

Qu. 22. Whether all such who have only been sprinkled, ought not to be deemed Unbaptized persons, since Aspersión is not Immersion, or Rantizing, not Baptizing? For though the Greek word Baptizo, in a remote and improper sense may signifie to wash, yet, as the Learned confess, it is such a washing as is done by dipping, swilling, or plunging the Person or Thing all over in the Water.

Q. 23. Since you say Children have Faith potentia: I query, Whether Unbelievers, and all ungodly persons, have not also the like Faith potentia as well as Children, and so the same Right to Baptism? We grant they may have Faith hereafter; what tho'?

ham; or in short thus, that judging visibly, or like Men, between such of whom we have great hope, and of such concerning whom we have great despair.

As to your additional Censure about Childrens having Faith in Heaven, we mean no more than this, the Object of their Faith is there as well as ours; we are not to answer for the Printer's faults. See whether the place we quoted agrees not with it, *Heb. 11. 1, 2*. Your catching at distant Circumstances and Words shews your cause weak.

Now to your Questions about the Fathers.

Qu. 1. What reason can be given why Nazianzen, an eminent Greek Father, should counsel the deferring of the Baptism of Infants, until the third or fourth Year of their Age (except in danger of Death) if it were in Nazianzen's Time, as some suppose it was, the Opinion of the whole Church, as also his own, that Infants, by an Apostolical Tradition, were to be baptized as such, that is, as soon as born?

Qu. 2. Whether all the Fathers of the third and fourth Century, both of the Greek and Latine Church, who have wrote any thing about Infant-Baptism, do not unanimously give this as the Reason why Infants should be baptized, viz. the washing away Original Sin, or the putting them into a capacity of Salvation; and some of them, particularly St. Austin, sentencing Infants to Eternal Damnation, if not baptized.

Qu. 3. If so, whether the Fathers might not be mistaken in the Right of Infants to Baptism, as well as in the Judgment of most Protestants they are, in the Reason why they should be baptized.

Answers to your four other Queries.

Qu. 1. Whether God hath allowed or enjoyned Parents to bring their little Babes, of two or ten days old, into a Covenant with him by Baptism, since 'tis not to be found in the Scripture he either hath allowed or enjoyned them so to do?

Qu. 2. If it cannot be proved he hath required any such thing at their hands, Whether that Covenant can be said to bind their Consciences when they come to Age, especially since they gave no Consent to it, nor were capable so to do?

Q. 3. and 4. If this pretended Covenant was not of God's appointment, I query, how these Children who refuse to agree to the said Covenant when at Age, can thereby be guilty, 1. Of rejecting Christ; 2. Of renouncing the Blessings of the Gospel; 3. And that 'tis Rebellion continued against their Maker; 4. That 'tis Ingratitude and Perjury to their Redeemer; 5. Gross Injustice to their Parents; 6. That 'tis self-killing Cruelty to their own Souls; 7. And a damning Sin.

Q. 4. I query, Whether this be good Divinity, not rather a strange Doctrine? And whether unwarrantable Articles of Faith, taken out of the Jewish Talmud, or Turkish Alcoran, may not by as good Authority, be put into a Christian Catechism, as such Assertions as these?

Answers to four Queries sent by another hand.

Qu. 1. Whether Traditions, Jewish Talmuds, the Opinion of private Doctors, Schoolmen, &c. be a sufficient Warrant for the Churches to establish such a Practice, that hath neither Precept nor Example in the holy Scriptures.

Ans. 22. Those that doubt may be of the sure side.

Ans. 23. No, the Case is very different. Take a parallel, Those Heathens that refus'd proselyting into the Jewish Religion, cou'd not expect the Priviledges of any one Infant of the Israelites, of which there yet appear'd no despair but that it might be a true Son of Abraham; between such of whom we have great hope, and of such concerning whom we have great despair.

Ans. 1. If Nazianzen counselled to delay it till the third or fourth Year, but not if in danger of Death, it plainly shews the practice of Infant-Baptism then, and the utmost was at a time when they were too young to make a profession of their Faith. So that this Query is for, not against us; but cite this Father's Works, we cannot believe that he would contradict himself, having said the contrary elsewhere.

Ans. 2. That was not the only Reason assign'd, tho' 'tis as old as Irenæus, but neither does this destroy the Authority of Infant-Baptism. St. Austin's particular Opinion makes no general Rule.

Ans. 3. The answer of this Query (if given as you would have it) destroys the few Authorities you can bring against Infant-Baptism in the 4th and following Centuries; but it concerns not an universal and perpetual practice, as we have proved.

Ans. 1. We have already told where he allowed and enjoyn'd Infants in covenanting, and we expect of you to shew us where it was repeal'd, if you will justify your neglect of it, or condemn ours.

Ans. 2. This falls with the first, being built upon the same Foundation with the first.

Ans. 3. and 4. We have nothing to do with this Charge; these seven Assertions are none of ours, nor any where to be found amongst what we ever said or wrote; so that 'tis impertinent to bring 'em here, and rail at 'em as Jewish, Turkish, &c.

Ans. 5. Gross Injustice to their Redeemer; 6. That 'tis self-killing Cruelty to their own Souls; 7. And a damning Sin.

Ans. 1. See our foregoing Appendix for an Answer to this.

Qu. 2.



Qu. 2. Since the pretended Foundation of Infant-Baptism, (viz. its absolute necessity to Salvation) proving to be a mistake of the Text, Joh. 3. 5. as is generally acknowledged by Protestants, Whether the Structure ought not to fall with it, as it did in the Case of giving the Child the Eucharist?

Qu. 3. Whether the Faith of the Parent, or Gossip, on the Child's behalf, be required of God, or will be imputed to the Child by God? If not, why ventur'd on, and not rather a waiting for Faith in the Subject; as required in Holy Writ, by the Apostles and Primitive Churches, and seemingly by the Church of England in her Catechism?

Q. 4. Whether the Church hath a good War-rant that will justify her before God, in changing the Mode from Dipping to Sprinkling? and whether that Alteration doth so well answer the Design of the Holy God, as that Ceremony which himself appointed?

As to the Postscript, there's nothing but what's the old o're and o're; only two things are of very great consequence, and upon which the whole stress of the Question lies, to wit, that of Repealing Infants Privileges, and the Testimony of the Fathers.

As to the first, viz. That of Repealing Infants, you engage our Syllogism, which is thus laid down.

An Ordinance once enjoyn'd and never repeal'd, is always in force? But the Ordinance of Childrens In-covenanting was once enjoyn'd, and never repeal'd; Ergo, &c.

You deny our Minor, and say, it was repeal'd, alledg-ing, —He took away the first, that he might establish the second, Heb. 8. And Now the Ax is laid to the root of the Tree, &c. Matth. 3. To the first of these Texts we answer, you prove a Change of the Covenants, but not of the Subjects of the Covenant, so that it still lies upon your hands; as to the last Text, either Children are concern'd in it, or they are not; if they are concern'd, then they are all damn'd, for they cannot bring forth good fruit: If they are not concern'd, to what end did you bring it? So that the Argument is yet untouch'd.

The next thing we meet with of moment in your Postscript, is some small Animadversions upon the Authority of the Fathers; you challenge us to prove one Instance in the first or second Century for Infant-Baptism, telling us, that all we have depends upon Origen's Testimony; take one that was his Senior by forty six years, and who liv'd in the second Century, 'tis Irenaeus, from whom you have these four Testimonies,

Ans. 2. Prove your first Author that expounded this Text, and we'll prove Infant-Baptism several hundred years in the Primitive Church before such Exposition was ever made, which will evince that Infant-Baptism depended not upon that Exposition, and therefore ought not to fall with it.

Ans. 3. Such practice was in the Jewish Church, and never contradicted by Christ or his Apostles, nor but by one Father (as we read of) in the Primitive Church, whom we have before cited, therefore we think it very reasonable to continue it.

Ans. 4. This we have fully answer'd before.

Ans. 4. This we have fully answer'd before.

Lib. 2. c. 39. adv. Haereses, Christus enim, &c. Christ did sanctifie EVERY AGE by his own Susception of it, and Similitude to it, &c. In Epist. ad Rom. l. 5. pro hoc &c. Ecclesia ab Apostolis Traditionem Suscepit etiam PARVULIS Baptismum dare, &c. For this also did the Church learn from the Apostles to baptize CHILDREN, &c. In Lucam Homil. 14. PARVULI baptizantur in Remissionem peccatorum, CHILDREN (or little ones) are baptized for the Remission of sins. Et in Lib. Homil. 8. propterea baptizantur & PARVULI, Children are also baptized. —We expect a full Answer to this, or pretend to no more Authorities. —What you urge out of Greg. Nazianzen is false, (or he contradicts himself) in Orat. 40. in Sanct. Baptisma, he says. Νῦν οὐκ ἔστι σοι — Hast thou a Child? let not sin get the advantage, but let him be sanctified from his Infancy, &c. And afterwards 'Εσθὲ ταῦτα φρονεῖ καὶ ὁ ἄνθρωπος τὸ βάπτισμα, &c. Thus for the Baptism of those that desire Baptism; but what shall we say of Infants, who are sensible neither of the Gain nor Loss of it, (shall we baptize 'em? most certainly, &c. You cite Dr. Barlow, who says, Tertullian condemns Infant-Baptism as unwarrantable and irrational. Thus you bring in Mr. Daile and Danvers for the same purpose; but those that consult History and Tertullians Contemporaries, will find that it began to grow into a Custom to baptize the Children of Heathens, which therefore Tertullian oppos'd; besides, he was otherwise erroneous, and was for deferring the Baptism of Virgins and Widdows till they were married; 'twas in the beginning of the third Century; but by the by all these are Arguments for Infant-Baptism, for that could not be oppos'd which had not a being.

### Postscript.

AND now Gentlemen, upon the whole, the weight of the Dispute lies in this; You ask for a Divine Command for Infant-Baptism, we ask for a Divine Repeal of the Rights that Children once had to the Covenant.

To gratifie our demand, you brought us two Texts (as above) the one of 'em we have shewn does only signify a change of the Covenants, but not the Subjects of the Covenants; the other (we have prov'd) cannot concern Children, but the consequence will be damnation to all the Children that ever have or shall be born.

To gratifie your demand, we have shewn that Children once were in the Covenant, that the Jews did baptize, proselyting Men, Women and Children into their Religion, that our Saviour continued the Custom, and by his Authority made it of Divine Institution; and that it being a general Custom, a general Commission was enough, viz. Disciple all Nations, &c. which the Apostle St. Peter (Acts 2. 29.) And the first Fathers of the Primitive Church took in a general sense, that we have frequent mention of it in Irenaeus, Clemens, Justin Martyr, Origen, Cyprian, Fidus, &c. And now after all, to avoid Eternal Controversies, we'll cut the work short with you,

and give you up the cause, if you can do these three things.

1. Prove the Repealing of the Privileges that Children once had with their Parents.

2. Or, A Confutation of the Authorities we have brought for Infant-Baptism.

3. Or lastly, To give us an Instance amongst the first Fathers of the Primitive Church where Infant-Baptism is but once mentioned, as in orthodox before many Instances that we have brought wherein it is mentioned as orthodox.

If you are able to undertake the Proposals, do it, if not, we desire you would give a publick satisfaction to those you may have mis-led, by acknowledging your Errors; but we desire to be freed from the impertinencies of one of your Party, who has hitherto been so disingenuous to make a noise, and run away with our Arguments without thinking what they were brought for, and then to say, They do not conclude so, so, which we were intended they should; such a person we think not fit to dispute with—You shall, if there be occasion, hear from us every nine weeks in the twelve Numbers, six of the nine we'll allow you to make good your Party; but be so ingenuous for the future, as not to say we have not answered such and such Queries when we had never seen 'em.