


baptist too in opinion, being of the Sect of the Dip- Chap. 3.
pers, and so must help to bear the Burden of his own
Reproaches, which will rebound severely on him-
self.

4. Since the Anabaptists in *England* were never known by divers of these Names, nor ever could be justly charg'd with the Errors proper to divers of the Sects Mr. R. has here mentioned, till he was pleas'd thus to dignify and distinguish 'em: It can be no good Excuse for him to say he speaks of those that were formerly in *Germany*, there being many Places in this Treatise, particularly in this and the ninth Chapter, where he so often confounds 'em together, and so often mentions 'em as now in being, as his Neighbours, and the Persons with whom he has to do in this Controversy, that no equitable Reader can doubt on whom he design'd to make that Dirt stick, which he has taken the pains to rake together.

5. When his hand was in, he might have added *Madmen or Fools*, as another Sect of the Anabaptists, as well as those he calls *Pueris Similes*, who he says would play all sorts of childish Tricks, riding about upon Sticks and Hobby-horses, and rolling themselves in their Excrements: for there is no Sect in the World, that engrosses the People of this Character. But if so great a Man as the Apostle Paul was counted mad when he spake the Words of Truth and Soberness, and was willing to be look'd on as a Fool for Christ's sake, while his Preaching was call'd Foolishness by the pretended wise Men of the World; the Anabaptists ought, in imitation of so bright a Pattern, to be patient under all the Contempt and Scorn this Gentleman is pleas'd to throw upon them for his Divertisement.

Acts 26.
24, 25.
1 Cor. 1.

6. But supposing divers of 'em to have been guilty of some of these Errors, which Mr. R. charges on 'em here and elsewhere; is the Error any Man entertains, to be confounded with the Truth he holds? Is the wholesome Sweetness of Truth, converted into the deadly Poison of destructive Heresy, as Mr. R. would persuade us it sometimes happens? Where will he find a Church in the World, to whom many Errors and Heresies may not be imputed, if all the unsound Noti-

Chap. 3.  ons that are embrac'd by some of its Members, must be put to the Account of the whole Body? Would it not be easy to produce Instances of Men of corrupt Minds and of corrupt Manners too, who have sprung up in the Communion of all the Reform'd Churches? yet it does not hence follow, that the Reformation is ill founded, and that those Churches have no Truth remaining among 'em. 'Tis certain the Doctrine of Baptism, as held by the Anabaptists, has no tendency to lead Men into those Extravagancies Mr. R. would fasten on them.

7. Divers of the Sects he mentions are deriv'd from several particular Mens Names, who are said to have been chief among 'em; and at this rate one might make abundance of Sects in any body of Christians: and this Method is us'd by the Papists, from whom this Author seems to have collected many of his Calumnies. That they may make those who oppose the Corruptions of the *Romish* Church pass for egregious Hereticks, they charge on 'em a Multitude of old Heresies, as if reviv'd by them, and give 'em a great number of Names, to make the People think they entertain abundance of Errors. Thus they call'd the *Vaudois*, *Herricians*, *Petrobrusians*, *Josaphists*, *Esperonists*, *Lollards*, *Arnoldists*, *Siccars*, *Fratricelli*, *Gazarès*, *Turlupins*, *Patarins*, *Cathari*, &c. And since the Reformation a Multitude of Names have been given the Protestants to diversify them, as *Lutherans*, *Majorans*, *Illyricans*, *Osiandrians*, *Musculans*, *Interimists*, *Adriaphorists*, *Pneumaticks*, *Zuinglians*, *Calvinists*, *Bucerists*, &c. Now because the Protestants are distinguish'd by these Names and a hundred more, must all their Principles be corrupt, and their Separation from *Rome* an infamous Schism? Were they not all in the right in opposing Idolatry? tho they could not all be so in those things wherein they differed among themselves.

8. That which renders Mr. R's Conduct towards the Anabaptists in *England* yet more strange, is, that the Confessions of Faith they have publish'd, as well as their Sermons, sufficiently declare that at least a great body of them are far from countenancing those

those Errors, which he imputes to the several Sects, by Chap.4. whose Names he will have 'em call'd. To convince any Impartial Reader of this, I need only refer him to the Confession of Faith publish'd by above a hundred Congregations of 'em in *England and Wales*, Edit. 3. printed Anno 1699. out of which I shall have occasion to cite divers Passages hereafter.

9. And after all Mr. R. has no more colour to join these *German Anabaptists* (let 'em contain as many Sects as he pleases) to those in *England*, than these have to throw 'em into the Bosom of the Church to which he belongs, or into the Communion of many other Churches that are for Pædo-Baptism. For if those People were and are only for Adult-Baptism, as well as the Anabaptists here in *England*; they were and are for sprinkling or pouring on Water on those they pretended to baptize, as well as the present Pædobaptists, as Mr. R. owns in the beginning of his fifth Chapter: therefore the Anabaptists with whom he has to do, are so far from acknowledging the Baptism of these Sects, that they don't think they had or have any true Baptism administered among them, which is more than (I suppose) Mr. R. will say of their pretended Baptism, when they undertake to baptize one that was never baptized in his Account before.

C H A P. IV.

An Answer to Mr. R's Third Chapter, entitul'd, Concerning the Antipædo-baptist, and the Infants Cause pleaded.

MR. R. begins this Chapter, by giving an account of the Opinion of the Anabaptists. "The Antipædobaptist (says he) denieth Baptism to Infants, confining it to Adult Persons only. They give this Heterodox Reason, because an Infant is not *Subjectum Capax*, a Subject capable of Baptism, since Faith and Repentance ought as prerequisites

" to

Chap. 4


“ to precede the Ordinance ; and therefore none but
 “ the Adult who do repent, and are capable of mak-
 “ ing Confession of their Faith, are to be admitted
 “ to Baptism. Tho he is pleas'd to call this a *Hetero-*
dox Reason, the Anabaptists will be likely to continue
 their good Opinion of it, till they see some Ortho-
 dox Reason to invalidate it, which is a Task Mr. R.
 has undertaken in this Chapter. But 'tis strange he in-
 troduces his illiterate Adversaries with Latin in their
 Mouths, saying, an Infant is not *Subiectum Capax*;
 for is it likely that they who are so ready to carp at
 his Sentences of Latin (as he lets us know in the Pre-
 face) would use any Latin themselves ; and that they
 who cavil at Moods, Tenses and Participles, because
 they don't understand 'em, should be able to know
 the meaning of *Subiectum Capax* ? But if they don't
 Mr. R. can inform 'em, for he tells us it is a *Subiect*
capable. And to show the Heterodoxy of their a-
 bovemention'd Reason against Infant-Baptism, he tells
 us the Errors they hold that are consequent on it :
 “ So that (says he) if any have been baptiz'd in their
 “ Infancy, they must when grown old renounce their
 “ former Baptism and be rebaptized, without which
 “ they conclude none can be sav'd, and that all that
 “ are not baptized in their way are damn'd. He
 concludes right, that those who can't be sav'd must
 be damn'd : but very wrong in making the
 Anabaptists deny Salvation to all whom they ac-
 count unbaptiz'd ; it would hence follow, that
 they deny Salvation to some who have true Faith and
 Repentance, and so are in a state of Salvation : for
 that they believe Persons may have these Graces while
 unbaptiz'd, is most evident, in that they account these
 to be prerequir'd to Baptism : but this Slander has
 been sufficiently answer'd before, and therefore I pass
 it. He here makes the Anabaptists require a Renunci-
 ation of former Baptism when Persons are grown old,
 as if he would insinuate that they admit no young
 People to this Ordinance. Whereas tho they are not
 for the Baptism of Infants, yet they baptize a much great-
 er Number of Young Persons than Old ; for those who
 do not believe and repent while they are young, are
 seldom converted in old Age. Nor do they approve
 of

of the Renunciation of any Baptism that has the Essentials of that Ordinance, as instituted by Christ, and practised by his Apostles; they are only for baptizing those who have not been baptized before according to the Command of Christ, and so have yet had no true Baptism. Chap. 4.

And seeing he acknowledges in the next Words, that they don't determine the time of Baptism to any certain Period, to what purpose does he tell us of the Opinion of an old Man at *Dover*, that it should be defer'd till about 30 Years of Age? Is the whole Body of the Anabaptists accountable for the private opinion of every old Man? Or will Mr. R. be answerable for the fancy of every old Man or young Man either, in the Church with which he has Communion? However this old Man of *Dover* it seems, was not always for deferring Baptism till People were grown old, unless about 30 Years of Age may pass for old Age in Mr. R's account. The Consideration of what he here adds of Dipping, I shall refer to the fifth Chapter, where he more largely treats of it.

After this brief account of the Principles of the Anabaptists, he seems frighted at the Discovery, and cries out in a Surprize, *Here is multum in parvo, a Number of Heresies in one Article*, but thinks not fit to tell us what they are; he declares that he shall say little on this Head, tho one might have expected he would make his greatest Efforts against these pretended Heresies, especially in this Chapter, in the Title of which he promises to plead the Cause of Infants. But, he says, it hath been the main Subject of many learned Treatises, Conferences and Disputations, by which he seems to suggest that there is less need for him to insist on it: yet he says this is their chief Principle, and that they openly profess it, but they conceal their other Principles as far as possible. So that Mr. R. is of the humour to overthrow their conceal'd Principles more than those they openly profess: Or is it the Excuse he designs to make, for imputing so many Heresies to 'em without proof, that they are conceal'd Principles, that can't be charg'd on 'em with clear Evidence? But he tells us, *They will find this Point* (by which I suppose he means the point of

Chap.4 of Baptism) sufficiently discuss'd by a Neighbouring Minister of the Church of England, whose Books the best of them are not fit to carry after him. Who that Minister is, or what his Books are, I know no more than Mr. R. knows after whom the best of the Anabaptists are fit to carry Books, and therefore can say nothing to his Neighbour's Treatise, with which he threatens them. He goes on, *Nor can Mr. P—y himself answer it, tho he boasts to have taken up the Cudgels.* No wonder if Mr. P—y himself (whoever he be) can't answer this design'd Book before he sees it: for 'tis not likely that he boasts to have taken up the Cudgels, to answer what he never saw. He adds, that perhaps some such ignorant Scribler as Danvers or Jerrubaal, may bluster, in the room of sound Divinity and solid Argument. What Jerrubaal is, I know not: but this Author has no occasion to call Danvers an ignorant Scribler, before he has answer'd his Arguments; nor to prognosticate that his Learned Neighbour will have a *blustering Answer, instead of sound Divinity and solid Argument.* One would think it were time enough to judg of this suppos'd Answer to the Book he talks of, when there is such an Answer in being: But Mr. R. has such a particular Kindness for the Anabaptists, that not only what they have written is censur'd by him, but even what they have not written must be *ignorant Scribbling and Bluster*; for no good can be expected to come out of *Nazareth.*

He proceeds, " Yet will I not here wholly omit the Infant's Cause, since he is not able to plead for himself; let me plead on his behalf, as all the whole World, as well Paganish and Jewish as Christian, have always done. This is surprizing indeed, that Pagans and Jews, as well as Christians, should plead for Infant-Baptism; he might have omitted the Pleas of the Pagans and Jews in this case, if he could have produc'd a Plea for it, from the Writings and Practice of the first Christians, and from the Command of Christ the Founder of Christianity. The Anabaptists don't find themselves oblig'd to go to the superstitious Traditions of Pagans or Jews, for the Baptism of Adult Persons. But let us see what Pleas these

these are, of which this Gentleman makes so great an account. Chap. 4.

He begins with *John Baptist*, “ who, he says, was
 “ the first that we read of in Holy Scripture, who
 “ us'd Baptism sacramentally ; and adds, that he be-
 “ ing the immediate Forerunner of Jesus Christ,
 “ chang'd the *Jewish* Ceremony of Washing, into the
 “ Sacrament of Baptism for Christians: and after-
 “ wards says, that before him the *Jews* always did,
 “ and still do baptize, and that even Infants ; that
 “ they us'd *initiating* Rites of their Children into
 “ the Mysteries of Religion, and that Water was a
 “ part of the Ceremony ; and that the Mosaick Law
 “ is full of these Watery Purifications. If Mr. R.
 thinks the Anabaptists so stupid and ignorant, that
 they will be stun'd with any thing that is confidently
 asserted, does he think all the rest of Mankind will
 believe what he says, merely because he affirms it ?
 Has he acquir'd so great a Reputation in the World,
 that all he says must pass for Truth, for no other rea-
 son but because he says it ? Where does he find that
 the *Jews* always did, and still do baptize Infants, and
 that to initiate 'em into the Mysteries of their Religion ?
 Or that the *Mosaick Law* was full of these Watery
 Purifications ? Is there any Law in the five Books of
Moses, prescribing the Initiation of Infants into the
 Mysteries of the *Jewish* Religion by Baptism ? If the
Jews practis'd Baptism to initiate Profelytes (as
 some pretend they did) it must have been an Invention
 of their own, for no such Initiation is commanded
 in the Law of God ; and if it were a Tradition of
 their own, it will fall among the rest of their super-
 stitious usages, under that censure of our Saviour,
Ye reject the Commandments of God, that ye may Mark 7.
keep your own Tradition ; and that of the Prophet ci-
 ted by him, *In vain do they worship me, teaching for*
Doctrines the Commandments of Men. And now I
 would put to Mr. R. that *Dilemma* which Christ put
 to the *Jews* concerning the Baptism of *John*, and by
 which he pretends to puzzle the Anabaptists concerning
 the Baptism of Infants : Was the Baptism of *John* from
 Heaven or of Men ? I presume he will not say of Men ;
 and if from Heaven, there was a Divine Warrant for it,
 which

Chap. 4.


Joh. 1. 19
 — 25.

which is a much better Foundation than a human Tradition: For what Reason then should he go about to make the World believe, that *John* chang'd an unscriptural Tradition into a Christian Sacrament, when the Divine Original of this Ordinance is so plainly intimated, not only by this Question of our Saviour, but by his own Submission to it; and when the Holy Scripture declares that *John* was a *Man sent of God to baptize*? Or is it likely that when the *Pharisees* ask'd him, if *he were the Messias, or Elias, or that Prophet?* &c. and he disclaim'd any such pretence; they would have replied, *Why dost thou then baptize*, if this had not been a new Practice, but always common and familiar to 'em, and administred by Persons who pretended to no extraordinary Character or Mission?

But because some Learned Men have suppos'd the Christian Baptism to have been taken from a Custom of the *Jews* to baptize Profelytes, it may not be improper here to insert what Sir *Norton Knatchbull* says *, on the Opinion of those who derive Christian Baptism from the *Jewish* Washings.

“ I beseech you (says he) what so' visible Affinity
 “ is there between Burial and Washing, that Christi-
 “ an Baptism shall be thought to draw its Original
 “ from the Lotions or Washings of the *Jews*?—and a
 “ little after, The Masters themselves did disagree a-
 “ bout it. For in the very Text they urge, which is
 “ cited out of the *Talmud*, *Rabbi Eliezer* doth ex-
 “ pressly contradict *Rabbi Joshua*, who was the first,
 “ as far as I can learn, that ever did assert that kind
 “ of Baptism among the *Jews*. For *Rabbi Eliezer*,
 “ who was at least coetaneous to *Rabbi Joshua*, if not
 “ elder, expressly says, *Profelytum circumcisum*, &c.
 “ That a Profelyte circumcis'd and not baptiz'd, was a
 “ true Profelyte; for so we read of our Fathers, *Abra-*
 “ ham, Isaac and Jacob, who were circumcis'd and
 “ not baptiz'd. On the other side, *Rabbi Joshua* af-
 “ firms, *Eum qui baptizatus est & non circumcisus, esse*
 “ *Profelytum*; That he was a Profelyte, who was bap-
 “ tized and not circumcis'd. But to which of these

* Annot. in 1 Pet. 3. 20. 21.

Remarks on Mr. R's third Chapter.

63

“ shall I yield my Belief? To *Eliezer*, who affirms
“ that which the Scripture affirms, or to *Joshua*, who
“ affirms that which the Scripture nowhere menti- Chap. 4.
“ ons?—*And a little lower*: And that which
“ moves me more, *Josephus* himself (not to speak of
“ all the Fathers before the *Talmud*) who was like-
“ wise a *Jew*, and of the same Age with *Rabbi Elie-*
“ *zer*, who wrote also purposely of the Customs and
“ Ceremonies of his Nation, is totally silent in this
“ matter; so that it is an Argument to me next to
“ Demonstration, that two Persons of such Eminen-
“ cy both *Jews* and coeval, the one should expressly
“ deny, the other in all his History make no mention
“ of this Baptism. This Learned Gentleman adds
more to the same purpose, which for Brevity's sake I
omit.

But Mr. R. intimates that *John* however baptized Infants, for he tells us, he baptized all the Regions round about; and directing his Discourse to the Anabaptists, he says, *Let them inform us, if in all those Regions there were no Children*: And 'tis as easy for them to answer, let Mr. R. inform us, if in all those Regions there were no *Pharisees*? And yet we are told that they were rejected by *John*, when they offer'd themselves, for want of Repentance; and for the same reason he might have refus'd Infants, if they had been presented to him. The Anabaptists have no need to prove there were no Infants in all the Regions of *Judea*; but Mr. R. is oblig'd to prove that *John* baptized Infants, if he will maintain Infant-Baptism from his Practice; as they prove Adult-Baptism from his baptizing Adult-Persons.

As for the Practice of the *Pagans* and *Mahometans*
“ who (as he is pleas'd to express it) also us'd some
“ initiating Rites of their Children into the Myste-
“ ries of Religion; and 'tis observable that Water
“ was a part of the Ceremony, (by which I suppose
he means they us'd some Rites to initiate their Chil-
dren into the Mysteries of Religion, and that Water
was us'd in performing some part of the Ceremony :)
The Anabaptists have no very great Opinion of it;
'tis hard to persuade 'em that Christ borrow'd this Or-
dinance from the *Pagan* Priests, who lived before its

lu-


Chap.4. Institution, much less from the *Mahometan* Mufti's that arose several hundred Years since; or that he who declar'd so loudly against the superstitious, unscriptural Customs of Men, would indulge 'em so much, as to take one of the chief Ordinances belonging to his Religion from them: they think he came to bring Men off from their vain Traditions, and not to comply with them in the Continuation of them; and that the Holy Scriptures are a safer Rule for them than the *Alcoran*, or the *Greek* and *Latin* Poets, who (Mr. R. says) frequently mention those *Lustrations* and *Sprinklings*, in most of the Religious Rites of the *Heathens*. Besides, how can he expect that the poor *Anabaptists*, who are so generally unacquainted with Moods, Tenses, Participles and Latin Sentences, should know how to come at Infant-Baptism, if it lies among the *Latin* and *Greek* Poets? They bless God for the Holy Scripture in their Mother-Tongue, and desire he would prove Infant-Baptism from thence in the first place; and till then his Poets will in this point have no great Authority with them.

He is pleas'd in the next place to acquaint us, that
 “ tho Baptism is to be administred to any Adult Per-
 “ sons, who in their Infancy through their Parents
 “ Omision were not baptized; and tho Profelytes
 “ from Heathenism, Judaism and Mahometism, are
 “ to be admitted to Baptism; yet is not Baptism to
 “ be denied to Infants of Christian and Believing Pa-
 “ rents.

Whereas others who assert Infant-Baptism, however do allow Repentance, and a credible Profession of Faith, to be necessary to qualify Adult Persons for this Ordinance; Mr. R. thinks fit to inform the World, that it is to be administred to any Adult Persons, who in their Infancy thro their Parents Omision were not baptized, that is, I suppose, to any who were born of Christian Parents, without mentioning any other Qualification. Indeed he will have *Heathens*, *Jews* and *Mahometans* to be Profelytes, which can signify no less than to repent and believe, before they have a right to Baptism: And is it then the Privilege of any Adult Persons born of Christian Parents, that they may be admitted to Baptism, merely

on the account of their Birth? Is not Faith and Repentance as much prerequir'd of 'em, as of *Pagans*, *Jews* and *Mahometans*? If it be so, why does Mr. R. say any Adult Persons may be baptized, without suggesting any Restriction, unless that of their being born of Christians, which is intimated by the *Omission of their Parents*, in not causing 'em to be baptized in their Infancy? If it be otherwise, why does he not tell us so? And seeing he pleads that Baptism is not to be denied to the Infants of Christian and Believing Parents, by which it is intimated, that it may be denied to the Infants of those Parents, who are not Christians and Believers; and yet has accus'd some People of Heterodoxy, who deny it to the Children of *Whores*, *Witches* and *open Sinners*; I would willingly know of him, if *Whores*, *Witches* and *open Sinners* are Christians and Believers: If they are, Christianity is a very strange sort of a Religion; if not, Mr. R. seems to have a strange Itch of caviling, to find fault with the *Barrowists* and *Brownists*, for denying Baptism to the Infants of *Whores*, *Witches* and *open Sinners*, when himself pretends that no Children, but those of Christian and Believing Parents, are the Subjects of it. Chap. 4. P. 7.

But when he has spoken of the Baptism of Infants, whose Parents are thus qualified, he says, "This hath been, and is the constant Opinion and Practice of the Universal Church, both Primitive and Modern, Greek and Latin, Papists or Protestants; the *Greeks*, the *Muscovites*, *Armenians*, *Georgians*, *Jacobites*, *Copties*, *Abyssines*, *Nestorians*, *Indians of S. Thomas*, and all others practise it. Most of the Hereticks and Adversaries of saving Truth never denied it; the *Arians*, *Valentinians*, *Marcionites*, *Manichees*, *Eutyrians*, *Cerinthians*, *Servetians*, and even the *Pelagians*, &c. maintaining this Opinion and Practice. The Church of *Rome* in an Extreme holds it so necessary, as they think all Infants damn'd who die without it. All reform'd Protestant Churches, whether *Lutherans*, *Calvinists*, *Zwinglians*, *Remonstrants*, *Antiremonstrants*, the Church of *England*, the *Scottish Kirk*, the *French Protestants*, the *Albigenses*, the *Presbyterians* and *Independants*, do

Chap. 4.  “ all in their Confessions of Faith and laudable Practices allow of the Baptism of Infants: only the Antipædobaptists of these two last Centuries, contrary to the Example, Faith and Practice of the Universal Church, gainsay it, renounce it, and damn all others, who being baptized in Infancy, are not rebaptized.

I confess if Truth were always on the side of the greatest Numbers, our Author would have reason to argue after this manner: But if the Anabaptists could be tempted to be led by the Opinion of the greatest part of the Reformed Churches (from whom they are loth to differ) yet they would have no great Consideration for the Votes of the Papists and Hereticks, whom Mr. R. summons to make a more numerous Body against them. They think it hard too that the Papists, tho' gross Idolaters, and opposite to many of the Fundamental Points of Christianity, should be so kindly distinguished from the Hereticks he mentions, and made by him a part of the Church of Christ; while those who can't believe Infant-Baptism an Ordinance of Christ, are not only ranked among Hereticks, but made the Center and Sink of the vilest Heresies in the World. They wonder too that he should make it so great a Prejudice against them, that some Hereticks have been of their Mind (as he does in the second Chapter) when he glories in accumulating most of the Hereticks and Adversaries of saving Truth, to give countenance to his own Opinion: and since he entitles the Anabaptists to the Names of those Hereticks, who, he says, were not for Infant Baptism, how much soever they differ'd from 'em in other things; they think they have as good right to qualify him with the Titles of an *Arian, Valentinian, Marcionite, Manichee, Eutychian, Cerinthian, Servetian and Pelagian*, because he says these *maintain the same Opinion and Practice* with him as to Infant-Baptism. And if Hereticks may, notwithstanding their Heresies, hold the right Baptism, as Mr. R. grants, by citing so many of them on his side; if he could prove the Anabaptists to be guilty of the Heresies he with so little Justice imputes to 'em in his Book, this could be

no Argument against the Soundness of their Opinion, as to either the Subjects or Mode of Baptism. Nor are they less surprized, that in his ninth Chapter, to prejudice the Reader against the Anabaptists, he gives them the Names of almost all those Hereticks, whom he here expressly retains to strengthen his own Party: for if he were capable of proving what he contents himself only in affirming, viz. that the Anabaptists are *Arians*, *Valentinians*, *Marcionites*, &c. it might very well be retorted, that those Hereticks were by his own Confession originally Pædobaptists, and that when *Arianism* had overrun almost all that part of the World that professed Christianity, those who practised Infant-Baptism were almost universally *Arians*: So that if the Anabaptists were generally *Arians* now, and this could prove 'em in the wrong in the point of Baptism; the Pædobaptists having been generally *Arians* then, their *Arianism* might as well prove that they were mistaken in the point of Baptism too. And so by this way of arguing neither of 'em could be in the right: And whether Mr. R. has reason to charge so many Heresies (as he does) on the Anabaptists, we shall have occasion to consider hereafter. But what is yet more strange, this Gentleman in his 12th Page, makes the *Servetians* to be one of the Sects of the Anabaptists, so called from *Servetus* a Spaniard, who (he says) defer'd Baptism till 30 Years of Age; and yet he here informs us, that the *Servetians* among other Hereticks, maintain the Opinion and Practice of Infant-Baptism: so that the Reader may well be at a loss where to fix these poor unsettled Hereticks, till Mr. R. is pleas'd to assign them a certain Station. And since he seems pleas'd to lay claim to most of the Hereticks and Adversaries of saving Truth, as his Partizans in the Cause he is pleading, the Anabaptists are not willing to deprive him of his Company; for they care not how few Hereticks and Adversaries of saving Truth are on their side.

Moreover, if it be of so great importance to muster great Numbers of Votes, to give credit to any thing in dispute about Baptism, that even most of the Hereticks must be summon'd on such an Occasion: One would think that if Evidence can be produc'd,

Chap.4. to prove it to have been the constant practice of the Church for many Centuries of Years, to administer Baptism by Dipping; this should be allow'd to have some Weight in it. This I shall attempt to show in a proper place, to convince those who rely much on such Authorities, that the Anabaptists want not Arguments of this kind, tho they can acknowledg no other Rule to direct their Practice, than that of the Divine Word.

And whether this Gentleman speaks cautiously, when he assures us, that Infant-Baptism has been the constant Opinion and Practice of the Universal Church both Primitive and Modern, and only denied by the Antipædobaptists of these two last Centuries, contrary to the Example, Faith and Practice of the Universal Church, will appear when it is consider'd,

That this Affirmation must rely partly on the Authority of the Holy Scripture, and partly on human Testimonies. How far Mr. R. has hitherto prov'd Infant-Baptism to be the Faith and Practice of the Apostles and first Christians from the Holy Scripture, the Reader may judg by what has been already said. As for his Human Testimonies from Ecclesiastical History, from Fathers and Councils, by which he ought to have prov'd the constant Opinion and Practice of the Universal Church in this case, he is not pleas'd to produce 'em; so that it would be sufficient to deny what he asserts, till he offers something at least like Evidence to support it. Indeed I do not deny that Infant-Baptism began to creep into the Church in *Tertullian's* time, and that 'tis mention'd and approv'd by *Cyprian*; but to prove it a constant and universal Practice in the Church, ever since the Time of the Apostles, some elder Authors should be cited. Can Mr. R. produce any thing to this purpose out of *Barnabas*, *Clemens Romanus*, *Ignatius*, *Polycarp*, *Hermas*, *Justin Martyr*, *Athenagoras*, *Theophilus Antiochenus*, *Ireneus*, or *Clemens Alexandrinus*, who all wrote before *Tertullian*? Nor does it appear from what *Tertullian* says, that this Practice universally obtain'd in his Time, since himself dissuades from it in his Treatise of Baptism.

“ * According to every one's Condition and Dispo- Chap. 4.
 “ sition, and Age too (says he) 'tis more useful to de-
 “ lay Baptism, and especially as to little Children:
 “ Indeed our Lord says, *Forbid them not to come to*
 “ *me.* Therefore let 'em come when they grow up,
 “ let 'em come when they learn, when they are
 “ taught whither to come. Let 'em become Christi-
 “ ans, when they are able to know Christ. Why
 “ does that innocent Age hasten to the Remission of
 “ Sins? Men act more cautiously in Secular Affairs;
 “ for this is to commit a Divine Treasure, to such as
 “ are not entrusted with an Earthly Estate. Let 'em
 “ first know how to desire Salvation, that you may
 “ appear to have given to him that asks.

And the Arguments us'd by *Cyprian* in his Epistle to *Fidus*, for the Baptism of Infants as soon as born, seem to have no great weight in 'em; as when he says †, “ We have judg'd that the Grace and Mercy of God is to be denied to none of the Children of Men: for when the Lord in his Gospel says, *The Son of Man came not to destroy, but to save the Souls of Men*; we are to prevent the Destruction of any Soul, as much as possibly in us lies. And when he pleads for the Equality of Infants and Adult Persons, because (he says) according to God's account, there is no difference in respect of the Growth of our Bodies, tho there is in the account of the World;

* — Pro cujusque Personæ conditione ac dispositione, etiam ætate, cunctatio baptismi utilior est, præcipue tamen circa parvulos. — Ait quidem Dominus, *nolite illos prohibere ad me venire.* Veniant ergo dum adolescent; veniant dum discunt, dum quo veniant docentur, fiant Christiani quum Christum nosse potuerint. Quid festinat innocens ætas ad Remissionem Peccatorum? cautius agetur in secularibus, ut cui substantia terrena non creditur, divina credatur. Norint petere Salutem, ut petenti dedidisse videaris. *Tertullian. de Baptismo, l. 2. c. 18.*

† Judicavimus nulli hominum nato misericordiam Dei & Gratiã denegandã; nam cum Dominus in Evangelio suo dicat, *Filius hominis non venit animas hominum perdere sed salvare*; quantum in nobis, si fieri potest, nulla anima perdenda est, & quæ sequuntur. *Cypriani Epist. ad Fidum.*

Chap. 4. and because as God is no Respector of Persons, so he is
 no Respector of Age, but gives his Grace equally to all ;
 and farther argues from the Prophet Elisha's stretch-
 ing himself on the Shunamite's Child, to an Equality
 of Grace given to Infants and Adult Persons ; as well as
 A&. 10. 28. from Peter's saying, that God had shewed him, that he
 should not call any Man common or unclean : And when
 he endeavours to shew that Infants have less Guilt on
 'em than the Adult ; and therefore if these may be ad-
 mitted to Baptism, by a stronger Reason the other
 are not to be prohibited, and makes their Crying and
 Weeping to be nothing but *Praying*.

I think he must have a warm Brain, who can di-
 gest such Reasons as these, which seem partly found-
 ed on a Supposition, that Baptism is absolutely neces-
 sary to Salvation (which Notion Mr. R. himself some-
 times condemns) and on an Opinion that all Man-
 kind have equal Grace given 'em ; partly on the Mis-
 application of some Passages of Scripture, not rela-
 ting at all to the matter in hand ; and partly on pure
 Imagination, as when this Father turns the Cries of
 Infants into Prayers.

And here I have a fair Occasion to refer the Reader
 to the Notes of the Learned *Rigaltius* on this Epistle,
 which seem to have more Weight in 'em than what *Cy-
 prian* himself says : * “ Men (says this Annotator) are
 “ not born Christians, but are made such, No Man is ac-
 “ counted

* Fiunt non nascuntur Christiani——Nemo Fidelis habe-
 tur priusquam Christum sciat. Itaque prius audiat oportet
 qua sunt fidei Christiana. Posteaquam audierit ac percepe-
 rit, tunc ab ipsa fide Fidelis vocatur. Atque ut ea quæ jam
 illi sunt demissa per aures in mentem signo aliquo subiciantur
 oculis ; & ut fortius animum feriant, tingitur seu mergitur
 aqua, fluvio, fonte, lacuna, labro. Tria verò jam illi conti-
 gerant. Nam & idem perceperat, & per fidem adeptus e-
 rat veniam omnium retro delictorum, prætereaque acceperat
 pignus Resurrectionis in vitam æternam. Itaque illa tria
 Baptismus significat ; Tinctio, hominem fide imbutum ; Mer-
 sitio, ablutam foribus & maculis ; Emersio Resurgentem.
 Ergo jam perfecte fidelem dicimus, *πικρὸν βαπτυσθέντα εἰς καθάρ-
 σιν* Ebrium addei Christianæ succo ut lanam purpura. Sic
 Thi-

“ counted a Believer, till he knows Christ, therefore he
 “ must first hear what belongs to the Christian Faith ; Chap.4.
 “ and after he has heard and embrac'd it, from his Be-
 “ lief he may be call'd a Believer ; and that the things
 “ which have been infus'd into his Mind by his Ears,
 “ may be by a Sign subjected to his Eyes, and may
 “ strike his Mind the more powerfully, he is dip'd or
 “ immers'd in Water, in a River, Fountain, Pond,
 “ or Laver. And as he had received three things ;
 “ for first he received Faith, and then by Faith ob-
 “ tain'd the Pardon of all his past Sins, and moreover
 “ had the Pledg of a Resurrection to Eternal Life ;
 “ so these things are signified by Baptism. Dip-
 “ ping into the Water denotes the Man to be imbued
 “ with Faith, his being overwhelm'd signifies his be-
 “ ing wash'd from his Stains and Filth, and his rising
 “ up out of the Water, his Resurrection. Therefore
 “ we now call him a compleat Believer, as being deep-
 “ ly tinctur'd with the Christian Faith, and inebria-
 “ ted as it were with the Juice of it, as the Wool is
 “ with the Purple Dye. Thus *Philip* baptized the
 “ Eunuch in Water, which they met with in their
 “ Journey, after he was well instructed in the Christi-
 “ an Faith, and after his Profession that he believ'd
 “ that Christ was the Son of God with all his Heart.
 “ By this Baptism of the Eunuch, it appears that
 “ Dipping or Mersion, and the Form thereof was

Philippus Eunuchum jam Christiana fide perdoctum, jam
 profertum se toto corde credere Christum esse Filium Dei, ob-
 via forte in itinere aqua baptizavit, Tinctionem sive mersionem,
 & tingendi mergendique formulam tunc simplicissimam
 fuisse apparet hoc Eunuchi Baptismo ; neque enim aliud man-
 daverat Christus dimittens Apostolos : Euntes, inquit, doce-
 te omnes Gentes, baptizantes eos in Nomine Patris, & Filii,
 & Spiritus Sancti. Sic de Petri ad Populum allocutione una
 Lucas : Qui sermonibus ejus fidem adhibuerunt baptizati sunt,
 & addita sunt Ecclesiæ die illo animarum tria circiter Millia.
 Qui toto corde crediderat in Christum, jam in illa fide vive-
 bat Christianus Deo ; imbiberat Christum, & integre sapiebat
 ad Deum. Illi ergo Baptismus sive Immersio signum erat
 Fidei jam probæ, ac proinde necessitas signi sive Sacramenti,
 ostendebat necessitatem rei cujus erat Sacramentum.

Chap. 4. “ us'd with very great Simplicity. For after this
 “ manner Christ commanded his Apostles when
 “ he sent 'em forth: Go, says he, *teach all Nations,*
 “ *baptizing them in the Name of the Father, and of*
 “ *the Son, and of the Holy Spirit.* Thus Luke speaks
 “ of one of Peter's Sermons to the People: They
 “ that believed his Words were baptized, and on
 “ that Day were added to the Church about three
 “ thousand Souls. He who had believed in Christ
 “ with all his Heart, now liv'd to God as a Christian
 “ in the same Faith. He had imbib'd the Faith of
 “ Christ, and entirely favour'd the things of God.
 “ Therefore Baptism or Immersion was a Sign to
 “ him of a genuine Faith, and so the Necessity of
 “ the Sign or Sacrament shew'd the necessity of the
 “ thing of which it was a Sacrament.
 “ And a little after——“ * Seeing Faith springs from
 “ Assent, 'tis not discern'd in Man till he arrives at
 “ Years of Discretion, and becomes capable of Wis-
 “ dom. And therefore in the *Acts* of the Apostles
 “ we read, that both *Men and Women* were baptized,
 “ when they believed the Gospel preach'd by *Philip,*
 “ but not a word of Infants. So that from the A-
 “ postolick Age to the Time of *Tertullian,* the mat-
 “ ter remain'd dubious. And there were some who
 “ from that Word of our Lord, *Suffer little Children*
 “ *to come unto me* (to whom yet our Lord comman-
 “ ded not Water to be administred) took occasion to
 “ baptize even new-born Infants. And as if they

* —— Fides, cum ex assensu veniat, in homine non deprehenditur, ante annos intellectus & sapientiæ capaces. Adeoque in Actis Apostolorum legimus, cum credidissent Philippo Evangelizanti, baptizatos fuisse Viros & Mulieres, mentione infantium nulla. Itaque ab avo Apostolorum usque ad Tertulliani Tempora res in ambiguo mansit. Et fuere, qui occasione Verbi Domini: *Sinite parvulos venire ad me,* quibus tamen aquas ministrari non iussit Dominus, etiam recens natos infantes baptizaverint. Et quasi seculare aliquod Negotium cum Deo transigeretur, Sponsores & Fidejussores Christo dederint adultos a fide Christiana non recessuros, quod sane displicuit Tertulliano.

“ were

“ were transacting some secular Business with God, Chap. 4.
 “ they offer'd Sponsors or Sureties to Christ, who en-
 “ gag'd that they should not revolt from the Christian
 “ Faith when Adult; which indeed displeas'd Ter-
 “ tullian.—He says much more to the same pur-
 pose, which I omit for fear of being prolix.

It ought farther to be consider'd, that this Custom seems to have taken its rise from a Misinterpretation of those Words of our Saviour, *Except a Man be born of Water and of the Spirit, he cannot enter into the Kingdom of God.* From whence some concluded Salvation not attainable without Baptism, supposing [to be born of Water] signified external Washing: Whereas 'tis to be understood of the Internal *Washing of Regeneration*; for there is the same Reason to interpret [Water and the Spirit] the *Water of the Spirit*, or *Spiritual Water* in this Passage, as to understand [Spirit and Fire] to signify the *Fire of the Spirit*, or *Spiritual Fire*, in the Words of *John the Baptist*, when he says of Christ, *He shall baptize you with the Holy Spirit and with Fire.* These Terms of *Fire* and *Water*, being frequently used in the Holy Scripture, to signify the sanctifying Operations of the Holy Spirit, in allusion to the use of these Elements for Purification, not only in the ordinary Affairs of human Life, but in the religious Ceremonies of the Levitical Administration. 'Tis certain this groundless Opinion, that none could enter into the Kingdom of Heaven without Baptism, made Infant-Baptism prevail in the World; for Parents who believ'd Baptism absolutely necessary to Salvation, were easily prejudic'd by the Tenderness of their Affections, in favour of Infant-Baptism, and were willing on very slender grounds to be persuaded to a Practice, which might put 'em out of pain, in a matter so dear to them, as the Salvation of the Souls of their Children.

Chrysofome tells us, “ * Without Baptism 'tis impos-
 “ sible to obtain the Kingdom, and that 'tis impossible

* Ἄνευ βαπτίσματος ἀμύχανον βασιλείας ἐπιτυχέειν.—
 ἀδύνατον μὴ χωρίς αὐτῆ σωθῆναι. *Chrysofom. Homil. 3. in*
1 Ep. ad Cor. p. 256, & 257. Edit. Eton.

Chap. 4.

“ to be saved without it. * Weep (says he) for Un-
 “ believers, weep for those who differ not at all from
 “ them, for those who depart without Illumination,
 “ without the Seal. These indeed deserve your La-
 “ mentations, these deserve your Tears; these are
 “ without the Palace, among the sentenc'd and con-
 “ demned. For verily I say unto you, Except a Man
 “ be born of Water and of the Spirit, he shall in no
 “ wise enter into the Kingdom of Heaven.

Those who are at all acquainted with the Writings of the antient Fathers, know that they often call Baptism Illumination. *Justin Martyr*, speaking of the Administration of this Ordinance, in his Apology to *Antoninus Pius* the Emperor, having given an account of the Faith and Repentance prerequir'd to it, adds these Words.—“ † This Laver is called Illuminati-
 “ on, because the Minds of those who have learned
 “ these things are illuminated.

So that nothing can be plainer, than that *Chrysofome* misapplies the forecited Words of our Saviour, to support his Opinion of the Impossibility of Salvation without Baptism. || *Cyril of Jerusalem* appears to have been of the same Mind, when he tells us, “ Tho a Man be virtuous
 “ in his Conversation, yet if he receive not the Seal
 “ by Water, he shall not enter into the Kingdom of
 “ Heaven. And *Augustin* in divers Places speaks to the same purpose. Those of the *Romish Church* still build their Infant-Baptism on the same Principle, which the Protestants have justly abandon'd. And

* Κλαῦσον τὰς ἀπίστες, κλαῦσον τὰς ἔδωκ' ἐκείνων ἀπέχοι-
 τας. τὰς χωρὶς φωτισμῶν ἀπερχομένους. τὰς χωρὶς σφρα-
 γῶν ἑτοιούτως θνήσκων ἄξιοι, ἑτοιούμενων ἔξω τῶν βα-
 σιλείων εἰσὶ μετὰ τῶν καταδίκων, μετὰ τῶν καταγνωσμέ-
 νων. Ἀμὴν γὰρ λέγω ὑμῖν, ἐὰν μὴ τις γεννηθῆ ἔξ ὕδατος καὶ
 πνεύματος, οὐ μὴ εἰσελθῆ εἰς τὴν βασιλείαν τῶν οὐρανῶν. *John.*
 3. in *Ep. ad Philip.* p. 20.

† Καλεῖται ἡ τέτο τὸ λυτρὸν φωτισμῶς, ὡς φωτιζομένων τὴν
 διάνοιαν τῶν ταῦτα μαθησάντων. *Apol.* 2. p. 94. *Edit.*
Paris. 1636.

|| Οὐδὲ γὰρ ἐν ἀρετῶς τις γένηται τοῖς ἔργοις, μὴ λάβῃ
 δὲ τὴν δι' ὕδατος σφραγίδα, εἰσελεύσεται εἰς τὴν βασιλείαν
 τῶν οὐρανῶν. *Cyril. Catech.* III. *Illuminat.*