

nor evil. Here is therefore another Book opened, which (say they) represents the everlasting Election to Life and Glory in Christ. In this Book must all dying Infants either be found written, or else be Judged without Book. The Book of Conscience will not accuse them, therefore the Lamb's Book of Life must needs acquit them.

8. *All dying Infants are in the Covenant of Grace; therefore no dying Infant shall be Damned.*

When we say Infants are in the Covenant of Grace, we mean it, as God hath vouchsafed to interest them in his Mercy by Christ. That as Condemnation came upon them by Adam's Sin, so Justification of Life might abound towards them by the Obedience of Christ. Now either Infants are thus in Covenant with God, or they are not concern'd in any Covenant at all. For the Covenant of pure Nature (as Mr. Baxter terms it) made with Adam, concerns not Infants, but as the breach of it is imputed to the Lump of Mankind. And the Law of Works concerns not Infants. For to them it cannot be said, *The Man that doth these things, shall live in them.* And to say Infants are in no Covenant with God, is to rank them with Devils, and the vilest of Men. But seeing Mr. Baxter grants the Covenant made with Noah, Gen. 9. to be the Covenant of Grace, and the Scripture tells us, *That it is an everlasting Covenant, and made with Noah and his Sons, and with their Seed after them,* and consequently with all Infants; for it is not Vain, or Repealed, till Men abuse the Mercy of it; to this Mr. Baxter consents. And indeed, should it be otherwise, God should deal worse with poor Infants, than with the Beasts of the Field; for he was pleased to make a Covenant with them (even every living Creature of them) which also was very gracious according to their state and condition: and shall we think that he whose tender Mercies are over all his Works, will exclude the Infants of the greatest part of Mankind from his Gracious Covenant? No: He hath said, *He will remember his Covenant which he hath made with all Flesh,* Gen. 9.

9. *No Man can prove that any Infant ever was, or ever shall be damned in Hell Torments; therefore no dying Infant shall be damned.*

There is nothing to be held as an Opinion, or Point of Faith, but upon clear Proof, or Rational Demonstration. Now though it has
been

been often delivered from the Pulpits, that many Infants are yelling in Hell (yea, Infants of a Span long) for such and such offences of their Parents, yet this is only said, but no proof to make it good. I find Dr. Fulk saying, *That Calvin holdeth Dr. Fulk all Infants under the sentence of eternal Damnation*; only he admits, that *such Infants as are Elect, and Born again by the Spirit of God, may be saved.* But I find no proof that any Infants are Reprobated to eternal Damnation; neither does the holy Scripture say any such thing. And whilst *Diodate* expounds *Rom. 9. 12.* modestly and soundly, he goes back to his harsh opinion of God's casting *Eſau* (when or before he was born) out of his Love as a Father, (in what he says upon the 13th ver.) as if God's Love were taken away from poor Infants. But this is no proof that God hath Reprobated any dying Infant: for if we admit their Gloss, yet God that knew what *Eſau* would be in time, did here foreſhew what in time should be effected. *Eſau* lived to be a Man, and a very sinful Man, God knew all this before; *Eſau* is not to be ranked with dying Infants, therefore the Instance of *Eſau* is nothing to the purpose; and this Instance failing (as it evidently doth) I am sure there is not the least shew of proof in the Scripture, for the Damnation of dying Infants; and therefore no Man ought to believe such a strange and windy Doctrine, nor trouble the World (nor the Church) about it.

10. To hold Infants to be Damned, is contrary to all good Reason.

When Paul prayed, *To be delivered from unreasonable Men, for that all Men had not Faith.* He seems to make Reason a Friend, and no Enemy to Faith. Now when we hear that wicked Men shall be damned, because they received not the Love of the Truth that they might be saved; here Reason presently consents to the Judgment of God. And when we hear that Men will not be persuaded by *Moses*, the Prophets, or one that should rise from the Dead; how justly are they punished by that God whose Grace they have so grossly contemned? Yea, these and many like Instances, are according to the common Rules of Justice. But now to place poor innocent Babes among these damned ones, that they should be tormented with the Devil and his Angels, who only was born to cry and die, and sometimes to die before they should cry, is so cruel a Conceit, so inconsistent with Justice (as far as the Reason of Man can conceive what is equal) that

nothing can be more Cruel. It looks as if God took pleasure to send poor Creatures to Hell. For these poor Infants (many of them according to this Scriptureless Doctrine) were but created on purpose to be Damned, and nothing else; some never seeing so much as the Light of this World, and yet must be punished with the Devil to Eternity. O shameful Doctrine! unfit for the Tongue of a Christian, to tell the World, Infants (yea, of a Span long) are yelling in Hell! Will you charge the God of Love, yea, that God who is Love, with these Cruelties? Are these his doings? Why have you painted him in your Sermons with such bloody Colours? Is it to force on your *Pedo-baptism*? O wretched Cause, that cannot stand unless the Mercy of God to the greatest part of Infants be impeached! We say not that Reason is the chief judge in this Question, yet when we meet with Scriptureless Doctrines, 'tis not unlawful to refute them by Reason. And here I again declare, that this Error of holding Infants damned without Baptism, was the ground of that innovation of *Pedo-baptism*. For thus saith the *5 Con. de Carth.* *We will that whoever denies that little Children by Baptism are freed from Perdition, and eternally saved, that they be accursed.* Wherefore take away this false ground, by shewing the Salvation of all dying Infants, and then **INFANT-BAPTISM** vanisheth.

and windy Doctrine, nor trouble the World (nor the Church) about it.

10. To hold Infants to be Damned, is contrary to all good Reason.

When Paul prayed, To be delivered from unreasonable Men, for that
 all Men had not Faith. He came to make Reason a Friend, and no
 Enemy to Faith. Now when we hear that wicked Men shall be
 damned, because they received not the Love of the Truth that they might be
 saved; here Reason presently contends to the Judgment of God.
 And when we hear that Men will not be persuaded by Moses, the
 Prophets, or one that should rise from the Dead; how justly are they
 punished by that God whose Grace they have so grossly contemned?
 and many like Instances, are according to the common
 Rules of Justice. But now to place poor innocent Babies among these
 damned ones, that they should be tormented with the Devil and his
 Angels, who only was born to cry and die, and sometimes to die
 before they should cry, is to cruel a Concept, so inconsistent with Ju-
 stice (as far as the Reason of Man can conceive what is equal) that
 nothing

THE
QUERIST EXAMINED.

The Second Part.

WHEREIN

More than Sixty *Queries*, taken out of
the Works of Mr. R. Baxter, by
F. B. (the Author of Fifty former
Queries) are Refuted,

BY

A proportionable Number of *Antiqueries*.

SHEWING

The Insufficiency of the Plea for Infant-Baptism
urged by Mr. B. and Mr. F. B. from their
visible Church-Membership.

WHICH

Being granted (so far, and in such a sense) as Truth or
Reason will Warrant, is against, and no way
for the Baptizing of Infants.

By THOMAS GRANTHAM.

Printed in the Year, 1679.

to forbid any to say, the Scripture is more silent in that than
of the Scripture, who are all for Infant-Baptism.

That many Papists and Prelates (who are all for Infant-Baptism)
has maintained that it is not contained in Scripture. And how then

DIVISION I.

About the silence of the Scripture concerning
Infant-Baptism.

IT is certain, That to multiply Questions is the ready way to
darken Council, and to intangle the understanding of the weak
or unwary Reader. Yet thus hath Mr. J. B. been pleased to
incumber the Doctrine of Baptism with more than an hundred
Queries; which being set down in their exact Number, would be
more than five hundred *Queries*. By which frivolous way of Wri-
ting, it were easie to involve the Christian Profession in endless
Controversies.

Howbeit, as I have formerly redargued the first Book of his *Que-
ries*, so (lest he should suppose these to be unanswerable) I think
it may do some service to the Truth, to shew briefly the vanity of
his second Book also.

It would make my work too bulkie to set down his *Queries* at
large, yet I shall endeavour partly by what I shall present of his *Que-
ries*, and partly by the purport of my *Anti-queries*, to give a true
understanding of the import of all his Demands. And first we shall
take notice of his Preparatory Questions, which he grounds upon
the silence of the Scriptures in the case of Infant-Baptism. The first
is this.

J. B. 1. Is not the Scripture more sparing in such cases as these, in
speaking of those, to whom it speaks not, as concerning the Heathen, and
concerning Infants? &c.

T. G. 1. When Mr. Baxter (and you from him) have born the
World in hand, that you would offer plain Scripture proof for In-
fant Church-Membership and Baptism; Is it not a strange way to
make this good, by telling us the Scripture is more silent in these
Cases than in others? Or is not one plain proof in any Case enough

to forbid any to say, the Scripture is more silent in that than other Cases, seeing more silent, must import not speaking at all, or else very darkly. And indeed, Mr. Baxter does elsewhere grant, That many Papists and Prelatists (who are all for Infant Baptism) have maintained that it is not determined in Scripture. And how then shall he (being inferiour to so many) bring any plain Scripture for it?

2. Is not the Scripture plain enough, Gen. 3. 15. that the Covenant of God's Grace and Mercy to Sinners, concerns all Mankind (as they are fallen in Adam?) And how then can it be silent concerning Infants, in any thing needful to their Salvation, seeing Christ now by the Grace of God hath tasted Death for every Man? Heb. 2. 9.

J. B. 2. In lesser points of Faith? 3. In points not then questioned? 4. Does not the New Testament speak more sparingly of that which is more fully discovered, in the Old? And is not this the very case here? &c.

T. G. 1. Who that is truly wise would query this? Is any Persons Church-Membership and Baptism to be reckoned among the lesser points of Faith? Or, is it not of very great moment (rather) for us rightly to understand who ought to be incorporated into the Church of Christ, which is his Body? If there was no question in the Scripture-Times about your Infant Church-Membership and Baptism, was it not because there was none then that held with your Opinion in that Case? And whether it be not Anti-evangelical to make the Age of any Person the rule of his admission to the Christian Church-Membership and Baptism, whiles in the Law the Eighth Day was a time prefixed? But is not the time of the New Birth (at what Age soever) the time of Incorporating Persons into the Christian Church? Seeing it is expressly said, If any Man be in Christ, he is a new Creature, 2 Cor. 5. 16, 17. And whether Pedo-Baptists must not grant this, seeing they are forced to say of the Infants which they sprinkle, This Child is Regenerate, and Born again, though they can never prove this?

J. B. 2. Will the difficulty of a Point, that is not so clear as we would have it, prove that it is not a truth? The Apostle Peter tells us, many things in Paul's Epistles are hard to be understood, are they not Truths for all this? &c.

T. G. Whether it be not idle in you to compare Church-Membership and Baptism, with the hard things in Paul's Epistles, seeing what is needful to meet Church-Membership and Baptism are easie things,

things, even that which every Babe in Christ should know, and which three thousand learned in one Day, by one Sermon. Acts 2. 40, 41. *Then they which gladly received his Word, were Baptized, and the SAME DAY was added unto them about three thousand Souls.* And whether the whole carriage of this place do not shew your Vanity, in putting your Church-Membership before Baptism, sith here (as well as else-where) this Church-Membership evidently follows Baptism?

And whether you do not here also plainly enough tell us, that your case is very difficult, and hard to be understood? and indeed you may rightly place it among things unintelligible. For as one of your Way going to a Dispute, ('tis said) to hear Infant baptism proved by Scripture, told his Companion, *He was going to hear a Miracle.*

J. B. 3. *If never so clear Evidence be produced, will not Truth still be dark to them that are incapable of discerning it? And is not this the case of many Godly, that are but Children in knowledge?*

T. G. Whether this be not an excellent way to query Men out of their Wits? And if that which hath never so clear Evidence, may still be dark to the Godly, &c. How can you blame Men for not seeing that for which you can bring no clear Evidence? But for all this, whether every weak (if a Godly) Man, may not as easily understand the Mind of God about Church-Membership and Baptism, as to know that Jesus is his Saviour (unless your 100, or rather 500 Queries have blinded his Eyes)? And what one Point, hath been pestered with such a cloud of Questions, as you have invented about this? And whether you and Mr. Baxter cannot invent as many more, and so make good the Proverb, *Plura potest interrogare asinus, quam respondere Aristoteles.*

J. B. 4. *When the case is so difficult that we cannot attain to clearness and certainty, must not we follow the most probable way? &c.*

T. G. Whether you are not upon a dangerous Point, to suggest that the case of Church-Membership and Baptism, is to be judged of by Probabilities and not Certainties? And if you will needs have our way of Baptism to be more difficult than yours, who can know it? Seeing there is thus much said by a learned Man of the Church of England against your Way, viz. *That there is* Dr. Barlow's
neither Precept nor President for Infant-Baptism in Scripture. — *That there is nothing in Dr. Hammond, or Mr. Baxter's Discourses*

confesses about Infant-Baptism, that looks like an Argument. And whether it will not be hard for any Body to say more for Pædo-baptism, and against our way of Baptizing Believers, than they have done? And yet whether it be not safe for us to see you offer more than your Probabilities, before we part with our Baptizing Believers, for your sprinkling of Infants?

J. B. 5. And is it not a spirit of Rashness, and Headiness, that runs Men presently upon NEW untried Ways, upon every doubting about the Old? &c.

T. G. Whether the way of Baptizing Persons upon personal profession of Faith by Immersion, be not the old way of Baptizing, and granted to be so by the Learned of your own Church? for example, Ludovicus Vives, Grotius, and Diodate. And then, whether you are not the rash and heady, who run so eagerly after the new mode of Infant-sprinkling? And are not thousands involved in your new Way, before they do or can try it? And on the contrary, whether any can rationally be supposed to close with our Way, before they have tried it? Seeing we put all Men upon it, and have no Honours, Profits, or Pleasures in this World (as you have) to engage them to our Way, tis the evidence of our Cause that doth it.

J. B. 6. Is the overthrow of a Man's former weak Grounds, the overthrow of the Truth which he held? &c.

T. G. Is not the overthrow of your former weak Grounds for Infant-Baptism, the overthrow of the Cause it self, still you or somebody else bring Grounds of sufficient strength to support it?

J. B. 7. Is not one sound Argument enough to prove any thing true, in What if all the Texts that are brought, were put by, save one, is more than enough?

T. G. Have not we desired you to produce but one sound Argument, and one clear Text to prove Infant-Baptism true, with promise that shall suffice? But in stead of this, have you not sent us hundreds of false Grounds, and many Texts abused in these and your former Queries?

J. B. 8. Are not evident Consequences, drawn by Reason from Scriptures, as true Proof, as the very express word of the Text? Will you allow of such an Argument for Infant Baptism as Christ brought for the Resurrection? Mat. 22. 31, 32, &c.

T. G.

T. G. Should not the Practice of Christ and his Apostles, outvie such Consequences (infer'd by the most Learned) when the said Consequences fight against plain Scripture Presidents? as *Act* 2. 38. to 41. or *Act* 8. 12. *Gal.* 3. 26, 27. But who could ever prove that all Church-Members (as She contains all the saved, whether *Jews* or Heathens) must be Baptized? Might it not more strongly be pleaded, that all Church-Members must be admitted by Faith, from *Gal.* 3. 26. *We are all the Sons of God by Faith in Christ Jesus?* *Heb.* 1. 6. *He that cometh to God, must FIRST believe that God is?* And how shall all Infants believe on him of whom they have not heard, *Rom.* 10? And who taught you to make Baptism more necessary to Church-Membership than Faith? But why should your Consequences be made of equal Authority with Christ's? For he could not be deceived, but you may? And why may not our Consequences be as valuable as yours? Specially seeing ours agrees with Christ's own Practice, *John* 4. 1. as we know yours do not.

J. B. 9. *Should not the former and present Customs of the holiest Saints and Churches be of great weight to humble and moderate Christians, in Cases controverted and beyond their reach?*

T. G. Should not the undeniable Custom of the first Churches, immediately governed by Christ and his Apostles, be of more weight with humble and moderate Christians, than the Custom of any since their times? And whether your Conscience do not tell you we follow the Custom of the first Churches? Also whether there hath not very holy Men in many Ages since Christ opposed Infant-Baptism, as well as in these latter Times? Nay, is not the first clear mention of it gathered from them that opposed it? Such were *Tertullian* and *Gregory Nazianzen*, acknowledged by Mr. *Baxter*, to be for the delay of Baptism to Children, till they could understand it. And though it is alledged that *Nazianzen* was not against it in danger of Death, yet whether this be not rather against than for Infant-Baptism, seeing they might as safely die without it, as live without it? For did it in his judgment more please God, that Infants should live unbaptized? How then can their dying so be displeasing to him? Were not the Children among the *Jews* as much accepted who lived seven days Uncircumcised, and died before the eighth day, as if they had lived till the eighth day and then have been Circumcised? And may we not hence conclude, that seeing God hath not made the Age of any Person a Rule in the case of Baptism, as he

did in the case of Circumcision, but hath made it proper to the time of the New Birth, at what time soever it shall happen; that Nazianzen his supposed allowance of Infant-Baptism in danger of Death was groundless? But why do you arrogate the greatest Holiness to your Party, which agree with you in the case of Infant-Baptism? Why holiest Saints? Why holiest Churches? Though I wish you more holy than you are, and honour what Christian Vertues I see in any of your Party, yet let me faithfully tell you, that your Churches by means of your Pædo-baptism, are become the unholiest (generally) of all the Christian Churches in the World. And how can it be otherwise? When by this means you take in (not only those that fear God and work Righteousness, in every Nation, but) the whole Nations themselves, the greatest part whereof, God knows, are very far from Holiness.

Jo. B. 10. *Is this Controversie in it self considered, of so great moment, as some would make it? Why then was it not in the Creed? Doth not the Apostle speak of Baptism as a small part of his Work, in comparison of Preaching, &c? 1 Cor. i. 14, 17, &c. Mark 16. 16. He that believeth not (not he that is not Baptized) shall be damned, &c.*

T. G. Whether you Pædo-baptists do not make this Controversy of greater moment than any others, whilst the greatest number of you (to wit, the Papists and many Prelatists) do teach that none (no not Infants) can be saved without Baptism, or Bishop Gun-
ning. desire of Baptism? And whether you say any less, Query 17. when you tell us, Infants are not so much as seemingly in a state of Salvation, without your Church-Membership and Baptism? And do you not then make it more fundamental and absolutely Necessary than the Baptists do? who only say, not the want, but the contempt of Baptism damneth? And what though Baptism be not mentioned in the Creed, which you call the Apostles Creed, (though you never be able to make that saying good, according to the exactness of speech) yet seeing Baptism is mentioned in that Summary of Christian Doctrine, Heb. 6. 1, 2. which may more certainly be called the Apostles Creed than that by you so named, doth it not thence follow that Baptism is necessary to the beginning of a Christian Man? Or will you say that any Man can be admitted into the Christian Profession, to partake of the Lord's Table without Baptism? And what need was there to say, Mark 16. 16. *He that is not Baptized shall be damned?* When its to be supposed

Supposed he that believeth not, will not desire to be Baptized? *Luke* 7. 6. Neither indeed ought he to be Baptized because he believeth not, *Acts* 8. And if all Christ's Commands great and small are to be obeyed (as you grant) then why not this, *Acts* 2. 38. **REPENT AND BE BAPTIZED EVERY ONE OF YOU.** And though it be true that Paul esteemed (and that rightly) Preaching to be a greater work than Baptizing: Yet when did he hinder any for being Baptized with the Baptism of Repentance as you do? Or where did he shew any zeal at all for Pedit-baptism as you do? And are you not then deluded to spend so much time, in defending your own Tradition? And with what credit can you blame others (whom you constrain) for spending time to break the Snares which you have laid in the way of Sinners, to cause them to continue in Error.

J. B. *Though the point of Infant-Baptism be comparatively of less moment; yet whether the grounds on which it stands, and which are usually denied with it, be not of great moment?*

T. G. Whether this be not like a Contradiction? For seeing every Ordinance receives, from the grounds on which it stands, its very being, and value; How can the Ordinance be of small moment, when the grounds on which it stands are of great moment? And how can Infant-Baptism stand upon grounds of great moment, when it is not grounded upon Scripture, nor determined by Scripture, as is confessed by many Pedit-baptists, both Papists and Prelatists?

DIVISION. II.

Concerning the Commission, *Matth.* 28. 19.

Having done with your Preparatory Queries, I come now to try your *Main Question*, and the Queries which attend upon it. Your Query is thus stated by you:

J. B. *Whether some Infants ought not to be Baptized?*

T. G. Do we not alwayes tell you of Infants in general, that they ought not to be Baptized? So that you had better ask thus, *Whether some Infants ought to be Baptized?* For should you be put to shew, *That some Infants ought to be Baptized, and that other some ought not,* (as Mr. *Crage* was pleased to Fable it out at *Abergavenny*) it would

prove too hard a Task, and never be done, by plain Scripture proof. But I suppose I understand your Question, I shall therefore follow you.

J. B. *1. Ought not all Christ's Disciples ordinarily to be Baptized? (Matth. 28 19.)* May not the word Disciple be taken in a larger sense Relatively — for one, that belongs to Christ, as well as in a narrower sense for those who are, actually Learners.

T. G. Here you seem to grant, That some of Christ's Disciples ought not to be Baptized (i. e. their case being more, than ordinary) and then, I would know why Infants may not be excused, (tho' it must be an extraordinary thing, if any Infant, be Christ's Disciple. For if Infants, be Disciples, they are either made so by God, or Man; that God does make some, or all, or any Infants at all, Christ's Disciples, no Man can demonstrate. And I demand whether ever Mr. Baxter, or your self, did make an Infant Christ's Disciple according to the import of the Verb μαθησόμενοι? And if your Consciences shall tell you that you never did, or could, make an Infant Christ's Disciple, how can you suffer your selves to be deluded with this fancy of a Relative Discipleship? i. e. for one that belongs to Christ; For why may not all Infants belong to Christ, as well as those which you sprinkle? And then why do you not call all Infants Disciples? Is not Christ the Master and King of all Infants, whether Men will vouchsafe to devote them to him or no? How dreadfully, do you lessen his Authority, or Sovereignty?

J. B. *Doth not the Holy Ghost call them Disciples? Acts 15. 10.* Is it not evident that those on whose Necks the false Teachers would have put the Yoke were Disciples? If you say not all but some of them, — then will it not follow that it is but some only whose Circumcision the Synod doth conclude against?

T. G. Does not the Holy Ghost sufficiently expound Acts 15. 10. not to intend Infants? Whilst in Verse 19. he notes them to be such as from among the Gentiles were turned to God, and are not all that are called Disciples, Ver. 10. called Brethren, Ver. 23. and as such are written unto by the Assembly? And was not their Epistle read to all the multitude of the Disciples? Ver. 30. and did not all the Disciples rejoyce for the Consolation? Ver. 31. And is it not ridiculous to say the Holy Ghost intends Infants? Ver. 10. and yet excludes them in the Appellation [Disciples] in all the other places? And is it not grossly fallacious, to say, That because the false Apostles would have

put the yoke of Circumcision upon the Necks of the Disciples, that therefore all were Disciples, whom they would have Circumcis'd? Is there any more truth in it than in this? *Austin* would have Infants brought to the Lord's Table, therefore all were Infants whom *Austin* would have brought to the Lord's Table? Or is it not clear from *Ver. 1.* that the Discourse, *Acts 15.* does only concern the Brethren? *Except ye be Circumcis'd — ye cannot be saved*; this they are said to teach the Brethren, and thereby to subvert their Souls. And can you think the false Apostles could subvert the Souls of Infants? And is it not a sad thing that you should thus grope for the Wall at Noon? and deceive your selves and others with meer Fallacies and Ridiculosities. And why was not the Decree, *Acts 15.* a sufficient repeal of Circumcision, in respect of Infants, seeing the Disciples themselves were discharged, or freed from that Yoke? and then whether your Absurdity concern any Body so much as your self?

J. B. 2. If no Infants are Disciples, what is the cause? Is it because they are not capable? Or is it because God will not shew such a Mercy? Can you find a third cause? — If Infants are capable of being Servants of God, how can they be thought incapable of being Disciples, *Lev. 25. 41, 42, &c.*

T. G. Is not Instruction the cause of Discipleship, as truly as Teaching is the cause of Learning? And what instruction or teaching hath God appointed for Infants? and if none (as I am sure you can assign none) then what cause have they to learn? And if no cause to learn, then what cause can they have to be Disciples? And therefore what cause have you (a Learned Man) to query so unlearnedly? And should I follow you in your Fancies, I might also demand, what is the cause that Infants are not Repentant (seeing they are Sinners) is it because God will not shew them such a Mercy? To grant them repentance unto Life, what is the cause they have not Faith? Is it because God will not shew them such a Mercy, as to purifie their Hearts by Faith? What is the cause they are not brought to the Lord's Table? Is it because God will not shew them such a Mercy, as to partake of the Body and Blood of their Redeemer? Especially seeing it is said, *Except ye eat the Flesh of the Son of God, and drink his Blood, you have no Life in you.* What? Will God deny Life through Christ to Infants? Now if Infants want no Mercy from God though they be denied all these Mercies,

Mercies, what reason is there for you to cry so loud against God because they are not Disciples? And what though Infants should be called God's Servants, does it follow they must needs be Christ's Disciples, according to *Matth. 28. 19.*? Why then the *Sun, Moon, and Stars* are Christ's Disciples too, for they are called God's Servants *Psal. 119. 90, 91.* Rub your Eyes from the mist they have attracted by poring upon *Mr. Baxters Fables*, and know, that God will shew all the Mercy to Infants which they have need of (as is shew'd before) though he give them not all the Mercies which he gives to some, and particularly this mercy of Discipleship, which they have no need of during Infancy, sith they cannot discern between *the right Hand and the left.*

But you query still, *Whether the Infants of the Gentiles were so God's Servants, as the Infants of the Jews were?* And do you not here fairly grant that all Infants are God's Servants, though not so as the *Jews* Infants were? But you will not say that all Infants are Christ's Disciples: And then have you not confuted your own Fancy, seeing it's plain from your own words that the Title of *Servants* does not necessarily infer the Title of Disciples? And why may not God set more by one Servant (and so by one Infant) than by another, and yet love them all sufficiently? and may not this satisfie your demand why God should grant a Year of Jubilee to the *Jews* and their Infants, when he granted not that Mercy to others? Else what will become of all Christians and their Infants? For pray, Sir, when had they such a *Jubilee*, as the *Jews* were allowed once in Fifty Years? And yet I hope we have no cause to murmur against God, as if he were not Merciful enough both to us and to our Infants.

J. B. 3. *Are not Infants capable of being Subjects of Christ's Kingdom? and is not Christ's Church his Kingdom, and his School? — Are not all Subjects of Christ in his Visible Kingdom (or Church) Christians? And are not Disciples and Christians all one? — Acts 11. 26; 8cc.*

T. G. What if we grant that Infants are Subjects of Christ's Visible Kingdom, in respect of his Purchase, common Protection, the Designation of them to his Service (on the part of true Christians) and in respect of the Blessing of Heaven it self? Yet how doth it follow hereupon that they are capable of all the Priviledges of his Visible Kingdom? Much less of the Duties of his Subjects? And do you not your own selves exclude them during Infancy, from

all

all Priviledges and Duties of Religion (as much as we do) except your supposed Baptism? And where do you find that any Infants are called Christians? *Certes*, the Text, *Acts 11. 26.* says no such thing: I see no ground to call any Infant by the name of its Parents Religion, for then the *Child of a Papist* must be called a *Papist*; the Infant of a *Presbyterian*, must be a *Presbyterian*; the Infant of a *Quaker*, a *Quaker*, &c. But is not that saying of *Tertullian* more rational, *We are not born* (saith he) *but made Christians?*

J. B. 4. *Whether were not some Infants once to be admitted Members of the Visible Church, by the merciful Gift and Appointment of God not yet Repealed.*

T. G. Whether Infants once admission to particular Ordinances in the Church, be part of the Moral or Ceremonial Law? How could it be a part of the Moral Law, seeing it had no being in the World till *Abraham's* time? Was not the Moral Law observed by the Faithful in all Ages? When yet there was no such admission of Infants to Ordinances in the Church? Seeing then this Admission must be a part of the Ceremonial Law, was it not for the time being the merciful Gift of God, and was not the whole Ceremonial Law the same? And yet whether the taking away of the whole Ceremonial Law was not a Mercy, and consequently that Admission of Infants by that Law, done away in Mercy also? And seeing Infants could then but belong to the Kingdom of Heaven, with that painful admission by Circumcision, is it not a greater Mercy for them to be declared by Christ to be the Children of God, and to belong to the Kingdom of Heaven without it? *Matth. 18. 10.* And is not this spoken of little ones indefinitely, seeing else it will follow Men may despise some of them? but does not our Saviour include them all in this speech, *That which was lost?* How then can you exclude any of them, when he saith, *He came to seek and to save that which was lost?*

J. B. 5. *Were not Infants part of them that entered into Covenant with the Lord, that he might establish them to be a People to himself?* *Deut. 29. 10, 11, 12, 13.* And were not Infants engaged by the Seal of the Covenant, Circumcision? &c.

T. G. Whether this Covenant, *Deut. 29.* was not made for many before they were born? How then could it be a Covenant for Admission of them to Visible Church-Membership? Or dare you say that Infants were by this Covenant obliged to any Act of Obedience in Infancy? And how then does it suit your Case? Again,
Do

Do you think it would be lawful, by this, or any other Law, for Christians to enter into a Covenant, Oath, and a Curse (as the Israelites did) that our Children should be of our Religion? Ours are your Infants bound by your Solemn League and Covenant, to be for the Presbyterian way of Religion? And what ground have we to believe that God will establish our Children for his People, as he did promise to the Children of Israel? i. e. *To be a glorious Nation above all the Nations of the Earth*. (Can you prove that such Promises are made to the Christian Church militant? Or doth not Mr. Baxter himself sometimes say all that need be said, or can be rightly said on these words, *Ero Deus tui & seminis?* It sufficeth

Mr. B. Friend (saith he) that God will be to them a God of Mer-
Accom. p. 361. l. xv. and do for them all that is necessary, to put
them in *statum salutis, pro conditione parvulorum*. And
we demand whether God did not thus much for all Infants in the
first Edition of the Covenant of Grace, which he confesses, is not
Vain, nor Repealed by God. Did he not do all that was necessary
(to put them into a state of Salvation) for the condition of lit-
tle ones?

If Infants were engaged by Circumcision, (as you here observe) then they were not Visible Church-Members without it. And then doth it not plainly follow, that Circumcision being Repealed, this their Visible Church-Membership is Repealed also? Or will you say they remained in *Visible Church-Membership without an Ordinance?* and so destroy your *Master-piece*, in one Member of it? And let that Typical Membership be accounted (as it was) a *merciful Gift*, yet when the Antitype made that Type null, it was a great mercy that it ceased; nor shall we fail of proof in this case. 2 Cor. 5. 16. 17. *cum multis aliis.*

J. B. 6. *Dare any of you say that God hath Repealed Infants Church-Membership to their hurt in Justice? — Or can you say it is in Mercy for their good? How can it be a Mercy to take away a Mercy, except it be to give a greater Mercy in stead of it? &c.*

T. G. Though we might say much of the Justice of God in Repealing the Covenant of Circumcision, and therewith the Infant Church-Membership once allowed in the Jewish Church, yet how dare you say that this was to the hurt of any Person, whether Infant or any other? But we will abide by this, that God made this Repeal in Mercy. And how should you not see, that to be set at Liberty



Liberty from the Yoke of the Law, and from Circumcision, which made them Debtors to the whole Law, Gal. 5. 3. was all done in mercy? And was it not needful to abrogate the first, or old Covenant, that he might establish the new, or second Covenant? *In which though we have no particular order to admit Infants to the Duties of this Covenant, yet we are sufficiently recompensed, in the assurance given us by Christ concerning Infants, right to the Kingdom of Heaven, and his blessing them, without Baptizing them; that so, they are as happy whilst Infants, as we can desire they should be: And is not this a greater Mercy than the Old Covenant did give to any Infant by Circumcision? As for the Capacity of those who are concerned in the Duties of the Second Covenant, is it not expressly thus: That the Law of Christ should be put in their Hearts, and written in their Minds, Heb. 8. And, So God to be their God, and they to be his People, as knowing him, from the least of them to the greatest? And whether in these respects any Infant can from Truth or Reason, be said to be in the New Covenant? And how then are they to be admitted Members of this Visible Company or Church, seeing they know not God? And yet is it not very evident, that the Grace of the New Covenant extends to them, from our Saviour's Testimony, that of such is the Kingdom of God?*

Again, Was not Infants partaking of the Passover, and other Sacrifices and Rites of the Law, as great Mercies as their being circumcised? And yet what Mercies of this kind was given them in the taking away of these? and yet were they not all taken away in Mercy? And whilst you deceitfully lay the stress of the word Mercy, upon your Sprinkling of Infants, do you not invalidate the substance of those Types, which being come, for the Salvation of Infants (as well as others) is their sufficient Passover, though they cannot celebrate the memorial of it in Bread and Wine, as the Adult ought, and do? And is not the true Jubilee which came by Christ, a sufficient Gain in stead of the Jewish Jubilee, both to the Adult and to Infants, though neither the one nor the other hath any Jubilee in the nature of an Ordinance in stead thereof? Especially not Infants, seeing they know not the sound of the Gospel.

J. B. 7. And is there any Scripture that speaketh of delivering any from this sad estate (meaning to be without hope) but Church-Members?

T. G.

er Law, for
 urle, as the
 elligion? Or
 vengant, to
 und have we
 eople, as he
 ous Nation
 ch Promises
 n Mr. Baxter
 ightly said
 A. Iusticeth
 God of Mer-
 ys, to put
 orge, And
 ants in the
 iles, is not
 necessary
 on of lit-
 e observe
 And them
 ealed, this
 ill you say
 ance? and
 d, let that
 Gifts, yet
 erty, that
 in 16. 17.
 zih ni ll
 is Church-
 is in Mercy
 except it b
 God in Rev
 the Infant
 , yet how
 whether In-
 made this
 be set at
 Liberty,

T. G. Will *Ephes. 2. 12.* prove that no Infants among the *Gentiles* were saved? Does not that Scripture, *Rom. 2. 14, 15, 26, 27.* as clearly prove that the *Gentiles* which had not the Law, and yet did by Nature fulfil the Righteousness of the Law, shall be as much excused in the Day of Judgment as the *Jews*, who kept the Law? And do you not here espouse that Doctrine, *Out of the Church is no Salvation?* Not considering that the *Universal Body of Christ* may comprehend many that had never the opportunity to be incorporated into the *Visible Company of such as worship God in the use of Legal, or Gospel Institutions.* And will you thus damn all Infants in the World but those that are Sprinkled, or Crossed by the *Pedo-baptists?* And will not the Text, *Acts 2. 47.* alleged by you, if compared with *Acts 5. 14.* make against you? Seeing those that were added to the *Church*, were not Infants, but *Men and Women?*

J. B. 8. If it be no benefit to the *Catholick Church* to have Infants kept out of *Heaven*, nor hurt to the *Church* to see them there, why should it be a benefit to the whole *Church* to have them kept out on *Earth?* &c.

T. G. If I might follow your Fancy, I might ask you what hurt it will be to the *Church*, to see an *Infant* of a poor *Indian* in *Heaven?* And why then do not you admit them here on *Earth?* But is it not childish in you to suppose that any shall be *Infants* when in *Heaven?* Seeing, according to *Austin*, they are called *Infants* *A non fando*, because they cannot speak; may we not more rationally believe that what is lost of stature, and knowledg by the Sin of *Adam*, shall be restor'd by the Righteousness of *Christ?* And are not *Infants*, as frequently seen in the *Assemblies of the Baptists*, as in yours? And do we not bid them to God in our *Prayers* as well as you? And what do your *Infants* partake of (except your *Tradition of Sprinkling* them) which ours do not as fully enjoy? And is it not as great a benefit to the *Church* to delay the *Baptism* of their little ones, as to delay their coming to the *Lord's Table?* If your delay make them more fit for the one, does not ours make them more fit for the other? If ours die without the one, do not yours die without the other? What cause then of your *murmuring?* For who casts *Infants* out of the *Church?* Is not this, a *Barbarism?* For if they be in, we do all we are allowed of God to keep them there, by timely *Instruction*, and by imploring God's *Blessing* for them, and you do no more, only you *Cross*, or *Sprinkle* them? This is your all, on this you build your hope for your dying *Infants.* This your *Tradition* is therefore

your

your Idol. This is that small parcel of bad Wooll, about which you make this hideous Cry, as if God had no Mercy for poor Infants unless this be done; *Why are you so Imprudent?*

DIVISION III.

Concerning Rom. 11. 17.

J. B. 1. Is it not evident from Rom. 11. 17. That only some of the Branches were broken off from the Church? Therefore the rest remained in, the Gift was not Repealed. Doth not the Apostle say it of that Church whereof Infants were Members? &c.

T. G. Here you seem to hold that the Church in her Legal state, and in her Evangelical state were both one, in such a sense, as that he that by Faith was added to the Christian Church, was not broken off from the Jewish Church. Hence I Query,

Does not Paul plainly shew, Rom. 7. 1. to 8. That the Christian Church was freed from the Law of her former Husband? When therefore she ceased to be a Wife, upon the account of the Law, did she not then cease to be a Church on that account, that she might now be married to another, even to Christ, and so bring forth Fruit unto God? Why then should these words, [*Some were broken off.*] be understood, to suppose that some yet did stand by God's Appointment in the former Church? Or, is it not evident, that Mens eagerness to stand in the Old Church (which now was ceased de jure) was the cause why they were rejected? Again, Is it not said of the believing Gentiles, That they were grafted in among the Branches, (to wit, the Jews)? sure this is, not meant of the Jews, that stood in the House of Moses, or the Old Church-state; but of the Church or House which was builded by Christ: for *Old things were passed away, all things became New.*

Wherefore now consider, seeing the believing Jews themselves did not stand by virtue of their Old Church-Membership, that being now Repealed, Matth. 3. 9. Rom. 7. 4. 5, 6. whether it be rational to imagin that the Infant Church-Membership (which was of the same Law) should yet remain? And wherefore do you so boldly say, the believing Parents do remain in the same Church?

But further, Is it safe by the good Olive, Rom. 11. to understand

The Jewish Church? Was not Paul willingly broke off from that Church, *Phil. 3.* that he might be in Christ? Is it not more safe to understand the place, of *Abraham* not as a Natural Father, for so the Gentiles could no more be grafted into him than into the Jewish Church; But as a Spiritual Father, into whom as such the Faithful were grafted, or rather into his Seed, in whom all Nations should be blessed, even Christ, the true Vine? and the Faithful, both Jew and Gentile, are the Branches united to him.

J. B. 2. Is it not evident from *Rom. 11. 20.* That none of the Jews were broken off, but for unbelief.

T. G. And is there any thing more clear the Point, that this breaking off was not from the Jewish Church? for their unbelief caused them to stand in that Church? And seeing these two things are both evident, that the breaking off here meant, was by unbelief, and the standing here meant, is by Faith; is it not thence very evident that the poor Infants are not concern'd, either in this kind of breaking off, or this kind of standing in the Olive Tree? Alas, poor Souls; what have they done? Have not Infants a more sure interest in Christ, than to be jetted into, or out of him, by the Faith or Unbelief of Parents? What wise Man will think so? And what need have we, or any Body else, to talk of the Invisible Church, it being a thing unknown to Man? And suppose this Olive Tree be meant of the Visible Church Christian, walking in all the Commands and Ordinances of Christ blameless; yet seeing no Natural Branches (as such) do stand in this Olive Tree, but must be grafted in by Faith, before they can stand there; Is it not evident, even hence, that no Infant, merely as the Seed of a Believer, is concern'd in the Duties of this Church; seeing the very Natural Branches of Abraham himself, have not that priviledg on that account?

J. B. 3. If it be into their own Olive Tree (which they were broke off from, and of which they were Natural Branches) that the Jews shall be engrafted at their recovery (as *Rom. 11. 24.*) then how is Gods Ordinance for Infant Church-Membership Repealed, &c. when though they be not restored to the Mosaical Law, or Covenant of Peculiarity, but taken into the Catholick Church?

T. G. Though it be never so true that the Jews upon their return shall be grafted into their own Olive, viz. Abraham, as a Spiritual Father, and into Christ the Promised Seed, in whom all Nations are blessed; yet do you not here fairly grant that they shall not be grafted

into the Covenant of Peculiarity, or Mosaical Law? And then whether their bringing Infants to the Mysteries of Religion (which was one main thing which was peculiar to the Jewish state) is not consequently granted by you to be now Repealed, unless you can prove that the Catholick Church hath Command from Christ to bring their Infants to the Mysteries of Religion? And who (except your selves) did ever exclude the *Jews* Infants from the Catholick Church, viz. the Assembly that are written in Heaven? But how will you prove that the Infants of the *Jews*, or any dying Infants, are cast out of that Church? Or, are not all those of the Catholick Church, who are of the Kingdom of God? And does not Christ state Infants there without excepting any?

J. B. 4. *Is it not the same Olive or Church, which the Jews were broken off from, that we Gentiles are grafted into, as Rom. II. 17. 19. 24? And if theirs admitted Infants — must not ours admit of Infant-Members, also? &c.*

T. G. Whether the Church was not the same Church in all Ages? and yet whether she did not differ in her external order by God's Appointment? and whether this difference was not in the case of Infants being brought to, or left unconcern'd in the Rituals of Religion, as much as in any thing? And seeing you here say, *She was taken down as to accidental Ceremonies*; whether this will not justify us in not Baptizing Infants, as well as you in not Communicating them, seeing God hath not commanded the one any more than the other?

J. B. 5. *Would not Christ have gathered Jerusalem? — And is it likely that he would have unchurched all their Infants, when he would have gathered to him whole Jerusalem, on the whole Nation? Matth. 25. 37, 38, 39.*

T. G. Whether it be not evident we unchurch no Infants, in respect of their relation to Salvation by Christ, but only say they ought not to be brought to the Services of Gospel-Ordinances? And do not you your self say the same that we do, except your pretended Baptism? And suppose Christ had gathered all *Jerusalem*, would not he have gathered them after the same manner? Would he not have gathered them by Preaching, by Repentance, and by Faith and Baptism, which were capable of these things? But how should their Infants be thus gathered? Could he not have gathered their Infants (in the sense of this Text) without Preaching to them,

† without Faith or Repentance, required of them? And could, and would he not have gathered them without Baptism, as well as without these? And should not the Infants in *Jerusalem* and *Judea* have escaped the destruction which came upon them by the *Romans*, if the Adult had but received the Gospel? and can you think that though the Infants suffered in that Desolation of *Jerusalem*, that therefore they were damned with the unbelieving *Jews*? And if not, were they not still of the Catholick Church, though their Parents were rejected?

J. B. 6. Can you suppose the believing *Jews Children* (and so the Parents in point of Comfort) to be in a worse condition since Christ than they were before? &c.

T. G. Was not *Enoch*, *Seth*, and *Noah* (when Infants) as happy though not Circumcised, or brought to any Ritual in the Church, as *Isaac*, *Jacob*, &c. were in their Infancy, though Circumcised? And have we not as much ground to believe our Infants as happy (though not Baptized) as any Infant of the Faithful in the Old World? And did not *Augustine* think Infants as miserable if they died without the Lord's Supper, as you think them to be if they die without being Crossed or Sprinkled? And yet do not you believe he was deceived? And are we not as justifiable to believe that you are also deceived? Is it not as needful to feed upon Christ in the holy Supper, as to put on Christ in holy Baptism? Can you have comfort concerning your Infants in the want of the one, and must we have none concerning our Infants in the want of the other? And what is now become of the Covenant of Grace, *Gen. 3. 15.* if Infants can have no benefit by it, but on the condition of their Parents works of bringing them into the Church by your Tradition, as you suggest in the latter part of this Query?

J. B. 7. If the Church be not in a worse state now will it not follow that our Children ought to be admitted Church Members? &c.

T. G. Whether this be not a false suggestion which keeps company with most of your Queries; viz. That all Infants which are not brought to some Rite or Ceremony, are put out of the Church? Were the Infants of six days old in *Israel* put out of the Church? Did not thousands of Infants die before they were admitted to Circumcision? And if they were in the Church before it were lawful to Circumcise them, why may not ours be in the Church, as well as the Infants of six days old in *Israel*, before and until it be lawful

to Baptize them? May we not do well to *nurture* and fit them for Baptism, as they *nursed* and fitted them for Circumcision? And what though our Work may require more Years than they theirs did Days; yet we making all the speed that God requires, are we not as excusable as they? And what though some of our Children die before they can be fitted for Baptism? Did not some of theirs die before they could be fitted for Circumcision? And why may not we have comfort in our disappointments by Death, as well as they when so disappointed? And suppose our Children refuse to be Baptized when they come to understanding, and will not be fitted for it by all that we can do? what comfort would it be to have had them Sprinkled in their Infancy, when now we find them reject Faith and Repentance, the most substantial parts of true Baptism?

J. B. 9. *If the Children of Believers now be put out of the Church, are they not in a worse condition than the very Children of the Gentiles were before the coming of Christ?*

T. G. Do you not abuse the World to talk at this rate, as if either God, or we put Infants out of the Church, when the only Question is about their admission to such or such Duties of Religion? Wherein yet you do the same, *in many cases* (as I have shewed) which we do in the case of Baptism. And if any have in the heats of Disputation, *absolutely denied Infants to be of the Church*, yet you know their sense is only to deny your way of making them Church-Members: Not but that they all assert Infants to be of the Body of Christ, of the number of the saved, and so of the Church. And I here assert they are of the Visible Church, because by the Word of God, declared to be accepted of God, to the Grace of Life through Christ. But we put no Infants out of the Church. For example, I have had many Children (for which I give thanks to God): as soon as he gives them to me, I do by Prayer to God devote, and heartily commit them to him; and by his Grace I do my best to teach them the Knowledge and Fear of God, as they grow up; and (I bless God with this success) that all that yet are capable, have been Baptized. And now wherein am I to be charged for putting my Children out of the Church? And if I be Innocent (as I know I am in this) then I hope the Churches of the same Faith are as excusable. And whether, if there were faithful Ministers of Christ in every Parish, it might not be a more likely way to bring Souls to true Christianity, to instruct the Children twice or thrice a Week (especially such Children whose Parents cannot instruct them) as