

REMARKS

upon

Mr. Gales

Reflections

on *Mr. Walls*

HISTORY

OF

Infant Baptism.

In a Letter to a Friend.

by Thomas Dickson

Prov. 18, 17. *He that is first in his own Cause
Seemeth Just; but his Neighbour cometh, and
searcheth Him.*

2. Thes. 2, 15. *Therefore Brethren Stand fast
and hold the Traditions which ye have been Taught.*

Printed for and Sold by T. Wood,

ERRATA.

The absence of the Author from the Press may be some apology for so many Errors in the Press Work of so small a Treatise. The most Considerable whereof are here Remarkt.

P. stands for Page, and l. for line, &c.

PAg. 14 line 12 for *Leaving* Read *Bearing*, p. 16 l. 22 f. *on* r. *in*, p. 19 l. 2 f. *many't* r. *mayn't*, p. 19 l. 27 f. *not* r. *no*, p. 20 l. 32 f. *Wo* r. *He*, p. 23 l. 14 f. *Water* r. *Heart*, p. 32 l. 6 Dele *This* *mutter*, p. 34 l. 5 f. *Iecamenon* r. *Bebammenon*, p. 34 l. 25 f. *101* r. *110*, p. 39 l. 15 f. *Dipt* r. *Dips*, p. 43 l. 24 f. *Defict* r. *Detict*, p. 46 l. 3 f. 2dly r. *Q. Dt.* p. 72 l. 28 f. *Mathezeuontos* r. *Mattheteuontes*, p. 75 l. 7 f. *Scce* r. *Senſe*, p. 76 l. 28 after *Salvation* add, *The Sence I have here given.* p. 76 l. 30 f. *Bulivating* r. *Cultivating*, p. 78 l. 2 f. *Hezam* r. *Hexam*, p. 82 l. 31 f. *Infants* r. *Infans*, p. 82 l. 28 f. *peccatoribus* r. *peccantibus* p. 83 for the Greek quotation in the 5, 6 and 7th lines read *Ti de ar eipos peri ton eti nesion, Kai mete tes Zomias Epa sibanamenon, mete tes Karitos He Kai tauta Baptismon, panage, eiper tis Epcigoi Kindunos.* p. 83 l. 22 f. *Vermaculus* r. *Vernaculus*, p. 86. l. 27 f. *orrare* r. *ornare*.

To the
R E A D E R.

HAVING read what Mr. Gale against *Walt's History of Infant Baptism*, has advanc'd, I was too easily imposed upon by the Ingenuity of so Learned a Pen; and his plausible way of writing prevailed upon me too credulously to take in what was there offer'd; However for my further satisfaction I apply'd my self to the Author of the ensuing Discourse, and desired his Remarks on the most Material Passages in Mr. Gales Treatise; as also to essay the Vindication of Infant-Baptism, with the usual mode of administering that Sacrament by Affusion. In answer to which the following Composure was written, without any view to its being publish'd.

As I am privileged with a peculiar interest in the Friendship of the Author, I shall not hazard his Displeasure, by offending his Modesty. Only thus much I would crave liberty to say, That altho' he shuns Praises, He cannot miss a just esteem: from the Judicious. As this small Tract

To the Reader.

has yielded me great satisfaction, and been approv'd by Persons of a more Considerable Character, who have seen it in Manuscript; I was encourag'd to give it a Birth in Print, in hopes it might be serviceable to promote the Truth, which if attended with Success, will abundantly compensate for the Centure of Vanity, or what ever else may be thrown on him who may (at least) justly claim the Character of being *A Well-wisher to Truth.*

T. W.

Remarks upon Mr. *Gales* Reflections on Mr. *Wall's* History of Infant *Baptism*.

To his Friend Mr. *T. W.*

Sir

YOUR Acquaintance with my Circumstances makes you sensible of the little Leisure I have, from my multifarious Encumbrances, to answer your Desires; you must therefore not Expect from me, a particular Answer, to all that's Exceptionable, in Mr. *Gales* Reflections, on Mr. *Walls* History of *Infant Baptism*; But must be Content with having matter of Conviction Briefly offered, that his Arguments are not Unanswerable; and that a small degree of learning and Ingenuity, is sufficient to Undermine and Raze to the ground this admired Structure; which he has with such Elaborate pains and study Erected.

His two first Letters do principally consist of
 A Reflections

Reflections on Mr. *Walls* un-fair dealing, in his Book, (which not having seen, I am not able to vindicate.) These therefore not affecting the Controversy, I shall pass over in Silence.

Mr Gale begins his third Letter; by shewing wherein the Controversy between them and the *Pado-baptists*, Consists, viz. (1) *In the Mode of Baptism, whether its to be administred only by Dipping?* (2) *Who are the true Subjects of it, whether Adult Persons only, or Infants also?* * *These Things* he supposes so clear as to admit of no Dispute, and Even Dares to call in question the *Legislators Conduct*; if otherwise. Nay, he Even ventures to affirm, 'That our Enemies, allow, that as far as the Scriptures are clear, in the present Case, our practice Exactly agrees with them; and they must confels too, that their own is very different from what the Text declares to have been done, in the Ancient Times.

This his Harrangue labours of two considerable Infirmities; *Profaneness* and *Fals-hood*.

1. *Profaneness*. Must poor Dust and Ashes call in question the Conduct of *Infinite Wisdom*, if any points in Religion disagree with their Sentiments? What tho' the case seem'd clear to him, must he arraign the Conduct of the *most High* before the Tribunal of his frail Reason? surely this is insufferable Presumption.

2. *Fals-hood*. What *Peciousapist*. Author did Everacknowledge, that their Practice Exactly agrees

agrees with the Scriptures, and that our Practice is very different, from what the Text declares to have been done in the ancient Times? I challenge him in the words of *King Solomon* *
What is that Man's Name, or what is his Sons Name, if he can tell? And as we are very far from acknowledging, so I much suspect he will be as far from proving Those Allegations; We'll however hear what he has to say.

His first *Argument* is thus laid down. † 'The Word *Baptize* necessarily includes *Dipping* in its signification, and that Christ in Commanding to *Baptize*, has Commanded to *Dip* only. And subjoyns, I may Challenge any man to shew a single Instance, of its signifying any thing *Elle* (*than to Dip*) Except in some Ecclesiastical writers of the Later Corrupt Times.

I accept his Challenge; For although I freely acknowledge, that the word very frequently signifies to *Dip*, yet not always, which when made appear, will overthrow his whole *Argument*, from the word *Baptizo*.

All his *Quotations* from profane Authors, (if pertinent) will do him but very little service; for his highest Pretence from them must be that the word is sometimes used in the sense he pleads for, and particularly in the places Cited; But this notwithstanding, it may carry a different meaning in Thousands of Instances, for ought he knows. But what will become of his *Argumentation*

mentation upon this Topick, if some of his own cited Instances, should have the ill manners to Contradict him? which I am pratty Confident they will.

He brings an Instance from *Homers Batrachomyomichia*, who sayes, when one of the Champions was slain, by the side of a Lake, *he breathless fell,* and *The Lake was Ebapteto*, (which he translates (*Tinged with Blood.*) Can he perswade a Gentleman of your Reason to believe, that the Lake was Dipt in Blood, or that the Poet so intended? Especially when you Remember, that this mighty Hero *Crambophagus*, from whose slaughter was this Deluge of Blood, was but a Frog Dying by the Hands of his victorious Enemies, the *Mice*. I am sure that it would be a more natural, and genuine Translation, to Read it, *The Lake was sprinkled, or stayn'd with Blood*, This would (if we look upon these Champions as this ingenuous Ludicrous Poem Represents them, to be famous *Martial Chevaliers*) make the Poets words both Truth and sense; But his Translation neither the one or the other; For he himself is forced to acknowledge, it is *very Ridiculous, to speak of Dipping or Plunging a Lake, in the Blood of a slain Champion.*

Previous to a particular Consideration of his Crafty attempt, to make the word a Nose of wax, to bend to his purpose, I shall observe to you, that we are not to put a Metaphorical Construction upon any Authors words, unless the

the Sense of the Phrase Necessarily Require it, For this Practice would render all Writings, *sacred* and *Profane*, wholly Unintelligible, without any constant steady meaning, and liable to subversion, according to the Capricious Fancy of every humerfome Wrangler; This would render the *saered Scriptures* themselves but a Bone of Contention, and give a handle to the most Enthusiastical Sectaries, to bring in the Scriptures as Espousing their Extravagant sentiments.

How Mr. Gale, in the Case before us, and frequently in the following pages, has (without any occasion from the sense of the words) forc't upon them a Metaphorical meaning, with the greatest violence imaginable, you will, notwithstanding his plausible Discourse, be easily Convinced.

* This Phrase (says he) we must Consider, is borrowed from the art of Dyers, who colour things by *Dipping* them in their Dye.

But then here is a Comparison without any similitude; for I can't devise where lies the parity between *Dipping* things in Dye, and the Running of Blood into a Lake; It is therefore but a wheedling of all Mankind out of their Reason, To periwade them to accept of this Translation, or this Metaphor, as you'll be convinced, when you consider, (1.) That if the words are literal Translated, so as to be made sense of, they must be rendred as above *The Lake*

Lake was sprinkled or stayned with Blood. (2) If you choose the Latter of these Terms, and will have it Metaphorical, why it mayn't allude to the *staining*, in Common use, by *Affusion* or *Asperision*, Mr. Gale neither has, nor can offer any satisfactory Reason ; And if any can Doubt of the Practice of *staining* without *Dipping*, every Limner, and House Painter can convince him by ocular Demonstration. Moreover, the Nature of the thing spoken of, (*viz.* The Lakes being *stayn'd* by the blood that was shed by the side of it) much better answers the Metaphor of this Sort of *painting*, than of Dying by *Immersion*.

By this time you are (I'm perswaded) convinced, that the word in Controversy, cannot, without utmost violence, be translated to *Dip* or *Plunge*, and therefore That his Challenge is already answered, and thereby his Argument enervated.

But I'll proceed to a second Instance.

He brings in *Aristophanes* saying, That *magnes* an old Comick of Athens, used the Lydian Musick *to paint the face* ; and *smear'd it over* (*Baptomenos*) with *Tawny Washes*. This he acknowledges, was not *∴* by *Dipping* their Faces in the Colour ; , but by *smearing* the Colour on their Faces. Here we have then, by our Authors own acknowledgment, an Instance where the word does not signify *Dipping* or *Plunging*. And what becomes then of his Argument from the word *Baptizo* ?

Baptizo? But he'll tell us, That there is a *manifest allusion to the art of Dying, in these, and all such passages.* But how does this appear? 'The true Primitive Meaning is only still Referred to and Implied. And again, 'If we suppose the Sense of the word to be altered; there will be the greatest Confusion, in Languages imaginable, &c' He first brings this Instance to clear up his Sense of the word, Next, pleads from the Sense he gives the word, to the necessary Meaning of it in this place. A fine Round! I need not tell you, that this is a most bare-faced *Begging the Question.* But he tells us, 'That none can be so hardy as to deny, that the word is Borrowed from the Art of Dying. I confess, I have such a brazen fore-head, as to Peremptorily deny it; for I see no Metaphor in the words; and if any, it can't allude to *Dipping in Dye,* wherewith it has not the least similitude; but to the *staining or Painting,* before mentioned, with which it bears a lively and Exact Resemblance. Nay, Mr. Gale himself is forc't to acknowledge, That .'. 'Nothing can be more Ridiculous, than for a man seriously to talk of *Dipping* a Lake or River in Blood, or of a Ladies *Dipping* her Face in Vermillion, when she adorns it with artificial Colours, which on the contrary, its known, must be more artfully *Laid on.* But I'm sure its no wayes Ridiculous for a man seriously to talk of a Ladies *Painting* her Face with Vermillion,

million, after the above said manner; And what need then of this Far-fetcht and Incongruous Metaphor? Again.

We need not go above a Dozen Lines further, before we meet with the word *Baptei*, which I think no man of Learning but Mr. Gale, would have translated as he does. The words he quotes from *Aristo Hyst. Animal. Lib. 5. Pag. 645.* which I'll transcribe in English Character, and Construe verbatim, *Tblibomenos de Baptei, kai anthizei teen keira.* *Tblibomenos de*, When It's pressed, *Baptei* it Wets, *kai*; and, *anthizei*, it makes of a florid Colour, (*florida Readi*) *teen keira* the hand. Thus Sir I think it must be translated, If we make the *Philosopher* to speak sense. That it may be yet more clear, let us Construe the words in our Authors Sense. *Tblibomenos de*, if it is pressed, *Baptei*, it Dyes or Colours, *kai*, and *anthizei*, it Colours, or makes of a florid Colour, *teen Keira*, the hands. There is no need to make Remarks upon the Tautology of this Translation, or the Authors Unfairness in this Instance; But I must tell you, that if the word here be taken for *Dying*, it has no Reference at all to *Dipping*, nor can signify to *Dip* or *Plunge*, unless he can persuade us to believe, that squeezing a Lock of wet Wool in our hands, is to *Dip* or *Plunge* them. How far then the word is here from properly, signifying to *Dip*, (as Mr. Gale, would persuade us it always does) I submit to your Censure.

(Again,

He

He brings in *Strabo* saying, That the Souldiers marched a Day through the water, (*Baptizomenon*, which he renders) *Dipt* up to the waste But would it not be better sense to Read it, *Wet up to the Waste*? Unless Mr. Gale can persuade us, that there is no difference between *Wading* and *Plunging*.

I'll add but once or twice more; and no longer tire your patience, in this wild Goose-Chase. ∴ Mr. Gale promises us an Instance from *Plutarch*, which shall be Evident enough; and so it is, that the word in Debate does not always signify to *Dip*, or *Plunge*.

He finds *Plutarch* speaking of a Roman General, who, a little before he Dyed of his Wounds, set up a Trophy, on which having (*Baptisai*, Which he Translates *Dipt* his Hand in Blood, he wrote this Inscription, &c. You must understand, that this General received the Blood running out of his Wound; But how this was *Dipping* his hand in his Blood, or how he was capable so to do, Mr. Gale should have better Illustrated. Its plain, his hand was *Baptized* by *Affusion*, and no otherwise.

He Proceeds to quote the *Meditations* of that Renowned Pious Emperour *Marcus Antoninus*, who says such as the Thoughts are, that you are most Possessed with, such will your Mind be; for the thoughts. (*Baptisai*, which he Reads) *Dip the Mind*. It would make a man smile, were he
Never

Never so serious, to hear of the Mind's being *Dipt* or *Plunged* in the Thoughts. The meaning of the words plainly are, that the Thoughts leave a fixed impression on the Mind, and that according to the Thoughts we Entertain with our Dispositions and Affections be. Once more,

He finds the same *Royal Author* saying, *Don't make the former Emperours the pattern of your actions, lest (Baphes) you are infected with their Vices*. He indeed here again (*Ridiculously Enough* Reads it *Dipt*; but you see how far the sense of the Phrase is from leaving him out in it.

There is no need of further Reply to his constant Refuge, (when he finds an Instance plainly against him) a *Metaphorical Meaning*: for there can be no allusion, (if it be *Metaphorical*) so *Dipping* or *Plunging*.

Thus [Sir] you see that out of those very Instances that he has, with so much Toil, collected to confirm his Hypothesis, we have found seven, that Can't With any modesty be Translated to *Dip* or *Plunge*.

I might have taken Notice of other Passages, that further enlighten the Case before us; but I've already wearied my own patience, and I'm afraid yours.

In the Close of his Third Letter, and beginning of the Fourth, he would persuade us, that the *Lexicographers* and *Cruticks*, constantly affirm, That the proper and genuine sense of *Baptizo*, is *Immergo*, *Mergo*, &c. to *Plunge* or *Dip*. We'll then take the pains to peruse a few of them, and see what they say about it. Scrib

Schriuelius in his *Lexicon* (a Book of general Use; and best account throughout *Europe*) Renders the word (*Baptizo*) by *mergo, Lavo*, to Dip and Wash. The word (*Baptismos*) by *Lotio*, Washing only.

Passor, a generally approved *Lexicographer*, Renders the word Just as the former, *Baptizo, Mergo, Lavo*, To Immerse or wash; and *Baptismos*, by *Lotio*, washing only :

Martin, in his *Lexicon*, Renders the word *Bapto*, by *Mergo, Lavo*, To Dip or Wash.

Martin Rulandus, a very competent Judge, in his *Synonymia*, gives us, among other Terms, (synonymous to the word *Baptismos*;) *Loutrion palingenestas*, The washing of Regeneration, and *Photismos*, Brightness, Clearness light, the Effects and fruits of Washing.

We'll next look into *Esq; Leigh*, in his Celebrated *Critica sacra*, who tells us, That though *Baptizo* be taken from *Bapto, Tingo*, To Dip or Plunge, yet it is taken more largely, for any kind of Washing, Rinsing, or Cleansing, Even where there is no Dipping at all. Again, the same Author tells us, That the word (as *Hesycius stephanus scapula* and *Budeus*, the great Masters of the Greek Tongue, make good by very many Instances out of Classic Writers) importeth no more than Ablution or washing. What can be plainer ?

Beza ∴ on *Mark. 7. 4*. Renders the word *Baptizontai*) *Loti fuerint*, they were washed.

Zepperus de Sacram, si vocis Notationem, &c. i. c.
If we would attend the Notation of the word, it signifies the Act of Immersion and Washing.

Bucan Saves, *Baptismos* is para to *Baptein*, which is *Tingere*, *Madefacere* : et *Lavare*, To Tinge, to make Wet ; and to Wash.

Danaus *Isaq.* *Christ*, Lib. 5. *De sacram*, cap. 21. *Idcirco Baptismos pro Lotione & mundatione, in Sacra Scriptura fere accipitur ; i. e. Baptism is frequently accepted in the scripture, for Washing, and making clean.*

I have no Critick by me that may seem to speak so much in favour of our Authors bold assertion, as *Matth. Flac.* in his *Clavis Scripture* and yet Even he Contradicts him, his words are these, *Baptismus vox greca est in Ecclesia notissima, proprie intinctionem significat, Ducta autem est a Bapto, Intingo, et a Baptizo, Immergo, porro per Metalepsin significat abluo, Lavo i. e. Baptism (says he) is a Greek word, in the Church well known, which properly signifies Intinction, and is taken from Bapto, to Tinge, and Baptizo, To Immerse ; nevertheless by a Metalepsis, it signifies to Cleanse or Wash.*

Joh. Binch. in his *Mel. Theol.* Loc 26. Page 155. *Baptizo, viz. en aquam immergendo, vel aqua aspergendo. Baptizo (says he) viz. Immerging into water, or Sprinkling with Water.*

The Renowned *Wendeline* in his *Mel. Theol.* Lib. 1. Pag. 838. Renders *Baptizo* by *Conspergo*, and *abluo*, To Sprinkle or Wash.

I find by me one Celebrated Critick more it is *Joseph Lang.* his *Polyanthea Nova* in verb *Baptismus*, saith *Grece Baptismos et est ablutio, &c. Baptism. in Greek, Baptismos, and is a Washing &c.*

Thus,

Thus, Sir, I have perused all the *Lexicographers* and *Criticks*, I have by me, and have shewn you, how much Truth there is in Mr. Gale's bold assertion, That Pag. 132 *The genuine Sense of Baptizo, the Critick Constantly affirm is Mergo, Immergo, &c. To Dip and Plunge.*

If he intends by this Paragraph, that *Criticks* constantly affirm, That it signifies nothing else but to *Dip* and *Plunge*, it is utterly false, as you see in the above cited Instances, and he must be a Man of a Brazen Front, so confidently to assert it: But if he intends that *Criticks* constantly acknowledge; that it has the meaning he pleads for, it is true, but then it Labours of a small Imperfection, viz. it is nothing to his purpose; and he might have spared the pains of his following Quotations; for we all acknowledge it: But we also find, that it signifies to *Wash*, and Even to *Sprinkle*, as well as to *Dip*.

You see, by what has been said, how little Mr. Gale is to be Relied on, he having been very much out of the way in this Instance, we have great Reason to suspect him, in every thing else, that Depends upon his Authority.

I am persuaded, that not only these Authors that I have cited, but Even all other *Criticks* in general, will assign the meaning I plead for, to the word. *Baptizo*; but I have none else by me, nor advantages to obtain any in this obscure part of the world.

The next thing that lies before us, is to
B
consider

consider the use of the word in Scripture, and see whether it always, as Mr. Gale pretends, signifies *Dipping* there;

I shall offer you but one Instance out of the *Seventy's Translation of the Old Testament*, and one out of the *Apocrypha*; for the former being but a Translation, and the latter not Canonical Writ, the use of the Word in them is not so much to be depended upon, as in the *New Testament*, where the original Text (in which the Phrase, as well as sense, was Dictated by the Spirit of God) will fall under our Consideration.

That of the *Septuagint*, is in *Dan. 4. 39.* *The same hour was the thing fulfilled upon Nebuchadnezzar, and he was Driven from men, and did Eat Grass as Oxen, and his Body was wet; (Ebapha) with the Dew of Heaven.*

One would have thought this Instance so clear, that there would have been left no Room for Cavil; for can there be a greater Solecism, than to speak of being *Dipt* or *Plunged* in the Dew?

But Mr. Gale tells us, page 141. ' That the Chaldee word *Tahang*, and the Hebrew Word *Tabal*, the former of which is the original word in this place; Necessarily imply to *Dip*, and every Body must own signify nothing but to *Dip*. *Esq; Leigh* is as worthy to be depended upon in this case, as our Author, who in his *Critica sacra* Renders the word *Tabal*, by *Immergit*, &c. to which heads, ' *Ita Levit. Res non immergit sed tantum attingat humore,*
, *vel*

vel tota vel ex parte. It so washes that the thing, many't be cleansed, &c, And *Tabang*, (the word under dispute) he Renders *Immersus, Infixus, Affixus, Impressus fuit*, Immersed, Infix'd, Affix'd, Impressed. And I'm sure that the latter of these Constructions, that the Dew was *Impressed*, or fell upon him, is better sense than that he was *Dipt* in the Dew.

That the words may be sometimes used in the sense He assigns them, I don't Deny, but not always.

Our Author is again driven to his usual subterfuge, a *Metaphorical meaning*; and says Page 242. 'Its Evident that *Daniel* and his Translators, designed to Express the great Dew, *Nebuchadrezzar* should be Exposed to, more Emphatically, by saying, that he should lie in Dew, and be Covered with it all over, as if he had been *Dipt*. This Metaphorical sense, he endeavours to vindicate by alledging, 'That the Dews in the East are generally very large; which he Confirms by the Instance of *Gideon's Fleece* (which being miraculous, is very Improperly urged in this Case) But all this Harrangue is very impertinent; for it's plain that the Scope and Drift of the words, was not to shew the quantity of the Dew he was wet with (he was Exposed to no Dew but what was ordinary; there needed therefore not Emphasis upon the words) But the Brutal sort of Life, that so great a *Monarch* was brought unto, by the Just (the amazing) Judgement of God; How he was

turned out from Humane Society, and instead of his magnificent Palace, which he with so much Haughtiness gloried in, had no Roof but the Sky, to Cover him, and to shelter him, from the Injuries of the Weather, and the Dew of Heaven. This is evidently the Scope of the Story, and therefore it stands in no need of (but has apparent violence offered by) such metaphorical Constructions, as he puts upon it.

The next place I shall mention; is, That *Eccles. 34. 29.* He that washeth (*Baptizomenos*) because of a Dead Body, and toucheth it again, what availeth his washing? That the Washing here spoken of, was by *Sprinkling* is most certain, and will appear Evident (notwithstanding all Mr. Gale says to the Contrary) If the Institution of this Rite be duly Consider'd, you'll find it in *Levit. 19.* throughout *v. 13.* 'Whosoever toucheth the Dead Body of any man that is Dead, and purifyeth not himself, Defileth the Tabernacle of the Lord, and that Soul shall be cut off from *Israel*, because the water of separation was not *Sprinkled* upon him. *vers. 18.* And a clean Person shall take Hyssop, and Dip it in the water, and *Sprinkle* it upon the Tent; and upon all the Vessels, and upon the Persons that were there, and upon him that touched a Bone, or one slain, or one Dead, or a Grave. *vers. 19.* And the Clean Person shall *Sprinkle* upon the Unclean, on the third Day, and on the Seventh Day; And on the Seventh Day we shall purify himself, and wash

, with his Cloaths, and Bathe himself in Water,
 , and shall be Clean at Even. From this last
 Cited verse our Author tells us, *Pag. 146.* That
 , the Defiled Person was to be sprinkled with
 , Holy Water, on the third, and on the Seventh
 , Day, preparatory to the great Purification,
 , that was to be by Washing the Body, and
 , Cloathes on the Seventh Day. This is a gross
 mistake, for it was the Clean Person officiating,
 not the Unclean by touching the Dead, that
 was to wash his Cloathes, and Bathe himself in
 Water. This appears, 1. By the two following
verses, 14. 20. But the man that shall be Un-
 , clean; and shall not purify himself, shall be
 , Cut off from the Congregation; Because he
 , hath Defiled the Sanctuary of the Lord; the
 , water of Separation hath not been sprinkled
 , upon him, he is unclean. He is Unclean, not
 because he hath not *Bathed himself*; But because
 he hath not been *Sprinkled* with the Water of
 Separation. But the next *Vers*e puts it out of all
 Doubt, who was to Bathe himself in Water,
vers. 21. It shall be a perpetual Statute to them, that
he that sprinkles the Water of Separation; shall wash
his Cloathes, &c. This also further appears
 from the *7th verse*, which you may be pleased to
 turn to.

2. This is Evident also, if you Consider, that
 it was the Water to be *sprinkled*, and not the
 Bathe, that is all along called, *The Water of*
Separation, and of Cleansing, and of Purification,
 as in *vers. 12, 13, 17, 20, 21,* --- which is will
 be

be too tedious to transcribe again ; and I desire you therefore to turn to them.

Page. 147 Mr. Gale subjoyns, That ' it can't be Reasonably Imagined, that the Priest by barely purifying the Unclean, should need so much greater Washing and Purification, than the Unclean himself. Here he is out again ; for the Bathe was the far lesser Cleansing. This will appear if you take notice of *Lev. 11. 31, 32.* and forward, where it is ordained, *That who so toucheth the Dead Body of a Beast, was to Wash his Cloathes, and so be Unclean unill the Evening ;* and so the Priest, in the Case before us ; but he that touched the Dead Body of a Man, had contracted a greater Pollution, and therefore was Unclean seven Dayes ; nor was the ordinary methods of Purification, sufficient for his Cleansing, but there must be all this adoe of Burning a Heifer, mingling her Ashes with Water, &c.

But after all, if it be granted, that the washing for a Dead Body, was not perfect without the *Bathe*, the word in the quoted Text, nevertheless includes *Sprinkling* (for that was certainly at least a part of the Washing spoken of) and Therefore does signify to *Sprinkle*, as well as to *Dip*.

We'll next look into the *New-Testament* and see whether it always there, necessarily signifies so *Dip*, and if we find it there of a different signification, tho' but in one Instance, I'm sure we have gained the Cause.

The

The first Place I'll turn to is *Luk 3. 16.* *shall Baptize (BAPTISEI) you, with the Holy Ghost, and with Fire.* You are sensible how Ridiculous it would be, to Translate the words, *he shall Dip or Plunge you with the Holy Ghost and with Fire.* Mr. Gale indeed Insinuates, That the *Pag. 182.* "Metaphorical use of the word, must be, on his side. But you must Consider (Sir) that we are to Interpret Metaphorical Speeches, by taking notice of what is primarily alluded to in them, which in the Case before us, is the *Cleansing* or *Purifying* the subject. The office of the *Holy Ghost* is to *Sanctify*, or *Purify*, (not to *Dip*) the *Heart* and their being *Baptized* by the *Holy Ghost*, intends no other, than to be sanctified, or *Renewed*, by the *Regenerating Efficacy* of *God's Holy Spirit*. There is here no manner of allusion to *Dipping*; but to *Washing* or *Cleansing* In general, or rather to *Affusion*, for those that are *Baptized* or sanctified by the *Holy Ghost*, are said to have it *Come*, or be poured upon them. Thus *Mat. 3. 16.* *And he saw the Spirit of God, descending like a Dove, and lighting upon him.* And *Isa. 44. 3.* *I will pour my Spirit upon thy seed.* So also *Joel. 2. 28.*

The next place I take notice of, is *Mark. 7. 4.* *And when they come from the market, Except they wash (BAPTISONTAI) they Eat not, and many other things there be, which they have Receiv'd to hold, as the Washing. (BAPTISMOIS) of Cups and Pots, Brazen Vessels, and of Tables.* But I must put you in mind, that tho' it be here Translated
 Tables.

Tables, the original word [*Klinon*] is *Beds*, and never signifies otherwise, nor do I ever find it otherwise Translated, our English version only Excepted.

It may be worthy of Remark, that *Beza* and *Erasmus* Translate the word *BAPTISIONIAI*, *Locu lucrini*, They were Washed; and *Baptismus*, *Lotio es*, Washings; and so also our English version, which I think much better answers the meaning of the Text, than the sense *Mr. Gale* pleads for.

Our Authors long Discourse upon this Text, will hardly persuade any man to believe, that it was the Custom of these *Hemerobapists*, to Dip or Plunge themselves under water, every time they eat Meat, and every time they came from the Market; They must be Persons of hardy Constitutions, to bear immersion under water three times every Day, especially in Cold Weather, besides their occasional *Baptisms* when they came from the Market: But I'm sure your opinion for *Mr. Gale* cannot so put out the Eyes of your Reason, as to render it credible to you, that they plunged their *Beds* under Water every time they Lay upon them; for if so, they would find but little comfort in them, especially in the Winter.

I shan't Contend with *Mr. Gale* about his novel Construction of the former part of this verse; But he may, for me, embrace his opinion, that they were not personally *Baptized*, when they came from the market, but only *Baptized*
what

what they bought there, These Consequences must be improved against him; if this Sense be allowed him.

1. That many things bought at the Market were utterly Ruined, and Rendred useles, if *Dip* under Water, as *Meal*, *Bread*, and numberless other things.

2. That this *Baptizing* was usual with them before they went to Meat, whether they came from the Market or not, as is evident from the Text, and from their being Scandalized at our Saviours omission of it.

3. Their *Baptizing* their *Beds*, by *Dipping*, will (this Construction granted) be nevertheless Incredible, and Unintelligible.

4. If they had water enough in *Jerusalem* to *Baptize* themselves (by *Dipping*, every time they went to Meat, and to *Dip* their *Beds* under Water, every time they Lay on 'em. Then,

1. *Jerusalem* abounded with Water, that so many Thousands could be *Plunged*, three times every Day, which won't be easily Received, by those acquainted with the sacred story, where we find such pains Taken for, and such an Estimate put upon their Wells of Water. And,

2. If Water was plenty enough for the above mentioned purposes, then *John* had no need to *Baptize* at *Enon near to Salim*, for the sake of Water to *Dip* in, there being a daily practical evidence, that there was water enough at *Jerusalem*, and Elsewhere.

These things Considered, I think it falls but little

little short of Demonstration, that the *Baptizing*, in the quoted Text, was not by *Immersion*. But I pass on.

To take Notice of 1 Cor. 10. 1, 2. [*Moreover Brethren I would not that ye should be Ignorant, how that all our Fathers were under the Cloud, and all passed through the Sea; — and were all Baptized (EBAPTISANTO) unto Moses in the Cloud.*

This *Baptism* was Evidently by Sprinkling, and no otherwise; For would it not be a Trifling, unworthy of our Notice, to say, That their being wet, and Refreshed by Rain from a Cloud, was *Dipping* them under Water? And that the *Baptism* here spoken of, was by Rain from the Cloud, (under which the Apostle here says they were *Baptized*) will not remain Doubtful, when you have Read *Psal. 68. 7, 8, 9. O God, when thou wentest forth before thy People, when thou marchedst thro' the Wilderness, the Earth Shook, the Heavens Dropped, at the presence of God, &c. Thou, O God, didst send a plentiful Rain, whereby thou didst Confirm (or Refresh) thine Inheritance, when it was weary. We find the Heavens Dropped, the Clouds Rained, &c. which was undoubtedly, the *Baptism* referred to by the Apostle. And I'm sure I need not say much to convince you, that they were not *Dipt* in the Cloud, nor *Plunged* in the Rain.*

We'll next look into *Heb. 9, 10. Which stood only in Meats and Drinks, and Divers Washings [BAPTISMOIS] and Carnal Ordinances.*

This is a Home-Thrust, and therefore puts our Author into a Sweat to turn it aside; which by all
his

his Elaborate Pains he is not able to Effect. The Substance of what he Says, and upon which all his tedious Harrangue is founded, is page 169. "That the Words, for ought he knows to the contrary, may speak of those Washings only, which were by *Bathing* or *Dipping* into Water. This I shall therefore consider,

1. We shall first observe the End and Scope of these words, which was to shew, that all the Legal Cleansings under the *Mosaick Paedology*, were Typical of our being savingly Cleaned from the Pollution and Defilement of Sin, by the Laver of Christ's Blood; and therefore not Sufficient, to make him that did the Service perfect, as pertaining to the Conscience. And does it look at all likely, that the Apostle in shewing the Deficiency of all the *Jewish* Washings should Referr them only to the *Bathings*, which were by far the Least part of the Washings in use amongst them.

2. The words are not true in fact, if our Authors construction be allowed; it did not stand ONLY in divers *Bathings* and *Dippings*, there was divers *Sprinklings* also used for their Purgations, and that even in Cases of the greatest Defilement; But I Charitably Hope he was not aware of this Consequence: But to make all clear.

3. We'll allow the Apostle Liberty to Explain himself what Washings it was he refers to, and that he has done in the following verses. v. 13. 14. *If the Blood of Bulls, and of Goats and the Ashes of an Heifer, Sprinkling the unclean, Sanctifies to the purifying of the flesh, How much more shall the Blood of Christ? &c.* This

This makes it clear, beyond doubt, that the Washings Spoken of, were principally the *Sprinklings* used among the *Jews*; for these, and these only, he Instanceth in, and refers to, *Num. 8, 7,* and *19. per totum*, upon which I have particularly discoursed above.

By this time you can't but see, that the word in Debate, signifyes something Else beside *Dipping, and Plunging.*

I am already (and I'm perswaded you also) grown weary of this word *Controversy*, you'll therefore Excuse me from further searching after, the meaning of the word in Scripture, when I've only Remark't,

That the word in Debate is frequently used in Scripture; where (if the Sense *Mr. Gale* pleads for, be allowed, and it does signify to *Dip*) it will be far from Justifying the *Antipoedobaptists* in their Method of administering the Ordinance, for it don't necessarily (where it does signify to *Dip*) Imply, the *Immersion* of the whole Body, which is Clear,

1 From *Luk. 16. 24.* And send Lazarus, that he may Dip (Baple) the Tip of his Finger in Water, and cool my Tongue.

2. From *Luk. 11. 38.* And when the Pharisee saw it, he marvelled that he had not first washed, (EBAPTISTHE) before Dinner. This compared with *Mark. 7, 5* makes it Evident, that the washing of the Hand, is the *Baptism* of the man. Whether the hands were washed by *Dipping.* or *Affusion,* is not what I am now Enquiring; but what

what I observe is, that the Pharisee admired that he was not first *Baptized* (for so are the words Litterally to be translated) before Dinner, when the Washing of the Hand only, was what he Referred to. --- And also to the same purpose ;

3. From *Mat 26. 23.* *He that Dippeth (EMBAPSAS) his Hand, with me in the Dish.* Hence then I argue, If *Dipping* the Tip of the Finger in Water be (*Baptizing* ; If Washing the Hands be *Baptizing* the man ; If *Dipping* the Fingers into a Sop, be *Baptizing* the hand, Then the word *Baptize*, does not necessarily signify to *Dip* the whole Body, nor has our *Saviour* in requiring us to *Baptize*, required us to *Plunge* the Body under Water. So that if we allow them all they plead for, (and which none of them can ever prove) that the word *Baptizo* does signify to *Dip*, and only to *Dip*, yet it does not vindicate their practice, of a total *Immersion* ; for *Dipping* the *Face*, the *Hand*, *Foot*, *Nay*, the *Finger*, is a *Baptism*.

I have here indeed used the words *Bapto* and *Baptizo*, as Synonomous, with which our Author can find no fault, since he has assured us, that they are ; page 217. “ *Exactly the same,* “ *as to their signification.*

But if there be (as many have Learnedly argued) any difference in these words, it is altogether on our side : for if *Bapto* does not necessarily include *Dipping*, in its signification, all Mankind will acknowledge it certain, that

Baptizo

of them approve, and argue for *Sprinkling in Baptism*;

And this seems to have been the only Mode of administering the Ordinance in the early Ages of the Church, by that Story of *Clemens Alexand.* Related by *Eusebius Hist. Eccles. Lib. 3. cap. 20.* of an apostate youth, who after he had made a profession of *Christianity*, and enjoyed the Ordinance of *Baptism*; forsook the wayes and fear of God, pursued all manner of Dissolute Courses; Headed a Company of Thieves, and Banditti, gave himself up to Slaughter, Murther, and Extream Cruelty. This being made known to the *Apostle John* (who before had committed him to the Care of a Godly *Bishop*, for Education and Instruction in the Faith) He pursues him into the Wilderness, and finding him, brings him unto such a Sense of, and Repentance for his past course of Extravagance, that embracing the *Apostle*, he answered him as well as he could, for weeping; So that again (says the Hystorian) *he seem'd to be Baptized with Tears, The Shaking the Hand only omitted.*

Whether this Story be true or Fabulous, makes nothing to the purpose, but what I observe is, that this Ordinance was, in those Early Centuries, administred by *Shaking the Hand*, consequently not by *Dipping* or *Plunging*: (he could not be dipt in his Tears) but by *Affusion*, or *Asperison*; unto which that gesture is necessary.

I shall not weary your patience with the
many,

Baptizo can't be limited to that sense only.

Mr. Gale next endeavours to prove his mode of *Baptism*, by Citations from the Fathers of the Church, To all which its Answer sufficient,

1. That the most that he quotes are too late to determine the matter, This matter; This Mr. Gale supposes sufficient answer to Mr. Wall, when he quotes *Arrian of Nicomedia* Page 355. "That he lived not, until an Hundred and fifty Years after Christ; whereas these he Cites, are much later.

2. Where he does make a shew of having primitive Antiquity on his side, he does but abuse his Reader. For Instance,

1. He brings in *St. Barnabas* saying, That *we descend into the Water, full of Sins and Defilement, &c.* If he had done fairly by his Reader, he would have told him, that *St. Barnabas* Words might as truly have been translated, *We go unto the Water and come from the Water*; for so the prepositions he renders *into*, and *Out Of*, are very frequently used, as you'll see at Large hereafter. And

2. He quotes the *Apostolick Constitutions*, which he knows are Univerſally (by all learned men) acknowledged, to be spurious, and of a later date; He should therefore, have disabused his Reader, by giving him that account. All other his Citations, fall under the former Exception. To which I may add,

3. That the Fathers of the Church (as he knows, and is forced to acknowledge) do some of

Words, is the difference of Ideas, they stand for. He tells us again Book 3. Chap 7. S 4. In the Hebrew Tongue there is a Particle consisting of but one single Letter, of which there are reckoned up, as I remember, Seventy, I'm sure above Fifty Several Significations. He goes on to Instance in our English Word BUT, of which he finds Five (and doubts not but he could if it were his Business to examine it, find a great many more) Significations.

I might also observe to you, That we have some words, even in our Language, of a quite Contrary Signification, to Instance in the word Let, Sometimes used to permit, as *Let me go,* sometimes to hinder, as I have met with many Lets in my way.

You may see by this how much his Assertions and how much his Quotations, are to be depended upon.

I shall now Conclude the first Controversy about the mode of Baptizing, when I have shewn you that we don't want sufficient Reason for our Mode of administering the Ordinance.

1. Then what is Signified by, Represented and Sealed to us, in this Ordinance, is (in Scripture) expressed by *Sprinkling*, and *Affusion*, but never by *Dipping* or *Plunging*, that I Remember. To Instance.

1. *Baptism* signifies the Washing away our Sins by the Blood of Christ, as in *Acts 22, 16. Arise be Baptized and wash away thy Sins.* Now the washing away our Sins by Christs Blood is frequently represented by *Sprinkling*, as *1 Pet. 1, 2*
C
Through

many other Authorities of the *Ancients*, that might here be Introduced ; but only observe to you, That our Author himself brings in *Origen*, one of the most capable Judges among them all) rendering the word (*BEBAMMEΛON*) *Baptized*, in *Rev.* 19. 13. By *ERANTISME. NON*, *Sprinkled*, But rather than vail to the Authority of this Father, and of the *Syriac* and *Ethiopic* Versions, which also render it so, He would fain believe *Page* 181. That the Text itself is wrong, and that the word there has been altered. But why so ? is there any Copy of the *New Testament* in the World, to be found, that has any other Reading, different from the vulgar ? no ! But how is it possible for *Origen*, and those Early Versions to understand the word otherwise, than he does, or of any Larger signification ?

You see, *Sir*, what strange Refuges a Disperate Cause must have, that Men will rather suppose a Mistake in the Scripture, than in themselves.

Our Author must think that all Mankind has laid aside the use of their Reason, and that no body could read but himself, when with such an Air he ventures to say, *P.* 109 101. “ That he is inclined “ to believe, That in general is a mistake, that “ Words have more than one Signification. And for this to quote *Mr Lock* in the third Book of his *Essay of Human Understanding*. Let us Look into him and see what he says. *Book* 3 *Chap.* 9 *S.* 4 *That then* (says he) *that makes Doubtfulness, and uncertainty in the signification of some more than other Words,*

Through Sanctification of the Spirit unto Obedience, and Sprinkling of the Blood of Jesus Christ *Isa. 52, 15. So shall he Sprinkle many Nations Ezek. 36 25 I will Sprinkle clean water upon you, and ye shall be clean Heb. 12, 24. And to the Blood of Sprinkling, which speaks better than the Blood of Abel.*

2. The signification of *Baptism* is the Answer of a good Conscience, as the Apostle tells us, *1 Pet. 3 21. and this is also represented by Sprinkling; Heb. 10, 22. Having our Hearts Sprinkled from an Evil Conscience.*

3. *Baptism* Represents unto us our Sanctification and Cleansing by, and the Gifts of the Holy Ghost. Hence these Metaphorical Expressions of being *Baptized with the Holy Ghost*, before spoken of, and this is Set forth in Scripture by *Affusion*; as in the fore-cited *Isai. 43, 4. I will Pour my Spirit upon thy Seed. And Joel 2, 28. I will pour out my Spirit upon all Flesh.*

2. It can't be proved from Scripture, that the Ordinance was ever administered by *Dipping* or *Plunging*. there are indeed Expressions that seem to favour this mode of *Baptism*. but if Examined, will not prove so unanswerable as Mr. Gale. pretends. I shall distinctly consider the Texts, that he Cites for that purpose.

The first is *Joh. 3. 23. And John also was Baptizing in Enon, near to Salim, because there was much Water there. Here note,*

1 That the words in the original are, *because there was (hudata polla) Many Waters there. And Travellers assure us, that it is a place of many Springs,*

Springs, and therefore not likely to Dip those Multitudes in, that came there to be *Baptized*.

2. *John* being in the Wilderness, there was occasion for much Water, that the multitudes which attended his *Baptism* might have Water for themselves, and Horses, or other Creatures (on which its probable many of them Rid thither) to Drink, Many Springs of Water seem much more suitable to this purpose, than for *Dipping* or *Plunging* men.

3. While the Rites of Purification were continued among the *Jews*, it would have been thought a Scandal, for the same Vessel of Water to have been used for the *Baptizing* of many Persons, and therefore there needed much Water for this Administration, though it had been by *Affusion* or *Aspersion*.

4. If all that *John Baptized* had been *Dipt*, he must have stood whole Dayes together in the Water, and therefore could not have survived that Imployment but by Miracle.

5. If Three Thousand were *Baptized* at *Jerusalem* in one afternoon, (*Acts*. 2. 41,) Either they were *Baptized* by *Sprinkling* or *pouring* on the Water, Else there was no need of going to *Enon*, near to *Salim*, for the sake of much Water to *Dip* in.

As for their being *Baptized* of *John* in the *River Jordan*, it does not as *Ex. m. Fort. D. sp.* *Mr. Morgan* has Ingeniously Remark't; any more prove their being *plunged* all over in it, than the mans *Washing* his *Eyes* in the *Pool* of

Siloam *John. 9. 7.* proves his being *Dipt* all over. *Mr. Gale* Demands, "Which is most natural to Suppose, that the River was poured or Sprinkled on them, or they *Dipt* in the River? I assume the former, *Its most natural to Suppose, that the River* (by a *Synechdoche* of a part for the whole) was poured or Sprinkled on them, as in the above Example, of the mans washing his Eyes in the Pool of *Siloam*.

The next Text he brings to prove this Mode of Baptism, is That *Acts 8. 38.* *And they went both into the Water, both Phillip, and the Eunuch, and he Baptized him.* In answer to which; its sufficient to Say, That the Preposition (*Eis*) here rendred *into*, might as properly be Read *Unto* the Water, and so it is very often used in the Scriptures; It does not therefore necessarily argue, that he was Baptized by *Dipping*. *Mr. Morgan* has (in the above-cited Book) collected Sundry Instances, wherein this Preposition necessarily signifies *unto*, and *against*, whom for your satisfaction I'll transcribe " *Job. 13. 2. Eis*
 " *Telos, unto that End, Joh. 7. often Eis teen*
 " *Eoreon, unto the Feast Acts 29. often unto*
 " *Jerusalem. Mat. 18. 15. Ean Amartese Eis*
 " *se adelphos, If thy Brother trespass Against thee;*
 " *John. 12. 17. Eis teen Hemeran; Against the*
 " *Day, (not Into it), for she Spent her Oyntment*
 " *before the Day came. Thus he. To which*
 I may add an Instance wholly Unexceptionable; It is *Job. 20. 4* So they Ran both together, and the other Disciple did out run Peter and came first To (*Eis*) the Sepulchre, Here its most certain, that

that it does not signify *into* ; for in the Next Verse, the *H. Ghost* assures That he Went *not into* the sepulchre, no further than Just to Look in ; v. 5. *And he Stooping Down, and looking in, saw the Lining Cloathes lying ; Yet went he not in.* Many more Instances might be Produced, to shew that this Preposition. [EIS] may properly be translated *unto* ; from this Text therefore is nothing Evident, but that they went *unto* the water

Our Adversaries often urge our Saviours coming *Out* Of the Water, after his *Baptism*, Mat. 3. 16. But this is far from being to their purpose ; for the Words truly translated are, he went straightway *From* the Water, for thus I think the Preposition (*Apo*) is always to be understood ; it answers the Latin Prepositions *A, Ab, Abs*, and the English *from*. Thus, Mat. 1. 17. It is used no less than three times going, *so all the generations from [Apo] Abraham to David are Fourteen generations ; and from (Apo) David until the carrying away into Babylon, are Fourteen generations ; and from (Apo) the Carrying away into Babylon, unto Christ, are Fourteen generations.* Thus also, Mat. 19. 8. *Ap^o Arches, From the Beginning.* Thus Mat. 4. 25. *Apo res Gallilias, from Gallilee.* And thus Acts 10. 17. *Behold the men which were sent From (Apo) Cornelius, &c.* But I need not add Instances ; for this is the native and Constant meaning of the Word.

Though Mr. Gale urges these Texts With Earnestness enough, yet when he finds this Preposition Construed to his disadvantage, he Lear-
nedly.

nedly, and indeed truly argues, that *Page 440, 441.* *Apo* signifies *From*, in propriety of speech. So that all Arguments from *Christ*, and the *Eunuchs* coming *Out* of the *Water*, are by his own Pleas wholly out of Doors.

It is further worthy of Remark that we never Read any thing of going *To* the *Water*, or *From* the *Water*, in *Baptism*, Except in the *Wilderness*, or places distant from *Inhabitants*, where in all likelihood they wanted *Vessels*, to take up *Water* in.

But after all, were it granted that they actually went *into* the *Water*, its no Evidence that they were *Dipt* or *Plunged* into it; they might go into the *Water*, and not be wet up to their *Ankles*.

The next Text he brings is *Col. 2. 12.* and *Rom 6, 4.* Which are both of the same Import; and therefore may be Considered together. That upon which, he Lays The Stress of his Argument, is, our being *Buried with Christ in Baptism*. When he argues, That as *Christ* was Buried under the *Earth*, so should we be Buried under *Water*. In Answer to which, it is sufficient to tell you,

1. That the whole Scope of the Text is to shew us that we are *Baptized* to a Conformity unto *Christ's* Death, by our *Dying* to *Sin*; and to his *Rising* again in our living to *God*; Here is not the least Intimation that our Bodies should be buried under *Water*; and I can't but wonder that a Gentleman of Mr. Gale's Ingenuity should urge it.

2. Our manner of Administring the Ordinance, more Imitates a Burial than theirs; the throwing Water on the *Baptized*, is more like throwing Earth on the Dead. Dead men don't use to be *Dipt*, or *plunged* into the ground.

3. Our Author gives an answer to this himself, It he'll be tyed to the same meat as he would limit us *Page 180.* " All Metaphorical Passages (says he) are out of Doors, Because of their Ambiguoulnels, and Obscurity. I'll only add,

4. Our Adversaries themselves do practically deny their Commentary upon this Text, for the Administrator of this ordinance (among them) never *Dipt* but a part of the Body, nor are they but partly Buried under Water in *Baptism*. The Person to be *Baptized* goes into the Water himself above the Waste, and therefore either partly Baptizes himself, or else nothing but his upper parts are Baptized at all.

The *Antipoedobaptists* call for Express Proof, that Infants are to be Baptized; Let them therefore produce Express Proof, that this Ordinance is to be administered by *Dipping*.

3 We have Instances in the scriptures of the Administration of this Ordinance, that we can't Reasonably suppose was by *Dipping*. It is Scarce possible the three Thousand *Baptized* at *Jerusalem* (most certainly toward the Close of the Day) *Acts. 2. 41.* were all *Dipt*. The Jailors whole Household were *Baptized* in the Dead of the night, *Acts 16. 33.* *And was' Baptized, he, and*

all his straightway. There is not the least probability, that they went out unto any Depth of Water for it. Nor any more probability, that *Paul* was *Dipt*, as you'll see if you'll Read *Acts. 9. 9.* And the very Text it self seems to Contradict the *Dipping* of *Cornelius* and his Household, *Acts. 10. 47.* Can any man forbid Water, that these should not be Baptized? He does not say, who shall forbid them going to the Water, in order to be Baptized, But; *Who shall forbid Water,* (that is the bringing of Water) for that purpose. Finally, the Degree of the Washing is not any thing Essential to the Right administration of the Ordinance, any more than the quantity of the Bread and Wine, in the Lords Supper. Which may be Illustrated by transcribing *Job. 13. 8, 9, 10.* *Peter* said unto him, *Thou shalt never wash my Feet;* *Jesus* answered him. *If I wash thee not, thou hast no part with me,* *Simon Peter* saith unto him, *Lord, not my Feet only, but also my Hands and my Head;* *Jesus* saith unto him, *He that is washed, needeth not Save to wash his Feet, but is clean Every whis.* Though our Saviour did not Institute this Ceremony of Washing their Feet; as a standing Sacrament, yet he did thereby put them in mind of the necessity of their being washed in his Blood, from the Pollution of Sin, as is evident from his saying, *They had Else no part with him.* And we see that washing but a part of the Body, did sufficiently signify the Sanctification of the whole Man; and why then washing a part of the Body in *Baptism,* does

does not sufficiently Signify the Cleansing of the whole Man, our Adversaries are accountable.

Thus I have, as briefly as the Task you Imposed upon me, would allow, dispatched the first part of the Controversy.

HAVING finished my *Remarks* (I hope to your Satisfaction) on the *First*, it is time to Consider the *second*, and principal Article in Dispute; which, Refers to the subject of *Baptism*.

Mr Gale is forced, *Pag. 220.* To *Take breath a while*, before he Enters upon this, that he might Regain his Vigour, and strength to Encounter his Adversary, in this new Combate; but as he Toiled himself out of Breath, to but very little purpose, in his former Attempt, so (you'll find, *Sir*;) that his new Accession of Spirits and strength, will be but little Service to him, in this fresh Encounter.

He promises, *Pag. 220.* To "avoid all he can the Celebrated Arguments, from Original Sin, and Circumcision, which have been (as he says) so often, and fairly Baffled. In this Indeed was his prudence very Considerable, for as often Baffled as they have been they Remain yet too powerfull for him to abide in the field.

He proceeds to Lay the Foundation of a long, and triumphant Harrangue, by telling us, *Pag. 221.* That *Mr. Wall* "very freely allows, that "it can't be made appear from the *Scriptures* " that

“ that Infants are to be *Baptized*. Were this
 “ true, *Mr. Wall* had indeed given up the Cause,
 and made a voluntary offer of the Lawrels of
 Victory, to his Adversary : But tho’ he does most
 seriously, and frequently affirm, it, . han’t io
 Extensive a Charity, as to believe it ; But con-
 clude, That in this (as frequently else-where)
 he watches all opportunities, Right or wrong,
 to make, *Candida de nigris, et de candemibus*
nra i. e. Our opinion Black, and his White.

I dare not, indeed, affirm, That there is no
 such passage in *Mr. Wall’s* Book, (I not having
 seen it) But am sure that the Passages quoted,
 fall to very far short of any such Concession, that
 there can’t be modestly any such Construction
 (unless by a far fetch’t Innuendo) put upon
 them ; And I am ready to Conclude, that if
Mr. Wall had said it, our Author would not have
 been so tender of him, as not to transcribe it.

He indeed brings in *Mr. Wall* saying, That
 there is no particular Direction given, what to do,
 with Reference to the Children of those that Received
 the faith. And that among all the Persons, that are
 Recorded as Baptized by the Apostles, there is no Ex-
 press mention made of any Infant, &c. But what is
 this like acknowledging that it can’t be made
 appear from the Scriptures, that Infants are to
 be Baptized ? Much may be made appear from
 Scripture, that is not Expressly mentioned there,
 as the Admission of Women unto the Lords
 Supper, the Change of the Sabbath, and the
 Baptism even of the Apostles themselves, &c.

It is a Ruled Case, That good Consequences drawn from Scripture, are as much to be Relyed on, as the Express words of it.

Did not our Lord prove the Resurrection, by Consequences from Scripture? *Mat. 22. 31.* Did not the *Apostle* use Consequential Reasoning, when he argues from *Dem. 25. 4.* (*Thou shalt not muzzle the Mouth of the Ox that treadeth forth the Corn*) to the maintenance of the Gospel Ministers, *1 Cor. 9. 9*? And does he not use Consequential Arguments, when he argues from the Priesthood of *Melchizedec*, to the Priest-hood of *Christ*, *Heb. 7.* *per totum? Cum multis aliis* you hence see, that what is not Expressly mentioned in the Scriptures, may be evidently enough proved from them. And tho' *Mr. Wall* grants, that there is no Express mention of Infants, he may be far enough from acknowledging that it can't be proved from Scripture, that Infants should be Baptized. I insist more particularly here, to shew you the disingenuity of *Mr. Gale* in this Case, and how little he is to be depended upon, that will thus venture to say any thing; as well as to defeat the vanity of their common Outcry, *Let there be Express Scripture produced, that Infants should be Baptized.*

But it is not so material whether *Mr. Wall* allows, or disallows this Allegation, as whether it is true in fact; which if it appears to be, (as our Author would persuade us it is) our Cause, I must confess, is Expiring, and must quickly give up the Ghost. But I find so little grounds

of Dependance upon *Mr. Gales* Word, that I rather Examine the Cause, than strike to his bold *Ipsc Dixit*; And if upon a fair Examination, it does appear from Scripture, that Infants ought to be Baptized, He may Order a *Deleatur* upon his whole 6th Letter, for the Lawrels he so hastily Snatches up will appear to be withered, and his whole Triumphant Cant, but a vain Boast. But its time to come into the Enquiry:

Arg. 1. If Infants have *Faith*, they are qualified for, and ought to enjoy the Ordinance of *Baptism*. That *Faith* qualifyes for *Baptism*, is what I think no *Antipaedobaptist* will deny. The Consequence is Clear, and unexceptionable, see *Mark. 16. 16. Acts. 16. 31. 33.* It only Remains to prove from Scripture, that Infants have *Faith*; which you shall now see done, I hope, to your Satisfaction.

I freely own, that the Acts, and Exercises of *Faith* they are no more capable of, than the Acts, and Exercises of *Reason*; but as all men will allow them the Habits of *Reason*; I can't see why they should deny them the Habits of *Faith*. I'm sure there is the same Cause to Deny their being Rational Creatures, as Believers. And our Adversaries will hardly be able to tell us why they mayn't, (the want of the Exercise of *Reason* notwithstanding) as well be Believers, as Covenant-Breakers; as Uncircumcised Infants are styled, *Gen. 17. 14.* But this won't Remain Doubtful, when you Consider,

1. That they are Expressly styled *Believers* in *Christ*,

Christ, by him whose Authority must not be called in question. *Mat. 18. 2, 6.* And Jesus called a little Child unto him, and set him in the midst of them, and said, *Whoso shall offend one of these little Ones, which believe in me, &c.* This is plain and full Testimony; and the Objections commonly thrown in the way; to evade the force hereof, are but light, and trivial.

Its Objected that our Lord by Little One here may only mean those that are little in their own Eyes, those that are humble, &c. But this mistake is Evident enough, only by comparing the Consequent with the Antecedent. *One of these Little Ones, which believe in me.* What little ones? See verse 2^d. It was one of those little Ones, which Christ took in his Hands, and set in the midst of them, which was a *Little Child*. It does not any thing strength the Objection, that our Lord in the 3^d and 4th verses, urged the necessity of becoming as little Children, and as this Child, preparatory to our Entering the Kingdom of Heaven. This indeed refers to the Meekness, Humility, &c. necessary to all his Disciples; but observe, that in the 3^d and 4th verses, he does not tell them that they must become such little Children or such a Child as this, (as the *Antipocdabaptists* in *Germany* Dreamed, and therefore went playing about the streets with Rattles, &c. But as little Children and as this Child.

The Disciples had been Contending among themselves, who should be the greatest, as you'll see in the parallel Text, *Mark 9. 34.* He therefore takes a little Child in his arms, as a fit pattern,

tern to teach them Humility; and tells them, they must become as this little Child, &c.

2dly, As little Children affect not Dominion, nor Contend for Prerogative or Priority; As they are not given to Boast and Glory, nor prefer themselves to others; As they are not Haughty and Proud; As they are Meek, not Angry, Malicious, Vindictive; As they wholly depend upon their Fathers care and providence, &c. So must you be like them, &c. Whereas in the Text Insisted on, there is no comparison taken from the Child, the Occasion of the Discourse, as in the other Verses; But an Immediate Reference to that, and such like little Children: One of *These* little Children. Moreover,

The Scope and drift of our *Lords* Discourse in the 5th and 6th Verses, will help to Enlighten this. Our *Lord* is there shewing how much he values, and how highly Reverts Indignities done unto his Mystical Members, that he will well Reward the kindness shewn, and Revenge the Injuries done, to any of them, tho' but one of his Believing Infants, for his sake.

It is also objected, That this Child, tho' little, might be grown to some Years, and so be capable of Actual Faith. To which I answer,

1. He took the Child in his Arms, as *Mark* assures us, *Cap. 9 v. 35.* and it is therefore most Reasonable to conclude, that it was but in its Infancy.

2. The End of our Saviours presenting them
with

with that Emblem of *Humility, Meekness, &c.* was lost, if it was a Child arrived to an age capable of the *Acts of Reason and Faith*; for you are not so unacquainted with such little Children, as to be ignorant, how Proud, Pievish, Contentious, &c. they are, more I think at such an age, than any other.

If it be objected, That he called him, therefore he was not an Infant. I answer, He might call him in his nurses Arms, and it seems most probable that he did, by the forecited parrallel Text, *Mark, 9. 35.* Where its laid *he took him in his Arms.* But if otherwise, an Infant in Understanding, may be capable to go alone, and come when called.

As to the Objection, *That Infants can't be Offended,* Its too trivial to be taken notice of. Can't they be Reproached, Vilify'd, Scandalized, (as the Original Greek Word *Scandalise,* properly signifies)? Did *Hazael* offer no offence, or Injury to the Infants that he dashed to pieces, as was prophesied of him, in *2 Kings 8. 12.*

Our Adversaries Practice indeed makes evident their belief, that Infants can't be offended. This threatning of our *Lord* gainst those that do offend these little Ones, would Else make them tremble, when they deny them the Ordinances of the Gospel, a Station in the Church, and *Faith in Christ,* and Rank them among the Heathen.

2dly. Infants Either have *Faith* (habitual at least) or they can't be Saved, *He that Believeth*

not shall be damned, *Mark* 16, 16. *Job*. 3. 18, 36. It would be most Uncharitable Cruelty, as well as Express Contradiction to the Scriptures, to Deny Salvation unto all Infants, and to Damn them by whole-sale. And if they are saved without Faith, it must be in some way that the Gospel has never proposed; Nay, it must be in away directly Repugnant to the terms of Salvation, proposed in the Gospels. Can we any where find Salvation Exhibited to Graceless Infidels? And such are all Infants and such to be Esteemed, if without Faith.

Are they Sanctified and made Gracious, or do they all continue under the Pollution and Delement of Original sin? If the former, they must have Faith, the Sanctifying Grace and Root of all other Graces. If the Latter, they cannot be Saved, for no Unclean thing shall Enter into the Kingdom of Heaven. They must inevitably fall within the Reach of this Dilemma; Let then consult what Answer they will; For Infants must be Either Clean or Unclean, Sanctified or Polluted; If Sanctified, it must be by the Infusion of Grace, and Consequently of Faith; If Unsanctified, they can't be saved. I might yet prosecute this Argument, by shewing you,

3. That if they have not the Spirit of Christ they are none of his, *Rom.* 8. 9. And if they have the Spirit of Christ, Their Hearts are certainly purified by Faith, for the Holy Ghost will retake up his Dwelling, in an Impure and Unsanctified Mansion.

Mansion: But I believe what has been said will yield you Satisfaction.

What tho' we can't understand the Unsearchable Methods of the *Holy Spirit*, in begetting this Grace in them, He that calls them *Believers*, and sayes, of such are the Kingdom of Heaven, knows how to give them *Faith*, and a Title to his Kingdom. But I proceed to,

Argument 2. They that are in the Covenant of Grace, have a Right to have the Covenant Sealed to them by Baptism. But Infants of Believers are in the Covenant of Grace. This whole Argument receives sufficient Confirmation, from that *Acts 2. 38, 39.* Then Peter said unto them, Repent, and be Baptized, every one of you, in the name of Jesus Christ; for the Remission of Sins, &c. For the Promise is unto you, and to your Children. The Major of this Argument is plain from the Words, The Title they had to Baptism, and the Grounds of their being exhorted to it, was their Interest in the Covenant Promises; *Be Baptized; for the Promise is unto you.* And that Infants are in the Covenant of Grace, is no less Evident, *For the Promise is unto you, and your Children.* What can be plainer? And by the way, you may observe, That Infants have the same Claim to Baptism, as the Adult. By the Apostles argument in this Text, they are Exhorted to Be Baptized, in Order to receive Remission of Sins, and the *Holy Ghost*, which Exhortation is pressed upon them, from their Interest in the Promise, as an Enforcing Motive

D

and

and Encouragement, and as a Reason why they ought to be *Baptized*. Infants have the like Interest in the Promise (*The Promise is to you, and to your Children*) and therefore by Irresistible Consequence, the like Claim to *Baptism*.

It can't be Reasonably objected, That their Interest in the Promise was urged, only as an Encouragement unto them, that they should Receive Remission of Sins, and the Gift of the *Holy Ghost*; and not as a motive to their Being *Baptized*; For the Argument of the Apostle must have the next and most Immediate Reference, to their being *Baptized*; Because it was their Interest in the Promise, upon which their Right to *Baptism*, is founded. Their being Children of the Covenant, entitles them to the Seals of it. The Argument is very apt and applicable; *Be Baptized, That the Covenant be Sealed*, (in order to your Enjoying the Blessings and benefits thereof, *viz.* Pardon and Sanctification) For you have a Covenant Right, and therefore ought to enjoy Covenant Privileges. But the Argument is not so applicable, as an Encouragement to their Receiving the Gifts of the *Holy Ghost*; For there are many that have a visible Covenant Right, who never Receive the Gifts of the *Holy Ghost*.

But after all, If this Text does not Satisfactorily strengthen the Argument, what follows (as you'll be Convinced) will fall nothing short of Demonstration.

That the *Abrahamic Covenant* did include,
and

and was Sealed unto Infants, as well as the Adult; none can doubt, that will Read the 17 Chap. of *Gen.* and that it Extends in the same Latitude to Believers under the Gospel, is Evident, in that *Abraham* was made the *Father of many Nations*, *Gen. 17. 5.* of *Gentiles*, as well as *Jews*; and therefore the Covenant with him and his seed, Extended in the same Latitude to his *Gentile* seed, as to his seed after the flesh. As the Covenant was made with, and sealed to his natural Progeny, and their Infant seed, Even so to the *Believing Gentiles*, and their Infant seed. The Apostle Confirms this, in *Gal. 3. 14.* *The blessing of Abraham comes on the Gentiles through Jesus Christ.*

The Objection, That this Covenant which was Sealed by Circumcision, was only a Promise of the Land of *Canaan*, is almost too trifling to be taken notice of. For,

1. There was not a fourth part of *Abraham's* Posterity, (none but the Progeny of his Grandson *Jacob*) that were to Expect, or ever did Enjoy a portion in the Land of *Canaan*.

2. There is much more Implied in the very words of the Covenant, as in the 7th Verse of the fore-cited Chap. of *Gen.* *And I will Establish my Covenant between me and thee, and thy seed after thee in their Generations, for an Everlasting Covenant, to be a God unto thee, and thy seed after thee.* The Covenant was an *Everlasting* Covenant, but the Land of *Canaan* was not their *everlasting* Portion. The Tenor of the Covenant was

That he would be a God unto *Abrah.* and his seed. The promise of the Land of *Canaan* was but a Subjoined Article of Divine favour to, and Care of him and his. This is further Illustrated from *Deut.* 29. 10, 11. 13. (where God Renews this Covenant with the Posterity of *Abraham*, and their little Ones) *Ye stand this Day all of you, before the Lord your God, your Captains of your Tribes, your Elders and your Officers, with all the men of Israel, your Little Ones, &c. that he may establish thee to Day, for a people unto himself; and that he may be unto thee a God, as he hath said unto thee, and as he hath sworn unto thy Fathers, to Abraham, to Isaac, and to Jacob.*

It may be here Remark't, that God takes their *Little Ones* into Covenant with him, as well as themselves; and that the Blessings of the Covenant made with them, and their Fathers, *Abraham, Isaac* and *Jacob*, were no less than the enjoying God himself, as their Portion. This was the Covenant, whereof Circumcision was a Seal.

3. This Covenant could not be a Promise only of the Land of *Canaan*, in that the Blessings thereof Extend to believing *Gentiles*, as well as *Jews*, who are the seed of *Abraham* after the Spirit, and Heirs of this very Promise, or Covenant, that was made with him, as was before noted, and is very plain from *Gal.* 3. 29. *And if ye be Christs, then are ye Abrahams seed, and heirs according to the Promise.* Heirs of what? Of the Land of *Canaan*? No Surely! we have no Interest

est there ; But there are Richer Blessings in store, for those that are Members of Christ, viz. their having God himself, their Portion for Ever.

If I have been too long in answering this Trifling Objection, you know where to Lay the fault, I'll conclude this Argument by only adding,

1. That either Infants are yet Included in the Covenant made with *Abraham*, and his Spiritual seed, both *Jews* and *Gentiles*, and ought to have it Sealed unto them, as formerly, or else it lies at our Adversaries Doors, to shew us from Scripture, How, Why, and When they were cut off from the Covenant, and the annexed Priviledges.

2. That either Infants have an Interest in the Covenant, and a just claim to have it Sealed unto them, or else the Blessings and Priviledges of the *New Testament* Dispensation, are far less than the Old. That the Covenant of Grace, and the Seals thereof are Blessings and Priviledges, none can be so hardy as to Deny : nor dare any Christian suppose, that the Evangelical Dispensation, has Lessened the Priviledges of the Faithful, Therefore the Covenant of Grace must Extend, and be Sealed to Believers, and their Infant seed. *Arg. 3.* And now *Sir*, I shall venture (not withstanding *Mr. Gale* would even Laugh us out of it) to argue from Circumcision, and it will appear, that this so often Battered Plea (as he calls it) will yet be able to
hear

bear the Shock. of their fiercest Opposition.
I thus argue ;

If *Baptism* comes in the Room and stead of *Circumcision*, It ought to be administred to Infants, as *Circumcision* was. This is a Clear Consequence, and admits of no Debate. To say, that this is not Commaned, as that was, is a begging the Question ; for if it succeeds in the Room of *Circumcision*, it must be used in the Room thereof, and then certainly be administred to the same Subjects. It only therefore lies before us to prove that *Baptism* docs succed unto, and come in the Room and stead of *Circumcision*, which will receive clear evidence from these Scriptures.

I shall first turn to Col. 2. 11, 12. *In whom also they are Circumcised, with the Circumcision made without hands, in putting off the Body of the Sins of the Flesh, By the Circumcision of Christ ; Buried with him in Baptism.* The Apostle in the fore-going verse, tells them, That they were compleat in Christ ; But it might something plausibly be objected, That they could not be compleat, that wanted *Circumcision*, the Seal of the Covenant, and Symbol of their Covenant Right. He therefore as a Sufficient matter of Satisfaction to 'em in that point, tells them, That they had (1.) the thing signified by *Circumcision*, viz. the *Circumcision* of the Heart. (2.) That they had the Covenant Sealed by another Ordinance, that (since the abrogation of *Circumcision*) succeeded to, and was in the Room and Place of,
the

the former. They had not only the Circumcision made without Hands; but were also Buried with Christ in Baptism. This is (I think) the plain and natural meaning of the words.

Let us next look into *Gal. 3. 27. 29.* For as many of you as have been Baptized into Christ, have put on Christ, and if they be Christ's then are they Abrahams Seed and Heirs according to the Promise. Hence I argue

If *Baptism* be now a Sign and Seal of the very same thing whereof *Circumcision* was appointed a Sign and Seal, under the *Old Testament* Dispensation; Then *Baptism* comes in the Room and stead of *Circumcision*; The Consequence is clear, and can't be Opposed. And that *Baptism* is a Sign and Seal of the same thing, is express in the Text, where we find *Baptism* to be a Sign and Symbol of our belonging to Christ, and thereby of being *Abrahams* Seed, and Heirs according to the promise, as *Circumcision* also was; See *Gen. 17.* This is also Evident from

Acts 2. 41. Then they that gladly Received his Word were Baptized, and the same Day were added unto them about *Three Thousand Souls.* From whence I argue.

If *Baptism* be a Note and Symbol of our being Received into, and being Members of the Church, then it Succeeds in the Room and stead of *Circumcision.* The Consequence is clear, in that *Circumcision* was a Symbol thereof; see *Exod. 12. 43. 44.* There shall no stranger Eat thereof, but every Man Servant that is bought for Money, when

thou hast Circumcised him, then shall he eat thereof; So v. 14 And when a Stranger shall sojourn with thee and will keep the Passover unto the Lord, let all his Males be Circumcised, and then let him come near and keep it, and he shall be as one born in the land. None but the Church (which was then National) were to eat of the Passover, and we find every one that was Circumcised was a meet Subject of this Ordinance, and to be lookt upon as Members of this National Church; without Circumcision they were strangers, being Circumcised they were *Israelites*.

It now remains to consider, Whether *Baptism* now is (as *Circumcision* then was) a Symbol of Church Membership; this is plain from the quoted Text, where we find Three Thousand Souls added to them (that is the Church) by being Baptized. I'll add once more,

If the same Covenant and Promise, whereof Circumcision was a Seal, be the Grounds of Baptism, then Baptism comes in the Stead of Circumcision; The Consequence is Clear, and needs no Proof. And that the same Covenant and promise is the grounds of Baptism appears from that fore-cited Acts 2. 38. 39. which has been particularly explained above.

The Objections raised against this Doctrine, are very light and trivial, as,

1. They Object, That Circumcision was always performed on the *Eighth Day*, and therefore *Baptism*, if successive thereto, must also be Administered then.

Ans. That the Ordinances differ in Circumstances, is no Argument that this does not succeed, and supply, the place of that. The *Lords Supper* differs much in Circumstances from the *Passover*, and yet none can doubt its Succeeding it. That was to be taken in haste, with their Loyns girded, Shoes on their Feet, and Staff in their Hand, and upon a set Time, but once in a Year; This to be taken in a Table gesture, more frequently, and upon no prefixed Day in the Year.

They Object, That if *Baptism* Succeeds *Circumcision*; Then Females are not to be *Baptized*, they not being Circumcised.

Ans. The Seal of Circumcision could not be administered to Females, they were not capable Subjects, but it is not so with Respect to *Baptism*. Moreover,

Circumcision Sealed and Confirmed the Blessings of the Covenant, to all the seed of *Abraham*, whether they were Male or Female, tho' the Males only bare the sign in the flesh. This appears from the Institution, *Gen. 17. 7.* *And I will establish my Covenant between me and thee, and thy seed (Indefinitely) after thee, to be a GOD unto thee, and thy seed (Indefinitely, Female as well as Male) after thee.* Altho' none but the Males bare the Seal of this Covenant in the flesh; But the Dispensation now, is vastly different; they were then but one Family, the Posterity of one Man; But now the Gospel and Covenant of Grace, is promulgated unto all the Families

Families of the Earth: Circumcision sealed the Covenant unto the seed of *Abraham* after the flesh, and assured both Male and Female; that God would be their God, and Portion; upon their accepting of him, and living to him; But *Baptism* now, Seals that Covenant to none, But the seed of *Abraham* after the Spirit, who have a visible Covenant Right; and therefore to be administered to such, and none but such, whether Male or Female.

I'm afraid you'll Charge me with prolixity, I will therefore pass by all that might be further said, upon this head; and pass to,

Arg. 4 They that have the *Holy Spirit*, ought to be *Baptized*. *Acts. 10. 47.* *Who can forbid Water, that these should not be Baptized, who have Received the Holy Ghost as well as we?*

But some Infants have the Holy Spirit, or Else all Infants are Christless, and in an Estate of Condemnation, *Rom. 8. 9.* which the greatest Uncharitableness can't suppose, therefore some Infants ought to be *Baptized*.

Arg. 5. The visible Children of God, ought to be *Baptized*; But Infants of Believers are such. Our Adversaries don't deny, that *Baptism* belongs to all the visible Children of God; If they did, they would soon be a ground; for whence have they their Orders to make a difference in Gods Visible Household, to withhold, from some, and allow to others, their Portion of meat? And that Infants are the Children of God, I thus prove,

1. They

1. They are Either the Children of God, or the Children of the Devil. This is an awful Distribution, which divides all the Children of Men. *Job. 3. 10.* And I am sure none can be so uncharitable, as to Rank the Infants of Believers, among the Children of the Devil; and therefore they are visibly, in the Eyes of Charity, the Children of God.

2. God himself calls the Children of his Covenant People his Children, *Ezek. 16. 20.* *Moreover, thou hast taken my Sons, and my Daughters, which thou hast born unto me, &c.* which in *Verf. 21.* he calls *my Children.*

3. *Mr. Gale* with an Extensive Charity, acknowledges this, when he Says, *Page 421.* "If there be any Mercy in God, in him who is goodnes it self, which the greatest Impiety dares not doubt of, Then all Infants that could never offend him, shall assuredly be saved. I shall not now take time to Examine this bold Assertion, but only observe, That if they shall assuredly be Saved, they are as assuredly the Children of God.

Arg. 6. To whom belong the Kingdom of Heaven, to them belongs *Baptism*; For if they have a Title to the Kingdom, why mayn't their Title be Sealed unto them, in *Baptism*, which every body acknowledges, the Seal of our Regeneration, and Title to the Kingdom of Heaven?

And that Infants have a Title to the Kingdom of Heaven, is plain from *Luk. 18. 16.* *Suffer little Children to come unto me, and forbid them not, for*
of

of such is the Kingdom of Heaven. Whether the Church Militant or Triumphant, is here intended, by the Kingdom of Heaven, no waies affects the Arguments; for if they have a Title to Either, it ought to be Sealed in *Baptism*.

If any Object, That these little Children might not be Infants, but grown to some years of Understanding. The fore-going Verse Confutes them; for they are there called Infants [*Brephe*] Which necessarily signifies very young Infants, and is well Rendred, *1 Pet. 2. 2. New born Babes*. We have the same Word also *Acts. 7. 19*. Rendred *Young Children*, and young they were; For it Refers to the bloody decree of *Pharaoh*, who order'd all the male Children of the *Hebrews* to be cast out, and Slain from the womb.

Mr. Gale hath a long Discant upon this Text, but says nothing that affects our Argument, unless it be, that *Page 434*. "It may Equally be urged, that Infants may be Communicated" (as he words it) too. But he discovers his inadvertency; For who-ever supposed the other Sacrament a Seal of our Regeneration, and Title to the Kingdom, as *Baptism* is?

Arg. 7. If Infants of Believing Parents have a *Foederal*, or Covenant Holiness, they may be *Baptized*. This (I think) must be granted by all men; For if they have a Covenant Holiness, they have an Undoubted claim to Covenant priviledges; And that they have a Covenant Holiness, the Apostle assures us, in *1 Cor. 7. 14*. *Else were your Children nextean, but now are they Holy.* This

This by the joynt Suffrage of Expositors, is allowed to be a Fœderal Holiness, the *Ani-pe-dobaptists* only Excepted, and they have but a desperate Shift to Evade it by so Ridiculous, that one would have thought *Mr. Gales* Ingenuity would not have Suffered him to have Espoused it: But he must say something

Their Evasion is, That the Holiness here spoken of is *Legitimacy*, and that if the unbelieving Parent is not Sanctified by the Parent, that is a Believer, the Children are *Bastards*. *Mr. Gales* Gloss upon this Text, is, That the Apostle is here Correcting a mistake among these primitive Christians, who were ready to suppose, that their Profelytism dissolved all natural Tyes, and made it unlawful for a man any longer to Co-habit with his former Wife, she being no longer accounted his Wife. “ What
 “ can be more proper and natural (says he) than
 “ to Suppose, *St. Paul* is Endeavouring to put
 “ better thoughts into his Converts, and to per-
 “ swade them, that their Profelytism did not
 “ dissolve natural Bonds, and Consanguinity,
 “ and that it was not only Lawful, but advi-
 “ seable and a Duty, for the Wife to Dwell
 “ with her Husband? For he is still her *Legiti-*
 “ *mate* true Husband, otherwise indeed (says
 “ he) your Children would be Unclean, as
 “ *Bastards* were accounted, but the Husband
 “ being *Legitimate* the Children are so too,
 Thus he. To which I Answer,

1. That he must have a strange art of Evasi-
 on,

swasion, to gain Credit in this, that Children was lookt upon as *Bastards*, only thro' the unequal match of their Parents, especially by those primitive Christians, who had learned from the Apostle, that *the Marriage bed was undefiled*. Could they think their marriage with Unbelievers annulled, because such were not capable of, nor qualified for, so Holy a Relation? If so, the greatest part of the World must be Esteemed, *Fornicators* and *Adulterers*. But I'm weary of this unintelligible Jargon. And will therefore only add,

2. The word *Holy* is not applicable to *Legitimacy*, nor ever used in Scripture in a Lower Sense, than for a *Covenant Holiness*. I'm Sure, it looks odd Enough, to call Every *Legitimate Child* a *Holy Person*; For by that means, the far greatest part of the world, might be called *Holy*.

Arg. 8 If under the Gospel Dispensation the Children of Gods People are to be as aforetime, They should Enjoy the benefits of the Covenant, and have it sealed unto them; For so it was with them afore time.

But it is Expressly promised, *Jer. 32. 20. Their Children shall be as afore time.*

If any question, whether this refers to Gospel Dispensations, Let him Read the 9 and 21 Verses, and be satisfied.

And that under Gospel Dispensations we are Invested with the same Substantial priviledges that the Jews have Lost by Unbelief, Receives a

Meridian

Meridian Lustre, from that *Rom. 11. 17.* *And*
some of the branches be broken off, and thou being a
wild Olive Tree, wert grafted in amongst them and
with them, partakest of the Root and Fatness of the
Olive Tree, &c.

We have not only the Joynt suffrage of Com-
 mentators; but the clearest Evidence of the
 Text and Contexte to assure us, that by the Olive
 Tree is meant the Church of Christ; By the
 Root and fatness of the Olive Tree, all the
 Promises and Priviledges, the Graces and Or-
 dinances, the Spiritual Blessings and Benefits,
 which belonged to *Abraham* and his seed, or unto
 the Church of God under Legal Administrations.

This Argument must therefore be Fortible
 and Unanswerable,

If the *Gentile Church* are grafted into the same
 priviledges, Graces, Ordinances and Spiritual
 Blessings, which the *Jews* did Enjoy, and are
 by Unbelief cut off from, They've a claim to
 have the Covenant sealed, not only to them-
 selves, but to their Infant seed; For this was
 one of the most glorious priviledges Enjoy
 by the natural Branches of this Olive Tree.

But the former is most clear from the Text,
 therefore the Latter.

I believe, Sir, you are by this time Satisfied,
 that the Scripture is not so silent in this Case, as
 Mr. Gale would fain persuade us, and that
 Infant Baptism can be made appear from Scrip-
 ture; I shall therefore pass over much that
 might have been offered for the clearing of this
 Cause,

Cause, and only Consider the *Commission* of our Lord unto his Apostles, in *Mat. 28. 19, 20.* which *Mr. Gale* tells us *Page. 247.* "Is the main Ground and Foundation of the Ordinance. And tho' he would persuade us that *Page 258.* "There is nothing in the *Commission*, that can be tolerably urged, to prove that Infants are included in it. I can't Depend upon his Word, So as to take it for granted without some further Enquiry.

The *Commission* Runs thus, *Go ye therefore, and Disciple (Mathetensate) all Nations Baptizing them in the Name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost, Teaching them to observe all things, whatsoever I have commanded you, and Lo I am with you alway, even unto the End of the World.*

I have here indeed taken liberty to differ from our English Translation, by Rending the Word *Mathetensate*, by *Disciple*, instead of *Teach*, and the genuine natural sense; and meaning of the word bears me out in it.

Mr. Gale indeed (as was his Interest) stands up for our Translation, and something plausibly attempts to prove, that The Word always signifies to *Teach*, But his Reasonings will prove Superficial Enough, when they come to be Scann'd,

In the mean time, let us take it for granted, that the word does signify to *make Disciples*, as I have Rendred it, and then I can't see why the words mayn't be thus understood, *Go make Disciples of all Nations, by Baptizing them, and by Teaching*

Teaching of them to observe all things, that I have Commanded you. They are first ordered to make Disciples, next Directed how to do it, viz. by *Baptizing* and Teaching; *Baptism* is the Ceremony, or Symbol of their being Received into Discipleship, and the badge of their Christianity, as Circumcision was among the Jews, and Teaching a necessary previous Qualification to Discipleship, in all Capable Subjects.

It it be thus Understood, the Case is plain, That if Infants be a part of all Nations, to whom they were sent out upon this Errand, (Capable of being made *Disciples* by *Baptism*) they ought to Enjoy this Ordinance, for that End.

And this Sense of the Words will appear very natural and Reasonable, when we consider, That Infants were acknowledg'd *Disciples* under the *Old Testament* Dispensation, and made such by *Circumcision*, in the Room whereof, *Baptism* is now Instituted; as has been made evident above. And it is Considerable, that I have the most of Learned Interpreters on my side, Justifying this Sense of the Words: And I don't find our Adversaries capable to offer any thing against this Interpretation, unless that the Word *Mahecasate* signifies to Teach, which I design particularly to Consider, and am therefore loath to Anticipate it, in this place.

But whatever is the true meaning of that Word, *Infant Baptism* may be proved from the *Commission*, as you'll be sensible, If you'll take

notice of the Subjoyned promise, *Lo I am with you alway, Even unto the End of the World.* Christ is here promising his gracious Spiritual Presence unto, and his Blessing upon his Faithful Ministers, in the Administration of this Ordinance of *Baptism*, and preaching the Gospel, unto the End of the world; This Ordinance therefore shall not Cease, until the World Ceases to be. But if Infant *Baptism* be not of Divine Institution, I can't see how this Promise has been fulfilled. For,

1. Being supposed that Infant *Baptism* is no Ordinance of Christ, it must be an inevitable Consequence that for many Centuries there was no *Baptism* at all. *Mr. Gale* acknowledges that Infant *Baptism* was used in the Early Centuries of the Church, *Page. 528.* as Early as *St. Cyprians* time, who flourished *Anno 240.* By which Adult *Baptism* (if Constantly used before) was Shuffled out of Doors, and so the world from that time without *Baptism*, and consequently without a Church (contrary to the Promise; *Mat. 16. 28*) Until *N. Stock*, and his Outrageous followers in *Germany* Restored it; nor did they Restore it neither. For

2. From this Doctrine it follows, that the World being so long without *Baptism*, there was none qualified for the Administration of the Ordinance; It must therefore Inevitably and Eternally Fall to the Ground, unless some with a new and Immediate Commission from Heaven Revive it. For how can they *Baptize* others,

others, that are not *Baptized* themselves?

Thus you see that our Lords Promise to uphold this Ordinance, and his Ministers in the Administration thereof, (unless Infant *Baptism* be his Institution) is Inevitably Violated.

Mr. Gals in his 7th Letter, Entertains us with a very Large, and tedious Discourse, wherein he undertakes to make it Evident, that the *Commission* does directly Exclude Infants from *Baptism*; The Sum of all his Argumentation upon that Topick, I find thus proposed, Page 258. “ Infants are such a part of the Nations as
 “ are not capable of being Taught, and so not
 “ to be *Baptized*, because the *Commission* does
 “ as much command to *Teach*, as to *Baptize* all
 “ Nations. The whole Stress of his argument has its dependance upon the Greek Word *Matheusate*, which he translates *Teach*; this he acknowledges, and fairly tells us, that Page 259. “ If the Greek Word does signify barely to
 “ *Disciple*, by *Baptizing* suppose, or any other
 “ way, without Including to *Teach*, all our
 “ Argument from this Place, unavoidably falls
 “ to the Ground. That now lies before us to Examine, and if upon the Strictest Tryal, it appears that the Word does signify barely to *Disciple*, he must acknowledge that he is fairly beat out of the field, with his own Weapon.

The Methods he proposes, are very fair, and such as (Duelly observed) will infallibly bring us to the Sense of the Word. Let us therefore follow him in his own Track,

He first Searches into the Origination of the Word, to see if he can find any thing to his purposes from thence ; and I am of Opinion, that there is no way more sure to find out the true sense of a Word, than this ; This shews its native meaning, and therefore is more to be depended upon, than the figurative use Words often obtain among Authors.

Let us Seek therefore into the Etymology of the Word, and we shall find this Renowned Critick, Chargeable with the Greatest vanity Imaginable in venturing to say, Page 263. "it makes it necessary to understand the Word, " to signify to *Teach, Instruct,* or the like.

No Man doubts but *Manthano,* the Theme Signifies *Disco,* to Learn, and all the Derivatives, and Compounds bear an agreement in Signification ; thus *Mathesis,* the act of *Learning* ; *Amathes,* unlearned ; *Opimathes,* one that began late to *Learn* ; *Philomathes,* desirous of *Learning*. And thus in the Instances Mr Gale himself has assigned, *Mathema,* that which is *Learned* ; *Mathetos,* apt to *Learn*, *Mathetico,* I desire to *Learn* ; *Artimathes,* one that lately began to *Learn* ; *Automathes,* one that *Learned* of him self without the help of a Master ; *Oligmathes,* one that *Learned* but little ; *Polimathes,* one that has *Learned* much ; *Anamanthano,* I *Learn* again ; *Kats nantbeno,* I *learn* thoroughly, or exactly ; *Sam nan banin,* To *Learn* together, from whence, *Sammathales,* a fellow *Learner,* or School fellow ; and so in like manner the Words in Controversy,
doe

do Retain some marks of the same Signification, with the Theam from whence they are derived; as *Mathetes*, a *Disciple*, or *Learner*; from whence *Matheteuo*, to Constitute a *Learner*, or that which signifyes the very same to *Disciple*, the sense we contend for. But you'll say perhaps, how can Infants be Constituted *Learners*? I answer, by *Baptism*, whereby they are Laid under awful Obligations to Learn (as soon as capable) both the Doctrines and Practice of *Christianity*; And whereby their Parents do Solemnly Dedicate them to Christ, and oblige themselves to bring them up in his *School*.

And now (*Sir*) would not even a *School Boy*, but newly initiated in the Rudiments of the *Greek Tongue*, Laugh to Scorn *Mr. Gales* attempt to prove that *Matheteuo*, signifyes to *Teach*? Could he not tell him, That the Theam from whence it comes, signifyes to *Learn*, and that all its Derivatives bear a like Signification? Could he not Instruct him in the difference, between *Teaching* and *Learning*?

And yet how seriously does he proceed to say, *Page 263* " Since then the Primitive Signifies " to *Learn*, and all its Derivatives and Com-
 " pounds Retain the like sense, why must
 " *Mathetes* and *Matheteuo* be Excepted? I say, why Indeed? But who is it that does Except them? Is it not they that thus Industriously attempt to Change their True Native sense; and argue (tho' Ridiculously enough) that *Manibano* and its Derivatives signifyes to *Learn*,
 Therefore

Therefore *Matheteuo*, one of its Derivatives must signify to *Teach*?

One would think that this Gentleman designed his Book for the View of None but Illiterate men, or Dunces, that could not distinguish between *Teaching and Learning*, why **E**lle did he take such Elaborate pains to Expole both himself, and his Cause?

But as tho' he had not Effectually Bantered his Cause, he gravely undertakes to Shew the meaning of the Word *Disciple* among our selves, and likewise the use of it, among the Latin Authors, from whom we have borrowed it. Page 297. " Now its plain (says he) that *Discipulus* is formed from *Discere*, to *Learn*, &c. If this be true, (as he has made it appear to be by many quotations from Ancient Latin Authors) to make *Disciples* is (as the Greek Word *Matheteuo*, signifies) to Constitute them *Learners*, and not to *Teach*.

Thus you See [Sir] how unhappy his Arguments have been from the Origination of the Word, that instead of Clearing the Cause he undertakes to Defend, they have abundantly Confirmed ours.

He next proceeds to Shew how the word is used in Greek Authors, which he says, Page 266. " will perhaps be thought less liable to Exception, than arguing from Etymologies.

But I would Intreat *Mr. Gales* Pardon, if I am forced to believe, that this is much more liable to Exception, than arguing from Etymologies;
For

For (as a Gentleman of your Reading cannot be Ignorant) Words oft times in Authors, Suffer a violent Catechresis, as; *vir grex, ipse Caper, decerraverit.* *Vir g. Eclog. 7* i. e. The man of the Flock, even the He Goat himself, went astray. But no man will argue from thence, that *Vir*, a Man, properly signifies the Leading Goat of a Flock. And nothing is more common, than the Change of Words from their Native Sense; as you may find an Instance in our Author, out of *Pindar*, Page. 280. Who says *Salamis* can produce a brave Soldiers as any in the World. *Hic ut* Learned [Akoufen] the truth of this, before the Walls of Troy. Will any man of Sense argue from hence, that the Greek Word *Akouo*, To hear, signifies to Learn, by the feats of Martial Chivalry? But I'm sure I need not multiply Instances of this Kind to you.

So that if *Mr Gale* by Unwearied application, can Collect some passages from Authors, where the Word in Debate is used in the Sense he pleads for, (and yet I even despair of finding that done) it will not determine the Sense of the Word, inasmuch as they may (and in this Case certainly must) have taken the common liberty of Authors, in using the Word in a Sense different from its native and true Signification.

And therefore if you can find in any of his Quotations, the Word so used, as may seem to make to his purpose, I desire you to tray this Consideration along with you, which will stop the mouth of all Argument from thence; I don't speak

Speak this, because I'm afraid to joyn Issue with him, upon this Plea; but to shew you, that the use of the word in some single Instances, is not sufficient to Determine the sense of it, This being premised,

There are two things the Subject of our present Enquiry.

1. Whether the Word in Debate, as it is Commonly used by Authors, signifies to *Teach*; it not, all *Mr. Gales* Argument falls to the Ground; for that's the Construction, he assigns and pleads for; But in all his numerous Quotations, he does not find it once used in that Sense, or Indeed so much as look that way, Except in a passage taken from *Ignatius*, where he says; *I would also that these things should be enjoined by your Prædication, which you have prescribed; [Μαθητευοντες, which he translates] in Teaching* But why in this Instance (which is the only one, that in the least seems to favour his Construction) it may'nt as naturally be translated in the sense we plead for, there can be no Reason assigned. This *Father* is desiring the *Roman* Church, to whom he writes, not to use any Effayes to hinder him of a Crown of Martyrdom, which he then had in near View, and uses this as an Argument; That what they had præscribed in *Discipling* [*Μαθητευοντες*] others, and both profelyting them unto, and Confirming Them in, the Christian Faith, was to stand to the Cause of Christ unto the Death, and in that way to Expect a Crown of Life.

He

He would therefore have them confirm this by their Practice, and not hinder him of his Crown.

Now this Duty is prescribed to Profelytes, as well by Baptism, as by Teaching; they are thereby lifted under the banner of Christ, and awfully obliged to stand the shock of incessant opposition, and even to lay down their lives for his sake, when called to it. The Word therefore does not necessarily signify *Teaching*, even in this Place; But if it did, it does no way determine it to be the constant, steady meaning of the word, since in all his Exquisite Search he can't find it any where else to be so understood. He does indeed (disingenously enough) sometimes so translate the word as *Plutarch* vii *Deem. Rhetor.* page 1539. *Martirensus de re Patri*, which he translates, *Was Taught by his Father*; but this Instance (and all other where he so uses the Word) is apparantly on our side, and ought to be construed, *He Learned of his Father*, or which is the same thing, *was his Fathers Disciple*.

We are next to consider whether the word in Debate, as it is commonly used by Authers, does signify *To Disciple*, or *Constitute Learners*, and if we find that it does, Even by Mr Gales own Collection from Greek Authors, I'm sure you'll acknowledge that he is fairly Baffled upon this head.

I shall not mis-spend so much time in this word War, as to take particular Notice of all his Citations, but only consider four or five of the first of them, in the same order as he has placed them, By which you may judge of all the rest.

The first Instance is from *Plutarch vit. Demosthenis Rhetor.* pag. 1539. where he finds *Isocrates* saying (to those that not being able to pay for the whole of his Art, were willing to Learn a part of it) "We don't use to divide our Art, but if you would be Learners of it, I'll instruct you in the whole Art. This word is here used with an application to such as already were not, but were yet to be Constituted Learners of this famous Orator, which is the very same sence we contend for in the *Commission*.

And now let us see how well it suits the Construction, *Mr. Gale* pleads for (while he says, it necessarily and always signifies *To Teach*) by translating it in his Sence, "We don't use to divide our Art, but if you would *Teach*, I'll instruct you. I need not tell you that this construction (which it must have, or be wholly Impertinent to his purpose) is Ridiculous Non-sence.

But I find he would render it passively, *If you would be Taught, I'll instruct you*; But the Word is Active, and he therefore must account for this passive construction, or by looking back into his Accedence, be learned to Correct it.

His 2d Instance is from *Ignatius*, who in his *Epistle to the Ephesians*, says, *Though I am bound for his name, I am not yet perfect in Christ Jesus; nay, I am as it were but as now beginning [Matheteue (thai)] to be a Learner, or to be Discipled.* The word here is so clear in our favour, that nothing could have been plainer; For the Martyr here Represents himself to be, but an Initiated Learner, or newly constituted

constituted a *Learner* of Christ; which is the very sense we contend for; But how the most Luxuriant Fancy, can understand the word here, in Mr Gales Sense, or suppose that it signifies to Teach, is far beyond my Conception. Let us see what a monstrous Solecism it would be, to Translate the Words in this sense. They must be thus Read, *I am not yet perfect in Christ, nay, I am but yet beginning to Teach him.* To be taught of him, it cannot be rendered; for the Word as in the former instance. is Active, and therefore it cannot be passively understood.

His *Third Instance* is as clear as the Meridian Sun to our Purpose, it is from that same *Epistle of Ignatius to the Ephesians*, where he directs them how to behave themselves towards unbelievers and Strangers to the Faith; and advises them to Pray for all Men; For (says he) *there is some hope that they may Repent, and obtain the Mercy of God, Let them be Discipled, or won to the Faith [Matheuteuthenai] by your good works.* Here I think every body must allow me this Sense of the Word, if it be considered that the Heathen could not be Taught the Doctrines of Christianity, by their conversation and good works; but they might be *Discipled*, i. e. So won by their watchful walk, and Charitable, Christian-like Spirit, &c. as to be brought to declare for Christ, and bring themselves into his *School*, or (as you find the word properly Signifies) to be constituted Learners of him.

His fourth Instance I have considered already,
and

and therefore now pass it over.

In his *Fifth* Instance, the Word is a little altered from its native sense, and yet makes clearly against him. It is taken from *Clemens Alexand. Strom. Lib. 1. Pag. 320*, Where he says, *If they are Learners (Mathetewontes) of any thing, from the Hebrew Philosophy, let them acknowledge it. If they Teach any thing from the Hebrew Philosophy, it must be Rendred, in order to be made any thing Serviceable to Mr. Gales Undertaking, which is to prove, that the Word signifies to Teach; But this is an Absurdity, even too great for him to espouse.*

Here the Word indeed does not properly signify to make, or Constitute *Learners*, but it signifies being *Disciples*, or *Learners*, which is but little differrent.

His *6th* Instance is taken from the same *Clemens Strom. Lib. 5. Page. 691*. Who there says, *To Converse not only with the Greeks, but with the Barbarians too, and by these common ways of Improving their knowledge, they are brought to the Faith; And then having laid the Foundation of the Truth, they are better enabled to go on in the Search after it; and hence it is that they delight in being, Discipled, (Matheteusamenoi) to Christ, and by pursuing after knowledge, they Vigorously pursue Salvation.* The Word is necessary, if you Consider, (1) The purport of the Argument here Improved, which is to shew, that the **Cultivating** our Faculties by all Sorts of knowledge, will Render the Profession of *Christianity* desirable,

rable, in our first entring upon it, or beginning to be *Learners*, or *Disciples*; and make us willing to pursue further Degrees of knowledge. (2.) The Word here Respects the *Laying the Foundation of the Truth*, as the fore-going, and following Paragraphs make evident; And is not *the Foundation of the Faith laid* by our being made *Disciples* of Christ?

Thus [Sir] I have gone thro' *Mr. Gales* first Six Instances, (and might, with the like advantage, take notice of the Rest) and we find him as unhappy in this Undertaking, as in the former from the Origination of the Word.

He next brings in Sundry of our Modern Authors accepting the Word in his Sense; to which it's sufficient answer, That numberless others, as great men, and as much to be Relyed on as they, Justly Contradict 'em.

He proceeds to justify his Sense of the Word, from the various Translations of the *New Testament*: But here also he fails of Success; for tho' some of them do make for, yet others against him, and therefore all Argument from that head, must fall to the ground.

The *Hebrew* Translation renders it by *Lamad*, which properly signifyes to *Learn* (as Jer. 10. 2. *Learn not of the Heathen*) and in *Pibel Dicere fecit*, he has made to *Learn*, says *Buxtorf* and *Leigh*.

The *Ethiopick*, and *Arabick* Versions, use Words which *Mr. Gale* acknowledges signify to *Learn*, and was *Learned*.

The *Dutch*, Read it *Leert*, which signifies

to *Learn*, or be *Learners*, as you may see in *Hezam's Dutch Dictionary*.

The *Danish* Read it *La rer*, and the *Saxon*, *Lernas*, both which signify *Learners*.

The *French* Render it *Endoctrinez*, which signifies, To *Endoctrinate*, or bring into the Profession and Knowledge of Christianity.

I have by me two *Latin* Versions, the one of which indeed renders it *Docere*, but the other *Discipulos facite*, make *Disci les*.

Some of those Versions he mentions, I know nothing of, and am not therefore capable to Examine.

He next proceeds to tell us, that the *Fathers* of the *Primitive Church*, Understood the Word in this Sense; but this is all of a piece with the Rest: For where he Cites the *Greek Fathers*, as Understanding the Word to signify *To Teach*, they use the very same Word (*Matheteuo*) which is in the *Commission*; but whether it signifies to *Teach*, or not, is what we have been all this while Debating; For Instance, he quotes *Origen's Comment in Mat. Pag. 225*. where he says, *The Apostles obeyed our Saviours Command. (Matheteusate, which he Renders Teach, But we) Disciple all nations*. And again, *Origen Contra Celsum. Lib 2. Pag. 84*. *The Disciples going forth should (Mathetas, which he here Translates) Preach the Word to all Nations*. Thus also he deals by *O rigen Contra Celsum Lib. 2. P 79*. By, *Justin Expos Fides. P. 376*. And his *Dialogue with Tripho, Page. 272*. By, the *Apostolical*

Apostolical Constitutions, Lib 7 Chap. 40. By *Clement*, *Hom* 17 Cap 7. And by, *Epiphanius*. *Advers. Heres.* Lib 1. Cap. 50. His Argument upon this head, should be thus formed, The Greek *Fachor* Understood the Word (*Matheteuo*) in the *Commission* to signify to *Teach*, because they use the same Word, in their Comments upon the Text.

There's indeed several Passages he quotes, that make it plain, that they did understand the Word to enjoin *Teaching*, in Order to *Baptism*; but it's Evident (as you'l be sensible, if you'l Read his Quotations) that they had a peculiar Reference to the Adult only; and that such are to be made Disciples by Teaching, every body owns, tho' Infants may be Discipled otherwise.

He next undertakes to prove from Scripture, that the Word does signify to *Teach*; and if his performance had been any thing answerable to his undertaking, we must have been forever Silent upon this head.

He first from *Acts* 8. 37 Argues, That *Philip*, previous to his *Baptizing* the *Eunuch*, Instructed him. Bravely performed! But who questions this a necessary Pre-requisite, to the *Baptism* of the Adult?

He next argues from *Acts* 14. 21. *They had preached the Gospel in that City, and had Taught many.* This Word (says he) is the same with that in the *Commission*, and is here Rendred *Taught*; But why may we not Read it, had made many
Disciples;

Disciples; for so I find it rendered in the Old *Latin* Version, and also in the Margin of our Bibles: and so I'm sure the Sense best Carries it.

He next argues from the parrallel Place, *Mark* 16. 15. *Preach the Gospel to Every Creature*: But that is also Required in the *Commission*, *Mat* 28. 20. *Teaching them to observe all things, whatsoever I have Comanded you* Unto which the quoted Text is parrallel, whatever be the Signification of *Mat* 28. 20.

He again tell us, That *St. Luke*, with a particular Reference unto these Words, says, *That Repentance, and Remission of sins, should be preached in his Name, among all Nations* *Luk* 24. 47. And That *St. Peter*, who Immediately received the *Commission* from the Mouth of our Lord, assures us, That this was his sacred meaning, *Acts* 10. 42. *He Comanded us to preach to the People*. To both which its answer sufficient, That our Lord Required their preaching to all Nations, in the above-cited Clause of the *Commission*, *Teaching them to observe all things, &c.* whatever be the meaning of the Word in Debate.

Thus, *Sir*, we have heard all he has to say in this Case, and it therefore now belongs to you to Judge, what grounds he has, with such a Dogmatical Air to say, *Page* 262. "If any
"one can make the Experiment, and after Exa-
"mination, and deny it Signifies to *Teach*; he
"may as well, if he please, open his Eyes,
"and turning to the Sun when it shines out,
"deny

“ deny there’s any Sun at all, or affirm its mid-
 “ night.

What put *Mr. Gale* upon this Attempt, I’ll not undertake to Determine; If it was an affectation of Esteem for his Schollarship, his End is answered; but if what he pretends, he’s miserably disappointed.

You’ll now (*Sir*) I’m sure, Excuse me from any further Remarks on *Mr. Gale’s* Book, when you consider, that his 9th and 10th Letters, are taken up about the Customs among the *Jews*, and their manner of admitting their Profelytes, which I think can’t have so much stress laid upon it, as to be worthy our present Enquiry; And that all the Rest of his Book, is an Examination of *Mr. Walls* Arguments from Antiquity.

Had *Mr. Gale* found any authority to Confirm his bold Assertion, that *Page. 541.* “ There is
 “ abundant grounds to Deny, that it (*Infant*
 “ *Baptism*) was used above two hundred years after Christ, There would have been something Considerable, in the Argument: But since he layes it down præcariously, without one single Author saying a Word in his favour, we have found so very little grounds to depend upon his bare Word, that we may fairly Reject it. I should indeed have been willing to make some Enquiry into the truth hereof, if I had by me, or could in this Dark Corner of the World, come at the Ecclesiastical Writers of the first Centuries; But yet I must tell you, that I can’t help but Conclude, that the writings

of the Earliest and purest Times, are not so silent in this Case, as *Mr. Gale* pretends; for I find *Clemens Romanus, Irenaeus, Justin Martyr, &c.* quoted to this purpose, by those, whose Learning and Faithfulness I shall not question, Until I see it disproved; And I'm pretty well assured, that there's nothing in the primitive Fathers against Infant *Baptism*; if there had, *Mr. Gale* would not have scrupled to let us know it. What Ecclesiastical writers I can come at are very full and plain in this Case.

Origen, who flourished *Anno 220.* brings in full Testimony to Infant *Baptism*; as in *Lib. 5. ad Rom. cap 6* *Ecclesia Traditionem ab Apostolis suscepit, Etiam p. vulis dare Baptismum, i. e. The Church has Received a Tradition from the Apostles to Baptize Infants.*

Its true; that his *Greek Copy* is not Extant, and we have only a *Latin Translation* to depend upon, but its not very likely, that any Interpolation should be attempted, with a Reference to the *Baptism* of Infants, There being no Debate about that Subject, until of Late Years.

Cyprian, who wrote *Anno 240* is as plain as can be, in many passages that might be cited; take one, in *Epist ad Fid. Lib. 3. Epist 8. Si Etiam gravissimus ael. cloribus, & in Deum multum ante peccatoribus, cum postea Crediderint Remissa, peccatorum Datur, et a Baptismo, a que a gracia, nemo prohibetur; quanto magis, prohiberi non debet Infans, &c.* It (says he) is the most grievous offenders, and those that were before great Sinners,

is given, after they Believe, Remission of Sins, and no man Denyes them Baptism, and Grace; by how much the Rather, ought not In a to be prohibited.

Gregory Nazienzen, who wrote about the year 370. Orat. 40. p. 638. * Si e eis peritio nati-
 tionis. *K. i mte tes zemias Epaujmem panage? Eiperp-
 tis Epeigois Kindunos, i. e. But what do you say,*
 (quoth he) of those that are yet in their Tender age,
 they understand neither Crime nor Grace; Should we
 Baptize these also? Yes truly, If Danger Urges.
 This rather indeed had a singular Whim, that
 Unless danger urges, it were better to defer
 their Baptism, until they are three years old;
 But as this was his singular Opinion; It's no
 Evidence of the Faith and Practice of those
 Times; Besides, this makes nothing for our
 Adversaries; for he affirms, and argues for
 their Right to Baptism, even in their Earliest
 Infancy.

Ambrose, who wrote Anno 376. *De Abraham.*
Patriarch, Lib. 2 Chap. 12. says, Nec Senex pro-
sel-tus, nec Infans vermaculus exipitur, quia omnis
etas peccato obnoxia, et Ideo omnis etas Sacramento
Idonia. i. e. Neither an Old Profelyte, nor a Do-
mestic Infant is excepted; every Age is liable to Sin,
and therefore every age is fit for the Sacra-ent.

Augustine, who lived Anno 400, or 420, is
 very plain, full, and large upon this head, in his
 Controversie with Pelagius, as Lib. 1. *De Peccat.*
Mer. et Remiss. cap. 26. Parvulos Baptizandos esse
concedunt, qui contra autoritatem universae Ecclesiae,
procul Dubio per Dominum, et Apostolis traditam,

venire non possunt. i. e. That Infants are to be Baptized (says he) They (the Pelagians) grant, who cannot go Contrary to the Authority of the Universal Church, which, without doubt, was Delivered by the Lord, and his Apostles. And Serm. 10 De verb. Apostel. speaking of Infants Baptism, he says Nemo vobis suffraget Doctrinas alienas, Hoc Ecclesia semper habuit, semper tenuit, Hoc a majorum Fide accepit, Hoc usque in finem perseveranter Custodit, i. e. Let no man whisper any other Doctrine to you; this the Church has always had, always held; this she Receiveth from the Faith of our Ancestors; this she perseveringly keeps to the End.

These Testimonies are as full and plain as can be written, and tho' Mr. Gale intimates, that they are too late to determine the matter; I think not so; for can it be supposed, that in an affair of this Nature, the Church should be thus Imposed upon a Foundation laid for turning the true *Baptism* out of Doors, and even Un-churching the World (the necessary Consequence of bringing in Infant *Baptism* Contrary to Christs Institution, as I observed before) And this be received as the Ordinance of Christ, and the Constant Faith of the Church, in all Quarters of the World; And yet all Footsteps of this Innovation be obliterated, and the Remembrance and Knowledge of it utterly Effaced, in two or three Hundred Years? It does not look possible.

Many Errors indeed did creep into the Church in these Centuries, but as they generally met
with

with opposition, so we have for the most part an account, by what means they were brought in. But this Doctrine (tho' of such great moment) must at once creep into all parts of the Earth, and without any opposition, like an Irresistible Charm, gain universal Credit; and all Circumstances of this Change, be hid from the knowledge of Next Ages: And thus the true Ordinance of Christ, (which by his Promise was to continue to the End of the World) must fall a Sacrifice to this Innovation, and not one Tongue or Pen stand up in its defence.

Its Strange (if this were an Innovation) that there can be no account when it was Introduced. *Mr. Gale* is Ready, *Pag. 528.* to account it probable, that it was Introduced in *Affrica*, at or near *St. Cyprians* Time; But then, its Strange that *Augustine* in so little a time after, should know nothing of this, and boldly affirm, That the Church had always had, and held *Infant Baptism*.

Mr. Gale frequently tells us, that the Mode of administering this Ordinance in *England*, was Changed about *Queen Elizabeths* time; but would he not take it as an Affront, if we should tell him, He is too late to determine this matter, we can't depend upon what he says in that respect; he speaks of an Affair of too ancient a date for him to know any thing about.

If it should be enquired, what Religion was Established in *England*, before *King Henry 8th*,
 Could

Could not even every Plow-man (almost) tell us, it was *Papery*? How then should their *Farmers* in less time, be perfect strangers to the Practice of the Church about Baptism?

I might add much more upon this Head, and bring in *Jerom* and other of the Ancients, with several of the Primitive *Councils*, Confirming our Cause; but I've already out gone the bounds of my intended Brevity; therefore

Jam tempus Equum Spumantia solvere Colla,

Its time to have done with this Controversy, which I shall wind up, with this needful *Apology*,

You won't find many of the Arguments so largely handled, and so clearly Explicated, as you may desire; For I have carefully avoided Prolixity, and was willing to be as brief as I could, without obscurity.

Tho' you may be capable to Read the *Oriental Languages*, yet your Friends to whom you seem'd inclinable to shew this Letter, may not, and therefore what from them has occurred, I have written in *English Character*. You'll be Ready to Dis-relish the harshness of the Style; I am no Oratour, nor do affect a Harangue instead of Argument.

Ornare res ipsa Negat, Contenta Doteri.

You may find some Arguments herein, that others have handled before me; but (tho' I don't love to Transcribe) I see no Reason, to neglect

neglect the mentioning of 'em, because they occur in others; And I would also put you in mind of that Saying,

Non quicquid cum antiquis Convenit Ex antiquis Sumptum.

The many other Defects, I Submit to your Censure, Depending upon your Usual Candour:

If this hasty Scribble yeild matter of Satisfaction to you, it will also more abundantly, to

Your Humble Servant,

Elizabeth Town in
New-Jersey, March
25. 1716.

J. Dickinson.

F I N I S

David Livingston
MS. A. 1. 1. 1.