

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

soon as they could learn, and so to fit them for Baptism, than to run to the Minister with them to be Baptized in their Infancy, when God knows, neither the Infants, Priests, nor their Parents, know what they do?

J. B. 9. Was not the Covenant, Deut. 29. 10, 11, 12. a Covenant of Grace as distinct from the Law which was Repealed? How then is it, or Infants Church-Membership, grounded on it, Repealed? &c.

T. G. Seeing this Covenant, Deut. 29. obliged the Israelites to the whole Law, and left them under the Curse of the Law if they kept it not as appears by reading Deut. 29. and 30th Chapters, will it not follow that all the parts of this Covenant was not of the Covenant of Grace? Indeed some things repeated, or expressed here, might pertain to the Covenant of Grace. But what then? Why Infants Church-Membership, say you, is grounded upon it. And I pray, who denies that by the Covenant of Grace Infants are Members of Christ, of his Body, or the Universal Church? But what then must they therefore be brought to the Rites and Ceremonies of the Church, visibly professing the worship of God, in all Ages, as much as in any Age? This indeed is your false Inference, and with this you delude your self and others. And how long will it be, ere you make the Covenant, Deut. 29. and 30. agree with that which you quote out of Rom. 10. Heb. 10. in all Points? And if they differ in any thing, why may it not be in this, the one admitted Infants to Circumcision, and other Rites of the Law; the other only brings those that know the Lord by the word of Faith, being in their Heart and Mouth, to partake of Institutions of the Gospel?

J. B. 10. If Infants then were entered — Members by that Circumcision, which was a Seal of the Righteousness of Faith, How comes that Church-Membership to be Repealed?

T. G. Not to contend with you whether Circumcision was a Seal of the Righteousness of Faith to any that had not the Faith of Abraham (though plain Truth, and all good Reason seems to be full against you) yet to concede a little to see the most you can say, how do you prove that none were Church-Members before they were Circumcised? And how was Abraham admitted a Member of the Church by Circumcision? Was he not a Member of the Church before he was Circumcised? Was not Isaac a Member of the Church before he was eight Days old? Were they not Circumcised because

God

God had taken them into a Church-Covenant, rather than to enter them into a Church-Covenant? And is it not therefore said, *Gen. 17. 14.* That such Men children as were not Circumcised, should be cut off from his People, because they had broken the Covenant? And is it not plain then that these Children were already in Covenant, and of the Church? else they could not be cut off. And yet whether any thing here threatned, concern the Eternal State of Infants? Shall we think that God would damn them to Hell, because their Parents neglected to Circumcise them? Or is it like a Covenant of Grace to make such a Ceremony so absolutely necessary to the Salvation of Infants? Now seeing Infants were not made Members of the Church (much less of Heaven) by Circumcision, what need we assert the Repeal of their Membership in the Church (as it contains the whole People of God) but the Repeal of Circumcision is evident, and there-withal they are freed from any Obligation to the Duties of Religion, unless it can be shewed that God hath appointed the contrary, which never yet could be shewed. Thus if we give you all the advantage imaginable, yet nothing accrues to your Cause from this instance of Circumcision, till you can shew Authority from God to Baptize Infants, as plain as they had to Circumcise Infants: For does not one of your own Way tell us, *That Circumcision is a fine Historical Argument to illustrate a Point well proved before; but is not this that wherein you always fail? i. e. to prove by plain Scripture what you promised?*

J. B. 11. *If the Law of Infant Church-Membership, was no part of the Ceremonial, or merely Judicial Law, nor yet of the Law of Works, how can you say it is Repealed, seeing no other Laws are Repealed? &c.*

T. G. Whether these words [*The Law of Infant Church-Membership*] be a lawful Speech? And by what Law will you make it good? But (not to contend about words) if by *Law*, you mean the Covenant of Grace made with laps'd *Adam*, *Gen. 3. 15.* Then whether we do not assert it to be in force, more fully than you do? But if you mean any other Covenant save this, (for the often repetition of it makes it not another Covenant): then we say, it is your duty to assign or shew that Law, or Covenant; and we will consider it, mean while take notice, *That for the Repeal of that temporary Order once used to admit Infants to Ceremonies in Religion, is shewed (and generally granted) to be repealed in the Repeal of Circumcision, and no Institution*

or Ceremony (since the Repeal) ordained for Infants; and this is the Point in question. Why then go you about to wheedle us with a noise of words, of a Law of Infant Church-Membership unrepealed? A Law, &c. unrepealed? And whether you or Mr. Baxter either, can in the sight of your own Consciences say, that you well understand what you say?

And here I shall advertise the Reader, that as the remainder of the Queries we are to reckon with, are less specious than these we have examined, so let it be remembered, That we have granted, and do now once more assert, that by virtue of the Covenant of Grace made with fallen Adam, and all Mankind in him, Infants stand in a state of Grace, published (by God himself) to Man, so that they are visibly in a state of Salvation; nor will God break this Covenant, it is unalterable, for he is faithful. Infants do not transgress against it, therefore they stand in this Covenant. This Covenant was and is the Church-Covenant now confirmed by Christ, the faithful Witness of it: And by this Covenant Infants are Members of his Universal Church, his Body, that shall be saved. In the time of the Law when this Covenant was much Vailed, or hid under Shadows, Rom. 16. 25, 26. God was pleased to admit Infants to sundry of the Carnal Ordinances of the Law; but now the Mystery of the Gospel being displayed to all Nations, and the Worship of the Gospel being heightened to a very Spiritual Nature, God hath not engaged Infants in these Services, as he did in the time of the Law. Our Adversary thinks otherwise; this is our Difference: try seriously, and judg righteously.

DIVISION. IV.

About Infants visible Church-Membership.

J. B. 1. Is it not clear that there is an Universal visible Church, and that every one that is a Member of a particular Church, is also a Member of the Universal? And that the Jews Infants were Members of the Universal, and that this Universal is not dissolved? Now must not he that will affirm, the whole species of Infants are cast out of the Universal visible Church, prove it well?

T. G. Whether this Query be not grounded on meer Fancies? for though they that are Members of a particular Church, are Members of the Universal Church; yet dare you say, or think, that none are

Members

Members of the Universal, which are not also Members of a particular Church? Is not this the Dream with which you are Infatuated, to hold the Damnation of all Infants, yea, of all Persons who are not Members of some particular Church? And where do you find that Infants are cast out of the Universal Church, if they are not Baptized? is the Universal Church no larger than the Number of the Baptized? Can you think that the Uncircumcised Infant was cast out of the Universal Church? Suppose they were neglected till the 10th, 20th, or 40th day, &c. will you imagine them to be the Subjects of the Devil? What strange conceits have you of God? It's true, the Uncircumcised were cut off from the particular Society of the *Jews*, but did that Society constitute the Universal Church? Were none (what not an Infant in all the World) in a visible state of Salvation, except those in that Society? Me-thinks *Rom. 2.* well considered, should teach you to think otherwise. And what is now become of the Covenant of Grace, if Infants be so liable to be cast out of the Universal Church as you suggest? But why do you call the Universal Church Visible? Is not this a visible Mistake? And whether the latter part of this Query be pertinent, unless it be against your self? For if the removal of Persons, whether Infants or others, out of a particular Church, be no sound Argument that they are removed out of the Universal Church: then seeing the visible Professors of the Truth in this World, are but a part (and perhaps no very great part) of the Universal Church, may not Infants remain in the Universal Church, though not incorporated, or imbodyed with any particular Church practizing the Ordinances of God?

J. B. 2. *Is not that false Doctrine which makes the Children of the Faithful to be in as bad, or a worse condition than the Curse, Deut. 28. 32, 41. doth make the Children of Covenant-breakers to be in? &c.*

T. G. Is not this an injurious surmise? As if none were blessed in the Fruit of their Body but you, whose Infants are Crossed or Sprinkled? But who puts Infants out of the whole Visible Church? Do we not maintain the Church-Membership of Infants as far as Scripture will bear it? First, By the Covenant of Grace made with all Mankind, and now confirmed by Christ by whom they are blessed, and pronounced to be of the Kingdom of God. 2. According to the Law or Covenant of Circumcision, during the term of the Law, till Faith came, or till the time of Reformation.

J. B. 3. *Doth not the Doctrine which puts Infants out of the Visible Church*

Church of Christ, leave them in the visible Kingdom of the Devil? &c.

T. G. Is not this a Diabolical surmise? Are any Infants of the visible Kingdom of the Devil? Are your Infants of the visible Kingdom of the Devil till you Sprinkle them? Did not Christ declare them to be of the Kingdom of God, when yet not one Infant that we read of was Baptized? And what if your Crossing or Sprinkling prove no true Baptism, will it not follow from this your injurious Doctrine, that all your Infants are of the Kingdom of the Devil? Are any of the visible Kingdom of the Devil till they submit to his Delusions? and can you charge Infants with this? Be ashamed, O ye Presbyterians! of this.

J. B. 4. And will you leave us no sound grounded hope of the Justification, or Salvation, of any dying Infants in the World? &c.

T. G. Is not this Query a meer foolish out-cry? How plainly do you here damn all Infants that are not Sprinkled? Is not this the only cause of all this Clamour? What Doctrine can be more mischievous than this?

J. B. 5. What a full plain Text is that, 1 Cor. 7. 14. Are the Children of Believers holy in state? then ought they not to be admitted visible Church-Members?

T. G. How fully and plainly does Heb. 13. 2. explain this place, 1 Cor. 7. 14. Is not Marriage honourable among all Men, and the Marriage-bed undefiled? And is not that which is undefiled holy in state? And is not the unbeliever sanctified in this state, 1 Cor. 7. 14? Ye who but Men willing to be deceived, will say they ought therefore to be Baptized? And are not the Children therefore said to be holy, because the Unbeliever is sanctified to, or by the Believer? And how then can that Holiness be any other than Matrimonial? And does not Erasmus in his Paraphrase, give this very exposition on this Text? And does not Austin tell you, That whatsoever this Holiness is, 1 Cor. 7. 14. yet it is not of power to make Christians, or remit Sins? And why do you grudge that all Infants, procreated according to God's Ordinance, should be holy? See Malachi 2. 15. Doth not Diodate on the Text say plainly, That God's chief end in this proceeding, [to wit, in ordaining Marriage] was, that the Posterity might be Sanctified, being born in chaste Wedlock according to his Appointment, whereas it is defiled by all manner of unlawful Conjunctions.

J. B. 6. When it is said, Mark 10. 14. Of such is the Kingdom of God, Whether this be not more, than they may be visible Church-Members? &c.

T. G.

T. G. Whether we do not readily consent to all that is said *Mark* 10. 14. concerning Infants? do we not grant they are visibly stated in a gracious Right to the Kingdom of God? And if this be more than to say, Let them come to Baptism; Is it not more also than to say, Let them come to the Lord's Table? And is it not very considerable, that though three Evangelists mention these Infants, yet none of them so much as hints that they were Baptized? And whether these words, *Suffer them to come to me*, will not be a better plea for us in the Day of Judgment, in devoting our Infants to God by Prayer in the Name of Christ, than for you, in going so much beyond the Text, as to Cross or Sprinkle them, without the least ground from this, or any place of Scripture? And whether this your presumption, be not the real cause of our differences in Religion?

DIVISION V.

About the Texts objected against the Pædo-baptists.

J. B. 1. If these Texts, *Rom. 9. 8.* — *Ephes. 2. 3.* be objected. To the first Text. What is it the Apostle mainly drives at, but that Men are not therefore saved because they are Abraham's carnal Seed? — And to *Ephes. 2. 3.* What though we are by Nature Children of Wrath, doth it follow that we may not be otherwise by Grace?

T. G. Seeing you here grant that Men (but you must mean Infants also) are not saved because they are Abraham's Natural Seed, and that you dispute not the certainty of their Salvation, but only their Church-Membership; Have you not merely trifled all this while? Seeing now here is no sound ground it seems from their Church-Membership to prove them saved? And seeing none, as they are Abraham's Seed according to the Flesh, are either saved, or Members of the Church, so as to partake of Ordinances, is it not strange that you should prefer your Carnal Seed before his?

But how are Infants Children of Wrath in the sense of *Ephes. 2. 3.* otherwise than with respect to that Condemnation which came by Adam? And is not that made void by Christ, *Rom. 5*? We readily therefore consent, that Infants are otherwise by Grace.

J. B. 2. If you object that Infants are not capable of the ends of Baptism: To this, though Infants are not capable of every benefit of Baptism, —

...ants of the vi-
...ible King-
...Christ declar-
...the Infant that
...of Sprinkling
...out injurious
...of the Devil?
...sibant to his
...e advanced. O
...the Justific-
...v plainly do
...not this the
...e more ma-
...the Children
...nted visible
...in this place,
...den, and the
...filled holy in
...1 Cor. 7. 14?
...ought there-
...said to be
...e Believer?
...atrimonial?
...position on
...soever this
...Christians, or
...created ac-
...Galachi 2. 15.
...chief and in
...that the Ap-
...ing to his Ap-
...the Kingdom
...Church-Mem-
...T. G.

tism, — yet are they not capable of the principal ends? May it not be a Lifting Sign? &c.

T. G. Here you grant that Infants are not capable of every benefit of Baptism, nor can you prove them capable of all the benefits which you assign: For how are Infants capable of receiving Baptism as a Lifting Sign? Ought there not to be a free consent on the part of him that is Lifted? Or do you not rather press poor Infants (against their will, as appears by their resisting you what they can) then truly Lift them? Or how do they engage to be God's People, or take Christ to be their Lord (as you feign)? are not these meer Flourishes, and confuted by all Experience? And do not you confute your self, when you tell us here that *they understand none of these things?* And what benefit of Baptism are Infants capable of, more than they are capable of the benefits of the Lord's Table? If Remission of Sin be held forth in the one, is it not held forth in the other? And will you narrow up Remission of Sin to your way of Baptism? And must we still be ordered by Bonds and Leafes to transact Gospel Mysteries? Do you think to prevail by these Fancies?

J. B. 3. *And may it not be Operative by its signification as soon as the Child comes to the use of Reason? And in the mean time, as his Interest is, upon the condition of the Parents Faith, — so may not the Parent have the actual comfort of it, — as of a Lease that assureth an Estate to his Child? &c.*

T. G. It seems then Baptism operates not by its signification, till the Child comes to Reason, and you will not say it operates by the Work wrought? Why then cannot you let the Child stay till he have the use of Reason? And is it not absurd in you to say, that your Sprinkling assures the Parent of Heaven for his Infant, as a Lease assures him of an Estate? And why then did you tell us it was not the certainty of Salvation which you disputed for? What strange comfort do you give Parents concerning their Infants? Would any Parent value such a Lease as only names his Child, but gives no certain right to the Inheritance? Nay, for ought he knows, the Estate is more certain to one that is not named in the Lease (for *that's the true Import of your holding some dying Infants are damned*); but what a wretched Interest do you give the Child, whilst it rests upon the condition of the Father's Faith? Poor Child! if thy Father's Faith be false (as many are corrupt in that case) or if he fall from the Faith (as many do) what is then become of thy Interest?

May

May not you, as *Augustine*, before you be truly called, *Durus Pater Infantium*?

You suggest as if the Child's Baptism will operate as soon as it comes to the use of Reason; but that is false by all Experience: he must have better means than your Sprinkling, or he shall never be a Christian. You urge the *Sinlessness of Christ*. But suppose your Infants were as Sinless as he, would that intitle them to Baptism? I dare say you would hold it an Argument to the contrary. And what though *Christ was not buried with Christ in Baptism*? Yet is that a Warrant for you to Baptize those that cannot be buried with Christ in Baptism? And whether would your Fancies lead us at last, should we admit your Argumentation in other Cases?

J. B. 4. *If you object, How can an Infant covenant with God, or be engaged by this Sign? — To this, if only the Aged are capable of Engagement, may you not thence conclude that no Infant was ever circumcised? But may not that be the Childs action Morally, or in a Law-sence, which is only the Fathers action Physically? As when a Man puts his Childs name into a Lease? &c.*

T. G. Whether you do not here grant the circumcised Child did not covenant with God properly but in a Law-sence? And do we not grant this because there was a Law for it? There was also once a Law for the Circumcision of Trees, Lev. 19. 23. [*Take away his foreskin, which is his Fruit.* Ital. Transl.] Now shew us your Law for your Mode of admitting Members, viz. Sprinkling of Infants, and we will dispute no farther. And would you not count us very unwise, if we should Baptize our Trees, because the Jews did Circumcise theirs? And then why may not we count you as unwise to Baptize Infants, because the Jews did Circumcise Infants? But what Book of God taught you this fine distinction, viz. That my Baptism must be *another's act Physically*, and *mine Morally*? And let this Fancy run, and what Ordinance can you deny an Infant which his Father may perform *Physically? i. e.* As he may put his Childs name into a Lease, which is the thing you refer us to, to understand your distinction by.

J. B. 5. *Another common Objection is, If Infants must be Baptized, why may they not as well receive the Lord's Supper? To which, may not the very external nature of the Sacraments satisfy you? &c.*

T. G. Why do you not see your Error? Does not Dr. Taylor tell you, *The Wit of Man is not able to shew (in this case) a difference in*

thes:

these Ordinances? And are not little Children as capable to receive a small quantity of Bread and Wine, as to be Baptized? And did not Men admit them, to both for five or six hundred Years together? Does not the Apostle say of the whole Church who were engaged in the Christian Worship, *We are one Body and one Bread, even as we all partakers of that one Bread?* 1 Cor. 10. And might not any Man argue as strongly from hence for Infant Communion, as you from any other Text for Infant Baptism? And does not God's requiring Repentance of every one that is to be Baptized, *Acts 2. 37, 38.* restrain Baptism to such, as 1 Cor. 11. restrains the Supper to such as examine themselves? And does not your Instance of a Burges-Infant make against you, whilst you confess he is not born to Trade in his Infancy? Why then should Infants Trade in the Mysteries of the Gospel, though born to the Grace of Life, held forth to Mankind in the Gospel?

J. B. 6. It hath been objected, That if it be the will of God that Infants should be Baptized, it is strange that he hath left it so dark? To which, will you not grant that all Church-Members must be admitted by Baptism? &c.

*T. G. Dare you say that all that are under the benefit of the Covenant of Grace must be Baptized? And yet are not all such of the Universal Church? Are none of the Infants of the Jews of the Kingdom of God; and yet you will say they must be Baptized? Is it not as plain that all Church-Members must eat and drink at the Lord's Table, as that they are all to be Baptized? Does not Christ say, *Drink ye all this?* Does not Paul say, *We being many, are one Body, for we are all partakers of that Bread?* Let Infants then be never so truly of the Church, as she contains the whole Body of Christ, yet are they not of that Body which are bound to put on Christ in Baptism, and to continue steadfastly in the Apostles Doctrine, in breaking of Bread and Prayers. And whether the remainder of this Query hath not been considered before?*

J. B. 7. Another Objection is, The evil consequences of Infant-Baptism, as gross Ignorance much occasioned by it. To which, 1. Is not the Lord Jesus himself the occasion of the ruine and damnation of Multitudes? Luke 2. 34. 2. Can you shew what there is in the nature of the thing that should be hurtful to any? &c.

T. G. Is not that of very evil Consequence, that naturally tends, to deprive all Men of the sacred Ordinance of God, the Baptism of Repentance

Repentance for the Remission of Sin? Can you devise any way so natural, to fill the Church with Unregenerated Persons? And is not this a great evil; when God hath ordained the *New Birth*, as necessary to *Membership in his Gospel Church*? Do you not evidently turn things upside down? And contradict our Saviour, *John 3. 3, 5.* and his Apostle, *Gal. 3. 26.* And is not this evil? Is it not evil to speak a word in the Name of the Lord which he never commanded? How dare you then say, you Baptize an Infant in the Name of the Lord, when you cannot but know you speak falsely in his Name, and cannot shew no Authority from Heaven for Baptizing Infants, if you did the thing indeed? Suppose any should bring Infants to the Lord's Table, what evil can you shew us *in the nature of the thing*, that we cannot as well shew you in the *nature of your Crossing or Sprinkling*? And how dare you crack it up to be more solemn, than our way of Baptizing Repenting Believers? Do we deny any to be present when we Baptize, that are fit to be present? And why do you count the Footsteps of Christ and his Flock immodest, in comparison of your own Tradition? But more of your Immodesty anon.

J. B. If God would have Infants to be Church-Members, and so entered by Baptism, are not all these Objections against God, and a Carping at his Way?

T. G. Whether this be not an idle Query? And seeing it does not appear that it is the Will of God that Infants should be admitted to the Church professing the Gospel, by Baptism; are not you evidently the Men that carp at the People of God, and complain because Men will not lay aside the Command of God, and observe your Fancies and Traditions?

DIVISION VI.

About deferring or delaying Infant-Baptism

J. B. 1. Where do you find one word of Precept or Example in all the Bible, for the deferring the Baptism of any Child of a Christian till years of Discretion? Should you not bring some Scripture for your Way? &c.

T. G. Whether it be not vain in you to talk of our delaying Baptism, when we take the first tender of any Person (unless we have just cause to the contrary) to dispence that sacred Ordinance? Does

not DELAY suppose a present capacity and obligation for Duty, and then to put it off? But what Scripture have you to Baptize Members of the Church, and then to delay their other Duties and Privileges for 15 or 16 Years? And what Precept or Example have you to Baptize Persons when they are asleep? (As your Infants often are when you Sprinkle them) And who taught you to Baptize Persons *per force*, whether they will or no? As that is your common practice: As is confessed, when we are told by *Austin*, *That Infants do strive against Baptism with great Crying.*

J. B. 2. *Is not your Way inconsistent with obedience to the Rule? Is it not Christ's Rule that Persons shall be Baptized without delay when they are first made Disciples? Doth not this appear, Mat. 28. 19, 20. How can you Baptize (any) when they are first made Disciples, unless it be in their Infancy? &c.*

T. G. Why do you not come forth, and make some one Infant (at least) a Disciple, according to *Mat. 28. 19*? Would not such a thing, done by you, do more to decide this Controversy, than a thousand Queries? I require you to come to the Test here, or else may we not justly count you vain Talkers, and especially you of the *Presbyterians*; who whilst you boast more of making Infants Disciples than other *Pedo-baptists*, yet you do no more than they, that is just nothing? And why do you suggest that we cannot tell when a Person is first made a Disciple? Did the Apostles know this or not? And why may not others know this as well as they? Seeing they judged not in this case by immediate Revelation, but by Persons gladly receiving their Doctrine, *Mat. 28. 40, 41.* And how can you tell when an Infant is first made a Disciple? Are you not ashamed to pretend to know with ease, what is not to be known at all, that so you might make all Men ignorant of that they ought to know?

J. B. 3. *Would not this Practice of yours necessarily fill the Church with perpetual Contentions, as being about a Matter that cannot be determined by any known Rule? &c.*

T. G. May I not be confident, that it is hard for any Man to query more indiscretely than he that formed this Query? But, Sir, we are sure your Practice hath filled the World with Contention, both in former and latter Ages: your Bishops could not agree on what Day to Baptize Infants, you cannot tell us the Day. He that should not be Baptized, till your Ministers agree this Point, by one Voice, should he ever be Baptized? As for us, we have a known Rule to walk by, and

and that is, to Baptize them the same day they are Converted, if they reject it not. *Acts 2. 41.* Then they that gladly received the Word were Baptized; and the same day was added unto them about three thousand Souls. Yet it may be thought that the noble Bereans were longer about it, because they searched the Scriptures daily, to see whether things were so. Yet who (but such as feed on Fancies) would imagine the time when they were to be Baptized, could not be determined by any known Rule? And why? Forsooth, because they came gradually to the knowledg of the Truth, *spectatum admissi*, &c.

J. B. 4. *When you pretend to ground your practice on Mat. 28. 19, 20. — would not your Doctrine turn Baptism (for most part) out of the Churches of the Saints? For according to you, only they that are made Disciples by Ministerial Teaching, directly should be Baptized; &c.*

T. G. Whether this your talk of directly, indirectly, and remotely discipling the Seed in the Parent, be not plain Barbarisms rather than the Simplicity of the Gospel? And that cunning Craftiness whereby you deceive your Admirers? And whether such your indirect doings have not turned holy Baptism for the most part out of the World? But do you not err, to suggest that we would have none made Disciples, but by immediate Ministerial Instruction? Does not *Mat. 28. 19, 20.* shew that Ministers are to teach those whom they have discipled, to observe the things which Christ commanded his Apostles? and is there not liberty sufficient here for every one to spread the knowledg of the Gospel as he is able, in his Family, or elsewhere, as God gives him opportunity? And is it not a great shame that you should thus forge an Opinion to be ours which we never owned, and then to quibble upon it as you do? I profess I am ashamed to reade you in this, and many of these your imprudent Queries; which I cannot perceive to have any design but to throw stumbling Blocks in the way of Christians generally, and to make *them question almost every thing.*

DIVISION VII.

About the manner of Baptizing.

J. B. 1. *Your ordinary practice of Baptizing by Dipping over Head in cold Water (which you use as necessary) is it not a breach of the Sixth Commandment, Thou shalt not kill? &c.*

T. G. Is not this Query blasphemous? In that it reproacheth the Footsteps of God's Anointed? Was not Christ Baptized of John into Jordan? (So the Greek reads it) Was not that cold Water? seeing he was Baptized in the Winter season; for he was born about Midwinter, and Baptized when he began to be about thirty Years of Age, must it not then be about the same time of Winter? Is there any Form of Baptism necessary? Or hath God left that to you, to invent what Form you will? May we not better follow Christ's Form than yours? Did not Christ know rightly how to be Baptized? Will not your Way admit of as many Forms of Baptism, as there are parts in a Mans Body? And should any urge the same part to be the truest part to be Baptized, which was formerly Circumcised, might not a Man that would strain his Wits and Conscience, give as probable Arguments for that, as you do for the subject of Baptism, whilst you reason from Circumcision? Do you not boldly out-face the Holy Ghost by your Sprinkling, John 13. where he tells us the Reason why John Baptized in Eanon, was, because there was much Water? And why went Philip and the Eunuch both down into the Water, if your Crofing and Sprinkling were a due Form of Baptizing? Does not Dio- dore (and many of your Learned Men) tell us, that (Rom. 6. 4.) Baptism was a Dipping in Water, according to the ancient Ceremony? Were the ancient Christians Murtherers? When will you blush at your desperate Vanities? Nay, do not you grant that Dipping was the use of the Church in Scripture-times, only you ask us whether it was constantly used? But if you lay inconstancy to their Charge, should you not prove it? Does your Instance of the Jaylor prove it? Or do not you shew that you read that place with blind Eyes? Else you will find they went out of his House, even at Midnight, to celebrate holy Baptism; for is it not plainly said, That when he and all his were Baptized, that he brought them into his House, and set Meat before them? And yet, had they not been in his House before, to Preach to him and to all that were in his House? And can any place be more full against your childish Sprinkling? And whether Mr. Fisher, and Mr. Tombs hath not sufficiently answered your frivolous Quibbles about the quantity of Bread and Wine in the holy Table? And also your Quirk about warm Water to Baptize in? And seeing by the course of Providence Water is warm in the Summer, in comparison of what it is in Winter, how should it be a Sin to Baptize in warm Water? And that God which ordain'd Water for our nourishment as Men, allows us to

use it warm or cold, as may be most healthful and convenient. And why should we think it unlawful to use it so in the Sacrament of Baptism if necessity require it, as in an extreme Frost perhaps it may? And so in respect of the weakness of the Subject, is here any change of the Ordinance? And will not *Mat. 12. 7. I will have Mercy and not Sacrifice*, better defend such an innocent Practice, than your absurd alteration of the Ordinance?

J. B. 2. *Is it not a breach of the Seventh Commandment, Thou shalt not commit Adultery, to Dip Persons naked, or next to naked? &c.*

T. G. Is not this also a foolish and blasphemous Query? Is not the having one Garment on only next to naked? And yet may it not be decent enough to be Baptized in one Garment? But why do you so basely suggest that it is our practice to Baptize naked? Is not our constant Practice known to be otherwise? Are not both Men and Women attired in decent Garments among us when Baptized? Why do you thus ungraciously Scandalize an Innocent People? Will you not cease to pervert the right Ways of the Lord; And to make his Ordinance contemptible as your Fellows did, *Mal. 1. 6. 7?* Yea, this Reproach hath been by your means, *O ye Priests;* And let me in-treat you to lay it to Heart. And are you not more perverse still in the remainder of your Query? As if *the Dipping Persons clothed, would destroy our Argument for washing the whole Body?* What is this? You grant Dipping was used in the Scripture-times, sure they were Dipped either with Clothes, or without them: And is it not said of them that their *Hearts were sprinkled from an evil Conscience, and their Bodies washed with pure Water*, *Heb. 10. 22.* Now what shall we say to your *ungodly Query?* It will not permit us to be Baptized by Dipping (as you grant it was used in Scripture-times) neither with Clothes nor without. So then, nothing but your Crossing or Sprinkling can please you. How true is the Proverb? *Some Men are much in love with their own Fancies.*

J. B. 3. *What fruit of these things? How many of you that instead of labouring after the winning of Souls from Sin to God, make it your main scope to propagate your Opinion? &c.*

T. G. Whether this Query be not Hypocritical? As if the business of your Hundreds of Queries did not speak you to be as fond of your Opinion as any other? Or as if the winning Souls from the Errors wherein you have entangled them, and by which you have hardned them against plain Truth, were not a winning Souls to God? And have

have not you compelled us to defend what we hold? And do you now blame us for spending time to unmask your Falacies? For my own part, I could have been glad to have forborn this Labour: But what did you publish your Queries for? Was it that you might bear it high against the Truth, and that no Man should examine them? And is not your intolerable Calumnies against what we profess, and your immoderate sticking for Pedo-rantism, the cause of those Distractions (at least in part) which you would charge us with? As for Prayer in Families, if there be no sinful Impositions and Formalities, which of us are Enemies to Family Devotions? And are not you as strait in this as other Men? Would you have more Unity with us? This you pretend. But then cease your Heats for things really disputable, as Mr. Baxter confesses Infant-Baptism to be: *Yea, saith he, I know it to be a very difficult Point, — and many Prelatists have maintained that it is not determined in Scripture.* You may be sure therefore, you shall not hector us into your Opinion, by calling us Murderers and Adulterers, meerly because of our Baptism. And who that is wise would take such courses for Union with Dissenting Christians? Sure this will keep us from your Communion.

J. B. 4. *Whether it be at all credible that Satan would be so charitable to Believers Infants, as to plead for their Priviledges, or would be a Propagator of Christ's Kingdom? &c.*

T. G. Wretched Charity! Is this Charity to damn hundreds of Infants, that you may plead for one? Was not *Augustine* as Charitable in pleading for Infants Communion, as you are in pleading for their Baptism? Were not the false Apostles (in their own Opinion) as Charitable as the best of you all for Infants, when they would have had them Circumcised? For say they, except ye be Circumcised after the manner of *Moses*, ye cannot be saved. And say you less, except Infants be Baptized (as they were Circumcised under the Law) there is no sound ground of Hope concerning any dying Infant in the World? But in good earnest, whether we or you, be really and indeed the most charitable to Infants, let him that reads these Books impartially, judg? And how your practice of Pedo-baptism hath propagated Christ's Kingdom, may be sadly seen among the *Papists*, where yet Pedo-baptism is more common than with you? And how his Kingly Government is opposed by your withstanding his Counsel against your selves, is too evident. Men have a knack to pretend
Christ's

Christ's Kingdom, when it is their own that they strive to set up : and 'twill be well if you do it ignorantly.

J. B. 5. *Whereas we tell Sinners of the heinous aggravation of their Sins, as committed after Baptism, — Whether you that make Infant-Baptism a Nullity, dare undertake to bear the burthen of that Aggravation for them? &c.*

T. G. Whether you deceive them not in telling them they are Baptized, when they are not? Yet how dare you charge us for going about to extenuate any Sin, at any time, more than your selves? And whether does not Mr. B. himself make Infant-Baptism a Nullity? When he saith to the Adult (notwithstanding their Infant-Baptism) *They were never strictly nor comfortably in Covenant with Christ, till they freely consent; and (saith he) it was never a match till now.* And then is not this the fit time to Seal the Covenant (as you speak); for he saith, *their Infant-Covenant will not now serve.* Saints Everlasting Rest, P. 178, 182.

J. B. 6. *Whether it should not lie heavy on tender Consciences, to add to God's Word, holding the Repeal of the Ordinance of Infant Church-Membership? — How doleful is it that any Christians should be so zealous to dispute their Children out of Christ's Church, — and whether they may not have as many thanks from Christ, as the Disciples had for keeping such from him?*

T. G. Whether this be not the great evil of Mr. B. to add to God's Word, telling the World he has given plain Scripture-proof for Infant Church-Membership and Baptism, when in truth there is not one word for their being admitted Church-Members by Baptism? And whether we do not sufficiently evince, that we dispute no Infant out of the Church of Christ, though we deny them to be admitted by Baptism? And wherein the Christian Man's Infants have a blessing in the timely Dedication of them to God (as far as the Christian hath allowance from Christ, to bring them to him) which others have not who are born of those that know not God, have we not likewise shewed in our first Book, and now also in this? And whether (for all this Noise) Mr. B. does not make Infant Church-Membership a meer Trifle, *unless they be sprinkled*, when *that's all the cause of the Cry*, that *they have no sound grounded hope concerning them*; and that *for this cause they are supposed to be left in the Kingdom of the Devil*? And whether Christ will give Mr. Baxter more thanks for **THUS** disputing unbaptized Infants *out of Heaven*, than he gave to Austin
for

for disputing Infants out of *Life Eternal*, because they were not *Communicated with at the Lord's Table*. And whether it be not a good wish that *Mr. Baxter* may see his *Mistake* in the former, as 'tis supposed (by some) that *Austin* saw his *Mistake* in the latter?

The Conclusion.

Forasmuch as *Mr. Baxter* (and from him *Mr. F. B.*) have delivered a very modest Propofal, for more Concord among Christians who differ about the Point of *Infant-Baptism*, by which it seems to me, that notwithstanding the severity of their Queries, and their stiffness in fighting for the Point of *Infant-Baptism*, with such intentness: yet this is more to let us see what (they conceive) may be said, then what they believe, is necessary to be said in that case. I will therefore set down the said Propofal, and intreat all my Friends that differ from them, in the Point in Controversie, to take it into consideration, being loth at present to give an Answer to it, because it is a matter of moment, and common concern.

Mr. B's Propofal.

That if you would be contented your selves to satisfie your own Consciences to be Rebaptized, as one that doubted whether he were well Married, would secure it by being Married over again [or as one that doubted his Ordination, would be Ordain'd again] and would afterwards live peaceably in Communion with your Brethren, and not appropriate Church-Communion to your own Sect: And if you would not deny our Infants Church-Membership, and only deferred the Baptifmal Investiture, for the more solemn Inauguration and Obligation: Though I should not be of your mind, I would live in as loving forbearance and Communion with you, as with other Christians.

FINIS.

And whether Christ will give Mr. Baxter more thanks for THIS disputing unbaptized Infants out of Heaven, than he gave to Austin for