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An Account of the Disputation at Portsmouth, February 22d. between the Presbyterians and Baptists, concerning Baptism.

The Names of the Disputants.

For the Presbyterians.
Mr. Samuel Chandler of Fareham.
Mr. Leight of Newport.
Mr. Robinson of Hungerford, Moderator.

For the Baptists.
Dr. William Russell of London.
Mr. John Williams of East-Kno in Wiltsphere.
Mr. John Sharp of Frome, Moderator.

The above-mentioned Disputants being come to the Place of Meeting, between the Hours of Nine and Ten in the Morning; and having took their Places, Mr. Chandler the Presbyterian Minister, after having made his Apology to the People, repeated the Questions to be Disputed, viz.

Quest. 1. Whether according to the Commission of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, adult Believers are only the proper Subjects of Baptism, and not Infants?

Quest. 2. Whether the Ordinance of Baptism, as appointed by Christ, is to be administered by Dipping, Plunging, or Overwetting only, and no otherwise? These are the Two Articles (quoth he) we are to Dispute of at this time: We deny, and They affirm.

Then Dr. Russell for the Baptists began thus; If Christ (says he) hath no where required any of his Ministers to baptize Infants; then the Baptism of Infants is not according to the Commission of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ.—But Christ hath no where required any to Bap-
Command to his Apostles, to go into all the World and Preach the Gospel to every Creature, and such as were made Disciples by their Preaching, they should Baptize and none other. And in Matt. 28. 19. They are commanded to Disciple all Nations, and to Baptize such of them whom they had made Disciples by teaching, now when I have shewed you how that Infants not being capable thus to be made Disciples, they cannot be Subjects of Baptism, intended in that Commission, then you grant the consequence of the major, and by denying my minor you say they are capable.—Sir, you are bound to give a direct answer to my Argument.—Mr. Chandler I deny the consequence of your major.—Dr. Russell. By so doing you say though they have no knowledge to discern between good and evil, yet they are capable to be made Disciples by the ministry of men, how can this possibly be true.—Mr. Chandler. They have no knowledge, yet are capable of being incomplete Disciples.—Dr. Russell If by complete you mean perfectly so, I know no such Christian in the World, but I hope this doth not hinder but that there may be real and actual Disciples of Christ, made so by the ministry of men, and fitted for Holy Baptism.

Mr. Chandler. we allow Infants are not capable of to discern between good and evil, nor of being made complete Disciples.—Dr. Russell. Then the consequence necessarily follows that Infants are not at all intended in the Commission of our Saviour, Matt. Therefore now it is high time I descend to a new Argument.

Argument 3. If the Apostle Paul did declare all the Counsellors of God, and kept back nothing that was profitable for the Church of God, and yet never declared the Baptism of Infants to be a Gospel institution, according to Christ's Commission, then it is no Gospel institution nor any part of the Council of God, nor profitable for his Church.

Mr. Chandler. Your Arguments are long.—Dr. Russell; Not so long nor so hard to be understood. Upon which Mr. Leigh Answered, That he deny'd that the Apostle Paul did never declare Infant Baptism to be a Gospel institution
Then you deny my Minor, which I thus prove. If the Apostle Paul hath so declared it, it is some where to be found in the Writings of the New Testament, but it is not any were to be found in those Writings. Therefore the Apostle Paul did never so declare it.

Mr. Leigh. You know that St. Paul wrote divers Epistles, and in them different Subjects; so that it is as if a Man should write a Book of several things, and when he hath finished it, one comes and Cuts off six Leaves thereof, and after this there is a question, whether such a Man hath writ any thing about such a particular Subject. Now it doth not follow, that because it is not contained in the rest of his Book, that therefore it is not in the Six leaves that were Cut off.

Dr. Russell. If Mr. Leigh speaks ad rem, as I suppose he thinks he doth, then I thus refer upon him. First that he doth by this allow, that there is no mention made of Infant Baptism, in any of those Writings of the Apostle Paul's, that we have bound up with the rest of the Holy Scriptures, he supposes there may be something said of it in those six Leaves, that were Cut off after he had finished his Epistles.—Now the Assembly of Divines, tells us that the Scriptures of the Old and New Testament are the only Rule to direct us in matters of Worship, but whether Mr. Leigh be of their mind I cannot tell.—Mr. Leigh. Yes I am.—Dr. Russell. Then what do you mean by it, I know not; But I believe they meant what we have in the Bible, and not in what is contain'd in those six Leaves that were Cut off, otherwise they Design'd to put a trick upon the whole World, which I do not suppose. But as touching these six Leaves, I conclude our Bretheren have not them in their custody, because I never heard them speak any thing in the least concerning it; But if Mr. Leigh or his Bretheren have them in their custody, I desire they would produce them, and when they have so done, if they will please to favour us so far, as first to prove that these were the very six Leaves that were written by Paul, we will take the pains to examine them, and if it appears that there is
ize Infants; therefore the Baptism of Infants is not according to our Lord and Saviour Jesus.

Mr. Chandler. If you will allow good Consequences drawn from Scripture, I will deny your minor.

Dr. Russell. Then you must suppose that Christ has required some to Baptize Infants.

Mr. Leigh. We distinguish between Consequential Truths and Express Words.

Dr. Russell. So do we; but I hope our Lord's Communion about Holy Baptism, is delivered in Express Words, and not in Consequentials, the Term in my Argument is.

I do not say there commanded or required; and if you prove the Baptism of Infants any where by Christ, is sufficient.—Mr. Leigh, will you allow good Scripture consequences in this Case, or do you expect plain Scripture words.—Dr. Russell. I say again the term I use admits of any proof, he is not thereby obliged to produce any express command, if he can do it without, for if he can prove that Christ hath any way requested it, it will suffice Mr. Robinson; suppose Mr. Chandler cannot give an instance nor no body in the Company; you hence refer that none in the World can.—This is in Effect to give away your cause, when so many Men of Parts and Learning are here present, if none are able to give us an instance from Scripture, for Infant Baptism, we cannot expect any Body else should. Therefore if Mr. Chandler will confess he hath no instance to give, I will proceed to a new argument.

This Mr. Chandler refused to do, and yet would give no instance, Dr. Russell. If Mr. Chandler can give no instance, here are divers other Ministers and Gentlemen, of great Parts and Learning, have none of them an instance to produce, if you thus refuse to produce it, the People will think you have none to give. Whereupon Dr. Russell speak to this effect, Gentlemen, perhaps you may think I have but one argument; if you will say no more to this; I am not willing to tire the Auditory take notice (by the way) that my first Argument stands good, till you give your instance to the Contrary. Argument, 2. If Infants are not capable to be made Disciples of Christ, by the Ministry of Man, then
they cannot be the Subjects of Baptism intended in Christ's Commission. But Infants are not capable to be made Disciples of Christ by the Ministry of Man, therefore they cannot be the Subjects of Baptism intended in Christ's Commission.

Mr. Chandler, here you mean by being made Disciple you mean such as are entered into a School and given up instruction, then I deny your Minor.

Dr. Russell, Repeats his major, and desires Mr. Chandler to tell him what he denies in it, for says he, my words a plain, to be made Disciples by the Ministry of Men.

Mr. Robinson, Mr. Chandler distinguishes between Complete and Incomplete Disciples.—Dr. Russell, But what the doth he mean by denving my Major.—Mr. Robinson, He denies that they cannot be made Complete Disciples, are not intended in the Commission,—Here Dr. Russell seeing the would not be brought to give any direct Answer, proceeded thus—Whosoever are incapable to be made Disciple by the Ministry of Men, they cannot be Subjects of Baptism intended in Christ's Commission; But Infants are incapable to be made Disciple by the Ministry of Men; therefore they cannot possibly be the Subjects of Baptism intended in Christ's Commission.—Mr. Leigh. I distinguish it thus they may be entered into the Church in order for Learning, and to they are Disciples before Baptism. Yet in a more visible sense, they are made Disciples by Baptism.

Dr. Russell. If Infants have no knowledge to discern between good and evil, then they are not capable to be made Disciples by the Ministry of Men, for Infants have no knowledge to discern between good and evil, therefore they are consequently not Capable to be made Disciples by the Ministry of Men.

Mr. Chandler. You trick all this while, I told you by Infants being Baptized, I meant their being Solemnly invested by Baptism.—Dr. Russell. 'Tis a mistake Sir, 'tis evident from what I have said, that those that are truly Baptized according to Christ's Commission (which is the thing we are upon) must first be made Disciples by the Ministry of Men; For the Command is in Mark 16. 15, 16. is a Com-
is any such thing contain'd in them, as Mr. Leigh speaks of, we will allow it.

Mr. Leigh Hereupon was very angry, saying what do you talk of our being the keepers of them; and what do you talk of the New Testament, is all the New Testament of the Apostle Paul's Writings.—Dr. Russel. I do not confine your Writings to Paul's Epistles, much less pretend all the New Testament to be his, as you would intimate to the People; But my words are, it's no where so declared in the Writings of the New Testament, and pray produce one instance if you can; for that will put an issue to our Controversie. I further add, that if Paul never taught Infant-Baptism in the Church of Ephesus; nor in the Church of Corinth, nor in any other place: I hope you will then acknowledge it to be no Gospel institution, nor any part of the Counsel of God, nor yet profitable for the Church of God; And there is no Record in Holy Scriptures of his so doing.—Mr. Leigh. I say Paul's Writings are not the Hundredth part of what Paul Preached, we cannot suppose that in those Six Chapters to the Ephesians, he could contrive to put down the whole of his Preaching to them.

Dr. Russel. Sir, you might have spared all this Labour; for I am satisfied the People will not trouble themselves to seek for it any where else, but only in the Writings of the New Testament; and if they will take my Word, I can assure them it is not there to be found, and I perceive you think so too, or else you need not refer them to Paul's Sermons, which are not written. I have heard indeed of some unwritten Traditions that are lock'd up in the Popes Breast, to be delivered out as he finds occasion, for the serving of a turn, but I never knew that the Presbyterians were ever intrusted with any such Treasure.—Mr. Leigh. If Paul did not declare it if we have other places apparent and plain, at least consequential it is sufficient.—This is not an answer to my Argument.—Mr. Chandler. We deny the consequence, Paul might speak of it somewhere else, though it is not found in his Epistles.—Mr. Robinson. You are to prove
prove that, because Paul did not shun to declare to the Church of Ephesus the whole counsel of God, therefore Baptizing of infants must be found there, or else it is no part of counsel of God—says Mr. Leigh. However we will oppose the thing (but not grant it) that Paul has not spoken of infant Baptism.—Mr. Williams. If you suppose it will take it for granted, if we may not say so. Thus ended their opposition to this Argument. Dr. Russell. I will now proceed to another Argument.

Argument 4. Christ's Commission doth shew who are to be Baptized; But it doth not shew that infants are to be Baptized. Therefore consequently infants are not the Subjects of Baptism, according to Christ's Commission.—Mr. Leigh. I deny the Minor. Dr. Russell. By so doing you suppose it shew it. I therefore thus argue: If the Commission doth shew that infants are to be Baptized, Mr. Leigh, or some other Person, can shew it us in the Commission; But it appears that neither Mr. Leigh nor any other Person is able to shew it us in the Commission; Therefore the Commission doth not shew that infants are to be Baptized, Mr. Leigh. It is included in the Word [all Nations] that do prove it is not.—Dr. Russell. You have brought an Instance and it is your business to prove and make good your instance, otherwise my Argument stands firm and untouched; But if I shew there are some Qualifications required in the Commission, and prove that those cannot be found in Infants, then Infants cannot be included in the Word all Nations: I tell you he hath commanded us to Baptize some Persons, but he hath not commanded us to Baptize any Infants; Which I thus prove.—If those that Christ in his Commission hath commanded to be Baptized, must first be made Disciples according to that Commission; then Infants are not to be Baptized by virtue of that Commission; Therefore infants are not to be Baptized by virtue of that Commission.—Mr. Leigh. I deny your whole Argument, that all that Christ requires to be Baptized are Disciples, and that Infants are not capable.—Dr. Russell. If no other but Disciples are expressed in the Commission, then the
Major is true, and if Infants are uncapable to be made Disciples, then the Minor is true also.—Mr. Leigh. You talk of the Commission; It is the good consequences I insist upon, and say Persons are not to be compleat Disciples before they are Baptized, nor actually taught before they are Disciples.—Dr. Russell. Perhaps you mean a Man is not a compleat Christian, if he hath not attained to the highest Perfection, he is capable of in this Life, although he hath been a real Christian for many Years, I speak not of such a Completion, but of such that are actual Disciples made by the ministry of Man.—Mr. Leigh. I say there is no necessity of being Disciples in your fence, before they are Baptized.—Dr. Russell. Then I will prove there is a necessity; For if our Lord in his Commission did not require his Apostles to Baptize any, but only such as they made Disciples by teaching, then there is a necessity they should be actual Disciples before they are Baptized.

Mr. Leigh. I deny the Minor.—Dr. Russell. Then I will Read the Commission.—Mr. Leigh. You need not do that, we all know the Commission very well. —Dr. Russell. I will Read my Masters Commission; Matt. 28. 19. Go ye therefore and Disciple all Nations, Baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost, &c.

Mr. Robinson. Is this your Argument? And then be Bauls very Loud, saying, Mr. Williams, Will you suffer him to Preach here.—Dr. Russell. What do you talk of Preaching, are you afraid of the Commission, I hope it is not so bad with you, as it was with some formerly, who flew from the light of the Scripture (as Batts do from the light of the Sun) will you fly from the light of the Commission, of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ.—Mr. Leigh. No Sir, no such thing.—Dr. Russell. If you should you would directly oppose Mr. Calvin, For he saith, There is no mention made of Infants in the Commission, and further faith, we may as well apply these words in 2 Thes. 3. 10. That if any would not work neither shall he Eat. To little Infants and so keep them from Food till the Starve, as to apply what is said in the Com-
mission to them whereas it belongs only to the Adult. Mr. Robinson. What have we to do with what Mr. Cals says.—Dr. Russell. I did not know but you might have had a veneration for Mr. Calvin, but seeing it is otherwise, will thus argue from the Commission; If there be an express command in our Lord's Commission for the Baptizing of some Persons, and there be no express command neither there nor nowhere else for the Baptizing of Infants, then the Baptizing of Infants is not contained in that Commission. If there be no other Commission of our Lord in holy Baptism, but what is recorded in Matt. 29. and Mark 16. Then the Minor is true, but there is no other, therefore the Minor is true.—Mr. Leigh I deny the Sequel of your Major.—Dr. Russell. But we are now upon the Commission.—Mr. Leigh. We are so, but we say, good consequences derived from the Commission are sufficient.—Dr. Russell. Much good may do you; But I had rather walk exactly according to the Commission of our Lord, then by such consequences, wherein I may be deceived.—Mr. Robinson. I matter not what you had rather do, or what your Opinion is, I am for consequences.—Mr. Leigh. I deny the sequel of the Major; That they are to Baptize none but such as they are expressly commanded.—Dr. Russell. Then I thus argue; If there be no manner of allowance given them to Baptize any other but what are expressly commanded, then the sequel of the Major is true: But there is no manner of allowance given them to Baptize any other, but what they are expressly commanded, therefore the sequel of the major is true.

But Mr. Leigh was pleased to give a general denial without distinguishing. Upon which Dr. Russell refer'd him to his former arguments, wherein he had already shewn that there is an express command for the Baptizing of all such, that they are required to Baptize, by virtue of Christ's Commission.—Mr. Leigh. I deny your Minor, but distinguishing between the command and the subjects intended.—Dr. Russell. If the Words in the Commission, about Holy Baptism be a command from Christ to his Apostles, then
then the Minor is true.—Mr. Leigh. I allow that the command is expressed, but I say the Subjects are to be brought in by consequence.—Dr. Russell. Then will I prove that the Subjects are express'd, If Christ did command his Apostles to Baptize such as believe and are made Disciples, then the Subjects are expressed.—Mr. Robinson. You must say all the Subjects.—Dr. Russell. By your favour Sir, there is no need of that. For Mr. Leigh denies there is an express command in Christ's Command.
if you think otherwise, pray tell the People so. — For then I conceive that your Baptizing their Infants will do them no good; For you cannot alter the decrees of Heaven: Or if you will believe as the Papist do, that Grace is conveyed to them barely by the act done; Notwithstanding the Children are wholly passive in it, pray tell us so.— Mr. Leigh Refused to answer to the former, but gave us Answer to the latter: No, we deny that.

Baptist. If none can believe on Jesus Christ,
Authority, but for his Judgment; it being the Translation of a Man, that very well understood the Original: And although he was not accounted one of the best of Men, yet he was accounted one of the best of Scholars in his time. But will you deny this Scripture, Acts 8. 36, 37. When the Eunuch proposed Baptism, Philip tells him, If thou believest with all thine Heart, thou mayst. The Contrary (that fairly offers it self) is this; That if thou dost not believe with all thy Heart, thou mayst not. And upon this the Eunuch declared his Faith before he was Baptized; Therefore it follows, they must have actual Learning, and the Minister must also know it before he Baptize them.—Mr. Leigh. The Eunuch was a Profelite, and his Infants if he had any, were to be taken in also, Philip comes to him, and he requires a Confession of his Faith, because he was a grown Man. Yet had he had an Infant with him he had, had a right to this Ordinance after he believed, when by your Opinion it must be cast out, because not capable of actual believing.—D. Ruffell. I suppose Mr. Leigh has forgot himself to talk of an Eunuchs having Children, it put—russell. Thus a Nonet.... for Infants are not at all intended in this Commission, as I have already shew'd you; and as Mr. Calvin doth also affirm. But I hope Mr. Leigh will allow our Saviours words to be true; That also his Apostles Preach'd to, according to his Commission, if they did not believe they should be damn'd, for of such it is said, He that believeth not, is Condemn'd already, because he hath not believed in the name of the only begotten Son of God. But as touching Infants, I am far from Believing that God hath decreed them (as such) to Eternal Damnation. I will rather believe that all Infants, dying in their Infancy are elected, then conclude that any of them are damn'd, and I suppose you do not know the contrary; If you do, I desire you would tell the People so.—Mr. Leigh. What do you put that upon us for.—Dr. Ruffell. Because I do think it's Reasonable you should tell the People what your opinion is, seeing you have started it; for you see I have given my opinion freely about it; and
whether they are Disciples or no, before they must adventure to Baptize them.—Mr. Leigh. This purely refers to grown Persons; and by the same Argument you may say Infants must not Eat; because it is said in another place, He that cannot work must not eat.—Mr. Williams. Nay, Sir, it is he that will not work, not he that cannot. It is he that is able and will not. For I hope you will provide for your Parents, when by reason of Age they are not able to work for themselves.—Mr. Leigh. I would know whether Infants are not as capable of believing in Christ, as of coming to Christ? Now they are said to come when their Parents brought them, for Christ says Suffer little Children to come unto me: And ’tis most probable they were brought in the Arms to Christ, why may not they be said to believe, when they do not actually believe; If imputatively they are said to come when their Parents brought them; So why may not they be said to believe, imputatively when their Parents devote them to Christ, altho the Children do not actually believe; but only the parents.—Mr. Williams. I deny the Parents Faith was ever imputed to the Child, prove it if you can.—Here Mr. Leigh nor any other Person were able to do it.—Mr. Leigh. I challenge you to give one instance from Scripture, of any one Born of believing Parents, that were Baptized at Age, and I will give you the Cause. Dr. Russell, I will instance in Constandine the Great, whose Mother Helena was a Christian, and yet he was not Baptized till he was considerably in Years. Besides is there any account in History, during the first 500 Years, that any one of the Fathers, or eminent Bishops of the Church, that were born of Christian Parents, were Baptized till they were about 20 or 30 Years of Age; And if any of you know the contrary, I desire you would shew it.—Mr. Leigh. What do you tell us of the Fathers? we are not bound to abide by their Testimony.—Mr. Williams. Was not the Mother of our Lord a Believer when Christ was Born.—Mr. Leigh. What do you ask the question for? every Body knows that.—Mr. Williams. If do you believe it?—Mr. Leigh. Yes, I do believe.
What then.—Mr. Williams. Then here is a Scripture instance for you, of the Child of a Believer, that was a Believer before he was born; and yet he was not Baptized till he came to years, and this we can prove.—Upon this the People fell a Laughing at Mr. Leigh, and his countenance changed pale; and he was under some confusion of mind, so that he could not presently recover himself; but at last, he declared, and Spirits rallied again, and then he spoke to this effect.—Mr. Leigh, this discourse was grounded on the Commission, now was this before the Commission, or after it.—Dr. Russell. It is a mistake, Mr. Leigh, we were not now upon the Commission, but upon your question. And think Mr. Williams has given you an Answer every way suitable to it, and the Challenge you made us; and you are bound to take it, to which he made no reply.—Mr. Leigh. I will prove that some Infants are visible Church-Members from Matthew 19:14. Suffer little Children to come unto me (faith Christ) and forbid them not, for of such is the Kingdom of Heaven. —Dr. Russell. Do you bring this to prove that these Children were Baptized?—Mr. Leigh. No, I do not pretend to any such thing. —Dr. Russell. What then do you bring it for? Mr. Leigh. I bring it to prove that Infants are Church-Members,—Mr. Williams. If Infants are neither Members of the Universal Visible Church, nor yet of a particular Constituted one, Therefore they are not members of the Visible Church at all. —Mr. Leigh took no notice of this Argument, but went off from it, and Infants are part of a Nation, and therefore might be Baptized.—Mr. Williams replied, Though Children are part of a Nation, yet not of a Nation modified according to Christ's Commission. The moderator making no Answer, Mr. Williams said, It was all Nations Disciplined. Upon this, Dr. Russell and Mr. Williams did both desire them to produce one instance for Infant-Baptism out of the Word of God. And this they did very many times, but no instance was produced; at length Mr. Williams desired them in these words, Brethren, I would beg of you to produce one instance for Infant-Baptism; it will reflect upon you if you do not. What will the People say, when they are gone? So many instances desired, so many Ministers here, and not one instance produced. They must needs conclude there was not one to be produced. —Notwithstanding this, the Ministers were frequent; and not a Man did reply to it. —Dr. Russell. If Infants are capable to be made Disciples of Christ by the Ministry of Men, without the use of Reason, then the Beasts of the Field are also capable; but the Beasts of the Field are not capable, therefore Infants are not capable. —Mr. Robinson. Take notice, Dr. Russell hath ranked their Infants among the Brutal Beasts, and that if they became of his Opinion, they must look upon them as Dogs or Catts, or Hoggs, &c. —Dr. Russell. Hold, Mr. Robinson. I have already told you how great a esteem I have for your little Infants; that I will rather believe that all Infants Dying in their Infancy are Elect, than I will conclude they are Damned; I bring this to shew the absurdity of such a Notion, and you are bound to shew the disparity if you can. Suppose there were Twenty or Thirty new Born Infants in a Room, and the ablest and Learned among you should preach to them in order to make them Disciples, according to Christ's Commission, I believe you would have no better success, then St. Anthony had (as the story goes) who undertook to
Instruct the Pigs, or as some others have done (even Popish Saffo preach to the Bowels of the Air, &c: Of which I could furnish you with divers Inflances. And now I demand of any of you, to take off Relation; and shew the dispairity if you can. Upon which they where silent, and none of them would undertake to shew the dispariety. Dr. Leigh. It is time to Proceed to the other Question, whither the ordinance of Baptism as appointed by Christ, it's to be administered by Dipping, Plunging (or) otherwise. — Dr. Russell. The Holy Scriptures shews us the right way of Baptism, as appointed by Christ; but doth not shew that it ought to be done by Sprinkling; therefore Sprinkling is not the right way of Baptizing. — Mr. Leigh. Sir, You must bring in that Dipping is absolutely necessary; What do you think of it? — Dr. Russell. I hope you are not ashamed of your practice. But if you will disown Sprinkling to be the right way of Baptizing, I am contented, I will not then inquif upon it. — Mr. Roberfox, We are not discoursing of that now; you are to prove Dipping the only way, and you must and shall prove it. — Dr. Russell, Mull and shall, is for the King and not for Mr. Roberfox. If there can no infance be given that ever the Apostles did Baptize other way then by Dipping; then ours is the right way of Baptizing? but there can be no infance given, that ever the Apostles did Baptize other ways then by Dipping, therefore ours is the right way of Baptizing. — Mr. Chandler. But I can shew great probability that many in Scripture times were Baptized by pouring a little water on the Face, and there is no Certainty that Dipping was ever used. — Dr. Russell. How doth that appear? — Mr. Leigh. It might be done other ways then by Dipping; and a probability is the most you can pretend to for Dipping. Therefore I require you to prove that Dipping was intended in those places you bring it for. — Dr. Russell. It is Epressed in Mark 1. 9. Jesus came from Nazareth of Galilee, and was Baptized of John in Jordan; and John 3. 23. And John was Baptizing in Aphon, near to Salim, because there was much Water there. It is from this apparent that both Christ and John Baptized by Dipping the Body in Water; else they need not have sought Places where had been great plenty of Water; And Acts 8. 38. 39. And they went both down into the Water, bush. Philip and the Eunuch, and he: Batiized him; And when they were come up out of the Water. Here we have an account that they went both Down into the Water; therefore if Philip had not put the Eunuch into the Water and covered him with it why should they go down both into the Water? A little of it would have served the turn. — And Mr. Williams the Presbyterian said, he thought there had been little said to the purpose. Upon which Dr. Russell reply'd, Mr. Williams, I think there hath been a great deal more said, than hath been answered; but if you are not satisfied, we will wave all that hath been said, and I will dispute it over with you de novo. Mr. Williams shrugg'd and Answered no; I am not very well. Upon which it was thought meet by them to put an end to the Disputation. And Mr. Leigb, (after he had made a speech to thank the Governor, and the Mayor for their Civility towards them, and the Baptists returned thanks also,) he then concluded in Prayer; and to dimiss the Assembly. It was between the hours of six and seven of the Clock when the Dispute ended.
To the Honourable Major General
Earl, Governor; Colonel John Gibson,
Lieutenant Governor, of His Majesties
Garison of Portsmouth: and the Worshipful
Henry Seager, Esq.; Mayor of Portsmouth.

Honourable Sirs,

With Hearts full of Loyalty and Thankfulness to our Rightful Sovereign King William, we humbly lay these Papers at your Feet, who procur'd for us a Grant from his Majesty, publickly to vindicate the Common Cause of the Reformed Churches, and settle the wavering among us in the belief and practice of those truths, which tend very much to the advancement of Early Piety and Religion.

We appeal to you, the Honourable Governor and Worshipful Mayor, as to Disinterested Persons, and most proper Judges of the Truth and Impartiality of our Account, which is, what was taken by the Pens of the Scribes, without any material alteration. We thankfully acknowledge your Condescending
The Dedication.

Goodness, in Honouring us with your presence and preventing disorders, during the time of disputation.

May you still continue maintainers of Justice and discipline in your respective Posts: May your Names be transmitted to Posterity, as Glorious Reformers of a corrupt and degenerate Age, in conformity to the Injunctions and Example of our Gracious King: May others be excited and influenc'd by your Example: May these hopeful beginnings be carry'd on, that there may be no prophane Swearers or Debauchees in your Streets, and Vice and Wickedness may be put out of Countenance and not able to shew its Head: This is, and shall be the constant Prayer of,

Your Honours

Oblig'd Humble Servant,

SAMUEL CHANDLER.
To all the Pious and Sober amongst them that deny, or doubt of Infant Baptism.

Brethren in our Lord,

The matters in difference betwixt you and us, are not so great, as the angry and uncharitable on either side would make 'em seem; there may be some (we doubt not) both with us and you, that do Hereticate and Damn each other on the Account of their disagreeing Judgments about Baptism: (Nor is it to be wonder'd at, if those who are strangers to all serious Religion, should put the respective differing Opinions in the place and stead of it:) But we were willing here to let the World see, there are with us, and (we Charitably hope) with you also, those that are both of a sounder Judgment and of a much better Spirit.

We are persuaded, there are many amongst you, who (tho you do differ from us in some lesser matters, yet) are agreed with us in the most important and concerning things. Wherever there are real Christians on both sides, in any Controversie, (as we make no question but there are in this) it is most certain, the things wherein they are agreed, are greater, far greater, than any wherein they can differ. When all the great Substantials of Christianity are out of doubt, both with you and us, that which shall afterwards remain as a disagreed, or doubted thing on either side, must needs be Comparatively very small, and not worthy of the Heat and Zeal too commonly laid out upon it.

And we must profess for our own parts, (tho wherein we differ from you, we are verily persuaded, the truth is
on our side, yet reckoning it to be only truth of an inferior Nature) it has not been without regret, that we have been engaged in this Contention. The Disputation it self was not what we sought; or was forward to; it was not we that gave the Challenge: Nor when given, would we have accepted it, had it not been so circumstanced, as that our refusal would most probably have redounded to the detriment and dishonour of what we believe to be the Truth: Many, especially the more injudicious part of the Auditory, before whom the Challenge was given, not being likely to judge otherwise, than that what we maintain would not bear a publick hearing, shou’d we have declined a Disputation, which we were so publickly provok’d to.

And for this Publication of it, ’tis what we are alike passive in: The World shou’d have had no after-trouble about that Disputation, might we have been the choosers: But since your Dr. Russel has abus’d the World with a most false and unfair Account of that matter, we are necessitated in our own defence, as well as that of the Truth, to Publish the ensuing Papers. We would not therefore, that either what was said by us at the Disputation, or is further added in these our Reflections shou’d be misunderstood by you: This is not work that we take pleasure in, but what we have been constrain’d to: And if any Reflections shou’d occur that may seem too severe, we would here declare, they proceed not from displeasure against the whole Body of those whose sentiments agree with yours, nor against any one barely for that reason: But we could not but manifest a just indignation against the Egregious falsehood and uncharitablenes of him that publish’d the late (pretended) Narrative: And we desire, that no one of the Pious and Sober amongst you, would apply to your selves, what was only intended as a Rebuke to him, or those who are too like him. Nor will the rest of you (we hope) take it ill from us, that we expose, as it deserves, that which is so base, tho’ it be found with a Person that pretends, in the present Controversie, to fall in with you. You will not, you cannot once imagine, that his Concurrence with you in this Point of Baptism, will hallow or excuse all that deceit and falsehood that appears in him: Nor can you your selves...
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Selves like it, that he shou'd endeavour to support your cause with lies.

This being premis'd, we are in hopes, the following Papers, if they shou'd do no good amongst you, may at least be look'd into without doing hurt. So far as they report matters of fact, we can boldly, and without fear of being put to shame, appeal to the All-knowing-God, and to the Numerous Assembly, who were Witnesses, that they are undisguised Truths: And so far as they contain Matters of Opinion on one side or other, we leave you and all others to judge for themselves.

Yet (as we have already intimated) we wou'd not that the matters contended about in these Papers, shou'd be over-magnified on either side: Or that it shou'd be suppos'd we differ further than we do: And tis a much greater pleasure to us, to offer any thing that may tend to narrow and lessen, than to Enhance the differences there are betwixt you and us. After we had been tird with an unpleasing contention, we therefore (as a refreshment to our selves) undertook this more delightful service: here to attempt, so far as may be, (notwithstanding little differences) to reconcile, and bring nearer to each other the Pious and Sober on both sides. To which end we shall, fift, mention to you how far, and wherein we appre-hend we are agreed: And thence manifest in the second place, how incon siderable the things are, about which we differ.

I. We are agreed, (without doubt) in every thing that is of absolute necessity to salvation: This is as certain as that there are Christians (that are truly such) on both sides; that there are those that shall be saved on both sides: Nothing that does E ssentially constitute Christianity is controverted betwixt us: And even with reference to this very point of Baptism, we are verily persuaded, there is a nearer agreement betwixt the truly Pious and Serious on both sides, than is commonly consider'd. Particularly,

(1.) It is, it muft needs be agreed by all such, that there is no possibility of salvation, for any Soul in our Apostate World, but only in and thro' Christ, Act. 4. 12.

(2.) Tis also agreed, that the Covenant of Grace does fix the terms, upon which Christ will be a Saviour to any: That thence only it is to be known, whom he will save, and whom he will not be a Saviour to. a 2 * (3.)
(3.) 'Tis also undeniably plain, and what cannot but be agreed amongst us, that according to the Constitution of that Covenant, Christ will be the Saviour of none, but such as are sincerely devoted to God: He never was, nor will he ever be the Saviour of any others; but such he has always been a Saviour to, Jer. 31. 33. Psal. 119. 38. Heb. 7. 25. Upon these Principles it is, that every serious Soul does devote itself to God in hope. And we doubt not, but you are also agreed with us,

(4.) That such who are Sollicitous about their own Salvation, cannot be unconcern'd about the State of their Infants. Every Pious Parent will (under the apprehension of that Guilt and Corruption which they inherit with their Nature) with enlarged Affections yearn over their tender little ones, and earnestly cry to God for 'em, and gladly lay hold upon any word of hope concerning 'em. Thofe amongst you who are Parents, feel and know what is the heart of a Parent towards its Child: And however you are (as all that are truly Christians are) unfeignedly concern'd for, and desirous to promote the common Salvation; yet for your Infants, that are so near you, that are (as it were) parts of your selves, you feel yet another kind of concern: You cannot with any Satisfaction die from 'em; you can't, when they are dying, part with 'em, unless you have some ground of hope concerning 'em. Nor can any thing afford you Encouragement to hope, without some word of Promise. Nor is there any word of Promise, only to such as are devoted to God, and in Covenant with him, in and thro' Christ: To be without Christ, without hope, and without God in the World, is represented as the Case of such as are out of Covenant with him, Strangers to his Covenant, Eph. 2. 12. Wherefore,

(5.) We doubt not but you are also agreed with us, that we should do all that is in us lies, that our Infants may be in Covenant with God: You do desire (as well as we) that they may be so; and we are persuaded, you will do whatever you are satisfy'd is your Duty, in order to it. You will (nay, we doubt not but you do) pray earnestly for 'em; and plead his Promise with him, that he will be your God, and the God of your Seed; and depending upon this promise, you do actually surrender and devote 'em to
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To him; and look upon your selves as oblig’d to educate and train ’em up for him, &c. This is what thofe that are seriously Religious amongst you, do, and dare not but do: Nor is any part of this a Controverfie betwixt you and us. Now here is the internal and moft excellent part of Baptifm, in which we are agreed.—After which, tis somewhat to be wonder’d at, that there fhould be any remaining difference, as to this matter: However, that which can after fuch Agreements remain a Controverfie, muft needs be concluded to be of an inferior and lefs concerning Nature. Which we now therefore come to speak to.

II. The things in which we differ (from what has been already laid) appear to be no fundamental ones: Which will also yet farther be manifested, if the things themselves be particularly consider’d. That which is the Subject of the ensuing Papers, and which is commonly agitated betwixt you and us, may be reduc’d to these two heads, viz. (1.) Whether we may, and ought to devote our Infants to God in the Ordinance of Baptifm? And, (2.) Whether in the Administration of it, we be oblig’d to dip the Person wholly under Water? As to both which, it must be own’d, we are yet disagreed: You judging the Ordinance of Baptifm, which we apply to Infants, not to belong to ’em; And while we apprehend sprinkling it self, especially pouring a little water upon the Face of a Person, or dipping his Face alone in water, to be Lawful in the Administration of this Ordinance; you fuppofe we are oblig’d to dip, or plunge the Person wholly into water. And while there is a difference in our apprehenfions, it must also be concluded, that on one fide or the other, there is certainly a mistake: But tho’ there be a mistake, fuppofe it to be on your fide, or on our’s, ’tis far from being a damming one.

1. We will first (as we think we have juft reason) fuppofe the mistake to be with you; yet we dare not, nor do Account it a fatal, or undoing one. Thofe of your way, that agree with us as above (and all the Pious and Sober part of you, we take it for granted, do) do only differ from us in a Circumstance. You agree with us, that your Infants are to be enter’d into Covenant with God in Christ, and seriously devoted to him, &c. You on-
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In doubt, whether it may be done in this Ordinance: Now tho we are persuades, that they shou’d not only be enter’d into Covenant, but also that this solemnity of Baptism shou’d Accompany, and add force to the surrender we make of’em to God: Yet we do not Account it so absolutely necessary, as if the salvation either of the Parent or Child were suspended on it. We read indeed that Baptism saves us, 1 Pet. 3. 21: But the Apostle to prevent mistake, immediately explains himself, and tells us, he does not intend it of the External Ceremony, but of the Answer of a good Conscience: Our unfeigned consent to the Baptismal Covenant for our selves, and for those that we have Power to consent, and accept it for; and our sincere devoting our selves and them in that Covenant to God in Christ, is indeed necessary to theirs, and to our own salvation; and this is that Answer of a good Conscience, which the Apostle calls for: But where this is found, tho’ the External Ceremony shou’d be omitted (whether thro’ the mistake of the Parent, or thro’ the absence of a Minifter) we don’t think God will, nor are we any of those who dare, pass a sentence of Death in such a Case.

And for the point of dipping, we reckon it to be yet much less material: The necessity of it we do indeed oppose; and doubt not but the Ordinance of Baptism (so far as concerns this Controversie) is Lawfully Administer’d, if water be apply’d to a Person, in any other way or manner; so it be done with the awful and solemn mention of the Name of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost: But yet, supposing it be so order’d, that the Life of the Person be not hazarded by it; nor any breach made upon the Rules of modesty, we do not Condemn the Practice of Dipping: And in those two Cases, all that are truly Pious amongst your selves, must (upon deliberation) needs disallow it, as well as we.

2. And now we will suppose the mistake to be on our part: We make no difficulty of it, to own that we are fallible: As wife and good Men as we are, nay, far wiser and better than we, have been mistaken; and tis no wonder if in many things we be so; Nay, we doubt not, but in some things at least, we are so, because we are Men: Tho’ we do not know, that in any Principle of Religion we are to, for that we dare not knowingly Err: Wherein fo ever,
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ever we are convinc'd of a mistake, we do, and we are willing to retract it: But we may be in an error, and may not know it: And we will for a while suppose (tho' we have never yet been reason to grant) that, as to the matters in difference betwixt you and us, we are under a mistake: Yet neither can the mistake on our side endanger the Foundations, supposing we shou'd be mistaken. For,

As to the Point of Infant-Baptism, if it shou'd prove to be a mistake, 'tis only a Circumstantial one, a mistake as to the time of Administration: This is the worst that can be made of it, if we shou'd be mistaken: And where is the damage, supposing we shou'ld be too early laid under the most solemn Bonds to be the Lords? Tho' by the way, we see not how this can be done too soon. We do not, we dare not rest upon our having been baptiz'd in Infancy, as if that would of itself save us: We do indeed reckon it to be Valid Baptism, and that we do not need to be Baptiz'd again, when we become Adult; but we don't think our Infant-Baptism will stand instead of Regeneration, or exempt us from the necessity of Faith, Repentance, or a life of serious Holiness, when we are Adult; Nay, we look upon our selves (by Vertue of that Baptism) to lie under unalterable Bonds and Obligations hereunto. And now, tho' it shou'd be supposed, we are under a mistake, as to the time, when this Ordinance shou'd be Administer'd, yet can it have no hurtful influence upon us, or upon any of those great, and important Principles of Christianity in which we are agreed.

Or again, if you suppose us also mistaken as to the manner of application, while we do not (as you) dip, or plunge the Person baptiz'd wholly under water, but only apply a small quantity of water to 'em, most commonly by Pouring it upon their Faces: Yet neither can this surely, (if a mistake) be by you Accounted a very dangerous one: No part of serious Religion can be thought to be endanger'd by it. The Kingdom of Christ does not consist in Dipping; but as that he that is Dipp'd shall be saved, and he that is not Dipp'd shall be Damned: You your selves dare not lay so great a stress upon it. What! Shall a Soul that is truly Penitent, and with serious Acting in Faith and Love, give up it self to God in Christ, a Soul that resolutely lies at his Foot, that will not wickedly depart from him; Can you think such a Soul shall yet be rejected by him, meerly because in their Baptism they were not Dipp'd under water! This is what upon serious deliberation, we are persuad'd, none of you dare avow.

III. Now then, since it appears, that the matters in contest betwixt you and us (at least amongst the Pious and Sober on both
both sides) are so inconsiderable and comparatively small; we
would make it the matter of our earnest request to you, that
they may accordingly be owned and looked upon by you, do not
enhance, or over-rate the Value of 'em: By this means, a happy
mutual agreement might most probably be effected, however all
the ill effects of our remaining disagreeaments would be prevent-
ed or removed. (1.) No way more likely than this to promote
an Agreement amongst us: Apprehensions that the differences
are greater, and the mistakes more dangerous than they are, do
naturally influence both sides to look with Strangeness upon each
other, and prejudice 'em against what is, or may be offered on ei-
ther side: But were it rightly consider'd, how little the difference
is, it would yet tend to make it less: by softening minds on each
side, and preparing 'em with greater impartiality to entertain
whatever convincing evidence is laid before 'em. Or, (2.) If it
would not remove our differences themselves, it would (at least)
prevent all the ill effects of 'em: For instance, why might we
not love, and live like Christians (notwithstanding the remain-
ing differences in our Opinions)? Why might we not pray with,
and for each other? Why might we not, according to the Rule
of the Gospel, look favourably upon each others mistakes, and
receive each other to Love and Communion, avoiding doubtful
disputations, Rom. 14. throughout the Chapter. We solemnly
declare, we are ready thus to receive you; we dare not but re-
ceive all whom we are perswaded, our Lord himself will re-
ceive: Let there not be a breach maintaine'd on your Part, while
we impose no sinful, or so much as suspected Term of Commu-

nion on you. Or, supposing upon one or other mistake, you
thou'd think fit to separate your selves from us, from our Assem-
blies, yet, at least, we beg, you wou'd in your distinct Assem-
blies see to it, that the great and uncontroverted Principles of
Christianity may be ordinarily, and with greatest warmth and
earnestness insist'd on; and let not your Heat and Zeal be laid
out upon the little things in which we differ: Let your ende-

ours be rather to make Men Christians, than to make 'em Anti-
pedobaptists; and shew that you prefer the interests of our com-
mon Lord, before those of your particular Party. For a close,
we would leave those Words of the Apostle with you, Phil. 3.
15, 16. Nevertheless, wherever we have already attain'd, let us walk
by the same Rule, let us mind the same things: And if in anything ye
be other wise minded, God will reveal even this unto you.

B. Robinson,
S. Chandler,
W. Leigh.
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MUST I again, be called out to engage in this irksome and unpleasing Controversy? Who had much rather spend my time in healing differences, and provoking all Christians to love one another. I have often read with some pleasing satisfaction, these Expressions of Arch-Bishop Tillotson, (that Great Good Man, and National loss.) I know not (says he) whether St. Paul, who had been taken up into the third Heavens, did by that Question of his; Where is the Disputer of this World? Intend to intimate that this wrangling work hath place only in this World, and upon this Earth, where only there is a dust to be raised; but will have no place in the other. But whether St. Paul intended this or not, the thing it self I think is true, that in the other World all things will be clear and past dispute; to be sure among the Blessed, and probably also among the miserable, unless fierce and furious Contentions, with great heat, without light, about things of no moment and concernment to them, should be design'd for a part of their torment. I had much rather be dressing my own Soul for Eternity, and preparing others for those calm and peaceable Regions, where perfect Charity and Good will Reign for ever: Than in fomenting and increasing those Divisions among Christians, which are too unmeasurably wide already.

My Charity is not confin'd to any particular Sect, or Party of Christians; but I bear a hearty good will to all that agree in the Essentials of Religion, Notwithstanding their distant
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distant Opinions, in matters of an inferior Nature. A reform'd Catholick Christian, is a Name that pleaseth me better, than any of those distinguishing Titles which the Contentions of Men have occasion'd in the Christian Church.Tho' I was urg'd by many serious Christians, before the disputation, to Print my Sermons on this subject, which were managed rather in a Practical than Controversial way; Yet so adverse was I to foment or Increase differences, that willingly forbore. And if Dr. Russel had only Printed the Imperfect Notes of his own Scribes, perhaps we should still have been silent; and left the World to judge between us: but seeing he hath been guilty of so many Notorious Falsehoods and Misrepresentations, both on his side and ours, we are unavoidably constrain'd to Vindicate the Truths of Christ, the common cause of the reformed Churches, and our own Reputation, against the bold insolence of a Scandalous Libeller:

The true occasion of my being engag'd in this matter is this: I was invited some years ago, before any Anabaptift Meeting was set up at Golport, to Preach a Lecture once a fortnight at Portsmouth; which I have continued (I bless God with no small success) ever since. In the course of my Lecture, I thought it most advisable to give my hearers a true and orderly Scheme of the Christian Religion. Having therefore explained the Creed and Lords Prayer (Mr. Williams undertaking the Ten Commandments) I did without any importance from others, but purely in the method I had laid down, explain the Doctrine of the Sacraments: Here I largely explained the Nature of Baptism, and could not do right to my subject, without defending our own practice as to Infants right, and the way of Administration. Dr. Russel himself knows how falsely he hath Publish'd to the World, that I inveigh'd against the Poor Baptifts (as he calls them) with most severe Reflections: Seeing he hath read those Notes which Mr. Ring took of my Sermons, The very hardest expression in those Notes, is the Title of mistaken Brethren. These Sermons Mr. Samuel Ring, who, tho' of that persuasion, usually attends our Lecture, penned down in short hand, and afterwards wrote out at length; with an Innocent design (as he himself professeth) to show them to some of his Brethren. Farmer Bows, a pretende
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attended Messenger of the Churches, hearing of this, applies himself to Mr. Ring for a sight of those Sermons, and having read them, said words to this effect. Shall we bear this? If we suffer Mr. Chandler thus to go on, it will prejudice our cause. Mr. Ring reply’d, Mr. Chandler takes but the same liberty in his own Congregation, to defend his own practice, that we do in ours.

But this was not satisfactory. Mr. Bows goes over to Gosport, to Mr. John Webber, Pastor of a Congregation of particular Anabaptists, as they are call’d, opposite in their judgments, in many great points of Religion, to those in Portsmouth. Mr. Webber (as he told me himself) was willing to live in Peace, and did not desire to be engaged: But Mr. Leddel, and some others, Men of heat without light, were very urgent, and willing even to accept of Matthew Caffen for their Champion, whom Mr. Bows propos’d: A Man that denies both the Divinity and Humanity of Christ, and is justly proselitised against, by many of his Brethren, and particularly by Dr. Ruffel. Mr. Webber justly refused to own Matthew Caffen as a Christian, or a Brother. And therefore, since they would have a dispute, rather propos’d Dr. Ruffel. Accordingly, December 21, 98. Mr. Bows, Mr. Webber, and about twenty of their Party came to my Lecture boldly to confront me, when I was Answering the Anabaptists Objections. At the Conclusion, Farmer Bows stands up, and in the Name of the rest Challenges me with Preaching Doctrines false and wholly untrue, and desir’d I would admit of a publick dispute with an ordain’d Minister of the Gospel. This bold Challenge I accepted, provided they would procure a Man that understood the regular Laws of disputation, and preliminaries were first settled. Accordingly the next Day, Preliminaries were settled and Papers interchang’d, between Thomas Bows and William Leddel, as asserters of the two Questions on the one part: And Francis Williams, and Samuel Chandler, as deniers of the two Questions on the other Part. This Dr. Ruffel perfectly conceals, in his Account of the Preliminaries, pag. 4. Because it would have confuted his Slander upon the Learned Dr. Smith, as if he design’d, by saying, he that asserteth must prove, that the Proof lay upon us; but this is Accounted for elsewhere. Mr. Webber afterwards
wards declares his utter dislike of the dispute, and wished had never been: And before my self and Mr Smith, deny that the Letter in the Name of the Church at Gosport, Narr. p. 2. was wrote with his knowledge or consent. Therefore we impute not the falsity of the matter, as if Mr. Chandler had inveigh'd against and ridiculed their practice nor the false Grammar in that Letter to him. Mr. Ring expressed his hearty sorrow by Letter (as well as otherwise in these following words — (after having sent me the note of my Sermons, and delivered a Copy of the Disputation to Mr. Smith.) — I am troubled at the Sad Effects of that Disputation. I mean the difference it hath rais'd among those, that I hope are all the People of God: And the Grief it may have occasion'd to any of his faithful Ministers: An most of all that I have contributed any thing towards it. Tho' it hath been by accident and no otherwise: and as I pray God forgive me, so I beg your pardon, and crave a share in your Prayers. I always respected you, as a Minister of Christ Jesus; have pray'd for the Success of your Ministry, and have heard you with a great deal of Satisfaction, and I hope have profited by it; and shall continue to do so, and so attend your Ministry without the least Prejudice, and I hope with better Success than formerly. I am, Sir, yours in all Christian Service. Samuel Ring. Portsmouth, May 29.99.

This is the true Copy of Mr. Ring's Letter to me, who according to his promise usually attends our Lecture at Portsmouth. Now let the World judge whether my Prejudice against the growth of the Church at Gosport, could put me upon this work; or whether I ever inveigh'd against them; many of them can testify to the contrary, to whom I have, and shall bear an hearty love and good will; own them as excellent Servants of Christ, and be very willing to contribute my Assistance, to help them forward in their way to Heaven. But alas! 'Tis Mr. Bows and his party that are afraid of the growth of Mr. Webbers Congregation: And therefore did insist from their Commissin, one Isaac Harman by Name, a Joiner in Portsmouth, for hearing Mr. Webber: this the Young Man told me himself, and asked my advice about it; and Mr. Bows told me himself, before Mr. Francis Williams, that if he could believe that our Doctrine of Original Sin,
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Sin, he should think Infants had need of Baptism: And wonder'd the People of Gosport should Scruple the Practice of Infant Baptism, and yet maintain the Doctrine of Original Sin. This Man it seems wants not express Command or Example, but only to be feelingly acquainted with the universal Corruption of Humane Nature; and then would readily Embrace our Practice. I Pray God open his Eyes, and convince him of this great truth, which is of far greater weight than this of Baptism.
AN
ABRIDGMENT
OF THOSE
SERMONS
THAT WERE
The Innocent Occasion of the Disputation.

Here I must unavoidably dip my Pen in the Watry Controversy: I love not to meddle with matters of Dispute, especially where Sober and Good Men are at Odds: But I cannot do right to my Subject, without mentioning the Grounds of our Practice, both as to the Subjects of Baptism, and the manner of its Administration. I shall according to the order of the Disputation,

First, mention of the Subjects of Baptism.
1. I shall prove from Scripture, the warrantableness of Infant Baptism, or of the Baptizing the Infants of Believing Parents. Here I shall not burden you with many Scriptures, that might be produced: but only mention some few that I think must clear.

First From Mat. 28. 19. Go, Disciple all Nations Baptizing them. From hence I thus argue.

1. The Infants of Believing Parents are Disciples, and therefore ought to be Baptiz'd. Now we have a plain Text that these Infants are Disciples, in Acts 15. 19. Why tempt ye God to put a Yoke upon the Necks of the Disciples, which neither our Fathers nor we were able to bear? This Yoke was that of Circumcision, a very painful ordinance, Administered to Infants of 8 days old; this Yoke these false Teachers would impose not only on the Gentile Christians but their Infants too, and therefore St. Paul was acus'd by them, that he taught, they should not Circumcise their Children nor Keep the Customs of Mo'es, Acts 21. 21. Now when our Saviour says Go, Disciple all Nations: The Apostles must need understand, that such as were Disciples in the Jewish State, should be admitted to this ordinance in the Christian Church.

2. Infants are a considerable part of a Nation, and therefore we cannot suppose, they should be excluded, except they were excluded by Name or good Consequence.

3. All Nations, is here put in opposition to the one Nation of the Jews. As if our Saviour had said, whereas the Jews have hitherto been the peculiar People of God, and admitted to peculiar Priviledges, now I admit all Nations to the same Priviledges, the Jews only enjoy'd before; Eph. 2. 12, 13. Now it was a great Priviledg among the Jews, that their Infants were dedicated and devoted to God, and admitted into his Church, and Covenant, in their early years; therefore the Apostle must needs understand, when our Saviour said, all Nations should be Discipled, that the Gentiles, and their Children should be admitted to the same Priviledges, the Jews enjoy'd before.
4. Our Saviour must needs intend Infants unless he had excluded them. If he would not be any longer a God in Covenant with them, he would have raz'd out their Names. Suppose the words had run thus: Go, Disciple all Nations, Circumcising them; the Apostles must have understood that their Infants were intended, and why not the same, when only the rite is alter'd? Or suppose it had run, Go, Disciple the Jews, Baptizing them; They must needs admit Infants that were admitted before. So that whereas our mistaken Brethren call for an express Scripture for Infant Baptism, we have reason to answer, there needs express Scripture to revoke that Priviledg and Covenant Interest which Infants enjoy'd before. If it had been Christ's intention to have excluded Infants from the Church, there must have been a positive Law, where such an intention of Christ should have been express'd: for nothing can make that unlawful, which was a Duty before, but a direct and express prohibition from the Legis.

*Stilling-Fleet Iron. lator himself; * who alone hath Po-
pag. 7. power to Restind, as well as make

Laws. You know there was a great Controvery, whether Circumcision should continue or not, Acts 21, 21: and certainly there would have been a far greater, if, upon their coming to Christ, their Infants had been excluded the Church, and ranked with Heathens; but seeing we find no Objections made about this matter, nor that our Saviour ever revok'd this Priviledg, we may be assured they still enjoy it.

5. The Practice of Baptizing Infants was customary among the Jews; those that have but dip'd their fingers in the Jewish Writings know, that not only Proselytes (as Mr. Tombs acknowledgeth) but Native Jews themselves, were admitted into the Church by Circumcision, as an initiating ordinance; by Baptism, as a purifying Ceremony, to wash them from Legal Uncleanness, which they might ignorantly contract; and by Sacrifice to ex-

piate their Sin; and that this was not a Corrupt Traditi-
on, but grounded on those many Texts, that require washling from uncleanness: And therefore this Practice is grounded on, Gen. 35. 2. Exod. 19. 10. by the

Comera
Talmud, and Maimonides. Now therefore seeing Infants were thus admitted by Baptism, and our Saviour as pleased to adopt this custom into a Christian Sacrament, we have reason to believe that Infants are admitted now as before.

2. Another Scripture is in Acts 2: 38, 39. *Repent and be baptized, for the promise is to you and to your children; and to those afar off, even as many as the Lord our God shall call.* The Apostle Peter doth in this place persuade those he had convinced, of the greatness of their Sin, in murdering the Lord of Glory, penitently to return to God, and then Encourages them to hope, they should again be received into favour with God: And, says he, the promise will be made good, not only to you but to your Children too: And to the Gentile World also, Even to as many as the Lord our God shall call. Thence I argue.

1. This promise was the great promise to Abraham. Some pretend it is only that promise in Joel 2: 8. *Gods giving extraordinary gifts of the Spirit; That their Sons and Daughters should Prophecy.* But this cannot be, because that promise was not fulfilled to all afar off. Have all the Gifts of Tongues? Do all Prophecy? The promise signifies the great promise K. "For unto Abraham I will be a God to thee and to thy seed, Gen. 17: 17. Therefore this is called the promise Gal. 3: 14. That the blessing of Abraham might come upon the Gentiles, through Jesus Christ, that we might receive the promise of the Spirit, through Faith. The Blessing of Abraham: That great Blessing that God would be a God to him and his seed. Now if this great Blessing come to the Gentiles, Then they and their seed ought to receive the token of the Covenant; the Children of the promise ought to have the Seal affixed to it.

2. The Apostle with these words to comfort the Jews, that had Imprecated Divine Vengeance on themselves and their Children, Infants as well as others; a curse that lies on the unbelieving Jews to this day: *His blood be upon us and our Children;* no doubt, but many of these, that were prick’d at the heart at Peter’s Sermon, joy’d with the rabbles in that loud cry; *Crucifie him, Crucifie*
 Crucifie him, and were concern'd not only for themselves, but their Children too; therefore the Apostle uses this Argument, if you penitently return to God by faith in Christ, the curse shall be taken off from you, and your Children, you and yours shall be admitted again, and not only so, but those that are afar off, the Gentile World, when call'd.

3. If the words were to be restrai'd, only to those that believe and repent themselves, and concern not their Infants; this would be an Argument to perswade the Jews, to continue in the Synagogue still, rather than to come into the Christian Church. While Synagogue worship stood before Christ's coming, God had promises'd happy Privileges to themselves and Children but now if afterwards their Children must be cut off and look'd on as no other than Heathens, and strangers to the Covenants of promise, this would incline them rather to continue in the Synagogue, than enter into the Christian Church.

A Third Scripture is in Rom. 11.15, 25. In those verses, these following things are contain'd.

1. The Apostle speaks of breaking off from and grafting into the Visible Church; that the Unbelieving Jews were broken off from that Visible Church, to which they were related before, by their positive unbelief, and rejecting Christ; and that the Gentile Believers were grafted in, and so partook of those Privileges, from which the Gentiles were broken off.

2. Some only were broken off, the rest that Believ'd injoy'd the same Privileges they did before, v. 17th. Now this was a great Privilege, that God would be God to them and to their seed: Therefore they still injoy'd the same.

3. What Privileges the Jews' left, the whole body shall be restor'd to, when the faithless of the Gentiles shall come in, v. 25. therefore their Infants shall be restor'd to the same Privileges they injoy'd before.

4. The Believing Gentiles are admitted to the Privileges the Jews injoy'd before, grafted into the same Olive-Tree, v. 24. Seeing Jewish Infants were interested in the Church and Covenant of God, the Infants of Believing
Gentiles are also in Covenant, and consequently ought to have Baptism, the Seal, applied to them.

4. A Fourth Scripture is in 1 Cor. 7. 14. Else were our Children unclean, but now are they holy. Hence I guess, if the Children of Believers are holy, then this ordinance ought to be Administer'd to them. The only difficulty here, is to understand what is meant, by holiness in this place.

1. Internal Holiness cannot be ascrib'd to all the Infants of believers. Because we find by sad experience, that many of them shamefully Apostatize from God, and thereby plainly shew, the Seed of Grace was never in them, 1 John 3. 9.

2. Neither can it be understood of bare Legitimacy, our mistaken brethren pretend. For,

1. The Word is never us'd in this sense, in all the Scripture.

2. The Children of Heathens, if begotten in Lawful Wedlock, are Legitimate, as well as of Believers; therefore this can be no distinguishing mark, as in this place.

3. The Apostle's Argument would be weak and unconvincing, if he should only prove that they were awfully Man and Wife, because their Children were awfully begotten. The Question propos'd to the Apostle was this. Supposing a believing Wife Mary'd to an unbeliever, or e contra, whether the believer should well with the unbeliever, or part one from another. The Apostle Answers,

If the unbeliever be willing to abide, let them do so, for the unbelieving Wife is sanctified by the Husband, and else were our Children unclean, but now are they holy. Because one Parent is a believer, therefore their Children are peculiarly related to God, and in Covenant with him.

Now if bare Legitimacy were intended, then the Argument would run thus: You have no Reason to question, whether you are Man and Wife, because your Children are Lawfully begotten. Can any believe any could question the one, and yet grant the other?

4. This would not answer the Corinthians Scruple: They did not question, whether co-habiting with Unbelievers
lievers, expos'd them to Fornication; but, whether
would expose them to Irreligion, or at least, great Ten-
ptations. Now, says the Apostle, *How knowest thou,
Man, but thou mayst save thy Wife?* However, *you
Children are holy, because one is a believer.*

3. By holiness is meant Relative or Federal Holiness
That the Children of Believers are Separated to God
enter'd into a new Relation to him, by virtue of his
Covenant. Thus the *Israelites* are said to be a holy Peo-
ple, because Separated to God as his peculiar Treasures.

Deut. 14. 2. 26. 19, the Infants of Believing Parents ar
thus' holy, as related to God and enjoying distinguishing
marks of Favour; therefore ought to have this distinguishing
ordinance apply'd to them?

2. What Privileges are the Infants of Believers In-
vested in by Baptism?

1. They are solemnly admitted into the Visible Church
no longer strangers to the Covenants of Promise, but
more nearly related to God, than the Infants of Hea-
then.

2. Peculiarly interested in the Churches Prayers; we
are bound indeed to pray for all Men, but more peculi-
arily for the Church of God, *Gal. 6. 16.*

3. Have a Title to God's peculiar care. God gives hi-
Angels a charge over them, *Mat. 18. 10.*

4. They stand nearer to, and are the more especial
Objects of the promises of Grace, *Is. 44. 3. 59.* In-
fants are call'd by God's Name, therefore tho' God's Grace
is free, yet we have more Reason to hope, the promise
will be made good to them than others. The vein of
Election frequently runs in the Channel of Believing
Parents, and their seed.

5. They are put into a new Covenant Relation. As
Abraham receiv'd the sign of Circumcision, as a Seal of the
Righteousness of Faith, to himself and seed, *Rom. 4. 11.*
So this ordinance of Baptism, shall be a Seal of the Right-
eousness of Faith, to Believers and their seed.

6. If they dye during their Infant State, they shall be
saved. Our Saviour useth this Argument for the proof of
the Resurrection. *I am the God of Abraham,*
*Mat. 22. 32.* Now for God, to be the God of any, is

(8)
to distinguish them from others by his rewards; he did not do thus for Abraham, and his family, in this World, therefore there is another, Heb. 11. 16. Now when God is said to be a God to Believers and their seed, the meaning is, he will be a rewarde of them; therefore if they dy in their Infant State, they have a promise to rely on, that God will receive them to Salvation. Whereas others must leave their Children to the unfathomable depths of Divine Mercy, as they do the Heathen World.

3. The Practical uses of Infant Baptism beyond that of Years. This I do the rather, to take off the Common Objection, that Infant Baptism is an useless Ordinance.

1. By Baptizing our Infants we practically own our Original Pollution. Those Baptiz'd at Riper Years own themselves Sinners by Practice; but do not necessarily own, that there is a Fountain of Sin within: But when we offer our Children to be Baptiz'd, we acknowledge that we have been instruments of conveying polluted Natures to our Infants; and that they need washing by the Blood and Spirit of Christ. Thus the Prophet sets forth our sinful State, by the Pollutions of a new born Infant, Ezek. 16. 4.

2. Hereby we practically acknowledge the Necessity of God's free Grace, in order to our recovery. As an Infant cannot contribute to his Baptism, but is purely passive; So we can contribute nothing, by any Work or Merit of our own, towards obtaining the Grace of God, and Regenerating Influences of his Spirit. It is not in him that willeth, nor in him that runneth, but in God that sheweth Mercy, Rom. 9. 16.

3. Hereby we practically own Christ's universal Headship, that he is Lord of all, of all Ages, Sexes, and Conditions. Those that deny their Children, to be in Covenant with God, hereby deny them to be Visible Members of Christ; And thus rob him of a great part of his Subjects, and indeed rob themselves of that comfort they might enjoy: they look upon their Infants, as in the same case and State, with the Heathen World. If Christ save them, it is by a Prerogative of Mercy, and not as his Members or Covenant Children; but for this case,
cause Christ both Died, and Rose, and reviv’d, that he might be the Lord of the Dead and Living. Rom. 14. 9
and as Christ whilst an Infant himself, was head of the Church, so he is pleas’d to admit of Infant Members, in Covenant with him.

4. Infant Baptism lays stronger Obligations on Parents, to train up their Children for God. Certainly it is a mighty Obligation on a Parent to consider, I have Solemnly devoted my Child to God. Solemnly promised, before the Minister, and in the Face of a great Congregation, that I will Endeavour by hearty Prayers, Serious Instructions, and a Religious Example, to train up my Child for God; the vows of the Lord are upon me, and I shall add perjury to the rest of my Sins, if I Neglect them. The Prophet makes it, a great Agravation of the Israelites Sin, that they had taken their Sons and Daughters that they had Born unto God, and Sacrific’d them to Idols. Ezek. 16. 21. and it follows, Thou hast slain my Children. God calls them his Children, as born in his Family, and Solemnly devoted to him. So the Sin of Christians will be highly aggravated, if they bring up their Children for the Destroyer, and Neglect those Parental Instructions, they have oblig’d themselves to.

5. Infant Baptism Engages Children to acquaint themselves, with the Terms and Tenour of the Covenant. When Children are told by their Parents, how Solemnly they were enter’d into Covenant with God, this engages them to enquire betimes, what they are by Nature, what they may be by Grace, and to understand all the Principles of Religion, in order to that end.

6. Infant Baptism Engages us against Sin Betimes. We are predispos’d with a happy Prejudice against Sin, in our Early Years; and this is a great advantage. When Hannibal was but 9 years Old, his Father made him lay his hand upon the Altar, and Swear, that he would be an Irreconcilable Enemy to the Romans: And this was the Reason he would never admit of any Peace with them. My Friends, we were Engaged for God against Sin, and the Devil, as our Irreconcilable Enemies, not at 9 Years Old, but in our Infant State; and this obliges us to maintain a constant Enmity against them for ever.
Infant Baptism is a great Encouragement for Faith in Prayer, with Respect to our Children. Those that have dedicated their Children to God in Baptism, may pray to God, with larger Measures of Faith and Hope, than such as have Neglected this Duty. They may say, "Lord I have resign’d them up unto thee; Brought them to thine Authoriz’d Representative to be lifted into thy Family; contented for them, to the claims of thy Covenant, and the token of thy Covenant, hath been applied to them; let the Promises of thy Covenant be made good to them. They are call’d by thy Name, do thou receive them. They are Visible Members of thy Church. "Oh give them the Favourites that belong to thy Children." A Visible Relation to God is a good Encouragement for Faith in Prayer. We are call’d by thy Name: Thou bearest not Rule over them. Jer. 14. 9. Those that have not thus dedicated their Children to God, can only say, Lord be Merciful to them, tho’ they are not call’d by thy Name, and make them thine. But we have a better Plea; and can say, Lord they are call’d by thy Name.

Infant Baptism adds to the Parents comfort. They may comfortably hope as to their living seed, that if they are Faithful in training them up for God, he will according to his promise, Jer. 49. 3. pour out his Spirit and Blessing upon them: and as to those that die in an Infant State, they have Reason to Believe and hope, that they are happy, because God hath promised to be a God to them, and to their seed. Whereas those that Neglect this ordinance have no more Reason to hope for the Salvation of their Infants, than the Heathens; most only leave them, to the unfathomable depths of God’s Goodness, having no promise to rely upon.

I shall answer some Principal Objections against this Truth.

1. There is no Precept nor Example for Infant Baptism, in all the New Testament; This is a Common Objection, and therefore deserves a distinct answer.

1. To this I Answer: What Express Command or Example can they produce for previous Examination of Persons that offer themselves to be Baptiz’d; for Stated Prayer,
Prayer, before and after this Ordinance; or for dipping or Plunging the whole Body under Water? All these things must be deduced by consequence; for no express Scripture can be produced for them. I may add, what express Command have they for singing Psalms in Rhyme and Metre; which is the Practice of the most Orthodox Anabaptists at this day? I mention this rather, to convince Mr. Webber and his adherents, what a doughty Champion they have chosen for themselves. For this Dr. Russell hath written some Animadversions on his Brother Allen's Essay, on singing Psalms; wherein he advances the very same Arguments, against their Practice of singing Psalms, that he doth against ours for Infant Baptism; and therefore hath prov'd himself a Hackney disputant, that hath one constant Road, and train of Arguments, upon all occasions. Perhaps I may be so dull of apprehension, as not to be able to answer them, therefore must cry, Men of Israel help. The Arguments of Russell against Allen, pag. 91.

If it doth not appear from Scripture, or any Authentic History, that the Psalms of David were Translated into Rhyme or Metre till the 16th Century, then it is Impossible any Church could so sing them, as our Brethren now do; the Major is undeniable, the Minor I thus prove.

If it be so recorded, you or some other are able to show it.

Further, if singing in Rhyme or Metre was never practic'd in any Church, till the 16th Century, then it was, because our Lord Jesus had not commanded it so to be.

If our Lord had Commanded it, his Apostles would have so taught the Churches.

If the Apostles were faithful in the discharge of their Ministry, and kept back nothing, that was profitable to the Churches, but declared to them the whole Councel of God, then they did teach the Churches all that the Lord Jesus Commanded.

If the Apostles did teach the Churches to sing in Rhyme and Metre, then it is somewhere so recorded in the New Testament. Thus argues this mighty Man of Logick; but as he cannot distinguish between Rhyme and Metre,
So I can see, neither Rhime nor Reason in his discourse; these were the Arguments for want of better, he trifled with at Portsmouth; but Mr. Webber (to whose Civility I am indebted, for a sight of this curious piece,) must either Renounce his beloved Rhimes, or comply with the Practice of Infant Baptism, notwithstanding the Wonderful Arguments of his Champion to the contrary. But to return from this digression.

12. Those Truths that were Established in the Old Testament, are rather supposed than positively express'd in the New; but the Grounds and Foundations upon which Infant Baptism stands, were Established in the Old Testament. Infants were then admitted into the Covenant and Church of God: Except therefore Christ had blotted their Names out of the Covenant, and Rolls of the Church; They are to be continued there, under the New Testament. Thus a Magistracy was settled under the Old Testament, but there is no precept for it under the New; the Lawfulness of War was then settled, but supposed, not express under the New. The forbidden degrees of Marriage, were settled under the Old Testament: No need of mentioning them again under the New.

3. Ans. There are many Virtual and General Commands for the Baptizing of Infants in the New Testament, which were mention'd before.

4. Ans. There was no need of an express Command, because it was the constant Practice of the Church, when the Scripture was written, in conformity to the Practice of the Jews, for many Ages before. I cannot here express myself better, than in the words of the Learned Lightfoot *. If Baptism and Baptizing of Infants had been so strange and unheard of a thing, 'til John Baptist came, as Circumcision was, 'til God appointed it to Abraham; There would then no doubt, have been an express Command for Baptizing Infants, as there was for Circumcising them. But when the Baptizing of Infants, was a thing commonly known and us'd, as appears by Uncontestable Evidence from all their Writers; there need not be express Assertions, that such and such Persons
fons were to be the Objects of Baptism, when it was as well known before the Gospel began, that Men, Women and Children were Baptiz'd, as it is to be known that the Sun is up when it shines at noon day.

5. There would need a Positive Command, to exclude Infants, who were admitted into Covenant before. The Jews were extremely tender of their Priviledges, and you know there was a great dispute among them, whether their Children should be Circumcis'd, Acts. 21. 21. Now if their Children were wholly cast out of Covenant, this would have enraged them much more; seeing therefore, there is not one word in Scripture, that once mentions the unchurching of Infants, not one Apostle, that once questions or discovers it, the believing Jews did not once scruple it, nor the unbelieving once charge it on Christ; nor the Counsel in Acts 15. Reveall it, tho' they that taught Infants should be Circumcis'd, did suppose they were Church-Members. I say seeing all these things are True, Infants are Church-Members still, and consequently ought to be Baptiz'd.

6. There are Examples of whole Households that were Baptiz'd in Scripture, and we may well conclude, as Abrahams Children, In Luk. 19.9. Christ faith to Zaccheus. Salvation is come to this House, for that he also is the Son of Abraham. Zaccheus was a Publican, and a gatherer of the Roman Tribute, and perhaps a Gentile; but upon his Faith in Christ, he becomes a Spiritual Son of Abraham, and Salvation comes not only to himself, but his Houlse; God becomes a God to him and his. So when we read of so many Households Baptiz'd, upon the Parents and Masters Believing, we have Reason to conclude their Infants were, Baptiz'd, as Abraham and his were Circumcis'd.

7. There is no Instance of any Christian Child, whose Baptism was deferred till he came to Years. There was great Reason that they who had been Jews or Heathens before, should upon their undertaking Christianny, be Baptiz'd at Years; as Abraham at the first Institution of Circumcision was Circumcis'd, when he was old; but we may well suppose, their Children (as Abrahams) were Baptiz'd with them, and afterwards in their Infant State.
Now it is utterly unaccountable, that in that long tract of time, between St. Mathew's Gospel and the Revelations, when many Christian Infants were grown adult, we should read of none that were Baptiz'd, but only of Jews and Heathens. I say this is unaccountable, and therefore supplieth they were Baptiz'd in Infancy.


Infants are admitted on the account of their Parents' faith. As the Infants of Believing Jews, so are the Infants of Christians; nor is this at all unreasonable. For as infants contract guilt from their Parents, why may they not also partake of Mercy, on account of their Parents? Except God be more inclined to Acts of Justice, than Mercy? As many were heal'd of their Bodily diseases, by the faith of their Parents, Math. 15. 28. So why may they not be admitted into God's Church on the same account? As the Jewish Infants, Covenanted with God, in and by their Parents, Deut. 29. 11, 12. So why may not Christian Infants Covenant in and by their Parents? Children are admitted into the Arms of their Nurses or Parents, Luke 18. 15. 16. So why may they not be said Spiritually to come to Christ, in the Arms of their Parents' Faith? As Parents enter their Children's Names in Leaves and Covenants, and the Children are oblig'd to stand to these Covenants, and do by these Privileges, when they come to Years: So why may they not enter their Children's Names into the Covenant, and Church of God, tho' at present they are incapable of Personally Engaging themselves?

2. Infants are oblig'd to these duties as soon as they are capable; and their Early Engagements in Baptism, lay the more strong and forcible Obligation upon them to do. If afterwards they revolt from God, their Sin will be more highly aggravated, as adding Perjury and Apostacy to the rest of their Sins; and this may be one Reason why, sometimes, the Children of Believers are worse than others, because they Sin against greater Light, and Love, and stronger Engagements than other Men; and there fore
fore justly provoke the Holy Spirit to forfake them. T
Levites of a Month Old are said to keep the charge of
Sanctuary, because they were devoted to this Office, at
bound to it when capable, Num. 3. 28. So the Infant
of Believers are devoted to the Service of God: At
bound to Believe, repent, confess their Sins, and gladly
receive the word, as soon as capable.

3. These Texts therefore only shew what was requir-
of grown Persons, when Baptism was first appointed i
the Christian Church. Those Persons were either Jews
Heathens before, and therefore must Renounce their
former Errors, and profess the Christian Faith; but this:
no Prejudice against Infants who are to be admitted with
them. As when Abraham was Circumciz'd, he first Be-
liev'd in God, and Submitted to this Ordinance, but af
wards the Infants of the Jews were Circumciz'd in
their Infant State: So if we were to Preach to the In-
di ans, we must first persuade them to Believe and Repen-
t before Baptism; but when once they had Believ'd, their
Infants would have the same right with themselves.

4. As to Mar. 16. 16. because many are apt to insist
on the order of the words, and argue that Faith is put
before Baptism, and therefore ought to precede it,

I Answer: The order of the words is not always to
be exactly regarded. For confessing of Sin is put after
Baptism, Matth. 3. 6. Besides, this would condemn
all Infants; for, if, because they cannot Believe,
ye ought not to be Baptiz'd, then for the same Rea-
on they must all be damn'd. 'Tis not positively said
he that is not Baptiz'd shall be damn'd; Baptism is not
of Absolute Necessity to Salvation: But it is positively
said, he that Believeth not shall be damn'd. If the latter
part of this verse be Interpreted of Grown Persons, so
also must the former. As for Grown Persons, Faith
must go before Baptism: But it doth not follow, that
Infants are hence excluded from Baptism, no more than
from Salvation. Our Saviour doth therefore here, only
give a general direction to his Apostles, to Preach the
Gospel to every Creature, and admit the Gentiles to the
same Privileges with the Jews, and shows them the
Issue of the Execution of their Commission; that those
Jews,
Jews, or Heathens that would renounce their former Idolatry, and believingly submit to the Ordinance, as a Solemn Entrance into the Church, should be saved; but those that wilfully persisted in unbelief, should be damned. So that this is no Prejudice to Infants, who are still in Covenant with God thro' their Parents Faith, and were never cast out.

I proceed to the 2d General Question. After what manner, the outward Element in Baptism, ought to be apply'd, whether by dipping or plunging the whole Body under Water, or whether pouring Water on the Face be not sufficient? To which I Answ. 1. It is not Absolutely Necessary that this Ordinance should be administered by dipping or plunging the whole Body under the Water. There are many mistak'en Brethren lay too great a stress on this; but it proceeds from their ignorance of the Scriptures.

1. The Holy Ghost, never uses βάπτιζω, which most frequently signifies to dip, but βάπτω. Now why should the Holy Ghost consecrate a new World for this Ordinance; if dipping had been the only way of administering it? Now βάπτω is always used where dipping is signify'd. Mat. 26. 23. Job. 13. 26. He that dipteth with me in the dish. Luk. 16. 24. dip his finger. Rev. 19. 3. with Garments dip'd in Blood.

2. The Greek word βάπτιζω, is us'd in a differing sense in Scripture. Thus you read, Mar. 7. 4. The Pharisees not except they wash off.

Now the way of washing among the Jews, was this; Servant was ready to pour water, on his Masters hands, since Elisha is thus describ'd. 2 Kings 3. 11. Here & Elisha that pour'd Water on the hands of his Master Elisha. So we read of washing of cups and pots, Brazen Vessels and Tables or Beds, Mar. 7. 4. the Greek word is ἔβαπτιζον. Surely they did not carry them out to a River and dip them there, but pour'd water on them, and so made them clean. Again, Heb. 9. 10. we read of divers washings; Baptisms in the Greek. Now what were these Baptisms but 9. 13. 21. Moses's Sprinkling the Book and all the People, with the Blood of Calves and Goats and Water, so that ποτανίμω and βάπτισον signify the same thing. Let not Injudicious People therefore pretend, that ours is only Ramsism, when we find in Scripture that Ramsism.
and Baptism are us'd promiscuously for the same.

3. There is no certainty that dipping was ever us'd in Scripture times. All those Scriptures that are commonly urg'd to this purpose, may be easily apply'd another way if we begin with John the Baptist, he is said to Baptize not in, but with Water, as Christ with the Holy Ghost and Fire. Luk. 3: 16. Now how did Christ Baptize with the Holy Ghost and Fire? but at the day of pentecost when the Holy Ghost was pour'd on them: Acts. 10. 45. know the learned Casaubon's witty Criticism that in Acts 2. when the Holy Ghost came upon them it is said There came a sound from Heaven as of a rushing mighty wind, and it fill'd the House. So that they were as in Fifth Pond Overwhelm'd with the Holy Ghost. But this I answer, it was the sound that fill'd the House and not the Cloven Tongues of Fire, which were the Emblems of the Holy Ghost, and sure they were not Overwhelm'd with these; but that promise was made good, will pour out my Spirit. Acts 2. 17. Now the pouring out of the Spirit, is frequently represented by pouring out Water, Is. 44. 3.

But several Scriptures are pretended for dipping; the most material are these.

1. Mat. 3. 16. Jesus went up out of the Water.

I answer, he might according to the Practice of those times, go into the Water to wash his Feet, foul with Travelling, and John might pour Water on his Face; but the Greek word may be render'd, he went up from the Water. The like answer may be given to Mar. 1. 9. Jesus was Baptiz'd of John in Jordan. It doth not prove his whole Body was plung'd there. Nay the frequently signifies to; and if we compare this place with Mat. 3.

2. Jesus came from Nazareth of Galilee to Jordan to be Baptiz'd of John. So here we may read the words with a Parenthesis: And Jesus came from Nazareth of Galilee (and was Baptiz'd of John) to Jordan.

2. Another Scripture is Job. 3. 23. John Baptiz'd in Enon, because there was much Water there.

I answer, much Water may be meant not of depth but length, many Streams and Rivulets, where John and his Disciples might conveniently together Baptize or pour Water on the Multitudes.
3. Another Scripture is Acts 8: 38, where Philip and the Eunuch are said both to go down into the Water; whence some would infer that the Eunuch was dip'd. I answer, they might only go down to, and come from the Water. So the Greek may be render'd, the Water running in the valleys. But if Men will instruct on the letter of the Text, Philip must dip himself as well as the Eunuch; for they both went down. Or they might go deep, and Philip might pour Water on his Head or Face: either of these Interpretations are probable, and therefore it cannot Necessarily be prov'd he was dip't; besides the unlikelihood that he was dip't on a Journey, when perhaps he might have no cloaths to change.

4. The Principal Scripture they boast of, is Rom. 6: 4, Being Buried with Christ in Baptism. Whence they argue Baptism must represent a Burial, therefore the whole Body must be cover'd with Water. This Text we have given a distinct Answer to, in our Reflections on Dr. Tillotson, Chap. 2. Refl. 12. 13, therefore thither I Refer the Reader, and shall only say here,

1. It is no where said that Baptism represents Christ's Burial, but only that we are oblig'd to conform our selves thereby to Christ's Death, Burial, and Resurrection, to die to Sin, and rise again to newness of Life: This we do whatever rite be us'd.

2. In our way (if that will satisfy) there is a Representation of Christ's Death, the pouring out of Water denoting the pouring his Blood or Soul; of his Burial, as the Face the Principal part of the Body, is put under the Water; of his Resurrection when the Child is taken up and deliver'd again to its Parents or Nurses.

3. If they will keep strictly to the Significance of a Burial; the Person to be Baptiz'd, must not walk into the Water, but be taken up by the Baptizer and cast down into it: for indeed the difference between our way and theirs is only this, we Baptize the Face and they Baptize the head and Shoul'ers too.

4. Metaphors must not be stretched too far, and let our Brethren take heed, how they stretch this Expression, &c, as to Justify the Practice of others, that differ from
from them; you read v. 6. our Old Man is Crucify'd with Christ. Hence the Romanists infer the Necessity of Dying in Baptism; let not the Metaphor therefore be stretched too far.

5. There are many more Scriptures, that have an Allusion to Sprinkling or pouring Water on the Face: thus we read, Is. 44. 3. I will pour Water on him: that is thirsty, &c. which is Interpreted of God's pouring out his Spirit, and Blessing on the Seed of Believers. So Heb. 10. 22. Having your Hearts Sprinkled from an Evil Conscience, and your Bodies Wash'd with pure Water: And many other places. So that our way most fairly Represents the Death, Burial and Resurrection of Christ, together with the Application of his Blood, and Spirit; and the Anabaptists of Amsterdam are so sensible of this, that they Generally Baptize by pouring Water upon the Head.

4. There is great probability, (if not certainty) that many were not dip'd in Scripture times. Particular Acts 2. 41. we read of 3000 Baptiz'd in part of a day. And this was at Jerusalem, where there were no Rivers, but only the Brook Cedron. Besides these were either dippt naked, or with their Cloaths; if Naked, this would be an unseemly sight, and look as if they were full of New Wine indeed; tho' (by the way) I think that part, that is Baptiz'd, ought to be Naked, to Represent our Nakedness before God: if with their Cloaths this would be as strange, for it cannot be expected, they brought Cloaths with them at that Juncture, and it would have been very unseemly, to see so many Persons come out of the Water in such a condition; and go down to their Houses, which might be at a great distance; not to mention that it was hardly possible, for the 12 Apostles, if we should add the 70 Disciples to them, (which yet the Text mentions not) to dip 3000 in so short a time, they had need have brawny Arms and an Herculean Strength to do this.

Again we read Acts 9. 9. 18. that Saul after 3 days fasting was Baptiz'd by Ananias, we read not that he went out of the House; nor is it probable, that God (who will have Mercy and not Sacrifice,) would at that time require, he should be plung'd in Cold Water, which
which might Prejudice his Health or Life.

Again Acts 16. 33. The Jaylor and all his were Bap-

"d at midnight. Tis unlikely they went to a River at
tat time.

5. It is not the quantity of Water, but the quality
at is Significant. As in the other Sacrament we are

manded to Eat Bread and drink Wine in Remem-

ance of Christ; So in this to be washd in the Name

the Father Son and Holy Ghost: and as in the other,
is not said what quantity of Bread we shall Eat, or Wine

shall Drink; So neither in this, after what manner

Water shall be apply'd, whether by dipping, Sprinkling
pouring Water on the Face. It might be equally pre-

aded, that we must Eat and Drink plentifully at the

bards Table, because this best sets forth a Feaft, as it is

1 Cor. 5. 8. or Eat a whole Loaf to represent our

taking of Chrifts fulnefs, and receiving from him

pace for Grace: there is as much Neecefsity for this, as

dipping, to represent our Burial with Christ. But as

mall bit of Bread, and Moderate Draught of Wine,

th significantly represent the Death of Christ; fo a little

ater doth as significantly Represent the cleaning vir-

of Chrifts Blood.

6. It is very unlikely that dipping, which when

mention'd in Scripture, is generally us'd as a token

Gods Vengeance, fhould in this Sacrament be us'd

a token of his Mercy. Thus the Old World was

dip'd and drown'd for their Sins, Gods Vengeance fol-

d them, and they funk as lead in the Mighty Waters:

But Noah and his Family, whose entrance into the

ark, was a Type of Baptifm, as that is an Entrance into

Christians Church 1 Pet. 3. 21. They were only wet

with the Rain they met with in their paffage. Thus the

yptians were dip'd and drown'd in the Red-Sea, but

raelites were Baptiz'd unto Moses, in the Cloud

and the Sea, 1 Cor. 10. 2. by the dewings of the Cloud,

dashing of the Waves. Thus the Lord Jesufl shall

e down from Heaven, to render Vengeance on his

christian Enemies, with Garments dip't in Blood.

19, 13. I know the usual Objection of Naaman the

ian, of whom it is said 2 Kings 5. 14. he dip'd him-

self
Self in the River Jordan, Seven times, according to the laying of the Man of God. But this Objection I took off in theDuplication it self. Not according to the fair representation of the Narrative, but thus: The Prophet bids him, v. 10, go and wash in Jordan Seven times; and he washed himself, as the Hebrew may be rendred, according to the laying of the Man of God. As when our Saviour commanded the blind man to wash in the Pool of Siloam, John 9. 7, he had no need to dip himself, but only to wash his Eyes. So Naaman the Syrian had no need to wash any part of his body, but only where he was affected with Leprosie: And therefore till it can be prov'd, that Naaman was a Leprer all over, this Objection is of no Force. This was my Answer then, which perfectly silenced Russel. This Argument I used to prove the absolute Unlawfulness of Dipping; for I lay no stress at all on the Mode of Administration; and the Dipping was used in these places, as a Token of Vengeance, yet it may be apply'd in a way of Mercy. But I hence argue, it is very unlikely, that this way, and no other must be us'd in Baptism. And this may be a sufficient Answer to all that little Story about Mr. Fox in the Preface, and the Trifling Queries upon it.

2. Sprinkling, or pouring Water on the Face, in this Sacrament, is most significant. We pour water on the Face, the Noblest and Chiefest Part of Man. That part we pour water on is naked, to represent our nakedness before God; and this is sufficient, and significantly represents,

1. The Blood of Christ, whereby we are cleans'd from the Guilt and Filth of Sin. To this, there are particular Allusions made in many places of Scripture, Heb. 10, 22, 12, 23. 1 Pet. 1, 2.

2. It fitly Represents the Communications of the Spirit. The Spirit of God is promis'd to us under this Metaphor, If. 44. 3, 52. 15, Ezek. 36. 25. Thus in this Ordinance is signifi'd the pouring out of the Spirit, to cleanse us from that Pollution we have contracted.

3. Pouring Water on the Face, doth most aptly Represent the Grace of God apply'd to us, rather than dipping, whereby it may seem, as if we first apply'd our Felves
elves to him: In dipping, the body is apply'd to the Water; in pouring, Water is apply'd to the body.

This most fitly Represents, that God is the first Mover in our Conversion; that Regeneration and Sanctification is his Work: Whereas the other way, inclines us rather to think that we cleanse and purify our selves. It is no wonder, that they who magnify the Power of Nature, and think by their own free will they change and convert themselves, are for this way; but as for those that better understand the Scriptures, and their own weakness, and acknowledge that it is not in him that willeth, nor in him that runneth, but in God that sheweth Mercy, Rom. 9, 6, and that God Works in us both to will and to do, according to his own Good Pleasure, Phil. 2, 13. It seems very unreasonable for them to use such a Practice, that Intimates as if Man had Power to change and convert himself.
Mr. Chandler's Prologue.

My Friends,

IT is not out of Pride or Vanity, that I now appear in this Place, upon this occasion. Most of you now, and I suppose many of you have heard, that in the course of my Lecture here, I have been discharging of the Principles of Religion: And having explained the Creed and the Lord's Prayer, did undertake to treat of the Doctrine of the Sacraments particularly that of Baptism. Those that then heard me know, that I spake with a great deal of Modesty, calling those who deny Infant-Baptism, by no hard Name than Mistaken Brethren, when I was unavoidably engag'd in this Disputation by a bold and confident Challenge given me, which I knew how to refuse, unless I would betray that Truth which I believe to be the Truth of the Gospel. They themselves not being able to answer the Arguments I then used, have cried out, Men of Israel, come and help; and therefore have sent for this Gentleman from London. Now I desire that all things may be managed with the greatest Fairness and Calmness, that we may debate of these matters as Christians, that nothing may be done that is tumultuous or disorderly: And, as we have the Favour of the Govern-
ment both Civil and Military, so that we may give
them no occasion to repent of giving this Liberty
And I hope we shall all of us be willing to submit to
the Truth, as it is revealed in the Gospel, and la
our selves open to Conviction. I have no more to add, but desire all of you to join with me in this on
Request, That God would grant that Truth may pre
vail.

Chand. T H E Questions to be disputed of are these in
order:
Q. 1. Whether, according to the Commission of our Lor
Jesus Christ, Adult Believers only are the proper Subjects of
Baptism, or their Infants also?
Q. 2. Whether this Ordinance of Baptism, as appointed by
Christ, be to be administered by Dipping, Plunging, Over
whelming only, and not otherwise? We deny, and they af
firm.

Russel. I do suppose it will be necessary to understand
how much of this, that we affirm, Mr. Chandler owns, that
we may not dispute about those things wherein we are a
greed; whether you do own, that Adult Believers are the
proper Subjects of Baptism?

Chand. If they were not baptized in Infancy, they ought
to be so at Age.

Russ. You do suppose then that they are to be baptized by
virtue of some Commission, and that, the Commission of
our Lord Jesus Christ.

Chand. Yes.

Russ. Then with respect to the first Question, Whether A
dult believers only, or whether Infants also may be admitted
to Baptism? And I suppose you do expect that I should be
Opponent.

Chand. Yes, that was agreed.

Russ. Well then, I shall endeavour (God assisting) to
prove, Infants are not, according to Christ's Commission, the
proper Subjects of Baptism.

Arg. If Christ hath no where required any of his Minis
Ruf. If Christ hath no where required any of his Ministers to baptize Infants, then the Baptism of Infants is not according to the Commission of our Lord Jesus Christ.

Chan. I distinguish here upon your Antecedent. If you mean by Christ's Requiring, his Requiring Infants expressly, and by Name, there is no need of it: But if by Requiring, you mean either expressly, or by just consequence; then I deny your Minor.

Ruf. Then you suppose that Christ hath no where required it?

Chan. No. Distinguish between express words and good consequential Proofs.

Ruf. It's necessary the People should know what Mr. Chandler means; and therefore----

Robinson. It's fit indeed they should know what he means; but it's also fit he should explain his own meaning. You must not be permitted to explain Mr. Chandler's meaning in your own words. Your business is to prove what he denies.

Ruf. I do hope, Gentlemen, that you will not thus break upon us.

Rob. I do stand here on purpose to prevent Irregularity in the Disputants.

Leigh. This Gentleman is our Moderator.

Ruf. Pray what is your Name?

Rob. My Name is Robinson.

Ruf. Now if you will be silent, and Mr. Chandler be pleased to tell me what part of my Argument he denies, I shall proceed in the defence of it.

Chan. Repeat your Argument then.

Ruf. If Christ hath no where required any of his Ministers to baptize Infants, then the Baptism of Infants is not according to the Commission of our Lord J. C. But Christ hath no where required, &c. Ergo.

Chan. Here, I lay, as to the Major: If you mean by requiring, Christ's expressly Requiring in so many words, that Infants shall be baptized, then I deny the Consequence; but if you mean, that by genuine consequence it cannot be drawn from Scripture; I deny the Minor.

Ruf. The Term is very lax. I do not say, that he hath no
where commanded it, but no where required it. If it be any where required, it's enough. Give a direct Answer.

Leigh. Will you allow good Scripture Consequence to be Proof in this case; or do you expect Scripture words expressly? Let us not dispute in the dark.

Gentlemen, you that are Notaries, pray observe how ambiguously Mr. Russell expresseth himself. He will not say whether he'll allow just Scripture-consequence for sufficient Proof.

Russ. I think I give my Sense in as plain words as I can.

Leigh. Will you have it in express words, or good Consequence?

William. No reason for such a Distinction, because our brother hath the words were any said * anyway.

He is attempting to shift the Opponency.

Russ. It's all one to me, so you prove it the thing: Prove it any way.

Chand. I deny your Minor.

Russ. I prove it thus. Only I would let the people know what you say, viz. That Christ hath * somewhere required his Ministers to baptize Infants.

Leigh. Either expressly, or by Just Consequence.

Russ. If Christ hath any where required any of his Ministers to baptize Infants, then it is somewhere so recorded in the holy Scripture. But it is no where so recorded in the holy Scripture. Therefore.

Chand. This I answer by distinguishing again; If you mean by being so recorded in holy Scripture, its being there in so many express words, then I deny your Consequence, but if you mean that it's not so by good consequence, I deny your Minor again.

Russ. Let us not confound the people with so many Distinctions, but plainly deny what part you please *.

Leigh. I will make it appear, that there is that recorded in Scripture which by just consequence will prove what you deny.

--- Here Mr. Leigh was willing (who the ed. as enough. ---

Respondent ought not to Prove to offer Proof for the people's satisfaction. ---
Rob. Pray Mr. Leigh - Mr. Russell must prove, that it is not so recorded. This is what lies upon you, Sir.*

Mr. Robinson will keep to the Opponency.

Russell. I would know what part Mr. Chandler denies.

Chan. I deny the Minor.

Russell. Then you say, it's somewhere so recorded in the holy Scriptures.

Chan. It's your business to prove the Negative.

Russell. If it be somewhere so recorded in Scripture, then Mr. Chandler, Mr. Leigh, or some other person is able to shew it. But neither Mr. Chandler, Mr. Leigh, or any other person is able to shew it. Therefore, I deny the Minor.

Chan. It's a Universal Negative, you must prove it. I appeal to the Moderator.

Rob. This ought not to be put upon the Respondent, you must prove it still. Supposing that neither Mr. Chandler nor Mr. Leigh can give you an instance, you can't prove that none else can. If you can, we desire you would.

Will. You are but Moderator, let the disputants alone.

Rob. But Mr. Russell appeal'd to me.

Russell. I would have these honourable persons here present, consider that I am under great disadvantage—you are to give an Instance.

Rob. This is your Popular argument to shift the Opponency and turn it upon the Respondent.

Russell. If Mr. Chandler can give an instance, why do you inter him? I say it's an Universal Negative, and I demand only an instance to the contrary.

Leigh. Offer him the Commission — All Nations.

Rob. No reason for it to be allow'd; but if Mr. Chandler, is pleased to take the part of an Opponent upon him, now he may.

—I suppose, Mr. Russell you must needs know, since you have been so often engaged in such work as this, that, according to all rules of Logick, you ought to prove the Negative. You do Universally Affirm this Proposition, tho' in form it runs Negatively, That no person can give one instance in any record of holy Scripture, from whence we are obliged to baptize infants.

B 5

How
How do you prove this? It lies upon you to prove. Otherwise we must suppose Mr. Russell is a confident man and affirms what he cannot prove.

Rob. Mr. Moderator keep your place.

Rob. Sir I am in my place. I must not suffer the Disputants to break order: Mr. Chandler is Respondent as you are Opponents, and therefore pray keep your place.

Russel. I would take notice of one thing. Mr. Chandler hath preach'd to the People, That there is a plain command for Infant Baptism in Scripture, and I argue upon him to give but one Instance, and you will not suffer him to do it.

Leigh. It's not Mr. Chandler's Sermon, but the Question, which we now argue upon.

Russel. I hope that there are some Honourable Persons here that do understand the nature of this Controversy. And, I suppose, they will think it reasonable, that those who have made such a noise about this Practice ought to bring some colourable Proof for it. No, not one instance hath Mr. Chandler given. I am sure according to the rules of Disputation Mr. Chandler must prove the Negative.

Rob. I desire that the Persons here present would take notice, that however Mr. Chandler have asserted in this place, and very clearly proved the Baptism of Infant from the Commission of our Lord I. C. yet you are now to call upon him for proof; you having undertaken to prove the contrary. Mr. Chandler gives an answer; he deny's your assertion, and therefore you must prove it, and not sit down and say, Do you prove the contrary, or else I'll take it.—But if you can carry this argument no farther, it's time to proceed to another.

Russel. So I design, if there be no answer given.

Chan. Here is an answer. I deny the Minor.

Russel. I have prov'd it, according to the Judgment of all present.

Leigh. According to the Judgment of those that understand the rules of Disputation, you ought to prove the Negative. But we will undertake to prove, that there is that recorded in Scripture which will prove by just Consequence what you deny.

Rob. If you will change sides you may.
This is no changing sides: For I do not design to it the Opponency, only let him bring an instance.

Leigh. I would beg one favour, the offering a few words. I'll undertake in any Disputation, Philosophical or Divine, by this method, to turn the Opponency on the Respon-ent. I'll but make him bring one proof of what he says, and this way, immediately turn the Opponency on him. — And as for this, Here's a Gentleman that understands the Rules of Disputation.

—I desire, Sir, you would declare whether Mr. Russell, not obliged to prove the Negative he hath asserted.

Dr. Smith. According to the rules of Disputation. Negantis non probare.*

Russ. Well, what must I do?

Rob. Sir, you are to prove your opposition. Here is this worthy Gentleman of the me mind.

Russ. How do you mean prove? The whole Current of Scripture sufficiently proves it. The total silence of Scripture in this matter is Proof; What is not in Scripture, &c.

Rob. If you can proceed no farther upon this, then it's me you go on.

Arg. 2. Russ. If Infants are not capable to be made Disciples by the Ministry of Men, then they cannot possibly be the Subjects of Baptism intended in Christ's Commit-ment. But they are not capable to be made Disciples by the Ministry of Men. Therefore, &c.

Chan. Here if you mean by Disciples, Actual and Compleat Disciples, then I deny your Major. But if you mean Incompleat Disciples, such as are entered into a school in order to be instructed, and given up in order to learn there, I deny the Minor.

Russ. The Major is this. If Infants are not capable of being made Disciples by the Ministry of Men, then they cannot possibly be the Subjects of Baptism.
Here we expected that the Dr. should either have shewn that this distinction is groundless, or that he should have brought it into his next syllogism. But he doth neither.

Ruf. What doth he mean by denying my Major?

Rob. Mr. Chandler distinguishes between Compleat and Incomplete Disciples. If you mean Compleat Disciples, he denies the Major. If you mean Incomplete Disciples, he denies the Minor.

Ruf. Well, come, tell me what he means by Compleat and Incomplete Disciples, by the Ministry of Men?

Chand. I mean by Compleat Disciples, such as are actually capable of Learning; by Incomplete, such particularly, as are enter'd into the School of Christ in order to their future Learning, as we send Children to School before they are capable of Learning one Letter.

Ruf. I do not talk of that, I speak of their being actually capable of being made Disciples by the Ministry of Men.

Chand. I deny that those, that are capable of being made Disciples by the Ministry of Men in your sense, are the only Subjects of Baptism. That what you are to prove.

Ruf. Well, if that be the thing you deny, you deny the Consequence. And I prove it thus. If our Lord in the Commission which he hath given for Holy Baptism hath required his Disciples and Apostles, who were Men, to make those Disciples by their Ministry who were to be Baptized, then my Consequence is true. But our Lord in the Commission hath, &c. Therefore.

Chand. I deny the Minor. He hath not Commanded all that were to be Baptized by the Apostles, first to be made Disci-
disciples by their Ministry in your sense; I think here ought to be a distinction. Persons may have a right to tlick visible entrance into the Church of God, before they are compleat Disciples; that, we say, Infants have fore Baptism; and fo in a more imperfect sense are Disciples, but in a more perfect sense are made so by Baptism.

Ruf. We are talking whether Infants are capable of being made Disciples by the Ministry of Men.

Leigh. We say, that as they are the Infants of believers, so they are in a more imperfect sense really Disciples before Baptism. And it's nothing, to talk of their being made such by the Ministry of Men.

Will. If they are such, then it is by the Ministry of Men.

Leigh. That I deny, Knowing that you Ground your Assertion upon the position of Teach before Baptize, Mat. 19.

Ruf. Our Saviour hath joyn'd Discipling and Baptizing together. They are commanded first to make Disciples, and then to baptize them. Therefore, I say, if Infants not capable of being made Disciples by the Ministry of Men, they are not, according to this Commision, to be baptized.

Chan. Prove that.

Ruf. If Infants have no Knowledge to discern between Good and Evil, then they are not capable to be made Disciples by the ministry of Men. But they have no Knowledge, &c. Therefore, &c.

Chan. Here you trick all this while. I told you, by Disciples I meant incompleat ones, and such as are given in order to be instructed in the School of Christ. I require you to prove that these ought not to be baptized, because not capable of Instruction by the Ministry of Men.

Ruf. What do I care what you mean: we are speaking the Commissiion of Christ.

Will. The Scripture says they must be Disciples according to the Commision.

Ruf. We are talking of the Prerequisites to Baptism: therefore it's plain, according to what I have told you.

* Mr. Chandler calls for a Proof of the Consequent, and the Dr. goes upon the Proof of the Antecedent.
and the Argument is express and full, according to the words of the Text, that they must be made Disciples by the ministry of men, if they be to be baptized: For Mark Christ commissioneth to go into all the World, and preach the Gospel to every Creature. In Matt. 28. they went to Disciple all Nations, and then to baptize them. Not if Infants be not capable of being made Disciples by the Ministry of men, then they are not capable Subjects of Baptism. Now you denied this Consequence of the Major, which I proved thus *. If Infants have no Knowledge to discern between good and evil, then they are not capable of being made Disciples by the Ministry of men. But, Sir, by your distinction he denies both Antecedent and Consequent.

* Here the Dr. blunders again, confounding Antecedent and Consequent.

Rob. By his former distinction he denies both Antecedent and Consequent.

† i.e. Because they are not capable of Institution, or compleat Discipleship by the Ministry of men, therefore that they are not to be baptized.

* Here is not a word of the Consequence, which is still deny’d; but he goes on upon the Antecedent.

Chan. I deny your Consequence with my former Distinction †.

Ruf. Then you say, tho’ they have no knowledge, yet still they are capable of being made Disciples by the Ministry of men*.

Chan. I only desire a Syllogism.

Rob. You industriously seek to hide your meaning. If you mean by Disciples such as are so in the fullest and compleatest Sense, prove, that a must be made such, in order to the being baptized. But if you mean Disciples in the lowest Sense, as it intends such as are given up in order to be instructed in the School of Christ, prove that Infants are not capable of being made such Disciples. This Mr. Chandler’s Distinction puts upon you. We do not know what you mean.

Ruf. The Argument is so plain, that I doubt not but my body of understanding may know what I mean; therefore it’s strange that Mr. Chandler, Leigh, Robinson, do not understand me.

Leigh. We know there is a double sense of the word, accordingly we deny either Antecedent or Consequent.

Chan. You will not allow the distinction of Compleat Incompleat Disciples; nor yet shew it to be groundless.

Ruf. Fix upon something.
Chan. I told you before, If in your Argument, by Disciples you mean Incompleat ones, I deny your Minor. But if Incompleat ones, I deny the Consequence of your Major.

Leigh. Give a direct answer according to this distinction; i.e. Either prove that Infants are not Incompleat Disciples, or shew they are not to be baptized, because but Incompleat; i.e. not capable of Instruction by the Ministry of men.

Ruf. Have Infants any knowledge?

Chan. No, not in actual exercise.

Ruf. Then I proceed. If the Gospel, in the ministration of it, was appointed to inform men what is good and what evil, and Infants have no knowledge to discern between good and evil, then Infants are not capable of being made Disciples by the Ministry of men.*

Leigh. You ought to add (Incompleat).

Ruf. What doth he mean by Incompleat Disciples?

Here Mr. Chandler is forc't to explain his distinction, as before.

Ruf. You forget we are speaking according to the commission.

Chan. No I don't. I say, &c. As before.

Ruf. Then by Compleat you mean such as are Actually Disciples.

Leigh. A Compleat Disciple is one actually capable of Learning. An Incompleat is one given up as aforefaid in order to Learn. And we appeal to the whole Auditory, whether or no, a child of two years old thus devoted to Learning by the Resignation of the Parent and Acceptation of the Master, is not justly in an imperfect sense deemed a Scholar?

Ruf. Infants Scholars! Very mean Scholars indeed, not capable of Learning one word.

Leigh. I believe here is a Gentleman who teaches School. Sir, I would fain know whether no one may be accounted a Scholar, but he that is actually capable of Learning?

Mr. Ridge School-Master. I take all to be Disciples in my School, provided entrance Money be paid, * whether they Learn or not.

* He takes no notice at all of the distinction, but goes on to prove that Infants can't be Compleat Disciples by the Ministry of Men.

* Here followed a General Laughter.
Ref. I must appeal to these Honourable Persons, whether or not I did not tell Mr. Chandler, Compleat Disciples, such as are made by the Ministry of Men? What the meaning of all this Noise about such little Children do you think?

Rob. Prove what Mr. Chandler deny's.

Ref. Let me know, what Mr. Chandler deny's. You say that they have no Knowledge, and that they are no Compleat Disciples, the consequence then is, that the are not intended in the Commission

\[\text{Mat. 28. Mar. 16.}\]

Chand. Put it into a Syllogism.

Ref. There's no need of putting it into a Syllogism: For you have granted all the Parts of my Argument. Infants have no Knowledge to discern between good and evil. You have in the (2.) Place granted, that according to my Argument they are not capable of being made Compleat Disciples by the Ministry of Men. Consequence then is, that they are not at all intended in the Commission.

Rob. It's a most false thing you intimate to the People, and what you yourself cannot but know to be false. For that the Consequence, which you would persuade the People Mr. Chandler allows, is what he had all along deny'd. And if you can't prove it, pray proceed to another Argument.

Arg. 3. Ref. If the Apostle Paul did declare all the Council of God, and kept back nothing that was profitable for the Church of God, and yet did never declare the Baptism of infants to be an Institution of Christ, Then Infant Baptism is not according to the Commission of our Lord Jesus Christ. But the Apostle Paul did declare all the Council of God, and kept back nothing. &c. And ye did never declare the Baptism of Infants, &c. Therefore, &c.

Leigh. Your Argument is very long. I deny that the Apostle Paul never spoke of Infant Baptism, which is
part of your Minor. Prove that the Apostle Paul never declared the Baptism of Infants.

Ruf. If the Apostle Paul hath so declared it, then it's no where to be found in the Writings of the New Testament. But it's no where to be found in the Writings of the New Testament. Therefore, &c.

Leigh. I deny the consequence of your Major. For Paul right declare it, tho' the new Testament should not discover at he did, the Text you quote relates to the Church of Ephesus. And we have not the whole of the Apostles' epistles to them, no, not the hundredth part of them, being among them for the space of two years. Now you may prove that this refer's to that Epistle he hath left on record to the Ephesians. This being all that is left to posterity in Holy Writ of several hundred Sermons that he preach'd to that Church, wherein he might speak often of infant Baptism, tho' it be not mention'd in this short Epistle.

Ruf. You then acknowledge, that it's no where recorded in the New Testament.

Leigh. I deny that the Apostle did write the whole New Testament. And then, Would you confine what Paul there said to have declared to the Church of Ephesus, to what is left on record, Viz., that particular Epistle we never inquired to them? He had spoken to the Church of Ephesus all the Counsel of God, but we cannot suppose all that he deliver'd to them in 2 years to be contain'd within the compass of one short Epistle, containing but six chapters.

Ruf. Is all the Counsel, that the Apostle Paul wrote, in the New Testament? Is there any Commission for Infant Baptism in the whole New Testament? Do you think you speak any thing to me? I hope you'll own that the scriptures of the Old and New Testament are the only rule to direct us how we may serve and glorify God.

Leigh. Yes, that I will.

Ruf. I refer you to that Scripture and you run to a certain sort of supposition, &c. * Here the Dr. neither deny's that Paul did declare the Baptism of Infants in his Sermons, nor asserts that all be Preached is left on record.

are
are plain, Acts 20: 20. I have kept back nothing that was profitable for you: and v. 27. I have not shunned to declare unto you the whole Counsel of God. And again 1 Cor. 4. 17. He Declares, that his ways in Christ were such as he taught everywhere in every Church. I do not suppose that the Apostle Paul taught one Doctrine at one place, and another at another. Now if he never taught this Doctrine to the Church of Ephesus, nor to none else I hope that then you'll acknowledge (since it's not to be found in the Writings of the New Testament) that he never declared the Baptism of Infants.

Leigh. I utterly deny it, because in the Writings of the New Testament, are not all the Sermons that Paul Preached.

Ruf. I say this, if you'll declare before this People, that there is no Account that Paul did ever declare this in any of the Writings of the New Testament. It's sufficient; supposing the thing granted, that Paul's Epistles are not the whole of what he Preached. That's nothing to us, I suppose the People will not look any where else.

* This Word It's may either refer to Paul's Declaration, or to Baptism. And this ambiguity caused some confusion afterwards.

* Here the Dr. was to prove the Consequent, and he goes on to prove the Antecedent.

* The Dr. would ramble and we rather follow than leave him. And gave the Words ( All Nations ) supposing by the Word (It) he meant Baptism.

Leigh tells you, that Paul did declare it.
Leigh. I answer, that Paul might have declared the Baptism of Infants an hundred times over, and yet it might not be left on record in his Epistle to the Ephesians, nor any part of the New Testament that he did so.

Rob. That's the Consequence you are now to prove. Because it's not left on record in his Epistle to the Ephesians, that therefore he never declared it to the Church of Ephesus.

Ruf. I have neither Ephesus nor Paul's Epistles in my Arguments, yet you tell me.—Here was a general murmuring at the Drs. evasions, the weakness whereof was obvious to the Auditory.

Leigh. I'll beg a little silence. And first, read what this Gentleman Quotes, (Acts 20.)—The Apostle tells the Church of Ephesus, he had not shunned to declare to them the whole Council of God. From hence, he concludes, (Without Proof) that all that Paul had declared to them was written and left on record; and because the Baptism of Infants doth not stand on record, as being part of what he declared to the Church of Ephesus, therefore that he never did declare it. Remember. To the Church of Ephesus he speaks. Now of all the whole Council of God, which he is said to have declared to them, there is but one Epistle containing six short Chapters left upon record. Can this short record contain all the Sermons that he Preached to them in two Years? Or dare any say, that he never declared to them the Baptism of Infants in two years Sermons and Discourses, because it's not contained in this short record? And so I have done.

Ruf. But I have not done with you, the Apostle Paul is the Person under consideration, and mention'd in my Argument, as one that did declare the whole Council of God, and kept back nothing that was profitable for them.*

Leigh. The Church of the Ephesians. Pray remember that.

Ruf. The Question under consideration and my Argument is of one that did declare the whole Council of God. And that the Apostle Paul did so, I prove, Acts 20. 20. Compared, with v. 27. I have kept back nothing that was profitable for you, but have shewed...
you and taught, &c. Testifying to Jews and Greeks, &c.

v. 26. He doth not only say, That he was pure from the Blood of these Ephesians, but from the Blood of all Men. For v. 27. I have not shunned to declare to you. I do say, that in this Text, Paul doth solemnly declare that he had declared all the Counsel of God, and I do say, that Paul was faithful. I believe Paul was as faithful, as laborious a Servant and Steward of Jesus Christ, as ever Christ had in the World. And I argue. If Paul did never declare the Baptism of Infants to be a Gospel Institution, then, I tell you, there can be no such thing. The Major is proved from the Words of the Text. The other I prove by a Syllogism, that if he declare it, it is somewhere so recorded in the New Testament. But it is, &c.

* Remember he doth not mention any here to whom he had declared the Counsel, &c. but the Ephesians. He mentions Jews and Greeks, because there were Greeks or Hellenists at Ephesus, and many other places up and down, as well as Jews.

And we don't Question but he did declare the whole Counsel, &c. and therefore Infant Baptism; but say it's not necessary to be left on record, as Preach't by Paul, especially to these Ephesians, when there is other good Scripture Proof for it.

But the Dr. makes a long harangue only to bring over his own Argument again, which he could not make good.

Leigh. Here, Pray observe it Gentlemen, Greeks and Jews were in Corinth, Ephesus, and various places where Paul planted Churches. And [all Men] very often signifies all sorts of Men. And Paul speaks still to these Ephesians, among whom were Jews and Greeks, all sorts of Men. And is it be a certain truth that Paul was pure from the blood of all Men, yet all may here be understood with Limitation, and so it may not be evident from this Text.

Rus. Did Paul ever speak one word of Infant Baptism.

Chan. If Paul did not, in what is on record to the Ephesians, what then? We deny the consequence of the Argument. That because Paul says he had declared the whole Counsel of God to the Church of Ephesus, among whom he Preached for 2 years, and yet doth not mention Infant Baptism in his Epistle left
left upon record to them, that therefore he did never speak of it to them, nor none elsewhere.

_Ruf._ I am bound to answer here. If there are any other writings of Paul that are not contain'd in the New Testament, and you can produce them, then you lay something to the purpose.

_Rob._ Because this is what Mr. Respondent puts upon you to prove, unless you prove that you prove nothing: That, tho' Paul did not shun to declare the whole Council of God, and did not declare Infant Baptism in his Epistle to the Church of Ephesus, therefore he did not declare it in his Sermons to them.

_Arg._ 4. _Ruf._ Christ's Commission doth shew who are to be Baptized. But it doth not shew that Infants are to be Baptized; therefore Infants are not to be Baptized according to the Commission of our Lord.

_Chann._ I deny your Minor. That it doth not shew that Infants are to be Baptized.

_Ruf._ If the Commission of our Lord doth shew that Infants are to be Baptized, then Mr. Chandler, Mr. Leigh, or some body else is able to shew it. But neither Mr. Chandler &c. Therefore &c.

_Chand._ It's included in the words, (All Nations.)

_Ruf._ I prove it against you that Infants are not included in the words (All Nations) For if Infants then all Infants would be so. But you only allow Infants of believing parents.

_Leigh._ The force of this Argument is this. That unless we will Baptize all of all Nations we must Baptize none of any Nation.

_Ruf._ No it it is not.

_Leigh._ I say they are included in the words (All Nations) you must prove that they are not. And first of all, Gentlemen, I will appeal to you, Is it, in a Religious sense, improper to say, the whole Nation (suppose) of Palestine are Mahumetans, and so consequently, that their little Children are Young Mahumetans.

_Chann._ You must prove that all Infants are excluded from the words (All Nations.)

_Ruf._ Would you have me then shew you that there is a Limitation in the words (All Nations.)
Leigh. The Point ly's here. If he will invalidate my
Answer, he must shew, that, because all Nations are to be
Baptized, and infants are included in the words All Nations,
therefore it follows, that all Infants are to be Baptized.

Ruf. Therefore, if I shew there is a Limitation I
take away the force of the Argument, and this I do,
by Mr. Chandler's confuting himself. *

Leigh. I deny your Minor, That
Christ hath not included Infants in
this Commission.

Ruf. If those that Christ hath
commanded to be Baptized must be
disciples, then Infants are not includ-
ed in this Commission. But those, &c. Therefore.

Leigh. I deny your Consequence.

Ruf. I prove it thus. If there are no others Express'd
in this Commission, then they are not included. But no
others are Express'd. Therefore.

Leigh. They are implyed. The good consequence of
the Commission I insist upon. I lay there is no Necessity
for all the Subjects, included in this Commission, to be
Disciples in the fullest and compleat sense.

Ruf. All those that are required to be Baptized by
Christ's Commission are Disciples. But Infants are not
capable to be made Disciples. Therefore &c.

Leigh. I deny your whole Argument, and first your
Major.

Ruf. If there are no other express'd in Christ's Com-
mission, Then my Major is true.

Leigh. They are imply'd. You know you allowed
good consequence but now.

Ruf. We are talking of a Commission, good Sir.

Leigh. I hope we are talking of good consequence
from a Commission. That which I assert is this. That
all are not to be Compleat Disciples, before Baptized, or,
That they are not to be actually taught.

Ruf. I know not what you mean by Compleat Disciples; A Person
may be a Disciple twenty years be-
fore he be a Compleat one.

* Here our Scribes
were imperfect and I
cannot Remember what
ought to be inserted.
But the force of the Ar-
gument is not removed.

* How many times
hath the Dr. been told
what we mean by Com-
pleat Disciples?
If our Lord requires none to be Baptized by the Commission, but such as he commands to be made Disciples before he commands them to be Baptized, then what I say is true. But our Lord requires none, &c. Therefore,

Leigh. I deny your Minor.

Ruf. I'll read the Commission, Mat. 28. 18, 19, 20. And Jesus came and spake to them saying, All Power is given unto me in Heaven and Earth. Go ye therefore and teach all Nations, Baptizing them, &c. Teaching them to observe all things, &c. This Commission is very solemnly given, &c. In this Commission our Lord doth first of all declare the great Power that was, &c. Here the Dr. was going on with a large harangue.

Rob. Pray Mr. Ruffel, do not Preach us a Sermon, but bring us an Argument from the Words.

Ruf. I thought Mr. Leigh had brought the Commission for an instance, we are now coming to examine, &c.

Leigh. Pray form your Syllogism.

Chand. Pray do.

Ruf. I say, in this Commission our Lord doth first of all declare, &c. He is going on again with his harangue.

Rob. It's not a Sermon, but an Argument from the Commission, &c.

Ruf. What, will you not allow me to read my Master's Commission? Here in sight of us all, he would go on with his tedious dictates.

Ruf. I argue thus from this Commission. If there be an express command for the Baptizing some Persons in Christ's Commission, and there be no express command, neither there nor elsewhere in the Holy Scriptures, for the Baptizing of Infants, then the Baptism of Infants is not contained in this Commission. But there is an express command, &c. Therefore,

Leigh. Pray observe it, whereas good Consequence was but now allowed with great difficulty, now it's deny'd. He requires an express command. To this I answer. If Nations do include Infants, then there is a plain command.
Chand. We deny the Consequence of your Major, and then we deny your Minor.

* And thus to spend time, he will have his long Argument over again.

Ref. My Argument was this. * If there be an express command in Christ's Commission, &c. They deny the sequel of my Major, and by thus denying do say, that, notwithstanding there be no express command for the Baptizing of Infants, neither in the Commission, nor any where else in the Holy Scripture, yet they do tell us by this denial, that they may be included in the Commission.

Rob. Here is a sophism; says he, if it be neither in the Commission, nor any where else in the Holy Scriptures, then it is not in the Commission.

Ref. If there be an express command for the Baptizing of some Persons in Christ's Commission, and there be no express command for the Baptizing of Infants, then Infants are not at all intended in Christ's Commission. But, &c. Therefore, &c.

Leigh. First, I deny the sequel of the Major, and then I deny the Minor.

Ref. It seems very strange, that you do deny this, and I will endeavour to prove it. Here is an express command for some Persons to be Baptized, here is no express command for the Baptizing of Infants; is it not then a necessary consequence that they are not included in the Commission?

Leigh. I deny both Parts, and first your Major.

Ref. I shall prove it thus. * That there is an express command for Baptizing some Persons, the Commission it self proves.

Leigh. It's the sequel of the Major I deny. Pray prove that.

Ref. Then you do say, That, notwithstanding our Lord hath expressly commanded some Persons to be Baptized in the Commission, and hath not expressly commanded Infants, yet they may be some of the Number. Hath Christ two sorts of Subjects, one that he doth expressly command to be Baptized, and another that he doth not command?
Leigh. Put your Proof of the sequel of the Major into Syllologism.

Ruf. We are upon the Commission.

Leigh. I say, Prove the consequence of your Major.

Ruf. If no person be to be baptiz'd but what is expressly required to be so by Christ's Commission, then the consequence of the Major is true; i.e. That the Baptism of infants is not contained in the Commission. But no person is to be baptized, &c. Therefore.

Leigh. I deny your Minor.

Ruf. That which I am to prove is this, That there are persons to be baptized but what are expressly required by the Commission. I prove it thus. If the words of the Commission are an express command to the Apostles of our Lord, to direct them whom they should baptize, then the Minor is true. But the words of the Commission are, &c. Therefore, &c.

Leigh. I deny your Minor.

Ruf. If there be no other Commission of our Lord and Saviour J. C. for holy Baptism, but what is recorded Mat. 8. Mar. 16, then the Minor is true. But there is no other, &c. Therefore, &c.

Leigh. I deny the sequel of the Major.

Ruf. We are now upon the Commission.

Leigh. That we are; and we say, That whatever by good consequence is fairly deducible from the Commission, is the true sense of it.

Ruf. They are not to baptize any but such as they are expressly commanded so to do.

Leigh. I deny it.

Ruf. If there be no manner of allowance given them to baptize any other than whom they are expressly commanded, then the consequence of the Major is true. But there is no manner of allowance, &c. Therefore, &c.

Leigh. Now I deny your Minor.

Ruf. I still recur to my former Argument. If there be an express command in the Commission to the Apostles, for the Baptism of all such as they are required to baptize by virtue of that Commission, then my Minor is true. But, &c. Here follows a vacancy in the Notes of our Scribes.

Ruf. If for all those they are to baptize by virtue of the Commission, they are to have an express command from Christ to
so to do, then there is no allowance in the Commission to
baptize any other person. But for all those they are
required to baptize, &c. Therefore, &c.

Chand. I deny the Minor.

Leigh. I distinguish between the command's being ex-
preft, and the Subjects of it.

Chand. Prove that all the Subjects are express.

Ruf. If the words in the Commission about holy Baptism,
be a command of Christ to the Apo-
fles, then my Minor is true. But they
are a command, &c. Therefore.

Leigh. We allow it's a command, but deny that all the Subjects are ex-
preft. I say, I allow the command to
be express, but deny that all the Subjects are express; some
are taken in by good consequence.

Ruf. If Christ hath commanded his Apostles to Bap-
tize such as do believe and are made Disciples, then such
are to be Baptized. But &c: Therefore &c.

L. I find, in the first place, a fault with your Syllo-
gism. The Major ought to be Universal. Whereas it is,
such as do believe are the Subjects of Baptism; It ought
to be, Such are the only, or all the Subjects of Baptism; and thus, in the Second Place, I deny the Sequel.

Will. Then I am to prove that Believers only are
intended. If Believers are the only Persons that are in-
cluded in the Commission, then no other persons are. But
Believers are the only &c: Therefore.

L. I deny your Minor.

W. I will prove it in Mark 16. last. He that believ-
eth is Baptized, &c. Hence I argue that Believers are
the only Subjects to be Baptized.

L. To this I answer, First. If Previous Actual Be-
lieving be made Universally Necessary to Baptism, it is
much more so to Salvation, and Conquently no Infant
can be saved, For the following words are he that Believetb
not shall be damned.

Ruf. I do not affirm any such thing, I would rather
say that all Infants dying in their Infancy are Elect, and
so saved, the contrary to which I believe Mr. Chandler

* Here the Dr. seems to cannot prove *.

willing to turn off the Disputation, to Original Sin, which those of his
Profession deny.

L. Yes
L. Yes, we knew your Opinion about this well enough. I have your Confession in my Pocket. But if you will assert that actual believing is necessary to Baptism, then 'tis to Salvation; for it follows, be that believers not shall be damned.

Wil. If believers are the only Subjects of Baptism, according to the Commission, then Infants are not the Subjects of Baptism: but Believers are the only Subjects, &c. Therefore, &c.

L. I deny your Minor.

Wil. Then pray shew me where any others are in the Commission.

L. In the words (all Nations).

Wil. In the words (all Nations)? No, say I, It's all Nations so modified. It's all Nations discipled.

L. I deny it. This is not evident from this Text.

Wil. Go, discipled unto me all Nations, baptizing them. The word them is relative to all Nations discipled. If therefore there be none but believers, and such as are taught in the Commission, then Infants are not in the Commission. But there are none but believers, &c.

L. I deny your Minor.

Wil. If Infants are not capable of being taught, then they are no Disciples. But they are not, &c. Therefore.

L. I deny it, i.e. the Sequel.

Wil. If Infants are incapable of learning Jesus Christ, then they are incapable of being discipled unto Christ. But, &c.

L. I deny the consequence of your Major; That because they are incapable of learning Christ, therefore they are incapable of being Discipled to Christ.

Wil. I say, If Infants are not the Subjects in the Commission *, neither are capable of being taught and instructed, then they are not the Subjects of Baptism. But, &c: Therefore, &c.

L. I deny that they are not the Subjects. And the Greek word signify's to make Disciples. I deny that they are incapable of being made Disciples, because not capable of learning.

Wil.
wil. If to be a Disciple of Christ is to be a Scholar of Christ, then Infants that are uncapable of Learning Christ can be no Disciples. But, &c. Therefore, &c.

L. I deny still the Sequel of the Major.

Wil. If he that hath learn’t nothing is no Scholar, then because they are not capable of Learning Jesus Christ, They are no Scholars of Christ. But, &c. Therefore &c.

L. I appeal to all here present, Whether they do not count that child an Incomplete Scholar, that is resigned by the Parent and accepted by the Master, tho’ it hath not learn’d any thing. And now I deny your Minor.

Wil. Tell me where Christ’s School is for teaching Infants, and who is Christ’s School-Master?

L. Jesus Christ himself is the School-Master.

Wil. Jesus Christ is the great School-Master, but his Ministers are appointed to make Disciples by teaching. Now you say a Child is a Disciple as soon as he goes to School.

L. I say, the resignation of the Parent, and the acceptance of the Master, constitutes the Relation.

Wil. If he that hath been at School, and taught by his own consent, must appear to be a Scholar of Christ by his having actually learn’d, before he be baptized, then Infants that are entred, according to your saying, must not be baptized. But he that hath been at School, &c. Therefore.

L. I deny your consequence.

Wil. I prove it thus. The Eunuch was content to be taught *; Philip teacheth him: Yet afterward he must know whether he believed, before he baptized him. Therefore Infants, entred according to your saying, must not be baptized, because they are not content to be taught, &c.: And Erasmus, tho’ he was none of the best of Men yet he was accounted a great Scholar in his day, he reads it, When they have learned dip those them.

L. Here are two things that this old Gentleman argues from, the first is, The Instance of the Eunuch. The Second is, The Authority of Erasmus.

* What is a man’s Authority in this case but his Judgment?
Rob. Did Erasmus write in English? You say, you do not understand Latin.

Wil. In English. Here the people brake out into a great Laughter.

Rus. Is Erasmus in your esteem so mean, a Schollar, that there must be such Laughing at the old Gentleman's mentioning the Name of Eras- mas?*

L. Well, but as to the first thing; you argue from the Instance of the Eunuch; The Eunuch was a Profe- lyte of the Gate, and a grown person, and therefore Philip deals with him as such. Now, according to the Jewifh Law, a Profelyte's Infant was to be ta- ken into their Church, as the Infant of an home-born Inhabitant*. And because Philip requires of him a Pro- fession of his Faith, suppose he had had an Infant in the Chariot, must that be denied Baptism, and to look upon as the Infant of a Pagan, and be fout out of visible Church-membership, which he enjoyed before? Did his Pa- rents Faith deprive him of Church-membership? Then as to Erasmus, he was an Interpendent between a Papif t and Protestant; and many of these Gentlemen, in their great Zeal against Infant-baptism, will call it a piece of Popery, and yet can make use of the Name of an Half-Papif when it serves their Cause.

Wil. If the Administrator must have an account of the Subjects Learning, before he be baptiz'd, then Infants are not the Subjects of Baptism. But he must, &c. Therefore.

L. I deny your Minor, That he that administers the Or- dinance must always have an account of the Subjects Learn- ing.

Wil. I will prove it first by that of Philip: If thou belie- vest with all thine heart, thou mayest. The contrary where- unto is, If thou doest not, thou mayest not. Again, Mat. 28. Go teach all Nations, baptizing them, &c. The word is re- lative
ative to all Nations discipled. They must have an account whether they are Disciples or not. This is the Antecedent.

L. All Nations?

Will. Nay, all Nations Discipled.

L. So you say. But prove it. What! perhaps you think that All Nations cannot be the Antecedent to Them; because τὰ ἔθνη is the Neuter Gender, and αὐτὸς is the Masculine.

Ruf. Yes, αὐτὸς is of the Masculine Gender, and μαστίγος is of the Masculine Gender, and agrees with αὐτὸς.

Rob. I thought μαστιγὸς had been a Verb.

Ruf. I answer to what he says; he says that αὐτὸς is of the Masculine Gender, and I say so, and that μαστίγος is of the same Gender, and agrees with αὐτὸς.

L. I suppose Mr. Russell thinks he is got among his Hebrew Verbs. They, notwithstanding, refer each to other, the θῆρ be of the Neuter, and αὐτὸς of the Masculine Gender. For a Boy of 12 years of age, that hath lookt into the Greek, can tell you that such a Synthesis is frequently to be met with in the Greek.

Will. If Infants are uncapable of denying themselves for Christ, then they are uncapable of being Disciples to Christ. But, &c. Therefore, &c.

L. I deny the sequel of the Major.


L. This purely refer's to the adult. And I will argue ab absurdo. * If any work not let him not eat, but Infants cannot * work, therefore they must not eat. But both one Text, and the other refer to the adult purely.

Ruf. What's all this? We do say, that Infants are not at all concerned in the Commission, Mat. 28.19. Because they cannot perform the prerequisites, Faith and Repentance, therefore are not capable of Baptism. Now if you'll say, that incapable Persons are intended in the Com-
Commission, then I hope, you may put that upon your selves; Then you must argue, Infants must be starved to Death because they will not work. I demand of any of you to give an instance of any one Scripture, that speaks of Baptism in the New Testament, that doth respect any other but adult Persons.

Will. If the essence of faith consist in the Acts of the understanding and will, then Infants are incapable of being Disciples. But, &c. Therefore, &c.

L. I deny the sequel of the Major, viz. That Infants are incapable of being Disciples.

Will. If a Disciple and a Believer be the same thing, then the sequel of the Major is true. But a Disciple and Believer are the same thing. Therefore,

L. I distinguish upon the Minor. It's not Universally and in all respects the same thing. Those may be Disciples that are not actual Believers.

Will. He that is a Disciple of Christ according to the Commission, is a Believer. But Infants are not capable of believing. Therefore. He that is a Believer in Mark, is a Disciple in Matthew.

L. This I deny, and answered it before. It's not Universally true.

Will. If the essence of faith consist in the Act of the understanding and will, then Infants are incapable of believing, But, &c.

L. I acknowledge, The Act of faith consists in the Act of the understanding and the will, and that Infants are incapable of actual believing, but not of being Disciples in an imperfect sense* But I would fain know if Infants are not as capable of believing Imputatively, as of coming to Christ when brought in the Arms of other Persons.*

Will. They can do both alike, as well come to Christ as believe in him; by believing I mean actual believing. This I acknowledge.

* Reader, observe the Argument from Luk. 14. Is. dropt. And what Mr. Ruff here says farther, had been Answered before in the Words, All Nations.

* The contrary whereof, hath not yet been proved.

I. Why cannot Children be said in a Spiritual sense to come to Christ imputatively, as well as to come to Christ corporally when only brought in others arms. Coming to Christ and believing are the same. Tho' he that is brought in the Arms of the Parents faith cannot be said actually to believe, yet imputatively he may.

Wil. How could they come to Christ when they were brought?

L. And yet they are expressly said to come to Christ. And may they not as well be said to be capable of Spiritual as of Corporal coming when they were brought to him? Why can they not come spiritually by imputation, as before?

Wil. They cannot come spiritually unless they actually believe: A child cannot thus come to Christ without a sight of Christ and also of himself.

L. I do own in a proper and strict sense, none can be said thus to come to Christ but adult persons; yet in a more large sense, they may as well be said to believe on Christ imputatively when their parents believe and devote them to Christ, as to come to Christ corporally when brought in their arms. You know Christ says, suffer little children to come to me. It's most probable these were brought in arms to Christ. Why may they not be said imputatively to believe, as well as imputatively to come?

Wil. I deny that the parent's faith was ever imputed to the child.

L. You know the distinction of believers, in foro Dei, & in foro Ecclesie, which I suppose you'll allow. And under the notion of believers in foro Ecclesie, the parents faith may be imputed to their children.

Wil. We do say that a person is not a disciple of Christ before he have learned Christ.

* Here is no notice taken of the distinction, only the old thing asserted. L. Then do we send children to school because they have learned, or that they may learn?

Ref. I think we should now see whether we can possibly by force of Argument bring you to give an instance. Therefore I argue thus.
Arg. 5. If the Apostles of our Lord never did Baptize any Infants, then the Baptism of Infants is not according to the Commission of our Lord Jesus Christ. But the Apostles of our Lord never did, &c: Therefore.

Chand. I deny the Minor.

Ruf. If the Apostles did Baptize any Infants, it is some where to be found in the writings of the new Testament. But it's no where to be found, &c.

L. I deny your Major.

Ruf. If there be no other rule to direct us concerning Holy Baptism than what is in the new Testament, then, because it's no where to be found in the writings of the new Testament, the Apostles did never Baptize any Infants. But there is no other rule &c: Therefore &c.

L. You are come from an Example to a Rule. I say it may not be recorded in the writings of the New Testament, and yet the Apostles might Baptize Infants. But this is not granted, only supposed, that it's not recorded. It is not recorded in the New Testament (what you practise) that Grown Children of Believers were, when adult, Baptized. I challenge you to produce one instance of any, born of Believing Parents, Baptized at Age.

Ruf. That's no business of ours. Don't think to sham off the business so. We have called for your Instance several times of an Infant Baptized, and you have not been able to give it.

L. It's the custom of these Persons to Baptize Grown Persons tho' Baptized before, and yet there is no Scripture for it. They talk much of our having no Scripture for Infant Baptism, and of their having Abundance for their Practice. Now let them give one Instance of what is their Practice, viz: Of one Person born of a believer Baptized at years, and I'll give them the cause.

Wil. Give your instance for Infant Baptism, or else I hope the People will go away, and conclude you have none.

L. Give your instance to prove your Practice, or else I hope, the People will go away satisfy'd you have none to give. It was by the Computation of the learned from the Death of Christ to the Death of St. John the Apostle near Sixty Years, in which time many Thousands of the Chil-
Children of Believing Parents became adult, yet we challenge you to produce one instance in all that time of any of their Children Baptiz'd, when adult.

Ruf. The Emperor Constantine was born of a Christian Parent, and yet not baptized till adult.

L. But not because they then thought the Children of Believing Parents had no right to Baptism, but because they thought that sins committed after Baptism were unpar
donable; therefore, they oftentimes defer'd it till Death. * Besides, this is not to the purpose, because a Scripture instance was call'd for.

Wil. We are able to produce several instances where grown believers were Baptiz'd, but you not one of Infant Baptism.

L. That was at the first planting of the Gospel: Give an instance of a grown person, descending from believing Parents, that was baptized when adult.

Ruf. If this were any thing to the purpose, I would then say something to it. But I wonder you should talk thus, when it was practis'd a great many years in the Church to give the Lord's Supper to In-

* Besides, Constantine's father was a Pagan, and Constantine had a desire to be Baptiz'd in Jordan, be-

cause Christ was.

Wil. Was it? Then (ad hominem) they were Baptiz'd, because they were not to receive that Ordinance before they were baptized. We demand an instance of any child of a believing Parent that was baptized when adult. Give this, and we will give you the Cause.

L. Was the Mother of our Lord Jesus Christ a believer?

L. Yes.

Wil. Well then, there's the Son of a believer baptized at age *. Here the Anabaptists fell a laughing, and some cry'd out, it's done, it's done. And, for a while, Mr. Leigh attempting several times to speak, could not be heard.

* Observe, by Believers was before understood a Christian Believer, by themselves, wherever they judge of believing as necessary to Baptism: Neither was the word given in any other sense. Besides, it was granting before, that Jews and Pagans ought not to be baptiz'd till adult, and both Christ and his Mother were Jews at the time of his birth.
L. I thought our discourse had been grounded on the Commission. Was this before or after the Commission? Here the people laughed again.

Ruf. What do they laugh at? Not at what the Old Gentleman said, but at what Mr. Leigh says *. The Old Gentleman gave a right instance.

Rob. It's not at all to the purpose.

Ruf. Mr. Williams's instance was sufficiently to the purpose; for that Mr. Leigh called for an instance of the child of a believing Parent, baptized at grown years. The Virgin Mary was a Believer.

Rob. Tho Mr. Leigh did express himself in such general Terms, yet the whole strain of the discourse sufficiently manifests, he meant the child of such a believer as was properly Christian. The Virgin Mary was undoubtedly a believing Member of the Jewish Church; but this is not to our purpose; for we want an instance of the child of a Christian Parent, after Baptism was instituted by our Lord, that yet was baptized at grown years. The instance of our Saviour doth not agree to such a case as this is. For that Christianity, as distinguished from Judaism, had not then a being, and the Virgin Mary was not in this sense Christian, nor was baptism it felt then instituted by our Lord; and therefore this instance can signify nothing to the case in hand.

Will. I have given an instance of the Child of a believing Parent, baptized at Age. Give us an instance of any Infant that was baptized.

L. As for that. Our Lord Jesus Christ is not to be imitated in that particular.

Ruf. No?

Vill. Do you prove he was not.

L. If he were, then there is no Person to be baptized till 30 years of Age, nor baptized at all, unless Circumcised at eight days old. And thus their Scripture instance, with their triumph upon it, vanished.

Vill. I demand an instance of an Infant that was baptized.

L. I demand an express prohibition.

Vill.
I demand an express prohibition of Salt, Cream, Oyl and Spittle.

L. I Answer, (1.) The case is not parallel. You speak of the substance, we of the subjects of baptism. (2.) Infants are included in the words, All Nations. But Salt, Cream, Oyl, &c. are not in the word Disciple, or Baptize.

Rob. What need of an instance when we have a rule. Now, Mr. Chandler; if you please, you may take the Part of an Opponent. And prove our practice to be agreeable to Scripture.

Mr. Chandler turns Opponent.

Arg. 1. Chand. Visible Church Members ought to be baptized. But some Infants are visible Church Members. Therefore some Infants, &c.

Ruf. Adult believers may, but not Infants.

Rob. What's this to the purpose we are upon? Which of Mr. Chandlers propositions do you deny?

Ruf. Let him repeat his Argument.

Chand. Visible Church Members ought to be baptized; according to Christs Commission. But some Infants are visible Church Members; Therefore, &c.

* Mark that. The Dr. denies that visible Church Members ought to be baptized.

Ruf. I deny the Major.*

Chand. That all visible Church Members are to be baptized, according to Christs Commission, I prove thus. If there be no Precept or Example in all the Word of God, since Christ ordain'd baptism, that makes any other ordinance the visible means of entering a Person into the visible Church, then visible Church Members ought to be baptized, But there is no, &c. Therefore.

Ruf. This is to say. Because they are Members, therefore they are to be made Members.

Chand. No. Because they are Members, they ought to be solemnly Recogniz'd as Members: Like the Coronation of a King. He is a King before he is Crown'd, but he is Crown'd that he might be own'd as King.

Will. If baptism be the initiating ordinance into the Church, then they were not Church Members before.
Chand. I say, baptism is the solemn investing sign.

Ruf. That baptism is an initiating ordinance, I grant.

Rob. This Argument was brought to prove that visible Church Members ought to be baptized.

Wll. I deny that Infants are visible Church Members in their Infancy. * The Major is drop'd, and he denies the Minor; after a while, you will find the Major silently taken up unto me, for of such is the Kingdom of Heaven, Matt. 19. 14. Hence I argue: Those that belong to the Kingdom of Heaven, i.e. the Church-Militant here upon Earth, are visible Church Members. But some Infants belong to the Kingdom of Heaven, i.e. The Church-Militant here on Earth. Therefore,

Wll. I deny the Minor. That text proves it not.

L. If the Kingdom of Heaven cannot be taken any otherwise in this Text to make good sense of the Text, then it must be so taken, i.e. For the Church-Militant here on Earth. But it cannot be taken any otherwise to make good sense of the Text. Therefore &c: And this I prove by an Induction of particulars. There are various acceptations of this Expression, [The Kingdom of Heaven] in the Word of God. Sometimes it signifies, The Laws and Promises of the Kingdom; it doth also signify the Graces by which we observe those Laws and believe those Promises. Thus it's represented by a grain of Mustard-seed. Sometimes the Kingdom of Glory. And sometimes it signifies the Church-Militant. Hence therefore I thus argue.

If in this place it can neither signify the Laws and Promises of God's Kingdom, nor the Graces by which we observe those Laws and Embrace those Promises, nor the Kingdom of Glory; then it must signify the Church-Militant here upon Earth. But it cannot signify either of the former. Therefore it must signify the last, i.e. the Church-Militant.

Wll. I deny the Minor. I say it signifies the Kingdom of Glory.
L. If it be nonsense so to understand the words then they are not so to be understood. But its nonsense, &c: For then the Kingdom of Glory must consist in part of poor little weak things, such as Infants are: Whereas after Death all are perfect in the Kingdom of Glory, whatever they are here on Earth.

Will. I thought it had been, to such belongs the Kingdom of Heaven.

Chand. Mat. 19. 14. In the Greek it is, πως ἡ ἀκοείνος, of such is the Kingdom of Heaven.

L. That is, of such it consists in part. If we mention the Kingdom of England or France, and say, of such is the Kingdom, &c: It's to be understood, In part it consists of these.

Will. I deny that the Visible Church in part consists of these. If they are neither Members of the Universal Church, nor of a Particular Church, then the Church doth not in part consist of these; But, &c: Therefore, &c.*

* He Answers not my Argument by making good sense of the Text in any other way. But now break's rule and turns Opponent.

Will. I deny the Minor, i.e. That they are visible Members of the Church.

L. There are two sorts of Members of the Universal Church. There are Members in foro Ecclesiae, and Members in foro Cali. In which of these senses do you deny they are Members of the Church?

Will. If by the Church, you mean the visible Church, I deny your Minor. Here for about four or five lines, there is great confusion in what our scribes have written. But this I take to be the sense of it.

L. If they are Members of the Church in any sense then they are Members of a Particular or the Universal Church, and if of a Particular then of the Universal which includes it; and therefore they are Members of the Visible Church. But they are Members of the
church in some sense, and for Proof hereof I return to
my Argument which you have not been able to Answer;
if such is the Kingdom of Heaven, i.e. The Church Mili-
ant.

Will. I distinguish, as to the Kingdom of Heaven: It's
here meant of the Kingdom of Glory.

L. If of the Kingdom of Glory, then it's nonsense.
at, by the way, the Kingdom of Glory either is put for
the Happiness or Subjects of the Kingdom of Glory. If
the Happiness, then the words must run thus. Of such
little Children is the Happiness of the Kingdom of Glory. If
the Subjects, then thus. Of such little Children are the
objects of the Kingdom of Glory. Now neither of these is
the: Therefore cannot be meant: but my first interprer-
ation stands good still.

Will. I distinguish between a right Title and Posses-
in. Here is a vacancy—Three things. It's true, faith
ives a right to baptism according to the Commission, a
reception of that faith gives a right to the Administrati-
on of that ordinance, and it's the Commission that au-
toriseth the Administrators.

Ruf. This Text you produce hath no Relation at all to
be Commission, nor is Baptism in the least intended in the
text.

L. Mr. Russel, I'll propose this question to you. Whe-
er, both what Christ said and did, together with what
ie Apostles said and did, be the best explication of
Christ's Commission? And then, whether, I may not ar-
ue from Christ's own Words, For visible Church Mem-
ership and so for baptism?

Ruf. I do allow that what Christ said and did, and
what the Apostles said and did, is a very good interpreta-
ton of the Commission of our Lord. And I do say, that
ly adult Persons are intended in the Commission: And
hat the Apostles never did baptize
ny, other than adult believers.*

L. Then I hope, we may argue from Christ's own Words. Did he
peak pertinently or impertinently? If pertinently, how comes he to say, If
such is the Kingdom of Heaven, unless he meant the

* Here he takes no
notice of the second
part which is the main
of my Question.
visible Church, which alone makes sense of the Text. But is this an Answer to my Question, to say that Adult believers are only intended in the Commission?

Ruf. Yes, if your question relate to water baptism.

L. If the Kingdom of Heaven in part consists of Infants, then Infants ought to be baptized. But, &c. Therefore, &c.

Rob. Pray Mr. Ruffel, which of Mr. Leigh's propositions do you deny?

L. Give me an Answer directly.

Ruf: I demand an Exposition. What do you mean by the Kingdom of Heaven?*

*L. I mean the Church and Kingdom of God here on Earth.

Ruf. I deny your Minor.

L. I prove it from the forecited Scripture. If by the Kingdom of Heaven, Mat. 19. is signified the Church visible here on Earth; Then Infants do in part make up the Church. But &c; Therefore &c.

Ruf. I deny your Minor.

L. If we must make good sense of Scripture then it must so signify. But &c.

Ruf. I deny the Consequence of your Major.

L. If the Kingdom of Heaven cannot be taken in any other signification to make good sense of it in that place; then it must so be taken. But it cannot &c: Therefore.

Ruf. I deny your Minor.

L. If you can produce no other good Interpretation that can make good sense of that Scripture, Then &c.

Ruf. I deny the Consequence of your Major. It doth not follow because I cannot do it, that therefore it cannot be done.

L. Then I say it neither you, nor any other person can produce any other good Interpretation that can make good sense of that Scripture, Then &c.

Ruf. Is this a good way of arguing? If it be, then it was so in me as well as you.

Rob. Mr. Leigh. It was not fair, therefore not allowed them. You must not put the Proof upon the Respondent.

Leigh.
Leigh. I was not driving them to Proof, but going to prove my Assertion by an Induction of Particulars, as I have already done and that I shall do again.

If the Kingdom of Heaven here signifies neither the Laws nor Promises of the Kingdom, nor Graces by which these Laws and Promises are observed and embraced, nor Jesus Christ's Management of his Kingdom, nor the Glory of Heaven, nor the Subjects of Glory, then it must signify the Church-Militant here upon Earth. But it signifies neither of the former.

Therefore the last. *

Ruf. I deny the Minor.

L. I prove it by a Recapitulation of those Particulars. Of such little Children are the Laws and Promises of the Kingdom, of such are the Graces by which we observe and embrace them, of such is Christ's Management of his Kingdom, of such is the Kingdom of Glory, of such is the Happiness or Subjects of Glory. Now is there any good sense in all this.

Ruf. Its meant of the Kingdom of Glory.

L. By the Kingdom of Glory you must mean either the Happiness or Subjects of the Kingdom. If it be taken for the Happiness of the Kingdom of Glory, then I ask whether little Children are the Happiness of Heaven? If for the Subjects; then I ask whether of such consists the Subjects of the Kingdom of Glory, when every one belonging to that Kingdom, i.e. as distinct from the Church-Militant, immediately upon his expiring is compleat, e'en an Infant 3 days old?

Ruf. This is very uncharitable, to exclude Infants from Heaven. I would rather incline to say, and I am sure the contrary to it. Mr. Leigh can never prove, that all Infants belong to the Kingdom of Glory, than that none do.

L. Yes we know your Judgment of that matter well enough. But you wilfully misrepresent my sense. I do not say that none who dy Infants go to the Kingdom of Glory, but that none are Infants when they come there. But the Text says, Of such is the Kingdom of Heaven. This therefore is what I assert, that it is absurd to say that the
the Kingdom of Glory is, in any part of it, made up of weak imperfect things as little Infants are; And therefore that the Kingdom of Heaven, here spoken of, must mean the Church-Militant here on Earth which is in part made up of such,

Here Mr. Russell was silent for a considerable time.

Rob. What Mr. Russell have you no reply to make to all this; Pray, if you have any thing to say, let us hear it; Otherwise, be so kind as to tell the People, you can give no Answer, that we may go on to somewhat further.

Russ. My Answer is this. That whereas you have undertaken to prove that Infants are the Subjects of Baptism, according to Christ's Commission, you bring a Text for it that hath neither the word Baptism in it nor the Commission of our Lord.*

* This poor dry evasion, you see, he hath before, and is beholden to his old Friend Danvers for.

L. Very well then. If we prove from any Text of Scripture the right of Infants to Baptism, it must not be allowed, unless we find it in the close of the Evangelists, where is what you call the Commission; or unless the word Baptism be in it.

Rob. Mr. Russell, They are not obliged to have the mention either of Baptism or the Commission of our Lord in the conclusion of every Syllogism. They had it in the first. They then told you; That such as were Members of the Church-Militant on Earth were to be Baptized according to the Commission of our Lord: And this was the case of some Infants. You denied any Infants were Members of Christ's Kingdom, or Church-Militant here on Earth, and to prove this they brought that Text. And I suppose the whole company was satisfied that it doth sufficiently prove what it was produced for. And now you dare not deny the Major; if you do I doubt not but they are ready to prove it.

Vill. If Church Members have been denied Baptism, then Church-Membership is not the ground of Baptism.
If Church-Members came to John to be Baptized, and were denied, then Church-Membership is not the Ground of Baptism. But &c.

L. I deny the Minor.

Will. If Church-Members came to John to be Baptized, and were denied, then Church-Membership is not the Ground of Baptism. But &c.

L. I deny the Minor.

Will. I prove it, Mat. 3. When he saw the Multitude and many of the Pharisees and Sadduces come to his baptism, he said to them; O Generation of Vipers, &c.

L. I deny that they were de jure, Church Members whatever they were, de facto. Their being a Generation of Vipers is sufficient to prove, they were not Church Members, De jure; And we are speaking of rightful Church Members.

Will. I have proved that Church Members were denied baptism.

L. I deny it and distinguish between Church Members, De jure & De facto.

Will. I will not meddle with your distinctions.

Rob. And can you think that the word Church-Members cannot possibly admit of more senses than one?

L. I say, they were not Church Members, De jure.

Will. Were they denied any privileges?

Rob. According to what you said just now, they were denied baptism, was that no Church privilege?

Will. Such as are visible Members of the Universal Church, are qualify'd with a work of Grace, &c.

L. I deny it, viz. That they are always so.

Will. It is in the Judgment of Charity so.

L. Such as were a Generation of Vipers were not qualify'd with a Work of Grace, and so were not Church Members, according to your own assertion.

Rob. Especially such as were known to be a Generation of Vipers.

Will. If our Lord Jesus did Disciple such as were Church Members before they were baptiz'd, then Church Membership is not the ground of baptism. But, &c.
L. We distinguish between the Jewish Church and the Christian Church. And then I distinguish between Infant Church Members; and Adult Church Members. Now Christian Church Membership is a ground of baptism.

Sharp. The Anabaptist Moderator. You say Infants are Church Members; Church Members upon their apostacy ought to be Excommunicated: when were any admitted into Church Membership in their infancy, Excommunicated upon their apostacy?

Rob. There is with us as with the Jews Anciently, a two fold Excommunication, Excommunicatio Major, and Excommunicatio Minor: as to the first, which is a solemn cutting off from the Universal Church, I question, whether our Laws gives us the liberty of practising it; and as to the second, which is a suspension from the Lords Supper; I do not see that to be needful in the case before us.

Leigh to Mr. Sharp: we are not now talking about the management of Church Members, but who are the Persons which ought to be esteemed so? Further, it is needless to exclude those from Adult Church-Membership who never offered themselves to it. It's as if we should shut our doors against a Person, who never attempts an entrance.

To this Mr. Sharp made no reply.

W'il. Ministers are to Baptize none, but those that are discipled by the words of the Commission.

Chand. Here's the Consequence of it.

W'il. No here is no Genuine Consequence. The Commission mentions no more but Disciples and Believers, do it?*

Raf. It doth appear by all that hath been said, that our practice is allow'd.

Rob. Not your practice.

L. We do not allow your practice, unless to such as have not been baptized.*

W'il. We agree, that those that are not baptized ought to be baptized.

* Observe how he leaves his Argument, and runs to what had been worn threadbare before.

* The poor Man runs again from consequence to express words, the consequence was allow'd before.

* Remember, this refers to the Subjects only, not the manner.
zed. You are bound to baptize none, but such as you are bound to Preach to.

L. I deny it.

Ruf. Have Infants the use of reason?

Chand. No.*

Ruf. If Infants, without understanding, are capable of being made Disciples, by the Ministry of Men; then may the Beasts of the Field. But the Beasts of the Field may not, &c. Therefore.

L. I appeal to all present. Is it as proper to take Pigs and Dogs to School, as little Children of a year and half old? Are those so capable of the Parent's resignation and master's acceptance as these? If Infants might keep the charge of the Sanctuary from a month old and upward, they may be esteemed Believers and Disciples. But, &c.

Ruf. I wonder you will maintain this upon such silly foundations.*

L. Pray Answer the last Argument.

Ruf. There is nothing of Christ's Commission in it.

L. Unless we can prove Infant baptism in the close of one of the Evangelists; No proof is to be allowed.

Will. I thought it was to be argued according to the Commission, * but I see, &c.

Rob. If you be of Mr. Russeil's mind, then you may turn your Children out to the Dogs and Pigs, and Beasts of the Field. It is most insufferable; I never heard such an Expression in my Life. But you may see what the Principles of Anabaptists naturally lead Men to.

Here the Anabaptists being shamefully nonplus't, Mr. Leigh apply'd himself to the Mayor and Govenour, in this manner: You see they are not able to answer our first Argument, but are entirely gravell'd. The Rules of Disputation oblige us to go no farther in the Opponency. Yet we will be at your command. We have fix Arguments more at hand; if you please, we will proceed to offer *
Offer them. Or, if you please, we will proceed to the Second Question.

**Sharp. Anabaptist Moderator.** Let us have a precept or an example.

**Rob.** A precedent we need not give, here is a precept brought and yet no Answer given to it.

**Ruf.** What Precept?

**Rob.** That which by Undenyable Consequence obliges us to it tho’ there be not, in express words, a requirement that we Baptize Infants.—One would have thought, Mr. Ruffel should have allowed, tho’ they are not capable of Duties, yet they are capable of the Privileges:

Here an Answer to our last Argument was again and again call’d for, but none given.

**Rob.** Pray Mr. Chandler, let no more time be lost, but proceed to another Argument.

**Arg. 2. Chand.** If some Infants be the Disciples of Christ, then, according to the Commission of our Lord, some Infants are to be Baptized. But some Infants are Disciples. Therefore &c.

**Ruf.** I deny your Minor.

**Chand.** Those that the Holy Ghost in Scripture calls Disciples, are Disciples. But the Holy Ghost in Scripture calls some Infants Disciples; Ergo they are Disciples.

**Ruf.** I deny your Minor.

**Chand.** I prove it from that Text: Acts 15. 10. Now therefore, why tempt you God, to put a yoke upon the necks of the Disciples? Upon Infants the Yoke of Circumcision was laid, They are call’d Disciples.

**Ruf.** I deny that Text proves it.

**Chand.** If this Yoke were laid upon the neck of the Disciples, then Infants are Disciples. But &c: Therefore &c.

**Ruf.** I deny that there is any such thing in the Text either express or intended:

**Chand.** The dispute was occasion’d by some false Teachers, that had said, except Christians were Circumcised, and kept the Law of Moses, they could not be saved. Now says the Apostle, Why do you lay a Yoke upon the neck of the Disciples &c: This Yoke was the Yoke of Circumcision, which was laid on the neck of some Infants.
Ruf. No Infants can be here intended, for those, who are called Disciples in this verfe, are called Brethren and Believers in the 9th verfe. And therefore it could not intend Infants.

L. We will read verfe the First. Except ye be Circumciued after the manner of Moses. Now I ask you what was the manner of Moses?

Ruf. To cut the foreskin of their Flesh.

L. Suppose we were to teach this People, as the Judaizing Christians did them; Except you are Circumciued after the manner of Moses you can't be saved, no doubt but they would understand the manner of Moses to intend, not only all the Circumstances of it, but, that their Children must also be Circumciued, this being after the manner of Moses. Here I will form this Argument. If those are called Disciples who were to be Circumciued after the manner of Moses, Then Infants are Disciples. But, &c: And so ought to be Baptized. No, they themselves allow that Disciples ought to be Baptized.

Ruf. It's the Gentile Believers that are there called Disciples.

Chand. It is all upon whom the Yoke of Circumciusion was laid, which neither they nor their Fathers were able to bear.

Will. They could bear the Yoke of Circumciusion.

Chand. They were not able to bear it. The Holy Ghost says so expressly; which signifies the Painfullness and Troublesomeness of that Ordinance.

L. What you say of moment is this. That Children are able to bear the Yoke of Circumciusion, therefore that Yoke is not there intended, but the whole Ceremonial Law. We allow the Ceremonial Law was included, but Circumciusion was here chiefly intended.

Will. If Circumciusion was binding to keep the whole Law, then this is not the Yoke that neither we nor our fathers were able to bear. But it was so, Gal. 5. 3.

L. Thus far I think the old Gentleman is in the right, that the Apostles are here and in the Epistle to the Gal, endeavouring the same thing, driving them off from the observance of the Ceremonial Law. But herein he is G 2
mistaken, He would leave out Circumcision, one of the prime and most painful parts of this Law, and so would leave out these Infants whom these Judaizing Christians advised to be Circumcised.

Ruf. Prove that Infants are there intended.

L. If the context do oblige us to take in Infants, then they are there intended. But the context, &c. Ergo. It is a reproof of, or reasoning with, those that were inclined to impose Circumcision on the Necks of the Disciples, and with it the whole Law of Moses, v. 5. They were strictly observant of Moses's Law. Nothing is more plain and obvious to one observant of Moses's Law, than to Circumcise Infants at eight days old. And consequently nothing would they urge more on these Disciples.

Here is a vacancy in the Notes of our Scribes.

L. That's not necessary. Their being barely the Infants of these Disciples was enough. If I were to act the part of a Judaizing Christian, and were to persuade all these Gentlemen that they were to observe Circumcision according to the Law of Moses; And did call those Disciples, who were so Circumcised; Would they not take it to be sufficiently plain, that their Infants were intended as well as themselves. And therefore, that I called their Infants Disciples.

Ruf. If you bring a Text, and I shew you several weighty considerations, why it should not be understood in your sense: I expect not such Stories as these.

Rob. Is it not enough, if Mr. Leigh shews that this Text will admit of no other sense?

Will. If so be, that children were brought in, it would not follow that they were Disciples, for those that were Circumcised were not Disciples.

L. You say, the Qualification was, they must be believers and have their hearts purified by faith. I Answer. These Judaizing Christians would persuade them to Circumcise after the manner of Moses, And so to take the Yoke not only themselves, but also on their Infants. Now all these,
these, without distinction, on whom this Yoke was about to be laid are called Disciples, and therefore their Infants.

Will. After the manner of Moses: Thae relates to the Form, not the Subjects. Here again is a vacancy in the Notes of our Scribes.

Rob. Here hath been a great deal of time spent about this argument. The Substance of what was said on both sides is this: Mr. Chandler and Mr. Leigh have urged, that such as are Disciples of Christ ought to be baptized, and that some Infants are Disciples of Christ. This Mr. Ruffel deny's: and they have proved it from this, that some Infants are call'd Disciples by the Spirit of God. This also Mr. Ruffel hath deny'd; So that the whole Question returns to this head: Whether any Infants be in Scripture call'd Disciples? Now this hath been, I think, sufficiently clear'd from this Text, Acts 15. 10. where the Persons call'd Disciples are those, upon whom the Judaizing Christians would have imposed the Yoke of Circumcision. The Doctrine, they taught the Christian Gentiles, was, That their Christianity would avail them nothing, It was to no purpose that they did Believe in Christ; unless they were also Circumcised according to the Law of Moses; they could not be saved. You all know what the Law of Moses doth prescribe and command in this case, not only, that they themselves, but that every Male Child among them should be Circumcised.

Ruf. It is not, according to the Law of Moses, but after the manner of Moses.

Rob. Mr. Ruffel, it's true; it's after the manner of Moses in the First verse, but if you look forward into the Chapter, you will find express mention of the Law of Moses. You must be Circumcised and keep the Law of Moses, v. 5th. I suppose you that have so oft read this Chapter, could not but be sensible that such an Expression was there, tho' not in the first verse; And therefore the distinction you will pretend to make between the Law of Moses and the Manner of Moses, was but a meer Evasion, and in this case a Distinction without Difference. The one explains the other. That which is call'd their being Circumcised after the manner of Moses, in
in one place, is called their being Circumcised and Keeping the Law of Moses in the other place. They must be Circumcised as Moses did order, so that his Law might be observed and fulfilled in the doing of it; which it could not be, tho' they themselves were Circumcised never so regularly, unless their Infants were so too. And yet the whole Body of those on whom the Pharisees would have imposed the Yoke of Circumcision, are here expressly call'd Disciples; This whole Body of Adult and Infants are therefore in common included under this Name, which was all that we had to prove. And we are now willing to refer it to the People, whether what hath been said be not sufficient Proof. If you please therefore, we will now proceed to the Second question. Pray Mr. Chandler, let the Company understand what it is.

Reader, Here observe. We were ready (as before mentioned) to offer several other Arguments, but no tolerable Answert being given to these two, neither the Rules of Disputation did oblige us, nor the Company's patience, and the approaching evening allow us to do it, unless the Second Question were wholly excluded.

Q. 2. Whether, according to the Commission of our Lord, Baptism be to be Administered by Dipping, Plunging, or Overwhelming only, and not otherways. It lies upon you to prove, that it is by Dipping, Plunging, Overwhelming only.

Ruf. The Holy Scripture shews the way of baptizing.

* Here observe again, Dr. Russel would shift the Opposity on us.

* L. This Argument doth not prove, that it is by Dipping, &c. Only.

Rob. Conclude with the Words of the Question.

Ruf. I understand you own, it was in use in our Saviour's time. Here the Dr. spake several impertinencies, which our Scribes thought not worth the Writing.

L. I deny all this.

Rob. Bring it into an Argument.

Ruf. I put it into a Syllogism. I say, If the Holy Scriptures do shew us the right way of Baptizing, according to
to Christ's appointment, and yet do not shew us that sprinkling is the way of Baptizing, then, sprinkling is not the right way of Baptizing. But &c. Therefore &c.

Rob. There is not one word of Sprinkling in the Question. It is, whether it be to be administered by Dipping, Plunging, Overwhelming, only.

Ruf. I argue thus then. If the Holy Scriptures—

He goes on as before.

Rob. Pray Mr. Russell.

Ruf. What? Can't I begin to speak, but you must still be interrupting me. I don't speak to you. I speak to Mr. Chand. If the Holy Scriptures shew us the right way of Baptizing and yet do not shew us that Sprinkling—

Rob. If you would but observe order, you should have no Interruption from me. But you both must and shall conclude your Argument with the words of the Question, before Mr. Respondent shall take any notice of it.

Ruf. Must and shall Mr. Moderator?

Rob. Yes Mr. Russell you both must and shall. Otherwise it were fitter you should call me Mr. Cipher, then Mr. Moderator, if in this case I cannot Moderator.

Ruf. If that Baptism which is appointed by Christ and doth properly set forth his Burial and Resurrection is the only right way of Baptizing, then it must be performed by Dipping, Plunging, Overwhelming only and not otherways. But that Baptism, &c. Is the only right way, &c. Therefore, &c.

Chand. I first deny the Consequence of the Major. And then I deny the Minor.

Ruf. Then you do suppose, that it doth represent the Burial and Resurrection of Christ, yet it doth not thence follow, that this is the only right way of baptizing.

My Argument hath two parts which I shall prove. First, That it doth set forth the Burial and Resurrection of Jesus Christ. Secondly, That therefore it is the only right way of baptizing. First, It doth set forth the Burial and Resurrection of Jesus Christ, Rom. 6. 4. Col. 2. 12. Buried with Christ in baptism, where in also you
you are risen with him through the faith of the Operation of God. And, I do say that, Buried with Christ in his Sepulchre we cannot possibly be, but the Apostle says, we are Buried with him in baptism, which doth properly represent the Burial and Resurrection of Christ. Now I proceed to the next, to shew that therefore it is the only right way. If there was no other baptism instituted by Christ, nor practised by the Apostles and first Ministers of the Gospel, but what doth represent the Burial and Resurrection of Christ; Then Dipping only is the right way of baptizing. But, &c. Therefore, &c. Therefore, &c.

Chand. This is not the Consequence of the Major.

Reader. Observe, That the Dr. grounds his practice upon two Arguments linked together, viz. The resemblance between Dipping and a Burial. And Primitive Practice. Mr. Chandler, denies this resemblance between Dipping and Burial, to conclude for Dipping. And he ought to have proved that it doth; but instead thereof, he insists upon his second Argument drawn from Primitive Practice. Hereupon there was no room (without contention) to urge anything more against their first Argument. But you have it sufficiently Answered in the brief Contradiction.
L. Prove that those Texts where you render [baptism] by dipping, do truly and necessarily signify Dipping. Take what Text you will.

Ruf. I choose that of our Saviour, Mar. 1. 9. He was baptized of John in Jordan. The Greek preposition is, ἐν, Into. And to say, he was washed of John into Jordan is not sense; therefore it ought to be rendered thus, He was dipped of John into Jordan.

L. The preposition, ἐν, signifies [in] in the New Testament, as well as into; so here, he was baptized of John in Jordan, is the true sense of the Greek.

Now we will allow thus far. That what was commodious and usually practised on other occasions, without any burden, in that warm Country, might be observed in baptism. It is said, that all Judea and the Country round came to John and were baptized of him in Jordan. In those hot Countries the custom was to go bare leg'd, in sandals. Now they might go into Jordan a little way, and then have water pour'd upon them; and if so, allowing that the Word ἐν signifies to wash, They might be said in this manner to be washed in Jordan, without the least necessity of Dipping. I will offer it to the Company whether this be not a fair interpretation of those words, Mar. 1. 9. Christ came to John and was baptized of him in Jordan, i.e. He went a step into the water, and was washed of him, in the manner aforesaid.

Ruf. I will not allow your signification of the word. I say the word, ἐν signifies more than, In; So Christ is said to come into the world, ἐν τῷ κόσμῳ, Excellent Greek.

1 Tim. 1. 15. He went into the Synagogue, ἐν: And to into Jordan, ἐν τῷ Ἰορδάνῳ. This doth imply, that he was baptized or dip't into Jordan, as these other Texts, that he came into the Synagogue, &c.

L. This Gentleman produceth three places where ἐν signifies into, and I can produce three times three, where it cannot signify into, but must signify * In. The force of your Argument lies upon the which you would have render'd Into, where it

H

* Here we were going to read, but they gave no room.
signify's In. Then, add this to what I offer'd before, as a probable Interpretation contrary to yours, it's evident that there's no necessity of Dipping, from this Text.

Rob. There can be nothing beyond a probability asserted on our side or yours.

Chand. Well, prove that ἅρματος signifies ablue, to wash frequently in Scripture. Thither we will go, That's our tale.

Rus. According to all Lexicographers the primary signification of the word ἅρματος is, mergo, immergo, to Plunge, Overwhelm.

L. But by the way, you prove your Practice from the Prime and Native Signification of the word. Suppose it were mergo, to Plunge, and not ablue, (which yet we deny) you cannot argue from the Native Signification of a word, with any force, when the Scripture acceptation of it is different:

Rus. I did urge the Commission of our Saviour:

Chand. You are to prove that Dipping is the only way. If the word will bear the sense of washing or pouring water, then dipping is not the only way.

L. You argue from the Prime and Native Signification of the word. I'll appeal to the Learned. If this be a good way of arguing; Then the Mathematics must include all kind of Learning. Because it comes from μαθήματα to learn. Then every Youth that is skill'd but a little in Physics, may be call'd a Physician, because it comes from μύσις. Nay, and every Foot-boy, sent with a Letter may be call'd an Angel, because Ἀγγελός signifies Messenger. To know therefore the sense of the word ἅρματος in this ordinance, we must consider in what sense the word is usually taken in Scripture. And to say it signifies to Dip, where the ordinance is mention'd, is plainly to beg the Question, to assert the thing without proof; Therefore, rightly to understand the sense of the Word, we must have recourse to these places where the word is used, and the ordinance not intended. Now I require one such place of Scripture where the word ἅρματος signifies to dip necessarily.

Rus. No there is no need of producing such a place. I shall prove it from the story of the Eunuch and Philip. He commanded the Chariot to stand still, and they both went
went down into the water, and then, when he had put him under water, * The Text Ac. 8, 38. hath not a word of putting him under the water.

L. I deny that the word [Baptize] signifieth to dip in any place of Scripture, or to put under water. i.e. Necessarily.

Ruf. Mat. 3. 6. They were Baptized, i.e. dip't of John in Jordan.

L. How doth it appear that they were dip'd?

Ruf. The Assembly, The Continuators of Pool, Calvin, Dr. Hammond allow it.

Chand. That's nothing to us. I defy you to prove that the word ἁπτω in any Text of Scripture signifieth to dip.

Ruf. What then? You deny what Dr. Hammond, the Assembly, the Dutch Annotations have said.

L. We cannot say they have said so. We have not their Books at hand to turn to. Besides, suppose they should, that's no Proof. We are no Papists, to pin our faith on other Men's Sleeves.

In the next place. Whereas Mr. Russian hath brought the passage of Philip and the Eunuch, That they went down into the water and came up out of the water. It might as well be render'd, They went to and came from the water *. Now if they came by a River's side, they might go down out of a Chariot to the water, and when the Eunuch was Baptized, they came up from the water. Is not this a fair sense of these words? They went to and came from the water *. Again if you argue from the word ἁπτω, I can tell you of Seven Places, where the word is used and not applied to the ordinance. And you cannot prove that it signifieth to dip in any of them. I argue then. If there are several Texts of Scripture, where the word cannot possibly bear this sense; Then it doth not necessarily bear it. But &c.

Ruf. I deny the Minor.

L. I prove it by some Instances; Mark. 7. 4. Except
they wash, they eat not: 

except they be Baptized. But can it be imagined that they were plunged over head and ears every time they went to meals? 

The word is sometimes render'd dipping in our English Translation, as, He that dip'peth with me in the dish.

L. The word is there ἐκτέτο, not ἐκτετίω; besides, this would avail your cause but little, for can you suppose that he dip'peth himself over head and ears in the dish? 

A Gentleman in the Company. I'm sure he would be foul and sawcy then.

Ruf. But ἄκωτο, is a Diminutive from ἄκωτω, 

A Gentleman said to his Neighbour. Because ἄκωτο is a smaller word, he thinks it must be its 

*This whole passage hath been attested by the Peri'on that speaker the words.* 

L. I find the word to signify no more then ἰῶ, Mark 1. 4, 5. And ἰ ἁ Naaman is said to observe the Prophets word, which was ἰ, yet he went, and as we read, dipped. Now since he observed the command of the Prophet, it is plain that ἰ doth not necessarily signify any thing but washing.

Ruf. What is the word in the Hebrew?

Chan. There are two words, סָלַל and בָּלַה: And the Prophet commanded him, סָלַל; and it is added, according to the word of the Prophet, בָּלַה, where it is plain the words are used promiscuously; and בָּלַה signifies no more than סָלַל. So also we may observe, Christ commanded the blind man to wash in the Pool of Siloam. Must it be said, that he was dipt there? or can it be proved that Naaman was dipt, because בָּלַה. Nay, בָּלַה is so far from always signifying to dip, that בָּלַה; it self, is generally used in this sense, yet sometimes signifies only to wet or wash. Thus Dan. 4. 33. Nebuchadnezzar was wet with the Dew of Heaven. The Septuagint renders it סָלַל.

Ruf. But the Hebrew is not בָּלַה.

Chan. What is it then? Here is an Hebrew Bible, if you'll see.
Here the Hebrew Bible was handed to him, of Leusden's 2d Edit. and Mr. Ruffel kept it turning from place to place above half a quarter of an hour, and could not find the Book of Daniel, upon which the People fell a hissing. Then the Hebrew Bible was handed to Mr. Robinson, who turned the leaf down at the place, and handed it back again to Mr. Ruffel, who stood with his Spectacles on his nose, a while longer, poring on it, but could not read it. But he said, he understood Hebrew before Mr. Chandler was born, * and to satisfy the Auditory that he did so, turned to the First Chapter of Genesis, where he read some part of a verse, or verses. And then again turned to Daniel, and could not read the words yet. After some time more, Mr. Ruffel pretended to read some words, but with a low Voice.

Chand. We come not here, Mr. Ruffel, to know whether you understand Hebrew, only tell us what the word is in this place, which he could not do.

L. We can produce several other texts of Scripture, where βαπτίζω cannot signify Dipping, as where we read of their washing Beds or Tables, the word is Baptize according to the Greek.

Ruf. I deny it.

Chand. There is an —

L. What wash Beds, or Tables, by Dipping them under Water? Or must it be by pouring Water on them &c? Upon the whole, the Application of a little Water in Baptism, especially in these Cold Climates, is grounded upon what Christ quotes. I will have Mercy and not Sacrifice. Now it being not Necessarily implied in Scripture that Dipping was the ancient Practice, we lay, that having a fair and probable way deducible from Scripture, we must rest therein, having recourse to that general rule. David's hunger was a fair excuse for eating the shewbread, which is call'd Most Holy, and Lawful only for the Priests to Eat. Therefore, if Dipping in Cold Weather, and Cold Climates, do tend to the Prejudice of a Person's Health, yea to Endanger Life, and it be not certainly
first in Scripture, as the only way of Administering the Ordinance, we may use our own way, as, in General, most agreeable to the word of God.

Ruf. They think, tho' they Transgress a Rule, God will have Mercy and not Sacrifice.

L. No. This is not so. We observe the rule, a Moral Precept, which takes place of a Ritual, when opposite; Much more is it Obligatory when it's not evident that any Ritual one doth oppose it.

Chand. If in those hot Countries they had dip't, or been obliged to dip, this would not hold in such Climates, and at such Seasons of the Year wherein the Life of a Person would, this way, be Manifestly exposed to Danger.

Mr. Russel here attempted to read several Quotations, that he had Collected out of the Assemblies Annexed. Pool, Dr. Hairs, &c. which had been before disowned. And therefore the People refused to hear him, as being nothing to the purpose, however he spake to this Effect.

Ruf. I hope the People will observe, that you are forc'd to differ from the Red. Assembly of Divines, &c.

Chand. The Bible, the Bible is our Religion.

Rob. Mr. Russel, we are not ashamed to own our selves Protestants, with whom it is a Fundamental Principle, that the greatest and best of Men are fallible; And therefore our Assent is not concluded by the mere words of one or other name how great soever. We pay a just deference to the very worthy names you mention'd, but we cannot think our selves obliged to believe every thing they say; If you have any Solid Reasons to offer, or the clear evidence of any Text of Scripture, to determine this point, pray let us hear it before we close up the day. Nothing being said, he, applying himself to the People, added.

Rob. A great deal of loose discourse you have heard, upon this last Question. Mr. Russel was obliged by all the Laws of Disputation, to prove, that according to the Commission of our Lord, Baptism was to be administered by Dipping, Plunging, Overwhelming, and no other wise. Some attempts he made towards it, of the weaknefs of which,
which, I doubt not but, you are all sensible; And therefore (which yet they were not obliged to) Mr. Chandler and Mr. Leigh undertook to prove that it was not necessarily to be so administered. For the clearing of which, they have manifested that the word ἐντεταλμένος in the Greek as well as יִבְרָה in the Hebrew doth not, necessarily, signify anything more than only to wash, or, to apply water to a person, without determining whether it shall be by dipping a person into water, or pouring water upon him, or any other way; so that water be applied, it is all that can necessarily be concluded from the words: Of this they have given clear evidence both from the Old Testament and the New.

And now upon the whole, we are willing to refer it to your own judgments, whether you will be persuaded to account your own baptism a nullity, because it hath not been administered in the way of these persons. If you can without any solid reason, or without so much as the evidence of one single text of scripture, be satisfied; you may then take what our adversaries have said for satisfaction. But, since it hath been fully proved, that Christ hath only required that persons be solemnly entered into his church by baptizing or washing them in the name of father, son, and spirit, and hath not determined, so far as doth appear, whether this washing shall be performed this way or that, we are willing, I say, to refer it to the judgment of you all, whether our way of administration be not the most commodious:

FINIS.

I have compared this copy with the original, viz. Mr. Maltby’s and my own, and find it exactly agreeable thereto.

Witness, my hand,
this 10th day of July, W. Smith.
1699.
Some Just Reflections on Dr. Ruffel's pretended Narrative.

I S with great Regret, that we are again diverted from more pleasing and useful Studies, to dip our Pens in this Watry Controversy, and undertake this Invidious Service. As we were Necessitated by the Anabaptists Challenge to the Disputation it self, so had they not (by Publishing a falle account,) laid us under a like Necessity to Indicate the Truth and our selves, the World had never more heard of this matter. In these our Reflections we shall Manifest the Author's Egregious Falshood, in some parts of his Narrative, his Trifling Impertinencies in others, and the Uncharitable Principles that have drop'd from him.

The Narrative is pretended to be Transcrib'd from Mr. Biffel's and Mr. Ring's Copy's. Now we can assure the World, that Mr. Biffel's Copy was like a Lawyer's Breviate, containing only hints for Memory, and may be all contain'd in 3 or 4 pages, and hardly one word of it in this Narrative. As to Mr. Ring's, we have taken the pains to compare it with this account, and find several hundred Falshoods, Additions, Alterations and Omissions. It is an ill omen thus to stumble at the Threshold; and what begins with a Falshood, we have Reason enough to Mistrust. But to the Narrative it self, we shall (as to some parts) shew it's Egregious Falshood as to matters of fact, and that by its Omissions of some, and mictiting other particulars, as well as positive false assertions.

1. It is Egregiously false by Reason of its Omissions. Not that every Omission of a word or Sentence, (perhaps) would have render'd it fo; but such Omissions as alter the very State of the Disputation, and make it look like another thing, than it truly was, are undoubtedly to be call'd Falshoods. Should any one pretend-
ing to report the Psalms Sense, Ps. 14, 1. leave out the first words, and assure the world he said, there is no God; would not this be called a Notorious Fallacy? tho' the Fallacy of it lies, in not relating the whole sentence. From whence it may be collected. That it is not only asserting what was never said, but also the Omission of something that was said, may bring an Historian under the Guilt of Falsifying. And whether it be not so in the present case, we shall leave the World to judge, in these few Instances:

Mr. Leigh, upon their frequent pressing for an Instance from Scripture, of our Practice in Baptizing Infants, happily retorted the Argument upon themselves; and challenged them to produce one Instance of their Practice, as theirs differs from ours. For all that know us, know we also baptize such as are adult, upon the Profession of the Christian Faith, that were not baptized in Infancy: Nay, that we should refuse to baptize the Child of an Heathen, or other Notorious Infidel, (unless adopted by some Christian) till he become adult, and make a credible Profession of Christianity. Mr. Leigh therefore pref't them for one Scripture-Instance of a believing, meaning a Christian Parent's Child, whose Baptism was delayed till adult. And withal, told them, That from the Death of Christ to the Death of St. John, according to the computation of the Learned, was about 60 years, in which compass of Time, multitudes of Christians Children were become adult. Dr. Ruffel mention'd Constantine the Great as a Scripture-Instance, which was justly ridiculed: Mr. Williams, as he acknowledg'd to us afterwards, thought it not of any Force, and by the intimation of his Son, alludes the Instance of our Lord, as born of a Believer, of the Virgin Mary. To which Mr. Leigh reply'd, I thought we had been speaking of the Commission; now this was before the Commission. Intimating, that the Instance was not pertinent, relating to a Baptism that preceded the Commission of our Lord; and therefore our Disputation was no way concern'd in it. Notwithstanding this, Dr. Ruffel would have it a pertinent Answer, Christ being the Child of a Believer. And so he reports no Answer, but makes Mr. Leigh seek to be Opposition upon it, as it confounded with this Instance, pag. 35. Whereas, immediately upon the Reply of Dr. Ruffel, Mr. Robinson, our Moderator, adds, Tho' Mr. Leigh express'd himself in so general Terms, yet the whole Strain of the Discourse did sufficiently manifest that an Instance of the Child of a Believer, properly Christian, was call'd for: Now the Virgin Mary was a Jew, and not then a Christian: Nor was Christian Baptism then instituted. With more to the same purpose. Mr. Leigh also further replyed, That Christ was not to be imitated in that, because then no Person...
ought to be baptized till 30; nor except circumcis'd at 8 days old, as the Reader may see in the foregoing Narrative. After which Dr. Ruffel offer'd nothing. Now we appeal to all the World, whether when so large and distinct a Reply was made, both by Mr. Robinson and Mr. Leigh, this man hath fairly represented our Cause, when he takes no notice at all of it. But if this Gentleman, or any of his Friends, can yet produce one Scripture-Instance of the Child of a Christian Parent, baptiz'd at grown years, it will be somewhat to the purpose; and they may have the confidence to call for Instances from us, and to pretend that theirs (as distinguish'd from ours) is the Scripture-way, and most agreeable to the Commission of our Lord: But till then how unreasonable is it for them to expect Instances of our way, when they have none to produce for their own?

Again he hath omitted to tell the World, (what all that were present well remember,) that he was put to Silence by what was urg'd from Mat. 19, 14. to prove Infant Members of the Church-Militant upon Earth. Insomuch that after a long Silence, Mr. Robinson call'd to him, and ask'd if he had no reply to make, and begg'd of him that if he had any thing to say he would speak; otherwise tell the People, that we might proceed. To which Dr. Ruffel made a very weak reply, that in this Text there is not a word of Baptism, or the Commission; and Mr. W. instead of Answering took the Opponency, as in the Narrative. But not one word more from that Argument could be got from Dr. Ruffel.

Besides tho' he hath conceal'd yet he cannot (himself) have forgotten, that the 2d. Argument on our part, where he was again Silenced, was form'd up by Mr. Robinson in the words of our Narrative: Then we refer'd it to the Gentlemen present, whether we should offer any more Arguments on the 2d Question, and it was thought wholly needless. Mr. Robinson's closing Speech on the 2d. Question, is also wholly omitted.

We forbear to mention here, how he hath omitted such passages as did sufficiently expose his Ignorance to the Learned part of the Company: Such as were his telling us once and again, that πρέσβιον was of the Masculine Gender, agreeing with αυτοῖς when Greek Verbs admit not of Genders, tho' Hebrew do; and his saying τὸν ἔργον ἐργάζεται as if it had been with an Ωμέγα and Ι Κελεύοντας. So τὸν ἐργάζοντι. Faults for which a School Boy would deserve the lash.

And when he was not allow'd to conclude his first Argument, on the 2d. Question, otherwise than with the words of the Question, it will be Remember'd (tho' his Narrative hath not told us,) with how great difficulty he form'd his Syllogism, and
and how many attempts he made before he could bring the words of the Question, into the conclusion: Infomuch that our Moderator offer'd him his Assistance.

These and several other particulars which quite alter the Face of the Disputation, were by no means to be omitted: Neither can that be call'd a True Narrative, that supposeth the Truth in such Instances as these.

2. This Narrative is false; in regard of its strange misplacing some Particulars: on which account the Reader can form no true Idea of the Disputation. So, for instance, what he lays concerning ours and _Narrative_, page 34. (so far as it is true) should have come in in the midst of Mr. Williams's rambling Discourse, betwixt Dr. Ruffel's 4th and 5th Arguments; and that about the Beasts of the Field, should have had its place betwixt the 1st and 2d Argument on our part for Infant Baptism: when Mr. Williams and Ruffel were both Rambling again. And had they been found in their proper places, as in Mr. Ring's Copy, which _Narrative_ Ruffel pretends to transcribe, they would only have serv'd to expose the Weakness of him that brought them. But as he hath plac'd them here, they serve to hide the shameful Baffle they and their Cause had by the Arguments on our side. For, as was said before, they never re-assum'd the Opponency on the first Question, after the closing up the Argument from Infants Disciplehip. Tho Dr. Ruffel brings in these Two Arguments, as if they went off with Triumph, to the 2d Question. Which yet every Judicious Auditor Knows to be False. Leffer slips we pass by.

3. He hath forg'd several downright Falshoods; one of which is just under our Eye, with relation to what is immediately before said, and therefore (tho a little out of its place) shall mention it here. He positively tells the World, that Mr. Leigh said, they might take up the Opponency again, if they pleased: And again, that he re-assum'd the Opponency again, as Mr. Leigh's Request, of which he was sick. With much of the same sort, page 34. Which is the more Evidgment of his own Brain, and not one Syllable of it True. The Omission of some things that were said, and the alteration of the Face of the Disputation, might be imputed to a weak Imperfect Copy: But this must needs be a Contriv'd and Deliberate Falshood; nor hath he a right to be Believ'd in any thing, that dare Forge and Publish such an untruth.

But because the Preface is almost one continued Falshood, we shall particularly take notice of it.

1. He declares Mr. Bow and Mr. Webber were the sole cause of his being Engag'd in the Disputation, whereas Mr. Webber hath declar'd to Mr. Smith and Mr. Chandler, that he utter-
ty disliked the dispute from the Beginning, and was only thus far concern'd; seeing they would Engage he advis'd rather to Dr. Russel than Mathew Caffin, whom Mr. Bowes had pitch'd upon. A Man that denies both the Deity and Humanity of Christ, against whom Dr. Russel had print'd an Honest Profession. And this Man tho' overturning the Fundamentals of Christianity is hugg'd by Mr. Bowes: Because he agrees with him, in the darling Notions of Believers Baptism by dipping; Which, he told the Worthieful the Mayor of Portsmouth, was a Fundamental of Religion. Thus uncharitably doth this Man shut us all out of Heaven, and confine Religion to his own party, while a denier of Christ's Deity and Humanity hath been since, as well as before the Disputation, admitted into his Pulpit, while he, as a Messenger of the Churches, was travelling busily to spread false Reports against us.

2. Another falsehood which is indeed from the wrong Information of Mr. Leddel, (that Man of heat, which much Water cannot Quench,) is this; that he should twice go to Mr. Smith to compare Copies and he refuse'd to do so, altho' his Copy was then finish'd. This is a downright falsehood as appears by the annexed Testimonial.

To convince the World of the falseness of what is said in the 2 Page of the first leaf of Dr. Russel's Dedication, with respect to my self; I do declare, that Mr. William Leddel never came to me but once, when he ask'd me whether I had Transcrib'd what I wrote at the Disputation? I told him, I had not, but intended to do it. He farther said, if I had, or when I had done it, he desired to have it to read over; and I should have Mr. Samuel Rings Copy which was Transcrib'd; to which I Answered, that I had but an Imperfect Account of the Matter, which I believe is the most that any Scribe who wrote at the dispute, could truly say of what they wrote, being so full of confusion occasion'd thro' the Anabaptist's loose and stuffing way of Arguing. Mr. Leddel never intimated to me any design they had to Print the Disputation; nor did I think they really intended any such thing, because not long before, In my own and several other Persons hearing, Mr. Leddel did protest against Printing it. I had not when he came to me Transcrib'd one word from my Copy, neither was it finish'd till about 14 Days since; had I known their design of Printing I would have gotten my Copy ready for them: Which might have prevent'd Dr. Russel from Publishing so many untruths to the World. Witness my hand the 10 day of July, 1699.

William Smith.
The Truth of the above Relation, I do attest; being present when Mr. Leddell came to Mr. Smith, and knowing what is said about the time of Transcribing his Copy to be True. Witness my hand the Day and year above said.

William Wallen.

3. It is false that Mr. Chandlers Sermons were the occasion of the Dispute, and much more, that this is agreed to by us. As he afferts pr. pag. 2. We are all of Opinion, Mr. Bow’s Impudent challenge was the occasion of it, tho’ Mr. Chandlers Sermons were the Innocent occasion of that challenge. So that according to the Proverb, he might as well have said Tenterden Steeple was the cause of Goodwin Sands.

4. It is false that it lay upon us to prove our Practice, when in the Preliminarys they that made the challenge undertook to be Afferters, and Dr. Ruffel took the Opponency upon himself: He hath also abus’d Dr. Smith, who told him as he was Affertor he must prove, but Negantis non est probare.

5. It is false that as he says pr. pag. 8. Mr. Robinson should in the midst of the dispute give him the lye, and yet could not make any thing out about it. This sentence contains as many Falsities as can possibly be crowded into so narrow a compass. That Mr. Robinson speaks with a loud voice, is what all that know him, know to be false. Yet this Gentleman ventures to say pag. 13. he bawl’d very loud; again pag. 35. Mr. Robinson stood up, made a noise like one in a Delirious Paroxym. What doth the Man mean to Write at such a rate as this? Surely he thinks loud lies will do no hurt.

And that Mr. Robinson ever did in the Disputation give him the lye, (as far as can by himself or Freinds be Recolleced, or be made appear by any Copy’s then taken) is wholly untrue; and this strange (if this Dignify’d Dr. So well Remember it) that he could find no place for it in his Narrative; that so the Circumstances that attended it, might have allisted our Memories.

Yet (that we may not wrong him,) Mr. Leigh owns the words as his. That without a Complement it was a lie in him, to infliname to the People, as if Mr. Leigh would have all Infants excluded from Heaven.

Besides he intimates, upon giving him the lie, there was a challenge made to the party to prove it, and yet he could make nothing out about it. Whereas there was never any such challenge given, and we are ready to prove to his Face, that in the Disputation itself he told more lies than one; tho’ he should not have had that care of Complement from any of us,
us, Had he but behaved himself like a Scholar or a Gentleman,
6. It is false that Mr. Francis Williams ever said that Mr. Robinson exceeded the bounds of a Moderator; or abused Dr. Ruffell in misrepresenting him to the People. The whole that Mr. Francis Williams said was this. when Mr. John Williams complain'd that Mr. Robinson exceeded his bounds, he reply'd; if he did so, it was Ruffell constrained him to it. But as to Mr. Robinson's abusing Ruffell, he positively declares he never said or thought any such thing. Much more might be said under this head, but the unexpected news of the Death of Old Mr. John Williams, restrained our Pen; to God he is gone to give his account, and we shall tread softly over his grave.
7. It is a false Misrepresentation, that Mr. Farrel should acknowledg they gain'd any Credit to their cause by the Disputation, as appears by the following extract of a Letter from him.

"I Solemnly appeal to the great God, who best knows what were my words, that to the best of my Remembrance, I spake to Mr. Williams after this manner. Mr. Williams, I must tell you, and that not as mine own Sentiment only, but (I believe I may speak it,) as the Sentiments of the rest of my Brethren, that whatever Credit (not your cause) but ye may have gain'd, is wholly owing unto you. To which Mr. Williams reply'd, don't Sir put that upon me. I Answer'd, I will speak it, for you argu'd with more Simplicity, and less Subtilty than Ruffell, and so were the fairer Disputant. These words thus in Civility spoken, had a plain Reference, not to the cause disputed, but Persons disputing, not to the strength of Argument but form and manner of arguing, (many things Mr. Farrel offers that shew this was his fent, which we think it needless to repeat, because the words thus Circumstanced carry their own Evidence with them,) he concludes his Letter thus—I now leave it to the Judgment of the Ingenuous, whether it can be fairly deduc'd from my words, that we were conscious of any Credit gain'd by them to their cause; or whether they are not conscious their cause was wounded, and interest sinking, when they readily catch at so vain a shadow, to support their Cause and Reputation. I will add no more, but that having perus'd the Narrative, find it so full of Fraud, Partiality, Falshood, and Misrepresentation; that this Instance may serve as a Specimen, if not of the whole, yet of the greatest part. Attested by George Farrel.

8. It is False, that the Advertisement in the Post-Man was ours. And we can apt but amaz'd at the Confidence of the man who dares lay anything. It was well Known to Old Mr. John Williams, before he left Gosport, that the Honourable Colo-
nel Gibbon sent up that Advertisement: He generously allow'd us to mention him as the Author of it, and hath given the annex'd Testimonial in Confirmation of it.

By Colonel JOHN GIBSON, Lieutenant Governour of Portsmouth, &c.

I do hereby Certify all whom it may any way concern, That the Advertisement put in the Printed Paper commonly called, The Post-Man, upon the 25th day of February, in relation to the Debate betwixt the Presbyterians and Anabaptists, held at the Presbyterian Meeting-house at Portsmouth, upon the 22d day of February; I say, the said Advertisement was inserted, as above, by my Direction. I do also own, I was then, and am still of the same Opinion as mentioned in the above-faid Advertisement. Witness my Hand at Portsmouth, June 9th. 1699.

J. GIBSON.

This we are well affirm'd Dr. Ruffel knew, as being told so, by some of Mr. Chandler's Friends at the Coffee-House in Alderstgate-street; when he gave the Honourable Lieutenant Governour such Scurrilous Names, as we will not foul our Paper with. Notwithstanding this, this Man hath the Impudence, to dedicate his false Narrative to him; Indeed with a Diminutive Title as if he were not Lieutenant Governour, Receiving an Immediate Commission from the King, but only deputy Governour, deputed by Major General Earl.

This he should have enquir'd into, before he had dedicated his Book to him. This Noble Gentleman is aspers'd and ridiculous as one of our unthinking admirers Nar. pag. 7. and a squinter out of Foolish Advertisements, words that need no other Inveotive than the Bare Relation, Pag. 10. what he adds further, that we would not give him the Civil Title of Dr. that he took his degree at Cambridge, admitted as a Member of that
Honourable Senate, and that not *Ex gratia*; is partly false. That he was created a Mandamus Dr. by King James in 1688. we understand, and with how great a Price this Tool bought that priviledg, we leave the World to Judg. But what he means by a Senate at Cambridg, is beyond our understanding. That he was not regularly chosen as one well furnisht' with the Learned Qualifications requir'd, his Ignorance in Greek we think to be a sufficient Evidence. We could also inform him to whom he apply'd himself for the better understanding of the Latine Tongue. That he also kept a Coffee-House in Bartholomew-Clofe, is well known to the Neighbourhood there. But supposing he he had been a Regular Dr. in Physic, as he titles himself, this may no more qualify him for a Divinity Disputation than being a Coffeeman. So that why he should insist on his Title, in this case, we know not.

Here we shall also take notice of another Falsity; that this bold Gentleman hath Publish'd amongst and by his Friends in London. Tho' he have not adventur'd it into his Narrative; one of us hath been affur'd by a Person that had it, from the Mouth of an Anabaptift of considerable note in London, that Dr. Ruffel, to put it out of doubt, that he and his Friends had carry'd the day at Portsmouth, added, the Bishop of Salisbury had received a Letter from Colonel Gibson, wherein he applauded their *i. e.* the Anabaptist's performance. That such a report hath spread abroad we are well affur'd. But that it is most Egregiously false, that Right Reverend Person whose name he hath made use of, hath given us leave to assure the World He doth indeed own he had a Letter from Colonel Gibson, his near Kinsman, Relating to the Disputation. But to a purpose quite opposite to what this Falsifier reports; and adds, that not only the Letter he Receiv'd, but one directed to the *Id. A. B.* of Canterbury, did Represnt the disputation as much to our advantage as could be desired.

To this fente his Lordship was pleas'd to express himself to Mr. Robinson our Moderator, (who waited on him on this occasion) and Generously allow'd us to make use of his Name, for the undeceiving the World in this matter.

9. It is false, what he intimates pr. pag. 11. that when we were pinch'd upon an Argument, we made a Noife and Clamour that hindred the People from hearing what was said. Whereas all that were present, we doubt not, well Remember, the first disturbance we had of that kind, was that mention'd in the Narrative, pag. 35, when the Anabaptists (upon the mention of our Saviour, as an Inflance of the Child of a Believer, not Baptiz'd till adult) rudely enough set up a flour.
And Mr. Nebber, Ignorantly cry'd, 'Tis done! 'Tis done! Tho' the Triumph was but short liv'd, for so soon as Mr. Leigh reply'd to the Instance, the Body of the People return'd 'em their Civility, and set up another shout at them. Besides which, there was no further Noise or Interruption of that Nature, till that rude Comparison of Children and Beasts of the Field, of which more afterwards. The last Interruption was, when Russel would have put us off with a bundle of Humane Testimonys, instead of proof, and we had once and again protested against them, and given our Reasons viz. that we had not the Authors at hand, to try the truth of his Quotations; besides that should they have said what he would have them, their Testimony would not necessarily Engage our assent, they being but fallible men. When after this he yet would trouble us with his Impertinent long Quotations, the People refus'd to hear him, and continu'd to his till he gave over reading; but what was said at the closing up of that head by us, doth sufficiently Manifest no Human Testimony can pinch us: It was the Ridiculous weakness and not the force of the Argument couch'd in his Testimonies, that occasion'd that noise. And if there was anything in it, that was a grievance to him; Let him thank his Anabaptist Friends that gave the first Example.

10. It is false, that Mr. Fox was dip'd by Mr. Williams's advice, Who was not then in the Country, nor did Mr. Earle know him. That it was done by Mr. Chandlers advice, is also false; for he was then at London. But that none of us would refuse to dip a Person in such a case, is true. We never pleaded against dripping as one way, but as the only way; not against its Lawfulness, but Necessity. So that this Instance is brought in to no purpose; and Brother Duke should have inform'd himself better in the Circumstances of this story, before he had convey'd it to London. Nay he was dip'd not at Gofport but Havana.

We shall purposely wave the Falsity in the Narrative itself, because our own account doth sufficiently manifest them. We shall only add that the Conclusion of the Book is as false as the rest. For he says p. 59, 60. That God was pleas'd to make the hearing of the dispute, of such use to several Persons; That they were fully convinced—and did in few days after, submit themselves to be dip'd in Water; whereas we can hear of no unpredjudiced Persons, Who were any way inclin'd towards Anabaptism, by any thing that was offer'd in the Disputation. And we challenge them to Name us one Person so convinc'd. Those that were fix'd in their Prejudices, might perhaps take their weak Arguments and Trifling Answers for a sufficient Confutation.
of Infant Baptism: But we provoke them to Name one unprejudic'd Person that did so. And do offer, for one such Person so named by them, We will, if they demand it, tell them the Names of several who did strongly incline to Anabaptism before, who by that Disputation were left right and fully satisfy'd, that the Anabaptist cause both rest on weak Unscriptural Principles, how loudly soever they pretend to Scripture.

G H A P. II.

Having thus far manifested, how little Regard the Anabaptist Dr. had to Truth in his Narrative, these were enough to be offer'd by way of reply; nor need there any thing more to discredit an History, than to shew that it is false. But we shall so far confed on the weakness of Injudicious Persons; as to animadvert also on the Trifling Impertinencies, his Narrative abounds with.

1. All the Arguments they offer'd were Trifling Cavils. The First was design'd to turn off the Opponency upon us. The 2d. supposes what was never granted them, that the only Commission and universal directory for Baptism is contain'd in Mat. 28. 19. Mar. 16. 16. For indeed if this were Christ's only Commission, then his Disciples did Baptize Job. 4. 2. without his Commission; for this Command was not then deliver'd: again, if this Command were design'd as an universal directory, then previous Examination, discourses of the Significancy and Obligation of this Sacrament; stated Prayer before and after, are besides the Commission. Nay, the Apostles did deviate from the Commission, when they Baptiz'd only in the Name of the Lord Jesus or of the Lord, Acts 10. Vul. 19. 5. this is therefore no other than extending the Commission to the Gentile World; supposing that the Practice of it both as to manner and Subjects was well known before, only then confined to the lost sheep of the House of Israel. So that Infants may be Baptiz'd if we can bring good proof for it out of the other parts of Holy Writ, tho' it could not be prov'd from Christ's Command: For the whole Scripture is the will of Christ; and his will discern'd in this Matter is his Commission. But supposing (not granting) this to be an universal directory, We distinguish'd between Disciples, that are compleat or incompleat. Compleat may be made by the Ministry of Men.
1. As by the Preaching of Men, Parents may be converted and constrain’d to give up all they have and are to God, and so their infants thus consider’d in their Parents, they are remotely made Disciples by the Ministry of Men.

2. They are immediately made Disciples by the Ministry of Men; by the Parents devoting them to God; and bringing them to his Ministers to be solemnly dedicated to him. Dr. Russell’s vain attempts to take off this distinction, may be taken notice of in the foregoing Narrative, to which we refer the reader, as also to observe the little Arguments they further us’d, and weak Answers they gave to our Arguments.

2. His Reflections in the time of the Disputation itself and what he hath added, are equally Trifling and Insignificant. For Instance.

1. What he insinuates p. 6. as if in effect we gave away our cause, because we refused (at that time) to give an Instance, where there was any thing recorded in Scripture, that did oblige us to Baptize Infants, whereas it then lay on them to prove the contrary: Our business (who were the Refpondents) was to attend their proof, the time was not yet come for us to produce our own. It was agreed that they who had reflected on the Doctrine of Infant Baptism as false and wholly untrue; should prove that it was so. Yet this Trifier when he had undertaken to prove, that Infants are not the Subjects of Baptism, At the very first would have put it upon us to prove they were so, and would persuade the company we gave away our cause, unless we did as he directed. This was Doctor like Truly! And one would not grudge, (however he came by it) to give him the Title, who does so powerfully carry all before him. You have his whole sense in these few words. Gentlemen, if I prove that Infants are not the Subjects of Baptism, you will allow I perform what I have undertaken, pag. 5. now this I’ll make so plain, you shall not be able to answer or evade the force of my Argument. Thus I argue; if they be the Subjects of Baptism, Mr. Leigh, Mr. Chandler or some Body else is able to prove it. But therefore they are not so: And now I have effectually done your business; for if you say you can prove it, let’s hear it; if not, you give away your cause. To this sense doth this mighty Man of Logic Flourish at the entrance, and Wonderful Feats no doubt he thinks he hath done in it: But such Egregious Trifling is hardly found among any pretending to the least degree above common Sense. And it was fitter to have been hit’sd out, than so soberly reply’d to as it was.
1. What! Do you prove that Infants are not the Subjects of Baptism, by putting us to prove that they are. Wonderful! this 'tis to be a Dr. and to know more than all the World besides.

For till this Dr. came upon the stage, these 2 things were always very differing (to make proof of a thing, and put another to prove the contrary.) This Gentleman undertook to prove p. 5. but (as if he repented of his rash undertaking) he very courteously invites us to change sides with him, and thereby free him of a burthen that was too heavy for him.

2. Nor is every untruth, the contrary to which we cannot prove true. We cannot prove that this Narrative, Russell ever was at Cambridge, or took his Degrees there; but would he have us therefore take the contrary for certain Truth? Yes, we must, according to his method. If one boldly assert against us, That he never was at Cambridge, we desire they would prove it before we give Credit to 'em. In his way they'll prove it too, and then we must needs grant it. Well, we wait only for the Proof. Thus it is. You cannot prove that he ever was at Cambridge, or took any Degree there. Therefore, behold, he was not. The strange Effects of Logick!

3. Nor if we can prove it, doth it follow we needs must? especially when he had undertaken the Opponyency. We that stood upon our Defence (as Respondents) were only to attend to what they had to offer, and show the invalidity of it; but were by no Laws of Disputation, that ever yet were publish'd to the World, oblig'd to change sides with them and take the proving part on us. Tho' this we declare we were ready to do in due time, but it was no way fit to be done at the beginning of the Disputation, unless this Doughty Dr. had said in plain words (as he did in effect in his first Argument,) Gentlemen, I have undertaken more than I can do. And therefore tho' I cannot prove that Infants are not the Subjects of Baptism, I should take it kindly if you would please to prove the contrary.

4. And as to his pretense, that his Proposition was an Universal Negative; Therefore we were oblig'd by it to give our Infancy: It is a great mistake, and contrary to all the uncontested Rules of Disputation, nor could any order possibly be observ'd, if it should be admitted. For how easy were it for an Opponent in any case, thus to oblige the Respondent to change places with him—which what confusion it would create, any one that hath an insight into these things, will easily imagine. That Rule hath therefore (as far as we can find) universally obtain'd.
Neuter Disputantium alterius partes suscipiat, neque opposites in partem Respondentis introiet; aut contra; And consequentially a very Principal part of the work of a Moderato lies, in keeping each within their proper Limits. Régimen praejudic in eò consistit, ut diligenter attentas, utrum Opponents & Respondens suo officio fungantur necne: Si usumque aut alterum ad officio suo recedensem confecet, cum sui munera adminet, & intra limites continent, ne extra oleas (ut dixit Sole) eunentur.

5. Nor will that known Rule Negantus non est probare, and asserenti incumbit probatio, mention'd by Dr. Smith at all avail our Anabaptist Champion: As indeed it never was intended by that Worthy Person to any such purpose, as he hath allow'd us to assure the World: and as did plainly enough appear to all the Judicious part of the Company, when he spoke those words: his design was (as the design of the Rule it self, at least when apply'd to Logical Disputations) that the Proof lies not on the Respondent, who only denies, or distinguishes upon his Adversary, but upon the Opponent, who is the Asserter, whether his Arguments run in an Affirmative or Negative Form. But thus much is more than sufficient to expose his ridiculous Trifling under that Head.

2. He next reflects upon Mr. Chandler, as if he was at a Loss, so that Mr. Leigh and Mr. Robinson were forced to help him out with their Distinctions and Equivocal Expressions, page 11. Whereas, if Mr. Leigh did offer any Distinctions, 'twas what belong'd to him, as an appointed Disputant with Mr. Chandler: And that they spoke promiscuously, is owing to a Proposal made by the Anabaptists, that the Disputants might be allow'd it; which accordingly was agree'd before we went to the place of Disputation. So that 'tis Ridiculous Trifling for him, from Mr. Leigh's sometimes speaking, who was allow'd equal Liberty with Mr. Chandler himself, to infer that Mr. Chandler was at a Loss, and Mr. Leigh for'd to help him out. And it is somewhat more than Trifling, and should be insert'd among the Falshoods, what he affirms, p. 16. That Mr. Chandler finding himself unable to answer, quitted the place of a Disputant, and Mr. Leigh desir'd to take it up, which was admitted upon condition, &c. Whereas it was moy'd the Night before the Disputation, when the Anabaptists came in a Body to us at Mr. Williams's Houfe, That we would admit the Principal and his Second to speak promiscuously. The Reason given was, Because Dr. Russell, or Mr. John Williams, had an Infirmity that sometimes disabled him from speaking for a considerable time togerer. We took till the morning to consider of the Proposal, and then at the Hour and Place prefix'd we gave that Liberty to them, provided the same might be allow'd to us, which was
conceded to. Upon which it was resolved on both sides, that the Disputants should be allow'd to assist each other, as they saw occasion. With what Face now can this man intimate to the world, that Mr. Leigh, in the midst of the Disputation beg'd leave to speak, and could not be admitted but upon Terms: And all this only to set off that Falsc Lie, viz. That Mr. Chandler quitted the Place of a Disputant.

But to return to what we were upon: Mr. Leigh help'd out Mr. Chandler with his Distinctions. We grant he was helpful to him, and was chosen for that purpose, and was not Mr. Williams; also to the best of his skill helpful to Dr. Russel? But Mr. Leigh help'd out Mr. Chandler, and Mr. Williams did his best to help out Dr. Russel, tho' thro' the badness of the Cause, he neither did, nor could help him out. But Mr. Robinson help'd too with his Distinctions. 'Tis false; and his own Narrative (as it happens) will manifest it to be so; for that Distinction there mention'd by Mr. Robinson, is there mentioned not as his own, but Mr. Chandler's; and it was only mention'd to shew the no occasion he had to spend Time in proposing such frivolous Questions; a sufficient Answer to which he had already had from Mr. Chandler.

There only remains under this head, Mr. Leighs and Mr. Robinsons helping out Mr. Chandler with their Equivocal Expressions. But this (Equivocal) like the Senate at Cambridge, is a word of the Famous Drs. own coinage, and therefore he best knows the meaning of it. Equivocal we have often heard of, but equivocal we know not what to make of, unless by this, added to the Hebrew and Greek Instances of his Learning, we be left to collect that (as he says) he was Created a Dr in the most proper Sense Ex Inhabiti Materia. Doctor ex non doto. Yet if he intend Equivocal Expressions, tho' he charge them upon us, they are his own peculiar Talent. Perhaps few if any herein equal or exceed him at that sort of Weapon. If any thing said by us, was grievous to him, it was not that we us'd Equivocal Expressions of our own, but that we repeated and distinguished upon his.

3. How impertinently doth he Trifle, when he over-loaded his 3d Argument with a multitude of Propositions? Tho' Mr. Leigh deny'd first, That the Apostle Paul did never declare that Infant-Baptism is a Gospel Institution; yet could he never have it prov'd. Suppose he did (which yet he neither did nor can) prove that Paul never declar'd it in his Writings, yet how will he ever prove that he never declar'd it at any time by word of mouth? which yet if he assert, he must prove. And how frivolously doth he afterwards talk of our having in our Custody
any such unwritten Tradition? We never did assert, the Apostle Paul did declare any such thing by word of mouth that is not written, only said, he might do it, and put this wonderful man to prove he did not. And how infallibly weak and trifling are all the Reflections he hath under this Head cast upon us! While this was the Sum of what was said to his Minor or Antecedent. But afterwards we deny'd also his Major or consequent; that unless Paul declar'd the Baptism of Infants, it was no part of the Counsel of God, which (by his own account) he never prov'd; nor is it indeed capable of proof, unless what Paul declar'd must stand instead of the whole Scripture to us. And tho' the Apostle tells us, he had not shunn'd to declare, yet he never tells us that he had actually declar'd the whole Counsel of God, Acts 20. 27. οὐκ ὑπερεξιλασθεὶς. The word intimates he did not prevaricate with them, or fraudulently keep back any truth, that in the course of his Ministry among them, he had a call from God, to deliver to them: He did not do as Peter faintly did Gal. 2. 12. οὐχ ὑπερεξιλασθέναι, who with-drew, sought Subterfuges thro' a mean and Timorous Spirit, conceald the truth when it was most especially to be own'd by him; and for which the Apostle rebuk'd him v. 11. now (says he) I did not from any such mean or base Principle, suppress or hide from you, or misrepresent to you any part of the Mind of God; but have freely and boldly declar'd to you, so far as I had opportunity, and there was any occasion for it, the whole Counsel of God. Not that we can imagine the Apostle had any opportunity to declare the whole of what God had at any time, by any Messenger, reveal'd of his Counsel. Nor was there occasion he should spend his Time among them upon such Points with which they were well acquainted before; especially while he had himself immediate Revelations from Heaven to communicate to them. If therefore it could (as it never can) be prov'd that Paul never said a word of Infant Baptism to them, it would by no means follow that it is no part of the Counsel of God: but only, that it was no part of what was immediately reveal'd from Heaven to himself, nor any thing that he needed to infult upon among them, who might otherways and sufficiently be instruct'd about it. We might therefore (when we had deny'd the consequence) with just Reason say as p. 21. Suppose but not grant that Paul had not spoken a word of Infant Baptism, yet they cannot in the least advantage their cause by it. And so our Opposition stands good against that Argument, even as he himself doth represent the closing of it.

4. His Reflection upon us especially upon Mr. Robinson, for refusing to admit him to arrange the People upon the words of
of the Commission is (if possible) yet moretring.Was he not not allow'd to argue from the Commission? And was not that all that was fit to be allow'd him? Was he interrupted in reading the Text? What would the Man have? Why verily he wanted to illuminate us and our hearers with his Preachement upon the Text. Poor Ignorant Souls! He perhaps apprehended we could not understand the Commission without his help; In the presence of so many Ministers and particularly of him that had the right of the place; he might have had the Civility to have ask'd leave, or to have forborn till invited to it. Besides he knew our company came together, not to hear a Sermon especially from him, but to attend a Disputation: The man must by all means Preach and having nam'd a Text, he begins; This Commission is very solemnly deliver'd, wherein our Lord tells us, that all power in Heaven and Earth is given to him, and by virtue of that Power.—And here he takes it ill to be interrupted.—And we must be reflected on as Lucifuga Scripturarum, Bats and Owls that are afraid of the Commission, and fly the light of the Scripture, because we would not suffer him to go on with his Impertinent Harangue: As if it was all one to refuse to hear a Text of Scripture read, to as hear his Comment upon it: How excessively doth this man dote on his own Labours!

5. How Egregiously doth he trifle p. 24, when because our Moderator would not suffer Mr. Calvin's Authority to stand for an Argument, he Reflects as if he had no esteem for him. Whereas there are few Names since the Apostles days, for which he hath so great a Veneration. What! is it impossible, in this Dr's opinion, to have a Veneration for a Person, unleas we take his, ipse dixit, and swallow down all he says without chewing. But doth Mr. Calvin any where say, That the whole of the Commission is expressed in Mat. 28. 19. Mar. 16. 16. And the he say, Infants are not expressly mention'd in this Command, yet we are sure his Comment on the Place (which will best discover his Judgment) says, That God includes Infants in speaking to their Parents; and so that Baptism, when apply'd to Infants, is not separated from Faith and teaching. And this he speaks in opposition to the Anabaptists, who made a great noise against Infant-Baptism, upon this Pretence. See his own words, Harm. Evang. in Mat. 28. 19. Verum quia doceo prius iubet Christus, quam Baptizare; et tanum credentes ad Baptismum vult recipi, videtur non rite administrari Baptismus, nisi fides praecedit: atq; hos praetextus multum tumultuasti; sum Anabaptista contra Pedo-Baptismum; Soluto tamen non difficilis est. And so goes on to answer this Argument. Wherein he hath these Words, Qua olim Judeis data fuit promiss., Inter gentes quae; vigeat hostie, necessa est. Ero Deus tuis & Seminis sui, Gen. 17. 7. Isra
etos qui sine in Ecclesiâm Dei ingressi sunt, videmus cum sua sobole conditi in Christi membris, & in iis suis Hereditatem simul vocari. Nec vero separatur hoc modo Baptismus a sive vel Doctrina, quia licet parvi Infantibus nondum per eam præcipiant Dei gratiam, Deus tamen eorum Parentes commissos ipsos etiam complevitur. If this Famous Dr. hath not yet it in'd to considerable Proficiency in the Latin Tongue, as to construe this, there are many Worthy Doctors of the Colledge will assist him. Let the Judicious consider whether Calvin's Judgment and this Gentleman's be the same concerning this Command; and what a vain Flourish it is to bring in Calvin on this occasion. What he soon after adds, p. 24. to reflect on Mr. Robinson, as interrupting him, is as little to the purpose. He that pretends to Learning, and needs to hear any more of an Hypothetical Syllogism, than the Major, or consequence, is none of Solomon's wise men. 'Twas as well known to Mr. Robinson what would follow as to Dr.R. the Speaker. How is it then that he inuates as if he answered a matter before he heard it?

6. As to what he says p. 30. about Erasium's skill about the Etymology of a Greek Word, 'tis most ridiculously impertinent. Mr. Williams had a little before, very honestly acknowledg'd, that for his part, he neither knew what belong'd to Greek or Latin, and yet prefently quotes Erasimus as reading the Commission. Go Teach all Nations, and when they have learn'd dip them. Mr. Robinson remembering what he had said before, admir'd to hear him quote Erasimus: and therefore ask'd him whether Erasimus ever wrote in English? Or how he knew that he so read the Commission? But there was not a word said by any one about Erasimus's skill in the Etymology of a Greek word, but he must still be trifling.

7. The fury of the Eunuch p. 31. is like all the rest; for Mr. Leigh said not that the Eunuch had Children, but if he had had one or more, they must not be look'd on as the Children of a Pagan. He consider'd him not as an Eunuch but as a Christian. Besides might he not have adopted ones? Nay, might he not have Children, and be afterwards made an Eunuch? Besides all this we will tell the Dr. what he never knew before, and what is better worth his Learning than Old Women's Fables. And that is, that the word D? D is Equivalent to qui, & signifieth not only Eunuchus eviratus, but Princeps, Minifter regius. Thus Potipher is call'd an Eunuch or Officer of Pharaoh, tho' he had a Wife if not Children. Gen. 39. 1. So Gen. 40. 2. The chief Butler and Baker are call'd Eunuchs or Officers. Jer. 29. 2. The Nobles and Princes of Judah are call'd by this same Name in the Hebrew and Greek, and it is not probable they were all Eunuchs. Words have a different Signification in different
ing Ages; and tho' this word bear an Infamous Sense in this Age, yet formerly it had a more Honourable Signification. It would be we think profane and grating to Christian Ears, for any to call the Sweet Ordinance of singing Psalms, by the Name of Ballad Singing, as this Dr. doth in his Animadversions upon his Brother Allen's Essay on that Subject. Tho' he Justifies his himself from the Old Translation that calls the Song of Songs, the Ballad of Ballads; he might as well fav Paul was a Knave, because the same Translation calls him the Knave instead of Servant of Jesus Christ. To apply this to our purpose, the word Runich tho' now us'd in an Infamous, was once us'd in an Honourable sense, and the most Learned Critics tell us that this Noble Man had no such Infamous Character, but was high Treasurer or Chamberlain to Queen Candace. A Lapide, Menschius, Lud. de Fgni in Loc. So that all the Dr. here hath said is nothing but vain b BOOKING; And methinks what he says of the Turks Seraaglio, is too Lusious for a man of his Gravity. But if ever he had been entered in that Academy, the World had never rung with such scandalou Reports Turpiadie, concerning him.

8. Another Trifle you find, p. 32. That there cannot agree with Nations, because then is Malevolent, and Nations Neuter; but Relationem omni Antecedente concordat generis, numero & Personae. Alas, poor Dr. did you read this in your Latin or Greek Grammar? Not in your Greek certainly; for there you might have found somewhat better for the purpose. That by the Figure Synthetis quae de ubi relationem ad intellectum seu sensillum non ad vocem conformationis. And you have a Scripture-Instance for it, Gal. 4. 19. 

Tibi, μὴ δέ τοι ἀκοίνων ἡ Ὀνομασία. Nay, had you been able to read your Greek Testament you might have met with Instances as to this very word, Acts 15. 17. 21. 25. 26. 17. Rev. 2. 26. 27. 19. 14. in all which places, ἡ Ὀνομασία agrees with οὗτος and ἄνευ. So that if we not a rule in the Grammar to this purpose, it would have been highly fit to have Substituted one for this very occasion, rather than all these Texts should be accounted false Greek; and this we hope is a solid Answer worthy noting down, tho' the Dr. retiring it five leaves after forgot himself, and said we had no such Answer. But the Dr. hath recourse to Mr. Godbold for his Assistance, who tells him that the Antecedent must be not the Verb, as he said in the dispute, but the Noun μὴ δέ τοι ἀκοίνων; but where is this to be found? It is not in the Text, unless the Verb be the Noun. But if the Dr. had been as well acquainted with his Greek Grammar, as with that Beloved Book of Mr. Godbold, he might have prevented our Trouble and the discovery of his own Ignorance.
Tis as Ridiculous to abuse his dear Friend, and prefix false Greek as a Title to his Book, when at least in that Edition we have seen there is only a plain English Title, of the Doctrine of Baptisms; calling it βαπτισμος διαφορα, but there he may think himself safe, in keeping to the letter of the Scriptures; for the letters are the same, Heb. 6. 2. from whence the Title is taken. As the Dr. before could not distinguish between a Verb and a Noun, so here he is not to great a Critick, as to distinguish between the Nominative case and Genitive, but enough of this stuff.

9. How Impertinently did he alledge, p. 35. Confinuation, he great, as a Scripture Instance of a Believers Child Born and at Grown Years? What Dr. skip 200 Years at once, when you are pinch'd! Sure this Nimble Man was a Merry-Christmas before he commenced, Dr. It was a Scripture instance we call'd for, and an Instance of one Born in the latter end of the 3rd or Beginning of the 4th Century, is given. Besides, the Father of Christian was a Pagan, and it can't be prov'd that his Mother Helena was a Christian in her Sons Infancy. As to his Honour of the Fathers of the first Ages; we remember, not that it was mention'd in the Disputation, nor is it in any of the Copies; tho' we remember the Dr. pretended that for the first 600 Years, Infants were admitted to Communion in the Lords Supper, upon which one of us reply'd; then by your own confession, they were Baptiz'd, otherwise the other Sacrament would not be administred to them; which Silenced the Dr. and we heard no more of the Fathers that day. But if the Dr. dare be so hardy, as to abide by the Testimony of the Fathers, we will Joyn Issue with him here, whenever he pleases.

10. How Impertinently doth he Harangue, (by way of Apology chiefly) pag. 35. 36. 37, for his having let our Infants upon a level with brutes. But all that he can say, can never excuse that beastly Comparison. Nay, to make the matter worse, after he had thought of it again at London, where he drew up the greatest part of this Apology, as we suppose, for we had little of it at Portmouth; Yet still he had the face to challenge us to shew the Disparity if we can: As if it was his fixed Opinion, that there is no difference between our Children and our Dogs. We must confess we said little to it, as thinking it rather deserv'd stripes than an Answer. And the Honourable Colonel Gibson did profess to us, (the day after the Disputation) that he was so offended at it, that he would thereupon have quitted the place, had not some Gentlemen near him prevailed with him to stay, telling him if he went off, there was Danger,
the provoked Multitude would do him some mischief. And truly an higher affront cannot be put upon any Parent, than to make his Infants no better than Brutes. But he bears us in hand, he hath a mighty esteem for our Infants, even a greater than we have, for he hath over and over given it as his Opinion, that they are all sav'd that Die in Infancy. Now the Infants of Believing Parents we find in the compass of a promise. God will be their God and the God of their seed. Gen. 17. 7. So far therefore we may safely go. But seeing God hath not told us, how he deals with the Infants of others, we dare not pretend to enter into his Secrets, or to tell what we do not know. 'Tis enough for us, that God will accept the dying Infants of such as have sincerely devoted 'em to him. And for others, they are not concerned how God will deal with them. That Man can never be truly concern'd about the Salvation of his Child, that never was solicitous about his own. But after all, what strange kind of Salvation, what before unheard of Heaven hath this Gentleman discovered for Creatures, between whom and beasts there is no disparity! What! No difference, no unlikeness at all! For we hope he may have Learning enough to know the English of Disparity. Well! (whatever this Dr. can satisfy himself with,) we do both for our selves and dear Babes, wait and pray for such a Salvation and such a Heaven, out of which are excluded all Dogs and Hogs, and all of beastly Capacities and Inclinations, whether you take the Word Brute in a Natural or Moral Sense. Yet left this Man should think his Retortion, as he calls it, unanswerable, we add, there is a vast disparity between Beasts and the Youngest Infants. For (as was hinted in the time of the Disputation.) (tho' this Narrative not only omits but deny's it,) Supposing them utterly incapable of the Duties, yet no one can deny but they are capable of the Blessings and Privileges of the Baptistical Covenant.

They are capable of being Pardon'd, Justify'd, Sanctify'd and Glorified, and is it so with Brutes? But further, Infants are capable of being oblig'd to the Duties of the Covenant, tho' they be not in a present Capacity to discharge them. Thus the Jewish Infants by Circumcision were oblig'd to the Duties of that Covenant, tho' during their Infant state they could not actually discharge them. If they had not been thus oblig'd, how could they upon their after-forsaking God, be call'd Covenant Breakers, as we fin'd they are Exek. 16. 8. 95. and oft elsewhere. Their Circumcision made them Debtors, brought them under obligation to the Law, Gal. 5. 3. Lastly, Infants have a Fundamental and remote Capacity, to discharge the Duties of
the Covenant; tho' they have not an immediate Capacity for it. They have a Principle of Reason, tho' they have it not perhaps in present exercise: Now is there yet no disparity, between them and Beasts? Tho' so soon as they have a being, they are capable of the Blessing of the Gospel Covenant; and as to the Duties of the Covenant which is all that remains to be consider'd in it, they have such a Reasonable understanding Nature, as doth remotely capacitate them for the discharge of these Duties, and that doth most nearly and immediately Capacitate them to come under Obligations thereto: So that Infants (as incapable of any of ours.) have been all along (ever since there was a Sacrament appointed for that purpose,) Solemnly enter'd into Covenant with God, tho' we never find that any Brutes were.

11. What an Impertinent Trifer doth this Man shew himself again, pag. 37. when instead of proving that Dipping is the only way of Baptizing, He would have put us to prove that Sprinkling is the way. That 'tis not the only way we Grant; that it is not a Lawfull way he can never prove. But the Question was not whether that was the way: But whether Dipping, Plunging, Overwhelming was the only way? And when we held him to the proof of that, He knew not how to alter the Argument, so as to bring the words of the Question into the Conclusion of his Syllogism: We then perceiv'd him to be Clericus in Libro; and that, when put out of his Road, he was lost. However that he might seem to say somewhat he told the Company, his Argument was an Induction. It should be remembered, that he had lately been confound'd by Mr. Leigh's Induction: and many Reasons concur, to make it probable, that he scarce ever heard so much as the Name before. But with them that understand the thing as little as himself, a hard word would make it look as if he had somewhat to say. This therefore must be an Induction. But his Argument he brought being only level'd against one particular thing, (which the Nature of an Induction doth not admit,) Mr. Gbandier told a pleasant story from the late Bishop of Worcester, of a Covey of Patridges which yet was but one. Adding, were we have as Wonderful a thing, an Induction of one. What he adds afterwards is what we suppose he may have Learnd since his return to London, for we Remem- ber nothing of it. Nor is it in any of the Copy's, whether on our side or theirs.

12. His Argument from Rom. 6. 4, pag. 38. 39. is very ridiculous: Because we are said to be Buried with Christ in Baptism, therefore it must necessarily be by Dipping. This is distinctly Answer'd by Mr. Chandler in his Sermons: But because
because the main stress of the Anabaptists cause in this point leans upon it. We shall not satisfy our selves to have gravel'd them in the Disputation, when we deny'd both parts of the Argument as they form'd it; neither of which they were able to prove: But for the help of such as need it, Shall let this matter in a clear Light; In order to which let it be considered,

1. It is one thing for us to be Buried with Christ in Baptism, and another thing for Baptism to represent a Burial. The former the Apostle sais: The latter only Dr. Ruffel and his Brethren. We are (as the Apostle largely Treats. Rom. 6. 3. 4. 5. 6.) Baptiz'd into Christ's Death, Burial, Resurrection. That is, we are solemnly enter'd into the Christian Covenant, which is founded in, and secur'd by, the Death, Burial, and Resurrection of our Lord: Which thereupon most strongly obliges us to Die unto Sin, rise to, and walk in, newness of Life: But where doth he say a Syllable to intimate that our Baptism must represent these things? Our Baptism is to oblige us here to, and is accordingly urg'd by the Apostle, for that purpose, throughout this context: But we would beg any one to shew us any Intimation, that our Baptism is to represent these things.

2. And if Baptism must represent these things, it must represent all as well as any of them. There is at least as great if not greater evidence from the Context, That the Death of Christ, the manner and likeness of it, as that the manner of his Burial should be Represented in our Baptism. For besides that we are said to be Baptiz'd into his Death, v. 3. we are also said to be planted in the likeness of his Death. v. 5. whereupon v. 6. it follows, our Old Man is Crucify'd with him. But we are nowhere said to be planted in the likeness of his Burial. Now what is there in your Administration, that doth represent the likeness of Christ's Death, his Crucifixion? By the same Reason that you would prove dipping necessary in Baptism, a Papist or any other Person may prove crossing necessary too, and therefore the same Answer will Invalidate both: i.e. that neither of them are requir'd to be represented.

3. Tis as Trifling, what he adds pag. 39. where he says Mr. Chandler grants that Baptism doth signify a Burial and Resurrection: Mr. Chandler only suppos'd, did not grant it: Besides he had granted it, it would not thence follow, that it must necessarily be by dipping. For,

1. In our way, by pouring water on the Face, we represent Christ's Death; the pouring out of his Blood and Soul: His Burial; The Face; the Principal part of Man being put under
water, or having water poured on it, as Earth is poured on a Dead Body: His Resurrection; When the Child is taken up, and deliver'd again to its Parents or Offerers. This is a sufficient Allusion in Christian Sacraments, which are Commemorative of what is past; and there needs not a more exact Resemblance. Nay, it is as significant as breaking Bread, and pouring out Wine, to Represent the Sacrific'd Body and Blood of Christ.

2. If they will keep strictly to the Significancy of a Burial, the person to be Baptiz'd must not walk into the water, but be taken up by the Baptizer, and cast down into it. For indeed there is only this difference between our way and theirs: We Baptize the Face, and they Baptize the head and shoulders too: Unless the Person going down into the Water, may be said to baptize himself. And then there are more Se-Baptists among them than we ever understood before.

3. The Anabaptists in Holland are sensible of the necessity of Dipping, that the general way among them at Amsterdam is to baptize by pouring Water upon the Head. We need not send Dr. Russel cross the Seas (as he would us to the Turks Seraglio), but to a place better known, the Amsterdam Coffee-houfe, to enquire into the Truth of this. We would only here ask the Dr. these Two Civil Questions,

1. Whether he might not have spair'd all his Dutch? seeing Doope in that Language signifies only to wash, and is us'd when they only pour on Water?

2. Whether his Anabaptist Friends at Amsterdam do practice a Right Baptism? If n't, whether he would Baptize them again, or exclude them from the Church of Christ, as he doth us in his Closing Prayer of which more Anon? If he owns their Baptism Lawfull, Then why such a Clamour and Noise about a Circumstance? If their way is Justifiable, so is ours.

13. How Egregiously doth he Trifle, when he tells us that he is joynd with an Accusative cafe Signifys into. All that we can know from thence, is (what we well knew before) that tho' this Man pretends to be a dignify'd Dr, yet he hath not the Learning of a Common School Boy. When 'tis joynd with an Accusative—Why pray Dr. what other case doth it any way admit? We had thought Soli accusative, had been a Rule no one could have missed, that had but once cast his Eye on the Common Grammar? Well Sir: If you have any regard to your Reputation, we would advise you never more
14. As to his Humane Testimonys, They are of little value with us, for the Reasons given in the Disputation: And it was an Evidence of the wretched weaknes of his cause, that these must stand instead of an Argument with him. Thefe Testimonys he hath chiefly borrow'd from Danvers, and how Imperfectly and lamely they are quoted may be seen in Mr. Wills and Mr. Baxter's Anwers to him. So that to waft time and Paper about them is but actum agere: We shall therefore only put these following queries to him.

1. Will you f tand by the Authority of thefe Men in other Matters? If not, why would you have us in this?

2. Do any of thefe say that to wash is not the New Testament fentence of the word Baptize? Or do any Anwer thefe places we brought? Or prove us in the wrong? Or how many places can any bring where it necelfarily signifies to dip? We take not Mens Opinions upon Trust, but Trial.

3. How few are there of thefe Learned Authors, who have not adher'd to that in Mr. 12. 7. I will have Mercy and not Sacrifice, To J uify their Baptizing with a little Water in these Cold Countreys?

4. Will not the Opinion and Practice of your Brethren in Holland, argue as strongly against you, as the Opinions of thefe Men, (had their Practice been dipping also) do-against us?

5. Will not the Opinion and Practice of fo many Thousand Men, great for Learning, and Piety at this day, argue more strongly for us; than thefe Mens Opinions only, without their Practice do against us?

15. We have another Trifle pag. 45. They had pleaded Philip and the Eunuch went both down into the Water. It had been reply'd that the word only signifies they went down to the Water. But Mr. John Williams ventures upon a Greek Criticism, and tells us, he was inform'd there were 2 differing words in the Greek Text, where 'tis said v. 36. they came unto a certain Water, and v. 38. they went into. This Dr. Kusett confirm'd and thereupon, (as they represent the Matter.) Mr. Keigh conceifs'd. There is a word for you. 'Tis well we understand a little Latine: Otherwise this Man would quite Silence us. But
to the Point: whoever told them there were 2 differing words in the Greek, told them true. And we are very ready to concede, or (as we would chuse to speak, conform and yield to Truth. The words are οὐ and εἰς; and the true reading of v. 36th is, As they went on their way, they came by, near to, or over against, a certain Water: εἰς, with an Accusative, well admits such a reading. And v. 38. they went both down out of the Chariot into this Water. How well do these 2 verses Answer each other? and where's the difficulty this wonderful Critic hath laid upon us? But, What need of going down to the Water, unless he were to be dip'd? A little might have been brought up into the Chariot if Sprinkling would have serv'd the turn. In answer to which we say,

1. His going down to, or into the Water, doth no more prove that the Eunuch was dip'd, than that Philip was; for both went down.

2. 'Tis Improbable he was dip'd, being then on a Journey, and having no cloths to change.

And if you still ask why they went down?

3. 'Tis not certain, they were provided with a vessel to fetch up Water in.

4. There was not convenient Room in the Chariot for the performance of the Action, and what was to attend it. 'Tis not to be doubted, but it was attended with Prayer: your selves, we hope, would not administer Baptism without Prayer, before, or after, or both. But what Room could there be in a Chariot, for these two Persons to place themselves in a Praying posture? It would neither admit them, (at least if of the Modern form) to stand nor kneel without uneasiness—Which alone might be a sufficient Reason, for their coming down out of the Chariot, if there were no other.

16. How he trifled about the Hebrew Bible, and how fallly he represents, that matter appears by our Narrative. Mr. Ring had given over writing long before this; and Mr. Bows and Mr. Webster were affam'd of their Goliath, and therefore about this time basely deserted and left him alone. The true account in short is this. Mr. Chandler told Dr. Ruffel that Baptism was so far from always signifying to dip, that Baptism itself sometimes signifies to wet or wash; And mention'd that Text. Dan. 4. 33: Nebuchadnezzar was wet with the dew of Heaven, in the Greek it is ἔκφρυγμα. To which Ruffel reply'd the Hebrew is not הָבֵל To which Mr. Chandler return'd the Greek word we were then in-
inquiring into. However, to try his skill in Hebrew, who had so handsomely failed'd in the Greek, he was ask'd what the
Hebrew word was. He said, if he had an Hebrew Bible he could
tell. Mr. Chandler handed him being Asher's 2d Ediz. Amstel,
1668. with the Books in Latin Letters, placed after the same
order with other Hebrew Bibles. He could not find the place, but
read Gen. 1. 1., which he also fairly Pronounced. Mr. Chandler re-
turn'd: Sir we come not hither, to inquire whether you can
read Hebrew, but what the Hebrew word is in this place. Then
Mr. Robinson folded down the place for him: On which he
mutter'd something to himself, which his nearest Neighbours
could not hear; and said the word was not there. But he furt
not told us to this day what the word is. Hebrew Bibles are all
misplac'd with him; for we hear from good hands that at Ha-
ming in Fex, he was confound'd with the same place, and
could not find the Prophecy of Daniel. Now, we would be
friend him against he engages in the next Hackney Prize, and
inform him of a great Secret; That Daniel is mostly Chidler
and the word there is not Tabal, but Zeving YEB, a word of
the same Import. And this Mr. Chandler understand'd, and
before he was Born, but before the Creation of Mr. Rhett.
C H A P. III.

By this time it appears how unregardable both this pretended Narrative is, and it's pretended Author. A Pamphlet stuffed with such Notorious Fallacies, and where it happens to speak Truth, trifling to Egregiously. With what contempt doth it deserve to be Treated by the World? But there is yet one thing further, that may help to discover the man, and that is the Notorious and uncharitable Principles, that have dropped from him; and these we shall briefly advert upon.

2. In the very first page of the Narrative, Speaking of Mr. Chandler's Thursday Lectures at Pershanger, he tells you they were managed, so as was to the Grief of such as truly Fear God in those parts. Why? What was the Offence? He tells you it was given out, that Mr. Chandler would not only prove Infant Baptism from Scripture; but also furnish his hearers with Arguments to defend their Practice. Why? We cannot imagine how this should grieve any that truly Fear God. To have a truth proved, a truth about which so many good Men differ, to have it cleared from Scripture Testimony, to have the Oracles of God unfolded about it: This strange should be grievous to any; Yes (says he) it was to the Grief of them that truly Fear God in those parts. We are at a loss to know the Reason why it should be grievous to any such, and here he will not help us out. However (say we,) was it to the grief of God as were persuaded of this Truth? Were they grieved to have it cleared up and be furnished with Arguments for the defence of it? This can't be his meaning. Every one is pleas'd to see what he believes to be the truth, set in a clear Light—those that were for the Baptism of Infants could not be grieved at it: No, that he doth not say, but those that Fear God, that truly Fear him, were grieved at it. So that (with him) some that are for Infant Baptism in those parts will be allowed only to Fear God. Not one besides the poor Baptists, as he calls them, p. 2. Here's Charity with a Witness. All the Regular Members of the conforming and non-conforming Congregations, are content'd as delineate of the true Fear of God.
God! Pray Dr. your Reason for this! Will you condemn us and not tell us why? What is there in the notion of Infant Baptism that is inconsistent with the Fear of God? Why may not a Person be of Opinion, that he ought with the greatest seriousness to devote and consecrate his Children to God; and enter them by Baptism into his Covenant, and bring them under early bonds to him, and yet for all this truly Fear God? Nay the rather do it, because he truly Fears God?

2. That he may shew it is not an unwary Expression, but his deliberate Judgment; He doth in the very last Paragraph of his Pamphlet lay the same fires on the Point of Dipping. His concluding Prayer is, that as God had made the hearing of the dispute of such use to several Persons, that they were fully convinced, and did a few days after submit to be dipped—So it may be of like use to many others in the Reading—That so there may be added to the Church such as shall be saved. Such a Prayer scarce ever before appear'd in Print, made up of fallacy and uncharitableness. It is amazing to us that a man dare venture into the presence of God with a lie in his Mouth, and such uncharitableness in his Heart. The fallacy we have animadverted upon, Cap. 1. Paragraph 10. The uncharitableness we are now to take notice of. He prays that as several by hearing, so many others by reading, may be convinced and submit to be dipped; that so there may be added to the Church, such as shall be saved. What apprehensions must this man have of those that never were dipped? Why they are not yet added to the Church.—No not to the Anabaptists Church! but we doubt not, but Multitudes are added to the Church of Christ, that never were dipped. Yet whatever we think, this charitable man will not allow, they can otherwise than be, added to the Church, and consequently no otherwise saved. Here is his Religion! It consists in denying Infant Baptism, and assenting the Necessity of Dipping. If you agree with him in these, and accordingly submit to be dipped, you are (according to him so far as we can find,) added to the Church that shall be saved. No mention of Faith, Repentance, Obedience, inward purity; your being dipped in water upon profession, is with him instead of all these: But tho' you be Regenerate and Sanctified throughout in body, Soul and Spirit, Walk humbly with God, and unblamably before Men; Yet if you were Baptized only in your Infancy, or if when adult, not by dipping: There is no hope for you if this man were to be your Judge. But blessed be God, we are to be try'd at another Bar. And therefore with us it is a very small matter to be juss'd by him
(85)

or. Mans day, 1 Cor. 4. 4. knowing that he that will judge us is the Lord. To whose righteous Judgment we appeal, and for which we sit in hope.

But let this Mans notions of Religion be never so narrow and uncharitable, we declare our Religion is of no less compass than Christianity it self. All that hold the Essentials of Religion, we account to be of the same Religion with us: Tho’ they differ from us in some inconsiderable matters. We will not be persuad’d to look upon the English Episcopal, or the Foreign Presbyterian. The Congregational, or Anabaptists themselves, to be of a differing Religion from us; to be destitute of the True Fear God, or shut out of Christ’s Church, Religion consists in that which is Common to the Pious and Sober of all these Party’s, and not in any thing that distinguisheth them from each other.—We abominate such a narrow strait-laced Principle, as would place Religion in being for or against Liturgies, for or against this or that form of Church-Government, for or against Infant Baptism, or this or that mode of Administration. These things are none of them great enough, to be the Terms of Eternal Life: The Final Sentence will not proceed upon them:

We believe with St. Peter that God is no Respecter of Persons, but in every Nation, and among every party of Men, that hold to the head Christ Jesus: He that feareth God and worketh Righteousness, shall be accepted of him. Acts 10. 34. 35. and with St. Paul: The Kingdom of God is not meat and drink, but Righteousness and Peace and joy in the Holy Ghost, and he that in these things serveth Christ is acceptable to God, and approved among Men. Whether he be for or against these things we have nam’d, or any of the like kind. Rom. 14. 17, 18.

FINIS.

THE most material Errata, observ’d in a Review are World for Word, p. 17. l. 20. Word for World, p. 58. l. 15. Subjects for Subjects, p. 67. l. 31. Which with any others of the like Nature, can create no difficulty to an intelligent Reader:

There are indeed several Letters dropt out in working, for which the room is left, yet they disappear: but they may be easily supply’d. For instance: the ω is dropt in Βασιλεια ως, p. 17, and the σ in Μονογενος, p. 45, and the Letter v twice, a line or two after in the same Page, in Το Ιερουσαλημ.

And if any who are end either of the Greek Accents, or Hebrew Points, complain of their omission in these Original Words that here occur, they may charge it partly on the different inclination of the Corrector, and partly on the difficulty of bringing our common Printers any exactness in what lies out of their usual Road. To the latter of which it is also to be acrib’d, that so many of the Hebrew Letters are needlessly Dagesh’d.