

THE
ANTIDOTE
Proved A
COUNTERFEIT
OR
ERROR DETECTED,
AND
Believers Baptism
VINDICATED
Containing

An Answer to a Nameless Author's Book, Entitled, *An Antidote to prevent the Prevalency of Anabaptism*

By HERCULES COLLINS of *Wapping*.

LONDON,

Printed for *William Marshall*, at the Bible in *Newgate-Street*, where is to be Sold Mr *Knowles's* Exposition on the whole book of the *Revelation*, price bound 2s. 6d. And Mr. *Bunyan's* Works in *Folio*, price bound 14s. And Mr. *Claridges* Looking Glass for Princes, price bound 6d And likewise most of Dr. *Owen's* and Mr. *Beverley's* Works.

MDCXCIII.

**THE
Preface to the Unbyas'd Reader.**

WE live in a divided and opinionative Age, and mens sentiments of things, for the most part, being as various as their Complexions; Books have their Dooms, according to the different apprehensions of their Readers. Some Tracts have been applauded more for the Name of the Writers, or Opinion they espouse, than for any substantial Worth to be found in them: Other are too often rejected and decry'd, because their Authors are not of their Perswasion; tho they have Plain Scripture, the most Authentick Evidence for any Gospel-Doctrine or Practise, to plead for them. Some are the better treated for their Learned and Polite Styles, tho they want that which should give them just recommendation, namely, Truth; while Other which have it on their side, meet with hard usage; and that (which is to be lamented) from Good Men too, because not set off with those Artificial Embellishments, which gain so fast upon a Fanciful Generation, that Rhetorical Paint passeth for true Beauty.

But if thou art such an One, as the Preface calls thee, an Unbyast Reader; One who art fully and solely for God, not regarding the Names or Writings of Men, any further than they accord with the Revealed word of God; if thou art free to receive Truth, for its own sake, and resolvest to hearken only to him that speaketh from Heaven; then may it be hoped, this Vindication of Believers Baptism will find a cordial Welcome with thee.

Thou canst not, if thou hast read anything, be wholly a stranger to the Controversy about the Proper Subjects and Right Administration of Baptism, between those that are for Sprinkling, or Pouring of Water upon Infants, and those that Dip or Plunge under Water the whole Body of Professing Believers only. I do confess on the one hand, 'tis sad to consider what strife there is for Victory; but on the other, I rejoyce to see Christ and his Truth Triumph, as they do in Believers Baptism. Great has been the Opposition made against this Holy Ordinance; but greater has been the Defence of it. Every Age hath afforded some Testimonies for this Truth, but now we are incompass'd with a Cloud of Witnesses, Never was any Point more fully prov'd or better clear'd than this has been. That one would think our Opposites should either alter their mistaken Practice, or be wholly silent.

But since they still go on in their Error, and cease not to argue against this Ordinance, 'tis necessary it should be guarded from the Attempts of its Assailants.

The worthy Author of the ensuing Discourse has Travelled formerly, with good success, in this Field of Controversy; and now with no less, against him who calls his Book, An Antidote to prevent the Prevalency of Anabaptism, &c. Here thou hast the Cavils and Objections of the Adversary, answer'd; Infants, or little Children prov'd to have no Habitual Faith; the dissolution of the Old Covenant State demonstrated, and the Infants of Believers to have no Right, as the Seed of such, to Holy Baptism. In a word, the Antidote is throughly examined, and proved to be a Counterfeit.

I shall add no more, but my hearty recommendation of this Book to thy Reading, desiring of the Lord, that thou mayest so Read as to Understand, and so Understand that thou mayst Practice.

*London, 20th. of the
5th. Month, 1693.*

*Thy Souls well wisher in the
Lord our Righteousness*

Richard Claridge.

A Plain and Impartial Inquiry into the Antidote, and upon Examination found a Counterfeit.

COULD any have expected less then that this Gentleman's Book, in the Body of it, should have answered the Title Page, namely, *Infant-Baptism Vindicated*; which indeed proves nothing but a *Bravado*, and flourish; for if it be Vindicated, it must be either because Christ commanded it, or some of his Apostles practised it; some commended for its Observation, or others reprov'd for its Neglect; but not one word of all this appears in his whole Discourse: Then how can *Infant-Baptism* be *Vindicated*? Also he comes as short in the other part of the Title, *An Antidote to prevent the spreading of Anabaptism*, he means *Believers Baptism*. Can he stop the course of the Sun, the ebbing and flowing of the Water? Can he number the Clouds and Stars, or weigh the Wind, and the Fire, or the great Mountains? Then he may answer his Title. What! is this Man resolved to set himself in a posture of War against God and his Word? Doth he think in this to prosper? Will he endeavour to prevent the spreading of that which our Lord Jesus Christ hath given his Ministers in Commission to spread? He seems to be griev'd at our Translation of a Book concerning Baptism, from *English* into *Welch*; but if this be to be *Vile*, we shall be *more Vile*. What can be expected when a Man shall be an Advocate against the Truth?

HE tel's us of some few Reflections upon some remarkable Passages in a Book of *H. C. of Wapping*. What should be the Reason this Gentleman did not answer that Book? He hath not said any thing to the Argument of it; but pickt a little here, and a little there, which he thought he could deal withal; but the Argument of the Book is untoucht. He calls them, *a few Reflections*; he may well call them *a few*; of in 139 Pages he hath not spoken to as much Matter as Three Pages contain. As for Argument, in his Book, it is to little, that I was dead to the answering of it a long time, not fearing his making many Proselytes to *Pedo-baptism*, nor hinder the spreading of the Truth, tho he did his Endeavour; but the Book being so full of Scurrility, base and abusive Language, and he being, as it is to be feared, blinded with Prejudice, when he wrote it, could not see his Evil; therefore these few Lines are intended, in the room of an Oculist, to open his Eyes to behold his Error in Judgment and Practice, before he leaves the World. I have in my Book laid down several Arguments to prove the right Mode or Manner of the Administration of Baptism to be by *Dipping*, not *Sprinkling*, and that the Subjects are to be *Understanding Believers*, not *Ignorant Infants*. I have spoken to above 20 Objections, but he doth not pretend to give the least Answer to either, what should be the Reason that he did not take Paragraph by Paragraph, and answer it fairly, like a man of Sence and Reason? Some are ready to argue thus, and they cannot help it; It is either because he could not, or would not: Not because he would not, for that would argue little warmth for his own way, yea, a kind of betraying his Cause. I will conclude he is more true to his own Principle; therefore some say *Ergo*, in the Negative, he could not; but if he can, the Press is yet open for him, or any other: and if he be conscious to himself he cannot respond to it, let him fall in with the Counsel therein given.

AS for the Eight Queries, they are reducible to Five, because the 4th, 7th and 8th, are all of one import. As for the *major* part of those Queries, they affect not us; only he makes a Man of Straw, and fights with it, or his own shadow. 'Tis certainly an Argument of profound Confidence, for a man to pretend to the World the discovery of the Errors of a People whose Principles he knows no more, comparatively, than I know *Utopia*; or else why doth he begin with this question, *Whether it be possible for children dying in their Infancy, to be saved?* But if it be not from Ignorance, then it is from a worse Root; for it's apparent enough that he labours to insinuate unto the world, as if we Imagined no Infants dying in their Infancy unbaptized could be saved; but if his Book were well considered, he rather deserves *Austin's* Title, the hard Father of Infants. Now, tho I know none of another mind, but that Children must stand in the Day of Judgment before Gods Tribunal, yet his Topicks and Mediums, I think, are not found to prove it by: He quotes a Text

which tells us, *That every person shall be judged according to his Works*. This Text cannot affect little Infants, which have no Works, good nor bad. Was the Scripture written for the sake of Infants, or the Adult? Was not this written to the end Men should look to their Works, that they might give a good Account. It is well this Man is not the Peoples Eyes, for if he were, I fear they would be all quickly with him in the Ditch of Error: What! because *Rev. 20. 12. saith, I saw the dead small and great stand before God*; that therefore the *Small* here are *little Infants*. The latter is exegetical of the former, every one being judged according to his Works, argues, That the *small* are either the poor opposed to the rich in the world, or those not come to the perfection of Men, in opposition to them which were, yet knew good and evil, so were judged every one according to his Works. *Those in this Text are judged according to their Works; but little Infants have no Works, good nor bad; therefore they cannot be here intended.*

THE second Query is, *Whether Infants are saved by any other way than by Faith in the Imputed Righteousness of Christ?* In page 5. he asserts Infants are saved by Habitual Faith in the Lord Jesus Christ; That Infants are saved by Christ, we have asserted, because we know of no other Name but *Jesus*; but that they are saved by Faith; Habitual Faith in Christ; I must confess I never read it in all the Book of God; I wish he could shew me the Chapter where Christ said any such thing, That Infants are Saved by Habitual Faith. What! would this Man make a *New Bible*, have a new Rule to tell us of things never heard of? Had he the Notion by Inspiration he should have told us so. Now I do not wonder the man is so well pleased with an unscriptural Baptism, when he assert an unscriptural way of saving Infants; and yet this Gentleman will adventure to prove this in such a way, and by such Topicks and Mediums, that both the Universities could hardly ever think of; for he brings, to make good this *Thesis*, all those Scriptures which speak of the absolute necessity of the Adult, of Men and Womens Regeneration, and believing, and applies them all unto little Infants; as that in *Mark 16. 16. He that believeth, and is baptized, shall be saved; but he that believeth not shall be damned.* (We have not left out the latter part of the Words now, for I remember the false charge.) But to this Text in *Mark*, when Christ gave a Commission to his Apostles to *go into all the World to preach the Gospel*, and to inform them, *If they believed, and were baptized they should be saved; but if they believed not they should be damned*; were they to preach this to little Infants? That they were to believe upon the penalty of Damnation; (I do not say, *baptized upon the penalty of Damnation*, tho you have unwarily asserted some of us are like the *Jews in Judea*, who asserted no Circumcision no Salvation, so no Baptism no Salvation.) But to our business, it seems Ministers are bound to go into the World, and preach to Infants as well as the Adult, that they believe upon the penalty of Damnation; for this is the great Text brought once and again for Infants Baptism, because they have faith; but how came they by it? was it by hearing the word preached, according to the Commission in that place? No, no, saith the good man, 'tis habitual faith inspired. Why then doth he bring this Text? because he is almost at his Wits end, and famished for want of Arguments, and so will catch at any thing.

PRAY take one argument to think on before we go further, *If none are here intended in Mark 16. but Men and Women Capable to Hear, and actually to Believe the Gospel of Christ, then Infant Habitual faith is not here intended*; but the former is true, therefore the Latter (you see the mans great Bullwark is thrown down at once.) It is a wonder to me that a man who hath been so long a profest Christian should be so long ignorant of the word of God: what was the Scripture Calculated and written for? to be preached [to them]* why then did he not carry his children when Infants to be [baptzed] he said no, the Gospel was not written for Infants, why then doth he bring that Text that hath no manner of relation to Infants, but only to the Adult? You are in the pound, Sir, get out if you can. Then he comes with a home question; *But may some say how shall we know that Infants have habitual faith?* How shall we know it indeed? for my part I cannot tell

* The text is unclear in the original at this point, the words in square brackets an interpolation.

how, I wish this Gentleman could ell me; for he hath oftentimes asserted no Faith no Salvation, neither for Old or Young. But how do you think he Answers this question? by asking another, and as weakly answering it; *How do we know any children, saith he, are saved but by the Judgment of charity, and some Scriptural Intimations?* Ah, poor man, this had been better in then out, by some Scriptural Intimations? pray give us some Scriptural Intimations that Infants have faith, and we will say no more. Your bringing a Prophecy of Christ out of the 22 Psalm 9, 10. will not do it, and though I give you all you can desire that it may also be applied unto *David*, it signifieth nothing to the point; *Thou didst make me hope when upon my mothers breasts*; that is, thou didst give me sufficient ground for hope and trust if I had been capable of acting that grace and v. 10. *I was cast upon thee from the womb, thou art my God from my mothers belly*; that is, *I was like one forsaken by his parents and cast wholly upon thy Providence*; see our late Annotations. But for all this Infants have habitual Faith, saith our Antagonist, but his arguments are so feeble that maintain it, that it's like a tottering fence; well, but what if I should ask, what do you mean by Habitual Faith? I think there cannot be less in the word than this, that they have an Inclination to believe, and that they have Power, Might, Ability to believe; and if it be so, what is the reason they do not believe? surely if they have Power, Strength and Ability to believe, is it not reasonable they should be damned if they do not believe? which are his own words, page 17 *no Faith, no Salvation neither for Young nor Old*. If by *Habit* he meant an Inclination to believe, a disposition to believe, then let him prove they have such a disposition; and what it is that hinders their believing; we say a person that is disposed to a thing, hath power actually to do it. If he do not understand the meaning of the word habitual, why did he write it? was it to confound the Ignorant with the word Infant-seed of believers being in Covenant; what is meant by being in Covenant? there are thousands of themselves know nothing of it. Seeing they do not mean the Election of Grace for my part I think Transubstantiation, habitual Faith, and the Infant seed of believers in the covenant are terms equally allowable and probably equally understood among their various Professors; this habitual Faith in Infants is much of the likeness of our Athenian assertion, that Infants have faith *Potentia*, tho not *Actu visibli*; so you say they have habitual, though not actual visible Faith; for my part I think it calls for a prodigious Faith for any man to believe Infants have faith *potentia*, or habitual; all you have done is only begging when you should have bee a digging: But I think you have given away your Cause, and habitual Faith too, in page 26. in these words, *God is a free Agent, and bestows his Gifts of Grace and Mercy upon whom he pleaseth*. May not an earthly King bestow his bounty upon a poor dumb Cripple that can neither ask nor go to him for it, no, nor return him vocal thanks? Is not this to allow and say what I have said, That Infants are happy through the imputed righteousness of Christ; tho as poor dumb Cripples that can neither ask nor go, nor return thanks? So that tho in elect he saith, as I do, yet calls my Sentence a strange Sentence, which asserts Infants sins are done away by the Imputation of Christs Righteousness, page 18. And would any man, but one void of common sense urge such Scriptures for Infant inherent Faith, as Rom. 3. 26. *God is the justifier of him that believeth in Jesus*, Eph. 2. 8, 9 *By Grace are ye saved through Faith not of works, lest any man should boast*, Gal. 3. 22. *But the Scripture hath concluded all under sin, that the promise by Faith of Jesus Christ might be given them which believe*. And Mark 16. 16. *He that believeth, and is baptized, shall be saved*. And Gal. 6. 15. *For in Jesus Christ neither circumcision nor Uncircumcision availeth any thing, but Faith which worketh by Love, or a new Creature*. And he might as well have added, 1 Cor 7. *But the keeping of the Commands of God*, Rom. 5. 1. *being justified by Faith, we have peace with God through our Lord Jesus Christ*, Rom. 3. 28. *Therefore we conclude a Man is Justified by Faith without the deeds of the Law*. Doth this man think in his Conscience that ever these things were written or Preached unto Infants, or in any sense intended that Infants should have the comfort of it; if not, why are all these Scriptures applied unto them, when God never intended it for them? I hope he hath been taught better to Expound the Scripture; But still he positively asserts Infants have Faith, and do believe, and proves it by two Infallible Witnesses, as he thinks, the one is Mark 9 42. *And who so shall offend one of those little ones*

which believe in me; it were better for him a milstone were hanged about his neck and cast into the Sea. These little ones he asserts are Infants; but I would fain know, had I a mind to offend a believing Infant, how should I know which were him? There is no more appears in one Infant than another. Secondly, Men must know such a one which owns Christ, for it is because he owns Christ that any of the wicked offend him: But how shall I know the Infant with his Inherent Grace and Faith, what Family he is in, where he dwells, should I have a mind to offend him? Again, how shall the Infant know I am offended with him for his believing in Christ? Mark, Reader, the verse before, *Whosoever shall give a Cup of Water to drink in my Name, because they belong to Christ, shall not lose his reward.* Then the next words are, *And whosoever shall offend one of these little ones which believe in me.* So that you see these little ones Christ speaks of, are such as go under the notion of Christs Disciples, making a visible profession; and if we do the least kindness for them we shall not lose our reward. But how shall I know which Infants it is that hath habitual Faith, that stands in need of this Cup of Water? It cannot discover its own thirst, and so the poor Infant may Die, though I had a mind to relieve it. The Eighteenth of *Matthew*, is brought in by Christ upon the same account to abate the pride of the Disciples who were discoursing who should be greatest and be the highest in Heaven; upon this Christ calls a little Child, and tells them, except they were Spiritually what that Child was Naturally, in Meekness, Humility, free from Revenge and Pride, *They could not enter into the Kingdom of Heaven.* So he goes on, *whoso shall offend one of those little ones which believe in me;* not the little Infant or Child called and set in the midst, but those Believers that were like them in Humility, wrought by Faith in Christ; for had I a mind to please or displease an Infant with his habitual Faith, I know not where to find him; and surely our Lord did not speak of such who were never like to be known: Oh, when will you cease to pervert the right word of the Lord? How disingenuous are you in saying, I owned they were Infant-Children, but would not own they believed? My speaking those words was not from those Scriptures, but two others, namely, *Luke* 18. and *Matt.* 19. See my book, page 35. 36. where Children were brought to Christ to be touched; from whence some infer they were Baptized. But I need not wonder you are so unfair with me, when you are so with the very Word of God, when God saith, *Acts* 16. 34. *That the Jaylor believed in God with all his House;* you positively say, here we read of none but the Jaylor which did believe, and yet notwithstanding, say you, his whole Family was Baptized. I hope, Sir, you believe there is a Judg. Mr. *Charnock* speaking of an Habit, tells us, "It is an inward Frame enabling one to *Act* readily and easily, as when an Artificer hath the habit of a Trade; the new Creature consists in gracious qualities and habits, which beautify and dispose the Soul to act righteously and holily: Hence habits are as Seeds which make the Earth capable to bring forth good Fruit; but what good Fruit hath an Infant with all his habitual grace? This habit, saith he, is exprest by a fountain of Living Water springing up to Eternal Life. Page 75. Some say indeed that Regeneration is conferred in Baptism upon the Elect, and exerts it self afterwards in Conversion; but how so active a principle as a Spiritual Life should lie dead or a sleep so long, even many years, which intervene between Baptism and Conversion, is not easily Conceivable. Where these habits are, there is a Spirit of Love, of Grace, whereby as their understandings are possest with a knowledg of the Excellencies of his ways, so their wills are seasoned by the power of this Habit: And further, as Christ had a Body prepared him to do the work of a Mediator, so the Soul hath a habit prepared to do the work of the new Creature as the corrupt Nature is the habit of sin, so the new Nature is the habit of Grace; God doth not only call us to Believe, Love, Obey, but brings in the Grace of Faith and Love and Obedience; this habit receives various Denominations, either from the Subject, or Object, 'tis subjectively in the Essence the Soul; but as it shows it self in the Understanding 'tis called the knowledg of God; as 'tis in the Will, 'tis a choice of God; as in the Affection, 'tis a motion to God; and from the Object it is diversified; as it closes with Christ Dying, 'tis Faith; as it rejoyces in Christ Living, it is Love; as it lies at the Feet of Christ, it is Humility; as it observes the Will of Christ, it is Obedience; as it submits to Christ afflicting, it is patience; as it regards Christ offended it is grief; yet all ariseth from one habit; but where doth any of these things appear in the

Infants habitual Faith; he tells you further, where the habit of true Grace is, there is a ready disposition to every good work, because Seminally in every renewed person — And, saith he, as 'tis ready in respect of disposition, so it is in the activity of motion; yea, 'tis naturally active according to its divine Nature, moreover 'tis voluntarily active, where these habits are there is a kind of natural necessity of motion from life and habit; yea 'tis fervently active, the nobler the Being of any thing is, the greater degree of activity it is attended with; yea, 'tis unboundedly active, also powerfully active, easily active, and pleasantly active, the entire inclinations of the Soul stands right to good actions". Mr. *Charnock*, 2 Vol. Page 8. to 94. Now let all those Characters of Habitual Grace be put together, and hen consider whether any of these things can affect little Infants. I hope by this time you have enough of Infants Habitual Faith. I will only add this further, page 94. "There is in this habit an orderly motion and activity, and a permanent activity, a Spring of perpetual motion, even unto everlasting Life; how then can all the infant Seed of Believers have this Habitual Faith, when so many of them make their Parents Hearts to ake?" This is like Mr. *Marshalls* Notion in his Sermon before the Parliament. God doth Seal the Infant presently, and puts their name into the Deed, and that God accepts of such a Seal on their parts as they are able to give in their Infant age, expecting a further Ratification when they come to riper years, and that in the mean time affords them the favour of being in Covenant with him, and that the surety of the New Covenant is pleased to be their surety, yet faith, when grown men, they may refuse to stand to this Covenant and nullity all: Oh amazing! How inconsistent is this with perseverance? Take this Argument for a close of your second Query, and Answer it, *Those Children of Believers which Die in an Unregenerate State, either never had the Habits of Grace or else if they had them, they have lost them; But there is no losing Habits of Grace; Ergo, they never had them.* If you say they had them, and have lost them, that is against your own principle about perseverance: If you say they never had them, then you contradict your own book, which assert, That all the Infants of Believers have it, and therefore you Baptise them: get out of this Prison as well as you can.

For your third Query, What if I allow all Believers are wholly passive in Regeneration, and can do nothing to regenerate them selves, than a [*the text here is not readable in the original*] Faith? Is this a concluding Argument? Surely no; Pray Sir go to School and learn better Logick for this is no Argument in *Barbara*; There is no more, say you, in Children to hinder Grace, than in the Adult: *Ergo, they believe, (what think you Sir, is this good Arguing) Christ can raise of stones Children unto Abraham, Ergo, stones believe, or Stones are wholly passive, and have nothing to hinder Regeneration, Ergo, Stones are Regenerated; When you bring better Topicks and Mediums to prove your Argument by, more may be said to it; but you may think I have said too much to discover your Ignorance of Divine things already. Here we may give a hint to your fifth Query, Whether Children may not have the Golden Oyl of God's Free Grace, as well as Adult persons? Answer, What little Infants have, or what they may have, lieth not within our Sphere; secret things belong unto God, Revealed things unto us; but the question is, how this Gentleman will prove that infants have this grace which qualifieth them for Baptism; my neighbour is capable of being King of *Utopia*, Ergo he is king of *Utopia*, doth this Conclude? the Scripture saith Men and Women ought to believe who are capable of knowing good and evil; therefore infants do believe who know neither good nor evil. Your 4th, 7th, 8th. Queries look one way, and we do assert infants may be fit for the Kingdom of God, as our Lord hath said, and yet not qualified for Gospel Ordinances: Can it be shewed that ever our Lord Instituted Gospel Ordinances for Infants? Could it be made appear that Infants have Repentance, Faith, and are taught of God, have the answer of a good Conscience professedly, they would have a Right to the Ordinance of Baptism; but this Logick will never pass the Schools. My Child shall be heir to my Inheritannce, ergo, he is capable of understanding the signing and sealing of it at eight days old; had you said he had been capable of understanding the sealing this Estate over unto him at One and Twenty, it had carried more of Truth and Reason in it. Why are Children denyed the Lords supper if fit for baptism? what, are*

Children believers, and kept from the Lord's Table? do we ever read it was denied to a true Believer? what, are Children New Creatures, Regenerated, Born again, and deny them the Elements of Bread and Wine: Oh! hard Father of Infants Men as wise as your self gave Infants the Eucharist for several hundred years, from some of your own Topicks, and will you deny it them? all your long harangue about Infants being capable of one Ordinance, and not of another, is but wind; will you say in the Ordinance of the Lord's Supper, there must be inherent Grace, and also Grace exercised; but a state of Grace, tho not exercised, say you, is sufficient for Baptism; But how doth this Gentleman know Infants are in a state of Grace to qualifie them for Baptism? the word doth not help him here, and if he conclude so from Charity, then there is the same reason to have the same Charity for Children of Unbelievers, and more too some times, because the Believers Child often falls from a pretended Covenant, State, Faith, Inherent Holiness, New Birth, Regeneration, when the Unbelievers, Child abides in all Truly. But how comes this Gentleman so bold as to Assert and Print, That Actual Grace is not necessary to Baptism? Did not *Philip* call for Actual Grace of the *Eunuch* before Baptism? If thou Believest thou mayest: *How then can Persons be wholly Passive in Baptism? Did the Eunuch go down into the Water, and come up out of the Water? Did Christ go almost Forty Miles to be Baptized, and did it as an Act of Righteousness, and yet wholly Passive?* If you can shew me another Bible where Christ since hath said, Persons need not Actual Faith, and are wholly Passive in Baptism, I may change my mind. Whereas he doth Magnify the Lord's Supper so much above Baptism; I do Assert what ever is Sealed to a Believer in one Ordinance, is Scaled to him in another; nay, there is more particular words of Incouragement added unto Baptism, than to the other: 'Tis true, 'tis all comprehended in this, *This is my Body broken for you, and my Blood shed for the Remission of your Sins*, but for Baptism in *Acts 2*. you have the promise of *Remission of Sins and gift of the Holy Ghost*: in *Acts 22*. 'tis said to *Wash away Sins Symbolically*, *Mark 16*. *Salvation is annexed unto Faith and Baptism*; the Lord's Supper, was never so Dignified as Baptism by the Procession of the Holy Ghost; and it is a Symbol of *Regeneration and Justification*, *Rom. 6*. Do I see my Sins Pardoned, my Person Justified, God Reconciled, my Person Sanctified, Heaven assured at the Lord's Supper? I behold the same in Baptism, there I see my Sins Buried in his Grave, as in the other Nailed to his Cross; here I behold my Soul Washed in his Blood, Justified by his Righteousness, Saved by his Death; and is not this a Marriage Feast? And ought I not to have the Wedding Garment now as at the Table of the Lord?

BUT this Gentleman tells me, I have Written several strange Positions; I am not ashamed the World should see them: You must know one of the first Arguments of the Church of *Rome* for Infants Baptism, is, *That it Washst away Original Sin*: Now because I say in opposition to that, we know a better way to Wash away Original Sin, namely, *The Imputation of Christ's Righteousness*: This is one of my strange Positions. But pray which is most strange, this, or the applying all those Texts, which speak of Regenerated Men and Women unto little Infants, and what they speak of the necessity of Faith in them, to apply it unto Babes, who neither know Good nor Evil.

2dly, ANOTHER strange Position is, because I say, *That as Circumcision was the Door into the Jewish Church, which was National so Baptism is the Door into the Gospel Church, which is Congregational*: Now this being true in his own Opinion; why should it be a strange Position? Why, Because I will not allow, it came in the room of Circumcision: Cannot I make two Doors to my House, but one must be a type of another? Or rather, Cannot I pull down my Old House and Build a New; but my Door of my First House must be a Type of the Door of my last. The Door of God's Gospel-House is larger than the Door of his Legal House; that Door was only large enough for the Jews, and few poor Proselyted Gentiles; but the Gospel Door entertains all commers, *Jews, Gentiles, Barbarians, Sythians*: So that the First Door could not be an Exemplar or Type of the Last; Then only Males were Circumcised; now Males and Females Believing may be

Baptized; therefore Circumcision could not be the shadow of Baptism; the Subjects that enter the Door are not the same; one are Ignorant Infants, the other Persons of Understanding. Under the Law the Subjects were wholly Passive, but now Church Members must be Active in the Operations and Acts of Repentance and Faith; not only those called Conformists, but the Non-Conformists also have lost the Door, and the Subject that should enter the Door: for here are they wholly Passive, when they should be Active; so that the very Essence of the Ordinance is lost; here is neither right Form, nor right Subject, and what are they that enter not in by the Door, but climb up and come in some other way into the House?

READER, consider whether this saying of mine be so strange as his, which he hath put in two *Mercuries*, shewing I was not the Author of his Book, which I would not have been for the World: He tells the People, *I was never guilty in Writing nor Preaching of any such Extensive Evangelical Truths*: Is not this a piece of Arrogance with a witness? How hath he exposed his Profession and Name to the World? besides he knows not what my Preaching is, nor hath Read, I suppose, a third of what is written; so that he speaks in the dark. And whereas he saith, *I never was guilty of Writing or Preaching such things, I hope I never shall*. Again, Is not that a strange Position of his, page 25. Because I say, *John Baptist required, Matt. 3. of the Pharises and Sadduces Repentance from dead Works, in order to qualifie them for Baptism and Gospel Church Membership; every Tree, saith the Text, that brings not forth good Fruit is hewen down, and cast into the Fire*.

HE from hence concludes, and tells the World, that my judgment is, *That little infants, because they cannot bring forth good Fruit must be cut down by the Ax of Divine Wrath, and cast into Eternal Fire*: and saith, *I and my party are for saving Infants, by and for good Works*. Did ever man speak more impertinently, and wrong his Antagonist more unreasonably? What, cannot I speak to the Adult and say, *Unless you Repent you shall all perish*, but I must intend Infants who are not capable of it; *and except you believe, you shall be damned*: And when I say, *He that sows to the flesh, shall of the flesh reap corruption*, but must intend Infants: Surely the Doctrine of the Gospel was never Calculated for Infants; these Lines of His must be Written through ignorance, Inadvertency or worse; however it was, he ought to do his Neighbour right by a publick Recantation; and also of that in page 24. where he saith, *I smell rank of Rome, Popery, and Free Will*, because in my Book I give a reproof to the Seekers who put a slight upon the Blessed Ordinances. See page 60, 61, 62. I little thought he would have been an Advocate for them As to my Judgment, about Justifying Faith, it is well known both from the Pulpit and from the Press; but this is like the rest of his Writing, who labours all he can to blacken the ways of God, and render the Professors of it as odious as possible, or else he would never have raked into the Grave of one Godly Minister who hath been Dead almost twenty Years: He mentions several who have Apostatized from the Truth, *Judas* being one of them, Accumulates the Errors of some in Principles, and others in Practice, and jumbles them all together to make the name of a *Baptist* Odious; nay, Publisheth one particular passage of a Faithful Minister of Christ (wherein he supposed some Weakness, tho there was none) who is now Living, and an Honourable Person in the Church of God, whom he calls *a Pastor of a Congregation*, page 49. And because we withhold from Infants what Christ would not have given them, he tells the World we make *no better of Infants than Dogs*, page 11. *That we have Crafty Positions, uncouth Glosses, that we mince and limit the Fundamental Doctrine of Mans Salvation*, page 48. Doth he not acquire the name of an Exquisite Calumniator, when he tells the World, *Some of them are Arminians, some Socinians, some gone back to Judaism, others of them Gormandizers?* page 51. Now Courteous Reader, consider what dreadful work should we make in the Church of God, if we should Preach and Publish in Print the Errors of some of the *Pedo-Baptists*, both in Principle and Practice; but while we are Mourning under the Evil of others, I hope we shall not fall into the same our selves: He endeavours to make those Hearts sad God would not have made sad, by Misrepresenting our

Opinion to the World, as if we held no Baptism no Salvation; and that we account all *Babylon*, and none of the New *Jerusalem* but them of our Opinion, and very streight in our Love and Affection: Is not this the Man *David* speaks of, *That Travelleth with Iniquity, Conceived Mischief, and brought forth Falshood?* Remember, remember *John Child*, whose chief cause of Desperation, was his speaking and writing against those very People of God you now do.

NOW I come to your Challenge in your Book, page 12. *I Challenge all the Anabaptists in the World to produce but one plain Text of Scripture either in the Old or New Testament, from Gen. 17. to the very last of the Revelations, to prove that ever the Children of Believing Parents were cast out of Covenant by any Authority from God, and then I will Submit unto them.*

MY fear is, this person is so prepossesed that all a Man can say, tho never so much to the purpose, it will not be regarded; however, because he hath made so fair a promise, we will try if we can make him submit; but, pray Sir, do not Answer this Book and these Arguments as my first Book, for I expect a full Answer if you Write,

YOUR demand is, *That we prove Infants In-covenanting, and the priviledges Children once had with their Parents, repealed.*

THEREFORE that the Covenant of Peculiarity made to Abraham, and his Natural Seed, as such, is Abolished, I prove from these four or five Arguments following, laid down in so many Enthymems.

Argum. 1 THE Natural Branches are broken off, Ergo, Childrens visible Incovenanting is Repealed; the Antecedent of this Enthymem is cleared from the Apostles Assertion Rom. 11. 19, 20, 21. The Branches are broken off, By the Natural Branches, without Controversy is to be understood the Natural Seed of Abraham, and the breaking off must either be meant from a Visible Church Membership, and External Priviledges there-unto belonging, or the everlasting Covenant of Grace; it cannot be the latter, because that Covenant is Immutable, therefore it must be the former: God shewed Zachariah the Prophet, Chap 11. 10, 14. upon a Prospect of the Jews Unbelief in the Messiah, and their putting him to Death, that he would take his staff of Beauty, and his staff of Bands and break it, to signify he would break the Covenant he had made with Israel and Judah, who until this time were accounted the only Visible People of God in the World, tho now the Partition Wall is broken down, and all the Gentile Nations in the World are with the Believing Jews, all one in Christ. Hear worthy Mr Cotton on the Covenant, page 15. "John Baptist's Ministry, saith he, did burn like an Oven against all the Scribes and Pharises, and left them neither the Root of Abraham's Covenant, nor the Branches of their own good Works, Matt. 3. 9." In the Preface to Dr. Owen's True Nature of Gospel Church, he saith, "God took that numerous Progeny which came from Abraham's Loyns to himself in one Visible Body and Visible Church Membership". "The whole Nation being the same Politick Ecclesiastical Body", saith Mr. Tombes, which Church state was only Carnal, as their Ordinances were; but, saith the Preface, "when God had divorced that People, Abolished their Mosaical Constitution by breaking their Staff of Beauty and Bands; then he erects his Gospel Church, calls in Disciples by his Ministry, forms them into a Body, and furnisheth them with Officers"; so that this Covenant is taken up by the Roots, and the Natural Branches broken off, none excepted, but the Natural Branches which remain so by Faith in the Messiah, and so they broken off, may be Grafted in again; but until then, they remain broken off, ergo, the Visible Incovenanting of Infants is Repealed, for they could not be broken off the Everlasting Covenant of Grace, therefore it must be the Covenant of Peculiarity made with Abraham.

Arg. 2. NONE are Christ's Disciples but such as take up his Cross and follow him, ergo, Infants are not Disciples, and so no Visible Members of a Gospel Church.

The Antecedent is fully proved from our Saviours Assertion, *Luke 14. 26,27. If any man come unto me, and hate not his Father and Mother, and Wife and Children, and Brethren and Sisters, yea, and his own Life also, he cannot be my Disciple, and whosoever beareth not his Cross, and commeth after me, he cannot be my Disciple*, twice repeated, as if our Saviour had foreseen how men would boldly assert Infants Disciples who were wholly incapable of it. Let this put you to everlasting Silence from mentioning *Matt 28.18. your great Bulwark you always run unto; now you may plainly see our Saviour did not mean Children, when he said, go Disciple all Nations; if he had intended Infants to have been Disciples also, he would have made that exception; but our Lord knew they were in no wise capable of being taught, taking up Christ's Cross and following him, without which it's impossible, saith our blessed Lord, you should be my Disciples. Thus you see that Children are excluded the Commission because they cannot be Disciples, being wholly incapable to take up the Cross, and so consequently not Visibly in Covenant, nor Church Members; therefore that Covenant of Peculiarity with Abraham and his Natural Seed is Repealed.*

Arg. 3. The Promise of Remission of Sin, and the gift of the Holy Ghost unto the Children of Believers, is upon the terms of Repentance and Obedience, Ergo, the Promise is not to the Fleshly and Natural Seed of Believers as such.

The Antecedent is proved from Gods word, *Acts 2. 38. 39. where the Jews upon Conviction by St. Peter's Sermon, of their being the Murtherers of the Messiah, cries out unto the Apostle, Men and Brethrn, what shall we do? Peter Answers them, Repent and be Baptized in the name of Jesus Christ for the Remission of Sins, and ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Ghost; for this Promise is to you and your Children also, yea, to the very Gentiles afar off, if they are called. Repent, Believe and Obey the Messiah, for tho you called for the Guilt of Christs Blood to be upon your Heads, and your Childrens, yet for your Comfort it shall not be upon either. If both have these Qualifications before mentioned, therefore the consequent roundly follows that the Promise is not made to the Natural Seed of Believers as such, therefore the Covenant of peculiarity made with Abraham and his Seed is Repealed. But if you will not yet comply with this plain sense of the Words, but that the Promise of God in this Text is to the Infant Seed of Believers as such; consider your task; if God hath made such a Promise as Sins Remission, and the Gift of the Holy Ghost to all the Natural Seed of Believers as such, then you are to make this appear that the Believers Infant Seed as such, are indeed Partakers of these Promises which God hath here made, or else you Reflect unfaithfulness on God for non-performance of his Covenant, so that unavoidably all the Infant Seed of Believers, as such, must be Saved, since God hath made the promise of Sins Remission, and the Gift of the Holy Ghost unto them, unless you suppose some may Eternally Perish which have these Gifts; but if you will add, and say, we never believed they should be the better for the Promise, without an Actual taking Hold of the Covenant; then shew us what Promise and Priviledg the Child of a Believer hath, more than the Child of an Unbeliever, or Gentile afar off, if they do also actually take hold by Faith of God's Covenant. Thus you see that the Promise is not to the Fleshly Seed of Believers as such, but upon the terms of Faith and Obedience; therefore the Covenant of Peculiarity made with Abraham and his Natural Seed, is Repealed.*

Arg. 4. Abraham's Seed under the Gospel Dispensation are only Actual true Believers, Ergo, the Covenant of Peculiarity made with Abraham and his Infant Seed, as such, is Repealed.

The Antecedent is clear, from *Gal. 3. 29. If ye are Christs, then are ye Abraham's Seed; you boast, saith Christ, Abraham is your Father; but you are the Children of the Devil, for ye seek to kill me,*

so did not Abraham; boast not of your Birth Priviledes, it signifieth nothing except you are born again, for the Children of the Flesh, tho the Children of Abraham, are not the Children of God, but the children of the Promise, viz. The Children of Faith are counted for the seed Rom. 9. 8. The consequent follows naturally, that the old way of Infants Visible Incovenanting is Repealed, unless you think Infants do believe; so that whatsoever was comprehended in that Promise made to *Abraham* and his Seed, *Gen. 17. 7*, can no ways affect the Seed of Believing Gentiles, as such: for my Seed, as a Gentile cannot be the Natural Seed of *Abraham*, a Jew; nor the Spiritual Seed of *Abraham*, because such are reckoned according to the Spirit and Faith; So that that Text, *Gen. 17. 7*. hath been very improperly applied all along to the Seed of Believing Gentiles, as such, being neither the Natural nor Spiritual Seed of *Abraham*: And to advance a little further, know this that no particular Believer can infer they are a Holy Root to their Posterity; because *Abraham* is called the Father of the Faithful, for *Abraham* is accounted a Spiritual Father, but we are accounted Natural; So that the Covenant of Peculiarity made with *Abraham* and his Natural Seed, as such, must be Abolished, because we are not accounted *Abraham's* Seed now, but as we believe in the Messiah, and for a Gentile Believers Natural Seed, as such, cannot be the Seed of *Abraham*, neither in a natural nor Spiritual Sence, therefore cannot in any wise affect them: Here you have brought your self again into a Noose, and I cannot help it. Now seeing the Seed of *Abraham* are Actual Believers, therefore the Covenant of Peculiarity made with *Abraham*, and his Natural Seed is Repealed.

Arg. 5. Infants are not capable of the Qualifications of Gospel Church Membership, Ergo, Infants Incovenanting and Church Membership is Repealed.

THE Antecedent is clear from their being wholly incapable of being Taught and made Disciples, by taking up Christ s Cross and following him; also of Self-Examination. In the Covenant of Peculiarity made with *Abraham*; the Infant Church Members were wholly Passive in suffering the sign of the Covenant under the Legal Oeconomy. “But Members of a Gospel Church are Active; the *Corinthians* gave themselves first to God, and then to the Apostles, by the Will of God, in a Church State; in a Gospel Church they are Innitiated after Conversion, or at least a Profession of it: It's said of such, They that gladly received the Word were Baptised, and they eat their Meat with gladness and singleness of Heart, and went to their own Company, lift up their Voice in Prayer, and were Obedient to the Faith; but Infant Church Membership no ways agree to a Gospel Church State, who are said to be Sanctified in Christ Jesus; Saints by calling, Holy Brethren, Living Stones, Christ's Spiritual Temple, and House of God”. Church Members, now are to be Active; they are not to go, as *Austin* absurdly saith of Infants going to Baptism with others Feet, believe with others Faith, Covenant with others Tongues. I am sure Christ went upon his own Feet to Baptism near forty Mile, and the Eunuch also, and believed with his own Faith, and Covenanted with his own Tongue. Now for the Conclusion, I say, Infants are not now Visibly in covenant, it not being within my Sphere what they are as to Gods Decrees, yet conclude well of all that Die in their Infant State. But seeing there are so many Qualifications required individually to Gospel Church Membership, your task is to prove, that Infants have them; or give up the Cause, according to your Promise, and confess the Covenant of Peculiarity made unto *Abraham*, and his Seed, is Repealed

Whereas you mention *Jeremiah* and *John Baptist* Sanctified from the Womb; on *Jeremiah*, our Annotators say, I have Appointed and Approved thee as a fit Minister for the Work, I have Prepared and Ordained thee for Publick Service, viz, not with Saving Grace, tho that need not to be excluded; and of *John the Baptist*, they say, being filled with the Holy Ghost from his Mothers Momb; this is true both as to Prophecy, which is an extraordinary gift of the Holy Ghost, and also of the Holy Ghost considered as a Sanctifying Spirit; Now consider, our Annotators lay the great stress of those two Men Sanctified from the Womb, upon their being fitted for publick Work, for

as much as they had insuperable Difficulties which in those degenerate and corrupt Times they must unavoidably Encounter with; but what if it should be granted those two Men were not only Sanctified from the Womb? That is, set a-part to publick Work, which the word Sanctified some times imports; but that also they were Savingly Sanctified in their Hearts: Is this a good Argument to prove, that all the Infant Seed of believers have Habitual Faith from their Mothers Womb? If so, how comes it to pass that so many of them Die unsanctified? Logicians will tell you, its unsafe Arguing from particuliar Instances to general; is this a good Argument? *Solomon* was a very Wise man, *ergo*, all men are very Wise. *Sampson* was a Strong Man, therefore all Men have *Sampson's* Strength. *Abraham* was a great believer, therefore, all Men have great Faith. *Moses* was a Meek Man, therefore, all Men are Meek, and all Men Patient, because *Job* was such; I hope we shall never have these instances urged any more of *John Baptist*, and *Jeremiah*, for to prove that all the Infant Seed of believers have Habitual Faith.

SEEING some have queried, where you find that Children are forbidden to be Baptised, tho you know it is rather your work to prove the Positive, That there is a Command for the Baptizing of Infants, than for me to prove the Negative, That there is none; for if you would but prove the former, you would save me the Labour from proving the latter; however I shall attempt it for once.

TO prove the Baptism of Infants Forbidden.

ALL positive Commands Prohibit whatever is repugnant thereunto; but the Baptism of Infants is repugnant to the positive command of Christ for that Ordinance, *ergo*, the baptism of Infants is prohibited.

The Major is undeniable, the Minor I thus prove: If ignorance be opposed to understanding, the want of an act of Repentance, Faith and Obedience be opposed to the Act, and Teaching be opposed to them not capable of it. If a few drops of Water be opposed to a burial in Water: In a word, if a wrong Subject and a wrong manner of Administration be opposite to a right Subject and manner of Administration, then Infants Baptism is repugnant to Christ's Command for that Ordinance, and therefore roundly Prohibited; for no man of Sense can imagin that our Lord can allow of any Practice repugnant to his own Commission; the word all Nations, in *Matt 28*. is referable only to the Teaching of all Nations; all positive Commands, prohibit whatever is repugnant thereunto. We might Illustrate when we are commanded to Worship God in Spirit and Truth, it forbids all Ignorant Devotion, Formality and Hypocrisy, and when commanded to Worship God, all idols and Idolaty is forbidden; to eat bread and drink Wine in remembrance of Christ, forbids a belief of his Corporal Presence; what need I do any act to put me in remembrance of him who is Corporally Present, when God's Word asserts we are saved by Grace, it forbids Works as Meritorious; so when God Commands Persons that Profess Faith and Repentance to be baptised, it Prohibits all that are incapable of those Qualifications. Take heed of incurring Divine Displeasure, by commanding that in the Name of the Lord, which he never commanded: Oh! what a dreadful Judgment did God threaten against *Jerusalem* for doing those things which God Commanded them not, *In offering their Children to Molech in the Valley of Ben Hinnom, which I commanded them not*, saith God, *neither came it into my mind*, Jer. 19. 5. The *Geneva* Note on that place, saith, Whatsoever is not Commanded by God, touching his Service, is against God's word, because not commanded: Was not *Nadab* and *Abihu* prohibited false Fire when commanded to take Fire from the Altar? Is not *Tertullian's* Notion true, every positive Command of Christ includes a Negative? by this Argument you may set up a great part of the false Worship in *Rome*, by interrogating where it is forbidden, read *Matt. 28. 18. Acts 2. 37. Mark 16. 16. Rom. 6. 4. Acts 8. 36, 37. Acts 10*. All which Scriptures shew, that infant Baptism must be Repugnant unto that Baptism which is from Heaven, therefore is Prohibited.

Syllogistical Arguments against Pedo, and for Believers Baptism.

Arg. 1. THAT which hath no Divine Command nor Example, none Commended for its Observation, nor Reprehended for its neglect, cannot be of God, or Divine Authority; but the Baptising of Infants hath no Divine Command nor Example, none Commended for its Observation, nor reprov'd for its Neglect, *ergo*, the Baptising of Infants is not of God or Divine Authority.

Arg. 2 THAT which hath a Divine Command and Example, some commended for its Observation and others reprov'd for its neglect, must be of God and Divine Authority; but the Baptism of Believers hath a Divine Command and Example; some commended for its Observation, others Reprehended for its neglect *ergo*, the Baptism of Believers is of God and Divine Authority, *Mark* 16. 15. 16. *Luke* 7. 29, 30.

Arg. 3 THAT which was the Practice of the pure Primitive and Apostolick Times, about Initiating persons into the Church, ought to be the same unto the Second Coming of Christ: But to Initiate persons into the Church by Baptism, upon a profession of Faith, was the Practice of the pure Primitive and Apostolick times; *ergo*, to Initiate persons into the Church by Baptism upon a profession of Faith, ought to be the same unto the Second Coming of Christ. This Argument doth stand Immovable against the Churches for *Pedo-Baptism*; unless they can assign the time and place where Christ altered the Constitution of his Churches, and changed the manner of Initiation into them, or else to their Peril be it, who Constitute Churches any other way, or Initiate Members contrary to the Apostolick Practice.

Arg. 4 THAT which is contrary to the Doctrine and Practice of *John, Christ* and his *Apostles*, is of Human Invention.

BUT the Baptism of Infants is contrary to the Doctrine and Practice of *John, Christ* and his *Apostles*, *ergo*, the Baptism of Infants is of Human Invention.

FOR the *Minor*; That the Baptism of Infants is contrary to the Doctrine and Practice of *John, Christ* and his *Apostles*, the whole New Testament Witnesseth: That the Subjects of this Ordinance were Understanding Believers, not Ignorant Infants, and Dipping, not Sprinkling, the manner of Administration: and therefore the consequence of the *Major* is true, That Infant Baptism is of Human Invention.

Arg. 5 That Practice which hath no Promise Annexed unto it, either of Sins Remission, Divine Presence, the Gift of the Holy Ghost, nor Salvation, cannot be of God, or Divine Appointment.

BUT *Pedo-Baptism* hath no Promise annexed unto it, either of Sins Remission, Divine Presence, the Gift of the Holy Ghost, nor Salvation, *ergo*, *Pedo Baptism* cannot be of God, or Divine Appointment.

Arg. 6. That Practice in the Church, which hath the Promise of sins Remission, Divine Presence, the Gift of the Holy Ghost, and Salvation annexed unto it, is of God, and Divine Authority.

BUT the Baptism of Believers, upon Profession of Faith, hath the Promise of Sins Remission, Divine Presence, the Gift of the Holy Ghost, and Salvation annexed unto it, *Mat.* 28. 18. *Acts* 2. 38. *Mark* 16. 16. *Ergo*, The Baptism of Believers, upon Profession of Faith, is of God and Divine Authority.

Arg. 7. THAT manner of Administration of Baptism, which no way answers the Commission, nor Intention of Christ the Law-maker, cannot be Authentick.

BUT the Administration of Baptism by Sprinkling, Pouring or Dropping, doth no way answer the Commission, nor Intention of Christ the Law-maker, *ergo*, the Administration of Baptism, by Sprinkling, Pouring or Dropping, is not Authentick.

The *Minor* is clear, That the Administration of Baptism, by Sprinkling, Dropping or Pouring, doth no way answer Christ the Law maker's Commission, because he Commands the Subject to be Dipt, Immersed, Buried; in pursuance of which Command, the Apostles did always so Practice. Secondly, It can no way answer the intention of Christ the Law-giver, because his Intention was, That it should be a lively representation of the Death, Burial and Resurrection of Christ, together with the Believers Death to Sin, and a Resurrection to a new Life; all which appears, *Rom.* 6.1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6. *Colos.* 2 12. Now what Similitude or likeness is between Sprinkling, and Christ's Death, Burial and Resurrection, I leave to all the Judicious to consider; would Christ take such care to have his Death set forth in Lively Figures at the Lord's Table in breaking Bread, and pouring out Wine? And would Christ appoint a Dead Figure in Baptism? No, no.

Arg. 8. THAT Baptism which hath manifest Absurdities cannot be of God;

But the Baptism of Infants hath manifold Absurdities, *ergo*, the Baptism of Infants cannot be of God.

The *Minor* is thus proved; It's full of Absurdities, because asserted by some, That persons have Regeneration in their Baptism before Vocation, and may be visible Church Members before Conversion; moreover that persons may be baptised by anothers Faith, and making a National Gospel-Church, instead of a Congregational, and bringing in a Carnal Fleshly Seed into Christ's Church, in the room of a Spiritual Seed.

That Faith and Repentance is required of persons before baptised, yet confess that Children, unto whom they apply it, have neither.

Again, They profess that Baptism is a Demonstration of a Spiritual Marriage between God and the Believer, and yet Assign it unto One as incapable of such a thing as a Stock or Stone: Moreover, that the Baptismal Covenant enters into the Visible Church, yet deny Church Members the Lord's Supper.

Arg. 9. That Baptism that Introduceth Gross Errors into the Church, cannot be Divine, but Human.

But the Baptism of Infants introduceth gross Errors into the Church, *ergo*, the Baptism of Infants cannot be Divine, but Humane.

The *Minor* thus appears of its introducing Errors; It was first used to wash away Original Sin which nothing but Christ's Blood could do. Again; It's used to work Grace and Regeneration, and Effect Salvation by the Work done; and against all sence some say, It is an Apostolical Tradition, and that Children have Faith, are Disciples of Christ, that all Children of believers are in the Covenant of Grace, defiling and polluting the Church with false matter, and confounding the Church and the World together, introducing many Traditions and Inventions of Anti-christ with it,

as Gossips or Sureties, Bishoping or Confirmation, Chrism, Exorcism, Consignation; finally, it hath made a great deal of Contention in the World, and filled many with prejudice.

Arg. 10. The proper Subjects of Baptism are such who are capable of hearing the Word, and Teaching, of Repenting, Confessing of Sin, believing in Christ, and doing it as Christ's Commission, a part of Gospel Righteousness, as Gods Council, and as the Answer of a good Conscience, and ought to do it as a Symbol of Christ's Death and Resurrection, together with our own Death unto Sin, and Resurrection to a New Life, *ergo*, Infants are not the proper Subjects of Baptism.

Mr. *Perkins* saith, The Greek word ἐπερώτημα, Interrogation, 1 Pet. 3. 21. of a good Conscience, signifieth a Stipulation or Promise which the person Baptised makes in Baptism; and further saith, He bath a double Interrogation, one from the Minister, which he Conscientiously Answers, to perform the things Covenanted; and the other Interrogation is of his Conscience unto God, whether he will accept him, if he Dedicate himself as his Faithful Servant, tho a poor miserable sinner? But how can these things affect Little infants? How doth it appear they have the Answer of a good Conscience in Baptism?

To Conclude, Courteous Reader, I pray grant me one request, and that is, That you would be pleased to take my book of *Baptism*, and consider my Antagonist's Answer unto it: I also desire you would seriously compare my Answer with his Book, and I hope you will find no hing material left unanswered, tho he hath not spoken to the Matter contain'd in three pages, of one Hundred Thirty and Nine of my Book of *Baptism*; pray consider, if he doth give any Answer to my Answer, or whether he saith any thing to the Arguments or Argumentative part of my Books, and be not put off with Shadows instead of Substance, nor with a Shell instead of a Kernel; for you have Reasonable Souls, do not therefore suffer your selves to be imposed upon to take Brass for Gold, Non-sence for Reason, nor mens Inventions for Gods Institutions; but like the Noble *Bereans*, search the Scriptures to see whether those things be so or no; and believe nothing because I, or any other Man saith it, but because Divine Writ affirms it. In so doing you shall profit your self, and oblige him who wisheth you Everlasting Prosperity.

FINIS.

Advertisement.

Christ alone Exalted: being the compleat Works of *Tobias Crisp*, D.D. containing XLII. Sermons on several Select Texts of Scriptures: Which were formerly Printed in Three small Volumes, by that late Eminent and Faithful Dispenser of Gods Word. Who was sometime Minister at *Brinkworth* in *Wiltshire*; and afterward many of the Sermons were Preached in and about *London*. To which is added Ten Sermons, whereof Eight were never before Printed faithfully transcribed from his own Notes: Which is all that ever will be Printed of the said Doctor's.

The Texts of Scripture of the late Additon are as follow, *viz.*

Serm. I. John xx. 19. *Blessed are they that have not seen; and yet have believed*

Serm. II. Rom. viij. 32. *He that spared not his own Son, but delivered him up for us all, how shall he not with him also freely give us all things?*

Serm. III. IV, V, VI. (the Matter being undivided) Titus ij. 11, 12. *For the Grace of God that bringeth salvation, hath appeared to all men; teaching us, that denying ungodliness and worldly lusts we should live soberly, righteously, and godly in this present world.*

Serm. VII. *Amos* iv. 12. *Because I will do this unto thee, prepare thy self to meet thy God, O Israel.*

Serm. VIII. *Matt.* xvi. 24. *If any man will come after me, let him deny himself.*

Serm. IX. *Gal.* iij. 5. *Wherefore then serveth the Law? it was added because of transgression, till the seed should come, to whom the promise was made.*

Serm. X. Mr. *Brunsel's* Funeral Sermon, on *Gal.* i. 8.

Mellificium Chirurgie or the Marrow of Chirurgery. An *Anatomical* Treatise. Institution of Physick with *Hippocrates's* Aphorisms largely Commented upon The Marrow of *Physick* shewing the Causes, Signs and Cures of most Diseases incident to humane Bodies. Choice experienced *Receipts* for the Cure of several Distempers The Fourth Edition, enlarged with many *Additions*, and purged from many *faults* that escaped in the former Impressions Illustrated in its several parts with twelve *Brass Cuts*. By *James Cooke* of *Warwick*, Practitioner in Physick and Chirurgery.

Both Printed for *William Marshall*, at the Bible in *Newgate-Street*.

This text was transcribed from scanned TIF files downloaded from Early English Books Online (EEBO - eebo.chadwyck.com) and accessed through the University of Sydney Library. The original book the Bodleian Library. Reel position: Reel position: Wing / 1323:16. Date: 1693

Transcription by Mr Mark Smith, A Reformed Baptist's Disk (www.rbdisk.vor.org), © 2016.