

**INNOCENCY AND TRUTH  
VINDICATED:  
OR  
A SOBER REPLY TO MR. WILL'S  
ANSWER TO A LATE TREATISE  
OF BAPTISM**

**Wherein the Authorities and Antiquities for  
Believers, and against Infants Baptism, are  
Defended, and the misrepresentations and  
Forgeries he boasts of, all returned  
Upon himself.**

With a brief Answer to Mr. Blinmans Essay.

---

**By HENRY DANVERS**

---

*Vt ex lapidum attritu ignis elicitur, sic saepe veritas ex Alternantium Imo and altercantium sermonum  
conflictu  
Lipfius.*

---

**Prov. 18:17 - He that is first in his own cause seemeth just; but his neighbour cometh and searcheth  
him.**

---

Printed for Francis Smith, at the Elephant and Castle near the Royal Exchange in Cornhill, 1675

---

**The  
P R E F A C E**

**I**t is an ancient and well-approved Maxim Among the learned, that the more truth is winnowed and sifted, the more opposed and contended against, the more apparent and illustrious it appears. *Verstas Ventilata plus rutilat and impugnata magis elucesit.*

A further confirmation whereof you may meet with, from the late opposition Mr. Will's hath made against the truth, in his late Book called "Infants Baptism" attested and vindicated by Scripture and Antiquity, in an answer to a treatise, by Mr. Henry D'Anvers. &c.

Wherein notwithstanding the diligent search, he tells us, he has made in the University Library at Oxford, the most assistance that all the learned writers Mr. Marshall, Baxter, Cobbet, Cotton, Holmes, &c. can give him to disprove and weaken the authorities urged from Scripture and Antiquity for believers against "Infants Baptism", yet you will find they serve but so ----- the more to illustrate that truth he precedes to soil, giving only an opportunity for further confirmation and satisfaction, and to treat more full satisfaction or justification to any that have been in suspense, as to the truth of any of those authorities urged by me. Wherein notwithstanding his great flourish and noise you will find he is not able to reprove the truth of much as of one of those many authorities in the Historical part, and excepting that one in the doctrinal part viz. Calvin for -----, not another that is confidential in the whole Book.

Therefore all that I have to ask of the Candid Reader (at whose Bar the waiter is now brought betwixt Mr. Wills and me) is only to do themselves and the truth in Question so much right as to afford the Common Justice of an open ear, that having heard the Recrimination, they will also moved to what is said herein for vindication.

Wherein you have his arguments duly weighed, and refuted, his caviling exceptions answered; but presented forgeries, and falsehoods, disproved; the antiquities of believers, Baptism defended; the innovation, groundless traditions, and novelty of infants Baptism confirmed. The witness against it by eminent man and famous churches for many ages maintained; his injurious Calumnies and reproaches (that he not only designs to lour the profession of believers baptism me with but the profession itself also) detected ---- proved. The groundless custom of sprinkling instead of Dipping farther evinced.

After -----, and uncomely retractions, the -----, bitter wrathful, frothy and provoking spirit, he appears ---through the whole book. -----Christian candor's ---- ----- treated of --- ----  
----- is so --- that --- ----- and ----- from such hard ----- sat --- ----  
----- myself -----  
to suffer contempt and reproach for the truth sake, ---- ----- reading for reading. In being also some judged the sign of a bad ----, for ---- ----- the men ----- such ----. ----- and found arguments with rage, clamor and noise.

The Scripture arguments 'tis true I have little meddled with, and that for these following reasons.

First, because the Historical part upon which so much stress hath been laid (through the leanest part of the controversy) was the principal new thing added by me (it being as Mr. Will's observes, next to an impossibility to offer any new Scripture, or almost any new argument that hath not been before urged in the controversy;) and it mainly therefore by him opposed.

Secondly, because he has ingeniously confessed, that there is no express Scripture for the same; and so many of themselves with one mouth have owned, the necessity of express Scripture to warrant and justify the practice of every part f God's worship, and that to practice anything in the worship of God without express warranty, from the Word, is superstition and false worship. And that such a Principle ought to be held fast as the great Protestant Bulwark to secure us against all Popish Innovations and Traditions: and which is a sufficient answer out of their own mouths against any thing they urge from pretended inferences, and far-fetched consequences, being all that can possibly be said for it.

Thirdly, because Mr. Tombes hath now given a particular answer to him and Mr. Blinman therein, who being none of those rigid Anabaptist that Mr. Will's expresseth so much enmity against his arguments may he more acceptable to him.

Fourthly, because I intend to do it more particularly here after, (If God please) by it self, having yet much to reckon with Mr. Will's for his further abuses, and grand mistakes in the Doctrinal part. In the next place, it is very observable, and I desire the reader to take special notice of it, that the things he would so Injuriously father upon me he is himself found solely guilty of; making good Prov. 26:27 and f which I shall point you to a few instances, viz.

First, that the forgeries and prevarication's be charges upon me, do all return upon himself; and not one of them made good against me, as appears from I. i. To page 29.

Secondly that the several falsehoods he lays to my charge are all of them of his own making and not one of them to be proved against me, as is particularly evidenced from page 29 to page 62.

Thirdly, the notorious abuse he has put upon authors by forgery, curtailations, misquotation, mistranslating, and which fully appears by the following instances, viz.

1. By making an authority of his own for Infants Baptism, and fathering it upon Basil in the 4<sup>th</sup> century in his book "Contra Eunom," and asserting it to be the very next lines to what I had repeated from him, thence reproving me for unfaithfulness, in leaving it out, and to be duly suspected in all my Quotations, when not one syllable of any such thing if so be found in him as demon treated page 43 to page 49.
2. For mistranslating, misrepresenting, abusing and curtailing Greg. Nazien, as appears page 8 and 9 and page 47 and 48.
3. For his curtailing and abusing the old confession of the Waldenses, leaving out a considerable part thereof, and then making flourishes and insaneness upon it, as page 110.
4. By abusing his reader with a suppositions testimony, of Athanafius, when the Author from whom he brings it owns it to be forged, page 37-39 &c.
5. His egregious unfaithfulness in that notorious abuse he puts upon Oslander, pretending that he certifies several, things out of Peter Clumacenses, against Peter Bruis, he singing to the 12<sup>th</sup> century when he knew them to be the lying slander of the Monks inquisitors against the Albegois, in the 13<sup>th</sup> Century and of which he picks only 5 particulars out of 20. As page 118 to 123.
6. His abusing, and mistranslating, a passage out of Cassandra quite contrary to what he expresseth; falsely thereby, accusing the Mini's for the very crime therein he acquits them, page 160 to 163.
7. His abusing Erasmus, telling in that he testifies in his censure before Origen's Homelies on the Romans, that it was Jerome's Version, and not Ruffinus's; and that Jerome's Preface was prefixed thereto; whereat Erasmus saith the quite contrary in herb, viz. First, that it did appear to be Ruffinus's and not Jerome, and second, that the said Preface was a cheat of the Booksellers, and none of Jerome, as page 86.
8. His abusing his reader by a quotation from Vice Comes, as though he satisfied, that till Luther's time none denied Infants Baptism, when he doth the quite contrary in the same place, giving an Account of so many before Luther that did it, viz. Vincentius, Victor, Hinemarus, the Henrici, and apostolic, Wickliff, Strabo, Vives, &c. as page 127.
9. By further abusing the reader in telling him, that Rainarius in his catalogue of the Waldensian errors, gives not in their denying of infants Baptism as a great argument they were for it being one of the Monks inquisitor's employed to that end; when he doth it expressly in Totidem Verbis, as page 125.
10. His double dealing about Dr. Taylor's arguments against, Infants Baptism in his liberty of Prophecy, suggesting as though Dr. Taylor himself and Dr. Hammond had refuted them, whereas they suppose most of them to remain good against those common pleas for Infants Baptism; but do not undertake to answer them because many of those arguments usually brought by paedobaptists are not good in themselves page 52

Fourthly, fearful issuance or heedlessness, repeating my words truly in one place and yet afterwards fathering the quite contrary upon me; page 32.

Fifthly, notoriously partial in his answers all the book through, replying to some things he judges weak, and leaving others unanswered, and yet vaunting over the whole; as for instance, in the 4<sup>th</sup> century I give the sayings of 10 fathers for adult Baptism, he replies only to 4 of them saith not a word to the rest, and yet concludes against them all, as page 6 &c. So in like manner as to the 10 instances given from the most eminent men not baptized till aged, though the children of Christian parents, replies only to 4 and not a word to the other 6 and yet concludes against them all, as though he had particularly answered to them, as page 11 to 15. (Though his reply as you will find, is as insignificant in both as his silence.) And further I produce 3 Councils in the 4<sup>th</sup> Century for the same, to which he weakly replies, he can produce 3 times ten Counsels for Infants Baptism, viz. in after centuries when by Popish Counsels it was enjoined and imposed at page 10. And again I quote Spanhaemius and Ofiander to prove a thing, he takes notice

only of Spanhaemius that speaks to part, but not to Osiander that speaks to the whole and yet, reproves me for my mistake as p. 148.

And further he allows but tow witnesses for believers Baptism only, viz. Boemus and Srabo, and yet leaves multitudes of them unexpected against; unreplied to, at page 2 &c. In like manner excepts against but 6 of above 40 particular witnesses against Infants Baptism, and yet allows but 2 viz. Hinemacus and Adrianus, as page 104 and 105. And again, I quote eleven several Churches denying Infants Baptism, he excepts only against 32 saith nothing to all the rest, yet owns excepts only against 3 saith nothing to all the rest, yet owns none of them. Page 17.

Sixthly, the inveteracy of Spirit testified all along both against the professors and profession itself of Believers Baptism only, especially in his railing and false accusation, from page 145 to 171.

As for my Epitomizing and repeating some of Mr. Tombe's arguments, and not always mentioning his name, which he calls Plagiarism, I do confess in that my collection, I have not so punctually mentioned all our own party from Book to book, wherein (except in the historical part) I do little more than bring to remembrance in a new method (for the benefit of the present age) what has heretofore in large Treatise been written upon this subject, which I thing is usual in Polemical writings, and if I mistake not, Mr. Sydnham doth the same thing without mentioning of names, from whom the arguments are brought (which may be endless,) and if I have been thereby injurious to any, I beg their pardon; I am sure I have not been so to the mark; But herein I conceive Mr. Will's hath not dealt fairly, as to reprove me for the same thing he doth himself, for I, could draw parallels also upon him if I would be troublesome, and impertinent; and only to avoid answering the force of the arguments, upon pretence they are another not my own, which I conceive favors little of ingenuity and will scarce go the current pay.

It is true, it must be owned that Mr. Tombe's how much surer slighted by Mr. Will's (though in some things very different from whose that own this way) hath done very worthily in this controversy, and was an eminent in strident that God raised up ----it the learned to plead and defend that despised ---- -- whose learned ----- and unanswered books do witness for him in the gate, though Mr. Will's is pleased so ignorant to warrant it, and tell us in his epistle, that the arguments for believers against infants baptism are a parcel of Trite overgrown things, a nauseous crumb or repetition of old toured arguments, that had been in effect trampled upon and confuted again and again, though his Anti-padebaptism in 3 parts, containing near as I judge 1500 pages in quart replying to what had been written by above 20 several persons are all of them if I am not misinformed unreplied to this day.

And further, I must inform the reader that had any modest endeavors prevailed, these things had more privately (without this troubling the world) been rectified between Mr. Will's and me, but he having as he tells us received from the learned his album calculm, or approbation, would not by any means be stooped in his career for the supposed victory and glory, and how far he has merited that high Encomium given by his Imprimatur, M. B. in this Epistle Recommendatory, is to be considered, who tells us, that much thanks is due to him the reverend Author from the Church for answering my arguments satisfactorily, and by searching into, and so fully confuting all my pretending antiquities, thereby defending (as he saith Gods truth and the Churches right whilst other of his brethren by ignorance and sloth, treacherous silence or silly unsatisfactory arguing, have betrayed the cause.

But whether instead of the churches thinks they ought not both (in Mr Baxter's own language) to have the church told of them, for pestering the world with such importune noise, one for his heedless, writing of them, and the other for harsh and careless commendation, is submitted to Judgment.

And lastly, whether it is not none demonstrably evidence to all men that will impartially consider, that notwithstanding the confident vain glorious boast of these great undertakers that till better proof be manifested there as yet appears as such antiquity for Infants Sprinkling in the first ages, as (they themselves acknowledge) express Scripture for the same.

**THE  
WITNESSES  
FOR  
BELIEVERS BAPTISM  
Feed from Forgery and Prevarication**

---

**CHAPTER ONE**

The Baptism of Believers, with the Authorities urged for the necessity of Confession of Faith before it; is defended and the Quotations out of the Magdeburg's; vindicated from Mr. Will's charge of Prevarication and falsehood.

The Method I shall observe herein, shall be to give you a brief account of the Antiquities, and authorities brought by me, to prove the necessity of Faith before Baptism; and then his exception against them, and my reply thereto: Whereby the reader may be able to make an case, and speedy judgement, at whose door the Prevarication's and Falsehoods lie.

Having, as you will find, in the 6 chapters by 6 arguments from positive scripture proved: THAT BELIEVERS UPON PROFESSION OF FAITH ARE THE ONLY OBJECTS OF BAPTISM, did in my 7 chapters (by way of illustration only) confirm the same, from the eminent testimony that had been born thereto, throughout all ages, firmly witnessing. THAT CONFESSION AND PROFESSION OF FAITH WITH FREE CHOICE, WAS NECESSARY BEFORE BAPTISM; and which evidence, as I have given it you, through all the Centuries, you may gather up under 2 Heads: First, what hath been said thereto by the Ancient's themselves, in the first four Centuries, before infant Baptism was enjoined (and how confirmed by our modern writers); and Secondly, what witness of that kind hath been born thereto, after infants Baptism was imposed, as well by those that denied Infants Baptism, as those that owned, and practiced it, not only of the *Romish* Church, but others through all the rest of the Centuries.

**Mr. Wills charges for prevarication and falsehood.**

To which testimonies Mr. Wills makes his exception, charging me with prevarication, in relating something's partially, others falsely, and for the most part contrary to the intention of the writers; and to that degree, that exception only two: viz. *Boemus* and *Strabe*, that I have perverted the sayings of all the authors throughout the Centuries.

But how he makes this charge appear, is now to be the question. And therefore in order to the due examination thereof, we shall join issue with him, and put it to the trial, how an in what particulars he will make good, either the prevarication's, or falsehoods, suggested by him.

**First, as to the Prevarication's:**

The Prevarication's he mentions, must appear either in the authorities produced before, or since Infants Baptism was enjoined.

First, as to those produced by me, before Infants Baptism was imposed: viz. from the four first Centuries. It is manifest, that as to all the Testimonies I bring in the three first centuries, so positively affirming, that profession of Faith was to proceed Baptism: He gives no material Exception, only saith this of *Tertullian*, page 6 second part. That the Magdeburg; tell us indeed, that *Tertullian* in this age, opposed himself to some that asserted Infants Baptism, affirming that the Adults were the only proper subjects, but how weakly he doth it, may be seen afterwards, when we come to examine the witness, of which *Tertullian* is the van.

**None in the first 3 Centuries:**

So that I hope, it will be acknowledged, that here is no Prevarication, or perverting evidence, in these my first Testimonies in the three first Centuries and where you will find there is more than seven times

two. *Boemus* and *Strabe* being none of their number, so that if we should go no further, my first proposition stands firm, that believers Baptism was the only Baptism for near 300 years.)

But to proceed, I perceive his great cry against me, is for the authorities I produce out of the fourth Century, but how justly, will speedily appear.

### **That Adult Baptism only practiced in the 4<sup>th</sup> Century appears:**

I do indeed say, that it is manifest to me, from the Evidence the Magdeburg's give us herein: That it was the approved and universal practice of this age, as well in the Eastern, and Western churches, to Baptize upon profession of Faith.

#### **1. From the sayings of the Fathers:**

And which is made good by threefold evidence. First, from the sayings of the Fathers, and greatest men of this Century, both in Africa, Asia and Europe.

#### **2. Decrees of Councils:**

Secondly, from the positive Decrees of three eminent Councils in this Age.

#### **3. From the Children of Christians not baptized till aged.**

Thirdly, from the pregnant instances of ten of the most eminent men, that were not Baptized till aged, though the Children of Christian parents, in this Century.

### **AFRICA**

#### **1. Athanasius: 2. Arnobius: 3. Optatus Milev:**

First, that it doth not appear, that any other than Adult Baptism was practiced in the churches in Africa, is manifested by the saying of Athanasius, and Arnobius, two of the most eminent in those parts, in this age: Who do positively affirm, as appears by their saying, at large page 55 and 56. *That Teaching, Faith, and Desire should, according to Christ's commission, perceive Baptism.* And to which we may add, what we have from Optatus Milevitanus and other persons of great name in this church, in this age; who tell us in his 4<sup>th</sup> book, as say the Magdeburg's, Century 4 page 237. *That none ancient, but that every man by nature, though born of Christian Parents, is unclean, and that without the spirit he is not cleansed, and that there is a necessity of the Spirit cleansing before Baptism: so that the house must be trimmed and fitted for the Lord (viz as he saith, the soul of the believer is) that God may enter and dwell in it: according to the saying of the Apostle: you are the Temple of God. And he dwells in you.*

### **ASIA**

Secondly, that it was the Faith, and practice of the churches in Asia, appears by the like sayings, of Basil Greg Nazienzen, Ephrim, Syrus, Epiphanius, &c. as at large you have them page 55-57.

### **EUROPE**

Thirdly, that it was the universal practice in the Western, or European Churches, appears also from what is witnessed hereto, by Hilary, Ambrose, Jerome, and Marius Victorinus, in the for said pages. And therefore do the Magdeburg's upon Hilary's testimony, say, that the Western Churches did so observe it. And from Jerome's testimony, do also tell us, that it doth appear till his time that the *Western Churches* did so continue, to Baptize the Adult upon Profession. (The reader being desired, in both those testimonies page 55 & 56 to put Western for Eastern.)

#### **Three Councils:**

Secondly, the truth of this further, appears from those Decrees of the Three councils: viz. The Carthaginian Council in Africa; and the Laedicean, and Neocesarean Councils, in Asia; so positively decreeing: *that teaching, confession, Faith, and free Choice ought to precede Baptism*, which you have in page 89.

#### **Children of Christians not baptized:**

Thirdly, a third argument, that Adult Baptism was the only approved Baptism of this age, I demonstrated from those ten remarkable stances, of the most eminent men in this Century: that were not baptized,

though the children of Christian parents, till they were able to make profession of their Faith, viz. *Constantin, Basil, Greg Nazienzen, Ambrose, Chrysestom, Jerome, Augustin, Nectarius, Valentinian, and Theodosius.*

**Four of the 10 excepted against:**

To the first ten testimonies of the sayings of the Fathers, Mr. Wills except only against four, viz. *Athanasius, Basil, Ambrose, and Nazienzen*, because he saith, they are all of them express for Infants Baptism; and which are therefore perverted by me, because I bring them for Believers Baptism only, who were for *Infants Baptism* also.

To which I say, that if but four of the ten be excepted against, then we have six more stand good for us, besides the former (viz. 15 not excepted against) as perverted: But

**The four witnesses vindicated viz. Basil, Athanasius, Nazienzen & Ambrose**

Secondly, it cannot be denied, but these four are very full in their testimonies, for Adult baptism; only for Basil saith expressly. *Faith must needs proceed, and that none else were to be baptized, and what can be more full. Athanasius as express also as he, for teaching, and faith from Christ's commission before Baptism. And Nazienzen as positive as either, That they neither Baptize any of Old without profession, and that it was dangerous then so to do, and therefore advised, that Infants Baptism should be deferred, till they were capable to made some Confession. And Ambrose as full also, that the Baptized should not only make confession, but desire the same.* Therefore if any of them should contrary hereto say, Infants should be Baptized, it would not only contradict the acknowledged rule, the general confessed practice of the age, but themselves also in the aforesaid testimony born by them.

But thirdly, neither doth it appear upon a due search, for ought I can yet find, that these four did so contradict themselves, in asserting Infants Baptism, as affirmed: For

**Athanasius not for Infants Baptism:**

First, Athanasius is much injured in fathering those questions to Antiochus upon him, in the 114<sup>th</sup> and 124<sup>th</sup>. Whereof infant's baptism is asserted it being a forged, and spurious thing and none of his, as I shall make manifest presently by undeniable proof.

**Nor Basil:**

Secondly, neither will it appear, that Basil has any where asserted Infants Baptism, as I shall fully demonstrate in it's place also, and Mr. Wills his egregious mistake about it.

**Nor Ambrose:**

Thirdly, as for the testimony that he produceth, that Ambrose was for Infants Baptism, from that saying of his, lib. 2 de Ab. Cap. 11. Because every age is obnoxious to sin to sin, therefore every age first is fit for the sacrament, is no proof for the same; 1. Because Circumcision is there only meant. 2. If Baptized, then those of every age, that are fit for that sacrament, must be supposed as he before tells us) viz. those only that are capable to confess Faith and desire Baptism; otherwise (by this testimony as he would carry it) not only children, but all Men, and Women in the world, the bad as well as the good, the unbelievers as well as the believers, being all obnoxious to sin, are therefore esteemed the fit subjects of Baptism. But suppose Ambrose was positive for Infants Baptism, it is but the opinion of one Doctor, that contradicts himself too, and that against the judgment, and practice of the age.

Fourthly, as for the testimony he urges from Greg Nazienzen, which has the most in it, we shall duly examine; He tells us page 11 that Greg Nazienzen words are absolutely for Infants Baptism, in his 40<sup>th</sup> Oration, viz. *Hast thou a young child let it be early consecrated, yea form its infancy (as Mr. Wills renders the word) and therefore as in his 3<sup>rd</sup> Oration they baptize all ages, as he said.*

**Nazienzen not absolutely for Infants Baptism:**

To which I answer, that from his translating the word Infants, to conclude him absolutely for Infants Baptism, is to impose a fallacy upon his reader, when he knows the word signifies a state of childhood also, that is capable of understanding, as it is taken 2 Tim. 3:15. And tat from a child thou has known the Scripture; the word is --- --- --- ----- and therefore Nazienzen must be understood by his early consideration to mean not the cradle, but as he explains himself, so soon as they are capable to know mysteries except only in the case of danger of death, and which is to baptize not so much a child as a

dying person. And that he means not the Infants State is manifest, because in the same 40 Oration he hath these words (speaking of those who decease without Baptism:) viz. *Neither can they receive Baptism, either perhaps by reason of infancy or some altogether involuntary, chance by which it is that even they whom would obtain not the gift.* Whereby it is manifest, that in this time Infancy was one of the obstacles that hindered baptism, and whereby persons deceased without it. And therefore by that passage, in his third Oration, of all ages receiving Baptism, is to be understood, such only that are capable of instruction in the faith, and the Mysteries of that Ordinance, whether young men, old men, or Fathers having before declared, is so dangerous to come unprepared to it. Therefore Gregarious testimony, to much learned upon, to prove infants baptism in this Century, signifies nothing. And Doctor Barlow tells us that as Tertullian in the former age condemned it, as an unwarrantable, and irrational custom, so did Nazienzen (as he saith) dislike it too, and wold no have them brought to Baptism, till they were of some age, and able to answer for themselves, in his Oration.

But 'tis said, is it not manifest that in case of danger of death, he would have an infant Baptized it is true, but that was not *qna* Infant, but as a dying person; and which was through a superstitious conceit, that Baptism might save them, as some give the Eucharist, and Extreme unction, when they are just departing; In like manner there was also in this age an opinion, that some had to baptize children, to cure them of their beastly disease, Magdenburg's Century 4. C. 6. Page 423. As they were grown persons also in the next age to cure them, Aug. to 7. Col.89r. But what are either of these to that Ordinance of Baptism? *Tertullian* that as Doctor Barlow tells us, was so great an opposer of Infants Baptism, as irrational, and unwarrantable, yet had this fancy of baptizing dying child, to save it; which signifies just nothing to thing pleaded for, and that persons may as well, bring pretogenei for an authority, that pretended to Baptize the sick children of this age to cure their decease's as *Gregorie*, and *Tertullian* for baptizing dying children, to save their souls.

Secondly, as to the degrees of the three counsels, he saith this: *That if it must be by the number of Councils, they shall carry it, for if I name those, that must be supposed to be against Infants Baptism, he thinks he should not exceed, if he said, he could name ten times three for it. Besides he conceives, that those three councils, mentioned by me, had respect only to pagans, in those their decrees, from what Mr. Marshall had said in answer to that of Neocasarin.*

#### **Exception's against the councils very frivolous:**

To his first answer, I say, It is granted I think (as I have made it ready to his hand;) he may quote the Canons of thirty Councils, for Infants Baptism, in the following ages (and a stout argument, no doubt for it.) But what are such decrees to this fourth Century, wherein I produce three for believers Baptism, upon profession and free choice, and he not one in this time (as indeed it is impossible he should) there being none found to ordain any such thing, till after this Century.

And as to his conception, that he Neocasarin Council means only pagans, and not the *Children of Christian women*, as he saith. *Mr. Marshal hath made appear, and therefore in his usual eivility tells me, how impudent it is in me to trouble us with this silly ridiculous story.*

He must therefore know, that he and Mr. Marshal, both do miss the case, the stress of the decree lies not about the patent, but for the exclusion of all children, whether of pagan, or Christian Parents; because confession, and free choice is required in that Sacrament. And therefore saith Grotius from the Glossers, *That an Infant cannot be baptized, because it hath no power to confess, or choose the Divine Baptism. And which speaks reason, saith Doctor Tayler, and intimates a practice which was absolutely universal in the Church, of interrogating the Catechumens, concerning the articles of their creed, which is one argument saith he, that either they did not admit Infants to Baptism, or that they did prevaricate egregiously, in asking questions of them, who themselves knew were incapable of giving answers.*

So that we have as little prevaricated in our councils, as in our Fathers.

#### **Excepts against 4 of the 10 not Baptized in their Infancy:**

Thirdly, the next exception he makes, is against the instances of those eminent men not baptized till aged, and of the ten before mentioned, he gives in exceptions only against four, viz. Constantin, Nazienzen, Chrysectome, and Ausitn.

By which we have gained, six other unperverted authorities more; and surely it is of much weight, that if six such eminent persons, the Children of Christian parents were not Baptized, till they could make a confession of their Faith; it is a substantial argument, and believers Baptism was the Baptism generally owned in this age, and that infants baptism was not yet received as an Apostolic Tradition, and ordinance

of Christ, whilst so many renowned worthies of this Age, the parents of these great men, should neglect to baptize them in their Infancy, for the argument lies there, and not as Mr. Will's so weakly reasons, from some misapprehensions in the practice themselves, as in page 17.

#### **Constantine the Son of Christian parents as, Magdeburg:**

But as to the exceptions themselves: First, as to Constantine, if he, and Mr. Marshal doubt whether Constantine had godly parents at this birth: As good Historians, as they do not. As Grotius and daily witnessing. To Helana's Christianity before his birth, as page 60 and 62. And the Magdeburg's to that of his Father, Century 4 page 61. Out of Eusebius in these words, *Constantinus Constantis Imperatoru, Filis, Bonus a hone, pins a pie. Constantine the son of Constantine, a good man from a good and holy man from a holy one.*

#### **Nazienzen, the son of Christian parents as, Magdeburg:**

As to that of Nazienzen, I wonder Mr. Wills should cavil about him, seeing he knows the Magdeburg. In the account they give of his life, tell us from such undeniable *Authority*: That *his Father Gregarious was a pious Bishop, and his mother Nonna a gracious holy woman before his Birth, and that she by prayer obtained this her son of God, and how from his youth he did patrizare and matristatim a puero Pateruis Moribus Imbutusest*, Magdeburg Century 4, page 914 &c. Besides in confirmation thereof, Doctor Hall (as Mr. Tombes tell us) in his Honor to his married Clergy, 2<sup>nd</sup>, book 8<sup>th</sup> Section saith: *That Nazienzen was begotten of his Father being a Bishop, and t prove it, brings his Fathers words, speaking to him to persuade him to help him in his charge*, which he translates out of the Greek: viz. **THE PEARS OF THY AGE, ARE NOT TO MANY AS OF MY PRIESTHOOD**, confirming what was said above out of the Magdeburgs.

#### **Chrysostome Christian parents, as Grotius**

As for *Chrysostome* he Saith: Mr. Marshal saith, it is uncertain, whether Father and Mother were Christians at his birth, but as for that we will let it rest upon Gretius's testimony, as you have it page 61 whom none can think a partial author in this case, being s firmly for Infant's Baptism and without dispute so well read in antiquity.

#### **Austin Christian parents, As Dr. Taylar:**

And as for Austin I will recommend you to two instances, to make it good, and clear Mr. Will's doubts: The one is Doctor Taylar, not in his Liberty of Prophecy (which is excepted against by Mr. Wills, but how warrantable we shall here after examine) but in one of his last pieces, viz. in his dissuasive against Popery, printed 1667. *Where you have him in Section 13 page 117 thus expressing himself: viz. That there is no pretence of tradition, that the Church in all ages did baptize all the Infants of Christian Parents: it is more certain that they did not do it, than that they did: in the first age St. Ambrose, St Jerome, and St. Austin, were born of Christian Parents, and yet not baptized until the full age of a man: and more that the Apostles did baptize any children, is not at all reported by any credible tradition.*

#### **Mr. Baxter**

The other is Mr. Baxter, and evidence that in this case is not to be rejected, who is pleased to tell us in a very late piece, viz. his principles of Love,

*That he know that in the days of Tertullian, Nazienzen, and Austin, men had liberty to be baptized or to bring their children, when and at what age they pleased, and that none were forced to go against their consciences therein. And that he knew not that our Rule or Religion is changed, or that we are grown any wiser or better than they are are. And again Christian Directory page -27. Thus:*

*That ancient Christians had Liberty to let their Children Parents were baptized at age.*

#### **Dr. Barlow;**

And upon the whole, we may add what *doctor Barlow* saith to this purpose, page 64. I am sure *that in the Primitive times they were catechumen, then illuminati or Baptizati; and that not only pagans, and Children of pagans converted, but children of Christian parents also.*

Thus we have gone through our first four Centuries, and the proofs urged to this point of History from them; and therein I hope the reader will fully acquit me, from that charge of Prevarication, in perverting the authorities brought by me to witness, that in these times *Confession; and Profession of Faith*, was held necessary to *precede Baptism*.

**That only the Adult Baptized in the first ages confirmed by Divers:**

And that I am not mistaken, nor alone in my apprehension herein, I shall repeat a few, both of the ancient and modern writers, that have so fully confirmed the truth hereof, *affirming with much positiveness, that [only] the adult, upon confession of Faith, were the subjects of Baptism in these first times.*

**Scrabo**

*Walafrid Scrabo in Rebus Eccles. Page 26 That in the first times the grace of Baptism was want to be given, to them only, who were come to that integrity of mind and body, that they could know and understand, what profit was to begotten by Baptism, what was to be confessed, and believed, and lastly, what was to be observed by them that are new born in Christ.*

**Rhenanus**

*Beatus Rhenanus in Anotat. Sup. Tertullian saith, That the old custom was that those that were come in their full growth were baptized with the bath of regeneration which custom he said continued for some of the first ages.*

**Rupertus**

Rupertus in his 4<sup>th</sup> book of Divine Offices cap. 18 saith: *That in former times the custom of the primitive Churches was, that they administered not the Sacrament of Regeneration, but Only, in the Catechumens, who were instructed in the rules of Faith, rehearsing the same.*

**Becmus.**

*JO Becmus Lib. 2. De Gent. Mor. It was in times past saith he, the custom to administer Baptism only, to those that were instructed in the faith. &c.*

**Dr. Hamond**

Doctor Hamond in his Cat. Lib. I. C. 3. Page 23 saith, *that all men were instructed in the fundamentals of Faith anciently, before they were permitted to be baptized.*

**Mr. Baxter**

Mr. Baxter in his Saints Rest. Part. I Cap. 8. Section 5, saith: *That Tertullian, Origen, and Cyprian, who lived in the 2<sup>nd</sup> and 3<sup>rd</sup> Centuries, do all of them affirm, that in the primitive times None were Baptized, without an express covenanting, wherein they renounced the world, Flesh, and Devil, and engaged themselves, and promised to obey him.*

**The Testimonies for Adult Baptism after Infants Baptism was enjoined**

In the next place, for further confirmation of this truth, I gave you in some testimony that was born thereto, after infants baptism was established, in the Fifth Century, and that not only from those that denied Infants Baptism, but from those that owned and practiced it, Papists and others, through the rest of the Centuries.

**1. From Particular Persons, that denied Infant's Baptism:**

Of the first I produced several eminent men, as particular witness, some of which I shall mention, Viz.

**Crescon:**

Cresconius page 230, *who said that there was no true baptism, but such as was administered after Faith.*

**Faustus Regienses:**

Faustus Regienses page 230:I. That personal and actual desire was requisite, in every one that was to be baptized.

**Albanus:**

Albanus, *Who was put to death for his witness hereto, page 230.*

**The Swermers:**

*These eminent people called Swermers, in the sixth Century: that from Christ example of Baptism reprov'd, the evil custom of Infants Baptism page 231.*

**Bishop of Apamen:**

*The Bishop of Apamen, and Zoroaras, who did defend the Baptism of believers to be the only Baptism, page 231.*

**Adrianus:**

*Adrianus Bishop of Corinth in the 7<sup>th</sup> Century, who did stoutly defend Believers Baptism, not permitting an Infant to be baptized in his Diocese, Page 231.*

**Hincmarus:**

*Hincmarus, Bishop of Oandum, refusing Infants Baptism, only Believers, page 233.*

**Egyptian Divines:**

*The Egyptian Divines, in the seventh Century, taught Faith before Baptism, in opposition to the Romish Baptism page 232.*

**Carolus:**

*Carolus, Bishop of Maylane, taught that only such as were instructed and confessed Faith and manifested a holy life, were to be baptized.*

**Jacob de Roor:**

*Jacob de Roor, owned only, that Baptism that Christ commanded after teaching and believing, and which the Apostles did also practice, and which, saith he, must needs be after believing, because it is for the burying of sin, the bath of regeneration, the covenant of a Christian life, and the putting on the body of Christ, and planting into the true Olive tree Jesus Christ, and for the right entrance into the Spiritual Ark &c.*

Besides many others I forbear to mention, but refer you to the Book itself; and which I suppose are all full proper, and pertinent witnesses in the case, and against none of which he makes any exception, and which I hope you will add to all the rest, besides the two he will please to allow me.

**2. The Churches that denied Infants Baptism, witnessing for believers only:**

I do also bring into this evidence, besides many particular persons, and account of several Churches, that have in their principles, and practices, confirmed this of Believers Baptism after profession of faith, and which are as followeth:

**Donatists:**

*The Donatists that taught that none should be baptized, but those that believed, and desired the same, Page 222.*

**Waldenses:**

*The Waldenses that taught, that by Baptism the Believers were received to the holy congregation, there protesting, and declaring openly their Faith and amendment of life, page 239.*

**Germans:**

*The churches of Christ in Germany owned, and contended for this Faith, and practice; and many sealed the same with their blood, page 157*

**Helvetians:**

*The Churches in Helvetia asserted the same, and many suffered bonds, and Martyrdom from Protestant Brethren, for the profession thereof, page 260.*

**Thessalonians:**

*The churches in Thessalonica of the same Faith and practice page 76*

**Flanders:**

*The churches of Christ in Flanders asserting the same, and multitude of Martyrs that witnessed thereto by blood, page 267 &c.*

**Bohemia:**

*The Churches in Bohemia witnessing to this truth, and their great sufferings for the same, page 271.*

**Hungarians:**

*The Churches in Hungaria of the same practice page 274.*

**Poland:**

*The Churches in Poland of like Faith, and practice page 274.*

**Transylvania:**

*The Churches in Transylvania of the same practice, page 274.*

**English:**

*The Churches in this nation owning the same principle, and practice; viz.*

*First, in the time of the ancient Britains, page 226*

*Secondly, Under the name of Lollards from the Waldensian Barge of that name, page 278, page 203 and 204*

*Thirdly, under the name Wickliffians, who asserted also that Believers were the only Subjects of Baptism, page 283.*

*And Lastly, since Henry the Eighth's time under the name of Anabaptists, page 306.*

Against which latter testimony, from these respective Churches in these several Regions, he only excepts against the *Donatists, Waldenses, and ancient Britains*. Denying that they were of this faith and practice, which you have particularly replied to in the third Chapter, where the witnesses against Infants Baptism are defended.

But in the mean time it must be remembered, that the rest stand good as not excepted against.

**3. The witness born to Baptism after Faith, by those that owned Infants Baptism:**

Secondly, you have the Testimony, born to this truth by many Eminent Men, and Churches, that have owned, and practiced Infants Baptism, since the imposing thereof; some of whom are these that follow, as you find them in the respective Centuries; viz. *Chrysostom, Austin, Gretory, Cassiodorus, Haimo, Rabanus, Ansolm, Algerus, Rupertus, Lumbard, Albertus, Belarmine, Grotius, Lughier, Calvin, Hamond, Daissy, Tayler, Baxter, Church of England*. All or most of them, affirming with the church of England, that Faith and Repentance is required in all those that are to be Baptized, viz. Repentance whereby they forsake sin, and faith whereby they steadfastly believe the promises.

**Mr. Wills exception against this pare for the Testimony**

To all which Testimony Mr. Wills especially quarrels me, for perverting, as he saith, their sayings, against there intended senses, by improving what they say for adult Baptism (wherein they meant only strangers, and pagans converted to the faith) against infants Baptism, which is in an other way, and upon another account, and for being so notoriously contradictions to my self, in saying they are for Believers baptism in one part of the History, and yet the same Men, and councils, for Infants Baptism in an other..

Replied to:

To which I say, that by quoting their sayings, that are so expressly for us, though it may be not intended so, I have done no injury.

1.

### NOT QUOTED FOR ANABAPTIST

First, because I do not quote them as Anabaptists, or to prove believers Baptism was the only Baptism of those Centuries (that would have been madness, and contradiction with a witness, and which he seems to father upon me.

#### **But, Arguments ad hominem**

Secondly, because nothing is more fair or frequent than to improve men's own sayings against themselves, for their better conviction and clearing the truth; as Mr. Tombes has brought Mr. Baxter's 20 arguments against himself, and therefore called his book *Feloice Sa: and more injury done thereby*, than Mr. Tombes saith, was done by Bishop Morton, in alleging the *Xomanists words their writings, as an advocate for the Protestants against themselves, but right out thereby, as he saith to the Church of God*. So that what they say respecting the commission, for the necessity of teaching, profession, and confession, and so as their words necessarily exclude any other but such enable subjects, what injury to improve it for the truth and (and to which I have spoken, much to prevent Cavils of his kind, as you will find it page 85-86 and in the preface).

#### **Austin offers Adult Baptism in words as to exclude Infants.**

For instance, *If Austin tells us in one place that it is without due examination, both to doctrine and conversation, ought to be Baptized, and that no ignorant or ---- person, without due instruction, and fruits of repentance, are to be admitted to Baptism, what can be spoken more agreeable to truth and more indeed to assert believers Baptism; to be the only Baptism, and to exclude any other that are not capable to act faith, or testify fruits, for if no other, as he saith, then not Infants.*

#### **How weakly and contractiously Austin asserts Infant Baptism**

Yet the same Austin in contradiction hereto saith, *Let Infants be baptized by the Faith of another, to take away original sin, without which they can neither be regenerated nor saved*. Now, compare these two together, what sound Christian will not say, that Austin before spoke the mind of Christ, in wholesome sound word? And herein his own words, if not corrupt and heretical; *For as one will observe that such Doctrine as this, was the greatest parson, that ever the Father of lies poured into the hearts of sinners, to make people think, that sprinkling a little water on the face could regenerate, take away sin, and save the Soul, and beget grace ex opera operata by the worked done.*

#### **Calvin for Believers Baptism by Rule:**

*Calvin in one place tells us, the due and right order of Baptism from the Commission, saying thus viz. That men may rightly offer themselves, to Baptism confession of sins is required. Otherwise the whole action would be nothing else but sport.*

#### **Calvin for Infants Baptism contradiction hereto without Rule:**

Yet in another place in contradiction hereto saith: *Let the children of Believers be baptized, because God having taken their parents into covenant that themselves are also to be embraced in the same covenant; neither is Baptism hereby separated from Faith and teaching, because though Children have not yet Faith, nor are capable of teaching, yet their parents have both.*

But by what Rule or Reason this latter is urged and how possibly to be reconciled with the former, so agreeable to both, is the knot to be untied.

#### **Mr. Baxter for believers Baptism, by Precept and Example.**

So also Mr. Baxter upon Christ Commission, *Matt. 28:20: This saith he, Showeth the Disciples their several works in their several orders, viz. First, to make Disciples, which mark calls Believers? Secondly, is to Baptize them, whereto is annexed the promise of Salvation. Thirdly, to teach them all other things which are after to be learned in the School of Christ: And that to contemn this order is to contemn all rules of order; professing his doctrine is fully satisfied from this text, that it is one sort of Faith even saving, that must go before Baptism, the profession whereof the Minister must expect, as page 3. And Again, if there can be no example given in Scripture, of any one that was baptized without the Profession of saving faith, not any Precept for so doing, then we must not baptize any without it. But the Antecedent is true, saith he, from the practice of all baptized in Scripture, which he particularly enumerates, and then saith, so is the consequence.*

What can be said more consonant to truth more agreeable to the Scripture, and what more in justification to the Baptism of Believers, and to the excluding all others incapable of profession.

**Mr. Baxter for Infants Baptism without Precept or Example:**

And yet the same Mr. Baxter tells us, that an Infant is to be baptized: but by what Rule? Why, saith he, upon the account of his parents Faith? But where is that to be found in the *Precept*. Is it baptize the believing parent and his Child? Is that found in the order of the Commission, or is a Child to be found in all the pregnant Examples, in the New Testament, that he hath given us?

When Mr. Baxter or any one in his behalf, can reconcile Mr. Baxter to Mr. Baxter, Austin to Austin, Calvin to Calvin, I shall own my mistake herein, till then must believe, that it is good service, to improve their contradictions to themselves, and for the service of that truth, that they so vigorously oppose.

**Reply, No injury done them from their own expositions of their sayings:**

But thirdly, there is not injury done to them in the fence, that most of the Doctors, both Papists and Protestants, have given us themselves; respecting those expressions, about the necessity of repentance and faith, before Baptism and how they reconcile them to Infants Baptism and which we have so fully done to our hand, in the English Liturgy, that will put it out of doubt. You know it is there expressly told us, that Faith and Repentance is required, in all that are to be baptized. [Good sound Doctrine.] But then the question, you know, is put: How do Infants, who by reason of their tender age cannot perform them? Viz. can neither Repent nor Believe, [sound Doctrine still.] To which they answer, yes, they do perform them by their sureties; so that we are to understand, that though Infants cannot repent nor believe, which yet is so necessarily required in every one that is to be baptized, yet that others may undertake for them, answer the commission for them, Repent, Believe, Confess for them, and declare a willingness in their name to be baptized; and this is actually done by the *sureties*, as our English liturgy directs (and every days experience tells us in the christening of Children) which interprets to us, the ancient way of interrogating Sponsors, and which is performed after this manner: viz.

**How by Sureties Infants do confess and profess Faith and Repentance, and so capable of Baptism.**

The *Priest* saith to the surety, *Doest thou forsake the Devil, and all his works, &c.* Then the surety must answer, *I forsake them all*, *Priest*, Then, *Doest then believe in God the Father*, rehearsing the Creed? Surety, To which he is to answer, *all this I steadfastly believe*. *Priest*, then, *will thou be baptized into this Faith?* Yes, saith the Surety in the name of the child, *that is my desire*. This was the custom of old, and with Infants Baptism established, (though *it is true they had Sureties, or Witnesses, for grown persons before Infants Baptism was enjoined.*) Yet now because the commission required Faith Repentance, therefore was this invention found out to answer it? And therefore saith Lud. Vives in his commentary 1. I C. 37, *That none were baptized old, but those of age, who did not only understand what the water meant, but desired the same.*

**Lud. Vives why sureties invented for Infants:**

*The perfect image whereof, saith he, we have yet in our Infants Baptism, for it is asked of the Infant, will thou be baptized? For whom the Sureties answer: I will; and so saith Strabo page 60, and Jo Beoemus page 71.*

Madgeburg Century 5, page 516, *Infants aliena Fice Baptizars; Infants are to be baptized by the Faith of another.*

Therefore called *Pidejussors*, or *Sureties*: that plight Faith for them; and *sponsors*, that answer for them; *Sucentor*, that undertake Promise, Vow and Renounce for them.

So that this appears, to be the *untying the knot*, the reconciling, or the seeming difficulty, of the necessity of *confession*, *consent*, and *desire* with *Infants Baptism*. So making the Commission but one general Rule, to baptize both Adult and Infants, the adult by his own mouth and faith, the infant by the mouth and faith of another. Therefore all these sayings of these latter *Doctors*, and learned *men*, speaking to the nature of Baptism where *confession* and *profession* is required, is to be understood, not as Mr. Wills would have it, to intend only Adult Persons, pagans, and Heathens, but to intend Infants also; otherwise would be to make two Baptism, and necessitate two commissions: one of the Adult, and the other for Infants. But in as much, as none is to be found for the latter, they include and involve all in the former. Therefore by my producing, these proofs from all the Peadobaptist, as the true sence of the Commission, and a general Rule to baptize upon, it will be manifest, that I do not bring them contrary to the *mins* of the

Writers, being urged to confirm and establish Believers Baptism, according to Christ's Commission. The Lutherans are positive, that Children have actual Faith, and in Baptism hear the Word, use reason, &c. And all the rest, that others Repent, Believe, Profess, Confess, Desire for the, viz. either the Surety or the Parent.

**1<sup>st</sup> OBJECTION:**

But 'tis said, you carry it further, and improve their general Rule for Believers Baptism, against Infants Baptism, contrary to their intentions, because they intend infants not otherwise to be baptized, but as professed Believers in this way.

**ANSWER:**

To which I say, that truly serves the intention, wherefore it is brought under this hear, where we do not so immediately concern ourselves against Infants, which is an other part, but for Believers only; though I grant consequentially it doth so, for if a personal professing of Faith, he only intended in the Commission, and that no such thing as a surety is to be found in that Text, or any other, to profess or confess, form other, so as to warrant, the party confessed for, to be a proper subject to baptism.

Then it will follow, that all those sayings, make only for believers in their own persons, to the excluding all that are incapable of Personal confession and profession: When any such thing as a surety in Baptism, to believe, repent and confess for an other is made out from Scripture, they may have Reason to complain, but till then, n injury is done, so to clear the truth, from their own grants and sayings. But that there is no such thing in the Scripture, take the acknowledgement of some of their own party.

**Magdeburg against sureties**

The Magdeburg's Century 1 page 497, *Do tell us, that God-Fathers, or Fidejussors for Infants, or others, they find nothing of in the Scriptures; that is the second of the Acts they offered themselves to Baptism. And that it would be very ridiculous to think the Apostles would baptize none without Sureties.*

**Dr. Tayler against Sureties, and His reasons:**

And Doctor Tayler page 84, *I know, saith he, God might if he would have appointed God-Fathers, to give answer in the behalf of Children, and to be Fidejussors for them, but we cannot find any Authority or Ground, that he hath; and if he had, that it is to be supposed he would have given them commission, to have transacted the solemnity with better circumstances, and have given answers with more truths; for the Question is asked of Believing in the present, and if the God-Father answer, in the name of the Child, I do believe, it is notorious, they speak false and ridiculous, for the Infant is not capable of believing, and if it were, he were also capable of dissenting, and how then do they know his mind? And therefore, saith he, Tertullian and Gregory Nazienzen gave advice, that the Baptism of Infants shall be deferred, till they could give an account of their own Faith. If you would be further satisfied about these Sureties or Gossips, why and for what use, viz. for Bells and Churches, and grown persons as Infants, read page 84, 100, 128, 129 and 141.*

**2<sup>nd</sup> OBJECTION:**

But if you will not admit of GodFathers, what do you say to Fathers? Why may not they repent, and Believe for the Child, and so answer the Commission, especially being a believing parent, and in covenant, according to what Mr. Wills repeats from Mr. Calvin? Page?

**ANSWER:**

To which I say, that if you betake to that, you quit all your Ancient Authorities, that depend upon Sureties, where the Parent is expressly forbidden that rite, none being permitted to undertake for his Child, neither Father nor Mother, as *Vicacomes* tells us at large, from the Decrees of the Councils, chapter 33 page 92. Mr. Baxter owns it against the Canon Law also. Neither will you find one syllable in all the New Testament, to relieve you; and therefore must either find out a New Commission, for Baptizing persons without personal repentance, and Faith, or renounce the practice of sprinkling Infants that are so incapable to do any thing thereof. And which case you have very fully and honestly put by Mr. Baxter, in his Christian Directory page 817. And how well resolved you have it remarked, page 217 and worthy of your perusal, upon this point especially; it being brought herein, into such a narrow compass, for if no Scripture ground to baptize an Infant, by a Gossip or Parents Faith and Confession, then Infants Baptism

is certainly a nullity, and out of doors by their own grants. And therefore till Mr. Baxter, or some body else, give us a better solution in that case of Consequent, we may say in his own words: That for persons to be baptized without a professed contract is a Baptism not of Christ' appointment, and that being done without Repentance and Faith, is a profanation saith Mr. Baxter, and ridiculous saith Calvin.

Now, therefore upon the whole, let the Reader judge, whether my several proofs are not full, proper, and pertinent? And whether Mr. Wills upon the closing of his seventh Chapter, respecting my proofs upon the Centuries, hath spoken like a Judicious, sober, considerate person; in saying:

That besides Jo, Boemus and Strabo, *he may truly say, that from the beginning of the Century to the end, this UNFAITHFUL MAN hath perverted the sayings of all Authors, which he hath quoted and upon consideration of his carriage herein, I am confident of those two things:*

*First, that never any writer did more prevaricate, and show more falsehood than he had done.*

*Secondly, that he would certainly have forborne, if he had thought, any man would have been at the trouble, to examine and search whether he saith truth or no.*

### **My appeal upon the proofs and the Prevarication charged:**

I say, *it is referred to judgement*, whether any sober man can judge, Mr. Wills has read the Book he so contemns, vehemently asperses, and inveighs against, or *secondly*, if he hath, whether he did consider what was either written by the Author or by himself in answer? And *thirdly*, If so, whether he ought not to be esteemed a person extremely void of Reason or Conscience, and that prejudice did more prevail with him than impartial judgment?

### **SECONDLY, CONCERNING THE FALSEHOOD HE CHARGES ME WITH:**

#### **The Falsehoods:**

But in the next place, if it were supposed, the Authorities aforesaid are full and proper and that I am acquit of the PREFABRICATION? Yet what do I say to so many falsehoods charged upon me, *in the egregious abuse put upon so many Authors, in leaving out, and curtailing some of their sayings, and adding to others; pretending they say, that which they do not, and so making Authorities of my own, the chapter and page being so punctually given in against me.*

#### **ANSWER Firstly:**

To which I say, First, it seems to carry much weight in it, and the rather, because it proceeds from one that professes himself, a solid great person, a Minister of the Gospel, and Master of arts, and a learned man; and one that besides hath spent so much time lately as he tells us, in the University Library at Oxford, to trace these quotations and detect their errors, and delivered them with so much certainty, that nothing (as in that confident boast he expresseth it) but an index wxpurgaturius can relieve me, and which is not to be had in England.

#### **ANSWER Secondly:**

And Secondly, I must needs grant, that if I requite not my self herein, I may very well be esteemed, the unworthy person that he would indeed render me to be, that is guilty of so much Prevarication, Forgery, and Falsehood.

#### **ANSWER Thirdly:**

But then Thirdly, I hope it will be granted on the other hand, that if all these prove forgeries of his own, and no truth in any one of them, that then such a Stratagem bespeaks no less Malignity to my person, then to the truth witnessed by me, and that he hath justly contracted to himself, the Odium, and infamy he would reflect upon me, according to the equal decision, given us in the case, Deut 19:16-21; Prov. 19:15

Therefore to the Examination of the charge, I freely join issue with him, in order to the speedy Trial, at whose door the Falsehoods lie; for one of us (it must be agreed on all hands) is notoriously guilty, and so we shall proceed to the particulars, as we find them in order.

#### **First Falsehood Charged.**

The first whereof he thus begins with, in his Preface, &c. *He hath much injured the famous History of the Magdeburgenes, in very many places, by misrepresenting what they say: As that they tell us, that in the first Century THE APOSTLES BAPTIZED ONLY THE AGED, which (saith he) is false, for he himself added the word ONLY, as it shows (he saith) chapter 7 and part 1 page 2.*

### **Second Falsehood charged**

*Where he again repeats it, saying, that the Magdeburg's in Century 1 l. 3 c.6 page 496. Do not say that the APOSTLES BAPTIZED ONLY THE ADULT. And again in his page 38 mentioning my Repetition of that aforesaid saying, of the Magdeburg's give the following more.*

*Very good sir, Now you have learned to set down things right, but why did you say in the 36 (or the first Impressions) that the Magdeburg as to the subjects of Baptism tell us [THAT IN THIS AGE THEY ONLY BAPTIZED THE ADULT] was this, saith he, Lapsus Calami Ant Mentis: The slip of the tongue, or the mind.*

### **ANSWER #1**

To which I say, that it is most manifest, that this injurious man doth charge a Falsehood, of his own making, upon me there several times; for he can find no such words in my book. My words are expressly thus: *As to the subjects of Baptism they, viz. the Magdeburg's tell us: that in this age [they find] they baptized only the Adult, or Aged, &c.* I do not say, that they tell us, that in this age they [baptized only the Adult] these are his words. But that they tell us, they find they baptized only the Adult, for so they tell us, they find examples for the one, not for the other. And if I have not guessed right, let any sober man in his senses judge, they tell us in these words: *Rast Aatos Esse Danltos, Tun Jacobs, Tun Geates Exampla Probunt, Acts 2:8, 10, 16, 19. De Infantibus Baptisutis Quiaemans Tata Non Legnutur: That examples testify (from the aforesaid Scriptures) that the adult, both Jews, and Gentiles were baptized. But of the baptizing of Infants, they read not of one Example upon Record. So that if they find many examples for the one, and none for the other, will it may be said, they, find examples, only for the one, viz. for the adults.*

### **ANSWER #2**

For they are not my translation of the words (and therefore I add not the word [only] to them, as he falsely suggested) but my sence upon those their words, and no other than I presume every one will give. And wherein his shameful (Obstinacy, as he calls it, or) heedlessness is the more to be marked, for he himself in his first words of the seventh chapter first part doth repeat my words, as I expressed them; viz. *[that they find only the Adult or Aged, whether Jews or Gentiles, baptized in the Century]* And afterwards charges me three times over with the saying an other thing, *including* it with many aggravating *circumstances*, and as worthy of the greatest observation, puts it in the Van of the *Falsehoods*. And it was one of the first things that I met with, from a friend that was in his Book-Sellers shop, where some Ministers were heard to say, upon the reading thereof, that I wanted morality, in so dealing with Authors; Though truly if I had said the word I do not know where such a heinous crime had lain. So that this is plain to you, that first I neither said those words: Nor secondly, did I add the word only to the Author.

In the next place, in his preface he tells us of two other *Misrepresentations*: viz. *That I say, the Magdeburg's tell us, that the custom of dipping the whole body in water, was changed into sprinkling a little water in the face, in the first Century. Whereas there is not (as he saith) the least hint of the matter in this Century, no the following; but the contrary, for they tell us, as page 4 part 1 the word baptize signifies abluo, luo: viz. to wash; and that the Christian Baptism, was taken from the Jewish washings, of which the Apostle Speaks in Heb. 9:10, divers Baptisms. And so saith he, the Author fathers that upon the Century Writers, which they speak not.*

### **Third Falsehood Charged**

Wherein these two Falsehoods are charged upon me: First, in bringing the Magdeburg's, to assert the ceremony of Baptism to be by dipping, which they do not, but the contrary.

### **Fourth Falsehood Charged**

Secondly, In affirming that they say, the rite was changed in that Century, from dipping to Sprinkling, when there is not the least hint, either in this or the following Century, of any Such thing.

### **ANSWER #3**

To the First (that I am not mistaken, when I tell you) that they do assert the Rite of Baptizing to be by Dipping, let their own words determine (the substance whereof I before gave you) who having told us, viz. the Magdeburg's Century 1 Chapter 6 page 148. *That as is the place of Baptism, it was, as occasion was offered, in rivers and fountains, &c. And that the manner of it, was by dipping in these words: viz. Ministrum Baptismi in Aquam Baptizandos Immersisse, seu Lavasse, in nomine Patri, and Filii, and Spiritus Sancti, prebat Verbum Bantizu, quod immer Sionem in Aquam Significat, and quod Paulus immersiocm illam allgorice de mortificatione and resurrectione exponit, Rom. 6. And Col. 2 Et Phrases Ille Quibus Baptismus Lavacrum Dicitur, Eph. 5 and Titus 3 Etquod Ananias Jubet Paulum abluere peccatua, Acts 22 &c.*

*That the word Baptism, signifying an immersion (or dipping) in water, proves that the Minister of Baptism did dip, or immerge the Baptized, washing them in the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, and that Paul did expound this immersion by the allegorical death and resurrection, Rom. 6 and Col. 2. And therefore Baptism is called, the Lavar, or washing of regeneration, Eph. 5 and Titus 3. And that Ananias commanded Paul to wash away his sins.*

The truth hereof Master Wills could not but know, and no other than I did before in substance declare, and therefore for him to say, that they do not say this, but the contrary, is to me wonderful strange. Neither do they mention any thing of all those ten lines, of his, said to be in this place, as trough they took the word to signify washing, in opposition to dipping, and if in any other part of the Book they do say so, it will but discover a contradiction to themselves, but especially to the truth, that with so much evidence, they have here demonstrated, therefore what apparent injury this is let all men judge.

#### **ANSWER #4**

And as to the other, it is a Notorious as this; for I do not say, *that the Magdeburg's tell us, that the custom of dipping the whole body, was changed into sprinkling, &c. This Century as he fathers upon me.*

All that I say is this (and they are my own words, not theirs, after I had mentioned their understanding, of that rite and Ceremony, form the nature of the word, and usage thereof in Scripture) viz.

Which said custom of dipping the whole body in water, was changed into sprinkling a little water in the face; *And not as Mr. Wills perverts my words, that I say, [they tell us so] I neither expressed, not intended any such thing,* much less that they should tell us, of any such change that Century. Whereas as he says well, that there is not the least hint of the matter of sprinkling in this or the following Century. And which I do also afterwards take notice of, in thee words:

*That until the third Century we find not any that upon any consideration did admit of sprinkling. The first we meet with, is in Cyprians Epistle to Magnus, about Clyrical Baptism, which might sufficiently have satisfied Me. Wills, that I did neither express, or could intend the words as he carries them I did also in my record impression,* (which I presume he could not, but see waiting so many months for it coming forth, before he would put his, into the press as his printer and stationer both informed me) make some better distinction, by putting the foregoing words into a different character, least these latter words should be supposed not to be my own, and which might have been further light to him, if prejudice had not blinded the eye, discovering that his business was, that if he could not find a hole, he would make one. And that the ancients for these four first Centuries, used, and asserted Dipping. Mr. Wills that reads the Centuries cannot be stranger to, as testified by so many of the Fathers.

#### **Fifth Falsehood Charged**

An other falsehoods he would father upon me is that, I should say, page 113 *of the former which is I page 101 of the last, that they tell us: That the custom of dipping the whole body into water, was changed into sprinkling in the Third Century, and that cites the Magdeburg's century 3<sup>rd</sup> page 125-126 Where he saith, they say no such thing, but the contrary.*

#### **ANSWER #5**

Wherein he doth me manifest injury, for all *that I say* to that point, as you will find out, it this; viz. *Many were the corruption's about Baptism, that in this age were creeping in, some whereof, I mentioned, and amongst the rest, Altering the form from dipping to Sprinkling: But I do not quote page 125-126 for that, but for the superstitious Rites but did only thereby intend (as after I expressed it page 204.) that passage in Cyprians letter to Magnus, admitting sprinkling to a sick person; I do not therefore say, it was charged, but that it was amongst those corruption's that were creeping in and withal do in the same place say, That they do not find by and authentic testimony, that any one person was actually baptized in this*

*manner this age.* Page 204. *That we find not any, upon any consideration, that did admit of sprinkling till Cyprians letter, &c. Which afterwards was brought into use for sick children, and then for all Children.*

And yet this unfaithful man, notwithstanding all these my expressions to the contrary, is not ashamed to say, *That I say, the custom of dipping the whole man, was changed into sprinkling, in the third century, and that I quote for it* Century 3, page 125-126, when I neither do the one nor the other. And concerning this rite of dipping, you will hear more of me to this point, in a following Chapter; whereby you will understand, that notwithstanding this Notion of Cyprians, about sprinkling the sick. Yet that dipping was the universal custom, which was observed for the first four Centuries, and some ages after, as I shall manifest from approved Authors.

In the next place, he charges me with fathering several things upon the Magdeburg's, respecting the fourth Century, whereof one word is not to be found in them, as his page 10, part 1 and chapter 7.

### **Sixth Falsehood Charged**

As first, *that it was the universal practice of this act, to baptize the Adult, upon profession of Faith whereas they say the quite contrary, proving saith he, that in the Churches of Africa they baptized Infants in this age by Athanasius 114, and 124 Questions to Antiochus. And that they baptized Infants in the Churches of Asia, by Gregory Nazianzen's absolute determinations to Baptize Infants.*

### **ANSWER #6**

To which I reply, that I do not say, that the Magdeburg's do say in so many words, that it was the universal practice of this Age, to baptize the Adult upon profession of Faith, as he would insinuate: But as you will find my words to be, as page 55. *That from the several authorities they give us, out of the learned Fathers and Councils, they tell us so, viz. by the instances they do produce, and which I have before at large demonstrated, so that at least wise I judge, I have cause to think so.*

And as to the two instances he gives, to detect my forgery, they signify nothing: As to that of Gregory Nazianzen's, we have said enough already, to which we refer you, and which will substantially acquit me from this charge.

And secondly, as to that of Abranusius Puestions to Antiochus, proving that they baptized Infants in the Affrican Church, Particularly the 124<sup>th</sup> Question, which he mentions page 10 and chapter 7 1<sup>st</sup> part. I shall shew you presently it was a mere piece of forgery, and no truth at all in it, and which Mr. Will's could not well be ignorant of, though he would thus abuse the world with this story. But he should have done well, to have told you, what that 124<sup>th</sup> question was, that he so much brags of, which I perceive he was unwilling to do upon another score, least his instance might do him more hurt, than good, though the 114<sup>th</sup>, he mentions at large; The thing expressed therein, as the Magdeburgs tell us, is this: *Quod Infantim ait ter in age am immergemus, and ter educimus mus mortem, and tridnannm resurrectionem signifisauis* 4<sup>th</sup> Century Chapter 6 of page 419.

*That we dip the infant, saith he, three times in the water, and three times bring it out again, signifying the death, and three days Resurrection of Christ.* So that you see the reason, why he was ashamed of his instance, because he was afraid, with the proving his infants Baptism, he should have offered some thing for the rite of dipping, which is so loathsome to him, and so loose more, than he should get by the bargain.

It is true the inventor of this lie, must tell some thing that was true, as to the season he intends it, which was the trine immersion, that from Tretullian's time, till after this age, was so much used, as Jerome, Ambrose, Bazil, yea all of them with one mouth do declare; as the learned Vossius to this point showeth, *Thes. 6* Page 32-42, concluding after the recital of most of the Fathers, and ancients to prove it. *Har satis ostendunt ter immersisse Veseres, and Mystici quid in to constituisse.* Those (Authorities) enough show, that the ancients did use the threefold immersion, and the mystery designed, and contained therein. And which is not mentioned, that a three fold dipping is approved, or that there was any ground for it (but a perfect invention, wherein these fathers did so much abound) only that sprinkling was not the rite, and that dipping was owned to the custom in these first times, which Mr. Will's will not admit.

### **Seventh Falsehood charged**

Secondly, he charges me to pervert the saying of Athanasius, as when speaking for Adult Baptism, he might not be for Infants Baptism also. Whereas he meant by the former only Pagans, and Infidels who according to Christ's commission must first be taught, then baptized. *Ashanasius (saith he) was for Infants Baptism, and it was practiced in his days, as appears by the 114<sup>th</sup> question to Antiochus, where he*

*resolves a doubt that might arise from the death of Infants, whether they go to Heaven or not seeing, the Lord saith; suffer little Children to come to me, for of such is the Kingdom of Heaven? And the Apostle saith? Now your children are holy, it is manifest that the infants of believers, who are baptized, do as unspotted, and faithful enter into the Kingdom of Heaven.*

*Where, saith he, mark again how unworthy Antipadobaptists abuse the Father, in saying their strongest argument for children baptism is from Gradition, which they fly too, for want of Scripture. Implying here are two Scriptures for Infants Baptism, improved by this Father, one Matt 19:14 of such is the Kingdom of Heaven; and the other because the Infants of Believers are baptized, they are therefore holy, alluding to holiness of children, mentioned by the Apostle 1 Cor. 7:14 as though that was obtained by baptism, and which was the opinion of some of the Ancients also.*

#### **ANSWER #7**

To which I say and am not this excellently remarked from this famous instance? And Anabaptist unworthiness too? In taking no more regard, how well they proved Infants Baptism of old from the Scripture.

But now this Book of Questions fathered upon Athanasius, proving such, another Fable, as that goodly piece that was fathered upon Dionysus. It will only serve further, to discover what inventions, the Father of Lies had (by the working of the Mystery of Iniquity) not only to beget and usher in, but to nourish and strengthen this Illegitimate Birth, but the artifice, also he had to time the several forgeries; viz. Dionysius for the first; the Popes Decretals, and Justin Martyrs response, for the second; Origen's Stories, for the third; these questions of Athanasius, for the fourth age. And how ready and willing persons are to this very time, to catch up any of these lying fables; to strengthen themselves in deceits; Nay, there is good ground to believe, that they know them so to be, that so abuse the world therewith. For how can Mr. Wills, that is so well read in the Magdegurg's, be ignorant, how notably they have detected this cheat, and the reasons and grounds they give of its spuriousness? And therefore it must needs be so much worse in him, to impose this fallacy a fret, and so to improve it too, as though it was a piece of Gospel.

Know therefore, besides what merningus, and Montanus say of its forgery, of which I gave you a hind page 57 (whereof Mr. Wills would take no notice:) and what Sultetus (as Mr. Tombes, tells us) in his Medal, Pat. P. 2 1. I c. 42. Saith of it also. The Magdeburgs do give us this account, which I presume Mr. Wills can tell you, as will as myself, being so considerable a remark in the History of Athanasius his life, as you have it in the 4<sup>th</sup> Century cap. 10 and page 1032 in these words, speaking of his works; *Quartus --- quadam babes a diversis translate interpretibus, libellum de veriis, Wuestiemibus Scare Scriptural Antiochum Principem, interprete Valentino, As Pelandie Qurm Librum Athanasi nom esse indeliquam, quod ab ejus Antibore Athanasius citatur Quotim Vigesima Sertia hoc mode, and het quidem multm valens in Divine Scriptura Magnus Athanasus, nor vere qui ab ipse summsillmninati, &c. Asrisbt buc quod multes vidreect in eoscripte, ---atque opinonet ab Athanasio ulietus.*

*The fourth time hath some things translated by Diverse Interpreters, as for instance the Book of ---- questions of the Holy Scriptures to prints Antiochus (Valentinus Ampelandius being those interpreter) which book that it is not Athanasius is thence manifested, because Athanasius is cited by the Author thereof in the 23<sup>rd</sup> question, in this manner: And these things indeed saith the great Athanasius, who was mighty in the Scriptures, ---who are enlightened by him, &c.*

*And hereto it may be added (say they) that he may see in that writer many errors and opinions, that are for from Athanasius's.*

By which you may see, the design of this which cheat, by fathering this false thing upon this --- of name, to with to bring some reputation upon Infants Baptism, as though owned and practiced by the great Athanasius in this Age, and which our Antagonist fall in with, and improves to the utmost, First, in the severe check he is pleased to give me, for perverting, as he calls it, the Testimony given by him for Adult, against his judgment, and practice of Infants Baptism, as appears by these two questions urged. Secondly, for our so little regarding what the fathers say, when they urge Scripture, as well as tradition for Infants Baptism, witness those to pertinent Scriptures, urged by his eminent Father.

Thirdly, for drawing the injurious conclusion, that Infants Baptism was not practiced in Affrican in this age. From his testimony for Adult baptism, when contrary to manifestly appears from those questions.

But now this goodly story, proving a lie doth not the contrary to all these, naturally ---upon himself? And fully discover, that till we have better evidence to the contrary, that however Athanasius plaid the Bishop, and Baptized his school-fellow, when a boy in sport, that when he came to better understanding

he gave continuance to no other Baptism, than to that of the Adult only, according to Christ's Commission.

The next piece of fraud and injustice he charges upon me, *is the curtailing and leaving out part of a sentence, quoted out of Bazil page 65 mentioned by him in Chapter 7 part 1 and page 13 and ----- at also in his preface. The quotation is to prove, as he remarks, that Adult Baptism was then only practiced in the Eastern Churches, which are two sayings out of Bazil: One out of his 3 books against Enuomius, viz. must the faithful be sealed with Baptism, Faith must need proceed, and go before. And in his Exhortation to Baptism, that none were to be baptized but the Catechumens, and those that were duly instructed in the Faith. Upon which he saith, Now this is sufficient to impose fallacy upon any reader, that hath no acquaintance with that father, and understand not in what sence he speaks, who would not think that this ancient doctor was against infants Baptism, and that no such thing was owned in the Church in his days?* [Very true, and so one would indeed for if faith must go before, and children have no faith, then only professed believers were the subjects]. And again, if no one but the Catechamens, and those instructed in the faith were to be baptized, then surely no children were to be Baptized, who were so incapable, both of the one, and the other; Therefore by the way it must be granted, that this was a proper proof, to evidence, that the Eastern Church in his time admitted only of Adults Baptism, which he is pleased to say, is so abominably false.

And to evince my Forgery and Falsehood, from the good acquaintance he would have, you think, he had with this Father, that the same Author, viz. Bazil in the very next lines, in which I had above cited, speak thus, as he confidently affirms: What then say you of Infants, which neither knows good nor evil, may we baptize them? Yea saith he, for so we are taught by the Circumcising of children, and therefore, saith he, henceforward have a care, Reader, how ye trust the Authors, quotations, for the palpable abuse done in this Father.

#### ANSWER #8

To which I say, but if the abuse prove his own, what then? And that is so, the Reader will presently understand. Know therefore, that the quotations out of Bazil's exhortation to Baptism, you will find in the Magdeburg's 4<sup>th</sup> Century Chapter 6 and page 416, in these words, *Bazileus non alios quam Chatechumenos Baptizatos esse Scribitz Bazil, say they, wrote that none other but the Catechumens were baptized:* and then in the next lines immediately following, nothing intervening say, *Qui in Paschale Convoahantur in Exhortatione ad Baptismum: Who are called together at Easter to be exhorted in order to their Baptism.* There being no such syllable, nor any thing like it, either in the forgoing or following words, I have also searched all that the Magdeburg's say of that Father, and all Bazil's works themselves, and particularly the third book against Ennomius; but can find nothing like it. I have also examined the great Dutch Book of Martyrs, that recites most of the principal passages that Bazil speaks of Baptism; and who from Miringus and Montanus, their great Century Writers, do testify, that he was Altogether for Adult, and wholly against Infants Baptism. He used to say, *Sigus enim credimus in Patrem, and Filium, and Spiritum sanctum, sie and Baptizamur in romine patris, and Filis, and Spiritus Sanctum. As we do believe in the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, so we may be baptized in their names,* 4<sup>th</sup> Century page 235. And in the definition he gives of Baptism, he called it: *Sigillum Fiaei, Tessera Christiani Militu, similituo mirus sepulinro, ae resurrectionis protugrum. The seal of Faith, the Badge of the Christian Soldier, and the symbole of death, Burial and Resurrection form the dead.* And again very fully *Quienuque Baptizatur, fife Judans, Five Gra---; five Masenus, Five F---, quacuaque ----- differentia nominatus, exutus in Saguine Christi Veterem Bomineus, cum actibus suie, and per dectrinam ipsius novum in Spiritu Sanctaindutus, quisecondum Deum conditus oft in Justitia, and Sanctism veritatis, at renovatur ad igniticntus, secundive imagineus ejus qui condidit ipsum, &c.*

That whosoever is baptized, whether Jew or Greek, male or female, &c. have put off (by the blood of Christ) the old man with his deeds, and by his Doctrine have put on the new Man by the Holy Spirit, who according to God is built up in the Righteousness and holiness of the truth, and renewed in knowledge, according to the Image of him that created him, &c. And therefore in his book of Baptism, doth largely treat of the necessity of partaking of the Lord's Supper, that other Ordinance of Christ, immediately after Baptism.

*Regenerati vero, and nomina Filii Baptisatsemus, and Filii Dei declarari opus itaque deinceps, and nutriamur cibevita aterna: Those of us that are regenererte, and have made declaration of the Son of God, and are baptized in his name, it is meet that we should immediately be nourished with the food of Eternal life, viz. the Bread of God in that Ordinance.*

And whether all this is not agreeable, to what before was said of this doctor, is left to the Reader to judge, being also one of those (say the Magdeburgs) that made that former dedree in the Council of Neocasaria. But you will say, no came Mr. Wills by this saying it is to be supposed, he did not make it? Which will be with him to declare, and how he came to father it upon Bazil, that no man could ever find in him before, it is true, the words I find exactly to be the words of Gregory Nazienzen, but not of Bazil, 4<sup>th</sup> Century Chapter 4 and page 234. *Oratione in sanctum Lavacrum tertia: Quid de Infantibus Ais qui neque gratia, quid ne sit panacagnorunt, nam and illes Baptizemus? Maxime quidem [Si Periculum aliquod imminet, meliucest and initiates vita excedare]* all which Mr. Will's leaves out, then adds, *Idaque nobis designat post octavum diem Circumcisieilla, qua figurale fuit signaculum, What will you say of Children, which are neither sensible of good or evil? Shall we Baptism them, yes by all means [in case of urgent danger, for it is better to be sanctified without their knowledge, than to dye with out it] for so it happened to the children of Israel in Circumcision.*

But suppose there had been such a sentence, as Mr. Wills saith followeth, I had cited enough of the Father, to confirm the truth of what I asserted, viz. that instruction and Faith, according to Christ's commission, was necessary to precede Baptism; And that none but the Adult, that made profession of Faith, were to be baptized: And if he should have contradicted himself, as some others had done, it would have been their parts that should avouch him, in the behalf of Infants Baptism, to have reconciled such a contradiction, to those his former assertions..

But to put the matter more out of doubt; I procured a friend to write to Master Wills, to know where that passage was to be found in Bazil. To which he made this following return, viz.

#### **Mr. Will's Letter to his Friend about the Quotation of Bazil**

*As to that Passage of Bazil, I do not charge Master D. with misquoting, but partially quoting; and misapplying him, and upon examination of my Papers, cannot find any Page, to which that passage of mine, concerning that Father, doth refer: But when I go to Oxford, where I made my collection, I may be able to give better satisfaction.*

Therefore upon the whole, respecting this passage, I appeal to the Reader, whether Mr. Wills is not found tardy and justly reproveable in the following particulars; viz.

#### **Mr. Wills guilty of much falsehood herein:**

First, for the several Falsehoods (that it is to be feared he knowingly imposed upon the Reader) in affirming so positively: 1. That those were the very next lines, to what I had above recited. Secondly, that Bazil was herein an Eminent witness for Infants Baptism, in the fourth Century Page 136. Thirdly, from the great *acquaintance he had with this Father and his sence herein* (a false and vain glorious boast) *affirms those words to be his, in his third Book contra Eunomium* page 13 Comp. Page 136. Fourthly, For his deceitful leaving out part of *Naziensens* words, which should discover them to be his (a great demonstration it was, not *lapsus Calami*, but *Mentis*, not a sin of ignorance, or a mere mistade but a willful abuse.

#### **A False Accusation:**

Secondly, for false accusing of me: First, for curtailing, partially quoting, and misapplying; this Father stooping, where I should have gone on. Secondly, For imposing a fallacy, and Falsehood upon the Reader, to say he was only for Adult Baptism, when the contrary was so manifest. Thirdly, for so palpably abusing that father that I was not to be trusted in my Quotations, for time to come. Therefore, is it not very considerable, and to be remarked, that whilst he would pretend to reprove, and render me odious for Prevarication, Forgery and Falsehood, that the himself should be so left, to do the same things, in a far worse manner? Fulfilling Rom. 2:21-22.

#### **Ninth Falsehood Charged**

Another lie and falsehood, declaring, as he saith, want of ----- -- ----- -- --, page 44, is the bringing, the Waldenses as witnesses against Infants Baptism, and amongst other evidence for the same, to produce their confessions of Faith; Whereas there is not a word of that ignorance in them, but their *confessions of Faith quite otherwise, viz. for Infants Baptism*

**ANSWER #9**

To which I answer, that it is a very heinous charge, but what truth there is in it, and who most guilty of lying, and forgery, therein, he or I, you will easily discern, when you come to the examination of that matter, in the third chapter to which I refer you.

Again, there are two other instances of Forgery and Falsehood he charges upon me, in abusing, and deceitfully perverting the saying of tow of our modern Authors, Mr. Baxter and Dr. Tayler, which I shall add hereto, and be acceptable for in this place.

#### **Falsehood and unworthy dealing with Mr. Baxter:**

An first, he is pleased to say, that I have as an unworthy person deals craftily, and sinisterly with Mr. Baxter, page 12-13, and disingenuously perverted, and traduced, the sayings of that worthy man, to continuance my Errors; quoting divers of his arguments to Mr. Blake, as though he had been only for Believers Baptism, when he had so fully explained himself to mean Adult, not Infants Baptism, which he particularly excepted therein.

#### **ANSWER:**

In answer hereto, (overlooking his uncivil, and unchristian language) I say, that in my producing those arguments of Mr. Baxter, from Mr. Tombes, I have again, and again, given the reasons he produceth, for the same, and that induced me to insert them; which Mr. Wills had done will, to have taken some notice of: For if Mr. Baxter hath contradicted himself, he hath no more injury done him, to take notice of it, and improve it for the truth; then as Mr. Tombes tells him, the Papists had by Bishop Morton's improving, their contradictions, for the benefit of the Protestant cause. And if Mr. Baxter, or any body for him, can reconcile those seeming contradictions. I have only put an advantage into his hand, to do himself, and that cause he pleads right, and concerning which all judgements must be suspended, till Mr. Baxter be heard to speak for himself therein, which he has promised to do. And I presume, since Mr. Wills has not thought good to answer Mr. Tombes his argument, or my Apology, for producing those arguments, he had much better have forborne his uncivil Reviling upon it, which only for the most part bespeaks, either an evil cause, or an evil nature, and which neither reproves, or convinceth any.

And after the same manner, he deals with me upon Mr. Baxter's account, for the repetition of some passages out of his Christian Directory (which were so grieving, and offensive to most Protestant ears) charging me most severely, viz.

#### **Mr. Wills His Calumny:**

*That as being possessed with a malevolent Spirit, and filled with envy against him, and glad of an occasion to wound his reputation, who had so wounded our cause, I came forth therein with a sensing for real truth, but he feared with greater enmity to his person therein.*

#### **ANSWER:**

In answer to this slanderous reproach, I can truly say, I am so far from bearing enmity to his person, more especially for what he has said in that Book (what wonders soever as he boasts in his Ep.) he has done thereby, in exorcising, or conjuring down the unquiet Spirit (as he maliciously calls it of Anabaptism) wherein, as Dr. Barlo so well observes, he has said so much, to so little purpose, there being noting therein like an argument against us, and therefore no cause to envy him for the same; that I have had an honorable regard to his person, and a due value to his Labours, especially where he has said out himself to promote practical holiness (and wherein, as I have judged, his greatest Excellency lies) supposing had he let controversies alone, and addicted himself thereto, he would much more have furthered the Praise, and Union, he pretends to promote. It having been, as I have heard, a judgement that Bishop Usher made of him that he persisted in Polemical Writings, that he was like to prove a troubler, rather than a promoter of Peace.

As for those passages, collected an Epitomized out of his ---- Directory, they were no less as astonishing then grieving to many that under pretence to general reconciliation, he should endeavor to reconcile us to so much, both of the Doctrine and ----- of the church of Rome. And surely if conscience had not ----- me, prudence had all together forbid, to have provoked so potent and adversary, and who useth with so much severity to treat his opposites: But the cause is God's, with whom I leave it, who can plead his own truth in his conscience, and out of the mouths of babes can perfect his own praise, because of enemies, and avengers.

## Eleventh Falsehood

An other heinous thing he lays to my charge, is for my -----, as he calls it, in Dr. Tayler's case, by him ravings his savings, in his liberty of ----- --- though he was wholly for us. When what he saith therein, was but to represent our --- --- ----- . And not to speak his own judgment therein, And the better to convince the world hereof, and stop the mouths of those that were ready to take advantage thereat; he had since put forth, as excellent piece called, a consideration of the practice of the Church, in Baptizing Infants of believing parents. And with all that though ---- ---- -- ----- those arguments, in his liberty of -----, which same thought stood in -----as -----; Yet Doctor Hamond had effectually done the same, in his letter of Resolution to fix Queries, page 35-36, &c.

To which I reply: That *as t those arguments of Dr. Tayler's, I have already in the preface of both my books said to this purpose. That what ever was his judgment, or end, in writing those things, yet was meet to remark them to the world, that the wisdom, and power of God might more appear, to witness to his dissolves reproached truth.*

## Reasons why the plea for Anabaptists was Dr. Taylers own sence:

Yet truly, for what as yet appears to the contrary, the Doctor seems to have spoken therein his own, as well as *our apprehension*, in the greatest part of those *arguments*, and that for these following *Denie Strations*:

### REASON #1

First, because the Doctor having spoken to all the usual arguments: brought by Protestants for infant's baptism, and answered them distinctly, doth in the conclusion (speaking his own words, say these two things very considerable.

*First, that through the weakness f the Padobaptist arguments which are not good in themselves, those other arguments in plea for the Anabaptists, are good in opening them, and so they are accidentally strengthened (in their error, as he calls it) by the weakness, and confidence of weak opposition.* And it is to be observed, that those that follow (summed up briefly in his own words, Liberty of Prophecy page 228) First, the argument pleads from the infants of the type viz. -----Gen. 17. Secondly, from the action of Christ' calling little children to come to him, to bless them, Matt. 19:14. Thirdly, from the title infants have to Heaven. Fourthly, from the Gospel, instruction, and precept, John 3:5. Fifthly, from the energy of the promise, Acts 2:38-39. Sixthly, from the reasonableness of the thing, 1 Cor. 7. Seventhly, from the infinite necessity on the children part. Eighty, from the Apostolic practice, who having commission to teach all nations, baptizing them did baptize whole households. Ninthly, from the universal practice of the Church, and gossips, to answer for them, to supply incapacity, made good by Tradition.

### The answer he gives hereto:

These are the arguments, that he answers distinctly, which first in the *Anabaptist* plea he saith, *pretend fairly, and signify nothing, some o these allegations being false some, some impertinent, and all the rest insufficient.* And all which (agreeable hereto) in his own words, after he had replied to every one of them, he was pleased to pronounce weak, and *insufficient*, and which had therefore given so much strength, and confirmation to the *Anabaptists* way.

### REASON #2

And Secondly, concludes all with these words, THAT THERE IS MUCH MORE TRUTH, THAN EVIDENCE OF THEIR SIDE, and giving no better, or other argument, to demonstrate that truth was with them. Now I appeal to all men of understanding whether any but a person, that despond the goodness of this cause, an designed wholly to give it up, could say, that the evidence, demonstration, or proof, was on his adversaries side, all his own pleas brought forth; being removed, and taken away, himself being of age.

### OBJECTION:

But 'tis said, *That though he mentioned no other arguments than, yet he afterwards did, in that, which Mr. Wills calls, his excellent piece for Infants Baptism, Wills page 36.*

### ANSWER:

It is true; about six years after he had written his liberty of Prophecy (that being written 1647) he did Anno 1653. (Being much laid at, by many of his Friends, and having given such general offence to his

whole party thereby) take himself; concerned to say something, to persuade the World he was of an other mind, though when he had said it, it amounts to just nothing to any considering person, and which may appear to you from these reasons following.

**Dr. Tayler answers none of those arguments:**

First, because he undertakes not to answer or invalidate one of those arguments, whereby he had on the Anabaptists behalf, overthrown all those weak arguments, before mentioned; and that though some judged they stood in need of answering, and that he had thoughts to have don it, yet he forbore it upon some considerations, which Master Wills repeats from him, page 36.

**Repeats only some of the Old Baffled Arguments:**

Secondly, because what he saith in that Treatise (which Mr. Wills so boasts off) is not any new thing, but some of the very same arguments, he had before judged so weak, and insufficient, and had so substantially answered, and baffled. As first, that from Circumcision. Secondly, from children right to the Kingdom of Heaven. Thirdly, to adopt the --- to the Covenant. Fourthly, from Apostolic traditions; Only adds two or three more savoring, more grossly of Popery, viz. from the use and *necessity of Baptism to pardon their sin, Regenerate, and save them.*

**Because other books he confirmed the truth of them:**

And Thirdly, it also appears, that he spoke his own mind and sense therein, because in those two books he wrote to many years after, viz in his ---- against Popery second part; and in his --- --- conscience, he hath spoken to much agreeable hereto, as before hath been objected to you: viz. *That there was not apostolic tradition for Infants Baptism. That it was not practical till the third not judged necessary till the fourth Century. That there was no Scriptural proof for Infants Baptism. That the Children of Christian parents were not baptized till they came to understanding, for the first ages. And that dipping and not sprinkling was the usage of Christ, and his Apostles, and constant Doctrine and practice of the Ancients for many hundred years.* And which I conceive are substantial arguments, to prove the Doctor of one his ---, as well as our judgement therein, and which I must stand by, till I see better Reason to the contrary.

**OBJECTION:**

But 'tis said one reason Doctor Tayler gives, why he did not answer those arguments, was because his worthy friend Doctor Hamond, had in charity, and humility descended to answer that Collection.

**ANSWER:**

It is true indeed, Doctor Hamond in that piece, called his letter of Resolution to six Queries; bound up now in his first volume in Folio, page 481 doth therein pretend to reply thereto; as being, *at he confesseth, the most diligent collection that he ever met with, wherein the arguments of the Adversaries are so enjoined, that he knew not where to furnish himself with so exact a scheme.* But how far he hath performed that Task, and answered those arguments, let the impartial Reader judge;

**Dr. Hamond rather confirms then answers those arguments and why:**

Who instead of answering hath rather enforced, and subscribed to the truth of so many of them, and reproved rather the weakness, and insufficiency of so many of the chiefest arguments, brought by the Pasdobaptists, concluding his discourse with Doctor Tayler's own words, to that purpose, viz, *I consent to the truth of the Doctor's observation: That the Anabaptist have been encouraged in their error, more by the accidental advantages given them, by the meekness of those arguments, that have been brought against them, than by any truth of their cause, or excellency of their wit, &c.*

And therefore doth he in that discourse acknowledge these following things:

First, *the weak arguments from Circumcision rather to its typicalness, identity; Reason of difference, or invalidity of parallel with Baptism, so – to found Infants Baptism upon them,* page 482, &c. Comp. 474 Section 20.

Secondly, *The inconcludent Argument from Acts 2:39 Children their, as he fully grants, being really their posterity, not particularly the Infants of the Jews,* page 490 and Section 81.

Thirdly, *That to infer Infants Baptism from Christ's precept to baptize all Nations, is one of the blind and lame, that is of more use to betray and loose, than to defend and secure the Fort*, page 494 and Section 96.

Fourthly, *That to conclude Infants were baptized, because households are so mentioned to be, in unconvincing and without demonstration, it being so uncertain whether there was any child in the Families*, page 471 and Section 21.

Fifthly, *That arguments from Matt. 19:14 are imperfect ways of probation*, Page 474, and Section 23.

### **The other arguments Dr. Ramond urgeth for Infants Baptism:**

It is true the doctor useth other Medium, to confirm and establish Infants Baptism by which are not usually urged by the Paedobaptists, and which because the Doctor lays so much stress upon, and Mr. Wills seems also much to glory in; we shall give you some account of them.

#### **I. From the Jewish Baptism:**

The first is, because Christ's institution of Baptism, doth not exclude Infants from Baptism, there being nothing in Christ's Commission, that is against it, Page 475 and Section 75. And Mr. Wills Page 131-132. To which you have an answer in the next Chapter, by another hand, to whom I must refer you.

The second, and chief of the Doctors arguments, and upon which he seems to lay the greatest stress, to sound and enforce Infants Baptism, is from the Custom of Baptizing amongst the Jews of Old, from the *first giving of the law*, from whom Christ, *as he saith, took the usage, and made it a Sacrament: And who did baptize, as he tells us, not only the native Jews, upon their admission into the Covenant, but the Proselytes, both Men, and Women, and their Children also*; and which he pretends to make good, out of the Jews *Talmud*, by *Maimonides*, -- great Jewish Doctor: Rabbi Jeshus, another; and the *Gemara* Babyt, Tit. Christ both, and particularly concerning their Infants, that *they were baptized upon the knowledge of the House of judgment; viz. on their desire and behalf of the children, and their promise to let them know, what they have undertaken for them, as saith the Doctor, and that thereby gossips, or susceptors are also warranted; so agreeable to what Saint Austin saith. Our Mother the Church lends the little ones, other men's foes, tars, and tongue, that they may come, believe, and confess, and so be capable of Baptism*, pages, 470 to 474 and which Mr. Wills **takes in for Gospel too**. Page 141.

Now, if this is a good and substantial basis and foundation for Infants Baptism, and well proved, let all Men judge?

In answer to which new and strange Doctrine, I shall refer the Reader to the Reply, that (I suppose) was made hereto, by that judicious, and *learned gentleman Sir Norton Knatchbul, in his Animadver Siones in Lib. Nevi Testamenti*, page 315 *Accum Videam Summi Judicit Vires in his temporium, and Rabbinis Fundamenta Peter Veritatis, &c. But when I see these times, some men of the greatest judgement, to fetch the foundation of truth from the rabbi's, I cannot but stick at it, for whence was the Talmud sent to us* (they are the words, (saith he) of *Baxter's, in his synagogue Judaic*) *that we should give so much credit thereto that we should believe that the Mosaic Law, either may --- --- to be understood therefrom? Much less the Gospel; to which they are professed Enemies; the Talmud is call a Liberinth Aberrons, and the foundation of Jewish fables. It was perfected and acknowledged for authentic, five hundred years after Christ: and out of it, Maimonides drew his Doctrine, as also the rest of them; therefore we cannot acquiesce in such testimony.*

And again upon the difference he takes notice of that was betwixt two of their greatest Rabbi's. Upon that point (who were contemporaries) viz. Eliazer, that asserted that the proselytes were Circumcised, and not Baptized. And Joshua, who asserted the --- contrary, that they were baptized and not circumcised, saith; *virivers, Potius asserted? Eliezero Jui Assirmat Quot Neriptura, and Joshua Qua assirmat Quod unsquim Spinura dotet; ----- ----- ----- ---- to Eliezor that affirms what the Scriptures teach, --- -- Joshua that assert what the Scripture nowhere teacheth? Though (saith he) the Rabbis too did cleave to the latter; &c. Magistisevens (Quid Mirum?) sis bant pro ranbi Joshua, Facit --- -- ---- --- in heavens Religious Judges &c.*

Now that the blind Rabbis should establish their vain carbons, by such Jewish fables, is no wonder, being so left by God to blindness of eye, and hardness of heart? But that any professing Christianity should be so left of God, to assert and establish Gospel Ordinances from the fabulous Talmud, and their living Rabies, so directly contrary to the Scripture, is matter of the greatest admiration.

A third argument is from Antiquity, endeavoring to prove the succession there from the Apostles, and to make it out to be an apostolic tradition, from the following authorities, viz. Justin, Martyrs, Respanex,

Irenaus, Haginus, Origen, Cyprian, the Author of the Ecclesiastical Hicrachs, St, Angustin, and the Melvisan Concil, page 479 to 482. The force of all which you will have tried in the following chapter, to which I refer you. And so you have the substance of Doctor Hamond's strong arguments, wherein I have been larger, because you may be sufficient informed, that he rather confirmed, than answered, most of the Anabaptist plea, before mentioned. And that the strength of those his strong arguments (having slighted and canceled so many of the old, as weak and insufficient) may appear to you.

And that upon the whole you man have your satisfaction, whether I had not substantial ground, to quote Doctor Tombes arguments, he gives his liberty Prophecy in the behalf of believers, and against Infants Baptism, and whether Mr. Wills had reason to charge me with division, for producing of them; which as yet stand unanswered for the most part, and I believe ever will do.

## CHAPTER TWO

### THAT INFANTS BAPTISM HATH NEITHER FOUNDATION IN SCRIPTURE, OR ANTIQUITY, IS MADE GOOD, AGAINST MR. WILLS HIS PRESENCE TO BOTH.

As in the former chapter, so in this, I shall sum up what I have said, to justify the truth of the assertion, what Mr. Wills grants thereof, wherein the force of his Objections lie, and my reply thereto.

#### **That no Precept or Practice for Infants Baptism:**

*The first thing I did herein, was to make good the Scriptures total silence, either as to Precepts, or Practice, for Infants Baptism, and that by full grant, and acknowledgement of so many of themselves; Viz. the Magdeburgs, Luther, Ersmus, Calvin, Bucer, Staphilus, Choelent, Malancton, Swinglim, Rogers, Baxter, Page 89 to 93.*

*As also the necessity of Scriptures Precept, or Example, to warrant every Ordinance, by the sayings of Tertullian, Austin, Theophilact, Luther Calvin, Ball, 6. Art. Of the Church of England Page 91 to 97.*

#### **Mr. Wills Answer or grants:**

All which our Antagonist, fully grants, with our fore said Authorities, viz. *That there is neither Precept, nor Example for the Baptizing of Infants, that is to say, Expressly, Literally, and syllabically, pages 35, 36, 32. And that Scripture authority is necessary to warrant every Ordinance; But withal saith two things, viz.*

#### **1. No Scripture forbidding**

*First, that as there is no Scripture expressly commanding so, neither is there any Scripture, excluding Infants from Baptism, nor any Scripture that saith there was no Infants Baptized, pages 36, 38, 101, 131, & 132.*

#### **2. Good Consequence**

*Secondly, Though a thing may not expressly be commanded, as Thus Saith The Lord Jesus, Baptize your Children, for they believe; yet that it may be commanded implicitly, and by consequence, though not expressly enjoined in so man words: (And so was the Resurrection by Consequential Reasoning proved, Acts 22:31-32; 13:33-34.) And what was thus commanded, is as valid, and obliging as it was in so many letters, and syllables, and thus we affirm Infants Baptism is commanded, page 36. And we affirm against their practice of plunging over head, and ears, that there is no express command for the same, nor example plunge them as they do, with their clothes on, Page 101. And therefore in Mr. Baxter's words tell us (in his usual civility) what ignorant wretches we are, to call for express words of Scripture, when we have the evident consequence, or sence, and is Scripture Reason (saith he) no Scripture with you?*

#### **Reply to the First:**

To both which I reply, first, to his first argument, that Infants Baptism may be lawful because not forbidden in the Scripture, nor no where told where it was not done: May also prove the lawfulness of Baptizing Belts, and Church Walls, of Chrysmes, Exorcismes, Communicating Infants, and a hundred other inventions, that were practiced of old, and still are in use amongst the Papists; neither is it any where told us, in express terms, that such things were not practices.

#### **While not commanded in Worship, is forbidden**

But this we have clear in the Scripture, and which is to be a rule to us, in all such cases that that worship, which in express terms is not commanded is expressly forbidden; and for which take the following Scriptures, viz.

Col. 2:20-22 - *If ye be dead with Christ from the rudiments of the world, why, as though living in the world, are ye subject to ordinances, (Touch not; taste not; handle not; Which all are to perish with the using;) after the commandments and doctrines of men?*

Matt 15:9 - *But in vain they do worship me, teaching for doctrines the commandments of men.*

Deut. 4:2 - *Ye shall not add unto the word which I command you, neither shall ye diminish ought from it, that ye may keep the commandments of the LORD your God which I command you.*

Jer. 7:31 - *And they have built the high places of Tophet, which is in the valley of the son of Hinnom, to burn their sons and their daughters in the fire; which I commanded them not, neither came it into my heart.*

Josh 1:7 - *observe to do according to all the law, which Moses my servant commanded thee: turn not from it to the right hand or to the left,*

Which great truth, is well asserted, and defended by Doctor Quinn in his Book, called Innocence, and truth vindicated, in reply to Doctor Parker, Who having in his Ecclesiastical policy, page 189 said (with Mr. Wills) *That what the Scripture forbids not, it allows, and what it allows, is not unlawful, and what is not unlawful, may lawfully be done.* Doctor, Owin thus answers him, page 345. *This tale I confess we have been told by many, and many a time, but it hath been as often answered, that the whole of it, as to any thing of reason, is captious, and Sophistical: For if, because they are not forbidden, they may lawfully be introduced, into Divine Worship, then ten thousand things may be made lawful; but the truth is, although a particular prohibition be needful, to render a thing evil in itself: A general prohibition, is enough to render anything unlawful in the worship of God, so we grant that what is not forbidden, is lawful; but with all say that every thing is forbidden (that should be esteemed as any part of Divine Worship) that is not commanded.* (And therefore very excellently, and undeniable proves, page 339.) *That no part of God's Worship, either in the Old, or New Testaments, was lawful, but what had some express warrant, from his Word for the same: And that all additions and traditions of Men therein, God reprov'd, and rejected as vain Worship.*

### **Reply to Second, viz. That neither express nor consequential Scripture for every part of Worship, Mr. Collings.**

Secondly, as to his second argument, that is so much a Kin to the former, viz. *That Implicate; and consequential commands, are as valid, and obliging as if expressly enjoined, and commanded:* I shall refer him, and the Reader to some eminent Men of his own, for an Answer.

Mr. Collings before his vindicated Ministry Evangelism tells us: *That in things relating to the worship of God, it is a general Rule in which our Brethren, and we have long since agreed, THAT NOTHING OUGHT TO BE DONE WITHOUT AN EXPRESS WARRANT IN THE GOSPEL.*

### **Mr. Rutherford:**

Mr. Rutherford *in his due right of Presbyteries, Page 364. Doth also tell us; what the Apostles commanded not, in God's Worship, that the Churches must not do.*

### **Dr. Owin:**

But especially Doctor Owin in his *Communion with God, page 169-170, &c. saith Thus, the main of the Churches chaste, and choice affections to Christ lies in their keeping his institutions, and his worship according to his appointment, the breach of this he calls Adultery, and whoredom, every where he is a Jealous God, and gives him self, the Title and, in Respect of his Institutions; And the whole Apostasy of the Christian Church, is called Fornication, Rev. 17:5. And the Church that leads the other into false worship, the Mother of Harlots: This then they that hold Communion with Christ, are careful of, they will admit of nothing, in the Worship of God, Private, or Public, but what they have his warrant for, unless it comes in his Name, with THUS SAITH THE LORD JESUS, They will not bear an Angel from Heaven, they know the Apostles themselves were to teach the Saints, only, what Christ commanded them, Mat. 28:20.*

### **Only Plain Scripture for God's Worship:**

So that what ever ventures, Persons may make in drawing consequences, and Inferences from the Scripture, for any supposed truths (wherein great care, and caution is to be used) yet is it a known agreed Rule amongst Protestants: That the Worship of God, (wherein so much Sophistry hath been used to introduce, and impose, not only ceremonies about worship, but worship itself, from Old Testament Rites, and Observations;) Nothing therein as worship is to be admitted, without some plain, and express word, by precept, or practice, to warrant the same, out of the New Testament. And therefore when Doctor Parker in the aforesaid book falls so soul upon this principle (with intention to raise this great Protestant Bulwark, and tells us page 171. *That the very Mystery of Puritanism, lies in this very assertion, viz. THAT NOTHING OUGHT TO BE ESTABLISHED, IN THE WORSHIP OF GOD, BUT WHAT IS EXPRESSLY COMMANDED, IN THE WORD OF GOD, and that it is a vile, novel, and unreasonable Principle, that takes away all possibility of sesalement in the Church, and the main prescience is all pious villainies, &c.* You have Doctor Owin page 303, most worthily defending the same, adding only this hereto [viz. as pars of Worship.] And which

*he maintains, by the Authority of Scripture, Reason, and Antiquity, as well as from the testimony of the most learned Protestant writers.*

### **Doctor Hamond**

Doctor Hamond himself tells us (as Mr. Tombes in his Review hath it page 847) viz. *That it is highly unreasonable, that an institution of Christ, such as each Sacrament is, should be judged of, by another Rule, whether the fancies, or Reasons of Men, but either the Word, wherein the Institution is set down, or the Records of the Practice of Christ, or his Apostles in Scripture.*

So that by all this evidence it appears, that Mr. Wills is so Heterodox, in both his positions, that he has neither Scripture, Reason, Antiquity, nor the learned Protestant Writers, to stand by him therein. And wherein, if he persist, he gives up not only the independent, but whole Protestant cause, and all our reformation at once; For what inventions in worship are their? That men can impose, with any pretence to decency, and order, or analogy to any of the Legal Rites, that may not be introduced, and given way too. And Doctor Owin adds: *That all the superstitions, and Idolatries; yea all the confusion, Blood, and perfection; yea all the wars, that for so long a season have spread themselves over the face of the Christian world, have come in at this door.*

### **Resurrection on proved by plain Scripture:**

As to the two instances he gives, to justify himself herein, we say first, as to the Doctrine of the resurrection. What is in more plain, and express terms delivered to us in the Scripture? And therefore we may the better admit of Consequential reasoning, in such truths, that are also plainly delivered to us, in express termes else where.

### **Baptizing is dipping In English:**

And as for plain word, to dip over head, and ears, the word it self doth it, because dipping, or Emerging, as I make appear against Mr. Will's Sophistry, signifies nothing else, but so putting the thing under water, as to cover it all over; and that not only by the most eminent critics, but the constant usage of the word, both in the Old, and New Testaments.

And as for the Baptizing with clothes on, as no Scripture mentions the putting them off, so the light of nature teaches there should be some on. And that the clothes are dipped matters not, so long as the person is dipped, as all that experience it must needs acknowledge.

Though as to plain consequences, and Scripture reasoning, we admit, as well as they provided we have all the parts of worship kept to express words, and Gospel Ordinances asserted by Gospel Institutions. And therefore we deny the inferences usually drawn, from circumcision, under the law, for Baptism, under the Gospel, to be plain, proper, or true.

And because children were circumcised, under the law, by an express positive command, therefore that they may be baptized, without any Precept, of command, under the Gospel holds not any means. For though in some things Circumcision, may have some analogy with Baptism, viz. in heart Circumcision, or Mortification, must it therefore be good in all? It holds not. For though the Ark, as doctor Tayler will observe, in some thing holds Analogy with Baptism, therefore to draw in all the circumstances, of the one, to the other, would make Baptism a Prodigy, not a rite; and therefore, saith he, Types, and Figures prove nothing, except some command accompanies. Had we as express a command to baptize children, under the Gospel, as they to circumcise them, under the Law, it would end the controversy; but as we have neither command nor example, as granted, so neither can there be any analogy, either in subject, qualification, or end, as so largely proved. Not in Subject, one being to be males only in Israel; the other Males, and Females in all the world; not in qualification, one to be the natural seed of Abraham, without respect to Faith, and Repentance; the other the Spiritual seed of Abraham, with respect to Faith, and Repentance; for that is required in all persons that are to be Baptized, as so fully granted. Neither in the ends, the one to enter visibly into the national Church there, the other into the Spiritual Church, and to partake of Spiritual Ordinances, so entering also into covenant, and acting Faith in the Promises, and searing of privileges, in the very act of entrance, that no child, under the Law, or Gospel, could be capable of:

In the next place, as to the Antiquity of enjoining Infants Baptism, with its impious concomitants, of Salt, Oil, Spittle, Chrisme, Exercism, &c. He grants it was not till above four hundred years after Christ

in the Milevitan, and Carthaginian Councils; But withal Faith, the reason which was not enjoined sooner, was because the Lawfulness of it was rarely, if at all questioned before.

**A good grant from Mr. Wills for the Witness against Infants Baptism.**

To which I say, then if it be son, that the Canons in the respective councils enjoining, and enforcing Infants Baptism, [whereof, he saith, he hath above thirty to produce] were only made upon the occasion of those that denied. Or opposed it: We have then our witnesses throughout all Ages, confirmed by himself; yet with all I must remember him, presently, that though these first Canons, and those in other centuries, were made against those that deny Infants Baptism, curse, and Excommunicate, and destroy them, yet it was denied long before any Canons were made to impose it.

And further he affirms. *That though Infants Baptism was not imposed, before the fifth Century, yet that it was practiced in the former Centuries, from the Testimonies of Justin Martyr, and Irenaus, Origen, and Cyprian.*

**No Proof that Infants Baptism was Practiced in the Third Century:**

To which I say, that as to the validity of our Authors testimonies, as to the practice of Infants Baptism in the first times, we shall presently examine; though I deny not, but that it was discoursed before the third Century, and which appears, as I have owned, by Tertullian's reasoning against it; But the thing I affirm, is that it is not manifest by any Authentic Authority, that it was practiced as an Ordinance of Christ before; as Doctor Barlow so well observes, viz. that he doth believe it came in, in the second Century, (viz. in the Nation) and in the third, and fourth began to be practiced, and defended to be lawful, by the Text grossly misunderstood John 3:5.

And as to the Magdegurg's themselves, though they tell us, that from what they find from Origen, and Cyprian, concerning it, they conclude it was practiced; and that many Superstitious Rites in Baptism were also spoken of, in those first Centuries: Yet do tell us withal in express words, Century 3, Chapter 6, and page 125. *Nec de susceptione, de Baptisme, explicari Quiaquam inveniat, in omnibus bujus sacali, veris and probatis Scriptoribus: Neither can one find any thing spoken of, the Suggestion of Baptism, in all the true, and approved writers of this Age. They tell us indeed, of one only instance, mentioned by Vincentius, who wrote of the affairs of the Gallican Churches, mentioning a family, that was Baptized, in the time of Aurelianus the Emperor, in which there was a Godly young man, by name Symphorianus, who was baptized by Benignus the Presbyter; but with all they say of this Vincentius, Author non ita satis probatus; Anb author not so well approved of.*

Therefore till any instance be produced, of any child that was baptized as an ordinance of Christ, within the first three hundred years, or towards the conclusion of it, I am yet unreprouable in that my assertion. For if it should be taken for granted, that those four before mentioned had spoken of it, yet if they do not speak of the practice of it, which is all that I assert, I am very safe in what I have said.

**TRADITION THE PRINCIPLE GROUND, THAT HATH BEEN URGED FOR INFANTS BAPTISM.**

The next thing to be inquired into, is the principal ground, upon which Infants Baptism was first imposed, and afterwards established, which I have made appear to be humane, or unwritten tradition, by divers Authorities, both ancient, and Modern, page 133.

**AUSTIN:**

Austin saith, *That infants Baptism is not to be believed, unless it was an Apostolic Tradition, &c.*

**BELLARMIN:**

Bellarmin tells us, *That it is an Apostolic tradition not written, because (saith he) it is not written in any Apostolic Book, though in the books of almost all the Ancients, &c.*

**DOCTOR FIELD**

Doctor Field, *That Infants Baptism is therefore called a tradition, because it is not delivered in the Scriptures, that the Apostles did baptize infants, or that they should do so.*

**CONVACATION AT OXFORD:**

Confection at Oxford, *That without the consentaneous judgement and practice of the Universal Church they should be at a loss when they are called upon for proof in the point of Infants Baptism.* With divers others assert the same, from page 133 to the page 137.

To which Mr. Wills saith page 115 to 122. *That it is a false suggestion, and exceeding all modesty, for although the Church of Rome ascribes to much to tradition herein, making it equal with the Scripture; yet that the Ancient Fathers do plead, that it comes in the room of Circumcision, and that Infants have right thereto, from the right that the Jews Infants had to Circumcision; and that the Protestants, when they use the word tradition, do it as the Fathers before them, in sensu sano; in a wholesome sense, quite different from the corrupt sense of the Church of Rome.*

### **Agreement between Papist and Protestant about the Tradition of Infants Baptism**

To which I say, though Mr. Wills affirms, there is such a vast difference between the Church of Rome, and them, in the point of tradition, about Infants Baptism, wherein he owns them to corrupt; yet for my part I see not, as Mr. Wills represents, the Protestant sentiments about it, where the vast differences lies, and what reason he hath to conclude, they themselves, that hold with the fathers herein, are so Orthodox; and the Papist so corrupt, and Heterodox.

#### **1. Papists Tradition not written:**

For to the Church of Rome hold, that it is an Apostolic Tradition not Written; there being no thing written of it in any Apostolic Book, but only found in the custom, and practice of the Church, Treatise on Baptism Page 134.

#### **Protestant on Unwritten Tradition:**

So do Mr. Wills in behalf of the Protestants also affirm viz. *That Infants Baptism is therefore called a Tradition, because it is not expressly delivered in the Scripture, that the Apostles did Baptize Infants, nor any express Precept they should do so: and that Tradition is the practice of such things, as are neither contained in Scripture expressly there delivered, Mr. Wills page 108.*

#### **2. Papist A Tradition gathered from the Scripture:**

Do the Papists affirm: *That notwithstanding 'tis a Tradition, or custom of the Church, yet that it is plainly enough gathered out of the Scriptures viz. from Circumcision, Bellarm. Tom. 3. L. I de Scar. C. 8.*

#### **Protestant a Tradition on gathered from the Scripture:**

So doth Mr. Wills for the Protestants, say, *That notwithstanding, there is neither Precept, or Practice, expressly written in the Scripture; yet it is gathered thence by good consequence, as coming in the Room of Circumcision, and therefore that Infants have a right to Baptism, from the right that the Infants had to Circumcision, Mr. Wills Page 105.*

#### **3. Papists that it is of equal Authority with Scripture.**

Thirdly, *Do the Papists maintain, that the Ecclesiastical Traditions of Infants Baptism (as it is gathered from the Scripture, and appointed by the Church) is of equal authority with the Scripture itself, and to be observed with the like holy reverence, Treatise on Baptism page 132.*

#### **Protestant of equal Authority in Scripture:**

So doth Mr. Wills assert for Protestant Doctrine, *That the Tradition of Infants Baptism, proved by consequential Arguments from the Scripture, ought to be esteemed as firm and good as the Scripture itself? Page 117.*

#### **4. Papists: that the Church the subject, not the Author.**

Do the Papist teach, *That Infants Baptism was the appointment of Christ him self, and practiced of the Apostles, though no mention, when it was given forth, nor when, and where practiced, Treatise on Baptism 134*

**Protestant: that the Church the subject, not the Author**

So doth also Mr. Wills in the *name of the Protestants affirm, that Infants Baptism was an Apostolic practice, and Ordinance, not that the primitive Church was the Author, but Subject thereof, Christ himself having appointed it, and approved thereof, (though no where written)* page 119.

**5. Papists testified by the Ancients:**

Fifthly, do the Papists maintain, *That the Truth of this Ecclesiastical Custom, of Infants Baptism, is handed down to us, to be a Apostolic Tradition, by the writings of almost all the Ancients, Treaties on Baptism* page 133.

**Protestant witnessed by all the Ancients.**

So do also the Protestant Padobaptists defend, *That the holy Ordinance of Infants Baptism, hath been perpersonally observed in the Christian Church, for there is no ancient writer, that doth not acknowledge its Original from the Apostles,* Master wills page 102.

So that by this parallels we cannot find, where the great difference lies, betwixt Papists, and Protestants: But if the Papist are corrupt in the point of Tradition about it, so are the Protestants also, being in so great an harmony therein together.

That the papists, and many of the Protestants, do much accord in the point of Tradition about it is fully owned by Mr. Baxter, in his *Prino of Love* (as before.)

And that Mr. Wills, and other Protestants of his mind, do so too is manifest.

**Communicating Infants is said to be an Apostolical Tradition as well as Infants Baptism:**

For all do harmoniously acknowledge, that *it is not delivered in the Scripture, that the Apostle did baptize Infants, or that there is any express precept there found, they should do so,* and therefore an Unwritten tradition: Though the *Ground*, and reason thereof (they say) *is fairly to be gathered by Consequence,* pate 507. Which therefore must needs be the principal *ground*, the ground of the ground; so that if the unwritten tradition prove a mistake, the pretended Scripture ground, to justify it, must needs be a mistake also: As for instance, the giving of the Sacrament to Infants, was asserted by the sayings of the Ancients, to be an Apostolic unwritten tradition, and so practiced for many ages, and this not without a pretended Scripture ground, to justify the said practice to be good, as Doctor Barlow observes from John 6:53 Which you have also urged by Austin himself, with great vehemence, as necessary to salvation.

Now this being since disowned, to be an Apostolic Tradition, which was the principal Ground, the Scripture urged to prove, and *justify* it, doth necessarily prove a *mistake*, and therefore (saith Doctor Barlow) *upon the like gross mistake, they did defend Infants Baptism from John 5:3 and he affirms, they may do one, as well as the other.*

Therefore let all Men judge, whether Mr. Wills himself hath not justified, that he calls a false suggestion, and exceeding all modesty, to assert that tradition, has been owned to be the principal Ground of Infants Baptism: For take away the unwritten Tradition, then the pretended Scriptures, to justify that, avail nothing.

**The Papists are larger in point of Tradition than the Protestants:**

It is true the Papists are larger, in the business of Tradition than the Protestants, and affirm a larger power, through their Infallibility to be determine about it, than the Protestants can own; who cannot only by their infallibility tell, what our Saviour said to John lying in his bosom, but also what he told the Disciples in the Mount, not mentioned in the Scripture; and by the large trust committed to them, can impose those their conclusions as Oracles, and of like authority with the Scriptures: As for instance, their Chrysmes, Exorcismes, salt, Oil and Spittle (very ancient Traditions, if not more ancient than Infants Baptism itself) as Appendixes, if not essentials to Baptism: And so Altars, Copes, Holy Water, Temples, and Holy Days, with a vast number more of like kind, gathered also from Scripture analogy, from Old Testament rites, as Infants Baptism from circumcision. And therefore do they reprove the Protestants, for not receiving all the rest, as well as Infants Baptism, being all upon one bottom, viz. Apostolic Tradition, gathered from Scriptures Consequence.

**The Fathers larger in point of Tradition than the Protestants:**

The Fathers also herein, do seem to exceed the Protestants to (though Mr. Wills saith, they do so agree with them, in the point of Tradition, as holding it more soundly than the Papists) viz. *cyprian, Austin,* and

others of the ancients, hold Chrisme, Exorcism, Infants right to the Supper &c. to be apostolic Traditions and to be made good from Scripture proof, and analogy; And seem to be as large herein, as the Papists have since been: For instance, Austin in his 118 Epistle, ad Johan, saith: *illa qusnam Scripta, traditis custodimus, datur vel Apostolic plenarius consistius, &c.* The Apostles themselves, or general Councils, &c give the unwritten Tradition, which we keep.

And amongst others things (with Infants Baptism) he mentioned the solemnity of good Friday, Easter-day, Holy Thursday, and Wednesday, and adds, *if any other thing hath occurred, which is kept by the whole church, where ever it spreads itself.* This length our paedobaptist cannot go with the fathers, and Papist in other traditions though they hold fast that of Infants Baptism with them, which was the main argument for it till Luther's time, as Mr. Tombes tells Mr. Baxter in his third part of the Review, page 707 *Nor do I think Mr. Baxter can show me one Author, till Luther's day, who made Infants Baptism, any other than an unwritten tradition, although they produce many of them Scripture, for the necessity, reasonableness, and lawfulness, of the church to use it, to whose authority they affirm to much, in the appointing such rites, and interpreting Scripture to that end, I do not find that the engaged Papists cited by me, did set tradition above Scripture, but that they make it equal with it, I grant, &c.*

Therefore since (by substantial Argument) Tradition, appears to be the Principal Ground, and with so much confidence asserted, both by Papists, and Protestants, to be made good from the writings of all the Ancients (as saith Calvin) and Bellarmine (more modestly) by the writings of almost all the Ancients; Let us therefore in the next place, particularly examine the respective Authorities from Antiquity, avouched for the same; for if they fail, the whole Fabric tumbles down. Here also.

### SECTION 3

#### THE ANTIQUITIES URGED BY MR. WILLS, TO PROVE INFANTS BAPTISM AN APOSTOLIC TRADITION, DISPROVED:

##### **Authorities to prove Infants Baptism Traditional:**

There are five Authorities, that have been usually brought to prove, Infants Baptism and Apostolic Tradition, and the universal practice of the Church, which we have examined distinctly, and give an account of the insufficiency, and weakness, if not the wickedness, of most of them, and which appearing false, all the rest depending upon them, necessarily fall to the Ground.

The first three of them, viz. *Dionysius the Areopagite, in the First Century, the Decretals of the First Popes, or roman Bishops, with Justin Martyrs Responses,* in the second Century, are all of them owned by Mr. Wills to be spurious, and suppositious; though to this day leaned upon, by most of the Popish, and many Protestant writers also; whereby the Mystery of iniquity did early discover itself, not only to Usher in, but to support this innovation, by Lies and Forgeries.

##### **Justin Martyr to Triphon examined.**

But Mr. Wills tells us, that though these are forgeries, yet Justin Martyrs Dialogue to Triphon, is genuine, --- therein saith, that it was lawful for all to receive the Spiritual Circumcision, [viz. Baptism] whereby it may well be inferred, saith Mr. Wills from Mr. Baxter, that if all may receive it, then Infants, who were the subjects of Legal Circumcision, for they must be part of all, and not excluded, Wills 128.

Which I say, is a mere impertinence and nothing to the purpose.

#### FOR FIRST, THERE IS NOT ONE WORD OF INFANTS OR OF INFANTS BAPTISM, OR ITS APOSTOLICNESS.

##### **Justin Himself Contradicts Mr. Wills sense:**

Secondly, it is very absurd (the better to hook in Children) to interpret the word [all] to be all men; for if all men, then it must comprehend wicked, as well as good; believers, as well as Unbelievers; and which (as confined to Baptism, by Master Wills) is to contradict Christ's Commission, and the Apostles practice, who limited it only to those, that repented of their sins, and believed the Gospel. And though it is true, the Gospel was to be preached to all, and all of all Nations, in distinction to the Nation of the Jews, who only were concerned in the first Commission; yet only they taught believers amongst them, were to be Baptized; not the ignorant; and profane; and if the Word all, be so to be understood, it is a witness for us, not them, for Infants thereby are excluded, who are neither capable of instruction, repentance, of Faith. And that it is so to be understood, let Justin himself be the *interpreter*, who not only in his *apology*,

before mentioned, tells us, that they only, who were *instructed in the Faith, and believed, were brought to Baptism, to have their new Birth perfected*. But in this very Dialogue to Tryphon, tells us, *that by the Word, and Baptism, Regeneration was perfected, in all man kind, (viz. in all that did hear, and receive the word, and were capable to come to Baptism.) And again, that by the Grace of God, and the Baptism of Repentance, sins were expiated, as Magdeburgs 2<sup>nd</sup> Century page 47, which sufficiently declares that this is nothing to the purpose, except it be to confirm Believers Baptism only.*

#### **Mr. Baxter's Singular Notion:**

And to which saith *Mr. Tombes, This testimony for Antiquity of Infants Baptism, I remember not alleged by any before Mr. Baxter, and therefore, besides the Impertinence of the words, as he himself allegeth them, I see no need to search further into it, Review 2nd part page 71.*

#### **Ireneus Testimony Examined.**

In the next place Mr. Wills tells us of an other Antiquity, to prove infants Baptism Apostolic viz. Ireneus, whom in Lib. 2. C. 39. *Advers. Haeres, tells us, that Christ did sanctify ever age by his own suspecting of it, and similitude to it. All I say, who by him are born again to God: Whereby (saith Mr. Wills) We infer, that being born again to God, signifying Baptism, as the ancients for the most part took it, then were the Infants baptized in his day, Wills page 129.*

To which I reply, that if this be any more to the purpose than the former, let all Men judge; and whether it be not far fetched, and unnaturally screwed, without either Reason, or truth? For first, here is not one word of Infants Baptism, or its Apostolicness, and nothing but an impertinent begging question upon question, to make up and inference.

Secondly, The interpretations upon which it is founded, is wholly fallacious, for neither the Scripture, nor Justin Martyr, do call Baptism Regeneration absolutely, but only as it is the Symbol of Regeneration, already wrought by the word, and so Justin's words before import, and that only respecting the Adult, that were capable thereof: for if this be true Doctrine, then must all Hypocrites, and wicked men, that either now, or ever were Baptized, be actually thereby Regenerated, and so consequently saved; which is so absurd, and ridiculous, as nothing can be more. To which Mr. Tombes has so well answered Mr. Baxter in his third Review, page 79. (And which was never yet replied to) that we need say no more to it, viz.

#### **Mr Tombes**

*But Christ was not in his Age, an example of every age by his Baptism, as if he did by it sanctify every age, for then he should have been baptized in every age; but in respect to the holiness of his human nature, which did remain in each age, and so exemplarily sanctify every age to God, so as that no age but was capable of holiness, by conformity to his example. Now if the meaning were, that Christ came to save all that were baptized by him, or by his appointment, then he came to save Simon Magus, and who ever are, and have been Baptized rightly, Judas himself. Therefore such a sense is most palpably false, and therefore is this wrested by the Padobaptists, against its meaning, to prove Infants Baptism in his time.*

So that I hope it will be manifest, that these Authorities are as little to the purpose, as the three former, and all though these are not supposititious, yet who is insignificant, and nothing to the purpose.

Whereby it is manifest, that for the first two hundred years we have not the least proof, by any authentic *An hor*, that Infants Baptism was an Apostolic tradition, or that it was once practiced within that compass of time. And therefore saith Doctor Barlow, *I believe, and know that there is, neither Precept, nor practice in Scripture for Padobaptism; nor any just evidence for it, for above two hundred years after Christ.* And may it not be very well concluded, in Mr. Baxter's words about confirmation, *That it was very suspicious, to find in Justin Martyr's description of the Christian Churches practice no mention of it, page, 128.* So neither to find in Just Martyr, nor, as Mr. Tombes well observes, the least of it in *Eusebius, Ignatius, Clemens Alexindrintus, Athanasius, or Epphanius,* is very good ground to conclude against it, and reproof to Mr. Calvin, who saith, *that there is no Ancient writer, that doth not acknowledge, the original of the holy Ordinance of Infants Baptism, even from the Apostles. And to Mr. Marshal also, who hath that the Church hath been in possession of Infants Baptism this fifteen hundred years, and that no one authority can be found witnessing thereto, for two hundred years after Christ.*

#### **Origen's Testimony Tried:**

But in the next place, with greater confidence, saith Mr. Wills; *we adhere to Origen, notwithstanding the frivolous cavils of the Author.* It is true, Origen is the Authority especially gloried in, as being so

positive, and express for it apostolicness, as it is mentioned; *l. 5 and Rom. Chapter 6. And confirmed in Lev. 1:8; Hom. 8 and in Luke Hom. 14.* In these words, *the church hath received a Tradition form the Apostles, to give Baptism to Children (who had the secret Mystery of Divine things committed to them) because they being defiled with the pollution of sin, ought to be washed, or cleansed by the water, and Spirit, &c.*

To which we have said these three thins, viz.

### **Reason given before against it in Treatise of Baptism:**

First, *that Origen is but one single testimony, (as Doctor Tayler observes) and that against so much authentic testimony to the contrary, that none but the Adult are found in the Apostles times, and the next Century after them, to be baptized.*

Secondly, *that his writings are so notorious corrupt, and erroneous, and particularly in the point of Baptism.*

Thirdly, *that many of his ----, and particularly these that treat of Baptism, fell into such ill hands.*

### **MR. WILLS ANSWER TO THE FIRST:**

#### **Dr. Tayler that Origen was but a single Testimony:**

To which Mr. Wills Answers, First, that Origen was not a single testimony, because, saith he, we have the testimony of Ireneus also. But what Ireneus Testimony signifies you have heard; and therefore that neither Ireneus, or any other but Origen's testimony was in the case, you have Doctor Tayler in his dissuasive against Popery, part 2 and page 118 printed 1667, on of his last pieces, saying thus: *That there is Tradition to baptize Infants, relies but upon two witnesses, Origen, and Austin, and the latter having received is from the former, it relies wholly upon a single testimony, which is but pitiful argument, to prove a tradition apostolic, he is the first that spoke it; but Tertullian, that was before him, seems to speak against it, which he would not have done, if it had been a tradition Apostolic. And that it was not so, is but too certain, if there be any truth in the words of Ludov. Vives, saying, that anciently none were baptized, but persons or riper age.*

And herein the Doctor, it must be granted, speaks his own sense, not playing the Anabaptist, as 'tis said he did in his liberty of Prophecy.

To the second, he owes his corruption's, and great errors, but saith to balance him, that Tertullian did not come much short of him, in error, and corruption; that is one of my witnesses.

To which I say, let them then go together, only I shall have thereby the better bargain for Mr. Wills, in parting with Origen parts with all, but I have many more to witness for me besides.

#### **Mr. Wills to the third chargeth me with mistake:**

To the Third, that his *homilies on the Romans, were all translated by Ruffinus, is my mistake, for though Ruffinus might abuse some part of Origen's works, yet that Jerom did translate his Romans, and Luke also and which he saith, appeareth by Jerom's preface, affixed to them as Erasmus, (he tells us) confesseth, and therefore, though Ruffinus hath no credit with me, he hopes Jerom may, they being Jerom's version, and which upon Erasmus testimony puts it beyond all doubt.*

#### **Reply to the Charge therein Mr. Wills appears to be greatly mistaken:**

To which I say, first, that what ever good thoughts Mr. Wills hath of the Translation of the Romans, yet Mr. Perkins is pleased, as I told him, to put it amongst his spurious works.

Secondly, that Erasmus (what ever Mr. Wills so falsely tells us) is so far from asserting the Romans to be Jerom's and not Ruffinus, that he saith just the contrary, in his Century before Origen's words, in these words: *At qualigus ennar Attonem Epistola Z (adthcerius) Romanos est uerum ligit Origenem, ant Ruffinum: And he that reads his commentaries upon the Epistle to the Romans, is uncertain whether he reads Origen, or Ruffinus.*

But is not Jerom's preface before the Epistle? And doth not Erasmus tell us so, to put us beyond all doubt? It is true, Mr. Wills indeed tell us so but what credit is to be given to him, let all Men judge, when Erasmus, and Gryraus also, tell us the quite contrary? Erasmus his words are these: *Hic Ligegrii magnifice perfracnere frontus, and in Prasatione, and in per Oratione pro Ruffino, Hieronymum supponentes, hoc est vitrum pro Gemma Lectori obsrudere conantes, and baclenut sane lefellerunt incantos, nam prefario potera nutcunque viacri Hicronymi, fed in per oratione quasi sorices sno se*

*produnt indicate: Here in the book sellers have been very impudent, both in the preface, and conclusion also, putting Jerom instead of Ruffinus, that is to say, endeavoring to obtrude upon the reader. Glass instead of Jewel, and hitherto indeed they have deceived the unwary: for however, the preface may seem Jerom's set in the peroration (or conclusion) the rats do as it were betray themselves by their own discovery, In like manner (as saith the same author) Qnod idem factum est in symbole: Eum enim librum in Cypriani nomen transtulerunt, sed ita multis commutatis, ut ipsares clamitet non casu, fed de inanstria factum effe: The same thing is done in the symbolism: for they transferred that Book on the name of Cyprian, but many things being so changed, that the matter itself manifests sufficiently, that it was done not by balance but of design.*

*But then saith Mr. Wills, what do you say to Luke? For it is to be noted, that neither the author, nor any one else, hath any thing to say against Homilies on Luke (What ever they have to say, on that on the Lev. And the Romans) where Origen expresseth the same thing, concerning Infants Baptism, and Mr. Perkins himself less this pass without the censure of being spurious, page 132.*

To which I answer, First, then it is not denied, but that Leviticus, wherein is the same thing asserted, is so spoiled by Ruffinus, that it may be justly censured, for Mr. Wills saith nothing to it, and if he did, it is all one, for Erasmus is as positive for that, as for the other.

And as for that of Luke, Mr. Tombes observes in his third review, page ---. That Erasmus saith on Luke 1:3. *Sis enim visus est sentire, quis is suit, cnjus extant in Lucan commentarii Adamantii tituso: For so he seems to think whosoever he was whose commentaries are extant upon Luke under the title of Admantius which shows (saith he) that Erasmus took them not to be Origen's, or at least doubted thereof.*

### **Vossius**

And Vossius Disputatia 14 Section 8 and page 181, saith thus (having cited *Origen's whole testimony out of Luke, &c.*) *Sed de Origene minus laborabimus, qui quacitabimus Grace none extant: But we care the less for Origen's, Because the things we cited are not extant in the Greek.*

### **Scultetus**

And Scultetus in his Medul. Pat. L. 6. C 2. *Cum Graca Originis Opera Non extant bodie, and quibus Latina versia carrigi possit, and emendari: That Origen's works in Greek were not at present extant, by which the Latin version might be corrected, and amended.*

### **Erasmus:**

And Erasmus: *Atque utinam extarent Graca Originis monument: Quo Ruffinicas artes possemus deprehendere: And I wish that the Greek depict of Origen were extant, that so we might thereby discover the cheats of Ruffinus.*

### **Origen was more a Pelagian than to assert original Sin:**

But secondly, there is good reason to question, that those things about Infants Baptism, were not Origen's, from the reasons that is added to them, viz. to take away Original Sin; whereas it is so well known, that Origen was not only a great Arian, but the very fountain, and head of them, as *Jerom, and Epiphanius*, calls him Magdeburg, 3<sup>rd</sup> Century page 261. &c. but *notoriously did deny Original Sin*, as stated on pate 265. And therefore doth Doctor Owin, in his display of Arinsme Chapter 12, *say nor did Origen Pelaginize a little only, but is supposed first to have brought Pelagism into the Church.*

And therefore doth Vossius in his History of Pelaginism L. 4 Th. 6 page 153. *So much question, whether those passages in his works, mentioning Infants Baptism, could be his, upon the account of Pelaginism.*

By all which I doubt not, but that the judicious Reader will conclude, there is a good Ground, to judge this Testimony of *Origen's*, upon all these accounts, to be as invalid, and insignificant, as the *former*; and that as yet we have not the least evidence, to prove this our unwritten tradition to be Apostolic.

### **Cyprians Testimony Examined:**

The last, and chiefest, that is pretended to warrant this an apostolic Tradition, is that of Cyprian, in his, and his 66 Bishops Epistle to Fidus, (who is placed by Usher in the Middle of the third Century, 250) wherein it is said to this purpose, Viz.

### **An Epitome of his Epistle:**

*That it seemed good, not only to himself, but a whole council, those Infants might be baptized before the eight days and the Reasons to enforce it are these that follow. First, because the Baptism was simply necessary to Salvation. Secondly, That it washes away Original Sin, so, as it is never to be imputed more. Thirdly, Because the Grace of God is tendered to all, therefore all children should be baptized. Fourthly, Because children have lesser sins than others do, and so they need less pardon than Men of grown years, therefore less hindrance in them, to come to God's Grace. Fifthly, Because in their First birth they do nothing, but pray by they're crying, and weeping. Sixthly, Because the Soul, that is not baptized, is left. Cypr. 1. 3. Ep. 8.*

#### **AGAINST WHICH I GAVE IN THREE EXCEPTIONS.**

##### **Former Exceptions:**

First, Because Infants Baptism is not hereby urged, for an Apostolic Tradition, nor upon any Authority of Scripture, but upon his own, and Bishops arguments (as said) such as they are to enforce it, though if he should have said, it was an Apostolic Tradition, his word would no more have been taken, then when he tells us, Chrysme, and other inventions were so too.

Secondly, Because there is ground to Question, whether there was any such council: First, Because there is no place mentioned, where such a council was kept. Secondly, the grounds are so weak, and erroneous. Thirdly, Because it was a doctrine so much contradicted by his great master Tertullian. Fourthly, Because there were many things fathered upon him, not his.

Thirdly, That if it did truly appear to be his, yet there was little ground to receive it upon his word, as the rest of his corrupt, erroneous, and Antichristian doctrines, vented by him, whereof you have some account from the Magdeburgs in his Naevi.

##### **Mr. Wills answer to the First:**

*To the first he says, though he did not say, it was an apostolic Tradition, it follows not that he did not so own it, the Magdeburgs say that he did so affirm it.*

##### **Reply:**

To which I say, that in proofs of Apostolic Tradition, it is necessary to bring such only that upon warrantable ground are positive in it: For this at the best can be urged, but as a consequential proof, and far fetch too; viz. Because Cyprian in his time gave his opinion for it, therefore it was practiced in that age, and because it was practiced, two hundred and fifty years after Christ's time, therefore it was the practice of the Apostles, which if allowed, would be excellent authority, for all the superstitious observations of Chrysme, Exorcisms, and an hundred more of those knacks.

But he tells us, the Magdeburgs say, that Cyprian affirmed it was so. And that is just as much as if Mr. Wills should so affirm, except some Ancient, and Authentic authority be produced for the same; and it is not yet evidenced, out of his writings, that the any where saith so.

##### **Mr. Wills answer to the 2<sup>nd</sup> part of the First:**

But as to what I say, that if Cyprian had any where upon his own word told us, it had been an apostolic Tradition, yet it would have signified as little, as his telling us, that Chrysme was so, He replied:

*And doth not the same exception lie against Tertullian, who as the Magdeburg's tell us, was the inventor of Chrysme, and therefore (says he) is such inflexibleness, stiffness, and partiality, fair, and equal?*

##### **Reply"**

To which I say, If Tertullian, his master was the inventor of Chrysme, which Cyprian calls an Apostolic Tradition, what credit the is to be given to his testimony, that dares to avouch so fearful a lie so knowingly.

Secondly, if he should tell us, upon his own word, two hundred years after, that both were Apostolic, we have great reason to distrust, that of Infants Baptism, when we know the other is a manifest Falsehood.

Neither is there the like reason, to reject Tertullian's Testimony against Infants Baptism: First, because it is only urged as matter of Fact, that Infants Baptism was denied by him, to be an ordinance of Christ, the verity whereof (I think) never any doubted, with the reasons he gives for the same, in his book de

Baptism, as Doctor Barlow, and Doctor Tayler, so fully acknowledge: Had he indeed told us, that two hundred years before him (without any proof, but his own say so) some of the apostles had denied it, and at the same time told us, a manifest lie of them also, there had been, the like cause to have question his evidence: and as to Tertullian's testimony, so much contemned by Mr. Wills, you shall hear more of it in the next Chapter, where my witnesses are vindicated, against his Cavils.

### **Mr. Wills to the Answer:**

To the second exception, as to the three Grounds I urge, why no such Council? He first answers with a scoff (*and that is strange for one that hath launched out, as he hath done, into the vast Ocean of Antiquity*) then gives the reason, why he judges there was such a Council, because so many (in the fourth and fifth Century) of the Fathers, (some of whom he mentions from Doctor Hamond) had such a venerable esteem for it. But what then?

That is no Argument, it was a decree of such a council, because so many had a good esteem of it: for all the same Fathers, he mentions, esteemed very well of Chrysm, and Exorcism, &c. asserted by Cyprian; Do it therefore follow they were appointed by him in council, and to be received therefore by them, and all others, without further dispute. But that Cyprian's dictates were not so authentic among the Ancients, may appear by their universally rejecting, his Doctrine of Rebaptization, though determined in an undoubted council, at Carthage in Africa, under Gallus, mentioned in his Epistle to Jabbanus, and in all his Epistles, Magdeburg 3<sup>rd</sup> Century page 194. And that novel opinion of his, about sprinkling also, in his Epistle to Magnus, L. 4. Ep. 7. Which all of them declined for so many Ages?

### **Reply nothing to the Third:**

As to the other three Arguments, against the Council, he saith nothing at all; neither doth he say one word against those childish, erroneous, and ridiculous grounds, the (supposed) learned counsel gives for that their opinion, which I urge in the third reason: Only he Cavils with me for the Argument I urge from Austin's Confession against this council this council, viz. that it had not been determined in any Council, saying, that it is a pitiful mistake, and misunderstanding of Austin's words; who saith: Who had not its first institution from some Council. To which I say, the words are *Nec Consists institutum*: Neither instituted, or decreed in Councils. There is not first: So that he did certainly, by these words, conclude against any institution, or Determination, in this, as well as any other Council; and this to be sure, if it be not in this supposed council, of Cyprian determined, and instituted, he finds it no where else (this being the first Council, that ever is pretended to intention it, and excepting Origen he particularized, no authority higher. Austin's words run thus: *That which the Church (viz. in his time) held, and which had neither been instituted (in Cyprian, nor) in other council (so concluding against all Councils) and which was always held (yet gives no higher account, to prove that universal Tenet then Origen) must therefore be an Apostolic Tradition. A Notable convincing Argument no doubt, and so far from being next to, demonstration, as Mr. Wills fondly asserts, that it is next to nothing, and just as good, and authentic, as Austin's assertion, that the giving the Sacraments to Children, was Apostolic, and necessary to Salvation.*

And then in Mr. Philpot's words he tells us, because we deny this of Cyprian, to be good proof: *That the verity of Antiquity is with them, and that the Anabaptists have nothing, but lies for them, and their new imaginations, which feign that Baptism of Children is the Popes commandment.*

To which I say that what ever Mr. Philpot (that worthy Martyr) might heretofore in ignorance affirm, and Mr. Wills may now, with so much prejudice repeat and second: Yet he must pardon, us if we say: That until as full a command from Christ, he produced for Infants Baptism, as is from the Pope for the same, that the lie he talks of, will certainly rest at their door, who with so much confidence assert, that it was Christ's Precept, and the Apostles Practice, and yet are able to bring no more from Scripture, or Antiquity, to warrant it, whilst all that full-mouthed, and undeniable evidence, from the Popes Canons, and decrees, are manifested by us for the same.

But if it should be granted Mr. Wills, that this of Cyprian's decree was authentic, and that there was then a determination, to baptize all Children upon the reasons and Grounds mentioned therein (viz. because God's grace was rendered to all. Secondly, Because Children were more capable of it, than grown men. Thirdly, Because it was necessary to Salvation. Fourthly, Because of available to wash away original Sin. Fifthly, because they do nothing, but pray when they cry, in the first birth. And Sixthly, Because they would otherwise be left) What would it avail to prove, that their Infants Baptism that Mr. Wills pleads for, was an apostolic Tradition, or practiced in those first times? For Mr. Wills renounced this

as erroneous, and false, as we do his, who is neither for the baptizing of all children, nor upon those grounds asserted, which he reprobates, as Popish, and Ridiculous: And therefore Protegees his scheme for baptizing Children to cure diseases, might as well have been produced by Mr. Wills as Cyprians model to save their souls, and both like significant to what Mr. Wills pleads for. It is true this supposed Decree of Cyprians was the true Pattern, that those first Popish councils wrote after, and which the Papists have followed ever since, and who therefore do as much renounce Mr. Wills infants baptism, as he doth theirs, upon which score it was that the Larins counted the baptism of the Greek Church a nullity, and did rebaptize those again, as the Greeks did theirs, and therefore is Calvin, and Luther and those that made the first change, from the old pattern, put by the Popish writers amongst those, that positively denied Infants baptism, for they concluded that they had as good deny it, as so to alter the Ceremonial form, and change the ends thereof; So that if Mr. Wills seeks for Antiquity, for the Baptism of the Infants of believers only, he cannot go higher than Luther or Zwinglius, as Mr. Tombes observes, and if for the Children only of unchurched parents, (which I conceive to be his judgement) he cannot extend it higher than the New England pattern, about forty or fifty years since.

Thus it is manifest to you first, that there is neither precept, nor example, in Scripture for Infants Baptism, as is so fully acknowledged. So secondly, that the Scriptures silence, or its not bidding, cannot justify any thing in Gods worship, and that nothing but an express Scripture that carries, thus saith the Lord Jesus along with it, can free any from superstition and false worship; which fully excludes Infants Baptism by their own grants, Mr. Wills acknowledging (they cannot say), thus saith the Lord Jesus, Baptize your children. And Thirdly, it is as fully manifested, that the pretended Antiquity, for the practice of Infants Baptism fails; none proving it higher by any approved Author, than the fourth, or fifth Century: and then no other Baptism, than hath been renounced by most Protestants, as corrupt, and erroneous; and that however the Papists, and those that go their way, may prove Antiquity as high as the fourth, or fifth Century: Yet that Mr. Wills can go no higher for his, than New England, or at the furthest than Luther.

---

### CHAPTER III

#### WHEREIN THE WITNESSES AGAINST INFANTS BAPTISM, ARE VINDICATED FROM MR. WILL'S EXCEPTIONS.

The Witnesses produced by me, against Infants Baptism, were either particular people, or Churches, as you have them at large mentioned in the Seventh Chapter.

And first, as to the evidence from particular Persons, Mr. Wills in his preface tells us: *That notwithstanding all the flourishes Mr. D. makes, and the numerous quotations, he hath fetches from the Magdeburgensian History, in his seventh Chapter, from the first Century, to the end of the twelfth, there are but two persons, to be found against Infants Baptism, viz. Adrianus, and Hinemarus, which is just the same number, he was pleased to allow me before, for Believers Baptism; but whether these, and their follows, may not speed, as well as the former, shall be put to as fair a trial, and so submitted to judgment.*

#### **Tertullian the first Witness:**

The First of my witnesses, urged against Infants Baptism, was Tertullian, who doth as expressed page 221, eminently oppose it, in six arguments: first, from the mistaken Scripture, Matt. 19:14, suffer little Children, &c. (by which it seems some would have introduced such a practice) which could not, as he saith, be properly applied to Infants Baptism, for several Reasons urged from their incapacitates. Secondly, from the weightiness of that ordinance, which required caution, and consideration, and no such has. Thirdly, from the sinfulness of such a practice, by profaning an ordinance, and partaking of others sins, fourthly, from the absurdity of such a practice, in refusing to intrust them with earthly things, and yet commit Spiritual things to their trust. Fifthly, from the folly of expressing witness, propounded it seems, to supply the want of capacity in them, and to undertake for them. Sixthly, from the consideration that the Adult, upon many considerations, were the only proper subjects of Baptism. And to which we may add a seventh (which he is pleased (to falsely) to say, I purposely, and subtly omitted, there being no cause for it, that I know) viz. From the insignificance of the end, propounded for the same, viz. To take away to

which testimony, in the First place, he gives this acknowledgement, page 96 viz. *That it is acknowledged that Tertullian, who was the first writer of note in the Latin Church, hath divers passages seemingly against Infants Baptism, but yet withal it must be considered, that his testimony (such as it is) is but the testimony of one single Dr. in opposition to the general custom of the Church.*

Whereby the way, we may take notice, that our witness is owned by him, but the general, customs of the Church, he speaks of, is yet to be proved as utterly disowned by us, and for which there is not the least color of truth as yet produced.

### **Charges him with corruption and weakness:**

And again page 6, he doth grant, *That the Magdeburgs do indeed tell us, that Tertullian in thee third age, opposed himself to some that asserted Infants Baptism, affirming that the Adult were the only proper subjects of Baptism.* But what a corrupt person he was, and how weakly he had reasoned, he endeavors with much keenness to demonstrate.

In answer whereto I say, that this witness being allowed, and to such a Doctor or Note took in the Latin Church, it is sufficient; and I think, we need say nothing to those cavils of Corruption, and weakness the evidence being acknowledged. (The main thing intended) and which will be endless to answer, in ever authority that may be urged Pro and Con.

But yet in as much he is our first witness, and speaks so much reason, and truth, and so much to the purpose. And to make Mr. Wills his unreasonable opposition, ht better to appear, we shall give some distinct reply, to his exceptions against this our witness, whom he arraigns for so much corruption in Doctrine, and folly in this particular witness.

### **The Corrupt Doctrine he charges:**

And first, for that great corruption in Doctrine, he charges him with, about Chrysmes. I presume that are none of his ancient Doctors comes short of him, and who were as much Montanists as he therein, viz. *Origen, Cyprian, Chrysoctom, Austin &c.* only herein *Tertullian* was more Orthodox, holding none of those to be True Divine, whilst they took them to be Apostolic Traditions, and essential to Baptism, Magdeburg, 3<sup>rd</sup> Century, Chapter 10 and page 240. Compare 82, 225, 248. And for those evil sentiments of God, and Christ, it is certain that Origen did far exceed him, as you will find at large in his Navi, page 261. &c. and which argues a very partial mina to be so quick sighted in the one, and so stark blind in the other. And as to his being a Montanist, before he wrote his Book of Baptism, which Mr. Wills affirms, I see it not confirmed by any good authority, the Magdeburgs tell us, that from Carthage, he went to Rome, and lived long there, where he wrote against the Montanist, and wrote his book of prescriptions, as Helvicus saith, the filth of Severus, which Mr. Wills owns to be about the fortieth year of his age: And the said Helvicum tells us, that it was twenty years after, before he wrote for the Montainsts. And he that writes the lives of the Primitive Fathers, page 82 tell us, that in the eleventh year of Severus, Tertullian wrote his book of Baptism, against Quntila in his third Tome next to his prescriptions, and in the fifteenth year, his book of the resurrection, &c. But if he was turned Montanist before, the matter is not much, for it much be owned, that a man that is erroneous in one thing may be Orthodox enough in another: the business, whether as to matter of fact, he spoke these things against Infants Baptism, and that is not denied: and in the next place, whether he spoke not reason, and truth in that his testimony, which in the next place we shall examine.

Therefore secondly, as to the weakness of his Argument, which he renders so contemptible, and ridiculous and guilty of so much dotages's, I make the following particular reply to each exception, viz.

### **He abused not the Text Matt. 19:14**

First, as to his first argumnt, from the mistaken Scripture, he saith, he abuseth the Text by his paraphrases. But second thoughts will I presume, tell him, it is no abuse, but a very proper answer to them, that would make the word Come in the Text: to be a coming to baptism; which, saith he, cannot be, *because children cannot come to that Ordinance, till they are elder, till they know, and are taught, why they come, &c. Will you have them made Christians, before they know Christ?* And what could be spoken more full, and pertinuous, and more agreeable to truth?

### **To defer Baptism is often necessary:**

Secondly, from his advising caution, and consideration, from the weightiness of the Ordinance, he makes sport with it, as he applies it afterwards, to young men, and young women, viz. that they should

rather defer, and consider what they did, and how much mortification, and Sanctification, was required therein, then headily and rashly to practice it, and which conceive was wholesome council, and no way ridiculous, and no other than John the Baptist gave those that came to his Baptism, viz. that they would first bring forth fruits meet for Repentance, and amendment of life, agreeing also with the advice our Doctor gives in the case, viz. To sit down, and consider what the Christian life calls for, and what it will cost.

### **The Ordinance is Profaned Thereby:**

Thirdly, from the sin of *profaning the Ordinance where he charges Tertullian with contradiction, having, as he saith, else where acknowledged, that the Children of believers were holy, whom here he calls dogs*: Which is Mr. Wills mistake, he calls them dogs, but alludes only to Christ's proverbial saying, of profaning an Ordinance, viz. that such a practice would be as profane, as to cast perils before the Swine, and Holy thing to dogs.

### **Irrational and Absurd:**

Fourthly, from the absurdity of refusing to *intrust children with -----, though their want of knowledge, and authority, and yes commit greater things; viz. Spiritual to them, which he saith, is a very sorry argument, because children were capable of circumcision of old, and of benediction in the text. But what then? Were they not merely passive in both, and wherein neither knowledge, Faith, nor Activity was required, but all these required and absolutely necessary in Baptism? If thou believest with all thy heart, thou mayest; which Mr. Baxter so well observes, includes the negative, other than thou mayest not.*

### **No Rule For Sureties.**

Fifthly, from the folly of exposing of sureties (a good witness against them) which, saith Mr. Wills; speaks nothing against Infants Baptism: But therein he must pardon me, for taking away sureties (who were afterwards appointed to Repent, Believe, Confess, Promise, and Renounce, for the Children, as you have heard) Infants Baptism must needs fall, which had its main foundation upon them.

### **Proper only for the Adult:**

Sixthly, from the Consideration, that the Adult persons were the only subjects, from the necessity of the Prerequisites thereto, viz. Repentance, Faith, Fasting, Prayer, Viz. To which Master Wills saith that those might belong to Aliens. But what is that to Tertullian's saying? That they, viz. the Adult, are only to be Baptized, from the reasons, before mentioned, so agreeing also with the Scripture.

### **The End Insignificant:**

Seventhly, from the *Insignificance of the end propounded, viz. To take away sin*, and was not this sound Doctrine? And which, I presume, Mr. Wills himself must conclude, much more orthodox, than all the devisee of the Doctors, and councils, requiring Children to be Baptized (upon penalty of damnation) to take away their sins.

Now therefore what reason he hath so to vaunt over this witness, as such a piece of Dotage, and contemn it as so ridiculous, is submitted to judgement. Let him but produce as good Arguments, from any of his Ancient Doctors, for Infants Baptism, we will not contemn them, and when he makes as good a defense for Cyprians, and his 66, Bishops Grounds for it, we shall not slight, and scoff at it.

### **Dr. Barlow**

But in further confirmation of this our witness you have Doctor Barlow, telling us, *That Tertullian dislikes, and condemns Infants Baptism, as unwarrantable, and irrational.*

### **Daille**

Daille also tells us, as you have it page 149 that *Tertullian was of an opinion that Infants were not to be baptized.*

### **Scultet**

And Scultetus, also in his Medul. Pat. Lib. U Cap. 42, Page 1. *Tells us, that Tertullian, in his book of Baptism affirms, that they only should be baptized, that were capable of the knowledge of Christ.*

### **Magdeburgs**

The Magdeburgs do also tell us, page 52 that *he was only for Adult Baptism, and opposed himself to those that affirmed other wise.*

### **Beatus Rhenanus:**

Beatus Rhenanus, in his annotations upon Tertullian, saith, *That those that were come to their full growth were baptized, which custom, saith he, was long observed.*

### **His Own Grant:**

But what need we offer any more, Mr. Wills himself hath already owned it. Though not so honest, to add him to the other two, he granted me, which the ingenious reader I doubt not will do.

And as to his allegation, that this instance of Tertullian's denying it, *was a great evidence, that it was early practiced in the Church, is already spoke to:* For all that can be gathered thence, is that some pleaded for such a practice, and that it was as well confused, and suppressed (by sound reason, and truth) from this person of note; but what man of note witnessed for it, or that the Church, as he saith, in this time practiced it, is yet to be proved, Mr. Wills his insinuations being not sufficient.

### **Above 40 particular Witnesses against Infants Baptism unanswered:**

After Tertullian I have give you (from page 229, to 237, 243, 246, and 285.) above forty more particular instances of persons, that have asserted believers, and denied Infants Baptism, and to which I did expect (as in reason, and justice I ought) some fair return from my Antagonist, but instead thereof meet with the quite contrary, giving me just occasion of complaint.

### **Except only against Six or Seven:**

First, because he only excepts against Six, or Seven, and objects nothing against all the rest, and yet allows me but two of the whole number, viz. Adrianus, and Hincmarus, saying nothing to Vincentius, Victor, Heribertus, Cresconius, Fulgentius, Regienses, Albanus, the Swermers, Arnoldus, Henericus, Bruns, and about thirty more, so fully denying Infants, and asserting believers Baptism only: and therefore may it not fairly be concluded, that either his silence gives consent to the whole, or else his dealing is very disingenuous, and unfair.

### **His Exceptions weak and Frivolous:**

Secondly, Because his exceptions against those Six, or Seven, are so frivolous.

First, he tells me, Berinus is nothing to my purpose, because he respects Pagans only; of which let the Reader judge, who saith as page 232, that Baptism ought not to be administered to any, without instruction.

Secondly, That Guillertus, and Smaragdus, were both for infants baptism, which I also own; But with all say, that the Dutch century Writers do tell us, that they both altered their minds, and which I give you at large from them, page 234. Of which he takes not the least notice.

Thirdly, that I brought in Durandus, a severe enemy against Anabaptists, as a witness against Infants Baptism, page 146, the quite contrary he will find, is true in my page 242, where I pronounce him as the great enemy, and persecutor of Brauno, and Berengarius, for their witness against Infants Baptism; and is it not very Inguitious, and contradictious for him, to owns that Durandus was so severe and Enemy against Anabaptists, and yet not to acknowledge, and allow me Bruno, and Berengarius, my two witnesses I produce, for denying Infants Baptism, that he persecuted the same. It is true Durandus is in the index, I do not know how, put among the witnesses, but the said index directs to the page, where the story is rightly told you, and from whence he had the account, what an enemy he was to the Anabaptist.

Fourthly, that the Bishop of Apamer, &c. was mentioned amongst my witnesses, and page, 231, said to be for Anabaptism, yet not said to be against Infants Baptism, page 146. But the late Century Writers, so calling them in a modern sense, we have not reason to doubt it.

Fifthly, that I have nothing to evidence, that Peter Bruis denied Infants Baptism, but the prudent stories of two lying Abbots when he know I produced three, or four evidences more, to prove it: And he also knows, that those pretended absurdities he would bring upon the two Abbots, viz. Clunicenses, and Bernard, are lying forgeries of his own, which I shall presently demonstrate.

Sixthly, that I have no ground to say that Wickliff denied Infants Baptism, page 146, when I produced so much evidence to prove it, which you have from page 283 to 289, demonstrating, that he not only affirmed, that believers were the only subjects of Baptism, but withal that Children are not sacramental to be baptized, and what can be more express evidence in the case.

#### **A Notorious Fallacy and Abuse detected:**

Another piece of injurious dealing, I have to complain against our Author for, is for his fathering so notorious a fallacy upon the reader, and abuse upon myself, in affirming that I produce no great Bede-rote of witnesses against Infants Baptism, who were so firmly for it, as I in contradiction to my self grant. Viz. Austin, Chrysoftome, page 25 of his. And Theopolact, Anselme, Bede, Gregory, Anstoercus, Albertus, Lambard, &c. And the three Councils of Bracaraens. Tollatan, and Constantinople in his Recapitulation, page 139, &c.

Whereas I have again, and again said, that I produce them not as positive witnesses against Infants Baptism, there being not one of them in my Catalogue (which would have been madness indeed, when I have brought them in amongst those that have reasons only, viz.

#### **Why Persons owning Infants Baptism are produced for witnesses:**

First, to shew what strong arguments, so agreeing to the Scripture Institution, and Pattern, they have themselves produced for believers' baptism only, viz. From the necessity of Confession and Profession of Faith, and Repentance before Baptism.

Secondly, upon what weak and erroneous grounds, they assert Infants Baptism also, most of which I have given pro, and Con, that their contradictions not mine, may appear.

Thirdly, that, that which they make to reconcile that contradiction, may appear insignificant, viz. the Confession, and Profession of Gossips, or Sureties for them, of which the Scripture makes no mention, and whereby all the former Authorities, for Believers Baptism, may appear good for us, and against themselves.

#### **The Witnesses produced from Churches.**

Having thus cleared my testimonies, given in from particular persons, I come in the next place, to examine what he hath said to the witnesses, produced from the several Churches, I have mentioned, viz. the Waldenses, Donatists, Britains, &c. concerning whom he is pleased thus to express himself, page 129. *And in reference to the confidence of my Antagonist, that the Waldenses, Donatists, and Britains, were all against Infants Baptism, when none of them were, makes good the Proverb, Pertureant Montes, &c.*

But what cause he hath for this confident vainglorious beast, will soon be tried.

#### **THE WITNESS BORN BY THE WALDENSES, AGAINST INFANTS BAPTISM, JUSTIFIED.**

#### **The 4-fold Evidence to Prove the Waldenses denied Infant Baptism:**

The first he opposed, is that of the Waldenses whose witnesses Against Infants Baptism, I make good from a four fold Demonstration, viz.

First, from their confessions of Faith. Secondly, from the Witness born there to, by their most eminent men. Thirdly, from the decrees of Councils, Popes, and Empeorors, against the Body of the People, for the same. And Fourthly, from the footsteps thereof, they have left in the several Regions, and Countries, where they have been dispersed.

Upon which he make this following reply, page 46, viz. *That there are two sorts of people, that 'tis like will be imposed upon by the Flourishes, which this Champion makes, those who are ignorant, and those who are prejudiced against Infants Baptism, no doubt but all this will pass for Gospel amongst such:* But I may say of the Author, *Multalequitur, sednibit dict, or rather Prebats and that which he saith, is but vex, and praterea kibil: A great found words, but no proof, and this he promised to make appear in order.*

To the First, as to the confessions of Faith, he saith two things: *First, that there are no such confessions to be found of that nature, nor anything that looks like a Confession, unless it be in Utopia, page 111. But my adversary hath a notable dexterity, to prove, Quidlibet, exquolibet, page 46.*

Secondly, *That the quite contrary appears by their contrary confessions of Faith, witnessing how firmly they did assert Infants Baptism, page 46 and 64, &c.*

To both which I answer, First, that it may be manifest to the Reader, that their Confessions of Faith, do indeed exclude Infants from Baptism, I shall give in a parallel betwixt, what their Confessions say, and what he, in the Repetition thereof, makes them say, and leave it to judgement, how fairly he hath dealt therein.

**WHAT THEIR CONFESSIONS ARE**

Asp. 239 &c.

The Waldenses Confessions of Faith:

*[That God hath not only instructed us by his Word] But hath also ordained certain Sacraments to be joined with it, at a means to unite us unto, and to make us partakers of his benefits.*

*And that there are only two of them [belonging in common is as Members of the Church, under the New Testament, viz. Baptism and the Lord's Supper.]*

*We do believe, that in the Sacrament of Baptism, water is the visible, and external sign, which represents unto us.*

*That which [by the invisible virtue of God operating] is within [us] viz. the renovation of the Spirit, and the Mortification of our Members in Jesus Christ.*

*By which also we are received into the holy congregation of the People of God's heir professing, and declaring openly our Faith and amendment of life.]*

*We esteem for abomination, and Anti-Christian, all human inventions, as trouble, and prejudice to the liberty of the Spirit.*

*When human Traditions, are observed for God's Ordinances, then is he worshiped in vain, as Es. 19, Matt. 15. And which is done when grace is attributed to the External ceremonies, and persons enjoined, to partake of Sacraments, without Faith and Truth.*

*That Anti-Christ attributes the Re-generation of the Holy Spirit, unto the dead outward work of baptizing Children [into that Faith] and teacheth that thereby, [Baptism] and Regeneration must be had, [grounding therein all in Christianity, which is against the Holy Spirit.]*

**WHAT HE MAKES THEIR CONFESSIONS TO BE:**

Whereby you have demonstrated, his great unfaithfulness in misrepresenting their Confessions, by leaving out so much material, and considerable parts thereof, that make against him, and then unfairly, and untruly to say: *That there was a harmony between all the Protestant Churches in the World, in those articles, and the Waldenses, because all that are for Infants Baptism, believe the same.*

But whether it is so indeed, let us examine the Particulars.

**1. Infants not Capable to hear the Word:**

Page 45 &c.

-----  
-----  
-----

*God hath ordained certain Sacraments to be joined with the word, as are meant to unite us unto, and to make us partakers of his benefits.*

*And that there are only two of them -----*

-----  
-----  
-----  
-----

*We do believe that in the Sacraments of Baptism, water is the visible and external sign, which represents unto us.*

*That which -----*

-----  
-----is within ---- viz.  
*Renovation of the Spirit, and mortification of our members in Jesus Christ.*

-----  
-----  
-----  
-----  
-----

*We esteem for an abomination, and Anti-Christian, all human inventions, as a trouble, and prejudice to the Liberty of the Spirit.*

*When Human Traditions, are observed for God's Ordinances, then is he worshiped in vain, as Es. 19 Mat.15. And which is done, when grace is attributed to the External Ceremonies, and persons enjoined, to partake of Sacraments, without saith, and truth.*

*That Anti-Christ attributes the regeneration of the Holy Spirit, unto the dead outward work of baptizing Children, -----  
----- and teacheth that thereby, regeneration must be had:*

First, do all the Paedobaptists believe, *That Baptism, and preaching the Word, are joined together to instruct the Baptized partners, and that thereby they have union with Christ, and partake of his benefits?* Pray, how is that to be made good, in any Infant, that has no actual knowledge, Faith, or Understanding?

## **2. Nor of the Lord Supper:**

Secondly, do they indeed believe the Lord's Supper to belong in common, with Baptism, in all the members of the Church, why then do not Infants partake of one, as well as the other, since it belongs to them in common, if Members of the Church, as Mr. Wills saith, they are?

## **3. Nor to understand the Symbol thereof**

Thirdly, do Paedobaptists, with the *Waldenses*, believe as you say that water in Baptism is the usual sign, representing to the subjects thereof, the invisible virtue of God operating in them, viz. *renovation of the Spirit, and mortification of their Members?* And can it be truly said, it is so to an Infant, that is not capable to put form any act of Faith, Repentance, or Mortification, or discern any the least sign in the water, of any such things signified thereby.

## **4. Nor to make Confession of Faith before it:**

Fourthly, have they indeed a harmony with the *Waldenses*, in what further they confess, concerning this Ordinance? Viz. *That by it they are received into the holy congregation of the people of God, there professing, and declaring openly their Faith, and amendment of life.* But how is the Infant capable, with the *Waldensian* Christians (not pagan converts) to profess, and declare openly their Faith, and Repentance, and so to be received into the Congregation thereby?

## **5. That Infants Baptism is a human Tradition, and why:**

Fifthly, do Paedobaptists indeed believe with them, *That human Traditions, and Inventions, are to be esteemed Anti-Christian admonitions, and vain worship*, and that, that worship is vain and Traditional, when Persons are enjoined to it, without Faith, and truth? Why then are Infants baptized by them that have no Faith, or Knowledge of Truth? And for which there is neither precept, nor Example in God's Word? And by them owned to be an unwritten Tradition?

## **6. Anti-Christ grounds all religion in it:**

Sixthly, do they believe; *Those Anti-Christ Grounds all Christianity, and Religion, in the Baptism of Children, attributing Regeneration to that outward work done, contrary to the Holy Spirit?* Why then do they baptize Children, which as acknowledges, is the basis, and foundation of the false Church, and so contrary to the Spirit, and for which there is nothing, but the decrees of Popes, and Anti-Christian Councils, to warrant it.

Whereby you see, that Infants are manifestly excluded Baptism, in these six particulars, in these Confessions: And that Paedobaptists can not assert the same, without evident contradiction to themselves.

## **Objections to the contrary Confessions:**

But in the next place, if these Confessions be good as your say, against Infants Baptism, yet what do you say to those contrary Confessions, that own the Baptizing of Infants, as Master Wills hath given them from Perin, page 62, 63, 65.

## **Answer:**

To which I say, it is to me matter of the greatest admiration, that I having with that exactness, especially in the last edition, given you such a particular account of all those confessions, word for word, both of that of Bohemia, and that of Prevence: and proved to you by such ample demonstration, the following particulars, viz. First, that none of them were extant till the sixteenth Century, whereas the other is upon Record in the eleventh, or twelfth Centuries, so many hundred years before. Secondly, that, that confession, said to be made by the *Waldenses* in Bohemia, to King Ladislus, where not *Waldenses*, as they themselves acknowledge in the preamble thereof. Thirdly, have given an account how, and by what means, and when, those of *Provence* came to introduce that custom, so contrary to what their ancient Barb's had instructed them in: how sadly they had inclined even to going to mass. And how contradictory that practice was, to other parts of the Confessions, into which it was foisted; And that these *Waldenses* of *Provence*, that made these Confessions were inconsiderable to the Body of the People, that was dispersed

into so many parts of the World, that held the contrary. Yet Mr. Wills should take so little notice, of what I have said; and Mr. Bllndman that has written since (who has also transcribed the said contrary confession) without the least notice to what I have said, in answer thereto; which I think is such an abuse, as was never offered by any, pretending to answer books, and therefore I must refer them, and all others that desire satisfaction therein, to what I have so fully, and as humbly conceive, unanswerably spoken to each Confession.

## **2. From Their Eminent Leading Men:**

The Second demonstration, proving that the Waldenses denied Infants Baptism, is from the witness, that was born against it, by some of their most eminent leading men; viz. *Berengarius*, in the eleventh Century; *Peter Bruis*, *Henericus*, and *Arnoldus*, in the twelfth.

Berengarius:

*First, Berengarius*, who was so famous, *that the Waldenses were called after his name for a hundred years after, as Mr. Clark tells us*, and who filled all *France, Italy, and England*, with his *Doctrine, as Matthew Paris*, and who so eminently witnessed, not only against *Transubstantiation*, but *Infants Baptism*, which is made good.

First, from the reply that Lanifrank, Archbishop of Canterbury, gave to him upon that point, in his book called *Scintillaris*, saying, *that in denying Infants Baptism, he did oppose the General Doctrine, and general consent of the Church*, Magdeburg, Century 11, c. 5. Page 240.

Secondly, Cassancer out of Guitmond, *That with the real presence, he denied Baptism to little ones, though the latter not so publicly as the former.*

Thirdly, by the council, called by Henry the I of France, to suppress the heresies of Bruno, and Berengarius, for denying *Transubstantiation*, and *Infants Baptism*, Rib. Pat. Page 432.

Fourthly, from the testimony of Thuanus, witnessing, that Bruno, Archbishop of Triers, did persecute the Berengarians, for denying infants baptism, as you have it page 242 & 243.

None of which he excepts against, only saith, that there were several concepts, in which Berengarius was persecuted for the reap presence, but no mention is made of his denying *Infants Baptism*, page 51.

But what then? This four-fold testimony is enough to prove it. Secondly, Peter Brunis, Henerici, and Arnoldus, all in the twelfth Century, and so eminent that the Waldenses for a long time were called by their names, viz. *Petrobrusiani*, *Henerici*, and *Arnolds*, did all of them deny *Infants Baptism*, which is made good by these following Testimonies. Viz.

First, that Peter Bruis denied it, is testified by Peter Cinniacenses, who amongst the several things he charges him with (fifteen in number) puts his denying *Infants Baptism* in the front, in four particulars, Osiander Century 12, Lib. 3 Cap. 3.

Secondly, The said Peter cluniscenses, writhes to three Bishops in France, that the *Petrobrusiani*, and *henerici*, denied *Infants Baptism* and held *Rebaptization*, &c. and that when he urged for *paedobaptist*, the *Ambority of Austin*, and the *Latin Fathers*; Peter, and his Colleagues, appealed to the *Scripture*, and the *Greek Church*.

Thirdly, Cassander testifies, in his Epistle to the Duke of Cleve, that Peter Bruis, and Henericus, denied baptism to little ones. Affirming that only the Adult should be baptized.

Fourthly, Doctor Pridienx saith in his Latin Geese's, that Peter Bruis, and Arnoldus at Britain were in the second Lateran Council censured, for the heresy of rejecting *Infants Baptism*, *Church Buildings*, and *adorators of the Cross*.

Fifthly, Bernard, Abbot of Glarazebin Burgundy, doth in his letter to the Earl of St. Giles, pate 204, Epistle, accuse the Henerici, or Apostolic, of the heresy of denying infants Baptism.

And in his 65 sermons on the Cant. charges them to oppose *Infants Baptism*, *Transubstantiation*, *purgatory*, *praying for the Dead*. &c. Osland, Century 12, L 3. C. 6. Page 201.

All which Bernard said, he had either by investigation (or diligent search) personal disputation with them, or from those that were come from them, Magdeburg Century 12, Cap. 5, page 844. (The latter whereof Mr. Wills only takes notice of, so partial is he in his remarks.)

Sixthly, Vicecomes L. 2 Ch. 1, That the Henerici, and Apostolic, denied *Infants Baptism*.

Seventhly, Doctor Hamond confesseth, that Peter Bruis, and Henry his Scholar, and the *Petro Brusiani*, and *henricani*, that sprang from the, opposed, *Infants Baptism*, Tombes 3. Review, page 827.

To all which Testimony Mr. Wills gives in this exception, page 53 &c. That most of this witness is gathered from lying Papists, especially two lying Abbots, Bernard, and Cluniacenses; And tells me in as

much as I have cited Osiander, he doubts it may be some prejudice to my cause, because what ever Osiander saith of Peter Bruis, and henericus, denying Infants Baptism, he taketh it one of the works of Peter Cluniocenses, who doth Calumniari Forsiter, lay very admoniable errors to their charge, and amongst others, this venial one, of denying Infants Baptism. Now if any credit must be given is the Abbot, it must be per ---- through out in all, or else in nothing: And verify if his testimony be valid, and the Author form him, or opposites, ----not glory in such Waldenses, that they conspired with their opinion, nor we trembled at their dissenting from us.

Let us now therefore, saith he page 55, look into the wicked, and false testimony, or account, this lying Abbot gives of those two precious Ministers peter Bruis, and Henricus, as Osiander takes it out of his own writings. (his -----) Viz.

First, Baptismum Abjiciunt: They cast of Baptism meaning that of Infants.

Secondly, Gorportim Resurrectionem Negunt: They deny the Resurrection.

Thirdly, Carnem Comddl Prohibent: They forbid eating, flesh.

Fourthly, Christum non esse Deum, &c. That Christ is not God, not took flesh on the Virgin, &c.

Fifthly, Ecclesiam non posse aliquid pessidere niss in communi, &c. that the church should possess all thing in common.

Then saith by this time, I suppose we may conclude that these Waldenses were vile persons, or Clunicenses a lying Abbot.

And then goes on, page 57, with great severity to Chastise me: Now I think he should blush at his indiscretion, for introducing such a Papists Calumniation, for an evidence in this matter: and if he believe this Abbot slander Peter Bruis, and his followers, in these things, I hope he will excuse the reader, if he believe he did no less, when he chargeth them to be against Infants Baptism.

I see by this, that when men are engaged in a cause, and wedded to an opinion, they will not refuse the most forbid, and shameful ways to promote it: They will fall in with Slanderous Papists, and take up what they say, to defend their opinions, witnesses my Antagonist, and his predecessor Mr. Tombes, who was heretofore checked for this very thing, and who boldly justifies himself, and tells us in his precursor, page 29, that Cluniacenses, though a zealous Papist, yet though fit by Illyricus, to be reckoned amongst witnesses of truth in his Catalogue; and that if such as he, and Bernard, be not taken for witness of things in their time, I know not how the Protestants will make up, their catalogue of witness in all ages, which, he saith, are dangerous words.

To which I answer, first, let it be taken notice, that as to the proof offered by me, for these my witnesses, amongst the several instances produced, he falls upon that which he thinks the most weak, the usual method he takes with me all along, and avoids that which he finds most strength in, which favors of a very partial mind; and truly I conceive, were Cluniacenses testimony from Osiander left out, there is enough from all the rest, to prove that Peter Brunis, Henricus, and Arnoldus, denied Infants Baptism: the latter of which the eminent Aruelaus he take s no notice of.

But in the next place, since he lays so much stress, upon this supposed mistaken part of the testimony to cast reproach upon all the rest, we will join issue with him, in the examination thereof, and the rather because he entitles Mr. Baxter, and Mr. Marshal, also to the exception too. Know therefore, that hence, you have a further discovery of the great unfaithfulness, and want of conscience in the Author, for daring thus to abuse the World with a cheat, and that which he knows to be a mere forgery of his own, and which will I doubt, not appear to you by the following circumstances.

### **1. None of Cluniacenses:**

First, he knows that Cluniacenses, that he calls the lying Abbot, hath given no such wicked, and false testimony, as he produceth from him out of Osiander; for both Osiander, and the Magdeburgs, from whom he had it, gives an account of fifteen particulars, where with he charges Peter Brunis, as receiving them either from his own mouth, or as Mr. Wills acknowledgeth, from their won writings, and not upon uncertain report, page 56. And which are these that follows, viz. the four first, against Infants Baptism, the three next, against Transubstantiation, the eight, against praying for the dead, the ninth, for priests Marriages, the tenth, against adoration of Crosses, the eleventh, against superstitious adoring of Temples; the twelfth, against Church music, the thirteenth, for the lawfulness to eat flesh on Sundays, and fast days, the fourteenth, that upon common fame as he saith, they did not receive the whole canon of the Scripture (which saith Osiander) was as he supposeth the Apocryphal writings, and which appears by the next, the fifteenth, that they only received the Canon of Scripture and that the sayings of the Ancients were not to be compared to it. The 12 first of these Cluniacenses particularly, and at large in several pages makes

answer to Magdeburg, Century 12 and page 283 &c. Osiander Century 12 l.3 c.3. But here is not a word, of denying the resurrection; Christ's Incarnation, or such admonitions, said to be delivered by Cluniacenses, and by him charged upon them.

## **2. Osiander reports no such thing from Cluniacenses:**

Secondly, that Osiander, that he so often saith, reports it, and that therefore I did my self injury, he doubted in mentioning him, hath not one word of any such thing as from Cluniacenses, but only makes the repetition of those fifteen particulars, out of the Magdeburgs word for word, as Osiander Century 12. L3. Cap. 3 are manifest.

## **3. Not charged upon Peter Bruis, but upon others by other hands in another age:**

Thirdly, he knows that these particulars he mentions, were not charged upon Peter Bruis, but upon the Albegeois in the following Century by other hands than Bernard, and Cluniacenses, who were dead long before, for Helvicus tells us, that Bernard (who was contemporary with Calniacenses, Peter Bruis, and Henricus) flourished about 1110. And Osiander tells us, that this Algigensians Sect, or Heresy, was charged with these things by the Monks Inquisitors, Sabellieus, Schedeleus Anno 1206, who by Pope Innocent the third the Devil Incarnate, what were sent to discover that people, against whom he came forth with many of others so much murderous cruelty, by fire and Sword, with an army of hundred thousand men, to root up, and destroy them. And therefore the better to justify his cruelties, and to provoke all Europe, to come in to help these people, as the Monsters of Mankind.

## **Why Mr. Wills did this knowingly:**

And that Mr. Wills hath on this knowingly, appears, first, by his picking out only the five particulars, out of twenty, leaving out the most gross, viz. their owning two Gods, viz. God and the Devil; their condoning of Marriage, and justifying all manner of luxury, and uncleanness and patronizing thefts, and robberies, &c.

Secondly, that he knows Osiander saith these things, are not reported by Cluniacenses, and Bernard, but by Lucelbergius, Antonius, Vincentins &c.

Thirdly, because he neither mentions Century, Book, Chapter, or Page, which in other quotations, out of Osiander, he use to do.

Therefore let it be judged, whether he hath not injuriously belied Cluniacenses, belied Peter Brunis, belied the truth which by this forgery he would cover, and hide; abused the world, belied, and abused me also in specially whom he deals so severely with for the time, as you have heard. But much more fear his own conscience, by this piece of folly, and falsehood.

And therefore may we not well return his own words (which he gives me hereupon, viz. Now he thinks the Amber should blush at the indiscretion, for introducing such evidence and I see by this, that when men are engaged in a cause, and wedded to an opinion, they will not refuse the most forbid and shameful ways to promote it.

Thirdly, that the Waldenses did deny Infants Baptism, appears from the Decrees of several Emperors, and Popes, against the body of the people for the same: and the writings of learned men, living in those times, which you have at large, from page 248 to 255, viz.

First, the decrees of Robert, King of France, Anno 1000, first against the Waldenses of Thousands, afterwards against several at Orleans, for denying Infants Baptism.

Secondly, the decrees of the Emperor Henry the second, Anno 1017, to punish this sect.

Thirdly, the decrees of the Emperor Henry the fourth, Anno 1054. For their denying Infants Baptism. &c.

Fourthly, the decrees of Pope Leo the ninth, Anno 1050, to establish Infants Baptism, denied by them.

Fifthly, the decrees of Pope Gregory the seventh, Anno 1070, for the same.

Sixthly, the decrees of Pope Alexander the third, against the Waldenses, for denying Infants Baptism and the several ways he took to prosecute, and persecute them for the same.

Seventhly, the decrees in the Gallican Council, against them for the same.

Eighthly, the decrees of the general Latcran Council, against them for the same.

Ninthly, the decree of Pope Lucius, Anno 1181 in the Council of Veroni, against them for the same.

Tenthly, the decrees of the Pope Urbane, against them for the same.

Eleventhly, the decrees, of Pope Caelestine, against them, for the same.

Twelfthly, the decrees, and bloody actions, of Pope Innocent the third, against them for the same.

The writings also of several learned men, of these times, that opposed the Waldenses in this point, and charged, the whole party therewith, viz. Eckbertus, Barbrardus, Ermigendus, Cluniacenses, Bernard, Durandus, Thomas Walden. And to whom we add some others of great eminency that have come to hand. Viz.

Ermingerdus who wrote his book contra Waldenses in this age, wherein he chargeth tem in these words *Dicunt etiam quod nulli nisi proprio ort, and Corde bac Sacrar entrm pitat patest prodesse, Inde adducentcs hunc errorem, quod parvulis Baptismus can profit none, but those who with their own proper mouths, and hearts, desire the same; from whence they draw the error, that water baptism is not profitable to little children*, vet. Bib. Pat. Tom. 5. Page 1250.

And Rainerius in his Book contra Waldenses, saith: *De Baptism Dicunt, quod ablutio que datur Infantibus nihil profit item quod patrins none intellignet, quid respondeant Sacerdots; concerning Baptism, they say, that they which is given to little children profits nothing, and that the Gossips understand not their Responses to the Priests*, Bib. Patr. Tom. 13. Pages 300, 301, &c. And which evidence I desire the Reader to take the more notice of, because Mr. Wills doth so positively deny that Rainerius, in the Catalogue of their errors gives not the least hint of any such thing, no not one word of their denying Infants Baptism; which, he saith, is very strange, if he had understood any thing thereof, Wills pages 96-98.

You have also Favin, the French Chronologies, testifying that in these times, viz. twelfth, and thirteenth Century, the Albignses did deny Infants Baptism, esteeming it superstitious.

Against all which he gives no particular exception, only saith these two things; First, that whereas I cite two Cannons of Pope Alexander the Third, that was but just about the rise of the Waldenses, who were so called, from Peter Waldo of Lyons, about 1160. (as Perin unformeth) And which is evidence, as he supposeth, against the former decrees, inferring that those mentioned, to be made before that time, were before they were a people.

And secondly, in page 60 saith: *That these is ----- proof to be fetched from hence of their being against Infants Baptism, because they were their enemies, Calumniating malicious Papists, that loaded them with all manner of reproaches, to render them adious: And that unless some one doth, out of their own mouths give better evidence he shall believe, with Mr. Marshall, that this Doctrine of opposing the baptizing of Infants believers is an Innovation, no ancgater than the Anabaptists in Germany, and for which he quotes, Joseph Vicecomes L. 2 C. 1 page 103, in Mr. Wills Page 60 part 2.*

### **Waldenses so called from the valleys from ancient time:**

To both which I say, First, to the first exception, *you will find that Beza tells us, that they mistake themselves, that say, they were called Waldenses from Peter Waldo, in as much as they were so called from the place of their abode in the Valleys as at large you have it in mine, pages 338 and 142.*

And that Claudis Seifcelius, *Councilor to Charles the Great, in the eight-Century, mentions these by that name, in his book Contra Waldenses*. But however the people, or Sect of the Waldenses, were known, or distinguished by several names as the people of Lyons &c. as Eusebius tells us, page 340. And set forth in story under divers names, in several ages, as Doctor Usher tells us, and which you have more particularly, page 338 &c.

And to the Second, that there is convincing proof, offered from the Decrees of Pope, Kings and Councils, let Me. Marshal's grant suffice, who in page 82 of his Defense for Infants Baptism, saith thus: *I shall desire you, to show that any company, or Sect (if you will so call them) have denied Infants Baptism, produce if you can any of their confessions, allege any acts of any Councils, where this Doctrine was charged upon any, and condemned in that Council?*

And which I presume is substantially done, both from their confessions of Faith; and from acts of councils also, where such were condemned.

And as to that quotation out of Vicecomes, to prove that none denied Infants Baptism, till the German Anabaptists, I heartily thank him for it; which you will find doth the contrary, giving an account of several, that denied Infants Baptism before that time, as you have it in the quotation he refers to, page 102-103 telling us in these words.

### **Viccome owns that many had denied Infants Baptism of old.**

*That as the Adults Baptism, no one ever doubted thereof, witness (as he saith) the Monuments, or writings of all the holy Fathers, and Occumenioal Councils, as well as the Scriptures themselves, especially the Acts of the Apostles.*

*But as for Infants Baptism, he tells us, that Vinecutine, Victor, Hincinarus of Landuns, the Henerici, and Apostolic, (in Bernard, and Cluniaunes time.) John Wickliff in his 4<sup>th</sup> book of Triage c. 2 Walafrid, Scrabe, Ludevient Vives, &c. had all of them witness against it in their times. So that we have a good confirming evidence, from his Authority, to establish the truth, we have asserted, and he denied.*

It is true, Vicecomes in the same place, adds amongst the rest of the witnesses against infants baptism, Luther, Calvin, and Beza; and the reason is, because they did oppose, and neglect to so it, as the Church of Rome ordained, and practiced it; setting it up in a new way, without the services, and ceremonies of the Church, as which was all one to them, as it was not practiced at all; and therefore did the Church of Rome renounce of old. as you have heard; the Baptism of the Greek Church, as the Greeks renowned theirs, rebaptized those that were baptized by either, as much as if it had not been at all, by either side.

**From the four steps they had less thereof in several Countries:**

And Fourthly, that the Waldenses did deny Infants Baptism, appears from the footsteps we find hereof, in those respective regions and places, where they had heretofore imprinted it, as appears by the following instances, it being acknowledged that they were dispersed all Europe over, viz.

First, in Germany, through all the parts thereof, where they planted Churches, and has Schools in so much, that their Barbs could travel all the Country over, and lie every night at a friends house, where, both by Doctrine and suffering, this truth was eminently confirmed, and for which you have several instances, from most parts of the Country, from page 256 to 260.

Secondly, in Switzerland, where in like manner as was witnessed too from 260-267?

Thirdly, in Flanders, where it was also confirmed, and sealed with --- blood pages 267 to 269.

Fourthly, In Holland, ----- Countries, where it was also witnessed too, with much blood and ---- ----- pages 269-271.

Fifthly, In Bohemia, where it was eminently confirmed also, pages 271-273.

Sixthly, in Hungaria, in like manner, pages 273-274.

Seventhly, In Transylvania evidenced also, as Page 274.

Eightly, in Poland A confirmation thereof, page 274.

In England it hath also been confirmed, through many ages, by Christians under several denominations, viz. By Waldenses, Lollards, Wickliffians, and Anabaptists, through all the Kings Reigns, from the Conquest to this very day, as at large you have it from pages 275-310.

To all, which he saith thus, much by way of concession, viz. *that the Waldenses were indeed spread, not only by persecution, but also by their own voluntary choice before, into all these Regions, is not to be doubted.*

*But that the opposers of Infants Baptism, in the Upper, and Lower Germany, were the remains, and off spring of those the Waldenses, is a conceit foreign to all History, and hath no foundation in reason, or truth; and that his ipse dixit, or saying so, is no ground for us to believe it, he affirming it only from conjecture, and that ariseth also from his will, according to that saying: Quod Volumus, facile Credimus: what we would have, we easily behave.*

To which I say, that if I have proved that this was their Doctrine, and Practice, by their confessions of Faith, the practice of their ancients, and honorable Barges, and Worthies, by the decrees of Popes, Emperors, and councils; by the prints they have left thereof in the several countries ('tis confessed they were driven into) and all this by ancient records and authentic testimonies, which I presume I have (as yet) undeniably done.

Then I rest confident; that the judicious reader will acquit me of this slander of an ipso dixit, and that it is only my ill, and pleasure, to say all this of my own head, and fancy without proof. The German Baptists do in their Martyrology, prove their dissent from the Waldenses, through out the Centuries, Perin tell us, that Lollard was a Waldenses Barge, and that so Wickliff asserted no other but the Doctrine of the Waldenses, being instructed throughly by the Lollards.

This further Testimony have met with, in the Dutch book of Martyrs, which I desire the Reader to take notice of, as full measure, and heaped up as Mr. Wills words it.

First, they tell us, from Jacob Merningus page 713, Century 13 Chapter 5, out of Casarius, that the *Waldenses, and Albigneses, have rejected Infants Baptism, saying that it is of no force nor profitable to any, before they are taught, and do believe, but concerning that Baptism, according to Christ's appointment, they have a very high view, and esteem,* Dutch Martyr, page 307.

Secondly, that the *Waldenses were called Anabaptists, long before John Hus, they quote the testimony of several, viz. Dubravius, Mickovius, Oremeries, Mr. Glamus from Mernengtes page 733.*

Thirdly, that the said *Merningus pages 618, 619, & 629, makes it good from Rainerius, the Monk Inquisitor. That wrote his book contra Waldenses in the 12<sup>th</sup> Century, that the Waldenses did deny Infants Baptism, and produceth divers of Rainerius his arguments, against them for the same, and which he quotes from the bib. Patrum Tom. 13. Page 300. Though Mr. Wills is pleased to tell us page 97, that Rainerius saith never a word, about their denying Infants Baptism.*

Fourthly, they tell us, that *Balthazar Lydias, in his Treatise of the Church and of the Waldenses, page 86 Col. 1 tells us, that they reprove many things in the Popish Sacraments, and say, that the baptizing of Children is not Profitable to them, Dutch Martyr page 309.*

Fifthly, that *Abraham Mellinus in his History of Martyrs, page 447 Col. 1 doth tell us, that the Waldenses as cast far from them all the Sacraments of the Romish Church, and amongst them, do wholly reject that of Infants Baptism, as unprofitable, and unnecessary, Dutch Martyr. Page 320.*

And therefore the whole of this story, concerning this ancient honorable people, the Waldenses is submitted to judgment, and whether I have not good cause to conclude it, with the return (of Mr. Wills his own words upon himself) which he speaks to me upon this very occasion, page 44 viz.

### **Mr Wills his words returned upon himself:**

*And is it not a miserable cause indeed, whose advocates must kill have recourse to lies for its defense, and an argument of the want of honesty, and conscience for Men to persist in the course when more than enough hath been said, to convince them of the evil thereof. It was a solemn rebuke which Job gave his mistaken friend, &c. Will you lie (saith he) for God? Surely he hath no need of, nor doth he require us by any sinister, and sinful way, to justify him in his attributes, providence's, cause, or truth. As touching the matter in hand before us, if the Padobaptists have the truth on their side. Yet certainly it is little beholding to some of them, who have attempted to defend it by so many unwarrantable ways; In particular I have made in appear, that the present Author, with whom I have to deal with, is solely criminal, in laying out the utmost of his skill, in traducing those famous ancient Christians, as if in their several Generations (heretofore) they had not witnessed for Relievers, against Infants Baptism, when he cannot but know they were not only falsely, and maliciously charged (but cruelly, and murderously handled) by their Anti-Christian Enemies, for their faithful witness to these despised truths, &c.*

## **THE WITNESS BORN BY THE DONATISTS, AGAINST INFANTS BAPTISM, CONFIRMED:**

### **DONATISTS**

The next witness he opposeth, is that of the Donatists, concerning whom I gave divers Authorities, proving that they did deny Infants Baptism.

To which Mr. Wills is pleased to say, *that it is only my ipso dixit, and that I do thereof render my self guilty, of a great mistake, to say, that of them whereas neither the Magdeburgs, nor Danaus in his Opuseulum, nor several other writers, do charge any such thing upon them.*

To which I say, that herein Mr. Wills deals, according to his wonted manner, very disingenuously with me. First, that having given so many Authorities, and of such Antiquity to prove it, to tell the Reader, it is my Ipse Dixit only. Secondly, to deny them, and yet give no just exception against them. Thirdly, to produce the negative (or silence rather) of some modern Authors, to oppose so many positive Authorities, produced by me, one of which, in all pleas, is worth a hundred Negative ones.

But that the reader may be satisfied, I had good warranty, to justify my said proofs, and that it was not my Ipse Dixit only, I shall give them briefly to you, with what I have since met with, to confirm the same, which are as follows, viz.

First, from what is mentioned of *Donatus* himself, who, as *Sebastian Frank* in his *Chronicle* saith, *did teach, that no infant should be baptized, but only those, that believed, and desired it, Page 222.*

Secondly, from what we find mentioned, of his followers, Viz.

*Crelconious*, who did oppose *Austin* in that point, as saith *Jacob Merning*, page 230, who was a Donatists, as say the *Magdeburgs* 5<sup>th</sup> century page 631.

*Fulgertius*, another learned Donatists, as the *Magdeburg* tell us 5<sup>th</sup> Century page 631 *did deny Infants baptism, and assert only that Baptism, that was after Faith, Vicecom. L. 3. C 3, page 66.*

*Vincentius Victor, another who denied Infants Baptism, as saith Vicecom L. 1. c. 2, out of Austin Lib. 3. C. 14 de Anima.*

Thirdly, it doth appear, from what we find in Austin 3 and 4, Books Tom. 7.c. 23. Page 443. *Written against the Donatists*, wherein with so much zeal, and fury, he manages the argument for Infants Baptism against them, bitterly cursing those that oppose it. Page 123. Also in his Epistle to Marcellus Tom. 7.c.6. Page 724 *he opposes himself against them, for denying Infants Baptism.*

Fourthly, Eckherius, and Emericus, learned writers in the twelfth Century, contending against the Waldenses, or Catheri, for denying Infants Baptism, do say, that the new Catheri viz. the Waldenses then, did in that point conform to the old Catheri, the Donatists, and Novations, page 234.

Thomas Walden, that wrote against Wickliff, in Henry the fourth's time, tell us, *that Vincentius Victor, with whom Austin contended, did deny Baptism to little ones*, De Sacram. Tit. 5. Ch. 53. Fol. 118.

Fifthly, Our latter writers, do also agree herein, that the Donatists, and modern Anabaptists, were all one; so saith Osiander, Century 16, page 176. And fuller in his Eccles. Histor. Lib. 5 page 229, and Bullinger Lib. 5. Fol. 216, 222, of Baptism.

Spankemius also, saith, that the Donatists deny Infants Baptism, as appears, saith he, Austin's book against the Donatists, c. 23-25, Spasnh. Ch. 4 p. 45.

Sixthly, because the Donatists, and Novations, both one indoctrinate, were acknowledged to be the same in principle with the Waldenses, and that the Novations, banished by Innocent the third out of Rome, as saith Socrates L. 7, c. 9, did dwell in Italy, and Dalnuit, and were called by the same name with the Waldenses, viz. Catheri, and Fartricilli, in so much as Perin judges, they were the same people, and Osiander confesseth, that the Albigo's came from Rome, Century 13, L. i. Ch. 4. P. 329.

Therefore it is left to the judicious reader, whether I am not sufficiently justified, by his six fold testimony in my affirming, that the Donatists did deny Infants Baptism; and that they may well be reckoned amongst the number of my witnesses, and against whom Mr. Wills has made no just exception. But in the next place, Mr. Wills tells us, that *if it be taken for granted, they were against Infants Baptism, they being, as he confesseth, in many things so like Anabaptists, yet by what appears from Mr. Fox, as he tells us out of Eusebius, and from Austin's works, as for the Magdeburgs, that I have no reason to boast of my authority, for both Novations, and Donatists, were the persons, did always counted for heretics.*

To which I say, that if I should acknowledge them as corrupt, as Origen, Caprian, Austin, and Chrysostom, and others of his great witnesses, that held for Chrisme, Exorcism, and other superstitions, and that regeneration was effected, in the very act of Baptism, and that without baptism, and the Eucharist, no child could be saved, yet their witness as to matter of fact, is to be owned, which is all I produce them for, not understanding to defend them, in all the Tenets fathered upon them, more than Mr. Wills doth those that are so undeniably charged upon his witnesses, yet this he must give me leave to say, in vindication of the Donatists, and Novations, viz.

First, for the Novations, that what Mr. Fox speaks of them, From *Eusebius*, and Author of no great fame, is the less to be regarded, because he was a great friend to the Arians, and the Novations great impugners of them, and upon that score it was he spoke very maliciously of them; though Socrates, an Author of better account, speaks very honorably of them; and *Albaspaneus upon Optat, Milevitan, bespeaks them a very worthy people, in his 20 observations.*

And as for the *Donatists*, the *Magdeburgs* tell us, that they wonder, that there is no more mention of them by the Ecclesiastical Writers, of this age, either by *Sozamus*, or others; and that only the *Theodore's*, in his Heretical Fables, gives some hints of them. And that the *Hrpethoses* of their *dogmas*, they gathered not from any of their writings, which were not extant, but out of Austin's works, [*their great opposer*] Century 4. C. 5. P. 376-377. And from whom it is that Mr. Wills takes his *schisme*.

But how any can take a good measure from their severest enemy, to make a judgement against them, and condemn them for Heretics, ---- not; for may you not from Calvin's writings pick as great a charge against the Lutherans and as great against the Sacramentarians, out of Luther's writings? Also what a sad people, doth Mr. Edwards make the Independents; and what a dismal black line, do the Prelates draw upon the Presbyterians; and the Papists again upon them; and what a sad generation are Anabaptists, if Mr. Wills may be believed; Schisme being in all the incensing crime, which draws forth all the gall, and wormwood; and just so it was between Austin, who was so Catholic in his Communion, and the Donatists, that pressed for more purity in their separations, and from whence it was, that all that dirt was flung upon them, and they put into such Bears skins, as Mr. Wills puts his opposites in.

And for those decrees of Councils, that past upon them for Heretic's, is no good ground to conclude against them, for so they judge the truest Doctrine, and holiest walking in may ages, witness our Saviour

himself, who was censured for a Blasphemer, and the Apostles, and Saints in every Age ever since; and who more censured for Heresy, than the Waldenses, Lollards, and Wickliffians, their followers, and Disciples, that were so truly Orthodox.

### **THE WITNESS SAID TO BE BORNE AGAINST INFANTS BAPTISM, BY THE ANCIENT BRITAINS, DEFENDED.**

The last witness he opposeth, is that born by the Ancient Britians, and that they denied Infants Baptism, I gave the following Arguments, and which you have a large, page 226.

#### **Why they Denied Infants Baptism:**

First, because Mr. Fox tell us, out of *Bede, and Fabian, and others, that they refused to baptize after the manner of Rome, which Fabian as I find, more particularly explains, to be in the point of Infants Baptism; and in confirmation thereof gave five arguments.* First, *because they kept themselves, both in Discipline, and Doctrine, so expressly to the Scripture, (there being no express Scripture for Infants Baptism, as confessed on all hands.)* Secondly, *because they were such zealous impugnors of Tradition, that being as Austin confesseth, the only Divine Authority for it.* Thirdly, *Because Constantine, the son of Christian parents, was not baptized in this Island in his Infancy.* Fourthly, *because their custom was to baptize after confession of Faith, being in union and communion therein with the French Christians, whereof Instances are given.* Fifthly, *from the question that was here put to Austin viz, how long a child, that was so in danger of death, might stay unbaptized, which he could not resolve, till he sent to Rome for the solution. And to which we may add, what the Magdeburg's tell us from Hilaries testimony, page 55, that none but the Adult were baptized, in the Western Churches, in his time.*

#### **Mr. Wills Opposeth Fabian's Testimony from Bede:**

To which he replies as follows: *First as to that of Fabian's testimony, he saith, it is only a mistaken paraphrase of Bede; and that Bede mentions nothing hereof: And therefore gives what Austin replied to the Britians, in Bede's words L.2.c. Viz. That in as much as you do contrary to our custom [in many things] yea to the custom of the Universal Church, nevertheless if you will obey me in these 3 things viz. that you keep Easter in its proper time: Administer Baptism, whereby we are born of God, after the manner of the Church of Rome, and the Apostolic Church; and preach the Word of God, together with us, ---, the English Nation, we will patiently bear all other things you do, although contrary to our customs; but they answered, they would none of these, nor own him for Arch-Bishop.*

To which I say, that it doth appear from his repetition out of Bede, that Fabian has fully hit his meaning: First, because he tells, the British Christians, that amongst many things were in they were contrary to the Church of Rome, one was in this particular about Baptism, wherein they did not only contradict the Universal, but Apostolic Church. Now this must needs be in their refusing to baptize children. First, because as to the baptizing the Adult, they were not contrary to the Church of Rome, the Universal, or Apostolic Church, as appears page 238. Secondly, neither could it respect the particular custom of the church of Rome was not Universal, which was so much opposed by the Greeks, and Eastern Churches, and not all to be made out to be apostolic. Thirdly, therefore must needs respect infants Baptism: First, because the church of Rome had particularly enjoined, and imposed it, to beget Infants to regeneration, that they might be born of God, as the words of their Canons Demonstrate, and which words carry the reason, and ends of it, and that they intended the substance, and not the particular ceremony of the Ordinance. Secondly, because Infants Baptism was so universally received in this seventh age, in other parts of the world, to this end here mentioned. Thirdly, because it was also received, and enjoined to be an apostolic practice. Fourthly, it would have been childish, and ridiculous, to have said Baptism in general was Apostolic, which none ever denied, and so fully before received by them; therefore Austin could intend nothing else, nor Bede's words import fully, and significantly represent in saying, *give Christendom to Children, viz. let them as the church of Rome has received, and enjoined it, be born of God by Baptism, and become Christians, as also so generally received.*

And for Mr. Wills saying, *They did no more reject Infants Baptism, than they did preaching to the Savers with Austin,* is very true, having as much reason to reject the one, as the other, for by preaching here with them, must be understood Authoritatively, by being ordained by them, that they might not

preach, as they did as a company of Laymen and Mechanics, but to be set apart thereto by this Apostolic Ambassador, [or proud *Lordly* ----. Which they refused, not admitting him therein, to be their Arch-Bishop, and which explains Austin's meaning in the Business of preaching, and their denying thereof; which they had as good cause to do, as to deny their Romish Infants Baptism, and their Superstitious observation of Easter; and therefore it was, that this Ante Christian World did devour, and worry this flock of Christ, because they refused the Popish Baptism, and Ministry. Secondly, as to those five other arguments given by me, to confirm the former, he saith, they are mere trifles, (which is an excellent way of Answering, and next to Bellarmin thou lies) which is submitted to judgement.

**Mr Wills saith, Pelagius was a Monk of Bangor, and for Infants Baptism:**

And lastly, he gives another argument, why the Britians were not against Infants Baptism; viz. *Because Pelagius who, as he saith, was one of their fellow Monks of Bangor, yet did own Infants Baptism; which was two hundred years before this, and which was a good argument, that they did also.*

**Questionable**

To which I say, that as to Pelagius being one of these Old Britians, and belonging to this very people, is by no good authority to be found; for though is true, Humphry, Lloyd and Mr. Fuller, do so guess, yet they produce no Ancient Author to confirm it; It is true, in Austin's 106 Epistle he is called Pelagius Britto, to distinguish him from another Pelagius of Tarentius; but whether because he was sent into that nation, or of it, not certain.

It Follows not that the Britians were of his Judgement and why:

But Secondly, if it be granted, that he was a Britain, and one these Monks, it no more follows, that they must all be for Infants Baptism, because he was so, than that they were all for the Pelagian Heresy, because he was the head thereof; which it is eminently known they rejected, when they sent for the help of those famous French Christians, Germanus, and Lypus, who were sent to them again, and again, from the Elders, and Ministers about Lyons, to expel that Poyson; and therefore do I call them the Waldensian Christians, who inhabited those parts where their abode was, Magdeburg Century 5 and page 1147, &c.

But as to Pelagius, the Magdeburgs do give us this account of him, from Austin, and Lucelbergius, Century 5 page 1453 viz. *that he was full of zeal, and affection, and that his beginning was good, and holy* (so that, if he was a Monk of Bangor, he began well) *And that by the Catholics he was preferred, and was one of the Monks of Syria, and that having lived long at Rome, went from thence in to England, which Island he wholly infects with his error* (by which it appears, that if he was one of that Society, yet that he got his Poison abroad, both of one kind, and of another) *That after he fell into this error, he wrote many books, and many Epistles to the learned Men of this age, whereby he infested the Universal Church. And several Fathers opposed him, viz. Jerom, Austin, and others, and that his Books were condemned by many Synods, and Councils,* Magdeburg Century 5 and page 894, 586, 587.

Now therefore what ground Mr. Wills hath to conclude, the History of those Churches, and his book also, in that manner he doth, is submitted to his better consideration, and the Judicious Reader, and which they find in the following words, viz.

*And in reference to the confidence of my Antagonist, that the Waldenses, Donatists, and Britians, were against Infants Baptism, when none of them were, I shall conclude with a Distich, which I thing way may not improperly be applied to his whole discourse*

***Ridiculous tandem ecce Cavis Mus Prodit ad antris, Quem gravidi Montes perturiere din.***

*And from what hath been said, I see no reason why Mr. D. Should be so much offended with Mr. Marshal, and Mr. Baxter, for saying Infants Baptism was but lately opposed, by the Anabaptists in Germany, and do appeal to the Reader, whether Mr. Baxter doth not speak true, in his plain Scripture proof, page 153, who saith, that for his part he cannot find in his small reading, any one Divine, or party of men, did certainly oppose, or deny Infants Baptism, for many hundred years after Christ. And then again page 261 the world may see, what a cause you put such face upon, when you cannot give the least proof, so much as of one man (we will allow them one, viz. Hincmarus: What not Acrianus too? That is hard,) much less societies, and least of all godly Societies, that did once oppose, or denied Infants Baptism, from the Apostles, till about Luther's time.*

## CHAPTER IV

### WHEREIN YOU HAVE THE STORIES CONCERNING THE GERMAN ANABAPTISTS REVIEWED, AND THE PRINCIPLES AND PRACTICES OF ANABAPTISTRY (As Mr. Wills calls it) PINDICATED AGAINST HIS REPROACHES.

In the reflection I made upon the story of the Muenster, and John of Leyden, for whose sakes so much obliquity hath been cast upon the Anabaptists and their way, ever since; I principally intended these two things.

First tow show the unreasonableness of charging the ----- with the ----- of such as are guilty. And to this Mr. Wills in the general consents, though he tells us withal, the suspicion he hath, of the principle of anabaptistry itself.

Secondly, I gave a brief account of matter of fact, and therein showed that those ----- commotion's were not Anabaptistical in their Original, but moved upon the same pretensions, as the Helvetians and others before them had done, then gave the reasons why I thought there was ground to doubt of the truth of what was reported concerning the horrid ----- committed by them in their ----- ----- -----.

#### **Mr. Wills Objection:**

In answer hereunto Mr. Wills reproves me, First, for denying those motions to be Anabaptistical. Secondly, for making an odious comparison between those commotion's and them in Helvetia, page 103. Thirdly, for mistaking matter of fact in the Original of the Muenster commotion. Fourthly, as being extremely scandalous for my doubts concerning those horrid impieties in Muenster. And fifthly, he charges Principle itself as naturally leading to immorality and division.

#### **TO THESE I MAKE THIS BRIEF REPLY:**

#### **Why the commotion's in Swevia not anabaptistical:**

First, that the Commotion's in Swevia 1635 were not Anabaptistical appears by their twelve demands, which you have mentioned at large by Osiander Century 16 c. 36, page 100. Wherein is not one word savoring of Anabaptism, but about freedom from exaction's, and to deliver themselves from the Tyranny (as they say) of their Princes and Bishops more Helvetiorum (which Gnedolius also informs us, as before mentioned) being much of the same nature with those other demands made by the Rustics twenty three years before (which was the year after the Revolt of Berhe and Schasbuisen) of which you have also on account in Osiander Century 16 L. 1. c. 6. Page 10. And that these commotions's were not fomented and principally managed by the Anabaptists may appear. First from those first demands, which were principally made and managed by the Papists; as Osiander and Bishop Jewel against Harding inform, and the articles themselves express; and that the latter demands in 1625 were principally carried on by the Lutherans, (though it is true Luther afterwards writes against them) as Osiander tells us. In which attempt also that year fell of them (as pages in his Herisography inform us) one hundred and fifty thousand: the hundred parts whereof could not be Anabaptists.

The second he tells us is it both odious and injurious, to compare those attempts of Geneva and Switzers with those in Swevia, when non, as he saith, can be such diabolic as to charge the Switzers with robbing the Nobility, plundering of Town's, and Castles, rising of all that was sacred, as those Germans did.

To which I say, that the Chronicles themselves can best inform how those Cantons formerly, and those of Basil Schafbusen and Geneva since did manage their confederates, surprise their towns and castles, disposes, their princes, and Bishops; and possess themselves of their revenues Civil and Ecclesiastical. For my part I am yet to learn (from whatever I read) where the difference lay in the attempts, only that those Cantons had better Conduct and prospered, and the other had neither Conduct nor success, but

miscarriages in both; which if the other had done, as much oblique might have befallen them. And you'll find some Protestant writers as well as Popish to charge as much irregularly on the undertaking of the one, as of the other, who will tell you that the Boors in Germany, and they of Alunster, might as warrantable turn out their Princes, Bishops, and Canons; and possess themselves of their Revenues, as Geneva, and those of Helvetia had done. And we are not ignorant of the several attempts that city of Muenster, hath made within a few years, since wholly Popish, to deliver themselves from the exaction's of their Bishop, which by the Bishop hath been, esteemed no less seditious and rebellious, than the former. Thirdly, as to the Original of the Muenster commotion, though he grants the turning out of the Bishops, Cannons, &c. out of the Churches and the City also, by the reformists --- tells me, I speak falsely in saying that Spanhaus tells us that it came to arms between the Bishops and City, who saith the quite contrary and tells us, (as he saith) that it never came to blows.

To which I say my words you will find are these viz. That Spanhemius and Osiander tells us, that the first stir in the City was about the Protestant Reformation, the Senate siding with Rotman and others of the of the Ministers against the Papists, and their Bishops, that opposed them to Armas, and this before the coming in of John a Leyden.

I say, Spanhemius and Osiander tells us, &c. He takes notice only of the former and it is manifest they both of them speak of those first stir about turning out the Bishops Canons: Spanhemius it is true speaks very briefly of the difference and agreement that happened between the Bishops and Senate there upon, though I must tell Mr. Wills it is this mistake to say, that Spanhemius deems it came to Arms: for he saith no such thing. But Osiander from Sloyden goes to particulars: And tells us, how the Bishop drew a force down to a neighboring Village called Telgeto, Stop and strengthened them of provision (for so saith Sleiden) And sent messengers to command the restoring of the Canons to their Churches again, and the turning out of Town the new preachers. But how that instead thereof they detained his messengers, and sent a part out of the Town in the Night and surprised and brought away prisoners, divers of the Bishops men and that he himself had been taken also, if he had not gone out of his Quarters, that night before and if this could be done without Arms, and Blows, let all men judge. And whether the reproof doth not more properly belong to Mr. Wills than my self therein.

Fourthly, as to the Suspicion (why I supposed there was cause to doubt) of the truth of those monstrous Villainies acted in their communities in the Latter part of the Siege, as mentioned by their malicious enemies the Papists, and many of their inveterate enemies the Pratestnos, he saith is it extremely ----- in two respects. First for calling into Question the matter of fact, especially as reported by the Protestants, who were not (as he saith) inadsterate enemies, but very loving friends to them, and Secondly, for endeavoring to palliate such horrid acting's of the Anabaptists, a thing never done by any.

### **Why cause to suspect some of the reports about Muenster:**

In answer whereto I say let it in the first place be remembered, that as to the first part of my suspicion, why those horrid enormities reported might be scandals, viz. From the reports given them by the lying Papists (who speaks as bad things of Calvin and Luther themselves, and of the Waldenses before them, as you have heard) he seems silently to own. But his great offence lies against me for questioning the truth of what is said therefore by the Protestant writers such as Sleiden, Osiander, Spanhemius, Zwinglius, &c. who were (as he saith) most faithful historians, grave Divines, and who gave punctually the circumstances of time, place, opinions, &c. And from whom he transcribes the Story; and that my inferiors reflection upon them, at though they were the Ana Baptists inveterate enemies and that they were willing to take up and improve such reports, to blast not only the whole party of the Anabaptists but their principles also, against whom they contended, savoir in me (as he saith) of no less than the ebullition of a Malicious, or at best a prejudicial spirit.

To which I say, how shall we be assured, that these later writers did not make their reports from the popish writers? For Sleiden wrote not his commentary till 1555 about twenty years after the fact, and Osiander only transcribes from Sleiden. And as for Spanhemius he wrote not till eighty years after Sleiden. Upon whom Mr. Wills lays the greatest stress, and who appears to be a very partial and unfaithful writer respecting the Anabaptists in that his historical narration printed 1646. First falsely affirming that Stork, Stubner, and Munetzer, were the beginners of Anabaptism, and who first (as his own words express) helped the world to be delivered that sect. Secondly in his malicious charging the Anabaptists with all the old heresies that he could reckon up in any old author, viz. That they were Manicheans, Andians, Anthropomorphites, Tritheits, Samosatenians, Noetians, and Sabellians:

Apollinarists, and Predianites, Anastations, Nestroians, Eutichains, Corinthians, Photinians, Orogenians, Catharists, Novations, Donatists, Parmenians, Marcionites, Eunemians, Montanists, Niceluites, Basitidians, Cataphrigians, Gnostics, Pelagians, and Secinians. All which opinions, he enlargeth upon, and applies to them, then which what could favour more of the bulletin of Malicious Spirit?

And as for Zwinglius he could give no account of his business, who died five years before it, viz. 1531. But as to this great friendship (Mr. Wills boasts of) by the gentleness and tenderness that he showed to those Anabaptist, that fell off from his Church, whom he treated not as Enemies, but as his intimate friends (as he tells us) I shall give you some particular account, wherein you will find what is that kindness and gentleness, it seems we might expect from Mr. Wills if it was in his power.

It is true at first Zwinglius was a great Friend and Companion of the Anabaptist, and a great favor of their opinion in opposition to that of Infants Baptism, as treatise Baptism page 262.

But, afterwards who crueller amongst the Bloody Papists themselves than he, as you have a particular account from those edicts of Zurick, wherein he had the principal hand page 260. And the inhuman execution of them by drowning, burning, and starving. It is true to palliate this cruelty, Mr. Wills tells us from Spanhemius, that they suffered not these severity for being Anabaptists but, as perjured, disobedient and seditious persons, which is a farther discovery of his chalice and unfaithfulness.

### **The Cruel handling of the Anabaptist at Zurick:**

For those very decrees of Zurick extracted by me proved, out of the Dutch Mantyrology where they are inserted word for word, do testify that it was merely upon the account of their judgment for baptizing after profession, those that had been, baptized in their Infancies. And to confirm the same Gastins tells us. L. I. Page 178. That the Tigrines or (or those of Zurick) do drown them by water, who do baptize those that were baptized before. And Hornbeck in his Summa Controversial page 340. Gives us a pregnant instance thereof, telling us, that Felix Mentzius of Zurick, was by the command of the Magistrate (whose laws and authorities he had broke by proceeding to rebaptize persons within their jurisdiction) was himself drowned in water upon 5<sup>th</sup> anniversary 1527. And this was Zwinglius his kindness to his intimate friends and brethren (this Mentzius having been an ancient Disciple and an Eminent preacher) and much the like friendship they met with from their Protestant friends at Berne and Schashuisen as you have it page 256. And therefore it was no wonder, if they could be Prodigal of their lives that they should be so lavish of their reputations; for the latter would only help to justify the former: for just in like manner did the Papists deal with the Allegenis in innocent the third his time the better to cover over their murderous and bloody cruelties against them.

### **Why Ground to suspect those horrid things reported to be done at Muenster:**

And as to the second part of his exception against my suspicion, which he calls a palliating of those horrid Crimes, and repeats it as if I tied it only to the actions of John Mathias, and John of Leydon, when I mentioned my suspicion of what was reported to be done by the whole party in the Communities in the later part of the siege: Wherefore the public stock might give some occasion of report (as it had done, as I observed, amongst the Waldenses of old, as though with their goods they had the Women also in common too.) But for these following reasons Mr. Wills must bear with me, if I do not as yet receive it. First because, I cannot imagine those five Godly and learned, Ministers, viz. Bernard Rotmannus, Herman Strapedo, Henricuns Ruslius, Godfry Straling, Julius Frisius, and others, who had been so successful in the work of conversion in that place (as is confessed) and so many sober citizens, who had with them embraced that judgment of Baptism after faith, could so soon renounce all godliness and Honesty, so as to practice, or give countenance to such unheard of Impieties, and Villainies. 2<sup>nd</sup>, because Merno Simonis (of whom Cassandra saith, there were in him and his followers tokens of a godly mind, saith thus in his book of fundamentals concerning this people, viz. I doubt not but those our beloved Brethren who lately did sin against God by defending their Faith with Arms are in the Favor of God. And Mr. Robert Bailie in his Anabaptism, page 36, saith the Mennonites themselves the ill best of all who carried the name of Anabaptists, though they Anathemathna the Georgian's heresy, yet they approve so far of the Menasterians, that they do much excuse all their wickedness practices, and put no doubt of their saintship and acceptation with God, notwithstanding the crimes the world charges upon them. And what can his signify but the Mennosists disbelief of the crimes objected against that wicked community of the



**Mr. Wills proof fails to these of the blasphemies and immoralities of the German Anabaptist.**

The principle saith he is false, because they are usually so that proffers it and that they are usually so appears first by the horrid errors, and wicked lives of those in Germany, and by the blasphemy and immoralities of divers in our own Nation. But how doth he prove the one of the other.

First, how he proves the German Anabaptist to be of an erroneous as you have heard by Spanhaneius his lying fictions and ----- . But concerning whose Orthodox faith and Doctrine, you have an account in the Dutch good of Martyrs; firs by their Public owning the articles of faith exhibited by the Waldenses in the twelfth Century. Recorded at large by Perin and diver other authors; and which they sealed with their blood through all the parts of Germany, France, Italy, &c. in the several ages ever since whereof you have a faithful memorial in their Book of Martyrs from time to time. And who withal do give a punctual account of those latter conversions of their Elders out of all the Provinces in the Low Countries, Germany, Flanders, France, &c. the one at Amsterdam, 37, September 1627. And the other at Dart, 21. April 1632. Where the Old Waldensen Articles were subscribed and published; and which you have at large with the Scriptures annexed in the said Book of Martyrs, called the Bloody Theatre, Printed at Dort 1660. By which you have an account, that the Anabaptist in Germany were not such desperate Heretics, as Mr. Wills so untruly suggests; not but that I judge there were erroneous persons, both in former and latter times, that owned the Doctrine of Baptism after Faith both in Germany and England, and we find the purest Churches in the Primitive times, were not free from heretics of all sorts. Neither I presume will Mr. Wills our accuser himself undertake that the Doctrine of Paedobaptism doth secure from the grossest errors that are asserted. Therefore since the Articles of Faith that have been and are owned by those Churches are so found and Orthodox, there is no cause so to reproach them as Spanhaneius before; and Mr. Wills that now writes after his Copy. And thus much for their Doctrine.

Then as to the Commotion's and Rebellions that he tells us the way of Anabaptism stirred up in Swervia and Muenster from the same Author; and what unheard of Villainies were perpetrated in that City hath been already considered, and the proofs tendered for the one; which I presume is such evidence that no Court of Justice, nor any upright man can pass a judgement upon. And truly, if matter of Fact cannot be better told us at home, witness those many false Stories Mr. Edwards in his Gangrene, Fathered upon them; and Mr. Baxter in his report of their Baptizing naked (of neither of which Mr. Wills takes any notice) what credit can be given of these foreign uncertain stories?

But if it should be taken for granted, that they in Swervia and Muenster, were so seditious and ridiculous as Mr. Wills from Spanhaneius would make them, must all the Anabaptist in Germany both in that age, and ever ---- be so repulsed, and that their principle leads thereto ----? Yea and those very Anabaptist to ---- ---- both them, and ever since they bore witness against beating of ---- -- --- ---- ----- as Cassandra tell us, though in great -- ----- ---- -----, that we will not ---- thereof: --- rather ----- ----- concerning them; which discovers Mr. Wills so --- ----- ----- writes against; or what ----- ----- if he do, ----- to say why things -- --- -- without ----- --- concerning --- us that, they, viz. The --- ---- of ----- ----- --is what they did? ----- a fancy that they must destroy the wicked per vim exteynam by force of Arms, and this in order to the setting up the Kingdom of Chris; which Satanically defusion put them on upon such exorbitance's just of the same strain with those called 5<sup>th</sup> Monarchy Men, that put all London into such a fright some years since, as page 99.

Whereas Cassandra saith the direct contrary in that very place viz. That though they were guilty of other mistakes through their ignorant zeal, yet tokens of a godly mind might be perceived in them by this that they (accerrime semper refisterunt) always resisted the rage of Muenster and John Battenburg, and taught that the instruction and propagation of Christ's Kingdom was only by sufferings. So that the Reader may perceive that Cassandra saith the quite contrary to what Mr. Wills saith of these people applying the Battenburg and Muenster principle of resistance to these people that notoriously held the quite contrary; and therefore doth Cassandra plead with the Duke of Cleve for their Liberty, who were therefore as he tells him, *Cimmiseratione Potius and emendatione Quam insectatione and perditione digns Videantur*. More worthy of pity and amendment than persecution and perdition. So you will understand hereby, that he is an Author and Translations.

Whereby Mr. Wills would not only have all the German Anabaptists to be charged with that of Muenster, but even those that witnessed against it also; and is not that very hard measure? And would Mr. Wills be content to be so dealt with.

For instance, would he think it just and equal, if we should resort his own story upon himself, that he with so much Oblique reflects upon us, page 99. And tell him, that because those persons that had the conduct of that affair, that put all London into that fright, were most rigged independent Paedobaptists, as certainly they were, what ever Mr. Wills may insinuate to the contrary. That therefore all rigid Paedobaptist (Mr. Wills himself in number also) are to be esteemed of the same mind and spirit, notwithstanding all the witness that they, either at that time, or ever since, would be thought to bear against that Action: Yea, and that the very Principle of Independent Paedobaptism tends to such rebellious actions too, which is his way of dealing with those poor People.

#### **Mr. Wills is short in his proofs against the Anabaptist in England:**

But you may better judge of his foreign intelligence and proof, by what he tells us to our faces at home; which every body will be better able to discern, and to make a judgement of, Viz. That diver Anabaptists in our own Nation are guilty (as he tells us) of blasphemies and immoralities; and therefore the principle is false, &c.

To the making good thereof he brings in Mr. Baxter for a witness, though if he speak any thing to the purpose, the bare affirmation of a Party would, I presume, be judged as incompetent, as if the next that writes, should produce Mr. Wills his say so for Authentic proof.

#### **Mr. Baxter's Testimony against Anabaptists:**

But let us hear what Mr. Baxter saith to the point, which he tells us page 100. In these words, that though Mr. Baxter knew some good and sober men amongst them; yet that the generality were bad enough: for so (says he) we must understand him in his plain proof page 143. Where he tells us to this purpose; that he had familiarly known very many of them: and that the Ministers were for the most part censorious opinionatists, who designed to convert people more to their judgement than to Christ; and that Anabaptistry and been the ordinary inlet to the most horrid opinion, and how negligent many are in Family Duties, &c.

Now therefore let all men judge, whether this amounts to any proof. What if Mr. Baxter did know some of their Ministers over Zealous for their Opinion, and some of the people too remiss; and negligent in their duties to God? Doth this prove the immorality suggested? And for his apprehensions that it is the inlet into horrid opinions? So the Prelates think of Presbytery and the Papists of Protestantism; is either of them therefore so? And doth that prove them to be Blasphemers, and that we must understand by Mr. Baxter's words, they are for the generality bad enough.

#### **Mr. Baxter's late Testimony for the Anabaptists:**

But suppose Mr. Baxter in his heat had indeed said what Mr. Wills would make him say, (which we nowhere find as I know of) yet you will find Mr. Baxter in Cool Blood hath given another Character of the Anabaptists, of which, because Mr. Wills will take so little notice, I shall here give it you over again upon this occasion. Which, you may be pleased to read in his own words, in his Book called, The Defense of the Principles of Love, Page 7 viz. that Anabaptists are Godly men, that differ from us in a point to difficult, that many of the Papists and Prelatsts have maintained, that it is not determined in Scripture, but dependeth upon the Tradition of the Church. And I know as good and sober men of that mind, as of theirs that are most against them; and that, I once motioned terms of concord to the Anabaptists, and was in as hopeful a way for peace with them, as with most others. And in his late large Book called A Christian Directory, he is pleased to say, page 287, that Anabaptists may not only be admitted to Church Communion, but may be tolerated in their practice also. 1. Because they agree with us in all points absolutely necessary to communion. 2. That the Ancient Christians had liberty either to Baptize or to let them stay till age, as they thought best. 3. And that the Controversy is of so great difficulty that if in all such cases, none that differ be tolerated, we may not live together in the world or church, but endlessly Excommunicate or persecute one another.

Now therefore let it be considered, whether Mr. Wills hath proved his charge against the Anabaptists in England, and so consequently, according to his rate of reasoning, proved their principle false and dangerous? And whether it is not just and equal, that till he make good the same, he ought to be reputed by all men, a slanderous person, and a false accuser of the Brethren, and as justly to be suspected for his foreign intelligence, and Accusation also?

Only this I would advise Mr. Will, that when he offers his next proof, he be more particular as to the persons and crimes he chargeth; as also, since he makes it so comprehensive, to take in the generality of the Baptists, and of so great moment as to judge their principle by also, that the Blasphemy and Immorality is such as is fostered and born with by the Churches, otherwise they are no more chargeable with such crimes, if they have cast any such wicked persons out of them, then the Church of Corinth was to be charged with incest, though they had disown, and excommunicated the incestuous person.

And truly I think I may with much confidence challenge him, or any, the worst of their enemies, to produce any Blasphemer, or immoral person, so known to be, in any of the Churches of Christ under that denomination. But if any, either in this nation, in Germany or else where, that have owned that Principle, have turned ranters, and Atheists, as too many, 'tis to be feared, have. I hope the principle is no more to be charged with it, than Paedobaptism is; for all the Blasphemies and Immoralities that persons of that persuasion do much more frequently fall into without (or with so little) control.

### **Mr. Wills charges the principle to be of a dividing nature:**

Having considered the invalidity of the first reason, Why the principle is naught, viz. from the wickedness of those that presses it; we come in the next place to examine what he hat farther to say to that he calls the disquieting, dividing nature of it, to prove it false and dangerous. Which we find on page 95 in these words, Viz. *The very principle of Anabaptistry is of a dangerous nature, which in that rigidity, as some men hold it, is of a disquieting tendency, that, as Mr. Buniasn saith, is not fit for any age or state of the church. I cannot but sign to consider the ways of some men, whose spirits are impregnated therewith, so that their very constitution inclines them to nothing more than to rent and tear, and divide the church; The zeal for their opinion hath, and doth still prove the greatest hindrance to the conjunction of Christians here in this nation. For as soon as they become Baptist, as some call them, (and our opposites love to appropriate the name to themselves) they fall off from Godly Ministers and People, differing from them, though never so holy. But let men calmly consider, whether this is not an effect of ignorance, and pride; and more from an erring, than well instructed conscience: and what a Scandal and shame if is to the Christian Religion to make it thus a fomenter of faction, and disturbance in the World? And what an injury is hereby done to Christ, by contracting, and narrowing his Interest in such a manner? But I see not how it can be otherwise, if men adhere, and strictly keep themselves to the Anti-paedobaptistical principles: for if out ministers be no true Ministers, and our Baptism a Nullity; and consequently, our Churches no true Churches, how can they hold communion with us? And though some that are for Baptism of Believers do, yet it must be imputed to their good nature, and not their principle, which they cross in so doing.*

So that now you have him in words at length, and no in figures; as to which I desire the following things may be considered.

First, that notwithstanding what he hath said as to the Scandals attending it to prove it false; he seems now to make the proof of all to lie in this, that some persons holding the same refuse Communion with Mr. Wills; and therefore all such as so dissent from him, are to be exposed to scorn, and hatred, as lying, treacherous, disobedient, perjured, Seditious, filthy persons; for holding a false, and dangerous principle. Secondly, the principle of Anabaptistry itself, as some men hold it; by his own demonstration he here makes the mode of holding; and that by some men only, and not the principle to be dangerous; For if it were the principle itself, it would then be contrary to all principles, whether natural, Moral, or Divine; and to its self also: for Principles always remain the same in their own nature and receive not any such impression from the various conceptions of Men, as to vary in themselves.

If he had said that the principle does not justify them that hold it most rigidly in an evil opinion, or practice, his demonstration had been good: for I am so far from justifying the errors of those that hold either that opinion, or the opinion that is contrary to it; that I fear, both Mr. Wills, and my self, have cause to search, and to try our own ways; and to be humbled, for walking contrary to that principle which we both own concerning Baptism.

Thirdly, Mr. Wills says it is the contention on of some, impregnated with this principle, to rend the church. And let men consider, whether this is not an effect of Ignorance and Pride. Now then with Mr. Wills, it is neither the principle itself nor the manner of holding it; but ignorance and pride: So that if I understand his way of arguing, either Ignorance and Pride, are all one with the principles of Anabaptistry as terms convertible, or else the cause of unbrotherly divisions, is not from the principle of Anabaptistry, but from Ignorance and Pride.

Fourthly, if the correspondence and communion which some Anabaptists have with Mr. Wills be from their good nature, and cross to their Principles (as he declares it is) then it seems, that as Ignorance was before the ground of their rending from him, so here Ignorance is also the ground of their communion with him; as not knowing that they therein cross their own principles, nor that they are any way obliged to that fellowship by the Word of God, only their good nature inclines them not to break company.

Fifthly, as to what he quotes from Mr. Bunian, it had surely been more ingenuous, either to have replied himself to those six arguments, as yet unanswered, or provoked Mr. Bunian to have done it before he had thus joined with him in his Anathema, for surely reason is never convincingly answered by railing. Sixthly, I see not the reason why Mr. Wills, or any other person, should be thus severe against the principles of Baptism, as proper only to penitent and believing persons, (for it he mean any thing else by the principle of Anabaptistry he fights with his own shadow, we being as much against rebaptizing, as any that oppose it) for there is nothing in the principle itself, but what inclines to piety and unity; it being designed by Christ, not only to promote Sanctification, Rom. 6:4-6 &c. But to farther Love and Peace, as Eph. 4:3-5 being the incorporating knitting Ordinance. Yet no man that ever I have heard of, ever did, or can pretend, that this principle perfects grace, and knowledge: and therefore now (as of old amongst the purest Churches) are weaknesses, divisions, errors, and evils, found amongst us; and so must it be expected, so long as an evil heart and envious Devil remains: yet withal do we own subjection to a holy and perfect Rule and directory, to correct and rectify, all errors of evil that arise.

Objection:

But if Baptism is esteemed a visible inlet into the Visible Church, and that you can own church fellowship with none but Baptized persons, is not that a dividing principle?

Answer:

It is true, it tends to divide between World and Church, but not otherwise; and is no other than all that own the Christian religion, whether Papists, Protestants Presbyterian and Independents acknowledge, Baptism being also owned by the Ancients to be *Fanus Sacramentorium*; and so positive is Mr. Baxter for it, that he tells us in express terms, that they must deny the Scripture that deny it: His words are these in this place Scripture, page 24. *I know not what in show of reason those that renounce not Scripture can say to this; for what man dare go in a way that hath neither Precept nor example to warrant it, from a way that hath a full current of both? Yet they that will admit Members into the Church without Baptism, do so.*

So that till infants sprinkling be proved Christ's Ordinance of Baptism, Paedobaptistry (by their own acknowledgment) are not to be esteemed visible Members of the Church of Christ, having never had an orderly admission therein.

Objection:

But is not much Injury hereby offered to Christ, thus to contract and narrow his interest in such a manner?

Answer:

It is true, it is so said by Mr. Wills, dot this no other than reformation in all ages (since the Antechristian Defection) hath been charged with, and particularly that reformation that has been endeavored in that other Ordinance of the Lord's Supper: therefore do the Presbyterians cry out against the independents for sinful Schism, as being fomenters of faction, and for narrowing of Christ's interest in their respective separations and Church Communion: to the shame and scandol of the Christian Religion: The same do the Prelates say to the Presbyterians, and the very same doth Papists say to the Episcopians also. But Wisdom is justified to her Children.

Thus have we acquitted our principle and practice from Mr. Wills his False, Unchristian, and Injurious Calumnies he has cast upon us? And shall recommend it to the readers consideration, whether he hath not

by this unreasonable (not to say malicious) carriage towards us, witnessed too much affinity, with that slanderous Libel, called Baxter Baptized in Blood: That was the first answer to the Treatise of Baptism; and which by public Authority was renounced, and declared scandalous malicious.

**FINISH**