

truly Unbelievers as the other, nor is their Opposition to the Faith of Christ less violent. Mr. R. falls into the same Fault, in expressing himself concerning these several Enemies of Christianity, in the foregoing Page; but I could have spar'd this Remark and some others of the like kind, if he had trampled less on the Anabaptists for their suppos'd Ignorance, and made less Noise of his own pretended Learning.

Chap.2.


He adds, that 'tis the Faith of such Parents must entitle themselves and their Children to this Holy Mystery; but while they are out of the Visible Church, they are out of Covenant, and so have no right to the Seals of the Covenant, Eph. 2. 12. Here again it were to be wish'd that he would not have contented himself to tell us, the Faith of Parents entitles Children to Baptism, without producing any Proof of it; instead of that he is satisfied in informing us, that the Infants of Pagans, Jews, and Mahometans, are not to be baptiz'd, and renders this Reason for it, That being out of the Visible Church, they are out of Covenant, and so have no right to the Seals of the Covenant.

1st. Here I would fain know of this Gentleman, what Covenant this is of which he speaks, whether it be the Covenant of Grace, into which Men enter when they believe in Christ, for this seems to be his sense of the Covenant: and if so, since he here intimates that those that are out of Covenant, have no right to the Seals of the Covenant, by which 'tis not to be doubted but he means Baptism and the Lord's Supper; how he will prove any Infants to be actually in that Covenant, or capable of entering into it without Faith: if he means some other Covenant, he'd do well to let us know what it is. P. 18.

2^{ly}. I ask whether the Infants of those Parents who profess Christianity, and whose vicious Lives shew them to be no better than Pagans, Jews or Mahometans, have a right to Baptism; if not, why does he not exempt their Children from this Privilege, as well as those of Pagans? &c. If they have a title to it, I should be glad to know whether 'tis in the right of the Faith of their Parents, or on some other Account? If the former be alledg'd, 'tis absurd; for how can a Child have a right in any Evangelick Privilege, by virtue

Chap. 2. of the Faith of a Parent, whose Faith is without
 Jam. 2. 17, good Works, and therefore dead? If the latter be
 18. affirm'd, viz. that such Infants have a right to Baptism
 on some other Account, he may if he pleases inform
 us what it is; till then we are likely to be at a Loss a-
 bout it.

P. 18.

3ly. If none have a right to Baptism which is a
 Seal of the Covenant, while they are out of the visi-
 ble Church; because while they are out of the visible
 Church they are out of the Covenant, as this Gentle-
 man plainly assures us: I ask whether any unbaptiz'd
 Infants are in the visible Church? If they are, why
 does he represent their Non-admission to Baptism, as a
 bar to their Communion with the visible Church?
 Withal telling us, that *to deny Infants Church-Communion, is to deprive us of all sound hopes of their Salvation*;
That God is said to add such as shall be saved,
Acts 2. 47. not sav'd without, but in being added to the
Church; and concluding, that *without her Communion*
 (where it can be had) he knows *no Salvation*. Are
 they in the visible Church, and out of the visible
 Church at the same time? Or are they in the Com-
 munion of the Church, and yet no more sound hopes
 to be had of their Salvation, than if they were out
 of it? Can't they be added to the Church without
 Baptism, and yet were they Members of it before
 they were baptiz'd, *i. e.* before they were added? If
 no unbaptiz'd Infants are Members of the visible
 Church, but are out of Covenant, as Mr. R. argues,
 and none have a right to the Seals of the Covenant
 who are out of Covenant, as he farther tells us,
 then why is he for Infant-Baptism? since this, in
 his own sense, is an Application of a Seal of the Co-
 venant, to such as are out of the Covenant, and so
 have no right to it. He would do well to elucidate
 this matter, and to reconcile his Expressions which so
 unhappily militate, that we are left uncertain whe-
 ther he believes the Infants of Christian Parents to be
 in the visible Church or out of it. One while he
 says they are in it, that they may have a right to the
 Seals of the Covenant; and at another time, he will
 have them out of it, that he may have an occasion to
 tax the Anabaptists with Cruelty, in denying 'em an
 En-

Entrance into it, and so depriving them (in all appearance) of Salvation. Chap. 2.

4ly. If those that are in the Covenant have a right to the Seals of the Covenant, as Mr. R. supposes, when he says, those that are out of the Covenant have not that right: Why does he reproach the Anabaptists for denying Infants one Seal of the Covenant, without blaming their Adversaries for withholding from 'em the other Seal? If they have an immediate right to both Seals, why should they have but one? If one may be defer'd till they come to Adult Age, why not the other? This Gentleman, who pretends to *vindicate the Cause of Infants* with so much Zeal, and so vehemently inveighs against those who are not for the Application of one Seal to 'em, yet indulgently connives at those that refuse the Application of the other, tho, according to his way of arguing, they have a right to both.

He comes next to speak against the Iteration of Baptism in these Words: "Baptism must be administred
"but once, the Sacrament must not be iterated, it
"imprints an indelible Character upon the Person,
"which neither Schism, Heresy nor Apostacy it self
"can blot out. If it becomes not to him a Token of
"Salvation, it remains upon him as a Testimony of
"his Condemnation. This agrees with what he had
said before, *viz.* that "it imprints an indelible Cha- P. 2.
"racter of Christianity which cannot be iterated.


I agree that Baptism ought not to be administred more than once; and the Controversy wherein I am engaged with him does not depend on the Question, whether Baptism is to be repeated, but principally on these two other Questions, Whether Baptism can be truly administred by Asperision? And whether Infants are proper Subjects of Baptism? Let this Gentleman once prove, that the Ordinance of Baptism can be duly administred without Dipping, and that Infants are proper Subjects of it; and then it will follow that the Anabaptists are guilty of Rebaptization. In the mean time they profess to be against the Iteration of Baptism; but they are for having it once duly administred to every Believer, according to our Saviour's Institution.

Chap. 2.

What this indelible Character is that Mr. R. says Baptism imprints, I know not; but it seems a very odd one by his Account: for (he says) 'tis an *indelible Character*, a *Character of Christianity*; 'tis upon the *Person*, can't be blotted out by either *Schism*, *Heresy* or *Apostacy* it self; and yet sometimes remains upon a *Man* as a *Testimony of his Condemnation*, as at other times 'tis a *Token of Salvation*: and because Baptism imprints this Character, therefore 'tis not to be iterated.

'Tis very reasonable to desire of Mr. R. an Explanation of this mystical Character, that we may know what he means by it, seeing those of the *Romish* Communion, in whose Mint it was first stamp'd, are not well agreed in their Notions about it. He would do well to tell us, whether he counts this Character one and the same thing with Grace, as *Scotus* affirms. Or that there is a real difference between 'em, as *Biel* will have it. Whether it be a Relation, as *Soto* and *Durandus* suppose. Or an absolute Quality, as *Bellarmino* maintains. Whether it be in the Substance of the Soul as its subject, as this last asserts. Or in some Power or Faculty of the Soul, as *Thomas Aquinas* and others maintain. And then in what Faculty, whether that of the Understanding, as the same *Aquinas*, *Cajetan*, *Soto*, and *Vasques* say. Or in the Will, in which *Scotus* thinks fit to place it formally. Again, 'tis proper to enquire what kind of Quality it is, whether of the first Species, *i. e.* a Disposition or Habit, as *Suarez* declares; or some middle thing between a Disposition and Habit, partaking of both, which *Joannes de Turrecremata* reports to have been held by some: or of the second Species, *viz.* a Power, as the just mentioned Author, as also *Cajetan*, *Soto* and *Rubens*, determine: or of the third, and so a patible Quality, as others have thought: or of the fourth, *viz.* a Figure or Form, which Opinion *Valentinian* and *Suarez* ascribe to *Marsilius*. When Mr. R. shall please to tell us what he means by this indelible Character, of which the Schoolmen themselves know not what to make with all their subtle Distinctions; and shall afterwards prove by Scripture or Reason, that there is such a Character imprinted by Baptism: He may make what Improvement

Vide Chamier. Pan-
strat. Cathol. Tom.
4. l. 2. c. 12.

ment of it he thinks fit in the Controversy about In- Chap.2.
 fant-Baptism. But he ought not to take it amiss that 
 the Anabaptists don't believe it on his bare Assertion,
 since they dare not give so much respect as that to the
 Canon of the Council of Trent *, which anathematizes
every one that shall say, that in the three Sacraments of Baptism, Confirmation, and Ordination, there is not imprinted in the Soul a Character, that is a certain, spiritual and indelible Sign, so that they cannot be iterated.

And if Mr. R. could make good what he asserts of this mysterious Character, he would have no just Reason to blame the Practice of the Anabaptists, unless he could make appear that they baptize those who were truly baptiz'd before ; for they are as much against the Iteration of Baptism as he, tho not for the same reason, viz. that of an indelible Character suppos'd to be imprinted by it on the Soul, till they can better understand it.

Mr. R. proceeds and says, “ The outward visible
 “ Sign of Baptism is Water, an Element at all Times,
 “ Places and Occasions, to be had ; God makes his Benefits common to all. He sends us not to *Arabia* for
 “ Spices, nor to *India* for Gold, to be the Symbols of
 “ our Christianity ; but he hath appointed Water,
 “ which is every where plenty : nor hath he confin'd
 “ us to *Jordan*, or any Rivers far distant, but every
 “ Spring is at hand to fill this Laver of Regeneration.

If there is any thing of Argument herein levell'd against the Anabaptists, I suppose it must amount to this, viz. That God has so ordered it, that the Sacraments or Symbols of Christianity, might be easily administr'd in all Times and Places ; because the Elements proper to that purpose, might be every where had in a sufficient Quantity : therefore the Anabaptists are to blame in making so great a Quantity of

* *Concil. Trident. Sess. 7. Can. 9. Si quis dixerit in tribus Sacramentis, Baptismo scilicet, Confirmatione & Ordine, non imprimi Characterem in anima, hoc est Signum quoddam Spiritale & Indelebile, unde ea iterari non possunt, anathema sit.*

Chap. 2. Water necessary to the Administration of Baptism, since so much as may suffice for Immersion, is not to be had every where.

1. I suppose by saying *the outward visible Sign of Baptism is Water*, he does not mean that Water is a Sign of this Ordinance of Baptism, but that the Water in Baptism is an outward visible Sign of inward Grace, because he speaks after this manner before; and seeing 'tis a Sign of that Grace, by which we die to Sin and rise to Newness of Life, 'tis fit such a Quantity of Water should be us'd, as may aptly signify this change, which can't be well represented without the Immersion and Emerision of the Person, who professes Repentance and Faith in Christ. And tho God does not send us to Foreign Countries for Water, or confine us to *Jordan* or any distant Rivers; he sends us to such Places as may furnish Water enough for the Administration of his Ordinance, in such a manner as he has required, and as is proper to answer the end of its Administration, namely, to represent and seal to us our Death to Sin, and Resurrection to Holiness. Some indeed who disapprove of Immersion, have of late endeavour'd to persuade the World, that in *Enon*, where *John* baptiz'd, there was but very little Water, and consequently that he did not immerse the Penitents that came to him, but only sprinkled them;

Joh. 3. 23. tho the Sacred Text tells us there was *much Water*: nor will their little Criticism on the Text bring them off with much Credit, when they tell us 'tis *ὕδατα πολλά* in the Greek, which signifies many Waters, from whence they conclude there were only many very small streams, not to be suppos'd large or deep enough for Immersion. For besides that small Streams might fill very capacious Pools or Receivers; and that the *Jews* who us'd frequent bathings, were not without Accommodations for that purpose; these Gentlemen do not sufficiently advert to the Phrase, for *ὕδατα πολλά* is a Hebraism, the same with *מים רבים*, and does not necessarily signify many Waters in separate

Ecc. 8. 7. Streams, but a great Quantity of Water. For let any Man judg, when *Solomon* says, *Many Waters can't quench Love, nor the Floods drown it*, whether he alludes to a small or great Quantity of Water. But this I say only

only *en passant*, for Mr. R. has not thought fit to make use of this poor Criticism. But if he supposes (as he seems to do) that 'tis not reasonable to think this Ordinance requires so much Water as is necessary for Immersion, because 'tis not easily to be had in many Places; and because 'tis not to be thought that God would put us upon any difficulty, in obtaining the Elements proper for the Administration of the Sacraments of our Religion: I desire he would consider that there are very few inhabited Places that are long destitute of so much Water, as may suffice for Immersion, and fewer yet that are very remote from such Conveniences; and that a Quantity of Water sufficient for Immersion may generally be more easily obtain'd, than the Wine which is necessary for the Administration of the Lord's Supper, according to the Institution of Christ, for which whole Nations are often beholden to Foreign Countries.

As for what he adds, *That those who have hence cantingly call'd it Water-Baptism, betray their own Ignorance, since where there is no Water, there can be no Baptism, the meaning of the Word implying Water*: I suppose 'tis design'd against the Quakers, who indeed speak contemptuously of Water-Baptism, and deny that this Ordinance is to be still administr'd, tho the Commission of Christ promises his Presence to those who regularly administer it, even to the end of the World. But I don't think Mr. R. has reason to be so angry with them for calling it Water-Baptism; for tho the Word [Baptism] ordinarily implies Water, yet himself confesses but two Pages before, that that Word may signify dipping in Colours as well as in Water; and this Accusation will reflect on *John Baptist* himself, who says, *I indeed baptize you with Water*, by which according to Mr. R's account he betrays his Ignorance, because Baptism implies Water: but by his Leave, that Great and Holy Prophet spake very pertinently, in telling the People not only that he baptized, but that he baptized with Water; because he designed to distinguish between the Baptism of Water, and that of the Holy Ghost and Fire: for he adds, *But he that comes after me shall baptize you with the Holy Ghost and with Fire*. So that tho Mr. R. says, where there

Chap.2.



Mat. 3. 11.

is

Chap. 2.

is no Water there can be no Baptism, and from thence thinks it an impertinent Redundancy to speak of Water when we speak of Baptism, because *this* implies *that*; we see there is another sort of Baptism, which is not of Water; nay and a third too, namely of Sufferings, of which our Saviour speaks: and therefore it has been a common Saying among the Learned (however they may have betray'd their Ignorance in the matter) that there are three Baptisms, *Fluminis, Flaminis, & Sanguinis.*

As to the manner of administering the Water in Baptism, he says, 'tis either by dipping into, pouring out of, or sprinkling on the Water, all which Actions the Word will bear. 'Tis observable that he here grants the Mode of Administration us'd by the Anabaptists to be fit and proper, and yet ridicules 'em for practising it in the 5th Chapter: But of Immersion, and also of the Mode of Pouring and Sprinkling we shall chuse to speak hereafter, when he comes to expose the former to Contempt, and to maintain the latter; for here for the most part he rather asserts his Principles than offers Arguments to defend 'em. I readily concur with what he says concerning the Administration of this Ordinance, in the Name of the Father, of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost, and the Qualification of the Administrators. I also agree with him, that the time of it is not, like that of Circumcision, limited to any certain Period. And by the way, there seems to me no more Reason for the Law of Circumcision, to regulate the quality of the Subjects of this Ordinance, than the precise time of its Administration. If because Infants were circumcis'd under the Law, Infants are to be baptized under the Gospel, as he argues afterwards; then because the former were circumcis'd on the eighth day, why should not the latter be baptized on the eighth day too? Nay, why should not many other things relating to the one, be by the same Rule refer'd to the other? I would also agree to what Mr. R. adds, that as Baptism can never be administred too late, so it can never be administred too soon; if he would allow me to add this Proviso, that the Persons be qualified for the Ordinance, by a due Confession of Faith and Repentance. But his following Words.

Words, and the Scope of his Book shew him to be far enough from such a Concession. Chap. 2.

After he has given us this Account of Baptism, he concludes that "this is the general Doctrine of the Sacrament of Baptism, practis'd by the universal Christian Church ever since the Apostles, till Men of corrupt Principles have brought in many Innovations, to the disturbance of the Churches Quiet and Peace. 'Tis boldly said, but Mr. R. I suppose will never be able to prove all *this Doctrine of Baptism* he has advanced, to be that of the Universal Church; Will he prove that the Universal Church ever since the days of the Apostles has held that this Ordinance imprints that indelible Character of which he talks? Can he prove the Universal Church yet holds it, unless he will make the *Romish Church* to be the Universal? Can he prove that pouring or sprinkling of Water has been the Mode of baptizing ever since the Apostles, in the Universal Church? Or that this is the Practice of the Universal Church at this day, without thrusting out the *Greek Churches*, as well as the Anabaptists from the Universal Church? Or will he prove that Infants have been baptized ever since the Apostles days by the Universal Church? If he could have prov'd all this to be the Doctrine of the Apostles, we would have spar'd him the Task of proving it to have been practis'd universally ever since. But he neither performs one nor t'other; he speaks as if he expected his Affirmation would be sufficient Evidence in the Matter. But we shall have occasion in another place, to give the Reader some farther means of judging, whether Mr. R. is to be relied on, in what he so confidently assures us, concerning the Practice of the Universal Church, and of knowing who they are that have innovated since the Time of the Apostles, to the disturbance of the Church.


In the mean time we follow this Gentleman in his own Method: *Having seen the Truth* (says he) *let us view the many confus'd and wild Notions which some have had about this Sacrament.*

And first he tells us of the Error of the *Jews*, in baptizing Cups and Pots, &c. as if the *Jews* meant by dipping their Cups and Pots to administer a Sacrament

Chap. 2.

on 'em, and so were censur'd for this by our Saviour: whereas they are blam'd for their superstitious dipping of these Vessels, as a Practice founded on an unscriptural Tradition (tho they plac'd much of Religion in it) and not for the abuse of a Sacrament, in applying it to wrong Subjects; it was an Ordinance of their own Invention which they practis'd, and not a Misapplication of the Ordinance of Baptism which Christ instituted, or that which *John the Baptist* practis'd, for this was from *Heaven*, but theirs was a *Commandment of Men*. He then speaks of the Error of the Papists, in baptizing Bells and giving 'em Names, for which he says they have a certain Rubrick and Form of Prayer. As to their giving Names to their Bells, they might be born with in that; but to pretend to baptize 'em, is to be both superstitious and profane at the same time: and he might have added the Christning of Ships by some Protestants, at the time of naming them, as another erroneous Practice somewhat like the Popish Christning of Bells. Perhaps the Papists may draw Consequences for the pretended Baptism of their Bells, from some Rites in the *Jewish Church*, for the purifying and consecrating the Utensils of the Sanctuary, not much less plausible, than those which some People draw for the Baptism of the Infants of Christians, from the Circumcision of those of the *Jews*. But we are to recur to the plain Words of Institution, to direct us to the Practice of the Ordinances of Christ, which are not to be subjected to the capricious Humours of Men, and the arbitrary Consequences that are drawn by their ungovern'd Imaginations.

He goes on to tell us, that *others err in the proper Subject, and deny Baptism to Infants, allowing it only to the Adult*. How he'll prove it to be an Error, to allow Baptism only to the Adult, and not to Infants, we shall afterwards see. In reading the next Words, *viz. Others with some Jews confounded it with Circumcision*; I could not but think of those *Gentile Christians*, that deduce Infant-Baptism from the Law of Circumcision, and thereby indeed too much confound them together: but the next Words shew that Mr. R. means those who were for retaining the Rite of Circumcision, and for practising the Ordinance of
Baptism

Baptism too, which was the Mind of many converted Chap.2.
Jews at the first Plantation of the Christian Church, as  is manifest from *Acts* 15. As for the *Manichees* and *Marcionites*, the former of whom (like the Quakers) he says, baptiz'd none at all, and the latter none, but single Persons, as *Virgins, Widows, and Women divorced*; we have nothing to say in their Defence: but 'tis strange that this Gentleman, in relating the Practice of the *Marcionites*, in baptizing only single Persons, should enumerate these under the Denominations only of *Virgins, Widows and Women divorc'd*; as if there were no single Men. If any one of the Anabaptists had made such an Enumeration, no doubt but it should have been interpreted, to have arisen from a greater *Inclination* to think on the *fair Sex*, than on the other; since he thinks their administering of Baptism by Immersion, is a sufficient Occasion for a very gross and unchristian Reproach, with which he asperses their Ministry, in the close of his fifth Chapter: as if the Practice of an Institution of Christ, were an incentive to Vice; and as if that Mode of its Administration that represents the Death of Christ, and a Christian's *Death to Sin*, were a Temptation, at Rom. 6. 2,
least to the Administrators, to crucify him afresh by 3, 4.
a sinful Life. But I shall not impute his Omission, in what he says of the Persons baptiz'd by the *Marcionites*, to any worse Inclination than that of Forgetfulness.

The next confus'd and wild Notion he mentions is that of the *Barrowists*, who, he says, denied Baptism to the Children of *Whores or Witches*; to which he subjoins that of the *Brownists*, who denied it to the Children of *open Sinners*. So that according to Mr. R. to admit the Children of *Whores, Witches and open Sinners* to Baptism, must be a very regular and reasonable Opinion. And to be sure the Reason of this must be, what he has before told us in this P. 4, & 5.
Chapter; because they are born of Christian Parents, are federally holy, and have a right to the Ordinance on account of the Faith of their Parents. Now if Mr. R. accounts *Whores, Witches and open Sinners* true Believers, and that they have Faith enough to entitle their Children to Baptism, 'tis somewhat strange he
has

Chap. 2. has not Faith, or at least Confidence enough himself to entitle the Children of *Pagans, Jews* and *Mahometans* to this Ordinance ; for there seems to be as good reason for the one as for the other. To the *Brownists* he joins the *Independants*, who scruple (he says) to baptize the Children of those, who are not in Church-fellow-member-ship with themselves. Where he pick'd up that long-link'd Word I can't tell ; but if he means that the *Independants* are not for the Baptism of the Infants of any Believers, but those who are in strict Communion with their particular Churches, he very much misrepresents them ; since they make the suppos'd right of Infants to Baptism, to depend on the Faith of their Parents, not on their particular Form of Church Communion.

The *Independants* agree with Mr. R. in entitling the Infants of Believers to Baptism, on the account of the Faith of their Parents, tho they don't with him count Whores, Witches, and open Sinners, among the Number of Believers. And methinks this Gentleman might have had Charity enough to have permitted the *Anabaptists* to bear the Name of Christians (which yet his angry Title-page will by no means allow) as well as those infamous People above-mention'd, to whom he is willing to grant it, if there be any sense in his Words. Why should he be so wonderfully kind to Whores, Witches and open Sinners, and so extravagantly severe against a great Number of sober People, whose Conversation is of a contrary Character, however he is pleas'd to slander 'em ?

“ Others (says he) have mistaken the Oneness of
 “ Baptism, and would rebaptize those that have been
 “ baptiz'd by Hereticks, or by the Ministers of the
 “ Church of *England*, or by those that are not of
 “ their own Communion, or that have not been bap-
 “ tized with the Ceremonies they practise : Such are
 “ those we have chiefly to do with, who account all
 “ other Baptism besides their own invalid and no Bap-
 “ tism ; and from their rebaptizing are call'd Ana-
 “ baptists.

The *Donatists* indeed are reported to have been for the rebaptizing of all such as were baptiz'd by those whom they accounted Hereticks. But Mr. R. gives no
 fair

fair Representation of the People, with whom he says he has chiefly to do; since they are not for rebaptizing any, but for baptizing such Believers as they judge have not been baptiz'd before. If they have the Essentials of Baptism, according to the Institution of Christ, tho' the Administrator be not of their Communion, nay, tho' he should differ much from them, they dare not disallow that Baptism which is administered properly, that is, by Immersion in the Name of the Blessed Trinity, to Persons who are capable Subjects of it, according to the Commission Christ has given.

Chap. 2.



Mat. 28.

“ Some (he says) will have another visible Sign besides Water. The *Origenists* maintain'd a Baptism by Fire, and the Papists besides Water, have introduc'd Chrism, Spittle, Salt, and other Trumperies. The Anabaptists are against all these Trumperies as much as Mr. R. and it were to be wish'd, that these and all other such human Inventions in Religion were banished out of the World, and the Ordinances of Christ reduc'd to their primitive Purity and Simplicity.

What he next says about those that err as to the manner of Baptism, because they account Dipping essential to it, I shall pass, since he advances no Argument about it here, and handles it professedly in the fifth Chapter.

As to what he adds, concerning the Errors of some about the Time of Baptism, as “ of the *Clinici*, who defer'd their Baptism to their dying hour, and others who delay'd it till they were 30 Years of Age: 'Tis to be observ'd, that Mr. R. speaks of the *Clinici*, as if they were a sort of Hereticks; whereas the Word only signifies sick or bed-rid People, some of whom indeed were not baptized till they were near Death, but were of opinion to defer their Baptism when they were in a State of Health, before they could be call'd *Clinici*; but their Delay, and that of others, as of *Gregory Nazianzen*, *Chrysostom*, *Ambrose* and *Augustine*, as well as *Constantine* the Emperor, who submitted not to this Ordinance till they were Adult, tho' born of Christian Parents, shows that Infant-Baptism was not universally received, as Mr. R. would have us believe. But 'tis remarkable that himself says, *In deferring their Baptism, they alluded to the Practice of Christ*; but adds,

Chap. 2.

adds, *not considering that he was circumcis'd at eight days old.* Which is as much as to say, that tho Christ was not baptized till he was Adult, yet others may be baptized in Infancy, because Christ was circumcis'd when eight days old; as if the State of his Age when circumcis'd, was rather to guide us as to the time of our Baptism, than the State of his Age when baptiz'd. And tho he had said but two Pages before, that the time of Baptism is not, like Circumcision, to be limited to any certain Period; yet here Christ's Circumcision at eight days old, is mention'd as a Rule to regulate the time of our Baptism. If Mr. R. should reply, that he does not mention the precise time of Christ's Circumcision, to adjust that of Baptism to a day, but to show that it ought to be administred to Infants: I answer, that it seems more reasonable to argue for Adult-Baptism, from Christ's Adult-Baptism, than for Infant-Baptism, from his Infant-Circumcision.

He concludes this Chapter, in giving us an account of some who count *Baptism among things indifferent, to be us'd or refus'd at Discretion*: Who these are he does not tell us, and therefore I have nothing to do with them at present. He tells us of others, who *say there is such a Necessity of Baptism, that all that die without it are damned. So wild and confus'd* (says he) *are the Notions of those who are ever seeking, yet never come to the Knowledg of the Truth.* Of this latter Opinion he elsewhere accuses the Anabaptists, and the Church of Rome.

The former are so little guilty of it, that they generally exceed very many Pædo-baptists in charitable Thoughts concerning the State of such as die without Baptism, even when Adult, if they appear to have true Repentance and Faith before they expire. Nay, so far are they from concluding, that no unbaptiz'd Person can be sav'd, that they think none can be proper Subjects of Baptism, till they are in a State of Salvation, and give sufficient Evidence of their Title to Eternal Life by their Faith and Repentance. Whereas this, which he with so little Justice imputes to the Anabaptists, is justly chargeable on himself, as well as on those of the *Romish* Communion; for tho he will not allow others to say, *There is such a Necessity of Baptism, that*
all

all that die without it are damned: Yet he takes the liberty to say something very like it himself, when he tells us, *Those who deny Baptism to Infants, offer them greater Injury than to dash them against the Stones;* and that *to deny Infants Church-Communion, is to deprive us of all sound hopes of their Salvation;* and exclaims against the Anabaptists, for their *Cruelty and execrable Injury to their Children on this Account.* Is it just to condemn others for Heterodox Principles which they disavow, and to entertain the very same Errors in his own Mind? Or does he think he may take as much liberty to traduce his Neighbours, as he does to contradict himself? He who taxes others with *wild and confus'd Notions* about this matter, ought to have shown more Regularity and Consistence in his own.

Chap. 3.

P. 18, 19.

C H A P. III.

An Answer to Mr. R's second Chapter, which treats of the Anabaptists in general, their several Names and Sects.

AFTER Mr. R. has let fly some reproachful Words against the Anabaptists, according to his wonted Civility; he adds, that an Anabaptist is a sort of an amphibious Creature, Proteus-like changing himself into so many Shapes, that we can't easily tell how to call him, or what he professeth. He seems to call the Anabaptists amphibious Creatures, because they go into the Water to be baptiz'd. 'Tis strange how he dares to throw out this insipid Scoff, which equally reflects on our Saviour, who went into the Water when he was baptized, and on his Apostles, who also went into the Water together with those whom they baptized: Will he call Christ and his Apostles, and those Christians whom they baptized, *amphibious* Creatures too? But he complains that the Anabaptists change themselves into so many Shapes, that he can't easily tell how to call 'em. 'Tis strange again that he should be at any loss how to call 'em, when he gives 'em no less than four

Mat. 3.

Acts 8.

Chap. 3.

* Compare
this with
the 9th
Chapter.

general, and 24 more particular Names and Titles of Distinction in this Chapter, besides many others that are scattered up and down the rest of his Book. Since he seems to make no conscience what Names he gives 'em, but to be of the Humor to entitle 'em to all manner of Errors and Heresies, which he * charges on them by dozens; one may well wonder at his Complaint, that he knows not how to call 'em, or what they profess, especially when he pretends before to know them better than they know themselves. Is it that he knows not how to call 'em by any Name bad enough, when he gives 'em the worst he could either read or think of? 'Tis hard to account for this extraordinary Transport of his Passion. But his good Nature soon furnishes him with another Name for an Anabaptist; for he insinuates that he may be call'd *Duplex Nebulo*, a double Knave: He says, *duplex Nomen, duplex Nebulo*, was the Judge's Opinion of a Criminal in the Comædian; and therefore fears that *Doctrine or Opinion will not abide the Touch-stone of Truth, which shelters it self under so many Appellations*. By this Rule, because the Protestant Doctrine in general, which Mr. R. professes, is put under as many heretical Appellations by the Papists, as that of the Anabaptists is by him; every Protestant may be call'd *duplex Nebulo*, or rather *multiplex Nebulo*, if Multiplication of Names supposes a proportionate Multiplication of Knavery in those that bear 'em. So that great Numbers of Pædobaptists, and himself among the rest, herein suffer as much as the Anabaptists by the sharpness of his Wit.

To proceed; he tells us, an *Anabaptist* is generally so call'd from *Rebaptizing*; but if the People against whom he disputes be truly against Rebaptization, as we have in part shown they are, and hope to do it more fully; then it must be granted, that this is no very proper Appellation for them, tho' for Peace-sake they often take this Name quietly, since the Pædobaptists will needs give it them. He moreover informs the World, that they are call'd *Catabaptists*, or *Depravours of Baptism*, *Deuterobaptists* for *baptizing twice*, and *Antipædobaptists* for denying Baptism to Children. But they don't think their Cause a jot the worse, for
all

all the compound Names that are given them : for whether they are *Depravers* of Baptism, or for *baptizing twice* or not, can't be known by the Names that are impos'd on them, so well as by the Strength or Weakness of the Arguments produced on the one side and on the other in this Controversy. Chap. 3.

But our Author is extremely moved at the Name they give themselves : “ And now (says he) after near 200 Years he [*i. e. the Anabaptist*] hath christened himself, and forsooth will be called a *Baptist*, *emphaticke*, pretending the Ordinance of Baptism is only in him, that none are baptized that are not of his Communion; that all other Baptisms are none at all : and therefore he would reject his old Name of Anabaptist, by telling you he doth not rebaptize ; for all others, however baptized, were falsly baptized, and so it was nothing.

If the Anabaptists had done that with which Mr. R. is so much displeas'd, they might well plead that they had as much right to christen themselves, as he has to unchristian 'em, as he presumes to do in his Title-page. But they suppose they may more properly call themselves *Baptists*, than he calls giving a Name *Christning* : for he that is for the Administration of Baptism by Dipping, may on that account more truly be called a * *Baptist*, than he that has a Name given him, may for that reason be said to be christened, or made a Christian. I know Custom has render'd it common to use *Christning* and *Naming* as convertible Terms, but very improperly : and 'tis pity the Sacred Name of Christ should be insert'd in any Word of profane and common use ; - and that the Term that properly signifies the Divine Work of making a Christian, should be apply'd so often merely to the humane Ceremony of giving a Name.

* Which is derived from βαπτίζω to dip.

But there is no such occasion for Mr. R. to be angry at the Term [*Baptists*] since 'tis not only us'd by themselves, but often allowed them by the fairer sort of their Adversaries : and since he likes it not, he might have lengthen'd it into [*Anabaptists*] without giving 'em any great Offence ; tho they think they have more right to give themselves one fit Name, than he has to impose on 'em a great num-

Chap. 3. ber that are improper, and which expose his own
 ~~~~~~ Prejudices rather than their Principles.

Indeed they may very well object against the Name of *Anabaptists*, which is commonly given 'em; because it will never be prov'd that 'tis proper, till 'tis made evident that they baptize such as had that Ordinance truly administred to 'em before: yet they can be content to bear it, rather than contend long about it, and even call themselves so to humour their Adversaries, only with this Caution, that they don't thereby make any Concession that 'tis properly applied to them, as giving a just Idea of their Principles or Practice.

What he means by their pretending *the Ordinance of Baptism is only in them*, I know not; for his Phrases are often obscure: nor do the Anabaptists pretend, that *none are baptized that are not of their Communion*, as he says, if he means thereby Communion with their particular Churches; for the Generality of the Members of their Churches were baptiz'd according to the manner instituted by Christ, before they were admitted into their Communion; and many who are in Communion with other Churches, are acknowledged by the Anabaptists to have been regularly baptiz'd: they don't think true Baptism is render'd invalid, unless the Persons baptiz'd join themselves to their Churches; nor that Communion with any Church in the World, can render that pretended Baptism valid, which is not perform'd according to the Institution of Christ.

And what Mr. R. subjoins, of their *censuring all others to Perdition* but themselves, which he calls a *degrading Spirit of Error, and Luciferian Spirit of Pride, and an insolent Arrogancy*, has been sufficiently answered already; and we have made it appear that Mr. R. is much less clear from this censorious Spirit (let him call it by what other Names he pleases) than their Principles and Practice declare 'em to be.

From these more general Names, he *descends* to give (as he says) *the Names of their particular Sects*, and these he makes to amount to no less than 24, *viz. Muncerians, Apostolici, Separatists, Catharists, Silerites, Enthusiasts, Liberi, Adamites, Flutites, Augustians, Beucheldians, Melchiorists, Georgians, Menonists, Hemero-baptists, Se-baptists, Pueris similes, Servetians, Libertines,*

*tines, Denkians, Semper orantes, Deo relictis, Monasterienses, and Dippers.* Chap. 3.

For what end can Mr. R. be suppos'd to insert this Catalogue of Names, but to give the People of this Nation a monstrous Idea of the Anabaptists, as being made up of Error and Confusion? but with what Reason and Justice he takes this Method, I hope will appear by the following Reflections.

1. This Gentleman will by no means allow the Anabaptists an elder date than that of about 180 Years, and yet one of the Sects he mentions, namely that of the *Hemero-baptists*, was a Sect among the *Jews*, and is said to have been in the World above 1700 Years ago; before our Saviour's Incarnation, and consequently before the Institution of the Ordinance of Baptism, about which we are disputing. And divers of the other Sects he here mentions, are more antient by many hundreds of Years than he'll allow the Anabaptists to be, as the *Apostolici*, who arose about 1500 Years since, and are mentioned by *Epiphanius*. The *Catharists* who appear'd about the Year 279<sup>3</sup>, and are mention'd by *Augustin*. Or if he means the *Cathari*, as I suppose he does, by what he says of 'em, they were known in the World about the Year 256, and the *Adamites* about the Year 194; and those he calls *Silentes*, by whom I suppose he means the *Pattalorinchite*, must have been before or in *Augustin's* time, since he speaks of 'em: And the Sect of the *Enthusiasts* about 1<sup>o</sup> the Year 380. If these were Sects of the Anabaptists, why will not Mr. R. allow 'em to be of a longer standing in the World, than since the Year 1522? And if they were not, why does he thrust 'em upon the Anabaptists to render them odious? Does 1200, 1400 or 1500 Years make no difference in his account, who must be suppos'd, together with the rest of his human Advantages, by which he pretends to

p. 41.

<sup>1</sup> Epiph. advers. hær. lib. 1. hæ. 18. <sup>2</sup> Idem adv. hæ. lib. 2. hæ. 61. <sup>3</sup> Prateolus de hæ. lib. 3. c. 12. <sup>4</sup> Aug. hæ. c. 46. <sup>5</sup> Epiph. lib. 2. hæ. 39. <sup>6</sup> Prateol. lib. 2. c. 11. <sup>7</sup> Vid. Epiph. lib. 2. hæ. 52. <sup>8</sup> Prateol. l. 1. c. 1. <sup>9</sup> Lib. de hæ. <sup>10</sup> Prateol. l. 3. c. 12.

Chap. 3. excel the Anabaptists, to know Arithmetick and Chronology better, than to make such wide Mistakes as these?

2. Some of these Sects seem rather cited to render the Anabaptists more obnoxious to censure, as having a great Number of different Sects belonging to 'em, than for any ill Opinions or Practices among 'em; for if they were Heterodox or Immoral, Mr. R. does not vouchsafe to tell the Reader so: for Instance, when he mentions those he calls *Silentes*, he only says they speak little, which is often a sign of Prudence; and if this were all the hurt in this Sect, some People could almost wish Mr. R. had been of it, that he might have given himself and others less trouble. He says nothing amiss of the *Apostolici* or *Menonists*; of the former he only says, *They pretended to imitate the Apostles, in perambulating the Country to preach*; which may very lawfully be done by those who are regularly call'd to the Ministry of the Gospel. And of the latter he says no more, than that they have their Name from *Menon* of *Frisia*, from whom they had a while their common Appellation. Now since he distinguishes the other Sects by some particular false Doctrine or evil Practice, it seems reasonable that these should have been so distinguish'd too; 'tis true, he speaks again of the *Apostolists* (as he calls 'em) in the 9<sup>th</sup> Chapter, but not of the *Silentes* or *Menonists* any where else that I remember.

3. He makes the *Dippers* one particular Sect of the Anabaptists, as if it were a Crime to administer the Ordinance of Baptism by Immersion: by this account he will make the Sect of the Anabaptists as old as Christianity itself; for *John the Baptist* and the Apostles were Dippers; and to administer this Ordinance by Immersion, was the general Practice of the Christian Churches for many Ages, as I shall shew in due place, and is the Practice of the *Greek Church* to this day; so that Mr. R. has enlarged this Sect of the Anabaptists to a great degree. Nay, the Church of *England* prescribes *Dipping* in the Office of Baptism in the first place, tho' she allows pouring on Water in case of necessity; so that if this Author is of the Mind of that Church, which he calls his Mother, he is an Ana-

\*

bap-