, *Sgareplus*, and *Cassander*. The Custom of the ancient Church was not Sprinkling but Immersion, in pursuance of the sense of the Word baptizing, in the Commandment and of the Example of our blessed Saviour, *Council Florent*, Sess. 9. c. 9. and *lib.* of Infants-Baptism, pa. 693. *Jer. Taylors* doctor dubit, l. 3. c. 4. Reg. 15. Numb. 9. 'To substitute in the room of Immersion either Sprinkling or any other way of applying Water to the Body, to signify the same thing, is not in the power of the Dispensers of Gods Mysteries or of the Church as *Tho. Aquinas* excellently observes it belongs to the signifier to determine what sign is to be used for the signification; but God it is who by things sensible signifies spiritual things in the Sacrament. And that the sick as well as healthy were wont to be plunged, which is properly to be baptized, says *Pamelius*, in his Notes upon *Cyprians* Epistle to *Magnus*, besides other Proofs I omit. To be brief, the Acts

of several Saints do testifie, as in the Acts of St. *Sebastian* the Martyr, we find that *Tranquillinus* a Noble-man, afflicted with the Gout, was so baptized by holy *Polycarp* the Presbyter, and restored to Health by his Baptism: Also a Paralitick *Jew* who having long tried the Physicians, and in vain, bethought himself of the Application of Christian Baptism; being brought in his Bed to the Font or Dipping Place, at the Appointment of *Atticus*, who succeeded *Chrysostom* in the Constantinopolitan See, was plunged over Head and Ears, which being done, was immediately freed from his Distemper to Health, *Socratus*, l. 7. c. 4. And let not any be afraid of repeating Baptism, or of the Scandal of any Church, because, as St. *Gregory* saith most excellently well, that is not said to be iterated which is not certainly demonstrated to have been rightly and duly done, *L. 1. Ep. 7.* Nor is it to be doubted, saith the famous *John Forbes*, but that they are again to be baptized, who before have only recieved a vain Washing, and not the true Sacrament of Baptism: And tho' it be not so great as the Papists imagine, yet is the Necessity of this Sacrament very great and the Profit and Advantage very considerable. See what the late Arch-Bishop of *Canterbury* saith, see his Book titled *Sermons on several Occasions*, Fifth Edition, pag. 188, 189. speaking of *Rom. 6. 3. 4.* "Antiently saith he, those who were baptized put off their Garments, which signified the putting off the Body of sin, and were immersed and buried in the Water to represent the Death of Sin, and then did rise up again out of the Water to signifie their Entrance upon a holy Life: and to those Customs the Apostle alludes in this 6th. of the *Romans*, when he saith how shall we that are dead to sin live any longer therein, &c. The same hath D. *Sharp* the present Arch-Bishop of *York*, in a Sermon Preacht before the late Queens Majesty, *March 27. 1692.* "And this in ancient Times was taught every Christian in and by his Baptism, when ever a person was baptized, he was not only to profess his faith in Christs Death and Resurrection, but he was to look upon himself as obliged in Correspondence therewith to mortifie his former carnal Affections, and to enter upon a new State of Life, and the very form of Baptism saith he, did lively represent this Obligation to them, for what did their plunging under Water signifie, but their Undertaking in

"Imitation of Christs Death and Burial to forsake all their evil Courses as their ascending out of the water did their Enjoyment to lead a holy Life: Thus our Apostle, saith he, doth more than once declare to us, *Rom. 6. 3. 4.* May not this be a sufficient Reproof for his suggesting, "as if our way of Baptizing were immodestly and done not as comely and of good report. Surely if it be Gods way, it is a comely way in the Eyes of all good men; and let him remember that for this he is to be accountable; but would Mr. *Harrison* come and see our Order in the administration of that Ordinance, I doubt not but he will be convinced of his Error, and be forc'd to say that the subject goeth with more Sobriety and Modesty to the Sacrament of Baptism then thousands do to the hearing Gods Word, or to the Sacrament of the Lords Supper.

And whereas he saith, page 37. "That there were no Anabaptists in the Apostles days nor many hundred years after, for this I will thank Mr. *Harrison*, for in this he doth confess, that Infant-Baptism was not in the Apostles time, nor many hundred years after, which I thus make out, when he calls us Anabaptists you must understand he supposeth we baptize some that were baptized before in Infancy, tho' that we deny; now, saith he, there were no Anabaptists, viz. those who baptized again, until many hundred years after, fully confessing, as I think, that there was no Infanc Baptism in the Apostles days, no, nor many years after this; this is just like the *Athenian Mercury*, who tells us there were no Churches of Anabaptists until about three hundred years after Christ: Indeed we know not how there should, Anabaptists, that is to say *Rebaptizers*, as they confess we are unjustly called, forasmuch as there were no Infants baptized, or rather sprinkled, until about that time. Thus we see here is, I think, an implicate Confession from both, that Infant-baptism was not known until about three hundred years after Christ.

Whereas he tells us, it was highly improbable that three thousand should be baptized by Dipping in one day, p. 49. tho' he does not question, I suppose, the possibility of sprinkling as many; unto that I say, that a Person may be baptized by Dipping as soon as Sprinkled, for in the administration the words of Institution are to be repeated to every subject, I baptize thee in, or into, the Name of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, and in this time the Person is dipped and there is the same words and time used when

when the Infant is Rantized: I have lately met with a passage in Mr. *Clark's* 2d. Vol. of Examples pertinent to this, p. 114. where he tells us that one *Ajdanus* baptized 15000 Persons converted in the space of seven days; now then if one man could baptize so many in seven days, it was far more probable that twelve Apostles and seventy Disciples might baptize 3000 in one day. His Answer to our Objections is answered in the Book, and should I reply particularly I should be forc'd to Tautologize, and say but the same things over and over, which to me is not grateful.

And whereas it hath been too generally cast as a Reproach upon the People called *Baptists*, both by those stiled of the Reformed Religion, and others, that we lay more stress upon external Ordinances, and particularly Baptism, then we ought, of which charge we are altogether ignorant, because nothing short of the immense Bowels of the Father, and infinite Merit of the Son, is our Foundation for Salvation; and why we should be so hardly born upon for an Act of Obedience to our Sovereign and most Gracious Lord, is a thing to us unaccountable; and whether there be not more reason to suppose that the *Pedobaptists* are excessive in that Error they would charge upon others, both the *Cons* and *Noncons* equally criminal here: For if a Child be sick before it be privileged with the Font or Basin,

Oh in what haste is the Minister sent for, lest the Child should expire before it be baptized; what can be the Interpretation of this, but that the Childs Soul is in danger of losing Heaven, shut out of the Covenant, and Eternal Perdition? whether in this there be not a symbolizing too much with the Council of *Carthage*, who anathematized all that asserted Baptism did not wash an Infant clean from Original Sin? and is it not apparent that the *Pedobaptists* lay more stress upon External, then we who frequently assert, because we dare not be guilty of Will-worship, in the baptizing our Children, that therefore the Parents have no well grounded Hope of their Salvation; and that we set them among *Pagans* and *Infidels* who are of the visible Kingdom of the Devil: As if their Infant Baptism made them Members of the Church, and regenerated them, is not this much like the *Opus operatum*? yea, they advance farther; as if this did deliver them from Hell, and give them a Right to Heaven, who can find the Man that ever laid such stress upon Believers-Baptism as here is laid upon Infant-Baptism?

Thus I have given a fair Answer, I hope, to those Books, may I have but as fair a Reply it may tend to encrease love and affections, tho we differ in Opinion; but might I have my Will and Desire, I would rather all Controversie should cease by a Conviction of the Conscience, and my Opponents falling in with the Love and Practice of that Truth they have so long militated against.

For my part, if a Man may be believed, I am much averse for appearing in the Field of Controversie, and would please my self with those thoughts that it will be the last friendly Debate I may have with my Brethren, and tho' all Truth be precious to me, yet if it may be written without a Censure, my Delight is in Doctrines more sublime, and am not a little sensible what a loss it is to a Church where a Person is called unto a Pastoral Charge to be taken off by Controversies from a Laborious Meditation concerning things of greater Moment, for considering what Work Ministers have to do in their Families, their Visiting both Saints and Sinners, and as Occasion is, the Writing of Epistles upon various Accounts, besides their other publick Work in the Ministry, there is but little time left for other things, and had I not more than an ordinary Call for what I have done, as you may see in the Narrative, I should have been silent, but that the Glory of God, the Credit of Religion and the Church lay at Stake, which be dearer to me then my own ought to be.

Yet I am not unensible the Heart is so deceitful that it may propose the Forms, when indeed self is uppermost, but that I may be delivered from that Deceit, I beg the sincere Prayers of all the Godly who shall read what is here written.

Syllogistical Arguments against Pedo, and for Believers-Baptism.

Arg. 1. That which hath no divine Command nor Example, none Commended for its Observation, nor Reprehended for its Neglect, cannot be of God, or Divine Authority; but the Baptizing of Infants hath no Divine Command, nor Example, none Commended for its Observation, nor reprov'd for its Neglect, ergo, the Baptizing of Infants is not of God or Divine Authority.

Arg. 2. That which hath a Divine Command

mand and Example, some commended for its Observation, and others reproved for its Neglect, must be of God and Divine Authority; but the Baptism of Believers hath a Divine Command and Example; some commended for its Observation, others reprehended for its neglect, *ergo*, the Baptism of Believers is of God and Divine Authority, *Mat.* 16. 15, 16. *Luk.* 7. 29, 30.

Arg. 3. That which was the Practice of the pure Primitive and Apostolick Times, about Initiating persons into the Church, ought to be the same unto the second coming of Christ: But to initiate persons into the Church by Baptism, upon a profession of Faith, was the Practice of the pure Primitive and Apostolick times; *ergo*, to initiate persons into the Church by Baptism upon a profession of Faith, ought to be the same unto the Second Coming of Christ: This Argument doth stand Immovable against the Churches for *Pedo-Baptism*; unless they can assign the time and place where Christ altered the Constitution of his Churches, and changed the manner of Initiation into them, or else to their Peril be it who constitute Churches any other way, or Initiate Members contrary to the Apostolick Practice.

Arg. 4. That which is contrary to the Doctrine and Practice of *John, Christ* and his *Apostles*, is of Humane Invention.

But the Baptism of Infants is contrary to the Doctrine and Practice of *John, Christ* and his *Apostles*, *ergo*, the Baptism of Infants is of Humane Invention.

For the *Minor*; That the Baptism of Infants is contrary to the Doctrine and Practice of *John, Christ* and his *Apostles*, the whole New Testament witnesseth: That the Subjects of this Ordinance were Understanding Believers, not Ignorant Infants, and Dipping, not Sprinkling, the manner of Administration; and therefore the consequence of the *Major* is true, That Infant-Baptism is of Humane Invention.

Arg. 5. That Practice which hath no Promise Annexed unto it, either of Sins Remission, Divine Presence, the Gift of the Holy Ghost, nor Salvation, cannot be of God, or Divine Appointment.

But *Pedo-Baptism* hath no Promise annexed unto it, either of Sins Remission, Divine Presence, the Gift of the Holy Ghost, nor Salvation, *ergo*, *Pedo-Baptism* cannot be of God, or Divine Appointment.

Arg. 6. That Practice in the Church, which hath the Promise of Sins Remission, Divine Presence, the Gift of the Holy Ghost, and Salvation annexed unto it, is of God, and Divine Authority.

But the Baptism of Believers, upon Profession of Faith, hath the Promise of Sins Remission, Divine Presence, the Gift of the Holy Ghost, and Salvation annexed unto it, *Mat.* 28. 18. *Acts* 2. 38. *Mark* 16. 16. *Ergo*, The Baptism of Believers, upon Profession of Faith, is of God and Divine Authority.

Arg. 7. That manner of Administration of Baptism which no way answers the Commission nor Intention of Christ the Law-maker, cannot be Authentick.

But the Administration of Baptism, by Sprinkling, Pouring or Dropping, doth no way answer the Commission, nor Intention of Christ the Law-maker, *ergo*, the Administration of Baptism, by Sprinkling, Pouring or Dropping, is not Authentick.

The *Minor* is clear, That the Administration of Baptism, by Sprinkling, Dropping or Pouring, doth no way answer Christ the Law-makers Commission, because he commands the Subject to be Dipt, Immersed, Buried; in pursuance of which Commands, the Apostles did always so Practice. Secondly, It can no way answer the Intention of Christ the Law-giver, because his Intention was, that it should be a lively Representation of the Death, Burial and Resurrection of Christ, together with the Believers Death to Sin, and a Resurrection to a new Life; all which appears, *Rom.* 6. 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6. *Colos.* 2. 12. Now what Similitude or Likeness is between Sprinkling and Christ's Death, Burial and Resurrection, I leave to all the Judicious to consider; would Christ take such care to have his Death set forth in Lively Figures at the Lord's Table, in breaking Bread and pouring out Wine? And would Christ appoint a dead figure in Baptism? No, no.

Arg. 8. That Baptism which hath manifest Absurdities, cannot be of God:

But the Baptism of Infants hath manifold Absurdities, *ergo*, the Baptism of Infants cannot be of God.

The *Minor* is thus proved; It's full of Absurdities, because asserted by some, that persons have Regeneration in their Baptism before Vocation, and may be visible Church-Members before Conversion; moreover, that persons may be baptized by another's Faith, and making a National Gospel Church, instead of a Congregational, and bringing in a Carnal Fleishly Seed into Christ's Church, in the room of a Spiritual Seed.

That Faith and Repentance is required of persons before baptized, yet confess that Children, unto whom they apply it, have neither.

Again,

Again, They profess that Baptism is a Demonstration of a Spiritual Marriage between God and the Believer, and yet Assign it unto One as incapable of such a thing as a Stock or Stone: Moreover, that the Baptismal Covenant enters into the Visible Church, yet deny Church Members the Lord's Supper.

Arg. 9. That Baptism that introduceth Gross Errors into the Church, cannot be Divine, but Humane.

But the Baptism of Infants introduceth gross Errors into the Church, *ergo*, the Baptism of Infants cannot be Divine, but Humane.

The *Minor* thus appears of its introducing Errors; It was first used to wash away Original Sin, which nothing but Christ's Blood could do. Again, It's used to work Grace and Regeneration, and Effect Salvation by the Work done; and against all sense some say, It is an Apostolical Tradition, and that Children have Faith, are Disciples of Christ, that all Children of Believers are in the Covenant of Grace, defiling and polluting the Church with false matter, and confounding the Church and the World together, introducing many Traditions and Inventions of Anti-christ with it, as Gossips or Sureries, Bishoping or Confirmation, Christm, Exorcism, Consignation; finally, it hath made a great deal of Contention in the World, and filled many with prejudice.

Arg. 10. The proper Subjects of Baptism are such who are capable of hearing the Word, and Teaching, of Repenting, Confessing of Sin, believing in Christ, and doing it as Christ's Commission, a part of Gospel Righteousness, as Gods Counsel, and as the Answer of a good Conscience, and ought to do it as a Symbol of Christ's Death and Resurrection, together with our own Death unto Sin, and Resurrection to a New Life, *ergo*, Infants are not the proper Subjects of Baptism.

Seeing some have queried, where you find that Children are forbidden to be baptized, tho' you know it is rather your work to prove the positive, That there is a Command for the baptizing of Infants than for me to prove the Negative, That there is none; for if you would but prove the former, you would save me the Labour from proving the latter; however I shall attempt it for once.

To prove the Baptism of Infants forbidden.

All positive Commands prohibit whatever is repugnant to the positive command of Christ for that Ordinance, *ergo*, the Baptism of Infants is prohibited.

The Major is undeniable, the Minor I thus prove: If Ignorance be opposed to understanding, the want of an Act of Repentance, Faith and Obedience be opposed to the Act, and Teaching be opposed to them not capable of it. If a few drops of Water be opposed to a Burial in water: In a word, if a wrong Subject or wrong matter of Administration be opposite to a right Subject or manner of Administration, then Infants Baptism is repugnant to Christ's Command for that Ordinance, and therefore roundly prohibited; for no man of Sense can imagine that our Lord can allow of any practice repugnant to his own Commission; the Word all Nations, in *Mat. 38.* is referable only to the Teaching all Nations; all positive Commands prohibit whatever is repugnant thereunto, we might illustrate; when we are commanded to worship God in Spirit and Truth, it forbids all ignorant Devotion, Formality and Hypocrisie, and when commanded to Worship God, all Idols and Idolatry is forbidden; to eat Bread and drink Wine in remembrance of Christ, forbids a belief of his Corporal Presence; what need I do any act to put me in remembrance of him who is corporally present, when Gods Word asserts we are saved by Grace, it forbids Works as meritorious; so when God commands Persons that profess Faith and Repentance to be baptized, it prohibits all that are incapable of those Qualifications. Take heed of incurring divine Displeasure, by commanding that in the Name of the Lord which he never commanded: Oh! what a dreadful Judgment did God threaten against *Jerusalem* for doing those things which God commanded them not, *In offering their Children to Molech in the Valley of Ben Hinnom, which I commanded them not*, faith God, *neither came it into my mind*, *Jer. 19. 5.* The *Geneva* Note on that place faith, Whatsoever is not commanded by God, touching his Service, is against God's Word, because not commanded: Was not *Nadab* and *Ahihu* prohibited false fire when commanded to take Fire from the Altar? Is not *Tertullian's* Notion true, every positive Command of Christ includes a Negative? by this Argument you may set up a great part of the false Worship in *Rome*, by Interrogating where it is forbidden, read *Mat. 28. 18. Acts 2. 37. Rom. 6. 4. Acts 8. 36, 37. Acts 10.* All which Scriptures shew, that Baptism must be repugnant unto that Baptism which is from Heaven, therefore is prohibited.

The Substance of a LETTER writ in Vindication of Mr. Hercules Collins, and sent to Mr. Mence, Jan. 26. 1691.

By a Private Gentleman.

Mr. Mence,

Altho' the Holy Scriptures have foretold, that Differences would arise in the Churches, and we by sad experience find it true; yet that they should proceed from, be fomented and maintain'd by those, who, we hope, truly fear God; and managed in such a manner, as is utterly unbecoming both an Ingenious Man and a Christian, calls for a *Jeremy* to bewail it. But hereof you are greatly guilty, in your late Dealing with Mr. *Her. Collins* and his Book, by curtailing his Words, and palpably wresting his Sense.

When I was at your House, you may remember, that among many other things then discoursed of, you told me Mr. *Collins* asserted, that none of the Children of Believers were that none of the Covenant of Grace: Whereupon, I asked you, whether you were certain he did assert it? You answer'd, you were sure of it, and seem'd to be angry with me, for even suspecting the contrary of him; concluding, as you very well might, if that was his Assertion, then they must be damned. Moreover, you told me, he held, that Children might be saved, tho' they were not sanctified.

Now these Assertions being very gross and uncharitable; I could not be induced to think (having long known Mr. *Collins* to be a Person sound in the Faith of our Lord Jesus Christ, and of a more charitable Opinion about poor dying Infants) notwithstanding your confident Affirmation, that he should hold them. And therefore in order to my further Satisfaction in a matter of this moment, I took this method;

First, I examined that passage in his Book, [*viz. The Antidote proved a Counterfeit.*] which you refer'd me to: But could not find any foot-steps of such Monsters, as you said lurked there.

Secondly, I went to Mr. *Collins* himself, and desired him to tell me his Judgment plainly about the aforesaid Points, which I found to be far distant from the Errors you were pleas'd to charge him with.

And because you have not only in private, but also publickly endeavour'd from the Pulpit to fasten upon him, *The damning of all the Infant Seed of Believers dying in Infancy*; I shall here transcribe your own Words, as they were taken from you, by one who wrote your *Sermon*.

1. Say you, if Infants are absolutely shut out of the Covenant of Grace, then they must be damned; and this you told your Auditory he held.

2. Upon Mr. *Collins's* denying Habitual Faith to Infants, you thus reason, If Infants have not Habitual Faith, then dying Infants must be damned; for no unclean thing can enter into Heaven.

3. To prove it was his Opinion, that Infants might be saved without being either in Covenant or sanctified, you thus argue, without either sense or reason.

But some may say, that Infants may be saved by the imputed Righteousness of Christ, altho' they neither have Habitual Faith, or are in Covenant. I tell you, this is *Mountebank-Divinity*: For there can be no Imputation of the Righteousness of Christ, to a Person that is not sanctified and cleansed.

Then to sum up the Indictment, in brief it is this,

1. He holds the Infant Seed of Believers are all absolutely shut out of the Covenant of Grace, or of God.

2. Infants may be saved without being sanctified.

3. Infants may be saved without being in Covenant, and without Habitual Faith.

An Heavy Charge indeed, if there were not a little Charity in the two last to save the Rigour of the first, namely, that Infants may be saved: But the Absurdity of the Tenent, which is a Child of your own, and unjustly father'd upon Mr. *Collins*, is so gross, *viz.* That they may be saved without being either in the Covenant or sanctified, that it renders his Charity vain and frivolous: Because we have no Ground in Scripture to hope well of those whom we ex-

clude the Pale of the Covenant of Grace, and judge dye un sanctified.

In your Prologue to your Sermon, wherein you so roundly charge him, you pretend much aversion to Controversie, and great love to Peace; but under this smooth Language you cover your severe Intentions, and to use your own Proverbial Eloquence, endeavour to cut his Throat with a Feather. Thus *Joab* dealt with *Amasa*, 2 Sam. 20. 9, 10. While he called him Brother, and took him by the Beard to kiss him, he smote him with his sword in the fifth rib, and shed out his Bowels to the Ground. And such false Friendship is yours; for tho' your Words are soft, yet they cut like a Razor.

But give me leave to tell you, tho' you have endeavour'd to wound him under the Pretext of Friendship, yet still his Reputation lives, and the cause he is concern'd in is victorious.

I shall therefore prove your Indictment, tho' plausibly presented, to be a meer Libel; because the matter contained in it is neither asserted by Mr. Collins, nor deducible from any thing by him delivered: Unless we may take Mens Words, which in themselves are straight and beautiful, and distort them to what crooked and deformed shape and sence we please. For,

1. Mr. Collins doth not assert, that the Infant Seed of Believers are all absolutely shut out of the Everlasting Covenant of Grace, as you are pleased to charge him. His Words are these, in the Book before mentioned, *Antidote* proved a Counterfeit, p. 4. For my part (saith he,) I think Transubstantiation, Habitual-Faith, and the Infant-Seed of Believers in the Covenant, are Terms equally allowable, and probably equally understood among their various Professors. And here is not one Syllable concerning the absolute Exclusion of all the Infants of Believers out of the Everlasting Covenant of Grace. For 'tis evident, that Mr. Collins in that comparison of Infants being in Covenant with Transubstantiation, doth not respect the Truth or Falshood of the thing; but your Uncertainty about the manner of it: For upon this Question, *What is meant by being in Covenant?* He answers, *There are thousands of themselves know nothing of it: Seeing they do not mean the Election of Grace, for my part, I think, Transubstantiation, &c.* Where 'tis plain, the comparison respects your Uncertainty about the Mode, and not the Truth or Falshood of the thing. For, says he, *there are thousands of themselves know nothing of it.* And then for his next Words, viz. *Seeing they do not mean the Election of Grace,* forasmuch as when you

say the Infants of Believers are in the Covenant, you do not understand thereby their being in the Covenant of Election, or Everlasting Covenant of Grace, as he supposeth in that place, how can you assert, he holds the absolute Exclusion of all the Infants-Seed of Believers out of the Everlasting Covenant of Grace, and consequently their Damnation? when he is only discoursing in that Paragraph against your imaginary Covenant, wherein you fancy the Infants of Believers are, and very truly compares your unintelligible Jargon to the Popish Fagment of Transubstantiation.

But you were pleased to leave out this Sentence, viz. *seeing they do not mean the Election of Grace,* and so incandily perverted his Sence; which Sentence had you taken in, there could not have been the least Colour for such a Conclusion as you have drawn.

Again, as the manner of Christ's Presence in that Ordinance (which is commonly called the Sacrament) is differently understood by Papists, Lutherans and Calvinists; so the Infant Seed of Believers being in Covenant is so ambiguously used among your selves, that comparing them together, Mr. Collins might very well say, with respect to the different Apprehensions of Persons about the mode of the things themselves, *I think Transubstantiation, Habitual-Faith, and the Infant-Seed of Believers in the Covenant, are Terms equally allowable, and probably equally understood among their various Professors.* I pray Mark it, equally allowable; a soft Expression surely, and deserving rather your Thanks than your Censure.

But if you will yet force him to speak in that Passage of the Everlasting Covenant of Grace, whereof 'tis manifest to any unprejudiced Reader, that he doth not; doth he not sufficiently inform you of his meaning, p. 13, 14. of his *Antidote*, &c. where no less than nine or ten times he uses the Reduplication, as such, when he speaks of the Infant-Seed of Believers: Whereby you may see, if the Scales of Prejudice were off your Eyes, that he excludes not the Infants of Believers simply and absolutely, as you tax him, but denies their Being in the Covenant of Grace, as such, that is, because they are the Seed of Believers; for not the Parents Faith, but the Free-Grace of God thro' Christ entitles to that Covenant.

Let me intreat you hereafter to deal more ingenuously with your Neighbour, if you engage him again; for whatsoever you would that Men should do unto you, do you even so to them, for

this is the Law and the Prophets, Mat. 7. 12. Let your Arguments be as sinewy as you can make them, but do not defalcate his Words, or wrest his Sense, and then draw malignant Consequences from them.

You know who it was that mutilated Scripture in tempting of our Saviour; and truly tis a trembling Thought to me, that any who profess to fight against the Tempter, should use that part of his play in contests wth their Brethren.

2. Mr. C. affirmeth not the Salvation of dying Infants without their being sanctified. His Words from whence you make your Inference, are these, See Antidote proved a Counterfeit, p. 9. and Believers Baptism from Haven, p. 113 114. One of the first Arguments of the Church of Rome for Infant-Baptism, is, That it washes away Original Sin. We can tell you a better way of washing away Original Sin, namely, by the Imputation of Christs Righteousness, to Infants dying in Infancy. Now is there any thing in them that gives the least countenance to your Charge? for do not Christs imputed Righteousness, and his Sanctification go together? is it possible to have the first made over and not the latter? The Apostle says, Christ is made Righteousness and Sanctification, 1 Cor. 1. 30. And whom he justified them he also glorified, Rom. 8. 30. Christs imputed Righteousness is not only our Justification, but is also comprehensive of, and necessarily infers our Sanctification; Justification and Sanctification are together, and at once in the same Subject; for tho' they are distinguished, yet they are not divided. Therefore to conclude, that because dying Infants are saved by Christs imputed Righteousness, they are saved without being sanctified, is to divide Justification and Sanctification in the same justified Person, which is against the whole current of Scripture, and so in Effect to make void the imputed Righteousness of Christ: Which, where-soever it is received, hath Sanctification instantaneously accompanying of it. Not that Justification and Sanctification are formally the same, so as the one may be called and taken for the other; for Justification is not Sanctification, neither is Sanctification, Justification: But the same Person that is justified, is at the same Instant also sanctified. One would have thought, nothing could have been spoken more clearly and less liable to Exception, then what Mr. C. hath said about the Salvation of dying Infants. The Papists hold that Original Sin is washed away by Baptism; which is to ascribe a re-

generating Efficiency to an external Rite; No, saith Mr. C. 'tis the Blood of Christ, or his imputed Righteousness which doth that. And he speaks the Language of the Holy Spirit, Col. 1. 14. 1 Joh. 1. 7. Rom. 5. 9, 18, 19. For 'tis Christs Blood, i. e. his Righteousness alone graciously imputed, that justifieth or cleanseth from all sin. Without Holiness no man shall see the Lord, Heb. 12. 14. that is, Holiness is necessary in Order to a participation of the Beatific Sight of God: But tis not for Holiness, but for Christs Righteousness imputed, as the meritorious and material cause, that any poor soul is justified and saved.

3. You charge Mr. Collins with holding that Infants may be saved without Habitual-Faith, or being in the Covenant. Answ. The latter he utterly disowns; for he believes there is no Salvation out of the Everlasting Covenant of Grace. And as to the former, he doth not think that dying Infants which are saved, are either capable of Habitual-Faith, or that Habitual-Faith is necessary to their Salvation.

1. He conceives dying Infants are incapable of Habitual-Faith; because it being of the Nature of all Faith to assent, and that being the Work of the Understanding, which they have no use of, by any thing that appeareth to us, we have no reason to think them capable of Habitual-Faith, unless they are also capable of Habitual Assent, for all Faith is Assent. To talk of Habitual-Faith with Exclusion of Assent, is to destroy the very Nature of Faith, and render the intellectual Faculty wholly useless in believing.

2. He conceives Habitual-Faith is not necessary to the Salvation of dying Infants. For,

Whatsoever is necessary to the Salvation of dying Infants, is either expressly declared or certainly imply'd to be so, in the Word of God. But Habitual-Faith is neither expressly declared or certainly imply'd to be so in the Word of God:

Therefore Habitual-Faith is not necessary to the Salvation of dying Infants.

If you object against the Minor, I demand where in the Word of God Habitual-Faith is either expressly declared, or certainly imply'd to be necessary to the Salvation of Dying Infants? Indeed Mr. Shute pretends to an Intimation of Habitual-Faith in Infants, from Psal. 22. 9, 10. Thou didst make me hope, when I was upon my Mothers Breasts. I was cast upon thee from the Womb, thou art my God from my Mothers Belly. But Mr. Collins from the late Annotations hath shewn how impertinent that is to the purpose. 'Thou didst make me hope, when I was upon my my Mothers Breasts,

'Breasts, that is, thou didst give me sufficient Ground for Hope and Trust, if I had been capable of acting that Grace. *I was cast up on thee from the Womb, thou art my God from my Mother's Belly, that is, I was like one forsaken by his Parents, and cast wholly upon thy Providence. Antidote proved a Counterfeit, p. 4.*

Now upon the whole matter, let any indifferent Person judge, whether Mr. Collins deserved such hard usage from you as you have given him? Whether his Positions are so dangerous as you have misrepresented them? or worthy of that scornful Appellation of *Mountebank-Divinity*? But 'tis the way of some Persons, when they are not able to withstand the clear Evidence of Truth, to load it with odious Consequences; and truly Sir, it grieves me that this hath been your Method.

Doth Mr. Collins exclude the Infant-Seed of Believers out of the Everlasting Covenant of Grace, when he only denies their being therein upon the reason assigned by you, viz. because they are the Children of Believers? or doth he hold the Damnation of Infants dying

in Infancy, who tells you, *their Original Sin is wash'd away by the Imputation of Christs Righteousness*, in his *Believers Baptism* from Heaven, p. 113, 114. and his *Antidote* proved a Counterfeit, p. 9. and in this latter p. 15. saith; *I conclude well of all that dye in their Infant-state?* or doth the Imputation of Christs Righteousness to dying Infants argue they are saved without being sanctified, seeing Justification and Sanctification are contemporary in the same subject? or lastly, doth it follow, that because he denies Habitual-Faith to be in Infants, therefore dying Infants must be damned, as tho' your Habitual-Faith in Infants (which neither your self, nor any other of your Opinion understand well what you intend by it;) were of the same necessity with Christ and his imputed Righteousness?

Sir! You know such Conclusions could not flow from his Assertions, if the Fire of your Intemperate Zeal had not forc'd them thence; so that they are yours in a proper sense, his only by abuse.

An APPENDIX,

CONTAINING

- I. The Pedigree of Infants Habitual Faith; And,
- II. The Judgment of Learned Men against it.

By Richard Claridge.

I. It hath no Honourable Pedigree, unless it is to be accounted one to be a Descendant from Rome. The Papists, (saith Belarmine) hold that Infants only have Habitual-Faith, and that it (together with Hope and Charity) is infused into them in Baptism. *De bapt. l. 1. c. 10, 11.*

Fer. Taylor having rejected the Lutheran Device of Personal and Actual Faith, and the Calvinian of Imputative Faith, saith, 'And yet there is a third Device, which the Church of Rome teacheth, and that is, that Infants have Habitual-Faith. *Liberty of Proph. Sect. 18. N. 29. p. 141.*

I have more Charity then to think our Bre-

thren like it the better, because it was first hatcht in her Nest; but I see some Men are very apt to hug any thing, that they imagine will help them, when they are put to their Shifts.

2. The Judgment of Learned Men about the Faith of Infants. And,

1. *Augustine*, tho' a very severe Pedobaptist, yet held not the Personal or Habitual-Faith of Infants, as is manifest from his Writings.

'Altho' the Infant (saith he) hath not that Faith which consisteth in the Will of Believers; yet the Sacrament of that Faith (as he terms it) maketh him a Believer. For as it is answered, as he doth believe, so he is also called

called a Believer, not by an assent of the Mind to the thing it self, but by receiving the Sacrament of the thing it self. *Tom. 2. Epist. 23. ad Quæst. Bonifacij.*

And in another place, he saith, 'This Word of Faith is of so great Efficacy in the Church of God, that it cleauneth the Infant by him that doth believe, offer, bleis and dip him never so little, tho' he be not yet able to believe with the Heart unto Righteousness, and make Confession with the Mouth unto Salvation. *Tom. 2. sup. Joann. Tract. 80.*

2. Bernard is of the same Opinion, 'Infants (saith he) are saved not by their own Faith, but anothers. *Epist. 77.* — 'It is meet and belongeth to the Goodness of God, that to whom Age denies a proper Faith of their own, Grace should afford them the Benefit of anothers. For the Justice of Almighty God doth not think a proper Faith is to be required of those, whom he knows to have no proper fault of their own.

3. Zanchius in his Answer to this Question, What are we to think of Infants, who cannot actually repent and believe? saith, *Oper. Tom. 4. p. 440.* 'The Answer of Augustine and others is true; that they are so baptized in the Faith of the Church and their Parents; but I add, they have also the Spirit of Faith. I pray take Notice, he doth not say the Habit of Faith, but the Spirit of Faith, which he calls in another place the Spirit of Regeneration, to distinguish it from the Habit of Faith. For the Spirit may renew and sanctify, where yet no Habit of Faith is produced. 'For (as Usher says) the Spirit of God in Elect Infants supplis the Room of Faith. *Body of Divinity, p. 418.*

But an Habit of Faith, if Pemble's Definition be true, is very unlikely to be in Infants; 'The Habit of Faith (saith he) is that renewed Quality of the Soul, whereby it is made able to discern, and yield Assent unto, and also willing to put Affiance in all divine Truth revealed. *Of the Nature and Properties of Grace and Faith, p. 19.*

4. Musculus owns that the Anabaptists (so called) are not the first, nor the only Persons that deny Infants have Faith. For, 'Tho' (saith he) there are some in our Age dispute about the Faith of Infants, and stiffly plead for their believing; yet I cannot approve of their Opinion. *Loc. Commun. de Pædobapt. p. 729.*

'It is absurd to require Faith of an Infant, which neither God himself requireth of it,

neither can it by reason of Age either have or express. *Ibid, p. 736, 737.*

And speaking a little after against that Abrenunciation of the Works of the Devil, and Answer about the poor Infants Faith made by the Witnesses in its Name, he asks, *p. 737.* 'What need there is of this custom, to do and speak such things in the Church of Christ, which cannot be spoken with any probability; much less Assurance at all?

5. Beza saith, it is neither certain that Infants are endued with Habitual-Faith, nor is it likely they should be capable thereof, who have no use of Understanding; unless God peradventure should work in them some extraordinary way, whereof we can have no Account, *Confes. Fidei, cap. 4. sect. 48. de Infant. Bapt.*

6. The Martyr Philpot in Fox's Acts and Monuments, tho' very zealous for Infants-Baptism, yet doth not ascribe Habitual-Faith to them. He argues indeed for a Reputative or Imputative Faith, thus, 'Whom God doth account among the faithful, they are faithful, but God doth repute Children among the faithful; but not a Word of Personal or Habitual-Faith. *Vol. 3. p. 510.*

'Such as be of Age may hear, believe, and confess, &c. But so cannot Infants. *p. 511.*

7. Whitaker in his Answer to Duræus the Jesuite, writeth thus, 'I was never yet of that Opinion which you falsely attribute to me, to judge that Infants do believe, seeing the Scripture doth not teach, nor Reason perswade any such thing. *De Paradox, lib. 8. p. 681, 682.*

Again, 'If Infants were endued with Habitual-Faith, then they have a Knowledge of Divine Things, tho' by reason of bodily Impediments they cannot express them. I demand then, whether they may afterwards loose that Habit or not? but this I believe you will not affirm, because it is absurd. If then they retain that Habit, they know the Mysteries of Faith before they are taught. *Ibid 683.*

8. Vossius, in his Theological Disputation about Pædobaptism, saith, tho' Infants are capable of a Spirit of Faith, by which the Soul receives a Spiritual and Supernatural Principle, yet are destitute of the Habit of Faith, his Words are these:

'A Person is said to be an Unbeliever two ways;

Nega-

“*Negatively*, who is indeed wholly void of the *saving Habit of Faith*, but is not polluted with the contrary Habit.

“*Positively*, who both wants the *Habit of Faith*, and labours under the contrary Will of Unbelief.

Infants are only negatively Unbelievers, that is, they have not Faith as yet, being naturally incapable thereof. *Thes. 15.*

“*Again*, Infants cannot have *Habitual* or *Actual* Faith; because Grace presupposeth Nature: But there is not yet such a Perfection of Nature in Infants that Reason can shew it self in them, much less can there be a supernatural *Habit* in them, or an Act proceeding therefrom. *De Sacram. Vi. & Effic. par. poster. Thes. 47.*

9. *Curcellæus* having shewn the Absurdity of their Opinion, who think that Faith is produced by Baptism in Infants new born, and of theirs, who say Infants do believe in Christ; doth in the third place refute the Opinion of those, who do not ascribe any *Actual* Faith to Infants, but yet nevertheless attribute an *Habit*, or some seed of Faith.

What is that seed? *saith he*, “In the Seed lieth hid the whole Virtue and Substance of the thing that is to arise from thence. Is there any such like thing in Infants? doth this Virtue shew it self of its own Accord in them, when they grown up? No truly, except they are instructed in the Doctrine of the Gospel. *Instit. l. 7. c. 8. § 16. p. 468.*

“But (say they) without Faith it is impossible to please God, *Heb. 11. 6.* Therefore we must judge that either Infants have Faith, or that they are eternally damned, if they dy in their Infancy.

Ans. “This is a foolish Consequence, as if truly it doth not appear, that this, as all the rest of the Precepts of the Gospel, belongs to the Adult only, and are capable of Instruction, either of Virtue or Vice, and obligeth them alone. Certainly Faith is not more necessary to Salvation, then the keeping of the rest of the Commands of the Gospel, and to live after the Spirit, not after the Flesh. Seeing then they do believe that Infants may be saved without these, why not also without Faith?

10. *Downe*, in a Treatise upon this subject, proveth by irrefragable Arguments, that Infants have neither *Actual* or *Habitual* Faith. *Of the Faith of Infants, p. 194, — 200.*

Both *Lutheran* and *Papist* agree in this, (*saith he*) that Infants have a particular Faith of their own.

“The Principal Reasons that they alledge for proof hereof are these. Infants please God:

“But without Faith it is impossible to please him, *Heb. 11. 6.* The Kingdom of God belongs to them: *Mat. 19. 14.* Which yet the Scriptures say cannot be attained without Faith. The Word of God every where maketh particular Faith a necessary means unto Justification and Salvation, as where the Prophet saith, *Hab.*

2. 4. *The just man shall live by Faith*: But Infants are justified before God, and being justified cannot but be saved. Nay, Christ himself expressly saith, that they do believe,

Mat. 18. 6. *Mar. 9. 42.* And *Luke 1. 41.* *John* the Baptist in the very Womb of his Mother was filled with the Holy Ghost, and sprang at the Salutation of the Blessed Virgin. Other Arguments they use, but they are all of the like Nature, and notwithstanding them all, I cannot be persuaded, that Infants while they are such, have any Faith of their own, either *Actual* or *Habitual*. And these among sundry others are my chiefest Reasons.

1. The Scripture in plain Terms affirmeth, that they have no Knowledge at all, either of good or evil, *Deut. 1. 39.* they cannot so much as discern between the right and the left hand, *Joh. 4. 11.* If so, how can they who conceive not of things natural, understand those things that are Heavenly, and above the pitch of Nature? If we should go about (saith *Augustine*, *Epist. 57.*) to demonstrate with words, that Children know the things of God, who as yet know not the things of Men, I fear we should offer wrong even to our very Senses, endeavouring to persuade that by words, the Evidence of the Truth whereof far exceeds all Power and Office of Speech.

2. When Infants are presented at the Font, and either sprinkled with the Water of Baptism, or dipped therein, how chanceth it that they so much dislike thereof, testifying their dislike by their crying, and other motion of the Body? Certainly, had they *actual* Faith, they would endure all with much patience and cheerfulness, and never bewray so much Averseness and Discontent.

3. If they have Faith, why are they not after their initiation by Baptism, forthwith admitted to the Communion? In the time of *Augustine*, and *Innocent* the first, it was the Practice of the Church so to do: And it continued, as some write, for the space of 600 years, down to the time of *Ludovicus Pius* and *Leobardus*. But why is that Custom now grown out of use, and why are Children barred

red from the Eucharist, if they believe as well as Elder People? Nay, why are they not rather admitted than those of riper years? For Infants have not so much as evil Thoughts in them, but these by reason of their longer life have made themselves guilty of many evil deeds besides.

4. *Faith*, as *Paul* witnesseth, cometh by hearing, and hearing by the Word of God preached. But Infants hear not, neither by the Ear, nor by any other way proportionable thereunto: Or if they do, yet they understand not what they hear. For did they understand, I presume they would hearken more attentively unto what is said then we see they do, wherefore not hearing, neither do they believe. If you say, they believe by an inward hearing; then is that Faith wrought either by ordinary or extraordinary means, not by extraordinary means, for it is done every day and hour. By ordinary therefore. If so, then have we a double manner of working Faith, and both of them ordinary: The one by inward hearing in Infants only, the other by inward and outward also in those that are adult, which is a meer Novelty in the Church of God.

5. How cometh it to pass, if Children have Faith, that among so many millions of them as have been in the World, not so much as one of them when they come to riper years, giveth any Testimony of his Faith, until he be farther taught and instructed? If a Child born of Christian Parents, and entered into the visible Church by Baptism, shall afterwards while he is yet in his tender years fall into the hands of *Infidels* or *Turks*, as the more the pity many thousands of them have done, and the whole Band of *Janizaries* consist of none other, doth he not readily receive that Religion which is first instilled into him, without once dreaming of the *Christian Faith*? which yet how should it be, having from his first Infancy been seasoned and sanctified with the *Christian Faith*, cannot easily be conceived or imagined.

6. Tell me, do all that have received Faith in their Infancy, loose it again when they come to be of more years? It seemeth so, if then they received it, for otherwise, why are they put to their Catechism, and taught the Elements of Faith again? But this were a very strange Course, for how should they lose it? unless perhaps God secretly take that from them which he gave them; which to say, is very derogatory to the Bounty of God.

7. And lastly, there is not the least Habit, either acquired by custom, or infused from above, but maketh a man more apt and prone unto their proper Actions. For Example, whosoever is possessed of the Virtues of Justice, Temperance, Liberality, Fortitude, will readily do justly, temperately, liberally, valiantly, it being the Nature of Habits to facilitate Actions. Tell me then, are the Children of Christians, when they come first to be instructed, more capable of Christian Religion, or more inclinable to Holy Actions, then the Children of *Infidels*? Experience tells us they are not, but are as Wax, indifferently flexible any way. It is absurd therefore, and void of Reason, to place in Infants the *Habit of Faith*, which yet inclines them no more to Acts of Faith than those which are without it.

Now having thus briefly demonstrated, that Infants have neither *Actual* or *Habitual* Faith: It followeth in the next place to answer the contrary Arguments above set down. And first, where it is said, that Faith is a necessary means unto Justification and Salvation, in as much as none can please God, or live without it.

I answer in a Word, it is to be understood not of Infants, but of those that are of riper years, unto whom alone Faith is necessary. These cannot please God, nor live, nor be justified and saved without a particular Faith of their own; but Infants by reason of their Incapacity through the Indulgence of God may. Adde hereunto, that according to the Tenent of our *Divines*, it is not the *Habit*, but the *Act* of Faith that doth justify: In Regard whereof they define it by a Motion of the Will, grounded upon an Assent of the Mind unto the Truth of the Gospel. Unless therefore you grant unto Infants such a Motion, both of the Mind and Will, which *Papists* expressly deny, and *Lutherans* seem to stagger at, neither can they be justified by *Actual Faith*, having none. And seeing without it the *Habit* avails nothing at all, as being an idle Faith: I see not to what End the *Habit* should be infused. And if it be to no End, neither is it infused. For if Nature doth not, much less doth God any thing in vain.

To that of our Saviour, where he seemeth expressly to affirm that Little Ones believe: I answer,

1. That those Little Ones are not Infants properly, but such Men as resemble little Children in holy Innocence and Simplicity; in Regard

gard whereof they are elsewhere called by Christ, *Mat. 11. 25.* *παιδες*, that is, Infants.

2. Grant it that Children be also meant, yet not such Children as are Infants, but grown to some Stature and Capacity. For altho' the Child whom Christ took in his Arms be called *παιδον*, a little Child; yet was he both a Follower and Hearer of Christ, and such an one as in some measure could understand, such as were those, *παιδων*, *1 Joh. 2. 14. Mat. 18. 26.* little Children to whom John thought it not unfit to write. For as the Text saith, he was one that came of himself being called, and farther, he was capable of Scandal and Offence, which questionless is not incident unto Infants.

Lastly, 'To the Example of John the Baptist, I answer with *Augustine*, Epist. 57. neither do I condemn, saith he, that which was done in John, neither do I from thence frame a Rule, what we are to think of Little Ones: Yea, I acknowledge it to be marvellous in him, because I find it not in others; moreover, it is not said of him, he believed in the Womb, but only he sprang in the Womb; and this Exultation or Springing was done by the Power of God in the Infant, and not by any Humane Power of the Infant. Or if use of Reason and Will were so hastened unto him as he did believe, it is to be reckoned among the Miracles of Gods Power, and not to be drawn into an Example of Humane Nature. Thus far the Learned Downe.

11. *Willet* saith, That Infants neither have Faith in themselves, nor yet are profited or furthered to their Salvation by the Faith of others. *Synopsis Papismi*, p. 574.

12. *Usher* of *Armagh* was no Favourer of this Notion, 'Infants (*saith he*) are not capable of Grace that way whereby the grown are, by Hearing, Conceiving, *Believing*; yet it follows not that Infants are not capable in and by another way. It is easie to distinguish between the Gift conveyed, and the manner of conveying it. Faith is not of absolute necessity to all Gods Elect, but only to those to whom God affords means of believing. It is the Application of Christs Righteousness that justifies us, not our apprehending it. God can supply the defect of Faith by his sanctifying Spirit, which can do all things on our part, which Faith should do; do we not know that the Sin of Adam is imputed to Children, and they defiled by it, tho' they be not capable to understand it? Even so the Righteousness of Christ may be, and

is by Gods secret or unknown way to Elect Infants; and so to those that are born deaf, and Fools not capable of Understanding. *Bo- dy of Divinity*, p. 416, 417, 418.

It is hard to affirm (*as some do*) that every Elect Infant doth ordinarily before or in Baptism receive Initial Regeneration, or the Seed of Faith, and Grace. For if there were such an Habit of Grace then infused, it could not be so utterly lost or secreted as never to shew it self, but by being attain'd by new Instruction.

Again, 'The Scripture requiring Faith in the Party to be baptized, speaks of grown Men. And as we have said before, the Spirit of God in Elect Infants supplies the room of Faith, and however it be, Adams Corruption cannot be more effectual to pollute the Infant than Christs Blood and Innocency is to sanctifie it; and Gods Willom wants not means to apply it, tho' we cannot attain unto the manner.

13. *Eyre* in his Answer to *Woodbridge*, *Cranford* and *Baxter*, argues solidly against it, 'If they say Infants have the Seed or Habit of Faith, the Scripture will contradict them, which affirmeth. *The free Justific. of a Sinner*, c. 14. sect. 5. p. 142.

1. That they have no Knowledge at all, either of good or evil, *Deut. 1. 39.* And that they cannot so much as discern between the right and the left hand. And if so, how can they who conceive not of things natural, understand those things that are heavenly and spiritual.

2. That Faith cometh by bearing of the Word preached, *Rom. 10. 17.* Now Infants either hear not, or if they do, they understand not what they hear: We have sufficient Experience, that no Children give any Testimony of Faith, until they have been taught and instructed. Elect Children (which are afterwards manifested to be such) are as obstinate and unteachable as any others.

And a little after he delivereth his Judgment about the Salvation of Infants, (wherein he accords with *H. Collins*) in these Words; 'That any Infants (*saith he*) are saved, it is meerly from the Grace of Election, and the Free Imputation of Christs Righteousness; of which, all that are elected, are made partakers in the same manner.

14. *Tomb*, arguing against the Discipleship of Infants, useth this Medium, viz. They are not termed Believers; which he substantially proves thus, 'Believing (*saith he*) is an

an Act of the intellectual part, and suppo-
seth the use of Reason, which Infants ordina-
rily have not; nor is the Term *Believer* any
where in Scripture applied to them. *Antipa-*
debapt. 2d. part. p. 148.

And in another place he saith, 'Believing
is an immanent Act, which neither is, nor can
be anothers Act than the Persons, nor by a-
ny others Motion then his own, nor from a-
ny other Principle without his own Under-
standing. And then how can Infants be-
lieve, who have no use of their Understand-
ing. *Antipdebapt. 3d. part, p. 870.*

15. 'Whether Infants have Faith or no,
is a Question (saith *Jeremy Taylor*) to be
disputed by Persons that care not how much
they say, and how little they prove; first,
Personal and Actual Faith they have none,
for they have no Acts of Understanding, and
besides, how can any know that they have
Faith, since he never saw any sign of it, neither
was he told so by any that could tell. Infants-ha-
bitual-Faith he calls the Device of the Church

of *Rome*, but who told them they have it?
'how can they prove it? what Revelation or
'Reason teacheth any such thing? are they
'by this Habit so much as disposed unto an
'actual Belief without a New Master? can
'an Infant sent into a *Mahometan* Province be
'more confident for Christianity when he
'comes to be a Man, then if he had not been
'baptized? are there any Acts precedent, con-
'comitant, or consequent to this pretended Ha-
'bit, this strange Invention is absolutely with-
'out Art, without Scripture, Reason or Au-
'thority, but the Men are to be excused,
'unless there were a better. And again,
'to this purpose, if any Man runs for suc-
'cour to that Exploded *Cressbugeron*, that In-
'fants have Faith, or any other, inspired Ha-
'bit, of I know not what, or how, we desire
'no more advantage in the World, then that
'they are constrained to answer, without Re-
'velation, against Reason, Common Sense,
'and all the Experience in the World. Dr.
Taylor's Liberty of Prophecy, p. 240, 242.

A brief, but an honest and true Answer to Mr. Mence his Book, Entituled Deceit and Falshood detected.

BEfore I speak unto the Book, I have some-
thing for Information to my Candid Rea-
der. Whereas all Christian Endeavours have
been used by me to prevent the Reply to this
Book, knowing that Gospel Enemies do not
use to put the best Constructions upon such
Pro's and Con's: Neither was it without an Eye
to my Opponents Reputation, and the Congre-
gation whereunto he belongs; but not meeting
with that which was justly expected to pre-
vent this Answer, the Church whereunto I
belong have thought that I am greatly obliged
for the publick Honour of the Gospel, and
Advantage of the Ministry, and stopping the
Mouths of Enemies, that I do make the Vin-
dication as publick as the Asperion: And had
it only concerned my own private Reputation,
I hope I could have buried much more than
this amounts unto. And tho' my Friends were
very tender to Mr. Mence, yet they saw no
reason to acquit him, but to condemn
his undue Management of the Controversie
with me, (this being their own Sense, and no

Imposition of mine upon the Reader.) And
whereas at our parting there was some Dis-
course of another Meeting, which I have since
endeavoured to obtain, in order to accomodate
the Difference, yet Mr. Mence hath been pleas-
ed to decline it.

It is matter of Admiration, and also a ground
of Trouble, that a Person in Mr. Mence's
Sphere should make Answers to Books, neither
like a Christian, a Minister, a Scholar, nor like a
Gentleman, or a Man of a sober moderate Tem-
per; for what is it that hath the loudest voice
in his book, but what would foul a Mans
thoughts to think, and his Mouth to express,
viz. This is an Untruth, this is another Un-
truth, this is a Falshood, and thumping Un-
truth, and the other a Lye; and that I am a
Halophanta: i. e. A base flattering Fellow, one
that for hire or gain will say any thing; a
dishonest lying Fellow; see *Gouldm. Diction.*
and is it not a thing unaccountable, that
when I earnestly press'd him again and again,

before several grave Divines, to prove me guilty of but one Untruth, and I would confess it before, which notwithstanding all, he made not the least attempt to do any such thing, tho' too much of this Nature evidently appeared against him in the presence of all that heard the Case. But now I consider it, Mr. Mence had obliged himself to prove my little Book a Book of Lies, tho' never so full of Truth, having told his People that it was all Lies; now he supposing they would not take his simple *ipse dixit*, but expect he should prove it, he hath made a dreadful Attempt to make Light show like Darkness, and Truth like Error and Untruth; but Light is Light still, and Truth Truth still, with a *non obstante* all his Evasions and Quibbles; and I must needs say, I am troubled for him, to see that the more he struggles to clear himself, the more he is entangled, like a Wild Bull in a Net, and will be so, until he disentangles himself by true Repentance; for there is no way like it, and this every man will confess when he comes to dye, if in any good frame. My Opponent exclaims greatly in the Beginning and Ending of his Book against my publishing my Books on the Sabbath day; my Honest Defence for this is, that if there be but one effectual way left for me to vindicate my Innocency, I presume that my rational Reader will allow me that way, as if it were his own Case, Mr. Mence had greatly aspersed me in his Pulpit before his Auditory, and I not having the Advantage to use his Pulpit to undeceive the People, I was obliged to take the best way I could to do it, which I thought was by putting a Book into their Hands; I hope I have as great a Desire to sanctify the Lords Day as some others; neither can any think that the doing a good work can prophane it, as the undeceiving an honest, deceived people, and the publishing Verity. Is it not as laudible a Practice freely to give Truth and Innocency, as it is to sell Deceit and Falseness on his Sacrament-Day? and why is it not as lawful for me to vindicate my self upon that day, as it was for Mr. Mence to reproach his Neighbour upon that day, in the face of hundreds? pray let it be considered which is the greatest Evil. And whereas Mr. Mence saith, that my great design was to wound his Reputation, which I can truly say it never was, but that he might be brought to Repentance, and the Acknowledgment of his sin, by some faithful Christians, or the Church

whom he imposed an Untruth upon; and it is the Opinion of very wise men, that if twenty Persons had writ against him, none could more effectually ruin his Credit and Reputation than he hath done himself in his scurrilous way of Writing, so that he is *felo de se*; and is it not to be wondred at, that at the same time a man is condemning another, he is acting the same thing, for who is more guilty herein than himself; all that read his Book may see, and that my Readers may be satisfied, and set in a true Light, that the first principal Cause of Difference, was my asserting, we know a better way to wash off Original Sin from dying Infants than by Infant-Baptism, namely, the Blood of Christ, and the Imputation of his Righteousness, which I prove from his own Words in the Pulpit, quickly after I had answered Mr. Shutes first Book. But some may say, saith he, tho' Infants have no Habitual-Faith, neither be in the Covenant, yet they may be saved by the Righteousness of Christ; I tell you this is Mountebank-Divinity; now if this were not the principal thing, why should this be the only thing urged by him and its well known that the mentioning those Words was the very first Difference between him and I. And whereas he disowns, and saith it is false, that he should say if Infants have no Faith they must be damned; hear his own Words, if Infants have no Habitual-Faith, then they must be damned, for no unclean thing can enter into Heaven; and that he suggested to his Auditory, as if I held the Seed of Believers absolutely shut out of the Covenant of Grace; hear his own Words, if Believers Seed are absolutely shut out of the Covenant of Grace, then they must be damned, and this he spoke, because I asserted that that the Children of Believers as their fleshly Seed are not in the Covenant of Grace; and tho' this Qualification was not added, where Infants in Covenant and Transubstantiation was joyned, yet he must know I so intended, it being five or six times in one page said, they were not in the Covenant of Grace as such. *Antidote proved a Counterfeit*, p. 13.

Whereas Mr. Mence spends his 10th. 11th. 12th. 13th. pages, upon telling the World that I have founded my Fabrick upon one single Testimony, I would have him know, it was not because I had no more; hath he not cause for to thank me to produce but one, when I had more; and whereas he suggests that I have forged an Accusation, because I did not name the Writer, let him know, that if ever there

which was in Controversie before, and I not be guilty of Nonsense nor Untruth.

To conclude, *A. P.* died in *October* 1693. and was buried *November* the second, his Sermon where he asperst me with holding Mountebank-Divinity was about three weeks, little more or less, before the aforesaid Persons death, about which time *Mr. Mence* was with our Ministers and gave me the Challenge, his Sermons upon the Covenant were not till some months after this, about the Spring, that is about *January*, which is conformable to what he saith in his last Book *pa.* 36. that it was thirteen months before he printed this Book that he Preached the Sermons upon the Covenant. *Mr. Mence* confesseth that my first offer to discourse him, was that day he preached his last Sermon on the Covenant, so that it appears from himself that he was the Challenger, and not I; moreover, many can remember that both those times I mentioned the matter, I thus worded it, that I was willing to accept *Mr. Mence* his Proposition before the Ministers, therefore he must first make it.

You tell us *pa.* 27. when you sent the Line of *Latin*, that you did desire the Person by whom you sent it to acquaint me, that whereas I understood you had been a University Scholar, that I had challenged to dispute you in *Latin*, to which you say you never had an Answer; I know not how you should, for as I never said any such thing, so no such Message was ever delivered me; and having asked the Messenger, he solemnly professeth you never said any such thing unto him; who speaks amiss now? Moreover, I challenge any Person in the World to say to my Face, that ever I spoke any such thing, and as for the Minister who said you had sent me a *Latin* Letter, his Name shall be forth coming upon the first Occasion. His Word of Advice, *pa.* 37. sufficiently proves what I charged him with, saith he, let those have a care of Blasphemy against God, his Tabernacle, &c. that are so bold as to call

that Everlasting Covenant, which as an Instance of Gods Rich Grace is made with *Abraham* and his Seed for ever, an Antiquated and Repealed Covenant; and how unfair is he, in *pa.* 35. to argue that it is enough to mention a position and not the Reason of it, I do affirm the contrary, that if there be a position laid down, and a Reason added unto it, whether it be before it or after it, the Reason being to clear the position, it ought to be mentioned, or else how can the Position be cleared, Oh how hard it is to bring this Man to Repentance; I wish he is not more careful of his Reputation among Men then a good Conscience.

For my Charging of him with an *Hyperbole*, and a great Untruth, which he told his People together and apart, *viz.* That I should deny what I had writ and when proved upon me, the Elders held down their Heads and were ashamed on't. This he is very loath to take to himself, till he cannot help it; Oh how fain would he not be the man, no nor doth he care to understand what I did mean by his friends together and apart: I question not but the Church knows, and he too, what I meant by it; neither is he willing to know who I mean by his own friend, who was with him at the Ministers; but he could not witness for him, neither is he willing it should have the Name of an *Hyperbole*, or Untruth; he tells us *pa.* 30. that I was proved guilty of an Untruth before the Ministers, but what this Untruth is, that page is so full of Confusion, that wise men cannot find it out. But now he is in two Stories, which would he have us to believe to be true, that which he told his People or this in the Book? in his Book he saith, the Ministers whispered that sat near him, and asked if it were so wrote in his Book, and one answered the other that it was, but here is nothing mentioned of my denying any thing. Now that I was proved guilty of no Untruth before the Ministers, the following Certificate will satisfy any reasonable Person.

WHereas *Mr. Mence* in his Book entituled Deceit and Falshood detected, *pa.* 30. hath asserted that *Mr. Hercules Collins* was found guilty of an Untruth before the Elders and Ministering Brethren, This is to Certifie, that *Mr. Hercules Collins* was Convicted of

no Untruth, or any thing like it, either in reference to his Book, or any other Matter whatsoever.

Witness our Hands, April 1. 1695.

William Kiffin,
William Collins,
Richard Adams,
Benjamin Keach,
Leonard Harrison,

Richard Claridge,
Benjamin Dennis,
Thomas Harrison,
Simon Brunt.

Mr. Mence greatly wished another had been in my post; he believes God hath appointed every mans Habitation, or he believes it not, if he believes it not, he denies divine Providence; if he believes it, why is he displeased with the Bounds of my Habitation? Before I close, let me mind you of some of his Contradictions in his Answer to Mr. Dennis, he seems angry for his espousing my cause, because he saith, what he did was only or principally against one private Person, and not the whole party; let his own Book confute him; In *Vindiciæ Fæderis*, p. 43. and now let me, saith he, apply my self to you my Brethren of the Anabaptists Perswasion, &c. p. 44. saith, and here I might retort upon my Brethren, because many of your Members, &c. p. 43. The Anabaptists are greatly put to their Shifts, speaking about 1 Cor. 7. and in p. 70. saith, some have lodged that precious Scripture in a Miry Labyrinth, p. 74. in dealing about the Covenant with Abraham, we have to do with our old Adversaries the Papists, tho' marching under the Banner of a People of another Denomination, p. 113. saith, many of the Anabaptists do found their Churches in their renouncing Infant-Baptism, p. 117. our Friends the Anabaptists, p. 120. how many Arguments do the Anabaptists, &c. By all which it appears he struck at the whole party, tho' he contradictingly saith, it was only calculated against me; yet in p. 18. saith, that I did not abuse him, neither was I for any Abuse offered to him among them, nor for any thing peculiarly relating to him, as he doth assert, but what all of them (meaning the Ministers) were equally concerned in, therefore for any one to say, it was there purely upon Mr. Collins's Account,

is utterly untrue. So that one while all he hath done was against Mr. Collins only, another time tells us that all the Ministers were equally concerned about it; so p. 22. he saith I made a false Insinuation, without the least Attempt of any proof, yet a few Lines after tells us, that I did offer something to prove the matter by, namely, his Incivility before the Ministers; in p. 19. he asserts, according as a Criminal I received my Charge, which was thus, viz. that I should say in my Pulpit that Believers-Baptism was Mountebank-Divinity. This is a false Charge against the Elders, for they did never charge him with it, which Mr. Mence in contradiction to himself confesseth p. 18. the Ministers were far more ingenuous than Mr. Collins, for they concluded one Witness, tho' of a great figure, was not sufficient to give Credit to an Accusation against me.

How hard is it, to believe what this Man saith, in his Epistle he tells us of a Black Catalogue of Lies he hath against us, and tho' he had so much Occasion to demonstrate them, having told his Friends my Book was all Lies, yet here is not one of this Catalogue appears, as I know of; but this is like that, that I should say I would preach upon his Text and refute him, let him bring me that Person that dare say so to my face.

Thus I have done, begging of God to heal our Divisions, and the Divisions of all the Churches, Praying according to the Prayer of Christ, *thy Kingdom come, thy Will be done on Earth as it is in Heaven*; and desire Prov. 28. 13. may be considered and believed, *He that covereth his Sin shall not prosper, but whose*

confesseth and forsaketh his Sin shall find Mercy.

I might have taken Notice of many more Impertinencies, Self-contradictions, and Falsi-

ties, but I think this is enough and too much to be made Publick, if there had not been an absolute Necessity for it, Considering the Subject of this Discourse.

— *Tum frigida Mens est
Criminibus; tacita sudant praeordia culpa.*

Τὸ ψυχρὸν ἐν σὴδεσσι, ἔξου ταλαπνεύσια θυμῶν,
Ὡς δὲ μὲλα πολλὰ ἐπιδόχου.

F I N I S.

Books Printed for, and sold by William Marshal at the Bible in Newgate-street, and John Marshal at the Bible in Gracious-street, near Cornhill.

THE Works of that Eminent Servant of Christ Mr. John Bunyan, late Minister of the Gospel, and Pastor of a Congregation at Bedford.
A Treatise of Baptism: Wherein, that of *Believers*, and that of *Infants*, examined by the Scriptures. With the History of both out of *Antiquity*; making it appear, that *Infant Baptism* was not practised for near three hundred years, nor enjoined as necessary, till four hundred years after Christ: With the Fabulous Traditions, and Erroneous Grounds upon which it was, by the Pope's *Canon* (with *Gossips*, *Chrism*, *Exorcism*, *Baptizing of Churches* and *Bells*, and other *Papish Rites*) founded. And that the Famous *Waldensian* and Old *Brittish Churches*, *Lollards* and *Wickliffians* and other *Christians* witnessed against it. With the *History of Christianity amongst the Ancient Britains and Waldensians*. The Second Edition with large Additions. By *Hen. D'auvers*.

The *Antidote* proved a Counterfeit: Or Error detected, and Believers Baptism vindicated, Containing an Answer to a Nameless Author's Book, Entituled *An Antidote to prevent the Prevalency of Anabaptism*. By *H. Collins* of *Wapping*.
A Looking-Glass for Religious Princes: Or the Character and Work of *Joiahab*, delivered in a Sermon upon 2 Kings 23. 25. By *Richard Claridge*, M. A. and then Rector of *Peopleton* in the County of *Worcester*.
Baptism discovered plainly and faithfully, according to the Word of God.

Wherein is set forth the Glorious Pattern of our Blessed Saviour Jesus Christ, the Pattern of all Believers in his Subjection to Baptism. Together with the Example of Thousands who were baptised after they believed. By *John Norcott*, late Servant of Jesus Christ, and of his Church. The third Edition, Corrected by *Will. Kiffin* and *Rich. Claridge*. With an Appendix by another Hand.

The Child's Delight: Containing a Scripture Catechism. Wherein all the chief Principles of the *Christian Religion* are clearly (though Briefly) Opened. Necessary to Establish young People in God's Truth, in opposition to *Popery*, in these perilous Times. Adorned with Copper Cuts, By *Benjamin Keach*.

