

'Nor can it, saith he, be proved, that ever the Spirit of God is tied by any Promise, to apply himself to the Soul in a gracious Operation, when Water is applied to the Body: If it were so, then all that were baptized were regenerated, then all that were baptized should be saved, or else the Doctrine of Perseverance falls to the ground. Some indeed, says he, say, that Regeneration is conferr'd in Baptism upon the Elect, and exerts its self afterwards in Conversion. But how so active a Principle as a Spiritual Life should lie dead and asleep so many years, &c. is not easily conceived. On *Regen.* p. 75.

*Arg. 6.* If the Church of England says, that Faith and Repentance are required of all that ought to be baptized, and in so saying speak truly, and yet Infants can't perform those things; then Infants ought not to be baptized. But the Church of England says, that Faith and Repentance are required of all such, &c. and speak truly, and yet Infants cannot perform these things. *Ergo*, Infants ought not to be baptized.

*Object.* If it be objected, That they affirm they do perform it by their Sureties:

*Ans.* If Suretiship for Children in Baptism is not required of God, and the Sureties do not, cannot perform those things for the Child: then Suretiship is not of God, and so signifies nothing, but is an unlawful and sinful Undertaking. But Suretiship in Childrens Baptism is not required of God, and they do not, cannot perform what they promise. *Ergo*.

Do they, or can they cause the Child to forsake the Devil and all his Works, the Poms and Vanities of this wicked World, and all the sinful Lusts of the Flesh? In a word; Can they make the Child or children to repent and truly believe in Jesus Christ? for these are the things they promise for them, and in their Name. Alas, they want Power to do it for themselves, and how then should they do it for others? Besides, we see they never mind nor regard their Covenant in the Case: and will not God one Day say, Who has required these things at your Hands?

this Controversie, may doubt of this Custom amongst the Jews, such we refer to our second Paper, where we bring some Authorities from the Jews themselves, tho' it's unquestionable amongst all the Antient Writers, and is in part (if we needed it) confest by our Antagonists themselves in giving an Instance (*Arg. 7.*) of a Dispute about the Legality of it betwixt two Rabbies, which shews its being a practice, as we inferr'd before.

But as to what follows about promising for the Infant, is meant no more than their utmost endeavour for the Child to do so and so, and that's the utmost any one can promise for himself when adult, or baptized at the years of discretion.

*Argu. 7.* If there be no Precedent in the Scripture, (as there is no Precept) that any Infant was baptized, then Infants ought not to be baptized. But there is no Precedent that any Infant was baptized in the Scripture. *Ergo*.

If there is any Precedent or Example in Scripture that any Infant was baptized, let them shew us where we may find it.

*Erasmus* saith, 'Tis no where expressed in the Apostolical Writings, that they baptized Children. *Union of the Church*, and on *Rom. 6.*

*Calvin* saith, 'It is no where expressed by the Evangelists, that any one Infant was baptized by the Apostles. *Instit. l. c. 16. Book 4.*

*Ans.* 6. 'Tis not only a very unhandfom, but also an inadvertent Charge you make upon the Church of England, to serve your own turns, before ye have examined her Principles, or truly weighed your own; pray in what Edition was it that you saw the word all, all persons to be baptiz'd? But suppose by an Error all should be slipt in it, I'm sure it's no where added, that Faith and Repentance are required before-hand, of all persons; they mean no more than thus; viz. of all that are actually capable, when adult, or of baptized Children after they come to be grown up.

As for Suretiship, it has probably been always the Custom from the Apostles days, who no doubt had it from the Jews, long before our Saviour's time, who when they proselyted any Heathen Families into their Religion, they baptiz'd 'em, and all that were capable answered for themselves, and those that were not had Sponsors, or such as answered for 'em. We find this practice no where condemn'd by any of the Prophets, our Saviour himself, nor any of his Apostles, who cou'd not be ignorant thereof, and then we need not be afraid of the Censure of the Anabaptists. The first time that we find this Custom quarrell'd with, was two hundred years after our Saviour, the Primitive Church us'd it then; for it is impossible to Censure a Custom that had no being; it was Tertullian, his words are these, *Quid enim necesse est Sponsores etiam periculo ingeri, &c.* What necessity is there that Sponsors should expose themselves to danger, who through death may fail, &c. Some perhaps who have not seen

this Controversie, may doubt of this Custom amongst the Jews, such we refer to our second Paper, where we bring some Authorities from the Jews themselves, tho' it's unquestionable amongst all the Antient Writers, and is in part (if we needed it) confest by our Antagonists themselves in giving an Instance (*Arg. 7.*) of a Dispute about the Legality of it betwixt two Rabbies, which shews its being a practice, as we inferr'd before.

But as to what follows about promising for the Infant, is meant no more than their utmost endeavour for the Child to do so and so, and that's the utmost any one can promise for himself when adult, or baptized at the years of discretion.

*Ans. 7.* This is one of the most extravagant Positions we ever met with, and condemns not only all Christian Churches, but the Anabaptists own practice. What think you of your Wives communicating? shew me one female Precedent in all the Scripture, or a literal proof of All the Articles of your Faith: We grant most of 'em to be express, but not all; I believe the holy Catholick Church, the Communion of Saints, &c. How will you come off in such cases without the help of necessary consequences; as for the few Authorities you mention, there's none that say that Infant-Baptism is not to be found in the Scripture by necessary consequence, but only that the express Terms are not to be found, so that they are cited to no purpose at all.



*Ludovicus Vives* saith, 'None of old were wont to be baptized but in grown Age, and who desired and understood what it was. *Vide Ludov.*

The *Magdeburgenses* say, 'That concerning the baptizing the Adult, both Jews and Gentiles, we have sufficient proof from *Acts* 2, 8, 10, 16 Chapters; but as to the baptizing of Infants, they can meet with no example in Scripture. *Magdeb. Cent. l. 2. p. 469.*

*Dr. Taylor* saith, 'It is against the perpetual Analogy of Christ's Doctrine to baptize Infants: For besides that Christ never gave any Precept to baptize them, nor ever him- nor his Apostles (that appears) did baptize any of them: All that either he or his Apostles said concerning it, requires such previous Dispositions of Baptism, of which infants are not capable, viz. Faith and Repentance. *Lib. Proph. p. 239.*

*Arg. 8.* If whatsoever which is necessary to Faith and Practice is left in the Holy Scripture, that being a compleat and perfect Rule, and yet Infant-Baptism is not contained or to be found therein, then Infant-Baptism is not of God. But whatever is necessary to Faith and Practice, is contained in the Holy Scriptures, &c. But Infant-Baptism is not to be found therein; *Ergo,*

*Ans. 8.* All the Authorities you bring are needless, for we say the same; viz. That the Scripture is a full and perfect Rule for all matters of Faith, either in express words, or in necessary consequences, amongst which we shall quickly prove Infant-Baptism to be one.

That the Scripture is a perfect Rule, &c. we have the Consent of all the Antient Fathers and Modern Divines.

*Athanasius* saith, 'The Holy Scriptures being Inspirations of God, are sufficient to all Instructions of Truth. *Athan. against the Gentiles.*

*Chrysostom* saith, 'All things be plain and clear in the Scripture; and whatsoever are needful, are manifest there. *Chrysost. on 2 Thess. and 2 Tim. 2.*

*Basil* saith, 'That it would be an Argument of Infidelity, and a most certain sign of Pride, if any Man should reject any thing written, and should introduce things not written. *Basil in his Sermon de Fide.*

*Augustine* saith, 'In the Scriptures are found all things which contain Faith, manner of Living, Hope, Love, &c. Let us, saith he, seek no farther than what is written of God our Saviour, lest a Man would know more than the Scriptures witness. *August. in his 198 Epistles to Fortunat.*

*Theophylact* saith, 'It is part of a Diabolical Spirit, to think any thing Divine, without the Authority of the Holy Scripture. *Lib. 2. Paschal.*

*Isychius* saith, 'Let us who will have any thing observed of God, search no more but that which the Gospel doth give unto us. *Lib. 5. c. 16. on Levit.*

*Bellarmin* saith, 'That though the Arguments of the Anabaptists, from the defect of Command or Example, have a great Use against the Lutherans, forasmuch as they use that Rite every where, having no Command or Example, theirs is to be rejected; yet is it of no force against Catholicks, who conclude the Apostolical Tradition is of no less Authority with us than the Scripture, &c. This of Baptizing of Infants is an Apostolical Tradition, *Bellarmin in his Book de Bapt. l. 1. c. 8.*

*Mr. Ball* saith, 'We must for every Ordinance look to the Institution, and never stretch it wider, nor draw it narrower than the Lord hath made it, for he is the Institutor of the Sacraments according to his own pleasure; and 'tis our part to learn of him, both to whom, how, and for what End the Sacraments are to be administered. *Ball, in his Answer to the New-England Elders, p. 38, 39.*

And as to the *Minor*, 'tis acknowledged by our Adversaries, it is not to be found in the Letter of the Scripture. And as to the Consequences drawn therefrom, we have proved, they are not natural from the Premises; and though we admit of Consequences and Inferences, if genuine, yet not in the case of an Institution respecting a practical Ordinance that is of meer positive Right.

*Arg. 9.* If Infant-Baptism was an Institution of Christ, the Pedo-Baptists could not be at a loss about the Grounds of the Right Infants have to Baptism: But the Pedo-Baptists are at a great Loss, and differ exceedingly about the Grounds of the Right Infants have to Baptism; *Ergo,* 'tis no Institution of Christ.

*Ans. 9.* 'Tis a false Supposition; have not Christians differ'd extreamly about the Nature of Justifying Faith? yet he's no Christian that denies such a Faith. There's no need the Scripture shou'd particularly mention the Ends of Pedo-Baptism, since there is but one Baptism for all; tho' more Subjects of that one Baptism.

As touching the *Major*, I argue thus; That which is an Institution of Christ, the Holy Scripture doth shew, as well the End and Ground of the Ordinance, as the Subject and Manner of it. But the Scripture speaks nothing of the End or Ground of Pedo-Baptism, or for what reason they ought to be baptized; *Ergo,* 'tis no Institution of Christ.

The *Minor* is undeniable; Some affirm, as we have shewed, p. 15. it was to take away Original Sin. Some say it is their Right by the Covenant, they being the Seed of Believers. Others say, Infants have Faith of their own, and therefore have a Right. Others say, They have a Right by the Faith of their Sureties. Some ground their Right from an Apostolical Tradition; others upon the Authority of Scripture. Some say, All Children of professed Christians ought to be baptized; others say, None but the Children of true

Believers