

“ Lies, and not of the Holy and good Spirit of God ?” Chap. 4.

If Christ was the Author of this Doctrine of the Anabaptists, with which Mr. R. is so displeas'd, then all the noise he makes about the pretended Authors of it, on whom he bestows all this angry Rhetorick, comes to nothing. If some Men who have been guilty of any of the Crimes he mentions, have held this or any true Doctrine, their Knowledge may have aggravated their Guilt, but not lessen'd the Value of the Truth they knew. I would suppose Mr. R. here speaks only of the Anabaptists in *Germany*, of whom he treats in the latter part of his Book (because he says in a *Parenthesis*, in the Sequel he shall make it good) But if he means them alone, with what Justice can he speak thus of the Modern Anabaptists promiscuously with them, as he does in this and the next Page, and in many other Places? He puts this Question to them: “ Why should we reject the Communion of Saints, and follow them whose Principles are Heretical, whose Practices are immoral, and whom we believe guided by a Spirit of Error and Delusion? He had need tell us he speaks without Slander, when he takes such Measures as these to defame those whom he calls his Brethren. However in enumerating so many immoral Characters, he might have left out that of Mechanicks; for there is no great evil that I know of in being a Mechanick, unless every thing be a Crime in an Anabaptist.

He proceeds: “ This Wisdom descendeth not from above, but is Earthly, Sensual, Devilish. But the Wisdom that is from above, is first pure, then peaceable, gentle and easy to be entreated, full of Mercy and good Fruits, without Partiality, without Hypocrisy; and the Fruit of Righteousness is sown in Peace, of them that make Peace, *Jam.* 3. 14, 17, 18. Let the Anabaptists examine their own Consciences, whether they can claim this Heavenly Wisdom. Mr. R. had just before been calling 'em ignorant, and now he says this *Wisdom descends not from above*; I know not what he means by their Wisdom, unless it be their Doctrine, for there seems no good Connection between these

Words

Chap. 4.

Words and those before. And in the next Paragraph he asks them, if the Baptism of Infants is from Heaven? Himself supposing that it is from thence; so that by the Opposition he makes of his own Opinion to the Doctrine of the Anabaptists, it seems that he accounts the latter not *to descend from above*, but the former *to be from Heaven*. But he ought to be cautious how he calls that Doctrine *Earthly, Sensual and Devilish*, which has a good Foundation in the Word of God, as we have already made appear: If he means any heretical Doctrines that he has charg'd on them, I shall consider them in a fitter place, and desire Mr. R. at present to review the Texts of Scripture he has here cited (to use his own Words) *with a calm Mind and a serious Conscience*; and then (as he advises others) let him examine his own Conscience, *whether he can claim this Heavenly Wisdom*.

He now threatens the Anabaptists with a *Dilemma*;
 “ The *Dilemma* (says he) which Christ put to the
 “ Jews concerning the Baptism of John, *Mat. 21. 25.*
 “ may not unfitly be put to our Anabaptists. The
 “ Baptism of Infants, is it from Heaven or of Men?
 “ If from Heaven, why do you not practise it?
 “ Why do you gainsay it? If you say of Men,
 “ why should we believe you? The whole Church
 “ of Christ since the Apostle's time testify against you.
 “ Why should we forsake the Holy Catholick Church,
 “ that is guided by the Spirit of Truth? Why should
 “ we reject the Communion of Saints, and follow
 “ you, whose Principles are heretical, whose Practices
 “ are immoral, and whom we believe guided by a
 “ Spirit of Error and Delusion? If Mr. R. puts this
 Question to the Anabaptists, *The Baptism of Infants,*
is it from Heaven or of Men? he may be sure they'll
 answer *of Men*, whether he'll believe them or no,
 till he brings some Testimony from the Word of God,
 to prove it to be *from Heaven*. Nor has he yet prov'd
 it to have been practis'd by the Catholick Church ever
 since the time of the Apostles, or that the Church of
 Christ is so guided by the Spirit of Truth, that her
 Dictates are an infallible Rule to lead Men into all
 Truth. Till these things are set in a clear Light, the
 Anabaptists may well return him the Question, *The*
Baptism

Baptism of Infants, is it from Heaven or of Men? If of Men, why is he for the Practice of it? If from Heaven, why does he not prove it? Why should he be believed, when the Commission of Christ, the Practice of the Apostles and Primitive Christians, seem to testify against him? 'Tis well Mr. R. lets us know that he is of the Church of England in several Places of his Book, since he sometimes borrows such Arguments from the Church of Rome, as very little become a Protestant. For if we must depend on the Practice of the Church, to guide us into all Truth, we shall have no great occasion for the Scripture; but then we shall fall under the unhappy Necessity of turning over a Multitude of Authors, to know what has been the Universal Practice of the Church, unless Mr. R. will assure us, that the Universal Vogue of the Church now extant in the World will suffice us for a Rule; and even then we shall be at a mighty Loss again to know what is universally held by the Church, and what Course to take in those Matters, wherein the Sentiments of particular Churches (which make up the Universal) are opposite to each other. And a great Number of other Questions will need to be decided, to fix this pretended Rule of the Practice of the Church. Now our Author assures us, that the Anabaptists are a Company of illiterate Mechanicks, therefore it would be very hard to put 'em upon a research so very laborious to the Learned, but impossible to the Illiterate, to state this Rule; and if that could be done, it would be a difficult matter to convince 'em, that any Rule can be so good as that of the Holy Scripture; so that all Mr. R. says, will scarce make them put a less Value on their Bibles.


The Substance of his next Paragraph has been answer'd before, therefore I shall only make one Remark on it: He says, "When Peter baptized three thousand in one day, who embrac'd the Promises of the Gospel; Will any Man conclude they rejected their Children, &c? By the way, the Text does not tell him that Peter baptized them all; but I observe, there is no doubt to be made, that Mr. R. here grants the 3000, whose Baptism is spoken of in the second Chapter of the Acts of the Apostles, to have been

Chap. 4. Adult Persons, because he says they embraced the Promises of the Gospel, and distinguishes 'em from Infants, in saying, Will any Man conclude they rejected their Children? &c. And in the next Paragraph he endeavours to shew that Infants can't be sav'd without being added to the Church, which he thinks is done by Baptism. Now since the Text tells us only of 3000 Souls added to the Church; and Mr. R's Words plainly shew these were all Adult Persons, with what Colour can he pretend that all their Infants were admitted to Baptism at the same time? Were they admitted to Baptism and not added to the Church; when he makes being baptized, and being added to the Church, the same thing; or at least the latter, the necessary and immediate Consequence of the former? Or were they added to the Church together with the 3000 Adult Christians, and yet did not encrease the Number? If all that were baptized were added to the Church, and yet only 3000 Adult Persons were added, will any Man conclude that any Infants were baptized at this time? So that Mr. R. has by consequence granted, that no Infants were baptized with the 3000, in the second of the *Acts* of the Apostles, and yet presumes none will conclude so. If he is not willing to conclude according to his own Premises, I hope others may have the liberty to draw such a Conclusion for him.

His next Business is to shew more particularly how cruel the Anabaptists are to their Children, in denying 'em Baptism: this, according to him, is *as much as in them lies, to separate them from Christ, and as it were pluck them out of his Arms, offering them greater Injury than to dash them against the Stones; 'tis to deny them Church-Communion, and to deprive People of all sound hopes of their Salvation; for without Church-Communion where it can be had, he says he knows no Salvation.* This is to cut off Infants from the Church, like those who in their heat cut off a Tribe from Israel. And therefore in a pathetick manner he exhorts them to repent of their indiscreet and blind, if not malicious and proud, Zeal, drenching themselves with a Baptism of Tears for denying the Church the Baptism of Infants. In the next Paragraph he also declares, *That he can't without Astonish-*

Astonishment reflect on the Cruelty of the Antipadobaptists to their Children, and thanks God they have not the Power of exercising this Cruelty on other Children. And says, 'tis hard to say what account they will give to God at the last Tribunal, for their execrable Injury to their own Children: And that he believes the Jewish Woman, who in the Wars of Jerusalem killed her Child and eat it, will be more excusable, because she only killed the Body and that for Food, in a time of extreme Famine; but these kill the Soul in a time of Plenty, when all our Church-doors stand open, and the Font next the Door, to admit Infants into the Church's Communion.

'Tis easy for any one to see, that Mr. R. by these Expressions, and those of the like kind scatter'd up and down his Book, designs to render the Anabaptists odious, by representing them as guilty of the greatest Cruelty in destroying the Souls of their own Children; and that to prove this he proceeds on the following Principles: viz. 1. That baptism is absolutely necessary to Salvation, at least that there is no sound hope of the Salvation of those who die unbaptized: 2. That the Salvation or Damnation of Infants depends on the Will of their Parents, that they are saved if they present them to be baptized, but damn'd if they omit it; for without supposing these Principles, I know not what sense can be made of his Words: and yet the former of these Principles he condemns in the close of his first Chapter, and elsewhere explodes it as one of the Errors of the Anabaptists, tho we have shewn their Sentiments to be far from it. And for the latter Principle, 'tis most absurd, and highly injurious to the Honour of the Divine Grace and Mercy; nor does he attempt to make any proof of it: And yet unless these Principles be made good, his Accusation of Cruelty falls to the ground. Besides, he puts very hard things on the Anabaptists, in that one while he will allow Baptism to none but the Infants of Christian Parents, and yet at another time will have the Anabaptists bring their Infants to Baptism, tho themselves are not Christians in his esteem; or else he makes them barbarously cruel, and calls them to Repentance on that account. Must they repent of omitting

Chap. 4.  mitting that which, by his own Principles, ought not to be done? If they are not Christians themselves, what right have their Infants to Baptism? and if these have no right, where's the Crime in not admitting 'em to that to which they have no right? Nay, would it not rather be a Crime to bring 'em to an Ordinance, to which they have no Title? One would think Mr. R. and the Anabaptists should be agreed in this matter, tho on different Principles: He should be against the Baptism of their Infants, because he thinks the Parents are not Christians, as they are against the Baptism of their own Children, because they account 'em not qualified Subjects for that Ordinance.

But while he argues for Infant-Baptism, because he concludes it adds 'em to the Church, and against the Cruelty of the Anabaptists, because by not baptizing them, he supposes they cut them off from the Church; he forgets that they can't be cut off from the Church, if they were never added to it. Where's the Cruelty in not adding them to the Church by Baptism, if they were added to it before? And if they were never added to the Church, where's the Cruelty in cutting 'em off from that to which they were never join'd? When Mr. R. is at leisure, he may, if he thinks fit, try to reconcile these things together.

He farther argues, that " Infants are either
 " Christ's Disciples and Servants, or the Devil's Pu-
 " pils and Slaves. That they are Christ's Servants he
 " says, they (*i. e.* the Anabaptists) loudly deny;
 " that they are the Devil's Slaves, they are loth to
 " confess, but where shall we find a Medium? The
 Anabaptists have reason to think that Infants, even
 those that descend from believing Parents, *are by Na-*
ture Children of Wrath, even as others. They think
 it their Duty to pray for their Children, that they
 may become the Disciples and Servants of Christ, and
 to instruct them, as they grow capable of Instructi-
 on in the Principles and Duties of the Christian In-
 stitution; but they can't make a Judgment that they
 are the Disciples and Servants of Christ, till they
 make a credible Profession of his Doctrine, and are wil-
 ling to deny themselves, to follow and obey him, ac-
 cording

according to the Rule given us in the Holy Scripture, by which to judg of his Disciples and Servants; for Christ says, *Whosoever does not bear his Cross and come after him, cannot be his Disciple. And his Servants ye are whom ye obey* (says the Apostle) *whether of Sin unto Death, or of Obedience unto Righteousness.*

Chap. 4.
 Luke 14.
 27.
 Rom. 6. 16.

Mr. R. pursues his Design to expose the Cruelty of the Anabaptists, in the following Words: "When I see (says he) the Piety of some Jews, who brought little Children unto Christ, that he should put his Hands upon them and pray, *Mat. 19. 13.* When I see him rebuking his Disciples (as we do the *Anabaptists*) for opposing it; when I hear his Command on their behalf, *Suffer little Children to come unto me*: When I consider his Negative Inhibition to the *Antipædobaptist, and forbid them not*: When I remark the Argument he gives, *For of such is the Kingdom of Heaven*: When I read, he lays his Hands on them and blesteth them, nay both his Hands, giving them a double Blessing; I cannot without Astonishment reflect on the Cruelty of the *Antipædobaptists* to their Children, in denying 'em the initiating Ordinances of coming to Christ.

Here 'tis to be observ'd, that Mr. R. does not only take upon him to rebuke the Anabaptists, as Christ did his Disciples, and with much greater Severity, but turns Christ's Words to his Disciples against them too, when he says *Forbid them not*, speaking of the little Children that some were bringing to him. For Mr. R. says, *this Negative Inhibition* (so he terms it) *was to the Antipædobaptist*. I suppose he hardly grants that Christ's Disciples were *Antipædobaptists*, but pretends that what Christ said to his Disciples, may as well extend to those who deny Baptism to Infants. But how can this affect the Anabaptists, when there is nothing in the Text that intimates, that these Children were baptized, nor in either of the two other Evangelists *Mark* and *Luke*, who record the same Story? 'Tis evident that they were brought to Christ, that he laid his Hands on 'em and blessed 'em, not that he baptized them; nay we are expressly told, that *Jesus himself did not baptize*: Nor does Christ

John 4. 2

Chap. 4. order them to be brought to his *Apostles* that they might baptize them, but to *himself* that he might lay his Hands on them. And when our Saviour says of *such is the Kingdom of Heaven*, if he means the Kingdom of Glory belongs to such, 'tis a Principle the Anabaptists do not in the least deny, however Mr. R. misrepresents them: and if he means by the Kingdom of Heaven the Christian Church, they grant that those who resemble little Children in Docility, Humility, Innocence and the like Vertues, are interested in the Kingdom of Grace; for the word *τοῦτων* will very well bear this sense: and that which two of the Evangelists report our Saviour to have added at the same time, justifies this Interpretation, *Verily I say unto you, Whosoever shall not receive the Kingdom of God as a little Child, shall in no wise enter therein.* Nor can Mr. R. (I suppose) easily prove, because these Children received Imposition of Hands from Christ, that this is an initiating Ordinance to introduce Infants into the Church; neither would such an Attempt be consistent with his Affirmation in the next Paragraph, that the Holy Ghost hath left no other initiating Sacrament besides Baptism.

Luk. 18.
17.
Mar. 10.
15.

Mr. R. misquotes the Text when he says, he reads that *Jeremiah was sanctified from the Womb*, Jer. 1. 5. The Words are thus, *Before I formed thee in the Belly, I knew thee; and before thou camest forth out of the Womb, I sanctified thee, and I ordained thee a Prophet unto the Nations.* Now because this Prophet is said to have been sanctified before he was born, to signify God's Designation of him to the Office of a Prophet, must it needs follow that Infants have a right to Baptism? If *Jeremiah* was sanctified before his Birth, is it thence to be infer'd, that others are sanctified after the same manner? then they must be *ordain'd* Prophets too, as he is said to have been before his Birth. Or because he was sanctified in *one sense* before he was born; Does it follow that other unborn Infants are sanctified in *another*? And if this suppos'd Sanctification gives 'em an immediate Title to Baptism, why are they not baptized before they are born too?

Which brings to mind a Canon of the Council of *Chap. 4.*
Neocæsarea, held in the beginning of the fourth Cen-
 tury, by which it seems there were some in that time,
 who thought if a Woman with Child were baptized,
 the Child was to be accounted baptized as well as the
 Mother. The Canon thus determines * concerning a
Woman with Child, that she ought to be illuminated (i.
e. baptized) when she desires it; for in this there is no
Communion between the Woman with Child and the
Child she goes with, because the proper choice of each
Person should be discovered, and that by a Profession.

Upon which *Zonaras* thus comments †, “ The
 “ Canon says, Women with Child ought to be bap-
 “ zed when they desire it. And because some affirm’d
 “ that consequently the Child in the Womb is bap-
 “ zed with the Mother, and has no need to be bap-
 “ zed after it is born, lest it should seem to be twice
 “ baptized; those Words are added [*For in this*
 “ *there is no Communion between the Woman with Child,*
 “ *and the Child she goes with*] which is as much as to
 “ say, for she alone is counted worthy of Holy Bap-
 “ tism, and not the Child by means of her, because
 “ as the Canon says, the choice of each Person is re-
 “ quir’d by a Profession to become conformable to
 “ Christ; and by this ’tis discovered, whether they
 “ offer themselves to Holy Baptism with a willing

* Περὶ κυφορέσεως, ὅτι δεῖ φωτίζεσθαι, ὁπότε βέλεται.
 ἔδεν γὰρ ἐν τούτῳ κοινωνεῖ ἡ τέκνησα τῷ πλημένῳ· διὰ τὸ ἐκά-
 σε ἰδίαν τὴν προαίρεσιν τὴν ὅτι τῇ ὁμολογίᾳ δείκνυται.

† Ταῖς ἐν τῇ γαστρὶ φερέσας δεῖ βαπτίζειν, φησὶν ὁ κανὼν,
 ὅτε βέλονται· πινὼν δὲ λεγόντων, ὅτι λοιπὸν τὸ κυφορέμενον
 συμβαπτίζεσθαι τῇ μητρὶ, καὶ ἔχει αὐτὸ μετὰ τὸ γεννηθῆναι βαπ-
 τίζεσθαι, ἵνα μὴ δεῖ δευτέρῃ βαπτίζεσθαι, ἐπιμαρτυροῦν, ἔδεν γὰρ ἐν τούτῳ
 κοινωνεῖ ἡ τέκνησα τῷ τικτομένῳ, ἀντὶ τούτου, αὐτὴ γὰρ μόνη τῷ
 ἀγίῳ ἀξιῖται βαπτίσματι, καὶ ἔχει καὶ αὐτὴ διὰ μέσης αὐτῆς,
 ὅτι φησὶν, ὅτι τῇ ὁμολογίᾳ συντάττεσθαι πρὸ χειρῶν ἢ ἐκάσε
 προαίρεσις ἀπαιτεῖται, καὶ ὅτι αὐτῆς δείκνυται, εἰ πνεύματι
 πρῶσι τῷ ἀγίῳ βαπτίσματι, ἐπεὶ δὲ τὸ ἔμβρυον ἐσφραγίσται
 προαίρεσως, ἔδεν βαπτίζεσθαι δευτέρῃ, ὥστε αὐτὸ χρῆσι αὐτῆς
 βαπτίσματος, ὅτε προαιρεῖσθαι δύνησεται. *Zonar. Comment.*
 in Can. VI. Concil. Neocæsar.

Chap. 4.

“ Mind. Now seeing the unborn Child is not capable
 “ of Choice, neither may we account it bapti-
 “ zed ; so that it will afterwards need Baptism, when
 “ it comes to be capable of choosing.

I am much mistaken if the Reason mention'd in this Canon, and explained in the Commentary upon it, is not as valid against the Admission of New-born, as of Unborn Infants to Baptism : Since they are equally incapable of making a choice, and a Profession of the Christian Religion ; which are here sufficiently declared to be necessary to the Participation of that Ordinance.

But to return to Mr. R. As to what was said to *Zechariah*, that *John the Baptist should be filled with the Holy Ghost from his Mother's Womb*, Luke 1. 15. It was an extraordinary Promise concerning an extraordinary Prophet, and will by no means reach the Case of other Infants, concerning whom we have no such Revelation ; nor if we had, would it authorize any Man to baptize them without a Divine Institution. What he adds of *Samuel's* worshipping the Lord in *Shiloh*, and ministring unto the Lord before *Eli*, shews that Children ought to be early instructed in Religion, but will hardly prove Infant-Baptism or their Church Communion, since even the Circumcision of Infants under the Law (as we have shewn before) proves not their Title to Baptism under the Gospel. What he adds of *Josiah's* reforming Religion at eight years old, is a Mistake ; for he was eight years old when he began to reign, and in the 12th year of his Reign he began to reform *Judah* and *Jerusalem* ; so that he was in the 20th year of his Age when he began that Reformation. How much this makes for the Cause Mr. R. defends, 'tis easy to judg. Nor does *Timothy's* Knowledge of the Holy Scriptures from a Child, which he alledges to support it, make much more to his purpose ; for if his Knowledge of the Holy Scriptures should be allowed to have qualified him for Baptism, then 'tis to be hop'd Mr. R. will grant that a Knowledge of the Holy Scripture at least is still necessary to qualify Children for that Ordinance. And when he is advanc'd thus far, it will be proper to discourse with him about the degree of Knowledge sufficient to de-

2 Chron.
34. 1, 2, 3.

2 Tim. 3.
15.

denominate a Child a Disciple of Christ. He next Chap.4. urges, viz. that the Holy Child *Jesus* in his Infancy was brought into the Temple by his Parents, to present him to the Lord, *Luke 2. 22.* but the following Verse may satisfy him it was to fulfil that Law, which ordained that every Male that opened the Womb, should be called Holy to the Lord; which I suppose he'll grant was a Ceremonial Law, long since abrogated and nail'd to the Cross of Christ: and he knows our Saviour was not baptized before he was Adult. After this he declares he "can't be so uncharitable, "as to judg Infants incapable of Church-Communion, "having so many Instances of eminent Kings, Prophets "and Bishops, nay the Holy *Jesus* himself, dedicated to "the Lord by his Parents. And it were to be wish'd, that he who pretends to be so charitable to Infants, to judg 'em capable of Baptism and Church-Communion on such Proofs as these, would not be so uncharitable as to call the Anabaptists by so many ill Names, because they are not sagacious enough to see the Force of his Reasoning; especially since after all this Noise of Cruelty, and what he presently adds of *tempting Heaven,* and *running the hazard of the Salvation of such Children* as are unbaptized, and of *God's direful Indignation* to themselves, to fright the Parents; he grants that 'tis a *disputable Point.* And where's his wonderful Charity then to contend with so much Bitterness, about what himself confesses to be a *disputable Point?* Is the matter sometimes so clear, that it can be nothing but the Obstinacy of the Anabaptists that hinders their Conviction; and is it at last so dubious, that 'tis become a *disputable Point* even in Mr. R's account? One would hope he begins to be sensible of the Weakness of his own Arguments, but he's soon warm'd again with his returning Passions; and in the next Breath they that differ from him in this *disputable matter,* are *Phanatick Apostates,* and *noisy illiterate Mechanicks.* He concludes this Chapter, in giving us an account of God's Anger against *Moses,* for *omitting to circumcise his Son at the Persuasion of his Wife;* and infers from thence the great Hazard of refusing Baptism to Infants: and I close my Answer to it with this Remark, That God is so jealous of the Honour of his

Chap. 5. his Worship, that there is no more Reason to expect Impunity, in offering him that Religious Service which he has not required at our hands, than in omitting that which he has commanded; and as *Moses* sin'd in neglecting to do what God had ordain'd, so they are not imocent, who are forward to substitute their own Inventions in the room of his Precepts.

C H A P. V.

Reflections on Mr. R's fourth Chapter, entitled, Of the Catabaptists, and the impious Consequences of denying their former Baptism.

MR. R. not content, that the People against whom he writes, should pass thro the World without variety of Names, among others gives 'em that of *Catabaptists*; and this Chapter is especially destin'd to describe them under that Name, which he tells us *Chap. 2.* was used by the *German* Writers. He knows (I suppose) that hard Names go a great way to excite monstrous Ideas in the Minds of some People.

He introduces the *Catabaptists*, as he is now pleas'd to call 'em, objecting against somewhat he had said before against the iteration of Baptism, after this manner:
 " But saith the *Catabaptist*, those who have been baptiz'd in Infancy, were not baptized at all; this Baptism they must renounce and be rebaptized, otherwise they can't be sav'd. And by this Representation one might think these *Catabaptists* a People very absurd and inconsistent with themselves; but why they should for that be the Objects of Mr. R's Averſation, is another Question, since he makes 'em reason so much in his own Method; first he brings 'em in saying, *those who have been baptized in Infancy were not baptized at all*; and in the very next words, *that they must renounce their Baptism and be rebaptized.* Sure these *Catabaptists* are very unreasonable, to oblige those Persons to be

be rebaptized, who have never been baptized at all, and to make this Rebaptization necessary to their Salvation too. And if they talk at this rate, he may well cry out, as he does in the following words, O horrible! But if there be any occasion of Horror in the case, it rises from his sense, rather than from their Sentiments. What he means in the Words ensuing this Exclamation, "That the High Way to Damnation should be made the means of Salvation, the Denial of God the Way of seeing his Face, and the Road to Hell the narrow Path to Heaven; I know not, unless he would make the Opinion of the Incapacity of Infants duly to receive the Ordinance of Baptism, and that of the Obligation of the Adult to submit to it, to be the *High Way to Damnation, and the Road to Hell*. But I wish he would consider, whether Infant-Baptism be the *narrow Path* to Heaven, as he insinuates, or whether a Presumption of their having been made *Members of Christ, Children of God, and Inheritors of the Kingdom of Heaven*, by Baptism in their Infancy, has not been of very ill Consequence to many Adult Persons, by making the Path to Heaven seem less narrow than Christ represents it; and whether he uses that Charity that becomes a Christian, in suggesting, that they *deny God, are in the Road to Hell, and in the High Way to Damnation*, who can't find Authority from the Word of God for Infant-Baptism, and therefore are baptized when they believe and repent, as the same Divine Word plainly directs.

To confirm his uncharitable Censure, he tells us: " 'Tis the first Lesson that the Devil teaches in the School of the Exorcist, that the Witch-Profelyte must first renounce her Baptism, before she can be a fit Member for his dark Society; and attempts to draw a Parallel of this Lesson of the Devil, and that of the *Catabaptist* about the Renunciation of Baptism. And says moreover, " As the Witch is said to read the Lord's Prayer backwards, so must we say backwards the Articles of our Baptismal Stipulation, before we can according to their Doctrine (*i. e.* of the *Catabaptists*) become Members of their heretical Society. I must confess I am very

Chap. 5.

Mat. 7. 13,
14.

Chap. 5.

ignorant of the Devil's Ceremonies used in the School of the Exorcist, and of the way of making Witch-Profelytes (as our Author has it) nor do I see that all his Skill in those Infernal Mysteries, will excuse him from Weakness of Argument as well as want of Charity, in making such a dark Comparison as this. And when I speak of his Skill in those Mysteries of Exorcism, I would not have it thought that I take him for a Conjuror: But I suppose his intemperate Zeal leads him to all Quarters, to find Arguments against the poor Anabaptists, and he seems to have resolved like him in the Poet,

Flectere si nequeo Superos, Acheronta movebo.

Those of the *Romish* Communion may talk to us of the wonderful Virtue and Efficacy of their Crosses, Reliques, Holy Water, and the rest of their Mystical Ammunition against the Devil and all his Works, a long time, before we should think our selves oblig'd to believe 'em; because the Word of God gives no Countenance to their Superstitious Practices: And the Anabaptists can't easily be persuaded, that Infant-Baptism is so powerful a Charm against the Devices of Satan, that *Men can't be fit Instruments for the Devil's Service*, without having formally renounc'd it. The *Romanists* indeed, who make Exorcism one of the Rites appertaining to Baptism, and pretend to conjure the Devil out of those who are to be baptized, are not to be wonder'd at, if they think a Man can't be a *fit Instrument for the Devil's Service*, till he gives Satan leave to repossess him, by a Renunciation of that Baptism, at the Celebration of which he is suppos'd to have been cast out. But one would not think that Mr. R. being a Protestant, should have any regard to the Charms of Popish Exorcists, much less that he should ascribe that to Infant-Baptism as practis'd by Protestants, which is superstitiously attributed to the Exorcism of the Papists. And if it were an invincible Charm against Witchcraft, why should it not be as efficacious against other Crimes, unless Mr. R. thinks a Man can't become a fit Instrument for the Devil's Service, any other way than by becoming a Conjuror?

But

But how great a Defence soever he supposes Infant-Baptism may be to any one against the Powers of Hell, 'tis certain he will not prove the Anabaptists to be in a Confederacy with the Devil, and to act like so many Exorcists (as he is pleased to represent 'em) in opposing it, while there is no Institution in the Divine Word for the Practice of it. And they have as little reason to fear they shall be charg'd with Witchcraft on this account, as our Author himself has for the Invention of this subtle Argument against them. But to proceed,

He begins the next Paragraph with these Words,
 " In our Baptismal Offices (says he) whether of
 " Infants or of those of riper years, is a Pro-
 " mise on Christ's Part, and on our Part. That
 " on Christ's Part is, that by his initiating Sacra-
 " ment we be made *Members of Christ, Children of*
 " *God, and Inheritors of the Kingdom of Heaven:*
 " On our part, *We renounce the Devil and all his*
 " *Works, the Poms and Vanities of this wicked World,*
 " *and all the sinful Lusts of the Flesh.* And we pro-
 " mise that *we shall believe all the Articles of the*
 " *Christian Faith, and that we will keep God's Holy*
 " *Will and Commandments, and walk in the same all the*
 " *Days of our Lives.*

What Mr. R. means by the *Baptismal Offices*, is easy to understand by his following Words above-recited, taken out of the Catechism of the Church of *England*, which also refer to what is said in the Office of Baptism in the Book of Common Prayer. And methinks he speaks, as if this Office of Baptism at least were of Divine Authority; and equal to the Old and New Testament, in telling us what Promises Christ makes in it to Infants, as well as to Adult Persons when baptized. For my part I know of no Promises of Christ, but what are contain'd in the Holy Scripture, nor of any Authority the Composers of Liturgies have to apply any one Promise of Christ to Infant-Baptism. Our Saviour never annexes a Promise to any Act which he has not requir'd. And as to the Promises Mr. R. mentions as made by Infants when baptiz'd, to renounce the Devil and his Works, &c. they are incapable of entering into such Engagements. And what-

Chap. 5.

whatever Obligation is upon them to devote themselves to the Service of Christ when Adult, it does not arise from any Promise they made in Infancy, but from the Authority of the Divine Commands; for the Vow of their Sureties could not bind their Consciences. Every Man ought to pay his own Vows, supposing them to be lawful and possible; and to vow and promise what is not in our Power to perform, is great Temerity. And the Vow of one Person can't bind another, without his Consent to take the same Obligation upon him; because this would be contrary to the Nature of a Vow, which is a voluntary, solemn Promise to God, with which a Man binds his own Soul. And to this purpose I may cite the Words of the Learned Bishop *Sanderfon*: “ * In personal Obligations (says he) no Man is bound without his own Consent——And a little after—a Spiritual Obligation, which is in the Conscience, must needs be personal, as every Man's Conscience is his own; and such an Obligation cannot pass into another Person.

If therefore the Vow or Promise of the Sureties is made without the Consent of the Infant, and consequently cannot bind his Conscience; he can't be said to break that Vow which he never made; and if when he becomes Adult, he refuses solemnly to dedicate himself to the Service of Christ, 'tis a great Sin, but not that of Perjury, as some pretend, for the Breach of a Vow supposed to be made in Infancy. But if he desires Baptism among the Anabaptists, they are so far from putting him upon breaking any Vows and Promises he has really made, to renounce the Devil, the Vanities of the World, and Lusts of the Flesh, to keep God's Holy Commandments, and to adhere to the Articles of the Christian Faith; that they will not admit him to that Ordinance, without a very so-

* In personalibus nemo ligatur sine proprio Consensu——
Obligationem Spiritualem quæ est in Conscientia necesse est esse personalem, sicut est sua cuique Conscientia propria, & quæ non possit transire in aliam personam. *Sanderfon de Juramento Præf. 4. Scil. 9.*

solemn Promise and Profession to the same purpose; for they account *the Answer of a good Conscience* very necessary to the Candidates of Baptism. So that Mr. R. does 'em wrong, in charging them as if they obliged Christians in effect to cancel the Articles of the Covenant betwixt Christ and them, to renounce their Membership with him, their Relation to God as his Children, and their Right to the Inheritance of the Kingdom of Heaven, &c. 'Tis strange that Mr. R. should make the Anabaptists so very absurd as to make it necessary, in effect, to renounce those Articles of Christianity, that Covenant and those Religious Promises, without the making of which they count none qualified for Baptism, and yet that he should strenuously plead for Baptism to be administered to those who never took such Obligations, nor are capable of taking 'em upon 'em: 'Tis not hard to judg, whose Principles appear to have the most awful regard to the Solemnity of a Covenant with Christ and of such Promises, and on whose Minds such federal Transactions are likely to make the deepest Impression. This Gentleman affects to make monstrous Pictures, and then pretends to be frightened at them, that he may amuse other People; and therefore he closes this Paragraph with a pathetick *Apostrophe*:
 " Tremble O Heavens, and be amazed O Earth, at
 " the impious Consequences of such Doctrine and
 " Practice!

But this Complaint ends not here, for he immediately pretends that to become an Anabaptist, is *consequently to renounce the Holy Trinity, and to turn Atheists or Arians, Jews or Mahometans*; and the Reason he renders for it, is, that *the Holy Trinity*, into whose Name Infants are baptized, is a *Witness of their Baptism*, the Force of which Argument I cannot at present comprehend. Does the Baptism of an Adult Person into the Name of the Sacred Trinity, according to the Command of Christ, suppose a Renunciation of the Blessed Trinity, and of the Doctrine of Christ? Or can he who calls in question the Validity of Infant-Baptism, because he finds no Divine Institution of it, be justly said to renounce the Trinity? and because he supposes the Name of the Sacred *Three* has been misapplied to an Act that wanted Divine Au-

Chap. 5.
 1 Pec. 3.
 21.

Chap. 5. Authority ; is it a Renunciation of the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, to submit to an Ordinance perform'd in their Name, according to their Prescription ?

He asks whether there *are two Gods, one worship'd by the Universal Church, the other by the Anabaptists* ; as if Men could not differ about the Administration of an Ordinance, without worshipping different Gods. And again, *Is the Sacred individual Trinity* (says he) *divideable between them and us* ? As if their Arguments about Baptism, tended to divide the Trinity between the Anabaptists and Pædobaptists, when there is nothing like it in the Controversy ; for both Parties agree that this Ordinance is to be administered in the Name of the Father, of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit, and use the same Words when they pretend to baptize, and dispute only about the Subjects of it, and the Mode of its Administration. Yet after this he has these Words, “ But these Hereticks divide the Trini-
“ ty, are in Profession *Arians*, denying the Di-
“ vinity of the Eternal Word, and in rebaptizing us
“ would make us like themselves. By which 'tis obvious, he designs first to make the Anabaptists pass for Enemies to the Divinity of Christ, and then to make this the Reason of their pretended Rebaptism, *viz.* to make their Profelytes renounce the Doctrine of the Trinity, and submit to be baptized into the *Arian* Faith.

Now with what Forehead can Mr. R. advance such a Slander as this in a Nation, where the Anabaptists are so well known, and where their Principles have been so plainly declar'd to the World, in the Confessions of Faith, which have been publish'd by so great Numbers of 'em ; the Reader may for his Satisfaction consult, if he pleases, that *Confession of Faith*, which I had occasion to cite before, *Chap. 8. Sect. 2.* where they say, “ The Son of God, the second Person in
“ the Holy Trinity, being Very and Eternal God,
“ the Brightness of the Father's Glory, of one Sub-
“ stance and equal with him ; who made the World,
“ who upholdeth and governeth all things he hath
“ made ; did when the Fulness of Time was come, take
“ upon him Man's Nature, with all the Essential Pro-
“ perties

“ perties and common Infirmities thereof, yet with-
 “ out Sin, being conceived by the Holy Spirit in the
 “ Womb of the Virgin *Mary* ; the Holy Spirit
 “ coming down upon her, and the Power of the most
 “ High overshadowing her ; and so was made of a
 “ Woman, of the Tribe of *Judah*, of the Seed of
 “ *Abraham* and *David*, according to the Scriptures,
 “ So that two whole perfect and distinct Natures
 “ were inseparably join'd together in one Person, with-
 “ out Conversion, Composition or Confusion ; which
 “ Person is Very God and Very Man, yet one Christ,
 “ the only Mediator between God and Man. And
 Chap. II. which is entituled, *Of God and of the Holy*
Trinity, Sect. 3. they say, “ In this Divine and Infi-
 “ nite Being there are three Subsistences, the Father,
 “ the Word (or Son) and Holy Spirit, of one Sub-
 “ stance, Power and Eternity, each having the whole
 “ Divine Essence, yet the Essence undivided : the Fa-
 “ ther is of none, neither Begotten nor Proceeding ;
 “ the Son is Eternally begotten of the Father ; the
 “ Holy Spirit proceeding from the Father and the
 “ Son. All Infinite without beginning, therefore but
 “ one God, who is not to be divided in Nature, and
 “ Being ; but distinguish'd by several peculiar Relative
 “ Properties and Personal Relations ; which Doctrine
 “ of the Trinity is the Foundation of all our Com-
 “ munion with God, and comfortable Dependance on
 “ him.

Mr. R. at the Conclusion of his fourth Chapter,
 accounts *what he has said of the Catabaptist is very se-*
vere ; but adds, that he thinks “ it a *real Truth*, a
 “ necessary Consequence, and ought to be a just Consi-
 “ deration to a tender Conscience, that is cautious of
 “ playing fast and loose with those so Holy and Sa-
 “ cramental Institutions.

He has Reason indeed to think what he has said is
 very severe ; and if it be very severe, why would he
 use this Severity against those, whom he affects one
 while to own as his Brethren, tho at another time he
 makes them the Enemies of Christ ? And does he
 suppose the Name of the Anabaptists so little worth,
 and his own Reputation so irreproachable, that he
 may venture to cast the most scandalous Reflections on

Chap 6. *W*'em with Success; and that he shall gain a general Credit in the World to what he says, tho he confesses he knows not the certainty of what he positively advances, but barely *thinks* 'tis true? Must the Reputation of his Neighbours lie at the Mercy of this Gentleman's Supposition, when himself acknowledges he is very severe to 'em? I know not which is more to be wondered at, that Air of Confidence Mr. R. puts on, in affirming these very severe things of the Anabaptists without Reason, or the Air of Modesty and Caution he affects, in owning himself very severe, and in saying, he *thinks* what he has said is a real Truth. While he makes what he has said a just Consideration to *caution tender Consciences of playing fast and loose with Holy Sacramental Institutions*; I only wish he would have so just a Consideration for his own Advice, as to take that Caution to himself, which he is pleas'd to give to other People.

C H A P. VI.

An Answer to Mr. R's fifth Chapter, which treats, Of Dipping.

HE begins his fifth Chapter with these Words: "As 'tis peculiar to them to deny Baptism to Infants, so the Mode of Administration is proper only to them, which they say must be by Dipping. If this Gentleman means by this dark Sentence, that the right Mode of the Administration of Baptism is to be found only among the Anabaptists, why does he contend with them? If he mentions this as their Assertion, why does he like to express it as his own? As if he chose to lay aside common sense, as he advises them to lay aside Learning in this Chapter. He tells us Dipping is a Crotchet, newly invented in their giddy Brains, and yet three or four Lines below owns that he can't trace the Original of this Opinion; but he is resolved to find out what he can't trace, for in the next Words he tells us, he "must attribute it to the
"1g.