

CHAP. III.

Wherein the Erroneous Grounds both as to fabulous Traditions, and mistaken Scriptures, upon which Infants Baptism hath been both formerly and laterly founded, is made manifest.

THE First and Principal Ground that hath been asserted for this practice, hath been Ecclesiastical and Apostolical Tradition; or however (as hath been said) the Scripture is so silent in the Case, yet the clear, full and uninterrupted Tradition of the Church, makes up that defect, to which the Church of Rome and some others have adhered.

Though many Protestants, since the Reformation, have chose to flye to some Consequential Arguments deduced, as they suppose from the Scriptures to justify the same.

Both which in this Chapter are brought forth, and duly weighed in the Ballance of Truth.

The First we shall examine is the point

point of Tradition, and therein do these two things, Shew that it hath primarily been asserted to be the ground thereof. Secondly, The insufficiency of the Authorities that have been urged to prove the same.

Tradition
the principal
ground of
Infants
Baptism.

Austin.

That Tradition hath principally been leaned upon, as the main ground of the Practice, you have the following Instances.

Austin tells us, *That the Custome of our Mother the Church in Baptizing little Infants, is not to be despised, nor to be judged superfluous, nor to be believed at all, unless it were an Apostolical Tradition. Lib. 10. de Gen. c. 23.*

And again in his 4th Book against the Donatists, 24 Chap. saith, *That if there be any that do inquire for a Divine Authority for the Baptizing of Children, Let them that know what the Universal Church holds, nor was instituted in Councils, but alwaies retained, is most rightly believed to have been delivered by no other than Apostolical Authority.*

Chrysost.

Chrysostom saith, *That Infants ought to be baptized, as universally received by the Catholick Church, to take away Original Sin. Mag. Cent. 4.*

Bellarmino

Bellarmino, Tom. 1. L. 4. c. 2. saith, That the Baptism of Infants is an Apostolical Tradition not written; because, saith he, it is not written in any Apostolical Book though written, he saith, in the Books of almost all the Antients.

And which Tradition of the Apostles, saith he, is of no less Authority with us, than the Scriptures.

In the Council of Trent, after they had in the 5th and 7th Sessions made these Canons about Infants-Baptism, before mentioned, do conclude, That their Traditions, touching the same, should be received, *Pari Pietatis affectu, with the same pious affection with the Holy Scriptures, as you have it, p. 144.* Council of Trent.

In the Council of Basil, in the Orat- Council of Basil.
tion of the Cardinal of Ragusi, It is asserted, That in the beginning of this Sacrament of Baptism, they only were to be baptized, who could by themselves answer Interrogatories concerning their Faith; And that it was no where read in the Canon of Scripture, that a new-born Infant was baptized, who could neither believe with the Heart to Justification, nor confess with the Mouth to Salvation. Yet nevertheless, saith he, the Church hath appointed it.

Eck us.

Eckius against the *Lutherans* writes, That the Ordinance concerning the Baptism of Children is without Scripture, and is found to be only a Custom of the Church. And in his *Enchiridion* calleth it a Commandment and Ordinance of Man, and that it is not to be proved out of the Holy Scriptures.

A great Papist, lately in London, going to a Dispute about Infants-Baptism, told his friend, He was going to hear a Miracle, viz. Infants Baptism to be proved by Scripture.

And the Ground and Reason why they do so firmly own this Truth to the Protestants upon that subject, is but the better to inforce and introduce their many other Traditions, there being nothing else for that.

But whereas some object^r That *Bel-larmine* and others do also bring Scripture for it, *Becan.* Lib. 1. c. 2. Sec. 24. answers, That some things may be proved out of Scripture, when the Churches sense is first heard about the Interpretation thereof, for so, he saith, it is concerning Infants Baptism, which is proved from John 3. 5. Except a man be born of Water and the Spirit, &c. But the sense wh. reb^y to prove it, is only manifest

manifest by Tradition. And it is confirmed in the Canon Law and Schoolmen; That Infants Baptism was not reckoned perfect, till the Bishop laid on hands, which was called Confirmation, viz. of the imperfect Baptism in Infancy: and therefore saith Caistans secundum Caistans. Jewel, That an Infant wanting Instruction in the Faith, hath not perfect Baptism, Tom. prec. p. 86. Dr. Field, Dr. Field. Lib. 4. P. 375. saith, That Infants Baptism is therefore called a Tradition, because it is not expressly delivered in the Scriptures, that the Apostles did baptise Infants, or that they should do so.

Oxford

The Oxford Divines in a full Convocation, Jan. 1647. say, That without the consentaneous judgment and practice of the Universal Church, they should be at a loss, when they are called upon for proof in the point of Baptizing Infants, Mr. Tombes.

Divines.

Dr. Prideaux Controv. Theol. Sec. Dr. Prideaux 392. Infants Baptism (saith he) rests upon no other Divine right than Episcopacy, viz. Diocesan Episcopacy, in use in these Nations.

Mr. Baxter in Defence of the Principles of Love, p. 7. saith, That the Anabaptists are Godly men, that differ from

Mr. Baxter.

from us in a Point so difficult, that many of the Papists and Prelatists have maintained, That it is not determined in Scripture, but dependeth upon the Tradition of the Church. (Though, he saith, he is of another mind himself.)

To which many more might be added, to prove to you, That Apostolical Tradition, for want of Scripture, hath been urged as the principal and first ground of this Practice. And not only for this, but for all other Rites and Ceremonies, as well those that have been already declared; as *Chrisme*, *Exorcisme*, *Consignation*, and innumerable more, as those that have not yet been heard of or declared: for as a late learned Author excellently observes, *That the Papists, in point of Tradition, do herein very much exceed the Jews, those old Tradition-mongers, who so made void the Law of God in their days by it. For they tell us plainly, that now their whole Oral Law is written, and that they have no reserve of Authentick Traditions not yet declar'd: But here the Romanists, saith he, fail us, for although they have given us heaps upon heaps of their Traditions, yet they plead that they have still an inexhaustible treasure* of

of them laid up in their Church-stores, & breast of their Holy Father, to be drawn forth at all times, as occasion shall require. And which Principle hath been the means of their Apostacy, and is the great Engin, whereby they are rendered incurable therein. Dr. Owen his Proleg. P. 67.

Dr. Taylor, P. 237. argues so fully D. Taylor and strenuously upon this point of Tradition, that I cannot pass him by, who saith, Tradition by all means must supply the place of Scripture, and there is pretended a Tradition Apostolical, that Infants were baptized. But at this (saith he) we are not much moved, For we who rely upon the written Word of God, as sufficient to establish all true Religion, do not value the allegation of Tradition: And however the world goes, none of the Reformed Churches can pretend this Argument for this Opinion: Because they who reject Tradition, when it is against them, must not pretend it in the least for them; but if we allow the Topic to be good, yet how will it be verified? For so far as can yet appear, it relies wholly upon the Testimony of Origen, for from him Austin had it. Now a Tradition Apostolical, if it be
not

not consigned with a fuller testimony than of one person, whom all other Ages have condemned of many Errors, and whose works, saith Erasmus, are so spurious, that he that reads them is uncertain, whether he read Origen or Ruffinus. Therefore will obtain so little reputation amongst those, who know that things have upon greater Authority, been pretended to be received from the Apostles, but falsely; that it will be a great Argument, that he is ridiculous and weak, that shall be determined by so weak Probation in matters of so great concernment. But besides that the Tradition cannot be proved to be Apostolical, we have very good evidence from Antiquity, That it was the Opinion of the Primitive Church, That Infants ought not to be Baptized, which, saith he, is clear in the Canon of the Council of Neocaesarea, which he mentions at large in the original Greek; Determining that none ought to be baptized, without giving an account of their Faith, and desiring the same. Thus far Dr. Taylor.

In the next place we shall give you some account of the insufficiency and weakness, if not the wickedness of those first Authorities, that have been leaned upon

that the
Tradit-
ions for
Inf. Bapt.
are fabu-
lous.

upon to prove this Practice to be an *Apostolical* Tradition, and which appearing fabulous, all others depending upon the same, necessarily fall to the ground; whereof you have *four* or *five* of the principal of them, and which may be useful to the *Protestants*, whatever they are to the *Papists*, viz.

The *first* and earliest we meet with to prove *Infants-Baptism* to be an *Apostolical* Tradition, is that of *Dionysius* the *Arcopagite*, mentioned already *P. 109.* & quoted by *Bellarmin*, *Tom. 3. Lib. 8.* *Cassander* in his Book *de Bapt.* and many other learned *Papists*, for Authentick proof that *Infants-Baptism* was *Apostolical*, out of his Ecclesiastical *Hierarchy*, &c. But that this was a piece of Forgery put upon the world, may yet farther more fully appear to you in that which followeth, viz.

This *Dionysius* the *Arcopagite* living *Dionysius* at *Athens*, who some will have to be *Arcopag.* Bishop of *Corinth*, though *Eusebius* calls him Bishop of *Athens* (for you must know, according to *Eusebius* and *Dorotheus*, all men of Name in the *New Testament*, must be Bishops of some place or other, and therefore they can tell you, not only the Names of the

seventy

seventy Disciples, but what Bishopricks each did belong unto.) Now this Person being an *Athenian*, must be supposed to be a learned *Greek Philosopher*, and therefore upon none more fitly in this Age could be fathered all those *Philosophical Tracts* that are put upon him; and amongst which you have two of most eminency, viz. his *Hierarchy of Angels*, wherein you have the *Orders, Ranks, Dignities, Names, and Offices* of the *Angels and Archangels* (a profound piece no doubt.)

The other his *Ecclesiastical Hierarchy*, wherein the *Consecrations, Orders, Offices and Ranks* of the *Inferiour Angels*, viz. the *Priests, Friars, Monks, Bishops, Arch-bishops, and Popes* are methodically treated and handled, as also divers *Rites and Ceremonies* discussed amongst which that of *Infants-Baptism* is asserted to be an *antient Apostolical Tradition*, which he declares he received from his *Prefectors*, together with various *Ceremonies*, that according to like *Apostolick Authority*, are confirmed as an *Appendix* thereto, viz. *Gossips, or Sureties; Chrisme, or the Anointing Cream; Exorcisme or Sufflation, viz. a blowing used in Baptism,*

tisme, whereby the Devil was to be blown away; *Consignation*, or the signing the baptized with the Sign of the Cross; *Confirmation*, or *Bishoping* the Baptized Children, afterwards, to compleat his imperfect Baptism by laying on of Hands, *Albes* or white Garments for the Baptised, *Baptisterions*, or large Fonts to be placed in the Temples, *Altars* also for the *Eucharist*, and several other things, which he affirms to have been in use in the *Apostles* days.

And this is one of the first *Authorities* that Father *Bellarmino* and others of them give us, for the proof of this *Apostolical* Institution, and which must be received with equal Authority to the *Holy Scriptures* (and a very convincing one no doubt) concerning which, though if there was nothing but the bare *Repetition* thereof, it may sufficiently detect the *Cheat*; the lies being so gross, so ill made, and laid together, that every common understanding may easily perceive the juggle; For how absurdly ridiculous is it to say, that *Paul* or his *Presbyters* should acquaint him, that it was an *antient Apostolical Tradition*; if it had been true, *Paul* might have told him it had been *new*,
but

but by no means in those days an *old Apostolical Tradition*. And to tell the world of *Baptisterions* and *Altars* in Temples, when no such things as Temples for Christian Worship, for above 200. years after. And also of those other impious fooleries, that were not known nor heard of for some Ages after, so strangely, by Gods Providence, were they infatuated, to come forth with such ridiculous madness to detect their own folly: And to testifie that this was to be that Interest that should appear with all deceivableness of Unrighteousness.

Which horrid Cheat you have very convincingly discovered and detected by many Learned Men; & besides those already mentioned *Page. 110* in the *first Chapter*, You have he *Magdiburgenses*, Cent. 1. L. 2. p. 625, 626. and Cent. 4. p. 420, 554, and 1129. Also by *Perkins, Reynolds, River*, proving by many Arguments it was wholly spurious and supposititious, and that it could not, from many considerations, be written by the ingenuous Contriver, till the *fourth* or *fifth* Century, that none of the Church-writers in those times took any notice of it, and that

that *Austin* himself went not higher than *Origen*, And which wretched Forgery is excellently detected in 39 Arguments by the Learned *Dailly*, a late renowned Protestant-writer in France, in his Book called *de Scriptis*.

A Second Proof leaned upon to verify the truth of its Apostolicalness, is that of *Justin Martyrs Responses*, especially to the 56 Questions before mentioned, Page III. and Chap. 2.

Justin Martyr's Responses.

which many of the aforesaid Authors do learnedly detect to be *spurious* also, as *Perkins*, *Rivet* and others, yea and many of the very *Papists* themselves do disown the same as ridiculous, so much as *Origen* and the *Manichees* are mentioned therein, that were not in being for so long time after. And concerning which *Responses*, Mr. *Baxter* himself, in his plain Scripture proof, P. 155. is pleased to tell us, That as to that of *Justin Martyrs* to the 56th Question, He would not insist upon it, because though the place be most express for *Infants Baptism*, (for when the Friars hand was in, he could do it to a hairs breadth) and the Book antient, yet that it was either *spurious* or interpolated.

M. Baxter

A Third antient Proof urged in
Confir-

P. Clem.

P. Hugi-
nus.

Confirmation hereof, is the *Decretals* and *Institutions* of several Popes in this 2^d Cent. viz. Pope *Clement* for *Chrism*, *Consignation*, and *Confirmation*. Secondly, Pope *Hyginus* for *Gossips*, *Chrism*, and *Dedication* of Churches, upon whose Authority Mr. *Baxter* layes so much stress, that he Prints it in the front of his *Scripture-proofs*, amongst other of the *Antients*, and boastingly calls for as good proof from *Antiquity* against *Infants-baptisme*, concluding that *Gossips* could not be but for *Infants-baptism*: Though the words out of *Gracian*, as *L. Osiander* gives them, are otherwise, Cent. 2. L. 2. C. 5. viz. *In Catechisme, in Baptisme, and in Confirmation, if necessary require, there may be one Surety*, (or *Gossip*, as usually rendred) *Infants being not so much as mentioned*, having it seems *Gossips* (as hereafter you will find) in other Rites, as well as in Baptism; and for Men and Women, as well as Children.

P. Victor.

P. Pius.

Thirdly, Pope *Victor* for confining Baptism to *Easter*. Fourthly, Pope *Pius* for *Baptisterions*; The spuriousness of all which *Decretals* is learnedly by *Osiander*, *Perkins*, *Rivet*, &c. detected. And to whom I shall adde what I find.

And in Mr. Fox in his *Martyrology*, Mr. Fox. Vol. 1. P. 75. who speaking of these *Decretals*, saith judiciously, if not prophetically, viz. *Most lamentable it is, that the falsifying of such trifling Traditions, under the false pretences of Antiquity, either was begun in the Church to deceive the People, or that it hath remained so long undetected: For (saith he) I think the Church of God will never be perfectly reformed, before these Decretal Constitutions and Epistles, which have so long put on the vizard of Antiquity, shall be fully detected, and appear in their colours, wherein they were first painted.*

And concerning which the *Magdi-Magdi's. burgenses* very excellently, Cent. 2. P. III. That if it should be taken for granted, that all this was true, as is expressed in these *Decretals* of these Roman Bishops, then what could be more certain than that even now the *Mystery of Iniquity* began to work in the Church of Rome, in their so corrupting and contaminating the simple Form of Baptism, concerning which nothing is so much as mentioned of in any other Church.

The next Testimony that is alledged for *Authentick* proof in the Case, is that

Origen's
Testimony
examined.

that of *Origen* in the *Third Century*, and of which there is so much stress laid by *Austin* and others, for from him, saith *Dr. Tayler*, he only had his proof of *Apostolick Tradition*, for as yet it seems, the former *Testimonies* had not seen the Sun; his words are these, taken out of his *fifth Book* in his *Homilies* upon the *sixth Chap.* of the *Rom.* viz. *The Church received a Tradition from the Apostles, to give Baptism to Children.*

But whether this Testimony ought any more to be regarded than the former, let these following Considerations determine:

1. *Origen*
a single
Testimony.

And first it is to be considered, that if this was *Origen's* own, as it is asserted out of his supposed *Homilies* upon *Lev.* & the *Rom.* (it being mentioned in both) yet that is but one single Testimony in the Case, as *Dr. Tayler* well observes before, and that against so much positive witness to the contrary, who with one mouth do testify, that none but the *Adult* were either in the *Apostles* times, or the next *Centuries* after, baptised.

2. *Origen*
very cor-
rupt.

Secondly, His writings, or at least those that are fathered upon him, are
so

so notoriously corrupt and erroneous, as the *Magdiburgenses* do affirm in *Cent. 3. P. 262, 263, &c.* and whereof they give several instances, viz. That he was not only very *Heretical* and *blasphemous* about Christ, asserting *two Christs*, and denying his *Godhead*, who was (as *Epiphanius* saith) the very Head of the *Arrians*; but as *Jerome* saith, holding very desperately about the *Spirit*, and very corruptly about *Angels, Devils, Creation, Providence, Original Sin, Church-Government, and the Resurrection*, a fearful *Allegoriser* of *Scripture*, but desperately *Erroneous* about *Baptisme* it self, viz. First, That the very Act it self of Baptizing in Water, merits the Spirit. Secondly, That in that very Act, all Sin is taken away. Thirdly, That it enables to keep the whole Law. Fourthly, That there is to be a Baptisme after the Resurrection, to purge away Sin: And that the Baptized ought to be signed with the Sign of the Cross: And upon the 5th of *Math.* saith, Peter by promise ought to be the Foundation of the Church: and upon *Luke 17.* That Peter was the Prince of the Apostles. Whose Writings therefore, (for a great

part of them) for their Corruption, were impugned and rejected by *Jerome* and others; yea, and not only by several of the *Greek Fathers*, as *Alexandrinus*, *Epiphanius*, *Theophilus*, *Cyrenus* and others, but by some *Greek Councils* too, as appears by the *Magd. Eusebius*, and others: So that we may say of *Origen*, if these indeed were his own, as the *Magdiburgens.* say of the former *Decretals*, That they bespoke him an early Factor for Antichrist, and that the *Mystery of Iniquity* did work strongly in him; But what appears in the next Consideration, may give us to hope better of him.

Origen's
Homelies
upon Lev.
and Rom.
spurious.

But *Thirdly*, and more especially, It is to be observed, That many of *Origen's Works* fell into ill hands, and particularly those *Homelies* of *Levit.* and the *Romans*, if indeed there were any such, which *Mr. Perkins* and others doubt, because no *Greek Copies* thereof have been extant, and of which *Vossius* in his Book *De Baptis. faith*, *Sed de Origene minus laborabimus, quia quae citabimus Graece non exstant.* There being only a corrupt *Latin* piece, called a *Translation* of *Rufinus*, who ingenuously confesseth, that he

he took so much liberty in his *Translation*, as to adde and alter at his pleasure; which gives *Erasmus* so much occasion to say, That you know not when you read *Origen*, and when *Ruffinus*. And therefore are those *Homilies* rejected as spurious, and put by *Perkins* and others amongst his counterfeited Works: And well they may, if you consider the Story the *Magdiburgs* tell us of this *Ruffinus*, and his way of *Translation* and *Writing*, of which, I shall take the freedome to give you a brief account, as I find it in *Cent. 4. cap. 10. p. 1201, &c.* That you may better understand what trade was driven of this kind, and what fine *Merchants* we have to deal with about this *Romish* trash.

This *Ruffinus*, you must know, lived about the latter end of the 4. *Century*, who was an *Italian* Monk of *Aquila*, a wicked, though witty, learned Man, who went away with a famous *Roman* Curtizan into *Asia*, and sojourned at *Jerusalem* with her above thirty years; at first a great friend and companion of *Ferome's*, but afterwards when *Ferome* discovered his wickedness, especially in his abusing *Origen's* Works,

The History of Ruffinus and his Forgeries.

many whereof he translated out of *Greek* into *Latin*, sophisticating them at his pleasure, and for which, and for several *bastardy* pieces he brought forth, *Jerome*, *Anastasius*, and others write several pieces to detect and reprove him. Several corrupt *Heretical* Treatises he wrote, and fathered upon others, *viz.* One containing divers corrupt Tenents of *Origen*, he fathered upon *Pamphilia* a Martyr, who lived about the *Third* Century, the better to put it off in the *Martyrs* name; Another Book of one *Xystus* a *Pythagorean*, which he fathered upon a *Roman* Bishop and Martyr; several *Homilies* upon *Jshua*, which he fathered upon another eminent Person; A Book of the Lives of the *Monks* of *Basil*, a feigned piece; and another Book of *Monks*, innumrating a Multitude, as *Jerome* saith, that never were, and fathering *Origen's* Errors upon those that were. He made a corrupt, vicious Translation of *Josephus*, as discovered by *Gallenius* that was more faithful therein; he added two lying pieces to the History of *Eusebius* from *Constantine* to the Death of *Theodosius*, which *Socrates* reproves; and

and he wrote another frivolous Book of *Jacobs* blessing the *Patriarchs*, and an *Explanation* thereof.

By whose Impostures of this kind, you may discern what stuff was forged at the *Anichristian Anvil*, and particularly what *Credit* is to be given to this Mans Works.

Another *Traditional* Testimony, greatly boasted of, is that of *Cyprian*, about the middle of the *third Century*, in that his Epistle, said to be writ to one *Fidus* a Priest, wherein he declares his own and the judgment, as 'tis said, of Sixty six *African Bishops*, That *Children should be baptized, as well before as after the Eighth day*, with the Reasons and Grounds thereof, as at large exprest in the Epistle, viz. From the extent of Gods Grace and Salvation tendered to all, even the greatest of Sinners, therefore that Children should be baptized. Concerning which testimony of *Cyprian*, there are these things to be considered.

Cyprians
Evidence
tryed.

First, That he doth not urge the Practice of it from any *Apſtolical* Tradition or Precept, but from his own and Bishops Arguments (such as they are) to enforce the same: And truly,

if he had asserted it to have been an *Apostolical* Tradition, his word would no sooner have been taken, than when he tells us that *Chrysome* was so.

Secondly, Because there is good ground to question, whether this was *Cyprian's* and *sixty six* Bishops Conclusion. *First*, Because we meet with no such Council, neither can it appear where it was held: and if *Austin's* Argument before-mentioned be good to prove it an *Apostolical* Tradition, because no Council had determined it, it concludes against any such Council.

Secondly, That the grounds upon which the Conclusion is grounded, are so weak and frivolous. *Thirdly*, Because it

was a Doctrine so much contradicted by his great Master *Tertullian*, whom he so much revered. And therefore if you will believe *Baronius*, Tom. i.

p. 415. *Cyprian* was not for *Infants-Baptism*, as Mr. *Blackwood* observes.

Fourthly, Because other things have been fathered upon him, which were not his, as a piece called, *De Cardinalibus Operibus Christi*, by an Abbot in *France*, as *Dailly* demonstrates in his Book *De Scriptis*. p. 466. c. 39. L. 2.

But if his own, there is as little cause

to receive it as other corrupt and *Anti-very corrupt.*
christian Tenents, that are found in
 his Writings, and said to be his, viz.
 That the Church of *Rome* is the Mother
 Church. That there ought to be one
High Priest over the Church: And
 the Principle Church is *Peters*-chair,
 from whence the *Unity* of the *Priest-*
hood ariseth; And that upon *Peter* the
 Church is founded, with much more
 such stuff, which the *Magdiburgenses*
 have collected out of his Book, called
De Ordine in Ecclesia, Cent. 3. c. 4. p. 84.
 A violent impugner of *Priests* *Marria-*
ges, p. 86. In his Sermon of *Almes*
 concludes, That Sins committed after
 Baptism were done away by *Alms* and
good Works, p. 80. And again, That
 as *Water* extinguisheth *Fire*, so doth
Almes extinguish *Sin*, p. 81.

And concerning Baptism it self very
absurdly corrupt, Saying, That the
 Water ought first to be *Consecrated* by
 a *Priest*, to make it more efficacious to
 take away Sin. That the Person bapti-
 zing conferred the *Holy Spirit*, and
 the baptized was inwardly sanctified
 thereby. That *Chrysm*, or anointing
 the baptized, was absolutely necessa-
 ry, page 82.

Infants Baptism disproved.

That *Exorcismes* were also necessary to drive away the *Devil*; That *Baptism* should be done in *Temples*, and that the *Kiss* should be given by the *Priest* to the *Baptized Infant*, and that *Sprinkling* might serve instead of *Dipping*, p. 125.

By all which you may understand, that either *Cyprian* had been vilely *Ruffined*, and these things Fathered upon him, or that he himself was a notable Factor for *Antichrist*, and that in him the *Mystery of Iniquity* did very strongly work.

But we would rather believe, That these things were foisted into his Writings by that villanous cursed Generation, that so horribly abused the Writings of most of the *antient* Writers, as appears by the *Index Expurgatorius*; and who durst venture upon any Forgery, how impious soever, for the benefit of the *Holy Church*, witness that impudent Fable, as *Ostander* calls it, of the *Baptism of Constantine*, before mentioned, in the *fourth Century*, in the *first Chap. 2. Part.*

Thus you have the Principal Authorities urged for *Apollolical Tradition*, proved forged and fabulous; and
what

what doth more refute that fond conceit of the uninterrupted *Tradition*, so much boasted of, to prove this Practice, than the Testimony *Justin Martyr* gives, That the Believers were in his days the only subjects of Baptism. And the witness *Tertull.* gives against *Infants Bapt.* in the *third* Century, & the advice that *Nazianzen* gives to defer it; The *Decrees* of so many Councils to that purpose, and especially so many eminent Christians in the *fourth* Century that did not baptize their Children, till they could give an account of their Faith, as hath been before so learnedly observed by *Dailly*, *Grotius*, *Dr. B.* *Dr. Taylor* and others, and which I humbly conceive, are unanswerable Arguments against it.

But 'tis said, That by *Tertullians* opposing it, it may seem that there were some that practised it in the *third* Century, and can it be supposed that any did so, except it had been warranted by such *Apostolical* Tradition? Object.

It is granted, *Tertullian* did oppose it. But who it was that asserted it, and whether upon any such account, as supposed, is not mentioned; if any do affirm, it will be on their part to prove Answer

the one and the other, The *Magdiburgenses* and others, as you have heard, do tell us, That they meet with no instance of any that either practised this or any other of these Inventions fathered also upon Apostolical Tradition, as *Chrisme, Exorcisme, Consignation, &c.* in that Age. But 'tis said, If they did, it would demonstrate, especially in the practice of the latter, That the Mystery of Iniquity did then begin to work, in so corrupting that Ordinance of Christ, and had they not as good ground to do the one as the other?

Whereby that word of Prophecy 2 *Thes. 3.* concerning the taking place of that Mystery of Iniquity was so much fulfilled, which was to come on with all Deceivableness of Unrighteousness, and with strong Delusions to believe Lies; and which in nothing more appears than in this very thing, having not only forged so many Lyes about it, but imposed their Lyes to be believed by others. As their Forefathers, the Priests of old, that hired the Soldiers to tell a Lye about the Body of Christ, and then imposed, that their Lye to be believed, to deceive others, *Mat. 28. 12, 13, 14, 15.*

The

The consideration whereof may, I hope, be of use to *Protestants*, though as to the hardened and deluded *Papists* they are, as well observed before, utterly incurable herein.

In the next place we come to examine the *Scripture*-grounds urged for the practice, and to evince, That they have been no less mistaken in their *Scriptural*, than in their *Ecclesiastical* Authorities to found it upon, whereof we shall give you an account of some of the principal, and leave you to judge of the rest.

Scripture grounds for Infants Baptism examined.

I.

The *First* we shall mention, is that which was called (of old) the *Scripture*-*Canon* for *Infants*-Baptism, and upon which much stress hath been laid since to prove the same, viz. *Mat. 19. 14.* *Suffer little Children to come to me, and forbid them not, for to such belongs the Kingdom of Heaven.* But may we not well say, How doth *Baptism* come to be concerned in this *Text*, except it can be made out, That *blessing* was baptizing. And to which *Dr. Tayler* *D. Tayler* hath spoken so fully for us, that I need say no more, p. 230. Who saith, *From the Action of Christ's blessing Infants, to infer, that they were baptized,* proves

Mat. 19. 14.

nothing so much, as that there is a want of better Arguments: For the Conclusion would, with more probability, be derived thus; Christ blessed Children, and so dismissed them, but baptized them not, therefore Infants are not to be baptized. But let this be as weak as its enemy, Yet that Christ did not baptize them, is an Argument sufficient, that he hath other ways of bringing them to Heaven than by Baptisme; He passed an Act of Grace upon them by Benediction and Imposition of Hands. And therefore, although neither Infants, nor any Man, in puris Naturalibus, can attain to a supernatural end, without the addition of some Instrument, or means of Gods appointing, ordinarily and regularly, yet where God hath not appointed a Rule, nor an Order, as in the Case of Infants, we contend he hath not, the Argument is invalid.

And as we are sure God hath not commanded Infants to be baptized, so we are sure God will do them no injustice, nor damn them for what they cannot help; viz. If the Parent baptize them not.

Many 1000 ways there are, by which God can bring any reasonable soul to him, but nothing is more unreasonable than because

because he hath tryed all men of years and discretion to this way, Therefore we of our own heads shall carry Infants to him that way, without his direction: The conceit is poor and low, and the action consequent to it, is bold and venturous. Let him do what he pleases with Infants, we must not.

A Second Scripture that hath been much leaned upon, is that of *Joh. 3. 5.* *Joh. 3. 5.* Except a man be born of Water and the Spirit, he can in no wise enter into the Kingdom of God. From whence it is concluded, that there is no other way to regenerate and save Infants, and add them to the Church, but by Baptism; and therefore have they baptized them, as the Canons and Decretals of Popes, and the Opinions of the Antients do demonstrate.

But the Consequences drawn from hence, to infer the Baptizing and Saving of Infants, favours of so much Ignorance and Popish Darknes, that we need say little to it; for since the Reformation, most of the Protestants have protested against this as erroneous; Yet for the sake of others that yet cleave to it, saying, That in Analogy hereto, Children are hereby made Members

Members of Christ, Children of God, and Inheritors of the Kingdom of Heaven, I shall refer them to Bishop Tayler for Solution, whose words will have more weight than any thing I can say in the Case, who in p. 231. Calls such a sence of the words, a prevaricating of Christ's Precepts. For, saith he, *the Water and Spirit in this place, signifie the same thing, and by Water is meant the effect of the Spirit, cleansing and purifying the Soul, as it appears in its parallel place of Christ's Baptizing with the Spirit and with Fire.* For although this was literally fulfilled in the day of Pentecost, yet morally there is more in it, for it is the Sign of the effect of the Holy Ghost and his productions upon the Soul: And you may as well conclude, that Infants must also pass through the Fire, as through the Water. And that we may not think this a trick to elude the pressure of this place, Peter saith the same thing. For where he had said, That Baptism saves us, he adds by way of Explication (not the washing away of the filth of the Flesh, but the answer of a good Conscience towards God,) plainly saying, That it is not Water, or the purifying of the Body, but the cleansing of the

the Spirit that doth that which is supposed to be the Effect of Baptisme.

But to suppose it meant External Baptisme, yet this no more infers a necessity of Infants Baptism, than the other words of Christ infer a necessity to give them the holy Communion: Joh. 6. 53. Except you eat the flesh of the Son of Man, and drink his Blood, you have no life in you. And yet we do not think these words a sufficient Argument to Communicate them. If men therefore will do us justice; either let them give both Sacraments to Infants, as some Ages of the Church did, or neither. For the wit of man is not able to shew a disparity in the Sanction, or in the Energy of its expression. And therefore they were honest that understood the Obligation to be parallel, and performed it accordingly; and yet because we say they were deceived in one instance, and yet the Obligation (all the world cannot reasonably say but) is the same, they are honest and as reasonable that do neither: And sure the Ancient Church did, with an equal opinion of Necessity, give them the Communion; and yet men now adays do not. Why should men be more burthened with a prejudice and a name of obliquity, for

Infant Baptism disproved.

for not giving the Infants one Sacrament more than you are disliked, for not affording them the other? And farther, p. 242. If we must suppose Grace to be effected by the external work of the Sacrament alone, how doth this differ from the Opus operatum of the Papists, save that it is worse; for they say the Sacrament doth not produce its effects, but in a Suscipient disposed by all Requisites and due Preparatives of Piety, Faith, and Repentance; though in a subject so disposed; they say, the Sacrament by its own virtue doth it. But this opinion says, it doth it of it self, without the help, or so much as the co-existence of any condition, but the meer reception.

M. Baxter Mr. Baxter to this point, p. 306. of his plain Scripture-proof, That Baptism in it self can work no such Cause, for the Water is not a subject capable of receiving Grace, or of conveying it to the Soul, it cannot approach or touch the Soul, nor infuse Grace into it if it could.

Amesius in Bel. Enervat. Tom. 3. L. 2. c. 3. Outward Baptisme, saith he, cannot be a Physical Instrument of the infusing of Grace, because it bath it not in any wise in it self.

Zwingli Zwingli denieth Baptism of it self, worketh.

worketh any Grace, or pardoneth Sin,
or reneweth, as Tom. 2. p. 119, 120, 121.

Dr. Owen in his *Theolog.* l. 6 ch. 5. Dr. Owen.
p. 477. upon the point, saith, That the
Father of lies himself could not easilier
have invented a more pernicious Opini-
on or which might powre in a more deadly
poison into the minds of Sinners.

A Third Scripture insisted on, is the
Commission it self, *Mark 16. 16, He that*
believeth, and is baptized, shall be saved. Mar. 16. 16.
But Infants are Believers, Therefore
according to the Commission, they are
to be baptized. In which though all
Parties agree, yet how they do believe,
and what faith this is, there is great
confusion and contradiction.

Viz. The Antients said they had
the Faith of the Sacrament, as *Austin* :
The Papists the Faith of the Church,
as *Tho. Aquinas*, which is intailed to
all within the Pale thereof. The Lu-
therans say, they have a proper Faith,
which they hotly defended at the Con-
ference with the Calvinists at *Montpel-*
gart, and therefore Baptize all, whether
the Parents be good or bad. The Calvi-
nists say, they have an imputative Faith
from the Parent in Covenant, as *Mus-*
culus, Oecolampadius and others at that
Conference

Conference maintained, and therefore baptize only the Children of Believers.

The *Prelatick* Protestants affirm, they have the Faith of the *Gossip* or *Surety*, but none of their own, as the *Com. Catechisme* tells us: Most of the *Non-Confessors* do agree with the *Calvinists*, that it is an *imputative* Faith from the Parent, or *Pro-parent* in Covenant. Mr. *Baxter* in his *Right to Sacraments*, as before, saith, They have a *Justifying*, and Mr. *Blake* his opposite allowes but a *Dogmatical* Faith; some say it is a *Physical*, some a *Metaphysical*, and some a *Hyperphysical* Faith; some laying, as before, that Baptisme is an *Instrument* to convey *real Grace* to Infants; some say to *all*, as Mr. *Bedford* and others; some only to the *Elect*, as Dr. *Burges*: And thus you see they are not agreed in their Verdict, nor who shall speak for them. But for an Answer hereto, I shal again refer you to Dr. *Tayler*, p. 240. speaking so much my mind, and the truth herein, saith he, *Whether Infants have Faith or no, is a Question to be disputed by persons that care not how much they say, and how little they prove.*

D. Tayler

First, *Personal and Actual Faith* they
have

have none, for they have no acts of Understanding; and besides, how can any man know that they have, since he never saw any sign of it, neither was he told so by any that could tell? Secondly, Some say they have Imputative, but then so let the Sacrament be too, that is, if they have the Parents faith or the Churches, then so let Baptism be imputed also by derivation from them, and as in their Mothers Womb, and while they hang on their Mothers Breasts, they live upon their Mothers Nourishment: So they may upon the Baptism of their Parents, or their Mother the Church: For since Faith is necessary to the susception of Baptisme (and they themselves confess it by striving to find out new kinds of Faith to daub the matter up) such as the Faith, such must be the Sacrament: for there is no proportion between an actual Sacrament, and an imputative Faith; this being in immediate and necessary order to that. And whatsoever can be said to take off from the necessity of Actual Faith, all that and much more may be said to excuse from the actual susception of Baptisme. The first of these devices was that of Luther and his Scholars; the second of Calvin and his, and yet there

there is a third Device, which the Church of Rome teaches, and that is, that Infants have habitual Faith; but who told them so? How can they prove it? What Revelation or Reason teacheth any such thing? Are they by this habit so much as disposed to an actual Belief, without a new Master? Can an Infant, sent into a Mahumetan Province be more confident for Christianity, when he comes to be a Man, than if he had not been baptized? Are there any Acts precedent, concomitant, or consequent to this pretended Habit? This strange Invention is absolutely without Art, without Scripture, Reason, or Authority; But the Men are to be excused unless there were a better.

To which, saith he, this Consideration may be added, That if Baptisme be necessary to the Salvation of Infants (as the Fathers of old, and the Church of Rome and England since) upon whom is the imposition laid? To whom is the Command given? To the Parents, or the Children? Not to the Parents, for then God hath put the Salvation of innocent Babes into the Power of others, and Infants may be damned for their Fathers carelessness or malice. It follows that it

is not necessary at all to be done to them, to whom it cannot be prescribed as a Law, and in whose behalf it cannot be reasonably entrusted to others, with the apparent necessity; and if it be not necessary, it is certain it is not reasonable, and most certain it is no where in terms prescribed; and therefore it is presumed that Baptism ought to be understood and administered according as other Precepts are with reference to the capacity of the subject, and the reasonableness of the thing.

And again to this purpose, p. 242. And if any Man runs for succour to that exploded Cresphugeton, that Infants have Faith, or any other inspired Habit, of I know not what or how; we desire no more advantage in the world, than that they are constrained to answer without Revelation, against Reason, common Sense, and all the Experience in the World.

The Argum. from federal Holiness examined. The other Scriptures we shall speak to, are those that are supposed to hold out a Covenant-Right to the Children of Believers, and from whence Arguments are drawn for the Baptizing of them, which are principally, 1 Cor. 7. 14. Gen. 17. 7. compared Rom. 4. 11. and Acts 2. 39. From whence it is asserted,

4. Argum. From Federal Holiness examined.

asserted, *That the Children of Believers being a holy Seed, and in Covenant, that to them therefore belong the Seals of the Covenant, which we shall examine with care and circumspection; so much stress being laid thereon. And as previous to our Answer thereto, shall in the place take notice, that this way of arguing hath been the new way, which since the Reformation hath been taken up to prove Infants-Baptism by.*

Antiquity
of the
Argum.
from Fe-
deral Ho-
liness.

For when the unsoundness and rottenness of the antient ground of *Infants-Baptisme* appeared, they being loath to part with the Tradition, endeavoured to build it upon this new Foundation; for when it was discovered that *Infants* might be saved without *Baptism*, and that they were not damned if they died without it, and that the Sacrament did not give Grace by the bare work done, nor took not away *Original Sin*, it was high time to lay a new Foundation for it, or else it would have fallen, therefore is this new way of Covenant-Holiness found out, upon which our *Congregational-Men*, especially both in *Old* as well as *New-England* seem to go, of which *Zwinglius* about 120 years since, forasmuch as I can learn, was the

the first Founder, wherein he was singular from all that went before him. And which he seems himself to owne in his Book of Baptisme, Tom. 2. fol. 57. Saying, *That all those who have from the Apostles times written of Baptisme, have not in a few things erred from the scope*; he having it seems, found out a way freer from Error and Exception, than all the Tracts of the Antients.

Having observed to you the Antiquity of this new Foundation, we shall in the next place weigh and consider the Arguments themselves.

The First and chiefest is from 1 Cor. 14. *Else were your Children unclean, now are they holy.* From whence this Argument is raised, *The Arguments from Fœderal-holiness examined.*

That they who are holy with a Covenant-holiness, may be baptized: But the Infants of believers are holy with a Covenant-holiness, or it is said in the Text, but now are they; therefore they may be baptized. 1 Cor. 7. 4.

In which Argument we have these two things asserted, but not at all proved. First, that the holiness in the Text is a Federal, or Covenant holiness. Secondly, that Federal or Covenant holiness qualifies Infants for Baptisme. Both which are positively denied upon the following grounds.

First,

Infant Baptism disproved.

First, Because the Holiness in the Text, be it what it will, whether *Moral, Federal, or Matrimonial*, is neither here, or elsewhere, assigned to be a ground of baptizing Children upon; it being only the ground laid down in the Institution that can warrant the same.

The *Female*, as well as the *Male* Children, under the Law, had all of them a *Legal or Federal* Holiness, yet must none of them be Circumcised, because God had not so ordained; And for twenty Generations before the Law, Circumcision was neither administered to *Male or Female* for the like Reason. It being Gods Word only, not our Reason, or the *Inventions or Persuasions* of Learned Men that can warrant our practice in Gods Ordinances. That Profession of Faith and Repentance is a substantial ground to Baptize upon, is undeniably proved from Scripture, and consented to by themselves. But that *federal Holiness*, or any other Qualification in Infants, is any Scriptural ground for the same, is yet to be proved, this Text being altogether silent herein.

But Secondly, If it should be granted that *Federal Holiness* was a ground to baptize

Infants Baptism disproved.

191

Baptize Children upon under the Gospel, as it was to circumcise them under the Law, which must not be owned by any means. Yet from substantial Arguments it will appear, that no such Holiness is intended here.

No such
Federal
Holiness;
in the
N. T.

First, Because there is no such Holiness in the *New Testament*, as a federal Holiness belonging to Children, That because the Parents are Believers, and in the *New Covenant*, their *Natural* Seed must therefore be so esteemed, and have the like right thereby to the *Evangelical*, as the Children under the Law had to the *Legal* Ordinances; which, as no where to be found, so not to be admitted upon the following Considerations.

1. Because it contradicts the Gospel Dispensation as before.

2. Because such apprehensions intails Grace to Nature, Regeneration to Generation; in contradiction to that of our Saviour, *John 3*. That which is born of the flesh, is flesh. And that we are all the Children of wrath by Nature, *Eph. 2*.

3. Because it contradicts all the experience, both of former and latter times,

times, wherein Godly Men have had Wicked Children, and wicked Men good Children; as *Abraham* had an *Ishmael*, *Isaac* an *Esaú*, *David* an *Abshom*; and on the contrary wicked *Ahaz* begat good *Hezekiah*, wicked *Abia* good *Asa*, wicked *Amon* good *Josiah*.

4. Because it necessitates an owning the Doctrine of *Falling from Grace*.

2. The Text intends another Holiness, viz. A Civil or Matrimonial Holiness, viz. Matrimonial.

1. From the scope of the place.

Secondly, Because the Text intends another Holiness, viz. A Civil or Matrimonial Holiness in opposition to Fornication, Uncleanness, Bastardy. And which doth fully appear, First, From the Scope of the place; The Question propounded by the Believing *Corinthians* for Solution was, Whether their new Spiritual Relation to Christ, in the Gospel, did not dissolve their Carnal Relation entered into in Unbelief; and whether they could, without defilement, maintain their Converse without Sin any more than they could in *Ezra* and *Nehemiah's* time?

To which the Apostle replies, That the Civil Relation, before orderly entered into, was clean now, as before; The unbelieving Husband is as much clean and sanctified to his believing Wife; and that she might as freely converse with him in the Conjugal State now as before the Spiritual difference happened betwixt them. For Religion breaks no Bands nor Civil Contracts, They being as true Man and Wife as before the Marriage, as Honourable as before. And therefore the Apostle adviseth

adviseeth that they should abide in the state and Calling, Religion findeth them in, *Ver. 20.* And that by no means the believer should depart, and upon that account break the Relation, but that he should maintain his Civil, in expectation of gaining her over to a spiritual Relation. And in confirmation hereof brings an Argument *ab absurdo*; for otherwise the Children that they had together would be unclean, *viz.* if they should depart from their Relations from the unlawfulness of the Marriage, and uncleanness of the bed, what would they make their Children but Bastards, or unclean. But in as much as they had no question of their legitimacy or holiness; neither had they any cause to scruple the other. And farther also, the believer had the least ground to doubt hereof; because to him all lawfull things are clean, whether Husband, Wife, Child, Estate, &c. which is all the Holiness I conceive can be meant in the Text agreeable to the Holiness, *1 Thes. 4. 3, 4. & Mal. 2. 15.* the Bastard being amongst the unclean and unholy, *Deut. 32. 2.* as Mr. Calvin upon *Mal. 2. 15.* saith well, namely.

Believers Baptisme proved.

Wherefore hath God made one? to wit seeking a Seed of God, a Seed of God is here taken for Legitimate, as the Hebrews do name that Divine, which is pure from any fault or spot, therefore he sought a Seed of God, that is appointed Marriage from whence should be born a Legitimate and pure Offspring; secretly therefore doth the Prophet here shew, that they are all Bastards that shall be born by Poligamy; because they neither can, nor ought to be accounted legitimate but they who are begotten according to Gods institution; but where the Husband violates the faith given to the wife, and takes to himself another, as he perverts the order of Marriage; so also he cannot be a lawfull father; thus Calvin.

2. The holiness the same spoken to be in the unbeliever.

A second Argument, why it is a Holiness of this kind, and not such a federal Holiness as suggested; because the Holiness of the Children is of no other nature, then that spoke of the unbelieving Parent in the Text, and if one will intitle to the Ordinance so the other.

A third is from the consideration that Children in the Text, is not to be limited to Infants, or such Children that they might have since the Religious difference

difference happened, but of grown Children; for a Mans Child is his Child whilst he lives, though 30, 40, or 50 years old; and we suppose it would be as absurd to say, a Heathenish Son should be baptized upon a federal Holiness, as to say the unbelieving Parent should so be.

3. *Children noe to be taken for Infants only,*

A fourth Argument, why this cannot be a new Covenant-holiness that must qualifie and intitle to Baptisme; first, because that cannot be known; for if the Parent professing faith be a Hypocrite, and not in Covenant themselves, then may you baptize a wrong subject as well as a right one.

4. *But it cannot be known.*

And secondly, such an absurdity would follow, that no unbelievers Child is in Covenant or Elect, which is notoriously false; for as before *Hezekiah* was the Son of wicked *Ahaz*, and *Asha* of *Abia*, and *Josiah* the Son of wicked *Amon*.

Thirdly from the concurrent Testimony and Confession of many learned Commentators, and parties themselves.

3. *From the confession of Commentators upon the*

Austin.

Austin, a great asserter of Infants Baptisme, as before, saith hereupon. It is to be held without doubting, whatsoever that Sanctification was, it was not of power to make Christians, and remit sins.

Jerom saith, Because of Gods appointment, Marriage is Holy.

Ambrose

Ambrose thus upon the place; The Children are Holy, because they are born of lawful Marriage.

Melanc.

Melancton in his Commentary upon the place thus. Therefore Paul answers, that the Marriages are not to be pulled asunder, for their unlike opinions of God; if the impious Person do not cast away the other, and for comfort he adds as a Reason, The unbelieving Husband is sanctified by the believing Wife; meat is sanctified, for that which is Holy in use, that is granted to believers from God; so here he speaks the use of Marriage to be Holy, and to be granted of God, things prohibited under the Law, as Swines flesh, and a Woman in her pollution were called unclean. The Connexion of the Argument is this, If the use of Marriage should not please God, your Children would be Bastards, and so unclean: But your Children are

not Bastards, therefore the use of Marriage pleaseth God, and how Bastards were unclean in a peculiar manner, the Law shews, Deut. 23.

Musculus in his Comment upon the place, confesseth, That he had abused formerly that place against the Anabaptists, but found it impertinent to that purpose.

Muscul.

Camerarius in his Commentary upon the place, saith, (For the unbelieving Husband hath been sanctified an unusual change of the Tense, that is) sanctified in the lawfull use of Marriage; for without this, saith he, it would be that their Children should be unclean, that is infamous, and not Legitimate; who so are Holy, that is during the Marriage, are without all blot of ignominy.

Camerar.

Erasmus upon the place, saith thus. Infants born of such Parents, as the one, being a Christian, the other not, are holy legitimately; for the conversion of either wife or Husband doth not dissolve the Marriage which was made, when both were in unbelief.

Erasm.

And to which we might add many more; for as a learned searcher into this Controversie affirmeth, that

all the ancients went this way, and that none ever affirmed this new way of ſædral Holineſſ till the Controverſie of Anabaptiſts in *Germany* aroſe, Mr. *Tombes* in his *Examen* 82.

Object.

But you give another ſence of the word Holy then is to be found in Scripture; for no where is Holy the ſame with Legitimate, but throughout the Bible (yea in 600. places ſaith Mr. *Sydnam*, and Mr. *Baxter* again and again) Holineſſ is taken for a ſeparation to God, but never in a common ſence.

Anſw.

To which I answer firſt, That ſuppoſe it was ſo, that the word in all places but this ſhould have another ſence, it followeth not but it may have this ſence properly enough here, the ſcope of the place leading to it. As for Example, the word ἐξουσία, ſignifying authority or power in all other places; yet in the 1 Cor. 11 15. is rendered a Vail: So the word בֵּרַךְ that generally; and in moſt other places is tranſlated to *bleſs*, death in Job 1. 5, 11. & 2. 9. ſignifie a quite contrary ſence, namely to *Curſe*, and of which
we

we might give you many Instances, but let one more serve for all in the very word it self, viz. *וְקָדְשׁ* which generally signifieth *Holiness*; yet in *Dent. 23. 17. Hosea 4. 14. 2 Kings 23. 17.* is rendred *Whoredom* or *Sodomy*.

And *secondly*, neither are we to seek of some parallel place. where the word *Holy* signifieth this sort of *Holiness*, viz. *Matrimonial* or *Conjugal Holiness*, *Mal. 2. 15.* a Holy Seed, viz. a *Legitimate Seed*, as *Calvin* and *Camer*, and others enlarge upon it in opposition to *Bastardy* or unholy; for so were *Bastards* to be esteemed, *Dent. 23. 17.* And so *1 Thes. 4. 3, 4, 5.* This is the will of God, even your sanctification, that you should abstain from fornication, that every one should know how possess his Vessel in sanctification and honour, as 'tis said of the *Young men*, *1 Sam. 21. 5.* and not in the lust of *Concupiscence*, &c. Where *Holiness* is put in opposition to *uncleanness* and *fornication*.

But *Thirdly*, neither can *Matrimonial Holiness* be said not to be a *separation* to God; for it is no other then a setting apart according to Gods *Ordinance*, and which is called honourable,

(or in this sence holy) and that too all whereby Men and Women are dedicated and devoted to each other by mutual solemn contract, according to Gods Institution, that of two they may be made one, and fill up a Relation to the Holy ends God appointed, *viz.* to prevent uncleanness for mutual help and propagation: And though we do not call a Marriage a Sacrament with the Papists, yet we own it an honourable and holy state, Gods Ordinance having made it so.

Object.

But this seems to be a sence contrary to the *express words*; for is it not said that the unbelieving Husband is sanctified *by the Wife*, which is a sanctification derived from the *Believer*.

Ans.

To which I Answer, that the word [*ev*] translated [*by*] should be rendered [*to*] as it is *Gal. 1. 16*, [*to me*] *2. P. 2. 5.* [*to faith*] *Acts 4. 12.* [*to men*] which the scope over-rules, and which must needs be so here, which Mr. *Marshall grants Tombs Ex. P. 79.* for in no sence can ~~he~~ be sanctified by her: for he is not spiritually sanctified, being as yet an *unbeliever*; and one Argument therefore of the *Wives* remaining to endeavour to convert him:

Re

Nei-

Neither can it be a *federal Holiness*, for that by this Argument would intitle him to Baptisme as well as the Children; nor can it be proper to say, the unbeliever is sanctified in a Matrimonial sanctification by his believing Wife for that is only so by Gods appointment; therefore must it necessarily be to the Wife, viz. to her use and lawfull enjoyment, as Food and Rayment, and all Gods blessings are, it being not as [Mr. Marshal grants] a Holiness of State, but of use, and therefore she did not sin in continuing in the station and place Religion found her, which is the Answer to the *Scripture*.

But is it not said, now are your Children holy? implying some present alteration for good to them, upon the change of the state of the Parent, which did not belong to them before.

Object 3.

To which Beza's sence of the words may be a very proper Answer, viz. That the word (is not to be understood an Adverb of Time, but a Conjunction that is wont to be used in the assumptions of Arguments; and so the sence is [but now] that is, for as much as the unbelieving Husband is sanctified to the Wife, your Children are holy, that is lawfully begotten and born.

Answer.

Therefore notwithstanding your difference in Religion, that although he be an Idolater, and you a Christian, yet the civil state lawfully entered into before this alteration may be converted in without sin: For if the Believer should depart, and break the Relation, it was either for the defect of the first Band or Tie, or for unequal yoking with Infidels, as in *Ezra's* time. But as to the latter, there being no such Law to the Gentiles to put away Wives and Children upon that account. And to the former you having no doubt of the Legitimacy of your Children, but take it for granted they are Holy, neither need you doubt of your lawfull Marriage state, your new Relations infringing neither: Therefore from the Holiness both of Bed and Birth continue together, and let not the believing Husband put away his unbelieving Wife; nor let not the believing Wife depart from her unbelieving Husband, which is all the Holiness that is found in this Text. and no such thing as a federal Holiness, Though if there was, it would be no ground to Baptize an Infant upon, as before:



The Arguments from Circumcision Examined.

Another, and none of the least Arguments that is urged to prove Infants Baptisme by, is from pretended Consequences, from the Covenant made with Abraham, Gen. 17.

From whence it is thus argued.

THose to whom the Gospel Covenant belonged, to them the Seal thereof appertained; but to Believers and their Seed, the Gospel Covenant belonged; as Gen. 17. 7. I'll be a God to thee, and to thy Seed; and Acts 2. 39. The Promise is to you and your Children.

Therefore to them the Seal thereof Circumcision so called, Rom. 4. 11. did appertain, Gen. 17. 10. For the Federati were to be Signati, those in the

The Argument from Circumcision

Covenant were to have the Seal thereof. And therefore by Consequence it naturally followeth, That if Circumcision, the Seal of the Gospel Covenant belonged to the Seed of Believers under the Law, then doth the Gospel Seal, Baptisme, much more appertain to the Seed of Believers under the Gospel, which comes in the Place, Room, and Use of Circumcision, otherwise the priviledge under the Gospel, would be less then that of the Law; should Children be denied such a benefit.

Answer. That this is falacious, and false reasoning, (and that there is no natural Consequence at all from this Scripture, to infer the Baptizing of Infants; nor any ground to build the Gospel-Ordinance Baptisme, upon the command of the Legal-Ordinance Circumcision) may fully appear by examining the following particulars, which are begged, but not proved in the Argument.

1. *Whether Circumcision, called here the Gospel Seal, did of old belong to all in Gospel-Covenant.*

2. *Whether the new (or Gospel) Covenant, and that mentioned Gen 17. be one and the same.*

3. *Whether*

3. *Whether the Seed mentioned was Abrahams Natural or Spiritual Seed.*

4. *Whether Circumcision was a Seal of the new Covenant to the Children under the Law.*

5. *Whether Circumcision was administered to Believers as Believers, and to their Seed only.*

6. *Whether Baptisme did succeed in the Place, Room and Use of Circumcision.*

7. *Whether the not baptizing Infants makes the priviledges under the Gospel, less then the Circumcising them under the Law.*

To the first, *Whether Circumcision called the Gospel-Seal did belong of old to all in Gospel-Covenant.*

'Tis answered, that the contrary doth manifestly appear upon a double account; 1. Because some that were in the Gospel-Covenant were not Sealed; and 2dly. some that were out of the Covenant were Sealed therewith.

1. There were many persons in Covenant that were not Circumcised, that were *Fæderati*, but not *Signati*; as for instance, all the Believers from Adam to Abraham, who received no such Seal; nor 2dly. did any of the Believers

Circumcision, nor the Seal of the Gospel Covenant to all Believers.

1. Many in Covenant not Sealed with it.

lievers out of *Abrahams* Family, as *Lot*, *Melchisedeck*, *Job*, that we read of, received any such *Seal*; neither 3dly. did any of the believing *Families* in any Age receive it.

2. Many out of the Covenant they were Sealed.

And 2dly. there were some to whom the *Covenant* did not belong, that received that called the *Seal of Circumcision*: For of *Ishmael* God had said, that this *Covenant* was not to be established with him, but with *Isaak*, and yet he was *Circumcised*, *Gen.* 17. 20, 21, 25. *Gal.* 4. 29. 30. And the same may be said of *Esau*, *Rom.* 9. 10, 11, 12. 13. And as to all the *Strangers* in *Abrahams* House, or bought with Money in *Israel*, that were *Circumcised*, it may well be doubted whether the *New Covenant Promises* did belong to them.

To the second, whether the *New Covenant*, and that mentioned in *Gen.* 17. be the same.

In answer whereto it must be understood, That as *Abraham* by Promise stood in a double Capacity, viz. The Father of a Nation, viz. the Natural *Israelites*; so to be also a Father of many Nations, comprehending the *Spiritual Israel*, whether *Jews* or *Gentiles* through

2. The Covenant in *Gen.* 17 is mixt Covenant as the Seed was.

throughout the world; and so accordingly the Promises were of two sorts, sometimes respecting his *Natural Seed*, whether *Domestick* or *National*, who were Typical of the *Spiritual*, as the Birth of *Isaac*, the deliverance of his *Posterity* out of *Egypt*, the possessing of the *Land of Canaan*, with many outward *Temporal Blessings*, and benefits annexed thereto, as *Gen. 15. 13. 18. 17. 8. 15. 16. Acts 7. 3, 4, 5, 6.*

And others again respecting in a peculiar manner the *Spiritual Seed*, the Family, of the faithful, viz. the *Elect*, of whom through Christ he was Father, and which are Evangelical, and in an especial manner belonging to the new Covenant, as *Gen. 12. 3. 18. 18. In thee shall all Nations be blessed*, which is called a Gospel-promise, *Gal. 3. 8, 9. so Gen. 15. 5. So shall thy Seed be, Gen. 17. 5. A Father of many Nations.* And Verse the 8th. *To be his God, and the God of his Seed.* And therefore must the mind of Wisdom rightly distinguish, and truly apply the Promises that are many times so mixed, that the one may be taken for the other, and sure I am, much of the mistake and error

error lies here in this very thing, by applying that to the one, which belongs to the other.

3. The
Seed in
the 7th.
Verse the
Spiritual
Seed only.

But 3^{dly}. *What Seed of Abraham is it to whom the Promise doth belong? In the 7th. Verse, Whether the Natural or Spiritual, and who those Children of Promise, Acts 2. 39.*

To the clearing the first, namely, That of the Seed, Verse the 7th. I shall refer you to the Exposition it self, the Scripture hath given us hereof, with the concurring sence of many judicious Expositors, and all of them parties themselves.

1. The Scriptures expounding this
Gal. 3. 16 Text are Gal. 3. 16. Now to Abraham
and his Seed were the Promises made;
he saith not to Seeds as of many, but as
of one, and to thy Seed which is Christ;
And therefore saith Ver. 29. If you be
Christs, then are you Abrahams Seed
& Heirs according to Promise, and farther,
Ro. 9. 7, 8 Rom. 9. 7, 8. Neither because they are the
Seed of Abraham are they all Children;
but in Isaac shall thy Seed be called;
that is, they which are the Children of
the Flesh. These are not the Children of
God; but the Children of the Promise
are counted for the Seed, And Rom. 4.

13, 14. For the promise that he should Rom. 4.
be the Heir of the world, was not to 13, 14.
Abraham, or to his Seed through the Law,
but through the Righteousness of faith;
for if they which are of the Law be
Heirs, faith is made void, and the Promise
made of none effect.

Which so fully confirms the Seed
here mentioned, to whom the Promise
belonged, not to be the Carnal but
Spiritual Seed, and in farther confir-
mation thereof, you have these follow-
ing Authors, and all of them Pædo-
baptists, viz.

Calvin upon Gen. 17. 7. saith, That Calvin,
it is manifest that the Promise under-
stood of Spiritual blessing, pertaineth not
to the Carnal Seed of Abraham, but
to the Spiritual; as the Apostle himself
saith, Rom. 4. & 9. Chap. For if you
understand the Carnal Seed, (saith
he) then that Promise will belong to
none of the Gentiles. but to those alone
who are begotten of Abraham, and Isaac
according to the Flesh, Estius Ann. Gen.
17. 7.

Ainsworth on Gen. 12. 7. [thy Seed] Ainsw.
That is, all the Children of Promise,
(the Elect) who only are counted Abra-
hams Seed, Rom. 9. 7, 8. And in Christ

are Heirs by Promise, as well the Gentiles as the Jews.

Dr. Owen

Dr. Owen in his Book called the Doctrine of Saints perseverance, in Chap. 4. arguing from the Covenant of Grace, to prove the unchangableness of the love of God, begins with Gen. 17. 7. saying, That the effectual dispensation of the Grace of the Covenant is peculiar to them only, who are the Children of Promise; the Remnant of Abraham according to Election, with all that in all Nations were to be blessed by him and his Seed Jesus Christ; Ishmael though Circumcised, was to be put out; and not to be Heir with Isaac, and a little after he writes thus; what blessing then was here made over to Abraham. All the blessings saith he that from God are conveyed in and by his seed Jesus Christ, in whom both he and we are blessed, are wrapped therein, what they are, the Apostle tells you, Eph. 1. 13. They are all Spiritual blessings, if perseverance, if the continuance of the love and favour of God towards us be a Spiritual blessing, both Abraham and all his Spiritual Seed, all faithfull ones, throughout the world are blessed with it in Jesus Christ, and if Gods continuing to be a God to them
for

for ever, will enforce this blessing, (being but the same thing in another expression) it is here likewise asserted.

Amesius de Prædest. Chap, 8. Ser. 6. Amesius.
 faith, There are many of the Seed of Abraham, to whom the word of Promise doth not belong, as Ishmael and Ishmaelites. But if so, there be many of the Seed of Abraham; to whom the word of Promise doth not belong; Then the rejection of many Jews who are of the Seed of Abraham doth not make void the word of Promise. From whence may we not safely conclude, that if the natural Posterity of Abraham, were not within the Covenant of Grace by virtue of the Promise, Gen. 17. 7, Then much less are our natural Posterity; but the former is true, Rom. 9. 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12. so is the latter.

To which we might add divers others, but let these suffice.

And from the contrary perswasion what dismal Consequences would arise. For if God made his Covenant of Grace with the Posterity of Believers, as this Doctrine asserts. Then all the Posterity of Believers should certainly have Grace bestowed upon them; for it is the Covenant of God which doth convey

The evil
 Conse-
 quences
 of the
 contrary:

convey Grace, Rom. 4. 16. 2 Cor, 1. 30. None missing of Grace from Gods faithfulness, which Mr. Blake doth so *Mr. Bla.* confidently affirm, P. 6. saying, *That Christianity is hereditary, that as the Children of a Noble man is Noble, the Child of a Free man Free, of a Turk a Turk, and of a Jew a Jew; so the Child of a Christian is a Christian,* in contradiction not only of Scripture, which saith, we are Children of wrath by Nature, but of all former and latter experience.

Then would Grace be a Birth, Priviledge, and Regeneration (as before) tyed to Generation, contrary to Jo. 3. 3. & Jo. 1. 12, 13.

Then must all the Posterity of Believers be saved, without you will necessitate the Doctrine to be true, that men may fall from Grace.

Then must we tie up and confine the Grace of Gods Covenant to the Children of Believers only, and then what hope for the Children of unbelievers, contrary to the Experience of all Ages. For was not Grace extended to the Gentiles, who were not the Children of Believers when the natural Branches

the Children of believing *Abraham* were cut off.

Then is the Covenant of Grace it self overthrow, concluding an Interest without faith, *Rom. 4. 14.* deriving a Title by natural Generation.

And as to the other Scripture of the 2. *Acts 38, 39.* urged as a Parallel to the other. It is so indeed, rightly understood, but not at all in the sense supposed.

*Act. 2.
38. ansr.*

For first it is to be observed, that the promise there made, is the giving the Spirit, called the promise of the Father, prophecied of by *Joel 2. 28.* and doth follow the receiving of Christ in the Gospel, *Eph. 1. 13. Gal. 3. 14.* and the obeying his commands, *Acts 5. 32.* Therefore in the 38. *Ver. Peter* exhorts them to Repentance, and faith in order to the receiving of it; because the Promise is to them and their Children, viz. to the *Jews*, and to them that are afar off to the Gentiles also, even as many of both as the Lord should call, therefore the Promise is not made but upon condition of Calling, and Faith, and Baptisme.

Secondly,

Secondly, It is remarkable that the Apostle doth first exhort to Repentance, then to Baptisme, shewing the order that Christ had directed to in the Commission; neither is the Promise mentioned, as though of it self it gave right to Baptisme without Repentance, but as a Motive why they should repent and be baptized, that they might also as others had done, before their Eyes be made partakers of the Holy Spirit, which the Prophets had foretold, and Christ had promised, wherein Infants [neither capable of Faith, Repentance and Calling] are not concerned in the Text, and by Children spoken of are no other meant, then the posterity of, the Jews, for who knows not that they are so called, and that my Child is my Child, though 40. or 50. years old; upon which Text Dr. Ham-

mond in his *Resolution concerning Infants Baptisme*, Sect. 81. hath to this purpose. In the next place, saith he, is attempted the disproving of all Arguments brought in defence of Pedobaptisme from Peters words, Acts 2. 39. To which saith the Dr. I answer, That if any have made use of that unconcludene Argument, I have nothing to say in defence

sence of them; I think the practise is founded upon better Basis then so, and the word Children there is really the posterity of the Jews, and not particularly their Infant Children.

And Dr. Tabor upon this Scripture, *Dr. Tal.*
 Page 233. saith, That the words mentioned in St. Peters Sermon, (which are the only Records of the Promise) are interpreted upon a weak mistake. The Promise belongs to you and your Children, therefore Infants are actually receptive of it in that capacity; that is, the Argument, but the Reason of it is not yet discovered, nor ever will; for [to you and your Children] is to you and your Posterity, to you and your Children, when they are of the same capacity, in which you are receptive of the Promise. But he that whenever the word [Children] is used in Scripture, shall by [Children] understand Infants, must needs believe, that in all Israel there were no men but all were Infants, and if that had been true, it had been the greater wonder they should overcome the Anakims, and beat the King of Moab, and march so far, and discourse so well; for they were all called the Children of Israel.

The

The fourth thing to be inquired into, is, *Whether Circumcision was a Seal of the new Covenant to the Believers, and their Seed?*

Circumcision only a Seal to Abraham not to Believers, nor their Seed.

To which I answer in the Negative, that it was neither a Seal to them, nor much less a Seal to them of the new Covenant. It is true, it was a Seal, Confirmation, or Ratification of the faith that Abraham had long before he was Circumcised; but so could it not be said of any Infant that had no faith. It was a Sign put into the Flesh of the Infant; but a Sign and Seal only to Abraham witnessing to him, that he not only had a justifying faith, but to the truth of the Promises, viz. *That he should be the father of many Nations, Gen. 12. 23. 2dly. The father of the faithful, Rom 4. 11. Heir of the World, Rom. 4. 13. That in him all the Families of the Earth should be blessed, viz. in Christ proceeding from him which was no wayes true of any Infant that ever was Circumcised; for none had before their Circumcision such a faith, that intitled them to such singular Promises; the scope in that place in the 4. Rom. being to shew, That Abraham himself was not justified*

sed by works; no not by Circumcision, but by faith which he had, long before he was Circumcised, and so but a Seal or Confirmation of that faith which he had before, and to assure him of the truth of those special Promises, made to him and his Seed both Carnal and Spiritual.

And to which purpose you have both *Chrysoft.*
Chrysoftome and *Theophylact*, as Mr. *and The.*
Lawr. P. 168. viz. It was called a
Seal of the Righteousness of Faith; be-
cause it was given to Abraham as a Seal
and Testimony of that Righteousness,
which he had acquired by faith: Now
this seems to be the priviledge of Abra-
ham alone, and not to be transferred
to others, as if Circumcision in whom
ever it was, were a Testimony of Di-
vine Righteousness; for as it was the
priviledge of Abraham. that he should
be the Father of all the faithfull, as
well Circumcised as uncircumcised,
being already the father of all uncircum-
cised, having faith in Uncircumcision, he
received first the sign of Circumcision,
that he might be the father of the Cir-
cumcised. Now because he had this pri-
viledge, in respect of the Righteousness
which he had acquired by faith, therefore
 L the

the sign of Circumcision was to him a Seal of the Righteousness of faith: But to the rest of the Jews it was a sign that they were Abraham's Seed; but not a Seal of the Righteousness of faith, as all the Jews also were not the fathers of many Nations.

Secondly, Much less was Circumcision a Seal of the new Testament, as before; for nothing is a Seal thereof, but the Holy Spirit, Eph. 1. 13. 4. 30.

Thirdly, Neither is Baptisme more then Circumcision called a Seal; It is called a Figure, 1 Pet. 3. 21. And it is a sign as before: But a sign and figure proper only to men of understanding, representing Spiritual things and Mysteries; And not as Circumcision, which was a sign not improper for Infants; because it left a signal impression in their flesh to be remembered all their days, but so cannot Baptisme be to any Infants.

5. Circumcision not administered only to believers & their seed
The fifth thing to be examined is, Whether Circumcision was administered to Believers as Believers, and to their Seed after them; as such, to which Baptisme was to Correspond.

It is answered by no means; for it was an Ordinance, which by the institution

tution belonged to all the natural Linage, and posterity of *Abraham* good or bad, without any such limitation, as was put upon Baptisme, *If thou believest with all thy Heart thou mayst*, Acts 8. or any such qualification to an Infant capable to receive it, that he should have a believing Parent; but will you deny *Abraham* to be a believing Parent? and was not he a Father to them all? What then! he was a publick common Father, which reaches not the case in hand; for he was no such father to them; neither have they any other in his stead, therefore the Analogy holds not; yet if they had, would it avail? for that Priviledge would not stand the natural Children of *Abraham* in any stead to admit them to Baptisme; which though they claimed upon that account, *Mat. 3. John* rejects them upon it calling them a *Generation of Vipers*, bidding them bring forth fruits meet for Repentance, and which only would give them admittance to the Baptisme of Repentance, and that it was not enough to say they had *Abraham* for their father. And to the same purpose doth our Saviour tell *Nicodemus* a Mr. in *Israel*, that with-

out the *new Birth* his Birth-priviledge would not avail him in the *Gospel-priviledges*, Joh. 3. and with more severity doth he tell the *Jews*, that however they bore up themselves, as the Sons of *Abraham*, yet without believing in Christ, who could only make them free, they were *Bond-slaves* to sin, and the Children of the *Devil*.

6. Baptism came not in the room, place, & use of Circumcision.

1. Not in the room and stead

The sixth thing to be searched after is, *Whether Baptisme did succeed in the Room, Place and use of Circumcision*. To which I answer by no means, for the following Reasons.

1. Not in the room and stead.

1. Because then only Males, not Females, would be baptized; because no other Circumcised, but all believing women, as well as men, were to be baptized, *Acts* 8. 12, 16. 14. 15.

2. Because then some, not all Believers, should be baptized; because not only women, as before, were not admitted; but all Believers out of *Abrahams* Family, to whom he was a Spiritual father; because he was a Believer before he was Circumcised, *Rom.* 4. 11,

12. Whereas all Believers according to the

the Commission were to be baptized.

3. Because then the Circumcised needed not to have been baptized, if they had been already sealed with the new Covenant-seal: But Christ himself, and all his Apostles, and so many of the Churches were Circumcised, yet nevertheless were baptized.

2. Not to the ends and uses neither as 2. *Not to* suggested upon the following grounds, *the ends*

1. Because Circumcision was a sign *and uses.* of Christ to come in the flesh; and Baptisme, that he was already come in the flesh, witnessing to his Incarnation, Death, Burial, and Resurrection.

2. Circumcision was to be a partition Wall betwixt Jew and Gentile; but Baptisme testified the contrary, viz. That *Barbarian, Scythian, Bond and Free, Jew and Gentile, Male or Female,* were all one in Christ. *Cornelius* the Gentile must be baptized, and have the Spirit given to witness, that nothing must be called common or unclean, where God had purified the Heart by believing.

3. Circumcision initiated the Carnal Seed into the Carnal Church, and gave them right to the Carnal Ordinances;

ces; but Baptisme was to give the Spiritual Seed an orderly entrance into the Spiritual Church, and a right to partake of the Spiritual Ordinances.

4. Circumcision was to be a Bond and Obligation to keep the whole Law of *Moses's*; but Baptisme witnessed that *Moses* Law was made void, and that only Christ's Law was to be kept.

5. Circumcision was administred to all *Abrahams* natural Seed, without any profession of Faith, Repentance or Regeneration; whereas Baptisme to be administred to the Spiritual Seed of *Abraham*, was only upon profession of Faith, Repentance and Regeneration, and which appears more fully by the following Instances compared.

1. Because a Carnal Parent, and a fleshly begetting by ~~the~~ the Legal Birth-priviledge, gave right to Circumcision; whereas a Spiritual begetting by a Spiritual Parent, gave only a true right to Baptisme.

2. Because a Legal, Ecclesiastical, Typical Holiness (when Land, Mountains, Houses, Birds, Beasts, and Trees were holy) qualified for Circumcision; whereas only Evangelical and Personal
Holi-

Holiness was a meet qualification for Baptisme.

3. Because Strangers and Servants bought with Money, and all ignorant Children of Eight days old, yea Trees were capable of Circumcision; whereas only men of understanding that were capable to believe with all their Heart, and to give an account thereof with their mouths, were to be esteemed capable Subjects of Baptisme.

6. Circumcision was to be a sign of Temporal Blessings and Benefits to be enjoyed in the Land of *Canaan*; whereas Baptisme was to be a sign (as before) of many Spiritual benefits, *viz.* Remission of sins, Justification, Sanctification here, and Eternal salvation hereafter.

It is granted there are in some things an Analogy betwixt the one and the other, both signifying Heart-Circumcision, and an initiating into the Church, though as a different Church; so different Subjects, and Church-Members, upon different grounds, and to different ends, as before, and in a far different manner; one to be done in a private House, and by a private Hand,

and the other in some publick place, and by the hand of some publick Minister appointed by the Church to administer the same.

But now because there is some Analogy in some things, is there therefore ground to conclude, it cometh into the room, stead, and use thereof? by no means; for by the same Argument we may as well conclude, that it cometh in the room and stead of the *Ark, Manna, Rock, &c.* And from such-like Arguments drawn from *Analogies* what Jewish Rites may not by our wits be introduced, to the countenancing the *Papists* in their *High Priesthood, National Churches, Orders of Priesthood, Tythes,* and all other their innumerable *Rites and Ceremonies*, that without any *Institution* of Christ, or pretence of new *Testament-authority*, they have introduced or imposed upon the account of *Analogy* with old *Testament-Rites and Services*. Concerning which you have the Lord *Brooks* in his *Treatise of Episcopacy*, P. 100 saying very well, viz. *That the Analogy which Baptisme now hath with Circumcision in the old Law, is a fine rational Argument to illustrate a Point well proved before; but*

I somewhat doubt (saith he) whether it be proof enough for that which some would prove by it, since (besides the vast difference in the Ordinance) the persons to be Circumcised are stated by a positive Law, so express that it leaves no place for Scruple; but it is far otherwise in Baptisme, where all the designation of Persons fit to be partakers, for ought I know, is only such as believe; for this is the qualification which with exactest search I find the Scripture requires in Persons to be baptized, and this it seems to require in all such Persons; now how Infants can be properly said to believe, I am not yet fully resolved.

And very full and most excellently *Dr. Taylor* you have to this point Dr. Taylor, p. 228. Who saith, That the Argument from Circumcision is invalid upon infinite considerations: Figures and Types prove nothing, unless a Commandment go along with them, or some express to signifie such to be their purpose: For the Deluge of Waters, and the Ark of Noah, were a Figure of Baptisme said Peter; and if therefore the Circumstances of one should be drawn to the other, we should make Baptisme a Prodigy, rather than a Rite; the Paschal Lamb was a Type

of the Eucharist, which succeeds the other, as Baptisme doth to Circumcision; but because there was in the manducation of the Paschal Lamb no prescription of Sacramental drink, shall we thence conclude that the Eucharist is to be administered but in one kind? And even in the very Instance of this Argument, supposing a Correspondency of Analogy between Circumcision and Baptisme, yet there is no Correspondence of Identity; for although it were granted, that both of them did consign the Covenant of faith, yet there is nothing in the Circumstance of Childrens being Circumcised that so concerns that Mystery, but that it might very well be given to Children, and yet Baptisme only to men of Reason; because Circumcision left a Character in the flesh, which being imprinted upon Infants, did its work to them when they came to age, and such a Character was necessary, because there was no word added to the Sign; but Baptisme imprints nothing that remains on the Body, and if it leaves a Character at all, it is upon the Soul, to which also the word is added which is as much a part of the Sacrament, as the Sign it self; for both which Reasons it is requisite, that the Parties Baptized should be capable

ble of Reason, that they may be capable both of the word of the Sacrament, and the impress made upon the Spirit; since therefore the Reason of this Parity does wholly fail, there is nothing left to infer a necessity of complying in this Circumstance of age, any more then in the other Annexes of the Type; then the Infants must also precisely be Baptized upon the Eighth day, and Females must not be baptized, because not Circumcised; but it were more proper, if we would understand it right, to prosecute the Analogy from the Type to the Antitype by way of Letter and Spirit, and signification: and as Circumcision figures Baptisme, so also the adjuncts of the Circumcision, shall signifie something Spiritual in the adherences of Baptisme; and therefore as Infants were Circumcised, so Spiritual Infants shall be Baptized, which is Spiritual Circumcision; for therefore Babes had the Ministry of the Type, to signifie that we must, when we give our names to Christ become Children in malice, and then the Type is made compleat, &c. Thus far the Dr.

7. Whether the not Baptizing Infants makes the priviledge under the Gospel

Gospel less then under the Law, who had then Circumcision.

To which I answer, not at all, for the Reasons following.

1. Because they were not Circumcised, because they were Children of Believers, or Sealed with a new Covenant Seal, as being in the new Covenant thereby, as before proved; but upon the account of a Birth-priviledge as being of the natural Linage and Seed of *Abraham*, as a *Typical shadowy thing*; all whose posterity were to be marked therewith, to distinguish them from the Nations, and to keep that Line clear, from whence Christ according to the Flesh should come, and to oblige them to keep the Law, &c. But no such thing in the Gospel; the *Body* and *Substance* being come, the *Shadow* was to vanish and pass away, no common Father then but Christ, and if Christs, then *Abrahams* Seed, and Heirs of Promise, no Birth-priviledge, but the new Birth; therefore to go back to the national Birth priviledge, is so far from being a Priviledge, that it is a Bondage rather, to return to the *Type* and *Shadow*, the *Antitype* and *Substance* being come.

7 Notbap
tizing of
Infants,
makes not
Gospel-
Privi-
ledges
less then
Legal.

2. Neither ought such a thing to be any more *esteemed* the loss of a Priviledge, then our not enjoying literally a *Holy Land, City, Temple*, a succession of a *High Priest*, and a *Priesthood* by *Generation* or Lineal descent, (for you know their Children were *Priests* successively in their Generation, a *Levite* begat a *Priest* or *Minister*, as well as the other *Tribes* begat *Church-Members*) since all those Types are *Spiritualised* to us the Believers under the Gospel, who are now the *Holy Nation*, the *Holy City* and *Temple*, the *Royal Priesthood*, and all *Church-Members* by *Regeneration*, not *Generation*. Therefore we are so far from being *loosers* by the Bargain, that as far as Christ exceeds *Moses* and *Aaron*, the Gospel, the Law, the *Antitype*, the *Type*, the *Spiritual Birth*, the *Carnal*, the Extent of all Nations, the *Confines of Judea*; so far are we better, and not worse.

Nor thirdly, if it should be taken for granted, that Circumcision was a Seal of the new Covenant belonging to all the Children of *Israel*, then would not the Baptizing of the children of Believers answer it; Neither amount to so great a Priviledge, nor be

be equivalent to it, for these Reasons.

First, there were all the Families and Tribes of *Israel* (and all Profelyted strangers) with their Children without distinction of good or bad, to be Circumcised : But here only one of a City, or two of a Tribe ; for Believers are but thin sown, and the Children of unbelievers, and wicked men are to receive no such benefit in the judgment of so many.

And Secondly, you would be very short in another respect, as being at an utter uncertainty when you had a right Subject ; for if the *Parent* was a *Hypocrite*, or no *Elect* Person, which is out of your reach to *understand*. you cannot know whether the Child be fit for Baptisme ; for the Seed of a wicked man you must not *meddle* with by any *means*, whereas there was not the least doubt or scruple in *Israel* as to the Subject ; for the Father being *Circumcised*, it was an *infallible* mark they were right.

And Thirdly, neither can the Child (when he is grown up) have any certain knowledge, that such a Ceremony hath past upon him in Infancy, he having
no

no *Infallible* mark thereof; whereas the Circumcised Infant had an *indelible Character* and *mark* in his flesh, to assure him that he had received that Rite.

By all which demonstrations you may understand, that we loose no Priviledge under the Gospel for not Baptizing our Infants, though they were *Circumcised* under the *Law*.

CHAP.
