

~~BAP  
S5314~~

*Library of the Theological Seminary,*  
PRINCETON, N. J.

Presented by Mr. Samuel Agnew of Philadelphia, Pa.

*Agnew Coll. on Baptism, No.*

SCB  
10332







# Truth Prevailing

Against the

## Fiercest Opposition.

BEING A

# VINDICATION

OF

Dr. *RUSSEL*'s True Narrative  
of the *Portsmouth* Disputation.

Wherein those unjust Reflections cast upon divers Ministers, and others of the *Baptist* Perswasion, in that Partial Account published by the *Presbyterians*, are disproved, and their false Accusations detected and refuted.

Also, a Sermon upon *Mat.* 28. 19. by Mr. *John Williams*, late Minister of the Gospel; with his Letter to Mr. *Leigh* concerning the Dispute.

As also an Answer to the *Presbyterian* Dialogue, by another Hand.

---

Published by Mr. *JOHN SHARP*, Minister of the Gospel, and Pastor of the Church of Christ at *Froome* in *Somersetshire*; who was Moderator at the Disputation in *Portsmouth*.

---

London, Printed, and sold by *M. Fabian* at *Mercers-Chappel* in *Cheapside*. 1700.

1847

1847

THE

OF

AND

OF

OF

OF

OF

OF

OF

OF

OF

OF

THE

## Epistle to the Reader.

**W**E were engaged about a year since in a publick Disputation at Portsmouth upon these two Questions, viz. 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? 2. Whether the Ordinance of Baptism, as appointed by Christ, is to be administred by dipping, plunging (or) overwhelming only, and not otherways?

The occasion of that Disputation appears from the Preliminaries signed on their part, by Mr. Samuel Chandler, and Mr. Francis Williams, two Presbyterian Ministers, in the following words, Whereas by Mr. Chandler's late preaching on the Ordinance of Baptism, several Persons have taken offence; and upon desire of satisfaction, it's mutually agreed between us, whose Names are under-written, That these two Points be amicably disputed, &c. So that Mr. Chandler's Sermons were the cause of the Offence, and their desire of Satisfaction the occasion of the Disputation: And as for Dr. Russel, he knew not of that Agreement till afterwards, so that he could not possibly be the Aggressor.

When the Dispute was over, the Doctor having extraordinary occasion (by reason of his Wife's Illness, and other pressing Affairs) return'd for London the next morning; but before he could reach home, an Advertisement was printed in the Post-man (supposed to be pro-

cured by their importunity) giving an unfair and biassed Account thereof to the World. And some time after they published another Advertisement in the Flying-Post, full of Untruths, as I have formerly told them. And this, together with the Noise and Clamour they made in the time of the Dispute, by which the People were hindred from hearing what was spoken, were the Reasons why it was thought meet to make it publick; of which they had a particular account in the Dedication: And whatever be the Consequence, they must not throw it upon us, but take it to themselves.

As touching our Narrative, we think it may deserve the Title of a True Narrative; for it was published with all faithfulness, as to what was there delivered, according to the best account we could get either from our own Memories, or the Copies we could procure: And if they had been minded to have inform'd us of any thing further, they should not have refused us a sight of their Copy when desir'd. But after all this noise of Omissions and Alterations, &c. if they can say no more, nor give any better Demonstration of what they have said than what doth yet appear, we must needs tell them that our Narrative will stand good, notwithstanding all their Clamor against it; and theirs will appear to be (not an impartial, but) a partial Account. And this we may further assure them, that as they have manag'd it, they have been so far from giving us any further light or satisfaction therein, that they have wholly frustrated the great Expectation of divers of their Friends: For, when they saw those Advertisements they published from time to time complaining against our Narrative, and that Certificate they sent into the West, wherein they boast of their great Victory over us, which they saw was stuff'd with such great swelling words of Vanity, at the same time charging our Narrative to be full of palpable notorious Falshoods; and desiring them to suspend their  
Judg-



*Judgments till they had a view of their Answer: It made their own People to abuse us, and reflect upon us by their over Credulity; and filled them with an Expectation of some great things to be discovered when theirs should come out into the World. But at last (after six months time) when it came to their view, they found their Expectations frustrated: For, instead of giving them a more clear account, they had so torn and mangled it, that it seems to them to be in a most mishapen form, scarcely intelligible: And not so much as one of those vast numbers they boasted of could be procured to testify to the truth of what they had certified under their hands. This made divers Presbyterians to own the Truth, and submit to holy Baptism upon Profession of Faith, as several had done upon the Disputation: For when they saw there was Railing instead of Reason, and pretended Probabilities in the room of solid Arguments; and a false Abstract of Mr. Chandler's old patch'd up Sermons, taken out of other Mens Works, instead of those new Arguments they were in expectation of; and not one single Scripture Testimony either where it was commanded, or any Example of any one Infant that was baptized, either by John the Baptist, Christ or his Apostles, or any other Primitive Minister whatsoever; it was sufficient to convince any considerate judicious Persons, that they had been hitherto misled by these blind Guides, and that they had no design (let their pretences be what they will) that this Gospel-Ordinance should be restored to its Primitive Purity, and first Institution, according to the Commission of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, which they know to be agreeable to our Practice, and have confess'd it so to be. For,*

*Mr. Chandler in the Sermon he preach'd Nov. 24. 1698. on 1 Cor. 12. 13. saith thus. I come to the fifth thing propos'd, to show the Subjects of Baptism, who are qualified for the receiving of this Ordinance.*

Here we are to consider, either who are qualified in the sight of God, or who in the sight of the Church: That is, to whom God will apply the inward Grace signified in this Ordinance, and who Men may admit to Baptism, as not being able to judg of the Heart.

First therefore in the sight of God, Repenting Believers are to be baptized, they have an undoubted right to this Ordinance. God hath been graciously pleased to order it, that all those that turn to him by Faith in Christ, with resolution of Subjection and Obedience to him, should be admitted to this Ordinance, wherein he signifies and seals he will give them remission of Sin, adopt them into his Family, and give them Right and Titlẽ to Heaven. These were the Subjects of Baptism when the Ordinance was first instituted and appointed. Then it was necessary Men should repent and believe, otherwise they had no right to this Ordinance. While Men remained in a state of Judaism or Heathenism, till they give up themselves to Christ, submit to the Lord Jesus, they had no right to this Ordinance: Therefore you read, *Repent and be baptized*; and, *If thou believest with all thy heart, thou mayst*. So that if we were sent into an Heathen Nation, we ought to engage them to repent and believe before we administer this Ordinance to them.

2. In respect of the Church, profess Believers are to be baptized. God, he doth not give the inward use of this Ordinance to any but those that actually repent and believe: But the Church cannot see the Heart: Where Men therefore make a solemn Profession of Faith and Repentance, there they are to be admitted to this Ordinance. Where Men have a competent understanding of the Principles of Christian Religion, and solemnly profess to devote themselves to the Lord  
Jesus

Jesus Christ, and contradict not this Profession by notorious Ungodliness, or an openly wicked Life, these we ought to admit.

Would not any Man that had been a Stranger, and heard Mr. Chandler preach such Doctrine, have taken him for a Baptist Preacher, and not a Presbyterian? But pray how doth he acquit himself from being *αὐτοελάλητος*, condemned in himself? His Answer is this, If any through mistake, or neglect of the Parents, have not been baptized, they ought to submit to this Ordinance, as thereby professing they give up themselves to God. The same with what he said at Portsmouth in our very entrance upon the Dispute, viz. he did own that Adult Believers were the proper Subjects of Baptism. Dr. Russel said, Then you own our Practice to be right. Mr. Chandler said, Yes, if they have not been baptized in their Infancy. Dr. Russel replied, You suppose they are to be baptized by virtue of some Commission, and that it is by the Commission of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ. Mr. Chandler answer'd, Yes, I do so.

By all this it appears these Presbyterians own that Christ hath commanded Adult Believers to be baptized, and they are the proper Subjects intended in our Lord's Commission: So that at best, if Infants are the Subjects of Baptism, they are but improperly so. But (by his Confession) if Infants are not at all intended in that Commission, then those that we baptize upon Profession of Faith are the only proper Subjects of Baptism (according to Christ's Commission) and Infants are not the Subjects at all. And till he answers like a Logician to Dr. Russel's first Argument, and produces his Instance upon his universal Negative, and shews us where it is written, that Christ hath required any of his Ministers to baptize any one Infant, the Controversy is fairly issued, and it's we, and not they that have obtained the Victory; or

rather, that Truth is strongest, and hath prevailed.

These Men are just like the Pharisees, &c. in our Saviour's time, who acknowledg'd that the fifth Commandment did oblige the Israelites to honour and relieve their Parents in their Necessities: But by an Invention of their own, by putting a false Gloss upon the words, as appears by their Talmud (treating of Vows) Chap. 10. a Man is bound to honour his Father and Mother, except he vow the contrary. This our Lord takes notice of in Mat. 15. 4, 5, 6. Mark 7. 10, 11, 12, 13. by the name of Corban, a Gift. In Pool's Annotations you have these words: As touching this word Corban, the most free and unconstrained sense seemeth to be this: The Pharisees were a very covetous Generation, and had a share in the Gifts that were brought unto God for the use of the Temple, or otherwise; thence they were very zealous and diligent in perswading the People to make such Oblations: And when any pretended the need that their Parents stood in of their help, they told them, that if they told their Parents it was a Gift (i. e.) that they had vow'd such a portion of their Estate to a sacred use, that would before God excuse them for not relieving their Parents, &c. and that they were not obliged by that Precept to honour and relieve them any longer. Thus he tells them that by their Traditions, under pretence of a more religious expounding the Divine Law, they had indeed destroy'd it, and made it of no effect at all.

In like manner, if you ask these Presbyters, Whether Jesus Christ gave Commission to his Ministers to baptize Believers? Mr. Leigh shall speak for them; his words are these, We must all confess, that Jesus Christ gave Commission to baptize Believers when at the Age of Maturity.

But if this Question were put to the Pharisees, Whether such Jews were obliged by that Command of God



to honour and relieve their Parents, who had said to their Father or to their Mother, Corban? Their Answer was, He is free, and they suffered him no more to do ought for his Father or his Mother.

In like manner, if you ask these Presbyters, whether such Persons are obliged by that Command of Christ to be baptized in his Name when they come to years of Maturity and do believe, who have been baptized in their Infancy? Their Answer is (as the Pharisees of old) they are freed from that Obligation, and they will not suffer them to be rightly baptized according to Christ's Commission: Whereas Mr. Chandler confesses they ought so to be, if they had not been baptized in their Infancy.

Now forasmuch as there is no other Authority for Infant-sprinkling, but what the Pharisees had for their Corban, i. e. the Command or Tradition of Men, why may not we apply the words of our Saviour (to the Pharisees) unto these Presbyters? Thus have ye made the Commandment of Christ for holy Baptism of none effect by your Tradition of Infant-sprinkling; and thereby render'd the Word of God of none effect: And that it's vain Worship that is taught by the Precepts of Men, you must be forced to acknowledg, or deny the words of our Saviour: And if Will-worship, vain Worship, Mens Commandments, and Human Traditions be not forbidden in the Word of God, there is nothing forbidden; but Men are then at liberty to do what they please in the Worship of God. Why you (that are of this Opinion) should keep up a Separation from the Church of England, unless it be for Humour and Interest, I cannot imagine. But to proceed.

These learned Annotators say, That altho the Jews did for some tract of time keep to the Divine Law, yet in process of time they abus'd that Text, Deut. 4. 14, to found a new Invention upon it: That besides the Law written in the five Books of Moses, God delivered to him

him in the Mount divers things which were not written, which he delivered only by word of mouth to the Sanhedrim, which are to them as much a Rule of Judgment as any part of the Law which was written: By which means they gained themselves a liberty of making the Law of God what they pleased.

From whence we also may observe, that they did not deny this to be written that is recorded in the fifth Commandment, but that the other was also intended and included in it, which they endeavoured to perswade the People to believe, by their false Glosses upon the Text: For they confess it was not expressly written in the Law, but that it might be intended, tho not express: And that it was delivered by word of mouth, tho it be nowhere so written in all the Word of God: For they call'd it a Tradition of the Elders.

Whether Covetousness (as in the Pharisees) lies at the root of this Practice of Infant-sprinkling, themselves are the best Judges: But this they confess, That it is not expressly commanded in the Word of God: But they endeavour to perswade the People that it is intended therein (altho they can't produce one Instance of any Infant that was baptized) and by their corrupt Exposition of some Passages in holy Scripture, and their false Glosses (like those of the Pharisees) they prevail upon their ignorant and unthinking admirers to believe it upon their word, altho there is not one syllable of it recorded in the holy Scriptures.

But when this will not do, they tell them it was the Practice of the Church for many Ages, and they have reason to believe that it was taught by the Apostles, altho there be no mention of it in holy Scripture. For in p. 13. of their own Account they say, that Paul might declare it, tho the New Testament should not discover that he did. And in p. 15. Paul might have declar'd the Baptism of Infants an hundred times over, and yet it might

might not be left on Record in his Epistle to the Ephesians, nor any part of the New Testament that he did so. I therefore demand of these Presbyters, that if they be not of the Papists Opinion, that Infant-Baptism is an unwritten Tradition, what moved them to use their very Language? Had they not a fit opportunity to produce a Scripture-instance if they had been able? But it seems all the skill they have, with all their pretences to Learning, is not sufficient to inable them to find it out; and therefore we must still charge it upon them as a Scripture-less Practice, and a mere Human Invention, without the least shew of either Precept or Example to be found for it in all the Word of God: And consequently we must reject it as an unwritten Tradition, and Will-worship; and (as such) forbidden by the holy Scriptures; and that from the Pens of the most learned Pedo-Baptists, in their Expositions of the second Commandment.

And seeing these Men grant this Practice of theirs is not exprest in the Writings of the New Testament, let them tell us the reason of this total silence therein? Why did not our Lord command it if he intended it should be practised? Why did not the Apostles set it down in their Writings? What can be the reason why those holy Men should not make some mention of it in the many Books they have purposedly written for our Instruction? Why did the four Evangelists conceal it? The Acts of the Apostles make no mention of it when they set down in writing so many thousands of Men and Women that were baptized? How comes it to pass that the Apostles Peter, James, John and Jude, who wrote such excellent Epistles, should not say one word about it? But above all, the Apostle Paul, who wrote fourteen admirable Epistles, and speaks in them so often of this holy Ordinance of Baptism, who professes he did declare all the Counsel of God, and kept back nothing that was profitable to be known, and praises them for keeping the Ordinances as they were delivered

livered to them, and declares, that as he received them of the Lord, so he had delivered them; does not in all his Epistles make the least mention of Infant-Baptism. Is not this alone a great Argument against your Practice? I pray consider it: For the Apostle saith, Let every Man prove his own Work. You assert it, and therefore it lies upon you to prove it.

But to evade this, you make use of the same method against us, as the Papists do against the Protestants, when they demand of them to give some formal Passage in Scripture that doth expressly and by name deny what they affirm, viz. where it's said expressly that there is no fire of Purgatory, and that the Pope of Rome is not the Head of the universal Church, and that the Mass is not a Propitiatory Sacrifice. Now this method of Disputation is accounted in the Papists an unjust caviling to demand such unreasonable Proof, or else to pretend the Protestants cannot answer them. The Turks may as reasonably demand of the Papists, where there is to be found any formal Passage in Scripture that saith expressly that Mahomet is not a true Prophet, &c. and then pretend the Papists cannot answer them. And surely if it be unjust caviling in their own esteem, when demanded of them, it must be the same in themselves when they demand it from the Protestants.

Just so you Presbyters serve us. It belongs to you that impose this Opinion of yours upon us, and oblige others to believe it, to make the truth of it appear from holy Scripture. For no one is bound to believe that which cannot be prov'd to be true. You say that the Infants of believing Parents ought to be baptized; but we deny it. It's not our business to prove our denial by shewing some formal Passage in Scripture where it's said in terminis that Infants are not to be baptized; it's enough for us to tell you that there is neither Command nor Example for it in all the holy Scripture: And till you give your Instance



stance where it is so written, we shall neither believe nor practise it: For till that be done, the Controversy betwixt you and us is at an end: And (in my opinion) you had better have forbore ingaging in it at first, seeing you have so little skill to manage it. There was one present at the Dispute who wrote thus to his Friend in London, Sir, We have seen the gross Abuses of the Dispute printed by Mr. Chandler, &c. who makes Lies his Refuge, &c. to favour his bad Cause. But as a Minister of the Church of England said, If Chandler and the rest had no better Proof for their Separation from the Church, or Arguments to defend it, they were grand Schismatics; for they proved nothing. Another Minister of the Church of England that was also at the Dispute, told a friend of mine, that he had seen our printed Narrative, and did declare that it was a very good Account of the Disputation. Also a Doctor of Divinity, who came to give me a Visit, told me that a Country Parson of his Acquaintance who heard the Dispute, did declare to him his great Dissatisfaction against the Presbyters both for their weak and ill management of themselves in that Dispute; and did also declare to him that the Baptists were too hard for them. And this was no mean Man among the Clergy that gave him this account. I thought meet to put this in print, to put a stop to their vain-boasting.

As touching their Account of the Dispute, if it had been sutable to their Title, the World had heard nothing further from us about it; for we desire no other but that it may be truly known what pass therein on both sides: And if they had not given such severe and uncharitable Reflections upon divers Persons of our Perswasion, both Ministers and others, upon the dead as well as the living, and so forc'd us to write in our just defence, they had not received any harsh Language from us; for we do not think that an advantage to any Cause: but what we have done of that kind, we may say with the Apostle, they have compell'd

compell'd us to do: For we have not used this method out of any prejudice against their Persons, but to defend our selves from their unjust Reflections, and to vindicate that Truth they oppose, and which we believe in our Consciences to be the Mind of God, in opposition to that human Invention practis'd by them.

We have also took care to publish the Testimonials sent to us by particular Persons, according to their direction; leaving out some things we thought might too much expose Mr. Chandler and Mr. Robinson; for which I am sure we deserve their thanks. If what is contain'd therein be not deliver'd with that Accuracy as some may expect, let them consider it's not every Man's Talent so to do; neither do matters of Fact always require it.

Whereas we have caused to be printed an Answer to their Dialogue, written by a Friend to that Truth we profess, who lives in the Country, and gave it to Mr. Sharp when he came to London, with liberty to print it, if he saw good: And altho (for some prudent reasons) his Name is not thereunto affixed, he will not be wanting to vindicate what he hath written, when a just occasion shall present.

The Reasons for its brevity are these. 1. Because he himself had but little time to prepare for it. 2. The reason why I made no enlargement, was because I never saw their Dialogue till after Mr. Sharp shew'd me the Answer to it. 3. Our time together was very short, and we did not think fit to alter another Man's Copy. 4. Mr. Sharp being Moderator, he did not think it so fit for him to engage in it; and if the Author had not been refer'd to, they should have had no Answer from him. As for Mr. Sharp, he desired me to make an Apology for him with respect to his brevity, &c. But as I know not of any need there is for me to do it, so my limits in this Epistle will not permit me to enlarge.

As for that new-fashioned way of burying with a Turf only on the Head, which those Dialogue-makers seem to  
be

be so pleased with, as I know not any that practise it, so I shall leave it to themselves as I found it, without any Remarks upon it; not supposing the Reader will be fond of the Invention. But any whimsical Conceit serves these Presbyters to imploy their Wits upon in ridiculing our Practise of the holy Ordinance of Baptism, as commanded and submitted unto by the Son of God. If it be so grievous in their Eyes, why do they not answer what their own learned Authors have said for our manner of Baptism, before they thus reflect upon it? For, as one of their own Ministers hath told the World in print (since the Portsmouth Disputation) that their excusing themselves from that manner of Administration we use (by dipping the Person under Water) because of the coldness of the Climate, is in his opinion but a cold Plea. And notwithstanding their outcry against us, themselves could practise it upon Mr. FOX, to serve a turn.

There are so many Errors in their Account, that I shall not trouble myself any further about them, for my leisure will not permit me: and there's so much said in the Book it self to prove theirs to be what it is, i. e. a false and scandalous Account, that I need not add any more.

As for Mr. John Williams's Sermon upon the Commission, we were not willing the World should be deprived of it, not only because he hath deserved well of the Publick, but because they are the words of a dying Man; and we hope the Reader will not see cause to repent of that additional Charge he is thereby put to in the Price of the Book; for we are perswaded it will more than compensate that small Charge.

I shall conclude with what I did before (notwithstanding their perverse Construction of it) that the great Jehovah, from whom we receive all Blessings, would make our Endeavours herein successful to his Glory and the good of Souls, that so there may be added to the Church daily such as shall be saved.

WILLIAM RUSSEL.

*Directions for the more ready finding out the particular matters treated of in this Book.*

<b>M</b> R. <i>Sharp's</i> Animadversions begin	Page 17.
Mr. <i>Bowes's</i> Letter,	p. 45.
Another Testimony from the principal Brethren of the Church against Mr. <i>Chandler</i> , to prove him a false Accuser,	p. 49.
Mr. <i>Leddel</i> of <i>Gosport's</i> Vindication,	p. 50.
An account of thote Falshoods they charge on Dr. <i>Russel</i> ,	p. 56.
Dr. <i>Russel's</i> Observations upon their Dedication,	p. 65.
His Observations upon their Account of the Dispute,	p. 71.
Truth vindicated, or an Answer to their Dialogue,	p. 93.
Dr. <i>Russel's</i> Animadversions upon their Epistle,	p. 94.
A Sermon preach'd by Mr. <i>John Williams</i> from the Commission, <i>Mat. 28. 19.</i> To which is prefix'd his Letter to Mr. <i>Leigh</i> , after the Dispute,	p. 128.
Mr. <i>Isaac Marlow's</i> Letter to Dr. <i>Russel</i> , about the Etymology and use of the <i>Dutch</i> word <i>Doop</i> , &c.	p. 178.
Mr. <i>Isaac Harman's</i> Postscript, to prove the notorious Falshoods and Lies contain'd in Mr. <i>Chandler's</i> Postscript to their second Edition,	p. 181.

---

## E R R A T A.

**P**Age 28. line 17. for *wherei nour*, read, *wherein our*. P. 34. l. 25. f. *you*, r. *them*. P. 90. near the bottom, for *understand*, r. *understands*. P. 161. l. 34. f. *alter*, r. *Altar*. And if there be any others that have escaped our notice, the Reader is desired to correct them.



Here begins the ANIMADVERSIONS of  
 Mr. John Sharp, Minister of the Gospel,  
 and Pastor of the Church of Christ at  
 Froome in Somersetshire, who was Mode-  
 rator at the Disputation in Portsmouth.

**I**T may be thought strange that I should appear  
 in this nature to the World, in the matter rela-  
 ting to our Opposers Disputation and Contro-  
 versy with Dr. Russel; it is not as tho the said  
 Doctor had any need of my Assistance (and  
 therefore I intend no long Apology) but only for  
 these Reasons following.

1. Because it is the Cause of God, wherein his Truth  
 is eminently concerned.

2. Because our Opposers have condemned our Nar-  
 rative in that which they allow in themselves in their  
 own Narrative.

3. Because Brother Williams is dead, who was able  
 to have vindicated what he then offered (tho he is  
 now brought in as one then rambling in his Discourse.  
 See their Narrat. p. 59.)

4. Because it is fit that the World should be informed  
 how unfairly they dealt by us, both at the Dispute, and  
 now since, in their Narrative.

In these my short Notes I shall not strictly tie my  
 self to this or that particular method, but shall begin  
 first to take notice of their declaring publicly, in the  
 Appendix to their Narrative, p. 64. that we made the  
 first Disturbance; whereas all that were present may  
 remember how they acted towards us, making the  
 first Disturbance themselves: And therefore I do assure

all, where-ever the Narrative may come, that it was not as they relate it; and I am ready to think they themselves might forget it, by having so much business upon their hands, or else it must be to make those that are at a distance believe how well they carried it towards us, tho I was forc'd to reprove the People and them too, which I should not have done had they not acted towards us in that *manner* as they did. I am ready to give my Testimony before a Magistrate, if required, that they themselves did make the first Disturbance. How this might be improv'd against them, I will leave themselves and others to judg, if it were managed by their own Pens. Let them but remember their Deportment towards Mr. *Williams* when he quoted *Erasmus*, and seriously reflect upon it. Also I would not have Mr. *Leigh* forget, when he was charged afterwards with hissing, and he denied it, saying, he did not hiss: Mr. *Williams* being present, said to him, *Sir, You did hiss*; he the said Mr. *Leigh* answer'd and said, *It might be an Interjection*, making as if it was but a small thing. And tho Mr. *Williams* is dead, there are those that were present that can give evidence of this; and I my self can give it more fully, as I received it from Mr. *John Williams*, if there shall be need. But I would beg of you, Mr. *Leigh*, if you come to read this, that you would not be in an heat, as you were then; for, if you are, much Water will not quench it, if I may say by you as you said (*Nar. p. 60.*) by Mr. *Leddel*, you being, as I suppose, concerned in drawing up your Narrative. But must this be your way of ridiculing the Ordinance of Christ (as by us pleaded for?) I did think we should have been better treated at your hands. I mention not this out of any disrespect to you, but that you may be sensible that it is true what is said before, and that you were in the mistake.

Our Opposers may also remember how ready Mr. *Robinson* was at all times to make Disturbance, saying to Dr. *Russel*, *If you know not how to form your Argument, I will tell you*: which the Doctor had no need of, for he offered more than th y did know how by any fair and due method to evade, or than ever they will be able to answer. I never perceived that he was at a loss at any time to form his Argument, or to give them an Answer. But Mr. *Robinson* was so often in this abusive work, that Mr. *Bissel* said, *Gentlemen, Ye do not fair by Dr. Russel, ye ought to give him liberty to offer his Arguments, and when he hath done, then to make the best of them.* And, I suppose, it was for this piece of Service, that his Copy was by them afterwards look'd upon to be but as a *Lawyers Breviate, containing only hints for Memory*, as they slight it. *Append. to Nar. p. 56.*

Next, when they would have set Mr. *Williams* and the Doctor at a difference about their different Opinions, Dr. *Russel* replied, *If I am not of his Opinion, I am of yours, Sir,* (speaking to Mr. *Robinson*.) Then Mr. *Williams* said, *If you say an hundred times as much more as you do, you shall not set the Doctor and I together by the ears*: And here they fell a laughing, shewing their Rudeness.

Again, when Dr. *Russel* gave them the liberty of the whole New Testament to prove Infant-sprinkling was any part of the Counsel of God, I said, *They might take it any where, from Genesis to the Revelation, if they could but prove it.* Hereupon Mr. *Robinson* rudely said, *What, Sir, the New Testament is in Genesis?* But Mr. *Williams* reply'd, *Yes, Sir, the New Testament is in Genesis*: To which he made no Answer. And here I will take notice of their words, pag. 66. *So that Infants may be baptized, if we can bring good Proof for it out of the other parts of holy*

*Writ.* Here these Gentlemen forgot that there was given them such large liberty to prove their Practice out of any part of the written Word: but, as they did nothing then, so they have done nothing since by their printing, to bring any good Proof for their Infant-sprinkling out of any part of the Old or New Testament; and therefore I must conclude they cannot find it in Holy Writ: for they have been in their Studies before and since, and they knew what they were to be engaged in; and if they had not been prepared before the Dispute, they should have taken better care since.

Also there was much said upon *Mat.* 3. 7. and *Luke* 3. 7. between Mr. *Robinson* and my self; and if any of their Notaries have taken it (or any thing else that will serve their turn) let them bring it out if they please, yet so as not to wrong me: For I do deny that my Reply, which they have put down, p. 40. was to Mr. *Leigh*, for it was to Mr. *Robinson*, and I never spake the words as they are there put down to my wrong; it was so much of it that I did then speak, that I do not remember all that I said to him, but yet this I do remember of the words, *That all that appear to be a visible Generation of Vipers ought to be cast out of the Church, that is to say, without they repent.* He did confess that they did suspend them for a time: And I replied, *By the Rules of Christ such ought to be excommunicated, and they did not act according to Rule, if they did not do it.*

Further, when upon *Acts* 15. 10. I spoke, they need not stand so long upon the former part of the Chapter, the 9th Verse would clear who were the Subjects, and repeated the words: Mr. *Robinson* interrupted me, saying, *Sir, where are you now?* I replied, *If I have transgressed the Rule of a Moderator, I would ask the Peoples Pardon.* Thus neither I nor those

those of us that were to speak in the Dispute could speak, but he was ready to interrupt us; tho' all there present may remember that we acted towards them very soberly: but had we done otherwise, I do not question but you would have heard of it before now.

They made an Apology of their not being willing to have a publick Dispute before the People; and I having heard something of that the night before, told it to some of our People there: they told me that they would have disputed them in private, if they would have discoursed it according to the Scripture. When they were thus making their Apology, I replied, that they might have had it in private, if they would have discoursed it according to the Scriptures, and that they had been offered it before we came thither: This they could not deny, and alledged no further; and yet they would plead their Innocency since on purpose to blame us.

Mr. Leigh offered to argue it with me, but I replied, *I thought Dr. Russel and Mr. Williams were able to manage their own Arguments, and therefore there was no need of that*: Yet I have been heartily sorry since, that I did not offer then to change a plain Proposition with any of those our Opposers, it being so fair an opportunity to bring you to the Scripture, by which means the People would have had more light into the Truth. And when the Arguments on our part were brought to bear, and were back'd by the Scriptures, I desired our Opposites to grant, or deny, or distinguish, or give another sense of the Scriptures, but they would give none.

When Mr. Robinson was giving the aforesaid unfair Representation to the People, I desired he would forbear, if not, I would oppose him; and yet he went on (as he used to do in the Dispute) and gave



a further account to the People. I desired him again to desist, and if he would not, I could not, nor would forbear him: but, if he would give the *Doctor* leave to speak for himself, I would forbear; and so with much ado *I did get him to forbear.*

When I was called upon to conclude in Prayer, and it was said it was my place, *Mr. Robinson* would not leave off, but as he began, so he did continue to the end, and said it would be but vain Repetitions if he should: I replied, I would offer no vain Repetitions for them; I hop'd I made Conscience of the Duty of Prayer as much as they did elsewhere, and I would not do it there for them.

And now I would not have them talk too much of their *Copy*, and condemn others; I would have them to remember, that *Mr. Smith* was not capable to repeat one of the *Doctor's* Arguments when he was call'd upon to do it, after that *Mr. Liegh* had denied one part of it, and the *Doctor* desired him to repeat it, and he could not do it, which the *Doctor* improv'd upon him, and said, Do you not know what you deny? And if he fail'd in the present, I know not what he might do afterwards: But I do not question their Abilities to help him out. And as for *Mr. Ring's* Copy, they pretend in their Narrative to find a multitude of Falshoods, Additions, Alterations and Omissions in it; but nevertheless it is judged that he is as good a Writer as the other; and as for their Narrative, it will be particularly examined by the *Doctor* himself; and how many such faults he will find there, our Opposers may judg themselves, that have gone so large as they have done. They have made them speak on our side as mean as ever they can, and as full for their own. But I believe that all who look into the *nature* of the management of the Matter and the Arguments, will fall in with those

those that are most agreeable to the Word of God, and are fairly drawn from thence. For, I hope, all Persons will consider, that if our Opposers had Arguments offered them by such mean Men as they have represented the old Gentleman to be; what would they have done if they had had Men that had been thorowly furnished for that work? The less they make us, I think they make themselves the more mean. Could they not much easier have overturned their Arguments without so many Reflections? Can they think that will credit their Cause, or make them look greater? Doth this agree with that Character which the *Post-man* gave of the *Doctor*, as opposing Infant-Baptism with all the Subtilty and Sophistry of the Schools? Surely that doth not agree with this diminutive Description they now give of him: They could know little of his Abilities in the sacred Languages, for they did not discourse much at that time out of any of them; and if they had, what advantage would it have been to them to have known one anothers Abilities in the Languages, unless they could have convinc'd him by their Abilities? But tho they profess to have them, neither he nor others that wanted Conviction from them, had it by their giving us one instance of Precept or Precedent for their Practice of sprinkling Infants, instead of baptizing or dipping them when Adult Believers, that it was either commanded or practised by Christ or his Apostles: for I my self should have been glad to have received Conviction then or now by their Writing, if it have any foundation in the Word of God; and yet it seems they would have us believe it without, and blame us for not believing it upon their word. We could easily believe it, if it was as easy for them to prove and maintain it, as commanded or grounded in the revealed Will of God, to be observ'd and

practised by them and us. But until I receive such convincing Light and Satisfaction from them out of the Word of God as the Rule for our Practice in this matter, I shall, notwithstanding their Abilities in Languages, and for all what they have said as yet in the Dispute, or written since in their Account of it, continue in the same mind, and the same Practice, when those that believe do tender themselves to be baptized, according to the Practice of the Apostles. If you, Gentlemen, that are our Opposites, or any of you can still convincingly prove, that your Practice has any Precept or Precedent in the Word of God, I will own it to be of Divine Institution: In the mean while this plain Argument for our contrary Faith shall satisfy me.

*If Infant-Baptism hath neither Precept nor Precedent in the Word of God, then 'tis not of Divine Institution:*

*But Infant-Baptism hath neither Precept nor Precedent in the Word of God;*

*Therefore it is not of Divine Institution.*

When you have prov'd your Practice as we have done ours, then you will have a great many more of your side; and till then, you ought to deal more kindly and fairly by us than you have hitherto done, especially in the Dispute, as I have partly shew'd: and I must needs say, I am afraid you will not hereafter deal so kindly and fairly by us as you should, since you charge the dead with that which is false, and yet pretend to tread softly over his Grave, pag. 62. for immediately in the next words you give us Mr. Farrel's Misrepresentation against Mr. Williams (now dead) there are two Witnesses that were with him, and they wrote it down as Mr. Farrel spake it: and I my self had it from the old Gentleman's own mouth in the presence of several Witnesses, together with his

Argu-



Arguments, and carried them to Dr. *Ruffel*; and I have sufficient reason to believe it is true, and that he has abused neither Mr. *Francis Williams* nor Mr. *Farrel* in what he has said of them; and all that knew him, did know he was as able as most Men to retain what he had heard, and to give an account of it, but more especially, when others with him took such particular care to put it down in Writing, that they might not be mistaken in any thing afterwards. I believe that poor Story had never come into print, had old Mr. *John Williams* been living.

Furthermore, I would have the World judg between us (or at least those that are both judicious and unprejudiced, and so able to judg between us and our Opposites) how that pag. 66. they condemn our Arguments by wholesale, speaking in these words, *All the Arguments they offer'd were trifling Cavils.* Now I would have you, Readers, to consider, Is not this a very easy way of refuting to condemn *all*, when they are not able to answer *one* of them? Ye may see from hence whether it be they or we that did trifle: For in the next foregoing Page you may see how they do particularize the matter, and say it is false (tho what of it is so, those that are concerned in it may look to it, as in the case of Brother *Duke*.) Now in that Passage (pag. 65.) this is to be minded (to observe how well it does agree with what they say elsewhere); they say in these words, *But that none of us would refuse to dip a Person in such a case, is true: We never pleaded against dipping as one way, but as the only way; not against its Lawfulness, but Necessity.* And yet presently after they tell you, *that the Anabaptists Cause does rest on weak unscriptural Principles, how loudly soever they pretend to Scripture.* Now I must say, if our Cause, viz. of dipping Believers, be weak and unscriptural, they ought then to plead against it, and  
refuse

refuse the doing of it, which it seems they do not do by their own Confession aforementioned, but on the other hand they in plain words grant its Lawfulness. Now if it be lawful, that is, consistent with, and agreeable to the Command of God and Christ, and the Practice of the Apostles, then it cannot be unscriptural, nor our Principles so weak as they would make them in the Eyes of those who are for our Cause, and own our Principles, tho' these Men make so loud a noise against them as weak and unscriptural. We oppose the Principle and Practice of our Antagonists as unscriptural, weak, and unlawful, in so far as it is neither commanded by God or Christ, nor implied as so commanded by any scriptural Precedent. But if they will evade our arguing, and say, as they seem to do in their forecited words, That our *Principles and Practice of baptizing or dipping Believers is scriptural indeed*, but it is not the *only scriptural way*, but there is a *second scriptural way*, viz. of dipping those that do not believe, as Infants do not, by the preaching of the Word; and also a *third*, of sprinkling those that do believe, together with Infants that do not believe: and that these other ways are intended in the Command of Christ, and implied by this or that Precedent as commanded, and consequently are as well scriptural ways, as that of dipping Believers is (for this is the Question now between us) I say, if they can prove these other ways as distinct or different from ours, to be also scriptural, *i. e.* intended in the Command of Christ, and implied by some Precedent in Scripture, let them produce it if they can do it, for they have never done it yet: If they cannot, then theirs shall be their own darling Notion, and they have no reason to charge ours as our darling Notion, unless they can prove that their bare *ipse dixit*, or *say-so*, is sufficient proof against us that deny

deny

deny it. And indeed we need do no more than to deny this their *darling* and unscriptural Practice and *Notion*, till they are able to prove it: Because he that will not only affirm, but also convince another of his Principle and Practice as commanded in Scripture, ought in all reason to prove it to be so, 'ere he can blame another that denies it, that he hugs a darling *Notion* in his Bosom. Set the case some Papists should blame these Gentlemen that are our *Antagonists* for disowning the Baptism of Bells as being unscriptural, would it not be sufficient for them to say, that it is no where commanded in Scripture by any express Command, or any Practice that implies such a Command? And if the other should demand a Prohibition or Command to the contrary, or else they would continue to blame them as hugging a darling *Notion*, a weak and unscriptural Principle, would our *Opposites* not think this very unreasonable and weak? Well then, I do not question their Ability in making the Application in our case: For, if it be good in them, it's so in us.

Further, how do these their *Reflections* aforementioned, and the *Introduction* to their Narrative agree together? For in the beginning of that *Introduction* (which I suppose was penn'd by Mr. *Chandler*) are these words, *Must I again be call'd 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; and then follow some Expressions of Arch-bishop Tillotson.* But O! had he or they taken Dr. *Tillotson* for their Pattern, to write after his Copy indeed, I am persuaded we should have been more fairly and charitably treated by them, or by this Prefacer in particular than we are. For, we have a Passage cited by the *Doctor*, p. 59. where that great Man Dr. *Tillotson*

lotson does say, *Antiently those who were baptized put off their Garments.* Now this saying is so far from ridiculing us or our Practice uncharitably, that it makes for us; for he does not say they exposed their Modesty by putting off their Garments; nor does he there trifle as they do about the *Eunuch*, p. 81. And whereas in the said Introduction there follows these words, *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;* I do wish with all my heart all of them had put this desire in execution: I for my part would not have hinder'd them, nor do I know any that would that are concerned on our side in this Controversy, wherein our Antagonists have not only not pressed after that *Charity and Good-will* the *Introduction* speaks of, but also (I think) have laid a foundation for a greater Division, unless God by his Power and Providence over-rule our Spirits on both sides: For they have exposed us and the Truth wherein we differ from them, as very ridiculous and trifling: However, the Truth which we believe we cannot part with, we are to buy the Truth and sell it not; and instead of making us to part with it, they have rather given us more ground to believe it to be Truth.

Mr. *Chandler*, p. 2. begins the Abridgment of his Sermons thus, *Here I must unavoidably dip my Pen in the watty Controversy: I love not to meddle with Matters of Dispute.* It is a sign he does not (if I may say so) or else he had not lov'd to meddle with the matter of the Controversy which Dr. *Russel* had with Mr. *Allen* about *singing*; I suppose neither was at his Sermons, and what should make him bring their Controversy in thither, I do not well see, unless he loved



to defame Dr. *Ruffel*. He ſays indeed there, p. 12. that he mentions it to convince *Mr. Webber and his Adherents*, what a doughty Champion they have choſen for themſelves. But you may ſee thereby the Charity and Good-will he has towards us and Dr. *Ruffel* in ſpecial, notwithstanding his pretence that he aim'd at ſome Conviction, tho he might very well know that this expoſing Dr. *Ruffel* behind his back ſo publickly about the point of ſinging, and drolling upon him as a Hackny Diſputant, at a time when it did become *Mr. Chandler* to be more ſolid and ſerious, would ſignify nothing at all for any Conviction in the Point of Baptiſm. If Dr. *Ruffel* had been out in that Point, it will not follow he is in this. However, if *Mr. Chandler* had not only mentioned Dr. *Ruffel's* Arguments in that Point, but alſo had taken off the ſtrength of his Arguments, *Mr. Allen* perhaps would have had reaſon to have given him Thanks for it. To ſlight them as *Mr. Chandler* does there, p. 13. by ſaying, *Theſe were the Arguments for want of better he trifled with at Portſmouth*, was not to answer them: For, tho *Mr. Chandler* ſays in the Page before, that Dr. *R.* advances the very ſame Arguments againſt the Practice of ſinging *Pſalms*, which he does againſt theirs for *Infant-Baptiſm*; yet he may know in his Conſcience there were more, and they were all in my opinion ſo good againſt his Practice of *Infant-ſprinkling*, that he was not able to answer them as he ſhould, nor any of the other that were preſent to help him. But by reaſon I have told him ſo before, I needed not to have told it him now again, but that there was ſome occaſion for it; and I might have added, that I think he and his Helpers had rather need to cry to others, *Come and help us* (as in that 12th Page he has the like words) for the help he has had already, does him little Service to overthrow our Cauſe, and to

con-

\* But I hope Mr. Webber is not to be taken off from the Truth he hath owned by their ridiculing the Doctor and his Arguments, nor to continue in that wherein he hath not sufficient warrant to bear him out in the Word of God. I hope Mr. Webber is not so easy a Man as to be thus prevailed upon by him.

convince Mr. Webber, and his Adherents (as he calls them) out of it \*. But if others are called to assist him, it may do him perhaps more Service, to wit, to moderate him, and make him write more fairly and handsomly of his mistaken Brethren, as he counts us. I wish he had kept to that Language, and then we had not had all that Railery, Reflecting, and Trifling that was and is used by him. Mr. Chandler,

who was it that trifled with *incomplete Disciples*, you or we? Who gave Mr. Ridge's matter a full account, you or we? I know, and am satisfied, that the Doctor has given a true account of it, and in his own words, as near as words can be spoken.

I heard a Gentleman say that Mr. Chandler was a Fool, and deserved to be knocked about the Ears; he ought to have accepted the Argument, and given his Instance, which himself would have done if he had been there.

Whatever Mr. Chandler may suppose, I am sure his refusing to give an Instance upon an universal Negative (when so often prest to do it) neither made for his own Credit, nor yet for the Credit of his Cause: For, it made others conclude he could not do it, and that if he could, he would have condescended to have done it in so publick an Assembly, if he had been furnished with any to have given. But the plain truth is, as he could not then give us so much as one single Instance for his Practice, so he hath not been able to do it since: for if he could, we should have had it.

For,

For, in a Point of that moment it is a shame for him now to excuse it with this or that Nicety in Disputation, which (whatever he may think) rather shews, that he aims at and strives more for mastery in controverting, than that he himself doth heartily believe his own Practice to be scriptural; for, if he had so done, he would have condescended to any method to clear up that which he preaches for Truth, and pretends to have such a hearty desire to convince us of.

There was another said, he did not understand what was an incompleat Disciple of Christ; and yet he is one that understands an Argument (in my opinion) as well as Mr. *Chandler*, tho he did not *then* walk with us, nor the other neither. His incompleat Disciples are such as the Scripture never taught him to call so; and (I think) Mr. *Chandler* is grossly mistaken to suppose he has by this trifling Distinction salv'd the Credit of his absurd way of vindicating his Practice, and thereby evaded the strength of our Arguments: For, they that are serious and judicious Christians can easily discern it to be a fallacious and evasive shift, to cast a Veil over the Minds of those that are ignorant of this Controversy, and do not allow themselves the liberty to examine it: For it is wholly unscriptural, and groundless, and impertinent, as it is applied by him in the Case under Consideration.

But further: What a stir do these Men make about the word *equivocable*: If there were two Letters added at the Press, or (to suppose the worst) that it were wrong spelt, it had been the Corrector's place to have mended it. It was very much there had not been more than *one* Error in *mispelling* in the *Doctor's* Narrative; for it's too common a fault in printing. And it is to be observ'd, that there is no *Errata* made  
to

to the *Doctōr's*; there being few or no faults in it. But they were forced to make an *Errata* at the end of their own Book, which (by their own Confession) hath more Errors in it than they have noted, which they excuse by saying, they can create no difficulty to an intelligent Reader: And they also tell us of several Letters dropt out in working, &c. which if any complain of, they may charge it partly on the different Inclination of the Corrector, and partly on the difficulty of bringing our common Printers to any Exactness.

If by a Corrector of a different Inclination they mean a Baptist, the *Doctōr* saith he doth not believe it; for (if he be not misinformed) he is a Man of their Perswasion in the Point in Controversy: But this he is certain of, that the Gentleman who corrected his Copy when at the Press, is a zealous Member of the Church of *England*, and (to his knowledg) a Contender for Infant-Baptism; and yet he must give him this Character, that he was very faithful to the Trust reposed in him. But an oversight may be by the best of Men: But he is under a disadvantage about it where to charge it, because the written Copy was never returned. But it is so insignificant a Trifle to what (they confess) is in their own, that it's not worth contending about: And certainly it deserved no such ridiculous and base descanting on it, as to call it a word of the famous *Doctōr's* own coining, with other Expressions which they in their Spleen have vented against him. Is this their Charity and Good-will towards us? Surely, a little Charity would have serv'd to have excused so inconsiderable a fault; especially, when they only guess that he was chargeable with it; not knowing but it might be an Error of the Press, seeing there were so many in their own which they boldly charge upon the Corrector and Printer.

But



But they have not yet done with it; for they say, if he intend equivocal Expressions, they are his own peculiar Talent: Perhaps few Jesuits herein equal or exceed him at that sort of Weapon. I cannot but wonder (Gentlemen) that you should thus proceed in this manner, what can it be that thus moves you to speak against the *Doctor*? Doth this agree with that Charity you speak of (to those you call mistaken Brethren) in the beginning of your Book? Can you think that he deserved that Character from you (when you call to mind with what coolness of Spirit, and evenness of Temper he behaved himself, during the whole time of the Disputation) I appeal to your own Consciences whether you think he deserved such an uncharitable Insinuation and severe Reflection? Doth this also agree with Mr. *Candler's* short Request, p. 2. that God would grant that Truth may prevail? Surely, this doth not shew you had any design it should prevail upon the *Doctor*, and upon us, either then or since; for your Practice contradicts your Expressions hitherto. I know not what you may do for time to come: But if you go on as you have begun, I fear you may give the Government occasion to repent of allowing the liberty you speak of: At least you may have cause to repent of allowing your selves such a liberty as ye do against us.

Who was it that trifled about the Mother of our Lord being a Believer, you or we? And who fairly improved it to the World, you or we? What reason had Mr. *Leigh* to allow the Eunuch to be a Christian, and consider him as such, altho' (as he saith) he was but a Profelyte of the Gate? And yet in p. 31. to deny (in his sense) the Virgin *Mary* to be a Christian, and represent her a Jew, distinct from that of a Christian, and that Christianity in that sense had then no being. There were many Believers in Christ  
C
through-

throughout the several Ages of the World, both before the Jewish Oeconomy, as well under it, witness *Enoch* the 7th from *Adam*, who prophesied of him, *Jude* 14, 15. And were not *Abraham*, *Isaac* and *Jacob*, with all the rest mentioned in *Heb.* 11. with many others, true Believers in Christ? This you know is not to be denied. And are not all true Believers in Christ real Christians? And shall the Mother of our Lord be denied this Appellation? when the holy Scripture calls her a Believer in Christ, *Luke* 2. from v. 30, to v. 35. where it is thus written, *And blessed is she that hath believed*: And Mr. Leigh then confessed it.

The Answer therefore Mr. *Williams* gave to your Demand was good and proper, altho you thus trifle with it since, and change the word from what was then spoken: For, by what hath been said you may see that if it had been the word Christian, as it was not, yet if she was a Believer, then a Christian; for all true Believers in Christ, whether Jews or Gentiles, are Disciples; and you know the Disciples were called Christians. And altho that Name was first given at *Antioch*, yet they had the thing before the Name was brought into use, and imposed upon them.

And altho they then offered, upon giving you such an instance, to give us the Cause: Yet I do not think they were willing either then or now to give it us, for they have no mind to part with their Practice; for, if they had, they would not have used such poor shifts as they have done to support it. And amongst other Artifices they have made use of, this was one, to send a Certificate (before their Book was printed) down to *Froome* by the hands of *Thomas Smithwick* and *Hugh Wats*; and I doubt not but the Men are so honest, that they would not bring such a thing, if it had not been given them so to do:  
And

And the World shall have it in the same words as I had it delivered to me in my own House.

Mr. *Chandler's* and Mr. *Leigh's* Certificate.

“ These are to certify all whom it may concern,  
 “ That Dr. *Russel's* Narrative of the *Portsmouth*  
 “ Disputation is full of palpable notorious Falshoods;  
 “ and that there are many Alterations, Additions and  
 “ Omissions, even from Mr. *Samuel Ring's* own Co-  
 “ py which he hath honestly given to us. We can  
 “ procure the hands of vast numbers both of the  
 “ Church of *England* and Dissenters, and some Ana-  
 “ baptists themselves, that will acknowledg we ob-  
 “ tain'd an intire Victory. The Governor and Mayor  
 “ have promised their Testimonials, but being both  
 “ now at *London*; we cannot send them at present,  
 “ but shall publish with all convenient speed a full  
 “ Answer to Dr. *Russel's* Book, with the Attestations  
 “ of the principal Gentlemen present: Therefore we  
 “ humbly desire all Persons would suspend their Judg-  
 “ ment of this matter till they have a view of our  
 “ Answer.

Signed by

*Portsmouth*; June 1. 1699.

*Sam. Chandler;*  
*Will. Leigh.*

And now I hope, Reader, that Mr. *Chandler* and Mr. *Leigh* will not be angry for spending our Judgment upon their Narrative, themselves giving us that liberty, as (I suppose) is implied by this Certificate: For, altho it was sent to their own Friends, yet it being directed to all whom it may concern, I have reason to think it concerns me. But I am sure it did concern them to make it appear that the *Doctour's* Narrative was such as they have represented it to be,

which I am certain they have not yet done. Had they procured those vast numbers both of the Church of *England* and Dissenters, and also some Anabaptists (as they are pleased to call us, tho they know we disown both the Name and the Thing thereby signified) that would have acknowledged under their hands, that our Antagonists had obtained an intire Victory; and if upon examination they had been found to be Persons of Credit and Reputation, such as they promise by their Certificate, then they would have gained more by that, than they have done by all those undue Reflections they have cast upon us: For, such a course of Procedure serves rather to convince the sober and judicious, that they have taken this method to blast our Reputation, because they knew not how otherwise to evade the force of our Arguments against them, nor to justify their own Practice of Infant-sprinkling: for that had been their proper business, if they could have done it.

They say in their Certificate, the Governor and Mayor have *promised* their *Testimonials*. The Mayor's we have not, nor yet the Governor's, to any thing more than what relates to that first Advertisement that was put into the *Post-man*; and I expected they would have done as they promised. Gentlemen, will you thus adventure to charge the Governor and Mayor with Promise-breaking? I think that to be worse than to give his Honour a diminutive Title (as you phrase it.) And to give the Mayor a Title that is thought (by some) to be above him. That will not repair the damage he may sustain in being represented by you as a Promise-breaker. But I think he is more a Man than to do such a thing as that, notwithstanding what you say in your Certificate.

As touching Colonel *Gibson* I do, and shall thank his Honour for staying till the Dispute was ended;  
and



and also those Gentlemen that perswaded him to it, if that which is said be true, that they told him, if he went off there was danger lest the provoked Multitude should do Dr. *Russel* some mischief: But this (like other things) depends upon their bare Affirmation, and how much Credit may from thence be given to it, we must leave to the Reader to consider. For my own part, I have so much Charity for the Church-of-England People there present, that I cannot think, by any thing I could observe, that they had the least inclination to do the *Doctor* any Mischief. And as for our own People, I am sure they had no cause for it, if we take the *Doctor's* Argument as it is in it self, separate from Mr. *Robinson's* perverse Misconstruction and Misrepresentation of it. But as the *Doctor* did, so (we hope) we also know better things than what Mr. *Robinson* hath abusively put upon the *Doctor's* words: For we can and do make a difference between the nature of our Children, and that of Pigs and Dogs. But it is their business, and Mr. *Robinson's* in particular, to make a difference between what God can do in an extraordinary manner by his immediat operation upon Infants; and what can be done for, and upon them mediately, by the Ministry of Men, and that before they have the use and exercise of Reason: For they know his Argument was this,

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.

Now, as I may appeal to the judgment of all sober, judicious and unprejudiced Christians about this Argument, without supposing that any of them will put such a Construction upon it as Mr. *Robinson* hath done, that it carries with it a full Comparison with-



out exception, betwixt the Human Nature of Infants, and the beastly Nature of Brutes; when they do but consider that it was used by way of Retortion only: So I may also appeal to the Consciences of Mr. *Robinson* and his Assistants, whether they could possibly imagine from hence, that the honest intent and meaning of Dr. *Russel's* Argument was such as they represented it to be, in pag. 75. of their Book: As having thereby set our Infants upon a level with Brutes, and that there is no difference between our Children and our Dogs; and this to be his fixed Opinion, as they express it: And this after he had declared himself so fully to the contrary in his printed Narrative. For, altho they might pretend to have forgot what he said about it in the Dispute; or, their Passion might have hinder'd their Understandings from being employed as they ought in their attendance upon it; yet when they had it before them in print, wherein he hath vindicated himself from such a Misconstruction, I cannot see but they must needs know his true intent and meaning therein.

And, for my part, I believe all that read this Argument, and consider what the *Doctor* hath said about Infants, will be of my mind: Especially if they consider what Mr. *Williams* said concerning Infants, That they had a Right and Title to Glory by the free Grace of God, and the Righteousness of Christ. And let me add but one thing, that they are made meet for it by the work of the Spirit, which (to us) is altogether secret. But it never came into our Hearts to imagine any such Privileges to be intended as a Donation for the Beasts of the Field.

And if after all this, these Men shall still persist in it, and charge either the *Doctor* (or any of us) as they do him in their Narrative, that it is our fixed opinion, that there is no disparity, no difference, no  
unlike-

unlikeness at all between our Infants and the Beasts of the Fields, notwithstanding all that hath been said by us to the contrary, how can we help it? But this I desire the Reader to observe, that in *pag. 76.* where these words are, there are also words which they cite out of his Apology, that will testify in their Consciences that he allowed a disparity: And that the Parity implied in his Argument was only in a certain respect, as hath been already mentioned. But what may not Uncharitableness and Ill-will do, when such Men are resolved to pervert the words of him they contend with? And altho you talk never so highly of your Charity in the beginning of your Book, yet your Words and Actions to the contrary make it appear to be no other than an empty sound. For, a small measure of true Christian Charity would have enabled you to discern that gross Uncharitableness and Ill-will against the *Doctor*, which you have so often discovered in your Reflections on his Narrative.

What mischief therefore it should be supposed the Multitude should do the *Doctor* (as you intimate, *pag. 75, 76.*) I know not; nor yet from whom it should come, unless from your own Party: For the rest of the People were very civil to us, they made no disturbance at our going off, nor any attempts when we were in the Street; altho all the thanks they have from you is, to call them the provok'd Multitude. Whereas, if it had been true, the blame must have lain upon *Mr. Robinson*, who did use his Endeavour to provoke them; but as it was altogether without cause on our part, so it proved to be without success with respect to the People, who departed in a quiet and peaceable manner.

The Church of *England* hath less reason to be offended with us than with you: for, we deny nothing

to their Children, that we allow our selves to do for our own. If their Children are sick, we pray for them, if desired, &c. But it is you that put an affront upon those of that Communion by your Practice: For, whereas you say you baptize the Children of Believers, consider'd as such; and yet some of your Party have made some scruple of baptizing those whose Parents are not Members with you (as I have been inform'd) Do you think that all Parents in the Church of *England* are Unbelievers? And altho you profess to have a large latitude, it may be more than others of your Brethren; yet you do not often baptize their Children, which gives some seeming intimation, as if you made such a distinction betwixt your Children and theirs.

For our parts, we look upon our Children to have no more from us by Generation, than the Children of others have from them. And I dare not say (as you intimate in your Book) that the Line of Election runs to the Believers Seed. For, I know many that have been converted, and yet their Parents (to all visible appearance) were unconverted. Nay, the Children have been instrumental in the hand of God, for the good of their Parents: And (on the contrary) some Godly Parents have had very Ungodly Children, to the great grief and sorrow of their Souls.

Now therefore, if there was any cause for the Multitude (as you call them) to be offended, it is most likely to be at what you said (and not what the *Doctor* then said) that you should look upon them as Unbelievers; for so you do by your Practice and Writing, tho other things are pretended by you.

I would not have any think I am against the Doctrine of Election, I hope I own it as a Truth: And when your Children and mine come to be regenerated, it is a sure Character they were elected. And where-

as you talk of the Parents Faith being imputed to their Children; I must tell you plainly, I have heard of the Righteousness of Christ being imputed, but never that the Faith of the Parent was imputed to the Children before. It may be you will say, you do but suppose it; or, why may it not be so? It's the same method indeed that Mr. *Chandler* takes in his Sermons: But in my judgment, it is a way to make Men turn Atheists and Deists, and to ridicule all Revealed Religion, to make the holy Scriptures a nose of Wax, to serve your turns. I beg of you for time to come, to leave off such ways and methods, and to argue upon a firm and more certain Foundation.

But you proceed further in your Certificate, and say you will give a full Answer to Dr. *Russel's* Book.

If you had perform'd your Promise herein (as you have not) I do believe I should have been of your mind.

Neither have you been so good as your word in giving us the Attestations of the principal Gentlemen then present at your intire Victory, unless by them you mean Mr. *Smith*, Mr. *Maultbey*, and Mr. *Will. Wallen*, whom you produce as Witnesses in your Book: And if so, how can these be the principal Gentlemen present? And if they are, where be the Attestations under their hands, that you obtained an intire Victory at the Dispute? Or, is there any else hath done it? We find no such in your Book. I would have you that are so rigid in charging Dr. *Russel's* Narrative as false, by reason of some Omissions (as you say) in it; (whereas he was not willing, if he could have done it, to trouble the World with all those passionate Expressions that pass from Mr. *Robinson*, or others, that were of little concern to the World, lest he should have made it swell into too great a Volume; even as I my self think it not convenient



to make this my Writing swell with the several Remarks that might be made on many other Passages of your Book, lest it be made too chargeable for the Purses of our poor People.) I would, I say, have you and others consider whether the same Objection doth not fall as heavy upon your selves, seeing you have not performed your Promise under your hands, but have omitted to give us those Testimonials: But I suppose you were not able to obtain such a Testimony from those Gentlemen, or else we should have had it in your Book.

But there is one thing I would remark, which is this, That in p. 70. of your Narrative, you use this Expression, *That false Lie*. Now altho I do not allow your Charge to be true, yet suppose it had, could not you, by all your Learning and Skill, have found out an Expression less liable to exception? Pray, Sirs, when did you ever read or hear of a true Lie, that you tell the World this is a false Lie? Are there any Lies that are not false? Now I think this deserves as much notice as that of the addition of a Letter, and much more. And yet how strangely did you improve that against the *Doctor*: But I shall not deal so by you.

Thus, Reader, I hope I have made it appear how our Antagonists have no reason to boast so boldly as they have done of a Victory at the Dispute. But whereas on the other hand, they charge it as an egregious *Falshood* on Dr. Russel, p. 64. as if he had *boldly published amongst and by his Friends in London (tho not in his Narrative)* that he, to put it out of doubt, and his Friends had carried the day at Portsmouth, added, *the Bishop of Salisbury had received a Letter from Colonel GIBSON, wherein he applauded our Performance*. Now for the undeceiving of the World I think good further to add, that I charged the

*Doctor*



*Doëtor* with this Report (for which his said Enemies call him in the place aforecited, a *Falsifier of Reports*) but he told me he never said so, nor thought so, and therefore it must rest upon the Asserter, till he can bring forth his Evidence that the *Doëtor* said so, and that it was from thence that such a Report has spread abroad. However, this may serve as another Instance of their Spleen and Virulency against him, and how eager they are to snatch at any thing to asperse him, and to render him little, yea to degrade him in the highest manner. And hence it is that they cannot forbear to trifle with his being a Graduate, as in the last quoted Page: Wherefore for the satisfaction of some Persons that may have read their Reflections on him and his Degree, I shall here add the Certificate following, together with some other Certificates that I have lately procured, or have been sent to me out of the Country.

“ **W**Hereas it is render'd doubtful by the Presby-  
 “ terian Ministers in their account of the *Portf-*  
 “ *mouth* Disputation, whether *William Russel* be a Gra-  
 “ duate Doctor in Physick of the famous University  
 “ of *Cambridg*: These are to certify whom it may  
 “ concern, that we whose Names are under-written  
 “ have seen his *Diploma*, with the Seal of that Uni-  
 “ versity thereunto affixed; and concluding with  
 “ these words, *Dat. Cantabr. in Senatu nostro*. Given  
 “ in our Senate at *Cambridg*, June 11. 1688. Wit-  
 “ ness our Hands,

<i>William Salmon,</i>	<i>James Halsey,</i>
<i>Francis Salmon,</i>	<i>Edward Farvis,</i>
<i>John Wells,</i>	<i>John Sharpe.</i>

I have also seen a Book, entituled, *A Register of the Doctors of Physick in our two Universities of Cambridg*  
 and

and Oxford, Printed Anno 1695. diligently and carefully collected out of the Registers of both those Universities; beginning at 1659. and ending with 1694. inclusive: With the Names of those that were created Doctors in Physick during that time (which is 35 years) placed both in an Annual and Alphabetical Order. In both which I find Dr. *William Russel's* Name inserted in its due place and order.

From whence it is evident that Dr. *Russel* is in the right, and themselves in the wrong: And also it serves to discover another mistake of theirs, which they (through their ignorance) charge upon him, *viz.* for saying the *Senate* at *Cambridg*, which they call a word of his own coining, and do greatly ridicule him for it; whereas it appears by his own *Diploma*, that the Vice-Chancellor, Doctors and Heads of Colleges, &c. (when assembled) do call themselves a *Senate*.

Besides, the *Doctor* doth assure me that the King's Letter was thus directed: To our Trusty and Well-beloved, the Vice-Chancellor of our University of *Cambridg*, to be communicated to the *Senate* there.

So that it appears to me it is the common Appellation given to them (as that of Convocation else-where) altho these Men are so ignorant as not to know it, or so malicious against the *Doctor*, as not to allow it him. It therefore gives cause of doubting, whether either of them ever saw (in a true and proper sense) the inside of any University in their Lives.

Here

Here follows Mr. *Bowes's* Letter, wherein he hath vindicated himself from Mr. *Chandler's* unjust and scandalous Reflections.

From *Stubinton*, Sept. 29th, 1699.

*Much honoured and beloved Brother Ruffel, to whom Grace, Mercy and Peace be multiplied, through our Lord Jesus Christ.*

**T**Hese Lines come from your Brother in the Faith of our Lord Jesus, *Thomas Bowes*, and are to inform you of the horrid Falsities that are inserted in Mr. *Chandler's* pretended Narrative, which he would fain have the World believe is impartial, tho indeed it is no such thing: which I hope will evidently appear to all Men who are not prejudiced, especially when the falseness of what he hath writ concerning me and others is made manifest.

For if he will adventure so grossly to belie his Neighbours, who can disprove him, and have opposed him to his face; no wonder if he belie the Dispute it self, and the Disputants, rather than hazard his own Interest, which seemeth to lie at stake.

I shall now give you an account of those things in particular concerning me, which may be found in his Book, that are most notoriously false. And take them as followeth, *viz.*

**W**H In his Introduction near the latter end, he is bold to assert, That I and my Party did suspend from our Communion one *Isaac Harman* a Joyner, for hearing Mr. *Webber*, which is horridly false: For there was never any such thing acted by me and my Party in this World towards that young Man, nor any other Person, for going to hear Mr. *Webber*.

This

This Man hath but little regard to Truth it self, that he can boldly charge this notorious Falshood upon me and my Party, without being able to produce his Author for it, when it was required of him. He hath indeed confidently asserted, that the young Man told him so himself. But the truth of this is like some of the rest of his impartial Narrative.

For the young Man went himself, with one of our Friends with him, to the Meeting where Mr. *Chandler* had been preaching, and there charged him with the falseness of what he had written, to his face before many of his Hearers; and did then offer to attest upon Oath, that he never had one word of Discourse with him in all his life time, neither about that nor any thing else.

And Mr. *Chandler* did confess before those then present, that he could not say he had.

Yet so unchristian-like was their Carriage to him, that at his first appearance Mr. *Williams*, the Presbyterian Minister, bawl'd out, and said, Where is this Man that fears neither God nor Devil?

To whom the young Man replied, that he had a Soul to be saved as well as Mr. *Williams*, and did fear God as well as himself.

But that well qualified Man Mr. *Chandler*, did in his fury lay hands on him in such sort, that his own Hearers cry'd out, Pray Mr. *Chandler* do not strike him.

But alas! this great flood of Heat was soon turn'd into the cold ebb of Dissimulation, when they saw that way of stirring made them stink.

For the next Evening Mr. *Williams* sent one of his Hearers to *Isaac Harman*, and desired him that he would come to his House, and have some talk with him in a moderate way; and did acknowledg he was sorry that he should carry himself in such a passionate



passionate way to him the night before.

To this the young Man complied, and went to his House, where Mr. *Williams* treated him with many hollow Compliments. Now it was, Mr. *Harman*: But the night before he cried out, that he neither feared God nor Devil.

But when he saw he could not obtain his end by Flattery, he told the young Man he would have him put into the *Post-Boy*.

But I wonder Mr. *Chandler* should be so forward to ride Post, since the baseness of his Horse, and his own Infirmities have so often brought him to the ground.

But again, in his Introduction he is pleased to charge me with no less than four more as great Lies as is possible for any Man to pen. For,

1. He asserteth, that I applied my self to Mr. *Ring* for a sight of those Sermons which he had writ; which is utterly false.

2. He is bold to say that I read them, which is a horrid Falshood; for I never read them in all my life time.

3. He saith, I having read them, spake words to this effect, *viz.* That if we suffer Mr. *Chandler* thus to go on, it will prejudice our Cause.

But this is as false as any of the rest: For I never spake those words to Mr. *Ring*, no, nor to that effect; which Mr. *Ring* must witness, if he be not bias'd, and will but speak the Truth: But if he will not, they that were with me at that time will justify that I spake no such words, nor to that effect. And it is as false that Mr. *Ring* replied, Mr. *Chandler* takes but the same liberty in his own Congregation that we do in ours; for he never replied so to me. But (perhaps) Mr. *Ring* will give him leave to bely him and the Truth it self, rather than by opposing him hazard  
his



his own Interest, and the loss of a Place at his Lecture. But I shall not give him leave so to bely me, tho indeed he hath the Confidence to take it.

4. And lastly; (tho indeed these are not all the Lies he is guilty of concerning me; yet, I hope, it will be the last time he will venture so grossly to abuse me, and so greatly to sin against God) Mr. *Chandler* doth also tell the World, that I was a Man dissatisfied, and went over to *Gosport* to Mr. *Webber*, which is a notorious Lie; for I never went to Mr. *Webber*, nor ever sent to him about the Disputation first nor last: Yet this Man would have the World believe that what he hath written is Truth, and so deceive himself and them too (in the end) that hearken to him: For nothing can be more false concerning me, than what he hath writ for Truth; and therefore I shall charge those Lies upon Mr. *Chandler* as some of his own inventing, till he doth produce his Authors, which (I believe) is as hard to bring forth, as the young Man that told him he was suspended, and asked his Advice about it; for as yet he is invisible.

And I cannot imagine where he will find Authors for such Forgeries, unless he bespeak them. For I can attest upon Oath that all those things are utterly false and groundless, and therefore ought not to be called Mistakes unless there had been something in them.

Again, he is also pleased to say, that if I could believe the Doctrine of Original Sin, as they believe it, I should think Infants had need of Baptism: And, that I wonder'd that the People at *Gosport* should be against it.

Now whatever I did say, I can safely declare that I never spake what Mr. *Chandler* hath written: And so I told him to his face, and did offer to make my Oath of it.

For,

For if I had said what they have written, I should have wronged my own Conscience, in saying that which I did not then believe, nor do yet believe; but I am sure that he hath wronged himself and me also, in saying and writing that which I did not, nor could not speak.

But alas! any thing that does but drop from the Goose-quill of this Man (tho it be never so false) is good enough to please those that follow him; with whom I leave him till the Judgment Day of the great God, where he and I must give account of all things.

But if he in the mean time hath any thing to object, I am his Neighbour, and shall be ready to make good what I have charged upon him, by more than a single Testimony. Witness my hand,

*Thomas Bowes.*

Here follows a further Testimony, signed by the principal Brethren of the Church at *Portsmouth*, to prove *Mr. Chandler* a false Accuser in what he hath printed about *Isaac Harman*.

**WE** whose Names are under-written do testify, That *Isaac Harman* was not suspended from our Communion for hearing *Mr. Webber* preach; nor for any thing else. Witness our hands,

*Thomas Bowes;*  
*Isaac Harman,*  
*Edward Fishbourn,*  
*James Goodeve;*

*William Oakely;*  
*Walter Addis,*  
*George Kelley.*

Mr. *William Leddel* of *Gosport's* Vindication.

Here follows an account of those Mistakes and Falshoods they have presumed to charge Mr. *Leddel* with, and his Vindication of himself therefrom.

S I R,

**H**AVING received your Letter, I can do no other than reply for my self. I was willing to contradict that prophetick Remonstrance of being charged to be a Man of Heat without Light. And should I at first sight have declared my thoughts of their Proceedings, I might (perhaps) have written passionately, considering how they have endeavoured to cloud that which (through Providence) hath so many Evidences to the contrary. I believe Truth will have its time to be made apparent.

I shall not say much as to what past in the Disputation, but rather endeavour to acquit my self from Forgery, which I am charged with, especially with relation to what Mr. *Smith* hath said in his Certificate, or Testimonial, which he hath inserted in the 60th Page of Mr. *Chandler's*, Mr. *Leigh's*, and Mr. *Robinson's* impartial Account (as they call it) of the *Portsmouth* Disputation. Blame me not for putting him last who should have been first, because not nominated in the Preliminaries, and Mr. *Leigh* comes in by chance. But as to what Mr. *Smith* hath there declared to the World, some of it was then said, but not in that form, nor at all to that purpose, except that Clause wherein he now lets the World know he had an imperfect Account.

For having accidentally met with Mr. *Smith* at his own Habitation, he was pleased to thank me for putting

ting.

ting his Name in print, which I then took as an Ironical Speech. I then discovered to him the place where the words were spoken, but could not perfectly remember the day of the Month; whereupon he concluded, that if I did, he had forgotten it; but I hope his forgetfulness is not Argument sufficient to prove I did not. And this I can say, that altho there was but one time that I so directly desired the sight of his Copy to compare it with that I had, yet both before and after I desired the sight of his; and at that time I told him the reason thereof, which he also in his Certificate or Testimonial denies: Yet altho he hath forgotten the other times wherein I desired him to let me see his Copy, or see it when it was done, this does not prove it a Lie, or that he was never spoken to about it: For if it had been so, what cause was there for that needless Excuse of Mr. *Leigh*, that it not being transcribed was not fit to be compar'd, because I might take advantage therefrom; and that such things ought not to be communicated to an Enemy? As if it could not be compared with the Copy that I had, nor to such a Person whom they knew was adverse, and would improve what was there related to their advantage.

I must ingenuously confess I did not tell him it would be printed; but I then told him, I knew not but it would be printed, tho I was not then positive myself. Now if Mr. *Smith* would but recollect his Memory, he might call to mind that I spoke oftner to him than that time in his Shop. It's true, that about two or three days after the Disputation I was willing (for Peace sake) the whole should have been buried.

But to return to Mr. *Smith*, I cannot but wonder what should protect him in giving the World that account of the *Anabaptists* loose and shuffling way of arguing, which gave such Interruption to the bet-



ter taking of what past in the Dispute.

I cannot but retort this upon him; the *Anabaptists* (so called) might have had as civil Treatment among Heathens.

But that Mr. *Smith* should insinuate that he retorted this to me, and received no Answer, it must be supposed I was not so hot a Man as their learned Rabbins have reported me to be. But I cannot find fault if I have no Light: And since they have all the Light, there can be none left for me. Their Opponents are also accounted by them Blockheads and Dunces, as they then gave out, and have upon occasion still asserted. I am not willing to bring Names into question, only I can't but reflect upon those great Trophies of Art, and profound Academics, which were the great Maintainers of that unscriptural, not to say antiscritural Notion of Infant-Baptism: altho I might, seeing their elevated Profundity hath not so much as taught them good Manners; calling (at least) their fellow-Creatures, if not their Equals in all good Science, Fools, Blockheads, Liars, and Sophisters. How incongruous these Titles are, tho they had been never such learned Academicks, may appear to those who have but only common sense.

They seem agreed to carry on their contracted Conspiracy, tho it be against the Declaration of Heaven. But further, Pray, worthy Sir, must your Forgetfulness be charged as my Lie? Why may not you be under a mistake in this, as well as you are in that Clause of your Certificate, where you pretend the Imperfection of the Account was occasioned by the *Anabaptists* loose and shuffling way of arguing. For don't you know, when brought to the Test your Party could not be kept within bounds? Nay hath it not been defended by the Pastor you sit under, (Mr. *John Earl* by name) that we deserv'd n  
 bette



better Treatment at your hands; and yet lay we occasioned the obstruction of an intelligible Account to the World? Pray, Sir, the next time you get one to abet your Cause, be so kind as to instruct him better in what you would have him say. For *W. Wallen* to attest he was present when I came to you, and yet not know any more what passed then, is strange; or, if he did, why was he no fuller in his Relation?

As to what he says that relates to the time of transcribing your Copy, as it's little to the purpose, so it looks as if he had been your minute Companion, and had known I had never spoken to you but once. And notwithstanding his Attestation, I remember that you told me, that tho it were not done, yet you had begun it, and should make an end of transcribing it in a little time; yet never was so kind to let me see it, till it was calculated to your own Meridian.

But among other things, I wonder you should be so unhappy, as to discover your own weakness to the World, in upbraiding others of Fallaciousness, and yet could not keep your self clear. For to pretend you had compared this with Mr. *Maltby's* and your own, which you call Originals, and that you found it exactly agreable thereto; and that the one should not stoop lower, nor the other be raised higher; I can't but fear you have conspired together in a Lie: And have not only endeavour'd to insinuate it to be a Truth among your own Friends, but also to the Universe; for it seems to me no less than a Miracle. But what shall I say, when Men care not what they say, nor whereof they affirm; since 'tis well known that Mr. *Smith* knows little of the Greek, if any, and less of the Hebrew, whatever Mr. *Maltby* does: and that your Copy should so exactly agree to a tittle both with Mr. *Maltby's*, and what is printed, I must leave the World to judg.

But since nothing can be taken for granted but what we have Time, and Place, and Witness to: It will teach me for the future to take a Witness when I shall have occasion to treat with Mr. *Smith*, or any other of them upon such occasions. For as to the proof of this, it depends upon my Yea, and his Nay; I not thinking in the least this would have been so material, as to have given them such an occasion to ground their Cause upon, which was so lamely defended. This seems to be but like a Man that is in danger of being drowned, who will catch at a Feather, which when caught can give him no support. Upon what I have remark'd, there is reason enough undoubtedly to shew, that Mr. *Smith's* Certificate (by which he would convince the World) is fallacious.

And as to what Mr. *Chandler*, Mr. *Leigh*, and Mr. *Robinson* speak about this matter, neither the annexed Testimonial, nor yet what is in the second side of Dr. *Russel's* Dedication, saith any such thing; but saith, tho it was desired, could not be obtained. And I *William Leddell* do here attest that it was compared with another Copy, whose it was is yet unknown to me to this day, but was acknowledged by Mr. *Leigh* as before: And that acknowledgment does not want Witness, Mr. *James Goodeve* being present at the delivery of a Letter sent to Mr. *Leigh* by Mr. *Walter Addis*. Now what occasion there should be for a Concealment, tho in the Character it was written, besides the reason alledg'd by Mr. *Leigh*, I know not.

Sir, I think it not meet to animadvert upon all their Reflections and opprobrious Speeches with reference to my self, I not being academically learned; but I desire to learn more of Christ, and to concern my self less with those Persons who are in a Sphere too high for me, that count themselves great, and all others Shrubs, because they have not attained to a  
like

like Stature in human Literature. And let this pass as my Reply to what they have said in reference to me, not being in so great a Heat but a little Water may cool it, provided it be not foul.

William Liddell.

But, Sir, since I thought I had done, casting my Eye upon the third Page of Mr. *Chandler's* Introduction, I saw as absurd a Passage under my Name as any passed in the whole Book, contrary to an Account that I gave him my self touching *Matthew Caffin*: Altho then Mr. *Chandler's* business was (as he pretended) to know the Truth, that he might not err in what he was going about, with reference to *Matthew Caffin's* lying under such a Report of denying the Humanity and Divinity of Christ. But I having no Light, and Mr. *Chandler* having such Eyes as to see where none is; he is, for ought I perceive, creating Light out of Darkness. For he saith, *that I and some others, Men of Heat without Light, were very urgent to accept of Matthew Caffin for their Champion.* For I give this as my Testimony, That I my self ever refused *Matthew Caffin* to have any hand in it.

But what Spirit actuates Mr. *Chandler* I know not, that he should not care what he saith.

And when I see so many Untruths couch'd in one Paragraph of his Introduction, it's a plain Indication of those many that follow, for there they are crowded in heaps. But if Mr. *Chandler* had told me who were my Companions, we might then have gon to *Isaac Harman*, whom he recites (tho falsly) to have led us to him; to have borrowed some Light from him, as he (falsly) says *Isaac Harman* did. Now, Sir, pray

be so kind to your self, as to conceal your Paths (for they are dark ones) and let not blind Men tread on your Heels. I hope you will be more careful for the future, and not let Men with no Light (tho as yet you have found but one of them) see into the very Crannies of your wilful and woful Mistakes.

As to the truth of my refusing *Matthew Caffin*, I could bring many Witnesses: And I never knew but one Person who was for him, which *Mr. Chandler* hath happily mist, and is never like to know for me. This is all at present from your Brother in Christ,

*William Leddell.*

---

*Here follows an account of some of those Falshoods they charge upon Dr. Russel, in their pretended Impartial Account of the Portsmouth Disputation, and his Answers thereunto.*

Brother Sharp,

**F**Orasmuch 'as you have taken in hand so good a Work, as to vindicate the Truth of that Narrative I supervised and published concerning that Disputation at *Portsmouth*, wherein our well-beloved Brother *Williams* and your self were also engag'd; I thought meet to send you this following Account, to free my self from those Calumnies, the Publishers of that false and abusive Account of that Disputation have undeservedly cast upon me.

1. In *Pag. 57.* they say that I mention'd *Constantine the Great* as a Scripture Instance.

I answer; This they know to be false: For at the same time I refer'd them to the History of the first  
five



five hundred years, and alledged it only to prove matter of Fact from the Testimony of the Fathers; which Mr. Leigh accordingly understood, or else what made him give this Answer, What do you tell us of the Fathers? we are not bound to abide by their Testimony. See p. 35. of my True Narrative.

2. In Pag. 61. they say, it's false that Mr. Chandler's Sermons were the occasion of the Dispute, and much more that this is agreed to by them.

To this I answer: I have no more to do than to confute them by their own Pens.

My words are these. It is agreed on both sides that Mr. Chandler's Sermons were the occasion of that Offence taken by you (speaking to Mr. Bowes, Mr. Webber, and the Churches to whom they belong) and of the Dispute it self, as appears by the Preliminaries, &c.

Now that this is true, appears from their own Pens. For in the Title Page of their own Account they have these words: *An Abridgment of those Discourses that were the innocent occasion of that Disputation.*

And in Pag. 2. *An Abridgment of those Sermons that were the innocent occasion of the Disputation.* Now in both these places they confess what I say to be true. For I only say they were the occasion thereof, without so much as telling them whether it were an innocent or nocent occasion.

But, 2. I can prove it under the hands of Mr. Chandler and Mr. Williams of Portsmouth: And for that I refer you to the Preliminaries themselves, which were read publickly before all the People, and assented to by both sides, as you have them truly printed in my Narrative, pag. 3, 4. but omitted in theirs, which begins thus.

Whereas by Mr. Chandler's late preaching on the Ordinance of Baptism, several Persons have taken offence;

fence; and upon desire of Satisfaction, it's mutually agreed between us whose Names are underwritten, that these two Points be amicably disputed in the following order, &c.

*Samuel Chandler,*

*Francis Williams.*

I had that very Paper delivered to me in Mr. *Williams's* Meeting-house at the time of the Dispute, which they signed with their own hands, and have it still by me to witness against them.

And strange it is, that these Men should have the confidence to deny what is so solemnly delivered under their own hands. But perhaps they thought I had lost that Paper, and should not have been able to detect their false Accusation any other way. And this seems to be the true cause why they were so unjust as to omit putting down the Preliminaries in their printed Account, that they might not confute themselves under their own hands.

3. In the same page 61. they say it's false that Mr. *Robinson* should in the midst of the Dispute give me the Lie.

1. Pray observe: This is a falsifying of my words, which are these. He said in the midst of the Dispute with a loud Voice, *That is a Lie.* But I did not tell them he said so to me: And under this subterfuge they might suppose to shelter themselves in their Denial. But,

2. I do know that he did say as I have printed it: And if my word may not pass for it, I have divers to testify for me.

Mr. *Webber*, Pastor of the Church at *Gosport*, being with me in *London*, Sept. 6. last past, I asked him about it, and he affirms it to be true, that Mr. *Robinson* did give me the Lie, and that there were Wit-  
nesses

nesses enough could testify that; for he being mounted in the Pulpit at a distance from the rest of his Brethren, there could be no mistake about it. See the Truth of this well attested in Mr. *Sharp's* Account.

3. They confess that Mr. *Leigh* did give the Lie.

Now I did not accuse him, but Mr. *Robinson* only; and (I hope) Mr. *Leigh's* confessing that he gave the Lie, doth not prove that Mr. *Robinson* did not: But it doth prove that they were a couple of ill-bred, unmannerly Presbyters, to say no worse of them.

4. I must now charge them with a notorious Falshood which they have printed against me, in these words.

This bold Gentleman hath published amongst and by his Friends in *London*; Dr. *Russel* to put it out of doubt, that he and his Friends had carried the day at *Portsmouth*, added, the Bishop of *Salisbury* had received a Letter from Colonel *Gibson*, wherein he applauded their, *i. e.* the *Anabaptists* Performance.

To this I answer.

1. That I never heard of any Letter at all sent to that Bishop by Colonel *Gibson*, till I read it in their printed Account.

2. I never said so to any Person whatsoever: and I challenge them to produce their Evidence, for till then it must be charged upon themselves.

3. I neither knew nor thought that Colonel *Gibson* had been such a Zealot for their Cause, to trouble himself to send Letters to two Bishops (as they say he did) in favour of them, till I read it in their printed Account; whereas, had he not been extremely bias'd, he might have known better than to have sent up such an Advertisement as they say he did to put into the *Post-man*.

But Mr. *Robinson* confesses that he was the Informer, who waited on the Bishop to tell him this false and malicious Story.

And

And whereas he saith, that his Lordship generously allowed them to make use of his Name for the undeceiving the World in this matter: And whereas it plainly appears it was to deceive the World, I hope his Lordship will for the future have a care how he gives Credit to one that hath thus imposed upon him in such a confident manner, with such a notorious invented Story of his own making; and by that means give occasion to have his Name printed, in their false and scandalous Account.

4. This may well give his Lordship (and all others) a just occasion to suspect the Narrative they have published; for if they can allow themselves such a liberty to print such notorious Falshoods as these are about matter of Fact, what reason is there to believe them in any thing they say? And if Mr. *Robinson* will but be so just, as to present his Lordship with my True Narrative; upon comparing both together with our Vindication, I doubt not but he will have other sentiments of that Disputation, and be sufficiently convinc'd of their Partiality and Prevarications.

5. They charge me for abusing Mr. *Gosnold* in these words: 'Tis as ridiculous as 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*.

1. 'Tis they that abuse me: For the very first words in his Title are, Βαπτισμῶν διδασχῆς, in that Edition published by himself. If others that reprinted it since his death have left it out, 'tis their fault, not mine.

2. It's true and proper Greek, as they themselves confess, unless the Apostle *Paul* wrote false Greek; for they say the Letters are the same *Heb. 6. 2.* so that they must not charge Mr. *Gosnold* with it, but the



the Apostle *Paul*. Are not these bold Men, to charge *Paul* with writing false Greek?

3. Their Pretence is false: For that learned Man Mr. *John Gosnold* did know how to distinguish between the Nominative and Genitive Case, and so do I. But they must throw this Reflection upon our Translators of the Bible, and upon *Paul* himself, or rather take it to themselves as a false Accusation, to whom it properly belongs.

4. Mr. *Gosnold* doth not treat of the Baptism of Water alone, but of all the three Baptisms spoken of in Scripture, *viz.* that of Water, (which is a real Baptism) and that of the Spirit, and also that of Affliction, as metaphorical Baptisms. And as the Greek is true, so the Title of his Book is the most proper that could be thought of, *The Doctrine of Baptisms*.

5. As to that for which this Charge is brought, they pretend they gave the Answer there recited in the time of the Dispute; whereas they know 'tis an invented Answer of their own, made on purpose to sham off the matter to which it relates. But that is a small thing with them, for they have done so throughout their pretended Account of the Disputation; wherein they have most egregiously abused the World.

6. In *pag. 75.* they let us know their Memories are short with respect to what I set down in *pag. 35.* of my Narrative, where I say, I do not remember that there is any account in History, during the first five hundred years, that any one of the Fathers, or eminent Bishops of the Church, that were born of Christian Parents, were baptized until they were about twenty or thirty years of Age: And if any of you know the contrary, I desire you would shew it.

Upon which Mr. *Leigh* answered, *What do you tell us of the Fathers? We are not bound to abide by their*

*their Testimony.* And notwithstanding I then made a full Reply thereto, yet these Men tell the World, they do not remember that it was mentioned in the Disputation.

But the thing they could not remember was, to find out an Instance to the contrary: for that they have not given us, neither then nor since, which they would certainly have done if they had known how.

But they pretend to remember that which was never said nor thought by me, *viz.* That for the first six hundred years Infants were admitted to Communion in the Lord's-Supper. And this I must charge upon them as utterly false, and an Invention of their own.

But it is true, that from *Austin's* time for the space of five or six hundred years the Supper was given to Infants; and both that and Baptism contended for as necessary to Salvation: For which *Austin* had that Name given him of *Pater durus Infantium.* And this is so well known to the Learned, that these Men will but discover their Ignorance in denying it.

7. They have wholly altered the state of the Case, as to what Mr. *Chandler* said upon *Dan. 4. 33.* For whereas he asserted that the word in the Septuagint Translation was *baptizo*; I denied it, and told him it was *ebaphe*: But that if it had been as he said, it was nothing to his purpose, because it was not originally written in Greek.

Upon which he said, *Baptizo* comes from *Tabal.* I asked him then, how it was in the Hebrew in that place? He answered it was *Tabal*: which I denied.

And after I had seen the place, I told him it was not there. See p. 54. of my Narrative. And at last Mr. *Chandler* confest it was not. And they all allow it in Print.

Nevertheless in their own account, p. 82. they say, that

that to try my Skill in the Hebrew, who had so shamefully faulter'd in the Greek, I was asked what the Hebrew word was, and that I said, if I had an Hebrew Bible I could tell.

Now this I must charge upon them as an Invention of their own: And his Friend Mr. Ring can testify that I had made my Observations upon that place in *Dan. 4. 33.* and sent them to *Portsmouth* in a Letter, and received an Answer from him before I came down to the Dispute; and had examined the place upon the occasion of a Passage upon it in Mr. *Chandler's* Sermon, upon the word *Tabal*, and therefore knew what Mr. *Chandler* said was false before I came from *London*: So that I did not stand in need of a Hebrew Bible to examine that in the time of the Dispute. But I have cause to suspect that Mr. *Chandler* had not examined it himself, but made use of some other, who did not rightly inform him: for altho it be in *v. 33.* in the English Bible, it is not so in the Hebrew, but in *v. 30.* And altho I knew it, I was no more obliged to teach him that, than I was to instruct him in the difference between the *Hebrew* and *Chaldee* words in the Book of *Daniel*. But it was my business to force him to acknowledg before all the People, that what he said was false; which accordingly he did, and hath since done in Print.

And as for that silly Sarcasm of theirs, that Hebrew Bibles are all misplaced with him; for we hear from good hands (they should have said from lying hands) that at *Havering* in *Essex*, he was confounded with the same place, and could not find the Prophecy of *Daniel*.

I answer; First, I had but one Dispute at *Essex*, and that was in the Parish-Church at *Avely*, with Mr. *Pomfret* and Mr. *Taylor*; and there was no mention made of this place in *Daniel*, either by them or me.

2. There was no Hebrew Bible produced, nor was there any occasion for it: So that I must return this Story to the Father of Lies, from whence it came.

And that the World may see that what I say is true, I shall insert the following Certificate, written by Persons of known Integrity and Ability, who were present at that Dispute; which was obtained by your self, and sign'd in your presence.

**WE** whose Names are under-written do testify, That at the Dispute at *Avely in Essex*, between *Dr. William Russel* and *Mr. Samuel Pomsret*, concerning the baptizing of Infants, there was not any mention made of Hebrew Words, nor any Hebrew Bible spoke of, nor produced, for there was not any occasion for it, their Dispute being more about the Subjects than the Manner. Witness our Hands,

*Octob. 13. 1699.*

*John Lowke,  
Joseph Jackson,  
Cornelius Denne.*

There are several other things that deserve to be remarked, but because they will occur in my Observations upon the Dispute it self, and their Reflections upon it, I shall take notice of them as they occasionally present themselves in my following Observations.



Some OBSERVATIONS upon their

# DEDICATION.

By Dr. WILLIAM RUSSEL.

**T**hey dedicate their scandalous Pamphlet to the Honourable Major General *Earl*, Governor; Colonel *John Gibson*, Lieutenant-Governor of his Majesty's Garison of *Portsmouth*; and the worshipful *Henry Seager* Esq; Mayor of *Portsmouth*.

1st. These Men quarrel with me for calling Colonel *Gibson* Deputy-Governor, when themselves acknowledge that Major-General *Earl* is Governor. Is not Deputy-Governor as honourable a Title as Lieutenant?

If they think I speak too diminutively of him, can they suppose they have mended the matter in presuming to yoke their Worshipful Esq; *Henry Seager*, who drives that common Trade of a Baker in the Town of *Portsmouth*, with such honourable Persons as the other two? Is this all the Respect and Honour they can afford to give them?

2dly. They say, We humbly lay these Papers at your feet. Surely they have reason to trample upon them in disdain, when they find themselves intituled to such a false and scandalous Pamphlet.

3dly. They say, who procured for us a Grant from his Majesty, publickly to vindicate the common Cause of the Reformed Churches.

1. Infant-sprinkling is the thing you must intend. How then came you to decline the Vindication thereof, and refuse to give so much as one single instance

for your Practice, altho you were often call'd upon to do it (in the time of the Disputation) both by Mr. *John Williams* and my self?

2. How comes Infant-sprinkling to be appropriated (by you) to the Reformed Churches? Surely there are others in the World practise that, besides those of the Reformed Churches.

Are you so ignorant, as not to know that all the Papists in *France, Spain, Portugal, Germany, Poland, Italy, and Rome* it self (the Seat of the Whore of *Babylon*) do practise Infant-sprinkling as well as you? How then have you the confidence to tell these Honorable Persons, and the whole World, it is the common Cause of the Reformed Churches? whereas it is notoriously known, that it is the common Cause both of Papists and those you call Reformed.

3. If it be appropriated peculiarly to either, it must be to the Church of *Rome*; for you know that the Reformed Churches did receive it from her, and have retain'd it as one of her Relicks to this day. For they have no Scripture Authority for it.

4thly. They say it tends very much to the advancement of early Piety and Religion.

1. If they believe themselves, why were they guilty of so great a Sin of Omission, as not to vindicate their Practice when they were so often prest to it, and yet could not be prevailed upon to give any Scripture Instance for it: And would not so much as try their Skill (when so fair an opportunity was put into their hands) to prove their own Practice, and thereby settle those that are wavering among them; notwithstanding they pretend it was the thing for which those Honourable Persons procured for them a Grant from his Majesty?

But, 2. How the sprinkling a little Water upon the Infants Faces, and calling that Baptism, should be to them

them an occasion of early Piety and Religion, is sooner said than proved.

It seems to me rather to have a contrary tendency, especially your telling them when they come to years of understanding, that by their Baptism they are put into a new Covenant-relation, that you have dedicated them to God, that they are in a state of Salvation; that those who neglect it, have no more reason to hope for the Salvation of their Infants than the Heathens; but they must only leave them to the unfathomable depths of God's Goodness, having no Promise to rely upon, *p. 11*. That they are solemnly admitted by Baptism into the Visible Church; (how this agrees with Mr. Leigh's Argument from *Mat. 19*. he would do well to consider) that they are the more special Objects of the Promises of Grace; that the Vein of Election frequently runs in the Channel of believing Parents, and their Seed; and that if they die during their Infant-state, they shall be saved, *pag. 8*.

Add to this what is said in their Preface, 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.

Now unless these Men will deny the Doctrine of final Perseverance (as held by the Calvinists) they do rather give those Children an occasion from hence to neglect the most important Duties of the Gospel.

For, why should they repent and be baptized in the Name of Jesus Christ for the remission of their Sins, if they are baptized already, and their Sins all pardoned, and this Pardon sealed to them by sprinkling a little Water on their faces?

Why should they believe in Christ, that through him they might have an Interest in eternal Life and Glory, if it be secured to them already another way?

Why should they work out their own Salvation with fear and trembling, if it be secured and sealed to them already, by what you call Baptism, without any possibility of miscarrying? For they say, that if such die in their Infancy, they shall be saved.

Now, Do they not hereby do all that in them lies to perswade such Persons, that if they had died in their Infant-state, they should have been saved by being in the Covenant of Grace, and in the Line of Election? And can they (after all this) sin themselves out again, and become Reprobates? I thought you Presbyters had been of another mind. Can you put them (whilst Infants) into the Covenant of Grace, and turn them out again (when they come to be Adult) as you think fit? I cannot imagine you do believe your selves when you thus write; nor can you ever think to gain us to your Party by such Inconsistences as these: For we know that the Decrees of God are immutable, and it is not in the power of any Creature to alter them. And we also know, that you cannot (from your own Principles) be at any certainty who are elected, and who are not (whilst in an Infant-state) till such time as they come to be effectually called. And seeing you do not believe that all Infants dying in their Infant-state shall be saved; because you tell us, that you leave such as die unbaptized to the unfathomable depths of God's Goodness, there being no Promise to rely upon: I must now needs discern the cloven Foot, notwithstanding your sham pretences to cover it: For unless you did think that the sprinkling of Infants is necessary to Salvation (notwithstanding those deceitful Expressions in your Preface) or (at least) did doubt within your selves, whether any unbaptized Infant could be saved, all this you talk of is but insignificant trifling. And you had better deal plainly with the World (as one of  
your



your Brethren did) to let them know, that if he must baptize no Infants but what he knew to be of the number of the Elect, he must not baptize any; for he did not know what Infants were in the Covenant of Grace, and in the Line of Election, and what were not: For, I believe you know as little of the matter as he, altho you seem so unwilling to confess it. But if you neither baptize them, as knowing them to be the Elect of God, nor yet in the Covenant of Grace, how can you say they are in a state of Salvation, and that if they die in their Infancy they shall be saved; except you did conclude (as *Austin* did) that the Baptism of Infants is necessary to Salvation, and that they are actually brought into the Line of Election thereby, and made the Children of God, and Heirs of Glory? And if so, then free your selves from the Papists *Opus operatum*, if you know how. Is this the way to early Piety? Surely no.

For if they were not sprinkled in their Infancy, and afterwards told by you (or others) that it was a sufficient Baptism (altho in truth it is no Baptism at all) they might then be easily prevailed upon to submit to the Baptism of Christ. And when they are taught that Repentance from dead Works, and Faith towards God were to precede Baptism, and to fit them for it: And that Baptism is an initiating Ordinance, without which they cannot be true Members of the visible Church of Christ: And that they must be dead to Sin, before they were buried with Christ by Baptism: And that after they were baptized, they must walk in newness of Life. This were a more probable way to incline them to that great Duty of remembering their Creator in the days of their youth; and to promote and advance early Piety and true Religion in their Hearts and Lives.

But so long as you shall tell them that they are

made Disciples of Christ as soon as they are born; that they were made Christians, Members of the Church, and enter'd into the new Covenant by what you did for them when you sprinkled them with Water: This hath a direct tendency to lull them asleep in security, and make them draw this false Conclusion, that they were thereby made Christians indeed, and so deceive their own Souls.

For, it is found by woful Experience, that many of them who are poor, ignorant, impenitent, and wretched Sinners; yet they will be exceeding angry if you do but question their being (really and indeed) Christians. What (say they) were not we baptized in our Infancy, and thereby made Christians, Members of Christ, Children of God, and Heirs of the Kingdom; and do you question our Christianity? Now if you will but seriously consider how far you have been the unhappy Instruments of the ruin of these poor Creatures, by hardning them against the Truth, as it is in Jesus; and making them (like the Pharisees and Lawyers of old) reject the Counsel of God against themselves by that deception you have put upon their Understandings, you would certainly discern that you have made work for Repentance, and cannot acquit your selves therefrom, until you do renounce that scriptureless Practice of Infant-sprinkling, and submit to that holy Ordinance of Believers Baptism, as appointed by Jesus Christ, and provoke others thereunto.

5<sup>thly</sup>. But further, in their Dedication they appeal to the honourable Governor, and to the worshipful Baker, as to disinterested Persons, and proper Judges.

As for *Henry Seager* the Baker, he is no disinterested Person, unless this proves him to be such, because when he was Mayor, he carried the Mace to the Presbyterian Meeting, and hath gone to it both before  
and

and since the Dispute, and been a Benefactor to them for several years, as is certified from thence.

Now I can as little suppose him to be a proper Judg, as a disinterested Person; because I am well satisfied he is unskill'd in the Controversy, and incompetent as to Parts and Learning to fit him for it: But being worshipful, he would serve their turn to make a noise with in other Parts where he was not known, to give a faint Colour to a fading Cause.

6<sup>thly</sup>. But the most amazing Passage in it is this, That they should have Confidence to tell the World, that their Account (they give of the Dispute) is true and impartial: That it is what was taken by the Pens of the Scribes, without any material alteration: Whereas they know in their Consciences it is not so, as may be made appear in due place.

7<sup>thly</sup>. And whereas they talk of Disorders in the time of the Dispute; they also know there was nothing of that kind committed by us (notwithstanding their repeated Provocations) but all of it by themselves, and their own Party. Themselves were certainly guilty of great Incivilities in giving the Lie, in their hilling, and making such a noise that we could not be heard: Which was so far from being a sign they were willing that Truth should take place, that it was an evident Demonstration of the direct contrary.

I now come to make some Observations upon the Account they give of the Dispute it self: By which it will appear that it is a false and partial Account.

1. They have left out the Speech I made in the beginning.

2. Given no account of Mr. *Chandler's* beginning with Prayer.

3. The Preliminaries agreed upon, and read publicly, they have wholly omitted.

4. Mr. *Chandler's* Apology to the People, which he calls his Prologue, they have alter'd: For I have carefully examin'd Mr. *Ring's* Copy, and I find it there verbatim as I have put it down in my Narrative. For, 1. He puts Pride before Vanity. 2. Adds Doctrine. 3. Leaves out the New Testament. 4. There is a Transposition and Omission of other words, which I pass by.

5. Mr. *Chandler* hath alter'd the words of the first Question to be disputed. As first, he hath left out *and Saviour*, hath put *only* before *are*. And instead of *And not Infants*, he hath put in these words, *or their Infants also*; which alters the state of the Question. And in the second Question he hath put in *this* instead of *the*, and *wise* instead of *ways*; and it is the more remarkable, because it differs not only from mine, but from that written Copy signed by Mr. *Williams* and himself: So that it must either be a heedless or a wilful Act.

6. The Speech I made upon Mr. *Chandler's* repeating the Questions, is part of it left out, and the rest alter'd.

7. In what follows they have left out a whole Sentence, and put down words of their own framing; and have wholly omitted what I say about the manner of Disputation.

8. They put down my first Argument by halves, leaving out these words *and Saviour* in the *major*; and have not expressed either the *Subjects* or *Baptism* in the *minor*; and also left out the *Conclusion*. Is this your Impartial Narrative?

9. In his first Answer to this Argument he leaves out *commanded*, and in the room thereof he puts in *expressly, and by name*, which is not in Mr. *Ring's* Copy.

10. He leaves out my whole Reply to him, which contains nine Lines; and is as pertinent a Reply as any in the Dispute: But I suppose the reason was, be-  
cause



cause the whole Synod of Presbyters that met to contrive this Account, were not able to answer it.

But to hide that from the Reader, he makes a Reply of his own framing, as if then spoken by me; which is directly contrary to what Mr. *Ring* hath in his Copy, as spoken by me, when Mr. *Chandler* denied my *minor*. So that it must be wilful, because they had Mr. *Ring's* Copy by them: For I spoke affirmatively, as Mr. *Ring* truly saith, and not negatively, as they say.

The words I spake, as you may see in my Narrative, pag. 8. beginning, are these. By denying the *minor*, you say that Christ hath some where required some of his Ministers to baptize Infants, which agrees with Mr. *Ring's* Account.

But the words in their printed Account are these. *Russel*, Then you suppose that Christ hath no where required it. What can be more contrary?

11. Mr. *Chandler* is brought in giving a Negative Answer, when it was not he, but Mr. *Leigh* that gave the Answer; and I have put it down verbatim in my True Narrative, as it is in Mr. *Ring's* Copy, viz. Mr. *Leigh*, we distinguish between consequential Truths, and express Words; whereas they have brought in Mr. *Chandler* saying, No, &c. Is this fair dealing? to change both the Person and the Words also: yet this they have done.

12. They have also transposed and altered much that follows in that Page, and have left out about twenty Lines; particularly that Parallel I made between an Ambassador and a Minister of Christ, with relation to our Lord's great Commission, which they have wholly omitted.

13. They have left out Mr. *Chandler's* words in answer to mine. What, from the Commission? and yet these words are in Mr. *Ring's* Copy, altho omitted by them.

14. They

14. They also omit Mr. *Robinson's* words to Mr. *Chandler*, who cries out, Hold ! Dr. *Russel* must prove it by a universal Negative. And this they know is in Mr. *Ring's* Copy.

15. They also omit my Answer to Mr. *Robinson*, viz. Then Mr. *Chandler* must deny some part of my Argument, which I have not yet been able to prevail with him to do. This also is noted in Mr. *Ring's* Copy, but they take no notice of it.

16. Here again they repeat my Argument partially, leaving out that part of it which should give the common Reader the greatest Light, and best Information about it.

17. Here (I am well satisfied) they abuse the dead : For they bring in old Mr. *Williams*, saying that which is neither in Mr. *Bissel* the Town Clerk's Copy, nor in Mr. *Ring's*, nor in the old Gentleman's ; whereas it's evident, it was long after that before Mr. *John Williams* did engage in the Dispute. The words they note as said by him are these, *any way*.

But why must this be done, and marked with an Asterisk ? why this seems to be the Motive, that they might make their Observation upon it (in a Break made on purpose) before the words were, *any where*. A wonderful Observation ! But more of this hereafter.

18. They bring me in speaking thus, It's all one to me, so you prove the thing, prove it any way. Upon this they observe in a Break made on purpose (that which is utterly false) viz. *He is attempting to shift the Opponency*.

Where were these Mens Wits when they made this Observation ? Pray observe ; this was before ever Mr. *Chandler* had so much as fixt upon any direct Answer to my first Argument, as appears by their own printed Account. And in the following words they

they bring him in saying, I deny your *minor*. From whence the Reader may perceive that I was so far from shifting off the Opponency, that I was pressing him with all my might to give his Answer; and that I gave him all the scope he could desire: For I allowed him to do it by Consequence, or any other way, which way he pleased. But you see the Impertinency of these Men, that when I was Opponent, and he Respondent, they must trifle away so much time to know of me how I would allow them to prove Infant-Baptism (according to the stated Question agreed upon on both sides long before) when they should take upon them the Opponency: For till then it was no part of their business, but a mere shuffle to spend time, lest they should (by a universal Negative) be forced to assign an Instance for their Practice from Scripture, which they knew was impossible for them to do.

19. They bring me in saying, I prove it thus, only I would let the People know what you say, *viz.* That Christ hath some where required his Ministers to baptize Infants. Their Note upon it marked with an Asterisk, is this: *Somewhere*. The word is again alter'd from *any way* to *somewhere*. A worthy Observation for a Classis of Presbyters!

But this was not my Answer, but an invented one of their own: For my Answer was this, By denying the *minor*, you say, that Christ hath somewhere required some of his Ministers to baptize Infants. And this I did, that I might give those People to understand what we were then upon, who did not know what was the difference betwixt the *major* and *minor*, and without which they might have been ignorant of what we had intended in our way of arguing.

20. When I called for a plain denial of (any) one part of my Argument, even what part he pleased  
(as

( as themselves word it ) their Observation in a Break is this, The *Doctor* now seems unwilling again to allow Scripture-Consequence.

This is to abuse their Reader: For it was not Mr. *Chandler*, but my self, that was Opponent; and therefore there was no room for him to urge Consequences till it came to his turn.

21. Yet in the next words they bring in Mr. *Leigh* undertaking the Opponency, which they confess he ought not to have done. But he only talked of it, but did not do it, for he knew it was a Task too heavy for him, and so waved it.

Now there is not one word of all this in Mr. *Ring's* Copy, nor in Mr. *Bissel's*, nor in mine: And I am well satisfied there was not one word spoken by Mr. *Leigh* at that time.

22. Upon Mr. *Chandler's* denying the *minor* of my universal Negative, they have falsified my Answer, and made it quite another thing.

For, whereas I say to him, Hold, Sir, it is an universal Negative, you must give your Instance, &c. which are the words in Mr. *Ring's* Copy. They bring me in, saying, It's an universal Negative, you must prove it.

Now I did not call upon Mr. *Chandler* to prove my Argument, as they do silyly and disingenuously insinuate; but I call'd upon him to give his Instance where it was so written in holy Scripture, that Christ had required any of his Ministers to baptize Infants; which I then told him (and do still affirm) he ought to have done, otherwise we might argue *ad infinitum*. And this Mr. *Leigh* knew right well; and therefore he bids Mr. *Chandler* offer me the Commission for an Instance, as themselves have confessed in their printed Account.

But Mr. *Robinson* (they tell you) opposed it: for  
he



he knew there was no such thing exprest in the Commission, and did in effect give away the Cause of Infant-Baptism at once: For his words are these, (as recited both in Mr. *Ring's* Copy, and my True Narrative.)

Mr. *Robinson*, you must prove it still. Suppose Mr. *Chandler* cannot give an Instance, nor no body in the Company, you cannot thence infer that none in the World can.

23. This also they have falsified, and set down in their printed Account a Fancy of their own invention. They have put in Mr. *Leigh*, who was not then mentioned by Mr. *Robinson*, and have left out these words, nor no body in the Company.

Now they know it was urged upon them all, and desired that if any one of them could give an Instance, they would please to do it: And yet none of them could be prevailed upon so much as to attempt it. Surely the New Testament is not so large a Volume, but either Mr. *Chandler*, or some other of those Ministers that were present (whose number was said to be about five and twenty or thirty) might have been supposed to have read it all over, and to have known where such an Instance had been written, in case any such thing had been contain'd therein.

What, are they all so ignorant of the holy Scriptures, that not one of them can tell what is written in the New Testament about holy Baptism? How then can they be fit to teach others their Duty concerning it? I must therefore once more take the liberty to tell them, that when there were so many Men of Parts and Learning together (as there then were) if none of them are able to give us one Instance from Scripture for their Practice of Infant-Baptism, we cannot expect that any body else should.

It's much to me, that instead of Mr. *Chandler's* old

old Sermons, pick'd out of other Mens Works, they had not tried their Skill to have attempted some Instance from Scripture for their Practice, seeing they sat brooding upon their Narrative so long, as not to suffer it to come abroad till more than six Months were past after the Dispute. Surely they might have found it out in all that time, if it had been so written in the New Testament.

If therefore Mr. *Chandler's* Sermons are esteemed by them as their *ne plus ultra*, we must conclude they have nothing of that kind to produce, and therefore must cease for time to come ever to expect it from them.

24. Here they have thrust in Matter never spoken, and transposed and mangled what was spoken, and have formed it according to their pleasure, without any regard had to Truth or Justice. For,

(1.) They have made a Speech for Mr. *Robinson* that he never spake, and another for Mr. *John Williams*, p. 5. And I appeal to Mr. *Ring's* Copy, for there is not one word of either of them there, nor in any one of the other Copies I ever saw.

(2.) They leave out (almost) a whole Sentence of mine, and use their Art and Skill to deceive the Reader by making a *stroke*, as if it were left out by the Scribes: Whereas in that part they recite, they had Mr. *Ring's* Copy to inform them, and therefore must know that they did not put it down right; and so have wilfully misrepresented me to the World.

Their words are as follows. *Rus.* I would have these honourable Persons here present to consider that I am under great Disadvantage ————— you are to give an Instance. What my words are you may see in pag. 8. of my Narrative at the lower end; they are too long to recite: For my whole Answer to Mr. *Robinson* contains twelve Lines, and

theirs

theirs is contained in two Lines and a half. Is this agreeable to their Title, *An Impartial Account*?

(3.) Their transposing and altering. For my next words (which agree with Mr. Ring's Account) are these: Mr. *Chandler*, this is only a Trick to turn off the Opponency. Dr. *Russel*, What do you talk of a Trick? I hope you are able to give an Instance of what is your daily Practice.

But instead thereof they put down this false Account. *Rob.* This is your popular Argument to shift the Opponency, and turn it upon the Respondent. 1. Here is a change of Persons, *Rob.* for *Chandler*. 2. They proceed as they began, and make a Speech for me at their own pleasure: And thus they go on till they come to the next Page. This is a Practice they have great cause to be ashamed of, when (at the same time) they pretend to give an Impartial Account.

25. In pag. 6. they bring me in, saying, I am sure, according to the Rules of Dispute, Mr. *Chandler* must prove the Negative.

This I must charge as another Falshood upon them: For my words are these; If you say you have no Scripture-Proof for Infants Baptism, I have done. But why must you prevent Mr. *Chandler*? I hope here are some honourable Persons, and others that understand the nature of this Controversy; and they may reasonably expect that those who have made such a noise about it, can give some tolerable Instance for it: And if they will do that, we will proceed to examine it.

It is therefore evident, that here is not any thing like what they report; so that if I charge them with down-right Forgery, they must bear with it, for they knew that my words were according to Mr. Ring's Copy, and that they had abused both him and me.

26. They have again alter'd Mr. *Robinson's* next Answer,

Answer, and framed words for him that were not then spoken, as appears by Mr. *Ring's* Copy, which I have truly recited in my Narrative, to which I refer you.

27. Here they give an invented Answer again; *Ruf.* So I design if there be no Answer given: whereas my words are (as Mr. *Ring* hath noted) I have proved it, till you give your Instance; which they know to be the true sense of what I have put down in my Narrative.

28. *Chand.* Here is an Answer, I deny the *minor*. Now hear what Mr. *Ring* saith. *Robinson*. If you will change sides, Mr. *Chandler*, you may admit this Trick. In this they have both changed the words, and the Persons speaking.

29. They have also invented an Answer for me, directly contrary to Mr. *Ring's* Copy.

30. They have invented a Speech for Mr. *Leigh*, of which there is not one word in Mr. *Ring's* Copy.

31. Here they have transposed Mr. *Robinson's* words, and left out the one half of them, as they are in Mr. *Ring's* Copy.

32. Here they have brought me in answering Mr. *Robinson* thus: This is no changing sides; for I do not design to quit the Opponency, only let him bring an Instance.

Whereas I have truly represented the Answer I gave in p. 9. of my Narrative, according to Mr. *Ring's* Copy, where you will find that the Answer was given in other words; and not to Mr. *Robinson*, but to Mr. *Chandler*.

33. But why must this be put in here? They tell you, the *Doctor's* design even now was to turn the Opponency on us, as I can prove (saith he) from a Letter of Mr. *John Williams*: But now he will not quit the Opponency, and yet expects a Scripture-proof for Infant-Baptism.



To this I answer.

(1.) That no Man in the World could have known this, if I had so designed, for I never said so: And it's God only that knows the Heart.

(2.) I do now tell all the World (as I then told you) that I had no such design.

(3.) What you say of (the deceased) Mr. *John Williams* is utterly false: For he hath not so written in his Letter to Mr. *Leigh*, altho he hath the confidence to tell the World that he can prove it from Mr. *John Williams's* Letter. For I have a Copy of his Letter writ by himself, and signed with his own hand, and there are not those words, that I designed to turn the Opponency upon you, as you say. The genuine sense of his words is, to let you know what you might have done to have shewed your Parts in the Vindication of your beloved Practice, if you had given an Instance when I run you upon it by an universal Negative, and said you ought to have done it according to the Rules of Dispute: And that the World may be satisfied herein, both Mr. *John Sharp* and Mr. *Williams* his Sons have caused it to be printed, as containing such things in it as are of use to the Publick with relation to the Disputation.

34. They have introduced Mr. *Leigh* making a formal Speech, of which there is not one word in any of the Copies I have seen. But in Mr. *Ring's* Copy, Mr. *Robinson* is the Speaker, which agrees with my Narrative. But why is this done? The reason seems to be this, 1. To darken the Peoples Understandings, that they might not discern their Fallacy. 2. To throw the Reflection off from themselves, and cast it (as much as they can) upon Dr. *Smith*; for which he hath no reason to thank them. The Question (they say Mr. *Leigh* put) was this: I desire, Sir, you would declare, whether Dr. *Russel* be not obliged

to prove the Negative he hath asserted? Now, as I do not know any thing of it, so there is not one word in Mr. *Ring's* Copy, neither of that nor any thing else that Mr. *Leigh* spake at that time.

But if Mr. *Leigh* had so spoken, there had been as little sense in it as was in Mr. *Robinson's* words, when he called a Negative an Affirmative. But any thing serves to veil over a bad Cause. For, to set this in a clearer Light, I will give the Reader a view of the first Argument, and shew him how I brought them to that issue upon it: And I might have forbore to have argued with them any longer, unless they had given their Instance.

*Arg. 1.* 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 and Saviour Jesus Christ.

But Christ hath no where required any of his Ministers to baptize Infants:

*Ergo,* The Baptism of Infants is not according to the Commission of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ.

Mr. *Chandler*, after divers shifts and evasions about the *major*, says thus, I deny your *minor*. My Answer to him was, By denying the *minor*, you say that Christ hath somewhere required some of his Ministers to baptize Infants. This being by them allowed, I did proceed to make good my *minor* thus.

If Christ hath any where required any of his Ministers to baptize Infants, it's somewhere so recorded in the holy Scriptures.

But it's no where so recorded in the holy Scriptures:

*Ergo,* Christ hath not any where required any of his Ministers to baptize Infants.

Upon this (after a Question put, and a Distinction upon it) Mr. *Chandler* said, I deny the *minor*:

My

My Answer was, Then you say it's somewhere so recorded in holy Scripture. I therefore argued thus.

If it be any where so recorded in holy Scripture, Mr. *Chandler* or some other Person is able to shew it.

But neither Mr. *Chandler*, nor any other Person whatsoever, is able to shew it :

*Ergo*, It is not any where so recorded in holy Scripture.

Whereupon Mr. *Chandler* said, I deny your *minor*. Now by denying my *minor*, I appeal to all that understand an Argument, whether in so doing he doth not assert, that he or some other were able to shew where it is recorded in holy Scripture, that Christ hath required any of his Ministers to baptize Infants. And this is to go their own way. But I told him it was an universal Negative, and therefore he must give his Instance where it is so written, but could by no means bring him to it; and the reason was because he had none to give; and till he doth, my Argument will stand good, as I then told him: For otherwise we may argue *ad infinitum*, and never bring any thing to an issue. And I do once more challenge them to produce one single Instance for their Assertion.

After a tedious Discourse upon it, Mr. *Robinson* said, I appeal to any that understand Logick, whether this be sufferable for him thus to turn the Opponency upon Mr. *Chandler*?

Then Dr. *Smith* stood up and said, If I must speak, then by your leave, according to what I always understood, He that asserts must prove.

Whereupon I answer'd, Then they having asserted that Infants are the Subjects of Baptism, they are to prove their Practice, especially when they are forced upon it by an universal Negative: We desire but one single Instance, and they will not assign it.

35. But when they pretend to recite Dr. *Smith's* words,

words, they deal as unworthily by him as they had done by me: For they bring him in saying, according to the Rules of Disputation, *Negantis non est probare*; or, *Afferenti incumbit probatio*. He said the one, or the other, they tell you: But they do not so much as pretend he said both. What must the Reader conclude from hence? but that they did not, or would not know what he did say. For by the same Rule they say it was this, or that, and are not certain which it was, it might as well be neither; but only what I have said according to Mr. Ring's Copy. And thus after they have wracked their Brains to evade the force of this Argument, on purpose to shift off the giving an Instance out of holy Scripture for their unscriptural Practice, they have only fulfilled the old Proverb, *Parturiunt montes, nascitur ridiculus mus*.

For, if he had said, *negantis non est probare*, he that denies is not bound to prove, as they would persuade us he did, what advantage would it have been to them? I was upon the Negative, and had issued my first Argument by a universal Negative, which can never be invalidated without an Instance: Certainly then (according to that) I was not obliged to prove my Denial (but they to give their Instance) for I had proved that before by such Arguments as they were not then, nor yet since have been able by all their Learning to confute.

But themselves are doubtful whether Dr. Smith said so, and therefore tell us, if he did not say that, he said, *Afferenti incumbit probatio*, which is the same with what Mr. Ring's Copy saith; He that asserts must prove. But I do not believe he said either of them in Latin (not that I doubt of his ability so to do, for I have heard a good Character of him from a Physician, who said he knew him in the University) for, as I my self know not any such thing, so Mr. Ring,  
who



who hath several times took notice of the Greek words spoken both by me and them, only sets down Dr. *Smith's* words in English: And whoever observes my Answer, must needs know that I understood it so, by telling them, that they having asserted Infant-Baptism, ought to prove their Practice, by shewing us where it was so written in the holy Scriptures; we demanding of them but only a single Instance, by which the Controversy would have been at an end. So that they have labour'd in vain, and spent their Strength for nought; leaving the Multitude (as they call them) as wise as they found them, and so they are like to remain (so far as I can perceive) if they expect satisfaction from them. For they that want Light themselves, cannot impart it to others.

36. Here they sham a Forgery upon me, bringing me in saying, Well, what must I do? As if I had been at a loss what to say, and must ask them to direct me; whereas they know in their Consciences, I did not use to be at a loss to answer them, when three or four of them have very uncivilly fallen upon me at once; but it pleased God to keep me in a composed frame of Spirit, and to assist me under it beyond what I could have expected. But suppose I had been at a loss, can the Reader think I would have told them so, and ask'd their Advice what to do? This is as improbable a Story, as Mr. *Chandler's* lying Invention about *Isaac Harman*, wherein he was disproved to his face before divers of his Hearers. But however, he is unwilling to be brought to confess the Truth, but instead thereof (in their second Edition) seems only to make a weak excuse, by saying a silly Woman told him so; when he had reported the Story in Print as a thing of his own knowledg: And to close his Story, he tells us he shall no more trouble the World with personal matters,

but give *Pilate's* surly Answer to all such, *What I have written, I have written.*

But to come to the matter in hand, I know what they have said here to be utterly false, and contrary to *Mr. Ring's* Copy, as they also know: But I perceive they are resolved to say any thing, tho never so untrue, and against their knowledg, to avoid the shame (if they could) of being baffled in their Cause at the Disputation.

37. Again, they bring in another invented Story, and make *Mr. Robinson* to speak what he did not speak, and *Dr. Smith* to be of his mind. I must here vindicate *Dr. Smith* again: For, if their own Story (as I have before observed) be true, that *Mr. Leigh* should ask him this Question, Whether *Dr. Russel* be not obliged to prove the Negative he hath asserted? and he should answer as they say, *Negantis non est probare*, he that denies is not to prove; with what fairness could he tell the World that Gentleman was of his mind? And this they doubted would be discovered, and therefore they did not only put the words in Latin, but leave an excuse if they should be detected, by declaring, if he did not say so, he said otherwise, as is before noted.

38. He doth also misrepresent my words in telling the World I said, How do you mean prove, &c.? I have no such words, nor any thing like them. But seeing they have invented a Reply for me, I desire they would answer it also. They say, the total silence of Scripture in this matter is Proof. If I had said so, there had been no reason to have denied it: For I acknowledg the Assertion to be true, tho' not then spoken by me. But it may now be expected they should make some Answer to it that might invalidate it; but they only set it down, and then run away from it.

Sirs, I desire you seriously to consider, what you have said herein against your own Practice: Is it not a part of Divine Worship? is it not that Holy Ordinance of Baptism as instituted by Christ, that is the matter (in general) of our Disputation? And is it not about the Subjects in particular that we were then speaking of? And were not you called upon with great earnestness, and pressing importunity, to give us but one Instance where it was found written in the Holy Scriptures, That Christ had required any of his Ministers to baptize Infants? And do you (after all) tacitly acknowledg that there is a total silence of Scripture in this matter? Surely it is time then for you to quit your practice, if the Scripture says not one word about it. And if Mr. *Robinson's* Supposition be allow'd, it must needs be so. Suppose (saith he) Mr. *Chandler* cannot give an Instance, nor no body in the company; you cannot thence infer that none in the World can. To which I answer'd, This is in effect to give away your Cause, when there are so many Men of Parts and Learning present; for if none of them are able to give us one Instance from Scripture for Infant-Baptism, we cannot expect that any body else should. And yet all the Answer they gave, was, to tell us this is only a Trick to turn off the Opponency, notwithstanding I told them the direct contrary. Surely this is no better than tricking in them, thus to fence against those solid Reasons and Arguments that none of them are able to answer; and yet have the confidence to tell the World in print, p. 66. That all the Arguments we offer'd were trifling Cavils. Is this your *Impartial Account*?

38. Here they have left out several things that pass betwixt me and Mr. *Chandler*; which they have pass over with a total silence, because they did not make

for their Cause, but against it. Is not this great partiality ?

39. They bring in Mr. *Robinson* saying, *If you can proceed no farther upon this, then it's time you go on.* Now this is also untrue ; neither is there one word of it in Mr. *Ring's* Copy. But the words he saith I told them, are these ; *If you will say no more to this, I will proceed to another Argument.* And they know, right-well, that I urg'd this, That if Mr. *Chandler* would confess he had no Instance to give, I would then proceed to a new Argument. And further, that upon his refusal so to do, I did challenge the rest of them to give an Instance ; and provok'd them to it, telling them, That if they refused to do it, the People would think they had none to give. And yet none of them could be prevail'd upon to do it. Whereupon I spake to this effect, *Gentlemen*, it may be you think I have but one Argument ; If you will say no more to this, I am not willing to tire the Auditory, I will therefore proceed to a new Argument.

But take notice (by the way) that my first Argument stands good till you give your Instance to the contrary. And all this they wholly omitted in their printed Account, because (perhaps they thought) it would have been sufficiently evidenced how shamefully they had been baffled and put to silence before the People, for want of one single Instance for their practice.

Here I desire the Reader to take notice, that I am not yet fully advanced so far as three Leaves and a half in their printed Account of the Disputation ; and having discover'd so many Errors in so little a compass, it amazes me to think what was become of these Mens Consciences, who could contrive an Account to publish to the World, with so small regard to

Truth



Truth and Fidelity ; when at the same time they send it forth with that plausible pretence of *An Impartial Account*. What may the Reader expect to find in the whole body of it, if there be so many Faults in the very Entrance? But I have other Business, than to attend to the remarking of all they say of this kind: for, if I should do that, I must write a much bigger Volume than is proper upon this occasion, there being so many Errors committed by them throughout the whole of their Book.

In p. 65. they confess, that Mr. *Fox* was baptized by dipping. He was dipp'd (say they) not at *Gosport*, but *Havant*. It is not said by Mr. *Duke* that he was dipp'd at *Gosport*, that observation therefore was needless: but that he was dipp'd, they confess, which is the thing asserted by him. But they say 'tis false that it was done by Mr. *Chandler's* advice, for he was then at *London*: Now it doth not follow that Mr. *Chandler* did not give such advice, because he was (as he saith) then at *London*; for I have receiv'd a Testimony to prove it, under the hands of two Witnesses.

Mr. *Leddell* writes thus, I shall further annex one Testimony touching Mr. *Fox*, which was spoken (the same day the Preliminaries were made) out of Mr. *Chandler's* own Mouth, which take as followeth.

WE being enquiring, Why they should deny our Practice, and yet practise it themselves? We then had, and several times since have had this Concession from them; That to satisfy a scrupulous Conscience, they could dip any Adult Believer upon profession of Faith. And Mr. *Chandler* did there confess, that Mr. *Earle* had advice for the so baptizing of Mr. *Fox*, in a Letter from him from *London*. And this (tho it may not be in the very words) is the substance

stance of the Matter then spoken in our hearing, who were present at Mr. Williams's House in Portsmouth, the 23d of December 1698.

William Leddell,  
Edward Fishbourn.

I would further note, That they might have spared their Reflection upon our Brother Duke, if they had but minded these words in my Dedication, *And by another hand I have this Account.* And after all, they thus express themselves in their own printed Account, pag. 65. " But that none of us would refuse to dip a  
" Person in such a case, is true; We never pleading  
" against Dipping as *one* way, but as the only way;  
" not against its Lawfulness, but Necessity. How doth this agree with what Mr. Leigh saith in pag. 51. I deny that the word *Baptize* signifies to dip, in any place of Scripture? But seeing Mr. Sharp hath already spoken to it, I shall pass it by.

I shall remark one thing more, and that is, That these Gentlemen are pleased to reflect upon me about speaking false Greek: As they have also done upon Mr. John Gosnold, by saying, I abuse him in it, when they are his very words I recite, and the same words used *Heb. 6. 2.* So that rather than I shall escape their Lash, the Apostle Paul (whose words they are) must also be whipt till he learn better, if he come under the ruterage of their unmannerly Pedagogue. What, do these Men think no body understand *Greek* but themselves?

But after all, tho they do not charge me with printing any false *Greek* in my Narrative (as I perceive) yet they would perswade the World, that I have got an Art to form *Greek* Letters in the Air, so  
that

that they can discern them, when I express them with my Voice. And in order to convince their Reader, they have put down those *Greek* words wrong in their Narrative, which are printed truly in mine, but falsely in theirs. But any thing to render me ignorant and ridiculous, serves these mens turn, tho never so false in it self. But if I were really as ignorant as they represent me to be, as Mr. *Sharp* hath already told them, I had been the more easily confuted. I shall therefore commit what I have written to the Judgment of the Learned and Impartial Reader, declaring to the World, That my Narrative is much more impartial than theirs, and the best I knew how to publish; which they have only marr'd, and not mended.

To conclude: Seeing this is so, why doth Mr. *Chandler*, p. 19. say, that if we will keep strictly to the significancy of a Burial, the Person baptized must not walk into the Water, but be taken up by the Baptizer and thrown into it? for indeed we baptize the Face (saith he) and they baptize the Head and Shoulders too. And (a little after he saith) they had need have brawny Arms and an Herculean Strength to do this, speaking of the Apostles baptizing three thousand in one day with the help of the seventy Disciples; and endeavours to render the thing impossible. As for the possibility of it I refer you to the learned Dr. *Du-Veil's* Answer to this Objection, in his Explication upon the place.

But as touching the manner of baptizing by dipping, why do you thus quibble about it, and make as if it could not be perform'd aright, if the Subject were not taken up by the Administrator, and thrown into the Water? It's confess'd by your selves in Print that Mr. *Fox* was dipp'd; and in the account which I have received it appears, that when Mr. *Fox* was ask'd

this

this Question, Whether, when he was baptized by Mr. *Earl*, it was done by dipping the whole Body under Water? he said, it was; and that in the presence of four Presbyterian Ministers, which they do not deny in their printed Answer, but say that he was dipp'd.

And did Mr. *Earl* indeed baptize Mr. *Fox* by dipping, as you confess, by saying, he was dipp'd at *Havant*? I hope he did not take him up and carry (or throw) him into the Water to dip him; if so, we may know where to have a Man that hath brawny Arms and Herculean Strength. But we do suppose he went with him into the Water (as we do) and when they were both in the Water, Mr. *Earl* did then baptize him by dipping, as our constant Practice is; and this they call dipping. And we do not find that any of those four Ministers present did object against it, as not being the right manner of performing it. Nay, these Gentlemen in their printed Account do not deny the lawfulness of it, &c. as hath been observed.

And why (after all this) they should quarrel with us, we cannot understand, when they practise it after the same manner as we do, and call it dipping.

I will add the Testimony of a learned Man to vindicate our Practice.

*Lucas Brugensis* upon *Mat.* 3. saith, the Party baptized went into the Water as deep as his Thighs, or Navel; the rest of his Body was dipp'd, not sprinkled.

And Mr. *John Calvin* saith upon *John* 3. 22, 23. That *John* and Christ administred Baptism by plunging the whole Body into the Water: and he confesses the Church hath assumed to her self this liberty of sprinkling. But having given them such a Cloud of Witnesses in the Dispute, I shall not here recite them.



Truth Vindicated:

BEING AN

ANSWER

TO A

DIALOGUE

Between a Pedo-Baptist and an  
Anti-Pedo-Baptist,

Published by *Samuel Chandler*, and  
*William Leigh*, by the Advice of their  
Brethren from divers Parts.

Written by one, who was refer'd to the  
Account of the Dispute at *Portsmouth*, &c.  
for his Conviction, but hath since separa-  
ted from the Presbyterians, and now is a  
Member of a Baptist Congregation.

With *Dr. Russel's* ANIMADVERSIONS  
on their Epistle, prefix'd.

---

Printed in the Year 1700.

Some brief ANIMADVERSIONS  
by Dr. Ruffel, upon their Epistle to the  
Reader.

**T**HE first thing they begin with is wholly false: For they say, Because Dr. Ruffel, or some Friend of his, did a while since disgrace the Press with some scraps of their Narrative, stuff'd with Nonsense and Partiality; nay, and by its Title did delude the Vulgar with an Imagination, that it contained the true State of the Portsmouth Disputation; and the same, how unjust soever, being cheap, hath been scatter'd throughout most parts of this Kingdom, &c.

To this I answer, That neither Dr. Ruffel, nor any of his Friends did ever publish any such Paper, nor any other Paper about the Dispute at Portsmouth, besides their True Narrative, but only an Answer to Monsieur Berault, wherein they are scarcely so much as named. But this Paper they speak of (to use their own words) was pirated into the World with my Name affixed to it, without my Knowledge or Consent, therefore I am not chargeable with any Defects or Imperfections therein, tho' they are pleas'd unjustly to cast it upon me. But any thing will serve your turns to reproach me with, tho' never so false and uncharitable: Your Rage against me, is a plain Demonstration of your being baffled at the Disputation, tho' you have not humility enough to acknowledg it to the World.

May not I with as much Justice charge the Abstract of your Account upon you? But I have more Charity than to think so. And whereas you have put an Advertisement into the Post-man, Nov. 7. 1699. to disown it, and say, Whereas a Twopenny Paper hath been  
pirated:

pirated into the World bearing our Names, and called, An Impartial Account of the Portsmouth Disputation, we declare it was printed without our Knowledge or Consent. And this being the first opportunity we have to print upon this occasion, we have told the World the same that you do; and therefore those silly Reflections of yours might have been spared. There are some such ill Men belonging to the Printing Trade as will abuse any body's Works, by contracting and mangling them to get a Penny by; so that the best of Authors cannot escape being abused: And if you had but minded your own Advertisement, you might have known that without giving me the trouble of this publick way of informing you.

As for those needless and vaunting Expressions about the strength of the Arguments in your Dialogue, the Reader must be Judge of that; and therefore I shall not anticipate by making any Reflections thereupon; but desire him to consider the Answer this Gentleman hath given; and then I doubt not but he will see you had no reason to boast of your strength, before you had obtained so much as a seeming Victory. I shall therefore conclude in your own words: We request of them that they would weigh it in the Balance of Scripture and sanctified Reason; and the Lord give them Understanding in all things, which is the desire of him, who is a Lover of the Souls of all Men, and of his Antagonists in particular, being in Charity with them, tho they are not so with him.

William Ruffel

---

Truth

# Truth Vindicated.

B E I N G

*An ANSWER to Mr. Chandler's and  
Mr. Leigh's Dialogue.*

**T**HE first Argument (say they) the Anti-Pedo-Baptist offers is this.

*Arg. 1.* No Infants can be made Disciples by the Ministry of Men; therefore no Infants can be the Subjects of Baptism, according to Christ's Commission, *Mat. 28. 19. Go teach, &c. (or disciple) all Nations, &c.*

In *p. 5.* the Answer they give to it is as follows, I deny your whole Argument.

In the *Portsmouth* Dispute they distinguished on the word *Disciple*, some were compleat, others incompleat; I perceive the Gentlemen are ashamed of their former Defence, and it seems to me they are conscious of its weakness; and now they will be mad in earnest, and deny the whole Argument.

They assert, 1. If they could not be made Disciples by the Ministry of Men; yet this Text would not exclude them from Baptism; but with what reason do they do this? none at all truly; and therefore observe how this bold Assertion will stand.

Christ sent his Apostles to disciple all Nations, and then to baptize them; They affirm, if the Apostles could not disciple some, yet they might baptize them; this Text excludes all but Disciples from Baptism: they I say affirm the contrary without Proof.

That



That which they answer, p. 6. This is a weak way of arguing. I answer, If the order of words signify nothing in the Commission as they feign, Why do they not baptize the Adult first, and teach them afterwards? I would I could hear their Answer to this. Not only the Practice of the Primitive Churches, but even all down to this day, yea even themselves keep to the order of the words in this place, and teach the Adult before they baptize them: So that it is manifest some ought to be taught before they are baptized, even by virtue of the Commission; let them prove by the same Commission that some may be baptized before they are taught if they can.

But some were baptized confessing their Sins: Weakly urged! for that Particle (confessing) doth not in propriety of Speech import that their Confession was after their Baptism, but rather the contrary, confessing their Sins they were baptized. But if the order of words in some places were not strictly to be observed, that they are not to be observed here is a weak way of arguing indeed; and seeing themselves keep to the order of the words in respect of the Adult, but not in Infants, let them shew reason for this in the Commission.

But Infants may be Disciples by teaching, viz. by their Parents being taught, because the *Kohathites* in their Parents are said to keep the charge of the Sanctuary from a Month old, &c.

It is false: the Children of a Month old are not said to keep the Charge of the Sanctuary in their Parents, as you affirm; but all their Males, the young as well as the old, are said to keep the Charge of the Sanctuary. And that the Charge was such that Children of a Month old could not be said to keep it, let them shew if they can.

But *Levi* paid Tithes in *Abraham*. *Answ.* Therefore the great Grandfather's Learning makes the Grandchild a Scholar. O excellent Logic! By the same reason I will prove the Children of Heathens to be the Scholars and Disciples of Christ, and so may be baptized, because some of their Ancestors, *Adam*, *Noah*, &c. were taught and made Disciples.

*There did we rejoice*——

If the *Israelites* did rejoice in their Ancestors on the Banks of the Red Sea, then *Judas* believed in his Ancestors at the Red Sea, and was a true Disciple; and so the Infants of unbelieving Jews believed in some of their Ancestors, and therefore are Disciples, and may be baptized.

Let the force then of their Scripture-Instances be weighed, and you will see what broken Reeds they bring to support their Cause.

*Pag. 6. line 23.* By the preaching of Men, Parents may be constrained to resign their All to God, and so their Infants.

How is baptizing Infants a resigning them to God? What Scripture or Reason for this?

*Line 25.* They (*viz.* Infants) are immediately discipled by Mens Ministry, when Parents and Ministers concur in their solemn Dedication to God by Baptism.

I answer.

Then Baptism is not the Dedication of the Infant to God; for, say they, the Parents and Minister concur in their Dedication: but the Parents and Ministers do not concur in their Baptism, for that is the sole Act of the Minister; therefore Infants are not dedicated by Baptism, these Disputants themselves being Judges against themselves.

*Line 30.* The Master doth, &c.

This is altogether foreign to the Controversy, and

I must again observe that they have utterly rejected their Distinction of compleat and incompleat Disciples: And now the resignation of the Parents and the acceptance of the Master is the only means to constitute the relation between Master and Scholar.

Here I demand, 1. where Christ hath manifested his acceptance of all such as are sprinkled in his Name, and hath undertaken to be their Master.

2. If Christ hath undertaken the Tutorage of all such, whence is it all such do not learn of him? Can Christ fail in his Undertaking?

If there be any that won't be convinc'd that Infants are to be baptized by such wise Reasonings, let them let it alone, and be in their Wits still.

Pag. 6. l. 33: If Teaching were the ground of this Relation, then Persons long since dead might be our Governors.

O strange! What an Absurdity is here! What Fools were the Jews to say, *We are Moses's Disciples?* Their Argument is this.

It is absurd to say Teaching is the ground of the relation of Master and Scholar.

*Job* said, the former Age and their Fathers shall teach thee, therefore *Job* spake absurdly. O rare Disputants, that would charge Folly upon the holy Spirit himself!

Were these Mens Eyes in their heads, that bring Scripture to confute themselves?

Nay the Beasts of the Field may be our Masters too, *Job* 35. 11. *Who teacheth us more than the Beasts of the field, and maketh us wiser than the Fowls of Heaven:* for so it follows in the same Verse. The sense then is either, that none can teach us more than the Beasts of the Field can teach us, and so these Disputants would perswade us that the Beasts are our Masters. And truly had these Gentlemen but attended

well to what might have been learned of the Beasts and the Fowls, they would not have so much despised these Masters.

But alas! these Gentlemen who would now signalize themselves to the World by some new strains of Wit, have altogether mistook the meaning of the Text.

Verse 10. *None saith, Where is God my Maker, who giveth Songs in the night; who teacheth us more than the Beasts of the Earth, and maketh us wiser than the Fowls of Heaven?* In which words *Elihu* affirms,

1. That God giveth Songs in the Night, *i. e.* Matter of Praise.

2. That God teacheth Men more (*viz.*) more excellent things than he teacheth to the Beasts of the Earth, or to the Fowls of Heaven.

Pray, wherein doth the holy Spirit in this place teach us that the Beasts of the Field may be our Masters?

And tho this is not in the Text, yet I fear not to grant, that what thing soever is said to teach us, may be called our Teacher, without any Disgrace to that Assertion they would here oppose, *viz.* that Teaching and Learning make the relation between Master and Scholar.

I wonder they omitted their celebrated Distinction of compleat and incompleat Disciples: What can that do nothing now, that did so much before? The Achillean Shield is not worth a Contention for.

And because they say they expected the *Doctor* should have shewn that that Distinction was groundless, and did not speak directly to it: If leave might be given me, I would press them thus.

No unscriptural Distinction is to be admitted in any controverted Point of Divinity (the reason is, because the Scripture is to be the only Judg.)



This Distinction of compleat and incompleat Disciples is an unscriptural Distinction ( because neither the words or sense thereof is to be found in the Scripture. )

*Ergo*, This Distinction is not to be admitted in any controverted Point of Divinity : And therefore not in this now under consideration.

2. If Christ sent not his Apostles to make incompleat Disciples, then they made none such, nor could baptize such.

Again, he that is a Disciple only in an imperfect sense, in perfect sense is no Disciple at all.

A Child ( saith Mr. Leigh in his Narrative, p. 11. ) in an imperfect sense is deemed a Scholar.

*Ergo*, In perfect sense he is no Disciple at all.

So that, our Adversaries being Judges, it is not perfect Sense, and consequently Nonsense to call a Child incapable of Learning, a Scholar.

And I hope they will allow good Consequence.

I return now to our Dialogue.

*Arg. 2. pag. 7. line 9.* Neither ever did *Paul* declare, &c.

I answer, *Paul* did declare Believers were to be baptized, and therefore not Infants ; we being able to prove Believers Baptism, and you being able to shew no other : Therefore Believers Children ought to be delayed till they can personally profess their Faith.

But you hope to prove Infant-Baptism from *Paul's* words, 1 *Cor.* 7. 14. *Rom.* 11.

You hope, but are not sure ; *Hope that is seen is not Hope ; for what a Man seeth, why doth he yet hope for ?* Because you do not see Infant-Baptism in those Texts with clear Evidence, therefore you hope but in vain : Only I commend your Modesty here, 'twere Wisdom to give up a vain Hope.

Here is much stuff, and impertinent enough in this Page, about the History of the World, Ceremonial Law, Prophecies, &c. Indeed we cannot say this or that Epistle contains all Articles of Faith: And tho' *Paul* did declare all the Counsel of God, yet he might not write all; this is rational enough. But thus I would argue: If the Scripture is a perfect and compleat Rule of Faith and Practice, and in all the Scripture no mention is made of Infant-Baptism; then Infant-Baptism is not to be believed to be of Divine Institution, nor to be practised by the Saints: The former is true, therefore the latter.

*Pag. 8.* Pray take your Argument back again, &c.

Christ's Commission doth expressly shew who are to be baptized; but it doth not expressly shew that Adult Persons, if baptized in Infancy, are to be baptized again: *Ergo.*

I answer; The *minor* is false for these Reasons.

(1.) Because in every positive Command the contrary is forbidden. Disciples in the Commission are commanded to be baptized; therefore the Commission forbids to baptize those that are not Disciples, as are Infants.

(2.) Infant-sprinkling is not Baptism; surely that cannot be Christ's Baptism, in which there is not a Subject according to Christ's Command, nay tho' the Infant were dipped into the Water, no more than if a Heathen Person were so dipped against his Will, it could be called Christ's Baptism.

And methinks you will hardly deliver your selves from our Argument so well as we are delivered from yours. But let's hear.

2. I deny that Infants or Adult Persons are distinctly expressed in *Mat. 28. 19.* for both are included in the word *Nations.*

If Disciples are expressed, and Infants in no good sense

sense are Disciples, then the Subjects are distinctly expressed : but the former is true; *Ergo*.

If all Nations be the Subject of Baptism, according to Christ's Commission, without respect to being taught, then all may be baptized without being taught : but the Antecedent is absurd ; *Ergo*, so is the Consequent. And what can you shew in the Commission that will authorize you to baptize the Infant of a Christian more than the Infant of a Heathen ?

*Pag. 8.* If they are understood, then they are not expressed : you have confuted your self.

As if what is understood, was not expressed to the Understanding : the word for *them* is Masculine, but that for *Nations* of the Neuter ; the agreement is not between these words : For if the Apostles were commanded to baptize all Nations without the modification there expressed, *viz. taught*, then the Infants of Heathens, by virtue of this Commission, have as much right to Baptism as the Infants of Christians ; yea Unbelievers had as good claim to that Ordinance as Believers : all which is absurd, and therefore the word *them* must have relation to Believers, to Men discipled.

*Pag. 9. l. 8.* Infants may as well be Believers imputatively in their Parents, &c.

This is answered before, the Text saith not as they feign, that the Infants of the *Kohabites* did in their Parents keep the Charge of the Sanctuary.

Parents Faith may be imputed to Infants, &c. There was nothing of the Parents coming to Christ imputed to the Infants, 'tis altogether vain stuff. Our Blessings come not on us for our Works sake, much less on our Children for our Works sake.

That in *Heb. 11. 29.* *By Faith they passed through the Red Sea, as by dry Land.*

Is there any mention of the Imputation of the Pa-

rents Faith to their Children? Or, is there any necessity of such an Inference?

Is it said, all the Children of *Israel* passed by Faith? Is this indefinite Proposition equal to an universal? Would not the Proposition be true if only a thousand of them were Believers? Among all that Multitude are they sure there were no Orphans that were incapable of actual Faith? Whose Faith then was imputed to them? There went up also a mixt Multitude, had they all the Faith of Miracles, and was their Faith imputed to their Infants?

I appeal to all indifferent Men, whether this imputative Faith by them feigned, be not an unheard-of Novelty.

But what can they mean, but that God did account the Infants Believers for their Parents Faith? Well, many of these Parents soon forgot his Works, became Unbelievers, and consequently the Parents Infidelity must be imputed to the Children, and then they must be rejected of God. What Stuff is this? at one time accepted, and at another time falling from this Grace and rejected.

Whereas the truth is, that none are accounted Believers by God but those who are truly such; and those that went through the Red Sea by Faith, were truly Saints, the Text saith they were the Children of *Israel*; it saith not that all of them passed by Faith, even the six hundred thousand Men which these Gentlemen mention. And they know that an indefinite Proposition is not always equal to an universal, nor is not true in this place.

All to whom Faith was attributed in the 11th of *Hebrews* were true Saints: All the natural Seed of *Israel* were not true Saints; Ergo, Faith is not there attributed to the natural Seed.

But, say they, the *Israelites* Infants were baptized



in the Cloud, 1 Cor. 10. 1, 2. and this was a Type of Gospel-Baptism.

*Answ.* The *Israelitish* Church was also typical of the Gospel-Church. And if the whole Church were baptized, what doth it teach but that all Gospel-Churches ought to be baptized? But Gospel-Churches are made up of Believers, visible Saints, and not of Infants; therefore this infers not Infant-Baptism, not so much as by a legitimate Consequence.

But (say they) Infants are capable of Baptism, the Subject therein is passive.

The unbelieving Adult are capable of Baptism for the same reason, the Subject therein being passive. Will these Gentlemen then baptize promiscuously all Adult Persons not before baptized (as they phrase it) because they are capable? How frivolous is this? Their Reason lies thus. Every Subject capable of Baptism ought to be baptized: Every Infant is capable of Baptism: *Ergo*.

Let them now go and baptize the Infants of *Jews, Turks, Heathens*, and then boast they have made so many Christians.

*Pag. 10. line 13.* But neither this nor any one Word of God doth shew that Infants must be denied Baptism, because they cannot do what is required of Adult Persons.

*Answ.* This is a mistake: For not only this but every other Scripture that shews what is required of a Person in order to his Baptism, doth shew that all those are to be denied Baptism in whom those Requisites are not found. And I reason thus:

If the Scripture hath no where authorized the Ministers to baptize any, but those who professing their Faith in Christ do claim Baptism, then they ought not to baptize Infants: but the former is true; *Ergo*. Or thus.

If the Scripture excludes all from Baptism who do not profess Faith in Christ, then it excludes Infants: but the former is true; *Ergo*.

The Assumption is prov'd by this Text under consideration, *Acts 8. 37. If thou believest with all thy Heart, thou mayst, &c.* not else. No instance can be given of one baptized who did not profess Faith.

And to affirm the Scripture allows the Baptism of such, for whose Baptism there is to be found in the Scripture neither Precept nor Precedent, is only to affirm, and not to prove.

Let these Gentlemen prove when they write next, that there is an Indulgence given to Infants in respect of their receiving Baptism if they can? Otherwise to talk of one thing required of Infants, and another of the Adult, is altogether vain.

If the Scripture does not, with respect of Baptism, make a distinction between Infants and Adult, then the Minister ought not. And such distinctions as the Scripture is not acquainted with, are devised by shifting heads to deceive themselves and others.

*Line 28.* I shall quickly shew that the Scripture doth authorize the practice of Infant Baptism, &c. Bravely and confidently asserted!

But here is a grant, that the Scripture doth not expressly tell us that the Apostles did baptize Infants.

But this Argument will fall on your selves. The Scripture doth not tell us, that the Apostles did deny Baptism to any Christian's Infant; or administer it to any Adult Person descending from a Christian.

*Answer.* The Scripture doth not tell us that any Christian Parent did ever offer his Infant Seed to Baptism; how should it then tell us such were denied it?

It is not lawful for us to do in instituted Worship,  
any

any thing but what is commanded ; otherwise you may introduce with the Papists, the Cross, Oil, Spittle and Cream, into the Ordinance of Baptism, yea, and a thousand other Fopperies, and say, the Scripture doth not tell us the Apostles did not use these. And a Papist would utterly rout you, if you durst abide by this Argument.

Page 11. line 1. But we have some probable Instances of baptizing Infants.

Even now they would quickly shew, that the Scripture doth authorize the Practice of Infant Baptism ; but now their Confidence is turned into probable Instances.

(1.) Acts 16. 33. *He and all his were baptized straightway.* Here I warrant it is probable there were Children : But is it not as probable that there were none ? I mean, Infants ; and the reason is, he might be old, and his Children grown up, and might be capable of hearing and believing ; and that it was so, consult the Text, *And they spake unto him the Word of the Lord, and to all that were in his House.* Did they speak to Infants ?

But this no more supposeth (say they) that the Word was preached to all, even Infants, than those words, *Mark 16. 15. Go preach the Gospel to every Creature,* supposes Stones able to hear, &c. All in one place, and every in the other is to be understood with limitation according to the capacity of the Subject.

First here, as I hinted, it may be supposed that the Tylor was old, and his Children were capable of hearing and believing ; and is it not as probable (and much more, because the Word was preach'd to them) than that they were Infants ?

But it may be doubtful whether he had any Children at all.

(2.) This

(2.) This *All*, saith he, to whom the Apostle preach'd is to be restrain'd, according to the capacity of the Subject.

And must not that *all* be so restrained, where it is said, *he was baptized and all his straightway*? May we not say by all Infants, they are no more included than where 'tis said, *Go preach the Gospel to every Creature*, Stones and Trees are included?

Infants are no more capable of Baptism, according as it was instituted by Christ, and practised by the Apostles, where learning Christ and believing do ever precede it, than Stones and Trees of hearing the Gospel.

And to say as they, some were preached to as included in their Parents, is meer unintelligible stuff.

If some believed in their Parents, others did reject and persecute the Gospel in their Parents with as good reason; and so dying in Infancy every Infant must be accountable for, and damned for the Sins of his reprobate and unbelieving Parents; and so not only *Adam's* first, but all his Sins, yea all the Sins of unbelieving Progenitors will be charged on their dying Infants. This follows with as good Consequence as that the Word is preached to some in their Parents, and their Parents Faith imputed to them; and is such unreasonable, absurd and unmerciful Doctrine in respect of poor Children, that the like I am perswaded was hardly ever heard of before.

When you can shew that these are as plainly included in the word *Baptize*, as Infants are in the word *Nations*, we shall further consider what you say.

*Ans<sup>w</sup>.* That Infants are not at all included in the word *Nations* in the Commission is manifest, because there is meant no more of all Nations than are taught or discipled; and, as before is noted, to take *Nations* in the largest extent, then even the Unconverted and  
their



their Children also ought to be baptized according to the Commission; which being absurd, it must follow, that only such of all Nations as are discipled by the Ministry are to be baptized. Now pray let us hear, according to your promise, why you do not use Salt, Cream, Oil and Spittle, seeing they are not prohibited in exprefs words in the Scripture.

*Pag. 12. line 4.* I assert, Christ hath required his Ministers to baptize the Infants of professed Christians.

*Ans.* Required it by good Consequence I warrant, which now I shall attend.

*Pag. 12. line 8. Arg. 1.* Those of Nations ought to be baptized, that are not expressly or consequentially excluded by the Word of God; therefore the Infants of professing Christians ought to be baptized.

The *minor* here is to be supplied. But the Infants of professing Christians are not expressly or consequentially excluded by the Word of God. This I deny.

And this they might well have supposed would have been denied, which yet they have not proved, but have turned off the Opponency upon their Adversaries as soon as ever they pretend to take it on them; and say we have not been ever able to prove Infants excluded from Baptism by the Word, which was done by the very Argument they pretend to answer. For,

If Christ hath nowhere required his Ministers to baptize Infants, then consequentially he hath excluded them from Baptism; but the former is true, and these Gentlemen will never be able to shew a Command of Christ for baptizing of them. For,

None ought to baptize any, for baptizing whom he hath no positive Command: for in instituted Worship what is not expressly commanded, is forbidden. For example, In

In making the Tabernacle, Ark, and Cloths of Service, *Exod.* 39. 43. Moses looked upon all the Work, and behold they had done it as the Lord had commanded; not a Tack, Loop, or Curtain, more than commanded. Moses would not say, the Lord commanded 50 Loops to a Curtain; but he did not command I should set no more, I will therefore put 55; he well knew that being commanded to put 50, more or less than that was consequentially forbidden: So when our Lord commands to baptize such of the Nations as should be discipled by the Word, these Gentlemen might see that those words restrain their Commission, and that they ought to account all others excluded from their Commission, but such as were discipled by the Word.

*Pag.* 12. *line* 19. I deny that all things pertaining to an Ordinance must be expressed in the Institution for that Ordinance.

This they endeavour to prove by this Instance.

The Institution for the Passover doth not express the Cup, which yet was piously used by Christ himself.

*Ans.* Seeing the Cup was not mentioned in the Institution for the Passover, how did these Gentlemen know that it was used as part of that Ordinance? I speak of the Cup our Lord took for his Supper. I do read in *Luke* the Cup was took after Supper, that is, after the Passover was ended; and that it was a part of the Passover, if they have it not from the Institution, how do they know it?

But what if this that they say should obtain, that all things pertaining to an Ordinance need not be expressed in the Institution? I hope if some Circumstances be not expressed, yet they will grant that the principal things must: And the Subject in Baptism is a principal thing, otherwise let them go by that Rule, and baptize Infidels and their Children.

But they cannot yet prove even by Consequence that any Infants ought to be baptized: for by whatsoever words they shall prove in this Commission that Believers Infants are to be baptized, only changing the terms necessary, I will prove all Infants ought. They only talk of good Consequences, but bring none.

*Pag. 12.* Some Infants are Members of the Gospel-Church visible, therefore they ought to be baptized.

That Church-membership was a ground of Baptism was denied in the Dispute.

And also that some Infants were visible Church-Members.

That Infants, *viz.* Elect Infants, are Members of the Universal Church I grant, because redeemed by Christ, are sanctified, and shall be saved; but who these are we know not, it comes not into the Minister's Observation: And God doth not require Impossibilities of his Servants. God hath not made Election, or Redemption, or habitual Grace the signs to a Minister of doing his Office; because these are secret things, and cannot come into his Observation without a Miracle.

They say here, the Infants of Believers are Church-Members before Baptism; this we deny if they speak of an instituted Church, and they are not able to make it good: That Text *Acts 7. 38.* here quoted, speaks of a National Church, not a Gospel-Church, which is Congregational, and consists of professed Believers.

*Pag. 13.* These were Members of the Jewish, &c.

Here they grant that Members of the Jewish Church, without credible Profession of Faith and Repentance, were not to be baptized.

But the Jewish Church at that time was the only visible Church, therefore the Point is gain'd, that visible Church-Membership gives no right to Baptism;

tism ; if it did not then, much less doth it now.

I prove they are, *Suffer little Children, &c. for of such is the Kingdom of Heaven.*

The Dispute here is, Whether by Kingdom of Heaven, be meant the Church, or Kingdom of Glory? If I suppose the former, what advantage will they get? *Suffer little Children to come unto me, for of such, i. e. like these in Humility and Meekness is the Gospel-Church. I say unto you, whosoever humbles not himself as a little Child, shall not enter therein.* What is this to the Baptism of Infants? Nay, should you understand thus, that the Church redeemed by Christ hath some such as these, what is this to Baptism? Who denies these things? But where is the good Consequence to prove from hence Infant-Baptism?

Notwithstanding, I am apt to think that Christ tells them that such as these are received to Glory; these Gentlemen say this cannot be, because every Infant that goes to Heaven drops his Infancy, and enters perfect into Glory.

I demand here, whether it is impossible for God to bring an Infant to Glory?

Wherein lies the Contradiction?

How will these Gentlemen define an Infant? will they tell us it is a Creature rational, but not capable of using Reason? such may be an Ideot, and therefore agrees not to an Infant only: For my part I cannot tell how to define an Infant so as to make it include a Contradiction that it should be such in Heaven. Let's hear how they define an Infant, even a poor little weak thing, *pag. 34. line 4. of their Account.*

Well then, how do these Gentlemen know whether in Heaven there be such little Creatures as Infants? Cannot God make the Soul in those little weak Organs act as gloriously as in the Organs of a Giant?

Will



Will these Gentlemen affirm that bodily Strength is one of the Blessings of Heaven? Are they sure there will be need of it? For my part I have been ready to think much, if not the whole of the Glory of the Saints above consisted in the rectitude of their Understandings and Wills.

But as I said, if we should grant these Gentlemen their longing, and suppose that by the Kingdom of Heaven was meant the Church, where is the good Consequence to prove that they must be baptized? I have long waited for one, but still they delay me.

They say, *p.* 14. that the Members of a Christian Church have a right to Baptism: But I despair to find where they so proved it, and I do not think any impartial Judg will give it to them, that Church-Membership gives a right to Baptism, for the reasons before offered against this Opinion.

It was not so in the Jewish Church, much less in the Christian.

*Pag.* 14. *line* 20. I have shewn before how Infants may be Disciples by the Ministry of Men.

How weakly this was done, let the Reader judg: And we have not said that Infants are incapable of being made holy, or so incapable as the Beasts of the Field are; for they have the Seeds of Reason, may be justified, sanctified and glorified. God can do all this to them we say, tho you will not allow Glorification to Infants. But we say Men can no more teach them, and by teaching them make them Disciples, than they can teach the Beasts of the Field.

*Arg.* 3. The Infants of Believers are called Disciples, *Acts* 15. 10. *Why tempt ye God, &c.*

First, I grant some Persons here are called Disciples, but deny that Infants are so called, as is manifest from the Answer, *pag.* 15. *line* 1.

They are here up again with being taught in their

Parents, so may as well be said to be baptized in their Parents for any thing they have urged to the contrary; but something must be said lest their mouths should seem stopt.

2. They deny that all who are here called Disciples are called Brethren, *ver. 1.* or are said to be taught. This is but a bold denial, the Text is plain, none are intended in this place but the Brethren whom the false Apostles taught; the false Apostles did not preach to their Infants, if they had any such. And *Peter* testifieth of the Brethren, that God had purified their Hearts by Faith, and these he calls Disciples, and not Children, who could not have their Hearts purified by Faith: And tho it was the Disciples of *Cesarea* that *Peter's* words relate to, yet the case of both, *viz.* those at *Antioch* and these, must be parallel, or *Peter's* words had not been pertinent.

But say these Gentlemen, cannot God give Infants the Seed of Faith, and purify their Hearts by so doing? &c.

Ridiculous enough! do these Gentlemen believe really that to be the sense of the place? Do they think that *Peter* said this from Revelation? Dare they tell the World such stuff to bolster up a tottering Opinion? Is there so much as a probability for such a thing, or any good Consequences? It is manifest *Peter* was speaking of the Brethren, to whom the false Teachers came; for he parallels the case of the Brethren at *Antioch* with those of *Cesarea*, who received the Holy Ghost, and Faith, and a purified Heart by his Ministry, and if these were not Children, then neither those at *Antioch*: and here is a good Consequence; for otherwise his Instance in them had not been pertinent, which is very absurd to imagine.

The Heart indeed by infusion of holy Habits may be

be said to be purified, but that could not come into the observation even of *Peter* without a Miracle, and here is no need to feign one; I say feign one, because here is no rational ground of such a Conjecture: *ver. 7.* saith *Peter*, *God made choice among us, that the Gentiles by my mouth should hear the word of the Gospel, and believe.* I ask now those reverend Gentlemen, the Authors of this Dialogue, whether those that heard the word from his mouth were Infants? did Infants hear the word of the Gospel and believe? These are the very Persons of whom he testifieth in the *8th vers.* That *God gave them the Holy Ghost*; it is to be understood the extraordinary Gifts of the Holy Ghost: and *ver. 9.* tis said, *He purified their hearts by Faith*; 'tis the same persons still; and yet these Gentlemen feign, that they might be Infants, saying, *And cannot God give Infants the seed of Faith, and purify their hearts by so doing?* Yes indeed he can, but 'twas not done here; and this they knew well enough, if they examined the place, which I perceive they did by their next words: for they say they were the *Gentiles at Casarea*; and then how disingenuous is it for them to put such a blind upon their Readers, to cheat them out of their Understandings?

And I wonder what these Gentlemen hope to gain to their Cause, by telling us that *Peter* spake here of the *Gentiles at Casarea*, not those at *Antioch*. This we grant; but how weak was their Answer, just before to suppose them Children.

But I say, if it were not a parallel Case between the *Gentiles at Casarea*, and the Brethren at *Antioch*, to what purpose did *Peter* declare the History of their Conversion?

And that it was so, I prove from the *5th verse* of this same *chap.* compared with the first.

In the first *verse* 'tis said, *Certain men came down from Judea, and taught the Brethren, Except ye be circumcised, &c.* not ye and your Children, but your selves. Thence I conclude that these Brethren were men capable of hearing the word, and not Infants. And in *ver. 5.* certain of the Sect of the *Pharisees* which believed, said, *It was needful to circumcise them, and to command them to keep the Law*: but Infants were not capable of such a Command; therefore the Brethren intended in both places are Believers, and not Infants. As to the Equivocations about the manner which they make, this I say, it only shews that these false Teachers would have the Brethren that they taught to have the Foreskin cut off, and it cannot possibly have relation to Children, they being not intended by the false Teachers, or *Paul* or *Peter*, or any other in this place, as I think I have sufficiently demonstrated.

We say Circumcision cannot be the yoke, because Infants did bear it, and because it bound to keep the whole Law. To the first they answer, that it only signifieth a burdensome Yoke. Suppose so, this Yoke was to be laid on profelyted *Gentiles* when adult; and of these the dispute is, and not of Infants at all. And the Apostle saith, *If you be circumcised, Christ shall profit you nothing; verily I say unto every one of you that is circumcised, that he is a Debtor to the whole Law*: this was not spoke to Children but to Believers; and *Mr. Williams* said well, *after the manner of Moses* relates to the Form, not to the Subject.

What if the Yoke would have been laid on Infants, had the false Teachers obtained the point against the Brethren. Yet it proves not in the least the present Dispute was about any other than those that believed, as is manifest fully from what hath been before said, and therefore Infants are not called Disciples in this place.



Page 16. the last 3 lines; I have seven places at hand, &c.

(1.) *Mark* 1. 7. Except they wash (*i. e.* baptize) they eat not: Were they dipped over head and ears when they did eat? Ridiculous enough; the Text speaks of the Washing, *i. e.* Baptizing their Hands. I ask, when they washed, whether they did only sprinkle a little water, or pour a large quantity that did overwhelm them? and so for other places, as of Tables, Beds, is it likely it was done by sprinkling a few drops of water on some part of them? Certainly these things were covered with Water, when said to be baptized: so the *Israelites* were covered with Water, and with the Cloud, when in the Sea, which very well figures the Dipping used by us. And it is frivolous to answer all the impertinencies there utter'd. They never heard that βαπτω, much less βαπτίζω did signify plunging under Water. But *Stephens* saith ΒΑΠΤΩ doth signify *mergo*, *immergo*; and what is this but to dip, drown, or overwhelm, to plunge or dip in? *Item*, *Tingo quod fit immergendo*, to dye, because it is done by plunging into the liquor.

*Baptizo*, he saith also, signifieth *mergo* or *immergo*; *Item*, *Submergo*: and yet these Gentlemen never heard that these did signify plunging under Water, &c. whereas in these senses the thing is rather dipt in the Water, than the Water applied to it. So in *Schrevelius's Lexicon*, as set forth by *Robertson*, ΒΑΠΤΩ signifieth *intingo* & *mergo*, to dip in, to steep in, as well as *lavo* to wash; all which signify a plunging under Water. And here they own the Author of the English Annotations to be against them. Let the Reader consider whom he hath most reason to follow, the former being disinterested, and speaking according to his Conscience, or these to save their Credit and Reputation. I needed not have said any thing to this

Question, because it is fitter for the Learned than me. Only what I could observe I have, the rest of the Dispute being not worth taking notice of, as I think, their Objections being frivolous, and not pressing us at all, and by the ingenious Learned may be turned against them.

There have been enough of their own side to justify our practice, and themselves pretend to no more than a probability for their practice.

They say, we must so administer it as shall consist with the safety of the Subject.

God's preservation of those by us baptized, sufficiently acquits us from this Cavil.

So much is said of this point by Mr. *Keach* against Mr. *Owen*, that an Answer may easily be transcribed thence to all these Gentlemens Evasions.

Page 22. 1 Cor. 7. 14. *Else were your Children unclean, but now they are holy.*

*Ans.* Holiness without Christ's Command gives no right to Baptism. If it was not Holiness, but God's Command gave right to Circumcision, then not Holiness but Christ's Command gives right to Baptism. *Vid. Keach* against *Owen*, p. 109.

Their first Argument; Legitimacy cannot descend from Believers as Believers. *Ans.* I grant the Argument, but deny that this Holiness in the Text descends from Believers as such, but from their lawful Marriage; for the scruple was, whether the Believer being married to an Unbeliever might live together, because *Ezra* commanded idolatrous Wives and Children to be put away. The Apostle saith, they may dwell together, and that if the Unbeliever pleaseth to dwell with the Believer, that then the Believer should not put her or him away, for these reasons, because the Unbelieving is sanctified by the Believing, else were their Children unclean, but now are holy, viz. a holy Seed by a legitimate Holiness. And

And we may observe the holiness of the Seed is of the same nature with the holiness of the Unbeliever, who is said here to be sanctified.

There is no external relative federal Holiness of Persons or Things in Gospel-times. These being but ceremonial and typical, are now done away.

The unbelieving Husband is now sanctified to or by the Wife, that is, sanctified for use. 'Tis not Whoredom, 'tis not sin; else if it were, your Children were unclean, they would be Bastards. So saith the Scripture, *Mal. 2. 15.* And did he make one, (*i. e.* one Wife) yet he had the residue of the Spirit; and wherefore one? that he might seek a godly Seed, a Seed according to God's Ordinance of Matrimony.

Not only the Seed of the Faithful, but of Unbelievers also, is holy in this respect. Marriage is honourable in all, and the Bed undefiled. And had the Apostles made their Marriage void, their Children would have been Bastards, and the Marriage-bed a defiled one. For such as is the Sanctification or Holiness of the unbelieving Wife or Husband, such is the sanctification of the Child: but by the former only can be understood a matrimonial Sanctification, therefore such is the latter.

And indeed if the Children had from hence an external relative federal Holiness, the unbelieving Husband or Wife have the same, and might as well be baptized.

This Text is well opened by Mr. *Keach* against Mr. *Owen*, and our Interpretation defended against whatever hath been offered against it.

2. But these Gentlemen deny the word *holy* to be used in this sense in all the New Testament.

That the Old Testament defends our use of the word is sufficient, as the Text above-quoted doth manifest.

But what think these Gentlemen of 1 *Theff.* 4. 3, 4, 5. *For this is the Will of God, even your sanctification, that ye should abstain from Fornication; that every one of you should know how to possess his Vessel in sanctification and honour, &c.*

(3.) If Legitimacy were meant, the Apostle would speak false: that is, if these Gentlemen speak true, the words would run thus, say they, If the unbelieving Wife be not sanctified by the believing Husband, your Children would be Bastards. True, if God's Ordinance of Matrimony did not sanctify them to a holy use of each other; but it doth, and therefore this is a silly Supposition, and they had this, while both were Unbelievers, and the Conversion of either doth not dissolve the Marriage-bond.

Besides, it's most probable that the Apostle speaks of the Children they had, while both were unbelievers, because we may justly infer, that the Question was put as soon as one was converted.

*Page 23. line 6.* When you can shew that Bells were once Church-members, &c. The Question is, whether Holiness be a ground of Baptism, not whether Church-membership be. The Answer is, *No*, for this reason. If Holiness, *i. e.* relative Holiness, be a ground of Baptism, then Horses Bells must be baptized; for they are said to be holy, *Zach.* 12. 20.

But Horses Bells must not be baptized; therefore a relative Holiness is not the ground of Baptism.

*Arg. 2.* The Promise is to you and to your Children. This Promise the Infants of penitent Persons have a right to, therefore they have a right to Baptism.

By the Promise is meant either Christ and Salvation by him, or the offer of Christ and Salvation by him.

If the former, then all the Infants of penitent Persons have a right to Christ and Salvation, and not one



one born of Christian Parents can ever perish, except we hold falling from Grace, which I suppose these Gentlemen do not. If by the Promise be understood the latter, the sense is this: The offer of Christ and Salvation is to you, and to your Children, and to all afar off, among the *Gentiles*, whom the Lord shall outwardly call: *Utrum horum miris accipe.*

I say farther, these words were spoken to Unbelievers, and Impenitent; and no Argument for Infant-Baptism can be drawn from a Promise made to Unbelievers.

Methinks the sense of the words then should be this: That the Apostle spake to the Children of God, to the Elect among these, tho it's like he knew not who they were. Yet such he knew God would call, and therefore casts forth his Net, and leaves God to gather the Fishes together.

And to these Elect he cries, the Promise was to them, and to their Seed, and to all other Elect afar off, whom it should please God effectually to call.

And that thus this place should be understood, appears because God's Promises are certain and sure, and cannot fail of their end. Had God promised Salvation by Christ to all these, they should have certainly had it; had God promised it to their natural Offspring, they also should have had it. But to some God had promised it, even the Elect among these, and their Seed, also the *Gentiles* who are said to be afar off, whom God would call: to none of these did or could the Promise ever fail, because of the faithfulness and power of God, by which he is able and willing to perform all his word.

And tho the Apostle calls on those that believed and repented, by which their Election did appear, to be baptized; yet here is not a reward of their Infants that they should be baptized also.

And

And tho these Gentlemen say that the Apostle here spake impertinently, if he did not intend their Infant-  
seed ; yet it appears otherwise, and that the Apostle  
would inform them that God had a People as a-  
mong them, so among their Children, and among  
the *Gentiles* afar off, whom he would call.

Let us hear the Paraphrase of these Gentlemen ;  
You grown *Jews* and ye *Gentiles*, when called, have  
a right to Church-Privileges, but your poor Infants,  
who for many hundred years past have enjoyed the  
same (whose Infants do they mean here? those of the  
*Gentiles* also? had they for many hundred years en-  
joy'd Church-Privileges? sure Gentlemen you are here  
mistaken) are now through the gracious efficacy of  
Christ's Death stript of it. Well Gentlemen, what  
are the Infants of the called *Jews* or *Gentiles* stript  
of? sure only Shadows, the heavy Yoak of Cere-  
monies, which a painful Ordinance obliged them  
to; they injoy all the profitable and good things that  
the Children of the *Jews* enjoy'd ; they have Godly  
Prayers for them, holy Examples set before them ;  
the Oracles of God in a clearer light than ever the  
Jewish Infants did enjoy : when they are called, they  
have clearer views of God, Christ, Heaven, and Glo-  
ry, than the other could have ; and in all things  
wherein the Gospel excels the Law, the Elect Infants  
among the *Gentiles*, as they grow up and are called,  
have a more preferable Dispensation. And why, Ah  
poor hearts ! they never did the least to forfeit it !  
What Sirs ! do we say any real good is taken from  
them ? prove it if you can. What advantage have  
your Children by their Baptism, as you call it, and  
feigned Church-membership, above ours ? supposing  
the Parents of both equally holy. Surely this Dis-  
advantage yours have, that they often think them-  
selves safe when they are not, and at best they lose  
the

the

the benefit of Christ's Ordinance, and many times go with a doubting Conscience about it all their days.

Indeed, Sir, you may enjoy your Rhetorick, but for any thing argumentative therein, you had as good let it alone.

Pag. 25. line 3. We have another of Mr. Baxter's Arguments, God did not cast out those Infants in Judgment or Mercy to them.

Yes, Sir, in Mercy he hath taken away the bitter and left the sweet, yea he hath given better Sweets than the other enjoy'd. I speak of the Elect among both; as for the other nothing is really good to them, therefore they can lose no good.

I have above suggested, what greater Good elect Children enjoy now, than the Elect then; and so there is a fair end of this Argument.

(2.) Not one Privilege of the Covenant of Grace was ever taken away by the Death of Christ.

'Tis granted; but that external Privilege of Infants Church-Membership is no Privilege of the Covenant of Grace. The Jewish Nation, as such, were not under the Covenant of Grace: If you think otherwise, pray reply to Mr. Keach.

As for what you say, that the Jewish Infants had a visible right to the Covenant of Grace:

If some, then all of them, how wicked soever their immediate Parents were, and how visible soever their Wickedness, Unbelief, and Impenitency was; pray will you consider this, and tell me what right the Infant of a flagitious ungodly Professor hath to Baptism by your Principles, and yet how by this Argument you can deny to baptize such, seeing they could not refuse to circumcise such, and Baptism is a Privilege of the Covenant of Grace, but of Children you cannot determin who are in Covenant. You say they had a visible right. I ask, had they visibly a right to the Blessings

Blessings of the Covenant? What! and enjoy none of them, neither Election, Adoption, Justification, Sanctification, or Glorification. Surely their right in the Covenant could not be very visible, when there was none at all, which was the case of an infinite number of these visible Members. Do you not read, *all are not Israel, that are of Israel*; nor because they are the Seed of *Abraham*, are they all Children; those that are the Children of the Flesh, are not therefore the Children of God, but the Children of the Promise are accounted the Seed. 'Tis, Gentlemen, the Elect that are concluded in the Covenant of Grace, and the Interest of these in that Covenant is not, nor ever was visible till their Conversion, except a special Revelation concerning them intervene.

To talk that any are visible Members of the Covenant of Grace before their Conversion to God is visible, is not a true but monstrous kind of Charity, that the Scripture no where hath taught.

Pag. 26. The Infants of Gentile Converts are not kept out, because Jews and Gentiles have the same Privileges in Christ; that is, those who are really in Christ: but this makes not for their purpose, for not the Children of *Abraham*, or the *Jews*, as such, were really in Christ; not because they are the Seed of *Abraham* are they all Children, saith the Scripture: And may not I say, not because they are the Seed of the Saints, are they all the Children of God. How are these visibly then the Children of God?

I often find these Gentlemen calling their Narrative of the *Portsmouth* Disputation, their impartial Account, wherein they are the Trumpeters of their own Praise.

But to any indifferent Reader their Impartiality will seem questionable; and I would have them think that to honour themselves is nothing worth.



As to their boasting that they have proved the Infants of Believers holy Persons, Church-Members, Disciples, and this in a Scripture-sense, is but a vain Boast. These being the things in Controversy, should have been left to the judgment of the Reader, and their Modesty then would have been praised; whereas so great Presumption on such small grounds argues great Conceitedness and Value of themselves.

And methinks I cannot but take notice of the concern of these Gentlemen; they never think they have fully defended themselves, else why comes out this Dialogue? and yet their Cause is not one whit bettered, but their Weakness more manifest: For now we see the strength of all their Wit, sure nothing more can be expected from them, I mean nothing stronger; for this is midwiv'd into the World with the best Advice, and most mature Deliberation, and as a Correction of their former Faults.

The People could not but expect some strange Production after so many Essays from these Mountains; but their Expectation is at last deluded, and behold a ridiculous Mouse, the Matter of their Scorn and Laughter.

*F I N I S.*

Faint, illegible text, possibly bleed-through from the reverse side of the page. The text is arranged in several lines and is difficult to decipher due to its low contrast and blurriness.

1787

A  
S E R M O N

Preach'd

From the Commission,  
*Matth. 28. 19.*

I N T H E

Baptist Meeting-house at *Wallup*,  
at the desire of some Friends.

To which is prefix'd a LETTER to  
*Mr. Leigh*, written after the *Portsmouth*  
Dispute.

---

By *JOHN WILLIAMS*, Pastor of  
a Baptized Congregation.

---

*London*, Printed in the year 1700.

Mr. William's LETTER to Mr. Leigh,  
written after the Disputation.

**B**Rother Leigh, for so I can heartily call you, and own you if you please to accept of it: the occasion of writing these few Lines to you is this. I have in my reflex Thoughts weigh'd what was offer'd upon both sides in the Dispute; not being willing to abide by any thing that has not a foundation in the Word, nor to reject any thing that is offer'd against my present Opinion, could I see it were bottom'd on the Word, because I know I must one day be judg'd by the Word. You told me you could have said four times more for our Cause than was spoken by us, and ten times more than you did for your own. Possibly you might have spoken four times as many words as we did: but I think it would have been a hard task to have offer'd Arguments that had four times more weight and substance than those had that were offer'd by us; I mean for clearing the Point of the Subject according to the Commission which the first Preliminaries bound us to: yet I would not undervalue your Abilities, nor set our own in competition with yours: had we not had Truth on our side, your Abilities would soon have overturn'd mine. The *Doctor*, I think, might be able to cope with any of you in that respect: but if you can offer four times more for our Cause than we did, I wonder your own Arguments should not be convincing to you, tho' ours were not; and could we have that fourfold Strength added to our Arguments, I believe you would not be able to answer one of them. For so weak as our Arguments were, you did no otherwise answer them but by denying a part, which is an easy way of answering the strongest Argument that can be offer'd: and if you could have offer'd ten times more for your own Cause, why had you not done it? you might have had the Opponency soon turn'd upon you, when the *Doctor* gave you an Argument containing an universal Negative; and,



and, as I do since understand, you ought to have accepted it, according to the Rules of Disputation in the University, from whence you take these Rules: I am informed that a universal Negative is taken for a Maxim. I thought that artificial Logick had been the Improvement of natural Reason; but if this be a Rule to be observ'd in it, that the Opponent must prove an universal Negative, I know nothing that is more contrary to natural Reason: had there been either Precept or Precedent for Infant-Baptism on Record, then it had been possible for you or some body else to have produced it; and had you done it, his Argument had been gone, and you had gained the Cause: but it is impossible for a Man to prove, that neither you nor any one else can produce such a Record, otherwise than to deny that there is any such Record to be produc'd. If this be according to the Rule of Disputation, I look on it as an effectual way to keep People in ignorance. I suppose, that if you could have produc'd a Record either of Precept or Precedent for Infant-Baptism, you would not be tied so close to the Rule of Disputation, as not to have brought it to light.

Whatever you could have said, I know not; you know you did not give us an instance for Infant-Baptism, tho it was often desired, and that with great Importunity: and must we still look on Infant-Baptism to be an Ordinance of God, a part of Divine Worship, that hath neither Precept nor Precedent for its Practice? But, Sir, if you can say ten times more for your Practice than you did, it is not too late to offer it yet; and if you please to send it me, and it be such as is convincing, I will spread it for you; if not, I will fairly answer it, and not publicly spread it. Sir, when I consider what was offered by us, and denied by you, and with what Props your own Arguments were supported, being Men of such Parts and Piety as you are, on whose Credit the Ordinance of Christ is like to be administred to a wrong Subject for the future, as it hath been for Ages past upon a like traditional Bottom; I am really grieved, and that is the reason of my setting Pen to Paper.

First, when I consider what was offered by us, and denied by you. I can repeat my own Arguments better than

I can the *Doctōr's*, and therefore I shall confine my self to them: You know you prest us to allow of Consequēces rightly drawn from the Word; the *Doctōr* told you you should give it which way you could: but did you not deny almost, if not all the Consequēces that were offered by me to prove that Infants were not the Subjects of Baptism, according to the Commission? A Negative Task that we were put upon, which could no otherwise be proved but by Consequēces. To repeat some of my Arguments, and I need repeat but the *major* for the most part. My first Argument was this, That if Believers are the only Subjects of Baptism according to the Commission, then Infants are not. Here you denied the Sequel; but if the Antecedent be true, the Consequent is true, and rightly drawn from the Text.

There being none put into the Commission as the Subjects of Baptism but Believers, *Mark* the 16th, and 17th, you did not deny the Antecedent, how then could you deny the Consequent? My second Argument was this, That if Infants are incapable of believing, then they are not the Subjects of Baptism, according to the Commission; but they are so. Here you denied the *minor*, which I wonder at, that you should be of the Judgment that Infants are capable of believing; yea, your denying the *minor* speaks as much. My third Argument was, If the Essence of Faith consists in the Act of the Understanding and of the Will, then Infants are incapable of believing. Here you denied the Sequel; you did not deny but that the Essence of Faith consists in the Act of the Understanding and of the Will, and if you had, it would have been proved; but how could you deny the Sequel?

Are Infants capable of apprehending Christ in his Natures, and in his Offices, for so he must be apprehended as the Object of Faith? Are Infants capable of consenting Christ to be theirs, and they Christ's in all his Offices, which is the Act of the Will that follows the Act of the Understanding? Can Infants make a Resignation of themselves to Christ to be taught by him, and saved by him, and ruled and governed by him? Can you prove by the Word, that there is such a Capacity in Infants, or that there is such a Capacity

Capacity in the Children of Believers, considered as such, and not in the Children of Unbelievers? My fourth Argument was, That if none could believe on Jesus Christ, that never heard of Jesus Christ, then Infants are incapable of believing. Here again you denied the Sequel. You know there are Scriptures enough to prove the Antecedent in every Proposition, and the Consequent was rightly drawn; so that you had no more ground to deny the Consequent than you had to deny the Antecedent, yet you denied them all: and thus you might have run me up *ad infinitum*, by a continual denying, without rendring any reason for what you did, or discovering any Fallacy in any one of my Arguments. The Arguments you offered your self are judged by some to have little weight in them, and that by Pedo-baptists as well as others: Your first was, That if Children are Church-Members, then they have a right to Baptism, the initiating Ordinance; but they are so, &c. The *minor* being denied, you brought *Mat. 19. Of such is the Kingdom of Heaven.* You indeavour'd to prove, that by the Kingdom of Heaven was meant the Visible Church: I denied it, and offered an Argument to the contrary; That if Infants were not Members of a particular instituted Church, nor of the universal visible Church, out of which a particular instituted Church was gathered; then they were not visible Church-Members: but they are not, &c.

You told me it did not belong to the Respondent to form an Argument, that was all you replied to it; then I denied your *major*, that Church-Membership was the ground of Baptism: I brought *Mat. 3.* and *Luke 3.* and show'd you, that those that came to *John* to be baptized and were denied, were Church-Members; you replied that they were Church-Members *de facto*, but not *de jure*. I ask'd you whether you did own them Church-Members *de facto*? you said you did: Then said I, Church-Membership is not the ground of Baptism; you said again, they were not Church-Members *de jure*, for by the Law they ought to have been cast out: I desired you to produce that Law, but you could not do it. And now, Sir, I would offer you two things which were not then mentioned. First, Suppose a Grant, that by the Kingdom

of Heaven is meant the Church of the *Jews*, that was then a National Church, yet your Argument is impertinent.

This was before the Commission was given out, at which time it is granted, that Children were Church-Members; but if you would argue from Church-Membership to a right to Baptism, you must prove that they are now Church-Members under the new Dispensation. The Constitution of the Church being changed from National to Congregational, the Matter of which is visible Saints, and that is, such as in the judgment of Charity are inherently holy; and the Form, mutual Consent and Agreement; and that Church-Membership is put into the Commission to be the ground of Baptism: for if you prove not their right to Baptism by the Commission, you do nothing, and this I think will be too hard a Task. Secondly, When Children were Church-Members, Church-Membership was not the ground of Baptism; Christ and *John* never baptized Church-Members, considered as such, but first made them Disciples, and then baptized them, *Joh. 4. 1.* they were Church-Members before they were Disciples of Christ, and they were made Disciples before they were baptized. Your second Argument was, That if Infants are Disciples, then they are the Subjects of Baptism according to the Commission; but they are so, &c. The *minor* was denied. Now pray consider what weak Props they were you fortified your *minor* with; at first you said, a Child was a Disciple as soon as his Parents had dedicated him to be taught: But do you think he is a Disciple by Instructions according to the Commission, and so a fit Subject to be baptized, not having learn'd Jesus Christ? Secondly, Do the Parents dedicate their Children to be taught while Infants, when they desire you to baptize them? or do you undertake to teach them while Infants, or do you ever look after them, endeavouring to teach them? You say a Child is a Scholar the first day he goes to School, tho he hath learnt nothing; but is he a Scholar before he goes to School, or a Scholar by Instruction, when he hath learn'd nothing? You baptize them before they go to School, before you go about to teach them; will Christ look on these as Disciples to him



him by the Ministry of the Word, or on you Ministers as keeping close to the Commission? These things will not hold at the great Day, when the Commission shall be laid open again. Bear with me that I speak so plain, for it is the Cause of Christ that I am now pleading; his great Commission, wherein his Kingly Authority is so highly concerned, may be duly observed, and the Ordinance duly administered. However Children may be accounted Scholars by us in an improper sense the first day they go to School, tho they have learned nothing; yet I shewed you, that *Philip* did not account the Eunuch a Scholar, tho he had actually submitted himself to be taught by him, and he had taught him till he understood by his verbal Profession, that he had learned Jesus Christ; that is, indeed a Disciple of Christ, that hath learned Jesus Christ, and so learned him as to deny himself for Jesus Christ, *Luke* 14. 27, 28. Nor do I believe that you do look upon all that you have preached the Gospel unto to be discipled unto Christ, and so fit Subjects for Baptism according to the Commission. What you offered from *Acts* 15. has no foundation in the Chapter, the Controversy being about the Brethren, not the Infants; and the Yoke not being Circumcision barely considered, but the false Doctrine together with Circumcision, which Doctrine could not be imposed on Infants, tho Circumcision might. You asserted that Infants are a part of a Nation, and yet I am sure you will not baptize upon this ground your selves, why then did you offer it to us? The vilest Wretches that are, and the blackest Heathens in the World are part of a Nation; will you baptize such? Really I should blush to look back on such an Argument. I have written these Lines in Love, hoping that on second thoughts things may be better considered; and that you will not stand by that you have not the Word to stand by you in. The Commission saith that, *He that believeth and is baptized, shall be saved.* Do you believe that all the Infants that you baptize shall be saved? if not, then you do not believe that they are all Believers, and yet you baptize them as such. That Faith that fits the Subject for Baptism, it is a believing with all the Heart;

see *Pool's* Annot. on *Acts* 8. 37, 38. it is such a Faith as doth evidence the Subject's right to Salvation, *Mark* 16. 16. I shall offer you one Argument, and so conclude: If the Apostles that were enjoined to teach the Observation of all things whatsoever Christ had commanded them; never taught the Observation of Infant-Baptism, then Infant-Baptism was never commanded them by Christ; but they did not, &c. I shall now take leave, and remain your truly loving Friend,

*John Williams.*

---

**Mr.**

## Mr. Williams's Sermon.

---

Matth. 28. 19. *Go ye therefore and teach all Nations, baptizing them in the Name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost.*

**B**Efore I come to the words themselves, I shall give you a brief account of this Chapter, and of some remarkable Passages contained therein. *Vers. 1.* we have the Women coming to the Sepulcher, and the time of their coming, which was at the end of the Sabbath, as it began to dawn towards the first day of the Week. *Vers. 2.* we have an account of a great Earthquake, together with the cause thereof: *The Angel of the Lord descended from Heaven, and rolled away the stone from the door, and sate upon it.* *Vers. 3.* we have a description of this Angel, or this extraordinary Messenger which was sent from Heaven. *1st.* He is described by his Countenance, *His Countenance was like Lightning.* *2ly.* By his Raiment, that *was white as Snow.* *Vers. 4.* we have the effect of this Apparition, with respect to the keepers: *They are astonished at the sight; for fear of him the keepers did shake, and became as dead men.* *Vers. 5, 6, 7.* we have the Angel talking with the Women, in which there are three things observable: First he gives them a Caution, *fear not*: tho the Keepers did fear this bright shining Angel, yet the Women should not fear; their end was good in being there, they came in love to Jesus Christ: *I know that ye seek Jesus that was crucified.* Secondly, He preacheth unto them the Resurrection of Christ; the first tidings of this welcome News sounded in their ears: *He is not here, he is risen, as he said: come see the place where the Lord lay.* Thirdly, he sends them on a hasty errant; *Go quickly and tell his Disciples, that he is risen from*

*the dead; and behold he goeth before you into Galilee: there shall you see him, as I have told you.* *Vers. 8, 9.* the Women return from the Sepulcher; and first we have the manner how, and that was *with fear and great joy.* Secondly, the speed they made; they *did run to bring his Disciples word.* No doubt they thought it would be welcome News to the Disciples, as it was to themselves. Thirdly, They have a short stop by the way, being met by the Lord Jesus, who saluted them with all hail: *Peace be unto you, or rejoice.* Upon this they came and held him by the feet, and worshipped him. *Vers. 10.* and here observe: First Jesus Christ gives them another caution; *Fear not.* Secondly, he sends them forward in their Errand: *Go and tell my Disciples that I go before them into Galilee, there shall they see me.* *Vers. 11, 12, 13, 14, 15.* we have a Narration of the Watchmens coming into the City, to acquaint the Chief Priest with what was done; and of the way they took to stifle the blessed Tidings of the Resurrection of Christ: *They gave them large money to report, that his Disciples came by night and stole him away while they slept.* *Vers. 16.* tho the Disciples were not forward to believe that Christ was risen, yet they go into Galilee, and into a mountain, where Christ had appointed them. *Vers. 17.* Christ comes, and shews himself to his Disciples, according to his promise: and here we may see the effect of his coming; *When they saw him they worshipped him, but some doubted:* that is, they doubted for a time; but at last they believed. *Vers. 18.* he declares to his Disciples the full and ample Power that he was invested withal: *All Power is given unto me, in Heaven and in Earth.* By this Declaration he prepares his Disciples to receive their Commission; which Commission you have in *ver. 19, 20.* together with an encouraging Promise of his own Presence; *Lo I am with you always, unto the end of the world.* My Text contains in it two Branches of the Commission; to teach, and baptize. In which words we may observe these general parts: First, we have their mission, or sending; *Go ye therefore.* Secondly, we have the Subject, *All Nations.* Thirdly, their work, and that is two-fold: *1st, To teach; and 2ly, To baptize:* In which there is the order to be observed; they



must first teach, and then baptize. 3ly, We have the Subjects of Baptism, in this word *Them*: which word is a Relative, the Antecedent is *All Nations*, taught or disciplined. 4ly, We have the Authority of the Ordinance in these words: *In the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost*. Before I give you the Observation, I shall a little open the Terms.

First, As to their mission or sending, *Go ye therefore*; there are three things to be inquired into:

1. Who it is that sends, and that is the Lord Jesus Christ, as appears in the preceding *Verse*, *Jesus came and spake unto them, and said, go ye.*

2. Who they are that are sent; First more immediately they are the eleven Disciples, as appears by *ver. 16, 17, 18.* *Then the eleven went away into Galilee: and Jesus came and spake unto them, saying, Go ye.* But more remotely, all such as God should be pleased to gift, and qualify by his Spirit to preach the Gospel, and by his providence to call out, and to open a door so to do. The Eleven were here commissioned, but the Commission was not restrained to them: for First, we find that there were others that did instantly preach the Gospel, as well as they, who had no other Commission but this, *Acts 11. 19, 20.* *They that were scattered abroad upon the Persecution, preached the word not only to the Jews, but to the Gentiles also.* Now there was no Commission to preach to the *Gentiles* but this; therefore it must be by this commission, or none at all. I can't suppose that they did run before they were sent: for the hand of the Lord was with them, and a great number believed and turned to the Lord; and if sent, it was by virtue of this Commission. These were not the Apostles that preached unto the *Gentiles*, but such as were scattered abroad, when the Apostles stayed at *Jerusalem*, *Acts 5. 1.* compared with the *4th.*

(2.) It's by virtue of this Commission that the Gospel is preached at this day, and the promise of his Presence which is annex'd to it, remains to this day: *Lo I am with you always unto the end of the World.*

(3.) Why did Christ send them? this word therefore carries

carries us back to the 18th Verse, *All power is given to me in Heaven and in Earth; Go ye therefore: He had power to send them, and now he exerts his Power.*

*Secondly,* What are we to understand by *All Nations*; there is no great dubiousness here, the Commission is now enlarged unto the *Gentiles*, that was before restricted unto the *Jews*. It's to all Nations, as Providence should direct them, and open a door to them: for there was a hand of Providence in steering their course, *Acts 16. 7. They essayed to go into Bithynia, but the spirit suffered them not.* *Mark* renders it thus: *Go preach the Gospel to every Creature*; that is, To every rational Creature among the Sons and Daughters of Men: Angels are rational Creatures, but Ministers are not sent to preach the Gospel to them. 2ly, It must be such as have the use of their Reason among the Sons and Daughters of Men: Children in an Infant-state are rational Creatures, but they have not the use of their Reason and Understanding, they are not capable of hearing and receiving the word; it would be but lost labour to preach the Gospel to them: Ministers are not bound by their Commission to preach to Children in an Infant-state. And here by the way observe, that if Ministers are not bound to preach the Gospel to Children in an Infant-state, then they are not bound to baptize them in an Infant-state: for they must first teach before they baptize; that is, the same Person: Not teach one, and baptize another that was never taught.

*Thirdly,* What are we to understand by this word *teaching*?

1. To teach and to preach is the same thing, as appears by comparing it with *Mark 16. 15.* it's the same Commission; and there it's said, *Go preach the Gospel to every Creature.* To teach or to preach then is to open and interpret the word by the word, and to apply it: To preach the Gospel is to preach Christ crucified, buried, and risen again, *1 Cor. 15. 1, 2, 3, 4.* it is to declare the Doctrine of Christ contained in his word, to press men by the word, and exhort them to believe in Jesus Christ; with assurance from the promise of Christ, that *whosoever believeth shall be saved;* *Mark 16. 15, 16. Luke 24. 47.*

2. To

2. To teach here, is to disciple to Christ: it's granted by them that understand the Greek, that the word is to make Disciples, or to bring Disciples to Christ, or to disciple to Christ. First then a Disciple is a Scholar, one that learns: So the English Schoolmaster defines the word. *Wilson* in his Dictionary, tells you that a Disciple is a Learner, a Scholar, one that submitteth to another to be taught; one who learneth the doctrine of Christ, that he may believe and practise it: The word does import as much in Scripture, *John* 9. 27, 28. and he said unto them, *Will you be his Disciples?* they answered him, *Thou art his Disciple, but we are Moses's Disciples.* What does this import but that they had learned the Doctrine of *Moses*, and that they would not learn of Christ? it's observed, the word is sometimes translated learned, *John* 6. 45. *Every one that hath heard, and learned of the Father, cometh unto me.* And so the word Undisciplined is translated Unlearned, *1 Pet.* 3. 16. A Disciple of Christ then is one that hath learned Jesus Christ, and so learned him, as to deny himself for Christ.

1. He is one that hath learned Jesus Christ, *John* 6. 45. *Every one that hath heard or learned of the Father, (or is disciplined of the Father) cometh unto me.* A Person can't come to Jesus Christ, till he have learned Jesus Christ; the act of the Understanding must precede the act of the Will.

2. He is one that hath so learned Christ, as to deny himself for Christ, *Luke* 14. 26. *If any man come to me, and bate not his Father, and his Mother, and his Brethren, and Sisters, yea, and his own Life also, he cannot be my Disciple.* This hatred here may not be understood of a positive hatred, but of a less loving; the Soul must love Christ more than these, or he must love these less than Christ, *ver.* 27. *And he that taketh not up his Cross, and follows me, can't be my Disciple.* *Ver.* 33. *And whosoever it be of you, that forsaketh not all that he hath, cannot be my Disciple.*

3. A Disciple here in my Text, and a Believer, *Mark* 16. 16. is the same thing; for it's the same Commission, tho variously exprest, and the various terms or expressions do help to explain each other. *Calvin* in his Institutions observes, that the words Disciple and Believer, are two

words to express the same thing; and that *Luke* in the *Acts* does often make use of the word *Disciple* for *Believer*, *Acts* 6. 1. *When the multitude of Disciples were increased*; that is the multitude of *Believers*; *Acts* 11. 26. the *Disciples* (that is, *Believers*) were first called *Christians* at *Antioch*, *Acts* 15. 10. *Why tempt ye God to lay a Yoke on the neck of the Disciples?* These *Disciples* were such as had purified the hearts by faith, *ver.* 9. And what were the *Disciples* that came together to break bread? *Acts* 20. 7. Were not they *Believers*? To teach then, is to disciple them unto *Christ* or to bring them to believe in the *Lord Jesus*.

*First*, Sometimes by *Baptism*; we are to understand the extraordinary Gifts of the Spirit, *Acts* 1. 5. *And you shall be baptized with the Holy Ghost not many days hence.* This was done when the Spirit appeared in the form of *Cloven Tongues*, and sat upon them, *Acts* 2. 3, 4.

*Secondly*, By this word *Baptism*, is sometimes understood *Afflictions*, *Sufferings*, *Matth.* 20. 22. *You shall indeed drink of the Cup that I am to drink of, and be baptized with the Baptism that I am to be baptized with.*

*Thirdly*, By this word we are sometimes to understand *Water-baptism*, that which is an *Ordinance of Christ*; *John* did baptize in *Enon*, for there was much *Water*: and in this sense I take the word here for *Water-baptism*, and that for this Reason: It's a *Baptism* that is to be administered by the *Messengers* or *Ministers of Christ*. Now they can administer no other but *Water-baptism*; they can't baptize with the *Holy Ghost*; that must be done by *Christ*: nor they may not baptize with the *Baptism of Afflictions*, that's work for the *Enemies of Christ*; they can no otherwise baptize but with *Water*,

*Fourthly*, What are we to understand by this word *Them*? This word respects the *Subjects of Baptism*; it's a *Relative*, the *Antecedent* is *All Nations*, taught or disciplined to *Christ*: *Go disciple to me all Nations, baptizing them*; that is, them that are *discipled*.

*Fifthly*, What by these words, *In the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost*? This is the form of words that is to be used in *Baptism*, and it's a part of the

\*

form



of Baptism, and doth denote one or both of these.

1. Their being baptized into the Doctrine of the Trinity, which is owned and profest by those that are to be baptized.

2. To baptize by the Authority of the Trinity: To baptize in the Name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost, is to baptize by the Authority of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost. From the words I shall give you this Observation, or Point of Doctrine:

*Doct. That Believers, or such as are discipled to Christ by the Word, are the only Subjects of Baptism, according to Christ's Commission; these are to be found in the Commission, and there are no other to be found there; nor is there any other Commission left on Record for Ministers to baptize by.*

In the Prosecution of this Point, I shall, *First*; Give you a Description of Baptism. *Secondly*, Prove the Point. *Thirdly*, Answer some Objections. *Fourthly*, Give one Reason. *Fifthly*, Make some Application thereof.

*First*; I shall give you a Description of Baptism: Baptism is a dipping a Believer in Water by a Minister of Jesus Christ, in the Name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost. Here is in this Description the Administrator, the Subject, Matter, and Form.

1. The Administrator, that must be a Minister of Christ; and one that hath Commission from Christ to preach the Gospel: *Go preach and baptize*. Now here I do not tie it to a Minister in Office, that is, to an Elder, one that hath a Pastoral Relation to a particular People, but to a preaching Disciple: Baptism being no more tied to Office or Power, than Preaching is; Preaching is not restrained to Office or Power by the Commission, as I have shewed already: every one that is gifted and qualified by the Spirit, and providentially call'd, ought to have Commission to preach, *Acts 11. 20.* therefore such have Commission to baptize, *Go teach and baptize*.

2. The Subject must be a Believer, *Acts 8. 37.* *If thou believest with all thy Heart thou mayst*: the contrary that fairly offers

offers it self is this, If thou dost not believe with all thy Heart, thou mayst not.

*Object.* But some may say, the Administrator can't possibly know whether the Subject do believe with all his Heart, or no.

*Answer.* I grant it's true, yet it follows not but that the Subject ought so to believe; a true Faith is required of the Subject to give him a right to the Ordinance, as appears by the forementioned place; *If thou believest with all thy Heart, thou mayst.* A Profession of Faith gives the Administrator a Call to administer the Ordinance, *Acts 5. 13. Then Simon himself believed (that is, he made a Profession of Faith) and was baptized:* and so the Eunuch upon a Profession of Faith was baptized by *Philip*, and the Commission gives him authority to administer the Ordinance.

3. The Matter is Water, that is the Element that the Subject is baptized in. *John was baptizing in Enon, for there was much Water; John 3. 23. Who can forbid Water, that these should not be baptized, that have received the Holy Ghost as well as we? Acts 10. 47.*

4. The Manner or Form, and that is by dipping, in the Name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost.

(1.) It is by dipping; it's granted almost by all, that the word in the Commission signifies to dip, or to plunge into the Water, and signifies such a Washing, as when Linnen is plunged or dipp'd in Bucks: this is confest by *Dr. Featly*, who was a great Antagonist against the Baptist Interest. What he after speaks concerning the baptizing of Beds, and Cups, and brazen Vessels, that it was done without dipping, is more than can be proved; that being a superstitious Practice of Pharisees, I suppose they would not stick at the trouble of dipping: but it's enough that he grants that the primary signification of the word is to dip. The Church of *England* grants it to be by dipping, and admits of no other way by their Rubrick for the baptizing of Children, but by dipping, except the Child be weak: They say, if the Minister be certified that the Child be strong, and able to bear it, he shall dip it discreetly and warily.

*Erasmus's Paraphrase on the New Testament* reads it thus, *Go and teach all Nations, and when they have learned dip them.* The Addition to *Pool's Annotation* tells us, that it's apparent, that both *Christ* and *John* did baptize by dipping, *John 3. 23.* It is observed by those that understand the Greek, that the word that is often translated dipped, or dippeth, comes from *bapto*, which is the primitive word that signifies to dip. And here give me leave to transcribe a few Lines made ready to my hand, by one that understands the Greek: *Mat. 26. 23. He that dippeth his hand with me in the dish:* here the word is *embapsas*, the Participle of *embapto*, which is *bapto* in Composition, and signifies the same. *Mark 14. 20. He said, it is one of the twelve, that dippeth with me in the dish:* here the Participle of the Passive Voice of the same Verb is used (to wit) *embaptomenos*, which is used in the same sense. *Luke 16. 24. Send Lazarus that he may dip the tip of his finger in Water, &c.* where the word is *bapsē*, the Subjunctive Mood of *bapto*. *John 13. 26. He it is to whom I give a Sop, when I have dipped it: and when he had dipped it, he gave it to Judas Iscariot, the Son of Simon.* In the first Clause is used the Participle *bapsas*, from the Primitive *bapto*: in the second Clause is used the same, as in *Mat. 26. 23.* (to wit) the Participle *embapsas*. *Rev. 19. 13. Vesture dipt in Blood;* where the Participle of the Preterperfect Tense of the Passive Voice is used (to wit) *bebammenon*.

(2.) It appears it is by dipping, in that there was choice made of a place where there was much Water, *John 3. 23. And John also was baptizing in Enon, for there was much Water.* If baptizing had been by any other way than by dipping, there had been no need to make choice of a place where there was much Water, a little Water would have served the turn, especially if it had been by sprinkling, as the manner of some is: I suppose the same reason may be render'd why *John* did baptize in *Jordan*; and the People came from all parts thither to be baptized, for there was much Water. Also *Mark 1. 5. John* baptized them in the River of *Jordan*. It's very strange that he should baptize them in the River, if he did it by sprinkling a little Water on the Face.

(3.) It

(3.) It appears it was by dipping, in that the Subject and the Administrator went both down into the Water, and then baptized, and after the Subject was baptized, they came both up out of the Water. Acts 8. 38, 39. *And he commanded the Chariot to stand still; and they went down both into the Water, both Philip and the Eunuch; and he baptized him. And when they were come up out of the Water, &c.* Mat. 3. 16. *And Jesus when he was baptized, went straightway up out of the Water, &c.* But here it is objected, that the word that is translated Acts 8. 38. [*into*] is sometimes used for *to*, and not for *into*; it may signify either, and is used promiscuously for *to* or *into*; so that nothing may be concluded barely from the word. To this I answer; suppose this be granted, yet it follows not but that it may and ought to be taken here for *into*, as it is translated. For,

1. We see it was the Judgment of the Translators, that it ought to be so taken here, or else they would have translated it otherwise; I can't think they did it contrary to their Judgment.

2. The Text tells you, they came to the Water, antecedent to their going down into it: First, *They came unto a certain Water*, ver. 36. Did they draw back the Chariot, that they might come unto it a second time, and not go down into it at all?

3. It is observed, that the Greek word that is translated *unto*, is a different word from that which is translated *into*.

4. This word *into* is consonant with other Scriptures; where Baptism is the Point in hand; *Christ came up out of the Water*, and if so, he went first down into it. *John* baptized them in the River of *Jordan*; how could that be, unless they went down into the River? Again, it's observ'd, that the Greek Prepositions are used elsewhere in their proper sense for *into* and *out of*; Mat. 27. 53. *And came out of their Graves, and went into the holy City*: there it's observ'd, that the Preposition *ex* out of, and *eis* into, are used in their proper sense. *John* 20. 27. — *and thrust it into my side*; there the Preposition *eis* is used *into*. Mat. 16. 9. *Luke* 8. 2. — *out of whom he cast seven*: here in both these Texts *απο* out of is used. Acts 16. 40. *And they went out of*



of the Prison, and entered into the House of Lydia : where *εκ* and *εις* are both used in one Verse, as well as in *Acts* 8. 38, 39. and certainly they were both in Prison and Water before they came out ; here again these are borrowed Lines concerning the Greek words, as the former were, yet I suppose my Author hath not abused me in it.

(4.) It appears it is by Dipping, from the allusion it hath to a Burial; *We are buried with him by Baptism*, *Col.* 2. 12. A Person is not buried that hath only a little Dust or Earth sprinkled on his Face, but he is then buried when he is laid into the Earth, and covered all over. *Rom.* 6. 4. *We are buried with him by Baptism into death; that even as Christ was raised by the Glory of the Father, we also should walk in newness of Life.*

(5.) It appears it is by Dipping, in that the whole of the Subject is to be baptized, and not a part only ; the Commission is to baptize the Person, the Face is no more mentioned than the Feet, nor is there any part mentioned but the whole ; the word is, *baptizing them*. If it be objected, that the Face doth signify the Person ; I answer, if that be granted, yet the Person doth not signify the Face : It's the Person that is to be baptized ; but the sprinkling a little Water on the Face doth never wash the whole of the Subject ; and this being done on the Face of a little Infant, is neither the *washing away the filth of the Flesh, nor yet the answer of a good Conscience, by the Resurrection of Christ* : there is neither the Figure, nor the thing figured.

2dly, It must be by Dipping in the Name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost : In these two the Form of the Ordinance doth consist.

Secondly, I shall prove the truth of the Point by Scripture. And here, first, I shall prove that Disciples are the Subjects of Baptism, according to Christ's Commission: And, secondly, That they are the only Subjects thereof.

First, That Disciples or Believers are the Subjects of Baptism, according to Christ's Commission. And here I need not multiply many Scriptures, tho' it be a Point, the truth of which has been much opposed ; the Truth of the Point lying so full and clear in the Text, which Text is the only

Commission that Ministers have to act by; and whatever Arguments are brought to prove, that such as are not discipled to Christ by the Word (that is, by actual Instruction) ought to be baptized, are all insignificant, unless they can prove it by this very Text: if their Commission do not warrant them to baptize such as are not discipled to Christ by the Word, there is no Text in all the New Testament that will warrant them so to do. By the Commission it is to disciple and baptize, yet I shall subjoin a few Scriptures for the Confirmation thereof. First, That Disciples are the Subjects of Baptism, *Mark 16. 16. He that believeth and is baptized, shall be saved*: this is the same Commission; and here believing is to precede baptizing. *Acts 2. 38. Repent, and be baptized every one of you in the Name of Jesus Christ.* If Repentance here be not to be taken for Faith, yet I am sure it can't be without Faith: For, first, there cannot be a true Godly Sorrow for crucifying the Son of God, without a true sight of a crucified Christ. Secondly, There can be no acceptance of what is done without Faith; *for without Faith it is impossible to please God.* *Acts 8. 37. If thou believest with all thy Heart, thou mayst*; that is, thou mayst be baptized.

Secondly, I shall prove it by Scripture Precedents: And here we have not one Precedent in all the Scripture of any one Person that ever was baptized, till such time as they did believe, or were discipled unto Christ by the Word. The first Precedent that I shall offer is, those that were baptized by Christ and John, they were Disciples; *John 4. 1. When the Lord knew that the Pharisees had heard, that Christ made and baptized more Disciples than John, &c.* Those that were baptized by John, who was the fore-runner of Christ, were first discipled; and those that were baptized by Christ when he came, were first discipled. The Apostles, who well understood their Lord's Commission, and who were enjoined by the same Commission to teach us to observe all things whatsoever Christ had commanded them, never baptized any but such as were first discipled to Christ by the Word; nor did they ever teach others to baptize any but Disciples; nor is there any Apostolical Doctrine, from whence such a

Consequence may be drawn, to warrant the baptizing of any but Disciples. *Acts 2.41.* then as many as *gladly received the Word, were baptized*; not one more: They are first discipled, and then baptized; here are no more baptized than are added to the Church: *The same day there were added unto them about three thousand Souls*; and no more added unto them than were admitted to all the Ordinances: *they continued in the Apostles Doctrine, and breaking of Bread, and in Prayer.* *Acts 8.12.* *When they believed Philip, speaking of the things concerning the Kingdom of God, they were baptized, both Men and Women.* *Acts 18.8.* *Then Crispus the chief Ruler of the Synagogue, believed in God, with all his House; and many of the Corinthians believed, and were baptized.* If whole Families believe, then whole Families are baptized; if but a part believe, then a part is baptized.

2. I shall prove, that Believers, or such as are discipled to Christ by the Word, are the only Subjects of Baptism according to Christ's Commission: no other but Disciples, there are no other to be found in the Commission, therefore there are no other to be baptized by the Commission: *Acts 7.37.* *If thou believest with all thy heart, thou mayst.* The contrary is this, *If thou dost not believe with all thy heart, thou mayst not*: It had been altogether useless for *Philip* to have made him this Answer, if he might have been baptized while an Unbeliever. *Luke 3.7,8.* *Then said he to those that came out to be baptized of him, O Generation of Vipers, who hath warned you to flee from the Wrath to come? Bring forth therefore fruit meet for Repentance, and begin not to say within your selves, We have Abraham to our Father.* These came forth to *John* to be baptized, and were put back, and yet he denies not but that they were the Children of *Abraham*; that was enough to privilege them to Circumcision, but not enough to Baptism. *John* did never put by Believers that came to be baptized by him; but if Unbelievers come to be baptized, they are put by; which shews plainly enough, that they are only Believers that are the Subjects of Baptism. If there be neither Precept nor Precedent in the Word for the baptizing of any but Believers, then are Believers the only Subjects of Baptism: but there is neither Precept nor

Precedent in the Word for the baptizing of any but Believers, therefore Believers are the only Subjects of Baptism. I think this to be as fully proved, as we can expect a Negative to be proved.

3. I shall answer the most material Objections that have or may be brought against this Truth.

*Objeſt.* 1. Such as have an Interest in the Covenant of Grace, have a right to Baptism: but Believers and their Children, have an Interest in the Covenant of Grace; therefore they have a right to Baptism. That they have all an Interest in the Covenant of Grace, the Children as well as the Parents, appears, *Deut.* 29. 10, 11. *You stand all of you this day before the Lord your God, your Captains of your Tribes, your Officers, with all the Men of Israel; your little ones, your Wives, with the stranger that is in your Camp, from the hewer of thy wood to the drawer of thy water; that thou shouldst enter into Covenant with the Lord thy God, and into the Oath that the Lord thy God maketh with thee this day, &c.*

To this I answer; 1. I deny this Covenant to be the Covenant of Grace. 2. I deny the Subjects of this Covenant to be Believers considered as such. 3. I deny, that barely an Interest in this Covenant, or Covenant of Grace, is the ground of Baptism.

1. I deny this Covenant to be the Covenant of Grace; and it's enough for me to deny it, it lies on them that make the objection to make it good; yet I shall offer something of Reason for what I say: First, this Covenant is distinguished from the Covenant of Grace, *Jer.* 31. 31. 32. therefore it's not the same: *Behold the days come saith the Lord, that I will make a new Covenant with the house of Israel, and Judah; not according to the Covenant that I made with their Fathers, in the day that I took them by the hand to lead them up out of the Land of Egypt; the which my Covenant they brake, although I was a Husband unto them.* That the new Covenant that the Lord promiseth to make is the Covenant of Grace, I think is denied to none; and that the Covenant (which is here distinguished from the New Covenant) that was made with their Father when God brought them up out of Egypt, was that same C



venant that God made with them, *Deut.* 29. 10. can rationally be denied by none; that it was the same Covenant that was made, *Deut.* 29. 10. appears by *ver.* 25. where the Reason of the Judgments that the Lord threatens to bring upon them, is assigned to their forsaking the Covenant that the Lord made with them, when he brought up out of the Land of *Egypt*, which was the same Covenant that was made in *ver.* 10, 11. Now the New Covenant, or the Covenant of Grace, is not according to this Covenant, it differs from it in many respects; some of which I shall here lay down.

*First*, The New Covenant is absolute, *Jer.* 31. 33, 34. the Tenour of this Covenant is; I will, and they shall: *I will write my Law in their hearts; I will be their God, and they shall be my People; and they shall all know me, from the least to the greatest: for I will forgive their Iniquity, and remember their Sins no more.* This is the Covenant of Grace, and here is no Condition put into it, the performance of which doth intitle the Subjects unto the Blessings thereof.

But the Covenant that God made with them, *Deut.* 29. was a conditional Covenant, as appears *Deut.* 28. 1, 2. *If you will indeed obey my voice, and do all that I command you, then all these Blessings shall come unto you: ver.* 15. *But if you will not hearken unto me, to do all that I command you, then all these Curses shall come upon you, and overtake you, &c.* Now according to all these words in the 28th Chap. was Moses to make the Covenant with them in the 29th, as appears by the 1st *vers.* of the 29th Chapter.

*Secondly*, The Covenant of Grace is a better Covenant, *Heb.* 8. 6. He is a Mediator of a better Covenant, established on better Promises; God hath put Justification, Sanctification, and Glorification into the Covenant of Grace; that he will write his Law in their hearts, that he will be merciful to their Unrighteousness, and remember their Sins no more, *ver.* 10, 11.

But there is not one promise of Justification nor Sanctification put into this Covenant; if there had, this Covenant would have been good, and the Promises as good as the Covenant of Grace, or the Promises thereof. How could it

be otherwise, if the same Blessings had been put into this Covenant; as are put into the new Covenant? there is not the blessing of a new Heart, nor of the pardon of Sin to be found among all those Blessings, *Deut.* 28. 2 to 15. and these were the Blessings of this Covenant.

*Thirdly*, There is not one Subject of the Covenant of Grace but is justified, and shall be sanctified. *Jer.* 31. 33, 34. *I will write my Law in their hearts; they shall all know me from the least to the greatest: for I will forgive their Iniquity, and remember their Sin no more.* This remission of Sin is applied to the time of Christ's Oblation, *Heb.* 10. 15, 16. the witness of the Spirit is there called in to attest that great Truth that is laid down in the 14th ver. that by one Oblation he hath for ever perfected (or pardoned) them that are sanctified, whereof the Holy Ghost also is a witness; the witness that the Spirit bears is this; *Their Sins and Iniquities will I remember no more*: and from this testimony of the Spirit the Apostle draws this inference, That where remission of these is, there is no more sacrifice for sin: but there were multitudes of those that entred into Covenant with the Lord, *Deut.* 29. 10. that were never justified nor sanctified. *Deut.* 29. 4. *God hath not given them a Heart to perceive, nor Eyes to see; nor Ears to hear unto this day.* *Rom.* 11. 7. *What then? Israel hath not obtained that which it sought after; but the Election hath obtained it, and the rest were blinded.* There were of the Non-elect in this Covenant that went without New Covenant-Blessings, ver. 8. *As it is written, God hath given them the spirit of slumber; Eyes that they should not see, and Ears that they should not hear.* This does not look like that promise that God hath made in the New Covenant to all the Subjects thereof, that they shall all know him, from the least to the greatest of them; that Covenant, the Subjects whereof, or part of the Subjects thereof, might go without Justification and Sanctification, was not the Covenant of Grace. But for this Covenant, many of the Subjects thereof might and did go without Justification and Sanctification; therefore it was not the Covenant of Grace. Some of them indeed were justified and sanctified, but not by virtue of their Interest in this Covenant, but in  
the

the Covenant of Grace : for all the Elect among the *Jews* had an Interest in the Covenant of Grace at the same time. These two Covenants were in being together.

*Fourthly*, The Covenant of Grace contains only Blessings, there is no Curse put into that Covenant, the sum and substance thereof is Blessedness. *Gen. 22. 18. In thy Seed shall all the Nations of the Earth be blessed.* All the Subjects of this Covenant are blessed, their Sins are all pardoned, and such are blessed ones : *Blessed is the man whose Iniquities are forgiven.* The Promises of this Covenant are full of Blessings, and there are none but Promises put into it, Promises of good to be bestowed on them, *Ezek. 36. 26, 27.* that God will withhold nothing that is good, *Psal. 84. 11.* that all things shall work together for good, *Rom. 8. 28.*

But this Covenant contains Curses as well as Blessings, *Deut. 29. 21. And the Lord shall separate him for evil, out of all the Tribes of Israel, according to all the Curses of the Covenant that are written in the Book of the Law.* The Curses that are contained in the 28th chap. from ver. 16 to the end, were the Curses of this Covenant; and these might fall on the Subjects thereof without a sanctified use of them, as they did on those that were compared to the evil Figs, *Jer. 24. 8, 9, 10.*

*Fifthly*, The Covenant of Grace is still in being, it's confirmed by Christ, and there is no disannulling it : He is still the Mediator of the new Covenant, *Heb. 12. 24.* therefore the new Covenant remains.

But this Covenant is done away, *Zec. 11. 10. Then I took my staff, even beauty, and cut it asunder, that I might break my Covenant that I had made with all the People, and it was broken in that day.* If this Covenant, that is here said to be made with all the People, was not the Covenant that was made with the whole Congregation of *Israel*, *Deut. 29.* then shew me what Covenant it was; shew me another Covenant if you can that was made with all the people of *Israel*, and that was broken by Christ, when he was offered up, when they weighed for his Price thirty pieces of Silver this Covenant being broken, it's evident it was not the Covenant of Grace.

2. I deny that they were all Believers that at this time were taken into Covenant with the Lord ; therefore no argument can be drawn from it, to prove that Believers and their Children have interest in the Covenant of Grace. This was certainly a mix'd people, there were many among them that were vile and wicked. *Moses* declares that *God had not given them Hearts to perceive, nor Eyes to see, nor Ears to hear unto this day.* Here were the blind and the deaf, and I may say the hard-hearted too ; and this was the very day that they stood before the Lord, to enter into Covenant with him. Here were the strangers that were in the Camp, as well as the *Israelites*, which strangers I suppose were the *Egyptians* : for it's said, *Exod. 12. 38.* that *a mixed multitude went up also.* Do these look like Believers, that have neither Eyes to see, nor Hearts to consider ? this was a brave Camp indeed, if they were all Believers, from the Hewer of their Wood to the Drawer of their Water. I wonder how Ministers can look upon this to be the Covenant of Grace, that had such a mix'd People to be the Subjects thereof ; or upon these to be all Believers, or taken into Covenant under that Consideration.

*Object.* But some may say, They did all believe with a dogmatical Faith, they did believe a *Messiah* to come.

To this I answer. 1. This is sooner spoken than proved. It's a great question, whether all the Camp had such a Faith : But, 2. Would such a Faith serve the turn ? Would it be sufficient to interest them and their Children in the Covenant of Grace ? if it would, why will not the like dogmatical Faith serve now ? and if it will, then it's easy to prove that almost all, if not every English-Man and his Children have an Interest therein. Where will you find an English-Man, tho never so profane and wicked, that does not as much believe that Christ is come, as the generality of the *Jews* did believe that he was to come ? If this dogmatical Faith be the Faith that some intend, when they say that Believers and their Children have an interest in the Covenant, and a right to be baptized, why then do they exclude and put by the Children of any where this dogmatical Faith is to be found ? There are many that do agree  
from



from the same ground, that the Children of Believers have an Interest in the Covenant, and a right to Baptism, that yet will baptize none whose Parents are not true Believers in the Judgment of Charity.

3. I deny that barely an Interest either in this Covenant, or in the Covenant of Grace, was or is the ground of Baptism.

*First*, An Interest in this Covenant was not the ground of Baptism; those that came to *John* to be baptized, *Mat.* 3. 7. *Luke* 3. 7. and were denied, had an interest in this Covenant, they were the Children of *Abraham*, with whom this Covenant was originally made, *Gen.* 15. 18. which Covenant took in all the natural Seed, considered as such; and this Covenant remained in being till Christ was offered up, yet were these sent away not baptized. Had an Interest in this Covenant been the ground of Baptism, *John* would not have sent them away without it.

*Secondly*, I deny that barely an Interest in the Covenant of Grace is the ground of Baptism: where do the Scriptures say that such as have an Interest in the Covenant of Grace, have a Right to the Ordinance? For men to assert an interest in the Covenant of Grace to be that which gives a right to Baptism, and bring no Scripture to prove it, will go but a little way with those that make the Word their Rule in the matters of worship.

*Thirdly*, An Interest in the Covenant of Grace precedes Sanctification; a new Heart is an effect of this Interest, not the cause. Now this Interest is invisible; who can tell who they are that have an interest in the Covenant of Grace, till God change their hearts and lives by a work of Sanctification? but the ground of Baptism must be visible.

*Object.* 2. If Believers and their Children have an Interest in the Promise, then they have a right to Baptism: but Believers and their Children have an interest in the Promise; therefore they have a right to Baptism. *Acts* 2. 38, 39. *Repent and be baptized every one of you, for the Promise is to you, and to your Children.*

To this I answer. (1.) I deny the Subjects here to be Believers at the time when the Apostle said, the Promise is to

you and to your Children; and no Argument can be drawn to prove a Privilege to Believers and their Seed, from what is spoken to Unbelievers. That they were not Believers may appear,

1. In that they were but under some Conviction, they were pricked at the heart, that's all the account we have of them: but Conviction and Conversion are two things; a person may be convicted that is not converted; nay, he must be convicted before he can be converted: the whole need not the Physician, but they that are tick.

2. They were ignorant of the way of Salvation, and that a Person can't be that does believe: for Faith is as well the act of the Understanding, as of the Will; their ignorance of the way of Salvation appears in that they cried out, *Men and Brethren, what shall we do?*

3. It appears in that they were with many other words exhorted to save themselves from that untoward Generation; that is, as I apprehend, from the Judgments that hung over the heads of that untoward Generation for rejecting of Christ: but if they had believed, they had been saved already, there had then been no need of that exhortation.

4. They did not all believe at last, *ver. 41. Then they that gladly received the Word, were baptized, &c.* There were but a part of them that did embrace this exhortation.

(2.) I deny that by the word *unto*, is intended Interest in the Promise; they had indeed the Promise, but the Offer is one thing, and Interest is another.

1<sup>st</sup>. God did never vouchsafe this Privilege of Interest in the Promise to the Children of the dearest of his Servants, considered as such, not to the Children of *Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob.* *Rom. 9. 6. All are not Israel that are of Israel;* then all that were of *Israel*, had not an interest in the Promise: for the Promises were made to none but *Israel* (*Jer. 31. 33.*) *ver. 7. neither because they are the Seed of Abraham are they all Children, But in Isaac shall thy Seed be called:* *ver. 8. so then they that are the Children of the Flesh, these are not the Children of God; but the Children of the Promise are accounted for the Seed; that is, the Seed with whom God did establish his Covenant, Gen.*

17. 7. Here were some of the Seed of *Abraham*, which were the Children of the *Flesh*, that were not the Children of God, nor the Children of the *Promise*, nor accounted for the Seed. *Ver. 11. Jacob have I loved, and Esau have I hated*; and yet *Esau* was the Son of *Isaac*, his first born. Now can it be supposed, that a Person hated of God had an Interest in the *Promise*?

2ly. Such as have an interest in the *Promise*, shall certainly enjoy the good and benefit thereof, *Justification*, and *Sanctification*, and *Glorification*. *Rom. 9. 6.* It cannot be that the word of God has taken none effect: and if so, then it cannot be that such as have an Interest in the *Promise* should go without one or all of these Blessings, for they are the effect of the *Promise*. There are none will say that all the Children of Believers shall be saved, and yet they cannot miss of *Salvation* if they have an Interest in the *Promise*.

3ly. Once an Interest in the *Promise*, and for ever an Interest in the *Promise*. *Jer. 32. 40. I will make an everlasting Covenant with them, that I will never turn away from them, to do them good; and I will put my fear in their Hearts, that they shall not depart from me.* God covenants here for himself and them too; for himself, *that he will never turn away from them, to do them good*; for them, *that he will put his fear in their Hearts, that they shall not depart from him.* And here I should think that none, that deny falling from *Grace*, should oppose me in this.

(3.) I deny that the offer of the *Promise* is the ground of *Baptism*; those that did not receive the *Word* had the offer of the *Promise*, as well as those that did: where-ever the *Gospel* comes, there comes the offer of the *Promise*; it's not the offer of the *Promise*, but the *Command*, *Repent and be baptized*, that's the *Ground*; the offer of the *Promise* is a *Motive* to enforce the *Exhortation*. If the *Question* then be, What must those do to whom the *Promise* is? the *Answer* will be this, *Repent, and be baptized*. *Repentance* must come between the offer of the *Promise*, and the taking up of the *Ordinance*. But here it may be objected, that *Repentance* is enjoined the *Parent*, not the *Child*. I  
answer,

answer, that Baptism also is enjoined the Parent, not the Child; there are no more required to be baptized, than are required to repent antecedently thereunto.

Object. 3. If the Children of Believers are federally holy, then they have a right to Baptism; but they are so. 1 Cor. 7. 14. *For the unbelieving Husband is sanctified in the Wife, and the unbelieving Wife is sanctified in or to the Husband; else were your Children unclean, but now are they holy.* To this I answer:

1. These three Objections are but one in substance, tho they vary in terms; for, to have an Interest in the Covenant, an Interest in the Promise, and to be federally holy, is the same thing. If neither of the two former Objections will stand, then the third will not stand, for they are all built on the same foundation; and it appears by the Answers given already, that it is but a sandy Foundation that they are built upon.

2. Tho one of the Parents to whom the Apostle wrote was a Believer when he wrote to them, yet they were not so to be considered in their being sanctified each to the other, but as Husband and Wife. There was a Case of Conscience sent to the Apostle for Resolution, whether it was lawful for the Believer to abide with his or her unbelieving Yoke-fellow? this he answers in the Affirmative; but withal tells them, *ver. 12. To this speak I, not the Lord.* Therefore it was necessary to demonstrate it; and here, first, he professes the lawfulness of their Continuance by the lawfulness of their State: *The unbelieving Husband is sanctified in, or to the Wife, and the unbelieving Wife is sanctified in, or to the Husband;* that is, by the Ordinance of God, when both were Unbelievers, according to that Scripture, *Heb. 13. 5. Marriage is honourable among all, and the Bed undefiled:* Be they who they will, Believers or Unbelievers, they did not live in Fornication; but in Wedlock they were Husband and Wife, and so were separated from all others to the lawful use of each others Bodys. Their Cohabitation was lawful according to the Word of God, and in this sense the word *sanctified* is taken elsewhere (for that which is lawful) 1 Tim. 4. 5. *Every Creature of God is good, and nothing to be*



be refused ; for it is sanctified by the Word of God, &c that is, lawful to be used ; they were married, and so were sanctified each to the other ; this he illustrates by an Argument drawn from their Offspring, *Else were your children unclean, but now are they holy*. If they had not been married, and so sanctified each to the other by the Ordinance of God, their children had been unclean, they had been illegitimate, unlawfully begotten. The word *unclean* is elsewhere taken for that which is unlawful, *Act. 10, 14, Not so Lord ; for, I have never eaten any thing that is common or unclean ; nothing that is forbidden by the Word ; for the unclean Meats were no otherwise unclean, than as they were forbidden : Rom. 14 14. I know I am persuaded by the Lord Jesus, that there is nothing unclean in it self*. There is no inherent Unclean-ness in those Creatures, but they are clean or unclean, as they are lawful or lawful according to the Word of God, and in this sense I take the Unclean-ness and Holiness of the Children ; they are not illegitimate, but lawfully begotten.

2. I deny the Holiness of the Children here to be federal Holiness. For,

(1) The Holiness of the Child doth not arise from the Faith of the believing Parent, but from the Sanctification of the unbelieving, whose Sanctification did not arise from the Faith of his Yoke-fellow, but from the Ordinance of God when both were believers. Now there is nobody doth account the Sanctification of the Unbeliever to be federal-Holiness ; and if that be not federal Holiness, then the Holiness of the Child can't be federal ; for that's the Root from whence the Holiness of the Child doth spring ; Now such as the Root is, such are the Branches ; such as the Fountain, such are the Streams ; the Effect can't rise higher than the Cause. The Holiness of the Child springing from the Sanctification of the unbelieving Parent, must necessarily be of the same kind.

(2) The Apostle speaks here of their Children indefinitely, such as were born when both were Unbelievers, as well as those that were born after one of the Parents did believe (some of which, for ought we know, remained professing Pagans,

Pagans , as well as one of the Parents , and yet holy.) *Else were your Children unclean , but now are they holy.* The Holiness of the Child did not depend on the Faith of the Parent, nor is there a word spoken of the Faith of the Believer in the Text, as if that were the ground , either of the Sanctification of the Unbeliever , or of the Holiness of the Child.

3. I deny federal Holiness to be the ground of Baptism.

(1.) The Scripture doth no where make it the ground of Baptism, neither directly, nor consequentially ; if it doth, produce it: we may not run hand over head, and say this is the ground, and the other thing is the ground, when we have no ground in Scripture for what we say.

(2.) It's very apparent from the Word, that federal Holiness was not the ground of Baptism ; all the *Jews* were federally holy when Christ and *John* baptized, yet they were made Disciples before they were baptized, and so not baptized as considered federally holy, but as disciples of Christ, *John*. 4. 1. They that came to *John* to be baptized, *Matt*. 3. 7. were federally holy, and did in effect plead their federal Holiness as the ground of their Claim to Baptism, they pleaded that they were the Children of *Abraham* ; now the Children of *Abraham* were federally holy, considered as such, they were born interested in that Covenant, that peculiar Covenant, by virtue of which they were federally holy, a separate People . Had their federal Holiness been questioned, they could have produced the token of the Covenant in the foreskin of their Flesh , and yet these were denied, the Ordinance notwithstanding the Plea . That they were denied, may appear,

1. In that he calls them a generation of *Vipers* ; who, can think that he would have branded them with so black a Mark, and afterwards baptize them ? Would all the *Water* in *Jordan* have washed it off again ? Was Baptism an Ordinance appointed for *Viperous Brood* ?

2. He overrules their Plea: *Think not to say within your selves, We have Abraham to our Father.* He doth not deny their relation to *Abraham*, but rejects their Plea: Birth Priviledge did never intitle to Baptism; no Instance can be given thereof.

3. He

3. He counsels them to take another course; *Bring forth Fruits meet for Repentance*: this Counsel was rejected by them; and so they go without the Ordinance. *Luke 7. 30. But the Pharisees and the Lawyers rejected the Counsel of God against themselves, not being baptized by him; that is, by John.* Had federal Holiness been the ground of Baptism, *John* would have baptized them as well as others.

*Objct.* 4. If the Children of Believers are Disciples, then they have a right to Baptism, according to Christ's Commission, *Mat. 28. 19. Go disciple to me all Nations, baptizing them, &c.* But the Children of Believers are Disciples, therefore they have a right to Baptism. *Acts 15. 10. Why tempt ye God to lay a yoke upon the Neck of the Disciples, which neither we nor our Fathers were ever able to bear?* This Yoke was Circumcision after the manner of *Moses*, and that was for Children of eight days old, therefore Children of eight days old are Disciples, and so ought to be baptized.

To this I answer: 1. I grant the *major* Proposition, That such as are discipled to Christ by the Word, have a right to Baptism.

2. I deny the *minor*, That Children of eight days old are Disciples, or that they are intended or comprehended in the word *Disciples*, *Acts 15. 10.* it was the Brethren only on whom they would have laid the Yoke, not a word of Children in the whole Controversy; *ver. 1. They taught the Brethren, Except ye be circumcised after the manner of Moses, ye cannot be saved.* They did not teach the Children, nor did they teach the Brethren to circumcise their Children, it was not come so far as yet: the manner of *Moses* here did not respect the Subject but the Form; it was the Brethren that must be circumcised, but how? after the manner of *Moses*: The word *ye* is relative to the Brethren; had Children of eight days old been the Antecedent, it had been something to the purpose; but it's the Brethren, among whom Children of eight days old could not be numbered: For, 1. They were such as had received the Holy Ghost, *ver. 8.* 2. They had purified their Hearts by Faith, *ver. 9.* 3. They were such, who from among the Gentiles were turned unto God, *ver. 19.*

2dly. By the Yoke here we are not to understand Circumcision barely considered, but Circumcision binding them to keep the Law in point of Justification, *ver.* 5. this was the Yoke that neither they nor their Fathers were ever able to bear; Circumcision barely considered, Children of eight days old were able to bear, and did. Now tho Circumcision might have been imposed on the Children, yet the false Doctrine, which was that wherein this intolerable Yoke did consist, could not, for Children are as incapable of receiving a Lie, as they are of receiving the Truth.

3dly. A Disciple is a Scholar, one that learns; but Children that are incapable of learning, are incapable of being discipled.

*Object.* But some may say, that a Child is a Scholar the first day he goes to School.

To this I answer; 1. If this were granted, yet it would not follow, that he is a Scholar before he goes to School. Now the Children of Believers, while in an Infant-state, are not gone so far, they are not entred in Christ's School: pray shew me where Christ hath set up a School for teaching Infants in an Infant-state; Who is the School-master that Christ hath appointed to teach and instruct them? and where is this teaching restrained to the Children of Believers? for if there be such a School, and it be not restrained to the Children of Believers, then the Children of Unbelievers are Disciples as well as the Children of Believers, and so a right to Baptism may be claimed for them too.

2. I grant that in some sense a Child may be said to be a Scholar the first day he goes to School, according to the common acceptation, provided he has learned something; but if he has learned nothing, I will not say he is a poor Scholar, for properly he is none at all.

3. It is not enough to denominate a Person a Disciple of Christ, that he is in Christ's School, and under the teachings of such as are appointed by Christ to go and disciple to him; no, tho he hath freely and voluntarily submitted himself to be taught by them: the Eunuch had freely submitted himself to *Philip*, to be taught by him; *Acts* 8. 31. *Philip answered his desire, he went up into the Chariot and preached*  
Christ



*Christ to him*: but when he desired to be baptized, *Philip* takes an account of him, whether he had learned Christ, before he could conclude him a Disciple of Christ, *ver. 37, 38.* from whence it does plainly appear, that a Disciple of Christ is one that hath not only been under the teachings of Christ, but hath also learned Christ by the Word that he hath been taught.

4. A Disciple of Christ is one that hath so learned Christ as to deny himself for Christ. *Luke 14. 26.* *Except a man hate Father and Mother, yea and his own Life also, he cannot be my Disciple.* Children then that are incapable of learning Christ, so as to deny themselves for Christ, are incapable of being discipled unto Christ.

*Object. 5.* Such as are Church-members have a right to baptism; but the Children of Believers are Church-members, therefore they have a right to Baptism. That Children are Church-members, appears, *Rom. 11. 17.* when some of the Branches were broken off, through unbelief, the *Gentiles* were grafted in in their room, and did partake with those that remained of the root and fatness of the Olive-tree. Now when the *Gentiles* were grafted in, their Children were grafted in with them; *ver. 16.* *If the root be holy, the branches also are holy.* When the natural Branches were broken off, they and their Children were broken off together: so when the *Gentiles* were grafted in, they and their Children were grafted in together.

To this I answer; 1. I deny that the *Gentiles* were grafted in among the *Jews*, as they were counted a National Church, tho I grant that they were grafted in among them as they were considered the universal visible Church. The Constitution of the Church was altered from National to Congregational. As soon as Christ was offered up, their Tabernacle fell, their Priesthood fell, their national Ordinances alter; Tabernacles, and their national Church-officers were all down. *Jerusalem* and *Judea*, and all the Regions round about were but one Church before; but now those of them that did embrace Jesus Christ, were imbodyed into particular Congregations. There were a plurality of Churches in *Judea*:

*J* was unknown by face, saith the Apostle, unto the Churches of Judea, Gal. 1. 22.

2. I deny that the Children of the *Jews* were broken off, together with their Parents: if an unbelieving *Jew* had a Child that did believe, that believing Child was not broken off with the unbelieving Father; the Child stood a Branch upon the Root when the Father was gone.

3. I deny that there were more of the *Gentiles* grafted in than did believe: it were strange that the natural Branches should be broken off because of Unbelief, and that unbelieving *Gentiles* should be grafted in. What difference is there between an unbelieving *Jew*, and an unbelieving *Gentile*, that the one must be accounted a Church-member, and not the other? That there were none but Believers grafted in is evident, for they had their standing by faith; ver. 20. *They were broken off through Unbelief, and thou standest by Faith.*

4. I deny that the believing *Gentile* is the Root, he himself is but a Branch; the Root and the Branch are two things, ver. 15. *Thou bearest not the Root, but the Root thee.*

5. I deny that the Children of the *Gentiles* are the holy Branches, ver. 16. they are the natural Branches that are the holy Branches, the Children of the *Jews*, and not the Children of the *Gentiles*: ver. 15. *for if the casting away of them be the reconciling of the world, what shall their receiving be but life from the dead?* that is, the *Jews*. Here is an intimation of their return, that God will have a time to call them again, and renders this as the Reason, ver. 16. *For if the Root be holy, so are the Branches.* This respects the Children of the *Jews*, not considered as such, but such of them as shall in time believe, and so be grafted in again, ver. 23. *and they also if they abide not still in unbelief, shall be grafted in again, for God is able to graft them in.* There is no foundation in this Chapter for Childrens Church-membership. That Children are not Church-members, will farther appear, if we consider the matter of a Gospel-Church.

1. They are not Members of a particular instituted Church; the matter of such a Church is visible Saints, such as are inherently

herently holy in the Judgment of Charity. This appears, first, by the Titles that are given them in the Epistles that were sent to them, they are stiled Saints, such as were sanctified in Christ Jesus, called to be Saints, 1 Cor. 1. 2. The Church of the *Thessalonians* are stiled, *Such as were in God the Father, and in the Lord Jesus Christ*, 1 Theff. 1. 1. Secondly, it appears by the improvement that is made by each individual Member; *Your Faith groweth exceedingly, and the love of every one of you aboundeth one towards another*, 2 Theff. 1. 3. This is not applicable to Children in an Infant-state, and yet it's applicable to the whole Church, not only as it's collectively considered, but as it's distributively considered. *Phil. 1. 6. I am persuaded that he that hath begun a good work in you, will not cease to perfect the same unto the coming of Christ, as it is meet for me to think so of you all.*

2. They are not Members of the universal visible Church, that also is made up of visible Saints: 1 Cor. 12. 13. *By one Spirit are ye all baptized into one Body, and made to drink into one Spirit, whether Jew or Gentile.* A Jew that before was born a Church-member, is not now to be owned as such, (unless in the Judgment of Charity he be new-born. *Eph. 4. 4. There is one Body, and one Spirit, even as ye are called in one hope of your Calling: one Faith, one Baptism, one God and Father of all. And to every one of us is given Grace according to the measure of the gift of Christ.* This one Body is the universal, visible Church, and it's made up of such as are called in one hope of their Calling, and each individual Member hath in the Judgment of Charity a measure of Grace; here is then no room for Children to stand Members, that are not called in this one Hope, that have not as yet a measure of Grace bestowed on them.

*Object.* But some may say, The Children of Believers were Church-members under the legal Dispensation.

To this I answer: *First*, The Question is not what they were, but what they are; the Children of Unbelievers were then Church-members, as well as Believers: all the Children of the *Jews* were Church-members, and we must bewray our ignorance if we will say that all the *Jews* were Believers:

Unbelievers were then Church-members as well as Believers. *You believe not, saith Christ, because ye are not my Sheep, as I said unto you* ; and yet they were Church-members. Will you argue, that the Children of such who do not believe are Church-members now, or that such as do not believe, are now Church-members because they were such then ?

*Secondly*, The Constitution of the Church is now altered (as I said before) from national to congregational, the matter whereof is visible Saints, and the form mutual Consent ; neither of which are Children in an Infant-state capable of.

*Thirdly*, We may not now take our measures from the rules of that Dispensation any more for Members than for Ordinances, and for Officers, the Laws of the Dispensation being changed : there being a change of the Priesthood, there is made also of necessity a change of the Law, *Heb. 7. 12.*

*Fourthly*. I deny Church-membership to be the ground of Baptism ; that is, that Church-membership which Children once had ; or that any Person that stood a Member of that Church-state, was ever baptized, considered as such : the *Pharisees* that came to *John* to be baptized, and were denied, *Mat. 3. 7.* were Church-members.

The Partition-wall was not then broken down, the national Constitution was not then changed ; all the *Jews* were Church-members when *Christ* and *John* baptized, yet they were not baptized considered as such, but as disciples unto *Christ*, *John 4. 1.*

Baptism is administered antecedent to our being formed Members of a particular instituted Church, *Acts 2. 41.* they were first disciplined ; secondly baptized ; thirdly added unto the Church ; therefore Membership in a particular Church can't be the ground thereof, because it's subsequent thereunto : and tho it be granted that the Subjects of Baptism are Members of the universal visible Church, as being disciplined unto *Christ* ; yet it is upon the profession of their faith that they were and still ought to be baptized, and under no other Consideration. *Acts 8. 38.* *If thou believest with all thy heart, thou maist.*



*Object. 6.* If Baptism came in the room of Circumcision, then Children may and ought to be baptized: but Baptism came in the room of Circumcision; therefore Children may and ought to be baptized. That Baptism came in the room of Circumcision, appears, *Col. 2. 11, 12.* they are there put one for another.

To this I answer. 1. I deny that Baptism came in the room of Circumcision. If Baptism and Circumcision stood together several years by the Ordinance of God, then Baptism did not come in the room of Circumcision: but Baptism and Circumcision stood together several years by the Ordinance of God; therefore Baptism did not come in the room of Circumcision. Circumcision stood of divine appointment till Christ was offered up. If a *Jew* had been discipled to Christ, and baptized, and the next day made Father of a Son of eight days old, that Son must have been circumcised, or he had broken the Covenant: but God sent *John* to baptize; and Christ himself did baptize by his Disciples long before he was offered up.

2. Circumcision belonged only to the Male, not to the Female; but Baptism belongs to the Female as well as the Male. Did the Baptism of the Female come in the room of Circumcision, when Circumcision had never any place with the Female? or can the Baptism of the Female be argued from the Circumcision of the Male? Is there any room to form an Argument here, if it were granted that they came one in the room of another?

3. Circumcision was to be administered the eighth day, not sooner nor later; how comes it about that there is now no precise time for a Child to be baptized in, if Baptism came in the room of Circumcision? Where did God ever declare that Baptism should be administered in the room of Circumcision? But he would no longer tie you to an exact day or time; as for that you should take your own time.

4. The Subjects treated of, *Col. 2.* were Believers every one of them, they had received Christ Jesus, *ver. 6.* they were compleat in Christ, *ver. 10.*

5. It's spiritual Circumcision that is there mentioned, *ver. 11.* that which is made without hands, in putting off the

the body of the Sins of the Flesh by the Circumcision of Christ.

6. It is not spiritual, but outward Baptism that is intended in the 12th vers. *Buried with him in Baptism*, that is, Water-Baptism. Now how inconsiderately do Men argue, when they say that Baptism and Circumcision are put one for the other, when the one is spiritual, and the other outward? If you say that Baptism is here to be taken of spiritual Baptism, and so they are put one for another: I answer (if this be granted) this is foren from the Case in hand: the Question is, Whether Circumcision and Baptism, as they are considered the Ordinances of God, and outwardly to be administred, are here put one for the other? and that they are not, is so plain and clear, that he that runs may read; there is then no ground from this Text to say that Baptism came in the room of Circumcision, nor is there another Text to be found from whence such a Conclusion may be drawn.

*Object. 7.* If Children be capable of the Kingdom of God, and the Blessing of Christ, which are the greater, then they are capable of Baptism, which is the lesser: But Children are capable of the Kingdom of God, and of the Blessing of Christ, that is the greater; therefore they are capable of Baptism, which is the lesser.

That they are capable of the greater, appears in that Christ saith, *Suffer little Children to come unto me, and forbid them not, for of such is the Kingdom of God; and he took them in his Arms and blessed them.*

To this I answer: It does not follow that they are capable of the lesser, tho it be granted that they are capable of the greater. The Supper of the Lord may be called the lesser, as well as Baptism: but Children that are capable of the Kingdom of God, and the Blessing of Christ, which is the greater, are not capable of the Supper of the Lord, which is the lesser; and yet there is no more required as a Prequalification to the Supper of the Lord than there is to Baptism.

*Object. 8.* Children are as capable now of Baptism, as they were formerly of Circumcision; and why then should they be denied?

To this I answer : I do not dispute their Capacity, but the Authority thereof ; there was a Command for that, *Gen.* 17. 10, 11. shew me the like Command for this, and I will yield the point. *Abraham* did not circumcise his *Ishmael* at eight days old, because there was no Command for it ; nor would he have circumcised his *Isaac* at eight days old if he had not had a Command so to do. Either Believers are commanded to baptize their Children, or they are not ; if they are, produce it ; if they are not, then there is no such thing as Infant-Baptism of Divine Institution. If the Duty of baptizing Children in an Infant-state do not lie on the believing Parent, then I would fain know on whom it doth lie : I can't think that it lies on the Child while in an Infant-state ; the Child in an Infant-state is neither capable of knowing what is matter of Duty, nor yet of doing : Nor doth it lie on the Minister ; for, first, the Minister hath no Power to baptize the Child if the Parent refuse to have it done. Secondly, He hath no Commission so to do in case the Parent do consent to it. They are Disciples only that are put into his Commission ; but the Children of Believers are not disciplined in an Infant-state, therefore they are not put into his Commission. Where shall we find on whom the Duty of Infant-Baptism is incumbent, if there be any such thing ? Precepts do not leave us at a loss who it is they bind to that Duty.

*Object.* 9. We read of whole Houses that were baptized, and it's probable that there were Children in some or all of them.

To this I answer : 1. If it be probable, yet it is not certain, and therefore no Argument can be drawn from it : could it be proved that there had been Children there, then there would have been some room for an Argument ; but that can't be done.

2. It's more probable that there were no Children there, in that there are but four Households mentioned among so many thousands that were baptized, and were all known to be Believers. This affords a strong Presumption, that the Apostle did not baptize the Household upon the Faith of the Parent ; if he had, there would have been multitudes

of Houſholds that would have been baptized, if it had been common to baptize whole Houſholds: I ſee no reaſon why theſe four ſhould be mentioned more than others.

3. The Jailor believ'd in God with all his Houſe, *Acts* 16. 34. and *Crispus*, the chief Ruler of the Synagogue, believ'd in God with all his Houſe, *Acts* 18. 8. Here are two of the four Houſes that were all Believers, here are no Children in theſe, for Children are not capable of Faith; *Faith comes by hearing, and hearing by the Word of God*: but Children in an Infant-state are not capable of hearing ſo as to underſtand, and to believe. *Stephanus* and his Houſe are ſaid to be the firſt Fruits of *Acaia*, and that they had addicted themſelves to the Miniſtry of the Saints, which is tantamount to believing. Here are three of the four Houſholds that had no Children; and as for *Lydia*, no body knows whether ſhe was a Maid, Wife, or Widow: We read of the Brethren that were in her Houſe, but we read nothing of Children there, *Acts* 16. ult.

*Object.* 10. But if Children be denied Church-membership and Baptiſm under the Goſpel, that were admitted to Church-membership and Circumciſion under the Law; then Children are loſers by the coming of Chriſt in reſpect of outward Privileges.

To this I answer. 1. If this be granted, where ſhall the blame be laid? It was the Pleaſure of God under the Legal Adminiſtration that Children ſhould enjoy theſe Privileges; and it's the Pleaſure of God under the Evangelical Adminiſtration, that they ſhould not enjoy them. Men that were known after the Fleſh before Chriſt came, were no longer known after the Fleſh when Chriſt was offered up, Birth-Privileges were utterly ceas'd, *2 Cor.* 5. 16. The Apoſtle ſtops the mouth of all Objections in this matter, by letting us know that *all things are of God, who hath reconciled us to himſelf by Jeſus Chriſt*.

2. If there muſt be no alteration under the Goſpel of what there was under the Law, what then do you allow your Children in the room of the Paſſover, which then they had a right to? there was a Lamb appointed for a Houſe, Children were a part of the Houſe, and we can prove that there



were Children in those Houses where the Passover was eaten. Why do ye not plead for the Supper for your Children in the room of the Passover, as well as for Baptism in the room of Circumcision? you have as much ground to plead for the one as for the other. And what have we in the room of the Feast of First-fruits, and of the Feast of Ingatherings? shall we say that we are losers by the coming of Christ in respect of outward Privileges, because we have nothing in the room of these Feasts?

*Objekt.* II. But we are to teach all Nations, and to baptize them; Children are a part of a Nation, therefore they must be baptized.

To this I answer: 1. Turk and Pope are parts of a Nation, tho not both of the same Nation, and so are all the Pagans and Heathens in the World; must all these be baptized because they are part of a Nation?

2. Tho Children are part of a Nation, yet they are not part of a disciplined Nation, they themselves being not disciplined to Christ; the word *them* is relative to all Nations so and so modified and qualified; it is not all Nations considered as such, but all Nations disciplined to Christ that ought to be baptized.

III. I shall give one Reason of the Point, why Believers, or such as are disciplined to Christ by the Word, are the only Subjects of Baptism according to Christ's Commission, and that is, because such only are put into the Commission; these are to be found there, and there are none but these to be found there. Ministers must keep close to their Commission, and if they do, they will find that there are no more to be baptized by them than are disciplined unto Christ.

IV. I shall make some Application of the Point.

And first, By way of Information: Is it so that Believers, or such as are disciplined to Christ by the Word, are the only Subjects of Baptism according to Christ's Commission?

Then, *1st.* It may inform us, that Ministers have sufficient Authority to disciple to Christ by the Word, and to baptize such as are disciplined: That if the Question be, By what Authority they do these things, and who gave them this Authority? they have their Answer ready at hand, they have

have it from Christ; they have it not of Man, nor from Man; they have it not from the Magistrate, nor from Ministers that were before them; nor yet from any Church or Churches, but from Christ. That they have sufficient Authority for what they do of this kind, will appear in a few Particulars.

1. They have a Commission from Christ for what they do, and that under the broad Seal of Heaven: Christ came and spake unto them, and said, *Go, teach all Nations, baptizing them in the Name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost.* They are sent by Christ, and have their Work assign'd them by Christ; they have their Commission to show for what they do. The Baptism of Disciples is not of Men, but of God, their Commission is from him who is God as well as Man.

2. Jesus Christ had Authority to give them this Commission, and he declared his Authority before he gave it, *Mat. 28. 18. All Power is given unto me both in Heaven and in Earth.*

3. Christ had his Authority from the Father, who is the Lord of the whole Earth, in whom all Power is originally vested by right of Creation. *John 5. 22, 23. The Father judgeth no Man, but hath committed all Power unto the Son: That all Men might honour the Son, even as they honour the Father.*

2dly. It may inform us what the use and benefit of Baptism is that a Believer may expect in taking up of the Ordinance.

1. It is an obliging Ordinance; it binds the Soul to die to Sin, and live unto Holiness: *Rom. 6. 2, 3, 4, 5. How shall we that are dead to Sin, live any longer therein? Know you not, that as many of us as were baptized into Christ, were baptized into his Death? Therefore we are buried with him by Baptism into Death; that even as Christ was raised by the Glory of the Father, we also should walk in newness of Life. We are buried with him by Baptism into Death; that as the Body that is buried in the Grave lies rotting and consuming away, so the body of Sin should waste and consume away.*

2. It's a confirming Ordinance, it's of use to confirm our Faith

Faith in the remission of Sin by the Blood of Jesus Christ. Acts 2. 38. *Repent, and be baptized for the remission of Sin, &c.* Baptism doth not remit Sin, but *it's* a figure of that Blood by which the guilt of Sin is wash'd away: it's an Evidence together with Faith of our Title to Salvation. *Mark 16. 16.* *He that believeth and is baptized, shall be saved.* It's no Evidence by it self, but together with Faith it is, as it's taken up in Obedience to the Will of God; without Faith it's of no use at all, and therefore there is no reason to contend for it for such as do not believe; but together with Faith it's of great use.

Secondly, I would make use of it by way of Caution; first to Ministers, and secondly to People.

*First, To Ministers, and that in two Branches:*

1. To beware they do not mistake the Subject of Baptism, and so administer the Ordinance to those that have no right to it. I shall here propose a few things to be considered.

(1.) There are a great many Ministers that are mistaken (I mean such as are for Infant-Baptism) I do not lay down this upon a bare Conjecture, but upon certain knowledg: Ministers are divided into four Parties about the Subjects; tho they are all for baptizing of Children, yet not for the baptizing of all Children; and three of these Parties are mistaken, which is ground enough to put the fourth upon a further search and inquiry: for tho they seem to be all confident that Children are the Subjects according to the Rule, yet they are greatly divided whose Children they are that are the right Subjects according to the Rule; some will baptize all Children whose Parents make a verbal Profession of Christ, tho their Conversation do utterly destroy their Profession; a second sort will baptize all except Bastards: A third sort will baptize none but such whose Parents are true Believers in the Judgment of Charity: A fourth sort will baptize none but such whose Parents, one or both, are in Communion with themselves. Here are four Opinions, and there is but one Truth, therefore three of these must needs err, either they are too large, or too short in their Judgment; and I do not in the least question but the fourth

is in an Error also; he that is most strict in the Point of Infant-Baptism is too large, there being neither Precept nor Precedent for his Practice.

(2.) Consider, if you baptize a wrong Subject, you do it in your own Name, not in the Name of Christ; my meaning is, you do it by your own Authority, not by the Authority of Christ, having no Commission from him for what you do.

(3.) Consider, it's a bold attempt for Ministers to say, I baptize thee in the Name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost, if the Subject be not a Disciple of Christ: This is like setting the broad Seal of Heaven to a Patent of their own drawing up.

(4.) Ministers must give an account of their Stewardship another day: *The Books shall be opened, and every Man shall be judged out of the things that are written in the Books, according as his Works have been; Rev. 20. 11.* Then the Commission will be laid open once more, and Ministers must be tried whether they have observed Christ's order, first to disciple, and then to baptize.

2. I would caution Ministers to beware they do not mistake the form of Administration, and make use of sprinkling instead of dipping.

1st. Consider there are a great many Ministers that do either mistake, or alter and change the form; some there are that do grant that the word in the Commission signifies to dip, and that it was the Primitive Practice that Christ and *John* did baptize by Dipping, that yet make use of Sprinkling instead of Dipping, because we are under a cold Climate, and alledg this for their Practice, That God will have Mercy and not Sacrifice: and that where moral Precepts and positive Precepts do interfere, there positive Precepts must give place; as when *David* eat of the Shew-bread, and the Disciples pluck'd the Ears of Corn upon the Sabbath-day.

To this I answer: 1. Such as do think it good to alter the form of Baptism from Dipping to Sprinkling under this Consideration, had best to consider whether it were not necessary to alter their form of words too, and say, I  
r  
antize



rantize thee, instead of I baptize thee; that so they may speak truth in what they say, seeing they do it in the Name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost.

2. If the coldness of the Climate be such that it will not admit of dipping, why do you do any thing in the room thereof? Where is your Authority for that? you are to baptize if you do any thing, it's not left to your discretion which of these shall be done by you: this is to rantize in your own Name.

3. I grant that in some cases positive Precepts have given place when they have interfer'd with moral; but this is no where made a general Rule; for sometimes moral Precepts have given place to positive, as when God commanded *Abraham* to offer up his Son *Isaac* a Burnt-offering, the moral Precept, *Thou shalt not kill*, gave place to the positive.

4. When positive Precepts have given place to moral, it hath been in some case of exigency that hath suddenly fallen out, where in a little time the Subject might return to his Duty, unto the positive Precept again: but if the positive Precept to Dip must give place to the moral, because of the coldness of the Climate, we shall never have opportunity to return to our Duty to the positive Precept more, because our Climate will never alter; it will be always cold, and so the positive Precept to Dip, will be of no more use to us, than the Altar that was built on the other side of *Jordan* was to them, which was not built to offer Sacrifice thereon, but to be a Witness of what was formerly done, *Josh. 22.28.* so the positive Precept for Dipping shall only stand as a Monument of what was done in the Primitive Time.

5. It's but a begging the Question in this case, to say that the positive Precept doth interfere with the moral. No instance can be given of any one Person discipled to Christ, that ever sustain'd the least damage, or had his Health impaired by being Dipt, no not in the coldest season under this cold Climate.

2dly. Consider, if you mistake the Form, you mistake the Essence, for the Essence of a thing lies as well in the Form as in the Matter.

3dly. If you mistake the Form you deceive the Subject,  
he

he thinks he is baptized when it's no such matter, he is but rantized, not baptized.

4<sup>thly</sup>, If you mistake the Form, the Subject loses the benefit of the Ordinance; for it's not Rantism, but Baptism that obligeth the Subject to die to Sin, and to live to Holiness, *Rom. 6. 4.* It's Baptism, not Rantism that doth evidence together with Faith our Title to Salvation; *Mark 16. 16.*

Secondly, I would caution People, and that in two Branches.

1<sup>st</sup>. To beware you do not take up this Ordinance of Baptism till such time as you are discipled unto Christ.

1. Consider, there are many that will desire to be baptized, and are so, that are not discipled in deed but only in shew; *Simon Magus* was baptized, and I suppose there is no doubt but *Judas*, and *Ananias*, and *Sapphira*, and many more were baptized, that were never really discipled to Christ.

2. Consider, you have no right to the Ordinance till you believe; *Acts 8. 37.* *If thou believest with all thy heart, thou mayst*: the contrary that offers it self is this, If thou dost not believe with all thy heart, thou mayst not.

3. The Ordinance will stand you in no stead if you do not believe, it will be no ways acceptable unto God, nor profitable to your selves; *Without Faith it's impossible to please God*; and without Faith it will be no Evidence of your Title to Salvation: it's *not the putting away the filth of the Flesh, but the answer of a good Conscience by the Resurrection of Christ*, that will stand us in stead.

4. You will make your selves Hypocrites thereby, rank your selves among the number of foolish Virgins, and so render your Condition worse than it was.

2<sup>dly</sup>. I would caution such as are discipled to Christ, to beware they do not rest satisfied without taking up the Ordinance: And here consider a few things.

1. There are many that do give good tokens of their Love to Christ, to his Ways, and to his Saints, that yet remain unbaptized.

2. Consider you do not only lie short of your Duty here while you do lie short of the Duty of Baptism, but you lie

short

short of many other Duties as well as of this; short of the Duty of Church-Communion, short of the Supper of the Lord.

3. You do not only lie short of Duty, but you debar your selves of your Privileges also; you complain of the want of Assurance, and neglect the means of Assurance; Baptism and the Supper of the Lord are strengthening and confirming Ordinances.

4. The neglect of Duty when it may be performed is Sin, as well as the commission of Evil; so that you live in Sin all the while you live in the neglect of Duty.

3dly. I would make use of it by way of Examination; try then whether you be discipled unto Christ.

1. Have you that Gift by which you understand the Mysteries of the Kingdom of Heaven? I call it a Gift because the Scripture calls it so, *Mat. 13. 11. To you it's given to know the Mystery of the Kingdom of Heaven, but to them it is not given.* No natural Abilities can reach this; no acquired Parts can furnish us with the knowledg thereof, it's the Gift of Christ; *John 17. 2, 3. That I may give eternal Life to as many as thou hast given me: And this is Life eternal, to know thee the only true God, and Jesus Christ whom thou hast sent.* The great Mystery of Godliness, is God in Christ, God manifested in the Flesh, *1 Tim. 3. 16.* Do you know Jesus Christ? do you know him in his Natures, God-man, two Natures united in one; Man, that he might do and suffer the Will of God; and God, that he might merit by doing and suffering? Do you know him in his Offices, Prophet, Priest and King? He that hath truly learned Jesus Christ, is discipled unto Christ. I shall now lay you down a few Marks of a Person that hath truly learned, or is discipled unto Christ.

(1.) It's a sign that a Person is discipled unto Christ, or that he hath truly learned Jesus Christ, if the Will doth follow the Understanding, closing with Jesus Christ; where the Soul makes a Resignation of himself to Christ, to be taught by him, and saved by him, and ruled and governed by him, and him alone; where he goes out of his own Righteousness, and applies the Righteousness of Christ alone

in point of Justification; *Phil. 3. 9.* when the Soul is willing to be found in him, not having his own Righteousness, which is of the Law, but the Righteousness of God, which is by Faith: I say, this is a sign of a Disciple of Christ. *Pfal. 9. 10.* They that know thy Name, will put their Trust in thee. *John 6. 45.* Every one that hath heard, and learned of the Father, cometh unto me. It's a sign that the Understanding is truly inlightened where the Will follows the Understanding.

(2.) It's a sign that a Soul hath truly learned Jesus Christ, and is indeed discipled unto Christ, if he hath so learned Christ as to deny himself for Christ: *Luke 14. 26.* Except a Man hate Father and Mother, yea and his own Life, he cannot be my Disciple. There is a threefold Self-denial.

1. A denial of sinful self, this must be in all cases, in all places, at all times. *He that nameth the Name of Christ, let him depart from all Iniquity; 2 Tim. 2. 19.*

2. A denial of religious self; but this is only in the point of Justification; *Phil. 3. 9.* I would not be found in my own Righteousness, which is of the Law, but in the Righteousness of God, which is by Faith. We must go out of every thing of our own, Duty and Qualifications, lay all at the feet of Christ, and rest solely on his Righteousness.

3. There is a denial of natural self; self-Riches, Honour, Pleasure, Liberty, Life and all; but this must be only when any, or all of these come in competition with Christ, then we must take up our Cross and follow him, *Luke 14. 27.*

(3.) It's a sign of a Disciple of Christ, where there is true Love to those that are discipled unto Christ: *John 13. 35.* By this shall all men know that you are my Disciples, if you have love one to another: Love to Saints, as Saints, purely upon the account of the Image of God that appears in them, is a Mark by which a Man may be known to himself, and others too, to be a Disciple of Christ.

Fourthly. I would make use of it by way of Exhortation to such as are discipled to Christ, and not yet baptized, that you would now take up the Ordinance: And here I shall lay down a few Motives to inforce the Exhortation.



1. Consider it's your Duty ; as soon as a Person is disciplined unto Christ, he is bound to be baptized: my Text enjoins the Subject as well as the Administrator, *Go disciple to me, i. e. baptizing them, &c. Acts 2. 38. Repent, and be baptized every one of you in the Name of Jesus Christ.*

2. Consider you are meet Subjects for Baptism ; you believe, therefore you may: you are put into the Commission as having a right to the Ordinance ; you are capable to worship God in Spirit and in Truth ; and they are such Worshipers that the Lord himself seeks for, *John 4. 23.*

3. Consider it was not the Practice of the Primitive Christians to delay in this matter ; however it's now become too much a Practice: Three thousand converted and baptized the same day, *Acts 2. 41.* The Jaylor and his Household converted and baptized the same hour of the night, *Acts 16. 33.*

4. Consider, a little delay in this matter hath met with a Reprehension ; *Why tarryest thou? arise, and be baptized: Acts 22. 16.*

5. Consider, it's your Privilege as well as your Duty ; this is one step towards Church-Communion ; this prepares you to join Communion regularly: *Acts 2. 41. Then they that gladly received the Word, were baptized; and the same day there were added unto them about three thousand Souls.* First, disciplined ; secondly, baptized ; and thirdly, added to the Church. Here is the Apostolical Order ; and being added, they are admitted to all the Ordinances: *They continued in the Apostles Doctrine, and Fellowship, and breaking of Bread, and Prayer.*

*Object.* But some may say, they have not that assurance of their being disciplined unto Christ as they desire to have.

To this I answer: Should we stay from taking up the Ordinance till we have that assurance as we desire to have, we may stay till it be too late ; I know none that hath that assurance as they desire to have ; their assurance is imperfect.

2. The way to attain assurance is to take up the Ordinance: *He that believeth and is baptized, shall be saved: Mark 16. 16.*

3. It's not the Faith of Assurance, but the Faith of Re-  
 combance, or Reliance, that gives a right to the Ordinance:  
*Acts 8. 37. If thou believest with all thy heart, thou mayst:*  
 and this a Person may do that yet is in the dark, whether  
 he do believe or no, *Isa. 50. 10.*

4. If you can take up the Ordinance purely in obedience  
 to the Command of God, submitting your selves to the Me-  
 diatory Authority of the Lord Jesus, you may go on with  
 Comfort, it's a true sign that your Natures are changed:  
*For the carnal Mind is Enmity against God, and is not subject*  
*unto the Law of God, neither indeed can be; Rom. 8. 7.* And  
 if your Natures are changed, there is a Light infused, by  
 which you are instantly discipled unto Christ: *2 Cor. 4. 6.*  
*God who commanded Light to shine out of Darkness, hath shined*  
*in our Hearts, to give the light of the knowledg of the Glory of*  
*God, in the face of Jesus Christ.*

For Dr. WILLIAM RUSSEL, dwelling in  
 Barbican, London.

S I R,

I Have read your Narrative of the *Portsmouth* Disputation  
 with some Ministers of the Presbyterians; and have also  
 seen another Book published by your Adversaries, in-  
 titled, *An Impartial Account of the Portsmouth Disputation,*  
 —by *Samuel Chandler, William Leigh, Benjamin Robinson.*  
 Wherein I find such unchristian Reflections and Wrong done  
 you, as sutes not with the Profession they make of true Re-  
 ligion, but greatly demonstrates the badness of their Cause.  
 And I wonder at their Impudence in putting so plain a Cheat  
 upon the World, as I find in *pag. 79.* in these words, *viz.*  
*Whether he might not have spared all his Dutch? seeing*  
*Doop in that Language signifies only to wash, and is used*  
*when they only pour on Water. That this account of the*  
*sword Doop is notoriously false appears from the common use*  
*of the word, and the account which is given of it in their*

Dictiona-

Dictionaries. One I have by me, which I believe is the largest and best in that Tongue, it being a double Dictionary of *Dutch* and *English*, and *English* and *Dutch*, with Grammars to each of them: by *Hendrick Hexham* and *Daniel Manly*, and printed at *Rotterdam* 1675, and 1678. wherein the *English* word *Dip* is render'd *Doop*: as, to dip in a Sauce, *Doopen in een sanffe*; to dip to the bottom, *Doopen tot den grondt toe*: Dipped *Gedoopt*; a dipping, *een doopinge*; and *Doop*, *Doopsel* Baptism; *Doopen* to baptize, *Dooper* Baptizer, *Doop d'igh* the day of Baptism; *Doopen onder her water*, to duck or dive under Water. I also find, that to wash or rince is in *Dutch* *Wasschen ofte Spoelen*; to sprinkle, *Stroyen spreyden sprenckelen*; and also *Besprengen* is to sprinkle, besprinkle or to strow: to pour is in *Dutch* *Gieten* or *storten*; poured upon, *Opgegoten ofte op Gestort*. Now seeing there is nothing of truth in what they say in contradiction to you of the word *Doop*, but that it undeniably appears from the *Dutch* Dictionary to signify to dip, to duck or dive, and that it has nothing in its signification either to sprinkle or wash by pouring Water, which things are render'd by other *Dutch* words: I know not how they can clear themselves from the guilt of a wilful Lie to cheat the People of the true form of Gospel-Baptism, which, in my opinion, is a greater Sin than to cheat them of their Mony. And it's greatly to be lamented that any professing Godliness, should so grossly stain their Religion for the sake of Infant-sprinkling, a meer human Tradition, which has neither Command nor Example for it in the holy Scriptures.

Sir, I was willing to communicate this unto you, that if you need the Evidence of this Dictionary, and have not already met with it, you may have recourse unto it. And so heartily wishing you the increase of true Wisdom and Christian Courage for the defence of the Truth of Christ which you are engaged in, I rest your loving Christian Friend and Brother,

Leominster, Nov. 17. 1699.

Isaac Marlow.

I have examined this Letter, and find it to agree exactly with *Hexam's Dutch* Dictionary; and these Presbyters have

most basely betray'd their Ignorance in that Language, and have made their Reflections to consist of the most shameful Forgeries and Falshoods they could well have invented, both in this and the rest of their Accusations against me and others, as appears by those many authentick and undeniable Testimonies given under the Hands of so many Eye and Ear-Witnesses, who have also (some of them) prov'd Mr. *Chandler* to be a most notorious Liar to his very face, before divers of his Hearers, and others then present. And had not the Book swell'd too big, there had been printed a large Letter from Mr. *Williams's* Son, directed to those three Presbyters, wherein he hath not only justified his Father, but my self also, from those vile Reflections they have unjustly cast both upon the Living and the Dead: But if they offer to persevere in their lying Vanities, and gross Abuses, they may be furnished with that, and much more, not only from both his Sons, but from an eminent Person living in *Portsmouth*, who hath written largely upon that Subject, and also in Vindication of me and my True Narrative; who will neither be afraid nor asham'd to own what they have written, having given it under their Hands: And therefore both Mr. *Sharp* and my self do beg their Pardon, that we have omitted to make it publick for the Reason above-mentioned.

There are many things which they have asserted that are utterly false, which I have not took notice of; but I cannot omit what they have asserted in p. 64. of their Partial Account, where they bring me in saying, But βαπτω is a Diminutive from βαπτίζω; and they pretend a Voucher for it, but we must not know who. This is like the story about *Isaac Harman*, and is printed to no other purpose than to render me ridiculous; as if I did not know that βαπτω is the Theme, and βαπτίζω a Derivative from it. But I must charge it upon them as a Forgery and Invention of their own; for I neither said so, neither was it possible for me to think so. But why should I think it strange for them to belie me, when Mr. *Leigh* hath been so bold to belie the Lord Jesus? For, after they have mentioned *Mark* 7. 4. in their Printed Account in the Page before recited, they bring in these words as spoken by me, That it's render'd dipping in our *English*

Transla-



Translation, as, *He that dippeth with me in the dish.* And Mr. Leigh (as they say) replying, The word is there βαπτω, not βαπτίζω. Now whether he means *Mark 7. 4.* or that Passage about *Judas* in the Evangelists, it's notoriously false; for the word βαπτω is not to be found in any of those places: And he discovers his ignorance in the Greek Tongue, to talk after that unthinking and loose manner.

W. R.

## POST-SCRIPT.

*A Letter from Portsmouth concerning Mr. Chandler, dated Nov. 9. 1699. occasioned by his Post-script about Isaac Harman, in their second Edition.*

*Honoured Brother Ruffel;*

**T**Hese are to desire you to cause these few Lines to be printed, that the World may be rightly inform'd of the horrid falseness of Mr. *Chandler*, and his malicious Insinuation, by which he would fain perswade the World to believe that Mr. *Bowes* and his Party (intending thereby the Church of Christ at *Portsmouth*, whereof he is Minister) were so envious against their Brethrens Prosperity, that they did suspend me from their Communion for going to hear Mr. *Webber*; and is so particular in it, that he mentions my Name (viz. *Isaac Harman*;) and that he might gain the greater Credit to this great Lie, that so it might pass for Truth, he hath back'd it with another notorious Lie, viz. That I told him so my self, and ask'd his Advice: And in three days after I had opposed them, and charged them with a horrid Lie, they did (with much ado) procure a most wicked and worthless Woman to avouch it for a Truth, and that it was spoken in her House when Mr. *Chandler* was there. But this Assertion of Mr. *Chandler* and his wicked

Ayoucher

Avoucher I am bound in Conscience to bear my Testimony against even to my dying day.

And I do now in the presence of Almighty God, and before all the World most solemnly protest,

1. That I never was suspended by Mr. *Bowes* nor his Party (as he calls them) for going to hear Mr. *Webber*, nor for any other Crime in all my life-time.

2. That I never had one word of Discourse with Mr. *Chandler* in all my life-time, till I charged him with writing this notorious Lie concerning me. And to the Truth of this I do solemnly call God to record this day; and by the Truth of this I do desire to stand or fall at the Judgment-day of Christ.

Witness my Hand, *Isaac Harman*.

And upon the 16th of October 1699. I offered to attest upon Oath before the Right Worshipful Mayor of *Portsmouth*, That what I have here asserted is the Truth, and nothing but the Truth, concerning Mr. *Chandler* and his wicked Avoucher Mrs. *Jones*: And it hath pleased God so to work things about, that what I have said will appear to be the Truth, against all its black Enemies, and dark Opposers: For God hath confounded their Language, in that they have presumed thus to belie the Truth, wrong their innocent Neighbours, and deceive the World; for they now appear like the Builders of *Babel*, all Confusion; and may be rank'd with those two wicked Elders that so falsely accused innocent *Susanna*; which will evidently appear to all Men that this Priest hath not rid out of their Wits by his Priest-craft: for, when Mr. *Chandler* and Mrs. *Jones* were examined apart, they could agree in their Testimony no better than the two wicked Elders did in theirs.

For when Mrs. *Jones* was examin'd, she offer'd to attest upon Oath, That on a certain idle day in the morning, I came to her House to inquire for a young Man, and that I tarried there the space of an hour, in which time Mr. *Chandler* and his Wife going by her House, she called them both into her House; and that I then told Mr. *Chandler* what he hath printed: But being ask'd what that was, she could not

And

And when Mr. *Chandler* was examin'd, he declares the direct contrary: For he asserteth, That a certain *Evening* as he was walking *all alone*, he happen'd to go in at Mrs. *Jones's* House, where there was a young Man that told him that he was suspended, and ask'd his Advice.

And now I leave the World to judg of Mr. *Chandler* and his wicked Avoucher: for she says it was in the *Morning*, but he saith it was in the *Evening*; he also saith he was *all alone*, but she saith his Wife was with him. But at length Mrs. *Jones* hath confest Mr. *Chandler* was not there when the words were spoken: This she declar'd to one *Thomas Whitewood*, which he will make Oath of if call'd thereunto.

Notwithstanding they were thus detected, he hath had the Confidence to publish a Postscript to their second false Account of the Disputation, which is stuff'd full of horrid Forgeries; wherein he asserteth, that I have confest to several, and some of our own Friends (Members of our Communion) have acknowledg'd, how that I was check'd at our Monthly Meeting for hearing of Mr. *Webber*: And that when I went to sit down at the Sacrament, some rose up and said, If I sat down they would not; on which I withdrew as virtually suspended.

I do now utterly deny all that he hath there written; and I do hereby challenge Mr. *Chandler* to produce any Members of our Communion, that either have said, or will say what he hath written in his lying Pamphlet, and I will give him the Cause.

But let not Mr. *Chandler* think that the presumptuous Conclusion of his blundering Postscript is a sufficient Testimony to prove his invented Lies, by saying as *Pilate* did, *What I have written, I have written*. For, notwithstanding he would fain put it off with his surly Answer, It shall not serve his turn, I do here once more charge them upon him as invented Lies; and therefore let him clear himself, or confess his Sin, or for ever bear that Shame, which is the just desert of all such (as he is) that love and make Lies.

He is pleas'd to pray that God would give me Repentance: To which I shall answer in the Language of my Saviour to those of old, *Weep not for me, but weep for your selves*: so say

I to Mr. *Chandler*, Let him pray for himself, and not for me ; for the Prayers of the wicked are Abomination in the sight of the Lord.

But alas ! what will not this Man say, whose Piety consisteth more in Eating and excessive Drinking, than in Prayer and Fasting ; and his Works more in envious Lying and Slandering, than in Truth and Charity : For tho none preaches Charity more than he, there are none uses less than himself ; nor none that have more need of it than he, because he lives by Charity, and cannot live without it. He is also one of the greatest pretenders to Learning that ever I knew, altho none are more unlearned than he ; for he hath not yet learned to speak the Truth of his Neighbours ; yet he hath too much Learning for his Brain, and too little Judgment for his Learning ; and his too great opinion of both spoils all.

He is so frequent in the speculation of his own Parts and Abilities, that he is not at leisure to take a view of his own Deformities : His Eyes, like a Drunkard, see all things double ; and his Fancy, like an old Man's Spectacles, makes a great Letter in a small Print. And as he never fixes his Eyes on himself without Admiration, so he never removes them to his Neighbours without Reflection, calling them Blockheads, &c. His Discourse is all Positions ; thus it is, and thus it must be ; and as I have written, I have written. But he will not so much degrade his own Authority, as to submit what he saith to Proof and Trial, but you must take his bare word for it ; and tho the matter be never so false, he is presently in a rage with all that will not believe his Lies to be true, without calling him into question about them. I fear he is one that hath lost all good in himself, and is unwilling to find it in his Neighbours : For he and his wicked Avoucher hath bely'd the Truth, and enviously slander'd the Innocent : He is an everlasting Argument, but I am weary of him, whose Religion is a question, and his Salvation a greater, which Death only will conclude, and Judgment resolve ; and then all his Lying and Quibbles, and his unreasonable Cavils must have an end. And therefore I bid him farewell, till I catch him again ( as I have already done ) in his belying of me.

*Isaac Harman.*









