



(2)

The SECOND PART of the
A P O L O G Y
FOR THE
Baptized Believers,

Wherein the GROUNDS of
INFANT-BAPTISM
Are REVIEWED:

In ANSWER to Fourteen ARGUMENTS,
delivered by Mr. *Nathaniel Taylor*, M. A.
in a SERMON on *Matth. 28. 19.* entitled,
ΠΑΙΔΟΒΑΨΤΙΣΜΟΣ ΟΡΘΟΒΑΨΤΙΣΜΟΣ.

And therewithal,
The Reasons of the Separation of the Baptized Believers,
from the Pedobaptists, modestly propounded.

Upon the occasion of their great and long-continued Sufferings.

By *T. Grantbam*, a Servant of Christ.

L O N D O N ;
Printed for the Author. 1 6 8 4.

16034047

Yea, we have Charity for all Men, who are faithful to the Means



Errors introduced among Christians, so it has pleased God to raise

A N
A P O L O G Y
FOR THE

Baptized Believers, &c.

PRESENTED

To all Pious and Well-disposed Christians
in the Church of **ENGLAND.**

SECT. I.

Honoured and Beloved Brethren,

TO prevent a Mistake, and to remove an Aspersion too frequently cast upon us, be pleased to know, that tho we differ from you and others, in some things relating to the Constitution and Government of a true Church, yet we do not therefore arrogate to our selves alone the Christian Name, nor exalt our selves in our Imaginations above others; but do believe and hope, that the Number of the saved Ones will be gathered out of all sorts of Christians, who heartily love God and our Lord Jesus Christ, and live holily and charitably among Men, tho they be diversified in respect of Ceremonies, by reason of the Place and Government where they live:

Yea, we have Charity for all Men, who are faithful to the Means of Grace afforded them, how small soever, knowing that our God delights in Mercy, and does not exact the utmost Farthing of any Man.

But for all this, as it is certain there hath been abundance of Errors introduced among Christians, so it has pleased God to raise up a People still to testify against them, (*the Memories of whom are blessed, tho they were frequently persecuted.*) So we believe it a Duty incumbent upon us, to bear our Testimony to what Truth we know, and not to partake with any in their By-Paths in Life or Religion, and yet endeavour as much as in us lieth, after Unity and Concord with all that fear God, and own the Christian Profession.

To which purpose we have humbly proposed what we thought concern'd us, in order to a better Understanding and Compliance, in our *Friendly Epistle to the Bishops and Ministers of the Church of England*, published some Years ago, but has not been publickly taken notice of, till lately one Mr. Taylor, a Person of Worth for his Integrity, and Zeal for the Protestant Interest, and for his gentle Disposition towards such as fear God, tho differing from him in the Case of Ceremonies.

It hath pleased him (I say) to take notice of our said Epistle, and to offer something in order to a *Composure of Differences*, which I confess, with him, to be a thing greatly to be desired. But then he is pleased to shew us nothing of Mitigation, or Hopes of the removal of the Things which hath occasioned our Disunion, but does rather wholly charge the Cause of Division upon us, and supposes our *Difference about Baptism, to be the chief Cause of our dissenting from the Church of England.*

But tho this is indeed a matter of great Importance, because true Baptism is antecedent to Church-Communion; yet that which is greater in our Judgment, is that open Prophaneness, which, God knows, reigns and rages in the Church of *England*, and therewithal, the utter Neglect of Discipline to reform those Iniquities; and also that persecuting Spirit, which appears even in too many of the Guides of the Church, by whose Cruelty our Sufferings have been much augmented.

For these Causes we have thought our selves concerned to make this our Christian Apology, in which we crave leave to use that Freedom of Speech which the Matters depending do require. And yet,

yet, seeing we must acknowledg that we are not infallible, (as neither does the Church of *England* pretend so to be) we shall speak under Correction, and by the help of God, with resolution to submit to a clear Conviction, if indeed it shall appear, that the Things wherein we dissent are justifiable on the part of the Church of *England*; but till this be done, it would be Hypocrisy and Baseness in us, to violate our Consciences in Things pertaining to Religion, to obtain Favour from Men; for if we should so please Men, we should not be the Servants of Christ. Gal. 1. 10.

And we do the rather desire to be heard at this time; partly, for that Mr. *Taylor* is pleased to impute Folly to us, in separating from the Church of *England*, because we allow of the most of the Thirty Nine Articles; but especially being thereunto required by some of Eminency and great Authority in the Church of *England*, who also told us, That unless we could shew, that the Church of *England* does hold some Error in point of Faith, or that she does practise somethings in her Religion which is sinful, we cannot justify our Separation from her. And whether we be able on this wise to vindicate our present Separation, is the Business which we pray may be seriously considered.

SECT. II.

A brief Account of the Reasons why the Baptized Believers cannot conform to the Ceremonies of the Church of England.

REServing all due Honour to the Church of *England*, so far as she holds the Truth in the Thirty Nine Articles, and as she is a good Fortress against much Popish Superstition and Idolatry; we shall humbly make our Objections in three Particulars,

1. Concerning *Infant-Baptism*.
2. Concerning her *Discipline*.
3. Concerning her *Imposing of Ceremonies*.

From

From all which we think we may safely argue thus :

It is lawful, just, and needful, to maintain a prudent and friendly Separation from such a Church, as does believe, hold, and maintain such Things, as are evidently and actually destructive of that Christian Liberty, wherewith Christ hath made his Churches free; and of that sacred Baptism, and holy Discipline, which Christ ordained to continue in all Churches to the end of the World.

But the Church of *England* does believe, hold, and maintain such Things, as are evidently and actually destructive of that Christian Liberty, wherewith Christ hath made his Churches free, and of that sacred Baptism, and holy Discipline, which Christ ordained to continue in all Churches, to the end of the World.

Ergo, It is lawful, just, and needful to maintain a prudent and friendly Separation from the Church of *England* in her present Parochial Constitution.

Supposing the *Major* is not to be denied by any Christian, we shall endeavour to make good the *Minor*.

To begin with Sacred Baptism. It is evident from the Scripture, and partly from the Confession of the Church of *England*, that the Things prerequisite to Baptism, on the part of every one who is to be joined with the Church Militant, or to be baptized, are these: 1. They ought to have the Gospel preached, or some way made known to them. 2. To believe the Gospel. 3. To repent of Sin. And, 4. Willingly to put on Christ in Baptism. Or to express it in short: They are, first, to be dead with Christ; and then, secondly, to be buried with Christ by Baptism.

Now that the Church of *England* does hold such Things as are evidently and actually destructive of this Baptism, may in our Judgment be thus proved:

1. She believes, holds, and does teach others to hold, That all, or the very most of her Church-Members are regenerate, without hearing the Word of God, without Faith, without Repentance, or any Knowledge of God; and so believes what neither

we, nor any Body else can understand to be true, and errs in Faith.

2. Yet she does not believe that her Members are regenerate at all, till she cross or sprinkle them with Water; neither does she know (because she has no ground to believe) that Infants are thereby made anew, so as to become the Children of God, and Heirs of Heaven; and believing this without possibility (ordinarily) to know it to be true, she errs in Faith.

3. She believes, and maintains, that those ought to be baptized, whom she knows do not, cannot believe, nor repent, nor in any measure know God, nor any Duty of Religion; and herein she errs (as we conceive) concerning the Faith.

4. She believes and maintains, that Sponsors do believe and repent for Infants, or that Infants do perform Faith and Repentance by their Sponsors; and believing these things, and teaching her Youth to believe them, without any ground from the Word of God, she believes amiss, or errs in Faith.

5. She holds, that Persons may lawfully be baptized when they are asleep, and does actually pretend to baptize Infants when they are asleep, which we think verily must needs be a very great Error both in Faith and Practice.

6. She believes, holds, and maintains, that Crossing or Sprinkling is a lawful way of Baptizing, when indeed it is no Baptizing at all. Inasmuch as those that use that Mode, dare not speak as they act, saying, *I sprinkle thee in the Name, &c.* their Conscience bearing them witness, that the sacred Act of baptizing in the Name, &c. cannot be expressed by the word, *Sprinkling*; They therefore believing what they know is not true in this matter, must needs err in Faith, as well as in their Practice. And this Error has in a manner destroyed the way of Baptizing used by *John Baptist, Christ and his Apostles.*

7. Thus tho we grant, that the Church of *England* is no less zealous for the Doctrine of Baptism than our selves; yet it is apparent to us, that she hath accidentally lost this holy Ordinance, both in respect of the Subject and Manner of it, and in the due Use and End of it, which was not appointed (nor fitted) to receive new-born Infants into the Church Militant. And by this unwarrantable Change she has defaced the State, and lost the Praise of a true Church, *1 Cor. xiv. 2.* because she has not kept this Ordinance, as it was delivered by Christ and his Apostles; but hath rather

rather suppressed it, and much oppressed those that labour to restore it to its due Use and Practice in all Churches, which is a great Aggravation of all these her Errors in Faith and Practice, concerning Sacred Baptism.

S E C T. III.

Concerning Discipline.

WHAT manner of Discipline the Church of Christ ought to observe, is sufficiently declared, *Matth. 18. 1 Cor. 5. 2 Theff. 3. Tit. 3.* and other places. And it is very well expressed by a Minister of the Church of *England*, in his *Defence of the Thirty Nine Articles of the Church of England*, in these Words: *The manner of proceeding in Excommunication is, first by gentle Admonition, and that once or twice, given with the Spirit of Meekness, even as a Brother, if the Fault be not notoriously known; and next, by open Reprehension; afterward by publick Sentence of the Church, to put him from the Company of the Faithful, to deliver him to Satan, to denounce him an Heathen, and a Publican, if no Admonition will serve, and the Crimes and Persons be very offensive.* Thus he.

And to this *Discipline* we can heartily subscribe, it being indeed the very same which is religiously observed by the Baptized Believers in this Age and Nation.

But where now shall this *Discipline* be found in the Church of *England*? Does any one Assembly, or Court, of the Church of *England* observe it? Or does she not practise that in her Courts, which is too evidently destructive of it? For so far as we can understand, instead of this brotherly Admonition, Men are clandestinely presented and accused, and often excommunicated for they know not what. What Man is now taught or bound by any Order of the Church of *England*, that in case his Brother trespass against him, by defaming his Reputation, offering Injury to his Person, or by wronging him in his Substance, to take that brotherly Course prescribed to all Christians, *Mat. 18.*? Or if he would take this Course, what Congregation is empowered or allowed to hear or determine the Strife, as Sin is in such cases committed against God?

We

We see not how it is possible for the Offended, to do his Duty in an orderly way to the Offender; if he go about it, he shall probably be derided both by Teacher and People: So far is he from obtaining Justice against the Offender, in any Congregation of the Church of *England*, because the ancient Discipline is an unknown thing to the People generally. And for want of this Christian Government, are Men continually exposed to Suits and Troubles in Courts of Law, wherein the Poor can have small Help; as it is written, *Eccles. 5. 8.* (old Translation) *If thou seest the Poor to be oppressed, ——— marvel not, ——— for one great Man keepeth touch with another, and the mighty Men are in Authority over the Poor.*

3. But that which is more grievous: We do not see that open Prophaneness can be met with, or suppressed by your Discipline: For suppose a Man be given to Swearing, Lying, Drunkenness, and lascivious Talking, (as God knows, a great Number of the Members of the Church of *England* are known to be such) your Discipline seems to have no power in such Cases: for thus saith one of your own Ministers:

Who minds Canon 109, that prohibits common Swearers, common Drunkards, notorious Whoremasters, and Whores, &c. from the blessed Sacrament of the Lord's Supper? Do not even Bishops hear Men swear a thousand Oaths, and either do not, or dare not use any Discipline against them?

But now if a good Man do not stand up, and bow to the Altar at the Name of Jesus, when the Creed is read, because he dares not pay greater Reverence (in a religious way) to any Writing, than he pays to the holy Scriptures; If he dares not use the Sign of the Cross in Baptism, nor sprinkle his Child, &c. then shall he be prosecuted as a great Sinner, cast to the Devil, and laid in Prison; yea, he is sentenced already: For in *Canon 6.* thus we read: *Whosoever shall affirm, that the Rites and Ceremonies of the Church of England are-- superstitious, or such -- as Men who are zealously and godlily affected, may not with any good Conscience approve them, use them, or as Occasion requireth, subscribe unto them; let him be excommunicated ipso facto, and not restored, until he repent, and publicly revoke such his wicked Errors.*

4. Thus (as we conceive) the Discipline of Righteousness, Mercy, and Charity, established by Christ, is laid aside; and a Mercenary Court set up, holding the Traditions of Men, instead

of Christ's Institutions, in Ecclesiastical Government, who also live voluptuously upon the Sins of the People. But as for the Reformation of evil Manners, or the making Peace and Concord, alas! it is not sought for, nor indeed expected from these Courts. And as the Reverend *Grosthed* said at *Rome*, when he saw all things ruled by Money, so may I say of the Courts under consideration, *O Money, Money, what wilt thou not do there?* As for the opprobrious Language prohibited by the *Canon*, we think it uncomely for any to use it, tho we dissent from the Ceremonies themselves.

SECT. IV.

Concerning Imposing of Ceremonies.

1. **A**LL Divine Ceremonies ordained by Christ, or his Apostles, we reverence, and religiously observe and keep, as they were delivered.
2. That any Church since their days, hath just power to make and ordain Divine Ceremonies, to be any necessary parts of the Worship of God, we see no ground to believe; much less, that such Ceremonies may lawfully be imposed under pain of Excommunication, Banishment, Imprisonment, Loss of Estate and Life. For tho it is certain, God has given power to the Rulers of the World, to make, change, or disannul Laws in point of Civil Government; yet we believe all the Power on Earth cannot make one Institute or Divine Ceremony in Religion. And therefore we cannot but think the Church of *England* erred from the Rule of Righteousness, in decreeing Rites and Ceremonies which God has not commanded.
3. For when we see how sharply some were reprehended by *St. Paul*, for bringing the Christian Churches in *Galatia* under some Legal Ceremonies, which once had a divine Original and Use in the Church of God, as *Invaders of the Liberty wherewith Christ had made them free*; averring also, *That if they were subject to them, Christ should profit them nothing.* *Gal. 5. 1, 2.* We can see no ground to free the Protestants from Sin, who either
take

take up Scriptureless *Ceremonies* from the Papists, or invent *Ceremonies* themselves; but least of all, when they force Men, will they, nill they, to conform to such *Ceremonies*, or else to be ejected, and delivered up to Satan. And surely it was very unreasonable for her Bishops to consent to a Law, that pious Men, only dissenting in these things from the Church of *England*, should be banished, or else hanged as Felons, without Benefit of the Clergy. And we humbly desire, that the Severity of that Law may be considered and mitigated. See the 35th of Elizabeth.

4. But if it shall be said, That the *Ceremonies* of the Church of *England*, (as the Sprinkling of Infants, the Sign of the *Cross* in Baptism, bowing to the Altar, to name no more at present) are not sinful; then how shall we be ever able to reprove a Papist, for using holy Water, bowing to the Image of Christ? &c.

Certainly, if we must submit to the *Ceremonies* of the Church of *England*, in her present *Constitution*, we must submit to theirs too, where they have power on their side to enforce them. But he that shall impartially consider what a learned Protestant hath said of the Sinfulness of that one *Ceremony* of the Sign of the *Cross* in Baptism, in his Book entituled, *Against Symbolizing with Antichrist in Ceremonies*, will see great cause to avoid touching with any such Inventions, however they may be supposed to have had an harmless Use among *Christians* at the first.

But who sees not, that when such *Ceremonies* have got the Reputation of Religion upon them, and are forced on by humane Laws, what incredible Miseries they have brought upon the *Christian* World? How have they lorded it over Kings and Kingdoms, over the Estates, Liberties and Lives of *Christians*? Who sees not, that being thus set up, they are sometimes more set by, than sincere Faith, and an holy Life? as if all true Religion (and *Loyalty* too) were only to be judged of according to Mens Submission to those Humane Innovations. For it is notorious, even in this our Land, that let a Man but conform to all the *Ceremonies*, he shall live honourably, let his Life be never so debauched almost: But let a Man refuse these *Ceremonies*, out of conscience to God, because they are not from Heaven, then he is Envy's Mark, let his Life be never so just and harmless. Such Effects should lead us to consider what the Causes are.

And because we are speaking of Ceremonies, we crave leave to enquire, *What means the Ceremony of the Ring in Marriage?* Why are we forced not only to use it, but to use it *in the Name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy-Ghost?* The Church of England blames the Papists for saying Marriage is a Sacrament; but shall we then make a Sacrament of a Ring? Sure you make the Ring as sacred in Marriage, as you make the Water in Baptism. Such Usages as these, we fear, give the Papists too much cause to use this Speech, *A Protestant is but a Papist fear'd out of his Wits.*

It is not then any thing of Prejudice or Obstinacy, which makes us to stand off from the *Communion of the Church of England*, but an unfeigned Desire to serve God aright, and a godly Fear, lest by touching with these unwritten Traditions, we should bring our Souls under Guilt in the sight of God. Howbeit, if any can convince us, that the *Church of England* is justifiable in these things here objected, we shall suspect our selves to be mistaken in other things, which we here mention not.

Now may it please the God of Heaven, to put it into the Hearts of the Guides of the *Church of England*, to consider these things.

1. *That none of these Ceremonies about which we differ from them, are required of Christians in the Holy Scriptures.* And that therefore,

2. *To enforce them by Excommunication and Penal Laws upon the Consciences of Men, is more than God requires of you, or any Body else.*

And surely if the making these things necessary to our *Communion* were but removed, so that Things which are not delivered in the Word of God were left at liberty, we should not stand at so great a distance from the *Church of England*, as now we do: For tho we are verily persuaded, that these Things objected against by us are Errors, and therefore prudently to be amended; yet we believe the imposing of them is a thousand times more offensive in the sight of God, and more grievous to the Souls of Men, because (as we conceive) God's Authority is then usurped by Man, and Mens Fear towards him is then taught by the Precepts of Men.

And yet we know, and indeed must confess, that many Things, as to the more convenient performance of Religious Services in a Church-way, are left to the Prudence of the Church, guided therein

the Baptized Believers.

111

therein by the general Rules in the Word of God; and some Things also (which are not of the Essence of Christianity) will seem doubtful to some, and clear to others. And therefore there will be a continual Necessity of brotherly Forbearance one towards another, in some sinless Ceremonies, as many Things may be so esteemed, whilst not made the Boundaries of Communion, and forced upon Christians against their Consciences. For Example: tho Sitting be the most safe Gesture at the Lord's Table, because nearest to Christ's Example; yet if any in Humility, and of Devotion to God, think it their Duty to receive kneeling, this surely cannot justly offend any Christian. And thus also bowing at the Name of Jesus, being left at liberty, when, where, and upon what occasion the Conscience of a Christian may be most pressed to do it, need not offend any, tho it is apparent such bowing is not the meaning of the Text; *Phil. 2. 10.* And the same may be said of well-composed Prayers; so that still such Forms be used as a matter of Christian Liberty, and not imposed by Law as necessary.

And could Things be managed with such Moderation, (as certainly the State of the Inhabitants of this Land does much call for it) in a friendly and brotherly Spirit, 'tis hoped our Animosities would abate, and Charity would endear all that are upright towards God one towards another, tho labouring under many Weaknesses, or dark Circumstances. But whilst one Party stand up with a Sword in their hand, or with power to thrust Men into Goal, and rise their Estates, unless they will all submit to their Will and Pleasure, not only without, but perhaps in some Things against the Word of God, (*the pretended Rule to all Protestants in Matters of Religion*) this lays a Necessity upon all that are of Noble and truly Christian Spirits, to testify against such Cruelty, and unmanly Proceedings, and to assert the true Christian Doctrine and Liberty, and Christ's Sovereign Authority only, to make Laws for his Church, as such, altho for so doing they suffer the Loss of all Things which are dear to them in this World; and therewithal, to stand off from the Communion of such unreasonable Men, as have not learned to do to others, as they would have others to do to them under their differing Opinions, when in a state of Subjection to those who differ from them.

Thus much briefly of the Reasons or Causes of our Separation. We will now consider what Mr. *N. Taylor* brings to make good *Pædobaptism*. And the rather, because he says he has defended Infant-Baptism both by Scripture and Reason.

Let us hear how he doth this.

Mr. NATHANIEL TAYLOR'S Fourteen Arguments for Infant-Baptism, considered and answered.

BEfore we answer his Arguments, we will take notice of some of his Concessions. And,

1. He saith, *Baptism of Water is not absolutely necessary to Salvation.* pag. 2.
2. He tells us, *St. Paul joins the Word of God with this Baptism, in order to the purifying Christ's Church, that acting on the Soul, and this terminating on the Body. And that St. Peter's Assertion is clear that it is not Water purifying the Flesh, but the answer of a good Conscience towards God that saveth.* pag. 7.
3. He tells us also, *That the premising the Word DISCIPLE (Matth. 28. 19.) implies none to be capable of Baptism, who are not Disciples of Christ, and Members of the Church.* pag. 10.
4. And further, *That Christ would have his Ordinances performed by an external Administration, wherein the subject might be in the nearest capacity of understanding.* pag. 81, 82.
5. He grants, *That Childrens Baptism, and Church-Membership, are not mentioned in the New Testament.* pag. 51.

From all which a Man may very fairly argue, and conclude against Infant-Baptism thus.

If Infants are undoubtedly saved without Baptism; and are Members of Christ's Church without Baptism, and that the Word of God must act upon the Soul in true Baptism, so as that the Subject of Baptism must have the answer of a good Conscience: And
if

if none be capable of Baptism, till they be Disciples of Christ, according to *Matth.* 28. 19. and ought to be in the nearest capacity of understanding what is done in the external administration of Baptism. And if Infant-Church-Membership and Baptism be not mentioned in the New Testament; then Infants ought not to be baptized.

But all this is true, saith Mr. *Taylor*: Therefore I conclude Infants ought not to be baptized. And thus his Book (I will not say (as he) may be soon blown away; but it) may seem to be soon answered: And his learned Title very unfitable. For how shall ΠΑΙΔΟΒΑΠΤΙΣΜΟΣ be ὀρθοβαπτισμος, when it is not mention'd in the new Testament; can that be Orthodoxal Baptism which is not mentioned there? Sure this is incredible.

But let us hear his Arguments, by which he undertakes to vindicate *Infant-Baptism* both by *Scripture* and *Reason*.

Mr. *Taylor's* Argument 1.

If our Christian Privileges be as great as the Jews were, then our Children are rightly baptized: But our Christian Privileges are as great as the Jews were: Therefore our Children are rightly Baptized.

A N S W E R.

Because Mr. *Taylor* says he offers his Reasons for Infant-Baptism, in order to a composure of Differences, and I do believe he means as he says; I shall therefore endeavour to answer them with all Love and Sincerity, as becomes a Christian. And, I say,

1. That upon a fair Distinction, both Propositions may be denied. For, if the Question be of external Privileges only; then whether we respect outward Advantages in the World, or Rites and Ceremonies in the Church pertinent to Infants; the *Minor* is to be denied: for the *Jews* were under a sure Promise of a fruitful Land, and external Peace and Glory, as a Nation, whilst they did truly walk according to the Laws of God, of which Advantages their Children were partakers as well as others. But on the other side, the Christian Church by how much she is more faithful,

by

by so much the more is she subject to Persecution: As may be seen in the differing estate of the faithful Church at *Smyrna*, *Rev.* 2.8,9. and the unfaithful Church at *Laodicea*, *Rev.* 3.17. Or if we respect Rites and Ceremonies, then 'tis certain, even in the Judgment of all Christians, the Jews had more Ceremonies belonging to their Infants, than belongs to Christian Infants. For besides the Rite of Circumcision, there was an Offering to be offered for them, and they were to be presented in the Temple, and to partake of the Passover, *Exod.* 12.47, 48. (and therefore Mr. *Taylor* does ill to deny it, *pag.* 92.) Whereas the *Pædobaptists* only contend for the external Rite of Baptism to belong to their Infants.

But if by the Word *Privileges* in the Argument be meant some higher thing than external Ceremonies, then the *Minor* is true: For as God was gracious to Infants in the Jewish Nation, as to the Business of Salvation: So is he such to the Infants of every Christian Nation in the World.

But if now you be displeas'd, because I do not prefer, or at least equalize Christians Infants with Jewish Infants, in respect of external Ceremonies. Then let me freely tell you, that I do believe the Privileges of Christians is greater than the Jews, even in this, that God accepts our Infants to his Grace, and to Glory, *without imposing the Burthen of any Ceremony at all upon them.* For seeing he has by the Gospel taken away that bloody Ceremony of Circumcision, and by our Lord Christ declared Infants to have right to the Kingdom of Heaven, without imposing any Ceremony upon them instead of Circumcision, I say, herein our Privileges are greater than the Jews, and in this Sense I confirm your *Minor*. But then I deny the *Consequence of your Major*: For you may plainly see that our Christian Privileges (when compared with the Jews) stand not in having external Ceremonies, but rather in being freed from them. Even as it cannot be doubted but that the Children of *Seth*, *Henoch*, and *Noah*, &c. had as great Privileges as the Jews, and yet it is certain [*and plainly confessed by Augustine*] that they had no Ceremony or sign of Regeneration belonging to them that we read of. *Aug. de Civ. Dei, lib.* 15. *cap.* 16.

Thus your chief Fort being demolished, what Reasons you bring to defend it signifie nothing; however we shall meet with them in the following Arguments.

Mr. Taylor's Argument 2.

Those who were Circumcised under the Law, may be baptized under the Gospel: But Children were Circumcised under the Law: Therefore they may be baptized under the Gospel.

ANSWER.

1. I answer to the *Major*. If by [*Those*] you mean all those that were Circumcised under the Law: Then the *Major* is not true. For first, all Male-Servants which were bought with Money, must needs be Circumcised, they might not else dwell in the Family: (*Gen.* 17. 12, 13, 14. *Exod.* 12. 44, 48, 49.) But no such imposition is laid upon Families under the Gospel, *1 Cor.* 7.

2. If by [*Those*] you mean Infants, then I deny your *Major*: For tho Infants were Circumcised under the Law, it does not follow that Infants may be Baptized under the Gospel: Nor do your Arguments, brought to make it good, prove it at all. For,

1. Tho Baptism succeeds Circumcision as the Sacrament of initiation, yet it does not follow, that the same Persons, or Persons no otherwise qualified than the Infants of the Jews, or Servants bought with Money, are to be admitted to Baptism; because Circumcision belonged to the natural Seed of *Abraham* as such, whether in the Covenant or no (as in the case of *Ishmael*,) and to his Servants as such. But Baptism being the Sacrament or washing of Regeneration, belongs to those who are born from above (as such); Hence 'tis said, *Gal.* 3. 28. *We are Abraham's Seed, because we are Christ's*, so, as to have crucified the *Flesh with the Affections and Lusts*: *Gal.* 4. 24. And not that they are *Christ's*, because they are *Abraham's Seed*. This vast difference therefore between the Communicants of the Church Jewish, and the Church Christian, shews a great difference between the carnal Ordinances of the Law, and the spiritual Ordinances of the Gospel: so that it is no good arguing from Infants Right to the one, to their Right to the other.

2. You say our Children are *as capable of being Baptized, as the Jews were of being Circumcised*. But this is denied: for the Jews had a Command to Circumcise Infants, and that made them capable of that Ceremony; but without a Command none were capable

of it: For some Infants might be as capable of Circumcision in respect of Strength, on the seventh Day, as others on the eighth Day; but the Command not empowering any to circumcise till the eighth Day, made all Children that died before the eighth Day incapable of Circumcision. Again, you will not say that any Man, as such only, is capable of Baptism, because you grant they must first be Disciples, and, as such, baptized. Nor will you say, that all Infants, as such only, may be baptized, because you do not think God has required the Infants of the Turks to be baptized. So then, unless you can shew that God has required our Infants to be baptized, they have no capacity for it. We conclude then, whatever may be urged as a Capacity for Baptism, yet without a Command from God, to baptize our Infants, is meer Will-Worship and Presumption.

3. You say, *That the Precept of receiving Parent and Child into Covenant stands unrepealed to this day.* But if by receiving into Covenant, you mean a receiving to the Duties of the Covenant, what you say is not true; for the *Covenant of Circumcision* is repealed. Gal. 5. 2. *Behold, I Paul say unto you, If ye be circumcised, Christ shall profit you nothing.* And there was never any Covenant, but the *Covenant of Circumcision*, which obliged Parents to bring their Infants to the Ceremonies of Religion: So then Infants are not under the Burthen of any Ceremonies of Religion at this day. I marvel you should here say, *There is no Countermand of the ancient Jewish Practice of receiving Children to Circumcision.* Either the Printer has wrong'd you, or else you hold the Jews are yet bound to circumcise their Infants.

4. You argue from *Christ's being proposed as Mediator of a better Covenant*, that therefore this great Privilege (you mean, bringing Infants to Ceremonies of Religion) *is not repealed.* But the Truth is far otherwise; for the Covenant of Christ as Mediator, is therefore better than the Covenant of the Law, because he has taken these Ceremonies out of the way, and accepts poor Infants without any other Ceremony instead of them; yea, the Covenant is therefore better to Believers themselves, in that they are obliged but to a very few Ceremonies, whilst the Jews laboured under a burthenfom Yoke of many Ceremonies. And if your way of arguing were good, it would prove, that the Gospel is worse to Believers, than the Law was to the adult Jews, because they had abundance of Religious Privileges, to wit, Ceremonies, and Belie-

Believers have but a very few. Now who would think, that wise and good Men should thus grope at Noon-day?

5. You quote *Acts* 2. 38, 39. and say, that this Text expressly avers your Conclusion. But it is certain, the Promise there, is not of bringing Infants to any Ceremonies, and so does not at all favour your Conclusion; for the Promise being of the pouring out of the Gifts of the Holy-Ghost, according to the Prophecy of *Joel*, concerns not Infants in Infancy, saith *Dr. Jer. Taylor*. And as for the Precept in the Text, [to wit, *Repent, and be baptized every one of you,*] 'tis as certain that concerns not Infants; for Infants are just Persons, which need no Repentance, and consequently as little need the Baptism of Repentance. I rather therefore adhere to *Dr. Jer. Taylor*, than to *Mr. Nath. Taylor* in this Case; and I find that *Erasimus* and *Diodate* do expound this Text as we do.

6. Now, Sir, your great Strait seems to be this: You think the Children of Heathens have as great Privileges as we allow to the Infants of Christians. Let me answer freely; I do believe, that through the Grace of Christ their Infants, dying such, are in as sure a capacity for Salvation as our Infants. And why should this offend, that seeing Infants are equally concluded under Sin in the first *Adam*, God should have equally Mercy upon them in the second *Adam*. Nay, does not *Mr. Taylor* himself tell us, *p. 4. That it's dreadful to believe, that all Infants which die unbaptized, are damned.* And that any of them shall be damned, he cannot prove, seeing he says, *He cannot implead them of Sin, in not being baptized, being not capable of desiring it.* Well, I thank him for this, and shall requite him by granting, Christians Infants are more happy in some gracious respects, than the Infants of the Heathen, being the Seed of many Prayers, and piously devoted therein to Almighty God from the Womb, and have the Advantage of an early Education in the Christian Religion, that they may be as timely baptized as may be: On the other side, the Infants of the Heathens are perhaps devoted to Idols, as the Jews did sometimes devote theirs to *Moloch*. But yet, as we do not think that God sent the Jews Infants to burn in Hell, because their Parents burnt them to *Moloch*; so neither ought we to think, that he will punish the Infants of the Heathen with Devils, because their Parents devoted them to Idols; for as for poor Infants, what have they done?

7. You answer not our Objections, by saying, *The Covenant of Grace*, Gen. 17. 10, 13. *is permanent to the Worlds end, &c.* For tho' this were true, yet that the Ceremonies which there accompany that Covenant, were to continue to the World's End, and should pertain to Infants to the World's End, you neither believe your self, nor can any Man prove, that any Ceremonies by Order from Christ should belong to Infants to the World's end, seeing it is granted, that Infant-Baptism is not mentioned in the New Testament. And if I yield you your five Considerations following, pag. 33. I do not see that you gain any thing as to the Point in question; I therefore proceed.

8. I think you mistake, where you write that we say, *Those that had Right to Circumcision were a spiritual Seed*; for we know that the Carnal Seed had Right to it: What therefore you would build upon this Mistake falls of it self. But whereas you would infer, that Baptism, as well as Circumcision, belongs to the carnal Seed, it is certainly a great Error. It is true, some that are Hypocrites may come to Sacred Baptism, but then they profess (at least) to be otherwise, and are not admitted as Hypocrites, nor as Men only, (as you seem to urge, *Numb. 2, p. 34.*) but as they declare themselves Christians, or spiritual. And therefore it is said of the whole Church, *Ye are all the Sons of God by Faith in Christ Jesus; for as many as have been baptized into Christ, have put on Christ.* Gal. 3. 26, 27. And again, Col. 2. *Ye are circumcised with the Circumcision made without hands, in putting off the Body of the Sins of the Flesh, by the Circumcision of Christ.* [Therefore, Rom. 6.] *we are buried with him in Baptism.* And besides this, your Church makes Baptism a visible Sign of an inward or spiritual Grace; and does affirm of all whom she admits to Baptism, that *they are regenerate, and born anew*: Which shews that in this Point we agree, that the inward Work of Grace should be in all that are baptized.

9. I grant, that *Jeremiah* and *John Baptist* were sanctified, or separated to God from the Womb, the one to be a Prophet, the other to be the Fore-runner of our Lord Christ; yet I deny, that these extraordinary Cases are to be made the Rules for us to baptize by. God knows what we will be from our Birth to our Death; but these Things are hid from us. Things revealed and commanded belong to us. We may not presume to think either of Men or Infants above what is written; to say, this is sanctified from the Womb, and that not; this is a Believer, and that
not,

not, &c. But shew us a Rule to baptize Infants, and we will dispute no further.

Mr. Taylor's Argument 3.

Those who are within the Covenant of Grace, may be baptized: But Children are within the Covenant of Grace: Therefore Children may be baptized.

A N S W E R.

1. The *Major* being taken universally, for all that are in the Covenant of Grace, then it is to be denied; for God never made that the Rule of Baptizing. Nay, when Circumcision was in the greatest use, yet all that were in the Covenant of Grace were not to be circumcised. Such were the many Thousands of Male Infants, who died before they were eight days old; these were in Covenant, and their Salvation as sure as if they had been circumcised. The Females also were in Covenant, yet not to be circumcised. If you say they were not capable, learned Authors tell you otherwise, and name some Nations who circumcise both Sexes to this day. By this you see your *Major* runs upon a false Supposition.

2. And if by those who are within the Covenant, you mean some of those, then your Argument comes short of the Question, viz. *Whether all that are in the Covenant of Grace may be baptized?* But let us try your *Minor*. The Covenant of Grace hath two parts,

1. *A Declaration of God's Mercy in Mans Redemption*; in this respect I grant, Infants are within the Covenant of Grace. 2. *A Declaration of Mans Duty in point of Faith and Obedience*; in this Sense I deny Infants to be in the Covenant. Let us hear therefore how you confirm your *Minor*.

3. You say, *It is verified, in that Baptism is the Seal of the Covenant now, as Circumcision was under the Law, &c. And therefore those who are under the participation of the Covenant, may be admitted to the Seal, &c.*

4. But why do our Brethren of the Church of England speak of the Seal in the Singular? They used to tell us, the Covenant has two Seals, to wit, Baptism, and the Table of the Lord. And

I will abide by it, that the Lord's Table is as truly a Seal of the Covenant, as Baptism. Yet you deny Infants this Seal, tho you know when they first baptized Infants, they also brought them to the Lord's Table, and this custom continued six hundred Years. But I deny your Consequence; it follows not, that all that are in Covenant may have the Seal of Baptism. And you tell us, *That God's Grace is universal*, pag. 37. yet you will not say that Baptism is universal; it belongs but to those who restipulate, and enter into Covenant upon the Terms of Faith and Repentance. Acts 8. 12. *When they believed, &c. they were baptized, both Men and Women.* And here the City of *Samaria* generally received the Gospel, and yet not an Infant baptized.

5. But how shall I understand you, where you say, *That Children never excluded themselves from the Covenant of Grace, because not actual Unbelievers, and none but such were ejected?* And where you presently say, *They have the Covenant belonging to them with their believing Parents?* Have Infants no benefit by the Covenant of Grace, unless their Parents believe? Alas! poor Infants! But sure God does not exclude Infants from the Covenant of Grace, made for Mankind in Christ, because their Parents believe not; No, I will hold to your first Saying, *That none but actual Unbelievers are rejected.*

6. That the Holiness mentioned, 1 Cor. 7. 14. is only Legitimacy, or Lawfulness of Birth, you would have to be only a Gloss of the Anabaptists. But how can you fairly take it for any other, seeing it is taken immediately from the Sanctification of the unbelieving Husband, as the word [*else*] being rightly referred, makes evident. Upon which Consideration, *Erasmus* expounds this place expressly as we do, yet he was a Pœdobaptist. And *Austin* long before him said, *Whatever that Holiness is, 1 Cor. 7. 14. it is certain it is not of Power to make Christians, or remit Sins.* Sir, if you consider the Scope of the place, 1 Cor. 7. you will find, some in that Church were in doubt whether they might dwell with their unbelieving Yokefellows. *St. Paul* resolves the Doubt in the Affirmative, and gives this Reason for it: The unbelieving Husband is sanctified to the believing Wife; and if he were not so, their Children were unclean, but he being sanctified, their Children were clean; for Marriage is honourable among all, and the Marriage-Bed undefiled, *Heb. 13.* Therefore let not the Husband put away his Wife, nor the Wife depart from her Husband.

7. What you say further to this Argument, being built upon a wrong Supposition, *viz.* That we deny Infants to be within the Covenant of Grace, falls of it self. For we say with you, till they by actual Unbelief exclude themselves, the Grace of God extends to them, as well as to others, in respect of their Salvation.

Mr. Taylor's Argument 4.

Those who have right to the Blessings of the Covenant, have right to Baptism: But Children have right to the Blessings of the Covenant: Therefore they have right to Baptism.

A N S W E R.

1. This Argument is upon the matter the same with the former, and therefore upon the former distinction the *Major* is denied: for tho Infants have right to all the Blessings of the Covenant which they have need of, yet they have no right to the Duties of the Covenant, which they have no need of, because God requires no Duties of them.

2. And tho you say, that *our Concession* (that Infants are within the Covenant of Grace) *proves that Infants have right to all the Privileges of the Covenant*; Yet this is contrary to your own Judgment, for you your selves deny them right to the Lord's Table, and indeed all other Privileges, as much as we do, except your Crossing and Sprinkling them. What you say further here, is often repeated, and will be considered in the following Arguments; and if I repeat in my Answers, you have compelled me.

Mr. Taylor's Argument 5.

Those who are capable of being engaged in Covenant with God, are capable of Baptism: But Children are capable of being engaged in Covenant with God: Therefore Children are capable of Baptism.

A N S W E R.

1. This Argument, (as most of the rest) may be retorted thus;
They

They that are capable of being engaged in Covenant with God are capable of the Lord's Table: But Infants are capable of being engaged in the Covenant, &c. Ergo, They are capable of the Lord's Table. Which sufficiently shews the unfoundness of your Argument. But let us examine the proof of your *Major*.

2. To this purpose you tell us, *That Infants are in the Power of their Parents, to dispose of, as to Temporals and Spirituals.* And your Reason is, because Parents are obliged to take the greatest care imaginable of their Childrens Souls, for their Education in the Fear of God. Well, now I see why you use not the word *Infants*, but *Children*, all along in your Arguments: you know that Infants, such as you Sprinkle, are not capable of any Education at all. They cannot be taught the Fear of God. They then cannot be engaged in Covenant by the Means of Education, nor can they in that State be brought up in his Service, in respect of Religious Ordinances: So that instead of proving, you have lost your *Minor*.

3. What you argue, from *Deut. 29. 11, 12, 14.* will never prove that Infants are capable of entering into Covenant with God in their own Persons; but that their Parents did engage to bring them up in the Laws of God; and what this is to the purpose, I do not imagine. Is it therefore my Duty to baptize my Children, without a Command from God to do so, meerly because by the Covenant of Grace, and Rules of Christianity, I am to do my best to teach my Children the Fear of the Lord? This is very inconsequent, and will as much oblige me to bring my Infants to the Lord's Table, as I have shewed. This last you will not allow, because God requires it not; and for the same Reason I refuse to bring my Infants to Baptism, tho I believe it my Duty to do all that I can to engage them in Covenant with God, by Christian Education in the Fear of God, that they may serve him in all his Commands and Ordinances blameless.

4. Wherefore in Answer to your Argument: If by Infants being capable of being engaged in Covenant with God, you mean the Parents engagement to educate them in the Fear of God, &c. Then I deny your *Major*, and say, Those who are only capable thus to be engaged with God in Covenant, are not capable of Baptism. But if you mean, a personal and actual entring into Covenant with God, then I deny your *Minor*, and all the Experience of the World confutes you.

5. You