

fancies he has shewn in the Application of these Sto- Chap. I.
ries, 'tis certain there's no Argument in them till the Truth of the Fact be made out; and whether that be sufficiently done in the Body of the Book, we shall in due place enquire.

I can't but make a stand at another Observation of his, which is, "That when Men turn Anabaptists, despising the Ministry of the Gospel, then they become Antinomians, rejecting the Rule of the Law; then Enthusiasts—then Libertines—then Ranters—I have no need here to give an Answer to this Calumny, because I shall have occasion to do it in a more proper place, where this Author is pleas'd to give them many other Titles and Characters of like Reputation. But 'tis surprizing, that to this Observation he immediately subjoins these Words, "For the next step from Anabaptism is Quakerism. Just now the next step from Anabaptism, in Mr. *Rus- sen's* Gradation, was Antinomianism, and now 'tis Quakerism; and what yet farther augments the Wonder, the one proves the other, according to his Logick: *When Men turn Anabaptists, then they become Antinomians, then Enthusiasts, then Libertines, then Ranters.* And how does all this appear? Why, because they become Quakers, for the next step from Anabaptism is Quakerism; therefore (it seems) the next step is Antinomianism. Are Antinomianism and Quakerism synonymous Terms in his account, when other People make a very great difference between them? Or is it no matter in what Order, or for what Reason, or with what Consistence odious Names are accumulated to expose the poor Anabaptists, to all who are capable of following him in his Method of thinking?

When he has done what is sufficient to raise the Admiration of others, he in his turn breaks out into passionate Exclamations of Wonder and Pity, lamenting the Impiety of the Anabaptists "in quitting
"Subjection to Christ in his Holy Ordinance, that
"Ordinance for which he gives Commission and In-
"struction to his Apostles in these Words, Go ye dis-
"ciple all Nations, baptizing them in the Name of the
"Father, the Son and the Holy Ghost; which Words,
"says

Chap. I.

“ (says he) are the very Basis and Foundation of the
 “ Gospel's Ministry to the *Gentiles*, containing in
 “ them a Mission, *Go ye*; a Commission to teach,
 “ more properly to make Disciples, *Discipulos facere*.
 “ The particular Instruction for exercising the Com-
 “ mission, which is first *Baptizing*, then *Teaching*.
 “ The Order of Christ is not to be inverted, the
 “ Method he hath directed to make Disciples is to
 “ baptize in the first place, then to teach. The ge-
 “ neral Command is to *Teach*, to *Disciple*, expressed
 “ by the Verb of the Imperative Mood; the way to
 “ execute is *Baptizing and Teaching*, both expressed
 “ by the Participle of the Present Tense, admitting
 “ into the Church and School of Christ by Baptism,
 “ and then tutoring and training up by Doctrine.
 One would think by the former part of these Words,
 that the Anabaptists were utterly against the Ordinance
 of Baptism and the Commission of Christ, by which he
 directs his Apostles in the Administration of it; whereas
 they profess Subjection to this Holy Ordinance, and strenuously
 plead for the Authority of this Commission. And by the latter
 part of them one might suppose they were at least for
 inverting the Order of the Commission, whereas they contend
 for a Religious Adhæſion to it, and complain of the Inversion
 of it by the Advocates of Pædo-Baptism.

Mr. *Ruffen's* Notion on this Text seems to be, that here is a general
 Command to disciple all Nations; and then the way to execute it,
 particularly express'd, first by Baptizing, and then by Teaching: so
 that according to him those are Disciples who are baptiz'd, tho' they
 have never been taught, nor are yet capable of Instruction; and he
 seems to lay a great stress on this for Infant-Baptism, therefore I shall
 answer it the more largely.

1. I may well deny that any can be made Disciples without being
 taught, till an Instance from the Holy Scripture be produc'd of some
 Disciple made by Christ or by any of his Ministers without Teaching; and
 such Teaching or Instruction, as implies a great and good effect on
 their Souls, *viz.* their Faith in Christ, and Subjection to the Terms
 of his Gospel: for who

can

can pretend to make Disciples any other way than after the Primitive manner? Chap. I.


2. That none can be a Disciple of Christ without this, appears by the Words of our Blessed Saviour himself: *If any Man come to me and hate not his Father and Mother, and Wife and Children, and Brethren and Sisters, yea and his own Life also, he cannot be my Disciple. And whosoever doth not bear his Cross, and come after me, cannot be my Disciple.* Now if Christ says none can be his Disciple, without being so taught by him, and so learning of him as to take up his Cross and follow him, and Mr. R. says he may be a Disciple without teaching, whom are we to believe? Luke 14.
26, 27.

3. I would ask Mr. R. whom are the Ministers of the Gospel order'd to baptize? Is it all Men in general in all Nations, or those only who are made Disciples in all Nations? If all Men in general are to be baptiz'd first, and then taught; then all Adult Persons as well as Infants, ought to be baptiz'd before they are taught (which I suppose he will not assert) If only those who are made Disciples in all Nations are to be baptiz'd, then there is something requir'd to make Disciples before Baptism; and what can this be but Teaching? If he knows any other way, let him shew it.

4. Our Saviour's way, and that of *John the Baptist*, was to make Disciples first, and then to admit them to Baptism; for the Text expressly tells us, *That Jesus made and baptiz'd more Disciples than John.* Here John 4. 1
μαθητάς
ποίησεν. seems a plain distinction between making Disciples and baptizing them; and Mr. R. himself says, *The Order of Christ is not to be inverted.*

5. The Commission, as express'd in a parallel Text by another Evangelist, plainly directs that Teaching ought to precede Baptism: *Preach the Gospel to every Creature: he that believes and is baptiz'd shall be sav'd;* Mark 16.
15, 16. which Words shew the exact Order that is to be observ'd; first there must be preaching, then believing (for Faith comes by hearing) and then baptizing.

6. The Practice of the Apostles abundantly confirms this; for we find they first taught the People to whom they came, exhorting them to Repentance and Faith, Acts Ch. 2.
Ch. 3. & 8.
and else-
where. and then to be baptiz'd: and we read of none admitted C

Chap. 2.  mitted to Baptism, but those who made a solemn Profession of Repentance and Faith.

If then the Order and Method which Christ has establish'd is not to be inverted, why does Mr. R. take the Liberty to invert it, by telling us, that Ministers are first to baptize and then to teach, tho Christ bids them first teach and then baptize? Sure he can't think to excuse himself, by telling us the Text speaks of teaching after baptizing; for it was never yet denied that Men are to be taught after Baptism: tho to deny that seems as reasonable, as to deny that they are to be taught before it. For the same Commission directs to teach them before Baptism, that orders them to be taught when baptiz'd.

He tells us, that *Teach or Disciple is of the Imperative Mood, and Baptizing and Teaching express'd by the Participle of the Present Tense*: but to what purpose he makes this Grammatical Remark, he is not pleas'd to acquaint us; it would have turn'd to his Account indeed, if he could have hereby shewn that Christ has order'd his Ministers to baptize before they taught.

And now he is pleas'd to insult the poor Anabaptists for their suppos'd Ignorance of Grammar: "If here (says he) they cavil at my Moods, Particples, Tenses and Distinctions; if they carp at some Sentences of Latin scatter'd here and there, let them blame their own Ignorance! 'Tis for want of such human Advantages that they so strangely wrest the Scripture, and know not rightly to divide the Word of Truth. And he concludes that he has no hopes to convince any that are riveted in their Principles, their Obstinacy being a sufficient Bar to Confutation.

I hope this Gentleman does not count all Men Hereticks who are not good Grammarians, and that the Knowledg of Moods and Particples is as necessary to all Mankind, as that of the Fundamental Articles of Christianity; for then we should have but few Orthodox People comparatively in any Communion. Why does he charge the pretended Errors of the Anabaptists on their want of Grammar? Are not those who differ from 'em as liable to wrest the Scripture, as they without the knowledg of Moods, Particples

ables and Tenses, especially since 'tis to be fear'd Mr. R. with these Human Advantages, has made a shift to wrest the Commission of Christ, as grossly as most Men are capable of doing it *without* them? Nor ought he to triumph too much in his Grammatical Acquirements, since some Expressions scarce reconcilable to good Sense now and then escape him, as we have already seen, and shall have occasion farther to observe. And tho he has no hope to convince the Anabaptists, because he counts 'em obstinate as well as ignorant, I presume he'l give me leave to flatter my self with better Success on one of his Learning and Candor, if I can make the Insufficiency of his Arguments appear:

Chap. 2.

C H A P. II.

*An Answer to Mr. R's first Chapter, entitul'd,
Of Baptism in general, and various Notions
thereabouts.*

HE begins with a Remark on the Policy of the Devil, who is always undermining the *Fundamentals of Christianity*, and gives an Instance of it in the dangerous Error of the *Arians*. To these he joins the Papists and Anabaptists; for he says, "Whereas Christ has instituted in his Church only two Sacraments, as generally necessary to Salvation, both these have been extremely oppos'd by the Adversaries of Truth. The Doctrine of Transubstantiation hath been hotly maintain'd by the Papists, and for want of better Arguments confuted by Fire and Faggot: The initiating Sacrament of the Church-Baptism, hath been strangely perverted; this Subject hath been pregnant and fruitful with Errors and Mistakes, begotten by Men of corrupt Judgment, and nourish'd in the wild Fancies of the ignorant and obstinate. 'Tis agreed that the *Arians* by denying the Divinity of our Saviour, and the *Papists* by their absurd Doctrine of Transubstantiation,

Chap. 2. have extremely oppos'd the Truth: But why must the Anabaptists be forc'd into this Honourable Company, and be qualify'd with the Title of *the Adversaries of Truth*, equally with them? If Affinity in Principles with those of the *Romish Church*, could entitle a Man to this Character, our Author seems to bid much fairer for it, than the People with whom he so warmly contends; for he asserts in the Sentence immediately following, that "this Holy Sacrament" (*i. e.* Baptism) imprints an indelible Character of "Christianity, and which cannot be iterated; which is a Popish Notion, sufficiently exploded by many Protestant Writers, and which I shall have occasion to speak of in another place, where 'tis again affirm'd. This Author agrees much more with them, in some other Notions relating to Baptism, than we do; he is for the same Subject, the same Mode of Administration by Asperision, and for some of the same Ceremonies; and seems to make it *necessary to Salvation*, tho he blames them for it. He maintains it hotly, as they do their Transubstantiation, and for want either of better Arguments or of a better Temper, is pleas'd to scatter his Reproaches very plentifully; and what the other endeavour to do by *Fire and Faggot*, he seeks to accomplish by another kind of Flame, the Violence of which is felt by none so much as by himself: for when he says, the Doctrine of Transubstantiation has been hotly maintain'd by the Papists, and for want of better Argument, confuted by Fire and Faggot, I suppose by [confuted] he means [supported] which is a Fault I should be willing to charge on his Printer, if I did not find the like good sense in the Words immediately following, and in other parts of his Book.

P. 18.

P. 15.

When he says the initiating Sacrament of the Church-Baptism has been strangely perverted; if he means the Baptism Christ has instituted in his Church, it is confess'd it has been abus'd and perverted by many; and whether this Author is clear from a share of this kind of Guilt or not, I hope will be seen in the Sequel of this Answer. If he means the Baptism of any particular Church, That Church and all others ought to conform in this, and all other Matters, to the Institutions of Christ in the Holy Scriptures. For tho that Baptism which

which is practis'd in any particular Church may be call'd the Church-Baptism by that Church; yet it is no Argument of its being the true Baptism, if it wants a Foundation in the Word of God, unless that Church could fairly pretend to Infallibility. Chap.2.

But while he complains of the Perversion of the Church-Baptism, he adds, that *this Subject has been pregnant and fruitful with Errors and Mistakes.* So that according to him the Church-Baptism (whatever he means by it) is the fruitful Mother of a very hopeful Progeny, and has a sufficient Number of Fathers as well as Nurses, for this very numerous Family: for he adds, that *they are begotten by Men of corrupt Judgment, and nourish'd in the wild Fancies of the Ignorant and Obstinate.* Yet he professes to have a great Kindness for the Mother, tho he is out of conceit with the Children, as well as angry with the Fathers that begot them, and the Nurses that cherish them.

If he says his meaning is, not that the Church-Baptism abounds with Errors, but that Men have fallen into many Errors in opposition to the Church-Baptism, in which he believes the Truth is to be found; and refers us to his Preface, where he says, "If here or in any part of this Treatise, they cavil at my Moods, Participles, Tenses and Distinctions; if they carp at some Sentences of Latin scatter'd here and there, let them blame their own Ignorance, &c. I answer, the Anabaptists have no particular quarrel at present with his Moods, Participles or Tenses, but wonder a little at the manner of his putting the Parts of Speech together in composing his Periods, and that some of his Distinctions are so obscure; since he seems to have made no great distinction between the Mother of those Errors above-mention'd, and the ungodly Fathers and Nurses of them, unless by bestowing only on her the special Marks of his Favour; that tho they have no occasion here to find fault with his Latin, they are mightily shock'd at his English: and while he tells




'em they must blame their own Ignorance, have reason to tell him that he seems to make a very odd use of the Learning to which he pretends. If these be the *human Advantages* of which he boasts, they have no Temptation to envy him; and if for want of such Advantages, they strangely wrest the Scriptures, and know not rightly to divide the Truth, they are in great danger to continue in their Mistakes. But what need had our Author to tell the World that he was so much beholden to these *human Advantages* in writing his Book, and to make that good sense appear to be acquir'd, which seems to be so very natural to him? When other People write after this sort, they can do it without any great help from *human Advantages*, unless a Proneness to mistake be accounted an *Advantage*, as 'tis acknowledged to be *Human*, according to the old saying, *Humanum est errare*.

He goes on to declaim, "To set down (says he) all the wild Notions which have been spread, &c."

I must confess my self so ignorant, that I have much ado to make sense of this Period, or to trace the Serpentine Windings and Meanders of it (to use this Author's Phrase.) We shall afterwards see how he proves the Anabaptists a People of so black a Character, as is here suggested. When he says, *they are contrary to all, as all are contrary to them*, I suppose he means in respect of their Principles and Opinions (of which he is speaking just before, under the Name of Heresies) This is no great Discovery; for if others are contrary to them, they must be contrary to others: But their being contrary to others no more proves them in the wrong, than the Contrariety of others to them is a Proof those others are in the right.

They differ indeed from others, as others differ from them; and if this be to be contrary to all, Mr. R. himself is so, for he most certainly differs as much from other Men, as they differ from him: And if this be thought a part of the bad Character of the Anabaptists, it will as well fit any other Party of Men, and the Church to which Mr. R. belongs (for instance)

for

for she differs from all, as all differ from her in some respects ; and no Party professing Christianity, differs from her in all. Chap.2. 

If he mean they are contrary to all others, and all others to them in point of Charity, so that they can't look upon those that differ from them as Christians, nor they that differ from them look upon them as such : the contrary of what is said is well known ; tho they differ from other Christians, they are no Enemies to them, but profess to love all who love our Lord Jesus Christ : nay, after his Example to love their Enemies, and they are well persuaded of the same Sentiments of many other Christians towards 'em ; for all are not so contrary to 'em as our Author, who will not allow 'em the Name of Christians.

He goes on and tells us, that Baptism is originally Greek, and signifies a washing with Water. We agree that it sometimes signifies washing, but the primary and genuine significancy of the Word is Immersion or Dipping, as the Learned will easily acknowledge ; and Mr. R. himself grants it in the following Words, when he says it has also the Signification of the Verb *Tingo*, “ to dip in Water, or to dye in Colours, “ as we dye Cloth in a Dyer's Fat, and that it relates to “ our being dipp'd, dy'd or colour'd in the Blood of “ Christ ; and to this purpose cites *Isa. 63. 1. Who is this that cometh up from Edom, with dyed Garments from Bozrah ?* Because Dipping implies Washing, this is a secondary and consequential sense, in which the Word is sometimes us'd, but is not proper to express any washing that I know of, which does not suppose Immersion. But why does he determine this Washing to Water, when the Greek Word is not determin'd to any one Liquid, but is common to all ? and when he tells us in the same Breath, it has the Signification of the Verb *Tingo*, to dip in Water or to dye in Colours. “ He also tells us, βαπτω is the Original “ Word (from whence Baptism is deriv'd) which he “ says is translated by *Immergo*, to dip or plunge under Water ; but the Derivative βαπτίζω he says “ has a larger Latitude, and signifies any manner of “ washing, whether it be by dipping, rinsing, washing or sprinkling, or any other mundifying Act by

Chap. 2. “ Water. He adds, that it is render'd in Latin by *Luo, abluo*. Here he insinuates that the Primitive Word βαπτω signifies to dip or plunge, but the Derivative βαπτίζω to wash any manner of way; that the former is translated by *Immergo*, and the latter by *Luo, abluo*. I suppose his Lexicons will inform him, that βαπτίζω signifies *mergo* or *immergo*, to plunge or immerge, as well as βαπτω; and yet he throws down again what he had built, in telling us presently after this, that it hath also the signification of the Verb *Tingo* to dip, &c. What does he mean by all these Distinctions? Does not βαπτω signify *luo, abluo*, as well as βαπτίζω? and does not βαπτίζω signify *immergo* as well as βαπτω? If he founds his Translation of βαπτισμῶς, by washing with Water, on the different signification of the Verb βαπτίζω from that of βαπτω, let him plainly show this difference. If both the one and the other signify primarily and ordinarily, to dip or plunge, why these serpentine Windings and Meanders (to borrow his own Phrase) to render this Matter intricate and perplex'd?

And 'tis worthy of a particular Remark, that when he informs us of the Latitude of the Word βαπτίζω, he says it signifies any manner of washing, whether it be by dipping, rinsing, washing or sprinkling, or any other mundifying Act by Water; where, by an extraordinary kind of Logick, he makes Washing the Genus, and Washing one of the Species of that Genus; so that it seems among all the sorts of Washing, washing is one kind of washing. Now if we can't make such Discoveries as these, or see the usefulness of 'em when set before our Eyes, we may blame our own Ignorance; 'tis for want of such human Advantages, as our Author has in Logick as well as Grammar, that we are so much in the dark.

And while he pretends to give a large Latitude to the word βαπτίζω, he indeed restrains it to what he calls mundifying Acts by Water, tho he afterwards confesses it signifies sometimes to dye in Colours, which I suppose he does not take to be properly a mundifying Act whereas Dipping, which is the proper signification of the Word, is of a much larger extent, and comprehends washing as one of the Consequences

ces of it, tho washing does not comprehend that. Chap.2.
 He adds, "For the former signification, see *Ovid.*
 " *Lib. 1. de Tristibus. Tingitur Oceano custos Ery-*
 " *manthidos urse.* In the latter, when it is us'd sa-
 " cramentally, referring to that of Baptism, it re-
 " lates to our being dipp'd, dy'd or colour'd in the
 " Blood of Christ, sutable to that of the Prophet,
 " speaking of the Messiah, *Who is this that cometh up*
 " *from Edom, with died Garments from Bozrah? Isa.*
 " *63. 1.* And this Word *Tingo*, I find frequently
 " used by Latin Authors, in their Discourses about
 " Baptism.

All that I can make of this is, that the Latin Verb
Tingo signifies as much as the Greek Verb βαπτίζω,
i. e. sometimes to dip in Water, and sometimes to
 dye in Colours: but of these two Significations he
 might fairly have made one; for the Truth is, *Tingo*
 and βαπτίζω signify the same thing, that is, to dip;
 for let it be in Water or in Colours, 'tis still the same
 thing, what is dip'd in Water is as much dip'd, as if
 it had been dip'd in Colours. And these Words are
 not us'd to denote one Liquid more than another, but
 to signify the Action of Dipping or Immersion in any
 Liquid whatsoever. But to what great purpose this
 Verse of *Ovid* should be cited, I can't well imagine,
 unless it be to put us in mind of the human Advanta-
 ges this Author pretends to have above the Anabaptists,
 for the World might have been persuaded that *Tingo*
 is Latin for *to dip* without this Citation.

He goes on, "But leaving (says he) the various sig-
 " nifications of the Word, we come to treat of Bap-
 " tism as a Sacrament instituted by Christ, and which
 " our Church in her Catechism defines to be as to its
 " outward visible Sign or Form, Water, wherein the
 " Person is baptiz'd, in the Name of the Father,
 " and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost; and as to
 " its Inward and Spiritual Grace, a Death unto Sin,
 " and a new Birth unto Righteousness. Where it is to
 be observ'd: 1. That since the Catechism of the Church
 of *England* declares, that the Person to be baptiz'd,
 is to be baptiz'd in Water, this sufficiently shews that
 this Ordinance ought to be administred by Immersi-
 on; for it would be a very odd and improper Phrase,

Chap. 2. to say a Person is sprinkled *in* Water, but very natural and proper to say one is dip'd in Water; whence it follows, that Immersion is no such ridiculous thing as Mr. R. would render it afterwards.

P. 29, 30,
31.

2. That this is farther confirm'd by the Acknowledgment Mr. R. makes, that this Sacrament *as to its Inward and Spiritual Grace is a Death unto Sin, and a new Birth unto Righteousness.* By which 'tis reasonable, to think he means that this Grace, by which Men die to Sin, and live a new Life unto Righteousness, is necessary to qualify them for Baptism, seeing immediately from hence "with some other Particulars" adjoining (as he tells us) he draws this general "Doctrine concerning Baptism, viz. That the Subjects of Baptism are Believers, and that to such, and none but such, is this Sacrament to be administred." And if Men must be thus qualified for Baptism, 'tis proper that these Qualifications should be signified by the Ordinance it self, which can't be fitly done but by Immersion, and the Emerision which succeeds it, by which our Death to Sin, and Resurrection to Holiness is so fitly represented; and that this was design'd by Baptism, I shall have occasion to shew in its place.

3. As for the Particulars adjoining, which give Mr. R. occasion to infer this general Doctrine, I suppose they are the following Expressions in the Catechism. *Qy.* "What is requir'd of Persons to be baptized? *Ans.* "Repentance, whereby they forsake Sin; and Faith, whereby they stedfastly believe the Promises of God made to them in that Sacrament. For after this he might very well say, that the Subjects of Baptism are Believers, and that to such, and none but such, is this Sacrament to be administred. But what follows in the Catechism about the Baptism of Infants, seems to cast his Thoughts into some Confusion.

And therefore no sooner has he told us that Baptism is to be administred to Believers, and none but such, but he distributes Believers into two sorts, either *Adult Persons or Infants*; he says, in the *Adult Repentance and Confession of Faith* are requir'd; "and that "Infants are such as being born of Christian Parents, "are federally holy, and have a right to the Ordinance "in right of their Father's Faith; and are to be "speedily

“ speedily brought to the Ordinance, and by no
 “ means to be denied it. In the first place it seems
 strange, that Mr. R. calls Infants *Believers*, without
 offering one Text of Scripture, or any one reason to
 prove them such: Does he think that this is a self-evi-
 dent Proposition, or that his *ipse dixit* ought to pass
 for a Demonstration? 2. Since he thinks not only
 Faith is requir'd in Adult Persons, but the Confession
 of that Faith to qualify them for Baptism; and in this
 agrees very well with the Holy Scripture, because
 we can't know whether Men believe or not, without
 some external discovery of their Faith: It seems
 highly reasonable, that he should at least forbear to
 number Infants as well as adult Persons among Belie-
 vers, till there is good Evidence given of their Faith,
 by their Words and Works. 3. Since the Apostle
Paul assures us, that *Faith comes by hearing, &c.* and
 tells us, *with the Heart Man believes unto Righte-*
ousness, and with the Mouth Confession is made unto Sal-
vation; and the Apostle James tells us, *Faith without*
Works is dead, being alone: Mr. R. must pardon the
 Anabaptists, if they dare not number Infants among
 the proper Subjects of Baptism, till he has prov'd that
 they are capable of hearing the Gospel so as to un-
 derstand it, and embrace the Terms of it, of making
 a Confession agreeable to those Sentiments of their
 Faith, and of shewing their Faith by a suitable Con-
 versation: if he has any other way of discovering
 Faith, let him shew it. But 4. 'tis unaccountable that
 after Words so express, he seems not very consistent
 with what he had just said; for presently he tells us
 in the same Paragraph, that *Infants have a right*
to Baptism, in right of their Fathers Faith. Just now
 they were Believers themselves, and therefore had a
 right to Baptism on account of their own Faith, and
 now 'tis in right of their Fathers Faith. What need
 have they of their Fathers Faith to give them a right
 to Baptism, if they have a Faith of their own? And
 what right can their Fathers Faith give them to Bap-
 tism, if the Ordinance must be administred to none
 but Believers? If the Faith of the Father denominates
 the Child a Believer, why may not the good Works
 of the Father be accounted to the Child too, that so
 the

Chap. 2.

Rom. 10.
 17.
 Rom. 10.
 10.
 Jam. 2.17.

Chap. 2. the Child may be sanctified by the Imputation of the Father's Righteousness? A Doctrine I suppose not to be found in the Holy Scripture. 5. Since Mr. R. pays so great respect to the Liturgy of the Church of *England*, and particularly in what relates to the Office of Baptism; 'tis hard to understand for what reason he founds the right of Infants to Baptism on their Fathers Faith, when the Church Catechism founds it on the Promise of their Sureties, *viz.* their Godfathers and Godmothers.

Having given us this account of both Adult and Infant Believers, he tells us, that *besides these there are another sort of Believers*; that is, according to the obvious sense, such as are neither Adult nor Infants, and so must be a very strange sort of Believers indeed; these are such "who being born Infidels, *Jews* or *Mahometans*, have been converted to the Faith of "Christ, &c. So that according to Mr. R. one that is train'd up in the Christian Faith from his Infancy, is an *Adult Believer*, one baptiz'd in Infancy in right of his Father's Faith is an *Infant-Believer*; and one converted from Paganism, Judaism or Mahometism, another sort of Believer, that is neither Adult nor Infant, but wants a fit Name. Methinks Mr. R's human Advantages might have so instructed him in the significancy of the word (*Adult*) that he needed not to have scrupled to have given it to converted Infidels, *Jews* or *Mahometans*: for since he tells us *the Apostles had only to do with Infidels and Jews, who did not profess Christ, but upon their Preaching were converted and baptiz'd*; If these are a sort of Believers besides the Adult and Infants, there were no *Adult Believers* in the Apostles time by his account, any more than there were *Infant Believers* in the account of the Anabaptists: whereas it has never before now been denied, that there were *Adult Believers* in the time of the Apostles; nor am I willing to imagine that Mr. R. would deny it, but rather guess he affixes some other sense to the word (*Adult*) than what the Generality of People do.

When he has told us that *the Apostles had only to do with Infidels and Jews, who were by their Preaching converted and baptized*; he adds, that *this is the reason*

son why we read not expressly in Scripture of Infants baptized. That we read not expressly in Scripture of Infants baptiz'd, seems an ingenuous Acknowledgment; and that the Apostles having to do only with Infidels and *Jews*, who did not profess Christ, but upon their Preaching were converted and baptized, is the reason why we read not expressly in Scripture of Infants baptiz'd, is yet a larger Concession; and I readily agree with him in it: and why then should we dispute any longer, since our Controversy about Infant-Baptism is at an end? For if the Apostles had to do with none but Infidels and *Jews*, who did not profess Christ, but upon their Preaching were converted and baptiz'd, 'tis no wonder we read not expressly in Scripture of any Infants baptiz'd by 'em, since it was never yet pretended, that Infants were converted by the Preaching of the Apostles. Mr. R. tells us immediately after, that their Preaching was to *grown Persons, capable of hearing and understanding*; but tho his Acknowledgment is just, and his Reasoning thus far true, his following Words constrain us to conclude, that here he is to be taken in another sense, which renders his way of arguing somewhat perplexed and obscure. For he adds, *they (i. e. the Apostles) preaching to grown Persons capable of hearing and understanding, who believing were baptized, and consequently upon their Belief their Children also.* I must confess I find it no easy matter to arrive at what he means by this, which he gives as the reason why we read not expressly in Scripture of Infants baptiz'd, upon his supposition that they were baptiz'd. Is the Infidelity of *Pagans* and *Jews* before their Conversion, a Reason that the Baptism of Infants is not express'd in Scripture? Or is the Preaching of the Apostles only to grown Persons, capable of hearing and understanding, or their Conversion and Baptism, the reason of it? For my part I can't discern, why any or all of these things should be a reason against the express mention of Infant-Baptism in the Holy Scripture, supposing it to have been practis'd by the Apostles, but rather a cogent reason for it: For if Adult Persons were not admitted to Baptism, till they were taught the main Points of the Christian Religion by the Preaching of the Word,

Chap. 2.


so as to understand and believe them, and till they were converted; it seems rational to expect, that the Apostles in the Holy Scripture would have given some reason for their different Procedure toward Infants, if they had admitted them to Baptism without these Qualifications, or at least would have expressly declared their Practice, and signified the Mind of Christ therein, for the regulation of the Practice of the Church in succeeding times. He says, "those that believe were baptized, and consequently their Children" also. But where lies the reason of this Consequence, that because the Parents were entitul'd to Baptism by Faith, the Children should be entitled to it without Faith; and that because the Apostles baptiz'd those whom they converted by Preaching, therefore they must needs have baptized those who were incapable of such Conversion? But to corroborate what he had said, he adds, that *they us'd to baptize whole Houses, of which Children were a part.* I suppose he refers to **Act. 16. 15.** the House of *Lydia*, of whom it is said, *she was baptized and her Household*; and that of the *Jaylor*, of **V. 32.** whom it is said, that *he was baptized, and all his straightway*; and the *Household of Stephanas*, who **1 Cor. 1. 16.** were baptiz'd by the Apostle *Paul*, as himself declares; because these Texts have been often urged in this Controversy. But I can't see how Infant-Baptism can be infer'd from them, when it is consider'd,

1. That 'tis no impossible or very unlikely thing, that these three Families might consist only of Adult Persons, since 'tis not uncommon to find many such Families in all other Cities, as well as those of *Philippi* and *Corinth*, where the abovenam'd Disciples were baptiz'd. And if Mr. R. would give any colour to Infant-Baptism from such Passages as these, he ought to shew not only that there might *possibly be*, but that there *certainly* were Infants in these Families: For so weighty a matter as the due Administration of an Ordinance of Christ ought to be better founded than on a mere Conjecture. A plain Precept in the Holy Scripture for Infant-Baptism may be reasonably demanded of those who plead for the Practice of it; and a clear Precedent for it, is the least thing that can be requir'd in the Case. And Mr. R. ought to have set

set this matter in a clear Light, because he affirms Chap. 2. that *Children were a part* of those whole Houses said to be baptiz'd by the Apostles. But he is not pleas'd to produce his Evidence, expecting to be believ'd on his bare Word, as if he had been intimately acquainted with all the Members of those Families. How does he know that *Lydia*, who seems to have been remote from the ordinary place of her Habitation (for she is said to be of the City of *Thyatira*, tho now at *Philippi*) had Infants in her Family while at *Philippi* (as it seems) on the account of her Trade, she being a Seller of Purple? Nay, how does he know that ever she was married; or if she were, that she ever had any Children; or if so, that they were living, and that they were not Adult but Infants, and that they were with her at *Philippi*? And what cogent Proofs can he give us, that there were certainly Infants in the Family of the Jaylor, and that of *Stephanas*? Till he is pleas'd to inform us, we may as well take the Liberty to conjecture, that there were no Infants in those Houses, as he does to imagine there were some.

2. As for the Jaylor's Family, the Text declares, That Paul and Silas spake to him the Word of the Lord, V. 32. and to all that were in his House; and that he rejoiced, V. 34. believing in God with all his House; as well as that he V. 33. and all his were baptiz'd. So that Paul and Silas may be as well suppos'd to have preach'd to Infants in this Family, and these to have believ'd in God, and rejoic'd in their Conversation, as to have been baptiz'd by 'em. And if the Baptism of the Household of *Stephanas*, proves there were Infants in his Family who were baptiz'd by the Apostle Paul; the Declaration the same Apostle makes of this House I Cor. 16. of *Stephanas*, whom he calls the *First-Fruits of A-* 15. *chaia*, that they had *addicted themselves to the Ministry of the Saints*, as fully shews that those Infants employed themselves in this Ministry. For,

3. Because 'tis said, that *Cornelius* was one that Act. 10. 2. feared God with all his House; and of the noble Man whose Child was miraculously heal'd by our Saviour, that himself believed and his whole House; and of *Cris-* Joh. 4. 53. *pus* the chief Ruler of the Synagogue at *Corinth*, That he believed on the Lord with all his House; it may be

Chap. 2. as necessarily infer'd that there were Infants in these several Families, who *fear'd* God and *believ'd* in Christ, as that there were Infants baptiz'd in the above-mentioned Families, because the Heads of those Families are said to have been *baptized* together with their Houses.

4. If it could be clearly prov'd that there were Infants in all these Families, no necessary Consequence could be thence drawn, that those Infants were baptized. Since 'tis no uncommon Mode of Speech, in ordinary Conversation, to say that of a whole Family, which in strictness of sense belongs only to the greatest part and principal Members of it, especially when the thing asserted is such, as is not consistent with the Condition of the rest: Thus it is said, *Elkanah and all his House went up to offer to the Lord the yearly Sacrifice and his Vow*; and yet we are immediately told in the Context, that *Hannah went not up*, nor *Samuel* her young Child, who was not yet wean'd, *1 Sam. i. 21, 22.* If a whole Family is said to be very Penitent or Zealous on any Occasion, very Prudent or Charitable, common sense sufficiently leads us to exempt Infants in such an Account, because they are not capable of being mov'd by those Affections, and govern'd by, those Vertues that sway the Minds of Adult Persons. In like manner, when a Family is said to be *baptized*, and sometimes the Scripture expressly tells us the same Family *heard the Word, believed and rejoiced, and addicted* themselves to the Ministry of the Saints; and we are moreover inform'd by the Commission of Christ, and the Doctrine and Practice of the Apostles in the Execution of that Commission, that Faith and Repentance, of which Infants are incapable, were necessarily prerequisite in order to Baptism; it seems necessary to interpret the Baptism of a whole House, to signify the Baptism only of those Members of the Family, who were capable of being made Disciples by the Preaching of the Gospel, and were accordingly converted to the Christian Faith.

Mar. 28.

Mr. R. to strengthen his Assertion of Infant-Baptism, adds, that *St. Peter* tells his Auditory in his first Sermon, *The Promise is unto you, and to your Children*, *Acts 2. 39.* But I know not how the Citation
of

of this Text can answer his End, unless he can prove this to be a Promise of Baptism, or at least of somewhat that gives an immediate right to it, and the Children here mention'd to signify Infants, neither of which is attempted by him: and therefore there is no great Obligation on me to answer what he would insinuate, by mentioning this Passage; however I'll endeavour briefly to shew, that it will not give any good Countenance to Infant-Baptism. For,

1. The Context seems sufficiently to indicate, that the Promise here mentioned is the Promise of the Holy Spirit, spoken of *ver. 33.* which the Apostle Peter declares to have been fulfilled, it being pour'd forth on many on the day of Pentecost, and that in a very eminent manner, according to the Prediction of the Prophet *Joel*, which he cites at large, *ver. 16—21.*

2. This Promise is annexed to Repentance and Baptism, to engage the *Jews*, to whom the Apostle was preaching, to submit to those Duties, * as the Words of the Text plainly testify: *Repent and be baptized every one of you in the Name of Jesus Christ, for the Remission of Sins, and ye shall receive the Gift of the Holy Spirit: For the Promise is to you, and to your Children, &c.* And the Apostle Paul assures us, that this Promise of the Spirit was received thro Faith: *Gal. 3. 14.* So that unless Infants can be suppos'd capable of Repentance and Faith, there seems nothing in this Text to countenance their Baptism, or to shew that this Promise belongs to 'em.

3. There seems no reason to restrain the Term [Children] to Infants, since the *Jews* and their Children may well signify *themselves and their Posterity*, as the [Children of *Israel*] so frequently mentioned in Scripture, signifies *Israel's Posterity*, and not precisely the Infants of the twelve Tribes.

4. The Promise here mentioned is declared by the Apostle to appertain to *as many as God shall call*; which agrees well with what he had said before, when he annexed this Promise to Repentance and Baptism. And 'tis likely this was spoken to the *Jews*, and they men-

* See Dr. Hammond's Annotations on Act. 2. 38, 39.

Chap. 2. tion'd before the *Gentiles*, because the Gospel was order'd to be first offer'd to them to encourage their Repentance, and to prevent their Despair, tho' they had been the Betrayers and Murderers of the Lord of Life. Now with what reason can any one infer Infant-Baptism, from the hope the Apostle gives the *Jews*, that they and their Posterity should receive the Promise of the Holy Spirit, if they hearken'd to the Call of the Gospel, so as truly to repent, and submit to the Ordinance of Baptism? Were Infants capable of hearkning to this Call, or of repenting and subjecting themselves to Baptism, in hope of enjoying this Promise of the Effusion of the Holy Spirit? Can they have a right to a Conditional Promise, who don't perform the Condition of that Promise? Or are Promises, which are tender'd to a Nation and their Posterity under certain Conditions, which can't be perform'd but by the Adult, to be pleaded in favour of any of their Posterity, while in a state of Infancy, and so incapable of fulfilling those Conditions? Why may not the Adult also expect for themselves the Accomplishment of the same Promise, without fulfilling the Condition of it, as well as expect it for their Infants? And how many Promises as well as Commands are given in the Holy Scripture to the *Children of Israel*, which none ever yet imagin'd could be fulfill'd in them, or perform'd by them in a State of Infancy?

Mr. R. proceeds to tell us, that *neither an Infidel, Jew or Mahometan, nor their Children, while they continue such, may be admitted to Baptism*: which is very true; but he makes no very Logical distinction in his Enumeration of those who have no right to Baptism, when he ranks them under the three Names of *Infidels, Jews and Mahometans*: for by the first denomination, *viz.* that of *Infidels*, 'tis evident he means *Pagans*, as distinguish'd from *Jews and Mahometans*. Now Infidelity is as truly to be attributed to *Jews and Mahometans*, as to *Pagans*; and therefore being a general Term that sues them all, ought not to be made specific, as if it agreed only to these last. To call only the *Pagans* Infidels, seems to intimate that *Jews and Mahometans* are not so; whereas they are as

†

truly