

Believers have a Right to it. Sure, if it was an Ordinance of Christ, his Word would soon end this Controversie.

*Arg. 10.* If the Children of believing Gentiles, as such, are not the natural nor spiritual Seed of *Abraham*, they can have no Right to Baptism, or Church-Membership, by virtue of any Covenant-transaction God made with *Abraham*. But the Children of believing Gentiles, as such, are not the natural and spiritual Seed of *Abraham*; *Ergo*.

*Arg. 11.* If no Man can prove from Scripture, that any spiritual Benefit redounds to Infants in their Baptism, 'tis no Ordinance of Christ. But no Man can prove from Scripture, that any spiritual Benefit redounds to Infants in their Baptism; *Ergo*.

*Arg. 12.* That cannot be an Ordinance of Christ, for which there is neither Command nor Example in all God's Word, nor promise to such Who do it, nor Threatnings to such who neglect it. But there is no Command or Example in all the Word of God for the baptizing of little Babes, nor Promise made to such who are baptized, nor Threatnings to such who are not; *Ergo*.

That the Child lies under a Promise who is baptized, or the Child under any Threatning or Danger that is not baptized, let them prove it, since it is denied.

*Arg. 13.* If no Parents, at any time or times, have been by God the Father, Jesus Christ, or his Apostles, either commended for baptizing of their Children, or reprov'd for neglecting to baptize them; then Infant-Baptism is no Ordinance of God. But no Parents at any time or times have been by God commended for baptizing of their Children, &c. *Ergo*, Infant Baptism is no Ordinance of God.

This Argument will stand unanswerable, unless any shew who they were that were ever commended for baptizing their Children, or reprov'd for neglecting it, or unless they can shew a parallel case.

*Arg. 14.* If Men were not to presume to alter any thing in the Worship of God under the Law, neither to add thereto, or diminish therefrom, and God is as strict and jealous of his Worship under the Gospel; then nothing ought to be altered in God's Worship under the Gospel. But under the Law Men were not to presume so to do, and God is as strict and jealous under the Gospel; *Ergo*.

The *Major* cannot be denied.

The *Minor* is clear; See thou make all things according to the Pattern shew'd thee in the Mount, *Exod.* 25. 40. and *Levit.* 10. 1, 2. See how *Nadab* and *Abihu* sped, for presuming to vary from the Command of God, and *Uzzah*, though but in small Circumstances, as they may seem to us. How dare Men adventure, this being so, to change Baptism from Dipping into Sprinkling, and the Subject, from an Adult Believer, to an ignorant Babe? Add thou not unto his Word, &c.

*Arg. 15.* Whatsoever Practice opens a Door to any humane Traditions and Innovations in God's Worship, is a great Evil, and to be avoided: But the Practice of Infant-Baptism opens a Door to any humane Traditions and Innovations in God's Worship, *Ergo*, to sprinkle or baptize Infants is a great Evil, and to be avoided.

The *Major* will not be denied.

The *Minor* is clear, because there is no Scripture-ground for it, no Command nor Example for such a Practice in God's Word. And if without Scripture-Authority the Church hath Power to do one thing, she may do another, and so *ad infinitum*.

*Ans. 10.* The Children of Believers are the Spiritual Seed of *Abraham*, till by actual sin unrepented of, they are otherwise, as we have in part shewn in the preceding Answer to the fourth Argument, and shall farther demonstrate when we come by and by to treat of Foederal Holiness, that great Point about which most of this Contest depends.

*Ans. 11.* We'll prove the same spiritual Benefits belong to baptiz'd Infants, if either they die such, or afterwards live well; as ye can prove belongs to adult baptiz'd Believers; and their misery is but the same if they don't, with that of adult baptiz'd persons that apostatize from the Faith.

*Ans. 12.* As we said before, we'll prove by and by that Infants are included in the Commission; and if so, this Argument falls with the first.

*Ans. 13.* Pray Sir not so peremptory; your Argument is certainly answerable, unless you will destroy Laying on of Hands, one of the Principles of the Christian Religion; for by your unanswerable way of arguing, that and Infant Baptism must run one fate. None was ever commended or reprov'd in Scripture for being or not being the Subject of Laying on of Hands; *Ergo*, 'Tis no Principle of Christian Religion; but this by the by shews how strong and conclusive your Arguments are.

*Ans. 14.* You might have told every body that the Conclusion of your Argument is, Nothing ought to be altered in God's Worship under the Gospel. We can't well see how Baptism is properly call'd a Worship of God; but suppose it was, for we need not catch at words, it wou'd follow that the Church has ever alter'd it from what it was in the Apostles days, as we shall shew you presently; in the meantime remember that diminishing has the same Threatning as adding; and if so, your own Argument concludes against your selves.

*Ans. 15.* The *Minor* is a false Charge; for we have already told you, 'tis included in our Saviour's Commission, as we shall evince by and by.

*Arg. 16.* Whatsoever Practice reflects upon the Honour, Wisdom and Care of Jesus Christ, or renders him less faithful than *Moses*, and the New Testament in one of its great Ordinances, (nay, Sacraments,) to lie more obscure in God's Word, than any Law or Precept under the Old Testament, cannot be of God. But the Practice of Infant-Baptism reflects on the Honour, Care and Faithfulness of Jesus Christ, and renders him less faithful than *Moses*, and a great Ordinance, (nay, Sacrament) of the New Testament, to lie more dark and obscure than any Precept under the Old Testament; *Ergo*, Infant-Baptism cannot be of God.

The *Major* cannot be denied.

The *Minor* is easily proved: For he is bold indeed who shall affirm Infant-Baptism doth not lie obscure in God's Word. One great Party who assert it, say, 'tis not to be found in the Scripture at all, but 'tis an unwritten Apostolical Tradition: Others say, it lies not in the Letter of the Scripture, but may be proved by Consequences; and yet some great Asserters of it, as *Dr. Hammond* and others say, Those Consequences commonly drawn from divers Texts for it, are without demonstration, and so prove nothing. I am sure a Man may read the Scripture a hundred times over, and never be thereby convinced; he ought to baptize his Children, tho' it is powerful to convince Men of all other Duties.

Now can this be a Truth, since Christ who was more faithful than *Moses*, and delivered every thing plainly from the Father? *Moses* left nothing dark as to matter of Duty, tho' the Precepts and external Rites of his Law were numerous, two or three hundred Precepts, yet none were at a loss, or had need to say, Is this a Truth or an Ordinance, or not? for he that runs may read it.

And shall one positive Precept given forth by Christ, who appointed so few in the New Testament, be so obscure, as also the ground and end of it, that Men should be confounded about the Proofs of it, together with the end and ground thereof? See *Heb. 3. 5, 6.*

*Arg. 17.* That Custom or Law which *Moses* never delivered to the Jews, nor is any where written in the old Testament, was no Truth of God, nor of Divine Authority. But that Custom or Law to baptize Profelytes, either Men, Women or Children, was never given to the Jews by *Moses*, nor is it any where written in the Old Testament; *Ergo*, It was no Truth of God, nor of Divine Authority: And evident it is, as *Sir Norton Knatchbul* shews, 'That the Jewish Rabbins differed among themselves also about it: For, saith he, *Rabbi Eliezer* expressly 'contradicts *Rabbi Joshua*, who was the first I know of who asserted this sort of Baptism among the Jews: For *Eliezer*, who was contemporary with *Rabbi Joshua*, if he 'did not live before him, asserts, that a Profelyte circumcised and not baptized, was 'a true Profelyte.

*Arg. 18.* If Baptism is of mere positive Right, wholly depending on the will & Sovereign Pleasure of Jesus Christ, the great Legislator: And he hath not required or commanded Infants to be baptized: then Infants ought not to be baptized: But Baptism is of mere positive Right, wholly depending on the Will and Sovereign Pleasure of Jesus Christ, the great Legislator, and he hath not required or commanded Infants to be baptized.

This Argument tends to cut off all the pretended Proofs of Pedit-Baptism, taken from the Covenant made with *Abraham*; and because Children are said to belong to the Kingdom of Heaven, it was not the Right of *Abraham's* Male Children to be circumcised, because they were begotten, and born of the Fruit of his Loins, till he received Command-

*Ans. 16* The obscurity of the Ordinance of Infant-Baptism does not at all reflect on the Wisdom, Care or Faithfulness of Jesus Christ, since his Apostles to whom he deliver'd the Commission were Jews; and since at the same time it was a continual settled Custom amongst the Jews, to baptize whole Families (Men, Women and Children) of profelyting Heathens, so that it being the Custom to baptize all, there was no need of any thing farther than a general Commission. If there had been any occasion, our Saviour wou'd have excepted 'em out of his Commission; but we find nothing of that in any of his, or his Apostles Writings; so that the true and real state of the Question shou'd be this; Whether Children are by Jesus Christ or his Apostles forbid to be baptiz'd; or when or where they are excepted out of the Universal Practice, we appeal to the common sense of all Mankind: If this is not the most natural and genuine Conclusion that can be made, and if so, whether the Commission is at all darkly deliver'd, or more darkly for Children than for Men or Women, for neither are particulariz'd.

and others say, Those Consequences commonly drawn from divers Texts for it, are without demonstration, and so prove nothing. I am sure a Man may read the Scripture a hundred times over, and never be thereby convinced; he ought to baptize his Children, tho' it is powerful to convince Men of all other Duties.

Now can this be a Truth, since Christ who was more faithful than *Moses*, and delivered every thing plainly from the Father? *Moses* left nothing dark as to matter of Duty, tho' the Precepts and external Rites of his Law were numerous, two or three hundred Precepts, yet none were at a loss, or had need to say, Is this a Truth or an Ordinance, or not? for he that runs may read it.

And shall one positive Precept given forth by Christ, who appointed so few in the New Testament, be so obscure, as also the ground and end of it, that Men should be confounded about the Proofs of it, together with the end and ground thereof? See *Heb. 3. 5, 6.*

*Ans. 17.* Suppose we grant it, that this Custom of the Jews was not given by *Moses*, nor was of any Divine Institution, but only an Universal Practice crept in by degrees, yet our Saviour's not altering it (if he did, shew where) but confirming it by inessencing it into his Commission, does sufficiently authorize and make it a Divine Institution—That Instance of *Rabbi Eliezer* and *Rabbi Joshua's* Dispute, if we had need of it, confirms the Customs, for they cou'd not dispute about a thing that was not, as we have above remarked.

I know of who asserted this sort of Baptism among the Jews: For *Eliezer*, who was contemporary with *Rabbi Joshua*, if he 'did not live before him, asserts, that a Profelyte circumcised and not baptized, was 'a true Profelyte.

*Ans. 18.* This is the old Story in another dress, and one wou'd think a Question so often begg'd without obtaining, shou'd be equally nauseous and ridiculous. We say our Saviour did institute Infant-Baptism. See *Ans. 16.* As for *Abraham's* Heirs, we shall speak of it in its place.

Christ, the great Legislator, and he hath not required or commanded Infants to be baptized; *Ergo*, Infants ought not to be