

It is further to be considered, That though the two Natures in *Christ*, i. e. the Divine, and Human, are united after an unspeakable manner; yet no Christian does believe, that God did *transubstantiate* the Substance of the Human Nature, into the Substance of the Divine Nature, and that the Forms of Flesh and Blood only does remain. How then is it at all credible that God should *Deifie* the Creatures of Bread and Wine, by turning them into the Divine Essence as well as Humane, to be worshipped with the *highest degree of Adoration which is proper to God himself*? Conc. Trent. Sess. 13. Can. 6. And the Words of *Bellarmin* are very plain; God (saith he) *is verily and truly to be worshipped*, Mat. 4. *But Christ in the Eucharist, is very God*; Ergo. See Dr. *Willet* Synopf. Papif. p. 561.

Thus much of the first Proposition. And for the Second:

2. It is to be considered, That if the very Substance of Bread and Wine, be really transubstantiated into the Substance of Christ's Flesh and Blood, then they do either remain that same Substance of Christ's Flesh for ever, or else they are after some time either annihilated, or turned to Corruption. But to say either of these, is flatly to deny, or oppose express Scripture, which tells us, That the *Flesh of Christ saw no Corruption, and that he continueth ever*. And for the first, Acts 2. 27. Heb. 7. 24. that Bread and Wine, after the Words of Consecration, remains for ever, of the Substance of Christ's Real Body, it is no way credible. For then the Body of Christ must have received a mighty Augmentation since its Ascension. For,

If all the Bread which has been consecrated for almost 1700 years, shall be supposed to be all in one place, at any time (as sure the whole Flesh of Christ's Body is so) it might, for Magnitude, compare with a Mountain. And if all the vast quantity of Wine, which hath been consecrated for the like space of time, were supposed to be collected (as sure all the Blood of Christ remains in his Body, being impossible to be shed since he went into Heaven) it might compare with a considerable Fountain of Water. But both these are so very absurd, that 'tis hoped no Christian will affirm them; and therefore that Doctrine of Transubstantiation, which necessarily infers these, and many more Absurdities, is by no means to be received.

If the *Papists* shall reply, and say, That though the Bread and Wine be really turned into the Flesh and Blood, Body, Soul, and Divinity of Christ, yet it is not necessary that they remain so for ever; I shall earnestly desire



them to shew us what becomes of it then? And I ask whether by such reply they do not make the Real and Glorious Body of Christ the most mutable thing in Heaven and Earth, being, according to this Doctrine, subject to be really made, and unmade every day, and that in a thousand places on the same day?

If any (who are little acquainted with the Doctrine of the present Church of Rome) shall question whether they do indeed hold so gross an Error, as to teach, that the Bread and Wine in the Eucharist is turned into the very Substance of the Divine Nature of Christ, as well as his Human Nature; he may see it fully asserted by a Learned Papist in a certain Catechism, entitled, *An Abridgment to Christian Doctrine*, the last Edition, Printed at Doway, 1661. pag. 194, 195. in these Words.

Quest. What is the Blessed Eucharist?

Ans. It is the Body and Blood of Jesus Christ; true God, and true Man, whole Christ under the outward Forms of Bread and Wine.

This Catechism is Printed with the approbation of William Hyde, D. D. President of the English Colledge at Doway.

Quest. In what manner is Christ present under these Forms?

Ans. By the true and Real Presence of his Divine and Human Nature, and not Figuratively only, as some would have it. God in Mercy open the Eyes of all that are thus blinded with the Doctrine of Transubstantiation; which Word Transubstantiation, the Papists confess is not found in Scripture. See the said Catechism, pag. 196.

Papist Query 6.

Baptist Anti-query 6.

Whether Universality both for time and place, be not an evident Mark of the true Church?

What Church can you name that hath that Mark? And whether the Woman which St. John saw (called *Mystery Babylon*) be not meant of Rome? and whether her Cup was not universally received, so that all Nations were made drunk thereby?

Papist



## Papist Query 7.

## Baptist Anti-query 7.

Whether you have really this Mark; that is, whether you can fetch out of all Ages, and Nations, Professors of your Religion? in particular you are desired to name but one, or two in the first six hundred years after Christ of your Profession; for example, such as held the sole sufficiency of Scripture for the deciding Controversies, and denied the Lawfulness and Usefulness of Infant-Baptism?

Whether any man can shew this Mark, as it is here called for, without the help of Human History? and whether Human History be infallibly true, so as to be a ground for Divine Faith? and whether those Human Records which concerned Christian Religion for the first three hundred years after Christ were not the most of them burnt by the Persecutors of Christians? and whether those which remain have not been much

altered? and whether they are not in many things contradictory? Also, whether Infant-Baptism was so much as heard of in the first Century, and then how should any be named which denied the usefulness of it in this Age? And whether the first clear mention of it be not from *Tertullian*? and whether the Learned do not confess that he opposed it in the third Century as an *irrational* and *unwarrantable Custom*? Also, whether that Church, whose manner of admitting Persons into her Communion, her Constitution and Government, are according to the Scriptures, *Mat. 28. 19, 20. Heb. 6. 1, 2, &c.* be not the true Church of Christ?

And whether the Baptized Churches (commonly called *Anabaptists*) do not excel in these Particulars, all other Churches whatsoever?

Of all the Marks of the Church, so much stood upon by the Papists, this of Antiquity leads, and indeed it is of that importance, that if they fail of this Mark, they are like to miss all the rest, and that they must fail of the best Antiquity, in the case of their Baptism (without which they can have no true Church) will with much ease be made evident.

1. Because by their own Confession Infant-Baptism (which is the Baptism of the present *Roman Church*) is not grounded upon the Scripture. Here they fail of Scripture-Antiquity, which is the best.



2. Because they have not one Credible Witness for Infant-Baptism, in the first Century after Christ.

3. Because it is acknowledged by themselves, that they have changed the manner of the Administration of Baptism from Dipping to a little Sprinkling, *which indeed is no Baptism.*

Whereas on the contrary, the best Antiquity is as clear for our Baptism [*i. e. Believers Baptism*] as the light of the Sun, many thousands of Believers being Baptized by *John Baptist*, and more by Christ (or his appointment) *John* 3. 23. and 4. 1. three thousand Believers Baptized in one day, *Acts* 2. 40. And multitudes of Believers being Baptized in every Age since the Institution of Baptism, yea all the *Antient Fathers* for the first three hundred years, (if not for the first six hundred years) after Christ were Baptized Believers, so that I should think the Gates of Hell cannot prevail against our Church in the Case of Baptism, whether we consider the Subject, Manner, End and Use of Holy Baptism. Whereas,

The only Witness which is pretended by my Learned Adversary for the first Century is *Dionysius* the *Areopagite*, mentioned, *Acts* 17. 34. Who is said to speak thus, in a Book entituled *Eccles. Hierarch. c. ult. The Custom of our Mother the Church in Baptizing Children is not to be condemned, nor to be judged superfluous, nor indeed to be credited, if it were not an Apostolical Tradition.*

Truly this Author speaks not like a Man that was satisfied in this Point of Infant-Baptism, and such is the faintness of his Evidence, that methinks he should leave a suspicion upon every Man that reads him, that he did not know what to say, nor whereof to affirm, but leaving every man to think of the Words as he pleases, we will hear what the Learned have said concerning this *Book Eccles. Hierarch.*

First, They put it down in the Catalogue of Forged Writings, and *Cajetan* a Papist denies that Work to be written by *Dionysius*: Their Reasons are,

1. Because he never makes mention of *St. Paul* in that Book, who was the happy Instrument by whom *Dionysius* was converted: and yet he extolls *Hierophemus* as his Master.

2. Re-



2. Because he writes of many Orders; of Popes, Priests, and Monks, of which the first Age had none.

3. *Eusebius* and *Jerome* in their Catalogues never make mention of this Book. And *Gregory* the Great doth say it was not written by *Dionysius*.

4. *Iliricus* hath ten very considerable Reasons, why this Book was written long after the Death of *Dionysius*, one is this, The Author talks often of the *Distinction of the Quire, and the Church*: whereas (saith he) the Christians had no such Churches an hundred years after *Dionysius's* time. This Author therefore will never bear so great a weight, as to prove Infant-Baptism to have been either taught or practised by the Apostles.

Being thus found destitute of all Antiquity in the first Age, let us hear what one of *their own Chronographers* tells us concerning both the beginning of Infant-Baptism and the want of any Evidence for Infant-Baptism in this Nation till more than three hundred years after Christ.

*Robert Fabian*, a Papist, in his *Chron. part 5. c. 118. fol. 105.* tells us, the Faith had endured in Britain from the time of *Lucius* (the first Christian King in Britain) near upon the season of

The present Baptized Believers only do hold to the old Religion at least in the Point of Sacred Baptism.

four hundred years, and odd; and then in the next Chapter he gives account of *Augustin* the Monk coming into England, and how he prevailed with some Bishops to observe his Orders. And in Fol. 107. he saith, But for all this there were of them that said, that they might not leave the Custom which they so long had continued, without the Assent of all such as used the same. Then Austin gathered a Synod, to the which came seven Bishops of Brittain, with the wisest Men of the famous Abby of Bangor. But first they took Counsel of an Holy Man, whether they should be obedient to Austin or not. And he said, If you find him humble and meek, as to Christ's Disciple belongeth, that then they should assent to him, which meekness they should perceive in him, if he at their coming into the Synod, or Council, arose against them. When the said Bishops entred the said Synod, Augustine sate still in the Chair and removed not, wherefore they were wroth and disdained him, and would not obey to his requests. Then he said to them, Since ye will not assent to my Hests generally, assent to me especially, in three things.



The first is, That you keep Easter Day in due Form and Time, as it is Ordained.

The Second, That ye give Christendom to Children.

And the Third is, That ye Preach unto the English the Word of God as I afore-time have exhorted you : and all the other Deale I will suffer you to amend, and reform among your selves. But they would not thereof.

From this Passage it is very evident, that Infant-Baptism came not into this Nation till about four hundred years after the Gospel was first Received here ; and therefore the Papists must needs fail of Antiquity here, and must (if they will do us right) give place to the Baptized Believers, not only in the Case of Believers Baptism, but also in respect of the denial of Baptism to Infants, seeing these seven Bishops, and the wisest Men of *Bangor* withstood *Augustine* the Monk, in that point then, as we withstand the Papists in that point now.

And as we have suffered many hard things, even to the burning of our Bodies in *Smithfield*, for bearing witness to the ancient and true Baptism of Christ, even so it fared very ill with those that withstood *Infant-Baptism*, &c. in the Days of *Austin* ; for *Fabian* relates how they were many hundreds of them murdered ; and *Mr. Fox* seems to lay the Fault upon *Austin*. I shall instance in these two short Arguments.

1. The present Church of Rome cannot possibly prove her self to be the true Church of Christ ; Ergo, the present Church of Rome is not the true Church of Christ.

2. The present Church of Rome hath no true Baptism ; Ergo, She is not the true Church of Christ. Let the Papists defend their present Church against these Arguments [the Grounds whereof are delivered truly in the precedent Discourses] without which, all they can say, will signify little ; for what Power soever the Church hath, it is little to them, unless they make good proof that they are the true Church of *Jesus Christ*.

And for confirmation of my Second Argument I will here set down what is lately granted by one of the most Learned Writers now living in the Church of Roman Catholicks ; his Words are as followeth.

See the Book entituled, A Treatise of Communion under both kinds, p. 56. written by the Bishop of Meaux.



“ The pretended Reformers dip not their Infants in the Water of Baptism, as St. *John* dipped Christ in the River of *Jordan*. — To Baptize signifies to Dip. In this all agree. This Ceremony is derived from the Purifications of the *Jews*; and as amongst them, the most perfect Purification consisted in a total dipping of themselves in Water. Jesus Christ who came to sanctify and fulfil the old Ceremonies, chose this as the most proper and significant, to express the Remission of Sins, and the Regeneration of the New-Man.

“ The Baptism of St. *John*, which was a preparative to that of Jesus Christ, was performed by dipping. The vast numbers which resorted to this Baptism occasioned St. *John* to choose the Borders of *Jordan*, and particularly the Country of *Anon*, near *Salem*, because of the great plenty of Water there, and the great facility of dipping those who came to consecrate themselves to Penance by this Holy Ceremony.

“ When Jesus Christ came to St. *John* to render Baptism more glorious and wonderful by his own receiving it, Scripture saith, He ascended out of the Waters of *Jordan*, to shew that he was wholly dipped.

“ There is no Evidence in the *Acts of the Apostles* that the 3000, and the 5000 converted by St. *Peter*’s Sermons, were baptized any other way; and the number of these Profelytes is no Argument they were baptized by Sprinkling (as some would have it): for, not to insist on their not being baptized all in one Day, ’tis clear St. *John* Baptist, who baptized as many, since all *Judea* flocked to him, yet baptized them by dipping; and his Example hath sufficiently shewed us, that in order to the baptizing many, they usually chose a place where there was good store of Water. Besides that, the Purifications and Baths of the Antients; especially of the *Jews*, did much facilitate the Ceremony.

“ In fine, the Scriptures shew us not any other way of baptizing, and we can prove by the Acts of Councils, and ancient Rituals, that Holy Church, as much as was possible, baptized no other way.

“ Tho’ these are indisputable Truths, yet (saith he) neither we nor the pretended Reformers take notice of the *Anabaptists*, who hold this dipping as essential and indispensible, and neither of us scruple to change this dipping of the whole Body into a meer sprinkling of some part of the Body. And in p. 73. He adds this remarkable Passage. Jesus Christ said *Baptize*, that is, Dip, as we have often observed: We have also said, He was thus baptized himself, and the Apostles followed, and it was continued in the Church till the twelfth and thirteenth Ages. And yet Baptism by Sprinkling was admitted without any Difficulty, Upon the Authority ONLY of Holy Church.



And which is yet more remarkable, this Learned Man does thus plainly express himself also concerning the Subjects to be baptized. — "Jesus Christ said, Teach and Baptize. And again, he that believeth and is baptized shall be saved. Holy Church by the force ONLY of TRADITION and Practice, hath declared the Instruction and Faith Jesus Christ united to Baptism in These Words, may be separated in relation to little Infants. Thus far the Learned Papist.

From all which it is most evident, 1. That the use of Baptismal Water, by Sprinkling, is a late Invention, and no way warrantable by, but contrary to the Scripture.

2. That Christ Jesus is not the Author of Infant-Baptism, for to that Baptism of which he is Author, he united Instruction and Faith. And that it was not Christ, but Tradition which separated what he had united. These things impartially considered, I think it will appear utterly impossible for the present Church of Rome to prove her Baptism to be of Divine Institution, either in respect of the subject, or manner of Administration; and consequently she cannot be a true Church of Christ, till she turn to the Truth from which she has erred in this, as well as in many other cases. May she be so happy to consider her ways, and to turn to the Truth from which she is undeniably departed in this case of Holy Baptism. See Rom. 6. 3, 4, 5.

This Learned Bishop has one weak Reserve, to which its like he will recur, notwithstanding all that he has granted. He holds that Dipping is not essential nor indispensable. But I shall prove the direct contrary from his own Words, and by the Truth it self.

First then, He tells us, Jesus Christ said, Baptize, that is, Dip. And he tells us, Christ Jesus was baptized so himself. And that the Scripture shews us not any other way of Baptizing. All this is very true. And the place where this saying of Jesus Christ is recorded, is Math. 28. 19. βαπτίζοντες αυτοις, Dipping Them, &c. and this Christ commands to be done by virtue of all Power in Heaven and Earth. vers. 17. And that Jesus Christ himself was baptized by Dipping, is expressly recorded, Mark 1. 9. η βαπτισθη εν ιωρδανη εις ιωρδανην. And was Dipped of John into Jordan. Thus we see this Learned Bishop and the Holy Scripture, do thus far speak the same thing. And hence the Argument is.



If Jesus Christ's own Example, being dipped himself, in the Administration of Baptism to his own Person; and his express Command by virtue of all Power in Heaven and in Earth, does teach and require his Followers to use Baptismal Water by Dipping, and does not teach them to use it by any other way of baptizing: then Dipping is essential and indispensable to the lawful and due Administration of Sacred Baptism.

But Jesus Christ's own Example, being dipped himself, in the Administration of Baptism to his own Person; and his express Command by virtue of all Power in Heaven and in Earth, does teach and require his Followers to use Baptismal Water by Dipping, and does not teach them to use it by any other way of baptizing.

*Ergo*, Dipping is essential and indispensable to the lawful and due Administration of Sacred Baptism.

No whither now can my Learned Adversary betake himself for a Dispensation, for *meer sprinkling* (as himself calls it) instead of Dipping, but to his Church. But then I must crave leave to tell him, that unless he can prove his Church to be a better example to Christians, than Christ himself was, and that she has more power than all the power in Heaven and Earth: And that she is wiser than either Christ, or Holy Church, who followed his example in using Baptismal Water, by dipping, for 12 or 13 Ages together. May, unless he can prove these things, it will be lawful and necessary for all that fear God, to reject his Church herein (tho they were all Angels from Heaven, *Gal. 1.8,9. Mat. 28.20. 1 Tim. 6.3,4,5.*) as unworthy to be the Competitor of Jesus Christ (much less his Superior) to alter his heavenly Commands, and to dishonour his glorious Example at her pleasure: As that has been her great Sin, God give her Repentance before it be too late.

And since I have taken upon me (who am a Man of low degree) to speak to so great a Person as *James Benign Bossuet*, Bishop of *Meaux*, and *Counsellor to a King*. I shall crave leave to propose a few things to him, (and in him to all the *Roman Catholics* in the World, for my Conscience bears me witness, that I so desire their eternal Happiness, as that I would wish my self any thing short of Perdition, that they were found faithful to Jesus Christ, and his Truth in the Purity of it.) Wherefore,

I beseech you to consider, that you have now to do with such Christians as are in good earnest for the purest Antiquity of the Christian Religion; such as would not have any Truth, delivered to the Church by Heavens Authority, to be neglected, nor in any wise corrupted by innovation, change or alteration, but religiously observed and kept, according to the due form and true power of Godliness.



2. As to the Case immediately depending, be pleased to understand that the Salvation of our Infants is as dear to us as yours can be to you; and therefore you cannot in reason once think, that we would willingly omit any thing which God has appointed as a furtherance thereunto: and being (as all men know) no less zealous for the Ordinance of Baptism than your selves, you may be confident we would by no means hinder its due extent, but promote it therein by all the lawful means we are able.

3. That our Lord Jesus has made Baptism necessary to the Salvation of poor Infants, is not revealed at all in the Holy Scripture, and therefore it could not be well done by the *African Council*, to *Anathematize* all that say *Infants may be saved without Baptism, &c.* For it is certain that Christ is the Author of this Doctrine (whose Words are perpetually true) assuring us that *Infants are of the Kingdom of Heaven*: and this he speaks of Infants indefinitely, and particularly of such as were not baptized, seeing no Man can prove that the Infants brought to him were baptized; and seeing Christ is the Author of this Doctrine, we do nothing doubt the Salvation of any dying Infant.

4. It is not revealed in Scripture, nor conceivable in Reason, that our most wise and gracious God should put the Salvation of poor Infants under the power of sinful Men, to save or to damn them as they please, to baptize or not to baptize them. *Circumcision* it self was never appointed for Infants under such damning Circumstances, for God saved the greatest part of the Infants of the Jews without Circumcision, to wit, all Females, and Males which died before the eight day. Cut off they must be, if not Circumcised, from the Congregation, but damned they could not be, because *the Child shall not die for the Iniquity of the Father*: which can only be true in respect of Eternal Death, for Children often die for the Sin of Parents.

5. Tho the Transgression of Adam against the first Covenant made both himself and his Posterity liable to eternal Wrath, yet we know God did in Mercy prevent the Effect, inasmuch as no Man can prove that so much as one of his Posterity shall go to Hell for that Transgression: seeing it pleased God in his own Council and Goodness to ordain the second Adam, as a Lamb (virtually slain) from the Foundation of the World, as a help against this Sin in the condemning nature of it, *John 1. 29. Rom. 5. 18.* And thus Infants only falling in Adam, are justified by Christ.

6. Indeed were it as you conceive, that without Baptism no Infant can be saved, it were then the most needful thing in the World to promote that Doctrine and Practice: and yet this was a business which Christ and his Apostles never minded at all, neither to act it, nor to record it; and can you imagine



imagine they would neglect it, if it were of the importance that you would make it? Was it not worth a few Lines? Sure they did write many things of far less concernment, if your Doctrine herein be true.

7. It should be considered by you, whether Christ or his Apostles ever baptized any Person when he was asleep; or whether the Institution of Baptism, and the Qualification of the Subject required to be baptized, will admit of such a sleepy Service: For you cannot but know that it falls out that your Infants are sprinkled when they are fast asleep, very frequently.

8. It is to be considered, that all worldly Pomp, Riches and Pleasures stand on your side; your Devised Baptism ushers you into all the glories this World can afford you, rather than to any thing of self-denial. Indeed it self is a self-chosen Path, standing upon no Authority but your own, under pretence of your being the Church; whilst on the other side, as it is clear that Christ said, *Teach and Baptize* (as you grant); so this Baptism is attended with no external Honour, but with all the Difficulties and Discouragements (from this World) that can well attend a People in any Religious Undertaking. And this appears,

9. In the great labour that faithful Preachers have to convince Men of their sinful state, and to bring them to due Humiliation, and to embrace the Truth in the Love and Belief of it: And then the Service it self is so despicable in appearance, that generally the great Men of this World are offended at it; how few of them will travel 50 or 60 Miles to be dipped in Baptismal Water by a poor Minister, after the example of Christ who came from *Gallile* in the North of *Canaan* to *Jordan* in the South, to be dipped of *John into Jordan*. We have neither Riches nor Honours to induce us to follow Christ herein, but contrarywise great Persecution (as you know very well) have attended us in all Nations for our love to Christ his Truth in this particular, as well as others.

10. From all that has been said, have you not some reason to fear that your Church is no more infallible than other Churches; and that she hath indeed actually erred in a very material point of Faith and Practice of the Christian Religion, and consequently may have failed in other respects also? And can it become wise and good Men to suffer themselves to be imposed upon, not only without the Authority of the holy Scripture, but also in things confessedly contrary to the blessed Example and Doctrine of the Lord Jesus, the Head of his Church.



