

[*Repentance whereby they forsake sin, and faith whereby they stedfastly believe &c, are required of persons to be baptized (and not only that have been baptized.) And yet that Infants that cannot do this are to be baptized, because [they promise them by their sureties,] and it is not said because they profess to do them at present by their sureties.*

2. The Child is baptized upon the undertaking of these persons as sponsors or Covenanters, whose parts and duties are thus expressed, [To see that this Infant be taught so soon as he shall be able to learn, what a solemn Vow, promise and profession he hath here made by you; and that he may know these things the better, ye shall call upon him to hear sermons, and chiefly ye shall provide that he may learn the Creed, the Lords prayer, and the ten Commandements, in the vulgar tongue, and all other things which a Christian ought to know and believe to his souls health; and that this Child may be brought up to lead a Godly and a Christian life.]

3. The Conformists here are not agreed themselves, what that subjective individual Faith, renunciation and desire are which the Infant at present PROFESSETH by his sureties: It is not that the Infant doth actually believe himself for the Catechism confesseth that he doth not. Nor is there any probability that he doth, unless by miracle unknown. And if it be any ones faith else that the Infant then Professeth which is Imputatively his own, it is not agreed whose faith that is or must be; whether the Godfathers, or the Churches, and what Churches; whether that Congregations, or the Diocesan Churches, or the Na-

tional

tional Churches, or the Universal Church? or whether it must be the Parents, Adopters or Owners of the Child.

4. Though the Godfathers be not by words to promise their *Parts*, yet standing purposely there as undertakers of it, and hearing the Minister expressly tell them what their *PART* and *DUTY* is, their coming and standing in that relation, is a plain signification of consent, and rendereth them obliged Covenanters or Sponsors.

5. These sponsors are not obliged to profess that the Child is *theirs by Adoption or any propriety*: And so far is any such *adopting* or *owning* from their purposes, that we never in all our lives knew any Godfather or Godmother as such, (not having before taken the Child as theirs on other reasons) that ever became a sponsor with such a signified intent.

6. In most Country Parishes that we have known, a great part of the Communicants, seem Ignorant themselves of what is to be undertaken for the baptized, (as we judge by our tryal where we have lived, and the credible report of other Pastors:) And too many notoriously live themselves in a course of life contrary to what is to be undertaken for the Child.

7. In all our lives we never knew one person that undertook this Office of Godfather or Godmother who beforehand gave the Parents any credible promise or signification, that they had any purpose at all to perform, what the Church Chargeth on them, and they there undertake as their *parts* and *duties*.

8. Nor did we ever know one in all our lives that as a *Godfather* or *Godmother* did perform it;

viz. [To see themselves that the Child be taught his Covenant as soon as he is able to learn, and to provide that he be taught all before recited, his Creed, &c. and all things which a Christian ought to know and believe to his souls health; and that he be virtuously brought up to lead a godly and a Christian life: But they leave them to the Parents.

9. No man can compel another to be Godfather or Godmother.

10. All such undertakers that we have known have been of some of these following sorts:

1. Either ignorant persons that knew not, or careless that considered not what they did: 2. Or persons that mistook the sense of the Church, and thought that they were but the representers of the Parents, and that what they promised, it was not they, but the Parents that were bound to perform: 3. Or Nonconformists (in this point) who purposed beforehand to be but the Parents Representatives, and that the promise and obligation should all be devolved from them on the Parents, though they knew the Church meant otherwise; and that they were not bound to the Churches sense; and therefore their standing to bear [this is your part] was no consent to take it for their part. And none of all these do answer the Churches sense in their undertaking: And if we are commonly baptized and made Christians in a way of false Vowing or Covenanting of such persons, or of delusory Equivocation, it is not well.

11. We know not where Parents can procure any to undertake this Office as the Church imposeth it, that credibly signify themselves able and willing to perform it: we could not do it our selves were we never so desirous: Perhaps
som

Some Rich men might hire others to take their Children into their Care and Education, as must be promised; but who would do so for the poor? yea for all the poor of England? And the Non-conformists are not satisfied that it is lawful to engage any in a perfidious covenanting before God, when before-hand they have no credible signification of any purpose to perform it. Nay, when the Parent resolveth to educate his own Child, and not to trust him to the Provision or care of others.

12. The Minister Covenanting [to use the form in the Book of Common Prayer prescribed in administration of the Sacraments, and no other] Can. 36. No Parent may speak a word in the name of his own Child, nor to enter him there into the Covenant of God; nor profess that he offereth him to Baptism by virtue of, and in confidence in the promise [I will be thy God, and the God of thy seed in their Generations;] Nor to promise himself what the Godfathers are to promise: The words also of the Can. 29. are these; "[No Parent shall be urged to be PRESENT; nor be admitted to answer as Godfather for his own Child: Nor any Godfather or Godmother shall be suffered to make any other answer or speech than by the Book of Common Prayer is prescribed in that behalf.]

13. It is the Godfathers work also (by the Liturgy) to take care that the Child be brought to the Bishop to be confirmed by him (in the manner of the Church of England) as soon as he can say the Creed, Lords Prayer, and ten Commandments; and be further instructed in the Church Catechism; which Godfathers use not

at all to perform; nor do the Parents use to expect it: Nor doth one Child of a multitude understand what the Baptismal Covenant is, of many a year after they have learned to say the said Catechism.

14. That the Godfathers stand not there as the *Representers* of the *Parents* is evident. (according to the sense of the Church) because the Parent himself is not suffered to do it, or speak one covenanting word; nor must be urged to be present; nor are they to speak in the *Parents name* in any of their undertakings; Nor is there the least intimation that the Church taketh the Sponsor for the Parents Representative.

15. The Parents are to be admonished not to defer the Baptism of their Children longer than the first or second *Sunday*, unless upon a great and reasonable cause to be approved by the Curate (whether they can get understanding, credible Godfathers or not :) These are the Matters of Fact.

Here note 1. That there is no Controversie between the Conformists and Nonconformists, whether Christians Infants should be baptized: 2. Nor whether a Conformists baptizing be valid: 3. Nor whether the Parents presence be absolutely necessary, and another may not speak in his name: 4. Nor whether Adopters, or any Proprietors may not covenant for the Child: 5. Nor whether the old Sponsors be lawful, who 1. Witnessed the credibility of the Parent; 2. And undertook the Christian Education of the Child, if the Parents should either *die* or apostatize: The Nonconformists are against no such Sponsors, though they think that their Children have

right

right to Baptism without such. 6. Nor do they deny that Baptism in the Parish-Churches is *valid* and *lawful* as to the Parents and Godfathers, if they do but agree on the Nonconformists way, that the Sponsors shall but represent the Parents, and that they be not bound by the contrary judgment of the Authors of the Liturgy to the contrary. But the questions are 1. Whether a Christians Child, whose Parents have no way forfeited their credit, have not right to Baptism, without other Godfathers. 2. Whether the Parent should not *solemnly enter his own Child into the Covenant of God* (as well as in times of Circumcision.) And whether any Parent should be *forbidden* it, *viz.* to appear and speak as the Representer of the Child, or Undertaker for him, and Promiser of his Education. 3. Whether that Child must *profess* by another, that *He Himself Believeth, Renounceth, Repenteth and Desireth Baptism*: And it be not rather to be *professed* that he is the *seed* of a *Believing, Penitent Parent*, whose *Will* is as *his Will*, and is under God's Promise [*I will be thy God, and the God of thy seed.*] 4. Whether a Christian Parent may consent to the *perfidious undertaking* of any *Godfathers*, who give him not the least reason to believe that they intend that provision for the Children which they undertake: Or else may let his Child be unbaptized till he can get such a credible Undertaker; which is never like to be with most, or many. 5. Whether the Children of Heathens, or Infidels, or Atheists, have right to Baptism upon the presentation of any Godfather, who never adopteth them, or taketh them for his own, nor giveth any credible notice

that he really intendeth to educate those Children as *pro forma* he seemeth to undertake: Or whether such Children are truly said to believe, because the Godfather, or Minister, or Congregation, or Diocess, or Nation, or Catholick Church believe.

III. The Nonconformists are not of one mind about receiving the Lords Supper *Kneeling*; Many judge it *Lawful*, though neither necessary nor most eligible were they free; some judge it also most eligible: And some judge it, as things stand, unlawful: Their reasons are.

1. In doubtful cases duty lieth on the surest side: But this to them is a doubtful case on one side, and to imitate Christs institution by such sitting as men use to do at meat, is certainly Lawful.

2. Because they think this *Kneeling* violateth the reasons of the second Commandment, being used where, by whole Countries of Papists round about us, and many among us it signifieth *Bread-Worship* or Idolatry by the same Action at the same season used. For they suppose that the second Commandment forbiddeth *Images*, as being *External, Corporal, Idolatry*, and *Symbolizing* scandalously with Idolators, though the mind intend the worshiping of the true God alone. And such they think this kneeling is, and that it encourageth the Papists (as is instanced in a story in the Life of Bishop Hall.)

3. Because they think that the Tradition and Custom of the Catholick Church and the Canons of the greatest General Councils not repealed by any other (as *Nic. 1. Can. 20. & Can. Trull. &c.*) are of stronger obligation than the

the Canons of our Convocation. And those Canons, Customs and tradition prohibite all Adoration by Genuflection on any Lords day in the year, and on any week day els between Easter and *whitsontide*; And this custom continued 2000 years as the Tradition of the Universal Church; and was never repealed but changed by degrees by contrary practice: They that think not that they are bound by these Canons or Customs at all, yet think that they are enough to nullifie a contrary Canon of a lower power; or *ad hominem* may excuse them. Yea the Constitutions called the Apostles, seem to Command all the people to receive the Sacrament standing and to go for it *Lib. 2. Cap. 57.* Having prescribed the order of worship (that after the old Scriptures read, they sing a Psalm and then read the Acts and Epistles and the Gospels, and then that the Presbyters one by one exhort the people first and the Bishop last (for in those time every Church that had an Altar had a Bishop) he concludeth [*Postea vero fiat sacrificium, cuncto populo Stante & silentio precante, & oblatione facta, quisque ordo seorsim corpus Domini & preciosum sanguinem sumat, accedentes ordine cum pudore & reverentia ut ad corpus Regis. Item mulieres operto capite, ut ordinem earum decet, accedant* that is [After let the sacrifice be made, all the people standing and praying in silence: And the oblation being made let every order apart take the body of Christ and his precious blood: Coming to it in order with modesty and reverence as to the body of the King. And let the women approach with covered heads as becometh their order.]

For such reasons as these set together, some Nonconformists, (Lay and Clergy) take this *Kneeling* (while Papists about us by the same gesture adore the Bread) to be unlawful, who yet profess as great Reverence to Christ and the Eucharist as any others.

But other Nonconformists say that they can answer all these arguments. But that they truly render the scruples of the dissenters *tollerable*, and the persons unmeet to be *therefore excommunicate*.

2. By the Canon and Rubrick, no one of these dissenters must be admitted to the holy Communion, *Can. 27. Saith [No Minister when he celebrateth the Communion shall wittingly administer the same to any, but to such as kneel, under pain of suspension.]* And the Ministers Covenant to use *"no form of administering the Sacraments but according to the Liturgie.*

V. The Rubrick after Confirmation saith *[There shall none be admitted to the holy Communion, till such time as he be confirmed, or be Ready and Desirous to be confirmed.* So that desire of Confirmation in the *English* way, is made a necessary Condition of Communion.

2. The publick owning of the Baptismal Covenant, is that which the Nonconformists are so far from being against, that they take it with a serious Confirmation thereupon to be the meet way of transition from the Infant state of Church-membership, into that of the Adult: and the most Congruous means of uniting dissenters about Church discipline, and of preventing Anabaptistry that can be found out. But many sober Christians are unsatisfied with the *English* way

way of Confirmation, 1. Because they find it so like to that Confirmation which the Papists have made a Sacrament, and which very many beyond-Sea Protestants have written against: *vide Dalleum de confirmat.* 2. Because it is made the proper work of a Diocesan, and wholly denied to the Parochial Pastors; And because those Diocesans know not ordinarily whether the persons be meet or unmeet to be confirmed, being strangers to them; for how can they know all the persons, men, women and such Children of so many Parishes as a Diocess doth contain: (some Diocesses having above a thousand Parishes others many hundred: One above 100 miles in Length, and others, very great) ? Its true, that the Minister of the Parish is bid to Catechise them, and to bring or send in writing the names of such as he thinks fit for Confirmation. But 1. This is not ordinarily done: but Children in our time have used to run together to a bishop when he came into the Country on that work, without the Ministers Certificate or Godfathers; and none, that ever we knew of, that came for Confirmation in this manner, was refused: And as the Bishop never saw or knew one of the multitude whom he Confirmeth, so he taketh not time so far to examine them as to give him rational satisfaction of their fitness: Nor indeed can he possibly do it for one of a multitude of so large Diocesses, when most *great Parishes* are too big for a present Minister who is acquainted with them better than a strange Diocesan can be: How can a man that hath so many other employments as Diocesans have find leisure, were he never so willing, to examine
so,

so many hundred thousands as are in this Diocesse? or so many score thousands as are in many others? 3. And as the Ministers rarely certifie according to the Canon, so the Bishop is not tyed to take his consent, but may thus impose confirmed persons on his Communion, though he know them to be never so ignorant or unmeet. 4. And it is *Children* that are thus to be confirmed, who rarely ever come so young to own with any tolerable understanding and seriousness, their Baptismal Covenant. Few of us by experience can say, that we did it of many years after that we had learned the Lords Prayer, &c. 5. And no other qualification is necessary, but that he learn the Creed, Lords-Prayer, Decalogue, and Church-Catechism, the bare words of which are learnt by rote by multitudes of Children, who understand little or nothing of what they say: We do not find, that if persons stay unconfirmed till they are adult, that any Heresie or wickedness of life, is a bar to their confirmation; much less are they required to bring any testimony, that they live according to their Baptismal Covenant. 6. And as far as we can learn, it is but a very small part of this Kingdom in comparison of the rest, that ever were confirmed. 7. Nor know we many Ministers that ever examined their people generally, whether they were ready and willing to be confirmed.

VI. The Nonconformable Laity are ejected from the Communion of the Church, and their Children (that are disposed of by them) from Baptism, Christendom and Christian burial, if not from salvation, as far as in the Church

lyeth;

lyeth; and those that affirm themselves to be Non-conformists are by the Church Laws excommunicated *ipso facto*, though they should desire Communion.

2. That no Minister is to admit them to the Sacramental Communion is before shewed from Can. 27. And also that their Children are not to be baptized, unless they will submit them to the dedicating sign of the Cross; no nor to be buried with Christian Burial (of which more afterward.)

3. If they have a Minister in their own Parish that never preacheth, or so bad as that they dare not commit the Pastoral care of their souls to him, they must not be admitted to Communion, in any other neighbour Parishes, Can. 28.

That they are *ipso facto* excommunicated, shall be anon shewed.

SECT. IX.

The Matters of Fact that concern the Conformity and Nonconformity of the Ministers: And 1. of Assent, Consent and Subscription that nothing is contrary to God's Word.

1. **T**HE Canon to be subscribed (36th.) willingly and *ex animo* is [That the Book of Common-Prayer, and of ordaining of Bishops, Priests and Deacons, containeth in it NOTHING CONTRARY TO THE WORD OF GOD; and

and that he himself will use the form in the said Book prescribed in publick Prayers and Administration of the Sacraments, and none other.

2. The meaning of this subscription is not agreed of by the Conformists that take it: As to the first clause, some say that by [*Nothing Contrary to the word*] is meant as it is spoken, [*Nothing*] indeed. Others say by [*Nothing*] is meant [*Nothing which I have discerned so to be: Or Nothing, except such failings as all humane writings are lyable to.*] And by [*Contrary*] Some say [*Contrary in the Common sense of the word*] is meant: But others say that by [*Contrary*] is meant [*so far Contrary as should drive us from Communion with the Church*] or [*Contrary to any great doctrine or precept of the Word of God.*] And the Nonconformists interpret it as the first sort do, according to the usual and proper meaning of the words.

3. So the later clause, [*that he himself will use that form in publick prayer and administration of the Sacraments and none other;*] Dr. Heylin and very many others suppose is meant properly as is spoken viz. That by the form is meant all the words and orders, and that by publick prayer is meant as is spoken, *All publick prayer used by a Minister in the publick assemblies*] And that by [*None other*] is meant [*neither wholly nor in part.*] But others think that by [*Form*] is meant only [*the form of words, and not the orders*] And that by [*none other*] is meant only [*No other Book of Common-Prayer or set Liturgie.*] Or [*No other entire form and order excluding this;*] And that it doth not mean [*No other form before or after Sermon in the Pulpit, or in*
some

some parts of Worship, so it be of our own Compo-
 sure:] Nor yet that we may not use sometime
 some other order than is prescribed in the Ru-
 bricks, viz. 1. Sometime read other Chapters
 than the Calender prescribeth, because that Li-
 berty is expressed in the Preface to the second
 Book of Homilies: 2. Sometimes to give the
 Sacrament to some that kneel not: 3. To baptize
 some without the Cross, &c. (of which more
 hereafter) Because the Rubrick saith only [*you
 shall do thus*] but saith not [*you shall do no other-
 wise.*] But to this the former sort answer 1. That
 if any universal Negative (*none other*) may be
 particularly or limitedly interpreted upon our
 own surmises, no Laws, Covenants or Promises
 signifie any thing, and no words are intelligible:
 2. That we subscribe strictly to this Article (to
 use no other form,) But not so to the Book of
 Homilies, but only that we take it for wholsom
 Doctrine: 3. That if the Rubrick for Crossing,
 Kneeling, &c. exclude not all other inconsistent
 forms of administration, it signifieth nothing, but
 leaveth every man to his own will.

4. It is yet a greater doubt with the Con-
 formists themselves, whether these words be
 not at least a Covenant that *They will use no other
 printed prescribed Liturgy.* And so some think
 that it plainly obligeth them not to use those
 printed Forms which the Archbishops and Bi-
 shops have used to draw up and impose, for se-
 veral Publick Fasts, Thanksgivings, and particu-
 lar occasions. But others think that it doth not
 bind them to disobey the Bishops therein: but
 that such exceptions were intended though not
 exprest, or at least had been inserted if not for-
 gotten.

II. The Act of Uniformity requireth that every Minister that officiates " [Do openly and publicly before the Congregation there assembled, declare his unfeigned Assent and Consent to the Use of all things in the Book contained and prescribed, in these words and no other [I A. B. do here declare my unfeigned Assent and Consent to all and every thing contained and prescribed, in and by the Book entituled, The Book of Common-Prayer, & Administration of the Sacraments and other Rites and Ceremonies of the Church, according to the use of the Church of England; together with the Psalter or Psalms of David pointed as they are to be sung or said in Churches, and the form or manner of making, ordaining and consecrating of Bishops, Priests and Deacons.] And page 10. [He shall declare his unfeigned Assent and Consent unto, and Approbation of the said Book, and to the use of all the Prayers, Rites and Ceremonies, Forms and Orders therein contained and prescribed according to the form aforesaid.]

2. The Conformists themselves are not agreed of the meaning of these plain words, One party expounding them as the Nonconformists do, according to the properest and ordinary use of the words, and the other party otherwise. The former hold that as many Acts of Parliament contain more in the body of the Act than in the Title, and make the means more extensive than the end, so here the ASSENT and CONSENT to the USE of the Book is the END in the first clause, and APPROBATION also in the second: And that the Declaring that form of words is the Means to that end: That

Assent

Assent signifieth *Assent to the Truth*] and [*Consent* and *Approbation*] relate to the *Goodness, rectitude and use,*] And that this is not only of the Prayers and other parts which the subscriber is to Read to the people, but as is exprest [*of all things* (without exception) *Contained in and prescribed by it ; particularly [to all the Prayers, Rites, Ceremonies, Forms and Orders ;*] without collusion or equivocation.

The other part hold, that all this signifieth no more, but that [*I Assent that I may lawfully use, and I Consent to use, so much as belongeth to my place, and that I will not unpeaceably oppose it.*] Their argument is, *Because* [*to the Use,*] is mentioned before the Form of words. To which the other answer as before, that 1. That *Approbation* is mentioned after as well as *Use*. 2. That the *Means* are larger than the *end* : As in the Corporation Act, the end is the *preventing of Rebellion* ; but the *Means* is *Declaring that [There is no obligation on me or any other from that Oath.]* 3. That without gross violence *Assent* can be judged to mean no less than [*Assenting that it is true.*] 4. That there is not a word in the Book which was not intended for some *Use* : And therefore, to *Assent, Approve* and *Consent to the Use*, is more than merely to *Assent to the Truth* : The Preface hath its *Use* ; and the Calendar its *Use*, and the Rubrick its *uses*, and the rest of the parts their several *Uses* ; But did we believe it to be *false*, how could we *Approve* it, or of what *Use* would it be? 5. To put all out of doubt the Parliament-men long ago told us (none Contradicting it to us) that into another Bill, the house of Lords added a *Proviso* that the

Decla-

Declaration in the Act of *Uniforimity* should be understood but as obliging men *to the Use of it*; and that the House of Commons refusing, at a Conference about it, they gave in such Reasons against that sense and proviso to the Lords, upon which they did acquiesce, and cast it out.

III. By this General Declaration we are obliged to *Assent* to (as true) to *Approve* and to *Use* these words after the Calender, "*[Rules to know when the Moveable Feasts and Holydaies begin. Easter-day (on which the rest depend) is alwaies the first Sunday after the first full Moon, which happens next after the one and twentieth day of March.]*"

2. This Rule is false: As 1. Every Almanack will shew: 2. The Table following to find out *Easter-day* for ever: 3. And the practice of our Church, that keepeth *Easter* on another day.

3. To consent to *Use this*, is to consent to keep *Easter-day*, contrary to all Christian Churches, and contrary to another Rule in the same Book; and to consent to *use both Rules*, is to consent to keep two *Easter-days* in one year; and so of *Easter Term*.

4. Hereupon some Conformists say, that [*Assenting to, Approving of, and Consenting to All things contained and prescribed,*] signifieth but [*as to humane, fallible writings, so far as there is no mistake*] or [*Assenting and Consenting to be peaceable.*] But others say that it is but [*to Assent that it is true where it is not false, and Approve it as good where it is not bad; and to Consent to use it where I have no cause to the contrary.*] And they ask, 1. Whether this be the usual or proper signification of such words? 2. Whether any

Non-

Nonconformists would refuse it in that sense. 3. Whether they will give leave to the Papists and all other subjects to take the Oath of Allegiance in such a kind of sense and exposition.

But there is one that hath defended this as true, and tells us that by the [full moon] is not meant that which we call the full moon, or the same that's meant in the other parts of the Book, but by the full moon is meant [the mean Conjunction] and [the fourth of April that year 1664. Or [14 daies after the ancient new moon found by the Golden number the 14th day of the Ecclesiastical Cyclic month] For an old Mass Book saith [Post veris æquinotium Quare plenilunium & Dominica proxima sacrum celebra Pascha: Non verius inveneris si mille legas Codices.]

Quest. 1. Are we sure this Mass Book meant not pleniluniam as we do properly?

Quest. 2. And are we sure they erred not that wrote this?

Quest. 3. And yet are you sure what they meant?

Quest. 4. Would you perswade us that our Convocation now borrowed their Direction from this Mass Book?

Quest. 5. Are you sure that this Mass Book should be our rule herein of speaking or interpreting?

Quest. 6. And yet not in the Calendar and other passages in our Liturgy?

Quest. 7. Did the the Convocation intend that we should not here understand [The full moon] properly, nor as in all the rest of the Book?

Quest. 8. If this defender be in the right, was there ever a plainer way made to bring all men

to an *Implicit Faith*, to believe as the Convocation believeth, even in Calendars, when we know not what they believe themselves. For my part I must confess that after all this Dr. (*Pell* they say) hath said of another sense of the word [*full Moon*] I know not yet what he meaneth. *Q^a*. Whether the Convocation meant that none should Preach Christs Gospel that understood not this strange sense of the [*full Moon*] that is [*no full Moon*] and yet would not by one line expound it to us, to keep us from being cast out and ruined? Or whether they meant that all men should be forced and taught to subscribe or declare assent to that which they never understood? when I had never yet the advantage of speaking with one Bishop, or conformable Dr. that understood the word [*full Moon*] as this Doctor taught them (whether in good earnest I know not.) And if our Conformity must be thus performed, by equivocation implicitly, contrary to the common sense of mankind, we shall yet suspend it, till we know how much further we have to go, if it be blindfold that we must be led; and refer all to God our final Judge, whose judgment we are near.

" 4. We Assent to, Approve of and Consent
 " to, these words in the Preface [we are fully
 " persuaded in our judgements (and we here profess
 " it to the world) that the Book as it stood
 " before established by Law; doth not contain in it
 " any thing contrary to the Word of God, or to sound
 " Doctrine, or which a Godly man may not with
 " a good Conscience Use and submit unto, or which
 " is not fairly defensible against any that shall oppose
 " the same, &c.] 2. Psal. 105. 28. The words in
 the

the Liturgy and old Translation are [*They were not obedient to his word*] And the new Translation according to the Hebrew is [*They rebelled not against his word*] Clear contrary : Therefore the Nonconformists think that one of them is Contrary to the word of God and this old Translation is Continued still in the Church.) 3. In the old Book in the Gospels these texts are thus translated *Rom. 12. 2. Epist. to 1. Sunday after Epiph.* [*Be ye changed in your shape :*] The new Translation is [*Be transformed by the renewing of your mind*] *Phil. 2. 7. Epist. for Sunday next before Easter* [*found in his apparel as a man :*] In the new Translation it is (Was made in the likeness of men.) *Gal. 4. Ep. to 4th Sunday in Lent*, It is [*Mount Sinai is Agar in Arabia and bordereth on the City which is now called Jerusalem.*] In the new Translation it is [*For this Agar was mount Sinai in Arabia, and answereth to Jerusalem which now is.*] *Mathews day Ep. 2 Cor. 4.* The old Book has it [*We go not out of kind.*] The new is [*We faint not.*] *John. 2. for third Sunday in Lent* [*When men be drunk*] is the old Books Translation : But the new is [*When men have well drunk*] *Luke 11. for third Sunday in Lent*, the old Book hath [*When one house doth fall upon another*] the new hath [*A house divided against an house falleth.*] *Luke 1. for the Annunciation* ; the old Book sayeth [*This is the sixth month which was called barren*] in the new Translation it is [*This is the sixth month with her who was called barren.* If one of these be God's Word, the Nonconformists think that the other is contrary to it. 4. In the old Book in the Psalms there are whole verses left out, which

are in the Hebrew Text, and our new Translation; and divers translated in a quite different sense the former following the Septuagint. 5. The Rubrick for *Christmas day* is [*Then shall follow the Collect of the Nativity, which shall be said continually unto New-years day.*] And the Collect for all these several daies is [*Almighty God, which hast given us thine only begotten Son to take our Nature upon him, and THIS DAY to be born of a pure Virgin.* So the Collect on *Whitsunday* is [*God which upon this day, &c.*] The Rubrick is, [*The same Collect to be read Munday and Tuesday.*] So on *Christmas day*, and seven daies after [*Because thou hast given Iesus Christ thine only Son to be born as on this day for us, &c.*] And on *Whitsunday*, and six daies after [*According to whose most true promise the Holy Ghost came down this day from Heaven.*] These things, and such other we must approve in the foresaid *Approbation* of all things in the *old Common-Prayer-Book*.

V. We must Assent, Approve, and Consent to all the *mis-translations* in the present *Liturgy*, as well as to justify the *old Edition*: That before-cited *Psal. 105. 28.* is in the present *Book*, and so are the rest of the omissions and differences in the *Psalms* before mentioned, which are many. Different Translations which have all the *same sense*, may be all called *God's Word*, because their *sense* is so: But where they have *different senses*, so far one of them is contrary to *God's Word*: For *God's Word* is *one* and *true*, and not contrary to it self. The question is not whether these faulty Translations were not a *good work*, and a great mercy to the Church, till we had a better?

better? Nor whether they may not be lawfully used where there is no better? Yea or where there is a better, if the Command of Governours, or Concord, make it best for that time and place. But it is, Whether all the *faults* of the *Translation* may be *Assented*, *Approved* and *Consented to*? We commit some failings and sins every day, but we may not *Approve* of them, and profess that we *Consent* so to do.

2. Some Conformists here think that the Declaration is to be taken *properly*, without any force or distorting, and they say that *both Translations* are justifiable, because one followeth the Hebrew, and the other the Septuagint, and Christ and his Apostles have justified both by using them. But others of them hold that this instance proveth that by [*All things*] *Assented* and *consented to*, must be meant only [*All things that are not by humane frailty mistaken, or erroneous*] or els, that by *Assenting* and *Approving* must be meant no more than *Assenting that they may be Used*: And so they consent with the Nonconformists in the matter, but not in the exposition of the words. And to the former they say, 1. That there are other mistranslations, besides those that follow the septuagint. 2. That Christ and the Apostles by citing some Texts according to the septuagint, do not thereby approve of all the rest; for they cite others otherwise. 3. That by citing them, they justify not alwaies the translation, but only the *sense* so far as it is cited for, it being that scripture which the people then commonly used.

3. And they say that if this objection should hinder mens *Assenting* to the Liturgy, it might

as well hinder their Assenting to the Bible in our translations. And indeed we know no Nonconformist who would declare or subscribe that he doth Assent to, Approve and Consent to all things Contained in the Bible according to any Translation, but only all things Contained in the Bible as it was delivered by the sacred writers, and in all Translations so far as they truly signifie or express that to us. But if they might but say, as one part expounds the Declaration, [We Assent, &c. To all things Contained, &c. That are not by humane frailty mistaken] they would soon Conform herein.

6. The Calendar in the Common Prayer appointeth the publick reading of the Books called *Apocrypha* beginning September 28. And so Continuing to November 24. Every day of the week, except the proper Lessons interposed. Part of the *Apocrypha* to be read are the Book of *Tobit*, *Judith*, *Bel*, and the *Dragon* &c.

2. Learned Bishops and Divines of the Church of England have written to prove that these Books are not only *Aprocryphal* but fabulous, and have manifest untruths; as that the intralls of a fish will drive away all Devils and keep them from returning: When Christ saith [This kind goeth not out but by Fasting and Prayer] And when the Angel saith that He was the son of *Ananias* of the tribe of *Naphtali*,] &c.

3. These Books are to be read just in the place and order as the Sacred Scriptures are; and under the same title of the [First Lesson] Only called *Apocrypha* in the Bibles. But 1. It is not appointed that the Priest tell the people so: 2. If it were, they understand not Commonly what

[*Apocrypha*]

[*Apocrypha*] signifieth : 3. If they were sometime told it, they forget it; and apply not that name to every Lesson that they thence hear. 4. It is not denyed that the sounder Books that are *Apocrypha* may be read in the Church as a Homily may be with due notice of their difference from the Canonical Books: But the question is whether not only *they*, but the Books proved fabulous by many Protestants, may be there read, and that instead of so much of the holy Scripture then omitted, and that without any better notice given to the Common people of the difference. 5. And the chief doubt is, whether this may not only be done, but also the Calendar as so appointing it, may be Approved of and Consented to by us all.

7. It hath been before opened, that no Parent is permitted to be Godfather to his own Child; or to speak one word at his baptizing, to enter him into the Covenant of God, or dedicate him to him, nor to promise in his name, nor to undertake any part of his Christian education, nor so much as to be urged to be present. Nor is there a word to intimate that the Godfathers represent the Parent, or speak in his name or stead, but the contrary is implied. [Though the Parents are to procure these God fathers.

2. It hath also been before shewed how great a Controversie it is, whether Infants Right to Gods promises and Church state, be not by that Covenant [*I Will be thy God and the God of thy seed* ;] implied in 1. Cor. 7. 14. [*els were your Children unclean but now are they holy.*] And so whether Infants have any right upon a Godfathers words there, who never took them for,

his own; if on the Parents account they have no right. And whether such Godfathers act be truly the Childs in Gods account; 3. And it was before enquired, In what sense this Godfather doth (not *promise only* that the Child *shall believe* at age, but) in the Childs name *profess* that he *doth at present believe*: And whether it be not enough [and much more necessary then the Godfathers faith] that he be the Child of a *believing Parent, dedicating him to God*. 4. And it hath been shewed that Godfathers promise themselves partly to teach the Child, and partly to provide that he be taught all that a Christian should learn as necessary to his souls health. 5. And that these Godfathers never ordinarily, give the Parents the least reason to believe that they have any purpose to do any such thing as they undertake: Which is perfidiousness in the weightiest business: And 6. also that (as such) they are no adopters or owners of the Child. 7. And also how hard it is for any Parents ever to get better, seeing *wiser* and *better* will not undertake it in the foresaid conformable sence. 8. The sence and use of Godfathers is partly known by the Practise of Princes and great men, (who must be supposed to know best, and be most righteous and exemplary) who usually by a *Proxie* are Godfathers to the Children of Foreign Princes, or Great men, (perhaps Papists) whom they never saw, nor ever are like to see their Children. 9. Ministers must Assent, Approve of and Consent to, all this exclusion of the Parents, and presentation, profession, undertaking and promise of the Godfathers, which the Liturgy mentioneth;

tioneth; 10. Conformists are not agreed themselves, of the true Office and undertaking of these Godfathers, nor of the Parents part, nor by whose right it is that one Child rather than others is to be baptized, and whether any at all should be refused, by whomsoever (that is a Christian) offered thereunto.

8. The Rubrick to which we must declare our Assent, Approbation and Consent, hath this Article of faith. [*It is certain by Gods Word, that* "Children which are baptized, dying before they commit actual sin are undoubtedly saved."] And the Rubrick at Buryal, excepteth all the unbaptized from Christian Burial, according to the Office.

2. The Canon 68 and 69, suspendeth any Minister who shall refuse or delay to Christen any Child without exception which is brought to the Church on Sundays or Holydays to be Christened, according to the Form in the Common-Prayer; or if in case of danger he be desired to do it privately. Neither Rubrick nor Canon here except from Baptism and certainty of salvation, any Children of *Turks, Infidels, Heathens, and Atheists*, or those whose Parents renounce Christianity, and consent not to their Childrens Baptism; so be it any Godfathers as aforesaid bring them.

3. The Conformists agree not of the sence of this Article of Faith: Some hold that the word [*Children here meaneth not* *All Children that are Baptized*] but *some* such only: But others affirm that this exposition is false, and contrary to the plain importance of the words, for it is an *Indefinite*, say they, *in re necessaria*, in the sense

sense of the Book. And if the meaning be not [*Children that are Baptized, quia tales*] it hath no intelligible sense, the certainty of their Salvation being Asserted as from Scripture, and not any other reason of it given. But if this be the meaning (as it is) then *a quatenus ad omnes valet consequentia*; unless any exception had been added, which is not.

4. Some say that it is implied that Children that had no right to Baptism are excepted. But others say 1. That *ubi lex non distinguit non est distinguendum*. The Church could have excepted if they would. 2. And that *quod fieri non debet factum valet*. 3. Yea that all Children have right to Baptism, if any Christians offer them to it.

5. Some confound the Ministers right to Baptize them, and the Infants right to be Baptized; And this right as only *in foro Ecclesie*, and as *in foro Celi*; As if all Baptized upon any of these rights were undoubtedly saved. But others distinguish these, and say, 1. That the Minister may have right to Baptize one if offered, that yet ought not to have been offered; which will not save an incapable subject. 2. That the Children of Hypocrites have right *Coram Ecclesia*, and that their Baptism ascertaineth to them no more than external or common priviledges; 3. And that only the Children of true believers have such a right *coram Deo* as certainly saveth them. But others say that both the last sort are saved.

6. Some of them hold that *All Infants in the world Baptized or not, are saved by universal redemption, if they dye before actual sin*: And that the Article therefore affirmeth it of the Baptized.

But

But others say, this cannot be the sence: For 1. To say [*All baptized*] and mean [*All unbaptized*] or any [*not as Baptized*] were not intelligible nor candid. 2. And the Burial Rubrick excepting the unbaptized from that Christian burial, sheweth the meaning of the Church in this Article.

7 Also about the [*undoubted certainty*] they differ; some think that the subscriber or Declarer doth not by these words, profess that he himself is [*undoubtedly certain*] of the salvation of all dying Baptized Infants; but only that the thing is *certainly revealed* to be so in Gods Word. But others say, that both objective and subjective (or personal) *certainty* must needs be meant: And that it were too hard an imputation to say that the Church commandeth *uncertain, doubting* men to profess that the thing is *certain* and *undoubted* of; for how can they tell that it is so? And if they know it not to be so, why should they declare it to be so? The meaning is not [*I declare that the Convocation saith it is certain;*] for that were but the part of a cryer or reader: Nor is it *I declare that it is certain to others, though not to me.*] For no man knoweth anothers certainty; Therefore it must mean that [*I am certain and past doubt by the Word of God*] or [*I see ascertaining evidence in Gods Word putting it past doubt.*] So that no *uncertain* or *doubting* person can truly thus declare or subscribe.

8. Divers of those Divines who are furthest from the Nonconformists, hold that by the Scripture alone we cannot prove that Infants are at all to be Baptized; and the *jus Baptismi* must be