

Reply. First, That the Prophets declared the spiritual Blessings of this Covenant, I grant; and that there were some amongst the *Jews* that did discern them to be the greatest Blessings; but had this been the Covenant into which the natural Seed were taken, they would all have had a sight of them. The Promise is, *They shall all know the Lord, from the least to the greatest of them.*

Secondly, I would enquire, How it appears that the Moral Duties were prescribed by the Covenant of Grace? That Moral Duties compared with Ceremonial are the greatest, I grant, but that they are prescribed by the Covenant of Grace, I deny.

SECT. X.

YOU say, the next thing debated was, Whether this Covenant into which the *Jews* entered, be repealed, and Childrens Church-membership be abolished, or no? And whereas I attempted, in my first Reply, to prove that it was made void by the Death of Christ, you returned this Answer, That this Covenant being the Covenant of Grace, it was not then abolished, but only the Ceremonial Law, which is sometimes called the first and old Covenant, *Heb. 8. 7, 8, 13.* but instead of giving you a satisfactory Answer, I did Nicely distinguish between the first Covenant and the Ordinances thereof; and that I then took a great deal of needless pains, to shew in what respects this Covenant was faulty, and in what not.

Reply. First, What I spoke in that Nice Distinction, (as you call it) shewing in what respects the first Covenant was faulty, and in what not, is but poorly answered by a bare recital thereof, without one Word of Reply to it. I should have thought, that a Nice Distinction should have been taken into Consideration, so far as to have shewn the Nicety and the Unsoundness thereof,

thereof, but seeing you have returned no Answer to it, I conclude that the Distinction stands good, that they were not the Ordinances, but the Covenant it self that was faulty.

Secondly, You say, I tell you at last, that the Covenant *Deut. 29.* is clearly distinguished from the Covenant of Grace by this Mark, that it was the Covenant that God made with them when he brought them up out of the Land of *Egypt, Deut. 29. 25.* compared with *Jer. 31, 32, 33.* You say, you have well considered those Scriptures, and you can't find that these were two Covenants, and that you have already proved, *Sett. 8. pag. 41.* that it's the same Covenant with that *Gen. 17. 7. Heb. 8. 10. Jer. 31, 33.*

Reply. What proof was then offered was again disproved in my Reply, wherein I shewed you the vast difference there is between the Tenor of these two Covenants.

Thirdly, You say, that Covenant into which the *Jews* entred with their seed contained Spiritual Blessings, and the Precepts of it were written in their Hearts, *Deut. 30. 6, 14.* compared with *Rom. 10. 8.*

Reply. I have already answered the first part of this Objection, and disproved it.

Secondly, I deny, that the Laws of the Covenant of Grace were written in their Hearts, or that there was any Law written in their Hearts by vertue of this Covenant. First, The word *Written* is not in the Text, nor is the sense of the Word there to be found. Secondly, That which is called the Law, *Deut. 30. 12.* is called *Christ, Rom. 10. 1.* I do not think it proper to say, that *Christ* was written in their Hearts. Thirdly, If the Law was written in their Hearts, it must be there as a ruling Law, or as a Dispositive Law: Not as a ruling Law, in that sense there was no Law written in the heart since *Adam's* fall, and it was only the Moral Law

Law that was so written, antecedent to that fall : If it were there as a Dispositive Law, then were all their sins pardoned : He that hath promised the one, hath promised the other, and both absolutely, *Jer.* 31. 33, 34. Shew me a Person in whose heart the Law of God is written, by vertue of this Covenant, and I will shew you a person whose sins are pardoned. All that can be gathered from these two places, is, that Christ is brought nigh to a people by the Gospel ; and to grasp after more, is to reach after that which these Scriptures will not afford.

Fourthly, You say, this Covenant was not first made with the *Jews* when they came up out of *Egypt*, it was first made with *Abraham* and his seed, and only renewed with the *Jews* at the Land of *Moab*.

Reply. I grant it, yet is that renewing called the making of the Covenant ; and in that you grant it to be the same Covenant which that Mark refers to that you have in the 25th. verse, it is clear it was not the Covenant of Grace.

Fifthly, You say, that Covenant that was made with *Israel* when they came up out of *Egypt*, was no other but the *Mosaical Law*, as appears *Heb.* 8. from the 1st. to the 8th.

Reply. *First*, If the Covenant that was made with *Israel* when they came up out of *Egypt*, was no other than the *Mosaical Law*, then that Covenant *Dent.* 29. 10, 11, 12. was no other than the *Mosaical Law* ; for that was the Covenant that God made with them when they came up out of *Egypt*, as appears by the 25th. verse ; and you confess your self, that the *Mosaical Law* is distinct from the Covenant of Grace, and that it is repealed, therefore that Covenant is then repealed.

Secondly, I deny, that the Covenant that God made with them when they came up out of *Egypt*, was no other but the *Mosaical Law*. You will find *Dent.* 29. 1. that

that it was according to all the Words that were spoken in the 28th. Chapter, that he was to make the Covenant with the Children of *Israel* in the Land of *Moab*, which was the Covenant that he made with them *ver.* 10, 11, 12, 13. Now there is more contained in the 28th. Chapter than the *Mosaical Law*; there are a great many outward Blessings that are promised on condition of their Obedience, from *ver.* 2, to 15. among which there is their Prosperity promised in the Land of *Canaan*, which was the Land that the Lord promised to give them, *verse* 11. now this Land was the Inheritance of the first Covenant, *Gen.* 15. 18. God never renewed this Covenant with them after he then made it with *Abraham*, but he still mentions the Land of *Canaan*, as you may see *Gen.* 17. 8. *Exod.* 23. from 22, to the end, and *Deut.* 28. 12.

Thirdly, There were a great many Curses threatned in case of Disobedience, *Deut.* 28. from 15, to the end, and these are called the Curses of the Covenant, *Deut.* 29. 20, 21. Those Legal Ceremonial Laws that you refer to, *Heb.* 8. and the beginning, are the things which are called the Ordinances of the first Covenant, *Heb.* 9. 1. which were annexed after the first Covenant was made, *Gen.* 15. 18.

Fourthly, You say, that this Covenant is delivered in one continued Speech, *Chap.* 29. 30.

Reply. If it be granted without proof, that the 29th. and 30th. Chapters were delivered at one continued Speech, yet it will not follow, that what is spoken in both these Chapters, do all of it respect that Covenant mentioned in *Chap.* 29. 10, 11. I doubt not but *Jer.* 31. was delivered at one continued Speech, and yet there are two Covenants spoken of, *ver.* 31, 32, 33.

Secondly, I deny, that Heart-circumcision promised *Deut.* 30. 6. is a Branch of that Covenant, *Deut.* 29. 10. or that it belonged to all the Natural Seed, who were

were the subjects of the first Covenant: I would now Query, Whether the Curses that are threatned *Deut.* 29. 20, 21. be not the Curses of that same Covenant mentioned *ver.* 10, 11?

Secondly, Whether these Curses be not threatned in case they brake that same Covenant? And if both of these be granted, it will necessarily follow that it is the same Covenant that is intended *ver.* 25. where the reason is rendered why the Lord laid all these Curses upon them; and if so, it may still be distinguished by this same mark from the Covenant of Grace.

Again, If it were only the *Mosaical Law* that was repealed, how then came Circumcision to be repealed, that was the Token of that Covenant that God made with *Abraham* and the Natural Seed, *Gen.* 17. 10? This was no *Mosaical Rite* in respect of the first institution. All the *Mosaical Law* might have been repealed, and Circumcision have remained; but the Repeal of the Covenant, whereof Circumcision was the sign, made void the Token.

Again, If it was only the *Mosaical Law* that was repealed, how came the *Jewish Church-State* to be repealed and dissolved, when Christ was offered up? you say, it was by virtue of Covenant that they were constituted a Church, by virtue of Interest in that Covenant that their Children were Church-members, yet you grant that their Church-state was dissolved when Christ was offered up; and that the *Jews* themselves were to be considered as Aliens, till they embraced the Christian Faith. If the Covenant, by virtue of which they were constituted a Church, had remained, their Church-state would have remained; that which gave it its being, would have continued it its being: The Repeal of *Moses's Law* would not have made void their Church-state, had not the Covenant been repealed: Now that the Covenant it self, in which all the people of *Israel* stood,

stood, was repealed, when Christ was offered up is as clear as Words at length can make it, *Zach. 11. 10.* Then I took my staff, even Beauty, and cut it asunder, that I might break my Covenant that I had made with all the people, and it was broken in that day. Dr. Owen observes upon the place, "That when the Covenant of Grace was confirmed by the death of Christ, that then was the peculiar Covenant that God made with *Israel* broken, and *Israel* ceased to be a Church.

In your next Paragraph you say I tell you, that seeing the Legal Ordinances are repealed, and a New Administration of the Covenant of Grace is established, the Church-membership of Children must be proved by this New Administration, and not by the Old, which is abolished; for in the change of the Administration there is a change of the Constitution: The Church was National under the Law, it's Congregational under the Gospel. To this you say, that though the Legal Administration be abolished, yet the Covenant is the same, and the Privileges of Believers in spiritual things is rather greater than lesser under the Gospel.

Reply. That the Covenant of Grace remains, is granted, that the Peculiar Covenant that God made with the *Jews* remains, is denied: If the Covenant by which they were constituted a Church had remained, their Church-state would have remained, but their Church-state is dissolved, granted by your self, therefore the Covenant by which they held their Church-state is dissolved.

Secondly, That the Privileges of Believers in spiritual things are not lessened, is granted, but what is that to their Children that are not Believers? that Believers are Church-members, none denies; the Question is, Whether their Children that do not believe are so or no?

Secondly, You say, that by virtue of the Covenant

of Grace, the Children of Believers have a Right to Church-membership.

Reply. First, I have but your bare say so for this, neither Scripture nor Argument to prove it, and my bare denial is of as good Authority.

Secondly, I proved, that the matter of a Gospel-Church was visible Saints, such as in the judgment of Charity were inherently holy, among the number of which Children can't be reckoned: I told you also, if you could produce but one Infant that ever was a Member of any one Gospel-Church, I would give you the Cause; but these things you never replied to.

Thirdly, You say, That the Church under the Gospel is not only Congregational; for tho' a Congregation of Christians under the Gospel may rightly be called a Church, yet many such Churches by the Apostles Authority were united under one Head; *Timothy* was ordained the first Bishop of *Ephesus*, as the *Postscript* declares in 2 *Tim.* and it's evident he had the Government of several Congregational Churches, because he is required to have inspection over other Pastors, and to charge some that they teach no other Doctrine, 1 *Tim.* 1. 3. And *Titus* was ordained the first Bishop of the Church of the *Cretians*, as appears by the *Postscript*, and was left by *Paul* to ordain Elders in every City: And the Angels of the Seven Churches of *Asia* were single Persons, and had Rule over *Presbyters*.

Reply. First, If it were granted, that many such Congregational Churches were by the Apostolical Power united under one Head, it would not relieve you, neither on one hand nor on the other, you could no sooner prove that Children were Members under the New-Administration than before: If you can't produce one Child in ten Congregations singly considered, then you can't

can't produce one in the same Congregations collectively considered.

Secondly, If this were granted, yet it cannot be denied but that the constitution of the Church is altered, and still there is a plurality of Churches under the Gospel; whereas the Church was National under the Legal Dispensation, and if altered in any thing, it's by vertue of this New Dispensation, and that shews that we must now take our measures from thence; and if we will prove Childrens Church-Membership under the Gospel, it must be done by the Law of the New-Dispensation, or we do nothing.

Secondly, I deny, that many such Churches were by the Apostolical Power united under one Head, and therefore shall in the next place examine your proofs. Your first Instance is of *Timothy* ordained the first Bishop of *Ephesus*, and you prove it by the Postscript.

Reply. First, I Question the Authority of this Postscript, and that for these Reasons: *First*, I do not find it in all Translations; if it were of Divine Authority, I wonder it should be left out. *Secondly*, The Postscript to that which we call the *first Epistle to the Corinthians*, tells us it was the first, when it appears *Chap. 5. 9.* that it was the second, therefore I look upon these Postscripts to be Humane.

Secondly, If I grant the Authority of them, it will stand you in little stead: For, *First*, The Church of *Ephesus* was but one single Congregation, produce a plurality if you can. *Secondly*, He was ordained by Election, not made and imposed upon them by any Apostolical Power, he was chosen by the People.

Thirdly, A Bishop and an Elder is the same thing, *Tit. 1. 5.* compared with the *7th.*

Fourthly, It doth not appear from *1 Tim. 1. 3.* that *Timothy* had an inspection over other Pastors, in that

he was to charge some that they should teach no other Doctrine. For,

First, You do not know that these were Pastors teaching or preaching, not being tyed to Office-Power; the Members might teach as well as Pastors, they might all prophesie one by one: Prophefying is a speaking to Edification, Exhortation and Consolation, 1 Cor. 12. *Many of the Brethren in the Lord waxed bold to preach the Gospel by my Bonds, saith the Apostle, Phil. 1. 14, 15, 16. As every man hath received a gift, so let him minister the same, as good Stewards of the manifold Graces of God: He that speaks, let him speak as the Oracles of God, 1 Pet. 4. 10.*

Secondly, If it be granted that they were Pastors, yet what power does there appear in *Timothy* over them by this Scripture, more than was in the Members of the Church of *Coloss* over *Archippus*, Colos. 4. Say to *Archippus*, that he take heed to his Ministry that he hath received, to fulfill it.

Fifthly, There was a plurality of Bishops or Elders in *Ephesus*, though *Ephesus* was but one Congregation or Church, Acts 20. He sent and called for the Elders of the Church of *Ephesus*, and gave them a charge to feed the flock of God over the which the Holy Ghost had made them Overseers. The Church of *Ephesus* was but one flock, and each of these Elders was an Overseer of the whole flock; they had equally the oversight of them, and it doth not appear that here was any Superintendent, Primate, or chief among them.

Your second Instance is *Titus*, and his power hath but a Postscript for it neither.

Reply. What I have said of *Timothy* with respect to the Postscript you may read over again, and let it serve for an answer here.

Secondly, You say, he was to ordain Elders in every City.

Reply. *First*, If *Titus* were ordained an Elder of a particular

ticular Church in *Crete*, it was by Election, which shews the power of ordination lay in the Church, not in Ministers; and what power there is in one Church is in another: Now we may not suppose that *Paul* who never attempted to take the power of the Church from them himself, would give *Titus* a Power so to do; he gave him Rules to observe; *That thou should'st ordain Elders in every City, as I had appointed thee*: *Titus* was left there to be of use by way of advice and counsel to them, to acquaint them with the Rules that were to be observed by them in the Organizing of Churches, but not to exercise a Monarchical Power over them.

Secondly, The ordination of an Elder is not the Act of a Particular Person, but of the whole Church, therefore *Titus* had not this Power in himself, *Acts 14. 23. When they had ordained them Elders in all the Churches by election, &c. Not by laying on of hands, but by lifting up of hands, (as Cartwright observes on the place in answer to the Rhemists) it was by common suffrage; the essence of Ordination lieth in the choice of the people, and the acceptance of that choice. Beza notes on the place, That in the Primitive Times Ministers were not made, and thrust upon the people through Bribery or Lordly Superiority, but chose by the common suffrage of the people: Each particular Congregation is invested with full power for the right ordering of themselves, Mat. 18.*

Thirdly, *Titus* was an Evangelist, as it appears by his work; he was not long Resident in one place, and was only left at *Crete* for a season, to be an Assistant to them in this Work, no fixed Bishop over all the Churches in *Crete*.

Your third Instance is of the Angels, *Rev. 2d. and 3d. Chapters*, they were single Persons you say, and had the Rule over *Presbyters*.

Reply. First, That these were particular men I grant, and so were the Churches that they related to, particu-

lar Churches or Congregations; produce a plurality of Congregations in any one of these Churches if you can.

Secondly, These Angels were the Messengers of the Churches; so the word *Angels* signifie.

Thirdly, You can't produce one instance in these two Chapters, that these Angels had rule over *Presbyters*; for what is contained in these Epistles is spoken to the Churches, both by way of commendation, and by way of reproof, and not to the Angels distinct from the Churches; what the Spirit spake was to the Churches, though the Epistles were sent to the Angels: You can't say it was the Angel of the Church of *Ephesus* only that had lost his first Love, unless you contradict yourself, page 52. You say it is evident, that some of the Church of *Ephesus* fell, and were threatned unless they did repent; now the same that were here threatned, that were before commended, that had tried them, that had said they were Apostles, and were not, and had found them Lyars, *verse 2.* so that it was the Church that had this Inspection over the pretended Ministers, not the Angels distinct from the Church. And it was the Church of *Pergamos* that was reprov'd, in the *14th. verse*, for suffering corrupt Teachers to remain there: Nor are you ever able to prove that these corrupt Teachers had Office-power committed to them. If they had not, then these Angels had not rule over *Presbyters*; if they had, it was the Church, not the Angels singly considered, that had this ruling power; if the neglect had been the Angels, not the Churches, the Church would not have been reprov'd for the Angels fault.

In the next place you say I tell you, that the only Commission the Apostles had from Christ was to make Disciples by Instruction, and then to Baptize them; to this you say, that Christ commissioned them to baptize all that were discipled, and that Infants of Believers are
in

in some sense Disciples, because God is pleased to take them into Covenant.

Reply. First, You granted in your last, that the chief Commission that the Apostles had from Christ, was, to make Disciples by Instruction, and then to baptize them: Upon which I desired you to shew me another, if this were not the only Commission that Christ gave them: Now because you can't find another, but must grant that this was the only Commission they acted by, you have left out the word Instruction, which you had granted before; but this will not do your Business.

Secondly, To be discipled by Instruction, and to be a Disciple of Christ, is the same thing; a Person can't be a Disciple of Christ unless he be taught. Can a Person be a Disciple of Christ unless he hath learned Christ? If you did not know that a Disciple and a Scholar were the same thing, the Opposition you make against it were the more tolerable: You can't define a Disciple of Christ, but you must say, he is one that hath learned Christ. Calvin, that was no Friend to the Perswasion of the Baptists, saith in the 3d. Book of his *Institutions*, Chap. 2. Sect. 6. that the Apostle doth commonly use the words *Faithful* and *Disciple*, as several Words expressing the same thing; and *Wilson* in his Dictionary tells you, the Word *Disciple* signifies a Scholar, without giving any other sense of it; nor did I ever meet with any other sense of the Word, unless the point of Baptism were in debate, and then I confess Men will shift and strain the Word strangely, (as you do) to bring in Children to be Disciples, though they know they are incapable of learning Christ.

Secondly, The Apostles had no Commission to baptize any but such as were discipled by Instruction: The Commission is, *Go disciple to me all Nations, baptizing them*; the word *Them* is relative to all Nations discipled.

Thirdly, I deny, that Infants are discipled in any sense, and it seems you don't know your self in what sense they are Disciples; you say, they are so in some sense, but do not tell me in what. In what sense I pray is he a Scholar that never learned, that never went to School to learn, that is not capable of Learning.

Secondly, You say, that though you grant that Aliens from the Faith must be discipled before they be baptized, yet you can't see how all Infants are hereby excluded.

Reply. The same Commission that expressly enjoyns them to Baptize the former, doth implicitly and consequentially forbid them to Baptize the latter. I would but ask, Whether Christ, when he doth expressly command them to teach baptized ones to observe all things whatsoever he hath commanded them, hath not in the same command implicitly and consequentially forbidden them to teach them to observe that which he hath not commanded them.

Thirdly, You say, that the Children of Believers are born within the Covenant, and so ought to be baptized before they are capable of Instruction.

Reply. *First*, You do but beg the Question to say they are born within the Covenant, that's the thing denied by me, and not proved by you.

Secondly, I deny, that barely Interest in the Covenant is the ground of Baptism; there is nothing that you pitch upon to prop up Infant-Baptism withal, that you have any express Scripture to prove it by; if you say, they are in the Covenant, that must be proved by consequence; if you say, that Interest in the Covenant is the ground of Baptism, that must be proved by consequence; and whatever else you make the ground of it, must be proved the same way; and so you are still left upon uncertainties your selves, and from mistaken

premises you draw wrong Conclusions. Nothing can certainly be made the ground of Baptism but the command of Christ, keep to that and you are upon a sure Foundation, and if you keep to that, you will never Baptize any but such as are disciples by the Word.

SECT. XI.

YOU come now you say to Vindicate your Arguments for Infant-baptism against my Exceptions. Your first Argument is drawn from *Acts 2. 39*. This you say is strongly assaulted with many Engines of Battery. *First*, I argue thus, that what right the Children are here said to have, they had before their Parents did believe. In Answer to this, you say, the Promise was proposed to the *Jews*, to encourage them to believe, and to repent; and if they would lay hold on the Promise, and become Disciples, that then they should gain an Advantage to their Children; for the Promise was offered to them on Condition that they would embrace Christianity, but they had no actual right to it till they did believe; and though the Promise was proposed to the *Jews* whilst Unbelievers, yet an Argument may be drawn from it to prove a Privilege to Believers and their Children.

Reply. First, Here is a grant, that the *Jews* were not Believers when the Promise was proposed to them; by which I perceive that my Engines of Battery were not raised in vain, the main Fort is beaten down, and the strongest hold that ever Infant-baptism had is now demolished. No Argument can be drawn to prove a Privilege to Believers and their Children, from what is spoken to Unbelievers.

Secondly, Grant this, and you must necessarily grant the other, that what right the Children are here said to have, they had before their Parents did believe; *The Promise is to you, and to your Children*; this was antecedent to their Faith.

Thirdly,

Thirdly, I deny, that the offer of the Promise was on Condition, that they would embrace Christianity: For, *First*, Had the Parents refused to embrace Christianity, that had not blockt up the way of the Children; the advantage or disadvantage of the Children did not depend on their Parents receiving or rejecting; the Children had the offer as well as the Parents.

Secondly, Those that never did receive it had the offer as well as those that did; nothing can be more free than the offer of the Promise.

Thirdly, There is no assurance given in the Text, that such as did embrace Christianity should gain an advantage to their Children; what the Promise was to the Parents before they did believe, that it was to their Children before they did believe; that is, they both had the offer of it, and the Children had no more after their Parents did believe, by virtue of their Parents Faith, than they had before. I would now Query, What advantage the Parent gained for his Children by embracing of the Christian Faith? If you say, it was Baptism, I must desire you to prove it too as well as say so; if you say, it was an Interest in the Promise, by virtue of which they had a right to Baptism, then I shall desire proof to both, for neither of them is founded on the Text.

Secondly, I would Query, Whether they gained an advantage for all their Children, or but for a part of them? If you say, for all, then for the Adult as well as for their Infants, then had they an Interest in the Promise, and a right to Baptism, though they remain'd profest Pagans, or continued Aliens, denying Jesus of Nazareth; and this is contrary to your own Principles. If you say, they gained an advantage for their Infants only, then you will be to seek for proof for this distinction; nay, the Text will contradict you, for their Children are indefinitely considered. *Secondly*, This would

would not reach the Case, they had said but just before, *His Blood be upon us, and upon our Children*; the Apostle now applies a Plaister as large as the Sore; *The Promise is to you, and to your Children*; as if he had said, though you have imprecated his Blood on your own, and the Heads of your Children, yet have you and your Children the tender of the Promise.

Secondly, You say, though the Promise was proposed to the Jews whilst Unbelievers, yet an Argument may be drawn thus, the offering of a Promise to the Wicked doth not make it ineffectual to the Righteous; though the Gospel be preached to the Wicked that reject it, yet such as believe and obey the Gospel may reap Benefit by it.

Reply. I grant it, but here is no Argument in this to prove an advantage to more than do believe: What is all this to Infants that do not believe, nor are any wise capable so to do? could I have argued no better, I would have let this alone; and now I say again, that no Argument can be drawn to prove a Priviledge to Believers and their Seed, from what is spoken to Unbelievers. Should I say, the Promise is to Believers and their Children, and no more, and bring this Text to prove it, you would turn this Text against me, to prove that the Promise is to Unbelievers and their Children, and what Reply have I then to make?

Secondly, You say, I tell you, that if the Children of Believers have an Interest in the Promise, they shall then enjoy the good of the Promise, for Interest in the Promise can't be lost. You say, if this baffled Argument were of any force, many grown Persons as well as Children that profess the true Faith, would have no Interest in the Promise.

Reply. The Argument has not yet been baffled, and I think it will not for the future; the Apostle tells us, *Rom. 9. that it cannot be, That the Word of God should*
have

have taken none effect; the Promise can't fail those that have an Interest in it; the Promise is not Yea and Nay, but Yea and Amen; the Reason why some of Israel went without the Benefit of it, was, because they had no Interest in it; the Promise was made to Israel, *But all were not Israel that were of Israel.* A new Heart is absolutely promised to those that have an Interest in the Promise, *That God will forgive their Iniquities, and remember their Sins no more;* how then can they go without the Benefit of? Did these Promises hang on Conditions, it were something, but that they do not; you grant your self, that the change of the Heart is absolutely promised.

Secondly, I grant, that many grown Persons, that profess the true Faith, have no Interest in the Promise: This runs me upon no absurdity; there are many Hypocrites that profess the true Faith. The foolish Virgins professed the same Faith that the wise did; it's not the Profession of Christ, but Relation unto Christ, that is the ground of Interest in the Promise; *If ye be Christs, then are ye Abrahams Seed, and Heirs according to Promise.* It is not the Profession of the true Faith that is the Evidence of Interest in the Promise, but Faith it self.

Thirdly, You say, that all that have an Interest in the Covenant, in regard of external Priviledges, may not enjoy the saving Benefits thereof, because they prove false to the Covenant, and Apostatize from it.

Reply. The Question was not about those that have an Interest in the Covenant, in regard of external Priviledges, (though I know no such Interest singly considered; he that hath an Interest in the Covenant of Grace, hath a Right and Title to all the good of it, Grace here, and Glory hereafter.) The Question is, about those that have an Interest in the Promise, and that I keep to, such shall not fail of the Benefit of it; the

the Promise is absolute, *Jer. 31. 33, 34.* Secondly, Such as have an Interest in the Promise, are by the same Promise secured against Apostacy, *Jer. 32. 40.*

Fourthly, You say, that God will not fail on his part, to give us Grace sufficiently to enable us to keep his Covenant; but we on our part may fail of our Duty, and so fall short of true Happiness.

Reply. Will he give us true Faith? or will he not? If he will not, then he will not afford us Grace sufficiently to enable us to keep his Covenant; *For without Faith it's impossible to please God.* If he will, then it's impossible for us to fall short of true Happiness: *He that believeth shall not perish, but have Everlasting Life.* Every Believer hath his Sins pardoned, *Acts 13. 39.* every Believer shall be saved, *Mark 16. 16.*

Fifthly, You say, I tell you, the Promise is not proposed here as the ground of Baptism, but as a Motive to enforce the Exhortation, *to repent and be Baptized.* To this you say, the same thing may be a Motive and a Ground too, in several respects; the Promise of Eternal Life is a Motive to Obedience and Holiness, and when we are Holy it's the ground of our Hope: So the Promise here was a Motive to encourage the Jews to believe and to embrace the Gospel, and when they did believe, it was the ground of Baptism.

Reply. First, Should I grant you all this, you would be no gainer by the Bargain, for Persons must believe before the Promise here becomes the ground of Baptism; so that you your self have left no room for Children to come in upon this ground; it is only a Motive to them to believe and obey the Gospel, and no ground to be baptized upon, till they do believe.

Secondly, The offer of the Promise was never made the ground of Baptism, no instance can be given of it; wherever the Gospel comes, there comes the offer of the Promise; those that did not repent, had the offer of

of the Promise as well as those that did ; but if the offer of the Promise had been the ground of Baptism, then had they a right to it as well as others.

Thirdly, It was the command that was the ground of Baptism ; when they had embraced the Promise, and not their Interest in the Promise, the Precept was, *repent and be baptized* ; and that was the ground why Penitent ones took up the Ordinance.

Fourthly, Your instance that you bring to prove, that the same thing may be both a Motive and a Ground too in several respects, is not much to the Purpose ; you should have brought an instance of that which was a Motive to, and the ground of the same thing ; and for want of that, you brought an instance of that which was a Motive to one thing, and the Ground of another, a Motive to Holiness, and the Ground of Hope.

Sixthly, You say, I tell you, that the Children were not baptized when their Parents were, because they were not capable of receiving the Word. To this you say, *First*, If the Promise belonged to them, then Baptism appertained to them ; and though they were not capable of receiving the Word, yet this did not render them unfit for Baptism.

Reply. You grant but just before, that the Promise was but a Motive to encourage to believe, not the Ground of Baptism, till they did believe ; whence I conclude, the Promise belonged to the Children no otherwise than as a Motive, not as the Ground of Baptism, because the Children did not believe.

Secondly, The Faith of the Parent gave not a right to the Promise unto the Child, what right the Child had bore date before the Parent did believe ; *The Promise is to you, and to your Children* ; this was before the Parent did believe, granted by your self, and there is not a word spoken of Children after the Parents believed.

Secondly, You say, it does not follow that the Children

dren were not Baptized when their Parents were, because it is not recorded ; there is no doubt but the Apostles were baptized, yet there is no Record when and where it was done.

Reply. I grant, if there were no more to be said in the Case but barely the want of a Record, it were not ground enough to conclude it ; but there is more to be said in it : For, *First*, There were no more baptized than were added to the Church ; that I suppose you will grant me. *Secondly*, There were no more added to the Church than were admitted unto the Supper ; *The same day there was added unto them about three thousand Souls, and they continued in the Apostles Doctrine, and breaking of Bread, and Prayer.* If there were no more Baptized than were added to the Church, and admitted unto all the Ordinances, then their Children were not Baptized ; but there were no more baptized than were added to the Church, and admitted unto all the Ordinances, therefore their Children were not then baptized.

Your second Argument, you say, was drawn from the right the Jewish Children had to be admitted into the Church-state : To which I replied, that the Law of that Church-state being repealed, and a new Administration established, we must not now take our measures from thence. To this you say, though the Administration be different under the Law and Gospel, yet the Covenant is the same.

Reply. The Question was not about the Covenant, but about Church-membership ; now the Administration being changed, in which there is a change of the Constitution of the Church from National to Congregational, you must prove their Church-membership from the Law of this New Dispensation, or you do nothing : *Old things are passed away, behold all things are become new, 2 Cor. 5.* and so great is the change, that
Birth-

Birth-Priviledges are ceas'd, and a Son of *Abraham* according to the *Flesh* hath no more notice taken of him than a Stranger. You your self grant the *Jews* to be Aliens as well as others, till they believe; a *Jew* that under the Old Administration was born a Church-member, under the New is not to be lookt on as such, till in the Judgment of Charity he be New-born, 1 *Cor.* 12. 13. seeing you can give me no instance of one Child that ever was received a member of any one Church, since the change of the Administration, I shall pass from this Head, as judging it a needless task to answer those Arguments that have been answered already.

Secondly, You say you urged this for Infant-Baptism, that if the Children of Christians are excluded the Covenant and Church of God, then they are in a worse Condition than the Children of the *Jews* were under the Law; and which is more absurd, they would have no more Priviledge than the Children of *Turks* and *Pagans*. To this you say I replied, that Interest in the Covenant of Grace is the same now as then it was; and though Children are not now admitted Members, yet have they the Benefit of the Word as then they had. But here you say the first clause is very obscure, and if I mean by it, as you think I do, that some Children are elected under the Gospel as well as under the Law, this is nothing to the purpose.

Reply. *First*, I mean as you think. *Secondly*, It's much to the purpose, for I can assure you, that none but the Elect then, nor now are, or were the subjects of that Covenant; for none but the Elect are given to *Jesus Christ*, and such only as are given to him are the subjects of this Covenant. As for the last Clause, that they have the Word allowed them, you acknowledge that a Priviledge to those that are capable of receiving it, but it can be none to Infants that are incapable of it.

Reply.

Reply. When the Question was put, What Profit hath the *Jew* more than the *Gentile*? The Answer was, much every way, but chiefly, because to them were committed the Oracles of God; and though Children are incapable of receiving the Word in an Infant-state, yet are they in a fairer way to receive Benefit by it than the Children of *Turks* and *Pagans*, to whom the Word is not vouchsafed.

Secondly, I know not why it should be look'd on as an absurdity, to say they have no more Priviledge than the Children of *Turks* or *Heathens* in an Infant-state, or how does the Lord become more bound to them than to these?

Thirdly, You say I tell you, that the Priviledge of Church-membership is taken from them under the Gospel, though the Jewish Infants enjoyed it, which is a thing that Infants are capable of.

Reply. First, I deny that Infants are capable of Church-membership under the Gospel, though they were under the Law. *First*, They are not fit Matter: The Matter of an instituted Church are visible Saints, such as in the Judgment of Charity are inherently Holy. *Secondly*, They are not capable of the form, which is mutual Consent. *Thirdly*, They are not capable of answering the ends of Church-Communion. *Fourthly*, The Jewish Infants are as capable of enjoying it now as the Infants of Christians; and yet you grant, its taken away from them; you your self would not admit them.

Fourthly, You say, that according to this Doctrine the Children of Christians are worsted by Christs coming, and it had been better for them to have been born under the Law.

Reply. You may as well say, that the Children of the *Jews* were worsted by Christs coming; for before that they were Church-members, but as soon as Christ was offer'd up, their Church-state ceas'd; (granted by

your self) Father and Child were unchurched together, and had the Children of Christians been born under the Law, their Church-membership would have ceas'd when Christ was offered up, as that of the Children of the Jews did.

Fifthly, You say, unless I could have answered this better, it had been my Wisdom to have past it over in silence, and that an ingenious Antagonist should acknowledge his Error.

Reply. First, As to the Answer that I have given, standers by may better Judge than you or I that are concerned. *Secondly*, If passing things in silence be the way for a Man to shew his Wisdom, you have in your Answer to mine shewn your Wisdom abundantly. *Thirdly*, There is nothing of ingenuity in acknowledging an Error antecedent to Conviction.

Sixthly, You say, that the little Cavil that I make about the Passover avails me nothing, and unless I could prove that Infants are qualified to receive it, it's a Vanity to argue for the probability of it.

Reply. First, Did you prove that Children were qualified for Baptism according to Institution, before you offered the same Argument to prove the probability of their Admission? or could you prove that there was one Infant in all those Households that were baptized? if not, it was a double Vanity for you to uge it.

Secondly, I know no qualification that was required of Infants to partake of the Passover, (being circumcised antecedent thereunto) but a capacity of eating Flesh; *It was a Lamb for a House, according to its eating*, Exod. 12. 4. Now it's easie to prove that there were Children in the House, that the whole House was to eat thereof, and that Children in an Infant-state were capable of eating Flesh; and the Argument is your own, *Book 2. Page 29.* that whole Households were baptized, and that Children are a part of the Household. I say, the

the Household were to eat the Passover, and that Children are a part of the Household; and now methinks an ingenious Antagonist should not refuse his own Argument when turned against him.

You say your last Argument for Infant-baptism was this, that if the Infants of Believers be not Church-members, nor any way in Covenant with God, How then could they be in any State of Salvation? But there is good ground to hope, that the Children of Believers may be saved; *For of such is the Kingdom of God.* To this you say, I Reply, that some Children are in Covenant with God and in a State of Salvation, is granted; but what Children they are, is not known. You say, if I mean by this, that some Children are elected, this is impertinent; for the Covenant of Grace is not the Decree of Election, nor are all the subjects of that Covenant elected.

Reply. When I say some Children are in the Covenant, I mean as I say; they are in the Covenant, they had their Names written there *from the Foundation of the World.* Secondly, Such Infants as are in the Covenant, they are elected, and being elected they are given unto Jesus Christ. *Thine they were, and thou gavest them unto me, and all mine are thine, and thine are mine,* John 17. 6. The same individual Persons that are the Fathers by Election, they are the Sons by Federal Relation. Thirdly, Those only that are given to Jesus Christ are the subjects of this Covenant, Gal. 3. 29. Fourthly, These whilst in an Infant-state are unknown to us. Fifthly, If they are not elected, they can't be saved, dying in their infancy, granted by your self. You say, that none but the elect, or faithful persevering Christians, shall inherit Eternal Life; you can have no more hopes of their Salvation, than you have of their Election.

Secondly, You say, the Question was not, Whether Infants were elected? But whether they were in a visible State of Salvation?

Reply. You have forgotten the state of the Question, though you repeated it just before; the Question was, If the Children of Believers were not Church-members, nor any way in Covenant with God, How then could they be saved? Now some Children are Church-members, (that is, of the universal Church) and in Covenant with God, and so capable of Salvation, though they are not visibly so.

Thirdly, You say, I seem to deny all Infants to be Members of the Church, and in a visible state of Salvation, which will hardly agree with our Saviours Assertion, *Mark 10. 14. Of such is the Kingdom of God.* To this you say I Reply, that Christ speaks not here of the Children of Believers, but of Children indefinitely. *Secondly,* He doth not say, that all such do belong to the Kingdom of God, But, *of such is the Kingdom of God.* You say, that Christ speaks of such Children as were brought to him, and doubtless they were the Children of the *Jews*.

Reply. Grant that they were the Children of the *Jews*, yet it will not follow that they were the Children of Believers, considered as such; he doth not say, that these Children do belong to the Kingdom of God. But, *of such is the Kingdom of God*; intimating, that Infants are capable of Salvation as well as grown Persons.

Fourthly, You say, that Christ did not exclude any such Infants from the Church, but saith indefinitely, *Of such is the Kingdom of God.*

Reply. The time was not then come, the Jewish Church, of which Children were a part, was not then demolished. But *Secondly,* Why had you not replied to the second part of my Answer, which was this, Christ did not say, that all such belong to the Kingdom of Heaven, But, *of such is the Kingdom of Heaven*: If you can't say, that all the Children of Believers shall be saved,

ved, then you can't say that they are in a visible way of Salvation, considered as such.

Fifthly, You say, that if the Kingdom of Heaven be made up of Infants as well as grown Persons, then they are in a visible State of Salvation; and if so, they must needs be members of the visible Church.

Reply. First, This Doctrine damns inevitably all the Children of *Jews* and *Pagans*, dying in their Infancy; for you grant, that they are no Members of the Visible Church; truly, I thought you had been more Catholic in your Charity towards Children, though you forbear to commit them to the Dust *in sure and certain hope of the Resurrection to Eternal Life*; if they dye unbaptized, if their capability of Salvation does necessarily infer their membership of the Visible Church, then none but such as are Members of the Visible Church can be saved, and consequently the Infants of all others must perish; and thus to exclude all the Infants of *Jews* and *Pagans* from Salvation, is to pry too far into the Secrets of the Almighty. And now give me leave to tell you, after all the Pains that you have taken to prove Childrens Church-membership, (which you can never do) could you have accomplished this task, you would have been as much to seek to prove their right to Baptism as before, Church-membership being not the ground thereof. *Christ* and *John* did not baptize Church-members, considered as such, but first made them Disciples, and then Baptized them, *John* 4. 1.

S E C T. XII.

YOU say, that whereas you argued, that Baptism is the initial Sacrament, whereby we are solemnly admitted into the Church of God, and into the Covenant of God, and that it may rightly be called the Seal of the Covenant, against which I make several Exceptions

tions ; as, *First*, That Christ never ordained Baptism for the solemn entrance of Members into the Church. To this you say, that if the Apostles baptized Persons as soon as they were made Disciples, and none were admitted to Church-Communion till they were baptized, this seems to insinuate, that hereby they were initiated into the Church.

Reply. First, Such as were discipled to Christ by the Apostles, were Members of the universal Visible Church, antecedent to Baptism.

Secondly, Their Admission to Church-Communion is by a particular instituted Church, and this you grant is not by Baptism, *Page 2*.

You say my second Exception is this, that if Persons are in Covenant, and Church-members, before they are baptized, then they are not entred in by Baptism. To this you say, though Persons are reputed Church-members, and in Covenant before, yet it is no absurdity to say, they are entred in by Baptism.

Reply. My former Answer must be again repeated, if they were in Covenant, and Church-members before, then they are not entred in by Baptism ; if they be entred in by Baptism, then they were not in before.

Secondly, You say, they were invisibly and before God in Covenant, and Members of the Church, before they were Baptized, but they are solemnly, and in the face of the Congregation admitted by Baptism.

Reply. I thought that you had pleaded all this while that Children had been visibly in Covenant, and visible Church-members, but now it seems it's quite another thing, they are invisibly such. But be it so, *First*, I would enquire, How you know that they are such ? That you have not told me yet : That which is invisibly so, is out of your sight, or else it is not invisible. *Secondly*, If they are not visibly so, then you Baptize such as are not Members of the visible Church ; to be Mem-
bers

bers of the visible Church, and not to be visibly such, is such a piece of Contradiction that I think none can unriddle so as to make sense of it; if the whole be visible, the parts are visible; that which is invisible is no part of the visible Church. Now visible Church-membership is no longer the ground of Baptism, but invisible.

Thirdly, You illustrate this by a simile, you Query, Whether it be not common among Men, to use some Ceremonies in admitting a Man to an Estate? The Title he hath to it is the ground of his Admission, but he is not legally invested till he be admitted according to the Custom of the Mannor.

Reply. First, I do not understand that the Custom of Mannors is founded upon the Word as their Rule: I suppose Customs of Mannors may differ in many things, and if so, they do not go by the same Rule. *Secondly*, I do not know why we should look to the Custom of the Mannor for Example in the admitting of Members: You say, the Title that a Man hath to an Estate is the ground of his Admission, whence I conclude, this Title must be visible; the Custom of the Mannor will never admit a Man to an Estate that hath no visible Title to it; so that your simile is impertinent. The Title that the Child hath is invisible, yet there are two things that may be inferr'd from hence: *First*, That Children are not Members of the Visible Church antecedent unto Baptism. *Secondly*, That the Gouler and the Eunuch were not admitted according to the Custom of the Mannor, because they were not solemnly received by Baptism in the Face of the Congregation.

Fourthly, You say I tell you, that there is no Scripture ground to call Baptism the Seal of the Covenant. To this you say, if Circumcision be called a Seal, why may not Baptism be called a Seal too, seeing it's a Sacrament of the same Covenant?

Reply. First, I deny, that ever Circumcision was called the Seal of the Covenant; it's said indeed, *That Abraham received the sign of Circumcision, the Seal of the Righteousness of Faith*; this Ordinance was blest to him for Confirmation, but as it was set to the Body of the People, it was never called the Seal of the Covenant; nor did it Seal that to all as it seal'd to *Abraham*; did it Seal the Righteousness of Faith to them that never believed?

Secondly, It sealed that to *Abraham* that it never sealed to any but to *Abraham*, that was, *That he should be the Father of all them that believe*.

Thirdly, I deny, that Baptism was an Ordinance of the same Covenant; there were many that had an Interest in that Covenant, and a right to all the Ordinances thereof, that had no right to Baptism, *Luke 3. 7, 8.* and many that had no Interest in that Covenant, that yet had a right to Baptism; that Covenant was abrogated, *Zech. 10. 11.* before the Commission was given forth at large, *Mat. 28.*

You Query here, Whether Baptism be not some mark to distinguish the Members of the Church from those that are without?

Reply. First, If it be, then Persons are without till such time as they be Baptized, and so you Baptize them that are without. You needed not to have laboured so hard, to prove that Children are Church-members, seeing those that are without may yet be Baptized; to be without and within too, are Terms inconsistent; if they are without, they are not within; if they are within, then they are not without. No created Being can be in two places at one and the same time; a Person can't be a Member of the Visible Church, and yet at the same time be no Member thereof.

Secondly, I do not know that Baptism is of that use to distinguish the Members of the Visible Church: Persons

sons are and may be Members of the visible Church, tho' they are not baptized. You grant, that some must be disciplined to Christ by instruction, antecedent unto Baptism, and to say, that they are disciplined to Christ, and yet without, seems very absurd.

Secondly, You Query, Whether Baptism doth not seal remission of sins to such as are qualified for it, *Acts* 2. 38. 22. 16.

Reply. That God doth bless this Ordinance to Believers, and make it of use to confirm their Faith in the remission of sin, by the blood of Jesus Christ, I grant, yet this proves it not to be the seal of the Covenant of Grace; nor may a Person be known or concluded interested in the Covenant of Grace meerly from taking up this Ordinance; nor do I yet know any external Seal of that Covenant, by which a Person may be known to have an interest therein.

SECT. XIII.

YOU say, I took that in evil part which you spake concerning the rules of Disputation, when you intended no more than this, I should have defended, not proved.

Reply. I took it no otherwise than you do now explain it, and do again declare, that I do not pretend to much Skill in those rules, I may again err in them.

Thirdly, You say, if the Scripture in some places require Faith and Repentance before Baptism, and in other places asserteth, that the Children of Believers are Church-members, federally holy, and consequently fit Subjects for Baptism, then it must needs follow, that the Adult only are bound to profess their Faith before they are baptized, but the Children of Believers ought to be baptized first, and afterwards to believe and obey the Gospel.

Reply.

Reply. I grant all this, with a *Proviso* that the Scripture does thus teach, but I deny that any one of those things concerning Children is held forth in the Word.

Fourthly, You say that you told me, that Children are as capable of entering into Covenant with God as the little ones were in *Moses's* time; to which I replied, that I did not dispute their capacity, but the Authority thereof; shew me as clear a Command for it as *Moses* did, and I will yield the cause. *First,* You say, that there is such ground laid for it in Scripture, that it is equivalent with a Command.

Reply. But then there was an express command, *Deut. 29. 1.* So that there was no Scruple left in the case, and such a one you can't produce.

Secondly, You Query, Whether *Adam* did not stipulate for his Posterity, and by his miscarriage brought Misery upon them; and if we bring evil upon our Posterity by our vices, it is but equal that they should reap benefit by our Piety and Charity.

Reply. *First,* It is yet to prove that *Adam* did stipulate for his Posterity, though God made a Covenant with him, for a Covenant does not always imply a mutual stipulation; there was no such stipulation in the Covenant that God made with all flesh, *Gen. 9.*

Secondly, We do not stand the Representatives of our Children, as *Adam* did of his, by vertue of that Covenant, so that this instance is not to the Purpose.

Thirdly, Though God made a Covenant with *Adam* for himself and his Posterity, yet we can't make a Covenant with God for our selves and Posterity.

SECT. XIV.

YOU say, the Objections that I urge against Infant-Baptism are two, the *First* is grounded on the Commission, *Mat. 28. 19.* from whence, in reply to your Answer,

Answer, I draw these two Conclusions: *First*, That there is no other way of Discipling unto Christ but by Actual Teaching. *Secondly*, That Christ hath not commanded any more to be baptized than such as are disciplined by Actual Teaching. To this you say, *First*, That the substance of the Commission is to baptize Disciples.

Reply. I grant it, the Commission is, *Go, Disciple to me all Nations, baptizing them*; and this must be taken exclusively of all but Disciples; there are none but Disciples put into the Commission, therefore none but such are to be baptized by vertue of this Commission.

Secondly, You say, the Children of Believers are in the state of Disciples, they are Disciples of Gods making without Man's Teaching.

Reply. This will never pass without some proof to it; your bare say so is not of sufficient Authority. *Secondly*, Children that are incapable of learning Christ, can never stand in the state of Scholars; who but a Child would account a Child a Scholar, that hath learned nothing?

Thirdly, You say, that if Children be Disciples, then they may be baptized without preceding Teaching, for it's the state of Disciples that's enquired after, not the manner how they be disciplined.

Reply. *First*, I deny that there is any such thing as a Disciple of Christ that is not made so by the Word, either by reading or hearing, produce an instance if you can. A Disciple of Christ is one that hath learned Christ, and to suppose a Person to be a Disciple of Christ that never heard of Christ, is to suppose that which can't be supposed.

Secondly, I deny that the Commission enjoyns the baptizing of any but such as are taught by the Word antecedent thereunto: The Word *Them* in the Commission is relative to all Nations taught or disciplined, and there is

no teaching Christ but by the Word; what is not here expressly commanded in respect of the subjects of Baptism, is implicitly and consequentially forbidden.

Fourthly, You say, the Teaching in *Mat.* 28. 19. doth not exclude Infants from Baptism, but only shews that Aliens must be taught before they are baptized.

Reply. First, I find no such distinction in the Text as here you make, nor do I find any thing offered by you to prove your distinction.

Secondly, I find none in the Commission to be baptized but such as are taught antecedent thereunto; there is not one more put into the Commission.

Fifthly, You say, that Children are not to be excluded from Baptism because they are not capable of believing, though Faith be required to go before Baptism, *Mark* 16. 16. for Faith is there as much required to precede Salvation as to precede Baptism.

Reply. First, I would Query, Whether it be not the same Commission, this in *Mark* with that in *Mat.* 28. only varying in Terms, not in Things. *Secondly*, Whether a Believer in *Mark* be not the same thing with a Disciple in *Matthew*. *Thirdly*, How it comes to pass that a Child should be incapable of believing, as he is by your own grant, and yet not incapable of Discipleship, which is the same thing? I wonder you have not found out some shift for this before now. Could you not have said, that the Children of Believers are in the state of Believers, as well as to say, they are in the state of Disciples, and that they are reputed so? Surely the one would have past as well as the other; but here is an ingenious acknowledgment that they are incapable of Believing.

Secondly, Here is a Grant, that Faith is required to go before Baptism, and what can be desired more? If it be required, Christ requires it, and how then can you adventure to baptize those that you confess are incapable

ble of believing? is not this the Commission you act by? and is it not inserted in your Commission, that Faith must precede? have you any other Commission than this? and will this bear you out in the baptizing of such as are incapable of believing? if this Commission requires Faith to go before Baptism, then have you no Commission that requires Baptism to go before Faith.

Thirdly, Children in an Infant-state are not the Subjects of this Commission, nor have Ministers any charge concerning them, though they are commanded to preach the Gospel to every creature, this word must be taken with some restrictions. *First*, It must be understood of rational Creatures, not of Brutes. *Secondly*, Of such among them that have the use of their Reason: Infants are rational Creatures, but they have not the use of their reason and understanding, they are not capable of receiving benefit by the Word, granted by your self pag. 53. it's irrational to think, that Ministers are bound by this Commission to preach to such that are in an Infant-state, and if not to teach them, then not to baptize them, for they are not bound to baptize more than they are bound to teach; and in that Faith is required to precede Salvation as well as to precede Baptism, this shews that they are the Adult only, and not Infants that Ministers have the charge of, by vertue of this Commission.

Sixthly, You say, that Children are capable of Salvation before they believe, and consequently they are fit to be baptized before they believe.

Reply. *First*, Though Children are capable of Salvation, yet they may not be capable of an Ordinance of Christ: Infants are capable of Salvation, yet they are not capable of the Supper of the Lord; now there is the same Faith required in order to Baptism as is required to the partaking of the Supper.

Secondly, A capability of Salvation is not the ground of Baptism; the Children of Unbelievers are as capable of

of Salvation as the Children of Believers. Christ speaks of Children indefinitely, *Of such such is the Kingdom of Heaven*; it would be very uncharitable to say, that none of the Children of Unbelievers are capable of Salvation.

You say, that there are three Arguments that you brought to prove, that the Children of Believers are Disciples. *First*, You argue it from *Mark 9. 37. Luke 9. 48*, Christ would have them to be received in his Name, and accounts the receiving of them the receiving of him, therefore they are Disciples. Against this you say I make two Exceptions:

First, That it is doubtful, whether this was the Child of a Believer or no: You say, it's very probable that this Child was born of such Parents that were of the Jewish Church; and seeing he exprest so much favour to him, there is no reason to condemn him as one out of the Church.

Reply. As it was doubtful before, so it is still, you have left it but where you found it: You say, it's probable he was born of such Parents, but it is but probable, it's not certain; but grant this, and yet the doubt remains, the Child might be born of Jewish Parents that were Church-members, and yet not be the Child of a Believer, for such there were among the Jews, *John 10. You believe not, because ye are not my sheep*; so that my first Exception stands good. You say, it's the Child of a Believer, but you can't prove it, and it's your unhappiness you have espoused a cause that notwithstanding all the Attempts you make, go which way you will, you have but consequences to prove it by.

You say my Second Exception is this, that by a little Child here is meant a grown Person, one that hath humbled himself, and is become as a little Child, as appears by comparing both these places with *Mat. 18. 5. 6. to this you say it's granted, that by little ones, Mat.*

18. are meant such, but this doth not argue that he speaks only of such, for it's evident he speaks also of Children incapable of believing, because the *Greek* Word here speaks of an Infant, and it's clear that Christ speaks of the same Child here which he proposed as an Emblem to his Disciples, *Luke 9. 48. Whosoever receiveth this Child in my name, receiveth me.*

Reply. First, That the Child that was set before them was properly a little Child, is not denied; that which I deny is, that the Child that was to be received in Christ's Name is so to be considered. The little Child was but the Emblem of those that were to be received in Christ's Name; and whereas you say, that it's the same little Child that was to be received, you must know that one Scripture must be interpreted by another; it's the same thing that is handled by all three Evangelists, upon the same occasion, and to the same end, which was to teach his Disciples humility and meekness: And that in *Matthew* speaks not of the same Child, you grant, and yet it's the same thing that is there treated of; and *Pool's Annotations* refers to *Matthew*, and tells us, that this of *Mark* and *Luke* must be interpreted by *Matthew*.

Secondly, *Mark* speaks not of the same little Child, but one of such Children in my Name; and though the Child was proposed as the Emblem, yet it's applyed to the Disciples both in *Mark* and *Luke* too; in *Mark* it's said, *That whosoever shall give you a cup of cold water to drink in my Name, because ye belong to Christ, &c. And whosoever shall offend one of these little ones that believe in me, &c.* this can't be understood properly of a little Child, *Luke 9. 48. Whosoever is least among you, the same shall be great:* It's the safest way to expound Scripture by Scripture, and to take our measure from the clearest, where several speak of the same thing, as here they do; and by comparing the three Evangelists it appears plain enough, that the Child that is to be received in Christ's Name, is one that is become as a little Child.

Secondly,

Secondly, You say, it's a little Child that is incapable of believing.

Reply. He that is incapable of believing is incapable of Discipleship, for a Believer and a Disciple is the same thing; he that is a Disciple, *Mar.* 28. is a Believer, *Mark* 16. you well know that a Disciple of Christ is a Scholar of Christ, and that an infant is incapable of.

Secondly, You say you proved, that Children were Disciples, from *Acts* 15. 10. *Why tempt ye God to lay a yoke upon the neck of the Disciples, &c.* To this you say I replied, that the Persons that these false Apostles would have laid the yoke upon, were not the Children, but the Brethren; and the yoke was not barely Circumcision, but the false Doctrine together with it. To this you say, that Circumcision after the manner of *Moses* must need intend Children as well as the Parents, because they as well as their Parents were the Subjects of Circumcision, and so they as well as their Parents must need be Disciples.

Reply. This is a poor Answer with little of Argument, they must needs be so, because they were once the Subjects of Circumcision, but, Sir, does the Text lead you to this conclusion? or is there any thing in the Text that looks like it? the manner of *Moses* respects the Act, not the Subject; the Subject was described before they taught the Brethren, that they must be circumcised, but how must the Brethren be circumcised; why, after the manner of *Moses*. I gave you several Arguments in my last, to prove that Children could not be numbered among the Brethren here, but not one word of Reply have you made to them; and I dare say, that you are satisfied that Children can't be here numbred among them, and that's the reason you slipt them without a Reply.

Secondly, You say, that if the false Doctrine, together

ther with circumcision be the Yoke that was laid on the neck of the Disciples, it must needs be granted that the Yoke was on the Children, with respect to the Act; and the Yoke being laid on Children as well as Men, it must needs be granted that Children are included among the Disciples.

Reply. To grant the false Doctrine, together with Circumcision, to be the yoke, and yet to say, that this must be laid on the Neck of the Children, is to argue for an impossibility, and it's contradictory to your own Principles: p. 63. You say, that Children are incapable of receiving the Word; now if they are incapable of receiving the Truth, then they are as incapable of receiving a Lye. *Secondly*, It's to argue for an Impossibility, tho' Circumcision might have been imposed on them in an Infant-state, yet the false Doctrine, together with the Circumcision, could not; and to this purpose I argued the last time, why had you not removed the Objections? was it not because you could not? I offered you two things more, which you have not replied to: The *First* was this, that to expound this Text of Children, is to expound it contrary to the signification of the word *Disciple*, as you well know; and if I had abused you in it, sure you would have returned me some Answer, I can't think you would have spared me. *Calvin* brings the same Text for instance, when he saith, that a Disciple and a Believer are used as several Words expressing the same thing.

Secondly, To expound this of Children, is to expound it contrary to that plain Text, *Luke 14. 26. Except a man hate Father and Mother, yea, and his own life also, he can't be my Disciple*, verse 27. *And whosoever doth not bear his cross, and come after me, cannot be my Disciple*: If the Children of Believers, considered as such, are the Disciples of Christ, what need then is there of any farther mark to describe a Disciple by? but a Disciple of

Christ is not so easily known, there must be some special Mark or Character which the Children of Believers may be destitute of, and of which a Child in his Infancy is incapable, *John 13. By this shall all men know that ye are my Disciples, if ye have love one to another.*

Your third Argument, you say, that you brought to prove that the Children of Believers are Disciples, was, because they are holy in such a sence, that they have a right by vertue of the Covenant of Grace to be admitted Members of the Visible Church, *1 Cor. 7. 14. Else were your Children unclean, but now are they holy.* My Reply to this, you say, is, that the holiness of the Child is not Federal Holiness, but of the same nature with the holiness of the Parent, and that the Parents were sanctified each to other, when both were Unbelievers.

To this you say, *First*, That though Marriage be of the Law of Nature, and the Children of Infidels may be lawfully born, yet they are not holy in the Apostles sence.

Reply. First, I take it for granted, that you allow my Exposition thus far, that the Sanctification of the Parents each to the other was by the ordinance of God, when both were Unbelievers. Not to deny in a point of Controversie, is silently to grant.

Secondly, Grant this, and it will naturally follow, that the Children were holy when both the Parents were Unbelievers, for the Holiness of the Children is derived from the sanctification of the Parents each to other.

Secondly, You say, though the Children may be lawfully born, yet they are not holy in the Apostles sence; for he speaks here of some Priviledge that the Children of Believers have above Pagans, and he expressly affirms, that the Children of Believers are holy, and the Children of *Pagans* unclean.

Reply. First, I deny that the Apostle speaks of any Privi-

Privilege that the Children of Believers have above others, or that Believers and *Pagans* are here brought in competition. The business of the Apostle was to answer a case of Conscience, whether the Believer might lawfully abide with his or her unbelieving Yoke-fellow? which case he answers in the affirmative, and proves the Lawfulness of their continuance from the Lawfulness of their state; they were Husband and Wife, and so sanctified each to other by the ordinance of God, and it's from their sanctification each to other that he infers the Holiness of the Children.

Secondly, I deny that the Apostle here doth expressly affirm that the Children of Believers are holy: He speaks not of the Children of Believers, considered as such, but of the Children of those that were sanctified each to the other, which Sanctification was antecedent unto Faith.

Thirdly, I deny that he doth expressly affirm that the Children of *Pagans* are unclean; the Words are, *Else were your Children unclean*; had they not been sanctified each to other, the same Children that now are holy had been unclean.

Thirdly, You say, that the Holiness of the Child is not of the same nature with the Holiness of the Parent, for the Unbeliever is not holy in himself, but is sanctified in or to the Believer; but the Children are said to be holy in themselves, and not barely sanctified to another.

Reply. First, The Holiness of the Child is not an Inherent Holiness, nor is there any such thing to be found in the Children of Believers more than in the Children of Unbelievers; *That which is born of the Flesh is Flesh*.

Secondly, The Holiness of the Child doth not arise from the faith of the Believing Parent, but from the sanctification of the Unbeliever; now such as the root is, such are branches, the holiness of the Child being deri-

ved from the sanctification of the Unbelieving Parent, it must necessarily be of the same nature. Is not the stream of the same nature with the fountain from whence it flows?

Thirdly, I deny, that the Unbeliever is sanctified to the Believer; there is not a word of a Believer in the Text, it's to the Wife; it is not said to the believing Wife, or the believing Husband, nor are they so to be considered in their sanctification each to the other, but barely as Husband and Wife.

Fourthly, You say I tell you, that if it were granted, that the Holiness here were federal, yet this would not render them Disciples of Christ, because many of the *Jews* that were federally holy were not Disciples of Christ. This instance you say is impertinent, for the *Jews* were not federally holy in relation to Christ, till they embraced the Christian Faith.

Reply. The Question is not, Whether they were federally holy in relation to Christ? but, whether they were federally holy till Christ was offered up? if you deny this, it will soon be proved, the Partition-wall was not broken down till Christ was offered up, and till then they remain'd a separate People; and whilst they were a separate People, they were a holy People: The Covenant in which they all stood held good till they weighed for his price thirty pieces of Silver, *Zach. 11. 10, 11, 12.* and whilst they remained in Covenant, they were federally holy. You say your self, *page 17. Book 2.* That the *Jews* were Church-members, were interested in the Covenant under the old Dispensation; and if so, they were federally holy all that time: And you grant, that the change of the Dispensation was when Christ was offered up, therefore they were a holy People until then; and if so, the instances that I have already given, *John 4. 1. and 9. 27, 28.* are sufficient to prove that Persons might be federally holy, and yet not Disciples of Christ.

Fifthly,

Fifthly, You say, if I would have spoken to the purpose, I should have proved that the Members of the visible Church of Christ were not Disciples.

Reply. First, I would Query, Whether the *Jews* were not the visible Church of Christ? you say, *page 65*. They were the true Church of God: Were they the Church of God, and not the Church of Christ? you own them to be Christians, *page 64*. you make the Child of a *Jew* that was a Church-member, and the Child of a Christian, to be the same thing: Were they a Church of Christians, and yet not a Church of Christ? Either the *Jews* were the Church of Christ, or they were not; if they were, all your Objections are removed; if they were not, then tell me what Priviledge the Children of Believers have now lost, that once they had a right to, in their not being received Members of the Church of Christ? for if the Church of the *Jews* were not the Church of Christ, no Instance can be given that ever Children were admitted Members of the Church of Christ. I do not lay much stress on this, only I was willing you should see what might be built on a foundation of your own laying.

Secondly, If by the Visible Church of Christ you mean, a Church that is constituted to the New-Dispensation, (I hope you will bear with me if I keep a consistency in my own Writings) my work is to prove that each individual Member of such a Church is a Disciple of Christ, and not the contrary; but the Church of the *Jews* had many Members that were not discipled unto Christ, and yet they were all federally holy, so that federal Holiness and Discipleship are two things, the latter of which can't be argued from the former.

SECT. XV.

THE Second Objection that I brought against Infant-Baptism, you say, is this, there is no Example