

Qu. 6. If the *Fleshly Seed*, or *Children of believing Gentiles*, as such, are to be accounted the *Seed of Abraham*; I query, Whether they are his *Natural Seed*, or his *Spiritual Seed*? if not his *Natural Seed*, nor his *Spiritual Seed*, what *Right* can they have to *Baptism*, or *Church-Membership*, from any *Covenant-Transactions* God made with *Abraham*?—

Ans. 6. They are his *Spiritual Seed* (*visibly*) for so far only belongs to us to judge, and therefore they have a *Right* to the *Seal* of the *Covenant*.

Qu. 7. Whether those different grounds upon which the *Right of Infant-Baptism* is pretended by the *Fathers of Old*, and the *Modern Divines*, doth well agree with an *Institution* that is a meer positive *Right*, depending wholly on the *Will of the Legislator*, doth not give just cause to all to question its *Authority*?

Ans. 7. This is already answered.

Q. 8. Is it not an evil thing, and very absurd for any to say, *Baptism* is a *Symbol* of present *Regeneration*, and yet apply it to *Babes* in whom nothing of the things signified thereby doth or can appear? And also to say, I baptize thee in the *Name*, &c. when indeed he doth not baptize, but only *Rantize* the *Child*? and to say, *Baptism* is a *lively Figure* of *Christ's Death*, *Burial* and *Resurrection*, and yet only sprinkle or pour a little *Water* on the *Face* of the *Child*?

Ans. 8. This is added, but 'tis your common treatment, the word *present* *Regeneration*, &c. is no where exprest—The term *Visible* solves all these *Quibbles*, and brings us into our own sphere: How do you know *Hypocrites' hearts*? if they profess *Faith*, &c. you baptize 'em. So we baptize *Children* as the *Seed of Believers*, and as such, they are *Visible Members* of the *True Church* till they apostatize, if ever.

Qu. 9. Whether that can be an *Ordinance of Christ*, for which there is neither *Command* nor *Example* in all the *Word of God*, nor no *Promise* made to such who do it, nor *Threats* denounced on such who neglect it, or do it not? For though there are both *Promises* made to *Believers* baptized, and *Threats* denounced on such who neglect it, yet where are there any such in respect of *Infant-Baptism*?

Ans. 9. This is answered before in one of your *Syllogistical Propositions*.

Qu. 10. Whether a *Pagan* or *Indian*, who should attain to the knowledge of the *Greek Tongue*, or of the *English*, or any other *Tongue* into which the *Original* should be translated, by reading over the *New Testament* a thousand times, he could ever find *Infants* ought to be baptized; if not, how doth it appear the *Faith* of *People* about *Pedo-baptism* stands in the *Power of God*, and knowledge of his *Word*, and not rather in the *Wisdom of Men*, who having endeavoured, with all the *Art* and *Cunning* they can, to draw pretended *Consequences* for it, tho' after all they do not naturally and genuinely follow from the *Premises* to which they refer?

Ans. 10. A good *Scribe* well instructed in the *Kingdom of Heaven*, brings out of his *Treasure* things new and old. This passage has been interpreted by all *Divines*, to relate to the *New and Old Testament*, whereby it appears we must search both; and if so, your *Indian* well instructed, would find *Infants* in the *Covenant* in the *Old*, *Gen. 17. 12.* and *Children* in the *Covenant* in the *New*, *Acts 2. 29.* But neither he nor you will be ever able to shew where they were turn'd out of the *Covenant*; do this only, and we'll for ever yield up the *Cause*.

Qu. 11. Whether *Christ* having expressly mentioned the *Qualifications* of such as are to be baptized, viz. *actual Repentance*, *Faith*, and the *Answer of a good Conscience*, &c. doth not thereby exclude all those who are not capable of those *Qualifications*.

Ans. 11. This only belongs to the *Adult*, and you are to prove where *Children* are excluded from the *Rights of Baptism*.

Qu. 12. Whether it doth not reflect upon the *Care, Wisdom* and *Faithfulness* of *Jesus Christ*, who as a *Son* over his own *House*, exceeded the *Care and Faithfulness* of *Moses*, to affirm, *Infants* ought to be baptized, and yet it cannot be found in all the *New Testament*? Can it be thought it should be a *Gospel-Precept*, nay, a *Sacrament*, and yet *Christ* speak nothing of it? or could it be in the *Commission*, and yet the *Apostles* never to mention it, but contrariwise, require *Faith* of all they admitted to *Baptism*? *Paul* says, He declared the whole *Counsel of God*, and said nothing of it in any of his *Epistles*, nor any where else. How many thousands of *Children* were born to baptized *Believers*, from the time of *Christ's Ascension*, to the time *John* wrote the *Revelations* but not one word of any one *Child* baptized?

Ans. 12. This is answered in one of your preceding *Syllogistical Positions*.

Q. 13. Whether in matter of positive *Right*, such as *Baptism* is, we ought not to keep expressly and punctually, to the *Revelation* of the *Will of the Law-giver*?

Ans. 13. Yes.

Qu. 14. Whether the *Baptism of Infants* be not a dangerous *Error*, since it tends to deceive and blind the *Eyes* of poor ignorant *People*, who think they are thereby made *Christians*, and so never look after *Regeneration*, nor true *Baptism*, which represents or signifies that inward work of *Grace* upon the *Heart*?

Ans. 14. We never tell 'em that they are made *Christians* thereby, but that they have the name of *Christians* from it; but it must be their own *Piety* and *Obedience* to the *Will of Christ* that effects the rest: We hope you teach the same *Doctrine* to your *Adult Profelytes*, and if so, it tends not to blind the *Eyes* of poor ignorant *People*.

Qu. 15.



Qu. 15. Whether the Antient Church, who gave the Lord's Supper to Infants, as well as Baptism, might not be allowed as well to do the one as the other, since Faith and holy Habits are as much required in those who are to be baptized, as in such who come to the Lord's Table? And all such in the Apostolick Church, who were baptized, were immediately admitted to break Bread, &c. And also the Arguments taken from the Covenant, and because said to be holy, and to belong to the Kingdom of Heaven, are as strong for them to receive the Lord's Supper, there being no Command nor Example for either, and Human Tradition carrying it equally for both for several Centuries.

Qu. 16. Whether Nadab, Abihu, and Uz-zah's Transgressions were not as much circumstantial, and so as small Errours, as to alter Dipping into Sprinkling; and from an understanding Believer to a poor ignorant Babe? And whether to allow the Church a Power to make such Alterations, be not dangerous? See Rev. 22. And doth not this open a Door to other Innovations?

Q. 17. Whether there is any any just cause for men to vilifie and reproach the People called Anabaptists, for their baptizing Believers, and denying Infants to be Subjects thereof, seeing they have the plain and direct Word of God to warrant their practice, i. e. not only the Commission, but also the continual usage of the Apostles and Ministers of the Gospel all along in the New Testament, who baptized none but such who made profession of their Faith? And the Church of England also saith, Faith and Repentance are required of such who are to be baptized. We dare not baptize our Children, because we cannot find it written; 'tis from the holy Fear of God, lest we should offend and sin against him, by adding to his Word.

Q. 18. What should be the reason that our faithful Translators of the Bible should leave the Greek word Baptism, or Baptisma, and not turn it into English, seeing the Dutch have not done so, but contrariwise translate, for John the Baptist, John the Dooper; and for he baptized, he dooped, or dipped them?

Qu. 19. Whether those who translate out of one Language into another, ought not to translate every word into the same Language into which they turn it, and not leave any word in the same Original Tongue, which the People understand not, and for whose sakes they undertook that Work; and not to translate every word, but also to give the right, literal, genuine and proper signification of each word, and not the remote, improper, or collateral signification of it? Which if our Translators of the Bible had so done, I query, whether the Doubt among the Unlearned, concerning what the word Baptisma signifies, had not ceased?

Q. 20. Seeing the Greek Church uses Immersion, and not Asperision, may it not be look'd upon as a great Argument against Sprinkling, especially seeing they disown the Baptism of the Latine Church, because they use Sprinkling; for doubtless the Greeks best knew the genuine and proper signification of the word, that Tongue being their own natural Language in which the New Testament was wrote.

Q. 21. Whether if a Minister should administer the Lord's Supper in one kind only, and so doing, it cannot answer the great Design of Christ the Law-giver, i. e. the breaking of his Body, and shedding of his Blood, would not prophane that holy Institution? If so, whether such, who instead of dipping the whole Body, do but sprinkle or pour a little Water on the Face, do not also prophane the Holy Sacrament of Baptism, since it is not so done to represent in a lively Figure the Death, Burial, and Resurrection of Christ, with our Death unto Sin, and Vivification unto Newness of Life? Rom. 6. Col. 2. 11, 12.

Ans. 15. Infants of Christians have a Right to the Lord's Supper, the substance of both Sacraments being the same; yet the Lord's Supper ought not to be given to Infants, because 'tis an active Institution; whereas Baptism is a passive one, as was Circumcision. Seeing taking and eating are required at the Communion, which Children are incapable of. Baptism is for Incipients, the Lord's Supper is for Proficients; both Exercises in the School of Christ; but because he in the lowest Form is not capable of the like Studies as he in the highest, does it therefore follow that he is no Scholar, and must be excluded the School? Pray

Ans. 16. We have answered this before.

Ans. 17. There is no reason at all to reproach you for your Practice, but rather to pity you. We know Adult Believers, if not baptized before, have a warrant for Baptism, but till then, they implicitly own themselves Heathens: But it follows not if Baptism belongs to the Adult, that it does not belong to Infants; no more than because Abraham, and millions more were Circumcis'd when old, that Infants ought not to be circumcised. If you say, you want not a Command for your Practice, we say, we must see the first Command repeal'd till we give over ours, *Sacramenta sunt mutata, non Fides.* August.

Ans. 18. They are best Judges themselves, if we can but understand 'em, 'tis enough.

Ans. 19. They are the best Judges, as we said before. Your design about the *Modus* is not material; we have comply'd with the Emphasis, and told you our Church denies Dipping to none, but rather enjoyns it. See her words in the Rubrick—Then the Priest shall take the Child into his hands, and shall say to the Godfathers and Godmothers—Name this Child—and then naming it after them (if they shall certifie him, that the Child may well endure) he shall dip it in the Water discreetly and warily, saying, &c. But if they certifie that the Child is weak, it shall suffice to pour Water upon it, &c.

Ans. 20. See our last Answer.

Ans. 21. Our Answer is as above.

Qu. 22.