

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 Spiritualls.* 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

5. You shall never be able to prove that Infants are capable of Fasting and Prayer, as they are Duties, tho you seem to affirm it; and what tho they did fast (so did the Beasts) and that Fast was pleasing to God, yet nothing hence arises to prove that either Infants, or the Cattle, *Jonah 4.* performed any Duty to God, nor that they are therefore to be brought to the participation of Baptism, nor any other Religious Ordinance, without Order from God to do it. Yet if a Man were disposed to Syllogize from hence after your manner, he might as strongly plead for one Error, as you do for another.

6. The Capacity of Jewish Children for Circumcision, or other Rites of the Law, depended chiefly on the Will of God to order it so. Prove that it is his Will to have Infants baptized, and we will not mention their Incapacity. If it be not his Will, wherefore is it done? Who has required it?

Mr. Taylor's Argument 6.

Those who are Members of Christ's Church, ought to be baptized: But Children are Members of Christ's Church: Therefore Children ought to be baptized.

ANSWER.

If by the Church of Christ, you mean all that since the Death of Christ, shall be saved; then I deny the *Major*. For the Infants of the poor *Indians* may be saved, yet in your Judgment they ought not to be baptized. But if by the Church of Christ, you mean only such as are in the actual Profession of the Gospel: Then I deny the *Minor*, and retort your Argument thus.

1. Those who are Members of the Church, ought to continue in the Apostles Doctrine, and in Fellowship, and in breaking of Bread, and in Prayers. But *&c. Ergo, &c.* The *Major* is proved, *Acts 2. 41. 1 Cor. 10.* They continued stedfastly in the Apostle's Doctrine, and Fellowship, and in breaking of Bread, and in Prayers. We being many, are one Body and one Bread, for we are all partakers of that one Bread. These things were spoken of the whole Church, which was in these Places engaged in the actual profession of the Gospel. Now see how you can defend your self against my *Minor*, and there-

herein you will easily see the infirmity of your own.

2. But to prove your *Minor*, you say, *The Children of the Jews were with their Parents Church-Members under the Law, and that Law is not yet repealed.* But if by their Church-membership you mean, their Right to, and their Parents Act in bringing them to Ceremonies in Religion, the contrary is true. The Covenant of Circumcision being repealed, as it was an Obligation to the Children of *Israel*, and never made with any Nation since; nor any other Covenant extant where such things are imposed upon Infants.

3. That the Children of converted Jews, lost not their Privileges, is not true, if by Privileges you intend Ceremonies; but if by Privileges you mean a being delivered from the Law of Ceremonies, then I grant it. And it is certainly a greater Privilege that Children are under a declared Right to the Kingdom of God by Christ, and his gracious blessing a part of them, as a Pledge for the whole, than if he had ordained a Law to baptize them in order thereunto. And it is also certain, that the Jewish Church-state, being dissolved upon the Death of Christ, and the Gospel-Church, confirmed in the Gift of Tongues, &c. No Person could rightly stand a Member of the Jewish Church, which was the only Church that ever had command from God to bring their Infants to Rites of Religion.

4. You still urge, *that the Gentiles had equal Privileges with the Jews.* And I grant they have greater Privileges, but not in Rites and Ceremonies, but rather in being accepted without them, as touching their Infants, and with a very few as touching themselves. But you say further, *That the Children of Parents who did not believe, were rejected; therefore the Children of believing Parents, or Gentiles, are Church-Members.* And here, I confess, I know not how to reconcile you to your self, where you say, *None are excluded from the Covenant of Grace but actual Unbelievers,* pag. 26. Sure the Son shall not dye for the Sin of the Parents, so as to go to Hell with them. Shall not the Judge of all the Earth do Right?

5. You say, *Children are either Members of the visible Church of Christ, or else are visibly of Satan's Kingdom, there is no Medium between these two.*

Surely I did not think Mr. Taylor had been of this Opinion! No Papist can say worse of poor Infants. Here you condemn many thousands of Infants; God give you a better Understanding. Are Infants of *Jews, Turks, and Indians* all of the visible Kingdom of Sa-

Satan? No, I will believe my Saviour, who saith, *It is not the will of his Heavenly Father that one of these little ones should perish*, Mat. 18. 14. And sure I am, that none are truly of Satan's Kingdom, but such as are his Subjects. For he has no right over any by Creation, and Purchase, as God and Christ have. Now it being clear, that Infants are none of Satan's Subjects, it must needs be very injurious, to say they are visibly of his Kingdom. But being Created by God, and Redeemed by Christ, and never offended in their own Persons, it is rational to think they are in God's Favour, as it appears the Infants of the *Ninevites* were, *Jonah* 4. In his gracious Arms we shall therefore leave them, and proceed.

Mr. Taylor's Argument 7.

Those who are Disciples of Christ may be baptized: But Children are Disciples of Christ: Therefore Children may be baptized.

ANSWER.

I. The *Minor* is denied. Infants are not Disciples of Christ, neither does God and Christ own them for such, as you affirm. But you bring *Acts* 15. 1, 2, 10. to prove it, and say, *That the Yoak which the Jews would have laid upon the new converted Gentiles, was Circumcision, which pertained to Children who were Circumcised the eighth day, and yet it is laid too upon the Disciples Necks.* But Sir, do you think this to be rational, that because the Jews would have laid the Yoak of Circumcision on the Necks of the Disciples, that therefore all were Disciples upon whom they would have laid that Yoak? sure this is a very unlawful Consequence: No better than this; You would lay the Yoak of Crossing and Sprinkling upon Infants, therefore all are Infants upon whom you would lay the Yoak of Crossing and Sprinkling. Again, they that were preserved in the Ark of *Noah* were Men and Women: Therefore all that were preserved in the Ark of *Noah* were Men and Women. You may easily see these Consequences are very untrue, and verily so is yours. For tho the false Apostles would have laid the Yoak of Circumcision upon the Necks of the Disciples, yet all were not Disciples whom they would have Circumcised: for 'tis said, *They taught the Brethren, except they were Circumcised, &c. they could not*

be saved. But you cannot imagine that they taught Infants. *Acts* 15. If *Acts* 15. be diligently read, it will expound it self; for *vers.* 19. the Disciples are said to be such as from among the Gentiles were turned to God. And all that are called Disciples, *vers.* 10. are called Brethren, and as such they are written unto by the Assembly, *vers.* 23. And the Epistle is said to be read to all the Multitude (meaning of the Disciples,) who thereupon are said to rejoice for the Consolation: Sure these were no Infants.

2. But you say, *They are Disciples in that; tho Man cannot teach them, yet God can, and may.* Well, I thank you for your Ingenuity. It is true (as you say) Man cannot teach, or make Infants Disciples; and then to be sure, they are not intended by our Saviour to be made Disciples, by what he says in your Text, *Mat.* 28. 19. For all that are to be made Disciples, by that Commission, are to be made such by Men: So that you are evidently besides your Text, in all that you say to this Argument, and you are beside your own Exposition of your Text also, which I will here set down, as you give it, *pag.* 10. *πορευθητες εν μαθησασατε, Going to Disciple all Nations, instruct them in the Principles of my Religion; and then being Disciples, baptize them: So that there is a Discipleship pre-existent to Baptism; and indeed the premising the Word DISCIPLE, implies none to be capable of Baptism, who are not Disciples of Christ, and Members of his Church.* These are your Words. 'Tis true, you say Infants will be proved to be Disciples. But surely, not by saying as you do here, that God can make them Disciples, or teach them: For it is no good arguing from what God can do, to say he has done it, or will do it. For God can, of the Stones in the Street, raise up Children unto *Abraham*, but I may not therefore say the Stones in the Street are the Children of *Abraham*. You say indeed, that God hath given several instances of his teaching several from the Womb, but you can neither name the Persons, nor shew us what he taught them; however if you could, such miraculous Operations are not given for general Rules. God once taught a dumb Ass to speak, and to reprove a Prophet; but it would be bad arguing from this instance, that Asses are Disciples: And yet this is a clearer instance of God's teaching the Ass, than you can give of his teaching any Infant.

3. But seeing you put Infants Discipleship upon the account of God's teaching them, you must have some competent ground to believe that he has miraculously taught them, before you baptize them;

them; or else you destroy your Exposition of the Text; which avers, *That there is a Discipleship pre-existent to Baptism.* And when you shall shew me the Infant whom God hath taught, or made a Disciple, I believe I shall not oppose your Baptizing that Infant, and this is as much as you can desire.

4. But you say further, *That God hath promised to teach Children.* What, Sir, in their Infancy? Let us see your Proofs; *Isa. 54.*

13. All thy Children shall be taught of the Lord, and great shall be the Peace of thy Children. *John 6. 45. It is written in the Prophets, and they shall be all taught of God. Every Man therefore that hath heard and learned of the Father, cometh unto me.* Certainly had you

read those Texts with their Coherence, and considered, that our Saviour himself in the latter expounds the former, you would never have imagined, that God here promises to teach any Infants, much less all the Infants in the Christian Nations; for it is very apparent, they that are taught according to these Scriptures, *have heard and learned of the Father, so as to come to Christ.* And indeed

the meaning is, that God speaking to us by his Son, (who is very God, *1 John 5.*) had now made good that gracious Promise, *Isa. 54. 13. All thy Children shall be taught of the Lord.* But you

have another Text, *Acts 10. 47. Can any Man forbid Water, that these should not be baptized, who have received the Holy-Ghost as well as we?* Now he that reads this place, will easily see, that the Persons here spoken of were only such as were assembled to hear *Peter, in whatsoever they should be commanded of God; and that the Holy-Ghost fell on all that heard the Word.* Which place therefore

can with no shew of Reason be brought, to prove that Infants are taught of God. However, when you shall find an Infant, that has *received the Holy-Ghost, as well as the Apostles;* then for my part I shall not forbid Water, that you should baptize him, provided you first be baptized your self.

5. You will have Infants to be Disciples, because *Christ* (you say) *commands the receiving of them in his Name;* and you quote *Luke 18. 16, 17. Mat. 19. 13. Luke 9. 47.* I have carefully read all these places, but can find no Command to receive Infants in the Name of Christ, much less to receive them by Baptism. It is true, *Christ called a little Child unto him, and said, Whosoever shall receive this Child in my Name, receiveth me.* Now this Child was able to know what Christ said, and is no fit Instance to prove an Infant of eight days old to be a Disciple of Christ; neither does

this

this Text call this Child a Disciple, but the Disciples are distinguished from it. And yet it (and so any little Child) may be a good Precedent even to Disciples, to learn Humility and Simplicity by ; and so may a Lamb or a Dove serve to teach us to be humble and harmless, yet they are not therefore Disciples. Neither can the receiving this Child, (or any other in like case) be understood of receiving them by Baptism ; for then you may read the place thus, *Whosoever baptizeth a Child in my Name, baptizeth me* ; but this is both false and absurd. And besides, he that is baptized, may be rather said to receive Christ, than he that baptizeth, in that Action. Or would you make our Saviour to say, He that baptizeth an Infant in my Name, receiveth me ? If so, I would know by what Authority you take the word, *receiveth*, for baptizing in the first place, and in the second for something else. Surely, if to baptize an Infant in the Name of Christ, be a receiving of Christ, it's an easy thing to receive Christ, especially for the Priest, who pretends to baptize Infants daily. But sure it is as much the Duty of other Christians to receive Children in the Name of Christ, as the Priests ; for the Word is, *Whosoever shall receive this Child in my Name* ; and therefore it cannot be meant of baptizing them, and then these Scriptures prove not your Argument at all.

6. You urge, that Infants are Members of Earthly Kingdoms, and I grant it ; and also I grant, that they belong to the Kingdom of Heaven, and so are of the Universal Church : But this proves not that they are Disciples at all ; for the Infants of Heathens are Members of Kingdoms, and may go to Heaven, and yet you think they are no Disciples for all that. And if Infants may in some Sense be said to be God's Servants, *Psal. 119. 91.* yet this proves not that they are Disciples ; for all Creatures, as well sensitive, vegetative, as rational, are said to be his Servants, yet all Creatures are not Christ's Disciples.

Mr. Taylor's Argument 8.

*To whom Christ grants Imposition of Hands, to them belongs Baptism :
But to Children Christ grants Imposition of Hands : Therefore to them
belongs Baptism.*

ANSWER.

1. If the *major* Proposition be taken universally, that to whomsoever Christ granted imposition of Hands (or touching) in any case, that to them belongs Baptism, then the *Major* is not true; for he touched or put his hand upon the dead, yet Baptism belongs not to the dead, *Luke 7. 14.* If it be said, Christ touched the Bier, not the Dead; I answer: He touched the Childrens Cloaths, when he took them in his Arms; but he took the dead Damsel by the hand, and said, *Talitha, cumi, Damsel, I say unto thee, Arise.* *Mark 5. 41.* Thus much to the *Major*; now to the *Minor.*

2. If by laying on of hands, you understand that which by Christ's Doctrine, *Heb. 6. 2.* is made a standing Ordinance in his Church, and in order next to Baptism, as is evident you do; then I deny your *Minor*: For that Ordinance was not yet instituted, nor useful, because the End of it was not yet to be received; for the Spirit of Promise was not yet given, nor as yet to be given, because *Jesus* was not yet glorified, *John 7.* Wherefore your Misinterpretation of *Mat. 19. 13, 14, 15.* is injurious to Truth, and would prefer these Infants to the Apostles, in the reception of the First-fruits of the Spirit, unless you think Christ laid hands on the Children, without obtaining the End or Effect of the Service. So then it's clear, that this laying on of hands, or touching Infants, (for so it is expressed both by *St. Mark* and *St. Luke*) cannot with any fairness be understood of that laying on of hands which follows Baptism, and therefore is no Proof at all for your *Minor.*

3. The Church of *England* does not believe that Infants are fit Subjects for laying on of hands, and therefore does not understand this Text, *Mat. 19.* of that laying on of hands which follows Baptism; neither does *Mr. Taylor* himself believe that Confirmation belongs to Infants: If otherwise, they are very unfaithful, in that they were never known to lay hands upon any one Infant for confirmation, as I can hear of. But how comes it to pass that *Mr. Taylor* will baptize Infants, when yet he confesses their Baptism is not mentioned in the New Testament, and yet not plead for their Confirmation, till they be capable to own their Covenant made in Baptism, when yet he pretends, (tho I dare say he believes

(believes it not) that Text, *Mat. 19. 13, &c.* is express for that Laying on of hands which follows Baptism, to be granted to Christ to Infants? pag. 56.

4. Mr. Taylor says, *That Christ confirmed, or laid hands on the Baptized.* (I shall entreat him to make this plain, for I would gladly see it well proved; however, I am sure his Doctrine orders it to be done, and that's sufficient.) What you say further here, is either what we oppose not, or what is answered elsewhere, save only your last Particular, which now we shall consider.

5. *Their coming to Christ* (say you) *is their becoming his Disciples or Profelites: Suffer them, $\omega\epsilon\varsigma\ \epsilon\lambda\theta\epsilon\iota\nu$ to be Profelites to me.* If to this I should answer, with *Tertullian, Veniant ergo dum adolefcunt, &c.* Let them come therefore when they are grown up; it will be thought too little, tho God knows (how hasty soever Men are to get them sprinkled) they are slow enough to bring them to Christ, when they are capable to be taught; I will therefore answer further: Do you think that when Infants are brought to a Priest to be sprinkled and crossed, that then they are brought to Christ? Or can Christians no other way bring their Infants to Christ? Or do no Infants belong to Christ, but those who are so brought? These Things will not be asserted, I think, yet let us go as far as we can by the Light of the Text. By this Example of Christ, I think the Ministers of Christ may lawfully pray for a Blessing in behalf of all the Infants of those that shall desire it; and that it is well done in those Parents that do desire the Prayers of the Church, or her Ministers, for their Infants. And this is as much as can be fairly urged from this Text, as imitable for us. For the touching by our Saviour's hands, may be a Point too high for us, unless we will also touch the Dead, &c. which (I hope) is not written for our Example. But now if the Minister will needs baptize my Child, because I bring it into the Congregation, and desire Prayer to be made to God for his Blessing upon it, he herein goes beyond the Example of Christ, and beyond the Text, and therefore there I must leave him, his $\omega\epsilon\varsigma\ \epsilon\lambda\theta\epsilon\iota\nu$ notwithstanding. For $\pi\epsilon\sigma\sigma\eta\lambda\upsilon\tau\omicron\ \epsilon\kappa\ \upsilon\epsilon\rho\beta\omicron\ \pi\epsilon\sigma\sigma\epsilon\lambda\delta\upsilon\tau\omega$, quod est *advenio quoniam veniebant, est Ethnicis ad Judaismam*, saith the Learned, and I think Infants cannot change their Religion, nor was it fit to call an Infant of a Jew, a Profelite when it was brought to Circumcision; and consequently as improper to call the Child of a Christian a Profelite. However, all that can lawfully be done

to profelitate an Infant (if you will needs have that Term used) is but to devote them to Christ by Prayers for his Blessing, but not a Syllable for baptizing them.

Mr. Taylor's Argument 5.

If the Faith of the Parents entitles the Children to the Covenant, then it entitles them to Baptism: But the Faith of the Parents entitles the Children to the Covenant: Therefore the Faith of the Parents entitles the Children to Baptism.

ANSWER.

1. The Consequence of the *Major* may well be denied: for tho it should be some ways true, that the Faith of the Parents entitles the Children to the Covenant, yet it follows not, that it entitles them to the performance of, or submission to the Things which they understand not, nor are able to perform. And whether would such a Consequence lead us, if we should follow it? What Duty should not Infants be entitled to, as well as to Baptism? But let us see whether the *Minor* be well proved; you quote *Acts 2.* and think it a clear place to prove that the Faith of the Parents entitles the Children to the Covenant. But this Text says not a word to that purpose; for *Peter* derives the Title both of Parents and Children from the Promise of God: and builds the Title of all the Called of the Lord, and of them that were afar off also, upon the Promise of God, and not upon the Faith of *Abraham* himself. Besides, the Promise here is of the Gifts of the Holy Ghost, and therefore not pertinent to Infants, as I have shewed: Here is therefore no proof at all of your *Minor*. I think it were better to say, that by Faith a Christian knows his Child has an interest in the Covenant of Grace, than that his Faith entitles his Child to it. I fear this *Minor* is a very dangerous Assertion, and that partly because the Consequence of such an Opinion is to shut out all Infants from the Covenant of Grace, who have not faithful Parents to entitle them to it: And in truth it seems to swell with too much boldness, and carnal presumption; but I spare you.

2. The Faith of the Jews and Profelites did not entitle their Children to the Covenant of Grace; but they themselves being

An Apology for

incorporate into that Church-State, their Children, by express Command from God, had a Title to legal Priviledges: but the Covenant of Grace (for that's it we dispute, tho you leave out the Word *Grace* in your Argument) extended to Infants by God's free Redemption, which he purposed for them, in Christ, from the Foundation of the World; or else what shall become of the many thousands of Infants of Unbelievers?

3. You can never prove, that the Faith of the *Jaylor*, or *Lydia* either, did entitle their Infants to the Covenant, for you cannot prove they had any Children. And it is so exceeding plain, that all that were baptized in these two Families were Believers, that I wonder much that you should say, that on the believing of the *Jaylor* and *Lydia*, the whole Families were baptized. Pray read *Acts* 16. 32. to the end, and you will find that they that were baptized, were actual Believers, and capable of being consoled by the Apostles.

Mr. Taylor's Argument 10.

Those who are capable of the Kingdom of Heaven, are capable of Baptism: But Children are capable of the Kingdom of Heaven: Therefore Children are capable of Baptism.

A N S W E R.

1. The *Major* being taken universally, for all that may go to Heaven, it may very well be denied; for Mr. *Taylor* dare not deny a Capacity of Salvation to some of the Infants of the Jews, and yet Mr. *Taylor* himself does not think they are capable of Baptism; for he makes the Faith of the Parents necessary to the entitling them to Baptism, which in this Case is wanting.

2. That the greater includes the less, is not universally true; for Women have a capacity to go to Heaven, yet they have no capacity to be Bishops, which is less than going to Heaven. Infants are not capable of the Lord's Table, which is less than to go to Heaven. Indeed, this Argument being admitted to be good, would bring Infants to all Priviledges in the Church-Militant, as well as to Baptism; for thus a Man might argue: Those who are capable of all the Priviledges of the Church Triumphant, are
capable

capable of all the Privileges of the Church Militant, (for the greater includes the less): But Infants are capable of all Privileges in the Church Triumphant; *Ergo, &c.* And if it be unreasonable (as you say it is) to deny the external Sign, to those to whom Christ hath granted the internal Grace; pray, why are you so unreasonable, as to deny your Infants the Sign of the Lord's Table, seeing you affirm they are regenerate, and born of Water and the Spirit? But if you were put to prove, that Infants, whom you sprinkle, have the inward Grace which entitles to Baptism, you would never be able to make demonstration to your own, or any wise Man's Satisfaction; for is not the inward and spiritual Grace, Repentance, whereby Sin is forsaken, and Faith, whereby the Promises of God are steadfastly believed? And what Infant did you ever know thus qualified for Baptism?

Mr. Taylor's Argument II.

All who are Believers, ought to be baptized: But Children are Believers: Therefore Children ought to be baptized.

ANSWER.

1. The *Minor* Proposition, that Infants are Believers, is not true. And I answer in the Words of Dr. Hammond, who saith, (Letter of Resolut. p. 297.) *I shall profess to be none of those that are concerned in the Question, Whether Infants have Faith? I freely confess to believe, that Faith is so necessarily founded in Understanding, that they that have not Understanding, cannot have Faith, whether actual or habitual.* And Dr. Jer. Taylor tells us expressly, *Whether Infants have Faith? is a Question to be disputed by Persons, that care not how much they say, and how little they prove.* Thus these two Pillars of the Church of England explode your Argument, as an egregious Error.

2. And for that place, *Mat. 18. 5, 6.* by which you would prove Infants Believers, the Learned of your own Church expound it to a contrary Sense, and take the *little Child that believeth, to be a true Christian, that hath laid aside all worldly Pride, whereby he is become abject in the sight of the World.* I shall not contend with you about the proper signification of *παιδίον*, (profes-

ing my self no Scholar) tho *Ludovicus Vives* useth $\pi\alpha\iota\varsigma$ for an Household-Servant. But it is sufficient to my purpose, that you dare not say Infants are actual Believers; (nay, you confess, *they have not actual Faith*: And for imputative Faith, (if there be any such thing) yet it can be no Rule for the baptizing any Body, seeing it is not revealed to whom Faith is imputed; and whilst you say, God may esteem Infants as Believers, another may as well say, he may esteem them as baptized also); I say, your granting Infants have not actual Faith, you can take the word, *believeth*, Mat. 18. 6. only by the Figure called *Prosopopœia*, if you will needs have the Child an Infant of Days. And if it be good arguing from hence to the Baptism of Infants, then you may argue as strongly for baptizing the whole Creation, (if you can tell how) for it is said to *groan, expect, and wait for the manifestation of the Sons of God, and to be delivered from the Bondage of Corruption*. Rom. 8. 19. We conclude then, that it is not a figurative Faith, but an actual Faith, (at least by profession) that entitles to the reception of Baptism.

3. We do not say, that God will impute Unbelief to Infants, but only to those that refuse to believe; and tho we know Infants are not Believers, yet we do not say or think they are Unbelievers, they being not capable to sin against God in that case, or any else. And Unbelief presupposes a capacity in the Subject, and means sufficient, to believe, and yet the Creature refuses to believe. The Sin of Unbelief therefore being no way chargeable upon any Infant, it follows by necessary Consequence, that they have no capacity for Faith. Neither do we pretend to judg Mens Hearts; for tho God has ordered Faith to be a Pre-requisite to Baptism, yet we are only to judg of the Profession of Faith, not of the Sincerity of it. And as it is true, as you say, that Infants cannot play the Hypocrite; so it's true, they cannot play the Christian, and therefore not fit for the Duties of Christians, of which Baptism is one.

Mr. Taylor's Argument 12.

They who are capable of the Ends of Baptism, may be baptized: But Children are capable of the Ends of Baptism: Therefore they may be baptized.

A N S W E R.

1. If by the Ends of Baptism, you mean the Things which concern God's Mercy in the Redemption of Man only, then the *Major* is denied; but if by the Ends of Baptism, you mean the Things required on Mans part, then the *Minor* is not true; for Mortification and Vivification are the Ends of Baptism on Man's part, of which Infants are not capable; for they cannot put off the Body of the Sins of the Flesh, nor have they any need so to do, neither can they rise to Newness of Life. And tho I grant, (and have often said it) that we ought to devote our Children to God in the best manner we can; yet to go beyond the Word of the Lord under that pretence, will neither profit us, nor our Children.

2. What you say here, of Baptism being a Seal to Infants, &c. is answered before. And surely the word *Heathen*, (so often used by you) as it imports sometimes an Enemy to God, (yet being of it self of no ill signification) Infants are not so to be accounted Heathens; nor doth the word, *Christian*, as it imports a Follower of Christ, belong to Infants. So that this is only a Noise of Words, to talk that our Infants are not distinguished from the Infants of Heathens, tho I have shewed a difference between them.

Mr. Taylor's Argument 13.

Whom the Church of Christ ever received to Baptism, may still be baptized: But the Church of Christ hath ever received Children to themselves too young to be baptized. Therefore they may be baptized.

A N S W E R.

1. The *Minor* Proposition is not true, and therefore I do deny, that the Church hath always received Infants to Baptism. And indeed you do not so much as pretend any thing from the Scriptures to prove it, but before, do honestly confess, That Infant-Baptism is not mentioned in the New Testament; and therefore certainly it will be impossible to prove, that the Church did always receive Infants

Infants to Baptism. And it is also very observable, that *Eusebius*, who wrote the History of the Church for four hundred Years after Christ, does not so much as mention Infant-Baptism at all.

2. But how then does Mr. *Taylor* prove his *Minor*? Why, his chief Author to that purpose is Mr. *Walker*, in his Book called, *A modest Plea for Infant-Baptism*; which Book in that part has been answered by Mr. *De-Laune*, to which I refer the Reader. The Sum of which Answer is to prove, that all Mr. *Walker*'s Testimonies from Antiquity for Infant-Baptism, for the first 300 Years after Christ, are either invalid, or taken out of forged and spurious Books. And it is more than sufficient to ballance Mr. *Walker*'s and Mr. *Taylor*'s bold Assertion, *That the Catholick Church hath always received Infants to Baptism*, by the contrary Testimonies of *Ludovicus Vives*, and *Dr. Barlow*; the first exprelly saying, *In old Time none was brought to Baptism, but he was of sufficient Years to know what that mystical Water meant, and to require his Baptism, and that sundry times*. The other tells us, *There is neither Precept nor Practice in Scripture for Infant-Baptism, nor any just Evidence for it for about 200 Years after Christ*.

2. You say, *That for many hundreds of Years the Question [about Infant-Baptism] was not moved*. But this is a great Mistake; for *Tertullian* did question it, as an *unwarrantable Practice*, in the beginning of the third Century; as is shewed by Mr. *Tombes*, and others, who have diligently enquired into the ancient Customs of the Church.

3. The first Instance which you bring for the Practice of Infant-Baptism in our Nation, is that in King *Ina*'s time, about the Year 692; but we can prove it was opposed by the *Britain Bishops* two hundred Years before this. See *Fabian's Chron.* part 1. fol. 107.

4. You say, *The deferring of Baptism among the Ancients, was not for their questioning Infant-Baptism*. But sure, if they did think themselves too young to be baptized, at twenty or thirty Years of Age, they could with no reason think their Children old enough for Baptism at seven or eight days old. Extremes have undone all; they were too slow, and you are as much too quick. But the proper time for Baptism is, when Men attain to the new Birth; Baptism is therefore rightly call'd the *Washing of Regeneration*.

5. You seem to hold, *That Infant-Baptism was lawfully practised by God's People before Christ, and even from the Apostles Time since Christ*: But I wonder by what Law; you give us none but Mr. *Walker*'s Book, which is very well answered by Mr. *De-Laune*,

in his Book entitled, *Truth defended*. And I am sure, the best Antiquity says nothing for you.

Mr. Taylor's Argument 14.

That Doctrine which introduceth many Unchristian Consequences, is erroneous : But the Doctrine of the Antipædobaptists introduceth many Unchristian Consequences : Therefore the Doctrine of the Antipædobaptists is erroneous.

A N S W E R.

1. The *Minor* Proposition is not true ; for our Doctrine in the Case of Baptism is true, and Truth does not introduce any erroneous Consequences. Now that our Doctrine is true, appears thus : Because it fully agrees with your Text, *Mat. 28. 19.* even as it is expounded by your self, in these Words, *ποσδδεις εν ιαδνδδατε, Going to disciple all Nations, instruct them in the Principles of my Religion ; and then, being Disciples, baptize them.* This you say, and this we say ; the only difference is, *We do as we say, but You say and do not :* You therefore must needs be in the Error in this case.

2. But let us hear what you have against our Doctrine. First, you say, *It opposeth the whole Current of Scripture, nullifies many Scripture-Promises and Privileges, and destroys the Covenant of Grace, as the premised Pages manifest.* But I hope the premised Answers do manifest the Charge which you bring against our Doctrine to be very unjust. And seeing you are the Men, and not we, that have changed the Ordinance of Baptism, you may justly fear the Censure of the Prophet, *Isa. 24. 5.* for breaking the everlasting Covenant. See the Place, and consider it seriously.

3. You say, *Our Doctrine introduceth the World into Gentilism or Heathenism, and makes Christ's Church always gathering, and never gathered.* But how can you say this, seeing we are for the teaching or discipling all Nations, and every Person in the Nations, as they are capable, and God gives his Ministers opportunity ; and we take the same way to do this which the Apostles used, according to our Ability, *i. e.* to preach the Gospel to every one that will hear us, and to bring up our Children in the Nurture and Admonition of the Lord ? And what tho the Church be thus always gathering, does not *Mat. 28. 19, 20.* warrant this Practice

to the end of the World? and if you do not thus gather your Children to Christ, they will never be Christians by your Crossing and Sprinkling them.

4. Your talk of excluding Infants from the Covenant, is answered before, and proved untrue; what you add, of our *introducing of despair of the Salvation of Infants*, shews your Self-contradiction. For now you seem to make Infant-Baptism so necessary to Salvation, that if they be not baptized, we must despair of their Salvation: Than which what can be a more erroneous Consequence of your Doctrine of *Pædo-baptism*?

5. It is apparent that our Doctrine makes the Covenant established by Christ better than yours (whatever you say here to the contrary); not only because we assert the Grace of God in the Business of Salvation to extend to Infants more generally than you do: But also for that it shews, God has not imposed any Ceremonies upon them, as he did upon the Jewish Male Infants of eight days old. Whilst your Doctrine makes your Crossing and Sprinkling them of such importance, as that if it be denied them, despair of the Salvation of Infants is *genuinely introduced*, pag. 74. As if God had tyed the Salvation of all the Infants in the World to a Ceremony. Thus does your Doctrine make the Covenant established by Christ, worse than the Law of *Moses*; for under it the greater part of the Infants of the Jews were saved, without being Circumcised, to wit, all the Females, and all the Males under eight days old: But you have no hope for Infants Male or Female, tho but of a day old, if it be not sealed with your pretended *Baptism*. *Lord, whither will Men go when they forsake thy Word!* They will make Christ an *Impostor*, if Infants be not capable of *Baptism*: See Mr. Taylor's Book, pag. 72. n. 5.

6. You say, *Our Doctrine equals the Children of Christians with the Children of Turks, &c.* But we have shewed the advantage to be on the part of the Children of Christians. And what if God, willing to magnify his Mercy and Goodness, has provided a Saviour for the innocent Babes (dying in Infancy) throughout the World? What need this trouble any Body? must our Eye be Evil, because his is thus Bountiful? We know that he hath concluded all under Sin, that he might have Mercy upon all. And if God hath not Mercy on poor dying Infants, so as to save them all by Christ, pray shew what Mercy he hath upon them? Sure it had been a Mercy they had never been born, but not one *Iota* of Mercy to be born, only

only to cry, dye, and go to Hell. Can you think that such Doctrine befriends the Covenant of Grace? I think not.

7. To what you say (or have said) about the Form of Baptism, you much mistake us if you think we do not baptize in the Name of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost. The Article of our Faith, which you point to, was not written (as I conceive) to teach any to dispense Baptism in different Forms of Words, but to shew that the Name of Son is to be taken, *as he is our Lord and Saviour*. Yet let me tell you, that I can shew it under the Hand of some now in your Ministry, that says *Matth. 28. 19.* does not impower any to use that Form of Words in Baptism, and shews also that the Learned are not agreed in that Matter. However, I am one with you, as to the use of the Form there set down, and no other.

Of the manner of using Baptismal Water.

1. Mr. Taylor grants, *the Mode of Baptizing is laid down by our Saviour, and expressed in the Word Baptizantes, baptizing them, Mat. 28. 19.*

Now this is very well, and I am glad he has done this Holy Ordinance so much right, as to acknowledg Christ to lay down (in his Commission *Mat. 28. 19.*) the Manner or Mode in which it ought to be performed. But then, I am sorry to see my good Friend so soon forget himself, as in the very next Page to tell us, that the Mode of Baptizing is an indifferent thing; left to the Prudence of the Church, whether to dip or sprinkle. Neither of them being commanded, nor either of them absolutely forbidden by the Precept of Baptizing. What shall I say to this? If *Baptizantes* be the Precept for Baptizing, and yet commands nothing, neither to dip nor to sprinkle, nor absolutely forbids either, sure then we keep no Command in doing either, nor do we break any in omitting both. Pity it is, that Men to uphold their own Tradition, should thus fight against both Scripture and Reason. For, if our Saviour, by the Words *baptizing them*, command nothing, then its best to do nothing; if he command both dipping and sprinkling, then both must be done; if he command but one of these, then but one of them must be done: Let him chuse which he will, he must chuse but one. But yet he tells us otherwise, *pag. 76.* for saith he, *The Word Βαπτίζω equally admits of both Significations, as is granted by the*

best Criticks: And quotes chiefly Mr. *Walker's Doct. of Bapt.* p. 60. to p. 64. For answer, I say, if the word βαπτίζω do equally signify dip and sprinkle, then unless we will be unequal we must do both; or else shew which of them may lawfully be omitted.

As for Mr. *Walker's Book*, I have seen it, and observed that he plays with the Word βαπτίζω, βαπτίζω, βαπτίζοντες, βαπτισμῶ, till he makes their Signification altogether uncertain, and sets the Learned together by the Ears about the meaning of these Greek Words. And indeed, according to Mr. *Walker*, no Man can certainly know when he hits right upon the thing to be done in Obedience to this Precept, *Baptizing them*. As if our Lord should leave his Apostles, and they leave us to guess at his meaning; in a Passage wherein he commands nothing certainly. And yet to go round again, however we use Water in the Name, &c. we can hardly go besides the meaning of Christ: For if we dip the Subject in the Element of Water, we are right; if we sprinkle it upon any part of the Body, (for you can assign no one part more than the other) we are right still; if we dip the Head only, or only the Foot, we are right; if the Head, or Breast, or Hand only be sprinkled, still we are right. Now who can think, that our Saviour should use an ambiguous Word, which is to guide us in matter of Fact? Do not Men that thus deal with the Word *Baptize*, make him the Author of all our Contests in this Case? And assuredly Mr. *Walker* has run many a one into a maze, about the meaning of βαπτίζω, and I am sorry to see Mr. *Taylor* to follow him. But sith he refers me also to Mr. *Leigh's Crit. Sac.* He shall do well to mark what he saith (even as quoted by Mr. *Walker*, p. 36.) the reason (says he) why βαπτισμῶ is put *pro Lotione & mundatione*, is, because such as are immersed (that is, dipped) come out of the WATER washed or cleansed.

So then, to Baptize, is to dip the Subject in the Element in the Name, &c. and that which is no small, but a most important Confirmation of that Mode (and only that) is the Baptism of Christ's own Person; for Mr. *Walker* cannot deny, that the Greek in *Mark* 1. 9. being rightly rendred in English, is thus read; *Jesus came — and was baptized of John INTO JORDAN*, and therefore he may be confident he was not sprinkled, for it would be nonsense to say he was sprinkled *into Jordan*; but good sense and plain truth too, to say he was dipped *into Jordan*. And yet for all this, Mr. *Walker* fights stoutly both against Truth and Reason, leaning only

only upon the single Authority of *Bernard*, and will have Sprinkling to be meant or signified by the Word *Baptize*, as well as Dipping. And Mr. *Taylor* says the same, tho many learned Writers contradict them both.

But it shall suffice here to set down two, both equal in Learning and Vertue to these our present Opposites. The first shall be that truly Famous Man, Dr. *Fer. Taylor*, in his *Rule of Conscience*, l. 3. c. 4. *If you would attend to the signification of the Word, BAPTISM signifies plunging in Water, or dipping with washing. And saith Keckerman, Immersion not Asperion (that is, dipping not sprinkling) was the first institution of Baptism, as it doth plainly appear from Rom. 6. 3. Syst. Theol.*

But for all this, Mr. *Walker* pretends Antiquity for Sprinkling, and it is strange to see what learned Men will say, when they are set to defend Error. We will but touch two of his most ancient Instances, that you may see the bottom of the business.

1. He goes as high as the second Century, and takes an instance of sprinkling from the service of the *Demons* (that is, Devil-Gods) but why so? Because he supposes the Heathen used sprinkling in the Service of their *Demons*, in imitation of the Christians Practice. But the truth is, it's more to be feared, that unwary Christians did fall to imitate the Heathens; for we are told so in effect, even by a learned Popish Author, which for the plainness of the Testimony, I will here faithfully transcribe. He saith, --*This chief Chair of the Church being translated from Antioch to Rome: He [Peter] and his Successors, were very careful and vigilant to reduce the Christian Religion (being as yet indigested, unpolished, and little practised) and the Professors thereof, into better Order and Uniformity, out of the Law of Moses (which Christ came not to abolish, but to fulfil) out of the Civil and Politick Government of Romans, Greeks and Egyptians, and out of both sacred and prophane Rites, Laws, and Ceremonies of other Nations, but most especially by the wholesom Doctrine and Direction of Christ Jesus, and the inspiration of the Holy Spirit.* See a Book called, *The Manners, Laws and Customs of all Nations*, pag. 151. Behold here the Springs of Human Inventions and Ceremonies.

Mr. *Walker*'s second Instance, is a Story of one sprinkled with Sand, instead of Water (the Water being scarce, and the Party like to dye): but alas they could not dip the Sick into the Sand, and however their Zeal may be commended, their Action is not

to be commended at all: It shews their Folly, for it's better to be without a Ceremony, when we cannot possibly have it in God's way, than to set up our own Devices in the stead, and place, and use of it. *For I will (saith God) have Mercy and not Sacrifice.*

And thus we shall leave Mr. *Walker* to consider his *Sandy Foundation* for his sprinkling Infants.

2. Mr. *Taylor* says, *Sprinkling cannot nullify Baptism, and therefore our dissenting Brethren are to blame, to make our Baptism to be essentially corrupted, and not to be accounted Baptism, because not performed by Dipping.*

To this I answer; When our Saviour commanded to baptize, he commanded but one, not divers kinds of Actions; and to do that, which is not only contrary to his own blessed Example in this very thing, but also such an Act as cannot with any equity of Speech, or good Sence, be called Baptism, is to err essentially in the performance of it. And so great is the difference between Dipping and Sprinkling, that such as sprinkle Infants dare not speak as they act, when they pretend to baptize: No, they dare not say, I sprinkle thee in the Name of the Father, &c. which they might well say, if the word Baptize does equally signify dipping and sprinkling.

We are not therefore to blame, to labour to have this Ordinance kept as it was delivered, for sure if it be our Duty to keep God's Ordinances, it's our Duty to keep them as they were observed by Christ, and the Primitive Churches. And so far as the manner of doing this command of Christ is essential to the Ordinance, dipping is of the essence of it, without which it cannot be called Baptism.

Again, All the Scriptures which command to baptize, do expressly command to dip the Party to be baptized, and therefore Mr. *Taylor* is to blame, to say, *There is not one place of Scripture which in express Words commands Dipping*, pag. 59. Yea, Sir, your Text, *Matth. 28. 19.* commands Dipping: For were βαπτίζωτες translated into plain English, it must be rendred by dipping. And I pray Sir, consider, whether you could not with a good Conscience translate it so? And on the other side, Whether your Conscience would not accuse you, should you translate the Text, *Teach all Nations, sprinkling them?* I dare say no Man dare thus read the Text. Why then do they thus act? Shall we speak one thing, and do another? *So speak ye, and so do ye, as they that shall be judged by the Law of Liberty;* to wit, the Gospel:

3. What you urge from the Legal Washings, has been answered by the Learned of our way, and particularly by Mr. *Danvers*, who says, *I have carefully examined all the Places in the Old Testament, where the word Dipping or Baptizing is mentioned, and do find it is expressed by the Hebrew Word, טבל, as Minceus and Dr. Hammond observe. The Septuagint do render the Word Tabal in the Hebrew, by βαπτίζω, and with all the Translators, both the Latin, Dutch, Italian, French, and English, do translate to dip; the Word rendered Washing, being another Word, as the following Scriptures inform you, Gen. 37. 31. Exod. 12. 22. Lev. 4. 6. & 17. 14. & 6. 16, 51. Levit. 9. 9. Deut. 33. 24. John 3. 5. Numb. 16. 18. 2 Kings 5. 14. I cannot think therefore, that you can conscionably parallel Rom. 6. 3, 4. Col. 2. 11. with the Jewish Washings, which are expressed by the word דחך, not the word טבל (as Mr. *Danvers* further shews.) And sure I am, that Rom. 6. and Col. 2. is so very clear for our way of baptizing, that the Learned of your way do grant these Places allude to the ancient way of baptizing, which (say they) was by dipping the Party into the Water.*

4. What you say of your Sprinkling to be as significant as Dipping, is not true; for indeed unless it be commanded to signify the Death, Burial, Resurrection of Christ, and our Mortification and Vivification, it can signify none of these things. Otherwise every time you wash your hands, might signify what is signified in your Baptism; yet you will not say it doth so. And the same Answer may serve to what you say, of Sprinkling and Dipping, being equally obliging; for unless God hath given them to oblige, they have no obliging Nature or Virtue in them.

5. What you say of the Scarcity of Water, can be no Plea for you that have no want of it, whatever it may be for them that have it not. But sure, where God gives not Straw, he will require no Brick. He does not make Baptism so necessary, that we shall perish if we cannot, but rather if we will not obey him therein.

6. Your Surmise, that Dipping seems an indecent thing, is indecently said, both by Mr. *Walker*, and your self, seeing it may be done as decently as your Sprinkling; for your Talk of transparent Garments, shews your unacquaintedness with the right way of Baptizing. And know this, your ruffling Ladies in their gorgeous Apparel, may work upon your pravity of Heart sooner, than to behold an humble penitent Sinner, cloathed in comely, tho mean Garments, to be buried with Christ by Baptism.

7. To your Objection about the Coldness of the Climate, you need but put on the Garment of Love to God and his Truth, and act from a Principle of Faith, and you need fear no Ill, tho this Path may seem to you as the Valley of the Shadow of Death. Yet if any Person be really weak of Body, and cannot be satisfied to delay, (as I confess that may be dangerous) there may such care be taken, as in the Eye of Reason no Inconvenience need be feared. And if the Water be frozen, (as you object) surely he that will allow us to thaw that for our natural, will not blame us, if we do so for our spiritual use.

8. Does plunging or dipping take away the Understanding? Why, not more now than in Christ's Time. And is it so necessary that the Understanding act in the Duty? I marvel then why you baptize Persons (as you call it) when they are asleep.

9. What you say of the great Labour of dipping, and the Impossibility for one Man to baptize 3000 in one day, and that it is therefore unreasonable to think the Apostles did dip all that they baptized, &c. I answer; First, you grant then, that they dipped some that they baptized; prove now that they sprinkled so much as one, and the Dispute is at an end. Secondly, But Sir, what need was there for one Man only to baptize the three thousand? *Acts* 2. 40. Does not Mr. *Walker* himself suppose, that there were of the hundred and twenty Disciples, eighty two in a Ministerial Capacity, to wit, the Seventy two, besides the Apostles? Surely they might easily baptize three thousand in a few hours.

But you will now prove the Lawfulness and Reasonableness of Sprinkling; let us hear what you say.

1. You now make *Sprinkling* not only equally signified in the word, βαπτίζω, but to be more congruous with its genuine Signification; your reason is, βαπτίζω being a Derivative, can admit of no larger Signification than its Primitive βαπτω, which we find (say you) in the History of *Nebuchadnezzar*, when like a Beast, ὑβάρη, he was wet with the Dew of Heaven.

But for Answer; 1. I say, this Place in *Dan.* 4. will never prove, that Sprinkling is more congruous to the genuine Signification of βαπτίζω, than Dipping: For *Nebuchadnezzar* being seven Years to live with Beasts, out of Habitation or House, was sufficiently washed, especially being probably naked too; so that this kind of wetting holds some resemblance with plunging in
Water,

Water, there being no part free from the Water thus rained upon *Nebuchadnezzar*: In which respect, it seems, the Septuagint renders or expresses his lying open to the Snow, Hail, Rain, or Dew, so long a time, by the word, ἕσῶφι. And, 2. My Answer is, That the Greek here is *Hyperbolic*, and not properly to be understood; and our Translators knowing this, did not (as I suppose) translate the Word according to its proper Signification, our Language not well bearing it in that case, but according to the thing which was to befall *Nebuchadnezzar*. And it seems very disingenuous, for you to conclude from this *Hyperbole*, that Sprinkling is more congruous to the signification of βαπτίζω, than Dipping, tho in so saying you contradict most of the Learned that have interpreted the word, βαπτίζω. And I am sure, (and you know it much better than I can tell you, for my Learning is nothing, when compared with yours,) that our Lexicons, Dictionaries, and Grammars, do make the prime Signification of βαπτίζω to be a dipping, as they do who dye Colours; and *Scapula* does not make βαπτίζω, nor βαπτίζω, to signify Sprinkling at all.

2. What you say in your 2d, 3d, 4th, and 5th Particulars, is answered before; but here you say, *The Church was never confined to that Mode of Dipping, but had several Ways of baptizing, dipping, or sprinkling, &c.*

I answer: What Usages the Church has had, is not the Question; but the Ground of her doings is the matter of our Enquiry: But yet I will venture to say, she was always confined to dip, if she kept that Ordinance according to Christ's own Example, which I think is a better Expofitor of the word βαπτίζω, than any *Lexicon* in the World.

2. The Alteration of the manner of this Ordinance, has not only occasioned us to say, You that only cross and sprinkle are not baptized; but the *Muscovites* declare the Latin Church to be unbaptized for the same reason. For this you may read *Daille* on the Fathers, lib. 2. p. 148. where he tells us; 'The Custom of the Ancient Church was to plunge those they baptized over Head and Ears in Water, as *Tertullian*, *Cyprian*, and *Epiphanius* testify. And this is still the Practice of the *Greek* and *Russian* Church at this day, as *Cassander de Baptismo*, pag. 193. And yet notwithstanding this Custom is now abolished by the Church of *Rome*; and this is the reason why the *Muscovites* say that the *Latines* are not rightly and duly baptized. Thus he. Nor is this the only Cause.