

*Remarks upon the last Sheet Publish'd by the Anabaptists.*

AS our last Sheet went into the Press, there came to our hands another Piece called *Confidence Corrected, &c.* 'Tis a magnificent Title, and calls for our humble thoughts; therefore since we have told the World we would in these twelve Numbers give an Answer to all the *Anabaptists* have written, we shall take notice of what it contains, but upon examination we find nothing material in it, but what we have already answered, only some New Expositions, and a few Catches, like drowning men, at whatever they think may bespatter and render us odious; amongst the rest, we'll only examine these Expositions that seem to answer any of those three Points we have before laid down, to which (we hope) we have justly reduced all this tedious long Dispute betwixt us, which may continue to Eternity, if we follow 'em in the long Chase of impertinent Circumstances that have so little relation to the matter in hand.

As we remember, (so we may be pardon'd for tautologizing, since our Papers are at the Press) the Heads are these, which if ye answer, the Cause is your own.

1. Since Children by God's immediate Appointment and express Command were reckoned and included with their Parents as proper Subjects for Incovenanting, where are they by God's immediate Appointment and express Command excluded again?

2. Disprove our Testimonies either of the Jews or Primitive Fathers.

3. Or bring One credible Instance where Infant-Baptism is mentioned as inorthodox, before many credible Instances that we have and can yet farther shew, where 'tis mentioned as orthodox in the first Ages of the Church.

We desire the Reader to pardon our stating these Heads again, since we have done it (our Papers being absent) not only to examine by them what this last Book of the *Anabaptists* may urge against any of them, but also to take off another Objection that they have started against us, as that our Positions are darkly delivered, especially upon the first Head, which every Disputant ought to avoid, since such things start new Argument, and are only proper for bad Causes, and such as would lose the Argument first stated.

The second Head is first engaged, but stands firm, since confirm'd by what we have brought, as well as by your own Instance of the Rabbi's disputing about the Legality of Circumcising Profelytes without baptizing them, which could not be without such a practice; and since other Nations that had their Customs from the Jews, have the same practice. See Dr. Lightfoot's Collections upon this Point, and they will fully satisfy you.

The next that comes near any of our three Heads, is your Exposition upon *Acts 2. 39. The Promise is to you and your Children.* Here you bring several Texts wherein Children is taken in another sense, besides *Little ones*; but this does not therefore exclude *Little ones*, since it is as commonly taken in this sense too; and which is yet more, since St. Peter by that Text refers to *Abraham* and his Seed, and mentions that Covenant wherein *Little ones* were included; which we hope proves no exclusion of Infants, but the contrary.

A little after speaking of Childrens being in Covenant, you say, if you grant, that they are in Covenant, Holy, &c. (page 35.) yet you deny that they ought to be baptized—*Ans.* The most reasonable persons amongst you always granted this upon that supposition, but we want not your suffrage; for St. Peter in *Acts 2.* makes the Covenant a Ground and Title for Baptism.

P. 35. You say, you value not the universal Consent of Churches, nor Antiquity for Infant-Baptism. *Ans.* Then you are past dispute; for who are the most proper Judges of the unexpress'd Subjects of a General Commission, (*Go disciple all Nations*) than the immediate Successors of the Apostles, unless you believe the Apostles practices were not known by those very persons which they set over the Churches, and that the Successors of these slept all the time their Predecessors taught them and their Contemporaries; certainly if such persons Testimonies are not to be valued, especially when we see 'em brought to the Stake for their Masters Truth, then every thing is to be question'd, even the Bible itself, which by their Tradition we are assur'd to be the *Word of God*. Nothing but an *Anabaptist* could question their Knowledge and Truth, or deny that to be the sense of our Saviours words, which himself never contradicted, nor his Apostles after him, but what was made frequent mention of in the Writings of such as convers'd with the Antient Presbyters that were contemporary with the Apostles themselves.

What you urge about Antiquity as to the true Marks of it, is obscure, since you have not given us your true Marks of it; and as for your saying, *from the beginning it was not so*, it lies upon you to prove when it it began; we have given you Authority that it was practis'd before our Saviour, as also in the time of those that convers'd with the Contemporaries of the latter Days of the Apostles.

Ye say, p. 39. that Childrens Faith is not to be prov'd from that Text, *Little ones which believe in me, &c.* we'll examine this by and by, when we consider your Postscript, particularly that of *Childrens behold-*



ing God's Face in Heaven, and the Inference from it. — *An Ordinance once repealed, &c.* p. 41. See it stated to your better satisfaction in the first of our three Heads; and we expect a full Answer to it, or else that you hold your Tongues, and not persecute every bodies Ear with Abuses, Non-sense,

*And now to your Unchristian, Scandalous Postscript.*

HERE we are treated very meanly; the occasion is, because we asked you for an *Instance of Female-Baptism*; could you not have given it in mild and plain terms, and then you had done all that could be expected, but instead of that, you leap at the poor Question, like a Cat at a Mouse, and having fasten'd upon it, you grumble, play, and tantalize the poor thing, till you are weary with its disgrace, and then out of pity end its expectation, bringing a purring Syllogism to prove it lawful. Generously done! but you did not consider, that whether there was, or was not any such Instance, it made our Case of Infant-Baptism neither better nor worse, which shews your Quarrel lies at whatever you can catch; tho' after all, we have to tell you there are three or four more such Questions, if you could have seen 'em, which we ask'd on purpose, not that we want to be satisfied in 'em ourselves.

The next Quotation which we are so severely check'd for, is a passage which we think fit to cite again, to shew the World how much malice and ignorance appears in their Comments upon us; the words are these; *If God be pleased to irradiate upon the Souls of Children, in Heaven; and they do behold the face of God (as our Saviour says) then it follows that they have Faith in Heaven; and why not on Earth? To behold the face of God is an act of Faith, Heb. 11. 17.* Let the Reader take notice, that we are here supposing, that if Faith were absolutely prerequisite to Baptism, Children have it, from our Saviour's words; *These little ones which Believe in me*: And that our Saviour's words may as well be expounded of Infants as of such who are meek and humble as Infants, we have brought some unquestionable Instances in our first Paper (where these words are cited) of Infants who have had strange Effects of Actual Faith, even before they had the proper use of their Reason, from whence we spoke as above, and meant no more by it than this, that *if God who is in Heaven was pleased to irradiate and shine upon the Souls of Children (who are upon Earth, for we don't plead for the baptizing those Children that are in Heaven, that's not our design) and that these Children by a reflex of this irradiation do see God, or behold Jesus Christ, who is the Object of their Faith in Heaven, why mayn't their Faith serve for an Ordinance on Earth, as Baptism, &c?* That we mean Children upon Earth is plain also from the Text cited, *Heb. 11. 17.* where St. Paul speaks of a Subject upon Earth, and not of a Subject of the

and impertinent Inferences, as of a Man bringing a Chizzel to cut out a Doublet, &c. What you there offer is nothing near it; Mr. C—understood what we meant, and bid fairest for an Answer, to which we have rejoyn'd, and if you can help him out, do.

Beatifick Vision: But why so malicious and spiteful an inversion of the Order of our words? *Why not on Earth?* To therefore on Earth, and from thence to fix non-sensical Syllogisms, and irrational Consequences upon us; but to teach these persons a little Justice and Reason, we'll shew 'em how they might make our sense into a Syllogism agreeable to it, by changing the *Why* into a very fair presumption.

'Tis highly reasonable that if Children are capable by Faith to apprehend God, or Christ Jesus in Heaven, which is a great matter, they may apprehend Baptism upon Earth, which is a lesser matter.

But Children are capable by Faith to apprehend, &c. *Ergo, &c.*

The Third thing you ridicule in your Postscript is our Query, *How the Faith of the Parent can put the Child further off from God, and how Children can lose by Christs coming, &c.* We think there's but little Absurdity in it, for if Children had the Happiness of being in the Covenant with their Parents under the Law, it must be an Unhappiness if they are excluded out of the Covenant from their Parents under the Gospel; if so, Children have lost by Christs coming; which we don't meet with any where under the Gospel, and if you do, it lyes upon you to prove it, and then we'll yield our Inference an Absurdity. See the first head of our proposals to you, as above.

The last Scurrilous reflection gives to Pedit-Baptists the Character of the *faculty of fawning upon one another*, only because we inserted a Postscript which mentions Mr. Elliot; tho' at the same time we told the World it was sent to us from an unknown hand. The Miserable stuff that follows it *has our Pity*; especially when we find such an humble submissive Person in the close, that for all his humility can prefix such an Arrogant Magisterial Title to his Book.

There are seven Arguments Subjoyn'd to the Treatise, six of them are answered by us already, the 7th runs thus;

Arg. 7. *That which is Substantially and Severely forbidden by the Word of God is not of Divine Authority: But Baptizing Infants in the Name of the Lord is Substantially and Severely forbidden by the Word of God: Ergo, Infant-Baptism is not of Divine Authority.*

Ans. This Syllogism is out of form, yet prove the *Minor*, and we'll for ever give up the Cause. And remember that you oblig'd your self to do it, or else to Submit.

Till then,

Farewel.