

THE CHARACTER OF THE BEAST

OR

THE FALSE CONSTITUTION OF THE CHURCH

Discovered

IN CERTAIN PASSAGES BETWIXT Mr. R. CLIFTON

& John Smith, concerning true Christian baptism of New Creatures or New borne Babes in

Christ; and false Baptism of Infants born after the Flesh.

Referred to two Propositions.

1. That infants are not to be baptized.
2. That Antichristians converted are to be admitted into the true Church by baptism.

Revelat. 13.16. And he made all both small & great, rich & poor, free and bond, to receive a mark in their right hand or in their foreheads.

Revelat. 14. 9-10. If any man receive the mark in his forehead, or in his hand, the same shall drink of the wine of the wrath of God.

Revelat. 21. 5. And he that sat upon the Throne said: Behold: I make all things new.

Printed. 1609.

TO EVERY ONE THAT LOVETH THE

Truth in sincerity Salutations.

It may be thought most strange, that a man should oft times change his Religion: & it cannot be accounted a commendable quality in any man to make many alterations and changes in such weighty matters, as are the cases of conscience; but if constancy be commendable in any thing, it is most commendable in the best things which is Religion: & if inconstancy be worthy reproof in matters of inferior estimation, it is much more blameable in matter of Salvation; In respect whereof the wisest & most Religious men have been always most constant in their profession & faith; & inconstant persons cannot escape the deserved imputation of folly or weakness of judgment therein.

This must needs be true, (& we confess it) if one condition to be admitted, that the Religion which a man change be the truth: For otherwise to change a false Religion is commendable, & to retain a false Religion is damnable. For a man of a Turk to become a Jew, of a Jew to become a Papist, of a Papist to become a Protestant are all commendable changes though they all of them befall one & the same person in one year, nay, if it were in one month: So that not to change Religion is evil simply: & therefore that we should fall from the profession of Puritanism to Brownism, & from Brownism to true Christian baptism, is not simply evil or reprobable in itself, except it be proved that we have fallen from true Religion: If we therefore being formerly deceived in the way of Pedobaptistry, now do embrace the truth in the true Christian Apostolic baptism: Then let no man impute this as a fault unto us. This therefore is the question: whether the baptism of infants be lawful, yea or nay: & whether persons baptized being infants must not renounce that false baptism, & assume the true baptism of Christ: which is to be

administered upon persons confessing their faith and their sins. This being the controversy now betwixt us, & the Separation commonly called Brownists: For the glory of God, the manifesting of the truth to our own nation, & the destruction of the man of sin, we have thought good to publish this present treatise, wherein the whole cause is handled: Let the indifferent reader judge of the whole & give sentence without partiality: & I doubt not but he shall be constrained to give glory to God in acknowledging the error of baptizing infants, to have been a chief point of Antichristianism, & the very essence & constitution of the false Church, as is clearly discovered in this treatise. Now happily some man will wish that the controversy had been with the Rabbis of the Separation, & not with Mr. Clifton whom they calculate to be a weak man, unable to deal in so great a controversy: well, let the Reader take notice, that although it be Mr. Clifton's pen, yet it is not only Mr. Clifton's cause & defense, but his allegations & reasons are the best plea of the greatest Rabbis themselves: & if they think that they can say better they may now speak, for by publishing answer to their reasons: we do challenge all the Separation in special to the combat. Be it known therefore to all the Separation that we account them in respect of their constitution to be as very an harlot as either her Mother England, or her grandmother Rome is, out of whose loins she came: & although once in our ignorance we have acknowledged her a true Church yet now being better informed we revoke that our erroneous judgment & protest against her, as well for her false constitution, as for her false ministry, worship, & government: The true constitution of the Church is of a new creature baptized into the Father, the Son, & the Holy Ghost: The false constitution is of infants baptized: we profess therefore that all those Churches that baptize infants are of the same false constitution: & all those Churches that baptize the new creature, those that are made Disciples by teaching, men confessing their faith and their sins, are of one true constitution: & therefore the Church of the Separation being of the same constitution

with England & Rome, is a most unnatural daughter to her mother England, & her grandmother Rome, who being of the self same genealogy & generation, (that of the prophet being true of her, as is the Mother so is the daughter) she dare notwithstanding most impudently wipe her own mouth, & call her mother & grandmother adulteresses. Herein therefore we do acknowledge our error, that we retain the baptism of England which gave us our constitution, did call our mother England an harlot, & upon a false ground made our Separation from her: For although it be necessary that we separate from England, yet no man can Separate from England as from a false Church, except he also do separate from the baptism of England, which giveth England her constitution: & whosoever doth retain the baptism of England doth withal retain the constitution of England, & cannot without sin call England an harlot as we have done: & this we desire may be well minded of all that Separate from England: For if they retain the baptism of England, viz: the baptism of infants as true baptism, they cannot separate from England as from a false Church, must needs Separate from the baptism of England, as from false baptism. For the baptism of England cannot be true & to be retained, & the Church of England possibly be false except the baptism be false, unless a true constitution could be in a false Church which is as impossible as for light to have fellowship with darkness. It is impossible that contraries or contradictions should be both true: & so it is impossible that a false Church should have a true constitution or a true baptism. To say thus:

England hath a false constitution.

England hath a true baptism, is as much to say thus.

England hath a false constitution.

England hath a true constitution, which is to contradict:

But the Separation they say England hath a false constitution, & is a false Church & to be Separated from: & yet they say also: England hath a true baptism (that is a true constitution) which is not to be Separated from. For a true constitution & true baptism are one & the same: So is a false constitution & a false baptism. So that the speeches & actions of the Separation are contradictory in this particular. Finally, they that defend the baptism of infants cannot with any truth or good conscience separate from England as from a false Church though they may separate for corruptions & they that do separate from England as from a false church but of necessity separate from the baptism of England, & account the baptism of England false, & so account the baptism of infants false baptism. Therefore the Separation must either go back to England, or go forward to true baptism: & all that shall be in time to come Separate from England must separate from the baptism of England, & if they will not separate from the baptism of England there is no reason why they should separate from England as from a false Church: & this is more at large proved in the second question of this discourse, whether the reader is to be referred. Now concerning this point of baptizing infants we do profess before the L. & before all men in sincerity & truth that it seemeth unto us the most unreasonable heresy of all Antichristianism: for considering what baptism is, an infant is no more capable of baptism then is any unreasonable or insensible creature: For baptism is not washing with water, but it is the baptism of the Spirit, the confession of the mouth, & the washing with water. How then can any man without great folly wash with water which is the least and last of baptism, one that is not baptized with the Spirit, & cannot confess with the mouth. Or how is it baptism if one be so washed? Now that an infant cannot be baptized with the Spirit is plain, 1 Pet. 3:21, where the Apostle said that the baptism of the Spirit is the question of a good conscience into God, & Heb. 10.22, where the baptism which is inward is called the sprinkling of the heart from an evil conscience. Seeing therefore infants

neither have an evil conscience, nor the question of a good conscience, nor the purging of the heart, for all these are proper to actual sinners, hence it follows that infants' baptism is folly & nothing. Again: John's baptism was the baptism of repentance. Infants have not repentance, and therefore cannot have the baptism of repentance. That infants cannot have repentance is evident, seeing repentance is knowledge of sin by the Law, sorrow for sin by the gospel, mortification of sin & new obedience, all which are as much in the basin of water, as in the infant baptized. Now I confess the Pedobaptists have many shows of reason for the maintenance of their heresy, & one man shapeth them into one form, another man into an other, as every man's wit & learning teacheth him, but indeed they are all built upon the self same sandy foundations, the resting of some places of Scriptures: all which (in a manner) are discovered in some measure in this treatise: whereby the reader may perceive the manifest perverting of the scriptures from their true sense. Now because men call for antiquity, & except they see antiquity they will not believe, though the Scriptures be the most ancient, I have thought good therefore to propound two pregnant testimonies of Antiquity (besides that which is alledged in the page 30 & 31. of this treatise) against baptism of infants: that men may know that this truth also hath her footsteps among the Fathers.

Tertullianus lib. De baptismo adversus Quintillam hath these words:

Then which is nothing is more plain.

Itaque pro cujusque personae conditione, dispositione, etiam aetate cunctatio baptismi vtilior est precipue tamen circa parvulos: Quid enim necesse est, si non tam necesse, sponsores etiam periculo ingeri? Qui & ipsi per mortalitatem destituere promissiones suas possunt, & proventu malae indolis falli. Ait quidem dominus. Nolite illos prohibere ad me venire: veniant ergo dum adolescent: veniant, dum discunt, dum quo veniant docentur: Fiant Christiani cum

Christum nosse potuerint. Quid festinate innocens aetas ad remissione peccatoru. Cautius agitur in secularibus vt cui substantia terrene non creditor, divina credatur. Norint petere salutem, vt petenti dedisse videaris.

That is to say in English.

Therefore to defer & not to hasten baptism is more profitable for the condition, disposition, & age of every person: but especially as concerning young children. For what necessity is there to bring suertyes into danger for the baptizing of infants, if there be no such necessity of hastening the baptizing of infant. Seeing the sureties oftentimes are disabled to perform their promise both by reason of mortality, & of the evil disposition of some children when they come to years, for whom they promised in baptism. Indeed the Lord saith, forbid them not to come unto me: Therefore let them come to Christ but let them come when they are grown, when they learn, & when they are taught to what they come. Let them by baptism be made Christians when they can know Christ by instruction. Why doth the innocent age hasten to the remission of sins? We deal more safely in worldly matters. Shall we commit heavenly things to young children unto whom we dare not commit our earthly substance? Let them first know how to ask salvation that so we may seem to give to him that asketh.

Euseb. Ecclesi. Hist. Lib. 10. Chap. 15.

Athanasius his baptizing of children in sport that answered according to the custom of the Catechumeni, is approved by Alex. Bb. Of Alexa. & his Clerks: whence it is to be noted that these children baptized by Athanasius were unbaptized, & yet knew the manner of baptism, as being children born in the Church. So that by this place & all other places of the Ecclesi. Hist. where like mention is made of the children of Christians first catechized & then baptized, it may easily be discerned that baptisme of infants was not yet universally received, but by little & little

prevailed, as other Antich. Heresies have done: in respect whereof Origen, August, Ciprian, & all the Papists with one consent acknowledge it a tradition of the Church.

And thus much for the Testimonies of Antiquity which hereafter shall be produced more plentifully upon further occasion offered: if the Separation or any other dare adventure the trial of the matter out of Antiquity: but there is one, & indeed but one argument which the separation principally stand upon, & that is the covenant which say they if it be answered they must needs yield unto the truth: now although this Argument be answered in this writing even to the satisfaction of every indifferently minded man that loveth and seeketh the knowledge of the truth more than the defense & justification of error. Yet seeing many things are variably alledged concerning the covenants made with Abraham and his seeds, & concerning Abraham's Fatherhood & concerning circumcision which is called a seal of the righteousness of Faith. I have thought good to refer these particulars to a more full discourse entertained upon occasion with another of the Mrs. of the separation, not doubting but very shortly through God's goodness that treatise all shall be published, concerning the foresaid particulars of the covenants or Test. & other matters thereto appertaining. In the meantime I desire the reader to make use of this writing, & to read without prejudice or partiality, & I doubt not but that through God's mercy much light of truth shall shine in his heart even by this present discourse: & for the separation who are the stiffest & most obstinate adversaries of this truth of the Lord I could wish as the Tyrant wished concerning the people of Rome, that all their heads were joined into one, & all their strength comprised into one writing, that with the sword of the Spirit it might be smitten off at once, that so we might have an end of this controversy, & that we might not be troubled & charged with the writing & printing of many books. Howsoever it be, we profess our readiness to employ our time & cost for the manifestation of the truth, & we desire the Sep. that the will

not in craftiness withdraw from the combat, as hitherto they have done in the matter of translation, wors. & the Presbytery. But we require them in the fear of the Lord that seeing they have suffered so much for so much truth as they profess, they would not bow subtly (being guilty in their consciences of their disability to defend their errors) draw back, & pretend excuses as they do. But we require them, nay we charge them, yea we challenge them to the defense of their errors. Lo, we protest against thee, to be a false Church falsely constituted in the baptism of infants & their own unbaptized estate. We protest against them to have a false worship of reading books. We protest against them to have a false government of a triformed Presbytery. We protest against them to have a false Ministry of Doct. Or Teachers. Finally, we protest against them that seeing their constitution is false, therefore there is no one ordinance of the Lord true among them. These things we have published & of these things we require an answer. For we proclaim against them as they proclaim against their own mother England: That the Separation the youngest and fairest daughter of Rome is an harlot. For as is the mother so is the daughter. Now furthermore we desire the separation and all men that they would not impute unto us untruths and condemn the innocent without cause. For we disclaim the errors commonly, but most slanderously imputed unto us: we are indeed traduced by the world as Atheists by denying the old Testament & the Lord's day: as traitors to magistrates in denying magistracy: & as Heretics in denying the humanity of Christ: Be it known therefore to all men, first that we deny not the Scriptures of the Old Testament, but with the Apostles: acknowledge them to be inspired of God: & that we have a sure word of the Prophets whereunto we ought to attend as unto a light singing in a dark place: & that whatsoever is written aforetime is written for our instruction that we through patience & comfort of the Scriptures might have hope: & that we ought as Christ counseled to search the Scriptures of the Old Testament, as the men of Berea did,

because that in them we may find everlasting life, & that they do testify of Christ. This we believe according to these Scriptures. John 5:39. Acts 17:11. Romans 15:4. 2 Timothy 3:16. 2 Peter 1:19. Yet nevertheless we affirm all the ordinances of the Old Testament, viz: The Church, Ministry, Worship, & Government of the Old Testament to be abolished all which were types & shadows of Gods things to come, but the body is in Christ. Col. 2:14-17. 20.

Secondly we acknowledge that according to the president of Church Disciples & the primitive Churches, the Saints ought upon the first day of the week which is called the Lord's Day, Revel. 1.10 to assemble together to pray, prophesy, praise God, & break bread, and perform other parts of Spiritual Communion for the worship of God, their own mutual edification, & the preservation of true religion and piety in the Church: & that we might be better enabled to the foresaid duties we ought to separate our selves from the labors of our callings which might hinder us thereto, & that according to these Scriptures, John 20:19. Acts 2:1, 41, 41, & 20. 7. 1 Cor. 16:1.

Thirdly, concerning Magistrates, we acknowledge them to be the ordinance of the Lord that every soul ought to be subject unto thee: that they are the ministers of God for our wealth: that we ought to be subject unto them for conscience sake: that they are the ministers of God to take vengeance on them that do evil: that we ought to pray for thee that are in dignity: nor to despise government: but to pay tribute, toll, custom, &c. & that according to these Scriptures, Rom. 13:1-7. 1 Tim. 2:2. 1 Pet. 2: 13-15. 2 Pet. 2:10. Jude vs. 8 but of Magistrates converted to the Faith & admitted into the Church by baptism, there may many questions be made, which to answer neither will we if we could, neither can we if we would: when such things fall out, the Lord we doubt not will direct us into the truth concerning that matter, in the meantime we are

assured according to the Scripture that the Kings of the Earth shall at the length bring their glory & honor to the visible Church, Revel. 21, 24.

Finally, concerning the Flesh of Christ we do believe that Christ is the seed of Abraham, Isaac, & Jacob, & of David, according to the Prophecies of the Scriptures, & that he is the Son of Mary his Mother, made of her substance, the holy Ghost overshadowing her: So have other children their bodily substance from their parents: also that Christ is one person in two distinct natures, the Godhead & manhood, & we detest the contrary errors: our grounds of Scripture are these: Gen. 22:18. & 26: 4. & 28: 14. Psal. 132:11. compared with Acts 2:30. Roman. 1:3, 4. Heb. 1: 8-10. & 2. 11. 14. 16.

Briefly to conclude let the Separation be advertised: That whereas they do so confidently through their self love and self conceit, fill their mouths with heresy and heretics, as if thereby they would fear babes. That herein they tread in the steps of all the Antichristians their predecessors. Do not the Papists call the Protestants heretics, & call for fire & fagot? Do not the Protestants proclaim the Separation Schismatiques & Heretics, & judge them worthy the gibbet? Not the affirmation of me without proof, but the evidence of willfull obstinacy in error maketh men heretics. And let them take heed that they notwithstanding their Siren songs prove not cages full of most ugly and deformed Antichristian Heretics. Thus desiring the Separation not to be wise in their own eyes through pride, but to become fools that they may be made wise through humility, & desiring the forwardest preachers and professors of the English nation well to weigh what is the true constitution of the Church, & what is the subject of true Christian baptism, & accordingly to measure a true & a false Church, I cease: wishing the light and love of the truth to everyone that readeth.

JOHN SMITH.

CERTAIN REASONS PROPOUNDED TO Mr. Rich. Clifton: concerning the two propositions following.

1. That infants are not to be baptized.

1. Because there is neither precept nor example in the New Testament of any infants that were baptized, by John or Christ's Disciples: Only they that did confess their sins, and confess their faith were baptized. Mark 1.4.5. Acts 8.37.
2. Because Christ commandeth to make disciples by teaching them: and then to baptize them: Mat. 28, 19. John, 4.1. but infants cannot by doctrine become Christ's disciples: and so cannot by the rule of Christ be baptized.
3. Because if infants be baptized, the carnal seed is baptized: and so the seal of the covenant is administered to them unto whom the covenant appertaineth not. Rom. 9.8. which is a profanation.

2. That Antichristians converted are to be admitted  
into the true Church by baptism.

1. Because Churches are so to be constituted now after the defection of Antichrist, as they were first erected by the Apostles: But in the constitution of Churches the Apostles received in the members by baptism: go: So must we do now.
2. Because true baptism is but one: but the baptism of Antichrist is not true baptism, and so not that one baptism of Christ: but all members of Christ must have true baptism.
3. Because as the false Church is rejected & the true erected: the false ministry forsaken, and the true received: So false worship, (and by consequent baptism) must be renounced, and the true baptism assumed.

Mr. Rich Clifton.

AN ANSWER TO TWO ANABAPTISTICAL opinions: viz.

1. That infants are not to be baptized.
2. That Antichristians converted are to be admitted into the true Church by baptism.

Although with great sorrow I am forced to undertake this business against him that was dear unto me: yet being thereunto provoked by the sending to me these two positions with certain reasons annexed under the Authors own hand: I thought it my part (although the unblest of many) to contend for the maintenance of the faith which was once given to the Saints. Jude 3. And by the help of God to put a brief answer to these opinions, which by the Churches in all ages have been and are condemned for heretical: the practice whereof I could wish might never have befallen to any of mine own country, especially to them that were partakers with me to the afflictions of Christ for the witnessing of his truth. And chiefly unto him, to whose charge both I and diverse others had once purposed to have committed our souls had he not besides these broached some former opinions, both erroneous and offensive, whereby the truth (for which we suffer) is like to be the more blasphemed of the wicked and many hindered in our own country, that shall hear thereof, of whom we had great hope that they would have walked in the same faith with us. Notwithstanding for as much as I am informed, that the author hath promised upon the sight of his errors to confess the same, I do the more willingly take upon me this labor, praying the Lord to give a good issue, to his glory, for his mercy's sake amen. Now I will come to answer the positions with the reasons thereof, and first concerning the former, which is this.

John Smith.

A REPLY MADE IN DEFENCE OF TWO truths, viz:

1. That infants are not to be baptized.

2. That Antichristians converted are to be admitted into the true church by baptism.

These two truths are by you, Sir, in your answer entitled Anabaptistical, which reproach I do no more account of the you do of the imputation of Brownisme, nor then Paul did of Heresy: but rather as Paul professed himself joyful is sustaining that blasphemy for the truth, and you rejoice in that you for the truths you profess, are calumniated with such undeserved imputations: even so do I bless God that I am accounted worthy to suffer rebuke for Christ his truth: but know you, Sir, for your humiliation that your reproach shall light upon your own head, and that Christ and his truth are by you evil spoken of.

In your preface you avow that you are provoked to write, I marvel you should so speak: seeing your conscience telleth you, that you did make the first request or motion to Mrs. Bywater: and I could do no less than I did, for if I had refused the motion, it would have been thought that I distrusted the cause: and whereas you thought that I distrusted the cause: and where you alleged Jude 3 for justifying your course in answering, I say you pervert the Scripture: for although you are to contend for the maintenance of the faith which was once given to the Saints, yet you are neither to plead for Baal, but to let him plead for himself, neither are you to contend for defense of Antichristian errors, but rather as you have in a very good degree raised the Temple of Antichrist, even so you should now proceed to undermine the very foundation, and to blow it wholly up at once: which is done by entertaining the baptism of Christ to be administered upon persons confessing their sins, and confessing their faith: neither will it help you to say that these two truths have been condemned for heresy by the churches in all ages, for

if the Apostles age afford contrary to the succeeding ages, I say that which is most ancient is the truth: and you know that many of your truths whereto you are come, have been condemned for heretical in as many ages as these truths which I defend.

Again, whereas you affirm that by the broaching of these opinions and some former erroneous and offensive, the truth is like more to be blasphemed, and therefore you could wish that we your countrymen and friends had never fallen into them: I answer, that although I shall not rejoice that any truth be evil spoken of, yet if it shall fall out by occasion of publishing the truth that wicked men blaspheme, let them know that Christ is a rock of offence, and a stone to stumble at: and if any be hindered from the truth by publishing the truth, it will be their corruption and sin, and the truth or the publishing of the truth is not in fault: but if you fear hereby that your Antichristian Church will fall to the ground, I say, it is that which is appointed to perdition, and to perdition let it go. I will never use means to support it. Finally although I have professed my readiness publicly and privately, to forsake my errors upon their discovery. (And as I have already practiced for the which I am reproached among your brethren) yet I never professed my readiness to be perverted from the truth, which you call heresy: and therefore if you did undertake to write upon this ground, you might well have spared your pains, and saved your self from so greivous a sin as you are fallen into by pleading for Antichristian corruptions, and by praying the Lord to overthrow his own truth, by blessing your labors in oppugning it: and this briefly shall suffice for your preface general.

Mr. Rich Clifton.

1. That infants are not to be baptized.

Answer.

Touching this first position, that Infants are not to be baptized, I read that Auxentius one of the Arrians sect with his adherents was one of the first that denied the baptism of Infants, and next after him Pelagius the heretic, against whom Augustine and others of the ancient Fathers have opposed and condemned for heresy, and that according to the Scriptures, which by God's grace we shall together with them also further manifest, and prove by sound reasons out of the word lawfulness of baptizing infants, which first I will undertake, and then answered the reasons to the contrary.

Gen. 17.10. God made his covenant to Abraham and to his seed: from whence I  
reason thus.

1. That covenant which God made with Abraham he commanded to be sealed to him and to all his seed, yea even to infants.

But the covenant that we under the gospel do receive is the very same that was made to Abraham, &c.

Therefore that is commanded to be sealed to us and to our seed, yea even to our infants, for so was that to Abraham's.

The Major can not be denied, see Gen. 17.10.11.12.

The Minor is likewise as true, for the Apostle speaking of this covenant, Acts. 2.39 sayth, the promise is made to you and to your children, and to all that are afar off, as many as the Lord our God shall call. In which words it plainly appeareth that this is the very same covenant and promise that was made to Abraham, which they that were afar off, that is the Gentiles believing, do receive and were baptized into. And therefore is Abraham called the Father of many nations, Gen. 17.4 also Gal. 3.13.4. Christ is said to redeem us from the curse of the Law, that the blessing of Abraham might come on the Gentiles through Jesus Christ. That we might receive the

promise of the Spirit, see vers. 8.9. Now then if we be partakers of the same covenant (for otherwise Abraham's covenant should not be an everlasting covenant, Gen. 17.7. seeing his posterity after the flesh is cut of for a time, Rom. 11, 15. 17. 20.) it must follow that the same must be sealed to us, and to our infants, (else is it not the same) and that by the commandment of God. For the abolishing of circumcision, and the bringing in of baptism under the gospel, doth not abrogate or disannull the commandment of sealing the covenant to the believing parents with their infants, which was once commanded to Abraham, but only showeth a changing of the outward sign. And therefore as the covenant belongs to the Gentiles believing so doth the seal thereof to them & to their seed, as that did to Abraham & to his seed: The outward ceremony only changed.

John Smyth.

Now in the next place you make a special preface to the first point, affirming that baptism of infants was denied by Auxentius the Arrian, and by Pelagius whom Augustine and others refuted and condemned for heresy, and that by Scripture: I say that one heretic condemned another contrary to the Scriptures for the truth's sake: and whereas you bring in the Fathers in this particular point in your 6. pag. I answer I can prove that Augustine, Cyrill, Ciprian, Origen, Nazianzen, Ambrose, and many others were almost as gross heretics (if he be an heretic that holdeth an heresy) as Auxentius and Pelagius, and you your selves account the all Antichristians: and therefore the ancient practice of pedobaptistry in ancient antichristian Churches is no more to be respected then the ancient practice of the Prelacy and read prayer in the same: but these are buy Florishes: let us hear your arguments from the Scripture proving.

1. That infants are to be baptized,

Your first argument is taken from Gen. 17.10 and is framed thus:

That covenant which God made with Abraham, he commanded to be sealed to him, and to all his seed, yea even to infants.

But the covenant that we under the gospel do receive is the very same that was made to Abraham, &c.

Therefore it is commanded to be sealed to us, and to our seed, yea even to our infants for so was it to Abrahams.

To this argument I make answer thus: first distinguishing the two covenants or testaments (for a covenant and testament is all one in the originals though the English words are two): one covenant was made with Abraham and his carnal seed and of that covenant was circumcision a seal: another covenant made with Abraham and his Spiritual seed, and of that covenant the holy Spirit of promise is the seal: for the carnal covenant had a carnal seal upon the carnal seed: the Spiritual covenant had a Spiritual seal upon the Spiritual seed: For things must be made proportionable, and circumcision which was a carnal seal, could not seal up the Spiritual covenant to the Spiritual seed, for to say so, is to leap over the hedge, and to make a disproportion betwixt the type and the truth.

These things being thus distinguished let the be remembered and applied orderly and the argument will appear of no value: for the major is thus to be understood if it be true: that the carnal covenant which God made with Abraham and his carnal seed, was to be sealed up to his infants with a carnal seal, viz: circumcision: if it be not so understood as it is false: Now the minor, if it be assumed out of the major, (as it must be, else it is a Sophisme) is very false and flatly contradictory to the Scripture: for we under the gospel do not receive that carnal covenant which was made to Abraham and his carnal seed, whereof circumcision was the carnal seal: but that carnal covenant and seal together with the subject of that seal, viz: a male of 8 days old is

taken away by Christ's cross: and in the rone thereof we have the Spiritual covenant typed by that carnal covenant, and the Spiritual seal, viz: the holy Spirit of promise signified by that carnal seal, and the Spiritual infant, viz: a new borne babe in Christ, in whom Christ typed by the male is newly formed, signified by that carnal infant.

That all these particulars are so: I prove unto you plainly by these places of Scripture.

1. There are two Testaments made with Abraham, Gal. 4.24. For Hagar that is the Old Testament, and Sara that is the New Testament, were both married to Abraham, and Abraham had them both.

2. There are two seeds: Ishmael (of Abraham and Hagar) who typed the carnal seed borne after the Flesh: and Isaac (of Abraham and Sara) who typed the Spiritual seed borne by promise vers. 23.

[3.] There are two seals: Circumcision a seal of the carnal covenant upon the carnal children: Gen. 17.11. and the Holy Spirit of promise a seal of the Spiritual covenant upon the Spiritual seed, 2 Cor. 1.22. Eph. 1.13. and as circumcision was a seal from God to the carnal seed of the promise and from the carnal seed to God in obedience: So the Spirit of promise is a seal from God to the Spiritual seed of the promise, and from the Spiritual seed to the Lord in obedience, Eph. 1. 13. John 3.33. these things are evident: but now you, I am persuaded of mere ignorance, mistaking the covenant, do make circumcision a seal of the everlasting Spiritual covenant, which is an error, and thereupon you build all your false building of pedobaptistry which is as a house built upon the sand by the foolish builders.

Now for your places of Scripture I expound them in order.

Gen. 17. 10. 11. 12. this place proveth that circumcision was a seal of the carnal covenant made with the carnal seed, & not a seal of the Spiritual covenant made with the Faithful: For the

Spirit is the seal thereof, who is therefore called the Spirit of promise, and the seal. Eph. 1. 13. and if the place of the Rom. 4. 11. be objected to prove that circumcision sealed the righteousness of Faith to Abraham: I answer, that is not the scope of the place: but this: viz: that circumcision had one specialty in Abraham differing from all other, that by circumcision he was sealed up to be the Father of all the Faithful as concerning the matter of their justification, namely, that as he was justified by his actual Faith so should all the believers be justified by their actual Faith whither they believed in their uncircumcision or in their circumcision.

Acts 2. 39. the promise is offered to the impenitent Jews, and to their posterity, and to the Gentiles afar off: and it was exhibited only to so many as yielded obedience to the Faith: and whereas in rehearsing the Apostles speech, you say, the promise is made I say, therein you add to the text. For if you intend that the promise of the Spirit was exhibited to all the Jews and their infants, and to the Gentiles believing and their infants and that this place affordeth it, I say the place doth not intend any such thing, but only an offer of the Spiritual covenant, to the carnal Jews and their children, according to the Flesh, and also the Gentiles: but a true conferring or exhibiting of it to so many as should be effectually called by the offer of it in the preaching of the Gospel.

Further whereas you seem to assume that seeing the covenant was made to Abraham and his infants, it is therefore made to us and our infants. I deny that ever the covenant Spiritual was made that is conferred to all Abraham's infants according to the Flesh: neither therefore is it made that is conferred to all our infants: this you should prove, but it is undone: I confess the promise was offered to all Abraham's carnal seed under that carnal covenant of the Old Testament, and so it is offered now to all our carnal children by the preaching of the gospel in the New Testament: but as the Spiritual covenant was only exhibited to the Faithful, the true seed of

Abraham, so is it now only exhibited to the Faithful which are the only true seed of Abraham, who is the Father of us all, and we all his children, and justified by actual Faith as he was: in respect whereof infants wanting actual Faith cannot be truly said the Children of Abraham, but are that they are in secret to the Lord whatsoever they are.

Thus much for the Scriptures by you alleged in your first argument: From that which I have answered I reason against pedobaptistry thus.

1. As it was with Abraham the Father of the Faithful, so must it be with the Children of Abraham, Rom. 4. 11.

But Abraham the Father of the Faithful, first believed actually, and being sealed with the Spirit of promise, afterward received the sign of circumcision.

Ergo: The Children of Abraham the believing Gentiles, must first believe actually, and be sealed with the Spirit of promise, and then receive the baptism of water.

2. As in the Old Testament, the carnal children were carnally circumcised and so admitted into that Church of the Old Testament. So in the New Testament the spiritual children must be Spiritually circumcised, that is in hart, and then be admitted by baptism into the Church of the New Testament.

But the first was signified by type: Ergo the second is verified in the truth.

3. As in the Old Testament carnal infants were carnally begotten and borne by the mortal seed of generation by their carnal parents, and then were carnally circumcised, and received into the carnal covenant. So in the New Testament Spiritual infants new borne babes in Christ, must be Spiritually begotten and borne by the immortal seed of regeneration, by the Spiritual parents, and then being Spiritually circumcised they shall by baptism with water be received into the New Testament.

But the first was signified by type: Ergo the second is verified in the truth.

4. If the carnal infants in the Old Testament were circumcised, then the carnal infants in the New Testament must not be baptized: because that as circumcision is abolished which was the sign or seal, so the infant is abolished which is the subject of that sign or seal, and a proportionable infant introduced: which is one regenerate by the Spirit and the word.

But the carnal infants in the Old Testament were circumcised.

Ergo the carnal infants are not now in the New Testament to be baptized.

5. As in the Old Testament when the male appeared the 8. day, there was a painful circumcising and mortifying of the superfluous foreskin when the party was received into the covenant actually: So in the New Testament when the Lord Jesus Christ (typed by the male) appeareth: and when there is a painful circumcising and mortifying of the superfluous foreskin of the heart, the party so qualified shall be by baptism received into the New Testament actually.

But the first was signified by type: Ergo the second is verified in truth.

And this shall suffice for answer to your first argument.

Mr. Rich Clifton.

Col. 2. 11. 12.

[2.] If circumcision belonged to Faithful Abraham and his seed, yea to such as were but infants, then doth baptism also appertain to all believers and to their seed being infants.

But the first is true, Gen. 17. 10. Ergo the second.

The reason of the consequent is double: 1. for that baptism cometh in place of circumcision as a seal of the same promises to us and our seed: Col. 2.11.12. 2. For that the covenant must be as largely sealed up to us as to thee, therefore to our females as well as males,

and infants as well as persons of years: For the covenant in Christ is not lessened but of as large extent now as then: 2. Cor. 1. 20. Seeing in Christ all the promises of God are yea and amen.

I answer that this argument is built upon the same false ground with the former a mere mistaking of the covenant, and seal, and seed: and there is manifest violence committed upon the Scripture by perverting and wresting it to false consequents: first therefore I deny the consequence. & I give reasons of my denial.

1. Because circumcision did not appertain to Abraham and his infants as a seal of the everlasting covenant of life and Salvation, but of the external temporary covenant of the land of Canaan, and of obedience to the Law of Moses: and therefore though circumcision appertained to Abraham and his carnal infants as a seal of the external covenant yet it doth not follow that baptism belongs to the Faithful and their carnal infants as a seal of the Spiritual covenant of the New Testament made in respect of Christ.

2. Secondly because the believers do not occupy Abraham's place in the covenant of the New Testament, because Abraham is the Father of all the Faithful, but no man though never so Holy hath that prerogative to be the Father of the Faithful: Therefore Abraham receiveth the Faithful into his bosom. Luke 16. 23.

3. Thirdly, because the infants of the faithful do not possess the place of the true children of Abraham the Father of the Faithful: but possess the place of the typical children of Abraham according to the Flesh, & therefore the disproportion being in all these particulars the consequence of the argument is weak and insufficient.

But if you will make true consequents you must reason from the type to the truth proportionably, and not from the type to the type as this argument importeth: neither must you

confound the covenants and seals as you do: but you must make all things distinct and proportionable the one to the other, as thus.

Abraham the Father of the carnal infants: Abraham the Father of the Faithful: Carnal Abraham and his carnal seed, carnally circumcised: So Faithful Abraham and his Faithful Children, Spiritually circumcised. The carnal infants of the Old Testament carnally circumcised: The Spiritual infants of the New Testament, that is, men regenerate baptized.

Thus you see the disproportion of your argument, and the true proportion that you ought to have made if your argument had been good.

But let us see the reasons of your consequence, and the Scriptures you do produce for the confirmation of them: you say that baptism cometh in the roome of circumcision as a seal of the same promises to us and our seed: I utterly deny it: and I prove the contrary unto you: Seeing that the circumcision of the heart succeedeth in the place of circumcising the flesh: Rom. 2.29. and circumcision made without hands cometh in the place of circumcision made with hands, Co. 2.11. compared with Eph. 2.11. and circumcision the seal of the flesh, hath the H. Spirit of promise which is the Spiritual seal to succeed in place thereof, Eph. 1. 13. 14. which seal of the Spirit is the earnest of our inheritance, as circumcision of the flesh was an earnest of the inheritance of the land of Canaan to the carnal Israelites: and I desire to be informed in all the Scriptures where baptism is called a seal, for I deny that baptism of water is the seal of the New Testament, though I cannot deny that the baptism of the holy ghost is the seal.

I say therefore that the seal of the Spirit must go before the baptism of water: and as all the ordinances of the New Testament are Spiritual, and yet visible, so is the seal of the New Testament Spiritual, and yet visible: and thereupon men being visibly sealed with the Spirit as Cornelius company was. Acts 10.47. may challenge the baptism with water, as Peter there

teacheth: this visible seal of the New Testament is confession: as in the Old Testament circumcision was their confession: and baptism is not a seal but a manifestation of the seal. You see therefore that baptism is not the seal of the New Testament and that circumcision did not seal up the everlasting covenant to Abraham, and all his carnal seed: now the place of Col. 2. 11. 12. which you produce to prove that baptism cometh in the room of circumcision, is not so to be construed, but the Apostle teacheth the virtue of Christ's circumcision and baptism, which is mortifying and burying of sin and resurrection from sin: and the Apostle doth not intend to teach that in the New Testament baptism succeedeth for circumcision: but he teacheth the virtue of Christ's circumcision and baptism in the Faithful: so that seeing circumcision was a seal of the promises of the Old Testament to the carnal seed, and that the Spirit is the seal of promises of the New Testament to the faithful seed of Abraham, therefore neither doth baptism of water succeed circumcision, neither doth baptism with water seal up any promises to the Faithful, but only doth visibly declare what promises they already are partakers of, viz: of the Spirit of promise.

Again: in your second reason you would insinuate a restraint in the New Testament, if baptism be not due to infants seeing circumcision was due to infants in the Old Testament: I answer many ways: 1. Seeing that baptism doth not succeed circumcision, this allegation is nothing to the purpose: 2. Seeing baptism is both to male and female it is larger than circumcision which was only upon the male: 3. Seeing that baptism is both to Jew and Gentile, therefore more large then circumcision: but these things are almost nothing to the purpose: Therefore I say more pertinently, that the covenant made with Abraham in respect of Christ is now as large as every it was: For that was never made with Abraham and all his carnal children, but only with Abraham and the Faithful, and so it continueth in the same tenor still: and it is enlarged now since Christ's coming only in respect of the clearer, and more universal publication

o fit: for then the covenant made with Abraham in respect of Christ was shadowed out darkly in types, now since Christ it is preached plainly: then it was only to the Jews, now to all nations, Mat. 28. 19. besides I affirm that circumcision was never a seal of that covenant that God made with Abraham in respect of Christ, for the Holy Spirit of promise is the seal of it: but circumcision only was a seal of the external covenant: and the seal of the Spirit is as large as the seal of the Flesh: For all the carnal Israelites were carnally sealed, all the true believers are sealed by the Spirit: all the males were carnally sealed, all that have the male Christ formed in them (whither men or women) are sealed by the Spirit: For in Christ there is neither male nor female: Gal. 3. 28. all the carnal seed were carnally sealed whether young or old, so all the Spiritual seed are Spiritually sealed whether new borne babes in Christ, or perfect men that are come to the measure of the age of the fullness of Christ: and so the covenant is not lessened, taking things in their due proportion, and not perverting them. And whereas you say in Christ all the promises of God are yea and amen, 2. Cor. 1. 20. thereby insinuating that in the New Testament the covenant must be as large as in the old, I confess it to be as large, but this place is strained to the proving thereof: For the meaning of it is that unto the Faithful all the Lord's promises are verified, but his promise was never that all their carnal seed should have baptism as a seal of life and salvation, but that all the believers should have the Spirit of promise which is the New Testament's seal.

From that which I have answered to your second argument I reason thus.

1. If all the carnal infants of Abraham were never actually under the everlasting covenant in respect of the actual possession of it, then they never had title to the seal of the everlasting covenant.

But all the carnal infants of Abraham were never actually under the everlasting covenant in respect of the actual possession of it: Seeing that Abraham's children according to his actual Faith were only under it, Rom. 4. 11.

Ergo: all the carnal infants of Abraham never had title to the seal of the everlasting covenant, and therefore not to baptism.

2. If baptism doth not succeed circumcision, then baptism doth not pertain to carnal infants though circumcision pertained to carnal infants.

But baptism doth not succeed circumcision, because the seal of the Spirit is correspondent to the typical seal of the Flesh, and baptism with water is only the manifestation of the seal.

Ergo, baptism doth not appertain to the carnal infants.

3. If circumcision did not seal up the everlasting covenant to Abraham and all his carnal infants: then (by your proportion) baptism doth not seal up the everlasting covenant to the Faithful and their carnal infants.

But circumcision did not seal up the everlasting covenant to Abraham and all his carnal infants.

Ergo: (by your proportion) baptism doth not seal up the everlasting covenant to the Faithful and their carnal infants.

4. If believing parents do not stand in Abraham's rome to convey the covenant to their infants, then though they be baptized themselves, yet their children shall not.

But the believers do not stand in Abraham's rome, to convey the covenant to their infants: For no man is the Father of the Faithful as Abraham was, and he did never convey the everlasting covenant to his carnal infants.

Ergo: though believing parents be baptized themselves, yet their infants shall not be baptized.

5. If infants of the faithful do not occupy the place of the true children of Abraham, but only occupy the place of the carnal children: then though the true children of Abraham, the actual believers be baptized, yet the infants shall not which cannot actually believe.

But the infants of the Faithful do not occupy the place of the true children of Abraham, seeing the children of Abraham do the works of Abraham, John 8. 34. which infants cannot do.

Ergo though actual believers be baptized, yet infants shall not.

And thus much may suffice for answer of this second argument which you see is as weak as the first being built upon the same sand.

Mr. Rich Clifton.

Mark. 10. 13. 14. and Mat. 19. 13. 14.

3. They that are of the Kingdom of God have right and title to all the Holy things thereto belonging, and may participate of so many of them as they are capable to receive.

But the infants of believing parents are of the Kingdom of God.

Therefore the infants of believing parents have right and title to all the Holy things thereto belonging, & may participate of so many of the, &c. And consequently of baptism, seeing they are capable of that.

The major proposition I think will not be denied, it is written 1 Cor. 3. 21. 22. All things are yours, &c. Rom. 9. 4.

The assumption is Mat. 19, 13-17. For of such is the Kingdom of God, meaning that this Kingdom stood not only of such as being of years that believed but also of their infants. And this he declareth not only in this saying, but also by his displeasure against his Disciples for

hindering their coming unto him: by commanding to suffer them to come, and by putting his hands upon them, and blessing them. Mat. 19. 13. 14. 15. For would Christ have blessed them that were not of his Kingdom? Or do not the blessings appertain only to the children of the Kingdom, even to the seed of Abraham, Gal. 3. 8. 18.

If it be objected that children are not capable of baptism. I answer, they are as capable thereof as the infants of Israel were of circumcision, being both partakers of the same promises with them, and in all respects as capable of the outward seals of the covenant, as they were. And therefore the infants of believers are to be baptized.

John Smyth.

Your third argument followeth, from Mark 10. 13. 14. Mat. 19. 13. 14.

They that are of the Kingdom of God have right

And title to all the holy things thereto belonging,

And may participate of so many of them as they are capable to receive.

But the infants of believing parents are of the Kingdom of God.

Ergo, the infants of believing parents have right

And title to all the holy things thereto belonging,

And may participate of so many of them &c. and

Consequently of baptism, seeing they are capable of it.

The major you say is written, 1. Cor. 3. 21. 22. Rom. 9. 4.

The assumption is proved Mat. 19. 13. 14,

To this argument of yours I make answer diversly: first you have not proved that the visible Church, and all the ordinances thereof pertain to infants of the faithful: For the infants of the Jews that were presented to Christ were not infants of believers for ought that I see: neither

can it be proved that they were infants of the Jews, but there is some likelihood to the contrary: seeing the disciples repelled the that brought the: it may be they were the children of some of the Roman soldiers, or some Cananitish persons: but suppose they were children of the Jews, how is it proved that their parents were believers? Seeing that the people of the Jews were for the most part stiffnecked and uncircumcised in heart, and if they had been the children of believing Jews that were baptized by John or Christ's disciples (by your doctrine the infants were already baptized) what need was there to bring the to Christ except it were for popish confirmation? And so hence you cannot conclude baptism. I avow constantly against you that either they were not the children of Jews: or that they were not the infants of believing Jews: or if their parents believed, yet it followeth not that therefore these infants were of the Kingdom of God, or to be baptized: for Christ doth not say, of these, but, of such is the Kingdom of God: and so he doth expound himself Mat. 18 3-6. Besides how can you prove that by the Kingdom of God Christ understandeth the visible church of the New Testament? Or how can you prove that Christ blesseth none but members of the visible Church? Or how can you prove that the blessing of Abraham appertaineth only to the members of the visible church? Or that from this particular of Christ praying for infants Mat. 18. 13. baptizing of infants followeth? Or have can you prove that Christ obtained for them, and prayed for remission of sins, the H, ghost, faith, everlasting life? For many were brought to Christ for relief of bodily infirmities.

Secondly: I deny that, because Christ blessed some of the infants of the Jews or Gentiles upon special entreaty, therefore it may hence be concluded that generally the covenant and seals of the covenant (as you call baptism) doth appertain to them: for there is not the same reason of all infants, as of some specially blessed: as of John Baptist, Jeremy, Sampson.

Thirdly if baptism doth appertain to infants because Christ blesseth some particular infants, and because Christ saith the Kingdom of God doth appertain to such, then the Lord's supper also: for if you say, they are not capable of the Lord's supper in two respects: 1. for that they cannot eat it, 2. for that they cannot examine themselves: I answer they must have it as soon as they can eat it: and they cannot confess their sins and faith, and so cannot be baptized.

Fourthly: I would know why the Apostle put infants back, and why Christ did not command them to be baptized: Surely, if they had been the infants of believers, or if the Apostle had known Christ's mind for baptism of infants he having so fit an opportunity would have put it in practice: but the deep silence of baptism in this place where there is so just an occasion doth instruct us evidently that Christ either did not deal faithfully which to say were blasphemy, or that he never purposed the baptism of infants.

You see therefore by that which hath been answered that both your major and minor are weak and the Scriptures alleged by you do not confirm them: for the place 1. Cor. 3. 21. 22. declareth that all things are yours: that is theirs that actually believe and are baptized: and all the ordinances of the visible church are theirs both in title use and possession: So that hence you must needs prove if your argument be good that infants must have the use of all: only your caution helpeth you, viz: that they may partake so many means as they are capable of: but where is this caution expressed in all the scriptures do you think that the members of the Church are not capable of all the means of salvation? But I avow unto you that this place pertaineth only to baptized persons not to persons unbaptized, and therefore it fitteth not your purpose.

Rom. 9.4 The covenants and promise pertain to the Israelites: I deny the word appertaineth, it is put into the Text, and perverteth the meaning of the Apostle For Paul intendeth not to prove that the carnal Israelites were all actually within the covenant of grace and

salvation by Christ being really possessed of it, but that under the outward covenant and promise whereof they were really ceased, the Spiritual covenant and promise was offered and presented unto them, the one preaching the other, the law being a scholmr. to Christ.

Lastly, whereas in the answer of an objection you intimate that infants now are as capable of baptism as infants were of circumcision, being both equally capable of the covenant and seals, I answer: that baptism is not the seal of the covenant of the New Testament as circumcision was the seal of the Old Testament and that infants of the Old Testament were capable of circumcision absolutely seeing that to be circumcised there was nothing required but a foreskin apt to be cut off: but to baptism in the New Testament there is required actual faith and repentance confessed by the mouth, Mat. 3. 6. Act. 4. 37. and 10. 47.

From this answer I collect arguments against pedobaptistry thus.

1. They that are not members of the visible Church, have no title to the holy things of God, and therefore are incapable of them: and so of baptism.

Infants of the Faithful are not actually members of the visible Church: For these places. Mark. 10. 13. 14. Mat. 19. 13. 14. do not prove that the parents of these infants were believing Jews, or if they were believers their infants were already baptized with their parents according to your doctrine, and so Christ cannot intend baptism to appertain to them, but the rest of the ordinances.

Ergo: Infants of the Faithful have no title to the Holy things of God, & so are incapable of them, and by consequent incapable of Baptism.

2. If the Apostles by putting back infants presented to Christ declare plainly that infants were not to be brought to be baptized by Christ, nor commanded to be baptized by him.

But the first is true: that the Disciples put back infants presented to Christ, &c.

Ergo: The latter is true: that infants were not baptized or commanded to be baptized by Christ.

3. If the persons presenting infants to Christ to be blessed and prayed for: do not desire baptism for them: then they knew no such custom used by Christ to baptize them.

But the first is true: that persons presenting infants to Christ to be blessed and prayed for, do not desire baptism for them.

Ergo: they knew no such custom used by Christ of baptizing infants.

4. If Christ receiving infants, praying for them, blessing them, doth neither baptize them, nor command his Disciples to baptize them: then either Christ's pleasure was they should not be baptized, or else he forgot his duty, in not teaching baptism of infants upon so just an occasion.

But Christ receiving infants, praying for them, blessing them, doth neither baptize them, nor command his Disciples to baptize them: neither did forget his duty in not teaching baptism of infants occasioned.

Ergo: Christ's pleasure was (and is) that infants should not be baptized.

5. They that are not actually possessed of the promises or covenant, are not actually to be invested with baptism.

Infants are not actually possessed with the covenant: Seeing they perform not the condition, viz: confession of their sins and their Faith actually.

Ergo: infants are not to be invested with baptism. This shall suffice for answer of your third argument.

Mr. Rich Clifton.

1 Corinth. 7. 14.

[4.] If the children of believing parents be holy, then are they within the covenant of Abraham, and so consequently have right to the seal thereof.

But the first is true, 1 Cor. 7. 14. Ergo the second.

Touching the former proposition. I take it, that none will affirm holiness in any that are not of the covenant, for in that respect, Israel was called a holy nation. Exo. 19. 6. 1. Pet. 2. 9. and all others unclean, Act. 11. 3 and 10. 15. that were without. If infants be within the covenant, then can not the seal be denied to such, seeing the Lord hath joined the promise and seal together, Gen. 17. 10. which no man may or ought to Separate, Mat. 19. 6.

What can be objected against the assumption, I see not, seeing the Apostle plainly affirms, but now are your children holy. Unless it may be said, as of some I have heard, that as the unbelieving wife is sanctified to the husband, so are the children viz: to the use of their Father: but this to affirm is a great abusing of the Scripture. For the Apostle in that place answering an objection that the Faithful is defiled by the society of the unfaithful: proveth that the faithful husband may with good conscience use the vessel of his unfaithful wife, by an argument from the effects, namely because their children, which are born of them, are accounted holy or within the promise, God having said to all the Faithful, I will be thy God, and the God of thy seed. As for that other strange exposition, that the Children of a believing Father are no otherwise sanctified then the unbelieving wife is unto her husband, viz: to their Fathers use only, that cannot stand with the meaning and purpose of the Apostle. For so much may be said of an unbelieving servant, that he is for the use of his master to do him service: if children be no more holy

then so, then have they no prerogative in being the children of a believing Father, neither is the objection removed by this answer.

If it be further pressed that the unbelieving wife is said to be holy, as well as the children, yet is she not within the covenant. I answer, that she indeed is not holy, as be her children, for she being an infidel is without Gods covenant, and therefore she is said to be sanctified in her husband, the Apostle respecting their marriage, which though it was contracted before either party believed, yet stands firm and not dissolved when either of them is called to the Faith, so that the believing husband may lawfully use her as his wife, if she be content to dwell with him, 1 Cor. 7. 12. Now the children cannot be sanctified or Separate to such use to their Father, as the wife is to her husband. And therefore are the children called holy, because they are the seed of a believing Father.

John Smyth.

Your fourth argument is from 1 Cor. 7.14. thus. If the Children of believing parents be holy: then are they within the covenant of Abraham, and so consequently have right to the seal thereof.

But the first is true: 1 Cor. 7. 14. Ergo the second.

I answer: First denying your majors consequent: Seeing that all the nation of the Jews were holy, and yet not within the covenant of Abraham, I mean as you do of the everlasting covenant in respect of Christ: that they were not all within that covenant is plain, Rom. 9.6. all they are not Israel which are of Israel: vs. 7. neither are they Children because they are the seed of Abraham, vs. 12. God revealed, that the Elder should serve the younger, Acts 7. 51. ye have always resisted the holy ghost, as your forefathers have done so do you: if it be objected that the place of the Romans is spoken in respect of

God's secret election, and not of man's knowledge, I answer, the verse 12 is plain of that which was revealed unto the Church, and yet Esau was holy and circumcised when he was born, being not under the covenant of Abraham in respect of Christ: and for proof of this point that the whole Church of the Jews was not under the possession of the everlasting covenant made with Abraham in respect of Christ: but only under the offer of it, I use these reasons.

1. First: The condition or obedience of the matter or members of the New Testament is not the condition or obedience of the matter or members of the Old Testament.

Faith and repentance is the condition of obedience of the matter or members of the New Testament, Mark. 1. 15.

Ergo: Faith and repentance is not the condition or obedience of the matter or members of the Old Testament.

The reason of the major is evident, seeing that as the ministry, worship, and government of the Church of the Old Testament was of another nature than the ministry, worship, and government of the New Testament is, so the constitution, viz: the matter & Forme of the Church of the Old Testament was of another nature, then the constitution that is the matter and form of the New Testament is: Seeing therefore that the ministry, worship, and government of the Old Testament was carnal, the constitution must also be carnal: Therefore the matter and form must be carnal: Therefore the Faith and repentance was not required to the matter of the Old Testament, but only a carnal holiness, viz: The circumcision of the foreskin, whereby the carnal form, that is the carnal covenant or

commandment was induced upon them, and whereto they were typed in obedience, Heb. 7. 16. Gal. 5. 3.

2. Secondly. The type, shadow, figure, similitude of a thing is not the truth, the substance, the thing it self: True is nature and reason.

The constitution, viz: the matter and form of the Church of the Old Testament is the type,, &c. The constitution or the matter and form of the church of the New Testament is the truth, &c. Heb. 10.1. & 9. 19. 23.

Ergo: The constitution, viz: the matter and form of the Church of the Old Testament, (that is the members, & covenant) is not the truth: that is the members are not truly holy, but ceremonially holy, the covenant is not the everlasting covenant, but the typical carnal covenant or commandment: and so true holiness that is Faith and repentance was not required to the members or matter of the Church of the Old Testament.

3. Thirdly, that which was not nor could not be accomplished, performed, effected, or produced by the walking or communion of the Church of the Old Testament, was not required, or exacted, or presupposed to the constitution of the Church of the Old Testament.

Justification and Faith, Sanctification and repentance, were not effected, performed, accomplished, or produced by the walking or communion of the Church of the Old Testament, Heb. 9. 9. Gal. 2. 15. 16.

Ergo: justification and Faith, Sanctification and repentance were not required to the constitution of the Church of the Old Testament: and so by consequent, the members of the Church of the Old Testament were not truly holy in their constitution.

4. That which brought not perfection and life to the members, presupposed not Faith and repentance to the members: and so not real or true holiness. But the Old Testament, the Law, and the obedience of the Law brought not perfection and life to the members of the Church of the Old Testament, Heb. 7. 19. Gal. 3. 21.

Ergo: The Old Testament, or the Law, or the Church of the Old Testament did not presuppose, Faith, Repentance, or true Holiness in the members.

5. That which was a Schoolmr. only to teach Christ, did not presuppose that the Scholars had already learned Christ or put on Christ, which is only done by Faith and repentance.

The law or Old Testament was a Schoolmr. only to teach Christ. Gal. 3. 14. Rom. 10. 3. 4.

Ergo, The Law or Old Testament did not presuppose that the Scholars had learned Christ or put on Christ, which is only done by Faith and Repentance.

6. That which was hidden, kept secret was a Mystery and not revealed, the members of the Church of the Old Testament, in their constitution were not indued withal.

Faith, or obedience to the gospel was a mystery, and not revealed, but kept secret from the beginning. Gal. 3. 23. Rom. 16. 25.

Ergo, The members of the Church of the Old Testament were not indued with Faith or obedience to the gospel in their constitution.

7. There is no condemnation to them that are in Christ, Rom. 8. 1.

There is condemnation to them that are under the Law, Gal. 3. 10. For it is the Ministry of death or condemnation, 2 Cor. 3. 7.

Ergo: The Law or Old Testament doth not presuppose Christ: or they that are under the Law are not in Christ: and so the members of the church of the Old Testament were not truly holy.

Finally, the whole disputation of Paul to the Romans and Galatians concerning justification by Faith in Christ without the works of the Law doth evidently confirm this excellent truth. Teaching that seeing the utmost obedience of the Law did not effect or produce justification, therefore of necessity it followeth that the Law or Old Testament did not presuppose it, or true holiness in the members thereof: For it had been a vanity to have given them a Law which should not or could not preserve and produce that which was in them in their first constitution: wherefore I do boldly defend against all men, that the Church of the Old Testament in the matter or constitution of it was not really Holy, but only Typically: and were not truly holy or sanctified, or in actual possession of that everlasting covenant which God made with Abraham in respect of Christ: but only under the offer of it in that typical Testament given to Abraham, and afterward assumed written and amplified by Moses, John. 7. 19-23. compared with Heb. 8. 8. 9.

Having sufficiently confirmed this truth, I return in particular to answer your objections saying still that the nation of the Jews was holy, not truly but typically and that their holiness was this, that by that external covenant whereinto they were by circumcision admitted, they were trained up, or Schooled to Christ, being by all the ceremonial law and Old Testament, or carnal commandment, as it were by so many means consecrated or dedicated to that holy end and purpose, which was tipped and shadowed by those figures and similitudes of heavenly things. Therefore as the word sanctifying or hallowing is visually taken in the Old Testament for the setting of any thing apart to a holy use: so were the people

of Israel holy: even an holy nation above all the nations of the Earth, See: Exod. 19. 10. 14. 15. Job. 1. 5. Deu. 14. 1-4. compared with Acts. 21. 28. & for the place which you allege, Ex. 19. 6. to prove the Israelites an holy nation, I say, that either the meaning is that they were typically, holy, trained up to holiness, or that they by attaining the end of the law should attain true holiness in Christ: So that this place is nothing to your purpose of the holiness of the eternal covenant which God made with Abraham: So that though infants be under offer of the covenant made with Abraham in respect of Christ, yet shall not baptism be administered upon them, as your consequent doth import, because that in the Old Testament none were circumcised but those that were actually ceased upon that external covenant: and therefore none in the New Testament shall be baptized but those that are actually possessed of the covenant of the New Testament: but the actual possession of the promise is by obedience to the Faith: For by Faith (saith the Apostle. Gal. 3. 14.) we receive the promise of the Spirit, and we receive the Spirit by the hearing of Faith preached, Gal. 3. 2. and Faith cometh by hearing of the word preached, Rom. 10. 17.

Secondly, I answer concerning the consequent of your Majors consequent that it shall not follow that because children are under the covenant (as you suppose, but we deny) that therefore they shall have the outward sign or seal thereof: for you know under the law the females were actually under the covenant of the Old Testament, and yet were not signed with the seal: and before the law was given all that were actually under the covenant of the Old Testament, and yet were not signed with the seal: and before the law was given all that were actually under the covenant until the time of Abraham had no external sign or seal thereof if you say in opposition to the circumcision of the female that she was incapable of it: I answer the Lord had abundance of Spirit, and if it had been his will that all under the covenant

should be partakers of the sign or the seal thereof, he could in wisdom and would undoubtedly have appointed such an external sign or seal that might have been administered upon all under the covenant, but seeing the Lord choose out the male only for circumcision, thereby he purposed to teach in a type that only the male (that is, one that is in Christ) shall be sealed with the Spirit of promise under the new Test: But if you say in opposition to that before the Law, that there was no seal or sign appointed by God for them under the covenant, because the Lord thought it not meet or needful: I say that hereby it appeareth that, to be under the covenant, was not the cause of title to the seal, but the particular express commandment or will of God: and so the insufficiency of your consequent appeareth, which importeth that to be under the covenant is reason sufficient to prove a party to be entitled to the seal or sign of the covenant: and this excellent truth hereby is manifested, that if it should be granted that infants were actually under the covenant yet it could not follow thereupon that therefore they should have the sign or seal of the covenant, which you say is baptism, except it could be proved by express commandment otherwise: for this argument you see proveth it not: Hence therefore appeareth the weakness of your argument, viz.: that if infants were holy, and so under the covenant, yet it doth not follow that therefore they shall have the sign or seal of the covenant which (you say, but we deny) is baptism.

But I pass unto your assumption: which you say is evident, 1 Cor. 7. 14. but now are your children holy: you affirm that infants of one of the parents Faithful are holy: I except many things here: first: I desire that you expound unto me what this holiness is which the Apostle here mentioneth: happily you will say it is to be under the covenant, then I demand what it is to be under the covenant? Perhaps you will say (though this be to run in a circle) it is to be justified by imputation of Christ righteousness. The I demand which of these three,

viz. to be holy, to be under the covenant, to have Christ's righteousness imputed, is first in nature? Happily you will say: First, they are under the covenant. Secondly, they are justified by the imputed righteousness of Christ. Thirdly they are sanctified or holy: Then I proceed, and demand when do infants come under the covenant: when they are conceived: or when they are born? Or when the parents are converted being already born? It will be answered: that these infants that are begotten of Faithful parents come under the covenant in their conception: and these infants that are already born come under the covenant when their parents are regenerate: hereby then it appeareth that the covenant is conveyed to the children from the parents by generation, and by filial relation: hereunto add that if it be true that some say, that children under the government of the faithful also are under the covenant, that the covenant is conveyed also by pupilship or adoption: and if bondslaves or servants being infants be under the covenant because of their believing Mrs. then servitude is also a means or instrument of conveying the covenant from Mr. to Servants: this being propounded then as the truth you hold, that plead for Pedobaptism, then you maintain, that seeing generation, filial relation, pupilship, adoption, and servitude are means to bring infants under the covenant, then they are means to bring infants under justification, and under sanctification: So that it followeth that we must account all the infants of believing parents that are children by nature and by adoption, all infants of believing Mrs. that are borne in slavery or servitude to be justified and Sanctified, because the covenant is communicated unto them by the foresaid relation: Then I proceed and demand why may not all the infants born under on King, if his subjects, be all his Servants and Vassals (as they say) be subjects, be by that relation brought under the covenant, and so be accounted justified and sanctified: For relation of a King and a subject borne so is as near the relation of a Mr, and Servant, or an adopted

Child: And then I demand, seeing the relation of a man and a wife is nearer a great deal than any relation of adoption or servitude, why the wife shall not be under the covenant for the relation of marriage: happily it will be said the wife being of years cannot be admitted because of her unbelief: and I say that infants of parents and Mrs. cannot be admitted, because of their want of Faith being under years: but it will be said that the covenant with Abraham was with him and his seed only: I say, that it was made (by your confession) with him and his adopted infants, with him and his pupils being infants, with him and his Servants being infants: and therefore not only with him and his seed: and seeing some not of his seed may be admitted into the covenant, and those that are further of, why shall not those that are nearer as his wife: but you will say because infants do not refuse the covenant, they may be admitted to baptism, though adopted children, though pupils, though Servants: but wives refusing the covenant may not: I further insist that as infants do not resist, so they do not consent: and that all the Children, Servants, and Wives, that do not resist, may be admitted, though they cannot make declaration of their Faith and repentance: if you say: not so: because that in them that are of years Faith and repentance is required, but of infants no such thing is required: I answer, first show that by Scripture, and then I say there is no reason why Faith and repentance should be required of one to make him capable of the covenant of justification, and Sanctification more than of another, except you will say that God is acceptor of persons: and further the covenant is only with Abraham and his seed, not with his Servants, and therefore in the Faith and repentance must necessarily be had, and so they cannot be baptized till they show their Faith and repentance which is contrary to your doctrine: besides you cannot show in all the Scriptures that persons may be said to be partakers of the covenant actually, except actually they fulfill the condition of the covenant:

and if you say that infants being under the covenant, justified, and sanctified, therefore they have Faith and the graces of God in them, I say that is contrary to the Scriptures which say that Faith commeth by hearing: and that the word is the immortal seed of regeneration, whereby new borne babes under the gospel are regenerate: and if it be said that infants have a kind of Faith wrought in them invisibly, and after an hidden manner: I say what God worketh invisibly, and secretly we dispute not nor regard, but what he worketh visibly and to our knowledge, and by the means appointed for the communion of the Church: For there is but one Faith, which is the common Faith of the members of the Church, which is visibly seen by speaking and confession, according as is written I believed and therefore I speak, Tit. 1. 4. and if it be objected that then we do condemn all infants dying before they be converted: I say No: we pronounce nothing of infants but leave the secret of them to the Lord, who hath reserved secret things to himself: Hence then I conclude that seeing you cannot declare what this holiness is which infants have, seeing they cannot have actual holiness: Seeing you cannot declare that they have Faith or justification, seeing they cannot have actual Faith: Therefore you cannot declare that they are actually under the covenant, by actual Faith and holiness: and so if they be not actually under it, but under the offer of it only, that is it which we affirm, and which will help you nothing to baptism of infants.

Secondly, I desire that you would prove unto me by Scripture, that in this place. 1 Cor. 7. 14. Holiness signifieth true sanctification, or to be actually under the covenant, having it really invested upon them. You endeavor to declare it out of the text: For you say Paul answereth an objection, viz. that the faithful are defiled with the Society of the unfaithful, and proveth that the Faithful husband may use the vessel of his unfaithful wife with a good conscience by an argument drawn from the effects, namely, because their

Children are holy, and under the covenant: God having said to the Faithful I will be thy God, and the God of thy seed. Well, let us see the force of your reason: your fourth argument was this.

If infants be holy then are thy under the covenant.

Infants are holy: Ergo infants are under the covenant.

Your proof that infants are holy is this.

If infants be under the covenant. Ergo infants are holy.

I ask you, Sir, in good sooth, is this circular reasoning sound: you say infants are Holy, because they are under the covenant, and you say they are under the covenant because they are holy: Let all men judge whether you have proved infants Holy or not.

Thirdly I answer that (Holy) doth not so signify as you expound, neither is the argument taken from the effects, but from the greater to the lesse after this manner.

If your children (in your own judgment) be holy, and you do not put them away when you are converted to the faith, but use the still as your Children to all those uses whereto children are appointed, the relation natural of Father and son remaining, though you believe: then much more the relation of man and wife remains, and you may use your wives, they being of a nearer natural bond then your children.

But the first is true by your own confession, and by the light of nature.

Ergo the second is true by the light of nature much more.

And whereas you say that by this exposition an unbelieving servant is in as good an estate, and as holy as children in respect of the covenant, I confess it to be so: and you that plead for pedobaptism say so likewise, seeing that you will have servants under the covenant by their Mrs. Faith: but I would know whither the Apostle speaketh only of infants or of all

Children generally: if generally of all Children, then all the Children of the Faithful are holy, yea even those that are unbelievers and then would I know how unbelieving children can be holy, if not as the unbelieving wife is holy: that is to the use of their parents in the relative duties of children and parents. If the Apostle spoke only of infants, then he spoke not so generally as God spoke to Abraham saying I will be thy God, and the God of thy seed, for in that speech you say all the seed is comprehended whither of years or under years, yea servants, pupils, children by adoption, &c. So that expound it as you will , it cannot be understood of holiness in respect of the covenant as you pretend: but you will say they are to be esteemed Holy and under the covenant till they manifest the contrary: and I say, that they must manifest that they are Holy before they can be esteemed Holy: and that you cannot prove that assertion from the Scripture: and the people of the Jews Abraham's carnal Children were Holy when they declared the contrary by their sins, Exo. 19. 6. compared with Exod. 32. 9. & 33. 3. 5. so are the children of the Faithful holy though they be unbelievers as the wife is holy though an unbeliever.

Finally you say: God hath said to all the Faithful, I will be thy God and the God of thy seed: I deny it utterly: God said that only to Abraham, Genes. 17. 7. and whether you expound it literally, or Spiritually, I avow confidently against you and all men that the meaning of it is not, that God made his covenant with the faithful man, or the Faithful woman, and their infants begotten of their Bodies: but that literally the meaning is, I will be God unto thee Abraham and thy seed according to the Flesh to give them the Land of Canaan: and so it is expounded Genes. 17. 8. Or Spiritually the meaning is, I will give unto Abraham the Father of the Faithful, and all that are his Spiritual seed, everlasting life, which is the true Land of Canaan: The latter which is the truth being signified by the former which

is the type: and show me in all the Scriptures that God said to every Faithful man and woman (for you must prove it spoken of women as well as men) that he will be God unto them and their seed: For I would feign know why the covenant should pass unto the infants of the Faithful: it will be said because of the Father's Faith: this is false doctrine: For the Prophet teaches that every man shall live by his own faith and that one man's faith cannot convey the covenant of justification to another neither can one man's sin cut of another from the covenant as this doctrine importeth: but the soul that sinneth it shall die.

Neither will it avail to plead that the covenant made with Abraham was an everlasting covenant: For berith gnolam in the original doth not import a covenant of everlasting continuance, but a covenant that doth continue his proper time: For gnolam signifieth any hidden time, or any set time of any length as 50 years the time of the jubilee: But let it be granted that the covenant made with Abraham, Gen. 17. 7. was the everlasting covenant made with Abraham in respect of Christ, (which yet I do not see proved) what then? Shall it follow that because it was with Abraham and the Faithful whether Jews or Gentiles believing actually as Abraham the Father did: Therefore it is made with the Faithful men who is the child of Abraham: and with his children begotten of his body which have not Abraham's actual Faith, and so are not the children of Abraham? I deny it utterly: For the Apostle says the seed is but one to whom the promises were made, viz: Christ or the actual believers: For Christ dwelleth in the hearts of men by Faith only. Gal. 3. 16. Eph. 3. 17. But if it be made with the Faithful who believe actually which is one seed whether Jew or Gentile, and the infants of the Faithful carnally begotten of their body, which is another seed, (for they are not begotten of the immortal seed of regeneration) then the covenant is made with the seeds which are many: and that is directly contrary the Apostle's words, Gal. 3. 16. Therefore the

one seed is persons actually believing, and actually justified by the righteousness of Faith, as Abraham the Father of all the Faithful was, Romans 4. 11. whence this Argument may be framed.

Abraham is the Father of all them that actually believe.

Infants do not actually believe.

Ergo, Abraham is not the Father of infants: and so infants are not under the covenant of Abraham.

Again. Abraham's covenant was only to Abraham's one seed, that is only to the believers.

Infants are not actually believers.

Ergo Abraham's covenant is not to infants: and so infants are not under the everlasting covenant of Abraham.

Again. They that are the children of Abraham, so the works of Abraham.

Infants cannot do the works of Abraham.

Ergo infants are not the children of Abraham: and so not under the covenant of Abraham.

Again. I reason thus: They that are not under the everlasting covenant made with Abraham shall not be baptized.

Infants are not under the everlasting covenant of Abraham.

Ergo: infants are not to be baptized.

These and many other such Arguments may be collected out of the answer to this fourth Argument of yours: but these shall suffice.

Mr. Rich Clifton.

1. Corinth. 10. 1. 2.

[5.] If the infants of the Israelites were baptized in the cloud and in the sea, as well as their parents, what letteth the infants of believing parents under the gospel, to be likewise partakers of baptism as well as they?

The former the Apostle affirms, 1. Cor. 10. 1. 2. and therefore good warrant must be showed, that our infants are cut off from this privilege that the Jew's Children had. And if the former Baptism of the Jews was a Type of our Baptism, then must there be an agreement between the Type, and the thing Typed, which is not, if our Children be not baptized, as well as theirs.

The depriving of our Children of the Sacrament, is to shorten the Lord's bounty towards his people of the New Testament, that being denied to their children, which God gave to his people, and to their infants under the Law, is to deny them (in regard of their seed) the like assurance and comfort, which the Israelites had of theirs. And so to make our estate worse and more uncomfortable then theirs was: and yet the Prophets prophesied of the grace that should come to us, and did inquire and search after the same. 1. Pet. 1. 10.

Glad tidings were preached to Abraham and his seed to infants of eight days old Gal. 3, 8. And this before Christ came in the Flesh, therefore much more he being come, is joyful tidings brought unto us and our infants. And so are we to believe that the grace of God is not lessened either towards us or our children, but enlarged by his coming.

John Smith.

Your 5. argument is taken from 1 Cor. 10. 1. 2, framed thus.

If the infants of the Israelites were baptized in the cloud and in the sea, as well as their parents, what let the infants of believing parents under the gospel to be likewise partakers of baptism as well as they?

The former the Apostle affirmeth, 1 Cor. 10.1.2. and therefore good warrant must be shown that our infants are cut off from this privilege that the Jews' children had: that baptism being a type of our baptism.

To this argument I make answer: by framing the like argument.

If their infants did eat the same Spiritual meat and drink which the parents did eat: then why may not our infants being able to eat and drink, eat and drink the Lord's Supper?

The former the Apostle affirmed, 1. Cor. 10. 1. 2. and therefore good warrant must be showed that our infants are cut off from that privilege: and those sacraments were types of our Sacraments.

Again, I answer more properly thus: That there shall be a proportion betwixt the Type and the truth, that baptism of the cloud and sea, and our baptism, viz: that as young and old carnal Israelites were baptized in the cloud and sea, so young and old Spiritual true Israelites shall be baptized by the baptism of repentance: and as the carnal parents with their carnal children were baptized in type: So Spiritual parents with their Spiritual children, that is such as are regenerate by the word and Spirit, shall be baptized with the baptism of repentance for the remission of sins, which is baptism in truth.

Further I say: That our infants shall have a privilege far greater than the infants of the Israelites had in that typical baptism: For they by it were only baptized into Moses and the Law: That by it they might learn Moses, and in Moses the truth in Christ as it were under a veil: but our infants under the gospel shall have the daily institution and education of Faithful parents,

which is infinitely superior to that dark pedagogical baptism, and all the baptisms and ordinances of the Old Testament: Seeing that with open face they may in the preaching of the gospel see Christ Jesus, and not under the veil of Moses.

Moreover I deny that the baptism of the cloud and sea was a type of the external baptism of the cloud and sea was a type of the external baptism of the New Testament, in the abstract: but it was a type of our baptism in the concrete: that is the baptism of the cloud did Type out our baptism in the 3. parts thereof, viz: 1. The baptism of the Spirit, 2. The declaration of Faith and repentance the antecedent of baptism with water, 3. The outward washing with water a manifestation of the foresaid particulars: and all these to be conferred upon infants proportionable to those infants, that is, New born babes in Christ.

And whereas you further allege that if your infants be not baptized, the Lord's bounty is shortened to us and our infants: our comfort is diminished in respect of our infants which they had in respect of theirs: and the gospel is not preached to our infants as it was to theirs: I answer that God's bounty, our comfort in respect of our infants, and the preaching of the glad tidings of the gospel is as large and ample every way to our infants as to theirs: For God's bounty of the actual exhibiting and sealing the everlasting covenant to Abraham and all his carnal infants was never extant in the Old Testament: Neither were the parents in circumcising their infants comforted in the assured conferring of it upon their infants: and circumcision did not so plainly preach Christ then as he is preached now to infants: but what could the preaching of Christ profit infants either then in types or now in truth? Neither do I think that the Lord ever intedned to teach the infant any thing at that instant, but afterward he was to learn that which the Schoolemr. Circumcision upon his Flesh taught him: viz: the circumcision of the heart: and if you say that so infants baptized are to be instructed, I answer, that in the New Testament by baptism we manifest

what we have, namely, the inward baptism, whereas in the Old Testament by circumcision they learned what they had not but ought to have, viz: The inward circumcision of the heart, and mortification of the sinful Flesh.

Mr. Rich Clifton.

Mat. 28. 19.

[6.] If Christ gave a commandment for the publishing of his covenant and administering of baptism the seal thereof to all nations: then are the believing Gentiles and their infants to receive the same.

But the first is true, Mat. 28, 19, Ergo the latter also is true, Act. 13. 48. and 16. 14. 15. 32. 33.

It will be objected against the Major, that it follows not, that the infants are any more bound to receive baptism, then they are bound whilst they are infants to receive the word, but the word they cannot receive, ergo. I answer, that the commandment is general to all nations, and therefore as Abraham if he should not have obeyed to the Lord commanding him to circumcise himself, and all his family, yea the infants, he should grievously have rebelled against God: So whosoever of the Gentiles shall not believe and be baptized both himself and his seed, shall have no part nor portion in the inheritance of Christ: Seeing he cuts himself of and his seed from the covenant of God, Gen. 17. 14.

And though infants be not capable of the preaching of the covenant, (which notwithstanding they are bound unto, as they shall come to years of discretion) yet are they capable of the seal, as before is shown, and therefore by virtue of this general commandment. Mat. 28. 19. are to be baptized.

John Smith.

Your 6. Argument from Mat. 28. 19. is framed thus.

If Christ gave a commandment for the publishing of his covenant and administering of baptism the seal thereof to all nations: then are the believing Gentiles and their infants to receive the same.

But the first is true: Mat. 28. 19. Ergo the latter also is true, Act. 13. 48. and 16. 14. 15. 32. 33.

The errors of this argument I will discover in order: First I deny that baptism is the seal of the covenant of the New Testament: Secondly I deny that circumcision was the seal of that everlasting covenant that was made with Abraham in respect of Christ: Thirdly, baptism therefore doth not succeed in the place of circumcision, there being only a change of the ceremony (as you pretend) the covenant being the same, these three particulars are already proved. Fourthly I deny, that though Abraham who had a special commandment, did circumcise his male infants, therefore Christians upon this general commandment, Mat. 28. 19. shall baptize their infants. Fifthly, I say rather the contrary is hence proved, because Christ commandeth to baptize only those that are by teaching made Disciples (for so the word matheteusate signifies) therefore infants are by express prohibition excluded, and it is as if Christ should say, I will have you make them Disciples and baptize them that are made Disciples by teaching and no other: and so Christ expressly excluded infants. Lastly, I deny that infants are capable of baptism, for they cannot confess their faith and their sins, neither declare that they are baptized inwardly with the Spirit, and so cannot outwardly by the baptism with water declare the same, but are in every respect unable thereto, and incapable thereof.

Hence therefore I reason against baptizing infants.

1. They only are to be baptized that are made Disciples by teaching. Infants cannot be made disciples by teaching. Ergo, infants are not to be baptized. Secondly I reason thus.
2. Every precept affirmative contains a negative under it. Make Disciples by teaching and baptize them, is an affirmative containing under it, baptize not those that are not made Disciples by teaching. Ergo, those that are not be teaching made Disciples, are by Christ forbidden to be baptized: and so infants are not to be baptized.
3. Thirdly I reason thus. They that are incapable of baptism are not to be baptized. Infants are incapable of baptism: Seeing baptism consisting of the inward baptism of the Spirit, expressed by confession in word, and washing with water in action: infants are incapable of the two former parts of baptism. Ergo infants are not to be baptized with water which is the latter.
4. If the New Testament be as clear and perspicuous as the old, and Christ the Mediator of the New Testament as faithful as Moses the Mediator of the Old Testament: then the persons to be baptized, and the condition of baptism, and the time of baptism are as clearly and faithfully described in the institution of baptism, as the person, condition, and time of circumcision.

But for the pedobaptism, there is no express description of the person, condition, or time of their baptism: and for true baptism: there is most evidently, and faithfully set down the persons, condition, and time of administering it, viz: persons confessing their sins, Mat. 3. 6. whereas persons impenitent were put by, Mat. 3. 7-12. compared with Luke. 7. vs, 29-30. Persons believing. Acts 8. 12. 13. and vs. 36-38. persons that had received the holy Ghost, and expressed the same by prophesying. Act. 10. 46-48 persons penitent, Act. 2. 38. persons that are by teaching made Disciples, Mat. 28. 19. John. 4. 1. persons born again. John 3.3.

Therefor such persons are to be baptized who are thus particularly described, wherein the New Testament is as clear as the Old, and Christ the Mediator as Faithful as Moses: and no other but these: For if others be, then is not the New Testament so clear as the Old, nor Christ as Faithful as Moses, which to say is to blaspheme.

Mr. Rich. Clifton.

[7.] Lastly, the Apostles practice is our instruction, but they baptized not only the master of the family which believed, but all his household. Act. 16. 15. 33. Therefore now also the like is to be done: and so consequently the infants are to be baptized, for they are a part of the family and that infants are of the family, see Gen. 45. 18. where Joseph bade his brethren, take their Father, and their households, and come to him, now in chapter 46. 5. 7. it is said they carried their children and wives in charets, nothing hereby, that children were of the household, else had they no commandment to have carried them into Egypt, see also vs. 27. and Exo. 1. 21. it is said, because the Midwives feared God, therefore he made them houses, in 1 Tim. 5. 8. the Apostle saith, he that provideth not for his own, and namely for them of his household, he denyeth the faith, &c. Now I would ask if children be exempted from the household in any of these places, or in any other where is mention made of a particular household. Therefore this argument will prove that children were baptized, unless it can be shown that they were specially exempted. And if the holy ghost have not exempted them, who dare do it against a general commandment of baptizing all nations.

John Smith.

Your 7. argument is taken from Act. 16. 15. 33. framed thus.

The Apostles' practice is our instruction.

But they baptized not only the Mr. of the Family which believed, but all his household:  
Act. 16. 15. 33.

Therefore now also the like is to be done: and so consequently infants are to be baptized, for they are a part of the family.

I make answer to this argument confessing it wholly, but yet denying the consequent of your conclusion: For it doth not follow because all the household of Lydia and the Jailor were baptized, that therefore infants were baptized: you shall see what exceptions I take.

First, I say though infants are a part of the family when the family hath infants in it, yet it doth not follow that whersoever there is mention made of a Family, that therefore that Family had infants in it: except therefore it be proved that the family of Lydia, and the family of the Jailor had infants in it, this allegation is nothing.

Secondly, by this reason you might prove that Lydia's husband, and the Jailor's wife, and their children of 40 years old, and their Servants of 60 years old, were baptized: For all these are parts of a Family, yet I suppose you will not say they were all of them baptized, except you can prove, that Lydia had a Husband, or the Jailor had a wife, or children of 40 and servants of 60 years old: your argument therefore is weak presupposing the thing that is in question.

Thirdly, if it were yielded that there were infants in Lydia's Family, and in the Jailor's, doth it therefore follow that they were baptized? Nothing less: and that I will declare thus.

1. You say that to the baptizing of the Jailor's wife, and children or years of discretion there was necessarily required Faith and repentance, or else they were not baptized: So say I that because infants cannot believe and repent, though they were in the Family yet shall they not be baptized: For there is one condition required for all persons to be baptized.

2. I say: that although it be said that all that pertained to the Jailor were baptized, yet it is also said vs. 32. That the word was preached to all that were in his house: and vs. 34. That all his household believed, and how came their faith but by the word preached vs. 32. Seeing therefore that all that were baptized in the Jailor's house believed by the preaching of the word: infants that could not believe by the preaching of the word, were not baptized if he had any: besides it was a marvelous distempered time at midnight to wake children, and to bring them before the Apostles for baptism.

3. I say: That for Lydia's family it is not said that all her household was baptized: or if it had been so said, yet it followeth not that every particular person of her family was baptized. For Mat. 3. 5. 6. it is said that all Judea went out to John and were baptized of him, confessing their sins: yet hence it cannot be concluded that all and every one went out to be baptized: no more can it be proved that because it is said that Lydia's Family was baptized, that therefore all and every particular person was baptized, but as Mat. 3. 6. only they that confessed their sins: and as Act. 16. 32-34. only they that believed by the word preached were baptized, so was it with them of Lydia's Family that were baptized: For the Apostles I doubt not kept one order, and required the same conditions in all that they baptized: So that by that which hath been said the vanity of this argument is manifested: and it is proved plainly that none were baptized in the Jailor's Family, but only they that believed after the word preached: and so infants specially are exempted, if he had any in his family which yet is not manifested.

Hence therefore I reason thus against baptizing infants.

1. The Apostles practice is our instruction. But the Apostles in baptizing households first preached the word to all that were in the Family, Act. 16. 32. and then the

believing were baptized, vs. 34, 33. Ergo: They only that by the preaching of the word were converted and believed were baptized. Again I reason thus.

2. That which the Apostles practiced in one Family, they practiced in all Families that they are baptized. But in the Jailor's Family, according to Christ's commission, Mat. 28.19. They first made them Disciples by preaching the Word: Act. 16. 32-34. Ergo: So they practiced in all Families: and therefore in the Family of Lydia, of Cripsus, Act. 18. 8 of the Ruler: John, 4. 43 and so no infants were baptized. And this shall suffice for answer to your arguments.

Mr. Rich. Clifton.

[8.] Hereunto I will adjoin some testimonies of the Fathers, not to prove that children ought to be baptized, which is to be done, and is by the Scriptures already proved: but to show the practice hereof in ancient Churches. Augustine (as I find alleged) writing to Jerome, Epist. 28. chap. 5. Saith Cyprian not making any new decree, but firmly observing the Faith of the Church, judged with this fellow Bishops, that as soon as one was born, he might Lawfully be baptized. See Cyprian Epist. to Fidus. And writing against the Donatists, Lib. 4. Chap. 23. and 24. saith, that the baptism of infants was not derived from the authority of man, neither of counsels, but from the tradition or doctrine of the Apostles. Cyril: upon Lec. Chap. 8. approveth the baptism of infants and condemneth the iteration of baptism. Origine upon the Roman: sayth, that the Church received baptism of infants from the Apostles. Nazianzenus in Orat. In S. Lavacrum. 3. saith: That baptism agreeth to every age, to every condition of life, to all men, if thou hast an infant, that is Sanctified from his infancy, yea from the finger ends it is consecrated. After he saith: Some man wil say, what sayest thou of infants which neither know what grace is nor pain, what shall we baptize those? And he Answers, yea verily. Amb: Lib. 2. de Abrah.

Chap. 11. Speaking of baptism, saith, nether Old man nor proselyte, nor infant is to be excepted, because every age is guilty of sin, and therefore stands need of the Sacrament. These and many others of the Fathers do bear witness according to Scriptures of the Lawfulness of the baptizing of infants.

John Smyth.

And herefore a conclusion you produce the Fathers: I say that the producing of Fathers who all of them held plenty of Antichristian heresies, shall avail you nothing in your cause: and you that deny the testimony of Fathers contrary to the Scriptures, how can you with any color of equity produce Fathers against us in a case contrary to the Scripture, is it not to set darkness against light? Do not you know that all the Fathers even every one of them brought his stone to the building of the Temple of Antichrist: but I know your drift in the producing of Fathers, viz: First to set a gloze upon your Antichristian heresy of baptizing infants. Secondly to draw the world into dislike of the Lord's truth: but if a man should produce testimonies of Fathers against our Separation, against you in the case of Prelacy, Priesthood, and Deaconry, read prayer, and other parts of your cause, what would you answer? Would not you say, that they were testimonies of men living in corrupt times, contrary to the Scriptures, &c. Even so say I to you: but you say that you do not bring testimony of the Fathers, to prove any thing: well then: you confess they prove nothing: remember that, and let all men take notice that you produce testimonies that you say prove nothing: but why do you produce testimonies of the Fathers: Forsooth, to show the practice of ancient Churches: but all those Churches were Antichristian by your own confession: and what doth antiquity Antichristian, or universality antichristian help you against the truth? Therefore I say: The truth needeth not the testimony of Antichrist: and old universal antichristian errors shall not prevail against the truth: I have showed you that from the

beginning it was not thus: ergo: baptism of infants is a Novelty: but let us show you some footsteps of the bringing in of baptizing infants, and that out of the Fathers.

Henricus Pantaleon: Chronolog. Fol. 16. saith: Victor Apher in the year 193. ordained: that at Easter baptism should be indifferently administered to all: hence then it followeth that before his time only such as were Catechised in the Faith were baptized: For he would not decree that heathen should be baptized.

Eusebuis. Eccles. Histor. Lib. 7, Chap. 8. saith that Novatus rejected the Holy baptism, and overthrew the Faith and confession which was accustomed before baptism: whereby it appeareth that Faith and confession were required before baptism, and therefore the rudiments thereof still remained, that in Baptizing of infants, a confession of sin, and Faith is required of the sureties or parents.

The same Euseb. Lib. 10. Chap. 15. reporteth the story of Athanasius baptizing children in sport: which baptism was approved (thought done in sport) by Alexander Bb, of Alexandria, after that he by examination had found that the children had questioned and answered according to the manner of the Catechumeni in baptism: whereby it appeareth that then only persons by confession of their Faith and sins were admitted to baptism in Alexandria.

Hosius: Petricoviensi confess. de fide. chap. 27. saith that these two are Apostolical traditions, which the Scripture teacheth not: viz: that there are 3 persons and one God: and that Dionisius and Origen do testify baptism of infants to be an Apostolical tradition: Now you know that their Apostolical traditions were antichristian inventions.

Polydor. Virg. Lib. 4. Chap. 4 de inventoribus reru. Saith thus: It was in use with the ancients, that persons of years in a manner should be baptized clad with white garments: Lactantius.

Candidus egreditur nitidis exercitus vndis:

Atque vetus vitium purgat in amne novo.

And this was performed at Easter and whitsontide except in necessity: in the meantime till the Feasts of Easter and whitsontide came they were catechized: this testimony is of good instruction.

Ludovicus Vives, writing upon the first book of August: de Civitate dei, chap. 27. saith: that in ancient times no man was baptized but persons of years, who could understand what the mystical water signified, and required baptism offer than once: and therefore now the infant to be baptized is demanded three times, if he will be baptized, for whom the sureties answer, yea.

Erasmus Rotrodamus in his annotations upon the fifth of the Roman. Saith, that is Paul's time it was not received, that infants should be baptized.

Thus have I thought good to show you testimonies of men: and so by setting man against man, to lead you to us all from man to the holy Scriptures, which is the rock whereupon we may safely build: which as you have heard flatly forbiddeth the baptizing of infants, who cannot be made Disciples by teaching. Mat. 28. 19. John. 4. 1.

Mr. Rich. Clifton.

Now let us come to consider of the reasons alleged to the contrary, [page 574:] the first of them is this.

1. Because there is neither precept nor example in the New Testament of any infants that were Baptized by John, or Christ's Disciples, only that they did confess their sins, and confess their Faith, were baptized, Mark 1. 4. 5. Act. 8. 37.

Answer.

First, this reason being brought into form, will betray the weakness of it: For suppose that should be granted that there were neither a special commandment or example in the practice of John or Christ's Disciples, for the baptizing of infants, yet may it notwithstanding be lawful to baptize them, namely, if by some consequence it may be gathered out of the Scripture. And this may be done by good warrant from the example of our Savior Christ, Mat. 22. 31. 32. where reasoning against the Saducces concerning the resurrection, proves it by an argument necessarily drawn from Exo. 3. 6. where no such thing was expressly mentioned. And thus he taught visually and refuted his adversaries, as the History of the Gospel witnesseth. After the same manner doth Paul in his Epistle to the Romans and Galatians prove justification by Faith only without works of the law: this he did not prove by alleging any place in all the Old Testament in plain terms affirming so much, but by conclusions of necessary consequence from the Scriptures and to this purpose might diverse other instances be alleged. So likewise if we prove the baptizing of infants by unanswerable arguments out of the Old and New Testament (though we cannot show any plain precept or example,) yet may we upon warrant thereof, not fear to baptize them. For the author of this reason him self cannot deny, that both he and we must believe diverse things which we gather out of the Scriptures by necessary consequence, that we shall not find in express words. As that there be three persons in one Godhead, that the son is Homousios, that is of the same substance with the Father: Now such express words cannot be shown in the Scripture, and many such like.

2. Secondly, also if this argument be sufficient to barre children from the Sacrament of baptism, then is it as sufficient to keep back women from the Lord's Supper, for there is no special precept, nor yet example that Women should partake of the Lord's Supper, but the Lawfulness thereof is only proved by consequence, because they are within the covenant, and are

partakers of the Sacrament of baptism, thus the weakness of this reason being manifested, I will thirdly answer unto it.

3. Thirdly, that there is both precept by Christ and example by his Disciples for the baptizing of infants as hath been proved by my two last reasons alleged to prove the Lawfulness of baptizing of infants: Commandment, I say, Mat. 28. 19. Go teach all nations, baptizing them, where I no exception of the children of faithful parents: and therefore there being a Law once given, that the covenant should be sealed to the infants as well as to the believing parents, the same Law of sealing the covenant must stand still in force to the parties (though the outward sign be changed) except the Lawmaker do repeal it, or have set down some ground for the repeal thereof which must be shown: or else this commandment doth bind us and our infants to receive this seal of the covenant. And as for examples we read that the Apostles baptized Lydia and her household. Act. 16. 15, and the Keeper, and all that belonged unto him, vs. 33. both which seeming to be great Families, it is not likely that they were without children, though the Evang: mention them not.

But the exception is that only such as did confess their sins, and confess their Faith, were baptized. I desire that to be proved that only such and no others were to be baptized. Concerning John, indeed he was sent to call the people to repentance, and so to prepare the way of the Lord. Mat. 3. 3. and so many as did repent and confess their sins he baptized, but did John refuse their children if they brought them to him? But it will be said, there is no mention made that he did baptize the, no more say I, is there that they were offered unto Him. There is no mention that the Disciples of Christ were baptized, and yet it were too bold a part, and no doubt very false to affirm that they were not baptized: Not all things that John did, nor yet that Christ did, in the particulars, are written John 20. 30. but the sum thereof: and therefore to gather an

argument from hence, because there is no mention that children were baptized by John, therefore they ought not to be baptized is a larger conclusion, then the premise will bear and so the reason taken from the baptizing of the Eunuch, (Philip baptized no children, when he baptized the Eunuch) is of no weight, to prove that therefore children ought not to be baptized. Was not the Eunuch a stranger far from his country, now in journey homeward and therefore not likely that he should have children with him specially in such a tedious journey, and not knowing of this accident.

John Smyth.

Now in the next place you proceed to make answer to my three arguments against baptizing of infants: In answer to the first argument you say that if it be brought into form it will betray the weakness of it: Well I will bring it into form, and then let us strengthen it where it is weak: as thus

That which hath neither precept nor example, is not to be done.

Baptizing of infants hath neither precept nor example.

Ergo, baptism of infants is not to be done.

Again another part of my argument may be brought into form thus.

That which hath precept and example must be practiced.

Baptizing of persons confessing their sins and their faith is commanded, and was practiced by Christ, John, and the Apostles.

Ergo, those persons are the persons to be baptized.

My argument therefore consisting of an affirmative which includeth a negative is as I take it a forcible Argument: Let us see your answer and exceptions.

First, you say that a consequence necessarily drawn from the Scripture is sufficient to prove the baptizing of infants, though there were no special commandment or example as Christ proveth the resurrection, Mat. 22. 31. 32, out of Exod. 3. 6. by necessary consequent: and as Paul in the Epistles to the Rom. and Gal. proveth justification by Faith only without works, by necessary consequents: and we believe many things that are not expressed in words: as 3. persons in one Godhead, and that Christ is coessential or consubstantial to the Father: this is your answer or exception: whereto I reply thus.

Although a necessary consequence in all cases shall prevail, yet I say the Lord can not leave us in this particular to necessary consequence he dealing plainly and faithfully with us: For seeing the New Testament is more manifest then the old, the Gospel being with open face, the Law being hid under the veil: and seeing Christ is as Faithful, yea much more faithful than all men, and therefore is called Amen, the Faithful and true witness: and so hath as faithfully prescribed all the ordinances of the New Testament as Moses did the ordinances of the Old Testament: and seeing Moses hath set down distinctly and most plainly, the persons with their qualifications to be circumcised, and the circumstance of the time when circumcision was to be administered: either Christ hath as plainly and fully set down these particulars in the new Testament, or else the new Testament is not so plain as the old, and Christ is not as Faithful as Moses: For it had been easily said, go teach, make Disciples, and baptize them, and if they have any infants baptize them without teaching them: or thus: baptize men of years when they confess their sins and their faith, but baptize all the infants of the faithful, though they cannot confess at all their sins and faith, or it had been easily said: John baptized them that confess their sins and their young children also: but to say that Christ, John, and the Apostles leaveth direction for this main matter, only by dark obscure, far fetched, probably conjectures and consequents from the

Old Testament which was only typical, and is abolished in respect of the Types and that he hath not left evident and undeniable ground for it distinctly and expressly in all the foresaid particulars, is to say that Christ is not so plain and Faithful in his office propheticall, as Moses was, who hath taught all these particulars so distinctly as nothing is more plain: and therefore though I must needs yield that necessary consequents are true, yet I deny that in this case the Lord hath left us to consequents, and it is against his truth, his Faithfulness, and the evidence of the new Testament, so to do.

Moreover seeing that the new Testament was wrapped up and preached obscurely in the old Testament, and the types thereof, it was necessary that Christ should out of the old Testament prove the resurrection, and Paul out of the old Testament prove justification by faith without works: for the Jews would not believe any thing contrary to the law or without warrant of the law: and the Gentiles, namely the Galatians especially, being seduced by them of the circumcision, Act 15. 1. must needs have their mouths stopped by the law: and there were no Scriptures but the old Testament, and the ordinances of the new Testament could not be so plainly drawn out of the old Testament without consequents: but now the new Testament being written, and all the ordinances thereof plainly taught by Christ and his Apostles: why shall we be sent to obscurities, and conjectural consequents, seeing that we may with open face look into the glory of Christ, as it were into a glass, and therein see all the beauty of the new Jerusalem as clear as crystal, Revel. 21. 11. 2. Cor. 3. 18. and whereas you would fetch arguments from the old Testament to prove the baptism of infants, we having the clear light of the new Testament, you therein set us to School to the rudiments of the world, and put aside the light of the sun at noon, and set up a candle as the Papists do in their funerals: for although it be meet that we attend unto the Prophets as unto a light shining in a dark place, yet seeing the day star is come,

and the sun of righteousness is risen upon us, let us walk in this clear light, and use the other when we want light as with the Jews who deny the new Testament: and in other like occasions.

Besides the trinity of persons, and unity of essence in the Godhead is proved by plain words, 1 John 5. 7. and hereby the Homoiousia of Arius is confuted: as also: Phil. 2. 6. and for the word person it is, Heb. 1. 3. and the word Godhead is Roman 1. 20. So that hereby you get nothing: but I say still that whatsoever cannot be plainly shown in the New Testament, is not needful for us to know in the New Testament, if it be an ordinance of the New Testament as baptism is: but the trinity and unity is no part of the New Testament more then of the Old Testament, and being common to both may be sought out of both, and so any other common truth.

Finally, I say show me any necessary consequence for baptizing infants, either out of the Old Testament or New Testament, and I yield: but I desire it may well be observed, first, that you are driven to consequents for this matter, and therein simple witted people may easily be misled by a Logician: Secondly, that the Gospel of Christ is for babes: Mat. 11. 25. and therefore the most simple person is capable of it: and so there shall need no obscure consequents out of it: for they are not able to comprehend them: and lastly, that the consequents that are brought I avow to be mere hallucinations and sophism, as I have already declared and shall do hereafter more fully as they shall be produced.

Your second answer and exception is, that if want of special precept and example, bar infants from baptism, it shall also bar women from the Lord's Supper: I deny it, for in plain terms it is said: 1. Corinth. 11. 28. Let Anthropos, viz: either man or woman eat after examination: and Gal. 3. 28. There is neither male nor female in Christ Jesus, but all are one, and 1. Corinth. 10. 17. we that are many are one bread, and one body, being all partakers of one

bread, and 1 Corinth. 12. 13. we have been all made to drink into one Spirit, and Dorcas is a Disciple: Act. 9. 36. and the Disciples meet together to break bread, Act. 20. 7. and the Disciples continued in breaking bread: Act. 2. 41. 42. being first 3000. then 5000. amongst whom there was Sapphyra, and the Widows of the Grecians, Act 2. 41 and 5. 1 and 6.1 so this exception is nothing to the purpose.

Your third answer and exception followeth, wherein you do affirm that there is both precept and example for baptizing infants, the Commandment is, Mat. 28. 19. The example is of the infants of Lydia, and the Keeper of the prison: Act. 16. 15. 33. To these I have already given answer in the 6. and 7. reasons going before, and therefore hold it needless to repeat it here again: only one thing is hear to be answered that you object. Viz: That must be retained, except a repeal can be shown: I answer, (besides that baptism is not the seal of the New Testament, but the Spirit: and that circumcision was not a seal of the everlasting covenant made with Abraham in respect of Christ but of the Old Testament) that when Princes and common wealths make Laws to endure but for a time, when the time is expired then they are repealed if they be not reestablished: So, though it were granted that infants of the Old Testament were by circumcision sealed to the covenant made in respect of Christ which I peremptorily deny, yet seeing the time of circumcision is expired therefore infants are not now to be sealed (as you say) by baptism: for the expiring of the time is the repealing of the Law: therefore until you can show that baptism of infants male and female is in the new Testament established: I will defend that they are not to be baptized especially the female infants which were never appointed to be circumcised: but I count these but slender exceptions.

In the last place you require proof that only persons that confessed their sins and their faith were to be baptized: I prove it unto you thus.

1. They only were to be baptized that Christ commanded to be baptized. Persons made Disciples by teaching, were only commanded to be baptized by Christ, Mat. 28. 19. Ergo: persons made Disciples by teaching, were only to be baptized.

The minor of this argument is evident, Mat. 28, 19. where this being the affirmative you shall make them Disciples by teaching them, and then baptize them: this must needs be the negative, you shall not baptize them till you have made them Disciples by teaching: and so persons taught were baptized and they only.

2. Again: considering that in every affirmative there is included a negative: the for whosoever an example that persons confessing their sins and their faith were baptized, there is signified that those that did not confess their sins and their Faith, were not baptized: For we must know that the body is one: and the Faith is one, and the Spirit one, and the baptism one, and the seed one: and that there is not two in Christ but one: For in the new Testament they know God from the least unto the greatest, Heb. 8. 11. and they are all taught of God, John 6. 45. and the least in the Kingdom of heaven is greater than John. Mat. 11. 11. and this do I take to be a plain proof of the point which you desire.

You say further that the reason why John baptized no children, is for that they offered them not. Well: I say that his preaching was such as peremptorily excluded infants: For it was the baptism of repentance for the remission of sins: Mark 1. 4. and he required confession of sins, and repentance of them that he baptized, Mat. 3. 6-11 compared with Luke 7. 29. 30. otherwise he would not baptize them: and therefore Christ's doctrine is the same with Johns, Mark 1. 15. both thereby signified unto their hearers, that whosoever would be baptized and enter into the Kingdom of God, must repent and believe the gospel. For being not regenerate (though they were Jews, and begotten of Faithful parents) yet they could not enter into the Kingdom of God.

John 3. 3. 5. and here it would be considered unto whom Christ and John Baptist preached: did he not preach unto the Jews the Lord's own holy people: and yet he said repent and believe: and required of them amendment of life: Now if they had been truly regenerate in their communion as is pleaded, John needed not thus have preached, nor Christ have required such conditions of them, but only they might in few words have said: come you Faithful and believing Jews, you and all your infants be baptized at once: For baptism is for circumcision: but John saith, think not to say you have Abraham to your Father: and Christ saith, you are of your Father the Devil: and John saith the Lord will purge his floor: whereby it is evident that the Jews were not Faithful in their communion: and that they perceived plainly that seeing repentance and Faith were required by John and Christ particularly, which must be declared by confession, therefore it was in vain for them to offer their infants whom they knew John and Christ would not baptize, but excluded from baptism by their doctrine.

Again, whereas you say there is no mention made that Christ's Disciples were baptized, and yet it were boldness to affirm they were not baptized: and so all Christ's and John's actions are not written but only the sum: and therefore though it be not mentioned that infants were baptized, yet in the sum it may be collected they were: I answer, for the Disciples of Christ it is plain they were baptized, John 4.1 and John 1. 35. 40. and for the summing and particularizing of all John Baptist's or Christ's actions, I say it was not needful to set down the particulars but the kinds: and if there had been any commandment or example of baptizing any one infant, it had been sufficient, though it had not been mentioned how many particular infants: but as it fell out in circumcision that one particular precept was sufficient, though it were not written how many thousand were circumcised, so likewise of baptism.

Finally, for that you say of the Eunuch, though I intend it not as you answer it, me things that some mention should be made of Philip to the Eunuch or of the Eunuch to Philip, his infants or children being at home far of concerning infants: or at least of some other that had infants, or did baptize persons that had infants, and that after this manner: What have you any infants? Let them be brought to baptism as well as yourselves: For they have title to it through your Faith, or thus, I have infants I pray you let them be baptized as well as myself: or thus, do you repent and you shall be baptized and your infants: but the deep silence of infant's baptism, yea the exclusive condition of believing and repenting necessary to the Kingdom of God, yea and the confession of sins and confession of Faith performed by persons baptized, yea and Christ's commandment of making Disciples before baptism, all these and many more are strong proofs unanswerable against baptism of infants.

Mr. Rich Clifton.

The next reason is this.

2, Because Christ commanded to make Disciples by teaching them and then to baptize them, Matth. 28. 19. John 4. 1. But infants can not be Doctrine become Christ's Disciples. And so can not by the rule of Christ be baptized.

Answer.

1. The Apostles were indeed commanded to make Disciples, and to call unto the Faith and fellowship of the Gospel, not only the Jews, but the Gentiles through out the world, Mat. 28, 19. and gave them power to preach the Gospel, which before had been preached to Abraham, Gal. 3. 8. and to baptize all that did receive it: and thus we grant that faith must go before baptism, in all such as are to be made Disciples, and brought into the covenant of God" So went Faith before circumcision, Abraham first believed, and after was circumcised, and likewise must

all they which with Abraham enter into God's covenant, first believe and then be baptized as the Eunuch, Act. 8. 37. Lydia. Act. 16. 13. and the Keeper of the prison, Act. 16. 33. But when such have received the Faith, then are their infants and household capable also of baptism as Abraham's Family was of circumcision, he believing the promises, Gen. 17. and therefore it is written, that when God opened the heart of Lydia, that she did attend to the Word that Paul preached, and believed, not only she herself, but all her household were baptized, and yet is there no mention of the Faith of any of them, save of Lydia's only: and so the Keeper believing all his received baptism, and this is proportionable to the example of Abraham, whose Faith we find sufficient to interest all his seed in the covenant, and make them capable of the seal.

2. Secondly, Christ took the same course (in giving out this commission to his Disciples, Mat. 28. 19.) in bringing the Gentiles into God's covenant, that the Lord took with Abraham, for making his covenant with him, that he should be the Father of many nations, &c. He did not first command him to be circumcised, but preached to him the gospel or covenant. Gen. 17. 1-8. and he believing was circumcised and his household: So here is a commandment, first, for the publishing of the Gospel to them that were not in Christ, and then for baptizing such as believed with their Families, for that is included in this commandment, else had not the Apostle baptized the Families of Lydia, and of the Keeper as before has been noted.

3. Thirdly, if children shall be excluded from baptism because they cannot be made Disciples by teaching, and so believe, then by as good reason may they be excluded from salvation, for he that said, he that believes and is baptized, shall be saved, said also, he that believes not shall be damned, Mar. 16. 16. if therefore want of faith be sufficient to exclude infants from baptism: then likewise the want of Faith is sufficient to exclude them from

Salvation, for if the former be held to be the meaning of Christ, then must the latter also be granted, a thought whereof is to be abhorred.

Lastly, general rules must be taken with their sense and meaning. It is a general rule given by the Apostle: 2. Thess. 3. 19. That if any would not work he should not eat: yet if any should gather from hence, that the impotent and infants should not eat, because they do not work, this were to offer violence, and to wrest the Apostles doctrine: So Christ giving a general rule for the making of Disciples, and baptizing them, now to deprive the infants of believing parents of baptism, because they cannot receive instruction, which is intended only of them that be capable thereof and unconverted, is to diminish the commandment of Christ, even like as he that should say, infants cannot believe, and therefore cannot be saved.

Again, that can never be the true meaning of a Scripture when it is expounded so as to contradict other Scriptures, or any sound conclusion gathered out of the Scriptures, as this exposition of the Anabaptists upon this place of Mat. 28. 19. doth, as my former reasons for the baptizing of infants, do plainly manifest.

John Smith.

Next follows your Answer to my second reason: which reason of mine is framed thus.

They that cannot by Teaching made Christ's Disciples, ought [not] to be baptized.

Infants by teaching cannot be made Christ's Disciples, Mat. 28. 19. John 4. 1.

Ergo infants ought not to be baptized.

Your answer to this argument of mine consisted in 4 particulars.

First, you say, that as Abraham first believed, and then was circumcised, and then all his household received circumcision with him: So all the believing Gentiles must first be baptized, and then though their faith all their household must be baptized as in the example of Lydia, and

the Jailer's family: of whose faith there is no mention made, as neither of the faith of Abraham's family.

To this first particular of your answer I say, that you err mistaking the Scriptures. For Abraham's faith did not go before his circumcision as a necessary antecedent to establish him a member of the Church of the Old Testament, but as a necessary president, example, type, or pattern of justification: and circumcision in Abraham was not a seal of his justification, or of the everlasting covenant God made with him in respect of Christ, thereby to establish him into Christ, (for he was in Christ and sealed in Christ many years before, by the seal of the Spirit:) but Abraham's justification in uncircumcision, was a type of the justification of the Gentiles who are uncircumcised: and Abraham's circumcision after his justification sealed him up to be the Father of all the believers circumcised: and so circumcision had a triple use in Abraham one general and two special and particular: the two special are these:

First circumcision sealed up Abraham's form of justification to be a pattern to all the believers in uncircumcision: that the believing Gentiles should be all justified by actual faith, as he was.

Secondly, circumcision sealed up Abraham's form of justification to be a pattern to all the believers in circumcision, that the believing Jews should be all justified by actual faith as he was.

The general use of Abraham's circumcision was common with him to Ishmael and all the persons of his family. And all the carnal Israelites, viz: to seal him up to the Old Testament, and to the observation of the whole Law, whereby Christ in that veil of the Old Testament was preached unto the Jews, it being their Schoolmr. to teach them Christ.

Now for the place. Rom. 4. 11. which I am assured you will ground your assertion upon, I say, it is both falsely translated, and expounded: for (tes en te acrobustia) is visually translated which Abraham had when he was uncircumcised: and this I say is a false translation: For this is the true translation, viz: which (is or was of shall be) in the uncircumcision: meaning that circumcision upon Abraham the Father of all the believing Gentiles was a seal of justification to all the uncircumcision that believe: and the end of his circumcision is his Fatherhood of the Faithful: and the righteousness of faith is not sealed up to Abraham's particular person, but to the uncircumcised that believe: and that which was sealed up in special to Abraham was his Fatherhood or presidentship of justification: So that circumcision in Abraham was to establish him the Father of the Faithful Gentiles, and his circumcision doth teach the Gentiles that if they will partake Christ they must by their actual faith apprehend Christ's righteousness, as Abraham their Father did, otherwise they cannot be justified, and so Paul's intent is plainly proved, namely, that all men must be justified by faith without the works of the law: and this do I confidently affirm to be the true translation and exposition, and that the common acceptation and translation of the place is the mother of this heresy of pedobaptistry.

Again, all the persons of Abraham's Family were not circumcised, because of Abraham's faith, but the males, all and only the males, were circumcised because of the special commandment of God: Gen. 17.10. the males being assumed as types for to teach the figuratively the male Ch. and circumcision of the heart by him. and the females were uncircumcised as they were also put out from being the matter of the burnt-offering (for the males only were offered in burnt-offering) to signify that those that had not the male Christ in them were not fit either to be members of the church of the New Testament, or to be sacrificed

into the Lord. Mal. 1. 14. but if Christ the male were in the whether male or female in Christ it was nothing: they were accepted, Gal. 3. 28.

Further you say that as it was with Abraham and his family in circumcision, so was it with Lydia and the Jailor, and their families in baptism: that is not so: I show the difference in diverse particular.

1. They of Abraham's family were circumcised upon particular precept in obedience of the Commandment: Genes. 17. 23. You cannot prove that the infants of Lydia's and the Jailor's family were baptized upon particular precept, but only you say it, and endeavor to justify it by the example of Abraham's family: but if Abraham's family be an example then you must bring a particular precept (as he had) for baptizing infants.

2. They that were males only were circumcised, but you will have both males and females baptized: this is another difference.

3. They that were circumcised of Abraham's Family, were all the males being of years, though they were never so lewd and wicked persons: So were not all the persons of Lydia's and the Jailor's family, but only the believers being of years according to your opinion.

4. As Faith did not entitle the female to circumcision, and as infidelity did not deprive the male of circumcision in Abraham's Family: So faith did entitle the female to baptism in the Family of the Jailor and Lydia: and infidelity in the male did exclude him from baptism: you see therefore that the proportion is not alike between baptism and circumcision.

The second particular in your Answer to this Argument is, that the same order is kept in Christ's commission, Mat. 28. 19. in bringing the Gentiles into God's covenant, as was kept with Abraham: he and all his Family were brought in by circumcision, after the gospel preached to

him. Genes. 17. 1-8. so Lydia and the Jailor were brought into the covenant with all their Family, and were baptized after the Gospel preached to them.

I answer, that in this particular there are differences between the one act of Abraham, and the other of Lydia and the Jailor, according to the commission of Christ, Mat. 28. 19.

First, Abraham and all his family by the Lord's commandment, came under the covenant of the Old Testament actually, and the males only were circumcised: but Christ doth not command all persons of a Family in the New Testament to be baptized, but only such as are made Disciples, and all them though they be women, as Lydia was.

Secondly: The gospel was only preached to Abraham's own person by the Lord but in the Jailor's case Paul preached the gospel to all that were in his house. Act. 16. 32. and so Christ commandeth to make them Disciples by preaching: So were not Abraham's Family, who being first circumcised afterward were taught the Law being a Schoolmr. to teach Christ.

Thirdly, the gospel was not preached to Abraham thereby to prepare him to circumcision, as if thereby it should follow that circumcision was a scale of the Gospel or New Testament: for it is not so as I have already manifested: but Christ in the New Testament commandeth the gospel to be preached to every creature, that is to every particular person, that is to be admitted into the Church by baptism, and so Paul did to the Jailor's Family, and this is another difference.

The third particular in your answer to this argument is, if infants be excluded from baptism for want of faith by hearing the word, then they shall also be excluded from salvation by that reason: Mark. 16.16. I deny it utterly: For Christ speaketh only of such as to whom the gospel may be preached, which only are men of years For when he saith go preach the Gospel to every creature, he doth no bid them preach to beasts, birds, fishes, or infants, which have no ears to hear, but he biddeth them preach the Gospel to every creature that hath an ear to hear, that is to

all that are of a docible age and nature: and then he addeth, whosoever (of them that have ears to hear) do believe, and upon their faith be baptized shall be saved, whosoever (of men that have ears to hear) do not believe (though they be baptized) shall be damned: now I pray you Sir, how doth this sentence include infants to baptism, or exclude them from Salvation? Or how doth your consequent follow: and for infants I say that either they are all saved, though they cannot come to faith by hearing, or that they are one of the Lord's secrets, and so not to be searched into: and that the Scripture doth speak only to and of thee that have ears to hear, and of things visible and known, and not of things invisible and secret: therefore this particular of your answer is vain.

Your last particular in the answer to my argument is, that general rules must be taken with their sense: as 2. Thess. 3. 10. that as infants or impotent persons though they cannot work yet may eat, because that speech is not directed to infants, &c. so Mat. 28.19. though infants cannot be made Disciples, yet they may be baptized, exposition of that place must be given as doth not contradict other Scriptures or necessary consequents from Scriptures.

Well Sir: I answer you that first you confess here that this place of Mat. 28. 19. is not uttered of Christ in respect of infants that they should be taught, and then I say he never intended that by this place you should gather that they should be baptized as you have done in your 6. argument and here you do evidently contradict your self as you see: and let that be remembered of you well.

Next I say, that general rules shall be expounded with their sense: and as important persons and infants shall eat though they cannot work seeing that is spoken of these that are able to work: so infants shall be saved though they cannot be baptized, seeing they cannot by teaching be made disciples: and this is not to diminish the commandment of Christ or wrest it from the

sense: but to make the commandment of baptizing larger then the commandment of teaching (as you do that will have the infants baptized that cannot be taught) is to separate those things that Christ hath joined, and work to wrack the command: of Christ out of joint, and to break thee in pieces: and woe be to thee that so do without repentance. Finally, I confess that it is not the true sense of a place that contradicts either Scripture or true consequence: but this truth of the Lord which you blaspheme with your title of Anabaptistry, doth not contradict either Scripture or sound conclusion from Scripture: but it is agreeable to the constant and most evident practice of John, Christ, and the Apostle (for you cannot produce an instance of an infant baptized by any of them) and most agreeable to all the precepts of the Apostle, Christ, and John for baptizing persons confessing their faith and their sins: and you are driven to most miserable shifts, and most narrow straights for your pedobaptistry, which you see cannot stand without scraping together all the wrestings and pervertings of Scriptures which you have heaped together in your answer: your principal foundation being a sandy molehill fetched from the Old Testament; even a false ground, that circumcision was a seal of the New Testament, and that the covenant made with Abraham in respect of Christ was made with all his carnal infants, who were all in Christ Jesus visibly in their birth and conception by virtue of the covenant: which I have proved to be manifest untruths, and so you see your building tottereth and will never be able to endure the storm.

Mr. Rich. Clifton.

Now follows the third reason.

3. Because if infants be baptized, the carnal seed is baptized, and so the seal of the covenant is administered to them, unto whom the covenant appertainth not, Rom. 9.8. which is a profanation.

Answer.

1. This reason seems to imply, that the seed of the faithful is part carnal, and part Spiritual, (for I cannot imagine that the Author holds all the seed of the faithful to be carnal, and that the covenant appertains not unto any of them, seeing so to affirm contradicts Acts 2. 39.) and therefore because the Spiritual seed is not discerned until it manifest it self by outward profession, therefore may not be baptized, lest in baptizing them, the seal should be set also upon the carnal seed, unto whom belongs not the covenant. To affirm this first is to deny that which is due to the seed of whom the promise belongs, for the wicked's sake, and so to injure them. Secondly, this reason also serves as well against the circumcision of the infants of the Israelites, seeing at eight days of Age they could not be discerned, whether they were of the carnal or Spiritual seed, and so the seal of the covenant not to be administered to thee, to whom the covenant did not belong. But as then the not discerning hereof, did nothing hinder circumcision to be administered to all the infants of the Israelites, no more now can the not knowing of the Spiritual seed from the carnal, hinder baptism.

2. Touching the seed of the faithful, thus I conceive thereof that it is carnal and Spiritual in diverse respects, carnal as they do naturally descend of their parents, so are they all alike in sin, Psalm 51.3. Spiritual, in respect of the covenant wherein they are comprehended with their parents. Gen. 17.7. Acts 2.39. in which regard also, all the children of the Faithful are said to be holy, 1 Cor. 7.14. and thus considered I deny the children of the faithful to be carnal seed, and do affirm that to such belongs the covenant and the seal thereof. And though some of them in the sight of God be known for none of his, yet to us it sufficeth for the administration of baptism, that they be the seed of the faithful: and therefore as the Israelites circumcised all their children,

(though some of them proved to be carnal afterward, as Ishmael, Esau, &c.) so are we to baptize all our infants, leaving secret things to God, Deuteron. 29.29.

3. If this be sufficient to clear us from profaning of the Sacrament if we baptize them that make confession of their faith, because they so do, though they be not the children of God, as S. Magus, Act. 8. 13. then it is not simply a profaning of baptism, to administer it to them unto whom belongs not the covenant, but to do it to them which plainly appear to us to be without: Therefore, if no man dare take upon him to say this or that infant is carnal and without the covenant of grace, it shall be no profanation of the Sacrament, if it be administered unto such, seeing we ought to hold the seed of the faithful, holy, 1 Cor. 7. 14. If it be objected (as some have done to me, that all the seed of the faithful are carnal, and so to be held until they believe and make confession of their faith, I answer, first, if they take carnal, as it is opposed to the children of promise in Rom. 9.8. I utterly deny it, for the children of the Flesh can never be the children of promise. Rom. 9. 8. 13. These two seeds are made so opposite by the Apostle, as that the one can never be the other. Secondly, if by carnal they mean nothing else, but that natural corruption wherein we are born: That hinders infants no more from baptism, then it doth those that can give an account of their faith, seeing natural corruption remaineth still in the purest professor, Rom. 7. 23 and if it be replied, that their natural corruption is not imputed to them that believe, no more (say I) is it to infants, else Christ died not for them, neither could they be saved, dying whilst they be young.

Lastly, if Abraham knowing that God would establish his covenant to Isaac Genes. 17, 19. yet circumcised Ishmael, vs. 24. and Isaac knowing that God had chosen his younger son, Gen. 25. 23. with 27. 33. yet circumcised Esau as well as Jacob, and in so doing neither of them profaned the Sacrament: much less is baptism profaned, when it is administered to the seed of

the faithful to whom belongeth the promise, Act. 2. 39. And thus having shown the weakness of these three reasons against the baptizing of infants, let us come to the second position, which is this.

John Smith.

In the next place followeth your answer to my third Argum: which Argum: of mine may be framed into this form.

The carnal seed is not to be baptized: For the covenant pertaineth not to them.

Infants are the carnal seed, Rom. 9.8.

Ergo infants are not to be baptized.

To this Argument you make Answer also in 4. particulars.

First, you expound my meaning, but I can expound my own words best: and therefore by the carnal seed I understand all children born by carnal generation whatsoever, though they afterward do believe: For they are carnal visibly to me whosoever they be that do not show their Faith by their works, that do not the works of Abraham yea though they die in their infancy and are saved with the Lord: For I must judge according to that which I see, and which is manifested: and I call them carnal as Paul calleth himself carnal, Rom. 7.14. and the Corinthians carnal, 1. Cor. 3 1. 3. and as in opposition to the Spiritual seed, that one seed of Abraham unto whom the promise was made: Gal. 3. 16. and the Phrase is taken from Rom. 9.8. where the children of the Jews are called the children of the Flesh: and Gal. 4. 23. where Ishmael is said to be borne after the Flesh, and Heb. 7. 16. the commandment is called carnal: So children born of their parents naturally are carnal, such were all the Jews infants, who were after the manner of Ishmael: Gal. 4. 23. Such are all our infants, for our infants are in no better estate than the infants of the Jews: They were all born according to the Flesh (except Isaac, who was in type born after the Spirit)

Gal. 4. 24. 25. 28. and I say that the covenant made with Abraham in respect of Christ did not actually cease upon any infant of the Jews in deed and truth: and the place Acts. 2. 39. doth not prove that it did: For that place is to be understood of the offer of Christ and the New Testament to all the carnal Jews and their children, but of the real exhibiting it to all that are called only: and therefore I say that to baptize infants is to baptize the carnal seed, for all infants are carnal, being conceived and born in sin, being the children of wrath, until the Lord work his work in them, which when he doth I know not: when I see it wrought in them by the fruits according as it is written, show me they Faith by thy works, then dare I pronounce them the spiritual seed of Abraham, for they that are of Faith, are blessed with Faithful Abraham: Therefore I affirm that infants are not to be esteemed actually under the possession of the New Testament, which New Testament is visible in the visible ordinances thereof: why then they are damned you will say: God forbid: do you condemn all the men that are not of your Faith: and yet they are nearer condemnation in the judgment of the Scripture to you then infants: for Christ saith that he that believeth not (speaking of them that hear the gospel and do not believe) shall be condemned, but the Scripture teacheth us nothing concerning the final estate of infants, except it be the salvation of them all: This is my exposition.

Now according to your exposition, I should intend that because it is not discerned which children are spiritual seed which the carnal, therefore both of them must be deprived of baptism, lest by giving baptism (which you falsely call a seal, and I therein speak according to your opinion) to all, it should be profaned by the carnal seed: well suppose that this were my meaning: what then: you except against this exposition two things: one that the spiritual seed should be injured by denying baptism to it for the carnal seed's sake: and I reply by giving baptism to all indifferently, we should injury baptism that is to be administered only upon them that confess

their Faith and sins, and that are made Disciples by teaching: another thing you except is that this reason should avail against circumcision seeing the males of 8. days could not be discerned to be the Spiritual seed: and I insist that it was not then needful that they should be discerned to be the Spiritual seed for that carnal seal of the carnal covenant: it was enough for investing of them with that carnal and typical seal, that they were the carnal and typical seed, and that they were male Israelites or Proselytes: and show me in all the Old Testament, but especially in the institution of circumcision that the Lord required any thing of any person to be circumcised, but to be a male: but now in the New Testament we having the truths of those types, it is plainly taught unto us, first that Christ the male must be in us, and 2. that there must be circumcision of the heart, and mortification of the Flesh, and 3. we must attain to and learn all that the Schoolmr. of the Old Testament could teach us: before we can be baptized, for John and Christ expressly require Faith and repentance in them that are to be baptized: and I do infinitely wonder at you and at my self, and at the whole Earth, that we should not see so evident a truth all this time.

The second particular you bring in answer to my reason is a distinction of the respects of the seed of the Faithful: For you say as they are born of their parents they are carnal and sinful: Psal. 51. 5. as they are under the covenant they are Spiritual, Gen. 17.7 and are called Holy, 1 Cor. 7. 14. and so are not the carnal seed: and so they may be baptized as well as the Jews infants were circumcised though some of them prove wicked afterward, as Ishmael and Esau, &c. I answer: First, your distinction is without warrant of Scripture: and I deny that infants of the Faithful are to be considered in these two respects: and whereas you bring two places Gen. 17. 7. and 1 Cor. 7.14. to prove the latter part of the distinction I have answered these two places already showing your false exposition of them, and that the infants of Abraham were not in their birth under the actual possession of the everlasting covenant made in respect of Christ but only

under the offer of it, and that the infants and all the children of the faithful are holy only as the wife that is an unbeliever is holy: and so this exception of yours is frivolous.

The third particular you bring in answer to my reason, is, that it is not simply a profaning of the covenant to administer the seal of it to them to whom it belongeth not: as to Simon Magus, Acts. 8. 13. but it is then profaned when it is administered to them that are wicked, &c: I answer, the Sacrament of baptism is profaned when it is administered upon a wrong subject whatsoever it be: as to give the Lord's Supper to an infant of two years old: So to baptize an infant is a profanation: For to all the ordinances of the Church and first to baptism: So absence of confession of Faith shall entitle any man to all the ordinances of the Church and first to baptism: So absence of confession of Faith shall bar every one from all the ordinances of the Church in communion: and although I will not say that Children are damned, yet I dare say that they are borne and dead in trespasses and sins, and that they do not nor cannot show any spark of grace to me, and therefore although I dare not say this or that infant is not under the election of God, yet I dare say that never an infant in the Earth is actually ceased of the New Testament which is only attained by confession of sin and Faith: For so saith Christ: the time is fulfilled, the Kingdom of God is at hand: repent and believe the Gospel: Mark. 1. 15. and except a man be borne again he cannot see the Kingdom of God. John, 3. 3. and Christ dwelleth in our hearts by Faith, Eph. 3. 17. and as I cannot deny but that many infants are elected, yet I cannot say which infants shall believe and confess their sins and Faith, and so I know not upon which to administer baptism: and I must be assured that they do believe before I can baptize them, for whatsoever is not of Faith is sin, and to know nothing to the contrary, but that they do believe [,] is not sufficient warrant for baptism: yea and I do know certainly that seeing Faith cometh by hearing, therefore they do not believe to me, yea though they could hear and did believe that is nothing to me

except they can show me their Faith by their confession. I say therefore that all infants are carnal to me. Rom. 9.8. For the Apostle: vs. 5 saith plainly that to be born of Abraham according to the Flesh is not to be borne according to promise, or to be as you say Spiritual, for your distinction before was that every infant of Abraham and so of the faithful was born spiritual as well as carnal: but here the Apostle saith directly contrary to your assertion that they are not all Children of the promise and covenant, because they are the Children that lineally descend of Abraham and you say peremptorily that all that lineally descend of Abraham and the Faithful man are children of the promise and covenant, and so to be baptized: I desire you with all your knowledge reconcile these contradictions: and whereas you say the Children of the Flesh are so opposed, that therefore the Children of the Flesh are so opposed, that they can never be the Children of the promise, and that therefore the Children of the Faithful cannot be so called carnal: I answer that all the children of the Jews Church were born according to the Flesh, Gal. 4. 23-25. and so were carnal, and so are the Children of the faithful: and yet as many of the Jews were afterward regenerate, and children of the promise though all at the first children of the Flesh, so many of the infants of the Faithful may prove Children of the promise by Faith, though at the first all are the children of the Flesh that is carnal: but I confess indeed that Esau can never be Jacob: and one so carnal can never be Spiritual: and whereas you say, that carnal corruption doth not hinder infants from baptism, no more than men of years that make confession of their Faith, I answer yes,: For men of years confessing their sins and their Faith, declare the mortification of sin and regeneration by the Spirit, infants being born in sin, cannot nor do not declare their regeneration at all to us: and so with them we have nothing to do: and whereas you say natural corruption is not imputed to infants no more than to men believing, let it be so, and yet you cannot defend that without the opinion of universal redemption, and then I say, that if the infants of the Faithful

being delivered from their natural corruption may therefore be baptized, then all infants shall be baptized who are partakers of the same benefit, even the infants of Turks: if you say no: Seeing the infants fo the Faithful are only redeemed and under the covenant, then you condemn all the infants that die who are not borne of Faithful parents: and yet you cannot prove that the infants of the Faithful are under the actual possession of the covenant, which is only by Faith, and so the scruple still remaineth unclosed.

The fourth particular you bring in answer to my reason, is, that Abraham circumcised Ishmael, and Isaac circumcised Esau, and yet they knew that the Lord would establish his covenant with neither of them: much more may infants be baptized to whom the covenant belongeth, Act. 2. 39. I answer: that the external seal of that external covenant was particularly enjoined by God to every male, and the knowledge of the reprobation of Esau and Ishmael did not hinder that carnal seal: nor disannul the precedent express commandment of circumcising every male of 8 days old: but now seeing we have no express commandment and many examples to the contrary, that only persons made Disciples by teaching, confessing their Faith and their sins, are to be baptized: and considering that infants born of Faithful parents are children of the Flesh, Rom. 9. 7. Gal. 4. 23. and are not actually under the possession of the everlasting New Testament, therefore baptism which you call the seal, can not be administered upon them, and the place Act. 2. 39 hath oftentimes received answer.

Mr. Rich. Clifton.

The Second Position.

2. That Antichristians converted are to be admitted into the true Church by baptism.

Answer.

As the former position denied the baptizing of infants, so doth this annihilate that baptism which we have received in the Apostate Church, and establish rebaptism. And this also I will show to be an error by proving the contrary and then answer the reasons hereunto annexed.

That the baptism administered in the Apostate Churches of Antichrist, is baptism not to be reiterated, thus I prove it.

If the Apostacy of Israel did not so pollute circumcision that it ceased to be the seal of God's covenant to so many of them as repented: no more doth the Apostacy of our fore-Elders, so pollute baptism that it ceaseth to be a Sacrament to so many of them as repented.

But the first is true, 2. Chron. 30. 11. 18. 21. else could not so many of Israel as came to Jerusalem have eaten the Passover, seeing no uncircumcised might eat thereof.

Ergo, the second.

If it be objected that the Apostacy is not alike, then let it be showed, that the Apostacy under Antichrist did make a nullity of baptism, and not the Apostacy of Israel of circumcision: For Israel played the harlot so deeply, that the Lord denied her to be his wife, or him self to be her Husband: Hos. 2. 2.

John Smith.

And thus having showed the vanity of your answers to my reasons against pedobaptistry, let us come to your answer made to my second position: which is this.

2. That Antichristians converted are to be admitted into the true Church by baptism.

The first thing that in your Answer you intend to prove, is, that the baptism administered in the Apostate Churches of Antichrist is not to be reiterated.

And for this purpose you produce 6. Arguments. Your first Argument is framed thus.

If the Apostacy of Israel did not so pollute circumcision that it ceased to be the seal of God's covenant to so many of them as repented: no more doth the Apostacy of our forefathers so pollute baptism that it ceaseth to be a Sacrament to so many of them as repented.

But the first is true, 2 Chron. 30. 11. 18. 21. Ergo the second.

I Answer that the Apostacy of Antichrist is deeper than the Apostacy of Israel, for first Antichristians are not called Israelites, but Babylonians, Egyptians, Sodomites, Gentiles in the Revelation, whereby the Holy Spirit of wisdom giveth us to conceive that he doth account the Apostacy of Antichrist equal to Paganism itself: yea to the very worst kind of Paganism.

Secondly, I declare plainly the differences betwixt the Apostacy of Antichrist and Israel, in this, that Israel's Apostacy did not destroy the true constitution of the Church: But Antichrist's Apostacy did raise the true Apostolic constitution: For the true constitution of the Church of the Old Testament was of carnal Israelites or Proselytes circumcised: Gen. 17. 10-14. Exod. 12. 48. 49. and so long as they retained circumcision in the Land of Canaan, they retained a true constitution, though their Apostacy was never so great in the worship, ministry, and Government, as it to be seen Hos. 4. 6. 8. 12. therefore Abijah doth not charged the Israelites with a false constitution, but declareth unto them that their false Government, 2. Chron. 13. vs. 8. Their false ministry vs. 9. Their false worship, vs. 8. and declareth the true government, ministry, and worship of Judah. But it is manifest that Antichrist hath not only set up a false Government of Prelacy, a false ministry of Priesthood, and a false worship of reading, but also hath set up a false constitution of the Church: For whereas the true Apostolic constitution was of baptized Disciples that confessed their Faith and their sins[,] he hath foisted in a false manner of the Church, viz: infants: and persons unbaptized: and so a false form: for infants are no more capable of baptism than is a fool or mad man or Pagan: neither can they express any more repentance or

Faith then such persons do: and seeing the true form of the Church is a covenant betwixt God and the Faithful made in baptism in which Christ is visibly put on: and that infants cannot receive the covenant which is only done by actual visible Faith, nor cannot seal back unto the Lord that he is true, John 3.33. as God sealeth unto them his truth by his Spirit, Eph. 1. 13. and they shall be all taught of God, John 6. 45. and shall all know God from the least unto the greatest: Heb. 8. 11. and the covenant is this: I will be their Father, 2 Cor. 6:18. and we shall be his sons calling him Father by the Spirit, whereby we are sealed, Gal. 4. 6. Hence it followeth that the Church of Antichrist being constituted of a false matter, viz: infants incapable of baptism, and of a false form, viz: infants unable to enter into the New Testament by sealing back the covenant unto the Lord, and consenting unto the contract, therefore they can have no title to Christ or any of his ordinances, but are as pagans or Gentiles in the Lord's account.

Circumcision therefore in the Israelite's Apostacy was true circumcision, because it was performed upon carnal Israelites or Proselytes the eighth day: but baptism in Popery is false baptism, and so in the Lord's account no better than Pagan washing, being administered upon infants a subject that God never appointed to baptism: a subject that is as incapable of baptism as an infidel, a mad man, a natural fool, or any other subject that cannot confess their Faith or sins, or be made Disciples by instruction.

Thirdly I declare that Israel was the true Church of God, or a member or part of the true Church of God though infinitely corrupt as well as Judah in the says of her Apostacy, see Ezekiel 8. toto. And Ezekiel 16. toto: and circumcision in her Apostacy when the Lord calleth her a harlot Ezekiel 16. 35. and the Apostacy of Judah is worse in the Lord's account than that of Israel Ezech. 16. 47-53. Surely the circumcision of Israel was also true, and Israel a true part of the Church as well as Judah: and for the bill of divorce which some plead was given to Israel by

Hosea: Hos. 2. 2. I say that was after the Passover of Hezechiah which was in the first year of his reign, 2. Chron. 29. 3. 17. and 30. 2. and the bill of divorce was given the sixth year of his reign, 2. King. 17. 23. compared with 2. King. 18. 10. yet nevertheless Hosea calleth Israel the Lord's people after he had prophesied of the bill of divorce to be given. Hos. 4. 6. 8. 12. and when the bill of divorce was given, diverse of Israel I doubt not, kept themselves pure from Samaritanism, and retained circumcision, and came up yearly to Jerusalem even till the days of Josiah 2. Chron. 35. 18 compared with 2. Chron. 34. 6. 7. 3-33. So that hereby it is most manifest that no manner of sin made the Church of the Old Testament a false Church, so long as they retained circumcision in the Land of Canaan, yea if they retained circumcision though in Babylon, whereupon I am persuaded that if the Papacy, or England, or the Greek Churches did only baptize men confessing their Faith and their sins into Christ, the Son of God, or into the Trinity, though they retained their false ministry, worship, and Government, and other abominations yet the baptism was true and not to be repeated: as their circumcision was good notwithstanding all their abominations and horrible idolatries, and fearful Apostacy in Israel.

Mr. Rich. Clifton.

Babylon in Chaldea (which was a type of Spiritual Babylon, Apoc. 18. 2.) though they did abuse and profane the vessels of the Lord Dan. 5. 3. yet did not that make a nullity of them that they ceased any more to be the vessels of the house of the Lord but were brought up with them of the captivity that came up from Babel to Jerusalem Ezra. 1. 11. Even so although Spiritual Babylon have profaned the Holy things of God, as baptism and the rest, yet remain they still God's ordinances to all them that come out of her, Apoc. 18. 4. and return to the celestial Jerusalem. And as these vessels of the house of the Lord need not to be new cast, because of

Babel's polluting them: no more is baptism to be reiterated to the people of God, because it passed through the polluted hands of Papists.

If it be objected, that they that administered baptism in Babylon, were Idolaters, and had no calling thereto.

I answer: That they which circumcised in the Apostacy of Israel were Idolaters, and so standing in that estate could not be fit Ministers of God's holy ordinances. And that the wanting of a lawful calling to administer the Sacrament makes not a nullity thereof, the circumcising of Moses Son by his mother Zippora, Exod. 4. 25. doth plainly teach. For as the Lord makes effectual his word to his people, though coming unto them, by the hands of a false ministry, so doth he baptism to all that be his, though administered by them that have not a Lawful calling thereunto. The sin of the minister makes not a nullity either of the word or Sacraments, else should the efficacy of the word and Sacraments, depend upon him that administreth the, which is not so, for both have their effect from the Lord.

If again it be objected, that baptism was not administered in the Apostate Church of Antichrist to a fit subject. I answer that the children in the Apostacy were as fit subjects to receive baptism, as the infants of Israel in the days of Jeroboam and Ahab, were to receive circumcision: Seeing the covenant of Abraham (after the coming of Christ) belonged as properly to the Gentiles, Gal. 3. 14. as before it did to the Israelites.

John Smith.

Your second argument followeth which is this in effect.

As the Babylonians abuse of the vessels of the Lord's house did not make a nullity of them, but they were used after the captivity, Ezra. 1. 11. so the Antichristian abuse of baptism

cannot annul it, but it may be retained when men come to the Faith: and it needeth not to be reiterated, no more than the vessels of the house of the Lord be new cast.

I answer many things: First, this argument is an excellent argument for retaining of idol Temples, the worship, government, ministry of the ecclesiastical assemblies of England: if it be said they were never appointed by God, so say I, that baptism of theirs was never appointed by God: but is the device of the Antichrist.

Secondly, I answer, that the vessels of the Lord's house were his own ordinance: who never ordained it: for you must distinguish them thus: The vessels of the Lord's house were substances framed by art into particular shapes at the Lord's appointment but the baptism of the Lord is a compound or concrete ordinance or action limited in certain essential particulars: not being a substance but an accident in definition: now if Antichrist had retained the essential parts of baptism, I confess it needed not to be repeated, no more than the vessels of the Lord's house need to be new cast after the abuse of the Babylonians: but seeing baptism in popery and Antichristianism, is not the Lord's ordinance in the definition of it, but Antichrist's invention: Therefore though the vessels of the Lord's house may be retained, yet baptism may not: That baptism is Antichrist's invention in the definition of it, I manifest thus: The matter of baptism, and the forme of baptism is invented by Antichrist go: it is an invention of antichrist in the definition: The matter of antichristian baptism is a carnal infant: The form is, washing one into the covenant that cannot consent to the covenant: or baptizing without a contract seal to the infant, and the infant cannot seal to the Lord: As I have manifested already in the answer to the former argument of yours: Therefore the baptism of antichrist is in the definition of it the mere device of antichrist. For the Scripture describeth true baptism which is the Lord's own ordinance thus: The matter must be one that confesseth his Faith and his sins, one that is regenerate and

born again: The form must be a voluntary delivering up of the party baptized into the Name of the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, by washing with water, Mat. 28. 19. Mat. 3. 6. John. 4. 1. Acts. 2. 41. & 8. 36. 37 compared with Roman. 6. 17. and Mat. 28. 20. & 18. 20. & Gal. 3. 27. & Roman. 6. 2-6. Wherein there must be a mutual consent of both persons contracting together: and that this is so, the form of baptism retained in popery yet, teacheth plainly: where they say. Credit? Credo: Abrenuntias? Abrenuntio: which other persons speak for the infant that cannot speak, thereby declaring that their must needs be a mutual contract of both the parties contracting: This ordinance of the Lord therefore is abolished both in the matter and form, and another strange invention of man is in the rone thereof substituted, which should have framed a Temple altar, arch, or candlestick, after their device, and given them to the people of the Jews, they could not have retained them and used them to Worship God withal: So cannot true Christians retain Antichristian baptism which is devised in the definition of it.

Thirdly, I answer, that if the Antichristians had baptized persons confessing their sins and their Faith into the name of the Son of God, and the Trinity, it had then been true baptism though in the hands of Antichristians, as the vessels of the Lord's house, in the hands of the Caldees, and therefore needed no repetition, as these vessels needed no new casting: Therefore we keep the Scriptures still though they abuse them, and the Church, ministry, worship, and government taught in the Scriptures though they have poluted the: but their devised word, that is their Apocrypha writings and false doctrine, and their devised church consisting of carnal infants and persons unbaptized, and their devised worship of the mass, and their devised ministry of the sacrificing Preisthood, and their devised government of the Prelacy we abhor, and utterly reject, as the very devised Idols of antic. And we will no more retain the Shrines of Diana, than the Jews would the wedg of Acha: so say we of his baptism.

And here you answer two objections.

First, that though the Antichristians that administer baptism be Idolaters, yet it may be true baptism as well as circumcision true by the Israelites that were Idolaters: and that the efficacy of the word and Sacraments dependeth not upon the worth of the minister: as circumcision by Zipporah declareth, Exod. 4. 25. I answer: First, what say you to Ciprian the ancient Father, and all the counsel of learned Bbs. Who concluded that the baptism of Heretics was a nullity and decreed rebaptizing.

Secondly I say that the Israelites circumcision was in a true church and antichristian baptism is in a false Church: and that is a dissimilitude.

Thirdly, I know nothing to the contrary, but Zipporah might circumcise her Son, her husband commanding her (for where is it said in all the Old Testament that a woman shall not circumcise) for Moses indeed did circumcise though Zipporah was the hand of Moses in the action, as it is the King's action, if the Lord's Chauncellor of the judge of an assise do it.

Fourthly I yield that the Minister shall not prejudice baptism: if the baptism be the Lord's own ordinance, that is, if a person be invested with baptism true in the definition: and yet you know that the baptism of women is strongly questioned, and I believe it would trouble you to satisfy a doubt made of a midwife's baptism in England, that it ought not to be repeated, or of a Child baptizing others as Athanasius did in sport, (which Alexander Bb. of Alexandria with his Clerks did approve) whether it ought to be repeated yea or nay: but I leave this point as being but of small importance.

The second objection you answer it, that although baptism be administered in a false Church of Antichrist upon an unfit subject, yet it shall not be repeated, no more than circumcision in the days of Jeroboam and Ahab, it being administered upon an unfit subject: I

say, as I have said diverse times, that the Israelite infants in their defection were the subject that God commanded to be circumcised, viz: the seed of Abraham, males of 8. days age: So are not the infants in Antichristianism, both for that they are 1. infants, 2. members of a false Church, 3. The seed of unbelievers which by your own confession have no title to baptism: and whereas you say that the covenant of Abraham in respect of Christ did as truly belong to the Gentiles after the coming of Christ as it did to the Israelites though both in defection: I deny it: For the carnal covenant belonged to the Israelites the carnal seed of Abraham even in their Apostacy, and the Spiritual covenant made with Abraham in respect of Chr. did never appertain to the 1. Apostate parents, 2. much less to the infants of them in their Apostacy, 3. no nor to the infants of the faithful as I have already proved, and Gal. 3. 14. is not to be understood of the blessing of Abraham to come upon any of the Gentiles in their Apostacy, but only being in Christ, as the words are, also vs. 7. & 9. but the external Covenant was made with Abraham and the carnal Israelites only upon the condition of circumcision carnally upon the males of eight days old, Gen. 17. 10.

Mr. Rich. Clifton.

If the word of God passing through the false ministry of Antichrist, was of force to convert God's elect in Babylon, the is baptism passing likewise through their false ministry of force to seal up God's covenant unto them, and so consequently not to be reiterated.

But the first is true Apoc. 18. 4. For in Babylon were God's people converted, other ordinary Ministry was there none, but that false Ministry of the Papists: and therefore it is apparent that God made thereby his word effectual to all them that believe.

Ergo &c.

If it be objected, that if God should convert his people by an Antichristian ministry, it were to give approbation to a false ministry, and to teach that men might lawfully use it, which is absurd: I answer, for us to use a false Ministry is unlawful, but it is no more absurd or yet any approbation of a false ministry, for God to work thereby the good of his own people, then it was his approving of the evil service of Joseph's brethren selling him into Egypt, because he used their Ministry, for the saving of Jacob and his household, for God can work good by an evil instrument.

If it be still urged, that the Antichristian Ministers had no calling to baptize, I say no more had the Jews to put Christ to death, yet was his suffering available to save all that believe: and so is the Sacrament to all God's people available to seal up salvation unto them.

John Smith.

Your third Argument followeth which is this in effect.

The word in the false Ministry of Antichrist is available to convert: Ergo: The baptism is also available to seal up the covenant to the converted, and so need not be repeated.

I answer: First the word converteth none visibly to me particularly known: So can baptism seal up none visibly to me: what they do both in secret the Lord knoweth and what the word doth generally I know by that place Rev. 18. 4. Also what the baptism doth specially I know, for God saith plainly whosoever receiveth the mark of the beast in his forehead shall perish, Rev. 14. 9-11. this mark is undoubtedly baptism whereby they are initiated into Antichrist, and receive his mark, as Christ's Servants in baptism receive his seal upon them: (remember I call baptism a seal in the concrete, or according to your opinion. For otherwise I deny it to be a seal) so that Antichristian Baptism is rather a seal of perdition to the Antichristians, then of the covenant of Salvation by Christ: and therefore it is to be renounced.

Secondly, Antichrist's baptism false (as I have said) in the definition is none of God's ordinance no not in the hands of the most faithful minister of the world: but God's word is the Lord's ordinance, though in the mouth of the most vile Judas of Antichristian in the world, yea though it be in the mixture of a 1000. heresies: So that in this respect also it followeth not that though God's word may convert in popery, therefore Antichrist's baptism may seal: but still you build upon a false foundation as you see, assuming that which is the question, viz: That baptism in popery in the Lord's.

Thirdly, I answer again, that if Antichrist had retained the Lord's true baptism, as I have described true I say in the definition, viz: That he had baptized persons confessing their sins and faith into the Trinity, or into Jesus Christ, it should not have been repeated: but seeing he intendeth in baptism, to set an indelible character upon them which is the mark of the beast, to confer grace ex opere operato to the infants which he washeth, another promising and answering for them Credo and Abrenuntio which the party baptized should himself perform, hence I conclude that he hath set up his own idol of abomination, and cast the Lord's holy ordinance away, having essentially destroyed the primitive Apostolic baptism: ergo his baptism is a nullity or rather a seal of perdition to them that retain it.

The amplification which you bring to this Argument I omit as a thing not denied, but yielded unto that God can work by a false Ministry, evil instruments, and bad means, but hence it will not follow that we may retain the mark of the beast, no more then we may retain the ministry of Antichrist, the Church of Antichrist, the Government of Antichrist.

Mr. Rich. Clifton.

Those Holy things which God by his merciful providence hath preserved for his people through the hands of profane persons, are not to be rejected for the Author's sake, Ezra. 1. 11.

But the Scriptures and baptism hath God preserved in the popish assemblies for the benefit of his people.

Therefore not to be rejected for the Author's sake.

If it be objected against the minor, it is not true baptism but false, that is administered in the assemblies of Antichrist. I answer, though it may be said to be false, in regard of some human devices used in the administration thereof: yet is it true baptism in respect of the matter, form, and Author thereof, which causeth it to have a true being.

John Smith.

Your fourth Argument followeth, which is this.

These Holy things which God by his merciful providence hath preserved for his people, though the hands of profane persons, are not to be rejected for the Author's sake, Ezra. 1. 11.

But the Scriptures and baptism hath God preserved in the popish assemblies for the benefit of his people.

Therefore not to be rejected for the Author's sake.

The minor you prove thus, saying the baptism though false in respect of humane devices used in the ministration thereof, yet is true in respect of the matter, form and Author thereof: and in your answer to my second Argument you say: the author of baptism in the Kingdom of Antichrist is Christ the matter water: the form washing with water unto the Trinity.

I answer directly, that if it could be proved that baptism in the Kingdom of Antichrist is appointed by Christ, and that water is the true matter of baptism, and the true form is washing into the Trinity, I would yield unto you: but this you have not proved, and I have already proved the contrary: but yet to deal something more fully in this point which is the main pillar and chief corner stone of the foundation, I say: 1. Water is not the matter of baptism, but only the

instrument of baptism: For as fire is the instrument of burning, so is Water of washing: the matter of burning is the fuel that is burnt, So the matter of washing is the party washed: For as we say accidentis esse est inesse: and the subject is all the matter of an accident: and as the matter of the Church are the Disciples or Saints: The matter of the Ministry are the Prophets, so the matter of baptism is the persons, upon whom baptism is conferred, and on whom it is. It is false therefore which you affirm that water is the matter of baptism. 2. I say that washing into the Name of the Father, Son, and Holy ghost, is not the form of baptism: For to wash a Turk, Jew, Fool, mad Man, or infant into the Trinity is not true baptism: but if it were so, if simply to baptize into the Trinity were the form of baptism: Therefore to baptize the true matter into the true Faith, or into Christ, or the New Testament, or the Trinity, or into the true body, is the true form of baptism: So that the true matter of baptism is a new creature: one regenerate: a confessor. As the true matter of circumcision was a male of eight days old either lineally descending of Abraham, or a Proselyte: So the true matter of baptism is a person that is of the Faith of Abraham, one that hath the male Christ formed in him: The true form of baptism consisteth in three things, 1. washing with water, 2. a new Creature, 3. into the Name of Christ or into the Trinity, for I think we are not tied to form of words. & so if antichr. Hath washed any, I say, I will never consent that they shall be rebaptized, but hold that Anabaptistry true heresy.

But if an infant that is not the matter of baptism, or a wicked man, mad man, fool, Turk, or Jew, or any Pagan be washed with water into the Trinity, I say there is neither true matter nor form of baptism, and Christ is not the author thereof: and therefore the baptism of antichrist is not Christ's but his own, and so all infants baptized by antichrist are either unbaptized or have the mark of the beast, and so are to renounce it, and to receive Christ's mark of baptism, or else woe be to them: and when they shall manifest a new creature, and Christ the male is formed in

them, and they confess with their mouth and then be baptized into the Trinity, this is not anabaptistry, but the true primitive Apostolic Baptism, and so Christ, John, Christ's Apostles were Anabaptists with you Sir: For they baptized men that had been washed before a thousand times with the Jew's baptisms, Heb. 9. 10. which baptisms were also into the Messiah's (no doubt) in those that saw the end of those Figures: But if it be blasphemy to say that Christ, John, and the Apostles were Anabaptists, though they were oftentimes some of them baptized into the Messiah in Type, because they were only once baptized truly and indeed: So shall it be blasphemy in all them that call the true Christians anabaptists, that baptize new Creatures once only into Christ, though baptized before by antichrist in their infancy when they knew not the right hand from the left, or what a new creature, or the New Testament, or Christ, or Baptism, or any thing else was: hence therefore I conclude undeniably that seeing Popish baptism hath a false matter, and a false form, therefore it is antichrist's Idol as much as a false Ministry, and a false Church is: and so the Lord is not the author of it: and thereupon though the Scriptures and God's word be retained by God's providence and in the word all the Holy things of God, through Popery: yet in the Popish Churches there is no true Church, Ministry, Worship, or Government, nor true Baptism, but all false and Antichristian: and so to be rejected, and the truth to be assumed out of the Scriptures: and so this argument of yours is answered.

Mr. Rich. Clifton.

If antichrist be not the author of baptism, but of some human devices annexed, unto in the administration thereof, then are we not to pluck up the wheat with the tares, Mat. 13. 29. And to cast away that which is Christ's with Antichrist but to Separate from that which is man's invention, and still to retain that which is of God.

But to baptize with water into the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost, Mat. 28. 19. is from heaven, and not from Antichrist.

Ergo, we ought not to cast it away, but those traditions wherewith Antichrist hath polluted it: as for example, King Josiah and before him King Hezekiah, when both the Land and Temple were polluted) 2. King. 21. 7. and 23. 7. did not pull down the Temple but appointed the Priests to cleanse it, who did so, and brought out all the uncleanness that they had found in the house of God, 2. Chron. 29. 16. 17. 18. & 34. 8. For in reformation of things, difference must be put between those things, whereof God is the Author, and such as are devised by man: The former is to be purged from all profanation, and the things still to be retained, the other to be quite abolished. This rule in all reformation of Religion ought to be followed.

John Smith.

The fifth Argument followeth, which is this in effect.

We must not pluck up the wheat with the tares, Mat. 13. 29. nor cast away that which is Christ's, when we cast away that which is Antichrist's.

But to baptize with water into the name of the Trinity is Christ's and not Antichrist's.

Ergo, we ought not to cast that away, but only the traditions of Antichrist.

So did Josiah and Hezekiah, 2. King. 21. 7. & 23. 4. & 2. Chron. 29. 16-18. & 34. 8. not pull down the Temple, but cleanse it, &c. that whereof God is the Author must be kept, and the corruption or pollution put away: that whereof man is the Author, is quite to be abolished: This is your reason.

I answer: That as when the Babylonians had utterly destroyed the Temple, the Jews built it again: So when Antichrist hath utterly destroyed the true Temple, the true Church, then must we build it up again, and when Antichrist hath destroyed the true baptism, then must we rear it up

again: Wherefore seeing as is shown before Antichrist hath abolished the true baptism of Christ in the definition or in the matter and form thereof, and hath reared a baptism of his own, it must therefore be abolished: and as when we do renounce that which is true in the false Church or Ministry, but only the falsehood so in rejecting the false baptism of Antichrist we do not renounce that which is true in it as to wash with water into the Name of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost: but only the falsehood: And yet as when we retain the truth in a false Church, or Ministry, we reject the Falsehood in them both, and erect both a new true Church and Ministry: So when we retain the truth of a false baptism, we reject the Falsehood and erect a true new baptism: and this is evident if you consider it well.

Again, seeing in the false baptism, church, and ministry, the corruptions are essential, and the truth only accidental: and truth and falsehood are so intermingled as we can not divide them asunder, assuming the one and leaving the other, but we must needs in renouncing the essential corruptions reserve the accidental truths and iterate or repeat the accidental truths if we will have the essential truth which Antichrist had abolished: Therefore necessarily we must for having true baptism repeat washing in to the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, which are but accidentals (for a Turk so washed is not baptized) and once only wash a new born babe in Christ, in to the truth which is true essential baptism which Antichrist had abolished, and which we only restore and nothing else: and so your argument is answered.

Mr. Rich. Clifton.

As God hath made an everlasting covenant with Abraham and his seed, Gen. 17.7 which through the malice of Satan and all his instruments shall never be cut off: so hath he preserved, both in the Apostacy under the Law and gospel, the seals thereof, for the comfort of the Faithful.

And therefore the Anabaptists in rejecting that baptism of Christ, whereof they were partakers in the Apostate Church: and devising a new, do bring in a new covenant and a new gospel, taking upon them to baptize themselves without warrant from the word: For I am sure it cannot be shown, that any did ever baptize himself without special commandment from God, as Abraham has for circumcision, Gen. 17. 9. or John for baptism, Mark. 1. 3. nor yet any others without ordinary or extraordinary calling. John. 4. 2 Mat. 3. 6. Acts. 8. 38. & 9. 18. & 10. 48.

If it be said the times be extraordinary. I answer, the Lord hath [not] left either example or rule, or ground of rule, whereby we may in extraordinary times have a sure warrant out of the word, to inform us in any thing that we ought to do.

John Smith.

Your 6. argument is thus much in effect.

That seeing the covenant made with Abraham in respect of Christ, is everlasting: Genes. 17. 7. and cannot by the malice of Satan be cut off: no more can the malice of Satan abolish the seals of that covenant under the Law or gospel, viz: circumcision and baptism.

I answer by an argument of like nature, from Mat. 16. 18. framed thus.

If the gates of Hell shall never prevail against the Church then there hath always been a true Church, and Antichrist could never make the church false: and so you of the Separation have sinned most shamefully in calling the Church of Antichrist false: Verum primum. Ergo secundum.

If my argument be not good against you of the Separation for erecting a new Church, no more is yours good against us for erecting new baptism: This is to answer as they say *regerendo*: But I answer more properly *solvendo* thus: That the covenant is said to be everlasting not in respect of the visible real existence in the world in an established Church, but in respect of the

stability and firmness of it in regard of Satan's malice which should not so abolish it, that it should never be recovered again: For otherwise the Church went into the wilderness. Revel. 12. 14. and all nations were made drunk with the cup of the fornication of the whore of Babylon, Revel. 18. 3. and there was no true Church in the depth of Antichristianism, and so no true baptism, for can any thing be true in a false Church, but the Scriptures and the truths contained therein? I deny therefore, that the covenant, Church or baptism was visible always: For it was invisible when the Church went into the wilderness: and therefore as you when there was not a true Church in the world, took upon you to set up a true Church (as you say, but we say a false Church) renouncing the Church of Antichrist and yet will not be said to bring in a new covenant and a new Gospel (for you in your false conceitedness will reject them for heretics, if there be any that dare say so of you forsooth): So the anabaptists (as you call them) do not set up a new covenant and Gospel, though they set up a new or rather the old Apostolic baptism which Antichrist had overthrown: and whereas you say they have no warrant to baptize themselves, I say, asmuch as you have to set up a true Church, yea fully asmuch: For if a true Church may be erected which is the most noble ordinance of the New Testament, then much more baptism: and if a true Church cannot be erected without baptism, for baptism is the visible form of the Church, as Disciples are the matter: Mat. 28. 19. John. 4. 1. Then seeing you confess that a true Church may be erected, you cannot deny (though you do deny it in opposing the truth) that baptism may also be recovered: and seeing when all Christ's visible ordinances are lost, either men must recover them again, or must let them alone: if they let them alone till extraordinary men come with miracles and tongues, as the Apostles did, then men are famelists (for that is their opinion) or if they must recover them, men must begin so to do, and then two men joining together may make a Church (as you say): Why may they not baptize seeing they cannot conjoin into Christ

but by baptism, Mat. 28. 19. compared with Mat. 18. 10. Gal. 3. 27. but it is evident that all Christ's commandments must be obeyed, Ergo, this commandment of having and using the communion of the Church, Ministry, Worship, and Government, those Holy means of Salvation which the Lord of his mercy hath given us with his covenant, and commanded us to use: and therefore if all the commandments of God must be obeyed, then this of baptism, and this warrant is sufficient for assuming baptism: Now for baptizing a man's self there is as good warrant, as for a man Churching himself: For two men singly are no Church, jointly they are a Church, and they both of them put a Church upon themselves, so may two men put baptism upon themselves: For as both those persons unchurched, yet have power to assume the Church each of them for himself with others in communion: So each of them unbaptized hath power to assume baptism for himself with others in communion: And as Abraham and John Baptist, and all the Proselytes after Abraham's example, Exod. 12. 48. did administer the Sacrament upon themselves: So may any man raised up after the Apostacy of Antichrist, in the recovering of the Church by baptism, administer it upon himself in communion with others: So we see the Lord's Supper is administered to a man's self in communion with others, so is prayer, Prophecy, Praising of God uttered for a man's self as well as for others. And as in the Old Testament: every man that was unclean washed himself: every Priest going to Sacrifice washed himself in the Laver at the door of the Tabernacle of the congregation: which was a type of baptism, the door of the Church, Tit. 2. 5. Every Mr. of a Family administered the Passover to himself and all of his Family: The Priest daily sacrificed for himself and others: a man cannot baptize others into the Church, himself being out of the Church: Therefore it is Lawful for a man to baptize himself together with others in communion, and this warrant is a plerophory for the practice of that which is done by us: Thus are your 6. weak reasons answered.

Mr. Rich. Clifton.

Thus having set down some reasons to prove that Apostates or Antichristians converted are not to be rebaptized, let us come to the examination of the reasons alleged to the contrary, the first whereof is this.

1. Because Churches are to be constituted now after the defection of Antichrist, as they were first erected by the Apostles: But in the constitution of Churches the Apostles received in the members by baptism. Ergo, so must we do now.

Answer.

1. The estate and condition of people now is not alike to the estate of the Gentiles or Jews in the Apostles times, they differ in diverse respects: First, all the people then both of Jews and Gentiles never had been themselves, nor were ever of the posterity of those that had been members of the Church of Christ under the gospel, seeing then was the first planting of Evangelical Churches: but we are now the posterity of such parents as were members of the Church planted by the Apostle else could we not have Apostated.

Secondly, that people, which the Apostle gathered into Churches were never baptized, and baptism coming in the stead of circumcision, and being a seal of our entering into God's covenant, it was fit, that they which believed and became the seed of Abraham should so enter into the covenant, they and their seed, as he and his seed entered, that is, as he and his were received in by circumcision: So they and theirs should be received in by baptism, Act. 2. 38. 41, & 8. 38. but we are a people that are already baptized, and the seed of thee that were baptized, and had received the gospel, and (although through Antichrist's deceivableness, both we and they were tainted with many corruptions) yet had they or might have in that Apostacy, (and so

we also) so much faith, as thereby both we and they might become the people of God, Apoc. 18. 4.

And concerning the constitution of the Churches, here it is to be noted, that the constitution of Churches set down by the Apostles was by the immediate direction of the Holy Ghost, and so serveth for a continual rule of establishing Churches to the end of the world, which form or frame laid down by them, no man hath power to alter or change, 1. Cor. 4. 14. 1. Tim. 3. 11. But the constituting of Church now after the defection of Antichrist may more properly be called a repaying, then a constituting of Churches, which through Apostacy have been ruined, or a gathering together of the dispersed sheep of Israel into such forms or shapes of visible Churches (the pattern whereof is shown unto us in the word) for (as before hath been noted) our state is not as theirs was that were the first constituted Churches, and so it will not follow (as it is alleged) that the receiving in of members into our Churches necessarily must be by baptism, as in the primitive time it was, except only of such persons as have not been baptized before.

And herein I take it, lieth the deceit of this argument that it putteth no difference between the people of God coming out of Babylon, and them that came to the faith from amongst the Gentiles, equalizing Antichristianism with Gentilism, the one being an Apostate Church, the other no Church: The one partaker of the word and Sacrament: (though with much corruption) the other partaker of neither at all, the one professing Christ and teaching many truths of God, and so many as the elect thereby might come to faith, Apoc. 18. 4. The other neither professing Christ, nor teaching any truth of God, whereby any might be converted to Christ, and become God's people in the estate of Gentilism.

And thus having made plain the different estate of the first planted Churches and ours in Apostacy, I answer first: That Churches now are to be constituted (if repairing be not a fitter

speech) as in the Apostles' times, and that all such as are received in as members, being unbaptized, must be received in by baptism, but for such as were baptized in Apostate Churches, their repentance is sufficient without rebaptism, as it was to the Apostate Israelites, who upon their repentance and returning to Jerusalem were received of the Church without any new circumcision, and therefore to add a second baptism, with the Anabaptists, is to Apostate from Christ and not to enter into his covenant.

And in that the Apostles received in members by baptism, they could do no otherwise, seeing the whole world was unbaptized, but if they had met with any that before had been baptized into the name of the Church as they that received the baptism of John, and as we are, I make no question, they did not, nor would not have rebaptized them, and therefore the conclusion will not follow, that we are now to receive in by baptism, them that are already baptized.

John Smith.

The next thing in your answer is a solution of the arguments brought by me to prove the truth: viz.

That Antichristians converted are to be admitted into the true Church by baptism.

This truth of the Lord's I have proved unto you by three reasons: The first whereof may be framed thus.

So are Churches to be restored or constituted after the defection of Antichrist as they were erected by the Apostles at the first.

But the Churches were at the first erected by baptism in their primitive institution by John, Christ, and the Apostles.

Ergo: so are they now to be restored: and therefore the members are to be received in by baptism as they were then.

As in the former point for baptizing of infants you were compelled to run to the Old Testament, and from thence to fetch the chief cornerstone of your building viz from circumcision: So in this second point you utterly forsake the New Testament of Christ and the true constitution Apostolic of the Church of the New Testament, and set us again to School to Moses, as if Christ had not been faithful enough to teach us his new Testament, but we must go learn the new Testament of the old Testament: Christ of Moses: The Gospel of the Law.

And first I would know why we may not as well with the Papists and Prelates go fetch one high Priest from Moses, a sacrificing Priesthood from Moses, succession in the ministry from Moses, and a succession in the Church from Moses, as a succession in baptism from Moses: and in effect you do fetch a succession of the Church from Rome: For in fetching a succession of baptism from Rome which is the form of the Church: and in fetching a succession of the matter of the Church which is the seed of the parents baptized you of necessity make the Church of Rome a true Church: For if infants of the Church of Rome have true title to baptism by reason of the Faith of some of their ancestors or forefathers that were Faithful, then are they the true visible matter of the Church: and if by reason of that title to baptism, they receive true baptism in substance as you say, in the Church of Rome then they have the true visible form of the Church, for they that have the true matter and form of a true church upon them are the true Church: and so are the infants of the Church of Rome a true visible Church in the constitution and essential causes thereof: and so as in the old Testament the Church came by succession of genealogy in respect whereof they made so much account of genealogies carnal, Philip. 3. 3-5. 1 Timothy. 1. 4. So in the New Testament the Church cometh by succession of a carnal Genealogy

through the Church of Rome to our days: and then as the matter of the Church, viz infants descending of baptized parents is by Genealogy, and the form of the church viz: baptism upon these infants is by descent: and therefore the Church is by succession: I demand why may not the ministry be by descent and succession as well as the Church? And then why is not the Church of Rome or England a true Church, the ministry of the Church of Rome or England a true ministry? And so why may not you return back again into England, and take up your former ministry, and renounce your Schism which you have made? And so I hear that some are minded to do: and truly for my part I hold it as lawful to retain the Church and Ministry of England, as to retain the baptism: and when I shall yield to the truth of the baptism of England I will yield to the truth of the Church and ministry of England: and I will confess I have been a Schismatic, and return and acknowledge my error: but because I know the ministry and Church of England is false, therefore it must need be that the baptism which is the form of the Church is false essentially: and therefore having Separated justly from the Church and Ministry of England for the falsehood of them, I must need also Separate from the baptism which is false, for the Church is false because baptism the form of the Church is false: and if baptism the form of the Church of England be true, the Church of England is true also: You are to know therefore (and so I wish you and all the Separation to mind it well, and the Lord give you eyes to see, and hearts to understand) that all the old Testament was carnal taken from the Elements of the World, thereby to type out and to teach them heavenly things: and therefore their Church was carnal to type to us in the New Testament a Spiritual Church: The matter of their Church was a carnal Israelite: the matter of the Church of the New Testament is a true Israelite in whom there is no guile: The form of their Church was carnal circumcision a carnal seal. Genes. 17. 10-14. The form of the Church of the New Testament is the circumcision of the heart, a new Creature, the Holy Spirit of

promise whereby we are sealed, which is manifested by confession and baptism in water: act. 10. 47. Ephes. 1. 13. Gallat. 3. 27. & 6. 15. John. 3. 5. Matth. 3. 6. Roman. 10. 9. Act. 8. 36. 37. Their carnal Church in the matter and form came by carnal Genealogy, and so they all of them were gendered unto bondage under the rudiments of the World under the carnal Testament or covenant: Gallat. 4. 24. 25. our Spiritual Church in the matter and form thereof is by Spiritual Genealogy, that is the Genealogy of the Faith of Abraham the Father of us all under the Spiritual New Testament, Gallat. 3. 7. 9. 14. Roman. 4. 16. 11. Their parents in the carnal Church was carnal Abraham and carnal Hagar, and all their carnal parents who according to the Flesh with carnal seed begot carnal Ishmael the type of the carnal Israelites: our parents in our Spiritual Church is Abraham. Spiritual, (and all our Spiritual parents) who by the word of God and by faith begot Spiritual Isaac the type of the children of promise after whose manner we are, Gal. 4. 22-28. Rom. 4. 19-21. Heb. 11. 11. 12. 1. Pet. 1. 23. Their ministry was a carnal ministry by carnal genealogy of the line of Aaron Sacrificing Priests: our ministry is by Spiritual genealogy of the election of the true Church that is Spiritual.

Thus if you would compare the Type and the Truth together, you should easily discern the sandy Foundation of your false Church ruined and your false baptism quite abandoned: who continue a Church by succession of a carnal line, and a baptism by succession upon the carnal Line through Popery: Whereas the true Church is only by the Spiritual Line of Faith, and true baptism by the Spiritual succession upon that Spiritual Line of Faithful men confessing their Faith and their sins, which was typed by that carnal Line of the Old Testament: you therefore that introduce a carnal Line into the Church to be baptized, viz: all your Children according to the Flesh, and that by succession fetch baptism upon that carnal Line through the Church of Rome into your Church (following the president of the Old Testament in that carnal circumcision by

succession of Genealogy) do therein unawares make Rome a true Church, your selves Schismatics, and set up Judaism in the New Testament, and so are fallen from Christ, and are become a new second image of the Beast never heard of before in the World: For such are you of the Separation.

This being premised as a ground which I earnestly entreat you (even in my best love unto you) and all the Separation, especially the leaders of them, well to weigh and ponder, and not to be ashamed to learn of their inferiors and juniors: I come to answer the exceptions which you take at my first Argument.

The sum of your exception is this: That seeing we are the posterity of baptized persons, and the Jews and Gentiles in the Apostles times were not so: Therefore we need not assume baptism in our entrance into the Church, which we had in our Apostacy, but we may enter into the Church without rebaptizing as the Apostate Israelites did without recircumcising: and so we must not in the new Testament be framed according to the pattern taught in the new Testament in entering in by baptism, but according to the pattern of the Old Testament and the Apostate Israelites therein, &c.

I answer diverse things: First, I say that the New Testament is as sufficient for the direction of all the affairs and occasions that befall in the time of the New Testament, as the Old Testament was for the occurrences that befell under the Old Testament: Seeing Christ is as Faithful as Moses: and the New Testament as perfect as the Old. Gal. 3. 15. And therefore if the Lord had intended to put a difference betwixt the Apostolic constitution of Churches, and our constituting of them in respect of the persons to be admitted into the Church, and in respect of baptizing and not baptizing or rebaptizing of them he could and would have done it: but seeing it is not done in the New Testament, but left in silence: and seeing the New Testament of Christ is

perfect and sealed with his blood, you that put this difference add to the new Testament, and bring in a new Christ, a new covenant, a new Gospel, a new Church, and a new baptism: and woe be to them that add to the word, Rev. 22. 18. and as they were accursed that added to the old Testament Deut. 4. 2. and 12. 32. So much more shall they be subject to the curse that add to the new Testament of Christ. Heb. 12. 25. in this respect there for your answer is sufficient.

Secondly, I affirm that (as the Holy Ghost saith) the Antichristians are in condition equal to Pagans, and therefore as I have said they are not called Israelites or Samaritans, but Babylonians, Egyptians, Sodomites, Gentiles: but the Holy Ghost knoweth what and how to speak: And therefore as the Babylonians, Egyptians, Sodomites, Gentiles washings were nothing, no more is the baptism of Antichristians anything: For the Holy Ghost foreseeing that the Antichristians would abolish the true baptism of Christ by baptizing infants, and so by admitting into the Church the carnal seed of the Flesh, would disannul that Holy ordinance of baptism, and so abolish the true constitution of the Church, in heavenly wisdom for our instruction calleth persons Apostating from the true constitution of the Church Babylonians, Egyptians, Sodomites, Gentiles, thereby teaching us that he esteemeth no otherwise of their Church or baptism, then of the Synagogues of Babylon, then of the washings of Egypt, then of the worship of Sodom and the Pagan: and these comparisons will fit you well against the assemblies and Temples of Antichrist, and I know no reason that they should not fit us as well against your Babylonish, Egyptians, Sodomitish, and Paganish washings of infants which though it be done into the name of Christ yet is no more available in the Holy Ghost's testimony then washing of Pagans, Babylonians, Egyptians, Sodomites Children.

Thirdly, whereas you say that repaying the Church now after the Apostacy of Antichrist is a fitter speech then constituting: herein do you both tax yourselves off the use of that word

constitution: and plainly signify that you incline to maintain the Churches of England and Rome to be true Churches, wherein whether you do not forsake your first faith, and turn with the dog to vomit look you unto it, and let all indifferent men judge: but your writings are against you sufficient witnesses in this case.

Fourthly, I say that the Jews that were converted to the Faith and new Testament of Christ by Christ, John, and the Apostles in your account were in a far better estate the Antichrist. For they (as you say) were of the same body with the Church of the New Testament, and their circumcision was a seal of the new Testament (as you say) and they were in Christ Jesus (as you say) and were washed I doubt not many of them into the Messiahs whose blood they typically saw in their manifold baptisms and purifications with water: and all of the had been partakers of the word and Sacraments in the Church of the Jews, and why might not they by Christ, John, or the Apostles be admitted into the Church without baptism: if therefore Christ John and the Apostles would need baptize them, and so by baptism constitute them into the new Testament that had all these p[r]erogatives in your judgment, much more will they have us to constitute Antichrist converted into the true Church by baptism: neither can you say without great indignity to the Lord's ordinances in the old Testament that they were inferior to the baptism of Antichrist.

Again you will need have this to be a great privilege to the antichristian to be the carnal seed of them that hath sometime been members of the Church of Christ in the new Testament, and therefore you say that in their parents or ancestors they had title to baptism: I deny that ever the English nation or any one of our predecessors were of the Faith of Christ show it if you can: but we came of a Pagan race till Rome the mother came and put upon us her false baptism: and therefore although the Roman might plead this, yet England cannot plead it: and so your dissimilitude cannot hold in that thing: and our case is simply Paganish.

Further, you say that the repentance of Apostate Churches is sufficient for their admittance into the true Church without rebaptization, as repentance was for Israel without recircumcision: I deny it, for the Churches of Antichrist are false, and the Church of the Israelites was not false: The Churches of Antichrist were false because they consisted of the carnal seed baptized which was not that one seed unto which the promise was made, that is the Faithful: The Church of the Israelites was true because it did consist of the carnal seed carnally circumcised, which was the true constitution of the Church of the old Testament: For otherwise if Israel had been false because of their Apostacy and Idolatry then Judah was as false who had in wickedness justified Samaria and Sodom, Ezech. 15. 51. but indeed they were neither of them false so long as they circumcised the males of 8. days old, but the Churches of Antichrist growing false by baptizing the carnal seed (which was not the true seed of Abraham's faith) therefore are to be baptized when they come to the truth, and cannot have Israel's Apostacy for their president: wherefore an Edomite or Israelite coming to be a proselyte of the Jewish Church that had omitted circumcision is a true President of the Antichristian Apostacy: For as they omitting in the circumcision of the males though of the Posterity of Abraham, yet being Proselytes were entered into the Jewish Church by circumcision: So is it in the Apostacy of Antichrist, with the Proselytes of Antichristianism: for so I take it the Proselytes were types of Antichristians, converted to the Faith, and admitted into the true Church: and the Israelites were not so.

Moreover whereas you say that if the Apostles had met with such as we are they would have received us into the Church upon repentance without baptism: I answer, if such an example had been left us we would then have rested satisfied, but seeing the Apostle have left no such example nor precept therefore you are yet in your Apostacy, and having not repented of nor

forsaken your Egyptian baptism are still unseparated, do still retain the mark of the beast, and are subject to the woe that the angel threateneth to persons so marked.

Mr. Rich. Clifton.

Now let us come to the second reason which is this.

2. Because true baptism is but one, but the baptism of Antichrist is not true baptism, and so not that one baptism of Christ but all the members of Christ must have true baptism.

Answer.

2. There is but one Faith and one baptism, Eph. 4. 4. and therefore is it sufficient to be once baptized, as it was to be once circumcised: Secondly, that the baptism of Antichrist is not true baptism I grant, and do also affirm that all members of Christ must have true baptism, and what then must it follow that now such as are baptized must be rebaptized, else cannot be members of a visible Church: I deny it and do further answer, 1. That the baptism which we received in the Apostate Church is no more Antichrist's than the word that we received therein: For Antichrist did never ordain a new kind of baptism, but did only pollute (with his inventions) the Holy ordinance of Christ: and therefore if this baptism that we have received be called the baptism of Antichrist that is to affirm an untruth, seeing the institution thereof was by Jesus Christ who commanded his Apostle to baptize all nations with water in the name of the Father and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost. And the same baptism for substance is still retained in the Apostate churches and none other. Secondly, this baptism may also in some respect be called true baptism, as before I have noted in my fifth reason against rebaptization: For 1. it hath Christ for the Author, 2. it hath the true matter outward sign or element which is water, 3. the true form of administering the same, which is, baptizing into the name of the Father, of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost, all which is practiced in the Popish Church, neither is any baptized into the name or

faith of Antichrist but unto the faith and possession of Christ and therefore our baptism is the baptism of Christ and to us that repent true baptism, and so consequently not to be reiterated.

John Smith.

In the next place you make answer to my second argument which may be framed thus.

All the members of Christ must have that one true baptism of Christ taught in the new Testament.

The baptism of antichrist is not that one true baptism, taught by Christ in the new Testament.

Ergo: The members of Christ must not have the baptism of Antichrist, but must take the true baptism of Christ, when they come into the true Church.

The sum of your answer is: That the baptism we received in the false Church is not Antichrist but Christ's: I make answer, that seeing infants are baptized which is the false matter of baptism, and seeing in them there is not the question of a good conscience unto God, 1. Pet. 3. 21. Nor the heart sprinkled from an evil conscience, Heb. 10. 22. which is the form: Seeing they cannot express credis? Credo: Abrenuntias? Abrenuncio: which is the form of baptism even the mutual contract betwixt God and the party baptized expressed visibly in confession: therefore the baptism is not Christ but Antichrist's, not from heaven but of man: and all that you object in this particular is already sufficiently taken away in answer to your 4. reason: whither I translated that which is here answered by you upon occasion there entertained.

Mr. Rich. Clifton.

The third reason.

Because as the false Church is rejected and the true erected, the false ministry forsaken, and the true received: so false worship (and by consequent baptism) must be renounced, and the true baptism assumed.

Answer.

First, I grant, that we ought to Separate from all false or apostate Church Apo. 18. 4. and to adjoin our selves to a true Church reformed according to the pattern of the Apostles. 2. also every false ministry is to be forsaken, Mat. 7. 15. 2. John. 10. Gal. 1. 8. and the true ministers of God to be received, Jer. 3. 14. 15. So did the faithful in Israel forsake the false Priests set up by Jeroboam, and returned to the Priests of the Lord to Jerusalem, 2. Chron. 30. 11. 3. it is our duty likewise to renounce all false wor. 2. Cor. 6. 14-17. Esa. 30. 22. and to worship the Lord, as he taught us in his word: and thus far do I approve of this reason, but the consequence I must deny, viz: that because false worship is to be renounced, therefore baptism also. For 1. we are to consider in that baptism received in apostate Churches two things, first, that which is of God therein. 2. that which is of man, that which is of God, is the substance of baptism, as before is observed, viz: the same matter and form that the Lord instituted, and likewise the same end which is the profession of the faith of Christ, and this is not false worship, and so consequently not to be renounced.

Again, that which in the administration of baptism is devised by man, are those unwarrantable ceremonies of crossing, breathing, anointing, &c. these are to be renounced as vain worship, Mat. 15. 4. Now the ordinances of God are to be purged from the pollutions of men, and not with their pollutions to be renounced, for if pollution might warrant men to cast away with it, that which is ordained of God, then might not the holy vessels polluted in Babylon have been brought again to Jerusalem: nor yet the Temple it self, that was so greatly profaned in

the days of the Idolatrous Kings have any more been used as a place of worship to the Lord.

Secondly, I answer that we have received a true baptism in the apostate Church as the people of God did circumcision amongst the ten tribes: and therefore we may no more renounce it, and assume a new, then they that returned to Ierus. 2, Chro. 30. 11. might renounce their circumcision, and be recircumcised.

It is objected of some, that this comparison holds not, for Israel was a true Church and therefore their circumcision was true: but Apostate Churches have nothing true, neither are the members thereof capable either of the covenant or seal in that standing, and it is not true baptism to such.

This objection in part I have answered before, and now answer further, 1. that the Israelites in their Apostacy were not a true Church, but false: seeing they Separated from Jerus. The true and only Church in the world, and erected a new Church and communion amongst themselves, joining together in a false worship and under a false ministry, 1. King. 12. 30-33. 20. & 18. 19-21. and so became an harlot, Hos. 2. 2. Secondly in the apostate Church there be some things true in the substance as the word and baptism, though corrupted in the administration thereof by false ministers, and humane devices. Thirdly the members of an apostate Church are to be considered two ways, 1. as they stand members of such a Church. Secondly, as they are the seed and posterity of their forefathers which received the covenant for themselves and for their seed: and though in regard of the former estate, they have neither right to baptism or the covenant (for the holy things of God belongs not property to false Church nor to the members thereof considered in that estate) yet even to such members considered apart from such standing and as they are the seed of their forefathers, so are they capable of the covenant and Sacrament and the same is available to them upon their repentance: For in apostate Churches God hath his

people which are beloved for their Father's sakes, Rom. 11. 28. and this appeareth in that he saith, come out of here my people, Apo. 18. 4. and to such it cannot be denied, but that to them belongs the covenant, yea whiles they are in Spiritual Babylon, as it did to the Jews that were in Babylon of Chaldea: bondage hinders not God's grace.

But some may reply, that they whose Fathers were Idolaters and unbelievers could have no right to the covenant to be baptized through the Faith of their Fathers. I answer, the right that children have to God's covenant depends not only upon their immediate parents, but title thereto descends unto them, from their ancestors, Exo. 20. if we respect herein God's mercy, even as men's inheritance do from their former Fathers: neither do the members of an Apostate Church cast off all profession of faith, for such believe the Scriptures, and in Ch. &c. though with all they profess diverse errors, and worship the true God in a false manner.

If question be made how it can be proved that the members of an Apostate Church had forefathers that believed. I answer, it cannot be denied, seeing that an Apostate Church ariseth not out of a company of infidels (for then could it not be called Apostate: seeing that to apostate must be in regard of the truth) but is the ruins of a true Church, and therefore it must need follow that their forefathers were believers, and had received the covenant.

And thus have I briefly answered these two Anabaptistical positions with their reasons, as the Lord hath enabled me for the present, wishing this labor might have been taken in hand by such as could better perform it. And further I do entreat, that the truth (which I contend for), may not, through my weak defense, bear any reproach, but that which is felt worthy, let it return upon my head: and do also earnestly pray that he that hath thus written, and both he and they that so practice, may seriously consider of that which is done, and glorify God by their repentance.  
March. 14. 1608.

Rich. Clifton.

John Smith.

In the next place you make answer to my last argument, which may be framed into this form.

As the false Church and ministry are rejected, and the contrary true Church and ministry assumed: So the false worship, and so by consequent the false baptism must be renounced, and the true baptism assumed.

Verum primum. Ergo secundum.

The sum of your answer is, that we must renounce indeed the false Church, ministry, and worship, and yet may retain the baptism received in the false Church, which (you say) is true in author, matter, form, and end: Though corrupt in circumstance, as oyling, crossing, breathing, &c. repenting of those corruptions, and not casting away the true substance with the corrupted circumstances devised by man, and annexed thereto, &c.

Although all that is mentioned here is already taken away in the former discourse yet is shall not be amiss to annex some thing for further clearing of the point.

First, I deny the popish baptism to be true in the 4. causes thereof as you affirm: 1. The Lord never instituted that infants should be baptized, 2. he never ordained that Pagan should be baptized, 3. he never instituted that the carnal seed of the faithful should be baptized: Therefore seeing infants that are not the seed of the faithful, but the seed of Babylonians, are baptized by Antichrist the matter of baptism is false, 1. the Lord never appointed that the party should be baptized without his own confession and consent to the contract that the Lord maketh in baptism: and therefore the Apostle Peter saith that in baptism there is the question of a good conscience into God: and Paul saith that when the body is washed with pure water, the heart must be

sprinkled from an evil conscience, 1 Pet. 3. 21. Heb. 10. 22. therefore infants are baptized which cannot stipulate or contract themselves unto the Lord therefore the Lord doth not contract with them, for Christ the husband of the Church will not contract in marriage with a bride or a spouse that is under age, Gal. 4. 1-4. 3. the Lord did never appoint that baptism should seal up his new Testament to infants, or that infants should be his baptism be admitted into the body of Antichrist and into the Church, ministry, worship, and government of Antichrist or that his baptism should set a character indelible upon parties baptized, or should give grace ex opera operator, all which or most of which are done in Antichristian baptism: but the end of Christian baptism is to manifest visibly that the party confessing his faith and sins is sealed by the Spirit unto the day of redemption, that he hath visibly put on Christ that he is mortified, crucified, dead, and buried, risen again, and ascended with Christ. Rom. 6. 1-6. and Col. 2. 12. Gal. 3. 27. Col. 3. 1-5. these are the true ends of baptism instituted by Christ. Seeing therefore the matter, form, and end of baptism in the false Church is from man even from Antichrist therefore the Lord is not the author of this baptism, but the baptism is antic. wholly: And although he useth the words, In nomine Patris, Filij, and Sp. Sacnti amen: as the papists do in sprinkling holy water, in baptizing their bells, and as conjurers do in their charms, yet this cannot make true baptism, but rather is a most notable profanation of the holy Scripture, even as it is profaned in their Sermons and daily worship performed by them. I affirm therefore again and again that the baptism received in the false Church is none of the Lord's ordinance, but antichrist's device, essentially corrupted, in matter, form, and end or use: and therefore wholly to be rejected with the anointing, breathing, and crossing, &c.

Here you endeavor to prove that Israel was a false Church, because it separated from Judah, and because they joined together in a new Church and communion, under a false ministry

and worship, and became a harlot: whereto I answer that so was Judah a false Church: when they worshipped Idols under every green tree, and in the high places: and if you so understand a false Church, viz: meetings or companies of men assembled together in a wrong place, and to a wrong worship, under a wrong Priesthood, I yield Israel so to be a false Church, but I deny that to be the true definition of a false Church for a false Church is contrary to a true Church: now a true Church is discerned in the true causes essential: and so a false Church is known by the want of those true causes essential: the true essential causes of the Church of the old Testament was the posterity of Abraham or proselytes circumcised: the want of these things only made a false Church: So long as the Israelites retained circumcision, they were the true carnal constituted Church of the old Testament: and Israel and Judah are called harlots, not for that they were a false Church, but for the worshipping of God in Idols, as before the calves at Dan and Bethel, or the Idols in Judah, this is plain enough in the History. So that I conclude against you that Israel was no false Church in the constitution, but had a true matter and form, viz: circumcised Israelites though under a false ministry, worship, and government, as I have already shown in the former treatise.

Lastly, you bring us in a double respect or consideration of members of the Church of Antioch. 1. as they are members of those false Church: 2. as they are the children of believing progenitors who received the covenant for themselves and their posterity: in the first respect they are not under the covenant or seal thereof in the second respect they are under both, for the Father's sake Rom. 11. 28. and so their repentance shall serve their turn when they come to the true Church without rebaptizing.

I answer diverse things: first, I do not deny but that me may be considered two ways visibly as members of Antichrist's body, invisibly as appertaining to the Lord election, and that

is the meaning of the Ap. Rom. 11. 28. but I deny that hence it followeth, that when they come from their invisible being in Christ to a visible being in the true visible Church they shall enter in any way but by the door which is baptism: For whereas you intimate that a man being invisibly elect and beloved of God, and invisibly having title to the covenant and holy things of God, may thereupon and then upon his repentance come to the true Church and enter thereinto not by baptism, but that the door of Antichristian Church shall open him the way into Christ's Church long before he came into Christ's Church, whereas I say you intimate unto us so much, you do hereby teach contrary to our Savior Christ who saith that we must go in by the door, and not climb up by the window, and that we must first be taught and made Disciples and the baptized into Christ but you in the Kingdom of Antichrist are first baptized falsely and then made Disciples flat contrary to Christ's commandment.

Secondly I say that no man is under the covenant or under baptism for the parents sake: and that is not the meaning of the Ap. Ro. 11. 28. but his meaning is that the elect of the Israelites are beloved for the promise God made to Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, in respect of Christ: not for that the children shall be partakers of that covenant, because of their parents faith, or because of God's covenant made with the parents and their carnal infants, but because the Lord elected them and predestined them in Christ to life and salvation invisibly: and therefore I do confidently deny, and you are never able to prove that the carnal infants are actually possessed of the everlasting covenant God made with Abraham for their parents sakes: do you indeed think that God loveth any man for another man's sake? Or do you think that God loveth not all men of his mere mercy: or for Christ's sake: neither is it the carnal line that is beloved of God for his mercy sake or for Christ's sake: but it is the Spiritual line of Abraham the faithful only and elect that are beloved for the Fathers, that is for the covenant made with Abraham,

Isaac, and Jacob, our Fathers in the faith: and so it is true that God loveth men in the false Church of An. for Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, that is for his merciful promise made to them: but what is this to prove that Antic. are beloved, and under the covenant, for their carnal line descending from a believing ancestor? Or if that were granted how doth it follow that the baptism visibly received in the Antichristian false Church is true baptism sealing up the covenant to them that the Lord converteth in the false Church. No: we have already proved that the baptism is essentially false and none of Christ and therefore it is the character or mark of the beast, openly retained in the forehead of all the subjects of Antichrist who professing themselves to be of that baptism do profess themselves to be of that body for of that body they are of whose baptism they are, and of that baptism they are of whose body they are, 1 Cor. 12. 13. Eph. 4. 4. Gal. 3. 27. and we have also proved that the Lord's true baptism doth not appertain to the carnal line, but only to them that are of Abraham's faith, that is actually believing to justification, and showing the faith of Abraham by the works of Abraham. Lastly, where you fetch the title to the Covenant and to baptism, for infants in the false Church from some ancestor believing 40. generations happily before according to that Exo. 20. that the Lord showeth mercy to 1000. generations of them that love him: I answer 3. things, 1. you must prove that some of our predecessors had true actual faith and were members of a true Church and this you must prove for every member you receive in without baptism thereby to assure you that he had title to the covenant and to baptism by his carnal line: 2. you must by the same reason receive by baptism in to the true Church (if you can come by the) all the infants of the Thessalonians, the Ephesians, the Galatians, the Colossians, the Philippians, and the Church of Asia that did sometime believe, 3. I deny that you expound the place Exo. 20. truly: For the Lord directly doth require that they upon whom he showeth mercy should fear him and keep his commandment: and I do utterly

deny that ever the forefathers of the English nation believed, and you can never prove it. For that which you say that seeing we are Apostates, therefore it followeth that sometime we or our ancestors had the truth, I wonder at you for so saying: for we are departed from the faith of the Scriptures, not from the faith of our ancestors, who never a one of them at any time believed visibly in a true constituted Church. Thus through God's providence and blessing I am come to a happy end of answering your writing: wherein I praise the Lord for his mercy I have received such assurance of the truth as that you and all the earth shall never be able to wring it out of my heart and hands, and therefore I desire you Sir, and all the leaders of the Separation to weight seriously even betwixt the Lord and their own hearts upon their beds this which is written, I doubt not but I may err in particulars, and I have resolved to be vile before men in confessing my errors, but for the main points in controversy, and the cause I defend it is the most undoubted and most evident truth that ever was revealed to me: and therefore as you love the Lord and his truth, and the people that depend upon you, seek it out and embrace it, and resist it not, but if we be in error, show it unto us, why? Shall we perish through your default? Will not the Lord require our blood at your hand? Are we not countrymen all of us? In exile for the common truths, we hold out against Antich. Answer we beseech you in the Lord: nay we adjure you in the Lord: if we be in error it is ignorantly, and of a desire to see the truth and to fear the Lord: Thus hoping speedily either to hear an answer to this writing, or to see you yield to the truth which I unfeignedly ask of the Lord: for you my countrymen, I end writing this 24. of March. 1608.

John Smith.

Rich Cliton. If you reply, show your strength, that we may make an end of these uncomfortable oppositions, for if I see not weight in your reasons, I will bestow no more labor.

John Smith. Sir: there may be weight in my reasons, and you happily either cannot through prejudice or will not through some sinister respect see the weight of them: I pray you be not charmed by evil counsel, but either show me my error, or yield to the truth. I would be glad to be an instrument of showing you this truth also: at least you by showing us our error shall discharge a good conscience: If you do not answer among you all: I proclaim you are subtly blind, and lead the blind after you into the ditch. FINIS.