

7/500

1027 396 AN
ANSWER

To Mr. Tombes his
Scepticall Examination

OF
INFANTS-BAPTISME:

Wherein Baptisme is declared to ingraft us into Christ, before any preparation: And the Covenant of the Gospel to *Abraham* and the Gentiles is proved to be the same, extended to the Gentiles children, as well as to *Abraham*.

Together with the Reason, why *Baptize children*, is not so plainly set down in the Gospel, as *Circumcise's children*, in the Law, and yet the Gospel more plain then the Law.

By *William Hussey*, Minister of
Chislehurst in *Kent*.

H E B R E W E S . 1 . 6 .

Who serve note the example and freedom of heavenly things, as Moses was adorned with the Spirit of God when he was about to make the Tabernacle: For so (saith he) I like those make all things according to the pattern showed to thee in the mount.

But who hath he obtained a more excellent ministry, by how much also he is the Mediator of a better covenant, which was established upon better promises.

L O N D O N,

Printed for *John Saywell*, and are to be sold at his shop at the Sign of the Starre in *Little Britain*, 1646.

An Answer to Mr. Tombes

William Hussey, 1647

Rare
265.1
H.9.6a

AN
S
W
E
R

Special Examination

of the

Doctrine

of the

Church

of

England

in

the

Year

1647

at

London

Printed

by

J. W.

at

the

Printers

Hand

of

the



TO THE
READER.

Courteous Reader,

Having read and seen the Labours of divers learned men that have undertaken the handling of this point, and seeing that this Doctrine of An-baptists hath much spread, notwithstanding all the industry that hath been used by men of singular parts and piety: I did wonder that such a growing evil should spread and prevail with men that d'd pretend so much to piety: and finding that they cryed up the authority of the Scripture, as if men that d'd plead for baptisime of children, had nothing to countenance the Scripture, when I saw that these An-baptists did so earnestly plead for the authority of Scriptures, and declare themselves so devoted to the rule of Gods Word, I had compassion on the afflictions of these men, willingly perceiving that that was indeed the rule we ought all to be guided by, I d'd as unpartially sift, how truly and faithfully they had dealt in the applying themselves to this sacred rule: I perceived that they d'd rather steal away the hearts of men with the show only of pretended respect unto the Scriptures: than that they d'd with a flagrant spirit search into the sense and meaning of the Holy Ghost, as men desirous to be led by the authority of God. I heard men cry up Scripture, Scripture, nothing would prevail with them but Scripture. I resolved to converse with them in this, that the Scripture and only Scripture ought to be our rule in this, that the Scripture and only Scripture and if I could have found that they had argued rightly out of Scripture, I should have most willingly joyned with them, but examining the sincerity of their dealing herein, I saw them carried on with a spirit of pride, imago

An Answer to Mr. Tombes
William Hussey, 1647

To the Reader.

ing that because children had been baptized, and that those men which had maintained childrens baptisme, had maintained other errors; therefore in the disquisition that they bear unto former times, they were resolved to wrap up baptisines of children among other things, and throw out it also together with the things that were indeed spiriual and humane, out of the worship of God: they could not endure man's inventions in Gods worship, and therein their zeal was good, if their knowledge had been answerable: but here I saw much pride, wiled under the cloak of piety, men carrying on their opinions with opposition and clamour of multitude, rather then with sobriety and all gentle enquiry into the state of the question: But whilest I saw this humour, wondering in the lower region of the unlearned, I did not so much wonder though I were much moved for their sakes because their souls were as precious to me as other mens, yet when I heard that it feared also among the learned, I thought it then high time to bestir my self, to search into the ground and reason, why they also with others might be deceived in that point: wherein I took some pains to search into the cause, and how for the publique good given some small account thereof: and here I will turn septuage with Mr. Tombes, and examine whether our books have fastened on the question of Anabaptists high enough, and have sufficiently cleared themselves of Scripures that are cited in the controversies. For my part, I conceive that the main reason that hath so much prevailed with the multitude, is, because the ceremony of circumcision being put down, and that being required of the Law; so that every circumstance of time, qualification of the person is express, he may be a male in the family of some believer: and no such plainness is a foed in the matter of the Sacrament of baptisime, for will-worship, because it is not said in plain terms, ye shall baptize children; enquiry; let it be considered, whether the different manner of the phrase be the Law was in shadow and type; therefore the external rite was plain: for the use of them: the authority of God did fall upon the rite in self immediately, without any other explication, but that it was the confirmation and

seal

To the Reader.

seal of the Covenant made with Abraham and his seed, whereby they were made partakers of the blessing in Christ; the seed of Abraham: Now, the Gospel doth declare the promise to Abraham more plainly, and no incorporating into Christ by baptisime more distinctly, according to the nature of the sacrament; and in a more rational way, entailing us to the persons, requiring the Ministers of the Gospel to baptize all nations, males and females: without any limitation of years or sex, whereby the proffer of grace is made to all nations: the seal of this proffer is baptisime, whereby we are incorporated into Christ, the promised seed, the promise of the Gospel is plainly declared to be the promise made to Abraham, enlarged not in it self, but by virtue of more ample dispensation: the promise to Abraham was not only to Abraham and his seed, but to all nations of the earth, though by precedence before Christ, kept within the nation of the Iewes. The ignorance, or not attendance on this different manner of administration have caused men so rigorously to require such expresse direction in point of administration of the sacrament of baptisime, and by this means brought themselves into such difficulty, that if they should stand to their principles, they could not finde out any way to administer the sacrament of baptisime at all, unto any person whatsoever, for want of more plain and particular direction: And thus, while they go about to insist upon the Letter, and require the regulation of the Ordinance of Christ, to their own fancy, they make the Gospel more obscure then the Law, contrary to the constant declaration of the Gospel which proclaimeth it more plain and full, more distinct and clear, then the Law, weak, and child's manifestations of the Law: The Law saith circumsise a child at eight dayes old in the family of Abraham, or any other believer; baptisime all nations, saith the Gospel: circumsise males, saith the Law; males and females, saith the Gospel: circumsise, this is my Covenant, saith the Law most obscurely; baptisime into Christ, by whom we have access by faith into grace, Rom. 5. 2. most plainly saith the Gospel: The Law giveth the ceremony therein most obscurely, wrapping up the promise of Christ, the Gospel promitteth Christ most plainly, and most rationally drawing after it the sacrament of baptisime; children are in Christ by election of grace, before they are born, this is plainly set down in the Gospel, but obscurely intimated in the Law. Now, sacramentally men

are

An Answer to Mr. Tombes
William Hussey, 1647

TO the Reader;

are ingrafted into Christ by baptism, but personally to judge men as he will, and thereby in Christ, before they were ingrafted into him, were a contradiction in adjecto, therefore are men appointed to baptize and preach the Word, as being able to administer externals only. The second delusion is, that they interpret the histories of the Acts of the Apostles, wherein historically is related, that persons baptized did believe, not that confession, or profession of faith was made to the Apostles; and that the persons baptized had their faith approved by the Apostles; and that that was the ground upon which they baptized them, which is a plain addition to the Scripture: But my earnest request to Mr. Tombes, and all other Anabaptists, is, to look on the doctrine of the Gospel, in a more spiritual way, than to subject it to such a gross and carnal apprehension, and find out some means in a more satisfactory way to state the promise of the Gospel according to the Word of God, then heretofore.

Yours in the Lord,
William Hussey.

July 1. 1646.

I Have perus'd this Answer to Mr. Tombes his Book against Pedobaptism, or the baptizing of children; and finding it to be, in my judgement, solid and judicious, I do allow it to be printed and published.

John Downame.



SATISFACTION

TO

Mr. Tombes his Scepticall Exercitation
Concerning Infants-Baptisme.



He Method that I shall take in the handling this Controversie shall be, first, to state the Doctrine of Baptisme, as it was delivered by Christ, and understood by the Apostles, as may appear by their practice, then answer the objections and fallacies of Anabaptists, and in particular, of Mr. Tombes; and lastly, some arguments to prove the lawfulness of childrens baptisme: As for the baptisme of John, it was of God; God sent him to baptize, but as the Ministry, for the Baptisme of John was perforce begun and ended in him; he was not a Minister of Heaven, he was the greatest of the Prophets, but the least in the kingdome of Heaven is greater than he; he was precursor, the forerunner of Christ, of whose baptisme the Scripture is so silent, (If you consider the form and nature of it) that we may quickly affirm more of it then we can be able to prove: As for Christ making Disciples, and his Disciples baptizing, the Scripture likewise speaketh little, only that Christ made Disciples, and his Disciples baptized them: during the tyme of Christs abode upon earth, he did all things well, but some things he did which he was not pleased to reveal to us, what is written, is written for our learning; and so much is written, as by believing we may have eternall life.

In things that are liable to no difficulty, a greater liberty of words is used: as, Go preach the Gospel to every creature; here men cannot easily mistake, because none are capable of the Gospel but reasonable creatures: So in the Commission, Christ saith, Make Disciples of all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, Son and holy Ghost. Here Christ giveth a Commission to make all nations his scholars, baptizing them, and teaching them what he commands: Here our Sa-

B

vour

An Answer to Mr. Tombes
William Hussey, 1647

vicour is plain in the manner and form of Baptisme that was new and unknown: concerning the doctrine they should teach, he telleth them, he will give special command what they should teach; and for the subject, that being before limited to Jews, is now extended to the Gentiles also: but what should be the qualification of persons to be baptized is not said, neither doth the Apostles any where declare, or give any thing in charge to *Timothy* or *Titus*, (to whom *St. Paul* wrote, as unto Ministers of the Gospel, to acquaint them with their duty) any matter of any difficulty wherein they might easily fail: and in *1 Cor. 1.* he by occasion speaking of Baptisme, speaketh of that, as of a thing consisting in form of words, and outward rite of washing, (so as it is ministerially to be performed) wherein no such difficulty was, or danger of mistake; and therefore he had little care thereof, men of meaner qualifications might do that; yet were the Corinthiacks baptized before he wrote to them, and a Church; in all the dogmaticall parts of Scripture, nor one word concerning any direction to the Minister whom he should baptize, whereby it is plain, that Christ did not charge his Disciples with any danger of mistake in baptizing, they should teach what Christ had or should command, for matter of doctrine; and Christ doth referre the communion to future direction; but in all the scripture no further explanation concerning the persons that were to be baptized: The Churches were baptized no man knowes by whom. To Churches and Saints, men received into the Church, is all the doctrine of the Apostles directed, whereby it appears, that they had care to teach all that Christ by his Spirit did command: but so little is spoken concerning the persons to be baptized, or the manner of administration, more then is in the communion; that it may plainly appear, no controversies were raised concerning that: it was a plain case wherein they walked, without dispute; or, it seemeth, suspicion of controversie, though light enough be given to the truth; so that Antipedobaptists, without offending against plain Scripture, can have no ground to epople the baptisme of Infants by those insinuatious and groundlesse arguments which they use against it; and certainly, it was less ere much was said, and the strength of that which is said, will appear. What is gathered out of the communion, *Ge. make Disciples of all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, teaching them, &c.* we shall consider:

Nations is the subject, that is cleer, that Mr. *Tombes* confesseth it, though with this limitation, nations that are made Disciples; which limitation can receive no colour without apparent alteration of the words. First, name them Disciples, and then baptize them, saith Mr. *Tombes*: three words are added, (*first, and, then,*) the words plainly imports, make Disciples by baptizing them and teaching. I have added nothing but the word *by*; and that is implied in the participiall exceptions, as we appeare to all English men that understand their own tongue: as in the like phrase; make, or build houses, laying the foundations on the rock,

rock, and raising the walls and roof of lasting and durable matter, do not these participles expresse the manner of doing? or, may a man gather from hence that the house must be built before the foundation must be laid? Again, the word nations, is a Name of multitude, and the very communion seemeth to point at the nation of the Jewes for the persons, that they should call other nations into covenant with God even after the same manner as the Jewes have been, by vertue of the same promise; and thus it is apparent, the Apostles all understood it. Paul, both to the Romans, *Rom. 4. 11.* and *Gal. 3. 17.* doth argue, that the promise might find the same to us, as was to *Abraham*, though circumcision be taken away; for as much as the promise was before circumcision, even to *Abraham*; and there might remain the circumcision of the heart, though the outward circumcision were taken away, and Baptisme put in the place of it; and from this promise, *Act. 2. 39.* *St. Peter* argueth to Baptisme, this promise belongs to you, therefore baptisme, that is, it may be, say, it must be received by a national covenant, the nation of the Jewes were only in covenant with God before Christ; but all nations after Christ hath broken down the partition wall. Now principally a national covenant doth consist in this, that the most principall of the nation do covenant for the rest, the more considerable part do receive for the rest, and require performance of others their inferiours. God had circumcision upon the Jewes under a penalty, which is a national way of receiving; God commandeth all to be circumcised by a Law under a penalty, that person that was not circumcised, must be cut off, *Gen. 17. 14.* that the whole nation might be circumcised. If any shall object, that the Jewes were not all to be circumcised under a penalty, but the Jewes was appointed of God. I answer, that was an especiall privilege of the Jewes, that they had their civill Lawes from God, but what litle upon a nation as a duty, that it may require of all, and cut off them that refuse; and this is implied in the communion, when nations shall covenant to be Disciples, which may be done by a part for the whole, then are such as in communion from Christ commanded to baptize and teach the whole nation, such as are in authority may covenant in a national way for the inferiour sort, and justly require all external performances from them, such as Baptisms, and firmness to be taught are; as for faith, and internal performance, no creature can judge of that, or require it of another in a judicial way.

If any object that the Apostles did not execute their commission, but upon such parties as did believe, and would be baptized.

I answer, a communion cannot be executed in full extent, until longanimity be gotten; he that hath a communion to hang up all the thieves in the kingdom, must execute it as he may; he must hang them as he can catch them: as soon as they could procure a national willingness, they were ready to baptize them, as

An Answer to Mr. Tombes
William Hussey, 1647

by many thousands baptized by them the same day of their conversion may appear, taking them in by families, which act by a national way, the matter of the family covenanting for his servants and children: So *Jobb. 24. 15. I and my household serve the Lord*; he may not believe for his servant, but he may covenant for external worship for his son, under a penalty, and for his servant according to his condition, under penalty, or dismissal of service, that the whole family or nation might come in: And that the Gentiles should in such a manner flow into the Church, the Prophets do fully testify, *Isa. 2. 2. All nations shall flow, &c.* See further what light the word Disciple doth give to this sense of the commission. Disciple is a relative, and is referred to master, to him that giveth precepts, which have sanctions of reward, and punishment annexed; and this is the covenant that is between the master and the scholar, that he will teach and punish the negligence of the scholar, the scholar must be under the covenant of submission, or otherwise he can be no scholar.

Now, note that two ways this covenant of a scholar may be put upon any person: First, it may be put on with the consent of the scholar: or, secondly, without, in case of a slave, his Lord may impose what covenants he pleaseth, without his consent, if he will live and enjoy his being, the father may, and that justly, by his interest, that he hath over his son by nature, put him to school, and make a scholar of him, even before he be willing to consent, he may justly carry him, and correct him, if he refuse to be put under the power of a Schoolmaster, giving his Schoolmaster power to correct him. Now, to send him to school to Christ, and teach him the precepts of Christ, and this imposed on the parent of Christ, by his Apostles, *Eplos. 6. 4. And ye fathers, provoke not your children to wrath: but bring them up in the nurture and admonition of the Lord.* And what a parent can do over his child in matter of duty, that may the parents of the country, the Magistrates, require of the nation. God requireth it of them, they may put all the nation to school to Christ. Now, what if some of them be too young to learn, yet if they be under the discipline of the Master, they are scholars; as may appear in many little children that are set to school, to keep them safe, and from wantonness, before they be of capacity to learn, many have a hornbook given, more for a play-game, than a book, yet are they scholars, because under the discipline and correction of the Master; is it not therefore great reason, that a Christian should dedicate his child to Christ, to be partaker of the blessing and discipline of Christ? surely godliness hath the promise of this life; and that which is to come. What is the infant capable of no good from Christ? neither in soul nor body? hath Christ nothing to do with him? Christ doth bless sucking infants, and as he blesteth, cannot he likewise punish at pleasure? Why then, if he hath power over all nations, and *de jure*, they are all under his discipline, may not Christian parents put their children under the tuition of Christ, seeing, though they cannot learn, yet

he can believe, and hath right, and will punish, which we by baptizing our Infants do; but acknowledge we certainly he is an Infidel that doth not think that Christ can teach the Infant by his Spirit, though we cannot by means that we can use, or that he doth not qualify the souls of the dead Infants, with gifts of grace, nor given to reprobates, if they die in infancy, which though he can, and will without baptism; yet this is sufficient incouragement for a Christian parent to put his son to school to Christ, if Christ can teach him, this were a vain thing to think for any ignorant parent to refuse to put his son to school, because he understood not the nature of Greek himself; it is sufficient that the Master understandeth and knoweth how to teach. And certainly, words could not have been invented that could have required the Ministers to baptize all the world, Infants and all, willing or unwilling; so that any would fee that any might be taught, and submit to the precepts and discipline of Christ, then to expresse it by the word Nation, and Disciple; and this was plain to them that understood what it was for a nation to be in covenant with God, whereof there was but one pattern at that time, and so it doth appear the Apostles did understand it as a plain thing in that, though often they took occasion to speak of baptism, yet never did explain this point concerning childrens baptism, as thinking it plain enough in the pattern: what might justly raise a scruple concerning the baptizing of women, seeing they were not circumcised, that is, declared in plain terms, both men and women were baptized. Baptism is in some of circumstances, as in answering Mr. Tombes his arguments, I hope to make appear. For the further understanding of this word Disciple, I shall endeavour to set forth the full latitude of the word: the formal reason of a Disciple, is *in relation ad Preceptorem*, the foundation of which relation is a covenant between the Master and the scholar, whereby the Master is engaged to deliver precepts, and the scholar is bound to hear and undergo the penalties of his errors and contempts.

Now this covenant is either imposed, as in case of a slave, when a Lord doth lay any covenants upon his slave; here the benefits of the covenant be mercies, the punishments, if he doth them the greatest, or under any conditions avoidable, are favours; so *Nash. 1. Sem. 11. 2.* rendered a covenant to put out every one of the Hebrews right eyes, which if he had been able to have destroyed, as he conceived he was, had been a favour: in this case one party maketh the covenant without mentioning the other but as patient; therefore, *Gen. 15. 18.* God is said to make a covenant with *Abraham*, and *17. 9.* God calleth the covenant, his covenant, God made the promise and conditions, not *Abraham*; but in *Gen. 21. 27.* there, when *Abraham* and *Abimelech* did covenant, the Text faith, *they both made a covenant*, *Abraham* his conditions, and *Abimelech* his.

If the word Disciple be taken in this sense, then it is no more, but tell all nations, that I am that Prophet that was promised by *Moses, Deut. 18. 18. 19.* and

An Answer to Mr. Tombes William Hussey, 1647

thus Peter Acts 3. and Stephen Acts 7. did make disciples, repeating those words of Moses, A Prophet shall the Lord your God raise to you like unto me, him shall you hear; and he that will not hear the voice of that Prophet shall dye the death; and then these words make disciples, doe signifie no more then tell all Nations that I am sent of my Father to teach them, and that they will not hear shall dye the death. Christ without any more ado doth give Precepts, and threaten death to all the world that refuse, and so make disciples is no more but tell them they are disciples, and under the Precepts of Christ; but if any acceptance be required of the disciple, the naturall father or father of the Country, may covenant for their children as before.

Secondly, a Disciple may be understood in reference to the end, and that either actively for a man that is active or diligent to get learning, he is said to be a Scholer, or passively a man is said to be a Disciple or Scholer that is learned; and this *inchoative vel ad certum aut designatum gradum vel perfectivè*: if this man that is to be baptised must be taught *inchoative*, it will serve turne to have learned one lesson in reference to that one lesson he is learned, though he hath learned but an A the first letter of his Alphabet. To the second sense men are assigned a certaine measure of learning as sufficient for one calling, another measure for another calling; what degree of knowledge men must attaine to before they be baptised, no man yet hath declared: and in so great a silence of Scripture were an arrogant inevitable; for want whereof, all that is said concerning a Disciple to be made before baptised, is without any regularity and certainty; if it bee understood *perfectivè* when a man must never be baptised, if not before he be made perfectly learned; whereby it appeareth that we cannot be said to be made learned in disposition to Baptisme, but as before made Schollers in relation to Christ our Master by Baptisme in the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, being taught the precepts of Christ.

Mr. Tombes 1. 27. p. filleth upon this as urged by some obscure person, but faith is so foolish, that no man will say so but he that is out of his wits, but hee in the mean time answereth it no better then by saying if this were true, the Apostles needed to have done nothing else then to baptise them: I thinke if ever a man were out of his wits, it was here, Christ saith, make Disciples by baptising them and teaching them, if hee meane so, need they only baptise them, and not teach them? or if they were made Schollers, must they not be taught when they are schollers? in what sense doth this man take scholler? surely in such a sense that hee need be taught no more: if hee must be a Disciple in such a sense before hee be baptised, it were a bold adventure for any Minister to baptise any man, or if hee will, the party baptised must be taught no more: if baptising would make Disciples, the Apostles need doe no more, this were a good excuse for not preaching. It is plain Christ commands to baptise and teach; what if a man do performe

forme

forme part of his duty, is he discharged of the other part? the command is in conjunctive terms both must be performed. But Mr. Tombes fell on that objection, rejected: but I further prove it.

What doe not *actus* *Corum* and *Intellectus*, being active participles, expresse the action of their verbs: and is not *substantivè* the end, is not every action to an end? yes certainly, and to make Disciples is the end, inrolling them by Baptisme, and after teaching them the means. I desire that men may not be outcaid from principles and rules. But I hasten to try the strength of Mr. Tombes his arguments.

He censurith this practice, that Infants borne of Beleevers are universally to be baptised, for my part I hate not the question so, but Infants borne in a Nation that are the Disciples of Christ, or have received the Gospell, are to bee baptised: of Beleevers much more; if presented by them; and they undertake to instruct them by themselves or others in the precepts of Christ.

But let us see Mr. Tombes his sophismes, That which hath no testimonies of Scripture that is doubtfull.

Infants baptisme hath no testimony of Scripture, *ergo* doubtfull.

The *minor* Mr. Tombes labourth to prove by an induction, but it wanteth force; he should have said, *et sic de ceteris*, none of all these places might prove this, and yet it might have testimony from some other place: but I will follow him in his exceptions, and see how jult they are against the testimonies produced.

The first testimony which he pretendeth accurately to examine, Gen. 17. &c. I passe by his jingle, he raiseth 14 arguments raised out of severall places of Scripture as urged in defense of Pedobaptisme, which he answereth, whose answers I shall endeavour to examine, and see how the arguments are as he urgeth them, or as they may be urged from this place of Genesis: to whom the Gospell Covenant agrees, to them the signe of the Gospell Covenant agrees; but to Infants of Beleevers the Gospell Covenant agrees, therefore the signe of the Gospell Covenant, and consequently Baptisme. That Mr. Tombes might prepare for an answer, he sheweth a great deal of his accurate skill, he examines *force, supposita*, things granted on the part of Pedobaptistes, and converteth them into questions, flattereth their apart, and to endeavour to take away the strength of the argument.

1. Whether the Covenant made with Abraham, and the Gospell Covenant be the same? Mr. Tombes denieth with this difference, that the Covenant with Abraham was mixed, but (with respect to Mr. Tombes, his opinion of learning he hath gotten) hee begunneth at the wrong end to prove it: for a Gospell Covenant hath gotten and man, taketh in all the Covenants that now are, or ever were

since

An Answer to Mr. Tombes

William Hussey, 1647

since the fall between God and man : God was never in covenant with any man or Nation, but in Christ: Christ is the adequate subject of the Gospel: this Gospel was preached from heaven by the Angels, Luke 2.10. *εὐαγγελίζεσθε*, I preach the Gospel, which was in the words Unto you is borne this day in the City of David a Saviour which is Christ the Lord : Certainly whatsoever the Saints enjoy upon earth, or shall enjoy in heaven, they enjoy it in and for Christ. Whereas Mr. Tombes distinguishes the promises made to Abraham into Evangelicall, Domestical, and Civil promises; what had Abraham some things in Christ and some things out of Christ? godliness hath the promises of this life and that which is to come. Now to deny the promises of this life to belong to Abraham under Evangelicall promise, or to distinguish individuals by speciall difference, is strange Divinity and strange Logicke; in reason of different nature in Peter and Paul, or in Pauls reason of another nature than Peter, because he useth some particular arguments that Peter doth not? Abraham had the blessings of his house, and others have the blessings of their families : as Gal. 3.9. Paul telleth us, that they which believe are blessed with faithfull Abraham, they are not blessed only as the seed of Abraham, but as Abraham they are favourites of blessing to their seed through faith in Christ, and that doth that inference clearly prove that Abraham was intitled to the blessing by his faith, *tanquam natus*, as Abraham, that those that believe are blessed not with Abraham, but faithfull Abraham; and further saith, note that the faithfull are blessed with the seed of Abraham, but with Abraham, they that believe have as full a right to the promise as Abraham himselfe: the same Covenant, the same blessing, remains to us with Abraham; as for those particular differences they are but numerical, and make no difference in the promise, no more than the difference of Peter and Paul doe in mankind: Abraham had his family blessings, we have none: *Legis non eratis aut desinit particularia*: if any fall say that his being father of Christ after the flesh putteth a mixture of the Covenant, and maketh it of another nature : I deny that it doth any more vary the nature of the Covenant, then a badge of honour doth the nature of man, and this shall appear in that so much of the covenant as was feild to Abraham by circumcision cometh down to us; and if Abraham had any blessing that came not to us, that was not feild to hum by circumcision, forasmuch as all the benefits that Abraham and his natural or faithfull seed had of circumcision, that the Believer hath without circumcision. For though it be true that circumcision was given to all indefinitely yet the benefit of circumcision came only to the faithfull both before and after Christ came: and this is plainly set downe by Saint Paul, that nothing can be more plaine, that circumcision was of force to Abraham by faith, Rom. 4.9. 10. Faith was reckoned to Abraham when he was uncircumcised, and that he received circumcision

as a foale of the righteousness of faith: and in verse 15. he saith, that Abraham was father of circumcision to them that were uncircumcised; where he implied that those that were uncircumcised were circumcised in a sense: and this is further affirmed of them who are in Christ Jesus by faith, Col. 2.10. that they are circumcised with circumcision made without hands, and this circumcision with hands is specified, Eph. 2.11. Ye were uncircumcised with circumcision in the flesh made with hands, implied that they were circumcised in the heart: what other sense can be tender of this circumcision of heart, but that that cleanness of heart which was signified to our fathers by circumcision, remaineth to us though the feale be altered? and this is that usual setting downe of Evangelicall duties and benefits by ceremoniall expressions: We under the Gospel are circumcised in heart without hands. Now how could that be, unless the internal part of circumcision did remaine to us? And thus Mr. Tombes 33. doth confess: that the substance of the Covenant doth remaine 1. but still helpeth himselfe with his mixt covenant, which I have formerly denyed, and shall presently evince: the different manner of administration doth not alter the Covenant: God did set forth, his promises of Heaven by Canaan: was pun'thull in the ceremonies; but the ceremonies did lead those that believed to better then the bare ceremony, without which, circumcision and all their service was utterly without use or benefit, God did in speciall manner blisse those outward duties in his cleat, because they were his owne Ordinance, causing them to see more in those types, then they in their owne nature doe seem to manifest. And thus Mr. Tombes confesseth, that the promises thus were Evangelicall in the more sover sense of the Holy Ghost, doe point at the priviledges of Abrahams house in the outward face of the words: so that it may be doubted whether this Covenant made with Abraham may be called simply Evangelicall: and this doubt is made the more just, because Mr. Tombes, and some of his company doe not call the Covenant on Mount Sinai simply Evangelicall: what have you distinguished between mixed and pure Gospel Covenants, on purpose to mixe the Covenant with Abraham mixt, and is it now doubtful? and therefore doubtfull, because Master Tombes and others doe call the Covenant on Mount Sinai mixt: What if they miscall it? What ground then of the doubt? away with such groundlesse doubts: for wee call that Covenant, and all the Covenants that God made with man since the fall, purely Evangelicall, without any mixture at all; and let Mr. Tombes, or any of his company prove the contrary: in the mean time, let me intreat Mr. Tombes, and all other that meddle with controversies, to make no more distinctions nor limitations, then lawes of division and limitation will allow: For, though at first they may win applause for their novelty, yet after ages will see their vanity, if any of them be taken up in a trash, yet times will come that will find them out: But all this while, Mr. Tombes doth not tell us what part of

An Answer to Mr. Tombes William Hussey, 1647

the covenant was sealed by circumcision, or whether circumcision did respect principally the domestic part or civil, or Evangelical part, or equally all; nor shew any reason why the Gospel covenant will not admit any such mixture as he supposeth; but I do not love to insult over a weak argument, or strike an adversary when he is dead.

Secondly, Mr Tombes cometh to distinguish the seed of Abraham. I will not excuse my self to repeat or rehearse notice of what Mr Tombes saith well, but of such passages as he layeth down, upon which he purpooseth to raise something against children baptisme: He insinuateth to prove, that the seed of believing Gentiles, were not the seed of Abraham; the reason is, because Mr Tombes doth not finde them so called: a man may not heare himself or his neighbour called a man in many years; nay, suppose they were never so called, were they therefore no men? But it is most plain, that the seed of believing Gentiles were the seed of Abraham; for that is the knot of the question, and God himself doth decide it. All that were by Gods appointment to be circumcised, were in some sense or other the seed of Abraham: or otherwise there had been no need at all of calling the faithful the seed of Abraham: But because they are partakers of the benefit of the promise, made to the seed of Abraham: And this is made plain in the doctrine of S. Paul, he handleth this promise to Abraham and his seed, not as the doctrine of circumcision or uncircumcision, shewing that circumcision was annexed to the promise but for a time, was but accidental to the promise, and might be taken away, the promise remaining: This the Apostle doth most artificially prove, according to rules of art: For, *Rom. 4. 10.* his purpose was to prove, that now they were not to retain circumcision, Christ being come, and baptisme being in the place and room of it; and that notwithstanding the promise made to Abraham did remain; now that he might prove this, he sheweth that circumcision was not a proper passion to Abraham and his seed flowing from the promise, as the emble, and therefore may be separated from the promise, as belonging rather to the ceremoniall administration then the essence of the promise; and that is proved thus: First, because the promise was of force to Abraham through faith, before circumcision, and therefore, *prior tempore*, before, in time or circumcision, which it could not have been, if it had flowed from the promise as the cause: For, though the immediate cause be before its effect in nature, yet not in time; man is not *rationally* before *visibily*, and therefore as the promise was before circumcision, so it may continue after.

Obj^d. But the promise was made to Abraham's seed, which we are not. To this I answer, the promise was made to one seed, not many, which is Christ; as *Calvin* and *Beza* explain it, not of the person of Christ, but believers in Christ; implying,

implying, that though there were a distinction between Jews and Gentiles, yet by faith in Christ they were all one, and the argument in *Gal. 3. 28.* doth directly shew this; neither Jew nor Greek, bond nor free, all one in Christ Jesus. Abraham had but one blessed seed to whom the promise was made, which is Christ, saith the Text, *vers. 16.* But I have proved the promise was made, which is Christ, in person as the seed of Abraham; but the seed of Abraham is reckoned in Christ's elect, which in reference to the promise are but one seed, whether Jew or Gentile, so are the blessings and satisfactions of the Church reckoned the sufferings of Christ. So that this seed of Abraham in reference to the promise, was never understood of Abraham's seed, according to the flesh, but by faith: And here note, that this is not an univocal division; as if the members did not coincide, or that some were the seed of Abraham according to the flesh, and none of them his seed by faith, and others by faith his seed that were none of them his seed in the flesh; nay, but this distinction is in reference to the promise as distinct from circumcision; all those were not of the seed according to promise, that were the seed of Abraham according to promise, *Gal. 3. 29.* If ye be Christs, then are ye Abraham's seed, and heirs according to promise; else not: And this is not to distinguish Jews from Gentiles, but believing Jews from infidels, and to draw the whole virtue of the promise on Believers: In the promise is belonging to Abraham through faith, and the seed of Abraham, as the word seed is understood in the promise, and in the distinction of God is the Believer only; so that the seed of Abraham by faith, and the seed unto whom the promise of God to Abraham did belong are the same, the seed of Abraham and the Believer, whether Jew or Gentile, whether before or after Christ, are all one, in the distinction of God: So that the seed of Abraham that were blessed were believers only, not all the seed of Abraham, nay, nor all the seed of Isaac, but in Isaac, that is, in Christ, that was the seed of Isaac, all that were in Isaac, that is in Christ, of whom Isaac was a type, that is, believers only, not all the seed of Isaac; for the promise did not belong to Esau that was the seed of Isaac; for that, though he were the seed of Isaac, yet he was not in Isaac, that is, he was not infered into Isaac as a type of Christ by faith; and therefore the seed must be understood that the promise might belong to all the seed, *Rom. 4. 16.* not to that which is of the Law only, but that which is of the faith of Abraham; not to them only which were circumcised according to Law, but to believers, though not circumcised, (that is, after circumcision was taken away by appointment of God, For, though circumcision was not so natural and essentiall to the promise, that it was enough at any time to entitle any to the promise without faith; yet, *virtute institutionis dividit*, was not to be emitted until God took it away;) for the promise was not to

An Answer to Mr. Tombes William Hussey, 1647

Abraham through the Law, therefore not through circumcision, which was a legal right, but through the righteousness of faith, *Rom. 1. 17.* to let us know that it gall right, but through the righteousness of faith, *Rom. 2. 29.* He is a Jew which is one inwardly, and circumcision is of the heart, in the Spirit, not in the Letter, whose praise is not of men, but of God. All this while the Scripture treateth of the feed of *Abraham* in the estimation of God: God accounteth none the feed of *Abraham* but in Christ, none heirs of the promise but in Christ, none circumcised but them that are in Christ, and therefore faith, *Rom. 2. 28.* that is not circumcision which is outward in the flesh, and this, *ex regula de nomine.* Again, *ex regula de nomi.* all that are in Christ Jesus, that is believers, are the feed of *Abraham*, heirs of the promise, circumcised in heart; but these have their estimation and praise not of men, but of God, and these are equally denied and affirmed to *Abraham*'s feed, and Gentiles according as they are believers, or not believers, this without any respect at all to *Abraham*'s feed according to the flesh; so that *Abraham*'s feed had no right at all to any part of the promise in the estimation of God, if they did not believe; and therefore, *Rom. 9. 8.* they that are the children of the flesh, that is, *Abraham*'s flesh, are not the children of God, the children of the promise are accounted for the feed; and therefore, in *Gen. 12. 3.* the Lord did make the promise not to *Abraham* and his feed only, but from *Abraham* he derived the blessing upon all the families of the earth; all the families of the earth were blessed in *Abraham*: Or, as *Gen. 22. 18.* all nations are blessed in the feed of *Abraham*, and therefore do Interpreters interpret that former by [thee] that is, in thy seed, and all that are in Christ, are plainly the heirs of the promise, and none but they, *Abraham* in honour and title, was called the fountain of the blessing, but in deed and truth, not *Abraham*, but Christ; for *Abraham* himself was blessed in Christ, not in himself, as Christ was; Christ was only blessed and justified in and for his own holiness by the works of the Law inherent in himself: So that Mr. Tombes his division of *Abraham*'s feed, *Gen. 12. 3.*, Christ's spiritual feed believers, natural feed is most unchristian, many of his natural feed were spiritual also: *Abraham*'s feed must be divided into equivocal and univocal; equivocal feed Christ, for that he was not like *Abraham* he was of *Abraham*, but *ex parte* according to the flesh, *Rom. 1. 3.* He was *Abraham*'s seed, as well as his son; his Saviour, as well as his feed: he was the promised feed, not the feed unto whom the promise did belong, as the feed of *Abraham*, but that feed that was the fountain of blessing to *Abraham* and all other his feed: and therefore Christ was the blessing it self, the promise that was made to *Abraham* and his feed, was through the righteousness of faith, *Rom. 4. 3.* but the blessing came not on Christ through the righteousness of faith, being the righteousness of faith is derivative

from

from Christ to *Abraham*: Christ's righteousness was primitive in himself, and that very righteousness that became *Abraham*'s by faith: and therefore is Christ the inheritance of *Abraham* and all the faithful feed, *Eph. 3. 6.* he is called the Covenant of the people, and a light to the Gentiles.

Secondly, *Abraham*'s univocal feed were like unto himself in relation to the promise; the word feed in the promise, I will be thy God, and the God of thy feed, is only the faithful, nothing belonging to the feed of *Abraham*'s flesh; but so as they are faithful, not excluding any Nation, or family, or person in the earth, so as faithful: as for *Abraham*'s feed according to the flesh, if not faithful, *non est nostri infans*; it is not belonging to the doctrine of the Promise to consider of them at all, *Rom. 2. 29.* they were not to be reckoned among the circumcised by God. Now for the particular application of this promise to this Nation or that, in one age to the family of *Abraham* according to the flesh, in another age to the Gentiles; in one age under the seal of circumcision, in another of Baptizing; sometimes to give a Nation the means of Grace, Word, and Sacraments, sometimes to lead them away into captivity; these things were ordered according to the particular determination and purpose of God, though God did in a more peculiar manner bless the feed of *Abraham* than other Nations, with the enjoyment of Word and Sacraments, and other blessings, yet they had them together with the land of Canaan, and the place of Gods worship; only on conditions of faith and obedience, as in *Deut. 8. 5.* and *39. chapters.* and by the many threatenings of removal of them by the Prophets, and their actual captivities may appear; so that these graces of faith and obedience come on this or that Nation or person according to the purpose of Gods will, as likewise effectual operation of the Word, and the particular effect of the Sacrament under the means of Word and Sacraments, wholly depend on the mercy of God according to the election of grace. Men are to administer the outward rite and sacrament according to the ordination of God: God by his Spirit begeth his grace, and withholdeth it from whom he pleaseth: The Jews were told by the eight day so figure the flesh with circumcision; but it was God that circumcised the heart, without which, the circumcision of the flesh was no circumcision in the estimation of God; as *Rom. 2. 28.* which man cannot not argue to take notice of, it is the way of God, no man knoweth it: it is God that giveth the new name that no man knoweth but he that hath it. Those that have this inward grace of circumcision, are called and accounted by God for the feed of *Abraham*, but whom shall *Abraham* for his part in reference to this promise, account for his feed? the covenant on Gods part is to be the God of *Abraham* and his feed, which God knows how to extend to Jew and Gentile, and limit to believers even among *Abraham*'s family. But *Abraham* had laid on him that he should circumcise, but he cannot walk by Gods rules in the estimation of his feed, *Gen. 17. 10.* This is my covenant that ye

C 3

keep

An Answer to Mr. Tombes William Hussey, 1647

keep between me and you, and thy feed after thee, every manchild among you shall be circumcised: in the former part, I will be a God to thee and thy feed, might have served *Abraham*; must he had known how to estimate his feed, as God did by the believer, but that was past *Abraham*'s skill, therefore must *Abraham* have another rule for him to walk by; and left *Abraham* insisting on the word feed should debarre many from circumcision of the flesh, whom God did intend to circumcise in heart; he is charged with his duty in plaine termes, 12. 13. verſe, Every manchild in your generations, he that is borne in the house or bought with money of any stranger that is not of thy feed. And Exod. 12. 48. When a stranger shall sojourn with thee, and will keep the Passover to the Lord, let all his males be circumcised; and then let him come neare and keep the Passover, for no uncircumcised person shall eat thereof, one law shall be to him that is home-borne, and unto the stranger that sojourneth among you: so you see how *Abraham* was to count his feed, not only those that were indeed his feed, but those that were of his family, nor fo only, but the feed of believing Gentiles, were to be the accounted feed of the promise: one law must be to the stranger that sojourneth, and to the natural feed of *Abraham*: the believing Gentile that would keep the Passover, must be subject to the same law with *Abraham*: he must circumcise not only himselfe, but all his males, and the reason is, because no uncircumcised person may eat thereof: the matter of the family might not be accounted a circumcised person, unless all his males were circumcised, because that was the law of circumcision, that he that was circumcised himself, must circumcise all his males, because the blessing of *Abraham* was a family blessing, as *Gen*. 12. 3. In thee shall all the families of the earth be blessed; and that which is there rendered by families, is in 18. 18. rendered by Nations, All the nations of the earth shall be blessed in him: seeing all families, and all nations be of the same extent. Thus you see plainly demonstrated that *Abraham* and believing Gentiles were to understand the feed of *Abraham* in reference to the promise of the feed of believing Gentiles, which *Mr. Tombes* doth not finde.

You see the promise made to *Abraham* and all families, and all nations performed in some families, even under the law of circumcision, the families of strangers, the males that were borne in the house or bought with money, were reckoned as *Abraham*'s males; but this stranger that would keep the Passover, must circumcise his males not under the name of *Abraham*'s males, not as borne in *Abraham*'s house, nor bought with money, but under the name of the feed of such a stranger that would keep the Passover; they could have no right to circumcision, but as the feed of believing Gentiles. Argue you see this promise is made to all Nations in *Abraham*, which must have a time of performance in that sense also: but this was never performed in any national capacity before Christs time; yet God never made a promise, but he taketh a time in some sense or other to perform

forms: but we see notwithstanding this promise, God had not any Nation blessed but the Jewes, and therefore doth *St. Paul* plainly interpret that part of the Scripture foretelling that God would justify the heathen through faith, promised before the Gospel to *Abraham* saying, In thee shall all the nations of the earth be blessed: see God made his promise to *Abraham*, and all families, all nations; he began with *Abraham* and his, and some other few Gentiles families, and after refresheth the performance of the promise as it concerneth all Nations to the times wherein he foretold that the Nations would beleeve.

3. Question, whether there be the same reason of Circumcision and Baptisme in signing the Gospel-covenant? To this *Mr. Tombes* saith, that the substance of the Gospel-covenant was the same in all ages, yet this covenant hath divers formes and functions, where after abundance of words to prove diversity of formes and functions, he endeavoureth to prove a diversity of the formes and function of the covenant with *Abraham*, and forme, function, and accomplishment of the new Testament covenant: and from thence he inferreth his conclusion in these words, Where I gather that there is not the same reason of circumcision and bap tisme in signing the Evangelicall covenant; nor may there be an argument drawne from the administration of one, to the like manner of administration of the other. I have heard very much of *Mr. Tombes* his learning and now and making syllogisms with two conclusions, *scilicet*, divers, and yet make them arise from the same premises: this is the learning so much magnified.

That which he principally gathereth is, that there is not the same reason of circumcision and bap tisme in signing the Gospel-covenant. For my part I know but two wayes of signations or sealings, one natural, the other *ex officio* *divino* *vel* *humano*. Now I conceive both circumcision and bap tisme doe sign or seale sacramentally, and by divine institution; and therefore there is the same reason of both their sealings. Now the different forme of the covenant maketh no difference in the seale: If it be an obligation for money, or a lease under large or ample covenants, or a conveyance of inheritance, wherein one parcel of land of an acre, or one free-hold, or more, one manor, or more, maketh no difference in the seale or signature, neither doth it vary the reason of the seale, which are *ex humano* *instituto* *obligatori*; neither doth the difference of the covenant with *Abraham*, and the Evangelicall covenant if differing, as *Mr. Tombes* would have, make any difference in the reason of the signing of the Gospel-covenant by circumcision and bap tisme: for grant that circumcision did seale both Evangelicall seale, Evangelicall promises, and for the same reason, because God had appointed them to be seals, neither doth the mixture of one promise with another alter the operation

An Answer to Mr. Tombes William Hussey, 1647

operation of the feale, seeing the feale doth worke as strongly upon every part of the covenant, or every promise in the covenant, as if there were but one promise in all, or as if every covenant or promise had a single deed and single feale: but all this while what Mr. Tombes hath here alleg'd as differences in forme and function, are differences in matter, not in forme or function: promissa, the things granted in the covenant belong to the matter of the covenant, not to either forme or function: things promised, whether Evangelicall or Politicall, past, present, or to come, belong only to the matter of the covenant, and do not vary the reason of their sealing, which maketh the collection of Mr. Tombes seem to me very strange; and lo much the more, because it hath the testimony among other things of a learned collection.

But, lest I might be answered, that this was affirmed but barely, I shall desire that all learned men would consider what be formall differences of covenants, and what maketh the differences of functions.

The formall differences of a covenant may be considered, either different *in formis verborum*, that is, when the same thing is granted in different formes of words: as when Christ is promised under the seed of the woman and the seed of Abraham. Secondly, covenants are said to differ formally; if one covenant be absolute, the other conditionall, one free, the other upon valuable consideration; the one upon a condition already performed, the other upon a remaining condition of service or rent; the one voluntary on both parties, the other voluntary on the one part only, and on the other imposed: These, or such like, are formall differences in the nature of a covenant; as for formality of words, difference in them will not make an absolute covenant conditionall, or the like: And consider, I pray you, what formall difference is there in the covenant with Abraham, and the Evangelicall covenant in Mr. Tombes his own sense? were not the covenant with Abraham and the Evangelicall promise upon the same condition in Christ through faith? were not both in Christ upon the same valuable consideration in our selves equally free? Do not we all stand bound to faith and obedience under both covenants, as you disallow them? Did not God equally impose on us all the means of our salvation? Where then is the formall difference in these covenants you talk of? unless you mean *verbis formalibus*, which make no difference in law or equity. Your difference you talk of, is but in matter, which I have formerly proved to be but imaginarij, but grant there had been a formall difference in the covenant, what had that been to the difference of the feal that signeth only the covenant performed, or to be performed, all sealed with the same feal, unless the institution put a difference.

But now let us consider what difference there is in the function: Sanctions are the ratifications and confirmations of a covenant, upon which the verity and

Lounds

bounds of the covenant are established: are an oath: secondly, a feal; thirdly, a reward: fourthly, punishment; fifthly, carnal, and perhaps, one other that may in mercy and skill will not reach to, but for all these they are the same in both covenants; but the oath that he swore to Abraham, Gen. 22. 16. is performed in Christ, the substance of the Evangelicall promise in your sense: and Zacharias, Luke 1. 75, 77. doth challenge that function as belonging to him, and telleth us plainly, that if Christ had not come to deliver us from the hands of our enemies, God had not performed his oath to Abraham. Now, if you look back to that oath, ye shall see that God promised in Abraham, to bless all the nations of the earth, which was not performed, yet, not to any one nation besides the Jews, nor so much as by way of profer, until Christ came under the notion of a nation; but worship was retained to Jerusalem, continuance to the Jews, therefore Christ gave his first communion unto the Isth sheep of the house of Israel, but after his communion was to all nations; and therefore Saint Paul, Rom. 2. 13. entitles the Jews to honour, glory, and peace first, and also to the Gentiles: And in Hebr. 8. 8. raiseth comfort after Christ, from the oath made to Abraham, and from thence I can gather (however it will found in Mr. Tombes his cares) that the covenant made with Abraham did remain after Christ, or else the consolation is but by way of analogie: But, what comfort can we have from the function, if the covenant be void, unless by way of analogie, with which kind of argument Mr. Tombes is much troubled, when he raiseth them against himself, though many of his own arguments be nothing but analogies? Besides, our saviour doth use the same function to the Gospel-covenant in Mr. Tombes his sense, even the covenant which he made with the believers in the new Testament, he doth confirm by an oath, John 5. 24. Verily, he that heareth my Word, and believeth on him that sent me, hath everlasting life; as likewise, John 6. 47. So that it is plain, this function of an oath was the same unto Abraham and under the Gospel.

Secondly, the function of the feal is to both the same; for the difference of the feal doth not make the difference in the function, for the confirmation is the same, whether the feal be a Lion or a Lamb: If a Prince should change his feal from his posture to his arms, which he may do, if the Law forbid not, or by act of Parliament, if it do, yet the function would be the same: circumcision and baptism, though different feals, nor different functions.

Thirdly, for the rewards, they are the same, hell and heaven are the same; for that temporall blessings and mixture of covenant, I have already spoken, to which I refer my Reader. But grant that there had been severall functions in reference to reward and punishment, what had that been to the difference of the reason, why circumcision and baptism should seal the Evangelicall covenant, seeing they are both but one function, namely, feals? but the change of the feal doth not change that function: Thus you see, how weakly this objection will follow from the

D

premisses,

An Answer to Mr. Tombes William Hussey, 1647

promises, and likewise, how false it is in itself; they are both seals, and the reason of being such, is the same, namely, divine institution. But for the second objection he draweth out of the same promises, is, that baptism and circumcision are not to be administered after the same manner; did any man ever say that baptism and circumcision should be administered after the same manner, that were a strange and unpolish'd thing to imagine?

His third question, whether *sedate, and to be signed are convertible termes*; and why *many were circumcised, to whom no promise in the covenant made with Abraham did belong*: as *Ishmael, the same may be said of Elean*. And why are these the only instances, I will grant Mr. Tombes more than he desires, that half they that were circumcised, were such, unto whom no part of the covenant do belong: was Abraham able to know that Ishmael was a reprobate, when he circumcised him? circumcision was administered by the appointment of God, and was not to intrinsecally to the covenant, that it must be, *Proprium tertio modo, proprium tertio modo, eveni falli non potest*; the time before Abraham, not liable to any seal, it had been in use a full before God gave it: and as for Job, Loo, and Isaac as lived in, and after Abrahams time, and were admitted with this covenant with Abraham, they left the benefit of the blessing if they refused to be circumcised, and what they did is not plain, the Scripture is silent.

After God had given the seal of circumcision, all that were in Abrahams house, and all believing Gentiles and their seed ought to be circumcised: in Abrahams house, those that were not circumcised were to be cut off from among Gods people, and those strangers were not to be accounted believers, nor suffered to eat the Passover; if they, and all their males were not circumcised formerly, proved out of Exod. 10. Then all that were in the covenant must be circumcised: as for the persons that were not eight dayes old, they were not to be circumcised actually, nor yet women, and yet were not uncircumcised; *Proterea non dicitur de femella habitis ante tempus statutum: as, calculus non dicitur calcis ante mimum diem, non lacte dentatur*; if he die before the eighth day, it is all one, as if he were circumcised, being in disposition to circumcision: and the female, as if he likewise circumcised as a member of Abrahams house, in that she was the seed of Abrahams, partaker of the blessing of Abrahams house, in that she was the seed of Isaac, eating the Passover, though in her person she was not, yet in her person was not the seed of Abraham, or the seed of a circumcised person might enjoy it; that all that were in the covenant were not circumcised, the blessing to the whole blessed; if ye come nearer to all the persons of Abrahams family that were males must be circumcised, how what of that not every member of the males, but

but their forefathers, yet every member of their bodies were partakers of the benefit, so were the females partakers of the blessing of the family, the first fruits sanctified the whole lump, the redemption of the firstborn, Exod. 13: 1. did redeem the whole issue: why may not the circumcision of the male, serve for the female? that which cometh within our consideration is only this, whether any were re-baptized because unbelievers, not because women, or such as God exempted.

But Mr. Tombes for all his abandoning of arguments, from analogie brought an argument from the like, and perhaps a greater reason: in children are baptized in their parents. But perhaps not for great a reason, perhaps no proportion, perhaps no reason at all, perhaps such a reason as Mr. Tombes upon second thoughts would not insist on; what, when God shall accept of the women to services, sacrifices, Passover include her in the blessing, nor young, nor old, never require circumcision of her, appoint the males, ordaine it in such a manner, as without further explanation could not be executed upon her: how can Mr. Tombes think of proportionable reason from hence, that may give with the baptizing Infants in their parents which must afterwards be baptized in their persons that are capable of Baptisme in their persons, by no colour of reason excuse: I pray Sir, let your next analogie have better proportion. Mr. Tombes proceedeth, *but it is manifest, faith he, that the termes comprehended in the Covenant made with Abraham, and circumcised, were never the less not admitted to baptisme by John Baptist and Christe apostles, till they professed repentance and faith*. Hence I gather that right to Evangelicall promise was not the adequate reason of circumcision, but Gods precept, *gratis offerretur*: he preach nothing, only he faith, that John Baptist did not baptize circumcised persons before they professed repentance and faith in Christ; notwithstanding Mr. Tombes hath not proved, neither can he prove any of his opinion, ever prove, that John did require that they should profess repentance and faith before they were baptized: it will not serve turne to prove that John required profession of repentance to prove he required repentance; repentance and profession of repentance be two things; neither will an historical narration, that that person did believe, prove he professed his faith. But we shall see this further, when we shall come to answer Mr. Tombes his other arguments. Hence that is from a thing not proved to a consequence that will not follow if granted: grant John Baptist would not baptize circumcised persons until they professed that they did believe that God did take away circumcision in Christ, and appointed baptisme in the stead; doth it therefore follow that circumcision while it stood in right, was not dependent on the right to the Covenant, as the adequate reason why this or that person might be circumcised, I shall put Mr. Tombes in minde of this colliding upon such an occasion as I will not desire to hear.

But let us see what affeate can be will he assigne, to shew that right to Evangelicall promises was not the adequate cause; Gods precept and mans right be

An Answer to Mr. Tombes William Hussey, 1647

a fociate reason, causa subordinata in *secunda causa*, be not associate, much leffe any cause or reason immediately flowing from the first cause is associate with any second cause, *causa principalitatis in secunda causa non associatur*, for then it could not be principally *causa principalitatis tantum associatur*. Maye right is included in Gods precept, or otherwise there can be no adequate reason taken from a topick place which is finite, nor any demolitive medium to prove them not associating, being they are all joined with the operation of Gods, *secunda causa non existet nisi iuxta primam*; an adequate reason doth not create the subordination of causes, but only parity of society, mans right to the Governour doth not exclude the Governour it selfe, God commands that all that have right to the Governour, and none but they shall be circumcised; it is not here right to the Governour in *un genere*, the adequate reason when they and none but they must be circumcised the materials of Gods commands are Covenants; and therefore in many places of Scripture are the commandments of God called Covenants. And Deut. 29. 1. These are the covenants which the Lord commanded Moses. From these grounds such as they are, Mr. Tombes denieth the major if universally taken, his meaning ought to be, if the proposition be universal according to the limitation of the terms in the proposition, the figure of the Gospell-Covenant must agree to every person to whom the Covenant doth agree; not every figure of the Gospell-covenant, but some figure, it is sufficient that reason figure in its universal nature be attributed *omni iuxta illa limitatione*, so as it is limited in the proposition. No man can deny this to be an universal proposition, though living creature may be in a limited sense, that every man is a living creature; though there be but some living creatures that be men, yet this is universally true, every man is a living creature: what should a man take of convertibility of such things found in *divinita serie*, where an many universal propositions if Mr. Tombes should deny it, he knew how easily it might be proved, and therefore is all this shuffe before which I have cleared, what chaik it is pretensed, and you shall see what goodly limitations follow; but see first the proove of this, it denyed.

Those relations that are conferred in the same subject, they are both or none in the same subject, but the Covenant and the feale of the Covenant are relatives conferred in the same subject, *ergo* the Covenant and the feale of the Covenant are both or none in the same subject; or thus, That subject which is capable of two such accidents as are always in the same subject, that subject is capable of both or none; but that subject which is capable of the Covenant and the feale of the Covenant, is capable of two such accidents as are always in the same subject, *ergo* that subject as is capable of the Covenant and the feale of the Covenant, is capable of both or none. I have not concluded the major which Mr. Tombes hath denyed if universally taken, because it is not a proposition; the terms are not in *re*, but is of the copula by means whereof a syllogisme cannot be made to make that.

that the conclusion; but from these conclusions, or any one of them, an Inference may be made whose consequence is not deniable. Thus the covenant and feale of the covenant are in the same subject; therefore, to whom the Gospell-covenant agrees, to them the feale of the Gospell-covenant agrees also, which is the very same in terms which be called the Major. This argument is the *Reboluptatis*; but I conceive the form is Mr. Tombes his; but why should this be particularly true, and universally false; I cannot understand why one should be capable of the figure of the covenant, because he is capable of the covenant, and not another?

Now, for the manifestation of the proove, that they are always in the same subject, the same instrument: if a covenant be written in one parchment, a seal appendant upon another parchment will not seal that covenant, neither is that a covenant formally ratified without a seal: Again, the truth of a figure doth depend on the connexion with the thing signified; for that if the bush hang at one house, and the wine sold at another, that is no figure, because false, *non verum est bonum*, may be convertible, and fit be any mans duty to fit up, or any wises give demonstrative figures they must be fit where the thing signified is, as near as in can, or otherwise they be not figures; and this were a foolish thing in any mans apprehension, to say the land, and the deed for the land did belong to such a man, but the feale of that deed did not belong to him, that was appendant on some other deed, and belonged to another person.

But let us see upon what limitation he will grant the major, as he calleth it; he telleth us it is true of that figure of the covenant which agrees universally in respect of form and function to them that receive the Gospell, but it is not true of such as are of particular form and function. This is strange logicke, what can a Proposition be universally true in respect of some particular? Again, Mr. Tombes limiteth the wrong term, what ever man did deny a Proposition to be universal by limitation of the predicate: the subject it selfe doth limit the predicate: as if I should deny this Proposition to be universal, every man is a living creature, with this limitation, that it is true of such living creatures as are rational, but of Lions and Beares it is not true, I argue further into this limitation; he saith, it is not true of circumcised; it is not affirmed of circumcised, it is affirmed only of the generall name of a figure, and consequently baptizme a circumcised it not a figure of the covenant, it was, and then it might be applied to them that were in the covenant, but now baptizme. A man taketh down an old sign, and putteth up a new, the old is no more a figure, it is carried into some best place of the house, or perhaps burnt, it possesseth not the place nor office of a figure; as for those juggling terms of form and function, I referre my Reader to what hath been said of them. But the minor be denieth universally taken and here is all the knot of the question, what labour is spent about the major is lost; but that Mr. Tombes is not willing to grant any thing true that is alleged by *Reboluptatis*, all the children of belie-

An Answer to Mr. Tombes William Hussey, 1647

ving Gentiles are not such as to whom the right of the covenant doth belong only such as were his spiritual seed; the ground of this distinction is an opinion; that the covenant did belong to all that in any sense were the seed of Abraham, but the Gentiles cannot be accounted the seed of Abraham after the flesh, and therefore all the claim they have to the seed of Abraham is (as Mr. Tombes flourish the matter) according to the election of grace by faith; and therefore Abraham might circumcise all his seed, because the promise did belong to his seed. Now the seed of Abraham is to be esteemed either by nature or by grace; they that have any way had right to be Abrahams seed, have right to the promise, but the seed of believing Gentiles have no right at all, the believers themselves have a spiritual right. I have formerly shewed the falshood of this distinction, and that the seed of believing Gentiles under the Law, were esteemed as Abrahams seed in right to circumcision: now he telleth us they have right by election, but faith he, which is unknown to us but by profession or revelation; implying, that those that baptize must know the election of them they do baptize, and that they can do by profession, these fancies I leave to their just opinion to be confuted. In the next time, I briefly say, if no children were under the covenant of grace, we might baptize none, for as much as some are, we may, we must baptize all, seeing the distinct knowledge of them that are, from them that are not, belongeth to God and not to man: and this was the rule that Abraham walked by, and that we must all walk by, as shall, I hope, appear.

But I come to the second argument. I have the longer insisted upon the defence of this first, because I conceive in answering what he hath said against that I have answered all.

The second argument that Mr. Tombes urgeth, as from the Pedobaptists from testimony of Scripture, is from 2 *Colos.* 11. 12. The argument he raiseth thus:

To whom circumcision doth agree, to them baptize doth agree; but to Infants circumcision doth agree, *ergo*, also baptize. The major proved.

If baptize inced in the room of circumcision, then baptize belongeth to them that circumcision belongeth, but the antecedent is true, *ergo*, the consequent. The major of the syllogisme is apparently false, for to them that circumcision did belong, to them sacramentall baptize doth belong, the contradictory is true, but his meaning is, that men of such condition, in respect of Infants, and he denieth, and uttereth the major of the conditional syllogisme into such parts, that he may find out something that he may deny: that it doth exceed baptize he cannot deny, nor readily finde out a reason why a man of years under the Gospel should not be able to bair as much as an Infante under the Law. I speak this in reference to the difference (under the Law) of the promises, the condition of the Church is called infancy, the heir under age; now, how should a child of eight dayes old, when the whole Church is under age, be able to receive

ceive

ceive circumcision, and now the Church is at age, our Infants not able to receive baptize?

He telleth us, that the argument supposeth baptize to succeed circumcision; it doth not suppose it, but prevent it out of *Colos.* 2. 11. 12. But he prepareth for were to be circumcised, it should be persons of such quality; but because he telleth no advantage of that difference, let him argue with his own expectation. In this sense it is false, saith he, females were not circumcised, not believers out of Abrahams family, as for believers out of Abrahams family, if he understand it of such believers out of Abrahams family, as lived before Abrahams time, or before the circumcised, were vain for to prove exemption from a positive Law, by some persons that lived before the Law was made from a positive Law, by some persons out of Abrahams family; the promise was made to all families in Abraham, and they might be circumcised, though neither bought with money, nor born in Abrahams family, but desirous to eat the Passover only, and so believers: they and all their states must be circumcised, but for the females, circumcision was given in terms, that did exempt females; baptize, to all nations, not males only, as circumcision was, but females also. Besides, the Scripture doth tell us, that the Apostles did baptize certain all nations, male and female, and accordingly did baptize, *Act.* 8. 12. Now, because God hath called in females, because they are capable of the sign of baptize, which in circumcision they were not, may you without warrant thrust out Infants? or, death it any way follow, because some persons of some quality are added, therefore those that were before capable are now incapable, if God had declared infants incapable, as he hath women capable, we must have been furnished? baptize may succeed circumcision, though with such difference as God is pleased to make; but because God maketh one difference in reference to the persons, man may not take liberty to make another: As for Job, Lot, and Melchizedek, or whomsoever else you can name, we know, if they lived after the Law of circumcision was made, they might come, and be circumcised, the extent of the promise made to Abraham did reach to them; and what those persons you name did, you cannot tell, if they had any particular exemption, that is nothing to the question, we know none had privilege to the ordinance but circumcised; and in plain terms, both in the old and new Testament, an uncircumcised person shall eat thereof, *Exod.* 12. 48. and *Rom.* 2. 29. 2. this is reckoned the profit of circumcision, that they had the Oracles of God, here is every circumcised person, for that it is properly assigned to circumcision, as the profit of circumcision, there is no uncircumcised person; yet Mr. Tombes will tell us, all persons in covenant were not circumcised, this is the reverence that is given to the Scripture, when it crosseth their opinions, though they would make the world believe

believe

An Answer to Mr. Tombes William Hussey, 1647

believe that they were the only men that did respect the Scriptures; he should have made his personal difference by believers, and not believers: by Infants and men of years: and not by male and female, in or out of Abrahams house. Two sorts of Infancie (which he denieth) of baptism to circumcision, is of time; because baptism began before circumcision ended. What if circumcisers did overlap a little, and baptism did begin a while before circumcision ended? the same Gospel Christ in his person, and by his Spirit in his Apostles, did put down one and let up another, that is all I say to that; and surely it is so frivolous, I needed not to have said so much.

In respect of signification, here Mr Tombes is put to his shifts, in some significations he confesseth, but not in others. First, I will consider the significations he alloweth, and observe, that whereas they agree, cannot hinder their inefficacy, *they both signify the righteousness of faith*, saith Mr Tombes; but he must mean it doth sacramentally confirm or seal, not demonstratively signify; but howsoever, he doth agree that baptism and circumcision have the same respect to the righteousness of faith; and yet the hinge of all Mr Tombers his work is on this, that Abrahams seed were circumcised, whether they believed or no, none must be baptized but actual believers, and yet circumcision and baptism have the same respect to faith. Me thinks the bare acknowledgement of this is enough to dash all that any Anabaptist can say, the controvercie is at an end, if there be no difference in respect of faith, why should faith be required none to the baptized, then the circumcised? certainly, I would have found our same difference, or found some other reason why Infants should not be baptized, then want of faith, or I would never have opened my mouth in such a case. I would never have considered them both seals of the righteousness of faith, and yet the whole weight of the business depend on this; that one might be given in infancy to them that have not actual faith, the other may not be given in infancy; for no other reason, but because they want faith. What is the reason, why circumcision, the seal, may be given where there is no faith, but baptism the seal of faith may not; and that for no other reason, but because faith is wanting? What? may a man make a difference of a common accident? or make a generiell form a speciicall difference, or a speciicall form a numeriicall difference? this is all one as if a man should say, that a Bear were not a man, because he can fly, or not a Lion, because he can hear; and yet after confesse, that both men, and Bears, and Lions, can both hear and see; just so doth Mr Tombes, baptism doth not succeed circumcision, because baptism may be given to believers only, yet confesseth, that both baptism and circumcision have a like respect to faith; it is true, he affirmeth other differences, but none of them will neede dissolve from baptizing, then from circumcising: The first difference is, that circumcision doth signify Christ to come of Isaac, according to the flesh, but baptism doth signify immortality, death and resurrection of

Christ,

Christ: doth this make the difference? can children better understand that Christ shall come of Isaac after the flesh, then that Christ is incarnate, dead, and risen again? Secondly, can Infants better understand that the Israelites were people, so they better understand that the Law of Moses must be kept, then that it is void, or the promise of the Land of Canaan, then of eternall life? The difference that Mr Tombes putteth betweene circumcision and baptism, cannot make Infants differ under the Law, and under the Gospel, and do they differ by that which doth agree to circumcision and baptism?

As for the place out of which this argument is drawn, *Colos. 2. 11. 12.* Mr Tombes saith, that the Text doth not say we are circumcised, because we are baptized, but we are complete in him, because we are circumcised in him, and buried with him in baptism; I must needs suspect this mans learning, or his honesty. Text say, ye are complete, because ignorant Reader thus; what, Mr Tombes, doth the Text say, and they shall find, *is it not our translatours have dealt more faithfully with us than he, that have translated it, in whom also that is, we are not only complete in him, but we are also circumcised with the circumcision of the heart; we have that mercy sealed unto us, though circumcision be taken away; we might seem to be without that confirmation or figure of the purity of heart, which our Fathers had. Why saith S. Paul Christ was circumcised, and that gave an defended to us, but the effect of our Fathers circumcision ended in Christ, and is not of the body was put off, in circumcision; but the body of sin was signified; now this Christ did in circumcision, not only so, but by burial he put off that body, baptism; so that baptism doth entitle us to circumcision of the heart, by the effectual by the circumcision of Christ; so we have the same grace expressed by circumcision of the heart, in baptism; it could not be plainer expressed, if it had been said, that the benefit of circumcision by Christ is made yours by baptism; Circumcision was the seal of circumcision of the heart to the Jews: circumcision of the heart is sealed by baptism to you; For if faith plainly, in whom also ye are circumcised with circumcision made without hands, in putting off the sins of the flesh by the circumcision of Christ, the means of all this conveyed unto you by baptism; no man can deny that circumcision in the flesh, did signify, and sacramentally seal the circumcision of the heart which the Apostle here affirmeth of Baptisme. Alas! all this incongruous stuffe, Mr Tombes denieth that baptism doth succeed circumcision, and therefore Infants are not capable of baptism as of circumcision; he hath confided that faith is as requisite for one as the other,*

E

ether,

An Answer to Mr. Tombes William Hussey, 1647

other, in regard they stand both in the same relation to faith, and thereby confess what he doth deny, and yet no more than the Scripture doth affirm.

Mr. Tombes filleth our work with this argument, and in a metaphorically way talketh of an Egg, out of which, if not refrainedly taken, nothing can be gathered: but that baptism and circumcision in some things signify the same; and do so Noahs flood, and the red sea, yet do we not say that baptism succeeded into their places, much less do we inferre any right to be instituted in their stead, respecting the same figures; I do provoke I was troubled to parallel this non-sense with any thing that might equal it: if we could get these Anabaptists to speak sense, a man might the better deal with them. Can any man make any thing of this after Mr. Tombes hath allowed that they both signify the same? that both signify the sanctification of the heart; are they again turned into *materiam peccatorum*, that Noahs flood might be paralleled with baptism, as well as circumcision. You bid us take heed of such argumentation; you might say baptism, and speaking in some things, do agree *(in praesentibus verbis)*; and walking pots in some things, as walking, in action with whatsoever we can do. Your argument to Noahs Ark, is *salvatio figurativa in genere ad speciem est*; *materiam* this Noahs Ark agreth with baptism in something, therefore in sacramental nature; as if a man should say, *est animal, ergo equus*; it is a living creature, *ergo*, an horse.

The collection that nothing can be gathered in a restrained sense, but that baptism in some things signify the same; yes, more than that, they agree in some things, we may gather in what they agree; they agree in the nature of a sacrament; in divine institution; in the seal of faith; they may be administered to all to whom the tender of grace is made, not only to all that are partakers of grace. The first, in respect of providence limited to a narrow compass, and by the ordinance bound within the nation of Jews, though not to the persons of the Jews: all nations might come in and be circumcised, and offer sacrifices, and eat the Passover, but they might sacrifice nowhere but at Jerusalem; but now the ordinances are tendered to all Nations, and baptism must be administered to all nations, no affliction of persons by the commission, surely the commission was not invented by man: Christ commaunded his Disciples to baptize all nations; here is not men, women, nor children, we must baptize some body; it may then be examined who they are that must be baptized; know what worship to baptize; it is no without ground out of Scripture, that it will worship; and if some others will be found *in substantia capaci* from the capacity of the flesh, or from the judgment of the persons in commission to baptize. Your part requireth, that you prove Infants are unfit subjects and I will prove in due time, that Ministers are unfit judges: For arguments drawn from analogies, I willingly grant to be invalid, if you mind analogies of proportion, to invent any part of Gods worship by; as if we

had

had invented baptism by rules of proportion, but being commanded to baptize all Nations, and told that it should stand us in the same stead that circumcision, in reference to such principles as concerne us most, and did equally concerne the Jewes in the same respects; and telling us now the particular privilege of the Jewes should cease, and the ordinances should freely be communicated to all Nations; never speaketh one word of the particular qualification of the person of them that are to be baptized, he leaveth that to be understood *ex materia rei* under the Gospell, God dealth with the Church as fathers with their children; when they come of years tell them the ground and reason of things, leaving circumstances, which necessarily will drive them upon unto their own discretion; whereas when they are children the father directeth them to the sensitive part not acquainting them with the reason, but suppleth the defect of the infant with the particular direction of the fact to be done, having a care that he take not more upon him then he is able to bear; but when he becometh a man if he should fill exercises in such simplicity as infant upon the same rule, and take no notice of any reasonable instruction; not by comparing his strength with infancie judge nothing of his owne power, but will looke for the same direction as he had when he was a child; when the father chootheth rather to instruct him by reason, then by sense, he could not escape the just censure of a fool. God our Father telleth us that baptism doth circumcise the heart, teacheth faith as circumcision did, Go baptize all Nations; this is enough for a man when he is told the nature of baptism by comparison with circumcision; and sheweth the difference in case of women and appropriation to the Jewes, to direct them to all that are told the nature of baptism; what God did direct his Church in infancie: ye shall circumcise no more, but ye shall baptize; that shall have the same operation upon the heart, and you shall not re-fraine my worship to Jerusalem as old, but goe to all Nations: If any shall further object, But what say you to Infants? I say nothing, but that baptism in respect of my worship, and the operation it hath upon the heart, is the same with circumcising; and you know what direction I gave to my Church when they were in infancie concerning circumcision; you are capable of as much purity of heart as they were then: that is all I say; you are now of years, whilst you were children I taught you sense, now I teach your understanding as for argument from analogie, though it doth come farre short of an argument from precept; yet it is equal with an argument from example; for indeed all that can be drawn from an example is by analogie, and among analogies those are more certain that draw from a precept; then those that arise more hardly from an example; without any shadow of a precept, when the analogie is made by God, and we are led to the thing signified by Gods owne direction, and told that circumcision of the heart is the same under baptism, as under circumcision of the flesh: how dare we say that infancie maketh men incapable of circumcision of the heart? yet

E 2

God

An Answer to Mr. Tombes William Hussey, 1647

God sometime did declare, that that should be no obstacle to the administration of the signe, seeing we are trued with administration of analogies which he uttereth of out of Durands *Irregularitate*; they are things of no analogie with this. I further say, that it is not the proportion of the signe with the thing signified, that maketh a Sacrament but institution; I hope no man will affirme that baptisme is without institution; and as for the person, if you will have him *adultus*, I make no question you shall runne upon a greater necessity of will-worship, then by administering of it to Infants, as I hope upon further occasion to make appear.

Your third argument is out of the verge of your owne method, as not being drawn from any place of Scripture, and therefore I omit that, and come to your fourth Argument from the Acts 2. 38. 39.

He frameth the Argument well; if the Proposition wanted noe forme, it should be they to whom the promise belongeth are to be baptized, but Infants of believers are they, to whom the promise belongeth, therefore Infants of believers are to be baptized.

Mr. Tombes before he can make any answer to the argument, hee must first answer, that is hee must misquote and multiply two or three places of Scripture to the intent his Reader may conceive, that the promise that was there made was not the promise made to Abraham, but the promise of Iesus Christ; others say Iesus the Holy Ghost, all is one if Christ had not been sent, the Holy Ghost had not been sent; and the sending Christ was to please a difference from the promise made to Abraham, and there spoken of by St. Peter, as must needs give full satisfaction to all that doubt of that; but let us view those places, Acts 3. 25. Youe Fathers, crying unto Abraham, And in thy seed shall all the kindreds of the earth be blessed; that is plain enough of the promise to Abraham, Acts 3. 25. 26. And we declare unto youe glad tydings, how that the promise that was made to the Fathers, God hath fulfilled the same unto us, Rom. 1. 8. 9. Now I say that the promise was the Minister of circumcision for the truth of God to confirme hath gotten by the places to prove any difference from this promise here spoken of, and the promise made to Abraham: But still Mr. Tombes the promise was they be Gentiles who are said to be asire of, Eph. 2. 12. or Jews in future ages, as Beza is doubtfull; indeed Beza doth argue that Peter did not then know the call of the Gentiles, or if he had, it is not likely that he would have told the Jews of it; it might be, Peter did not at that time know the Nationall calling of the

Gentiles

Gentiles that was afterward made knowne to him; for then he could not properly have said of them that they were asire of in respect of the Jews, but Peter was not ignorant that as many of the Gentiles as the Lord should call had right to the promise, and this was in no age effective to the Jews; they always knew that one law was to the homeborne and the stranger that sojourneth among them, Exod. 12. 48, that is, when and after they were called; they were put into the same condition with the Jewes in reference to the promise; it is plain that the promise in reference to Baptisme is the same that it was in reference to circumcision; now it is true he further teacheth the inner power and effect of the Covenant which was the turning men away from their iniquity: this is the doctrine both of circumcision and baptisme, that neither circumcision which is outward in the flesh is circumcision, Rom. 2. 28. neither is that baptisme which is outward, but that is circumcision which useth the heart, whose praise is not of men, but of God. Thus baptisme must be taught, it must be taught as from God, it must be administered as by men; therefore faith Mr. Tombes, the promise is not made but on conditions of calling, and faith which may be confirmed absurdly, Rom. 4. 13, 14, 16. Let the proofs be examined, St. Paul doth handle the promise made to Abraham in reference to the fruit and effect of it, and so to entitle the Gentiles to the comfort and fruit of the promise, forasmuch as the promise did always beare that sense, that never any of Abrahams posterity had any benefit from the promise unless they were believers, and that benefit the Gentiles always had if professes, and now in a more free way; and this was granted to the Romans to seeke for justification by faith, because that was always the true and meaning of the Covenant made with Abraham; but this was the use that the faithfull ought to make of the Covenant: Abraham was justified by faith as we see, Abraham was not justified by circumcision, nor we by baptisme; circumcision was administered in *facte Exempla*, according to the appointment of God, men had nothing to doe to obtaine faith, the praise of it, that was not of men, but of God; it is confessed that Abraham did circumcise without any judgement of faith, yet had as much need of faith for benefit by the Covenant as we, his justification and salvation the same with ours by faith in Christ, Gal. 3. 9. They which be of faith are blessed with faithful Abraham: we see Abraham himselfe had his blessing by faith, God preached the Gospell to Abraham, the seed of Abraham had the benefit of the covenant by faith; whereby it plainly appears that circumcision was not given by the effusion of faith, though it had it effect by faith; but every male of Abraham must be circumcised, and that because of the promise, the conditions of faith and repentance were not new conditions put on us which Abraham and his posterity had not, though they are more plainly prepared to us than to Abraham, God was the Judge of faith in Abrahams time, and is to now, but the promise of the land of Canaan stood upon conditions of obedience the effect

E 3

of

An Answer to Mr. Tombes William Hussey, 1647

is faith, notwithstanding circumcision: but, faith Mr. Tombes, the promise was not belonging to them simply as Jews, but as called; the promise did belong to all men, *quatenus* called, but it belonged to Jews, though not *quatenus* *ipsum*, yet it did belong to Jews to be *federati*, or *pariter*. Every Jew had an interest to the promise, though not *quatenus*, a Jew, because Gentiles also had this right, *per accidens*, as called; but it was accidental to the Gentiles, some were called, and some were not; all Jews before Christ were called, but more, that called so to be distinguished into outward calling, and inward or effectual calling: by an outward calling, All the Jews were called: by an effectual, only the elect were called; whether Jew or Gentile, both these callings had their several respects unto the promise, and the seal of the promise: The outward call had a right to the Oracles, *Rom. 1. 1.* the means of faith, and accordingly many had faith by that means, though some did not believe, that do not make the faith of God of none effect; the promise of God signified by the word faith, in that place, is effectual, though some do not believe, though it be without effect to them that believe not, yet it is effectual to them that believe; and though he doth not believe, yet the Holy Ghost maketh circumcision an inseparable accident to a Jew, by giving, that the advantage of the Jew, and the profit of circumcision were the same, and the chief privilege is, that unto them were committed the Oracles of God. Now, this outward call had the promise of God being their God, and the God of their feed, and accordingly had the seal given to them and their feed: this is plain in case of the Jews, they had circumcision, and the Oracles and the promise; but all these are effectually, without faith, *Heb. 4. 1, 2.* Let us therefore fear, lest a promise being left us of entering into his rest, any one of us come short of it: For unto us was the Gospel preached, as well as unto them, but the Word preached did not profit them, not being mixed with faith in them that heard it. You see, many have the promise left them that may come short of it, they may have the Word without profit, the promise of God, circumcision without effect, all for want of faith, all these external, have an external promise one upon another: those that were born in a believing family, had an external promise left them, had circumcision, had the word, though they might come short of the effect of all for want of faith; yet the external administration must go by this outward rule; the promise in this place is understood in this sense of outward calling; and that is implied in the opposition to these words *afire off*, such as are *afire off* is opposed to them that are *faith*: Now, they that are *faith* need no calling, but they that are *afire off*, then we call: so that it is plain, calling is in reference to them that are *afire off*; and then the sense of the words is as plain the promise belongeth to you and your children, therefore be baptized: and the promise likewise belongeth to them that are *afire off*, not yet called, as many of them as the Lord shall call: and this appears, in that the Apostle

speaks

speaks unto these Jews; and exhorts them to amend their lives, and be baptized, for the promise belongeth to them, so that the Proposition is immediately true, they shall be baptized, because the promise did belong to them, calling of them that are *afire off*, is not at all unadvisedly referred to baptizing, but to the promise; and therefore cannot by any means be a limitation of such persons, unto whom the promise did belong, to make fit for baptizing, as if there were some persons unto whom the promise did belong, that were not called, and some called; those that are not called, they may not be baptized; but this is to alter the form and sense of the Apolles words, though they might have a truth in them, yet they are not the words of the Text, nor signify what is there said: Amendment of life hath no relation to baptizing, but to that in they flood guilty of; and that they were convicted that they had crucified the Lord of glory; the immediate argument that he useth to persuade them to baptizing, is, that the promise belongeth to them, it is no argument at all why they should be baptized, because the promise belongeth to their children; nor because the promise belongeth to them that are *afire off*, but because it belongeth to them, that only was ground, why the Apostle should persuade to be baptized: what is further added, is to note the amplitude of the promise, to rise up their faith, to lay hold on the promise of Iobountifull a God, that extendeth his promises to largely, not to them only, but to their children, not to sayeth his bounty there, but reacheth it out also to them that are not called, to wit, such of them as he shall call; you and your children, *semper determinate*, them them that are *afire off*, *semper indeterminate*; but if all had been limited by as many as the Lord shall call, S. Peter had drawn an universal conclusion out of particular promises: For, if that part of the verse alleged, out of which the Apostle doth inferre this conclusion, or inference he limited, then the proposition is particular, as thus: If the sense of the words be, the promise belongeth to as many of you as the Lord shall call, then it is no more, but the promise belongeth to some of you, a few of you, therefore be baptized, every one, had been a very irrational argument; nay, if you refrain promise to its strict sense, for promise with effect to the effectually called, then it can belong to a very few of them; then fore every one of you be baptized, were very strange: The promise therefore must be understood in such a sense, as it was when applied to Abrahams seed, according to the *Heb. 9.* as the faith of God in his promise, is not of none effect, though some do not believe, the promise must be understood by us, as left for all, though all attain not to it, and this not in reference to universal grace, but universal dispensation of means by us men; and herein God did go before us by his owne direction in the infancy of his Church, leaving us to walk by the same rule; when we have a more ample dispensation of the means of grace committed to us, God did command all Abrahams seed to be circumcised, and all circumcised to

eat

An Answer to Mr. Tombes William Hussey, 1647

at the Passover, though they were taught always they should not possess the land of Canaan unless they obeyed the voice of the Lord, Deut. 28. and 29. Chapters: and all along, Moses and the Prophets preach the blessing to the be-leaver, and though under the forme of works, not the covenant of works; it was faith that God looked, as in Heb. 11. all the works of the Patriarchs are ascribed by faith, and not by works: faith grounded on the same truth of God, and the same Christ, God uteth the same liberty of his will, Rom. 9. 17. in the dispensation of his grace, 17. An instance out of the old Testament in Elisha and Jacob will serve as well as in Peter and Judas; the grace of God did no more or less depend on Sacraments then now. God did not account any man cir-cumcised but a believer no more doth he now baptiz'd, Moses and the Prophets censur'd but a believer no more doth he now baptiz'd, and that notwithstanding the did teach faith and obedience, to do the Apostles, and that notwithstanding the did teach faith and obedience, than the Elevation of God in all ages, the dispen-sation: thus went the doctrine, than the Elevation of God in all ages, the dispen-sation of Word and Sacraments to the Leves, and them that were share off as faction of the Lord shall call under the Law; but now to all Nations all are now many as the Lord shall call under the Law; but now to all Nations all are now called, God doth command all men every where to repent; in the fence of these words all the world have an outward calling. St. Peter doth argue with the Jewes to persuade them to Baptisme, *a notorium*, they knew right well the bounds and extent of the promise; it was no new thing to them that the Gentiles called, should be accounted among those to whom the promise did be-long, but that Baptisme did legally wash away sinne, nor that sinners must repent, but that the promise should be sealed by Baptisme, that only was new: as for that Peter did teach repentance with Baptisme both together, as faith Mr. Tombes, that is not the question; repentance and faith ought to be taught at all times, as be-ing such things as God doth only look on most seasonably at all times to all men, Luke 13. Except ye repent, ye shall all likewise perish: but out of this place it doth no way follow that repentance must goe before, or is required as a prepara-tion to Baptisme, verse 38. is an answer to this question, what shall we do? we that have crucified the Lord of glory? If to this generall question, what shall we do? Peter had filled it to instruct them to repent, he had been wanting to his duty, but presently will scarce stand with any Antisepicall discipline; you would hardly have any great company of Catechumens if you follow the example of the Apostle, which you so much stand upon, may the keeping men of years, many years under the discipline of Catechumens directly contrary to the Apostles ex-ample. But of preparation to Baptisme we shall have further occasion to con-sider in other arguments. Mr. Tombes telleth us, that the promise doth not be-long to all Infants of believers, which is the minor universally taken; he hath

merly told us of women, and believers before Abraham. I have firmly given satisfaction to these exceptions, but the promise is to be understood three wayes, as before may appear. Either first, in chaturtion of God, or, secondly, in dispen-sation of the inward grace of the Sacraments, and effectual operation of the former are distributed according to the election of grace to the believer only, but Christ, to all the families of the earth: But now in a more explicit and plain way to all the nations of the earth; and that not only in *potestate*, but by particular dispensation, and providence unto many nations in *actu exercitii*, actually many it seemeth, he granteth the promise into many nations, but without consent we cannot baptize any nation, and this is a good excuse: he, faith the Text, speaketh not the promise made to Abraham, which was extended not to Abrahams children only, but the Infants of believing Gentiles, as before: thus of the Argument from *Act. 2.*

As for the first argument, taken from 1 Cor. 7. 14. that the Infants of a believer are holy, I have already proved; that Infants of a believer, though not of the seed of Abraham, are federally holy, and that in the words of the promise made to Abraham doth appear: As for that the words in 1 Cor. 7. 14. They were your children unholly: I say, it may well be an allusion to that federal holiness, as I shall in full upon; yet not so improbable, that much may not be said: for the present thing I affirm, that the children of believing Gentiles are federally holy, for the argument, I neither affirm it, nor disclaim it, but refer my Reader to that that hath been spoken of that matter, by other men, whose learning and judgements I honour, and come to the sixth argument.

The first argument is taken from *Act. 19. 14.* which is repeated in *Act. 8. and Luke:*

An Answer to Mr. Tombes William Hussey, 1647

belong to such, you are not able to discern the difference, and therefore it cannot be laid to your charge that you did *saute* any willfully to enter into the Kingdome of God, that the Kingdome of God did not belong unto. But the Apostles might of heaven, they have not schall faith and repentance, and therefore we may not admit them into the Kingdome of heaven: to this our Saviours answer is plain; the Kingdome of heaven doth belong to such as these, therefore suffer them to come to me: Now for the further manifestation of the sense of these words, the Kingdome of God is understood, either of the Kingdome of grace, or the Kingdome of glory belonging to the elect only, or of the Kingdome of the visible Church where men walke under the mooves of grace. 2. The coming unto Christ may be understood of coming to Christ *more lesuū*, or coming to him by faith as he sitteth in his Kingdome of grace and glory, or last of all coming to him as he sitteth in the Kingdome of the visible Church: Christ hath a residence in the Kingdome of glory and in the Kingdome of grace; now no man can come to Christ as he sitteth in the state of grace or glory, but by faith agreed on by all parties; but Christ likewise sitteth in the Kingdome of his visible Church, and teacheth them as the Prophet promised by Moses, and there inviteth all nations to the use of the meates, and commandeth his Ministers to baptize all nations, and suffer little children, not those only that Christ blessed and gave speciall testimony unto; but those that were ben like unto them, *whom* they must be permitted to come to Christ. Now the question is, whether this coming to Christ is understood only of corporall coming to Christ or any, or in which of those respects this coming to Christ is here understood; though I dare not deny a corporall coming to Christ in there intimated, yet this is not that is meant in the direction, suffer little children to come to me; for the bare coming to Christs person could not have beene inferred from this assertion, for to them belongeth the Kingdome of God. It in the kingdome of the visible Church to dispense ordinances to all the world which I doe by my Ministers: A Prophet shall the Lord your God raise up to you, like me, faith Moses, and I am shall you heare, according to which promise, I fit always in the visible Church teaching the minds of Gods, as if thus fit ready to teach, suffer little children to come to me, for so such belongeth the visible Church: if thus you understand the Kingdome of God, and the belonging of infants thereto, to figurine their interest to the visible Church, then, come to me, figurineth no more in the direction then suffer them to be received into the visible Church, which is no more then suffer them to be baptizd, or hereafter when ye shall have commission to baptize all Nations, baptize them: Neither will Mr. Tombes his distinction serve turne, that those whole in the Kingdome of heaven may be baptizd, when it appears that the kingdome of heaven belongeth to them, the next is not of these last, that is of such as have no difference

from these as far as you can judge in reference to the Kingdome of God, these are to be permitted to come to me. Now whereas Mr. Tombes saith such that is such in meeknesse, that is a liberty not to be allowed in interpreting of Scriptures to asigne, or rather restrain the license to lamblity, whereas our *haviour* applyeth the license only in this, that they were little children; it was not *facillitate* *opulatum*, but *subiectis* *et* *omnes* *qualitates*, for a subject cannot be said to be like another, if any notable disparity can be found: it is true if a quality be assignd wherein they doe agree, that one quality is enough to make them alike though they differ in all other things; but for a man barely to say such as he is fit for this or that employment, he that is fit must be such with respect to his skill, fidelity, and all other conditiones requisite for that employment. Now if any thing were named wherein they were alike; it was in that they were little children, now there which they were a like fit for was the Kingdome of God: and if any children can be fit for the Kingdome of God, what unfitness can be found in one more then another by any mortall man? therefore Christ saith, Suffer all children to come to me, for they are all alike fit for the Kingdome of God, the visible Church and the invisible too; for ought you know: neither doe I know that the unfitness of the Invidious child is in the child, but in the parent that will not bring it, nor covenant for it that it shall be a disciple of Christ, nor undertake to bring it up in the doctrine of the Gospel; nor is that man that is an Invidious himselfe *fit* *discipulo* to be believed in that point, but if he will sell the interest of his child to a Christian, I doe not know but that Christian might bring that child to be baptizd in his upon that promise, that he will bring him up in the feare of God; I am certaine, notwithstanding the promise was made to Abraham and his seed, yet hee that was bought with money might be circumcised: all children therefore that are brought may be baptizd, so as they be brought by persons that have interest in them, and in any charitable consideration may be excused that they will bring them up Christians: it is sufficient for us if they be such as unto whom the Kingdome of heaven doth belong, though the Kingdome of God belong not to them; neither can that any way belong to this argument, that Christ doth teach men that are of years lamblity from the embleme of a child, yet one child cannot be distinguished from another as more or lesse fit to come to Christ by their lamblity: For that Mr. Tombes saith Baptizme doth not bring to Christ: I say, it doth as Christ sitteth in the visible Church, into which promise the Ministers of the Gospel have commission from Christ to admit all Nations, baptize all Nations; as for the kingdome of grace or glory, Ministers certainly have no power or authority to keepe any out of them, or hinder any from coming to Christ by faith.

The seventh argument is from Act 15 32, 33. Act 18. 8. 1 Cor. 7. 16.

If the Apostles baptizd whole households, then Infants, &c. but &c. &c.

An Answer to Mr. Tombes William Hussey, 1647

This argument, saith Mr. Tombes, rests on a slight conjecture, that there were Infants in those houses, and that these Infants were baptized: but faith he, the words plainly prove under the name of the whole house, are understood thofe only that heard the Word and believed. Hence he denieth the confopquence, implying that many whole houses may be baptized, yet no Infants, because it is possible they may be without children: And he further affirmeth, either these were without children, or else the children were not comprehended under the whole house, which he laboureth to prove out of the several circumstances of the several Texts which I shall endeavour to examine along with Mr. Tombes, not only as he mentioneth them here in this pag. 20. of his Exercitation, but as in his Examen of Mr. Marthals Sermon, from 7. 137. to 142. Mr. Marshall saith, that the Gospel took place, as the old administration by taking in those families together. This Mr. Tombes strongly endeavoureth to oppose, and endeavour to fix up an assertion opposite to that for true: faith he, the administration is quite opposite to that of circumcision: the opposition which he fancieth, he feigneth to confist in several differences: First, that Abrahams family was singled out: the males only: whether in the covenant of grace, or not children, or servants: elder or younger: at eight dayes old in the house, by the Master, or others in his stead.

For, his first difference was, Abrahams family only singled out for circumcision, that is boldly affirmed, it is plain the promise in the feed of Abraham was to all the families of the earth: *Gen. 12. 3.* which is rendered by nations, 18. 18. 22. 18. There promise is made in the feed of Abraham, which in the 3. of *Galat.* is applied to Christ: so that Abrahams family is not singled out for the blessing, it is true, Abrahams family is singled out to be the line of Christ, according to the flesh; many families could not have that privilege, but the privilege of circumcision was not refinued to Abrahams family, but extended to all the nations of the earth, and was actually afforded to so many families as would dwell among themselves desired to eat the Passover, as I have formerly proved: It is plain as many as would be, or were partakers of the blessing, shall be circumcised: but the blessing was promised in *allis signis*, to all the nations of the earth, though before Christ it was in *allis exercitiis* performed to no nation but the Jewes, yet many other families besides Abraham were circumcised; therefore that difference is not between baptism and circumcision, that circumcision did belong to Abrahams family alone.

For his second difference, that males only were circumcised, I have already spoken to that: and the third, wherein all the knot of the question doth consist, what is here affirmed by Mr. Tombes, is but *petitio principii*: as circumcision was to be administered in all the families that would eat the Passover, whether persons that were circumcised did belong to the covenant of grace, or not: so is baptism, there being no man on earth, that can judge of any but himself, whether he be-

long

long to the covenant of grace or no: As for the circumcision of children, infants, elder, younger, I know no baptisme doth make any more difference then circumcision doth; for that in the house, and by the Master of the family, or some in his stead; I say, that in Abrahams time, all the publick cities of King and Prieth, were in Abrahams person; Levi was in the lotter of Abraham, what land the Prieth or the Judge had in the Act of circumcision, the Scripture is silent: but certainly, whether it were to be administered privately or publickely, there shall be a publick account given of it, for as much as the person that was not circumcised shall be cut off, which could not be done, but by a publick act; neither do I know a more publick dispensation under the Gospel should inferre a more particular administration: but the agreement in the last circumstance, is that whereas the argument doth rest: that is, that whole families were brought to baptisme under the Gospel: To which Mr. Tombes saith, that it was but contingent to families: that they were baptized, no precept, no prophetic for it: contingent it is, I confesse, in respect of any causes, that any nation, family, or person in the world should be baptized; but that nations should be baptized is not without either precept or prophetic: the Apostles are commanded to baptize all nations, the blessing the mountain of Gods Church, *Mat. 2.* but we find not infants baptized, nor families baptized in conformity to circumcision: I say, that families were baptized, that conformity is not intimated: I say, that families were baptized, the conformity ariseth of it self; But Mr. Tombes desireth to close this argument, by shewing that actual faith was first required in every person before he were baptized; and therefore the Apostles did not baptize any, but such as actually did believe, and make profession of their faith; so that they did not baptize any family, and upon particular cognizance of every particular mans faith; this you shall see how fully he will prove: as for the examples from John, and before the commission, I know they walked by special light, but what, we cannot tell, after they had their commission, certainly they walked by it: The first instance after the resurrection, is *Act. 2. 41.* they that gladly received the Word of God were baptized, and why should they not? did ever any deny, that such as received the Word of God should be baptized? and these are they, saith Mr. Tombes, to whom he saith, *ver. 39.* the promise belongeth to you and to your children, added three thousand souls, yet never a child baptized; men may as well fay, never a man, or never a woman: from the word souls, an Infant may be called a soul, as well as men or women; but, saith Mr. Tombes, the Text saith, those that received the Word were baptized; doth it say, their children were not? but Mr. Tombes confesseth they were the same persons that gladly received the Word of God, unto whom Peter had said, the promise did belong to them and their children, that was the Word they gladly received: And saint Peter inferreth from this, that

the

An Answer to Mr. Tombes William Hussey, 1647

the promise did belong to them, that they should therefore be baptized, because the promise did belong to them.

Now if this argument from the promise was good concerning them, why is it not as good for their children? and if they received the word of the promise gladly for themselves, it is likely if it had been denied them in respect of their children, they would faine of them have had the boldnesse to have asked it for their children; and said, Peter, you told us of the promise, that it belonged to our children to as well as us, and you told us that that was a good reason why we should be baptized, and accordingly we are baptized: why should not that be a ground for our children to be baptized also? we know no reason why that should be a reason for us to be baptized and not for them: You tell us the promise doth belong to them as well as to us; as for the limitation of as many as the Lord shall call, that is to be referred to them that are affare off, not to us: affare off, is opposed to them that are neare, Ephesians 2. 11. You that were farre off are made nigh by the blood of Christ: farre off, signifieth them that are not yet called nigh, them that are called; to looke on the words in their original sense, we do not use to call them that are nigh already, but them that are affare off, that they may come nigh; and this appeareth plainly to be the sense; by that here are severall subjects of the promise, you are the subject of the promise, and your children and they that are affare off: You are not your children, your children are not you, you are not your children are not affare off, they that are affare off must be called, that they may be nigh, that so the promise may belong to you all, that so ye may all be baptized. What Mr. Goodwins fanaticke is, Mr. T. doth not tell us, nor have I form or heard, but cannot be desired that the word fancke doe comprehend men, women and children; for though there be some difference in their bodies, yet they agree all in this that they are soules taken for persons; though for pure, I will not argue from hence, that children were baptized; yet I say from hence is clearly evident, that children have a right and interell to baptisme, because to the promise, and that as clearly as any thing can be: for that which is a cause producing an effect in one subject, will produce the same effect in another, *posita causa ponitur effectus rationale est visibile*, is as true in children, as in men; he to whom the promise doth belong, may be baptized, is as true in children as in men, if the promise doth belong to them both; the text plainly saith it doth; and the pointing of the Greeke text doth plainly declare this to be the meaning of the words; for there is no point between you and your children, but between children and them that are affare off, so they the promise belonged to them and their children in their present condition to them that are affare off after their call: where note that the promise is to be understood, in the external or interuall consideration: according to the external Sacraments have their administration amongst men; which termes ye have applyed to Jews and circumcision, Rom. 2. 29. He is a Jew

which is one inwardly, and circumcision is that of the heart in Spirit, and not the Letter, whose praise is not of men, but of God; the Letter saith, God will be the God of Abraham and his seed, but the spirit saith, that he will be so to the doct and faithfull: The Letter saith, every male shall be circumcised; the Spirit saith, that circumcision is to circumcision which is outward, but that which is in the heart: the Letter lookeeth on the family of Abraham, either by generation or by the communion; the Spirit on a remnant only, according to the election of grace: *Alinworth in leuon*; the parent, some say, the child for the people; thus exterpate not of men, but of God: To this latter, only faith and repentance is required, or rather both; circumcision of the heart, and baptime of the heart, are nothing else but faith and repentance which God can judge, and praise not men; and thus the promise, according to the Letter, did belong to those Jews, to whom Peter spake, even before their effectuall call; and this Peter urgeth to them as a motive to move them to be baptized: as if the flood had fave full upon this ground ye were circumcised, and now upon the faine ground ye may be baptized; it is true, we are not only Ministers of the Letter, but of the Spirit, and therefore we preach faith and repentance as requisite to your baptime of the Spirit; but you must give account of that to God, and not to us, we can take no account of it, we are not Lords and Judges of your faith, we preach all the duties that belong to the inward man, but administer sacraments and guide our charity towards our brethren by outward rites, it must fanaticke us, if you will come and claim your interest to the promise, both for your selves and your children, we must baptize you and your children; we will teach what account ye must make to God of your faith and repentance, how you must bring up your children in the feare of God, but we can take account of none of these things. The next place of Scripture the Apostles did not take in whole families at once, because the whole City of Samaria: we prove a personall account of all to be baptized, was not required, because they were taken in by whole families in the Apollis time, and Mr. Tombes confute this, by saying, they were taken in by whole cities; I like such confutations. Next, out of Acts 8. 12. by which he proveth that the Eunuch and Paul, single persons were baptized; brave arguments, therefore families were not baptized, the Apostles had a commission to baptize all nations, and accordingly they performed their commission with all expedition, taking in the families, cities, nations, single persons, refusing none that would enter themselves in the School of Christ: Christ is not like a Grammar-school-master, that will receive no scholars, unless they be entred before; he teacheth from the text to the grave, from the A B C, to perfection; the next is of Cornelius, his household was

An Answer to Mr. Tombes William Hussey, 1647

baptized, as may be gathered out of Acts 11. 14. saith Mr. Tombes, though I conceive he mistaketh the place: the baptizing of Cornelius family is 10. 48. But this household was not an ordinary household, but a garrison of Soldiers, what matter is there in that, what did Peter cause them to be baptized, for fear, because they were Soldiers? God told Cornelius before Peter came, that he should tell them wordily which he and all his household shall be saved? Mr. Tombes inferreth that all Cornelius household were saved: good Charity, but bad Logicke; that because there was verue in the word to save him and all his household, therefore all his household were saved: in the 1 Cor. 1. 16. Paul baptized the household of Stephanus, but saith Mr. Tombes in 16. 13. the household of Stephanus is addicted to the Ministry of the Saints, what is this to the purpose? did ever any man say that those that were baptized should never after be good for any thing? he saith, some things of Crispus had not others, that the household is understood for them that believe in the house; but coming to Lydia, he saith nothing to say from any circumstance of that text, to prove that any of Lydias house did believe but herselfe; but faith it must be interpreted by other places where they expresse baptizing whole households, they expresse believing and receiving the word by the whole household: fringe that one hillory shall be expounded by another, because one household received the word and believed, therefore another household that was baptized, did likewise believe: an hillory can but inferre that some that did believe were baptized: but faith Mr. Tombes, the frequent use of the word household for growne men in the house, Mat. 23. 13. if the house be worthy, certainly what portion may be aimed at, as for whose sake the house is said to be worthy of the Apostles abode in it is uncertaine; the house there is understood of all, little and great, your peace is no more, but your prayers: now first the word himselfe may be found in the Master of the family alone, and the Apostles may pray for the whole family little and great.

But now Mr. Tombes will fall upon some argument, to prove that the Apostles did not take in families, for then faith he, if it be true that the president beey a household, I demand whether we must baptize wife and servants because they professe the faith, or because they be of the household? if because of the household whether professing faith or not, then an unbelieving wife or servant should be baptized because they are of the household; and if it be supposed that the husband or master being a believer, the wife or servant cannot be an unbeliever, the contrary faith he appeareth: and thus Mr. Tombes hath done his doe, and then cryeth aloud: but where lyeth the force of his inferences, and the absurdity I cannot tell; Mr. Marshall and Mr. Blaise say, whole households were taken in; but it followes all households must come in; all or none; all that is inferred out of that, is, that the Gospel may be received by a family: and matter of the family may render all his family to baptize, & the commission to baptize all the world, need enquire.

no further into the profession of the family, but may take the testimony of the Master for the whole family; for you change a terme, and say it a wife or a servant, make noe profession of faith (you minde to the Minister) when an unbeliever may be baptized, and so he may, though they should make profession of faith: all Anabaptists, for you throughout your whole Discourse, make faith, and profession of faith: all more Anabaptists, for say that mistake side which you shall doe, and all Anabaptists, for they are hope; for it is one thing to believe, and another to make profession of faith: you much talke of this household, and that household believing; but these me any but the Easch that made any profession of faith before baptism, in which case Philip did not teach him to confesse his faith, but to believe only: it cannot be denyed, that the doctrine of faith ought to be taught to men of years, and that not as a preparation to baptize only, but for that the doctrine of faith is necessary to all actions; whatsoever is not of faith is sinne: that which we argue from receiving of families, and from the Apostles commission to baptize Nations, is that Nations may make Lawes for their whole Nations to be baptized; and if the major part of a Nation doe according to their duty receive baptism, and undertake for the whole Nation to submit themselves to become scholars of Christ, they may justly compeell by any penalty to joyne with them in the external worship of God, *Deum esse colendum*, in the Law of Names: all Nations have ever agreed to serve some God, without which no humane society can be preserved: all societies are united by a Covenant confirmed by an oath in the name of some God, and doe agree upon some publick worship of their God: but may not a Christian Nation agree upon the service of God in Christ? may they not enrolle themselves the Disciples of Christ, and submit to the publick worship of God, of which baptism is the first? this therefore is it which is drawne from the commission directed to the Disciples for the baptizing of Nations, that Nations may act as Nations, and families as families: that is, that the more oegonical parts must act for the residue, the Magistrats for the Nation, the Master of the family for the family; otherwise it cannot be said to be the act of the Nation, or of the family, though a *part fallum* may be historically related to overspread a Nation that is done without any National consent to these the universality of spreading evil: yes where a duty is charged upon a Nation, it cannot be orderly received without a National consent: and that of the Gaolers household doth appere to be acted by his consent, as the text is plaine, Act. 16. 31. Paul preached to all in the house, but in 22. it is said the Gaoler was baptized and all his: as if the Gaoler had nothing to doe with, but those that were his he would persuade so Paul to be baptized. Now whereas in 34. verse it is urged by Mr. Tombes that he rejoiced believing in God with all his house: I confesse Pastor and others render *omnes* for yet it is an adverb of place, and can reasonably signifie no more

An Answer to Mr. Tombes William Hussey, 1647

more but the place where he rejoiced, besides if *omnes* should signifie with all in the house, it must signifie more then were baptized, because none were baptized but his, and if under the name of his, then he had an interest in presenting them. Now man can have no more interest in any then in his children, they are his in a more especial manner; so that if he had any children, it is apparent they were baptized, or else they were none of his, all his were baptized: And whereas Mr. Tombes saith, all the household believed, or all that were baptized believed; it is plain that the Master of the house only is said to believe, for the participle *credentes* is referred to the nominative case, the adverb that is *omnes* though it should be translated with all his house, is to be referred to the verbe, which is *credentes* rejoiced, they rejoiced to see their master or father so merry; if believing had been referred to all the house, it must have been *omnes credentes ut, cum dominus credente* with his house believing, whereas it is now to be rendered, he believing rejoiced with all his household, none is said to believe but himselfe as in Lydia's case, it likewise plain: from whence it will appere that a believing master may present his servant and children to baptism, though it doth not follow that a believing master may or will present those of his servants or children, that are adult or years without their consent, yet he may by his authority require them to it as an external duty, he cannot compel them to any duty, or restrain them from any vice without their consent, yet he may correct them, and incline them to any outward duty by his authority, and having wrought upon them to consent and submit, the commissioner may baptize them that come so presented: the master of a family is a King, a Prophet, and a Priest, if by any of these offices he can prevail with his household, he may bring them to the performance of their duties: Now baptizing as a duty and precept both on the Minister *aut-adeo* to the faith of the baptized; and is at least annexed to doctrine, and not to faith, they must teach and baptize all Nations: now it is plain they must teach as well them that believe not, as them that believe, againe baptizing is *modus docendi*, a manner of teaching, as I have said, and shall further be made appere upon occasion. Now whereas Mr. Tombes further saith, that then it will follow that the whole household must necessarily believe if the Master doth, and prooveth that some time it falleth out otherwise: I say, that though it bee the master or husbands duty to move his family, yet he cannot always prevail; and speciall direction concerning the wife is given to suffer her in regard of her conformity; and that under some limited and restrained terms in hope of her conversion, yet nothing is said concerning servants but that he may either force them or be rid of them if they continue Infidels in this sense, that is refuse to list themselves among Disciples; and the publick worship of some God being the bond of all humane society, 1o. 1. 1. 6. He that walketh in a perfect way, he shall serve *omnes*: he that keepeth any servant that will not be baptized, is not a good Christian, it.

it is true, all men of discretion ought to consent to every duty; but baptism is a duty without consent, as all other precepts are, it is *passive imposition*, as before; and so I come to follow his arguments, lapping up two or three of them, because he maketh little of the arguments, we shall take occasion to shew the weakness of some of his answers, and where the arguments be weak, the weakness is his, to bring them in.

The first argument of this sort, is taken from the generall premises to the godly and their seed, this hath already been handled how they cometh for baptism: he citeth, *Exod. 20. 6. Psal. 112. 2.* he saith they are for the most part concerning temporal things, then spiritual also, as confessed, generall and indefinite; if generall and indefinite it must be so by reason of the necessity of the matter, otherwise indefinite would be particular; election doth not stop children, they are elect when children, or never; these promises are with condition of faith and repentance, therefore not belonging to this place, saith Mr. Tombes. Well, then he was too blame to bring it.

2. *Mat. 49. 22.* it is foretold, that Gentiles should bring their children in their armes, therefore the Prophets foresaw the baptism of Infants: It is the happiness of the best arguments to have the weakest answers; they might be brought to other ends, which he proveth from *Mat. 19. 15.* but were those in that place brought to the Church according to the prophesie? then Christ must needs be understood as sitting in the Church, and suffer them to come to him, must be; admit them into the Church, as I have said; it is true, that men which come to the Church, come for other ends than to be baptized, but if baptism be the door of the Church, as it is the sacramental door of the visible Church, *semine contradi-cens*, besides Independents, then whatsoever be their business, they are to come by the door of baptism: And whereas Mr. Tombes saith, that was an analogie and was performed by the perswasions in which the Gentiles did persuade their children to embrace Christ: he formerly affirmeth little ones in armes are not to be baptized, because not capable of instructions, and must bringing of little ones in armes, be interpreted by instructions: it is true that *Infans dicitur fidei, cum eo sitis Evangelii quod est potentia Dei ad salutem, hoc unum allegorice dicitur de ann-putandis regni Christi spiritualis*; but he doth not say, that bringing of children in armes should be understood of grown children, capable of instruction, when it may be literally understood.

Lastly, I shall only mention that argument, taken out of *Epist. 5. 26.* where it is said, Christ cleansed his Church with washing of water through the Word: from whence it is argued, that the Church is washed with water of baptism, or not partaker of the washing by the blood of Christ: To which Mr. Tombes maketh this answer: that if this argument be of force, the thief repenting on the cross, Infans, catechumeni, martyrs, and others, dying without baptism,

An Answer to Mr. Tombes William Hussey, 1647

are excluded out of the Church, and the benefit of Christ; he should have said, if none of these were capable of baptism, then were they excluded from the benefit of Christ's death, where God doth prevent any by death, the party to taken away by God, is not deprived of the benefit of Christ's death; God is not tied to increment so, as that he cannot save without them, though contempt of sacraments be sinful and damnable.

Mr. Tombes his second argument is, That which agreeth not with the Lords institution of baptism, is deleriously doleful, but the right of Infants baptism agreeth not with the Lords institution of baptism, *Exco.*

I deny the minor, Mr. Tombes prooveth, becaufe Infants cannot be Disciples of Christ; I say they may. Mr. Tombes counteth Infants may be sanctified, but it cannot be made known to us, that is not Mr. Tombes his argument, that it must be known to us that they are sanctified, neither from the institution doth it appeare that they must be Disciples before they are baptized, much lesse that it must appeare: The commission to the Apostles, and from them to all the Ministers of the Word to the end of the world, is to make Disciples of all nations, baptizing, and teaching them what Christ shall command. The parties to be baptized, are all nations, without any restriction at all; their commission is, to baptize all nations, and this in reference to that rationall covenant that there was among the Jews, only the publick worship was limited to the Temple there, now to no place, make Disciples, is to illumination of persons: Their commission was to make all nations Disciples, which they were to execute, *pro viribus*, to the uttermost of their power; the commission of baptism, and teaching, with making Disciples, was not with respect to any personall restriction, but it is *comparatio mediatorum ad formam*, make all nations Disciples; the meaning is, by baptism and teaching: Now, the setting down of these words, making Disciples; first is, becaufe that was the end of their commission first, in intention, and must first be propoed: as in all operations is necessary, as if a man will have an heate built, a city conquered, an enemy taken; the first thing that he proposeth, is the thing that he will have done, and after directed or consulted about the means, though they must use the means before they get the end, I have already spoken to this, and shall more fully in my arguments that I intend for childrens baptism: For, that which Master Tombes saith, then the children of Infidels might be baptized, I have already spoken of, that it is not incapacity of the child: that discludeth him from baptism, it is the fault of the parent that will not bring his child, nor will undertake to bring up his child in Christian doctrine; (nor is he that is an Infidel, herein to be believed) but in Christ, Jews and Gentiles are all one, and a child as capable of Christian Religion, (according to his education) though his father be an Heathen, as if a Christian; the reason why the seed of Abraham had a privilege, was, the Ordinances were only in his house, as many as came to have bene-

ficat

ficat of the Ordinances, were circumcised, though not of Abrahams seed; that that were bought with money, or sojourned in Abrahams house, may; though they were reckoned as a family distinct from Abrahams, and the males reckoned not as Abrahams males, but their own males; yet, if they desired to eat the Passover, their males must be circumcised, *Exod. 12. 48.* Those that joy themselves to the Ordinances, and claim their interest in baptism, and relation in Christ, to be his Disciples, they must be baptized, and their families, and as many as they can undertake for, to bring to the outward means, if they can undertake for whole nations, the commissioners may not refuse them; they must be suffered to come, if any will undertake to bring them, though children. Now, that is the way of God, do no more than their duty, and what they can readily perform, and do bring their children to Church, and take order for their catechizing, which (were the parents as careful as they ought) were a great means to promote Religion and Piety among men, and is often required in the Scripture from the father: That is by this Antipastoral tender laid only upon the Minister, which turneth into a great incumbrance, and neglect of the instruction of the people, whereby many have been enforced to fall into that execrable error that all men have the office of a Minister, if baptized themselves, and have gifts, such as the people shall approve of: But, grant that the nations must be made Disciples, before they must be baptized, and that all nations must believe before Disciples; doth it follow, that every party must believe that he is baptized, *quod convenit parti, quo pars convenit toti gratia ipsius partii*, that which agreeth to any part, agreeth to the whole, by reason of the part; but not to every part? the whole man seeth with his eye (I speak de *alla visibili*) but not with any other member, but having gotten the knowledge by the eye, the soul implieth ether members *more impercepta*, to do their office: So the Magistrates that are not only the sense, but the understanding of the nations believing may be baptized, and by the duty of their place, require others to be baptized also: *Non quicquid totius animi pars est, in totis integritatis*, a man must see before he go into the river to be washed; he seeth with his eye, not with his foot; but when he is washed, his foot may be washed also: the nation believeth by the Magistrate by whose authority the whole nation is put to school to Christ, and is baptized, which is an external duty, and may be required by the Magistrate: as for faith, we have no Lords of faith, here every man must give an account of his faith to the Lord of faith, Jesus Christ, upon his day. In the mean time, it is a most insolent arrogancy, and contrary to scripture, for any man to judge of anothers faith. Sicut Pauli fuit, non as having dominion over your faith, but as helpers of your joy: *1 Cor. 11. 24.* and Saint Peter, not as Lords over the flock; if therefore they are not Lords, how can they be to be Judges? what do Lordship consist in a name, or in judicature? name: be

be

An Answer to Mr. Tombes William Hussey, 1647

to take account, that is not said; I hope, to make appear on just occasion was not done.

The fourth argument is taken from the next age immediately succeeding the Apostles; what is said concerning that point, is not argumentative; it dependeth only upon humane testimony, and men that give testimony thereto, are partially related where their testimony is agreed upon, that they did say so, as they are reported, yet their credit is questioned by him that dillicth their saying; sometimes that part of the work, out of which any thing is alleged, is proclaimed spurious, and that very author that we are content to alledge, with honour when he speaketh for us, him we bespatter and vilifie, when against us; so that what can be said of this kind, favoereth rather of affection, ostentation of reading, then of argument, and yeeleth matter of conceeration, rather then satisfaction; and therefore I leave the Reader that desireth to know more of this matter, to Dr. Holmes, and others, that may writle with Mr. Tombes in this point, my resolution being only to deal with him in such things as may carry shewes of argument out of Scripture, and so I come to the next argument.

The first argument is of the same nature with this, that the ages that did use baptism, took it upon wrong principles, as a tradition and imitation of Jewish circumcision, without universall practice, mixed with other errors. Among Apostolical traditions, many were vainly repeated and taken up to countenance several errors, as delivered from the Apostles; if some have disclaimed the proof of Scripture for childrens baptism, and held it notwithstanding lawfull from weaker grounds, that doth not any way weaken the authority of Scripture, and strength of reason taken from thence. If any one hath proved baptism lawfull from Apostolical traditions, that doth not the mixing it with errors in the same person, make the baptism of Infants erroneous, if so, all truths would quickly be turned into errors, seeing few men have been without their slips, which yet have not only held, but defended and propagated with admiration many precious truths; Mr. Tombes would be loth, if his Anabaptisme be convicted erroneous, that all that he hath, or shall hereafter speak, should be therefore reputed erroneous; by the same reason, all the truths that were taught among Papists, are *eo nomine* erroneous, because they taught them; and so not only the doctrine of the Trinity, but the incarnation of Christ, the resurrection of the dead, were therefore erroneous, because those that held these things, held likewise many other heresies, and so his tenth argument is likewise answered.

His 6th, 7th, 8th, and 9th arguments, are so near alike, and all to little purpose, that I bid thought wholly to have contented them, but that men would have given some contradiction then that they were weak, and therefore omitted, I shall therefore say something of them, lest men willing to be deceived, should place strength, where indeed there is none.

He

He telleth us in his sixth argument, that Infants baptisme hath caused many innovations to support it, and hath occasioned defect in Church policy, but provideth more of that which he saith: he only smirreth, that Infants-baptisme was supported by fanatics and Episcopall confirmation; and that it brought in Church-conventus as a preparation to the Lords Supper, for abuses that may creep in with any duty, they do not take away the goodnesse or lawfullnesse of the duty it self.

His seventh argument accuseth baptisme of Infants, with four errors: First, The third, Infants dying are saved by the faith done: The fourth, regeneration; fors may fall from grace.

To these two arguments, I plainly say, that none of all these things are occasioned by Infants baptisme, for if so many may not doubt of the goodnesse of all such things as wicked men may, or will take occasion to be offended at: for then Christ and the Gospel should be principally questioned, the great stumbling stone and rock of offence; so that occasion of offence is an argument, rather of goodnesse then of fault, Satan being most ready to entice us to corrupt our best actions.

What doth baptiszing Infants imply the conferring of grace by the work done? may we say of baptiszing, as Saint Paul of circumcision, that is not baptiszing that is outward in the ceremony, but that which is of the heart; but the praise of that is not of man, but of God: we cannot praise men for baptiszing of the heart, God baptiszeth, heere judgeth the heart, we baptise the body, but leave the residue to God only; in respect of Christ, we teach those children that by their parents are brought to be enrolled the disciples of Christ, the things that Christ hath commended us, and telleth baptiszed, when they come to be catechized, that they must have the effect of their baptisze by faith in Christ, and not by the work done. What Mr. Tombes, are all Pedobaptisist Papists? these are strange calumnies, and why must Infants baptisme necessarily imply, that the regenerate may fall away from grace? can none of your baptiszed persons that are baptiszed being full yeers fall away from the effect and benefit of their baptisze? if that be not an heresie, that such men as are judgd believers by your Ministers, and so adjudgd fit for baptiszing, and baptiszed, cannot ever after fall away from grace, I know not what is. I hope Religion and knowledge of God, is not brought to that outward formality that all should consist in your humane iudgements; it seems, Mr. Tombes, when he baptiszed any he will promise the parties he baptiszed, that they shall never fall from grace. I have heard many ignorant people use this argument, but that Mr. Tombes, a man cried up for learning, should use such an argument, is admirable and strange to me; and certainly, by this Mr. Tombes doth plainly confesse himself guilty of that opinion, that baptisme doth conferre grace by the work done: For he inferreth, that if children may be baptiszed in Infancy, then men may fall away from grace, because many, not withstanding their

H

baptisze,

An Answer to Mr. Tombes William Hussey, 1647

Infants become wicked afterward, doth not this imply, that if they were baptized, they were gracious? if baptism do not confer grace by the work done, how can it be inferred, that such men, as after baptism turn wicked, do fall away from grace? Saint Paul speaking of false teachers, 1st Joh. 2. 19. faith of them, they went from us, because they were not of us: not that they fell away from grace, but they deserted the profession, because they were not gracious: but, faith Mr. Tombes, if baptism be administered to Infants, and they walk not according to their profession, they fall from grace, no such matter: unless Mr. Tombes will say, baptism cannot be administered but to the gracious, they fall from baptism, and so will say that Mr. Tombes, or any the most discerning of them all, notwithstanding all the caution that can be taken, or else it were a most happy case to come under their hands which cannot be imagined, unless it flow from the operation of the work done, some of them that pass their examination will undoubtedly be unfaithful, or at least may be such, for ought they can do to prevent it: so that if they do deceive them and obtain baptisms, then baptism must confer the grace, or they may remain ungracious still, and so notwithstanding their baptism, they cannot be said to fall away from grace which they never had, though they should renounce their baptism, much less by not walking answerable to the profession into which they are baptized, or not behaving themselves as Disciples ought to do.

The eighth Argument is taken from this, That baptism of Infants hath caused many faults and abuses in discipline, worship, and conversation: this is likewise easily disprov'd in several particulars. First, private baptism: Secondly, baptism by women: Thirdly, of unborn Infants: Fourthly, Baptizing Infants of uncertain pregnancy: Fifthly, they that are baptized in the name of the Lord, know not the Lord: Sixthly, it hath brought in the admission of ignorant and profane persons into the Church, and into the Lords Supper; for who can do any rightly the right of the Church to be baptized? Seventhly, it prevents the order of discipline; that first a man be baptized, and after among the catechists. Eighthly, the sacrament of baptism is turned into a prophane meeting to feast together. Ninthly, men forget baptism; so that it hath the force of a carnal right, and not a spiritual indelible. Tenthly, it taketh away, or at least diminisheth the zeal and industry of knowing the Gospel: But, be all these faults? and are all of these flowing from Infants baptisms?

First, I shall shew, that many of these have necessity at all with Infants baptism. First, private baptism hath nothing to do with Infants baptism; for these Infants may be baptized publicly, as Layes may be made, requiring their public baptism, though Infants; nay, the Directory is at this time so pointed, and in all times public baptism was principally aimed at and desired; and for the most part to be performed; what he meant by private baptism, I do

not

not know; baptism in an house among so many as make a congregation, I cannot discern how that can well be accounted any such fault: I am sure he hath not proved it.

2. He telleth us that baptizing of Infants hath brought in the baptizing by women, as though Ministers may not baptize children as well as women.

3. The baptizing of Infants hath brought in the baptizing of children not brought to light: for my part, I can say nothing, but would at such an inference.

4. As for baptizing of children of uncertain pregnancy, I know nothing of it, but that if any man that is a Christian himself will undertake to bring him up a Disciple of Christs, such a child may be baptized.

5. They are baptized in the name of the Lord that know not the Lord: what inconvenience from that? It is true, St. Paul saith, No man can call upon him of whom he hath not heard: It would indeed put on the name of some probability (if it were referred unto the person that doth call on the name of God) that it were something absurd: but doth it follow, because no man can call on him of whom he hath not heard, therefore he cannot call on the name of God in the behalf of any but such as have heard of God? none can pray but those that have faith: but may not a faithful man pray for an Infidell? may not a Christian parent pray for his child, because the child doth not know the Lord? this were very strange: as for the childs consent, I say so farre as concerns the Covenant between God and man which is sealed in Baptisme, consent is not required on our part to the obligation: we are bound to obedience, and are under the sanction of condemnation if we consent not: and this is the very reason why circumcision which had as great a respect to the circumcision of the heart as baptism was, as yours, and nothing without faith as baptism was, yet stamped on the infants of the Jews, who were the Scripture is so silent; therefore this argument is not of any force that baptism is not to be admitted to Infants, because they doe not consent, unless the consent of the party to be baptized were required to the obligation: if the child were free from those duties into which he is tyed by his baptism until he had consented thereto, he were a great wrong to baptize him and thereby lay a yoke upon him without his consent, from which he were otherwise free; but whether he consent or not, the obligations of obedience and faith tyed on him, and the sanction of wrath and condemnation attendeth on the Infidell and disobedient whether they consent or not, whether they are baptized or not; so that consent both to obedience, and faith and baptism; whether baptism be regarded, or them as already done, or to be done, is required of him that is *adult* or of years, as a duty, not as liberty: the refusing to consent is a sinne and punishable both by God and man, though they consent much in internals, of which only God can judge and punish: faith and obedience

H 3

et

An Answer to Mr. Tombes William Hussey, 1647

of the heart; but as for the externals of Gods worship, such as are the external of baptism that is to be performed in the sight of men, and men may require him that is of years to consent to his baptizing, laying the neglect on him as a sinne, and punishing him for it as for adultery, fornication, or any other public offence, leaving the matter of faith which is private, to the judgement of God: so likewise may the Nations receive baptism for the whole, as all other externals, requiring parents to bring their children as before: I have thought good to speake something to this point, because it seemeth to carry some show of reason with it, that no man should be tyed to a Covenant unto which hee never gave any consent, which in free covenants is true, though in publicke covenants we are tyed by the covenants of our Ancestors, and are bound by those Lawes we are borne under, made by the consent of our parents; but in the case between God and us, he made us, and giveth Lawes to us, under which we must live or dye (I take Lawes here in a generall sense to signifie direction for faith and repentance, as well as any other rules of life) not by vertue of our owne consent, but Gods absolute right and authority.

6. Mr Tombes telleth us, that baptizing of Infants hath brought the admission of ignorant and prophane persons unto the communion of the Church, and to the Lords Supper; for who can deny rightly the rite of the Church to the baptized? so he.

To this I answer, that the engagement of the parent, to instruct his child (which is but his duty) will certainly be a great means to set men upon the performance of their duty therein, when men shall solemnly in the presence of God before a congregation be charged with the bringing up of their children in the feare of God, that they must looke to their owne conversation that it be exemplary to their children; if this be not performed by the parents, yet the charging it upon them out of Gods word, cannot but be a means rather to keep out ignorance and prophane persons then to bring them in. can any means be used by man more available then to instruct children in their tender years in the knowledge of God? Certainly God hath informed us, that this is the most lasting knowledge that wee learned in tender years; and our experience doth abundantly confirme this. Now what greater care can be had by the Church then in such a solemn and sacramental manner for a man to be charged with the education of his child as a Scholler of Christ, as soon as he is able to learne any thing? if this be a way to introduce prophane persons and ignorance, I know not what can keep it out; but he implieth as a great sinne, that ignorant persons should be admitted unto communion of the Church, and the Lords Supper; for this admittance into the communion of the Church, if any thing may be argued from thence touching the unlawfulness of Infants baptism, a just and due tract ought to be instituted, wherein the whole question must be placed; what is meant by

com-

communion of the Church, whether he understand the visible or invisible Church, whose office it is to admit, and whose to shut out of the Churches communion? what be the rites of a visible and what of an invisible Church? how can the Intimations of the Church (but how I cannot tell) until they be instructed to know the Lords body to remember the death of Christ, and examine themselves, which they are commanded to doe, and then eat? but where is the Minister commanded to give the Sacrament to all that are in the Church, or else to turne them out of the Church? these things must be proved plainly, or else otherwise the argument you charge to baptize all Nations: you say may: we shall then list in ignorance to receive the Sacrament; you were as good say, you will make communicants yourselves: Christ bids baptize and teach: you say there is more in the matter then baptizing must palle your conscience, and stay your leisure.

Christ bids you teach, and to much examination as is needfull for teaching may be deduced from thence: but did God give you in charge to admit and refuse, and give you any rules by which ye might walke in the discharge of this duty? if so, ye might then justly plead this right, and make that an argument to remove all that standeth in its way. But I wonder extremely at the intemperate zeale of those that plead the duty of admitting and refusing of men *en officio* from and to Baptisme, and the Lords Supper; and herein the Lords Supper is the most cryed up priviledge which you here fall upon (whether out of your owne opinion as it seems by some is suspected, or to confute your adversaries) and make this as a medium to prove that Infants may not be baptized, because none may be admitted to the Lords Supper that are wicked; though for my part I doe not understand the consequence how baptizing infants and charging their parents to bring them up in the feare of God would be a means to cherish and foster up ignorance and sin. But here men cry out against liberty to come to the Lords Supper, as if that would pollute the Sacrament, and contumencie in as though men might not have liberty to come to the Lords Supper upon their own examination, and yet might justly be punished for their sins when they can be proved against them: may not men make choice of their owne habitations and drinke when they please, and yet be justly punished for adultery and drunkenness? I do not know but the Magistrate may suppress and punish sin, though men may be allowed their liberty to receive Sacraments: For my part, I will soone stricter course were taken with sin.

The seventh fault laid to the charge of Infants baptism, is that, it perverts the order of discipline, that first a man be baptized, and after among the catechized, but who I pray you, Mr Tombes did lay downe this for an order of Discipline? it

seems

An Answer to Mr Tombes William Hussey, 1647

were of the command are annexed to the receiving of the sacrament, those are essential to the nature of the sacrament, though necessary to the efficacy thereof unto us: This must needs be a declining cause, that enforceth the strongest pattern of it in its defence, to deny the nature of a sacrament.

But see further: Mr. Tombes saith, that baptism is a signe of profession. Profession is taken popularly and materially for the Act or Trade that is professed, and then men may be said to wear some badge or signe of his profession; whereas, in a proper and strict sense, Profession is nothing else, but a figure of something in the heart or minde of him that doth profess; so that profession of our faith is but a figure of our faith, and a signe of that profession is but a figure of a figure; nay, profession it self is more manifest then any sacrament can be, and therefore needeth no figure; but grant it were the signe of our profession, what were that to prove that profession must be before baptism? sure, *figura est signatum hoc simul natura*, the signe and thing signified, are of the same continuance, one cannot be before another: Here is in this argument another circumstance; that baptism is frequently put for doctrine: therefore doctrine must go before baptism, nay, rather, then baptism doth teach: for that which is any where translated metaphorically, must have resemblance with the primitive signification: as if a man shall call his son the fesse of his age, the son must fulfill his father in his fesse condition: though I do not know how any of these places do prove any such thing, that baptism is taken for doctrine, otherwise taken materially, as in *Acts 10: 37*. John is said to preach baptism: so is he said to preach repentance. As for Mr. Tombes Argument from witchcraft, which he counteth, I leave every judicious Reader to think what be pleased, as not being worthy the consideration of a Divine; and thus I conceive Mr. Tombes Argument answered. I come now at last, to mine own Arguments for Infants baptism.

Those that in mans judgement ought to be esteemed fit for the kingdom of God are by men to be admitted to the privileges of the kingdom, etc. baptism; but all Infants in mans judgement are to be esteemed fit for the kingdom of God, therefore all Infants must be admitted to the privileges of the kingdom, *Math. 19: 13*.

I have already discussed this point, Christ himself saule with his Disciples, for not suffering little children to come, and saith not, I know these are of the kingdom of God; but telleth his Disciples, not only that, that were brought, but such as they, and that not only such as they in his estimation, but their view, otherwise there had been no ground of a rebuke, but commendation; rebukes be instructions for the time to come, at least, it is not well done; do fo no more; when you see any such as these, suffer them, and forbid them not. You see the purpose for the future is generally, men do not use to reprove but to the purpose, that the thing reproved be no more done; therefore the Disciples were to estimate

note not them only, but such as they were (and that in an alleged likeness, namely, in that they were little children) fit for the kingdom of God, and upon that the kingdom of God in the estimation of Christ. If these and the like had only been fit for the kingdom of God in the estimation of Christ by his omniscience, here had not been matter of reproof, but commendation: Christ would then have said rather, ye did well to forbid the little children to come to me, for you did not know whether the kingdom of God did belong to them; for you did not know whether the kingdom of heaven doth belong to them; neither can I give you any direction concerning other children for the time to come, because you cannot tell to whom the kingdom of heaven doth belong; however, let these come; for I know the kingdom of heaven doth belong to them, and such other children as these are; but ye see Christ doth rebuke them, and thereby giveth them directions for the time to come, which he could not have done, if the likeness had been in secret, and things only known to God.

But here Mr. Tombes and Mr. Blackwell, and others, will tell me, by this rule, Turkes children, and Infidels may be brought to baptism. If any will bring them, and assure the institution of them in the doctrine of the Gospel, I know not but they may: and if Turke would part with their children to Christians, I think it were a very charitable thing so to do: For, the promise was never fo tied to the family of Abraham, neither for ought I know, to any believers, but to education in the family of Abraham, or any other believing family.

But they will further say then, by the same reason are they to be admitted to other benefits, namely, to hearing of the Word, and the other sacrament: Answer. I say, they are admitted to the residue of the Ordels of God, as soon as nature or grace do make them fit for them, they may have right before they can use them: they are first admitted to come to Christ for a blessing, before they are capable of instruction: and preparation for the sacrament of the Lords Supper, is charged as a duty, which is no where charged on the parties to be baptized.

2. That Sacrament, that requirerh no preparation in the subject, is to be admitted to every subject; but baptism is a sacrament to be admitted without any preparation in the subject, therefore baptism is to be admitted to every subject, every person, all nations.

That Sacrament that in the figure and signification, is preparative to all other grace that is to be admitted without any preparation of the subject: but baptism in the figure and signification is preparative to all other grace, therefore it is to be admitted without any preparation: the major is true; or otherwise there would a process in *infinitum*; if that which were preparative to all other graces should have preparations to that, and that must have other preparations; and so in *infinitum*. The minor I shall prove out of Scripture, and plain reason drawn from them: *Gal. 3: 27*. as many as are baptized into Christ, have put on Christ: This doth probably prove, that men that are baptized, are baptized

An Answer to Mr. Tombes William Hussey, 1647

no Child, which could not be affirmed, if they were in Christ before baptism; they could not be said to be baptized into Christ, if they had been in Christ before, which, if faith and repentance must be manifest before baptism must be affirmed, be that believeth and is penitent is in Christ without doubt.

Objct. But some men will say, may not man believe before baptism?

Reply. I answer no, he cannot, until Christ baptise him with the Holy Ghost. Now, Christ baptizeth when he pleaseth, either before, or after ministerial baptism.

Objct. But, if Christ hath baptized him before, what need the Minister baptize him?

Reply. Christs baptism is not known to the Minister, whatsoever confession of faith is made, he must therefore baptize, in obedience to the command of Christ, and leave the baptism of Christ to him.

How would the Anabaptists insult in the cleanness of such a text? And here I cannot but note a notable subtilty of the Anabaptists, I will not say how common with other hereticks, when they have cited a Text, and put a gloss upon it without any respect to the argument of the place; they profrely cry the Scripture is all can crying down all the labours of the learned that is spent, though never so truly and piously. For the clearing of the Text, that is, Tongues, that is Art: gives us Scripture; we have the Scripture, and then we can carry away the people, take heed that no man spoile you through Philosophy and vain deceit, and this shall serve their turn, to answer all they understand not. If a man tell them that Philosophy is covertious about nature, and such things of reason as are too low for the things of Faith, and therefore have principles contrary to doctrine of Faith, as out of nothing nothing is made; and therefore make the first matter eternal, contrary to the doctrine of the creation, from a privation to an Inhere, no remedy, that which is dead cannot live again, contrary to the resurrection; but Logick is without any matter of its own, but teacheth men only how to find out the truth of any discourse, written or spoken. Oh, then Logick is nothing but fallacies, and herein many Schollers concur with them to hide their own ignorance, whereas indeed, fallacies be no part of Logick, unless you will say, no reason is reason: it is true, Logicians do mention fallacies, as a man may teach a young workman what faults he may commit, whence some ignorant man may affirm, that the skill of such a trade were only in faults, as these do, who only count Logick fallacies; and here they have such fondness, to make the word believe, that reason was an Affe: which, that men may wonder at them, they can give how foolish a thing Logick is, they can prove a sheep have eight legs, two before, and two behind; two on the right side, and two on the left. My Logick can do more than his, and yet will be both: fools if we want Logick, to know this it is no Logick: I will prove a sheep hath fourteen legs, by setting him between four men, one

before

before the sheep, the other behinde him, and on each side one; thus sheep will have four legs before one man, and four behinde, ere, which misleth many by rotation have no doubt ten names before and behind, may be the same thing in different respects, the same face is before, and on the right or left side; thus Logicks can discover well enough, without the help of a fool on foot at that he knoweth not. I impute not this to Mr. Tombes, but to the ignorance, that cry, all is their own by such a wile as this, as though none did regard Scripture, but they, and all the Scriptures were clerly theirs, what was spoken against them, was against Scripture, set by lamane authority and tradition.

First, in the figure it is preparative to all purity, it is washing so much faith as must come: men of years so submit to baptism is necessary, without which the flood will be purged, that those shall be had before the party may be baptized, is an evocation of the figure, and finally the figuration; it cannot be denied that faith and repentance are required to the efficacy of baptism, but subsequent to the Sacrament, the water doth sacramentally wash away sinnes; so Ananias Act. 22. 16. faith to Paul, Why tarriest thou, arise and be baptized, and wash away thy sinnes? Now washing doth suppose nothing in the subject but foulness, and blood of Christ cleanse us from all sinne, 1 John 1. 7. all the venes of the purgation is in the blood of Christ. Now can any man say that the blood of Christ cannot purge us if the party be purged before? if faith and repentance were required before baptism, then baptism could not offer the blood of Christ to purge sinne, because the party were cleansed before baptism, when Ananias could not have said, Be baptized and wash away thy sinnes, but wash thy sinne first, and then be baptized. Act. 15. 9. St. Peter sheweth that faith doth purifie the heart. Now it is true, faith doth receive the Word and Sacraments, and maketh use and to the other effects; but both Word and Sacrament do propose Christ, the Word to the care, Sacrament to other senses; baptism doth represent the blood of Christ washing, and faith doth looke on the washing of water, and faith on the promise annexed. Now as the word is proposed to the care, so water is tendered, and the body washed with water; whereas faith doth collect the purgation of the soul from the testimony of God; water is no more the immediate object of faith than the word; it is the authority of God in the word that is the object of faith, as likewise the blood of Christ in baptizing; they that believe, and they that believe not, hear the word, and it is no proclamation of the word to preach it to an infidel, neither is it any proclamation of baptism to baptize an infidel; yet it is hard to make him heare patiently that in no measure doth believe misse miracles, or in defect of them some assistance of the Civil Magistrate doth esteere; so that baptism is but an offering of the purgation by the blood of Christ to the eye and the body, as the word doth to the care, and may be tendered as the

13

word.

An Answer to Mr. Tombes William Hussey, 1647

word to all Nations, the power of the one and the other is by faith in Christ conveyed to us in the Sacrament of Baptisme or the word: baptisme cannot worke satisfaction till after administration, whatsoever is said of it before is but the operation of the word; the washing of water doth sacramentally strengthen our faith no day of preparation charged on any, no man ever reprehended for receiving baptisme unworthily, though the Minister hath baptisme charged on him as part of his duty, yet never any caution given to Ministers in general, or to Titus or Timothy to take heed that they baptize no unworthy persons; nor any time or punishment charged on any Minister for baptizing any rashly or without due examination; no precept concerning any difference, but before and teach all Nations to the end that they may become the Disciples of Christ. Now where no Law is, there is no transgression; where God doth not charge sinne, how dare any mortal man lay this or that is sinful? Any preparation is required let the Scripture be shewed where that was taught, where baptisme was deferred till any competent preparation were manifested what Scripture is directed to the catechumen; may what one sentence of Scripture is applicable to them, that is not applicable to Christians at all times, as well after as before baptisme? Baptisme is a religious rite which men are easily persuaded out of principles of nature to embrace, as may be seen in all Idolatrous worshippes, they leave their religious rites which they are persuaded come from the appointment of their gods, upon which ground they receive them. Now that God did appoint baptisme to satisfaction, and so we must tender it to Nations by the appointment of Christ, which though they receive but as an Infidell doth the word; yet when faith connecteth they make use of it. Therefore the Apostles argue to move reverence of life from baptisme already received. So Romans 6. 3-4. St. Paul argueth what use we should make of our baptisme; namely, that we should rise with Christ; but through the most noble way of arguing be from causes, and therefore in the Sacrament of the Lords supper, where the worthy receiving of that doth depend on an antecedent cause; there faith is said to obtaine the whole vertue of the worke. Ioh. 6. 25. I am the bread, he that connecteth to me shall never hunger, and he that believeth on me shall never thirst, y. 47. He that believeth hath everlasting life, 51. He that eateth of this bread shall live for ever: Whereby he plainly saith, That he that believeth esteem his faith, that bread which is my flesh sacramentally, and made such to me by faith. Never any such doctrine as this, he that believeth is baptized, because no doctrine is extant precepted to baptisme in reference to the Gentiles. See all the Epistles to the Rom. Corinthians, and the residue, all are written to Churches already baptized. Paul declared the whole counsell of God, and yet set one word what should be the carriage of the Catechumen, or the Ministers towards them, as if he should suppose none under the right of the Gospel that will not first be baptized, and received by the commandement of

Christ:

Christ: so he that will teach any thing in St. Pauls Epistles, they must teach them to the baptized to whom they are directed; as for the Catechumen, nothing is written or directed either to them or concerning them. As for those histories of the A. B. the greater part were Jews in Covenant with God already; unto whom Peter did indeed preach repentance in reference to that blood that they were guilty of in killing the Lord of glory; not as preparation to baptisme, but repentance; and baptisme are both exhorted unto as precedent to the gift of the Holy Ghost; whereas if such preparation had been needfull to baptisme, Peter should have stayed for the gift of the Holy Ghost to manifest their fitness, or at least given repentance and faith, which he never did. St. Iulie doth indeed say, or shew that they gladly received the word were baptized; but that they manifested it any way for a Historian to say they baptisme gladly doth not appeare, and this was ground enough to be baptized when they gladly received the word, wherein they were exhorted to be baptized when they were gladly baptized.

As for that story of Cornelius that was indeed a pure Gentile. Though Peter had commission enough to have gone to him by the command of Christ, Mar. 28. 19. and to have baptized him and taught him the commands of Christ, Mar. 28. 19. and to have baptized him and taught him the commands of Christ, yet it is plain Peter did not understand the Commission, therefore God for Peters owne satisfaction, and the satisfaction of them of the circumcision, was pleased in all that story to goe before Peter in a miraculous way; Peter was to first receive baptizing of Cornelius, that he was hardly persuaded to goe to him or preach to him, but as God did go before him by miracles, which when they of the circumcision saw, the rest faith, they were astonished: And of this very story St. Peter, Act 15. and other places maketh use of to justify the Jews touching the calling of the Gentiles: but this was the mercy of God during the infancy of the Church to use such extraordinary means for the drawing off the Jewes from that ceremoniall distinction that God himselfe had put between Jewes and Gentiles, but in the orderly administration God sent the Holy Ghost, though by extraordinary means of grace; as for the falling of the Holy Ghost upon the Apostles in cloven tongues, Act 2. that came seasonably upon them when they had occasion to see them, and after had been baptized; but the Holy Ghost promised in v. 28. is promised after Peter had preached repentance and baptisme: may on many after they were baptized, Repent and be baptized, and ye shall receive the holy Ghost: shewing that preaching and baptizing are but the ends of grace, neither the one nor the other of any force unless the Holy Ghost come. Now though the manner of the giving the Holy Ghost be different, yet the fashion is according to the way of Gods dispensation. God will have outward means first tendered, and after he will blisse it where he pleaseth, among which outward means these are chief, if not all can

or

An Answer to Mr. Tombes William Hussey, 1647

ye ought to be used by way of tender baptism, and teaching, which is all that is required in the communion, whatsoever is bubbled to the contrary: baptizing is first before teaching the commands of Christ, as I have formerly manifested; and indeed, it were a strange thing for the sacrament of baptism to be tendered to men that were already clean, and approved, declared and manifested to be clean; it is true, it may be tendered to men that professe their faith, because man cannot judge them faithfull, nor withstanding any profession, and therefore baptize them; but if they could know and judge them faithfull, they might give them the Lords Supper, in which all Christ is communicated, and baptism should not be needfull: baptism is the seal of the tender of Christ and of the purging power of his blood, not of our communion or partaking of Christ, that is sealed in the other sacrament.

Now to come to the figuration, it is preparative to all other graces, it signifieth regeneration; and therefore it is called regeneration, *John 3. 5.* Except ye be regenerate by water and the Spirit, ye cannot enter into the kingdom of heaven. Now, certainly the Holy Ghost would not set forth the grace of baptism by regeneration, or newbirth, if any grace had been preparative to it, it is true, in *John 3. 5.* Except ye be born by water and the Spirit, unless ye be by water and the Spirit; that which we translate born, is γεννηθαι, and *Tit. 3. 5.* Baptism is called *νεκροτα αναγεννησις*, the laver of regeneration. Let men may vulgarly imagine, that men are spiritually begotten by the Word, and were to remain some time in their mothers belly, the church before they were brought forth by baptism: during which time, they were to be catechumans, and made fit to be received into the Church: that word which is translated born, *John 3. in 1 Cor. 4. 15.* it translated begotten, I have begotten you through the Gospel: For, there it is *John 1.* and indeed, there can be no imagination of life before there is a being, before begetting; it is true, *mattheus* must have faith, such as it is, naturally, in man: before he can be baptized, he must be willing by some inclination or other: it were barbarous to baptize a grown man against his will, which could not be gotten but by some kinde of credence, though it might be just with them to punish him with death that should refuse, as it is with God to punish with eternal death, such as despise baptism; yet that Ministers should refuse to baptize any man that shall desire baptism, unless he hath saving faith, is to require articles of life, and reason from a man before he were begotten, or cleansed, and purity before he were washed. Again, that sacrament that was administered unto all the churches of the Gentiles in the Scriptures mentioned, without any mention in the Scriptures of any preparative grace that must first be the fruite of the first grace, and preparative of all other graces: But baptism is such, therefore baptism is preparative to all other graces. Let all the Epistles of the Apostles be searched, and

and ye shall finde they were all written to baptized persons, that theye should move them to repentance and newnesse of life, *Rom. 6. 4.* St. Paul doth not say, I will of that? therefore repent and believe, but doth he, but what doth he collect out of that? therefore repent and believe, and tell any of them, if they would and repentance, arise from thence to baptism, and tell any of them, if they would believe and repent, they should be baptized: 2. which the right method of handling the doctrine of the Gospel would have required, if faith and repentance had been preparatives; but I am consider, if any man shall take on him to teach faith, and that out of it that will not come: he that will teach any doctrine other than such as may make them willing to be baptized, and to receive other than such as teach them as disciples of Christ unwashed, shall follow no Apostolical Precept that teaching must go before baptizing, because *mattheus* is, without ground, the phrase of the words is changed, *mattheus* is *mattheus*, whereas had there been a methodicall enumeration of things that ought to have been performed in order one before another, the file ought not to have been altered: it should have been, *mattheus* or *mattheus*, Go, teach and baptize; and therefore those that read them so, which the Text will not permit. Again, the word *mattheus* is an baptizing and teaching what I command, are both Present. Again, this *mattheus* declared to thos that shall be injoyed about the means, as I have formerly proved, and so the file doth clearly manifest, ye shall make all the world disciples, baptizing them, and teaching them whatsoever I command, which is as much as if ye doing, ye shall make them disciples, as if a man should say loving in season, and making good choice of your feed and land, ye shall have a good crop: here is plainly intended, that these Participiall expressions, this loving and making good choice shall be taken up for the mean, and the crop is to be expected after, as the fauce and event of them: as for *mattheus*, from *mattheus*, to learn, and therefore some collect, that it doth imply a learning with profit, that is nothing to the preparation; if there be any thing in that, it is in the fauce, and it hath the virtue of a promise, and is estimated by God, limited and extended according to the good pleasure of God, *1 Pet. 48. 17.* I am the Lord thy God, that teacheth thee to profit: Paul plants, Apollo watereth, it is God that giveth the successe; and if it should stand in that sense as a preparation to baptism in the communion, it must contain a manifest fallhood, or prove undeniably universall grace, if they shall teach with profit all nations, and baptize them; or at least, an universall national acceptance.

An Answer to Mr. Tombes William Hussey, 1647

of the Gospell, teaching with profit can admit of no colder sense than that; and if every person must be taught with profit before he be baptized, then none ought to be baptized but the elect of God; and it were a sin for any Minister to baptize any other but such as received profit by the word; the word worketh to the hurt any other whatsoever flow of profit it may seem to have.

3. Reason, That doctrine that taketh away the distinction of the two Sacraments, that is a false doctrine; but Anabaptisme doth take away the distinction of the two Sacraments, *scilicet* the doctrine of the Anabaptists is a false doctrine. That doctrine that requireth preparation to both Sacraments, taketh away the difference of the Sacraments; but Anabaptists require preparation to both Sacraments, therefore Anabaptists take away the difference of the Sacraments.

The difference doth consist in this, that the Sacrament of baptism is preparative to the Lords Supper, sacramentally giving that to us which we stand in need of, so make us fit for the Lords Supper. I say, sacramentally, not that God cannot or doth not take his owne time of calling sometime before we are partaker of either Sacrament, sometimes after we have both Sacraments; yea and after we have finally professed the Lords Supper: but Sacraments have their proper use and signification, and are as all other duties lyable to abuse. Wee must behave our selves as men under the meanes: we have our duties charged upon us of God, whereof some are officious, some personall belonging to every mans person about the performance of all which, we may finne either by omission or misuse; but all the good that we receive by word or sacraments is of God: what we doe by way of office that lyeth charged on us by the rule that we receive from God, which is to baptize all Nations and teach them; the sacrifice is of God, and the account of faith must be given to God; we can take some account of some workes, to wit, those that are externall; but of faith and of such workes as are imminent the thoughts of the heart, we can say nothing to them. Now the communion that is between Christ and us, is set downe in Scripture by Christs being or dwelling in us, and we in him; we must first be in Christ before he can be in us: we were in Christ by election before the foundation of the world, and therefore may be received into Christ before we can have faith; may we are said to be baptized into Christ, *Rom. 6. 3.* so many of you are baptized into Christ Jesus, and the grace of baptism is said to be wrought by the Spirit; by the Spirit ye are baptized into one body; *1 Cor. 12. 13.* and *Gal. 3. 27.* As many as are baptized into Christ have put on Christ: Christ is never said to be conveyed into us by baptism; but by faith. *Ephes. 3. 17.* That Christ may dwell in your hearts by faith: what is instrumentally ours by faith, is sacramentally ours by the Lords Supper: he therefore that eateth Christ in the Lords Supper, Christ is in him. *Iohn. 6. 56.* Hee that eateth my flesh dwelleth in me, and I in him; but Christ is never said to be in us by baptism; but we are baptized into Christ; he is not baptized into us, but he is commu-

unicated

unicated into us in the Lords Supper, for which faith is required as a preparation, and the habitation of Christ in us is ascribed to faith as a meanes as before, that Christ may dwell in your hearts by faith; but our birth in Christ, or regeneration is not at all ascribed to faith, but to the Spirit and water, *Iohn. 3. 5.* I have begotten you through the Word, but never are we said, either to be born or begotten by faith: the acts of faith, are growth, life, and fruits of sanctification, *Ioh. 6. 35.* Those that believe and come to Christ, are said to eat and drink Christs Flesh, he that cometh unto Christ, is promised he shall never hunger; and he that believeth in him, shall never thirst. And this verbe is ascribed to the body and blood of Christ, from whence Divines do justly gather that he that believeth, doth eat the flesh, and drink the blood of Christ, but no intimation in Scripture from whence any man can collect that he that believeth is baptized, unless it be a *personification*: For, he that doth believe, must first be baptized by the Spirit, before he can believe; and thus are the graces offered in the sacraments, kept distinct, which otherwise would be the same: that the grace of baptism is initiall, that of the Lords Supper is perfective, which may further be manifested thus, our calling hath two parts, the professe of grace and the acceptance of grace professed: The first is by the Word, the Spirit, and baptism; the other is by the Word, Spirit, Faith, and the Lords Supper. I have here added faith, because the Scripture doth professe faith an instrument by which we receive Christ: but Christ must be offered to us by his Spirit and Word, before we can receive him, which is expressed in the word calling, as distinct from justification, and goeth before justification, in which we have the first act of faith, *Rom. 8. 30.* Whom he predestineth, these he also called, whom he called, them he also justified; we are not called by faith, but we are justified by faith, *Rom. 2. 28.* and *5. 1.* Baptisme is the seal and sacrament of Gods work in us, which had need to be most clearly manifested, and confirmed unto us, as having most of God, and least of us, that we might submit to it, wherunto we are most averse; therefore what hath most of us in it, that plainest qualification is more delightful to us than as it is in its owne nature, working happiness; but too many under a false apprehension, even of freedom and liberty before men; faith is not a boasting quality; nor to be pleased before men, but God; and this *St. James, cap. 2.* doth handle at large, shewing, that *man* we very indelicately to talk and boast of faith before men, and rely on workes before God; and herein the deceitfulness of our hearts is very great, when we conceive we deal with a heart-knower, then we finde the things of faith apprehended most wealdy of any thing; we can please our selves better in the opinion of our workes then of faith, but where we cease to deal with man, we are sure we treat of colours before blind

K 2

men,

An Answer to Mr. Tombes William Hussey, 1647

men: there we can boldly talk, we may speak as freely as travellers, we cannot be displeas'd, whereby it cometh to pass, often times, that heart that is least upright, is most bold; faith is indeed, in time of need, very heroic in her exploits, in that she acteth by the power of God, but sacrificeth little of her best affections to her self; she is always conversant with God, and therefore cannot but be conscious of such weakness and infirmity; faith is to always laden with difficulties, that the heart very little to say of her self; there must be great preparation on Gods part, before there can be any sense or feeling in man of the things of faith; there must be the mighty operation of the Word and Spirit, and God is pleas'd to adde baptism too, for faith to work upon: these things are of mighty operation, and so they had need, considering the loth of heart that is in us to believe: it is well, if after the Word and sacrament of baptism, faith do come. God layeth it as a ground and foundation for faith to work upon, and accordingly all the arguments of Scripture are to raise us to walk worthy of amendment of life, and to rise with Christ, *Rom. 6.* as if it should be said, God hath offered you grace in baptism, therefore accept of it; ye are born anew in baptism, let it appear in your conversation.

Propos. 4. That which maketh the admission into the Church merely arbitrary, that is a false doctrine; but the doctrine of Anabaptists maketh admission into the Church merely arbitrary, *Ergo,* the major is plain; for, that nothing is more directly contrary to the service of God then will-worship; but denying any that are tender according to the mind of Christ in the Word, and requiring such disposition in the party to be baptized, as the Minister pleaseth, without any rule from Gods Word, just to make the publique service of God, or at least a great part of it, wholly arbitrary; and this doth appear to flow from their doctrine: not yet any man durst affirm what was the measure of faith to be required how much he must believe that must be baptized, by means whereof the whole matter dependeth on the will of the Baptist, a thing most contrary to the nature of Religion; it cannot be imagin'd that the Holy Ghost would have been so silent in giving rules for the Ministers to walk by in the trial of the faith of the person to be baptized, if any such charge had lain upon his office. He must baptize believers only, faith Mr. Tombes, and the Anabaptists, but no Scripture directeth what, or how much he must believe; must be as much as the Minister shall think fit, then some Ministers will baptize with very small triall, others will be very hardly satisfi'd; some will baptize as soon as the childre can be taught to say he believeth in Christ, either fittive his own conscience, or others twenty years of age; wherein no man can without rules neither doth this differre from the doctrine come from accidental misconstructions or phrases, but inevitable necessity from the doctrine itself that the Minister must baptize none but believers; yet cannot tell how much, or what he must believe before he be fit for baptism, unless he walk by rules of mans making, without any intimation from Scripture.

5. That

5. That doctrine that giveth man that power which is divine, that doctrine is blasphemous and false; but the doctrine of the Anabaptists giveth man that power which is divine, therefore the doctrine of Anabaptists is blasphemous and false.

That doctrine that giveth man power to judge of faith in another, that doctrine giveth man that power that is divine; but the Anabaptist giveth men power to judge of faith in another, therefore the Anabaptist, that power that is divine.

Faith is in the heart: with the heart man believeth to righteousness, and with the mouth he confesseth to salvation, *Rom. 10. 10.* He therefore that judgeth of faith, must judge the heart which is proper to God. *1st.* Lord try the heart, *Jer. 17. 10.* Neither will it serve his time to say, that he judgeth by rules of charity if this charge lay upon his office; to judge charitably it is one thing, another to judge *ex officio*; for the judgement of charity can never pronounce the person judged to be such as he is judged by charity to be: judgements of charity are not always true, if it be possible we have warrant enough to judge it to be by charity; if children may possibly be such as the Kingdome of heaven doe belong too, wee may in charity judge them such; but if we are eyed by our office to baptize none but believers, it will not serve time to say we judge them such by charity, to prove that we must baptize none but such as are believers, seeing we may by charity judge many believers which yet are not believers: againe judgement of faith is denied to belong to the Apostles themselves, nor that we have dominion of your faith, *3 Cor. 1. 24.* If God had appointed Ministers to have judgement of mens faith before they had baptiz'd them, he would have given them some rules by which they should have been able to walk, which he hath not done; he hath annex'd baptism to the Ministers calling to let men know that the grace of baptism cometh immediately from Christ; therefore he hath sent the feale of it by calling that came immediately from him, but hath promised those officers of his no special qualifications whereby they shall have abilities to discern the faith of men more then other men have; the judgement of charity, is not a Ministeriall qualification that belongeth to every man, and is no Ministeriall qualification.

6. That doctrine that denieth the interpretation of the promise made to Abraham which S. Paul maketh that is a false doctrine; but the doctrine of Anabaptists denieth the interpretation of the promise made to Abraham which S. Paul maketh; therefore the doctrine of the Anabaptists is false. Those that deny the blessing of Abraham, and in him of all the Nations of the earth to be the Gospel preached to Abraham in reference to the Gentiles after their call, deny the interpretation that S. Paul maketh of the promise made to Abraham; but the Anabaptists deny the blessing of Abraham, and in him of all the Nations of the earth to be the Gospel preached to Abraham in reference to the Gentiles after their call, therefore the Anabaptists deny the interpretation made to Abraham which S. Paul maketh; the words of S. Paul

K 3

110

An Answer to Mr. Tombes William Hussey, 1647

are plain, Gal. 3.8. The Scripture foretelling that God would justify the heathen through faith, preached before the Gospel unto Abraham, saying, In thee shall all Nations be blessed, where ye for plainly St. Paul affirmeth the promise to Abraham to be the Gospel, and the Nations to be converted Gentiles, and that in the promise made to Abraham, there was a Prophecy of the conversion of the Gentiles, and the Gentiles under the Gospel had Abrahams blessing, that it is a blessing to them and their seed, as Abraham had to him and his seed: so that it is apparent that those which deny the blessing to the seed of the Gentiles, the blessing of the promise, deny Abrahams blessing to the Gentiles; which is directly to deny the interpretation of St. Paul concerning Abrahams blessing, and to deny that the blessing to Abraham was the Gospel, or that the promise was a Prophecy of the conversion of the Gentiles under the Gospel; all which things are plainly affirmed by St. Paul.

7. That doctrine that denieth the benefit or grace of circumcision to be offered in baptism, that doctrine is false: but the doctrine of Anabaptists is a doctrine that denieth the benefit and grace of circumcision to be offered in baptism; therefore the doctrine of the Anabaptists is false. That doctrine which denieth what St. Paul affirmeth, is a false doctrine: but that doctrine that denieth the benefit or grace of circumcision to be offered in baptism, that doctrine denieth what St. Paul affirmeth, therefore that doctrine denieth the benefit and grace of circumcision to be offered in baptism, is a false doctrine.

The place wherein St. Paul doth affirme that we have the benefit of circumcision by baptism, is Coloss. 2. 11, 12. Let the argument be weighed, I have spoken to it any answer to Mr. Tombes. In the which yer St. Paul affirmeth they were circumcised, that was not literally true; the thing he affirmeth in a figurative or metonymicall sense, *signi pro signato*, the thing signified by circumcision; and he further sheweth, how the benefit they were partakers of had resemblance with circumcision; circumcision did cut off the body by a synecdoche, part for the whole, but they put off the whole body, because it was the body of sin. Now this is done by the circumcision of Christ; it was this circumcision of Christ that made the circumcision of our fathers of any vertue: this had been as true of the Patriarches, that they were circumcised in putting off the body of the finnes of the flesh by the circumcision of Christ; whereof their legal circumcision was but a type, and Christs circumcision did put an end to that circumcision; yet the Colossians were circumcised in Christ: how could that be? the text plainly saith, they put off the body of the finnes of the flesh, and that was their circumcision in the circumcision of Christ; it was the benefit of circumcision to the Jewes, which had they thought they wanted the ceremony? Now all this benefit cometh unto you by being in Christ, get but into Christ and all is done; to put off the body is to dye; Christ dyed, if ye be in him, all that he did you did; he was circumcised, ye are

are circumcised; he died, ye die; in him; thus were your fathers in Christ by circumcision: so are ye in Christ by baptism, buried with him in baptism: nothing can be plainer than the grace and benefit of circumcision was offered to the Colossians in baptism.

That doctrine that refuseth to hear and obey the rationall and manly phrase of the doctrine of the Gospel, and reduce all to the sensitive and childish delivery of the Law, that is an unfaithfull and disobedient doctrine; but the doctrine of Anabaptists refuseth to hear and obey the rationall and manly phrase of the doctrine of the Gospel, and reduce all to the sensitive and childish delivery of the Law, therefore the doctrine of the Anabaptists is an unfaithfull and disobedient doctrine; God was pleased to deliver the service, which consisted in ceremonies and outward performances in such manner, that every external was directed to them the length, height of their Temple, and of every thing that was contained therein, to shew that God would be the author of all things in his worship: The colour, length of the curtains, of their altars, and every carved thing, were directed immediately by God; the place where the Temple should stand: If we should rigorously look for particular rules in this kinde, as those Anabaptists do in point of baptism look for the like direction for administration of baptism, as of circumcision; and for want thereof, to neglect what the Holy Ghost hath said concerning the nature of baptism, and giving direction to have it administered to all nations, thereby leaving the precept or duty of baptism without any lawfull use, for want of such sensitive and particular direction as they had under the Law, we might be condemned for will-worship, for building Churches without a pattern and direction from God, how high, or how long they should be, together with many things of the like nature; refuse to pray publicly or meet to serve God because he had appointed no place: the truth is, what they say against baptizing of Infants doth conclude against any baptizing at all: For, if the particular assigment of the persons to be baptized must be distinguished by any qualification for want of any such direction, we shall be enforced to leave all unbaptized: Baptize all nations, saith Christ, and Acts 2. 41: three thousand souls were added: Acts 13. men and women; they may comprehend all, male and female, without necessary inference, that they were grown men and women.

Now, if we leave this sensitive and childish way, and walk by the reasonable sense of Scripture, how clearly doth the Scripture give satisfaction in this point, I pray you observe: First, Christ doth command to baptize all nations: Secondly, he telleth, that the promise belonging to any doth entitle him to baptism, Acts 2. 39. Thirdly, that the promise is the same to Abraham, and the Gospel preached to the Gentiles, Gal. 3. 8. that the promise was to Abraham and his seed; that baptism doth circumcise us by ingrafting us into Christ, Col. 2. 11, 12.

By

An Answer to Mr. Tombes
William Hussey, 1647

By what rational excuses can we excuse our selves for disobediences to the commands of Christ, commanding us to baptize all nations, if we refuse any, that by a nationall covenant are brought unto us?

8 That doctrine, which under pretence of walking by Scripture, supports all their doctrine by fallacies, and false arguments, that doctrine is erroneous and false; but the doctrine of Anabaptists is such, I do challenge all the Anabaptists, and in particular Mr. Tombes, to produce any argument against Infants baptisme from Scripture, or sound reason, that shall reasonably conclude from the words without any addition or subtraction, or may agree with the sense and argument of the words produced, then I shall account Mr. Tombes his objections more tolerable; in the mean time, I will he might receive satisfaction, and spend his time in confirmation of his weaker brethren.

FINIS.

An Answer to Mr. Tombes
William Hussey, 1647