

Since this Foundation is by these last allowed to be insufficient to bear the Weight of Infant-Baptism, it might be worth a farther Enquiry, whether this Practice is founded on any solid Foundation at all; and if those who appear first to have us'd it, proceeded on so great a Mistake, whether this Custom ought not to be discontinued, as well as the Basis on which it was originally laid.


It is moreover to be observed, that about the time when Baptism began to be administered to Infants; various Superstitions were invented to accompany it, as Uction and signing with the Cross, of both which *Tertullian* speaks: * “ When we come out of the Laver (says he) we are anointed with a blessed Uction according to the antient Ceremony, by which they us'd to be anointed to the Priesthood by a Horn of Oil. *And in another place,* † The Flesh is wash'd that the Soul may be purified, the Flesh is anointed that the Soul may be consecrated, the Flesh is signed that the Soul may be fortified. The giving of Milk and Honey to such as were newly baptized, is spoken of by the same Author ‖. So that the same Antiquity, by which some pretend to justify Infant-Baptism, may be as well pleaded in favour of these unscriptural Usages adjoined to the Administration of Baptism. Mr. R. I suppose is for one of 'em, viz. the Sign of the Cross, and I allow it may vie with Infant-Baptism for Antiquity; but why then is he not for the use of those other Ceremonies just mention'd, that seem to be of like Authority?

Nor does the use of Sureties appear to be of less an-

* Exinde egressi de Lavacro, perungimur benedicta unctio de pristina Disciplina, qua ungi oleo de Cornu in Sacerdotium solebant. *Tertul. de Baptismo, cap. 7.*

† ——— Caro abluitur ut anima emaculetur, Caro ungitur ut anima consecretur, Caro signatur ut & anima munia- tur. *Idem de Resurrect. cap. 8. vid. etiam de Corona milit. cap. 3.*

‖ Ter mergitatur ——— inde suscepti Lactis & Mellis concordiam prægustamus. *Ibid.*

Chap. 4.  tient date than the Baptism of Infants, since **Tertullian* speaks of 'em when he opposes Infant-Baptism; but seems to have been invented to give some colour to it, and to take off the Edge of a plain Objection that lies against it. For it being evident both from the Commission of Christ and the Practice of the Apostles, that a Profession of Faith and Repentance were prerequired to Baptism, and it being impossible for Infants to be thus qualified for it; those who thought they could not be saved without it, and therefore earnestly desired to have them baptized, endeavoured (it seems) to persuade themselves and others, that what Infants could not in this case do for themselves, might be done for them by Adult Persons, who should answer in their stead when catechiz'd, and make a Profession of Faith and Repentance in their Name. Many Pædobaptists yet retain this Custom, without any Authority for it from the Holy Scripture; and others of them reject it as a Human Tradition, because it has no Foundation in the Word of God.

The former who continue this usage, thereby declare that *Repentance and Faith are required of Persons to be baptized*, as is plain from the express Words of the Catechism of the Church of *England*. The latter who refuse it, thereby declare that no human Inventions are to be added to the Ordinances of God. Those dare not baptize without Sureties, because they dare not baptize without a previous Profession of Faith and Repentance; These dare not baptize with them, because there's no Institution of it in the Word of God. The Arguments form'd on each of these Principles are valid, and those that use 'em press one another hard with 'em by turns. But they oppose each other much more successfully than they defend themselves. For these two Principles, if duly attended to, would entirely subvert Infant-Baptism. For if on the one hand, no Person is to be baptized, without a previous Profession of Repentance and Faith; and if on the other hand there

* *Quid enim necesse est, si non tam necesse Sponsores etiam periculo ingeri? &c. Tertul. de Bap. cap. 18.*


is no Institution of Sureties in the Word of God, to make such a Profession in the Name of any Person to be baptized: It will evidently follow, that no Person ought to be baptized, but he who first makes a Profession of Repentance and Faith in his own Person, which 'tis impossible for an Infant to do. Chap. 4.

I must own I cannot but agree with those Pædo-baptists, who are against the use of Sponsors in Baptism, because there is no Scripture to support that Practice; and I as heartily concur with those others that are against the Administration of Baptism without a Profession of Faith and Repentance, because such a Profession is necessarily prerequir'd, in the Primitive Institution of this Ordinance.

It is farther worthy of Consideration, that it was the General, if not the Universal Practice of all Christian Churches for several Ages, to admit all who were baptized to partake of the Lord's Supper; and therefore when Infant-Baptism was introduc'd, their Admission to the Table of the Lord was a Consequence of it. That this was practis'd in *Cyprian's* time, appears by a Story he tells us of an Infant born of Christian Parents, who was carried by her Nurse to an Idolatrous Sacrifice, and there made to eat some Bread tempered with Wine, being not of Age sufficient to eat Flesh, and afterwards brought to the Christian Assembly, where she shut her Lips against the Sacramental Cup when offer'd to her in her turn by the Deacon, who therefore poured some of it into her Mouth by force, which she presently cast up again *.

And as the Opinion of the absolute Necessity of Baptism to Salvation, from a misunderstanding of those Words of Christ, *Except a Man be born of Water and of the Spirit, he cannot enter into the Kingdom of God*, John 3. 5. seems to have introduc'd Infant-Baptism into the Christian Church: So from a like mistake of those other Words of Christ, *Except ye eat the Flesh of the Son of Man and drink his Blood, you have no Life in you*, Joh. 6. 53. the Participation of the Lord's Supper was suppos'd necessary to Eternal Life; and consequently

* *Cyprian. de Lapsis, p. 94. Edit. Amstelodam. 1709.*

Chap.4.  Infants admitted to that Ordinance. *Augustin* speaks of the latter of these two Sayings of our Saviour in these Terms : “ * Let us hear the Lord, I say, who is
 “ not now speaking of the Sacrament of the Holy
 “ Laver, but of the Sacrament of his Holy Table,
 “ to which none may regularly approach before he
 “ is baptized: *Except ye eat my Flesh and drink my*
 “ *Blood, you shall have no Life in you.* What would
 “ we have more? What Answer can any one make to
 “ this, unless he will pertinaciously set himself to
 “ fight against the utmost Evidence of Truth? Will
 “ any Man dare to say this Passage belongs not to In-
 “ fants, and that they may have Life in themselves,
 “ without the Participation of Christ's Body and
 “ Blood? &c. He elsewhere endeavours to prove
 that Infants can't have Eternal Life without Baptism,
 because till they are baptized, they can't partake of
 the Lord's Supper; and Christ says, none can have
 Life in 'em, except they eat his Flesh and drink his
 Blood: which Words ('tis evident) he interprets
 of the Sacrament of the Lord's Body and Blood
 For he thus expresses himself, speaking of those
 he opposes: “ † But if they have any deference
 “ for the Apostolick Seat, or rather for the Lord and

* Dominum audiamus, inquam, non quidem hoc de Sacramento sancti Lavacri dicentem, sed de Sacramento sanctæ mensæ suæ, quo nemo rite nisi baptizatus accedit: *Nisi manducaveritis Carnem meam, & biberitis Sanguinem meum, non habebitis vitam in vobis.* Quid ultra quarimus, quid ad hoc responderi potest, nisi pertinacia pugnaces nervos adversus constantiam perspicuæ veritatis intendat? An vero quisquam etiã hoc dicere audebit, quod ad parvulos hæc sententia non pertineat; possintque sine participatione corporis hujus & sanguinis in se habere vitam? &c. *August. de Peccatorum meritis & remiss. Lib. 1. cap. 20.*

† Si autem cedunt Sedi Apostolicæ, vel potius ipsi Magistro & Domino Apostolorum, qui dicit non habituros vitam in se metipsis, nisi manducaverint carnem Filii Hominis, & biberint sanguinem, quod nisi baptizati non utique possunt, nempe aliquando fatebuntur parvulos non baptizatos vitam habere non posse, &c. *August. contra Pelagianos, Epist. CVI.*


“ Master

“ Master of the Apostles, who says, that none shall
 “ have Life in themselves, unless they eat the Flesh
 “ of the Son of Man, and drink his Blood, which
 “ they can't do without being baptized; they will
 “ one day confess, that Infants unbaptized cannot have
 “ Life, &c. Chap. 4.

Suicerus * tells us, “ This Custom which was an-
 “ tiently received, afterwards prevail'd so far, espe-
 “ cially in the Time of *Charles the Great*, that the
 “ Eucharist was given to Infants, not only in the pub-
 “ lick Assembly of the Church after Baptism, or at
 “ other Times when the Church was wont to come
 “ together to the Holy Communion; but some of the
 “ Bread of the Lord's Supper was reserved, to be
 “ given such Infants as were sick, as well as to Adult
 “ Persons. *Ansegise*, an Abbot of *Liege*, who re-
 “ cites a Canon of the said *Charles* (in the first Book
 “ of the Laws of the *Franks*, chap. *CLV.*) publish'd
 “ on this account, gives us a very full Testimony of
 “ it. For the Words of the Canon are these, *Let a*
 “ *Presbyter have the Eucharist always ready, that when*
 “ *any Man is sick, or any Infant is weak, he may im-*
 “ *mediately give it him, that he may not die without the*
 “ *Communion.*

Nay this Custom it seems has continued down to
 this very Age in the *Greek Church*. *Vansteb a Domini-*
can Frier, in his History of the Church of *Alexan-*
dria, speaking of their Baptism, says, “ They com-

* Mos hic receptus antiquitus, usque eo invaluit postea, maxime Caroli M. Seculo, ut non modo Infantibus Eucharistia daretur in publico Ecclesie cœtu post Baptismum, vel alio tempore, quo Ecclesia ad sacram Synaxin convenire solebat: verum etiam panis cœnæ asservabatur parvulis agrotantibus perinde ac adultis exhibendus. *Ansegisus*, Abbas *Leodienfis*, qui canonem *Carolinum*, Lib. I. de Legibus *Francorum*, cap. *CLV.* super hac re editum recitat, hujus nobis rei testis locuples esse potest. Sic enim Canon ille habet, *Presbyter Eucharistiam semper habeat paratam, ut quando quis infirmatus fuerit, aut parvulus infirmus fuerit, statim eum communicet, ne sine Communionem moriatur.* *Suiceri Thesaur. Eccles.* sub Voce *συναξίς*. Tom. 2. p. 1138.

Chap. 4.  “ municate Persons immediately after it; and if they
 “ are Infants, the Priest dips his Finger in the véné-
 “ rable Blood of our Lord, and putting it to the
 “ Child's Mouth; makes him suck it *.

Here again I observe, that those who admitted Infants to the Lord's Supper, acted very consistently with their own Opinion of the right of Infants to Baptism; for supposing Infants have a right to Baptism, it seems very natural to conclude, they have a like right to the Supper of the Lord. If it be objected, that a *Discernment of the Lord's Body*, and a previous *Examination of a Man's self* be required to precede the latter: The Belief of the Death, Burial and Resurrection of Jesus Christ, and Dependance on him for Salvation, an Assimilation to him by a Death to Sin, and Life of Holiness, and *the Answer of a good Conscience towards God*, are prerequisite to the former, and an Infant is as capable of the one as of the other. They had reason to think, that all who ought to be baptized, might after their Baptism be admitted to the Lord's Table, but had no good Foundation for the Admission of Infants to the former, and therefore none for their Admission to the latter: and those Christians, who are against the Administration of the Lord's Supper to Infants, are so far in the right; but then they seem inconsistent with themselves in admitting 'em to Baptism; for if they may be allowed to come to this Ordinance, what good reason is there to refuse them the other? So that those antient and our modern Pædobaptists seem to have been both in the right in some respects, tho both in the wrong in others. The former (I say) concluded well, that all who were duly baptized, had a right to be admitted to the Lord's Supper; and the latter say as truly, that none who are in a State of Infancy ought to be admitted to the Lord's Supper; from both which Principles, if put together, it will evidently result, That

† Ils les communient encore immédiatement après, & si ce sont de petits enfans, le Prêtre trempe son doigt dans le vénérable sang de nôtre Seigneur, & le porte a la bouche del' enfant, pour le luy faire succer. *Vansleb. Hist. de l'Eglise d'Alexan. Partie. I. chap. 21.*

no Infants are duly baptized. If the Premises are good, as I believe they are, this Conclusion is not to be denied. Chap. 4.

And since Mr. R. lays so great a Stress on the antient Practice of Infant-Baptism, I desire he would give a Reason why the Practice of communicating Infants at the Lord's Table, which appears to be of like Antiquity, should not be continued as well as that: For if he can shew a good Reason for the discontinuance of the one, I doubt not but it will be of the same force for the discontinuance of the other.

To all that has been already said, in opposition to what Mr. R. advances, concerning the universal Practice of the Church, I shall add some Testimonies concerning the Sentiments and Practice of the antient *Vaudois* and *Albigeois* as to this Matter, and the rather because he particularly mentions these as being for P. 17. Infant-Baptism.

Chassanion in his History of the *Albigeois* has these Words: “ * Some Writers have affirm'd, that the
“ *Albigeois* approv'd not of the Baptism of Infants;
“ others that they entirely slighted this Holy Sacra-
“ ment, as if it was of no use either to great or small.
“ The

* Aucuns ont escrit que les Albigeois n'approuvoient point le Baptême des petis enfans. D'autres qu'ils depressoient entierement ce saint Sacrament, comme s'il ne seruoit du tout rien ni aux grans ni aux petis. On a dit le mesme des Vaudois, Combien toutetois qu'aucuns afferment qu'ils ont toujours batizé leurs enfans; cete diversité d'ecrits m'a tenu quelque tans perplex pour me resoudre de ce qui en pouvoit estre à la verité, en fin considerant ce que Saint Bernard en dit, en l'homil. 66. sur le second Chap. du Cant. des Cant. & les raisons qu'il amene à ce propos, refutant cet erreur, & ce qu'il a aussi escrit, *ad Hildefontum Comitum Sancti Egidii*, je ne puis nier, que les Albigeois pour la plus part n'ayent eu cete opinion la. Ce que me le fet croire davantage c'est qu'en l'histoire de la Ville de Trieves, dont est fait mention ci dessus sur la fin du 4 Chap. il est dit, qu'a Ivoi du Diocese de Trieves aucuns nioyent le Sacrament de Bateme profiter à salut aux enfans. En outre une Catherine

Chap. 4.

“ The same has been said of the *Vaudois*, tho some
 “ affirm that they have always baptized their Chil-
 “ dren; this Difference of Authors kept me for some
 “ time in suspence, before I could come to be resolv'd,
 “ on which side the Truth lay. At last considering
 “ what *St. Bernard* says of this matter, in his 66th
 “ *Homily*, on the second Chapter of *the Song of*
 “ *Songs*, and the Reasons he brings to refute this
 “ Error, and also what he wrote *ad Hildesum*
 “ *Comitem Sancti Egidii*; I cannot deny that the *Al-*
 “ *bigois* for the greatest part were of that Opinion.
 “ And that which confirms me yet more in the belief
 “ of it, is, that in the History of the City of *Treves*,
 “ which I have mention'd before at the end of the 4th
 “ Chapter, 'tis said that at *Ivoi* in the Diocess of *Treves*,
 “ there were some who denied that the Sacrament of
 “ Baptism was available to the Salvation of Infants.
 “ And one *Catherine Saube*, who was burnt at *Mont-*
 “ *pellier* in the Year 1417. for being of the Mind of
 “ the *Albigois*, in not believing the Traditions of
 “ the *Romish* Church, had the same thoughts concern-
 “ ing Infant-Baptism; as 'tis recorded in the Regif-
 “ ter of the Town-house of the said City of *Mont-*
 “ *pellier*, of which we shall speak at the end of the
 “ fourth Book. The Truth is, they did not reject
 “ this Sacrament, or say it was useless, but only count-

Saube, qui fut brulée à Montpellier l'an 1417, pour ne croi-
 re les Traditions de l'Eglise Romaine comme les Albigois,
 avoit cete opinion du bateme des petis enfans, selon qu'il est
 escrit au Livre de la Maison de la dite Ville de Montpellier,
 dont nous parlerons sur la fin du quatrieme Livre. Or ils
 n'ont point rejetté le Sacrament, & n'ont pas dit qu'il fut in-
 utile: Seulement ils ont estimè qu'il n'estoit point necessere
 aux petis enfans, d'autant qu'ils ne sont point en aage pour
 croire, & ne peuvent rendre temoignage de leur foy. Ce qui
 les a induits à cela (comme je pense) est pour ce que notre
 Seigneur dit, *Qui aura creu, & aura esté batizé, sera sauvé:*
mais qui n'aura point creu, sera condanné. *Chassanion. hist. des*
Albigois Imprim. l' an. 1595.

Mar. 16.

“ ed it unnecessary to Infants, because they are not of
 “ Age to believe, or capable of giving Evidence of
 “ their Faith. That which induc'd 'em (as I suppose)
 “ to entertain this Opinion, is what our Lord says,
 “ that *He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved,*
 “ *but he that believeth not shall be damned.*

This Author afterwards tells us, he thinks they erred in this Matter, but endeavours to excuse 'em, by alledging that they were not the first who were of this Opinion, seeing *Tertullian* was for deferring Baptism till Persons came to years of Discretion: And he gives divers Instances of the Practice of the Antients to the same purpose, to make this suppos'd Error appear tolerable. That which I observe is, that this Historian, who was a Pædobaptist, and who says he collected his History from two antient Manuscripts, one of which was written in the *Languedoc* Tongue, and the other in old *French*, declares himself convinced, that the *Greatest part of the Albigeois* were against Infant-Baptism.

Cassander in a Preface prefix'd to his Book of Infant-Baptism, imputes the * Denial of this Principle to *Peter de Bruis*, and his Disciple *Henry*, from whom the *Petrobrusians* and *Henricians* took their Name; and speaking of their pretended Heresy, has these Words:

“ † Which Hereticks first openly condemn'd infant-
 “ Baptism, and stily asserted that Baptism was fit
 “ only for the Adult, which they both verbally
 “ taught, and really practis'd in their Administration
 “ of Baptism.

Prateolus speaking of the same *Peter de Bruis*, says,
 “ He asserted that Baptism was useles to Children,
 “ who wanted the Exercise of Reason, because In-

* ——— Hujus autem Erroris præcipuus Auctor, & propagator fuisse videtur Petrus cuidam Eranius, homo Gallus, e Narbonensi Provincia, ejusque discipulus Henricus; unde & Petrobrusiani & Henriciani dici cœperunt. *Georg. Cassander in Prefat. lib. de B. pt. Inf.*

† ——— Quæ Heretis prima Infantium baptismum aperte damnavit, & adultis tantum baptismum convenire, & verbis docendo, & re ipsa baptizando, pertinaciter asseruit. *Ibid.*

Chap.4. “fants, who want the use of Reason, can't have Faith,
 “so as to believe the Word of God when preach'd
 “to 'em, which he asserted to be absolutely necessa-
 “ry to every one who submitted to Baptism; so that
 “if any one should be baptiz'd without previous
 “Faith, he said his Baptism would be of no use to
 “him*. This Author charges the same Opinion on
 † *Henricus*, the Disciple of *Peter de Bruis*.

These Persons liv'd in the 12th Century after Christ; and from them and their Followers who kept clear of many gross Errors, with which the *Romish* Church was so deeply corrupted in that dark time, was this among other Truths transmitted down to the anti-ent *Vandois* and *Albigeois*, long before the Reformation made in the time of *Luther* and *Calvin*.

And whoever will take the Pains to peruse the Learned Dr. *Allix* his Remarks on the antient Church of *Piedmont*, will find divers Passages that may confirm what has been said, and make appear that Infant-Baptism was oppos'd by perhaps the purest Churches that were then in the World, some hundreds of Years before the time Mr. R. assigns for the first Rise of the Anabaptists. I shall relate only one Passage after the Dr. concerning *Gundulphus* and his Followers in *Italy*, divers of whom *Gerard*, Bishop of *Cambray* and *Ar-ras*, interrogated upon several Heads in the Year 1025, and among other things that Bishop mentions the following Reason which they gave against Infant-Baptism, viz.
 “ || Because to an Infant that neither wills nor runs,
 “ that

* *Afferebat autem hic parvulis usu rationis carentibus non prodesse baptismum, quod parvuli qui sunt rationis expertes, fidem habere nequeant, nec Dei verbo, quod illis prædicatum fuit, credere. Hoc autem asseverabat summe fore necessarium cuicumque baptismum suscipienti: adeo sane ut si quis sine prævia fide baptismum suscepisset, nihil ei prodesse baptismum diceret. Prævol. Hæres. l. 14. c. 18.*

† *Idem l. 8. c. 7.*

|| ————— Quia ad parvulum non volentem, neque currentem, fidei nescium, suæque salutis atque utilitatis ignarum, in quem nulla regenerationis petitio, nulla fidei potest
 † inesse

“ that knows nothing of Faith, is ignorant of its own Chap.4.
 “ Salvation and Welfare, in whom there can be no
 “ desire of Regeneration or Confession of Faith,
 “ the Will, Faith and Confession of another Man,
 “ seems not in the least to appertain.

And that Infant-Baptism was not universally practis'd in the *Greek Church* for some Ages after Christ, appears from what *Vansleb*, in his History of the Church of *Alexandria* abovemention'd, recites from *Amba Macaire* Bishop of *Memphis*, who was Secretary to *Cosmus* the Third their LVIIIth Patriarch, and lived in the Year of our Lord 756, who says,
 “ * That in the first Ages Baptism was administred in
 “ *Alexandria* but once a Year, and that was on Good
 “ Friday, and then none were baptized but such as
 “ were thirty years of Age; and that tho, some time
 “ after, this Custom was chang'd, and Permission
 “ given to baptize the Children of Christians, yet
 “ the Custom of baptizing but once a Year was not
 “ alter'd, till the time of *Amba Theophilus* their
 “ XXIIIrd Patriarch.

To these Testimonies (to which many others of like Import might be added) we may subjoin the Concessions that have been made by divers Pædobaptists, of this and the last Age to the same purpose. I shall at present mention only two or three Acknowledgments of this kind. *Ludovicus Vives*, in his Notes on *Augustin de Civitate Dei*, on occasion of this Father's mentioning the Exhortations that were wont to be made to those who were baptized, says,

ineffe confessio, aliena Voluntas, aliena Fides, aliena Confessio nequaquam pertinere videntur. *Allix Remar. c. 11.*

* Que dans les premiers siècles on ne faisoit en *Alexandrie* le Bapême qu'une fois l'aunée qui étoit le Vendredi Saint, & qu'alors on ne baptizoit que ceux qui avoient déjà atteints l'âge de trente ans : & quoique quelque temps après on ait changé cette coûtume, & qu'on ait donné la permission de baptizer les enfans des Chrétiens; que néanmoins la coûtume de faire le Bapême, une fois l'aunée n'avoit changé que du temps d' *Amba Theophile*, leur 23 Patriarche. *Vansleb. Hist. de l' Eglise d' Alexand. Part. I. c. 23.*

Chap. 4.

“ * No Person was formerly brought to the sacred
 “ Baptistry, till he was of Adult age, and both un-
 “ derstood the meaning of that Mystical Water,
 “ and requested once and again to be wash'd in it.

And *Suicerus* tells us in plain terms: “ † In the
 “ two first Ages no Person was baptized, till he was
 “ instructed in the Faith, and tinctur'd with the
 “ Doctrine of Christ, and could testify his own
 “ Faith, because of those Words [of Christ] *he that*
 “ *believeth and is baptized.* Therefore Believing was
 “ first; and hence the Order of the Catechumens
 “ in the Church. And it was a Custom then con-
 “ stantly observ'd, to give the Catechumens the Eu-
 “ charist immediately after Baptism; afterwards an
 “ Opinion obtain'd, that no Man could be saved with-
 “ out Baptism; And therefore because the Eucharist
 “ was before given to the Adult Catechumens, as soon
 “ as they were wash'd by Holy Baptism, it was
 “ thought fit in like manner to give it to Infants, af-
 “ ter the Introduction of Infant-Baptism.

The like ingenuous Confession is made by *Curcellanus*,
 his Words are these: “ † Pædobaptism was not known
 “ in

* Nemo olim sacro admovebatur baptisterio, nisi adulta jam aetate, & cum idem ipse & sciret, quid sibi mystica illa vellet aqua, & se abluere illa peteret, nec semel peteret, &c. *Lud. Viv. Annot. in Aug. de Civ. Dei, lib. I. c. 27.*

† Primis duobus seculis nemo baptismum accipiebat, nisi qui, in fide instructus, & doctrina Christi imbutus, testari posset, se credere: propter illa Verba, *Qui crediderit & baptizatus fuerit.* Ergo prius erat credere; inde Ordo Catechumenorum in Ecclesia. Mos etiam tum perpetuus constanter observatus fuit, ut secundum baptismum Catechumenis illis statim daretur Eucharistia; postea opinio invaluit, neminem salvari posse, nisi qui baptizatus fuisset; Quia autem catechumenis adultis olim simul ac loti fuissent sacro baptismo, dabatur Eucharistia; hoc etiam in Infantibus ut fieri institutum post Pædobaptismum introductum. *Suiceri Thesaur. Ec. sub Voce Σύναξις.*

‡ Pædobaptismus——qui duobus primis à Christo nato seculis fuit incognitus, in tertio vero & quarto a paucis est approbatus, in quinto demum & sequentibus passim obtinere coepit

“ in the World the two first Ages after Christ, in
 “ the third and fourth it was approv'd by a few, at
 “ length in the fifth and following Ages it began to
 “ obtain in divers Places; and therefore we observe
 “ this Rite indeed as an antient Custom, but not as
 “ an Apostolical Tradition. And in another place
 he tells us, “ * That the Custom of baptizing Infants
 “ did not begin before the third Age after Christ,
 “ and that there appears not the least Footstep of
 “ it in the two first Centuries. Chap. 4.

After this let the Reader judg, whether Mr. R. had reason to say, that “ the Antipædobaptists, contrary to
 “ the Example, Faith and Practice of the Universal
 “ Church, gain say Infant-Baptism, &c. and to insult 'em
 as he does in the close of the same Paragraph, in the
 following Words: “ These are the *Goliath's*, against
 “ whom the stripling *Davids* are to fight (perhaps al-
 “ luding to his own Name) these are the Sons of
 “ that Giant of *Gath*, against whom the Cause of In-
 “ fants is to be pleaded. And as those *Philistine Gi-*
 “ ants fell by the Hands of *David* and his Worthies,
 “ so I doubt not but the Church of *England* and her
 “ Sons, will wound and slay those unbaptiz'd *Phi-*
 “ *listines* with the Sword of the Spirit, which is the
 “ Word of God. Since the Anabaptists are so con-
 temptible a People, and incapable of defending them-
 selves in Mr. R's account, why does he here make
 such formidable Giants of 'em, unless it be to inhance
 the Glory of his expected Victory? Sometimes they are
 represented as mean illiterate Adversarys, that the World
 may despise and reproach 'em; and on a sudden these Pig-
 mys are turn'd into *Goliath's*, that the Courage and Honour
 of a *David* may be ascribed to him, for the Conquest
 he hopes among others to obtain over 'em. He boasts

cœpit—& proinde hic ritus a nobis quidem ut antiqua con-
 fuerudo, sed non ut Apostolica traditio observatur. *Curcellæi*
Relig. Christian. Institut. Ljb. I. c. 12.

* Morem Infantes baptizandi non cœpisse ante tertium a
 Christo nato sæculum: In duobus vero prioribus nullum ejus
 Vestigium apparere. *Idem. in Dissert. secunda de Peccat. Orig.*
Seçt. 56.

Chap. 4. indeed of using the Sword of the Spirit against 'em; but whether he uses that so successfully as he pretends, and whether he does not trust more to another sort of Weapons, may be easily discern'd by the Substance of his Book. But if they are unbaptiz'd *Philistines*, why does he call 'em his *Brethren* in the 19th Page? Would he be counted a Giant, and one of the Family of *Gath* too, and yet wound and slay his *Brethren*? Are the Anabaptists no Christians, as he says in the Title, and *unbaptized Philistines* as he says here, and yet his *Brethren*, whom he with a pathetick Wish advises, not to cut off a Tribe from *Israel*? O that our *Brethren* (says he) would with *Israel* sit down and weep! &c. But why should they weep for their indiscreet and blind Zeal (as he calls it) in denying Baptism to their Children, if themselves are not Christians but unbaptiz'd *Philistines*? unless he will maintain that the Children of those, who are no Christians and unbaptiz'd, have a Title to Baptism. Again, 'tis a hard case, that one while he will have 'em to be properly call'd Anabaptists, because they rebaptize; and at another time will have us believe that they are unbaptiz'd; as if to be *twice baptized*, and *never baptized*, were synonymous Terms with him: For he will have the Anabaptists mistaken every way, both by Excess and Defect in the same case; they exceed in being twice baptized, and are deficient in not being baptized once. This is a terrible two-edged Sword in the hand of little *David*, to cut down these monstrous *Philistines*.

He goes on to argue; 'Tis the *Apostle's Rule* (says he) *where no Law is, there is no Transgression*, Rom. 4. 15. Very well, then if there be no Law of Christ for the Baptism of Infants, I hope the Anabaptists are guilty of no Transgression in not baptizing them. But Mr. R. makes another kind of Inference from this Rule: for he adds, "Since Infant-Baptism is no where prohibited, wherefore do they blame and condemn us for practising that, which the Scriptures so much seem to allow of? And the Anabaptists may well make this Return, Since Infant-Baptism is no where commanded, wherefore does Mr. R. blame and condemn us for not practising that which the Scrip-

Scriptures not only seem to disallow of, but plainly prohibit? for the Prophets render this as a sufficient reason against uninstituted Worship, that *God has not commanded it* *. And our Blessed Saviour rebukes the *Jews, for teaching for Doctrines the Commandments of Men*. Our Lord Jesus Christ has not only appointed the Mode by which Baptism is to be administered, but determin'd who should be the Subjects of it; he has not left it to the Pleasure of Men to administer it to whom they please, but has in his Word prescrib'd the Qualifications necessary to it. He has told us in his Commission, that Men ought to be *taught* or *made Disciples* in order to be baptized; and if that Limitation be taken away, all People in all Nations might be accounted to have an equal right to Baptism. Mr. R. indeed in his Preface pretends that these Words of Christ prescribe first baptizing and then teaching, notwithstanding the Order and obvious sense of the Words. A sufficient Answer has been given him before on this Head, here therefore I shall only cite two or three Passages out of the Antients, to shew how they understood this Commission of our Lord.

Mark 7.

Justin Martyr in his Apology to the Emperor *Antoninus Pius* has these Words: “ † And now we'll explain after what manner when we were renew'd by Christ, we devoted our selves to God, lest in omitting it, we should seem to prevaricate in our Discourse. As many as are persuaded and believe that those things which we teach and publish are true, and engage to live accordingly, are admo-

* Jer. 7. 31. Chap. 19. 5. & Ch. 32. 35.

† Οὐ τρίτον ἢ καὶ ἀνεθήκαμεν ἑαυτὸς τῷ Θεῷ χρηνοποιήθέντες διὰ τῶ Χριστοῦ ἐξηγησόμεθα· ὅπως μὴ τὸτο παραλιπόιτες, δόξομεν πονηρεῦειν τὴ ἐν τῇ ἐξηγήσει· ὅσοι ἂν παιδῶσι καὶ πσεύωσιν ἀληθῆ ταῦτα τὰ ὑφ' ἡμῶν διδασκόμενα καὶ λεγόμενα εἶναι, καὶ βίῃ οὕτως δύνασθαι ὑποχρῶνται, εὐχεσάιτε καὶ αἰτεῖν νηστεύοντες παρὰ τῷ Θεῷ τῶν προσημαρτημένων ἀφῆσιν διδάσκονται, ἡμῶν συνάχουμένων καὶ συννησεύοντων αὐτοῖς, ἔπειτα ἀρῶνται ὑφ' ἡμῶν ἐνθα ὕδωρ ἐστὶ, καὶ τρίτον ἀναγκήσεως ὄν καὶ ἡμεῖς αὐτοὶ ἀνεγενήθημεν, ἀναγενῶνται· ἐπ' ὀνόματι Θεοῦ γὰρ τῶ πατρὸς τῶν ὄλων καὶ δεσπότη Θεῷ, καὶ τῷ σωτῆρι Θεῷ ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστῷ, καὶ Πνεύματι Θεοῦ ἁγίῳ, τὸ ἐν τῷ ὕδατι τότε λυτρῶν ποιῶνται. *Justin. Mart. Apolog. II. p. 94. Edit. Paris. 1636.*

“ nish'd

Ch. p. 4.

“ wash'd to address themselves to God in Prayer and
 “ Supplication, with Fasting, for the Remission of their
 “ past Sins; while we fast and pray together with
 “ em. We then bring 'em to the Water, and they are
 “ regenerated with the same kind of new Birth,
 “ wherewith we were regenerated; for in the Name
 “ of the Father, and Lord God of the Universe, and
 “ of our Saviour Jesus Christ, and of the Holy Spi-
 “ rit, they are then wash'd in the Water.

Tertullian speaking of the Work of the Apostles, says, their Business was * first to preach, and afterwards to dip or baptize: And that † those who were ready to enter upon Baptism, should give themselves to frequent Prayers, Fasting, Kneeling and Watching, with the Confession of all their past Sins, that they might represent the Baptism of *John*, of which the Scripture thus speaks, *They were dip'd, confessing their Sins.*

Basil says, “ || Faith and Baptism are two means of Salvation nearly allied and inseparable; for Faith is perfected by Baptism, and Baptism is founded upon Faith—And the Confession which leads us on to Salvation goes before, and Baptism which seals our Covenant follows after.

Mat. 28

Jerom speaking of the Ministerial Work, ordain'd by the Commission of Christ, says, * * “ First they

* — Prius est prædicare, posterius tingere. *Tertul. de Bapt. cap. 14.*

† Ingressuros baptismum, Orationibus crebris, Jeuniis, & Genucationibus, & Pervigiliis orare oportet, & cum Confessione omnium retro delictorum, ut exponant etiam Baptismum Joannis. *Tingebantur, inquit, confitentes delicta sua. Idem ibid. cap. 20.*

|| Πίστις καὶ βάπτισμα δύο τρόποι, τῆς σωτηρίας συμφυεῖς ἀλλήλοις καὶ ἀδιαίρετοι· πίστις ἢ γὰρ τελεῖται δια βαπτίσματος; βάπτισμα ὃ θεμελιούται δια τῆς πίστεως—Καὶ περ ἀγχι ἢ ὁμολογία πρὸς τὴν σωτηρίαν εἰσάγουσα; ἐπακολουθεῖ δὲ τὸ βάπτισμα ἐπιστραφίζον ἡμῶν τὴν συναρτάθειαν. *Basil. Mag. de Spiritu S. cap. 12.*

* Primum docent omnes Gentes, deinde doctos intingunt aqua. Non enim potest fieri ut Corpus Baptismi recipiat Sacramentum, nisi ante anima fidei susceperit veritatem. *Hieron. in Mat. 28.*

“ teach

“ teach all Nations, and when they are taught, dip Chap.4.
“ ’em in Water. For ’tis impossible that the Body
“ should receive the Sacrament of Baptism, till the
“ Soul has embrac’d the Truth of Faith.

And the Learned Dr. *Barrow* speaks very well to this purpose; for discoursing of Baptism he has these Words: “ * What the Action it self enjoined is,
“ what the Manner and Form thereof is apparent by
“ the Words of our Lord’s Institution. Going forth
“ therefore (saith he) teach (or disciple) all Nati-
“ ons, baptizing them, &c. The Action is baptizing
“ or immersing in Water, the Object thereof, those
“ Persons of any Nation, whom his Ministers can by
“ their Instruction and Persuasion render Disciples,
“ that is, such as do sincerely believe the Truth of
“ his Doctrine, and seriously resolve to obey his Com-
“ mandments.

When Mr. R. tells us of the Practice of the Universal Church, he takes notice that Christ has said, *He will be with his Church to the end of the World.* It has been observed already, that he confidently presumes, but not proves the Universal Church to have practis’d Infant-Baptism; and what he says of Christ’s being with his Church to the end of the World, he refers I suppose to the Promise annexed to the Commission, about which we have been disputing; but till Mr. R. can find Infant-Baptism in that Commission, he’ll never make it appear, that Christ has promis’d his Presence to countenance that Practice. His Presence is not promis’d to his Ministers, any farther than they act according to his Command. Mr. R. goes on:
“ Can we suppose (says he) he hath guided his whole
“ Church in an Error ever since, till a few and a handful
“ of Men pretending to new Revelations, found out the
“ Mistake? Tho the Anabaptists think it an Error to
account Infants proper Subjects of Baptism, they don’t think the whole Church of Christ, ever since he gave the Commission to baptize, have been in this Error, for the Reasons above insisted on; and as for those

* *Barrow’s Doctrine of the Sacrament, in the 1st Vol. of his Works, p. 657. Edit. 1700.*

Chap. 4. who are mistaken in this matter, there's no Reason to think *Christ has led 'em* into an Error. Does Mr. R. think that the Church of Christ (or any part of it) is infallible, and that Christians can't be charged with Error, without supposing that *Christ* has guided them into it? And whatever he thinks of *a few and a handful of Men* (as he is pleas'd to express himself) 'tis no such strange thing for Mistakes to be discover'd by a few, when Multitudes overlook 'em. These are the very same sort of Reflections, that those of the *Romish* Communion made on our first Reformers; and if Mr. R. will trust to the validity of 'em, they'll easily carry him into the Bosom of the Church of *Rome*. But when he has despis'd the Anabaptists for the Smallness of their Number, he endeavours to expose 'em, for pretending to find out the Mistake about Infant-Baptism by new Revelations; whereas it seems no more than a new Revelation of his own Brain, to represent 'em as diffident of Scripture-Authority to maintain their Principles. The old Revelation of the Divine Will contain'd in the Holy Scripture, is that to which they constantly appeal, and profess to have no other Rule of their Faith and Worship, and therefore have no Temptation to recur to Enthusiasm for Authority to defend themselves. But Mr. R. is not pleas'd, that a few Men should make any new Revelation of old Errors, tho they use the antient Authority of Holy Scripture to make the Discovery.

He goes on: " Did Jesus Christ, who is King of his Church, rule his People by wrong Laws? No, but some People are not so willing as they ought, to be govern'd by right Ones. But where is the Ground of this Learned Question? Can it be infer'd from their Denial of Infant-Baptism to be a Command of Christ, that the Anabaptists suggest that Christ rules his People by wrong Laws? They have more reason to ask this Gentleman, if Christ rules his People by wrong Laws, seeing he is so unwilling to yield to the Authority of that Law of Christ, which requires Persons to be made Disciples before their Baptism, that he will needs have such baptized as want that Qualification. He continues, " Did he (*i. e.* Christ)

" not

“ not know they were mistaken, till the Anabaptists
 “ inform'd him thereof? And doth he reclaim his
 “ Church, now he hath discover'd the pretended Er-
 “ ror? No sure. If these Questions have an sense,
 I think they multesignify, that if the Church had been
 in a Mistake, Christ must needs have known it: and
 if he had known it, he would certainly have reform'd
 it. So that the Church is in no danger of being any
 considerable time under a Mistake, but may expect to
 be speedily rectified, if she should slip into an Error.
 This sort of Arguing is mean from a Papist, who
 holds the Infallibility of the Church; but from a Pro-
 testant who denies it, it appears extremely absurd.
 Where is the Enthusiasm now, with Mr. R. or with the
 Anabaptists? Is Christ obliged to make new Revelati-
 ons to his Church, whenever she is mistaken, to re-
 claim her? Is it not sufficient that he has given his
 Word, as the Rule and Measure by which to try all
 Doctrines and Practices? And is Mr. R. resolv'd to be
 govern'd by the Practice of the Church, rather than
 by the Divine Word? And if the Church be in an
 Error, must all the Members of it be reclaim'd from
 their Error at once, or at least the greatest part of
 'em, before Mr. R. will think fit to part with his
 Mistakes? He still goes on: “ He (*i. e.* Christ) is
 “ still raising up some to vindicate the Cause of Infants
 “ against the Devil, who seeks their Destruction; and
 “ the Antipædobaptists their Enemies, who would de-
 “ prive 'em of Salvation. It is not enough for this
 Gentleman to compare the Antipædobaptists to Beasts,
 as he does in his Epistle Dedicatory, but now they
 must be join'd with the Devil, as the mortal Enemies
 of Infants. Their Character must needs appear very
 black, who are represented to be as malicious and cru-
 el as the Devil himself. The Devil (it seems) *seeks the*
Destruction of Infants, and the Antipædobaptists are
their Enemies who would deprive 'em of Salvation; and
 Mr. R. is one of those (if we may believe him)
 whom Christ *has rais'd up against the Devil and the*
Antipædobaptists. I know not what Success Mr. R.
 promises himself against the Devil in this Controversy;
 but I'll venture to say, that in opposing the Anabap-
 tists in this Book, he often uses the Weapons of the
Accuser

Chap.4. *Accuser of the Brethren*, I mean those of Calumny and Detraction, from whence the * Devil has his Name. And as for the Anabaptists, I hope they will rather suffer the worst his Tongue or Pen can attempt, than use theirs after the same manner. But if he really thinks he is rais'd up by Christ to pour out such Reproaches upon those who love the Holy Name and Truth of Christ, he seems not far from that Enthusiasm, he with so little appearance of Reason imputes to others; and he would do well to consider, if on this occasion he is not guilty of taking the venerable Name of our Saviour in vain.

But let us follow him thro the next Paragraph, which begins thus: “ Indeed had these new Teachers, “ who pretended to discover this new Doctrine (that “ Infants were not to be admitted to Baptism, and “ that the Church was in an Error in so doing) had “ they (I say) been Men divinely inspir'd (for their “ pretended Revelations were but Diabolical Delusions, and an Hypocritical Cheat) had they had the “ Gift of Tongues, and the Power to work Miracles, “ or could by any extraordinary way, either Prophetical or Apostolical, manifest the verity of their “ Principles, some reason there had been to hearken “ to this new Doctrine. Would not any Man think in reading this Passage and what goes before, that the Anabaptists pretended to discover a new Doctrine by immediate Inspiration and new Revelations? whereas they profess to found what they hold on the Holy Scripture, and are willing to have their Doctrine try'd by that Rule, as has been said before. He goes on: “ But when (I speak without Slander, and in the sequel shall make it good) their Authors were the vilest Wretches, Hereticks, Blasphemers, Liars, Rebels, Murderers, Adulterers, sacrilegious Persons, ignorant Mechanicks, and impudent Vagabonds, and their whole Doctrine but a Medley of antient Heresies revived; who in a calm Mind, with a serious Conscience, can follow such Teachers, who “ are branded with the Marks of the Father of

* *Διάβολος* calumniator, à *διαβάλλω* calumniator.

“ Lies,