

Treatise of Baptism

Wherein

That of Believers, and that of Infants, is examined by the Scriptures; with the History of both out of Antiquity: making it appear, that Infant's Baptism was not practiced for nearly 300 years after Christ;

WITH

A Reply to Mr. Wills in Defense of the said Treatise
AND

A Second Reply to Mr. Baxter in Defense of the Same
As also

A Rejoinder to Mr. Wills, his Vindicatae,

With an Answer to his Appeal
By Henry D'Anvers

The Baptist's Answer to Mr. Wills his Appeal.

With H. D's Postscript.

And

Magna est veritas and praevallebit

London, Printed for Francis Smith at the Elephant and Castle near the
Royal Exchange in Corn-bill,

1675.

A
Treatise of Baptism
WHEREIN
That of Believers, and that of Infants is Examined by the Scriptures

WITH

The History of both out of Antiquity making it appear that Infants Baptism was not practiced for near Three-Hundred years, nor enjoined as necessary till Four-Hundred years after Christ. With the Fabulous Traditions and Erroneous Grounds upon which it was by the Pope's Canons (with Gossips, Chrism, Exorcism. Baptizing of Churches and Bells and other Popish Rites) founded. And that the Famous Waldensian and Old British Churches, Lollards and Wickliffians and other Christians witnessed against it.

WITH THE

History of Christianity amongst the Ancient Britains and Waldenses.

That persons Baptized in Infancy are to be baptized after they believe which is not to be esteemed Rebaptization, but Right Baptism. Peter Bruis, the great Waldensian Martyr.

Osiander, Cent. 12, l. 3, p. 162

The Second Edition with Large Additions

By Hen. D' ANVERS

Eph. 4: 5 One Lord, one Faith, one Baptism
Acts 17: 28 As certain also of your own poets have said.

London, Printed for Fran. Smith, at the Elephant and Castle
Near the Royal Exchange in Cornhil, 1674

TO THE READER:

Reader, as you go through this book, you will notice in several places where spelling are not uniform. I have tried, when and where possible, to correct this. Do not, however, that there are places where common names are used and I am not sure whether the names are one and the same or some other, i.e. Justinus and Justinian, so I simply let them as I found them. There are a few places in this work, Hebrew and Greek characters that were handwritten into the original text. I have attempted to properly convert the Greek, but have in two places found it difficult to discern the Greek. In these places, the Greek words may be incorrect (Please forgive my lack of Greek knowledge and know that D’Anvers made no such mistake, but I). Additionally, I have no way to convert the Hebrew characters. You’ll notice that in one or two places, I have simply put unusual “wing-dings” in their places and in one or two more instances simply left a blank space in their stead. Also, due to the size of this work, I am not sure whether I have corrected all of my errata. If I haven’t and you find them, please let me or Bro. Pound know what and where and we will make the necessary corrections. May the Lord bless the reading of this monumental work to your souls. J.K.O.

Wherein	1
WITH	1
A Reply to Mr. Wills in Defense of the said Treatise	1
AND	1
A Second Reply to Mr. Baxter in Defense of the Same	1
As also	1
A Rejoinder to Mr. Wills, his Vindicatae,	1
With an Answer to his Appeal	1
The Baptist’s Answer to Mr. Wills his Appeal.	1
With H. D’s Postscript.	1
And	1
Magna est veritas and praevalabit	1
London, Printed for Francis Smith at the Elephant and Castle near	1
the Royal Exchange in Corn-bill,	1
1675.	1
Osiander, Cent. 12, l. 3, p. 162	2
The Preface	15
Foundation For Infant’s Baptism	16
Infant Baptism Establishes the Rule and Reign of Antichrist	16
Establishment of the Jewish Antichristian Estate in the Place of Christ’s Estate	16
16	
The Contrast Between the Gospel Administrators and the Antichristian Administrators	16
The Reformers and their Different Reasons to Support Antichrist’s Baptism	17
The Differing Concepts of Faith Which Protestants Allow for Infant’s Baptism	17
Richard Baxter’s Conclusions	17
The Ancient Waldenses	17
Objection I	18

Answer		
18	Objection	2
.....	18
Answer		
19		
Objection 3		19
Answer		
19		
Objection 4		20
Answer		
20		
Objection 5		20
Answer		
20		
The Usefulness and Beauty of Believer's Baptist as the Ordinance of God		21
Infant's Baptism is an Invention of Man and an Innovation of Antichrist		21
Conclusion to the Preface		21
AN APPENDIX TO THE PREFACE		21
Objection 1,		21
Answer		
21		
Infant's Baptism is Antichrist's Baptism		23
Objection About Title Page		23
Objection 4		24
The History of the Sufferings of the Baptists in all Ages Since Christ's Time		24
Additions to This Edition		24
The Contents of the Whole		25
CHAPTER I		25
Wherein the Baptism of Believers is proved to be the only true Baptism, from Christ's positive Institution or Commission; Viz. Matthew 28:18,19.		25
I. From Christ's positive Commission		26
Richard Baxter		26
John Calvin		26
Piscator		26
John Tombes' Felo De Se		26
Mr. Perkins		27
Paraeus		27
Chapter Two		27
Wherein the Baptizing of Believers is proved to be they only Baptism from the apostles Doctrine teaching the same.		27
From the Apostle's Doctrine		27
Bede		27
Erasmus		27
Chapter 3		28
Where in Believer's Baptism is proved to be they only Baptism, from the Examples and practice of the Primitive Saints.....		28
Luther		28
Bullinger		28
Baxter		28
Jews		28
Samaritan		28
The Eunuch		29

Paul	29
The Gentiles.....	29
Lydia	29
The Jailer	29
Crispus	29
Corinth	29
Philip	29
CHAPTER IV	30
Wherein Believers are proved to be the only Subjects of Baptism,	30
from the Spiritual Ends of the Ordinance.	30
To be a Sign of the Mysteries of the Gospel.	30
Peraeus.....	30
Mr. Perkins	30
2. To Witness Repentance	30
Mr. Baxter	30
Bullinger	31
Dr. Taylor	31
Mr. Baxter	31
4. End signally to represent the Covenant of Man's Part	31
Mr. Perkins	31
Mr. Baxter	32
Voluntarily Obedience	32
Baptism is a Washing	32
Dr. Taylor	32
Baptism is the Answer of a Good Conscience Before God	32
Mr. Baxter	33
Fifth End to be a Sign of the Covenant on God's Part	33
Mr. Perkins	33
Bullinger	33
Sixth End to Present the Union Between Christ and the Believer	33
Dr. Taylor	33
Mr. Baxter	34
Seventh End is Entrance into the Visible Church	34
I Cor. 12:13.	34
Baptized into Christ	34
The Power of Solemnity	35
The Ancients called Baptism the Gate of the Sacraments	35
Ambrose	35
Justin Martyr	35
Ursinus	35
35	
Assembly Catechism	
35	
Mr. Baxter	35
Concerning John Bunyan	36
Chapter V.	36
The Old Testament Church Considered	36
The New Testament Church Considered	37
The Spiritual House	37
John the Baptist	37
John Owen	37
Then The Carnal Seed Under the Law-Now The Spiritual Seed Under the Gospel	37

Dr. Taylor	37
CHAPTER VI	38
Wherein Believer's Baptism is confirmed to be the only true Baptism, from the Constitution of the Primitive Churches, who were formed not of Ignorant Babes, but of professing Men and Women, that upon Baptism were joined together to observe all the ordinances of Christ, which is also further evidenced by the Dedications of the Epistles to the Churches, and by the Epistles themselves.	38
First, the Dedications of the Epistles to the Churches.....	38
The Apostolic Pattern and Example	38
The Jerusalem Church	38
Samaria	38
Cesarea	38
Philippi	39
Colosse	39
Corinth	39
The Church at Rome	39
The Church at Galatia	39
The Church at Ephesus	39
The Church of England	40
Dr. Owen gives a description of a Gospel Church	40
Mr. Baxter	40
Nor in the Epistles Themselves	41
Dr. Owen	41
I Corinthians 12:25, 26.	41
I Thess. 5:2, 4, 5.	41
Hebrews 6:11, 12.	42
From the Characters Christ Gives His Disciples	42
CHAPTER VII	42
Wherein there is an account of Believers Baptism, in a brief history thereof; not only from the Scriptures in the first Century, but from human Authors also, confirming the necessity of Instruction and Profession of Faith before Baptism, in all the Centuries. And that the Children of Christians, as well as Pagans, were not otherwise baptized; whereof you have some famous Instances, especially in the Fourth Century of several eminent Christians that deferred the Baptizing of their Children till they could give an Account of their Faith. Collected out of several Authors, especially the famous Magdeburgensian History.	43
Century I.	43
The Time When Baptism First Began.	43
Its Divine Original	43
Where, How, Upon Whom, and Why Baptism was Administered	43
Who Are the Meet Subjects for Baptism	43
When, Where, and by Whom Christ Jesus was Baptized	43
The Many Disciples made during Christ's Ministry	44
Christ's Enlarged Commission	44
The Apostles Baptized the Believing Jews and Gentiles	44
At Jerusalem	44
At Samaria	44
Upon the Way to Gaza	44
At Damacus	44
At Caesarea	45
At Philippi	45
At Corinth	45
At Colossee	45
At Rome	45
At Ephesus	45

Second	45
An Historical Account of Baptism, as we find it was upon the Profession of Faith owned to be practiced by the testimony of Antiquity, both in the First, as well as in the Remaining Centuries.	45
Human Antiquity for Believer's Baptism	45
The Magdeburgenses	45
The Subjects of Baptism	46
The Administrators	46
The Place	46
The Time	46
The Manner	46
The Ceremonies	46
Clemens	46
Ignatius	47
H. Montanus and Jacob Du Bois	47
Auxibins	47
Waldenses and Albigenses by D. Balthazar Lidins.....	47
The Ancient Britains	47
CENTURY II	47
Justin Martyr	47
Dionysius Alexandrinus	48
Clemens Alexandrinus	48
Walafrid Strabo	48
Century III	48
Tertullian	48
Origen	49
Mr. Baxter	49
Eusebius	49
Cyril	49
Justinus	49
CENT. IV	50
Athanasius	50
Hilary	50
Basil	50
Gregory Nazianzen	50
Ambrose	50
Arnobius	50
Jerome	50
Athanasius	51
Victorinus	51
Ephrim Syrus	51
Epiphanius	51
Decrees of Councils	51
Council of Carthage	51
Council of Laodicea	51
Council of Neocesaria	52
Basil Baptized Aged	52
Gregory Nazianzen Baptized after 20 years old	52
Constantine Baptized Aged	52
Ambrose Baptized after Bishop of Milan	52

Chrysostom Baptized at 21	52
Jerom Baptized in his 30th Year	53
Austin Baptized about the 30th Year of his Age.....	53
Theodosius Baptized Aged	53
Monsieur Daille	53
Dr. Field.....	53
Beatus Rhenanus	53
Mr. Den	53
Dr. Jer. Taylor	54
Dr. Barlow's Letter	54
CENTURY V.	54
Chrysostom	54
Austin	54
Synesius	54
Faustus Regiensis, Etc.	55
CENTURY VI	55
Gregory	55
Cassiodorus.....	55
The Council of Agathen	55
CENTURY VII	55
Various Councils' Decrees	55
Egyptian Churches Follow Apostles Doctrine	56
CENTURY VIII	56
Bede	56
Haimo	56
Various Councils Decrees	56
CENTURY IX	56
Rabanus	56
Albinus, Damascenus and Raphanus	56
Remigius and Strabo	57
CENTURY X	57
Auslebertus, Smaragdo and Theophilact	57
CENTURY XI	57
Anselm	57
Algerus	57
Bucharthus	57
Ivo	58
Waldenses	58
Bernigarius	58
Peter Bruis	58
CENTURY XII	58
Rupertus	58
Bohemius	58
Rupertus	58
Peter Lumbard	59
Albertus Magnus	59
Thomas Aquinas	59
The Petro-Brusians and Henericans	59
Waldenses Greatly Increase	59

CENTURY XIII	59
The Waldenses.....	60
Dulcinus	60
Many Friars	60
John Wickliff	60
John Huss.....	60
The Turlupins or Waldenses	60
Vignier	60
The Baltic Sea and Saxony	60
The Old Confession of Faith	60
CENTURY XIV	61
The Bishop of Meyland	61
The Anabaptists in Bohemia	61
The Confession of the Thaborites in Bohemia	61
Century XV.....	61
Old Waldenses or Baptists in Germany	61
Waldenses in Hungary	61
The Waldensian Confession of 1521	61
The Thessalonican Churches and the old German Waldenses	61
Thessalonians in Switzerland	61
CENTURY XVI	62
Jacob de Roer	62
Ludovicus Vives	62
Bellarmine	62
Grotius	62
Zwinglius	62
Luther	62
Bullinger	62
Erasmus	63
Ludovicus Vives	63
Melancton.....	63
Beza	63
Bucer	63
Chamier	63
Dr. Hamond	63
Dr. Field.....	64
The Church of England's Catechism	64
Chap. I	65
Wherein the Scriptures' total silence about Infants Baptism is observed with the necessity of Scripture warranty to authorize every Ordinance and that by the Confession of Parties themselves.	65
No Scripture for Baptizing Infants	65
The Parties Themselves Owning It	65
The Magdeburgenses	66
Luther	66
Erasmus	66
Calvin	66
Bucer	66
Staphilus	66
Choc lens	66
Melancthon	66
Zwinglius	66

Daniel Rogers	67
Baxter	67
Dr. Taylor	67
Luther	67
Calvin	67
Basil	67
Austin	68
Theophilact	68
Tertullian	68
Mr. Ball	68
The Sixth Article of the Church of England	68
Objection	68
Answer	68
68	
CHAPTER II	69
Century I	69
Apostolical Tradition's First Pretended Proof	69
Century II	70
Century III	70
Century IV	70
Infants Baptism Practiced in the Latter Part of 4th Century	71
Lying Forgeries About Constantine's Baptism by the Papists	71
Distinction Between Laymen and Clergy	71
Century V	71
The Milevitan Council's Canon Respecting Infants Baptism	72
Pope Innocent I Ratifies It	72
The 5th Council of Carthage's Canon.....	72
Also Confirmed by Pope Innocent I	72
The Doctors of this Age Approving Infants Baptism	72
The Various Impious Acts of Pope Innocentius I	73
Century VI	74
The Canons of Various Councils	74
Pope Gregory the Great	74
Emperor Justinian's Decree	74
Maxentius	74
Some Decrees Made in these Times against Anabaptists	74
Anabaptists to be Punished with Death	74
The Uncleaness and Murders found at Monasteries	75
Century VII	75
Various Canons.....	75
Century VIII	75
Additional Decrees and Rites	75
Century IX	76
Century X	76
Vossius	76
Century XI	77
Anselm	77
77	
Meginhardus	77
Century XII	77
Peter Lombard	77
Century XIII	78

Thomas Aquinas	78
Alexander	78
Bonaventure	78
Century XIV	79
Canons of the Council of Trent	79
A Blasphemous Decree	80
Princes of Germany Complain to the Pope	80
Pope Pius' Ridiculous Act	80
The German Protestants about Infants Baptism	80
The Smalkald Articles	80
The Mumpelgarten Conference	80
The Book of Concord	81
The English Protestants about Infants Baptism	81
Article 27 of the Church of England	81
The Scottish Service Book	81
The Directory.....	81
Chapter III	82
Tradition the Principle Ground of Infants Baptism	82
Austin	82
Chrysostom	82
Bellarmine	82
The Council of Trent	82
The Council of Basil	83
Eckius	83
The Traditions for Infants Baptism are Fabulous	84
Dionysis the Areopagite.....	84
Justin Martyr's Responses the Second Supposed Proof	85
The Third Supposed Proof are the Various Papal Decrees	85
Origen the Fourth Supposed Proof	86
The History of Ruffinus and His Forgeries	86
Objection	87
Answer	
87 Scripture Grounds for Infants Baptism examined	
88	
Scripture Canon for Infants Baptism	88
Matt 19:14	88
John 3:5	88
Mark 16:16	89
The Argument from Federal Holiness Examined.....	90
1 Corinthians 7:14	90
Objection.....	92
Answer	
93	
Objection	93
Answer	
93	
Objection	93
Answer	
93	
The Arguments from Circumcision Examined.....	94
From whence it is thus argued:	94

Answer	94
Galatians 3: 16	95
Calvin Confirms the Position	95
Ainsworth Confirms the Position	96
Dr. Owen Confirms the Position	96
Amesius Confirms the Position	96
The Evil Consequences of the Contrary	96
Acts 2: 38 Answered	96
Circumcision the Seal of the New Covenant?	97
Circumcision Administered Only to Believers and their Seed?	98
Baptism Came Not in the Room, Place and Use of Circumcision	98
Not Baptizing Infants Doesn't Make Gospel Privileges Lesser than Legal	100
Chapter IV	101
Wherein is made manifest that the Ordained Ceremony of Baptism is, in this of Infants altered and changed, and another Rite introduced, quite contrary both to the Signification of the Word, Nature of the ordinance, and manifest Practice thereof, not only in the Apostles' times, but many Ages after, as confessed by Parties themselves	101
The Manner of Baptism is by Dipping	101
From the Signification of the Word	101
Scapula and Stevens	101
Grotius	101
Pasor	101
Vossius	101
Minicaus	101
Liegh	102
Salmatius	102
Causabon	102
Pindarus	102
Beza	102
Selden	102
Daniel Rogers	102
Dr. Taylor	103
Joseph Mede	103
Chamier	103
From the Scripture Practice	103
Matthew 3	103
Cajetan	104
John 3: 23	104
Piscator	104
Calvin	104
Acts 8: 36	104
Calvin	104
Romans 6: 4	104
Cajetan	105
Keckerman	105
Diodatius	105
Leigh	105
Assemblies Annotations.....	105
Dr. Cave	105
Bishop Jewel	106

Mr. Baxter	106
Daille	106
Walfridus Strabo	106
Mr. Fox	106
Hieremias, Patriarch of Constantinople	107
Zepperus	107
Dr. Taylor	107
What Clinical Baptism?	107
Objection	108
Answer	108
Objection	108
Answer	108
Chapter V	109
Wherein you have an account of several Mischiefs, Absurdities and Contradictions that are justly to be charged upon the Practice.	109
Chapter VI	111
Wherein the Nullity and utter Insignificance of Infants Baptism is made to appear.	111
Neither Right Matter Nor Form	111
Objection	111
Answer	112
Chapter VII	113
Wherein there is an account of some eminent witness that hath been born against Infants Baptism from first to last.	113
Tertullian's Witness	113
The Witness Born by the Novations and Donatists	113
Argument	114
Answer	114
The Witness born by the Ancient Britains	115
Some Witness born by several Eminent Persons in several ages	116
against Infants Baptism.	116
The Witness born by the Waldenses	118
The First is the Witness we find hereof in their public Confessions of Faith.....	118
The Second is the Witness we find borne hereto by several of their most eminent leading men.	119
Berinagarius	119
Peter Bruis	120
Arnoldus	120
Henricus	121
Thirdly, In the Witness borne not only by some particular men, but by the Body of the People, as appeareth by Decrees of Councils, Decretal Epistles and Edicts given forth against them, as well as the Testimony of many Learned Writers.	121
Dr. Usher	121
Erbrardus	122
Lastly, From the Foot steps we find of This Truth, and the Sufferers from the Same in Several Countries and Places, We here the Waldenses had Heretofore Imprinted it, as Appears by the Following Instances.123	
By their Disciples in several Countries, Witnessing to these truths.	123
Germany	123

Aizates	124
Tryers.....	124
Stire	124
Mentz	124
Perermania	125
Donau	125
Eychester	125
Vienna	125
Schwas	125
Ansburg, Salsburg and Waltsen	125
Palatinate	125
Altze	125
Harlem	125
Rome	125
An Abstract of the Cruel Placates and Bloody Persecutions of the Protestant Cantons in Switzerland, Viz. Zurich, Berne, Schashuifen, against the Anabaptists	126
The Baptists persecuted by the Protestants in Helvetia	126
The First Edict of Zurich, 1525	126
The Second Edict of Zurich, 1530	126
Upon Which Edicts Followed These Persecutions	126
Faelix Mentz	126
Two Baptists Burnt	126
Six Baptists Burnt	126
The Placaet of 1639	126
The Baptists Reply to the Third Manifesto of Zurich	126
Their Doctrine was no Heresy	126
Zwinglius and Dr. Hubmeier Controversy	126
Oeculampadius and Dr. Hubmeier	127
The Minister of Schaufhuison	127
Christopher Hogendort, against Infant Baptism	127
Cellarius against Infant's Baptism	127
The Nine Ministers of Strasburg witness against Infant's Baptism	127
Pomeran and Bentius wrote against Infant's Baptism	127
The Second Charge that they disturb the Civil Peace	127
At Zurich, Two Christians Starved to Death, other Killed	128
Others starved and beheaded	128
The Magistrates of Amsterdam Intercede	128
The Placaet of Schaffhuisen	128
The Placaet of Berne	128
The States General of the Low Countries	128
The Duke of Newburg Banishes the Anabaptists	128
Thirdly in Holland	128
Friezland abounding with Anabaptists	128
Cassander about the Anabaptists	129
Beza's Honorable Testimony about the Anabaptists	129
AN ABSTRACT OF THE BLOODY EDICT OF THE EMPEROR CHARLES THE FIFTH, made June 10, 1535, against the ANABAPTISTS OR WALDENSIAN CHRISTAINS (and the execution thereof) in the Seventeen Provinces	129
At Sardam and Horne	129
At Leeworden, Gofdam and in North Holland	129
At the Buss, at Rotterdam and also in North Holland	129
At Enchusen, Waterland and Wormes	129

At Amsterdam	130
Philip the Second and his Cruel Edict	130
Sufferings in Flanders	130
Sufferings in Holland	130
The Placaet of Groningen, in 1601	130
Placaet of Danventer in 1620	130
Van Braght's The Bloody Theater	130
The Old Waldenses in Bohemia, Moravia and Austria	131
The Eminent Dr. Hubmeier and his wife martyred at Vienna	131
Comenius' History of the Anabaptists of Moravia in his History of Bohemia	131
They Lived in Colleges	131
Bishop Usher on the Collegians	132
The Collegiants in Several Countries in 1675	132
Hungarian Scholar Reports to Gov. D'Anvers about the Collegiants in 1675	132
Collegiants in Transylvania	132
The Collegiants were not Socinians	132
Collegians or Fraterinian Waldenses in Poland	132
The Waldenses and their Recourses, Residences and Succession	133
in England for Many Ages	133
Waldenses in the time of William the Conqueror	133
Henry 1, and King Stephen's Times	133
Henry 2's Time	133
Roger Hoveden and his Annals.....	133
Roger de Bedres, Governor of Gascoyn	133
Richard I and King John	134
Pope Innocentius the Third established the Dominican and Franciscan Orders to Suppress the Waldenses	134
Waldenses called Lollards in 1315	134
Lollards in the Time of Edward Third	134
A Treatise of Lollardism	134
An Account of that Eminent Servant and Confessor of Jesus Christ, Mr. John Wickliff	135
Wycliffe and the old Waldenses	135
For Two Sacraments	135
For Believer's Baptism	135
For Believer's Baptism only	136
For Churches of Saints	136
That Baptism Signs, not gives Grace	136
That Baptism saves not in itself	136
That nothing is to be received without Scripture authority	137
Against Traditions, Canons & Pope's Decretals	137
As a Lollard he denies Infant's Baptism	137
Denies Confirmation	138
No Head of the Church but Christ	138
Pope is Antichrist.....	138
Pope's Infallibility is blasphemous	138
Prelates diabolical	138
Against Church Ornaments	138
Against Patronage	138
Against Nuns	138
For Lay Preaching	138
Against Degrees of Divinity	138

Only Two Orders in the Church	139
The Church of Rome is the Synagogue of Satan.....	139
Against Monks and Friars	139
Against Lordly Priests	139
Against Tithes	139
Against Ignorant Worship	139
Against Canonical Hours	139
Against Set Forms of Prayer	139
Not to Fear Men in God’s Service	139
For Abounding in Charity	139
Against Unlawful and For Lawful Oaths	140
For Gracious Rulers	140
How Designed against and Preserved in Edward’s Time	140
Wickliff Persecuted and Cursed	140
An Earthquake	140
Londoners Friends to the Lollards	141
Government of the City Changed	141
Wickliff’s Death	141
Bones Burned Forty Years After	141
The Great Testimony Given To Wickliff by the University of Oxford.	141
Great Learning	141
Exemplary Piety.....	141
John Wickliff’s Life by Mr. James	142
Favored by Princes	142
Great Deliverance	142
Great Success in His Ministry.....	142
Friars’ Malice After His Death	143
Persecution of Lollards	143
Lucifer’s Letter to the Prelates	143
Pope’s Bull against Lollards	143
Queen Anne, a Friend to the Lollards	143
The Statute for Burning of Heretics	143
Articles for Discovery of Lollards	144
Lollards Burned	144
Cobham and 38 Hanged and Burned for Lollards	144
Diverse Lollards Martyred	144
Lollards Unanimous Herein	145
Objections Answered About Contrary Confessions	146
The Confession Not By the Waldenses	146
The Succession of Believers Baptism	151
THE	153
History of Christianity	153
Ancient Britains	153
Their Conversation according to their Enemies	157
Their Doctrinal Progress and Success	158
Waldensian Youth Taught the Scriptures	159
Waldensian Misisters are called Barbes	160
Waldensians Oppose Romish Errors	161
Rome Persecutes the Waldenses	162
Bunion’s Answer	177
Bunion Asserts Ignorance absolves from Sins of Omission and Commission	177

The Preface

Amongst all those ordinances and institutions of Christ, that the Man of Sin has so miserably mangled, metamorphosed and changed, none has been more horrible abused than that of Baptism; which as to Matter and Form, Subject and Circumstances has suffered such apparent Alterations and Subversions, that nothing but the very name of the thing remains, and yet that also very improperly too, if duly considered.

Foundation For Infant's Baptism

Which the better to Demonstrate, you have here not a Platform of the Primitive Institutions, in Christ's Commission, the Apostle's Precepts and Practice, and the Spiritual Ends thereof, plainly laid down from the Scriptures, and confirmed by the Learned; but the change itself of Believers into Infant-Baptism, traced out and detected, with all the Popish, Ridiculous Superstitions, and Fooleries, made essential to it, and concomitants with it, and that according to Apostolic Tradition, as their impious Forgeries would impose upon us.

Infant Baptism Establishes the Rule and Reign of Antichrist

Than which, as nothing did ever more tend to defile and ruin the true Church, and reproach the Wisdom and Authority of Christ their Head; So nothing could rationally more establish and confirm the false, or more apparently promote the Sovereignty and Dignity of Antichrist their Head; which is so plain, that he who runs may read. For if the very Act of Sprinkling, or pouring a little Water on the Child's Head, or face (with the Charms attending it) must give Grace, Regeneration, take away Sin, save the Soul, add to the Church, and give right to all the Ordinances; as Mr. Pope has been pleased, sitting in the Temple of God, as God, to Ordain and Decree, and that with Anathema's too, against every one who shall not so receive it.

Establishment of the Jewish Antichristian Estate in the Place of Christ's Estate

How naturally must it needs follow;

First, That Christ's Conversion, and the powerful preaching of the Gospel, His means to effect it, must be slighted and despised; Ignorance and Profaneness, the true Interest of this State, necessarily brought in; Christ's Baptism, with all its Spiritual Ends and Uses, ousted and contemned; the Jewish Antichristian Rites of a Natural Church and High-Priesthood, with all the Appurtenances, introduced.

But, Secondly, That as the Nations should accept this New Project of being made Christians and ChurchMembers by the Pope's Christening, they necessarily oblige themselves by receiving his Law, to embrace also his Government, and to be Ruled in chief by himself (as the greatest part, called Christendom, have done accordingly) who can deny it? To the erecting a Throne for the Beast, and to give that vile Person (who blasphemously they call his Holiness) cause to say (looking over his greedy Fabric, with his Father of old, Dan. 4:30.) Is not this great Babylon that I have built by the might of my Power, &c for the honor of my Majesty? Therefore, has it become the Corner and Foundation stone of the Antichristian Church and State.

The Contrast Between the Gospel Administrators and the Antichristian Administrators

For as they who take (as far as they can judge) living Stones (called the Spiritual Seed, Saints by Calling or Believers) to build Christ a House or Church, Orderly joining them together by Dipping, do yield Obedience to Christ's Command, conform to the Primitive Pattern of the New-Testament Churches, ascribe honor and glory to the Lord Christ the Institutor:

So they, who take the Carnal Seed, VIZ. Ignorant and Unconverted ones, to make up the National, or any particular Church, joining them together by Sprinkling, do thereby yield Obedience to the Pope's Canons, conform to the Jewish and Antichristian Pattern, and reflect Honor and Dignity to their Sovereign Lord, the Pope, the Contriver and Imposer thereof. And is not this very observable, that Pope Innocentius the First, (that Abaddon and Apollyon) that had so many marks of Antichrist, as you find in the account here given of him, was the first Confirmer and Imposer hereof.

The Reformers and their Different Reasons to Support Antichrist's Baptism

But that which is most to be lamented is, that the Protestant Reformers, who detected and cast away to many Antichristian Admonitions, should yet hold fast such a Principal Foundation Stone of their Building; though it is granted, with the rejecting of many of its Superstitions, and also upon other pretended Grounds. For when the Rottenness of the Popish Grounds aforesaid did appear for Infant's Sprinkling, it had certainly fallen to the Ground, but for some new Contrivances to support it, though therein they have not been so happy to agree amongst themselves in their Conclusions.

The Differing Concepts of Faith Which Protestants Allow for Infant's Baptism

For some are for Baptizing all Children, whose Parents are ever so wicked; others only the Children of Professors; whilst others are for the Baptizing of the Children of such Professors only, whose parents are inchurched, viz., belonging to some particular Congregation. Some are for Baptizing Children upon their own particular Faith, (which with many confidences affirmed they have.) Others deny that with great Vehemence, affirming they ought only to be Baptized upon an Imputative Faith, viz., upon the Faith of others, though saying, it must be by the Imputative Faith of the Church; others of the Gossip; others of the Parent or Proparent in Covenant upon the account of Federal Right. So that some are for Baptizing upon an Ecclesiastical Faith, some an Imputative, some a Seminal, some an Habitual, some a Dogmatical, and some upon a Justifying Faith.

Richard Baxter's Conclusions

Upon which Variety of Differences, you have Mr. Baxter himself in the beginning of his Book of the Sacraments saying, That it may seem strange that after 1600s years use of Christian Baptism, the Ministers of the Gospel should be so unresolved to whom it does belong; Yet so it is (saith he) and I observe it is a Question that they are now very solicitous about: and I cannot blame them, it being not only about a matter of Divine appointment, but a practical of such concernment to the Church.

Moreover, it is no wonder that such Contradictions should proceed from such contrary Principles; for if from one Baptism, **Ephes. 4**, Christ would oblige and engage us to Unity, let it not be thought strange, that from a Baptism so different from Christ's such differences and Divisions should flow. For as one ingeniously observes, That as it happens to Travelers, when they are out of the way, one conjectures he should go this way, another that way, and sometimes at hot disputes and contentions about it, and in the contest many Byways are attempted: Yet still the further they go, the more they are out of the way, till they can come to the true Road again. So it has been with the Baptizers of Infants, they are fallen into many new devices to maintain it, which has occasioned many hot contests, branches and divisions amongst themselves, whose principal Arguments and Scripture pretences for the Practice, you have here also Examined and Answered.

The Ancient Waldenses

The Ancient Waldenses you find from good Authority, were great asserters of this Primitive Institution of Believer's Baptism; and faith impugners of Infants, as a Human and Antichristian Tradition and Invention. In addition, it is not very strange, that the Protestants, who pretend to derive their Succession from them, should so much degenerate in so principal a Foundation, and give thereby so much advantage to a Common Enemy to reproach their whole Separation? For since they assert but two Sacraments in opposition to their Popish seven, how lamentable is it that by this deviating from this Primitive Rule and Pattern, they should so miserably differ in both, but more especially in this of Baptism?

Objection I

But it may be objected, that if the business of Believer's Baptism, be a thing so clear, as you would make it; how came it to pass, that so many learned and pious men, so many fearing God, both Men and Women, should so zealously and conscientiously cleave to such a piece of Error and Darkness, in Sprinkling their Children, while so few, in comparison, do embrace this great Truth of Baptizing Believers?

Answer

In answer to which Inquiry, I present the following Considerations for Satisfaction, viz.

1. That the Wisdom and Grace of God may more appear, that many times Reveals His Truths to Babes and weak ones, which he withholds from the wise and prudent, to prevent boasting, and that no flesh should glory in his presence, and to fulfil His holy and good pleasure, Who opens Hearts and Ears, and gives Understanding, as seems Him good.
2. To demonstrate that great Truth, that as God's People went into Mystical Babylon gradually, so that iniquity prevailing by steps, so must their coming out be, some at one time, and some at another, as they came out of Literal Babylon.

Therefore has it been, that some Ages have recovered much of the Doctrinal parts, while yet they have been very corrupt in Discipline, and held fast many Dregs of Antichristianism; as Luther and many of these Reformers, that under their zealous pleading for the Doctrine of Justification against Popish Merits, &c., yet held fast Images in Churches, and Consubstantiation, and many other things. Again, many who have got light in the Discipline have yet been very corrupt in /Doctrines, if not in Manners. Many having recovered the Form of Godliness, that have not lived up to the Power; and on the contrary many who have lived much in the Power of Godliness and holy living, that have been zealous opposers of the Right Form.

And as to that of Discipline, how Gradually has it got Ground, sometime in the Negative, opposing false Worship and Superstition; sometime in the Passive part, some age getting and recovering one piece, some others another; as for instance; How zealous have the Protestants been in opposing Popery in one Age, and yet as zealous opposers of any further Light that sprang up in the next? Again, how zealous the Puritans and Non-conformists were in opposing the Hierarchy and Prelacy, and yet as zealous opposers of a further Reformation as to Church-order and discipline according to Christ's Pattern? Oh what a strange thing was Independency among many holy, zealous and learned Men a few years since, and how few were those who stood up to assert it! However, especially what a monstrous, prodigious thing was Anabaptism!

3. Another reason may be from the inconsiderable persons, as to Gifts, Parts, Learning, Worldly Power and Greatness, that have been in the Profession and Practice of it, few but the Poor having embraced it.
4. Another from the Contemptableness of the things itself, in the Administrations thereof, being calculated not for the Meridian of fleshly Wisdom, or show, but the quite contrary; yet exceedingly accommodated to further Grace, Humility, Mortification, self-denial, to increase Faith, Love, holiness, &c.

5. An other may be from the Reproaches and Slanders cast upon the Professors thereof; or real falls and scandals of those under it, who may be suffered to fall for the offence of others that seek it; for it is said, That offences must needs be, Matt. 18.
6. And lastly, to instruct Humility in all attainments, having nothing but what we have received, and therefore to exercise Tenderness and Compassion to those who differ, know that he who is first may be last, and he who is last may be first.

Objection 2

But, why have you so many quotations from Paedobaptists? As though it were probable that men who so much oppose your practice would advantage you by their assertions, if truly urged.

Answer

To which I reply, that it must be granted that there needs no better Testimony than the Confession of Parties themselves; and herein, I conceive, there is enough from their own Pens, to contradict and condemn their own, and to justify our practice in every part thereof. In addition, if they have injured themselves by their acknowledgement, it will be their parts to show their own mistakes or to reconcile, if they can, their contradictions.

It is not so much from the force of the Authorities, as the strength of the Reason urged by them, that there are produced; not that any new thing is brought forth by them that has not been offered by some of their own; but Arguments from some Persons of Note among themselves, prevail forty times more than the very same, from persons they have a prejudice against, and therefore Paul quoted their own Poets, **Acts 17**. And, by how much they are against the Truth in their Practice, by so much the power and Providence of God may appear so, to make their own Pens and Tongues to fall upon themselves; witness what more especially is quoted from **Mr. Baxter's Right to Sacraments**, and **Dr. Taylor's Plea for the Anabaptists** in his **Liberty of Prophecy**.

Objection 3

But, it is possibly to be imagined that Mr. Baxter, that has been esteemed the great Maule of the Anabaptists, should make Assertions so much in Contradictions on to his former Position? Has he then changed his mind, and revoked his former Apprehensions?

Answer

That he has made all these assertions, and many more to the same purpose, his own Books are witness. From whence they are faithfully quoted especially that which he calls The Second Disputation of the Right to Sacraments. From whence it is that Mr. Tombs fetches the twenty Arguments he wrote against Mr. Blake, and improves them all against him, discovering Contradictions to his former principles in every one of them, in his Book which he calls *Felo de se, or The Self-Destroyer*; to which Mr. Baxter has never made the least reply, that I have heard of; though in the end of Mr. Tomb's said book he provoked him to a Reply, by these words, viz., *by the reading of this Book, all intelligent person may perceive Mr. Baxter's deceitfulness, or heedlessness, and if he persist on defending Infant Baptism, his unreasonable pertinacy in his own conceit and if he does not declare his forsaking his Doctrine in his Book of Baptism, his impenitency and unrighteous, dealing with the Church of God, which he has injured*. Therefore how much is he concerned to give some account, how such Assertions can be reconciled to his former Writings, which in the apprehensions of such ignorant Creatures as we are, seem to be as contrary to each other, as Light to Darkness. Though I doubt not, but that through the Profoundness of his Speculation and Subtlety of his Distinctions (having therein so much out done Thomas Aquinas himself in his late Writings) he will as soon Reconcile these seeming contradictions, as many of his former, wherein he has so much abounded, (non more than I know of,) being,

as you find, sometime a great opposer, then a great Defender of Episcopacy; sometime for Nonconformity (in some Tents he has seemed to shelter himself in the Storm, and with their Indulgence to come forth again.)

And as to these other Quotations that are so often cited from **Dr. Taylor's Liberty of Prophecy**; I know it is usually said, that what he wrote therein was not his own Judgment, but done on purpose to set the Parliamentarians together by the ears, in taking so much the part of the most hated Sect among them. To which I souls say that surely Dr. Taylor had the Reputation of a person of more Integrity, Conscience, and Honesty than so egregiously to prevaricate in the things of God.

Yet if that really was his design in bringing forth so much Truth (with such fullness of Demonstration) though in guile, envy, and deceit, we are yet therein to rejoice, as said the Apostle, **Phil. 1:4**. And the more also to magnify the Power, Wisdom and Grace of God, so to take the wise in their own craftiness, and that can make Balaam himself, that designs to curse his People, the bless them altogether.

Objection 4

But, why do you take so much pains, and quote so many Authors, to prove Believer's Baptism? Who ever denied it? For is it not all along urged that Pagans and Infidels should not otherwise be Baptized, but upon profession of faith, and that the Children of Christians, if not baptized in Infancy, should be baptized upon Profession of Faith?

Answer

To which I Answer, That the Arguments in the first Part, are not so much to prove that Believers professing Faith are to be Baptized, but that they only are so to be, and not others. And that the Authors that are produced to prove Believer's Baptism, whether from the Commission, Order, or Ends, therefore, do also by substantial Arguments conclude against the Baptizing of any others; and so necessarily, by their own Grants, exclude Ignorance and Unconverted ones. And besides, as so many of themselves acknowledge, the Catechumens were not only the Children of Heathen, but of Christians also, and such too as were born to them after their Christianity; witness those many instances given in the Fourth Century, and by Mr. Baxter himself. And as for baptizing professors, whether the Children of Pagans or Christians, we ask no more, because sprinkling of infants, as by many arguments as you will find, is a mere nullity. It is no baptism, if worse than none, as you will find made good, an ordinance being so profaned, and the Name of God taken in vain, where neither true Matter, nor right Manner is observed.

Objection 5

But, it may be said, and I have already met with it, To what purpose is this coming forth, in a point so controversial, at this juncture, where there is more need of healing than dividing Subjects?

Answer

That if Paul used so powerful an argument from one Baptism, **Eph. 4**, to press union and peace, then if there has been another baptism set on foot in opposition to it, that must needs be a makebate with a witness it being no less than an Error in a Foundation, nay that which does assert two foundations, and two principles; and if so, then what more hopeful endeavor can there be put forth to effect peace than to discover and remove such a rock of offence, by delivering from the false, and recovering to the true and one baptism? This union does not only deal the division between Baptists and Paedo-Baptists, but the PaedoBaptists among themselves, who are, as you have heard, at so great odds in this point, and so solicitous, as Mr. Baxter tells us, in a practical of such concernment. Without which, there being such an error in the principle, such an error in the Principle, such a foundation of Antichrist held fast, all exhortations to Union, viz., in church-fellowship and

communion, will signify little. Therefore let the cause be removed, the bone of contention taken away, the peaceable effects necessarily follow. A faithful pleading and pressing whereof, is the upright design of this undertaking, and is therefore with the more faith and confidence recommended to the blessing of God, and to the hearts and consciences of all sincere, upright ones, that desire to keep the commandments of God, and the Testimony of Jesus Christ.

With this earnest desire and expectation, that the candid, ingenuous reader, however contrary-minded, will overlook what of frailty and weakness he may take notice of, which may be too much; and eye principally the design, drift, and scope thereof. And that if by the multitude of quotations, through so ancient a track, he finds any particular mistake, misquotations, or misapplications, that he will not so dwell, or insist upon it, to reject the Truth of all the rest, that are full and clear without exception, which is the way that Carpers and Sophists take, and the method that Papists have all along taken in Reply to our Protestant-writers. Though this withal I can assure you, that I have not willingly given any such occasion; but have either transcribed the Authorities from their own works or from some authentic writers, that have so done, and especially from the Magdeburgensian History, so much esteemed among the Protestants, and whereof I shall be accountable to any judicious inquirer, that may doubt the truth hereof.

The Usefulness and Beauty of Believer's Baptist as the Ordinance of God

Though by the way, it must be remembered, that all human authority urged from antiquity, is at best but Argumentum ad hominem; it being Scripture /authority only, that is of divine force, and, as coming from God, can oblige the conscience. Therefore, if you will but please, before you make up your judgment, and pass the definitive sentence, to read the whole, and laying all parts together, weigh them (with an impartial mind) in the balance of the Sanctuary; you will find, I doubt not, that as no Ordinance of Jesus Christ is more fully and clearly asserted from the Scripture, founded with greater wisdom and righteousness, or of more excellent use to the Church than that of Believer Baptism, however it has been contemned, nicknamed, and reproached.

Infant's Baptism is an Invention of Man and an Innovation of Antichrist

So no invention of man, or innovation of Antichrist has been more pernicious, either to the Church or World, or founded upon less of reason, righteousness, and truth, than that of sprinkling infants, though it has so long and so currently past for Christ's ordinance of baptism.

Conclusion to the Preface

Lastly, if any shall be offended at this witness, (though thus made good by a seven-fold demonstration twice told) let them know, (that the Providence of God has so ordered, as they will find herein) that they cannot oppose it, without opposing and contradicting themselves, there being scarce one argument in the whole Book, that is not substantially confirmed by some eminent men of their own.

AN APPENDIX TO THE PREFACE

Since the last impression I have met with Come more Objections, which (though they have been answered in part) yet I find it necessary to say something more unto; which are as follow, viz.

Objection 1,

That Mr. *Baxter* is much injured by Mr. *Tombes* in his Quotations out of his second Disputations, so often to in this Book, by so improving those Arguments which He only gives for Adult Baptism, against Infant's Baptism, though without taking notice of the Caution he gives in the said Book that he would not be understood to include Infants-Baptism, having so fully asserted the same elsewhere.

Answer

In Answer whereto, I must refer you to what Mr. *Tombes* has said in the Epistle to his *Felo-de-se* (to obviate the same) which is as follows, viz.,

That though Mr. Baxter, in that his second Disputation intended only to overthrow Mr. Blake's Tenet; yet indeed the middle terns and proofs of his Arguments do beat down his own! tenet of Infants-Baptism; and direct into the way of restoring Believers-Baptism; to demonstrate, that those who have adhered to Mr. Baxter, may see how ill he has dealt with them, and may, if God give them wisdom to discern the truth, be brought into the right way of Believers-Baptism, is this Writing framed in which thou has presented to you a remarkable instance of God's Providence, clearing Truth by pen of its most eminent Adversary, and of his heedless writing, not observing how his own Arguments against another, fight against himself; the urging whereof, is that which Logicians approve of, and against the person, is ever counted a good Plea to argue for his own condemnation out of his own mouth and in this matter is good as to the thing, it being) not only asserted by him, but also largely proved.

In the publishing whereof, there is no more wrong done him, than was done by Bishop Morton in his Apology, in alleging the Romanist's Words in their Writings, as an Advocate for the Protestants, against themselves but much right to the Church of God, nothing is here set down as his, but his own Words. His Caution, that he means his Propositions in the case of Adult persons, and that he has elsewhere proved Infants-Baptism, are without wrong to him, left out, saith his Arguments do as strongly prove there should be none but Adult-Baptism,. As that none should be baptized upon the Profession of a bare Dogmatic Faith for though his aim be only to prove that the Faith professed which entitles to Baptism, may be justified, yet his Arguments to proves more; that none but such as profess such Faith, are to be baptized, and that this profession is to be by each Baptized in his own person, and no other to be baptized. Not one text he brings to prove that a parent, or Pro-Parent's Profession does entitle to baptism; what he has disputed elsewhere for Infants-Baptism, is all answered elsewhere also, no where does he prove (though that is it he should chiefly have proved) that in order to Baptism, a Parent's Profession is by God allows as the Infant's own; but still he supposes it, which is the main point to be proved; which Logicians know is of all Fallacies the grossest, viz. The begging of the Question. Thus far Mr. Tombes.

And that Mr. Tombes has rightly and truly improved **Mr. Baxter's** Arguments for Adult, against his former for infant's Baptism, take two or three instances; and which you have more fully in the Book, and be yourselves the Judges, viz., in his **Second Disputation, p. 149.**

He reasons thus: If there can be no Example given in Scripture of anyone that was baptized without the Profession Of a saving faith, nor any Precept for so doing, then must we not baptize any without it; but the antecedent is true; therefore so is the consequence, and in proof thereof, produces the several examples of all particular persons baptized in the Scriptures. In addition, upon his instancing of Philip's answer to the Eunuch, If thou believe with all thy heart, thou may; said, And to say that, Philip answered *de been see*, meaning, that it includes not the negative, otherwise thou gayest not; is to make Philip to have deluded not decided or resolved. Concluding, that there is not the least word of Scripture that gives us the least intimation that ever any man was baptized without a profession of a saving Faith.

And in **his 10th Argument, p. 116, 118,** saith, that Christ has instituted no baptism but what is to be a Sign of present Regeneration wrought; but to men that profess not a Justifying Faith, it cannot be administered as

a sign of present regeneration, therefore he hath instituted no Baptism to be administered to such. The Major is plain, said he, John 3:5. Titus 3:5.

In addition, in his Rag. p. upon the Eunuch's not being admitted to Baptism without faith said, he observes, that Baptism is the Seal of God's Promise;

1. That the Constant Order is that Baptism follow faith;
2. That it is no better than an impious Profanation, if it go without Faith; that is, if the Party seek it without the presence of Faith.

If the Pastor administer it without the Profession of Faith; And whereof many more might be added; even the whole Twenty Argument that Mr. Tombes ' mentions, and many often repented in the Book; but let these suffice. And may we not with admiration what should oblige Mr. *Baxter* so fervently to assert, and so strenuously to probe the baptism of *Believers* after *Profession* in the very *Method*, and Way that is so fully *owned* by the Baptists themselves. Is it that he may make *amends* for *all* the *bad words* he hath heretofore given them, and so fully now at last *justify*, confirm, and *plead* their Cause, he hath so endeavored to disgrace and pour *contempt* upon? For, if otherwise, to what end should he take all that pains to *assert*, *defend* and so zealously to *plead* and *press* that *Faith* and *Profession* there of should precede Baptism and that in a Country, where for so many Ages, none without the sin of *Anabaptism*, or being baptized again, having, as judged, been so well baptized in Infancy can practice the same. Can it be thought to be for the sake of a *Blacker*, a Turk, *Jew*, or some such *person*, that it may be, once in ten or twenty years may have been *sprinkled*? Surely not to be imagined: Or, *Secondly*, is it indeed to pull up *infants* *Baptism* Root and Branch? For it impious and *profane* do baptize any without Faith, and do go out of Christ's Order, what can more enervate such a practice? Do Scripture Precept and Practice warrant another Baptism besides the Adult Baptism, which he tells us, with so many undeniable Arguments, is only? And can there be a *Practice* of another *Baptism*, whereof neither *Precept* nor practice without setting a post by God's post erecting another Principle and Foundation in the Christian Religion without Christ's Institution, without being esteemed, as he intimates, impious and profane.

Therefore did Mr. Tombes, in a Letter (written some two or three years since, which he lately showed me) with much importunity, press Mr. Baxter for a candid and particular Recantation of his Book of Infants Baptism, he having by such substantial Arguments (as he had demonstrated in his *Felo de se*) so effectually done the same in those his twenty Arguments; but his answer to him (which he also showed me) was in my judgment altogether unbecoming either Mr. Baxter's Gravity, the reason, or the Candor of the Motion, being so full of severe and contemptuous relations and reflections.

Infant's Baptism is Antichrist's Baptism

In the next place, there is another Passage, that I hear some are very much offended at; which t may be meet to be a little more particular in a reply to, viz., That I have called Infant's sprinkling, or Baptism, Antichristian. To which I say, that I have not only called it so, but have by so much substantial evidence, made it so well appear, which they will do well to take into consideration, viz.

1. Because there is neither Scripture Precept or Practice for the same, as confessed by so many eminent men of their own, bespeaking it of the same Antichristian Birth with others of their Antichristian Inventions;
2. Because it is asserted to be an Apostolic Tradition by so much Antichristian Forgery, of which you have such manifest and undeniable proof and demonstration;
3. Because never judged necessary (as confessed by so many eminent, learned men) till imposed by Antichristian Canons, as began in the Waldensian and Carthaginian Councils, by Pope Innocent the first, that, as you will hear, had so many Mark of Antichrist upon him, and afterwards continued and reinforced by so many Popes and Councils.

4. Because it was designed and decreed to such Antichristian and Blasphemous Ends, as has been made manifest, viz., That by the very act of sprinkling a little water in the face, to take away Sin, regenerate the Person, and save the Soul;
5. Because it has so effectually been managed to propagate, strengthen, and advance the Antichristian Church, State and Kingdom, whereby whole Towns, Cities, Countries, and Regions have by the Pope's Christenings, received the denomination of Christians, the better to make up his National and Universal Church; yea, the whole Christian World.
6. Because the opposing thereof in defense of the true Christian Baptism (viz., that after profession of Faith according to Christ's Precept and Pattern) has cost so much Christian Blood, by the Antichristian Decrees and bloody Inquisitions and Butcheries as is made.

Objection About Title Page

Another Objection I have often met with, is, That whereas in the Title-Page it is affirmed that Infant's Baptism was not practiced for three hundred years after Christ, it appears from Tertullian's Testimony against it, and Cyprian, (and the Council of 66 Bishops) for it, in the Third Century, that it was practiced before. To which I say, That in my small search I cannot find there is any authentic testimony that it was *practiced upon* any till the fourth Century. If any do assert it, let them prove it. It is granted Tertullian spoke against it in Africa, which is clear evidence that some had been speaking for it in that Corner of the World, page 149.

Dr. Barrow said, That there is no just evidence for it for above 200 years; that he does believe that it came into the World in the Second Century, and in the Third and Fourth began to be practiced, though not greatly; And **Mr. Barter's Testimony from Antiquity**, which you find **p. 53**, speaks much at the same rate. As for the Determinations of that which is called Cyprian's (and his 66 Bishops) Council, you have the Exceptions against it, **p. 147**.

However, if it should be taken for granted that it was practiced in Cyprian's *time*, 30 or 40 years will break no great square in the computation. Therefore to resolve the Cavil, and to prevent stumbling at the threshold, I have now, in this put it, as you had, [near 300 years) not that I see any other Cause to alter it but only to prevent the *Offence of* any before they come to consider my Grounds, being fully of the same mind, as formerly, therein.

Objection 4

Another, and one of the considerable objections I have met with is this, viz. That whereas I have asserted that the Waldenses were such *great opposers of Infant's Baptism*, the contrary seems to be most manifest by those several *Confessions of Faith* recorded by Perrin, both *of the Waldenses of Province* and those of Bohemia also, testifying that they did own and practice the baptizing of infants, so well improved both by Mr. *Marshall* and Mr. *Baxter*, against Mr. *Tombes*.

To which I say, though I have *sufficiently* replied to *both* (whereof the objectioners take so little notice) proving that those several *Confessions*, both *of the Waldenses of Province*, and those pretended *of Bohemia*, were all of a late *Date*, via. None of them before the 16th. *Century*, and also since the Defection of those *French Waldenses*, for as *for those of Bohemia*, they disowned themselves so be (falsely, as they say, called Waldenses) which may be *satisfaction enough to the considerate reader* as you have it at large in the First Impression, *p. 327, &c.*

Yet because I would more fully remove all occasion of offence that may arise *there-from*, I have now given you the several *Confessions* themselves, and the respective grounds upon which *Perrin* concludes they owned Infants baptism, with particular and *distinct replies* to each of them; and which you will find in *p. 275, &c.* of this Impression.

The History of the Sufferings of the Baptists in all Ages Since Christ's Time

In the next place, the Reader is desired to take notice that since my last, I have *obtained* from *Holland* that large Book of *Martyrs*, called, the *Bloody Theater*, written in *Dutch*, by one **Thielem J. Van-Beaght**. It is a continuation of several *Chronologers* and *Centurists*, such as *Twisk*, *Merningus*, *Montanus*, *Frank Merlin*, &c the *John Foxes* in their days who have especially recorded the *Doctrines* and *Sufferings* of the *Baptists* in all *Ages* since our *Savior's* time, brought down to the year 1660. Whereof you have here some brief *Epitome*; by the excellent *Method*, exactness of *Quotation* (through the greatest variety of *Authors* that ever I met with), and accurate collection of the *Bloody Placates* and *Decrees*, as well as of the *Tortures*, *Sayings*, *Sufferings*, *Confessions*, and *Godly Letters* of their *Martyrs*, more especially in the latter *Centuries*. It is most worthy to be translated into the *English Tongues* for public benefit and satisfaction; and a *Work*, however attended with *Cost* and *Difficulty*, some are not without *Thoughts* and *Hopes* of performance.

Additions to This Edition

Lastly, the reader may understand that the most considerable additions made in this impression are principally these that follow, viz.,

1. The Scriptural-History of Baptism, page 40-45;
2. The Witnesses born by several eminent persons against Infant's Baptism, page 229-237.
3. The Sufferings and Martyrdom of Baptists in several Ages, out of the Dutch Martyrology, pages 257-272;
4. The eminent Witness of the Waldenses or Lollards in English thought all the Kings Reigns; particularly of the Famous Confessor, J. Wickliffe, pages 275-309;
5. The Answer to Mr. Baxter's Preface, page 361.

The Contents of the Whole

The Book consists of Two Parts, the first proving Believers; the second disproving Infant's Baptism, under these two Heads:

1. That the baptism of believers is only to be esteemed Christ's Ordinance of Baptism; 2. That the baptism of infants is no ordinance of Jesus Christ.

The first whereof is proved in seven Chapters, viz.

1. From Christ's positive institution and commission commanding it, page 1;
2. From the Apostolic doctrines and precepts teaching it, page 5;
3. From the Examples of Primitive Saints practicing it, page 7;
4. From the Spiritual Ends in the Ordinance enjoining it, page 11;
5. From the New Testament Dispensation requiring it, page 26;
6. From the Constitution of all the Primitive Churches confirming it, page 29;
7. From the Testimonies of Learned Men in all Ages since Christ, witnessing to it, page 40.

The Second is also made good in seven Chapters also:

1. From the Scriptures total silence as to any precept or practice to warrant it, page 89;
2. From the Silence of Antiquity itself, as to any practice of it for 300 years, or the imposing of it, for at least till 405 years after Christ, page 97;
3. From the erroneous Grounds, both as to Fabulous Traditions, and mistaken Scriptures pretended for it, page 152;

4. From the Change and Alterations of the Rite and Ceremony itself of Dipping the whole man, into sprinkling a little water on the head or face, page 181;
5. From the Nullity and utter Insignificance of it as to any Gospel-Ordinance, page 210;
6. From the absurdities and Contradictions of it, page 215;
7. From the eminent witnesses born against it all along, page 221.

A Treatise of Baptism

**The first part proves Believer's Baptism under this head, VIZ.,
That the Baptism of Believers is only to be esteemed Christ's Ordinance of Baptism.**

CHAPTER I

**Wherein the Baptism of Believers is proved to be the only true Baptism, from
Christ's positive Institution or Commission; Viz. Matthew 28:18,19.**

I. From Christ's positive Commission

And Jesus spake unto the Disciples saying, All power is given unto me in heaven and earth; go ye therefore, and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost; Teaching them to observe all things that I have commanded you: and lo, I am with you always unto the end of the world.

Mark 16:16, and he said unto them, Go ye into all the world, and preach the gospel to every creature. He that believes and is baptized shall be saved, but he who believes not shall be damned.

Where we have this plain order of Christ laid down:

First, that Men should be taught the Doctrine of Faith;

Secondly, Being so taught, they should be baptized;

Thirdly, that they should be in His School (or Church, whereof they are then made Members) be instructed in everything else, they ought to learn.

Richard Baxter

Which method **Mr. Baxter** himself does fully acknowledge in his Book called **the Second Disputation of Right to Sacraments, page 149, 150**, in his 16th Argument, in these Words, viz., This (saith he, speaking of the Commission of Christ to His Disciples) is not like some occasional mention of Baptism, but it is the very Commission itself of Christ to His Disciples for preaching and baptizing, and purposely expresses their several works, in their several places and Orders.

Their first task is to make Disciples, which are by Mark called Believers. The Second Work is to Baptize them, whereto is annexed the promise of their salvation. The Third work is to teach them all other things, which are after to be learned in the School of Christ. To condemn this Order (saith he) is to condemn all rules of order, for where can we expect to find it, if not here. I profess, my conscience is fully satisfied from this Text, that it is one sort of Faith, even saying, that must go before Baptism, the Profession whereof the Minister must expect, (But is it possible, that an Ignorant Babe can observe this Order, and answer this expectation) of which (said he) see what is to this purpose before cited by Calvin and Piscator, which he also mentions, page 85, viz.

John Calvin

Calvin, upon **Matthew 3:6**, said: Therefore that men may rightly offer themselves to Baptism, Confession of Sins is required, otherwise the whole Action would be nothing else but sport.

Piscator

Piscator, upon **Mark 1:4**, said, It is called the Baptism of Repentance for Remission of sins, because John preached the remission of sins to the penitent believers.

John Tombes' Felo De Se

Which Quotations of Mr. Baxters both here and hear after taken from that, his second disputation, I desire the Reader to take notice, I transcribe out of Mr. Tombe's Book, called Felo De Se, (that of Mr. Baxter being not at hand, nor easily to be come by) in which Book Mr. Tombes very judiciously returns Mr. Baxter's twenty Arguments, he wrote against Mr. Blake, upon himself, as naturally opposing Infant's Baptism, and which I conclude were faithfully recited, and would hope convincingly improved, because Mr. Baxter has never contradicted them, that I have heard, nor given the least reply thereto, as his Bookseller informs us.

Mr. Perkins

Mr. Perkins, in concurrence herewith upon these words, Teaching All Nations, Baptizing them, said, I explain the terms thus; mark first of all, it is said, Teach them, that is, Make them my disciples, by calling them to Believe and to repent. Here we are to consider the Order, which God observes in making with Men a Covenant in Baptism. First of all, he calls them by His Word, and commands them to believe and to repent. Then in the second place, God makes his promise of Mercy and Forgiveness. And Thirdly, He seals His promise by Baptism. They who know not, nor consider this Order that God used in Covenanting with them in Baptism, deal preposterously, overstepping the commandments of repenting and believing. In addition, this, said he, is the cause of so much profaneness in the world.

Paraeus

Paraeus also upon Matthew 3:5 shows, that the order was, Confession as a testimony of true Repentance goes first and then Baptism for Remission of sins afterwards.

But how is it possible for an Ignorant Babe, or any but men of knowledge, to answer this rule and order in Christ's Commission, is left to common sense to determine? And they who assert another Order, of Baptizing first, and then the teaching and expecting Repentance and Faith after, which is the case of all Children, do not contradict this and hold out thereby a necessity of some other Commission to justify such a practice?

Chapter Two

Wherein the Baptizing of Believers is proved to be they only Baptism from the apostles Doctrine teaching the same.

From the Apostle's Doctrine

Scriptures Acts 2:37, Acts 8:36,37, Acts 10:42, Acts 16:32. Accordingly he believing in God and his House, has it is said, verse 34, was baptized he and all of his straight way. To which may be added the Apostolic Order in laying down the principles of the Doctrine of Christ, first, Repentance from dead works. Secondly, Faith toward God. Thirdly, the Doctrine of Baptism's, Hebrew 6:12.

Bede

Bede said, that men were first to be instructed into the knowledge of the truth, then be baptized, as Christ has taught, because without Faith it is impossible to please God. **Magde. Century 8 page 220.**

Erasmus

Erasmus, in his paraphrase upon Matthew 28, observes that the Apostles are commanded first to teach, and then to baptize. The Jews were brought by ceremonies to the knowledge of the truth, but Christians must learn first.

So then does it not from this necessarily follow, that if the Apostles only taught that persons should be baptized after Repentance and Faith, according to the Commission, and that there is no instance to be found of any other Teaching, that such should be baptize and no other. In addition, for any to introduce another practice is not only contrary to Christ's Commission, but also contradicts the Apostolic Teaching.

Chapter 3

Where in Believer's Baptism is proved to be they only Baptism, from the Examples and practice of the Primitive Saints.

Acts 2:41, Acts 8: 12, Acts 18:8, Acts 22:14, and Acts 9:18, which is also confirmed by the following Testimonies.

Luther

Luther, de Sacrament Tom. 3, fol. 168. Said, that *in times past it was thus, that the Sacrament of Baptism was administered to none, except it where to those who acknowledge and confessed their Faith and know how to rehearse the same, and that it was necessary to be done, because the Sacrament was constituted externally to be used, and that the Faith be confessed and made known to the Church.*

Bullinger

Bullinger, in his **House Book, sermon 48**: said, *Baptism has no prescribed time by the Lord, and therefore it is left to the free choice of the faithful. Those who believed the preaching of Peter upon the day of Pentecost, as also the Eunuch, whom Philip baptized, Cornelius the Captain, Paul the Apostle at Damascus, Lydia the seller of purple, a woman who feared God, and the keeper of the prison at Philippi, and other more, as well Women as Men, as soon as they tasted the Gifts of Christ and believed His word, presently desired to be baptized.*

Baxter

Mr. Baxter, further in his **16 Arguments against Mr. Blake** in the aforesaid **Second Disputation, page 149**, said most significantly, *if there can be no Example given in the Scriptures of anyone who was baptized without the Profession of a saving Faith, nor any Precept for so doing, then we must not baptize any without it.*

However, the antecedent is true, therefore so is the consequence. In proof whereof he produces the several Scriptural Examples of persons who were baptized, which, said he, might afford us so many several Arguments, but I shall list them together.

First, as I have showed you, John required the Profession of true Repentance, and that his Baptism was for the Remission of sin.

Secondly, when Christ laid down the Apostolic Commission, the nature and Order of the Apostle's work is first to make them Disciples and then do baptize them into the name of the bother Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, as shown before.

Jews

That saving faith was required of the Jews, and Professed by them, **Acts 2:38**. This is plain from that Text.

Samaritan

the same at and believed and had great Joy, and or baptized into the name of Jesus Christ, Acts 8:12. Whereby it appears that it was bold the Understanding and the will which were both changed, and that they had the Profession of a saving faith, even Simon himself, verse 37.

The Eunuch

The condition upon which the Eunuch must be baptized was, if he believes with all his part, which he professed to do, and that was the evidence Philip expected.

Paul

Paul was baptized after true Conversion, Acts 9: 18.

The Gentiles

The Holy Spirit fell on the Gentiles before and they were baptize, Acts 10:44.

Lydia

Lydia's heart was opened before she was baptized; and she was one whom the Apostles judged faithful to the Lord. She offered to them an evidence of her Faith, Acts 16:30.

The Jailer

The example of the Jailer is very full to the resolution of the Question in hand. He first asks, what he shall do to be saved? The Apostle answers him, believe in the Lord Jesus, and thou shall be saved, and thy House. So that it was a saving Faith that is here mentioned. He rejoiced, and believed, with all his House, and was baptized in the same hour of the night, or straightway.

Crispus

Crispus, the chief ruler of the synagogue believed on the Lord, with all his house.

Corinth

And many of the Corinthians hearing, believed, and were baptized, Acts 18:8.

Philip

Philip, in Acts 8:37, is determining the Question, and gives this in as the decision; if thou believeth with all thy heart, thou mayest. So say that this is but de Bene esse, meaning that it includes not the Negative, otherwise thou may not, is to make Philip to have deluded, and not decided, or resolved.

In a word (said he) I know of no one word in Scripture, that gives us the least intimation, that ever man was baptized without the profession of a saving faith.

Thus far Mr. Baxter; who to save us the labor has himself (you see) given such exact Catalogue of the Examples of the Baptized in the Scripture; among whom (as he so well observes) there is not one to be found, that answers not Christ's Commission, and the Apostles' Precept in a professed Faith and Repentance. However, it is said, he mentioned only such as were baptized at age. That is very true, and the reason is, because the Scripture affords examples of none other, as he ingenuously confesses.

For if, Philip's Answer was decisive, and not delusive (as he is pleased to tell us) all others are excluded. And, therefore, we may safely conclude in his own words (that carry so strong an argument with them) viz., if there can be no example given in Scripture of any one who was baptized without the profession of a saving faith, nor any precept for so doing, then must we not baptize any without it.

CHAPTER IV

**Wherein Believers are proved to be the only Subjects of Baptism,
from the Spiritual Ends of the Ordinance.**

To be a Sign of the Mysteries of the Gospel.

The first end or use we shall mention is, that the baptized must have that represented in a Sign or Figure, and preached to his eye in the ordinance which has been preached to his hear and heart by the Word and Spirit of God, respecting the whole Mystery of the Gospel, and his duty and obligations therein.

Paraeus

A sign being, as Paraeus observes, some outward thing appearing to the sense, through which some inward thing is at the same time apprehended by the understanding. Therefore, he calls the Sacraments *Signa in oculis incurrentia*.

Mr. Perkins

In addition, therefore, **Mr. Perkins** said, that the Preaching of the Word, and the administration of the sacraments are all one in substance; for in the one, the witness of God is seen, and in the other heard, **Case Consc. P. 177**.

In addition, some do call them Hieroglyphics, viz. Such visible representations of things, as the Egyptians used to teach and instruct by.

Which, therefore calls for understanding and judgement, and senses to be exercised in all that partake thereof, otherwise the action will be wholly insignificant; and therefore, for any to carry a poor ignorant Babe to the Ordinance of Baptism, is as much as if you should carry it to hear a Sermon, which would be as significant, as if you should represent some godly show to a blind man, or instruct a stock or stone.

2. To Witness Repentance

The second end that we shall mention is, that the party baptized might thereby witness his repentance, Matthew 3 and 6, 11:6, 38. Acts 2:38, called therefore the baptism of repentance, Mark 1:4. To which, whoever offered themselves, were to bring forth fruits meet for Repentance and amendment of life.

Mr. Baxter

For which we are beholding to Mr. Baxter for very convincing arguments. Upon his first argument with Mr. Blake, in the fore-mentioned book, viz. wherein he does positively affirm, that we must not baptize any without the profession of true Repentance; which he proves thus:

First Argument, *If John the Baptist required the profession of true repentance before he would baptize them, then so must we, but John did so, therefore the consequence is clear. The antecedent I prove from Mark 1:3,4. He preached the baptism of repentance unto remission of sins, and doubtless, that repentance, (said he) which is to remission of sins, is true, special repentance.*

Second Argument, *If Jesus Christ has by Scripture, Precept, and example directed us to baptize those who profess true repentance, and no other, then we must baptize them, and no other; but the antecedent is true, so therefore, is the consequence; which is fully made good from Matt. 4:17; Mark 1:15 and 16; Acts 17:30; Luke 24:47. Where Christ Himself did and sent forth His disciples also to preach Repentance, to prepare them for baptism; which afterwards followed; as Matthew 3:11; Mark 1:8; Luke 3:16; Acts 2:37, 38, 41.*

Third Argument, *if they who profess to be buried with Christ in baptism, and to rise again, do profess true repentance, &c., but all that are baptized, may do so, &c. Col. 2:11, 12, 13; Rom. 6: 4, 5.*

Then in further consideration he quotes:

Bullinger

Bullinger upon Acts 2:38. Who said, *To be baptized in the name of the Lord Jesus Christ, is by the Sign of Baptism, to testify, that we do believe in Christ for the remission of sins. First, mark, it is not only an engagement to believe hereafter, but the profession of a present faith. Secondly, and that not a common faith, but that which has remission of sins. Thirdly, and this was not an accidental separable use of baptism, but the very expression of to be baptized in the Name of the Lord Jesus Christ.*

1. End to evidence present Regeneration

A third end of baptism is to evidence present Regeneration, whereof it is a lively Sign or Symbol. Regeneration being called in allusion to it, The washing of Regeneration, Titus 3:5. In addition, a being born of Water and of the Spirit, John 3:5; which is so essential to the Ordinance, that if that thing signified thereby be wanting, the sign only will be very ineffectual and insignificant: As,

Dr. Taylor

Dr. Taylor, late Bishop of Down, very elegantly said in **his Plea for the Baptists in his Liberty of Propheying, page 242**; *This indeed is truly to be baptized, when it is both in the Symbol, and in the mystery. Whatsoever is less than this, is but the Symbol only, a mere Ceremony, an opus operatum, a dead letter, an empty shadow, an instrument without an Agent to manage, or force to actuate it.* And to the same purpose you have:

Mr. Baxter

Mr. Baxter in his Tenth Argument, pages 117, 118. *Christ has instituted no baptism, but what is to be a sign of present regeneration: But to men who profess not a justifying Faith, it cannot be administered, as a sign or present Regeneration. Therefore, he has instituted no Baptism to be administered to such.*

The major is plain, said he in John 3:5, Except a man be born of water and the Spirit, he cannot enter the Kingdom of God. And so in Titus 3:5; where it called the Laver of Regeneration. And what can be a fuller grant, that Infant's Baptism is neither significant, nor any Institution of Christ, than what these two learned men have here given us?

4. End signally to represent the Covenant of Man's Part

The fourth end is signally to represent the Covenant and promise, that the Believer enters into hereby, viz., to die to sin, and live to Christ in new obedience, by that figurative death and resurrection in being dipped in water and so by going down under, and rising up out of the water, he is said to be buried, and to rise with Christ, to be planted into the likeness of his Death and Resurrection, to die and live with Christ by Mortification and Vivification. To which purpose you have Mr. Perkins very significant, viz.

Mr. Perkins

The action of the party baptized is a certain stipulation or obligation, whereby he binds himself to give homage to the Father, Son and Holy Spirit. This homage stands in faith, whereby all the promises of God are believed, and in obedience, to all His commandments. The sign of this obligation is, that he Party baptized willingly yields himself to be washed with water.

Mr. Baxter

And, also you have Mr. Baxter very fully upon his third argument to Mr. Blake, viz., it is of the instituted nature of baptism to be, in general, a professing sign for the present, as well as an engaging sign for the future. For first, the minister does baptize into the Name of the Father, Son and Holy Spirit, and the party does consent thereto.

Voluntarily Obedience

First, voluntarily offering himself to baptism; and secondly; voluntarily receiving that baptism; and his offer of himself here goes before the Minister's baptizing of him, and his reception of that Baptism is essential to it. So that Baptism essentially contains, on his part, a signal profession of consent, to that which is meant in the form used by the minister; Viz. I baptize thee in the Name, ect.) So that it is a most clear case, that baptism, as baptism, according to its instituted nature and use, does contain the person's actual signal profession of present assent to the Gospel, and acceptance of God, the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, as therein offered, and an actual signal profession that we there presently consecrate, devote and dedicate ourselves to God the Father, Son and Holy Spirit, in the aforesaid relations.

Baptism is a Washing

Secondly, another part of baptism is the Minister's washing the person, and the person first offering himself to be washed, and after actually receiving it, does hereby signally profess his consent. Now this washing does essentially signify our washing from our former filth of sins together with the guilt, our putting away the old man, which is corrupt according to our deceitfulness being buried with Christ. For all that are baptized, must profess to be buried with him, and to rise again signifies a being dead to sin, and alive to God, to newness of life, and not only our engagement of this for the future, but a profession also of it at present, which is made plain from Col. 2:11-13; Rom. 6:4-11. Yea, he who reads the whole chapter with judgment and impartiality will surely discern that true repentance and separation from the service of sin was to be professed by all who would be baptized, and thereupon they sealed their own profession and covenant by the reception of baptism, as Christ sealed his part in the actual baptizing of them.

Dr. Taylor

Concerning which you have here **Dr. Taylor** very excellently, **page 243**: *Baptism (said he) is never propounded, mentioned, or enjoyed as a means of remissions of sins, or of eternal life, but something of duty, choice and sanctity, is joined with it in order to the production of the end so mentioned. **Know ye not that as many are baptized into Christ, are baptized into His death?** There is the mystery and symbol together, and declared to be perpetually united. All of us who were baptized into the one, were baptized into the other; not only into the Name of Christ, but into His death also, But the meaning of this, as it is explained in the following words of St. Paul, makes much for our purpose. For to be baptized into His death, signifies to be buried with Him in Baptism, that as Christ rose from the dead, we also should walk in newness of life, that is the full mystery of baptism. For being baptized into His death or (which is all one in the next words) into the likeness of His death, cannot go alone, if we be so planted into Christ, we shall be partakers of His resurrection; and that is not instanced in precise reward, but in exact duty; for all this is nothing but crucifixion of the old man, and destroying of the body of sin, that we no longer serve sin.*

Baptism is the Answer of a Good Conscience Before God

And therefore, it is that baptism is called The answer of a Good Conscience toward God, I Peter 3:21. This can by no means be applied to the infant. And therefore, **Dr. Taylor again said, page 244**: *That baptism which saves us, is not only the washing with water, of which only Children are capable; but the answer of a*

good conscience towards God, of which they are not capable till the use of reason; till they know to refuse the evil and chose the good.

Mr. Baxter

And, **Mr. Baxter** very fully, **page 156**, *If (said He) according to the Institution, the answer of a good conscience must be joined with Baptism, for the attaining of its end, then we must admit of none that professes not the answer of a good conscience; but the former (said he) is certain from the Text; for baptism is said to save; that is its appointed use; yet not the external washing, but the answer of a good conscience does it. Therefore, this is of a necessary injunction; and without it baptism cannot attain its ends; but it is to be administered, and received only in order to the attainments of its End; and therefore never in a way, by which the end is apparently not attainable. What the answer of a good conscience is, the common expositions fully confirm, as I maintain.*

The Assembly's Annotations (said he) *recite both thus, viz. By the answer of a good conscience, we may understand that unfeigned faith, whereof they made confession at their baptism, and whereby their consciences were purified, and whereby they received the remission of their sins.*

Fifth End to be a Sign of the Covenant on God's Part

5. Fifth End of Baptism, is to be a Sign to the believer of the Covenant on God's part of washing away his sins by the blood of Christ, to give spiritual life and salvation, Acts 2:32, 33; Acts 22:16; I Peter 3:21.

Mr. Perkins

To which truth **Mr. Perkins** sets his seal, *we see (said he) what is done in baptism, the covenant of grace is solemnized between God and the party baptized, and in this Covenant something belongs to God, and something to the party baptized.*

Bullinger

And **Bullinger upon Acts 2:38**, *that baptism is an agreement or covenant of grace which Christ enters into with us, when we are baptized, as well as a professing sign of our true repentance.*

Sixth End to Present the Union Between Christ and the Believer

6. A sixth end is, that is might be a signal Representation of a Believer's union with Christ, called therefore a being baptized into Christ, and a putting on of Christ, figured out by such an union and conjunction with the Element, as imports a being born thereof, and being clothed therewith.

Dr. Taylor

Upon which (said Dr. Taylor) whosoever are baptized into Christ, have put on Christ, have put on the new man. This whole argument is the very words of St. Paul; the major proposition is dogmatically determined, Gal 2:22-24; the minor is Ephesians 4:24, the conclusion then is obvious, that they who have not formed in righteousness, and holiness and truth; they walk in newness of life, they have not been baptized into Christ. And then they have but one member of the distinction used by St. Peter; they have that baptism, which is the putting away of the filth of the flesh; but they have not that baptism which is the answer of a good conscience towards God, which is the only baptism that saves. And this, said he, is the case of children.

Mr. Baxter

And to this purpose also **Mr. Baxter again, p. 98**, *if it be the appointed use of all Christian baptism to solemnize our marriage with Christ, or to seal or confirm our union with Him, or engrafting into Him, then must we baptize none that profess not justifying faith, because this is necessarily pre-requisite, and no other can pretend to union, Marriage or engrafting into Christ.*

Both the antecedent and the consequent are evident in Gal. 3:27-29. For as many of you as have been baptized into Christ have put on Christ; ye are all one in Christ Jesus; and if ye be Christ's then are ye Abraham's seed, and Heirs according to promise. Here we see, that it is not an accidental or separable thing for Baptism to be our visible entrance into Christ, our putting Him on, our admittance by solemnization into the state of God's children, and heirs according to Promise. For (as all own) if we be truly baptized, we are baptized into Christ, then are we Christ's and have put on Christ, and are all one in Christ, and Abraham's seed according to Promise.

Seventh End is Entrance into the Visible Church

A Seventh end of Baptism is, that the Baptized person may orderly thereby have an entrance into the visible church, and have a right given him to partake of all the ordinances and privileges thereof. For as Circumcision of old was the visible door of entrance into the Old Testament Church, and so essentially necessary thereto, that without it, none were esteemed either Church-Members, or were to partake either of the Passover, or any of any of the privileges thereof, all without being called the uncircumcision: So also was Baptism such a door, and visible entrance into the New Testament Church, that none were esteemed members therefore, or did partake of its ordinances before they were baptized, being so God's Hedge and Boundary, that others were esteemed without. And therefore as Christ has laid down the Order in the Commission, Matthew 28: 19,20, first to teach, then to baptize, and then to reach them all things, viz., in the place of teaching His School or Church. So did they practice accordingly; as we read, Acts 2:41, 42. Where, after Peter had taught them it is said, they who gladly received his word, were baptized; and the same day there were added unto them three thousand Souls. And they continued steadfastly in the Apostle's doctrine and fellowship, and breaking of bread and prayer. So that after baptism, not before, the believers were said to enjoy and partake of all church-privileges. And which is Christ's directory and standard for rule and order to the end of the world. The church of Corinth was said, I Cor. 11:2, to have kept the ordinances as they were delivered unto them. And it was the apostle's joy and rejoicing to see the order and faith of the saints, Col. 2:5.

I Cor. 12:13.

And therefore it is said, I Cor. 12:13, *that by one spirit we are all baptized into one body, whether we be Jews or Gentiles, bond or free, and have been made to drink into one Spirit*, viz. The same spirit of faith, regeneration and holiness which gives right to baptism, orderly lets into the Body or Church, and so admits also unto the Supper, which is the received sense of most interpreters upon the place.

Baptized into Christ

And by this order, believers were said to be baptized into Christ, and to be implanted together with Him, Rom. 6:3; Gal. 3:27. For as public officers are invested into their trust by some external solemnity, that passes upon them at the time of their installment, and as the Husband and Wife enter into their relation by some solemn act done at the time of their Marriage. Or, as a corporation, by some public act done, does receive its members at their enfranchisement; even so according to the import of these Scriptures mentioned, do men and women receive that relative being, which they have in Christ, and as visible members of that Spiritual Corporation, wherein Christ is Head and Chief, from that solemn act of being baptized into him.

The Power of Solemnity

And as the officer is not invested with his AUTHORITY, or HUSBAND and WIFE with that POWER over each others bodies, (as I Cor. 7:4) nor any members with the immunities of the corporation, by any prequalifications, or actions preparatory thereto, until that be acted and done by way of solemnity, which immediately invests them with their several and respective capacities. In like manner, none are to be esteemed capable of those privileges which visibly belong to the Body of Christ upon the account of any precendaneous Qualifications or Actions whatsoever, until first they have past through those spiritual solemnities in baptism, upon which they are invested with the denomination and visible privileges which belong in common to the members of Christ's Mystical Body.

Which order of Christ has had such a sanction upon it, that all, or for the most part all that have professed Christianity, whether Papists, prelates, Presbyterians or Independents, have owned the same; not communicating in the Super with any they judged unbaptized.

The Ancients called Baptism the Gate of the Sacraments

In a word, Baptism has been called of old among the Ancients, and not without reason Janua Sacramentorum, the gate of the Sacraments, whereof they gave this reason, viz.

Ambrose

Ambrose, in all respects the order of the mystery is kept, that first by remission of sins medicine be prepared for their wounds, and then the nourishment of the heavenly table is added. Which truth is further witnessed unto, and confirmed by the following testimonies, viz.

Justin Martyr

Justin Martyr, in secunda Apologia pro Christianis, speaking of the Lord's Supper, to which the new baptized person is admitted, said, *this food we call the Eucharist, to which no man is admitted, but only he who believes the truth of our Doctrine, being washed in the Laver of Regeneration for the remission of sins, etc.*

Ursinus

Ursinus, in his Catechism; *baptism is a sacrament of entrance into the church, whence it comes, that the Supper is presented to none, except first baptized.*

Assembly Catechism

The **Assembly's Catechism**, *baptism (say they) is a sacrament of the New Testament, ordained by Jesus Christ, not only for the solemn administration of the party baptized into the visible church; But, etc.*

Mr. Baxter

Mr. Baxter, in his **Plain Scriptural Proof, page 24**, *as a soldier before listing, and a King before Crowning and taking his Oath, so are we church-members before baptism; but as every one that must be admitted solemnly into the army must be admitted by listing, as the solemn engaging sign, so every one that has right to be solemnly admitted into the visible church, must ordinarily be admitted by baptism; proved thus:*

If we have neither precept nor example in Scripture, since Christ ordained Baptism, of any other way of admitting visible members, but only by Baptism, then all who must be admitted visible members, must ordinarily be baptized.

But since baptism was instituted, we have no precept or example of admitting visible members any other way, but constant precepts, and examples for admittance this way. Therefore, all that must be admitted visible members, must be baptized.

I know not (saith he), what in show of reason can be said to this by those who renounce not Scripture. For what man dare go in a way that has neither precept nor example to warrant it, from a way that has a full current or both. Yet, they that will admit Members into the Church without baptism, do so.

Concerning John Bunyan

I had thought to have been larger upon this point and intended particularly to have answered a late piece of Mr. Bunion's in contradiction hereto, but being so well replied to by **Mr. Thomas Paul**, in his **Serious Reflections** so lately Printed, I shall say thereto little more, than what you find in the sixth chapter, respecting the constitution of the Primitive Churches.

Now may it not be referred to the Judgment and Conscience of the considerate impartial Reader, whether any but the Believer can possibly reach or attain those spiritual ends mentioned? And how capable poor ignorant babes are to answer any of them? And whether it is not contradictionous to common sense and experience for any to assert it? For what repentance or faith are they capable to profess? What present regeneration can they evidence? What Testimony of a good Conscience can they give, in striking, or keeping Covenant with God herein? And how can they embrace, or improve the Covenant on God's part for Pardon, Purging, Justification, Sanctification, and Salvation?

And therefore, is **Mr. Baxter** forced to confess, in his **Plain Scripture Proofs**, page 301, that *as to the ends of baptism, they are rather to be fetched from the aged, then infants; and that because the aged:*

1. *are the most capable subjects;*
2. *the most excellent and eminent subjects;*
3. *of whom the Scripture fully speaks, etc.*

But on the contrary, as for infant's baptism, he acknowledges in the same place, *that the Scripture speaks darkly of it; Yea, that it is so dark in the Scripture, that the controversy is thereby become, Not only hard, but so hard*, as he said, he finds it.

Wherein, if he had not said more in a few words for the baptizing of believers, and against that of infants, then all his great book can answer, let all the world judge; though he calls it, in contradiction hereto, **PlainScripture-Proof for infant-church membership and Baptism.**

Chapter V.

Wherein the Baptism of Believers is Proved to be the Only Baptism from the New Testament Dispensation, so Differing from that of the Old.

The Old Testament Church Considered

The Old Testament Church, we find, was National, consisting of the NATURAL and FLESHLY seed of Abraham. Therefore, INFANTS, by the ordinance of CIRCUMCISION added thereto, wherein they had a worldly Sanctuary, Carnal Ordinances, a Temporary Priesthood, and multitudes of Ceremonies.

The New Testament Church Considered

The New Testament church was, by Christ's appointment, to be a separated people out of the Nations consisting only of the Spiritual Seed of Abraham; and therefore believers upon profession of faith by the ordinance of baptism, were added thereunto, Acts 2:41; I Cor. 12:13.

The Spiritual House

Wherein, as in the Spiritual House, the true Tabernacle, they partake of Spiritual Ordinances in communion with Spiritual Members. And by an unchangeable priesthood do offer Spiritual Sacrifices, and worship God as true worshippers, in Spirit and Truth, John 4: 23, 24.

John the Baptist

Therefore, upon this change, you have John Baptist discharging that Privilege (of Abraham's natural Seed) that admitted into the old Church, from any such rite in the New, Matthew 3:9, telling them in express terms, that now in Gospel days, they must not say within themselves, That they have Abraham for their Father, viz. That they are the Children of a godly Parent, No, that which might have served turn under Moses, will not avail, nor must be admitted now under Christ. Nothing now but fruits meet for Repentance, gives right to the Baptism of Repentance; and nothing short of the Spirit's Birth can orderly admit to waterbirth and Spiritual Ordinances. The genuine reason Christ Himself face to that Doctor in Israel (though yet it seems, ignorant of the Mystery of the new Birth, which only gives the right of admission into the New Testament Church) because, said He, that which is born of the flesh is but flesh; Regeneration being not entailed to generation.

John Owen

To which purpose therefore, **Dr. Owen** very excellently in his **Catechism about Government, page 106**, *Our Lord Jesus Christ, has laid down (saith he) as an Everlasting Rule, that unless a man be born again, he cannot enter into the Kingdom of God, John 3:3., requiring regeneration as an indispensable condition in a member of His Church, a subject of His Kingdom, for His Temple is now to be built of Living Stones, I Peter 2:5. Men spiritually and savingly quickened from their death in sin, and by the Holy Spirit, (where of they are partakers) made a meet habitation for God, Ephesians 2:21, 22; I Cor. 3:16; 2 Cor. 6:16; which receiving vital supplies from Christ its head, increases in Faith and Holiness, edifying itself in love.*

Then The Carnal Seed Under the Law-Now The Spiritual Seed Under the Gospel

Under the Law, Ceremony, Shadow, Letter and Carnal Seed suited to Carnal Ordinances, but when the Substance and spirit was come (under the Gospel) then only a Spiritual Seed, as most meet and suitable, must attend the Spiritual Worship and Spiritual Ordinances.

Dr. Taylor

Herein does **Dr. Taylor** very well accommodate this Truth, **page 242**. *They (said he) that baptize children, make baptism to be wholly an outward Duty, a work of the Law, a Carnal ordinance; it make us adhere to the Letter without regard of the Spirit, to be satisfied with Shadows, to return to Bondage, to relinquish the*

mysteriousness, the substance and spirituality of the Gospel; which Argument is of so much the more consideration, because under the spiritual covenant. Or the Gospel of Grace, if the mystery goes not before the Symbol; (which it does, when the Symbols are consignations of Grace, as the Sacraments are) yet it always accompanies it, but never follows in order of time. And this is clear in the perpetual Analogy of Holy Scripture.

CHAPTER VI.

Wherein Believer's Baptism is confirmed to be the only true Baptism, from the Constitution of the Primitive Churches, who were formed not of Ignorant Babes, but of professing Men and Women, that upon Baptism were joined together to observe all the ordinances of Christ, which is also further evidenced by the Dedications of the Epistles to the Churches, and by the Epistles themselves.

First, the Dedications of the Epistles to the Churches

The truth where of appears not only from 1. the order directed unto in Christ's Commission, which (as already observed) requires that men be first taught in the Faith, 2. Then they are baptized into the faith, and then, 3. They are built up in the faith, viz. In the place of teaching, the Church, or School of Christ. (The contemning which order, as Mr. Baxter said, is to contemn all Rules of order.)

The Apostolic Pattern and Example

But also from the Pattern and Example the Apostles gave in observation of the aforesaid direction in planting the New Testament Churches we read of.

The Jerusalem Church

As first, the first of Jerusalem. Acts 2:41, 42. *They that gladly received his Word, were baptized, and the same day there were added to them three thousands souls.* (The [them] that they were added to, appear to be the Baptized Disciples, mentioned in Acts 1:15,21,22.) And *so they continued in the Apostles doctrine, fellowship and breaking of bread and prayers.* Where you have the order fully observed:

1. Receiving or believing the Word;
2. Baptizing;
3. Church fellowship in breaking bread, and prayer, ect.

And so in like manner you will find the selfsame order was observed in all the Churches, as:

Samaria

Secondly, the Church of Samaria; Acts 8:12, where it is said, that *when the Samaritans believed Philip preaching the things concerning the Kingdom of God, and the name of Jesus, they were baptized both Men and Women,* (but not a word of Children.)

Cesarea

Thirdly, the Church at Cesarea, Acts 10:47, 48; where Peter upon Cornelius and his friends believing and receiving the Holy Spirit, said, *can any man forbid water, that these should not be baptized, which have received the Holy Spirit, as well as WE?* And he commanded them to be baptized.

Philippi

Fourthly, the Church of Philippi, Acts 16:14; it is said, that Lydia, a Worshipper of God, heard us, *whose heart the Lord opened, that she attended unto the things that were spoken by Paul, and was baptized and her household.* And verse 32, They said unto the Jailer, *Believe in the Lord Jesus Christ, and thou shall be saved: and they spoke unto him the Word of the Lord, and to all that were in his house;* 33, *And he was baptized, he and all his straightway,* 34, *Believing God with all his house.*

Where you have two families baptized, but no child mentioned in either, but only such who were capable to hear the Word of the Lord, and to believe the same.

Colosse

Fifth, the Church at Colosse. Col. 2:10-12, where the apostle asserts, that Church at Colosse was *buried with Christ in baptism, wherein they were risen with him through the faith of the operation of God.* Which cannot be truly said of any but professed believers.

Corinth

Sixthly, concerning the Church at Corinth, it is said, Acts 18:18, *And Crispus the chief Ruler of the Synagogue believed on the Lord with all his house, and that many of the Corinthians, hearing, believed and were baptized,* and in I Cor 1:13, Paul tells the Church at Corinth, that they were not baptized in his name, and in I Cor. 12:13, *that by one Spirit they were all baptized into one body,* viz. that they were joined to the church by baptism; of whom it is said, I Cor. 11:2, that *they kept the ordinances as they were delivered to them.*

The Church at Rome

Seventhly, of the Church of Rome, it is written, Rom. 6:3, *Know ye not that so many of us as were baptized into Jesus Christ, were baptized into His death?* Therefore, we are buried with him in baptism into his death.

The Church at Galatia

Eighthly, of the Churches at Galatia, Gal. 3:26, 27, *for ye are all the Children of God by faith in Christ Jesus, for as many of you as have been baptized into Christ, have put on Christ.*

The Church at Ephesus

And lastly, of the Church at Ephesus, it is recorded, Acts 19:1-3; that *Paul having past through the upper coasts, came to Ephesus, and finding disciples, said unto them, have you received the Spirit since you believed? And they said, no, &c. and he said, unto what then were you baptized?*

By all which Scriptures is manifestly appeareth, that the New Testament Churches were formed only of Baptized Believers, wherein we neither find one ignorant babe, nor one unbaptized person as a member. And that Infants have as little right to be admitted into the Church, and esteemed members thereof, or to partake of the Spiritual Ordinances therein, as they have to that initiating ordinance, baptism. It may further appear,

if you do but consider, how incongruous it is to reason and sense to imagine, that little children are any way concerned as church-members, either in the dedications of the Epistles sent to the Churches, or in the Epistles themselves.

Children are not Concerned in the Dedications of the Epistles

First, in the dedications and directions of the Epistles, as first, that to the Church of Rome, Rom. 1:7,8, directed *to the beloved of God, called to be saints, and whose faith was spoken of through the whole world*; but can that be said of any infants?

Secondly, those epistles to the Corinthians, are they not also directed, I Cor. 1:2, *to those who are sanctified in Christ Jesus, called to be saints, with all that in every place call upon the name of Jesus Christ our Lord and theirs, enriched with all utterance, and knowledge, etc.*, But what ignorant Babe could be concerned therein?

Thirdly, that Epistle written to the Church at Ephesus, Eph. 1, is it not *to the faithful in Christ, the chosen, adopted abounding in Wisdom and Prudence*? By what poor child could be intended thereby?

Fourthly, in the letter directed to the Church at Philippi, is it not *to all the saints in Christ Jesus, who have had their fellowship in the Gospel from the first day till then*? Phil 1:1, 5. But how can that be said of any Child?

Fifthly, those epistles inscribed to the Church at Thessalonica; were they not to such as did *abound in Love, Faith, Hope, patience; that receives the Word in much affliction, and joy in the Holy Spirit.*, I Thess 1: 2; Thess 1:3. But what patience, love or hope can be attributed to Children?

And, lastly, those seven Epistles written to the Asian Churches, Rev. 2 and 3 wherein several graces are commended, and sins reprov'd and threatened, *and every one that had an Ear commanded to hear what the Spirit said to these Churches*. But how could there be one child concerned therein?

The Church of England

The Church of England in their Nineteenth Article, do acknowledge that the visible Church is a number of Christians by profession.

Dr. Owen gives a description of a Gospel Church

Dr. Owen, in his Catechism about new testament worship, **page 89** tells us that *a Gospel church is a society of persons called out of the world, or their Natural worldly state, by the administration of the Word and Spirit, unto the obedience of the Faith, or the knowledge and worship of God in Christ, joined together in an Holy Band, or by special agreement, for the exercise of the communion of saints in the due observation of all the ordinances of the gospel, Rom. 1:5, 6; I Cor. 1:2; I Cor. 14:15; Heb. 3:1; James 1:18; Rev. 1:20; I Peter 2:5; Ephesians 2:21, 22, 23; 2 Cor. 6:16, 17.*

And again, **in page 106**, *as the apostles in their writings do ascribe unto all the churches, and the members of them, a participation in this effectual vocation, affirming that they are saints, called, sanctified, judged and accepted with God in Christ, (for which, he again cites the foregoing Scriptures) so many of the duties which are required of them in that relation and condition are such, as none can perform to the glory of God, their own benefit, and the edification of others, (the ends of all obedience) unless they are partakers of this effectual calling, I Cor. 10:16, 17; I Cor. 12:12; Eph. 4:16.*

Mr. Baxter

Mr. Baxter in his 10th argument to Mr. Blake has these words, very significant to our purpose, viz. *Paul called all the baptized church of Corinth, justified, none that profess not a justified faith, are called justified, therefore none such should be baptized. The major is proved out of I Cor. 6:11, Ye are washed, ye are sanctified, ye are justified in the name of the Lord Jesus, and by the Spirit of our God. To which he adds, I confess it is sad, that good men should be so unfaithful to the truth, which is so precious, is not their own, which they should do nothing against, but all they can for it.*

Nor in the Epistles Themselves

Secondly, as Children are not concerned in the Dedication of the Epistle, so neither are they as ChurchMembers in the Epistles themselves, as may appear by a few instances; to which you may abundantly add in your reading the Epistles.

The first we shall mention is that I Cor. 6:4, *if then you have judgments of things pertaining to this life, set them to judge that are least esteemed in the Church.* And that he means least esteemed for wisdom and judgment, the next verse explains. But infants of 8 or 10 days old can neither judge nor speak: therefore we must necessarily conclude, there were no such members in the Church of Corinth.

Another you have in I Cor. 10:16, 17; compared with 11:28, 29. *The Cup of Blessing which we bless, is it not the communion of the blood of Christ? And the bread which we break, is it not the communion of the Body of Christ? For we being many are one Bread, and whosoever does eat and drink unworthily, shall be guilty of the body and blood of the Lord, and eateth and drinketh damnation to himself; not discerning the Lord's Body &c.* But poor ignorant Babes without understanding, cannot visibly either examine themselves, or have the least discerning of the Lord's Body, whether considered as symbolically or mystically represented in that Ordinance. Therefore were none to be found in the Church at Corinth, nor in any other Gospel church, as Dr. Owen said very well.

Dr. Owen

Dr. Owen, page 103, *as God has appointed saints to be the seat and subject of all His Ordinances, having granted the rights of them to them alone, I Tim. 3:15, instructing them with the exercise of this authority which he puts forth in the rule of His disciples in this world, He has also appointed the most holy institution of His Supper to denote and express that Union and Communion, which the Members of each of these Churches have by His Ordinance among themselves, I Cor. 10:16, 17. The cup of blessing which we bless, is it not the Communion of the Blood of Christ? The bread which we break, is it not the Communion of the Body of Christ? For we being many, are one bread and one body, for we are all partakers of that one bread.*

How consonant (by the way) and agreeable both to rule, reason and righteousness, does it appear to be to admit men upon profession of faith, to both Ordinances, keeping thereby the right subjects, as well as the due order.

But how childishly ridiculous it was in those first inventors of Infant's baptism for sin hundred years, so well to observe the order (viz. First to baptize, then to communicate) and yet so miserably to miss it in the Subjects, applying the Spiritual Ordinances to Ignorant Babes? And how much more badly in the Protestant Reformers, that so lamentably miss it both in the due Order, and right subjects also? Which the prelate and presbyter do in admitting Children to Baptism and membership, but not to the Supper? And the Independents more in point of order, in admitting them to baptism, but neither to membership, nor the Supper.

I Corinthians 12:25, 26.

A third observable Passage we have in I Cor. 12:25, 26; where the Apostle exhorts, *that there be no schism in the Body, but that the Members should have the same care one for another*. But how ridiculous would this be to be applied to a little Ignorant Infant?

I Thess. 5:2, 4, 5.

A fourth considerable Instance may be fetched from I Thess. 5:2,5., where the Apostle said, that *they all knew perfectly, that the day of the Lord so comes, as a thief in the night*. That he speaks of all, is evident, verse 4,5, in these words, *but ye, brethren, are not in darkness, that, that day should overtake you, as a thief: Ye are all the Children of the Day, and of the light, &c.*

But little Children that have no understanding, are no such Children of the Light, as to know perfectly, or in part the coming of the Day of God, for they know nothing at all of it: therefore no such infants were members of the Church at Thessalonica.

Hebrews 6:11, 12.

And fifthly, another convincing Passage we have in Hebrews 6:11, 12, where the Apostle thus exhorting: *And we desire, that every one of you do show the same diligence to the full assurance of hope to the end, that ye be not slothful, but followers of them, who through faith and patience inherit the promises*. But little Children can show no such diligence to the full assurance of hope to the end, neither can they show such diligence in following of them, who through Faith and Patience did inherit the promises. For they have no understanding in earthly things, how then can they understand Heavenly? John 3:12. Therefore, no such Babes were Church-Members in the Church of the Hebrews.

From the Characters Christ Gives His Disciples

And as a further proof against Infant's Church Membership, we may add some of the Characters Christ gives of His disciples, viz.

John 8:31, 32; then said Jesus to those Jews, who believed on him; *if you continue in my word, then are you my disciples indeed, and you shall know the truth and the truth shall make you free*. And John 13:34, 35; *A new Commandment I give unto you; that you also love one another, by this shall all men know that you are my disciples*. Again, John 15:8, *herein is my Father glorified, that you bear much fruit, so shall you be my disciples*. In addition, Luke 14:27, *and whosoever does not bear his cross, and come after me, cannot be my disciple*. And verse 33, so likewise, *whosoever he be of you, that forsakes not all that he has, cannot be my disciple*. However, how absurd would it be to apply any of these characters to little ignorant Infants?

Lastly, from that general exhortation, that Christ gives to all His disciples, Luke 21:36; Mark 13:37. *Watch and pray always, that you may be accounted worthy to escape all these things, and to stand before the Son of Man. Moreover, what I say unto you, I say unto all, Watch*. However, how ridiculous would it be to include a little Babe herein?

Which argument about Church Membership, we shall conclude with those full words of **Dr. Owen** so much to the purpose, **P. 107**. Viz.

From all which it appears, who are the subject matter of those Churches of Christ, as also the means whereby they come to be so, namely, the Administration of the Spirit and Word of Christ. As also by the Gifts and Graces of the Spirit given to them, to make sheep out of them meet for, and useful, that place, which he holds in such Churches, as the Apostle discourses at large, I Cor. 12:15, 15, 17, to 27, Col. 2:9, Eph. 4:16. It being manifest (saith he) that no ordinance of Christ is appointed to be observed by His disciples, no communication of Gifts of the Holy Spirit is promised to them, but with respect unto those Churches of His institution.

CHAPTER VII

Wherein there is an account of Believers Baptism, in a brief history thereof; not only from the Scriptures in the first Century, but from human Authors also, confirming the necessity of Instruction and Profession of Faith before Baptism, in all the Centuries. And that the Children of Christians, as well as Pagans, were not otherwise baptized; whereof you have some famous Instances, especially in the Fourth Century of several eminent Christians that deferred the Baptizing of their Children till they could give an Account of their Faith. Collected out of several Authors, especially the famous Magdeburgensian History.

Century I.

A brief Historical Account of Baptism from the Scriptures, both in its Original and continued practice, in the times of John the Baptist, Christ and His Apostles; in the first Century.

The Time When Baptism First Began.

In the fifteenth year of the Reign of Tiberias Caesar, Pontius Pilate being governor of Judea, and Herod Tetrarch of Galilee, and Annas and Caiaphas being the High Priests;.

Its Divine Original

The Word of God came unto John the Son of Zecharias, in the wilderness (where his Father dwelt) Luke 3:1-3; Luke 1:39; viz. By a Commission and direction to him from Heaven, to preach and baptize, John 1:33; Matthew 11:30, 31; and who in obedience thereto, (being the great Prophet that ever was born of a woman, Luke 7:28.) did in all the country about Jordan, Luke 3:3, preach the doctrine of Repentance (or Regeneration) Matthew 3:2, Mark 1:4, Luke 3: 11-14; and faith in Christ, the promised messiah, and His approaching Kingdom, Acts 19:4, Matthew 3:2; (whose fore-runner he was, to prepare His way, as foretold by the Prophet Isaiah, Luke 3:4-6.)

Where, How, Upon Whom, and Why Baptism was Administered

And then and there did he also baptize or dip in water the penitent Believers who flocked to his ministry from Jerusalem, and all the land of Judea, confessing their sins, Luke 3:16; Mark 1:8; Matthew 3:5,6. And upon no other terms did he admit to baptism, but upon fruits meet for repentance and amendment of life.

Who Are the Meet Subjects for Baptism

For when the Pharisees and Saducees, who were conceited of their own righteousness, that they stood in no need of repentance, Luke 18:9, came to his baptism without that due qualification of repentance, John refused them, that they rejected the Counsel of God against themselves, not being baptized with the Baptism of John, (viz. Upon the terms John offered it) Luke 7: 29,30, while the Publicans and others did justify God, being

baptized by John, confessing their sins, Matthew 3:6. Moreover, this Ministration of John thus entered upon, is called the beginning of the Gospel-state, or Kingdom of Heaven, Mark 1:1,2, ect.

When, Where, and by Whom Christ Jesus was Baptized

While John was thus preaching and baptizing, Jesus Christ comes from Galilee to Jordan, Matthew 3:13, being about thirty years of age, Luke 3:23, to be baptized of him; which John (knowing him to be the Messiah) with modesty, in sense of his own unworthiness, forbade saying, I have need to be baptized of thee, and comest thou to me? (implying that Christ through His personal holiness, had no need of such an addition from him; but he much rather to receive some such benefit from him). But our Savior urging it as requisite and expedient to fulfill all Righteousness, viz., that it became him, who was to be our Example in all Obedience, and all His followers, so to conform to the Father's appointment: Thereupon John consented, and dipped Him in water; who, when He was baptized, went up straightway out of the water, and addressed himself by Prayer unto the Father unto the Father, Luke 3:21. And while he was at Prayer, the Heavens were opened unto Him, and he (viz. John, John 1:33) saw the Spirit of God descending like a Dove, and lighting upon Him, and lo a voice from Heaven, saying, This is my Beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased, Matthew 3:13; Which was to be a further confirmation to John, that He was the Messiah.

The Many Disciples made during Christ's Ministry

Jesus Christ, being now Qualified with all Prophetical Gifts at His baptism, does (after His temptation, Luke 4:1,) enter upon His Public Ministry, teaching in Galilee in their Synagogues, being glorified of all; Luke 4:14, 15. Who afterwards came into the Land of Judea with His disciples, and tarried there with them, and baptized, all men flocking to His Baptism, John 3:22, 26. Making and Baptizing now more Disciples than John, though (it is said) that he Himself baptized not, but His disciples, John 4:1,2.

Christ's Enlarged Commission

Jesus Christ, after His resurrection, having received all power in heaven and earth, gives further direction to His Apostles about their Ministerial Work. That whereas neither John nor his ministration had extend further than the territories of Judea, and the Jewish Nation and Profession, as appears by his limitation of his first Missionaries, both the Twelve, and the Seventy, Matt. 10:5,6; Not to go into the way of the Gentiles, nor to enter into any of the Cities of the Samaritans, but to seek only the lost sheep of the House of Israel; does now extend and enlarge His commission for preaching and baptizing all the world over, viz. To the Gentiles as well as the Jews, that whoever of either did repent and believe, should now be baptized, and be entered into the Gospel Church, Matthew 28:18-20; Mark 16:15, 16.

The Apostles Baptized the Believing Jews and Gentiles

And, accordingly, in obedience hereto, the Apostles did practice throughout the whole world, receiving to Baptism those, that, after instruction, did process Faith in Christ, and bring forth fruits meet for Repentance; as appears from divers instances, both of Jews and Gentiles,

At Jerusalem

The three thousand Jews in Acts 2, who had their hands in crucifying of Christ; who upon their Repentance, gladly received the Word, and were baptized, and added to the Church at Jerusalem, in the early day of Pentecost, upon Peter's Sermon, Acts 2:37.

At Samaria

The Samaritans, who after they believed Philip's preaching the things concerning the Kingdom of God, and the Name of Jesus Christ, were baptized, both men and women, Acts 8:12.

Upon the Way to Gaza

The Eunuch, upon Philip's preaching to him, and the evidence that he gave, that he believed in Jesus Christ with all his heart, was baptized by Philip, going down with him into the water, Acts 8:35.

At Damacus

Paul, after his conversion and believing in Christ, was by the Lord's special appointment, for with baptized by Ananias at Damacus, Acts 9.

At Caesarea

Cornelius and his Friends and Companions, upon their witnessing their faith in Jesus Christ, were baptized by Peter at Caesarea, Acts 10:47, 48.

At Philippi

Lydia and her household believing in the Lord, were baptized at Philippi by Paul, Acts 16:14. And the Jailer, in the same place, believing in the Lord, with all his house, were baptized by Paul and Silas, Acts 16:33, 34.

At Corinth

The Corinthians, hearing and believing, were baptized by Paul, Acts 18:18.

At Colossee

The Colossians were baptized in like manner, Col. 2:10-12.

At Rome

The Galatians believing in Christ, were baptized, Gal. 3:26,27.

At Ephesus

The Ephesians also, upon the profession of the Faith, were baptized; Acts 19:1-3.

Thus, we have gone through the History of Baptism as we find it recorded in the Scriptures.

Second

An Historical Account of Baptism, as we find it was upon the Profession of Faith owned to be practiced by the testimony of Antiquity, both in the First, as well as in the Remaining Centuries.

(Editor's Note: Please remember Mr. D'Anvers is quoting almost without interruptions, from many who believed in baptismal regeneration. This is not his position, but he is faithful to reproduce their quotes word for word. REP)

Human Antiquity for Believer's Baptism

In the next place, we shall proceed to give an Account of some Human Authorities. Also, which we produce not for any Proof, but by way of illustration only. Because they may be of weight with some, and whereby it may be manifest, that not only Scripture-Authority, but even Antiquity itself (which has been so much boasted of) is altogether for Believer's and not for Infant's Baptism.

The Magdeburgenses

We shall begin with the account the **Magdeburgenses** do give us in their Excellent **History**, how they say they find the business of Baptism to stand in this first century.

The Subjects of Baptism

First, as to the subjects of Baptism, they tell us, *that in this age they find they baptized only the adults or aged, whether Jews or gentiles*, whereof they say we have Instances in the 2, 8, 10, 16 and 19 chapters of the Acts. *But as to the baptizing of infants, they confess they read of no example. De infantibus baptizatis exempla non legunt, Magdeburg, Century I. L, 2; page 496 of the Edicts of Basil, in 7. Tomes.*

The Administrators

Secondly, as to the administrators of baptism, they say they find *that other ministers of the church, besides the apostles did baptized, which in after-ages came more especially to be fixed upon Bishops, though in case of necessity, not only lay-men but women also, were admitted to administer that ordinance.*

The Place

Thirdly, as to the place of baptism, they find it was *an occasion offered, where Rivers and Fountains, and other conveniences for baptizing, were; and which was done as well privately, where only two persons, Philip and the Eunuch were, as in a great congregation, Acts 2.*

Neither do they find, as they say, that *the Water was in this Age first consecrated before Baptism, which was so much Ceremony was after enjoined to be in Fonts and Baptisteries fixed in the Temples.*

The Time

Fourthly, as to the Time, when it was to be done; they say, *they find it to be at any fit season, no certain Day or Feast, being either by Christ or His Apostles appropriated thereto, as after it was to Easter and Whitsontide.*

The Manner

Fifthly, as to the manner of baptizing, *it was by dipping or plunging in the water into the Name of the Father, Son and Holy Spirit; which was (they say) so agreeable not only to the sense of the Word, which signifies immersion in water, but to the allegory of Death, Burial and Resurrection, to which the Apostle so properly alludes, Rom. 6; Col. 2. As also to the many places where it is used for the washing away of sin; as I Peter*

3; Hebrews 2:10; Eph. 5 and Titus 3. And in the 22 of the Acts where they observe that Ananias commands Paul to be baptized, and to wash away his sins; which said Custom of Dipping the whole body in water, was changed into sprinkling a little water in the face.

The Ceremonies

Sixthly, as to the Ceremonies, they tell us *the parties baptized did freely come and offer themselves, professing their Faith, though not in any formal way of Confession, which after was enjoined and that without any Gossips or Sureties, to confess or undertake for them, which after was required both for the Adults as for the Infant. Neither were there any giving of Names in Baptizing, no exorcisms, chrisms, or anointings; no consignations, albes, salts, spittle; no gifts given or received, no confirmation or bishoping, no giving of meats, Milk or honey;* all which were after introduced and enjoined, as you will hear, **Magdeburg. Cent. 1. L. 2, ch. 6, page 496, 497.**

Clemens

Clemens asserts who are the right subjects of baptism, and in what order they ought, after due examination and instructions, to be baptized, as said

Jacob Merningus and his History of Baptism and The Dutch Martyrology

Jacob Merningus in his history of Baptism, p. 2, upon 2 cent. Page 209, out of Clemens, 3 Epistle. Also Dutch Martyrology.

Ignatius

Ignatius, in his Discourses about Baptism, asserts, *that it ought to be accompanied with Faith, Love and Patience after preaching,* as you will find in his Letters to Polycarp, Tralienses, and in his Letters to them of Philadelphia, for which see:

H. Montanus and Jacob Du Bois

H, Montanus, page 45, and **Jacob Du Bois, page 16-22** and the Dutch Martyrology called **The Bloody Theater,** Century 1.

Auxibins

Auxibins was baptized upon Confession of Faith., by the apostle Mark, as **Jacob Merningus, page 578, out of Metaphrastes, by D. Vicecomes, L. I. Ch. 4,** and in the life of Auxibins.

Waldenses and Albigenes by D. Balthazar Lidins

The Waldenses and Albigenes did in this age profess and practice the baptizing of Believers, **D. Balthazar Lidins, in his Treatise of the Church, p. 2, col. 2 out of Renarius.**

The Ancient Britains

The ancient Britains, who practiced the baptizing of believers, did by Evangelists sent from the Apostles themselves, receive the gospel under Tiberius the Emperor, as said **Gildas,** in his Book, called **De Victoria Aurelii Ambrosii.**

CENTURY II

As to baptism in the second century, they say, **Cent. 2, c. 6, p. 109**, that it doth not appear by any approved authors that there was any mutation or variation from the former. And in confirmation thereof quote what **Justin Martyr** saith in his second **Apology to Ant. Pius, the Emperor**. Which, because it is so considerable an instance, I shall give it you at large as I find it in the Apology itself in the words that Mr. Baxter himself hath rendered it in his *Saints Rest*, c. 8, sect. 5:

Justin Martyr

I will declare unto you how we offer up ourselves to God after that we are renewed through Christ. Those amongst us that are instructed in the faith and believe that which we teach them is true, being willing to lye according to the same. We do admonish to fast and pray for forgiveness of sins and we also fast and pray with them. And when they are brought by us into the water and there as we were new born, are they also by new birth renewed and then in calling upon God the Father, the Lord Jesus Christ and the Holy Spirit, they are washed in water. Then we bring the person thus washed and instructed to the brethren (as they are called) where the assemblies are that we may pray both for ourselves and the new illuminated person that we may be found by true doctrine and by good works worthy observers and keepers of the commandments and that we may attain eternal life and salvation. Then bread and wine being brought to the chief Brother (so they call the chief Minister), he taketh it and offereth praise and thanksgiving to the Father by the name of the Son and Holy Spirit. And so a while he celebrateth thanksgiving. After prayers and thanksgiving, the whole assembly saith Amen.

Thanksgiving being ended by the President (or chief guide) and the consent of the whole people and deacons, as we call them, do give everyone present part of the bread and wine over which thanks was given, and they also suffer them to bring it to the absent.

This food we call the Eucharist to which no man is admitted, but only he that believeth the truth of the doctrine, being washed in the laver of regeneration for remission of sins and that so liveth as Christ hath taught. And this, saith Mr. Baxter, is, you see, no new way.

This Justin Martyr is believed to have been converted to Christ within thirty years after the apostle John when it is credible also very many were living who had been frequent auditors of the Apostle who was beheaded under Verus the Emperor.

Now they that shall consider this description he makes of Christian baptism and the manner that Christians were admitted after it into the Churches of Christ in those days, can hardly, I presume, pick out any good warranty for infants church membership or baptism out of the same.

Dionysius Alexandrinus

Dionysius Alexandrinus in his Fifth Book of Baptism, writing to Sextus Bishop of Rome testifies that *it was their custom to baptize upon profession of faith and that one who had been baptized by heretics not upon profession of faith did desire to be so baptized, accounting his former for no baptism. Eusebius Pamphilius, Eccl. Hist. Edit. 1588, Lib. 7, ch. 8 out of Dionysius. Also Dutch Martyrol, Cent 2.*

Clemens Alexandrinus

Clemens Alexandrinus wrote largely for baptism accompanying faith and repentance, not at all mentioning that of infants. Saying, *that the baptized ought to be children in malice, but not in understanding even such children who, as the children of God, have put off the old man and the garment of wickedness and have put on the new man. Jac. Merningus, Hist. Bap. Part 2, p. 213, 214*

Walafrid Strabo

Walafrid Strabo saith *that no children, but aged, understanding persons were, upon profession of faith, baptized this age.* **Walafrid Strabo, in Eccl. Hist. C. 26, Vicecom. L. 1, ch. 30.**

Century III

In this third Century, they say as to the Rites of Baptism in the Asiatic Churches they have no testimony as to any alteration, but concerning the African Churches, they give some account and of so great corruptions creeping into the Church respecting this Ordinance of Baptism at least in opinion (though as to practice, they say they cannot give any particular instance) both as to subject, time, manner and ceremonies. **Cent 3, c. 6, p. 123-125**

Tertullian

They tell us that **Tertullian** in his Book **De Baptismo** opposeth himself (by several arguments at large) to some that asserted infants baptism, affirming that *the adults were the only proper subjects of baptism because, saith he, fasting, confession of sins, prayer, profession, renouncing the Devil and his works, is required from the baptized.* And further, **Tertullian** in his book of **Repentance, c. 6**, that *we are not baptized because we should cease from sin, but because we have ceased from sin and are purified in heart, referring the opposers of Christian baptism to the practice of the Churches of Corinth, Phillipi, Thessalonica, Ephesus and Rome, etc.* Mentioned by **Jacob du Bois** in his **Assurance**, printed 1648, **p. 27, 24.**

Origen

Origen saith, *they are rightly baptized who are washed unto salvation, but so was not Simon Magus. He that is baptized unto salvation receives the water and the Holy Ghost which Simon did not, but water only.* **Hom. 6, upon Eze., c. 16, v. 4. Montanus p. 36, 37.** And further, in his **Commentary upon Rom. 6**, saith, that such baptism as was accompanied with the crucifying of the flesh and rising again to newness of life was the approved baptism. How Origen's writings were injured by Ruffinus and made to speak for infants baptism contrary to truth appears by Erasmus upon the Life of Origen, printed before his works as **Jacob Merringus, p. 283, 291** and **Montanus, p. 29-35, 42, 43.** Whereof more hereafter.

Mr. Baxter

Mr. Baxter is pleased to give us this further account of baptism in this Age in his **Saints' Rest, part 1, c. 8, Sect. 5**, in these words: *That Tertullian, Origen and Cyprian who lived, saith he, in the second and third 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 to Christ and promised to obey Him.* And again, he is pleased to tell us in his defense of the Principles of Love, p. 7, in these words: *That he knew that in the days of Tertullian, Nazianzen 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 of religion is changed or that we are grown any wiser or better than they.*

Eusebius

Eusebius Lib 6, Hist. Eccl. saith *that Origen was appointed by Demetrius to be at Alexandria a Catechist, that is, teacher of those that were disciples and scholars in the faith. Which office before his time after the apostles Plautius and Clemens did execute, whose disciples, he saith, were Plutarch, Serenus, Heraclius and Heron. And that a woman, after she was baptized with water, was, as a Martyr, put to death and baptized with fire for Christ's sake. After Origen, Heraclius and after him Dionysius taught in the said School of*

Alexandria, those that were to be instructed in the faith before baptism. And again, **in Lib 7, ch. 8**, there was with us a brother which believed, who being present among those that were to be baptized and heard how they were questioned and how they answered, came weeping to me and desired of me to be cleansed and washed by Christian baptism.

Cyril

Cyril exhorts his auditors that *they would not go to baptism as the guest in the gospel who had not on the wedding garment, but having their sins first washed away by repentance, they might be found worthy at the marriage of the Lamb.* **Cyril in Catach. 2, Mystog. Bap. Histor., p. 318.**

Justinus

Justinus, after he had instructed Virianus, Marcalinus and Justinus, three learned men in the faith, baptized them. Twisk, Chron. Lib. 3, p. 68. D. Martyrol, Cent. 3. Pancratius, after he had been instructed in the faith, was baptized at fifteen years old. Twisk, p. 71. D. Martyrol Cent. 3. Pontus, the son of a Christian man, was after his instruction in the faith, baptized by Pontianus. Twisk, p. 73 Nemius, with many others that were instructed in the faith, after the keeping of a fast, were baptized at Rome. Twisk, p. 75.

CENT. IV

In this Age, they tell us that it was the universal practice to baptize the adult upon profession of faith and for which they give us several authorities out of the learned fathers and Councils at that time. Some whereof you have as followeth:

Athanasius

Athanasius contra Ariano: *Our Savior, saith he, did not slightly command us to baptize. For, first of all, He said TEACH, and then BAPTIZE that true faith might come by teaching and baptism perfected by faith.*

Hilary

Hilary, Lib. 2, de Trinitate: *The Lord hath commanded to baptize into the name of the Father, the Son and the Holy Ghost, that is, upon confession of the beginner, the only begotten and him that was given. And farther, the said Hilary prayeth thus to God: O living Lord, preserve my faith and the testimony of my conscience so that I may always keep what I have confessed in the sacrament of my regeneration when I was baptized in the name of the Father, the Son and the Holy Spirit. Namely, that I may worship Thee, O God our Father, with thy Son and stir up the Holy Spirit in me which preceedeth or goeth out from Thee. And again saith: That all the Eastern Churches did only baptize the adult.*

Basil

Basil contra Eunimium, lib. 3: *Must the faithful be sealed with baptism? Faith must needs precede and go before. And in his exhortation to baptism, saith: That none were to be baptized but the catechumens and those that were duly instructed in the faith.*

Gregory Nazianzen

Gregory Nazianzen in his third Oration saith: *That the baptized used in the first place to confess their sins and to renounce the Devil and all his works before many witnesses. And again, That none were baptized of old, but they that did so confess their sins and how dangerous it was headily and without due preparation to partake thereof. He therefore adviseth That the baptism of infants he deferred till they would give an account of their faith, as Dr. Taylor, p. 239.*

Ambrose

Ambrose saith in his third book **De Sacramentis, c. 2:** *That the baptized did not only make confession of his faith, but was to desire the same. And in his second book De Spiritu Sancto: In our sacrament, saith he, there are three questions propounded and three confessions made. Without which none can be washed.*

Arnobius

Arnobius, in Psa. 146: *Thou art not first (saith he) baptized and then beginnest first to affect and embrace the faith, but when thou art to be baptized thou signifyest unto the Priest what thy desire is and makest thy confession with thy mouth.*

Jerome

Jerom upon Matthew saith: *The Lord commanded his Apostles that they should first instruct and teach all nations and afterwards should baptize those that were instructed in the mysteries of the faith. For it cannot be, saith he, that the body should receive that sacrament of baptism till the soul have before received the true faith. Jerom saith: That in the Eastern Churches, the adults were only baptized in his Epist. Against the errors of John of Jerusalem. And again in his epistle to Pamachius, saith: That they are to be admitted to baptism to whom it doth properly belong-those only who have been instructed in the faith.*

Athanasius

Athanasius defends baptism after profession to be according to Christ's command against those that pretended it might be administered before profession: *For, saith he, our Savior hath not simply commanded to baptize, but first said teach, then baptize because true faith proceeds from teaching and baptism then rightly follows faith. In his third Sermon against the Arians. As Merning. Part 2, cent 4, p. 370. And the said Merning. Saith, p. 360, that the book called Questions About the Holy Scriptures, fathered upon Athanasius, speaking contrary hereto, is false and spurious. And so saith Montanus also, p. 69.*

Victorinus

Marius Victorinus against the Arians in his third book, saith: *That every believer that is baptized upon profession of faith receives the Holy Spirit and is made more holy thereby. Merning. P. 305.*

Ephrim Syrus

Ephrim Syrus relates that: *in his time, it was the manner or custom, when anyone was baptized, to declare they did forsake the Devil and all his works-adultery, uncleanness, lying, stealing, etc. And that the baptized used to confess their sins. In his third Oration of Baptism. And again, in his book of Repentance, saith: that the baptized did confess their sins and testified their faith before many witnesses. As Meringus, p. 328, 336.*

Epiphanius

Epiphanius, after Bishop of Cyprus, was, with his sister, baptized upon profession of faith by Stephen and did immediately receive the Lord's supper with 108 persons of the Church. As Vice-comes out of Metaphrastus, l. 1, c. 30, Epiphan. Epiphanius did afterwards himself assert for doctrine that none ought to be baptized without some god assurance for the same and a confession of faith. Mering. P. 366

Decrees of Councils

Council of Carthage

In the fourth Council of Carthage is was determined *that whoever was to be baptized should give in his name and that then after due examinations and preparations, baptism was to be administered. Magd. Cent. 4, c. 6, p. 417.*

Council of Laodicea

In the Council of Laodicea, in their 46th Canon, it was determined *that the baptized should rehearse the Articles of the Creed. Magd, Cent. 4, p. 418*

Council of Neocesaria

In the 6th Canon of the Council of Neocesaria, it is said *that confession and free choice was necessary to baptism. Magd., Cent. 4, p. 616. Grotius in his Annot. Upon Mat. 19 saith: the Canon of the Synod of Neocesaria held in the year 315, determined that a woman with child might be baptized because the baptism reached not the fruit of the womb because in the confession made in baptism, each one's free choice is shown. From which Canon, saith he, Balsamon and Zonaras do infer that an infant cannot be baptized because it hath no power to confess or choose the divine baptism. Dr. Taylor upon mentioning this Canon, p. 238, saith: It speaks reason and it intimates a practice which was absolutely universal in the Church of interrogating the catechumeni concerning the Articles of their Creed which is one argument that either they did not admit infants to baptism, or that they did prevericate egregiously in asking questions of them who themselves knew were not capable of giving answers.*

And in farther assurance and confirmation of this great truth, you have most remarkable instances of several of the most eminent persons of this Century that were not baptized till aged though the offspring of believing parents-Basil, Gregory, Nazianzen, Ambrose, Chrysostom, Jerom, Austin, Constantine, Theodosius, etc. And for proof whereof, take the following authorities:

Basil Baptized Aged

Osiander, Cent. 4, l. 3, c. 42, p. 371, saith: *That Basil of Caesarea, the son of Basil Bishop of Nicene, and his wife, Eumele, whose grandfather was a martyr under the persecution of Maximinius, was tenderly educated like a second Timothy under his gracious mother, became a learned man and a great preacher and after baptized in Jordan by Maximinus the Bishop, as he saith, is declared by Vincentinus in speculo. And for which story he also quotes Socrates, l. 4, c. 26, Sezom. L. 6, c. 34. Magd. Cent. 4, c. 10, p. 939.*

Gregory Nazianzen Baptized after 20 years old

Osiander, Cent. 4, l. 3, c. 43, p. 380, tells us: *That Gregory Nazianzen was the son of Gregory Bishop of Nazianzen by his wife Nonna, a very pious holy woman and instructed this her son, as Hannah of old did Samuel, who in the 20th year of his age was baptized.*

Constantine Baptized Aged

Hugo Grotius, Annot. In Mat 19: 14 saith: *It was no small evidence that baptism of infants many hundred years was not ordinary in the Greek Church because not only Constantine the Great, the son of Helena, a zealous Christian, was not baptized till aged, but also Gregory Nazianzen who was the son of a Christian Bishop and brought up long by him, was not baptized till he came to 20 years as is, saith he, related in his life.*

Ambrose Baptized after Bishop of Milan

Paulinus in vita Ambrosii, saith: *that Ambrose, born of Christian parents, his father's name was Ambrose and his mother's Marcelina, remained instructed in the faith, unbaptized, till he was chosen Bishop of Milan at which time he received baptism.*

Chrysostom Baptized at 21

Hugo Grotius farther upon Mat. 19 tell us: *that Chrysostom was born of Christian parents and educated by Miletus a Bishop, was not baptized till past age 21 years, who adds further that many of the Greeks in every age unto this day do keep the custom of deferring the baptism of little ones till they could themselves make a confession of their faith.*

Jerom Baptized in his 30th Year

Erasmus in Vita Hieronymi testifies: *That Jerom, born in the City of Strydon of Christian parents, and brought up in the Christian religion, was baptized at Rome in the 30th year of his age.*

Austin Baptized about the 30th Year of his Age

Walafridus Strabo, who lived about 840, in his book **De Reb. Eccl. chap 26**, saith: *That in the first times, the grace of baptism was wont 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 be gotten by baptism, what was to be confessed and believed, what lastly was to be observed by them that are new-born in Christ. And confirms it by Austin's own confession of himself continuing a Catechumenus, long before baptized, but afterwards Christians understanding original sin, and lest their children should perish without any means of grace, had them, he saith, baptized by the Decrees of the Council of Africa. And then adds how Godfathers and Godmothers were invented and the superstitious and impious consequent of it, etc.*

Naclerus Generat. 14, Anno 391 saith: *Austin the son of the virtuous Monica, being instructed in the faith, was baptized when he was about 30 years of age. Vossius' De Baptismo, p. 106, saith: That Nectarius was made Bishop of Constantinople before he was baptized.*

Theodosius Baptized Aged

Historia Tripartita, l. 1 affirmeth: *That Theodosius the Emperor, born in Spain, his parents being both Christians, was even from his youth instructed and educated in the faith, who, falling sick at Thessalonica, was by Achalio baptized and thereupon recovered of his sickness.*

Monsieur Daille

Monsieur Daille, the learned Frenchman, a great searcher into antiquity, in his book called **The Use of the**

Fathers, saith: *In ancient times, they often deferred the baptism of infants as appeareth by the History of Constantine the Great, Constantinus, Theodosius, Valentinian, Gracian and in St. Ambrose and also by the orations of Greg. Nazianzen and St. Basil on this subject. And some of the fathers have been of the opinion that it is fit it should be deferred, but whence it is, saith he, that the very mentioning hereof is scarce to be endured at this day?* **Lib. 2, p. 149**

Dr. Field

Dr. Field, on the Church, p. 729, saith: *That very many that were born of Christian parents, beside those that were converted from paganism, put off their baptism for a long time, insomuch that many were made Bishops before they were baptized.*

Beatus Rhenanus

Beatus Rhenanus, in Annot. Sup. Tert. Saith: *That the old custom was that those that were come to their full growth, were baptized with the bath of regeneration which custom, saith he, was observed till the time of Charles the Great and Lodowick, Emperors, as by the statutes by them established appeared, etc.*

Mr. Den

Mr. Den, besides the former instances of the children of Christian parents not baptized till aged, adds: *Pancratius, Pontius, Nazarius, Tecla, Luigerus and Erasma Tusca, Monica Austin's mother and the three sons of Leonilla.*

Dr. Jer. Taylor

Dr. Jer. Taylor in his Lib. Proph. P. 239 affirms out of an antiquity: *that the parents of Austin, Jerom and Ambrose, although Christians, did not baptize their children till they were thirty years of age and that it will be very considerable in the example and of great efficacy for destroying the supposed necessity of derivation of infants baptism from the Apostles.*

Dr. Barlow's Letter

Dr. Barlow, now Dr. Of the Chair at Oxford, a person of great learning and eminency, hath these words **in a Letter I have seen in print**: *I do believe and know that there is neither precept nor example in scripture for Pedobaptism, nor any just evidence for it for above 200 years after Christ. That Tertullian condemns it as an unwarranted custom and Nazianzen, a good while after him, dislikes it too. Sure I am that in the primitive times they were catechumeni, then illuminati or baptizari and that not only pagans and children of pagans converted, but children of Christian parents. The truth is, I do believe Paedobaptism how, or by whom, I know not, came into the world in the second Century and in the third and fourth began to be practiced, though not generally, and defended as lawful from the text grossly misunderstood John 3: 5. Upon the like gross mistake of John 6: 53 they did for many Centuries, both in the Greek and Latin Church, communicate infants and give them the Lord's supper. And I do confess, they might do both as well as either. But although they baptized some infants and thought it lawful so to do, yet Austin was the first that ever said it was necessary. And farther saith:*

I have read what my learned and worthy friends Dr. Hamond, Mr. Baxter and others say in defense of it and I confess I wonder not a little that men of such great parts should say so much to so little purpose. For I have not as yet seen any thing like an argument for it. Thus far Dr. Barlow.

CENTURY V.

Believers baptism was asserted in this Age and the grounds thereof by many of the learned witnesses whereof you have the following instances:

Chrysostom

Chrysostom saith: *That the time of grace or conversion was the only fit time for baptism, which, he saith, was the season in which the three-thousand in Acts 2 and others afterwards were baptized. And again, In Baptism, the principle thing to be looked after is the Spirit by which the water is made effectual. For, saith he, in the apostles' time the baptism of water and the baptism of the Spirit were different things and done at different times. Magd. Cent. 5, p. 363.* And again, *As Isaac was brought forth by the word of promise, so must we be born by the word of God which only makes baptism powerful and effectual, p. 364.*

Austin

Austin himself, in his book **De Fide & bon. Oper. Cap. 6**, saith: *That none without due examination, both as to doctrine and conversation, ought to be admitted to baptism. Cent 5, p. 654.* And again: *That no ignorant or scandalous person ought by any means, without due instruction and fruits of repentance, to be admitted to baptism. P. 654, 655.* *Austin's Creed and Chrysostom's Creed also were calculated for the Catechumeni for their better instruction before baptism. P. 655.* The names and qualities of several adult persons that were baptized in this Age are inserted, **p. 655.**

Synesius

Synesius Syrenenius was baptized upon profession of faith by Theophilus and then made Bishop of Tolomens. Twisk Chron. P. 402. Dutch Matyrol, cent. 4. Cyrillus Alexandrinus, lib. 7, Contra Julianum, saith: When we lay aside the darkness of our mind and leave the devices of Satan and wholly quit his service, we declare thereby our faith and meetness for baptism. Dutch Martyrol, cent 4.

Faustus Regiensis, Etc.

Faustus Regiensis, a Bishop of France, taught in this Age *that the will and desire of the party that comes to baptism is necessarily required. Merning. P. 425.* Evarius saith: *That they that have been instructed and enlightened in the word of God were the proper subjects of baptism. Mering. P. 421.* Fulgentius saith: *That none can be saved but the penitent converts who after faith receive baptism. Vicecomes, lib. 3, c. 3, Ex Fulgentio.*

CENTURY VI

In this Age, the adult, upon profession of faith, were baptized.

Gregory

Gregory, l. 4, c. 26, saith: *That a sermon was used to be preached to those that were to be baptized. And that the pomps of the Devil were used to be renounced before baptism. And that the hearts of believers are through grace cleansed thereby. In Baptism, the elect receive the gift of the Spirit whereby also their understandings are enlightened in the scriptures and that by faith in baptism all sins are relaxed. Cent. 6, p. 226, 227.*

Cassiodorus

Cassiodorus calls baptism *the divine fountain wherein the faithful have the new creature brought forth. Cent. 6, p. 226. Olympiodorus* saith: *Our spiritual life is one and the same effected with our spiritual death. For they who are born are buried with Christ in Baptism. P. 226*

The Council of Agathen

The **Council of Agathen** decreed *that the Articles of Faith be first preached to the persons to be baptized before their baptism. Vicecomes, out of The History of Baptism, p. 482.*

CENTURY VII

Various Councils' Decrees

The **Bracaren's Council in Spain** decreed *that no adult person, but such who had been well instructed and catechized and duly examined should be baptized. Cent. 7, p. 146. The sixth Council of Constance* ordained *that none should receive baptism without rehearsing the Creed and the Lord's prayer. P. 146. The Council of Toletanus, in the fifth Chapter, saith, that by being dipped into water, we do, as it were, descend into hell, and by rising up out of the water, we do witness a resurrection. Paulinus baptized in the River Trent in England a great number both of men and women at noon day. Bead. L. 2, c. 16, cent. 7, p.145.*

Egyptian Churches Follow Apostles Doctrine

In Egypt, the Christians departed from the practice of Rome in baptism placing it upon Apostolical Foundation: That faith should first be taught before baptism. Vicecomes, l. 2, c. 3.

CENTURY VIII

Bede

Bede saith: *that men were first to be instructed into the knowledge of the truth, then to be baptized as Christ hath taught because without faith it was impossible to please God. Cent 8, p. 220. And again: As the body is visibly cleansed by water, so the soul to the faithful is invisibly cleansed by baptism. And again: Only that kind of baptism where the Spirit of the Lord regenerates is effectual. P. 223. And again: If the word or water be wanting, it is no baptism. P. 218* and again upon John 3: *all those that came to the apostles to be baptized were instructed and taught concerning the sacrament of baptism, then they received the holy administration thereof.*

Haimo

Haimo in Postil. Upon Matt. 28: *go and teach all Nations, baptizing them, etc. fol. 278. In this place, saith he, is set down a rule how to baptize, that is, that teaching should go before baptism. For he saith: Teach all nations, baptize them, for he that is to be baptized must be first instructed that he first learn to believe that which in baptism he shall receive. For as faith without works is dead, so works when they are not of faith are nothing worth.*

Various Councils Decrees

The **Council of Paris**, in the time of Ludo. Pius, decreed, chapt. 6, *that none be admitted to baptism, but those that were instructed in the mysteries of faith.* In the **Council of Laodicea, Tit. 46**, it was decreed that *those that will come to baptism ought first to be instructed in the faith and to make a confession thereof.*

CENTURY IX

Rabanus

Rabanus, cap. 4, saith that *the catechism which is the doctrine of faith, must go before baptism to the intent that he that is to be baptized may first learn the mysteries of faith.* And farther he saith *The Lord Christ anointed the eyes of him that was born blind with clay and spittle before he sent him to the water of Shiloah to signify that he that is to be baptized must first be instructed in the faith concerning the incarnation of Christ. When he doth believe, then he is to be admitted to baptism to the intent that he may know what the grace is which he receiveth in baptism and whom he afterwards in duty ought and is bound to serve.*

Albinus, Damascenus and Raphanus

Albinus saith *three things are visible in baptism: The Body, the Water and the administrator and three things are invisible, the soul, faith and the Spirit of God which being all joined by the word they are effectual in that sacrament. Cent 8, p. 144.* **Damascenus:** *We are buried with the Lord in Baptism as saith the Apostle. P. 220.* **Raphanus** again saith *that the adult were first to be instructed in the faith and duly examined before they were baptized. And that as Noah and his family were saved by wood and water, so the faithful are saved by baptism and the cross. Cent 8, p. 144*

Remigius and Strabo

Remigius saith *that faith is the principle thing in baptism for without it, it is impossible to please God. P. 145.* **Walafrid Strabo**, who lived about 840, in his book **De Reb. Eccl., c. 26**, saith *that in the first times, the grace of baptism was wont 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 be gotten by baptism, what is to be confessed and believed, what lastly is to be observed by them that are new born in Christ. and confirms it by Austin's own confession of himself containing a Catechemenus long before baptism: But afterwards understanding original sin and lest their children should perish without any means of grace, had them, he saith, baptized according to the Council of Africa, etc.*

CENTURY X

Auslebertus, Smaragdo and Theophilact

Auslebertus saith that *the faithful are born not of blood, but of God of the word of God preached and of the baptism of God duly administered by which sacraments, saith he, God's children are begotten. Cent 10, p. 186.* **Smaragdo** on Matt 28: *First men are to taught in the faith, then after, to be baptized therein. For it is not enough that the body is baptized, but that the Soul first by faith receive the truth thereof. P. 187.* **Theophilact** saith *whoever are truly baptized into Christ, have put on Christ. P. 189*

CENTURY XI

Anselm

Anselm said, that *believers are baptized into the death of Christ, that believing His death, and conforming thereto may as dying with Him, live also with Him*, **Cent. 11, page 169**

And again, *The baptism of Christ is the washing in water into the word of life; take away either water or word, baptism ceases*, **page 116.**

Again, *Whosoever is baptized, has heaven opened to him, and knows God is there above, ready to receive him; which, as by the steps of a ladder, he must from his Baptism ascent to him; for as Solomon said, the way of life is above to the wise*, **p. 160, 170.**

Algerus

Algerus said, *As water extinguishes, cleanses, and whitens above other liquors; so in Baptismal Water fleshly lusts are quenched, sin, both original and actual, is washed away, and white Innocency thereby begotten; and so whilst the Image of the heavenly Father is reformed, the Sons of Adoption are begotten.*

Buchardus

Buchardus Wormatiensis said, that *repentance and faith must precede baptism*, in his sixth book **De Sacrament.**

Ado.

Ado Treverensis said, *That faith and Repentance must go before baptism.* **Vicecom. 1, 3. C. 12.**

Ivo

Ivo writes, that *those who come to Baptism, ought first publicly to acknowledge their Faith.*

Waldenses

It appears, that in this age the Baptism of believers was asserted and practiced by the Waldenses and Albigenses. **Twisk Chron. Lib. 11, upon the year 100, page 423.**

Bernigarius

The Learned Bernigarius and his followers were great asserters of Baptism after Faith. **Thnanus in his Preface to his History.** *And that many of them did witness the same to blood.* **Abraham Melin, l. 1, fol. 395; col. 3 and Saxon Chron. Anno 1135; out of the Dutch Martyrol., upon cent. 11**

Peter Bruis

Peter Bruis, a Learned man in Tholouse in France, and his followers not a few, were great asserters and practicers of baptism after faith and repentance. Dutch Martyrology, century 11, out of Cent. Magd., cent. 11, Where these doctrines are expressed at large.

CENTURY XII.

Rupertus

Rupertus said, that *they who do believe, and make confession thereof, are to be baptized, cent. 12, page 597.* And again, in his fourth Book of **Divine Offices, c. 18,** said, that *in former times the custom of the primitive churches was, that they administered not the Sacrament of Regeneration, but only at the Feast of Easter, and Pentecost; and all the Children of the Church, which throughout the whole year, through the Word were moved, when Easter came, gave up their Names, and were the following days, till Pentecost, instructed in the Rules of Faith, rehearsing the same, and by their Baptism, and dying thus with Christ, rose again with Him.*

Bohemius

Johannes Bohemius, lib., 2, De Gent. Moribus, said; *It was in times past, said he, the Custom to administer Baptism only to those who were instructed in the Faith, and seven times in the Week before Easter and Pentecost, Catechized: But, afterwards, when it was thought and adjudged needful to eternal life, to be baptized; it was ordained, that new-born children should be baptized, and Godfathers were appointed, who should make confession, and renounce the Devil on their behalf.*

Rupertus

Rupertus again said, that *many who are baptized with water, are not renewed in the spirit of their minds, have not put off the old man and his deeds, as if he was drowned in the Water, and the new man ready put on, in his third book upon the Second of John.* And, again, *That the visible baptism of water we may consider, but in which the virtue of Baptism does consist, we cannot, page. 598.*

Peter Lumbard

Peter Lumbard said, *That the reason why Baptism was instituted, was, that the mind might be changed, that the man, who by sin was made old, by grace might be renewed. And that Believers, who are baptized in the Faith, receive both the Sacraments, and the thing: but they who have not Faith, may receive the Sacrament, but not the thing intended in the Sacraments, p. 529.*

Albertus Magnus

Albertus Magnus said, that *the Laver of Regeneration is not proper, but to the Illuminated and Called, who can draw virtue from the Death and Resurrection of Christ, Cent. 13, page 413.* And again, *That baptism is Christ's Seal, wherewith he seals believers; and that where Regeneration is, there the sanctifying power of the Spirit operates with the water, page 414.*

Thomas Aquinas

Thomas Aquinas said, that *in Baptism, God works inwardly, as He dispenses outwardly; there is not only a consignation of the Soul, but the Body; because the whole man, by Baptism is dedicated to God; for by Baptism we die to the life of sin, and begin to live a new life of grace, Page 424.*

And, again, *In baptism there is a fourfold purification, viz. By the Word, by the Spirit, by the Blood of Christ, and by Baptismal Grace, viz. Repentance, Faith and Mortification fetch from Christ's Death, page 425.*

Alexander, Bonaventure, Aegidins, and other learned men of this age, speak also after the same manner, in justification of Believer's Baptism.

The Petro-Brusians and Henericans

The followers of Peter Bruis and Henricus, or old Waldenses, did very much increase about this time, in so much as there were very few in Province, Albi, Languedock, Gascoyne, who did not cleave to their Doctrine; although Pope John the third did violently oppose them. Twisk Chron. L. 13, page 528; Nich. Gill, Chron. Page 286; Guil. Merul. P. 798.

Waldenses Greatly Increase

That the Waldensian sect did so multiply in Italy and Lumbardy, that their Itinerate preachers (whereof they had many, whom they sent into most Countries) could, in their Travels from France to Milain, lodge every night at one of their Friend's houses. Twisk Chron. L. 13, page 546; Hen. Boxborn, fol. 25.

That the Waldensian Doctrine did so increase that through Lumbardy it spread it self into Sicilia, as the Edicts of the Emperor Frederick the Second do make appear. Twisk Chron. 1, 13, page 605; Jo. Crispin., History fol. 314; Merul. Page 843.

CENTURY XIII

Though the Magdeburgh. History reaches no further than the 13th century, yet we do find out of very Authentic History that the Profession and practice of Believer's Baptism did successively continue downwards through the rest of the Centuries.

The Waldenses

The Waldensian Faith did so spread in point of baptizing believers after faith, that it filled Poland, Lumbardy, Germany, and Holland therewith; as you will find in the Bible Patrum, tom. 15, page 300; Sleidan. Comment. Merning, upon century 14, page 737, and Montanus, page 86.

Dulcinus

One Dulcinus, and his followers were great asserters of this Doctrine. Twisk Chron. L. 14, page 646.

Many Friars

Pope John the 22nd, did accuse several Friars for their Apostasy from the Romish Faith, and cleaving to that of the Waldensian; Ab. Melin. Fol. 486. The Waldensian Faith was much spread in Poland and Bohemia, as appears by the Inquisitors of K. John. Flac. Iryricus. Catalog. Test. Verit, l. 16, Tit, de Waldensibus; Ja. Merning, page 609; and by the Bulls of Pope Urban, Bzov. Annals, anno 1365, Acts 8.

John Wickliff

Ab. Melinus does testify that *John Wickliffe, does deny Baptism to be of force to take away Original Sin, (as the Popes had enjoined it)*. **A Melin. Fol. 494.**

John Huss

Twisk said, that *Wickliff's Doctrine did spread in Bohemia, by his Scholar, John Huss, and that it was agreeable with that of the Waldenses*. **Twisk Chron. L. 14, page 720 and Jo. Crispin, fol. 354. Ab Mel. P. 497.**

The Turlupins or Waldenses

John Tyllins, in his Chron. Said, *in the year 1372, that the Sect called Turlupins or Waldenses did abound*. **Ab. Mel. P. 497.**

Vignier

Vignier, the famous French Historian said, that *the Sect of the Waldenses were in this age persecuted, and their books burnt by the Inquisitors of Paris*, **Vig. Eccles. History, an. 1373.**

The Baltic Sea and Saxony

There is mention also made of them upon the Baltic Sea and in Saxony. **Mat. Flac. Iler, Cat. Test. Verse 1, 15, pate 18; Tit. De Waldensibus.**

The Old Confession of Faith

Jacob Merningus said, That *he had in his hand, in the German Tongue, a Confession of Faith of the Waldenses in Bohemia, asserting that in the beginning of Christianity there was no baptizing of Children; and that their forefathers practiced no such thing; as say they*, **Johannes Bohemius** writes in his Second Book, **De. Gent. Moribus. Merningus, History of Baptism, page 2, page 738.**

CENTURY XIV.

The Bishop of Meyland

Carolus Bishop of Meyland, did exhort the Ministers under his charge, that first they should teach in the Faith, and that only upon Confession of Faith, and a good conversation, they should administer Baptism. **Merging, page 740; Vicecom. L. 5, c. 45.** Vicecomes does also testify that *Barnabas, when he first baptized in Meyland, did it in running waters*. **Vicecom, l. 1, c. 4; Merning. Page 741.**

The Anabaptists in Bohemia

That *Bohemia did abound with Anabaptists, so called in this Century*, as **Sebastis Frank, Chron of Romish Heretick. Page 121.**

The Confession of the Thaborites in Bohemia

The Confession of the Thaborites, delivered to Mr. Rekenzban, at Prague in Bohemia, **1431** does concerning the point of Baptism, affirm in these Words, viz., *that we do from our hearts acknowledge, that the Sacrament of Baptism is a washing which is performed with water, which according to Christ's words,*

does hold out the washing of the Soul from sin, according both to Christ's precepts and practice; for in His Commission to His Disciples, Matthew 28, he said, Go, and teach, and baptize, whereof he had before given an example by his own practice, being baptized in Jordan. Merning. History of Baptism, p. 743, 744. B. Lyd. Wald. P. 10, 11.

Century XV.

Old Waldenses or Baptists in Germany

In these Centuries were great Contests in Germany in Germany, between the Baptists or old Waldensian Sect, and those of the Spirituality, so called; which very much occasioned the spreading and increase of that Doctrine of baptizing Believers, more than ever before. Merningus, page 772.

Waldenses in Hungary

Twisk said, that in the year 1507, the Waldenses were much spread in Hungary. Twist, Chron. P. 930.

The Waldensian Confession of 1521

The Waldenses, in their Confession of their Faith to Fran. I, King of France, in the year 1521, do assert the baptizing of Believers after Faith, renouncing that of Children's Baptism. Montanus, Impress. 2. P. 90.

The Thessalonican Churches and the old German Waldenses

Balthazar Lydias testifies, that in Thessalonica in Greece, were several Churches supposed to continue successively from the Apostles times, directly agreeing with the Faith of the Waldenses. Balth. Lydias, in his Third Treatise of the Waldenses, and Dutch Martyrology, l. 1. Page 4. Out of a Book called the Spectacles; by J. S.

Thessalonians in Switzerland

Merningus does also testify that two persons were sent from the Churches in Thessalonica, to find some of the same Faith with themselves; and that coming into Switzerland, they were taken Prisoners, and put into the Castle of Passau; who did testify to many credible persons, that they had in their Custody the Original of Paul's Epistles that he sent to them, Merningus, History of Baptism, p. 739. Vicecomes does assert out of Nicephorus, that they in Thessalonica did baptize after Profession of Faith.

CENTURY XVI

Jacob de Roor

Jacob de Roor, a prisoner at Bridges in Flanders, owned only that baptism that Christ commanded after teaching and believing and which the Apostles did 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, to the putting

in the body of Christ and planting into the true olive tree Jesus Christ and for the right entrance into the spiritual ark whereof Christ Jesus is the Builder. Dutch Martyrol, p. 15 of l. 2, 1572

Ludovicus Vives

Ludovicus Vives saith that *they continued to baptize the adult even in Italy* in his days in his **Comment upon August. 1. C. 26.**

Bellarmino

And **Bellarmino** himself tells us in his book **De bon. Operib. L. 2, c. 17**, that *amongst the Lutherans the customs of baptizing the catechumens and absolving the penitent at Easter is abolished. Whereas amongst the Catholics (but especially in the City of Rome) there is no year wherein multitudes are not baptized.* Whereby a relic and footstep of truth may appear in Rome itself.

Grotius

Grotius Saith that *in every Age many of the Greeks, unto this day, keep the custom of differing baptism to little ones till they could themselves make a confession of their faith.* And the Armenians are confessed by **Heylin** in his **Microcos. P. 573** to defer baptism of children till they be of grown years.

Zwinglius

Zwinglius in his book of **Articles, Art. 18:** *In the old time, saith he, the children were openly instructed. Who, when they came to understanding, were called Catechumens, that is, such as are instructed in the word of salvation and when they had imprinted the faith in their hearts and made confession thereof with their mouths, they were admitted to baptism. And this custom, saith he, of teaching, I wish it were in use in our time.*

Luther

Luther: *In times past it was thus, saith he, that the sacrament of baptism was administered to none except it were to those that acknowledged and confessed their faith and knew how to rehearse the same.*

Bullinger

Bullinger in his house book, **Scym. 48**, upon these words: God hath not sent me to baptize, but to preach the gospel, saith. *This must not slightly be understood as if he were not sent to baptize at all, but that teaching should go before baptism. For the Lord commanded His Apostles both to preach and also to administer the sacraments, Matt 28: 19, 20.*

Erasmus

Erasmus paraphraseth thus **upon** those words in **Matt 28: 19, 20:** *When you have taught them the word of God, if they then believe and receive it, if they begin to repent themselves of their former life and are ready and willing to embrace the doctrine of the gospel, then let them be baptized with water in the name of the Father, Son and Holy Ghost, that they may be marked with his mark and written amongst the number of those which trust that are through the merits of his death freed and washed from their sins and received to be children of God.*

Ludovicus Vives

Ludovicus Vives in his comment afore said, **I. 1, c. 27**, *None*, saith he, *were baptized of old, but those that are of age who also not only understand what the mystery of the water meant, but desired the same. The perfect image whereof we have yet in our infants baptism for it is asked of the infant 'wilt thou be baptized?' And for whom the sureties answer 'I will.'*

Melancton

Melancton upon 1 Cor 11: *In times past, saith he, those in the church that had repented of them were baptized and was instead of an absolution. Wherefore repentance must not be separate from baptism for baptism is a sacramental sign of repentance.*

Beza

Beza upon 1 Cor 7: 14 saith *that to permit all children to be baptized was unheard of in the primitive Church. Whereas everyone ought to be instructed in the faith before they were admitted to baptism.*

Bucer

Bucer in his book entitled **The Grand Work and Cause** saith *that in the Congregation of God, confession of sins is always first the which in times past, went before baptism. For commonly children were baptized when they came to their understanding. And that in the beginning of the Church, no man was baptized and received into the congregation but those that through hearing the word, wholly gave over and submitted themselves to Christ.*

Chamier

Chamier, Tom. 4, l. 5, c. 15, Ser. 9, saith *Who seeth not that the custom of the scrutiny of the baptized was not in that time when scarce the thousandth person was baptized before he came to age and was diligently exercised in catechism.*

Dr. Hamond

Dr. Hamond in his Cat. Lib. 1, c. 3, p. 23, saith *that all men were instructed in the fundamentals of faith anciently before they were permitted to be baptized.*

Dr. Field

Dr. Field on the Church, p. 729 saith *that very many that were born of Christian parents, besides those that were converted from paganism, put off their baptism for a long time insomuch that many were made Bishops before they were baptized.*

The Church of England's Catechism

The doctrine of the Church of England held forth in their public Catechism, gives testimony to this truth where it is asserted that *repentance whereby we forsake sin and faith whereby we steadfastly believe the promises are required in every one that is to be baptized, confessing also that children can neither repent nor believe.* Which, though they would salve, by saying they do both by their sureties, upon which invention they lay the stress of the whole. For if there be no warranty for sureties in the case, they have in these few

words given up the controversy. For they grant that faith and repentance are required to qualify to baptism and ingenuously acknowledge that children are not capable of either, but that they do repent and believe by their sureties. Which how consonant to reason, rule and righteousness let all the upright judge and concerning which practice take the judgment of **Dr. Taylor, Bishop of Downe, p. 239 of his Lib. Of Proph.** *I know, saith he, God might, if he would have appointed Godfathers to give answer in behalf of children and to be fiduciaries 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 given answers with more truth. For the question is asked of believing in the present and if the Godfathers 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 he were, he were also capable of dissenting. And how then do they know his mind? And therefore, saith he, Tertullian and Gregory Nazianzen gave advice that the baptism of infants should be deferred till they could give an account of their own faith.*

How this invention of gossips came in and by what Pope it was instituted and how they were required in the baptism of bells and churches as well as infants, you will hear farther in the other historical part. We shall now conclude this chapter with that wonderful testimony given by **Mr. Baxter in his 20th argument to Mr. Blake** in the words: *Here note, saith he, speaking of the Eunuch's not being admitted to baptism till he made a profession of faith, first, that baptism as received is the seal of our faith (how much soever denied by Mr. Blake) as it is the seal of God's promise. Secondly, that the constant order is that baptism follow faith. Thirdly, that it is no better than an impious profanation of it if it go without faith that is first, if the party seek it without the presence of faith, secondly, if the Pastor administer it without the profession of faith.*

Thus you see by plentiful evidence that the Lord hath not left himself without witness hereto, from men, and that in several Ages, not only before, but since the Antichristian darkness took place, but that which is most to be admired and adored in this providence is, that much of this blessed testimony for truth hath proceeded from the pens of some of its chiefest adversaries whereby the wisdom and power of God hath much appeared, who can not only out of the mouth of babes and sucklings, but out of the very mouths of enemies also create and perfect his own praise and make even their own tongues to fall upon themselves. For what is esteemed better evidence and testimony amongst men, than the confession of parties themselves?

But it may be objected that however you may improve many of these sayings of the Paedobaptists to justify your way and condemn theirs, yet they have another meaning which will well enough reconcile such principles to their practice of baptizing infants and whereby you will be found mistaken in the supposed advantage, for it is to be thought possible that such pious, wise and learned men should so positively contradict themselves as you seem to make them do?

To which I answer that whatever their meaning may be, yet their words and reasons appear substantial arguments for the Baptists and full and clear evidence against themselves. For is not the commission itself fully owned, the order of it and practice upon it: that persons ought first to be taught in the faith before they are to be baptized into the same and that none in the Apostles' times and for some Ages after were otherwise baptized and that it is ridiculous, yea, profane for any otherwise to practice and that there was neither precept nor example for the baptizing of infants, who, as confessed, are so incapable either of themselves or any for them to answer the great ends thereof, but owned to be a practice taken up and enjoined several Ages after as many of the for-cited Paedobaptists have confessed and will more fully and particularly appear in the next part. And what is, or can be said more by the Baptists themselves in confirmation of their way and practice.

Thus we have dispatched the first Part and may it not now be recommended to the conscience of the impartial, unprejudiced reader whether this first assertion (That believers baptism is only to be esteemed Christ's ordinance of baptism) is not substantially made good, not only from clear and undeniable scripture and reason, but from most pregnant authorities of learned men and most of them parties themselves.

End of the First Part

A Treatise of Baptism

Infants Baptism Disproved

The SECOND PART

Disproves Infants Baptism under this Head, viz.

**That the Baptizing of Infants is no Ordinance of Jesus Christ;
which is made good in the Seven following Chapters.**

Chap. I

**Wherein the Scriptures' total silence
about Infants Baptism is observed with the necessity of Scripture warranty to
authorize every Ordinance and that by the Confession of Parties themselves.**

No Scripture for Baptizing Infants

If Infants Baptism had been any appointment or ordinance of Jesus Christ, there would have been some precept, command or example in the Scripture to warrant the same, but inasmuch as the Scripture is so wholly silent therein, there being not one syllable to be found in all the New Testament about any such practice, it may well be concluded to be no ordinance of Jesus Christ. For where the Scripture hath no tongue, we ought to have no ear. According to that known maxim: to practice any thing in the worship of God as an ordinance of his, without an institution, ought to be esteemed will-worship and idolatry.

The Parties Themselves Owning It

And that there is neither precept nor example for any such thing as infants baptism in the scripture, we have the ingenious confession of the parties themselves:

The Magdeburgenses

The **Magdeburgenses in Cent 1, l. 2, p. 496**, do say that *concerning the baptizing of the adult, both Jews and Gentiles, we have sufficient proof from Acts 2, 8, 10, 16, but as to the baptizing of infants, they can meet with no example in the scriptures.*

Luther

Luther in Postill. Saith *Young children hear not nor understand the word of God, out of which faith cometh and therefore if the commandment be followed, children ought not to be baptized.* And again, in his epistle of Anabaptists, saith, *We cannot prove by any place of scripture that children do believe. Neither do the scriptures clearly and plainly with these or like words say Baptize your children for they believe. Wherefore we must needs yield to those that drive us to the letter because we find it no where written.*

Erasmus

Erasmus in his book of the **Union of the Church**, saith, *it is no where expressed in the apostolical writings that they baptized children*. And again upon Rom 6: *Baptizing of young infants was not in use*, saith he, *in St. Paul's time*. And again in his fourth book, *De Ratione Conc.* Saith, *that they are not to be condemned that doubt whether childrens baptism was ordained by the Apostles*.

Calvin

Calvin, in his fourth book of **Institutes**, **t. 16**, confesseth that *it is no where expressly mentioned by the evangelists that any one child was by the Apostles' hands baptized*.

Bucer

Bucer upon Matt saith that *Christ no where commanded to baptize infants*.

Staphilus

Staphilus in **Epitome**, saith *that young children should be baptized is not expressed in the holy scripture*.

Choclens

Choclens, De Bapt. Parvulorum, saith that *Jesus took a child and placed him in the midst of them. what child was it? I think it was not a young or newborn child and that the same was not baptized. For infants were not in those days baptized, but such as being come to their full growth, confessed their sins*.

Melancthon

Melancthon in his **Treatise concerning the Doctrine of the Anabaptists** writeth that *there is no plain commandment in the holy scriptures that children should be baptized*.

Zwinglius

Zwinglius in his book of **the Movers of Sedition**, speaking of baptizing children: *So it be*, saith he, *that there is no plain words of the scripture whereby the same is commanded*.

These latter quotations from the German Doctors, you have in an old Dutch author called **A very plain and well grounded treatise concerning Baptism**. Englished 1618

Daniel Rogers

Mr. Daniel Rogers in his **treatise about Baptism, part 29**, confesseth himself *to be unconvinced by demonstration of scripture for it*.

Baxter

Mr. Baxter himself that wrote that book called **Plain Scripture Proof for Infants Church Membership and Baptism**, yet in contradiction thereto, in the same book, **p. 3**, confesseth *that infants baptism is not*

plainly determined in the scriptures. And again in the **Defense of the Principles of Love, in the Epistle**, saith, *that he having had more invitation to study the point thoroughly and to treat of it largely than most that are offended herein, that they must give him leave to say that he knoweth it to be a very difficult point.*

Dr. Taylor

Dr. Taylor, Lib. Proph. P. 239, saith, *It is against the perpetual analogy of Christ's doctrine to baptize infants. For besides that, Christ never gave any precept to baptize them, nor ever himself, nor his Apostles (that appear) did baptize any of them. All that either he or his Apostles said concerning it requires such previous dispositions to baptism of which infants are not capable and those are faith and repentance. And not to instance in those innumerable places that require faith before baptism, there needs no more but this one of our blessed Savior, He that believes and is baptized shall be saved. But he that believeth not shall be condemned. Plainly thus, faith and baptism will bring a man to heaven, but if he hath no faith, baptism shall do him no good. So that if baptism be necessary, so is faith much more for the want of faith damns absolutely. It is not so of the want of baptism.*

Thus you have it acknowledged by adversaries themselves that there is neither precept, precedent nor example in scripture for baptizing of infants. And in the next place, you have it further owned that there is a necessity for scripture authority to warrant every ordinance and practice in divine worship.

Luther

Luther upon Gal 1: 9 saith *there ought no other doctrine to be delivered or heard in the Church besides the pure word of God, that is, the Holy Scriptures. Let other teachers and hearers with their doctrines be accursed.*

Calvin

Calvin, l. 4, Inst. C. 8, Sermon. 8: *Let this be a firm axiom, saith he, that nothing is to be accounted the word and will of God, to which place should be given in the Church, but that which is first contained in the Law and the Prophets and after in the apostolical writings.*

Basil

Basil in his sermon **De Fide** saith that *it would be an argument of infidelity and a most certain sign of pride if any man should reject things written and should introduce things not written.*

Austin

Austin himself saith in **Detrahe Verbum**, *quid est aqua nisi Aqua? Take away the word, what is the water but plain water? If the word of institution be wanting, what doth the element of water signify?*

Theophilact

Theophilact, lib. 2, Paschal: *It is, saith he, the part of a diabolical spirit to think any thing divine without the authority of the holy scriptures.*

Tertullian

Tertullian contra Hermog. Saith *I do adore the fullness of the scripture. Let Hermogenes show that it is written. If it be not written, let him fear the woe destined to those who add or detract.*

Mr. Ball

And **Mr. Ball** very excellently to this purpose in **his Answer to the New England Elders, p. 38, 39**, saith: *We must for every ordinance look to the institution and neither stretch it under, nor draw it narrower than the Lord hath made it. For he is the institutor of the sacraments according to his own good pleasure and it is our part to learn of him both to whom, how, and for what end the sacraments are to be administered. In all which we must affirm nothing, but what God hath taught us and as he taught us.*

The Sixth Article of the Church of England

The sixth Article of the Church of England saith very fully to this point that *the holy scriptures do contain all things necessary to salvation so that whatsoever is not read therein, nor may be proved thereby is not to be required by any man that it should be believed as an Article of Faith, or be thought requisite and necessary to salvation.*

We shall conclude this chapter with that notable observation that **Ballarmino** makes in the case upon the Anabaptists calling for plain scripture proof for the baptizing of infants from them who exactly require it from others and will not in any other case admit the omission thereof, in his book **De Bapt., l. 1, c. 8**, where he saith that *though the argument of the Anabaptists from defect of command or example have great force against the Lutherans forasmuch as they use that principle everywhere, viz. That Rite which is not in scripture having no command or example there is to be rejected. Yet it is of no force against Catholics who conclude that apostolical tradition is of no less authority with us than the scripture. For the apostles spake with the same spirit with which they did write. But that this of baptizing of infants is an apostolical tradition, we know, whence we know the apostolic scripture to be the apostolic scripture, viz. From the testimonies of the ancient church.*

Objection

The objection that is usually brought under this head is that there is no express command or example for women's receiving the Lord's supper, yet who doubts of a good from consequential scripture for their so doing?

Answer

In answer whereto, you'll find there is both example and command for the practice, viz.

1. From example Acts 1: 14 where we read that Mary and other women were gathered together and that these women together with the rest of the Disciples *were all together in one place and continued steadfastly in the Apostle's doctrine and fellowship and breaking of bread and prayers.* Acts 2: 42, 44 It is expressly said that all believers were together.
2. It appears from command, 1 Cor 11: 28 *Let a man examine himself and so let him eat.* The Greek word signifieth a man or a woman (□□□□□□□) a word of the common gender as appears in 1 Tim 2: 4, 5, *There is one Mediator betwixt God and man* and woman. There is the same word used in Gal 3: 28 *There is neither male nor female, but ye are all one in Christ.* Let but as good proof appear (from command and example) for infants baptism and it shall suffice.

CHAPTER II

Wherein by an historical account of infants baptism in its rise and establishment, viz, when, by whom, and to what ends instituted, it doth appear that there was no authentic practice thereof for three-hundred , not any

human authority enjoining it till four-hundred years after Christ, together with an account also of its growth and how and by what lying authorities it was with many superstitious rites founded upon apostolical tradition with the impious and ridiculous fooleries added to it in every age.

From the learned authorities before given we have gained thus much, that there was no precept in scripture for the baptizing of infants, so neither was there the least practice to be found thereof in the Apostles' days as so ingenuously before confessed by the Magdeburgenses, Luther, Calvin, Erasmus, Rogers, etc.

Secondly, that the approved practice and known custom of the primitive church was to baptize the adult as all Ages acknowledge and only they (at least) for the first Ages are so fully accepted by Eusebius, Biatius, Rhenanus, Lud. Vives, Bullinger, Haimo, the Neocasarian Council, etc.

Thirdly, That not only the children of pagans were as the catechumens to be instructed and taught in the faith, but the children of Christian parents as those famous instances given from the Fourth Century by Field, Naucler, Daille, Grotius, Walafrid Strabo, Taylor and others.

Fourthly, the next thing we shall make appear is that as there was no scripture authority to enjoin it, so there was no human authority to enforce it. Till about 400 years after Christ. Though to justify that injunction, Apostolical tradition, was pretended whereof you have, by the way, this following account out of the three first Centuries.

Century I

Apostolical Tradition's First Pretended Proof

The first and most ancient pretended authority that hath been urged to prove infants baptism to be an apostolical tradition is that of **Dionysius the Areopagite**, Paul's convert at Athens, who flourished, as is supposed, about the 70th year of this Century. Who (as the story tells us) after his converse with Paul was sent by Clement, Bishop of Rome, to preach the gospel in the West with Saturninus, Lucianus, Rusticus and others. And that his lot was to go unto France where he preached and wrought many miracles and was afterwards martyred at Paris. And that he wrote a multitude of books as enumerated by Suidas and others and amongst them that famous piece called his **Ecclesiastical Hierarchy** which tells us of the several orders and dignities of the clergy, rites, services and sacraments of the Church. And among them acquaints us of the baptizing of infants which he tells us *he received from his prefectures as an ancient apostolical tradition with the additional rites belonging thereto of consecration, consignation, confirmation, chrism, exorcism.* Which, he affirms, *were all in use in the Apostles' time* as **Magdeburg Cent. 1, p. 625**. Which was, they tell us, also learnedly refuted by Erasmus, etc. Especially by Laurent. Valla who observes that none of either the Greek or Latin fathers or church historians do so much as mention him or any of his works. Neither Eusebius, Origen, Chrysostom, Epiphanius, or Gregory. Nor that Jerom who gave a catalogue of all the eminent writers takes the least notice of him. And how ridiculous and contradictious his lying stories are about monkery, about baptism that had no footing in the world for several Ages after and that the learned in his days supposed these books fathered upon Dionysius in this Age were done by one Apollinarius several Ages after **as Magd., Cent. 1, p.616**.

Century II

As a further proof of infants baptism and the several rites annexed thereto, we have more authorities fathered upon and pretended to be fetched from this second century of which the Mageburg. Do give us this account, viz.

First, the responses fathered upon Justin Martyr, the 56th whereof propounds the different condition of those children who die baptized and unbaptized which they renounce as spurious upon many considerations, **Cent. 2, p.111**.

Secondly, that of Pope Clements appointing oil in his baptism and also that he in his fourth decretal epistle affirms that after baptism there should be a consignation, viz. A signing with the sign of the cross and confirmation, viz. A laying on of hands for the sevenfold spirit.

A third is that of Pope Hyginus his appointing of gossips or sureties both in baptism and consecration which decree of Pope Hyginus we have word for word out of **Gratian L. Osiander, cent. 2, l. 2, c. 9.** Viz. In catechism, baptism and confirmation, let there be a gossip if necessity require.

A fourth is that of Pope Victor who is said to confine the catholic celebration of baptism to Easter except some urgent necessity intervene and that they should baptize in fonts as well as rivers.

A fifth is that of Pope Pius (who was much about Justin's time) his consecrating baptisterions or fonts to baptize in. But how feigned and fabulous these are, you have at large hereafter.

Century III

In this century we have two other famous testimonies that are much leaned upon by all forts to prove infants baptism to be an apostolical tradition.

The first is that of **Origen** who in his **Homilies upon Levit. And the Romans** is said to affirm *that the baptizing of infants was a tradition of the Apostles and according to the usage of the Church.*, **cent. 3, p. 124.**

The second is that of Cyprian in an epistle said to be writ to one Fidus, a Priest, who herein is supposed to deliver it to be his, and the opinion of 66 Bishops: That *children should be baptized at any time* (in opposition to Fidus his consigning it to the eighth day after the manner of circumcision) both which authorities you have at large examined afterwards.

Tertullian in this century gave several arguments against infants baptism whereof you have a particular account hereafter.

Many were the corruptions about baptism that in this Age were creeping in as the consigning baptism ordinarily to be performed by a Bishop, **Magd., cent. 3, p. 123.** Limiting the time to Easter and Whitsontide, **p. 129.** Altering the form from dipping to sprinkling and the place from rivers and fountains to baptisterions with diverse superstitious rites **as p. 125, 126.** Though they tell us withal, **p. 125** *that they do not find by any authentic testimony that any one person was actually baptized in this manner and form in this Age* whereof it may be conjectured that their corruptions were more in the notion than practice which though afterwards came all of them to be in use.

Century IV

By the decrees that passed in several Councils in this Age, viz. That of Carthage, Neocesaria, Laodicea, etc. holding out the necessity of confession and profession before baptism already in the former history mentioned, as also by those famous instances of so many of the eminent persons of this century born of Christian parents that were not baptized till aged before expressed. It doth manifestly appear that infants baptism was neither esteemed an apostolical tradition nor so much as in use the greatest part of this century either in the Latin or Greek Church.

Infants Baptism Practiced in the Latter Part of 4th Century

It is true towards the latter end of this century it is said that in some parts of Africa they did baptize children as **Magdeburg, cent. 4, p. 415.** And that some of the Greek Church did begin to approve it also. Greg. Nazianzen (who by Perkins is placed 380.) is said in his fortieth Oration to *admit infants to be baptized in case of necessity being in danger of death that they may not miss*, as he says, *of the common grace*, but gives his opinion *of others that they should stay longer that they might be instructed and so their minds and bodies might be sanctified.*

Jerom that by Helvicus is placed ten years after him, 390, is said to *incline to it also*, after Origen and Cyprian.

Lying Forgeries About Constantine's Baptism by the Papists

Many are the corruptions fetched from this and that former Age and not a few of them fathered upon Constantine in his baptism which they say *was done at Rome in a baptisterion by P. Sylvester and administered with all the Romish rites of consecration, consignation, chrism, exorcism, albes, rings, donation, etc.* How Constantine was *first miraculously cured thereby of his leprosy and the great donation he gave to See Apostolic and the acknowledgment to their universal bishopric.* All held forth in an edict said to be writ with Constantine's own hand and fairly kept in the Vatican Library writ in letters of gold as saith **Du Plessis in his Mystery of Iniquity.** Yet all a notorious forgery and cheat. Constantine being baptized at Nicomedia and not at Rome and not by Pope Sylvester who was dead fifteen years before. Neither had Constantine any such leprosy or miraculous cure, nor gave any such donation or acknowledgment to the Romish See as you have at large evidenced by the **Magdeburg., Cent 4, p. 568.** And concerning which **Osiander saith, Cent. 4, c. 38,** *which foolish and impudent fable is by many learned men refuted, viz. Marsilius, Patavinus, Laur, Valla, Cardinal Cusanus and Aeneas Sylvins after Pope Pius the Second.*

The working of the mystery of iniquity did as the Magdeburgenses tell us, strongly begin to act in many particulars, viz. Not only in the corrupting the rites and true form of baptism, but by those superstitions and sumptuous ceremonies that were used in the dedication, consecration, or baptizing of churches, viz. Either such idol temples that were given by the Emperors to Christian service or such new ones that were now erected, as, **Cent. 4, p. 76, 497, 490, 520.** The superstitious collection and exposure of the relics of saints for adoration, **p. 493.** The inclination to prohibit marriage as appeared by the Council of Nice where it was only checked by the famous Paphnutins, **p. 1088.**

Distinction Between Laymen and Clergy

The distinction in point of sanctification now made betwixt laymen and clergymen, the one reputed spiritual, the other carnal.

And it was in this Age as appears by the Decrees of Pope Sylvester, Julius and Sericini that all marriages must pass the benediction of a Priest and to be esteemed little less that sacrilege to omit it. Of which in the former centuries no mention is made, **Magd., Cent. 4, p. 482,** and for which the quote Gigas and Luitprand.

Century V

This was the Age wherein infants baptism did receive its sanction by the Decrees of Popes and Councils and as absolutely necessary was enjoined and imposed by Anathemas, never till then. Concerning which **Dr. Taylor,** in his **Lib. Of Prophecy, p. 237,** gives us a true, brief and notable account which you may please to receive in his own words: *And the truth of the business is (saith he) as there was no command of scripture to oblige children to the susception of it, so the necessity of Paedo-Baptism was not determined in the Church till the Canon that was made in the Milevitan Council, a Provincial in Africa, never till then. I grant, saith he, it was practiced in Africa before that time and they or some of them thought well of it and though that is no argument for us to think so, yet none of them did ever pretend it to be necessary, none to have been a precept of the Gospel. St. Austin was the first that ever preached it to be necessary and it was in his heat and anger against Pelagius who had so warmed and chafed him that made him innovate herein.* This Milevitan or Militan Council was celebrated by 92 Bishops, Anselm, the Popes Legate and Austin presiding in the fifth year of Arcadius and the first of Pope Innocentius in the year 402 as **Magdeb., cent. 5, p. 835.** The occasion of the Council is expressed to be about the difference that had happened between Pelagius and Aoelestius, Austin and others, respecting original sin, baptizing children, etc. The constitutions and decrees of the said

Council are at large expressed by the Magdeb. Out of the book of Decretals and among other Canons made in the Council. We find this, viz.

The Milevitan Council's Canon Respecting Infants Baptism

That it is our will that all that affirm that young children receive everlasting life albeit they be not by the sacrament of grace of baptism renewed and that will not that young children which are new born from their mother's womb shall be baptized, to the taking away original sin, that they be anathematized.

Pope Innocent I Ratifies It

Which with the rest of the Decrees was transmitted to Rome to Pope Innocentius for his apostolic confirmation in their large letters, **p. 841**. And which with a ready mind he performs accordingly by his decretal epistle expressed at large, **p. 845**. Afterwards, the fifth general Council at Carthage in the year 416 did decree to the same purpose in these words:

The 5th Council of Carthage's Canon

We will that whoever denies that little children by baptism are freed from perdition and eternally saved, that they be accursed.

Also Confirmed by Pope Innocent I

Which was also by Austin and seventy Bishops in their letter transmitted to the same Pope Innocent for his further Ratification and accordingly received the same in his decretal epistle at large, **p. 882, 825**. Inscribing their letters thus: *The Fathers of the Council to Innocent the Pope and High Priest styling him Most Holy Father.....* And that Pope Innocentius in these African Councils was the first that ever enjoined the necessity of this practice is further confirmed to us by Wilifrid Strabo as before who tells us that *children were baptized according to the Decree of the Council of Carthage for the taking away of original sin which aforesaid was not practiced*. **Luther** saith it was not determined till Pope Innocentius. And **Grotius** in his **Annotations on Matt 19** saith it was not enjoined till before that Council of Carthage. Which Canons of Pope Innocentius were afterwards confirmed by Pope Zosimus his successor and afterwards by Pope Boniface the succeeded Zosimus as appears in **Cod. Can. Cap. 110, Aff. Cap. 77 & De Consecrat. Distinct.**

The Doctors of this Age Approving Infants Baptism

Chrysostom saith that *infants ought to be baptized as universally received by the Catholic Church to take away original sin*. And again that *which the Holy Church throughout the world unanimously teacheth and practiseth about the baptizing of children ought not carelessly to be slighted*, **Magd., Cent 5, p. 375**. **Austin** was as a great patron so a great defender of infants baptism in his contests both against the Donatists and the Pelagians and the Coelestians whereof you have some instances. In his sermon **De Baptismo Parvulorum** against the Pelagians, **c. 14**, saith that *children should be baptized because of original sin and that without which they could never be regenerated or saved*, **Magd., cent. 5, p. 377-379**. And in his third book of **Free Will**, **c. 23**, saith *infants may be baptized by the faith of another and that the faith of the party that offers and dedicates the child to baptism profits the child therein as the Church (he saith) wholesomely appoints. For if the faith of the widow profited to the raising of the dead child much more may the faith of another profit the young child*, **p. 516**.

And again, in **his fourth book against the Donatists, cap. 23**, *Infants*, saith he, *are to be baptized who can neither believe with their hearts to justification nor confess with their mouths to salvation*, **p. 516**.

This controversy he managed with much furious zeal against the Pelagians in the African Councils. And so inordinate was he therein that in his twenty-third epistle to Boniface, he holds forth such a certainty of regeneration by it that he not only puts regeneration for baptism, but also makes no question of the regeneration of infants though they that brought them, did not bring them with that faith that they might be regenerated, but only to procure health to their bodies. A custom, it seems, they had to bring persons to be baptized for cure. Justifying thereby such a profane use thereof as that of Athanasius who baptized a boy playing in sport (playing the Bishop amongst his schoolfellows) which was confirmed notwithstanding to be good baptism by the Bishop of Alexandria.

And again, in **his seventh Tom., l. 1, c. 27**, asserts to the same purpose that *all baptized infants are believers and that the unbaptized are unbelievers*. Saying *who knows not that to infants to believe is to be baptized, not to believe is not to be baptized?* All the foolish ridiculous ceremonies called the Romish Baptismal Rites before mentioned were owned and practiced by Austin and others in this century with this addition, viz.

That the Lord's supper was given to the baptized infants as Austin in his 107th epistle saith where he holds a like necessity of their receiving that sacrament with that of baptism from John 6: 53. Wherein he was also so earnest that he boldly saith *in vain do we promise infants salvation without it*. Thus far Austin.

In the next place, before we leave this century, I think it will not be amiss to give some little account of this Pope Innocentius (our first confirmer and imposer of infants baptism) of whom it may be so truly said that he was one that changed times and laws and that sat himself in the Temple of God as God. As we find it recorded by **the Magd. Cent. 5, page 1228**, viz.

The Various Impious Acts of Pope Innocentius I

That he most strenuously labored for the universal Bishopric and supremacy over all churches as appears (say they) in all his epistles, designing to bring the determination of all principal ecclesiastical causes into that See. Especially in his epistle to Victricius and Decentium whereby, say they, it was manifest that the mystery of iniquity 2 Thes 2 did gradually get ground and increase. Who was (they say) a great establisher of human traditions and who blasphemously attributed divine honor to the Popedom as appears in that Epistle to Victricius. It was he that made confirmation a sacrament and consigned it only to the Bishops to lay hands on baptized infants, 1230. It was he also forbade Priests' marriages, 1231. And damned the nuns if they married, that also forbade marriage to any that by due divorce put away their wives., that also instituted many of the Jewish and Pagan laws as appears, they say, in his book De Ponti.

*And it was he that to witness his supremacy, did excommunicate the Emperor Arcadius and the Empress Eudoria and all his ecclesiastics that had their hands in the banishing of John Chrysostom, 662, 663. And it was he that first appointed that the Eucharist should be given to young children so soon as they were baptized, a custom that continued several hundred years after. And as Head of the Antichristian Race, he was the first, saith **Socrates, l. 7, p. 19**, that expelled the Novations from Rome, that famous worthy Church and people. Concerning whom we shall conclude with what the Magdeburgs said in their epistle to this Faith cent. To Ericus King of Sweden:*

That it might then be understood that Rome that had heretofore governed the world, was now made the very seat of Antichrist. And again, That the spirit of Antichrist did then manifestly begin to spread itself by the Bishop of Rome, lifting up himself in supremacy above all other Bishops and Churches.

And this was that Innocent who was the first great patron and imposer of this innovation. And was it not excellent service, think you, for Austin to play the game into the hand of such a vile wretch?

Century VI

The Canons of Various Councils

The Council of Gerunden in Spain held about 520, ordained that *young children from their mothers' wombs be baptized*.

The Council of Bracarense, 572, and the Council of Vivense ordained the very same. **Vossius de Bapt. P. 179.**

The Council of Marisconenses held 580, ordained that *the baptism of children should be at Easter except necessity binded.* **Magd. Cent. 6, p. 613.**

Pope Gregory the Great

Pope Greg. The Great, **Lib. 1, Ep. 4 as Boniface, dist. 4, De Confec.:** *Let all young children be baptized as they ought to be according to the tradition of the fathers.*

Who gave instructions to his Legate Austin to give Christendom to children when he sent him into Britain. Which you may read at large in the Book of Martyrs, mentioned hereafter.

Emperor Justinian's Decree

Justinian the Emperor who reigned 530 ordained *that it seemed him good that when the Samaritans that desire the unspoiled baptism that they for the space of two years together be instructed in the faith and the holy scriptures and that upon their repentance, they be admitted thereto. But as concerning the children which in regard of their years, cannot receive divine doctrine, they shall without delay be made worthy or partakers of baptism.*

That Gossips were appointed to all that were baptized as saith **Paulus Diaconus, Lib. 16 in Justiniano.** And it was the custom when the children of Princes and Potentates were baptized, that Bishops should be the Gossips. **Magd., cent. 6, p. 333.**

Maxentius

Maxentius saith that *children are not only adopted into a state of sonship, but have the remission of sin by baptism.* **Cent. , p. 227.**

Some Decrees Made in these Times against Anabaptists

In the fourth Later. Council Canons were made to banish the Anabaptists for heretics. **Twisk Chron. P. 164.** Felix, the 50th Bishop of Rome, ordained *that those that were baptized by the heretics should not be received into any spiritual office* and that they should be handled with all severity that were re-baptized. **Twisk, Chron. P. 164. Ex Plantina, fol. 91. Fascic. Temp. Fol. 112.**

Anabaptists to be Punished with Death

Theodosius and Honorius made and published the following Edict in the year 413, viz. *That the person re-baptized as well as the administrators should be punished with death.* **Sabast. Frank. Fol. 136, col. 3. Baronius Annals, p. 413, num. 6.**

Albanus, a zealous minister, eleven years after, was put to death with others, upon the said edict for baptizing of persons. **Twisk, Chron. L. 5, p. 149.**

The Anabaptists or Waldensian sect increasing in France and Spain, King Theodoricus in his fifteen year, called a Synod at Iierdin in Spain decreeing by many Bishops thus, viz.

Canon 6: *That those that have fallen by Anabaptism, the orders of the Nicean Synod should be imposed upon them, viz. That they should pray seven years among the catechumens and after that two years amongst the Catholics before they be admitted to the Eucharist.*

And Canon 14: *That none should so much as eat with the Anabaptists.* **Magd. Cent. 6, p. 468.**

One John Wouterez being accused for an Anabaptist, viz, one that was baptized again, denied the same saying he was never baptized but once when he was baptized after his profession of faith. That they called

the baptism of children, being a nullity, and no baptism. **Dutch Martyrology, lib. 2, p. 15. Hornbeck. Sum. Controv.**

All the aforementioned superstitions of the Romish Baptismal Rites were in use in this Age with this addition:

That lighted tapers were to be put into the hands of the baptized. **P. 332.**

The Temples or Churches, Altars and Relics in their dedications were christened by sprinkling water of conjuration upon them. **p. 369.**

The Uncleaness and Murders found at Monasteries

In this century, we meet with a dreadful piece of infants baptism, viz. The Heads of 6000 infants that had been murdered and buried in a warren near a Monastery as testified by Uldricus to P. Nicholas, **cent. 6, p. 388.**

Century VII

Various Canons

The Council of Toletanus instituted that *infants without natural capacity, should be baptized and that none should deny baptism to them at their peril.*

The Council of Constance ordained the same. **Magd. Cent. 7, p. 146.**

Isidorus saith that *if children were not baptized, and so thereby renewed and original sin washed away, they were in a state of damnation.* **P. 98.**

To the former ridiculous ceremonies now in use were added that *the names of saints departed or relations would be given to the baptized at their baptism. That none should be admitted to be Gossips without rehearsing the Lord's Prayer and the Creed. And that none of the Gossips might marry together because of the spiritual affinity and relation they had contracted at the Font.* **P. 147.**

At the consecration and dedication of Temples, the names of some angel or saint departed was to be given to them. A child that died unbaptized this Age was taken up and christened and had his father's name given him. **Magd. Cent. 7.**

Century VIII

Additional Decrees and Rites

Carolus Magnus declares that *baptism should be administered to infants as well as to the adult.* **Cent 8, p. 219.**

Daniel, in his epistle to Boniface, concludes that *infants should be baptized.* **P. 347.**

Bede also concludes *for the baptizing of infants.* **P. 218.**

To all the former continued superstitions there were added these:

1. That the administration be in the Latin tongue. **P. 384;**
2. That salt be used in Baptism. Aponius, l. 1, **p. 349;**
3. That the hair of the baptized be cut. **P. 350;**
4. That some gift was to be given in baptism which was to be called DEODANS. **P. 349;**
5. That Temples should be consecrated in the name of the Trinity. **P. 336.** Bells were posited in Temples in this Age.

Century IX

Sericus at large demonstrates that according to the custom of the church, little ignorant babes should be baptized. For which he sites the Decrees of the African Council by Pope Innocent, another of Pope Leo's and another of Pope Gregory's, at large. **Cent 9, p. 140, 141.**

Gizelbert saith that after baptism neither original nor actual sin remaineth. Who also calleth marriage a sacrament. **P. 171.**

To the former filthy customs the Ages added that of Exorcism and that the Head, ears and nose should be salted and anointed before baptism. **P. 235.**

To the former christening of Temples they added the pouring out of oil and anointing with holy chrism, singing Jacob's words *This is no other than the House of God. How dreadful is this place?* according to the 24th Canon of Aquensis. **Cent 9, p. 229.**

Century X

Smaragdus saith that little infants are to be baptized because it is said Suffer little children to come unto me and forbid them not, etc. Hence (saith he) the Holy Mother the Church doth beget the innocent infant into a holy and pure estate by the grace of baptism. **Cent 10, p. 188.**

Zonaras saith that the infants as well as the adult were to be baptized. **P. 292.** To the former wicked customs, they now added:

1. That the water of baptism should on Easterday be consecrated after this manner, viz. The Priest's hand should be stretched over the as Moses his hand was over the Red Sea;
2. The he should blow upon it;
3. hold a burning taper over it to answer they type of the fiery pillar;
4. that as they entered the Red Sea by night, so baptism should be administered in the evening. **P. 239.** The Gossips were to put on white garments as well as the Priests and the Baptized. **P. 299.** And as a further addition to the church christening, the Bishop was, before the water was brought to him, to strike the earth and then to pour down a great deal of water and then to name the church.

And further, it was in this Age that bells began also to be christened, which, from henceforward was most religiously observed.

Pope John the 14th was the first that baptized bells who christened the great bell of the Church of Lateran calling it John which was done to drive away evil spirits and to prevent any ill accident that might happen by lightning and tempest. **Magd. Cent 10, p. 295.**

Vossius

Vossius in his book **De Bapt., p. 158,** tells us that *though the more prudent did call this baptizing or christening of bells consecration, yet that they had most of the baptismal rites and ceremonies, both godfathers and godmothers, sprinkling, anointing, giving of names and great donations and that the silly women used to bring presents of coral, linen and other things and that they had a superstitious conceit that the sprinkling of that baptismal water procureth health unto the sick.*

Vossius also informeth us in the said book from good authority, that from Austin till Bernard's time, seven or eight-hundred years, *the custom was to baptize naked both men and women and children with the reasons usually given by the ancients for the same, viz. That they might therein be as in the state of innocency and be as naked in their second as in their first birth. And as they expected to be in heaven and therein no otherwise that Christ was upon the cross.* Which you may read at large in pages 31-36. Quoting these several authorities to justify it: **Cyril, Heir. Cat. Mystag, Amphilochius in vita S. Basil, Chrysostom Tom. 6.c.ii, Elias Cretensis in Orat. 4, Naz. Zeno Varonensis, Anselm on Matt 3, Ambros. Sermon 10, Bernard. Sermon 46, du Pauper, Greg. Mag. Tom. 2, col 269, Aleuinus in Divin. Off. Cap. 19, Chrys. Ep. As Innocent, etc.**

So, just was it with God to leave men that went a whoring after their own inventions (forsaking the word of God to embrace the traditions of man) to such unseemly and unnatural practices.

Yet is not **Mr. Baxter** ashamed to fix such an abominable slander upon the Baptists of this our Age of baptizing naked (which it seems was so long the real practice of the Paedobaptists) and about which he spends three whole pages in his **Scripture-Proof, viz. P136-138** to aggravate the heinousness of that their custom (which he is pleased to father upon them). And though I am persuaded he cannot but be convinced that the thing is most notoriously false and brought forth by him out of prejudice (not to say malice) rather than any proof or good testimony he ever received thereof. Yet have I never heard that he hath done himself his injured neighbors and the absurd world that right as to own his great weakness and sinful shortness therein in any of the many editions of that piece. Which, I humbly conceive, as well deserved a recantation as some other things he had judged worthy thereof.

Century XI

Anselm

Anselm asserts that children should be baptized and gives these reasons:

1. That the devil by the faith of the parent may be cast out of the children in baptism as the woman of Canaan in Matt 15: 21 had the devil cast out of her daughter. **P. 171**
2. That they may thereby be freed from original sin and be rendered saints and holy ones by baptism as they are owned to be, 1 Cor 7. **P. 171.**
3. That they may die to sin for they that are baptized into his death which he says is without exception for whosoever is baptized into Christ is baptized into his death.

Meginhardus

Meginhardus saith *if little infants or weak ones be brought to baptism, let them answer for them that bring them. And then let hands be laid upon them with holy chrism and so let the Eucharist be communicated to them.* **p. 168.**

Ivo saith that *the infants as well as the adult are to be baptized because of the faith of the sacrament.* **P. 260.**

The Latins of this Age did rebaptize the Greeks who disowned their baptism. **P. 263**
And the Greeks did excommunicate the Latins for renouncing theirs. P. 401

To the former superstitious Rites they added that salt should be put into the mouth of the baptized. **P. 261**
And to the christening of churches that salt should also be mixed with the water of execration.

The Waldenses did appear in this Age to witness against the Romish Superstitions and amongst the rest, that of the real presence in the Eucharist and baptizing of infants which you have at large hereafter with the opposition and persecution they met with for the same. They were called Beringarians from Beringarius, one of their chief leaders.

Century XII

Peter Lombard

Peter Lombard saith that *to the baptizing the adults their proper faith is required, but to the baptizing an infant, the faith of others sufficeth.* **Cent 12, p. 418.** And again, *Children are to be baptized because they are cleansed from original sin.* **P. 596.**

Bernard saith that *without baptism, children cannot be saved*. **P. 604**. And again, *As children of old were circumcised without or against their wills, for their salvation, so may they now be baptized*. **P. 599**.

Peter Cluniacensis, writing against Peter Bruis, one of the Waldensian Barbs who denied infants baptism, saith, **Lib. 1, Epis. 2**, *They who are not baptized with Christ's baptism cannot be Christians. And shall the children of the Jews be saved with the sacrament of circumcision and shall not the children of Christians be saved with the sacrament of Baptism?* **P.599**.

Heldigar saith that *as our little children that are not capable to feed themselves, have others to feed them, to keep them from temporal death, so is it with them in baptism, who being neither capable to believe or profess, having spiritual helps provided for them, that they may not want that spiritual food that may preserve them from eternal death*. **P. 602**.

Alexander the Third in his **Decretals, Lib. 3, tit. 40, c. 2** saith that *they who have any doubt concerning their baptism, may be baptized with these words: If thou art baptized, I do not baptize thee, but if thou beest not, I do baptize thee in the name of etc.*

The former ridiculous Rites were this Age observed with this addition:

Bernard saith to the dedication or right christening of churches, there must be aspersion, in junction, illumination, benediction and nomination. **P. 861**. And that if the Temple should come to be polluted by the Priests committing adultery in it, the sprinkling it afresh with holy water cleanseth it again. **Alex. L. 3, Decret. 5**.

The certain times wherein marriages were prohibited were from Septuagsima till Easter, from Rogation till Whitsontide and from Advent to Epiphany. Which were done by the Edict of Pope Clement as saith **Gigas, p. 919**.

The Waldenses were, in this Age, great witnesses to the baptizing of believers and as great opposers of infants baptism, called by the name of Petro-Brussians, Apostolics & Henerici. And for which they were great sufferers as hereafter. **Magd. P. 844-846**.

Century XIII

Thomas Aquinas

Thomas Aquinas saith *children are to be baptized not in their own proper faith, but in the faith of the Church*. **P. 419**. And again, *that they may be freed from original sin and condemnation*. **P. 422**.

Alexander

Alexander saith *baptism confers grace to little ones not only purging them from original sin, but by the merits of Christ's suffering, the faith of surety, but by the virtue of the sacrament*. **P. 426**.

Bonaventure

Bonaventure saith *If children die that are baptized before they come to years of discretion, they so receive grace by the faith of another that by Christ's merit they shall be saved. Which (he saith) is denied by certain cursed heretics*. **P. 419**.

Concurring hereto are several other Doctors of this Age as Hugo, p. 544, Gulielmo, **p. 419**, Albert, and the Decree of the Neomansian Synod, **594**, the Synod of Colonia, **938, 944**. But let these already mentioned suffice.

Tho. Aquinas saith *Though a Priest be the proper administrator of baptism, yet, in case of necessity, not only a Deacon, but a Lay person, yea a woman, nay an heretic or Pagan may baptize so be it the true form of the Church be observed and intend thereby what the Church intends*. **P. 419**.

All the abominable Rites before mentioned were in this Age observed with this following exposition upon them:

Gulielm saith that *the matter of the sacrament of confirmation is oil olive mixed with balsam and incorporated upon the fire called chrism and which can only be done by the hands of a Bishop. The form of which sacrament, he saith, is this, viz. I sign thee with the sign of the cross and confirm thee with the chrism of salvation in the name of the Father, Son and Holy Spirit, Amen. And which only a Bishop can administer.*

P. 417

Hugo saith *By exorcism the Devil is blown away.*

Albertus saith *By blowing an execration, the power of the Devil is expelled and being signed upon the breast and forehead with the sign of the cross, he is driven not only from the heart, but more visibly from the outward man. And that the salt is to be put into the mouth, the better to endue with spiritual savor and wisdom and that the ears and nose are to be anointed with spittle that grace and discretion from God may be conferred, which, because the spittle descends from the head that is thereby signified. And that the breast must be anointed to prepare the heart for God and the shoulders anointed to be enabled to bear*

God's burden.

After baptism, the neck must be anointed with chrism that the mind may be better disposed for God and holy contemplation which by chrism is signified being made of shining oil and healing sovereign balsam. They must be indued with white garments to hold for that innoceny which is received in baptism as well as the glory which they are to partake of at the resurrection. And a burning taper put into the hand that the word of God may be light a light to his feet.

Gulielmus saith that *as to the form of baptism, the virgin Mary is to be added to the Father, Son and Holy Spirit, viz. I baptize thee in the name of the Omnipotent Father, Son and Holy Spirit and the blessed Virgin Mary.* **P. 419.**

Thom. Saith there are seven sacraments, viz. Baptism, Confirmation, Eucharist, Penance, Extreme Unction, Order and Matrimony. Two whereof, viz. Baptism and the Eucharist were instituted by Christ and the other five by the Apostles, as Alexander. **P. 406.** Which seven sacraments were after confirmed by the Council of Trent with anathema to those who should deny them.

Pope Gregory X was the first in Anno 1271 granted tithes to the Churches. Those that opposed and witnessed against infants baptism and other Popish superstitions in this Age were the Albigenes and Ammonienses. **Magd. Cent. 13, p. 554,** etc.

Century XIV

Canons of the Council of Trent

That the baptizing of infants with all the Rites and ceremonies still continued especially in the Romish Church, we need not question when we read the Canons of the Council of Trent which was called on purpose to establish their old superstitions and idolatries so to suppress the light and truth that especially did shine in the Empire. In which Council which ended 1564, we have the following Canons:

It was decreed *that they who shall deny baptism to young children from their mothers' wombs for the taking away original sin, LET THEM BE ACCURSED. Os. Cent. 16, c. 60, 380.*

In the 7th Session about baptism in the 13th Canon it was decreed: *That whosoever puts not young baptized children amongst the faithful or saith, they must be re-baptized at the years of discretion, or that it is better to omit their baptism till then, LET THEM BE ACCURSED.*

And in the 14th Canon it was decreed: *that whosoever shall say that baptized children when they come to age ought not to be enjoined to ratify the promise made in their name, but to be left to their will if they refuse, not compelling them to Christian life, but denying them other ordinances, LET THEM BE ACCURSED.*

In the 3 Canons about confirmation it was decreed: *That whosoever said it was an idle ceremony, not a sacrament properly, or that it was formerly used that children might give an account of their faith. That to*

give virtue to chrism was to wrong the Holy Spirit, that every simple Priest is the ordinary minister for confirmation and not the Bishop only, **LET THEM BE ACCURSED. Os. Cent 16, page 417.**

And as a standing rule to justify themselves in the determinations, they conclude and decree that *their traditions should be observed Pari Pietatis affectu with the same pious affection with the Holy Scriptures.*

A Blasphemous Decree

In that instrument called the Interim, that decretal of Charles the Fifth, made till the Council's Canons could be perfected, it was determined that *young children by the faith and confession of the sureties should be baptized. And that all ancient ceremonies that pertained to the sacrament of baptism should be continued as exorcism and chrism, etc. Osiander, p. 482.*

Princes of Germany Complain to the Pope

Among the many Antichristian oppressions the Princes of Germany exhibited to the Pope from their convention of Nuremberg, they complained of that of baptizing of bells wherein they say, *The suffragans have invented that no other but only themselves may baptize bells for the lay people. Whereby the simple people upon their affirmation, do believe that such bells so baptized will drive away evil spirits and tempests. Whereupon a great number of Godfathers are appointed, especially such as are rich, which at the time of baptizing, holding the rope wherewithal the bell is tied, the suffragan speaking before them as is accustomed in the baptizing of young children, they all together do answer and give the name to the bell. The bell having a new garment put upon it, as is accustomed to be done to the Christians, after this they go to sumptuous feasts whereunto also the Gossips are bidden that thereby they may give the greater reward to the suffragans, their chaplains and ministers. Whereby it happeneth oft times that even in a small village an hundred Florins are consumed in such christenings which is not only superstitious, but contrary to Christian religion, a seducing of the simple people and mere extortion. Wherefore such wicked, unlawful things are to be abolished. Fox's Acts and Monum. P. 990.*

Pope Pius' Ridiculous Act

Pope Pius the Fifth baptized the Duke of Alva's standard and called it Margaret. **Dr. Morison De Depra. Bel. P. 24.**

The German Protestants about Infants Baptism

The Lutherans in their Augustan Confession made 1530 do declare: *that baptism is necessary to salvation. That God's grace is conferred thereby. That children ought to be baptized who by baptism are dedicated and received in to the grace and favor of God, condemning the Anabaptists who deny baptism to children and who affirm that children without baptism may be saved. Osiand. Cent 16, p. 153.*

The Smalkald Articles

In the Smalkald Articles, 1536, the Lutherans say *concerning infants, we teach that they are to be baptized forasmuch as they do belong to the promised redemption made by Jesus Christ, the Church ought to baptize and to declare the promise to them. Osiand., 16, p. 278.*

The Mumpelgarten Conference

In the Conference between the Calvinists and Lutherans at Mumpelgarten, 1529, it was agreed that *baptism came in the room of circumcision and that the children of the Christians are to be baptized. Osiand. P. 1020.*

Though about the ground of baptizing them they differed. The Lutherans affirming that *they had a proper and peculiar faith to entitle them thereto*. The Calvinists asserting they had none, *but ought to be baptized by virtue of the faith of the parent in covenant*.

The Book of Concord

In the Book of Concord, 1580, by the Lutherans, they agree that *the tenets of the Anabaptists are to be renounced that say infants are not to be baptized because they have no use of reason*. Osiander **p. 254**.

The English Protestants about Infants Baptism

In the Reformation begun in Edward the Sixth's time, about 1549, the Form of Worship and Administration of the Sacraments with all their Rites and Ceremonies were held forth in the English Liturgy as it was translated out of the Latin Mass book concerning which we have this account from **Mr. Fox in his Martyrology, p. 1499**.

That in the rising in Devonshire, upon the translating the Latin mass book into English, the King writes after this manner to quiet them, viz.

As for the service in the English tongue, perhaps it seemeth to you as new service when indeed it is no other but the old. The self-same words in English which were in Latin saving a few things taken out, so fond, that it hath been a shame to have heard them in English as all they can judge that list to repeat the truth. And if it was good in Latin, it remaineth good in English. For nothing is altered, but to speak with knowledge what was spoken with ignorance, etc.

Wherein the Time, Order, Manner and Ceremony of baptizing of infants is directed and enjoined with all the rites appertaining thereto.

In the said service book, in the Rubric before the Catechism, it is said that *children being baptized, have all things necessary for their salvation and be undoubtedly saved*. And therefore after baptism, the priest must say *We yield the hearty thanks that it hath pleased thee to regenerate this infant with thy Holy Spirit*. And the child is afterwards to be instructed when he comes to understanding, to say, *that herein he was made a member of Christ, and a child of God and an inheritor of the Kingdom of Heaven*. Just comporting length and breadth with Pope Innocent's first Canons.

Article 27 of the Church of England

In the 27th Article of the Church of England, it is said that *the baptizing of young children is in any wise to be retained in the Church as most agreeable to the institution of Christ*. Made in Queen Elizabeth's time, 1562.

The Scottish Service Book

In the Scottish Service Book, imposed in the beginning of the late War, it is said that *as oft as new water is put into the Font, the priest shall say, Sanctify this fountain of baptism, Oh, thou which art the sanctifier of all things*.

The Directory

The Directory in the Parliament's time leaves out Gossips and signing with the sign of the cross, changes the Fonts into Basins. And the Parliament's Ordinance, May 2, 1648, made it imprisonment to affirm infants baptism unlawful and that such should be baptized again. **Mr. Marshal informs us out of Phocius,**

p. 3334, that some of the Greek Churches have laws that whatsoever baptized persons refused to bring their children and wives too, to be baptized, should be anathematized and punished also.

At Zurich, as **Dr. Featly tells us out of Gassius, p. 68**, the Senate made an Act that if any presumed to rebaptize, viz. To baptize any that had been baptized in their infancy, that they should be drowned and that at Vienna many for baptizing such were so tied together in chains that they drew the other after him in the River wherein they were all drowned.

And that at Roplestein, the Lords of that place decreed that such should be burned with a hot iron and bear the base brands of those Lords in whose lands they had so offended. And **p. 182** out of **Ponton Catalog**. Through Germany, Alsatia and Swedeland, many thousands of this sect who defiled their first baptism by a second were baptized the third time in their own blood.

Chapter III

Wherein the Erroneous Grounds, both as to Fabulous Traditions and Mistaken Scriptures, upon which Infants Baptism hath been both formerly and laterly founded, is made manifest.

The first and principal ground that hath been asserted for this practice hath been ecclesiastical and apostolical tradition. For, however (as hath been said) the scripture is so silent in the case, yet the clear, full and uninterrupted tradition of the Church makes up that defect to which the Church of Rome and some others have adhered. Though many Protestants since the reformation have chosen to fly to some consequential arguments deduced, as they suppose, from the scriptures, to justify the same.

Both which, in this chapter, are brought forth and duly weighed in the balance of the truth.

The first we shall examine is the point of tradition. And therein do these two things: first, show that it hath primarily been asserted to be the ground thereof. Secondly, the insufficiency of the authorities that have been urged to prove the same.

Tradition the Principle Ground of Infants Baptism

That tradition hath principally been leaned upon as the main ground of the practice you have the following instances:

Austin

Austin tells us that *the custom of our mother church in baptizing little infants is no to be despised, nor to be judged superstitious, nor to be believed at all unless it were an apostolical tradition.* **Lib 10, De Gen. C. 23.** And again in his 4th book **against Donatists, chap. 24**, saith that *if there be any that do inquire for a divine authority for the baptizing of children, let them know that what the universal church holds, nor was instituted in Councils, but always retained, is most rightly believed to have been delivered by no other than apostolical authority.*

Chrysostom

Chrysostom saith that *infants ought to be baptized as universally received by the Catholic Church to take away original sin.* **Magd. Cent. 4.**

Bellarmino

Bellarmino, Tom. 1, l. 4, c. 2, saith that *the baptism of infants is an apostolical tradition not written, because, saith he, it is not written in any apostolical book though written, he saith, in the books of almost all the ancients. And which tradition of the Apostles, saith he, is of no less authority with us than the scriptures.*

The Council of Trent

In the Council of Trent, after they had, in the 5th and 7th sessions made those Canons about infants baptism, before mentioned, do conclude that their traditions touching the same should be received *pari pietatis affectu*, with the same piou affection with the Holy Scriptures, as you have it. **P. 144.**

The Council of Basil

In the Council of Basil in the oration of the Cardinal of Ragusi, it is asserted that *in the beginning of this sacrament of baptism, they only were to be baptized who could by themselves answer interrogatories concerning their faith. And that it was no where read in the Canon of Scripture that a new born infant was baptized who could neither believe with the heart to justification, nor confess with the mouth to salvation. Yet nevertheless, saith he, the Church hat appointed it.*

Eckius

Eckius against the Lutherans writes that *the ordinance concerning the baptism of children is without scripture and is found to be only a custom of the Church. And in his Enchiridion calleth it a commandment and ordinance of man and that it is not to be proved out of the scripture.*

And the ground and reason why they do so firmly own this truth to the Protestants upon that subject is but the better to enforce and introduce their many other traditions there being nothing else for that.

But whereas some object that Bellarm. and others do bring scripture for it, **Becan., Lib 1, c. 2, sect. 24,** answers that *some things may be proved out of scripture. When the Church's sense is first heard about the interpretation thereof, for so, he saith, it is concerning infants baptism which is proved from John 3:5 Except a man be born of water and the Spirit, etc. But the sense whereby to prove it is only manifest by tradition.* And it is confirmed in the Canon-Law and Schoolmen that infants baptism was not reckoned perfect until the Bishop had laid on his hands which was called confirmation, viz. Of the imperfect baptism in infancy. And therefore saith Caistans secundum Jewel, *that an infant wanting instruction in the faith hath not perfect baptism, Tom. Prec. P. 86. Dr. Field, l. 4, p. 375* saith that *infants baptism is therefore called a tradition because it is not expressly delivered in the Scriptures that the Apostles did baptize infants or that they should do so.*

The Oxford Divines, in a full convocation, Jan. 1647, say that *without the consentaneous judgment and practice of the universal church, they should be at a loss when they are called upon for proof in the point of baptizing infants,* Mr. Tombs.

Dr. Prideaux, Controv. Theol. Sect. 392, *infants baptism, saith he, rests upon no other divine right than Episcopacy, viz. Diocesan Episcopacy in use in these Nations.*

Mr. Baxter in Defense of the Principles of Love, p. 7, saith that *the Anabaptists are godly men that differ from us in a point so difficult that many of the Papists and Prelatists have maintained that it is not determined in scripture, but dependeth upon the tradition of the Church. (Though, he saith, he is of another mind himself.)*

To which many more might be added to prove to you that apostolical tradition, for want of scripture, hath been urged as the principal and first ground of this practice. And not only for this, but for all other Rites and Ceremonies as well those that have been already declared as Chrism, exorcism, consignation and innumerable more, as those that have not yet been heard of or declared. For as a late learned Author excellently observes *that the Papists, in point of tradition, do herein very much exceed the Jews, those Old Tradition-mongers who so made void the Law of God in their days by it. For they tell us plainly that now their whole oral law is written and that they have no reserve of authentic traditions not yet declared. But here the Romanists, saith he, fail us for although they have given us heaps upon heaps of their traditions, yet they plead that they have still an inexhaustible treasure of them laid up in their church stores and breast of their holy father to be drawn forth at all times as occasion shall require. And which principle hath been the means of their apostasy and is the great engine whereby they are rendered incurable therein. Dr. Owen, his Proleg. P. 67.*

Dr. Taylor argues so fully and strenuously upon this point of tradition that I cannot pass him by, who saith *tradition by all means must supply the place of scripture and there is pretended a tradition apostolical that infants were baptized. But at this (saith he) we are not much moved, for we who rely upon the written word of God as sufficient to establish all true religion, do not value the allegation of tradition. And however the world goes, none of the Reformed Churches can pretend this argument for their opinion, because they who reject tradition when it is against them, must not pretend it in the least fro them, but if we allow the topic to be good, yet how will we be verified? For so far as can yet appear, it relies wholly upon the testimony of Origen for from him Austin had it. Now a tradition apostolical, if it be not consigned with a fuller testimony than of one person, whom all other Ages have condemned of other errors, and whose works saith Erasmus are so spurious that he that reads them is uncertain whether he read Origen or Ruffinus; therefore, will obtain so little reputation amongst those who know that things have upon greater authority been pretended to be received from the Apostles, but falsely, that it will be a great argument that he is ridiculous and weak that shall be determined by so weak probation in matters of so great concernment. But, besides that, the tradition cannot be proved to be apostolical. We have very good evidence from antiquity that it was the opinion of the primitive church that infants ought not to be baptized which, saith he, is clear in the Canon of the Council of Neocaesaria. Which he mentions at large in the original Greek determining that none ought to be baptized without giving an account of their faith and desiring the same. Thus far Dr. Taylor.*

The Traditions for Infants Baptism are Fabulous

In the next place, we shall give you some account of the insufficiency and weakness, if not the wickedness of those first authorities that have been leaned upon to prove this practice to be an apostolical tradition and which appearing fabulous, all others depending upon the same. Necessarily fall to the ground. Whereof you have four or five of the principal of them and which may be useful to the Protestants whatever they are to the Papists, viz.

The first and earliest we meet with to prove infants baptism to be an apostolical tradition is that of Dionysis the Areopagite, mentioned already, **p. 109** and quoted by **Bellarmino, tom. 3, lib. 8**. Cassander in his book De Bapt. And many other learned Papists, for authentic proof that infants baptism was apostolical, out of his Ecclesiastical Hierarchy, etc. But that this was a piece of forgery put upon the world may yet further more fully appear to you in that which followeth, viz.

Dionysis the Areopagite

This Dionysis the Areopagite living at Athens, who, some will have to be Bishop of Corinth, though Eusebius calls him Bishop of Athens (for you must know according to Eusebius and Dorotheus, all men of name in the New Testament, must be Bishops of some place or other and therefore they can tell you not only the names of the seventy Disciples, but what Bishoprics each did belong unto). Now this Person being an Athenian must be supposed to be a learned Greek philosopher and therefore upon none more fitly, in this Age could be fathered all those philosophical tracts that are put upon him. And amongst which you have two of most eminency, viz. His Heirarchy of Angels wherein you have the orders, ranks, dignities, names and offices of the angels and arch-angels (a profound piece no doubt.)

The other his Ecclesiastical Hierarchy wherein the consecrations, orders, offices and ranks of the inferior angels, viz. The Priests, Friars, Monks, Bishops, Arch-Bishops and Popes are methodically treated and handled. As also divers Rites and Ceremonies discussed amongst which that of infants baptism is asserted to be an ancient apostolical tradition which he declares he received from his Praefectors together with various ceremonies that according to like apostolic authority are confirmed as an appendix thereto, viz. Gossips or Sureties, chrisem, or the anointing cream, exorcism or sufflation, viz. a blowing used in baptism whereby the Devil was to be blown away, consignation or the signing the baptized with the sign of the cross, confirmation or Bishoping the baptized children, afterwards to complete his imperfect baptism by laying on of hands, Albes or white garments for the baptized, Baptisterions or large fonts to be placed in the Temples, Altars also for the Eucharist and several other things which he affirms to have been in use in the Apostles' days.

And this is one of the first authorities that Father Bellarmine and others of them give us for the proof of this apostolical institution and which must be received with equal authority to the Holy Scriptures (and a very convincing one, no doubt) concerning which though if there was nothing but the bare repetition thereof, it may sufficiently detect the cheat. The lies being so gross, so ill made, and laid together that every common understanding may easily perceive the juggle. For how absurdly ridiculous is it to say that Paul or his Praefectors should acquaint him that it was an ancient apostolical tradition? If it had been true, Paul might have told him it had been new, but by no means in those days an old apostolical tradition. And to tell the world of Baptisterions and altars in Temples, when no such things as Temples for Christian worship, for above 200 years after. And also of those other impious fooleries that were not known nor heard of for some Ages after, so strangely, by God's providence, were they insatuated, to come forth with such ridiculous madness to detect their own folly. And to testify that this was to be that interest that should appear with all deceivableness of unrighteousness.

Which horrid cheat you have very convincingly discovered and detected by learned men. And besides those already mentioned, p. 110, in the first chapter, you have the **Magdeburgenses, cent.1, l. 2, p. 625, 626 and Cent. 4, p. 420, 554, & 1129**. Also by Perkins, Reynolds, Rivet, proving by many arguments it was wholly spurious and supposititious and that it could not, from many considerations, be written in those times took any notice of it and that Austin himself went not higher than Origen and which wretched forgery is excellently detected in 39 arguments by the learned Dailly, a late renowned Protestant writer in France, in his book called *De Scriptis*.

Justin Martyr's Responses the Second Supposed Proof

A second proof leaned upon to verify the truth of its apostolicalness is that of Justin Martyr's responses, especially to the 56th question before mentioned, **p. 111 and Chap. 2**. Which many of the aforesaid authors do detect to be spurious also as Perkins, Rivet and others. Yea and many of the very Papists themselves do disown the same as ridiculous forasmuch as Origen and the Manichees are mentioned therein that were not in being for so long time after. And concerning which responses, **Mr. Baxter himself, in his Plain Scripture Proof, p. 155**, is pleased to tell us that as to that of Justin Martyr to the 56th question. He *would not insist upon it, because though the place be most express for infants baptism* (for when the Friars hand was in, he would do it to a hair's breadth) *and the book ancient, yet that it was either spurious or interpolate*.

The Third Supposed Proof are the Various Papal Decrees

A third ancient proof urged in confirmation hereof is the decretals and institutions of several Popes in this second century, viz. Pope Clement for chrism, consignation and confirmation, and secondly Pope Hyginnus for gossips, chrism and dedication of churches. Upon whose authority Mr. Baxter lays so much stress that he prints it in the front of his Scripture-Proofs amongst other of the ancients and boastingly calls for as good proof from antiquity against infants baptism concluding that gossips could not be but for infants baptism. Though Gratian, as **L. Osiander** gives them, are otherwise, **Cent 2, l. 2, c. 5**, viz. *In catechism, in baptism and in confirmation, if necessity require, there may be one surety* (or gossip as usually rendered) *infants being not so much as mentioned*, having, it seems, gossips (as hereafter you will find) in other Rites, as well as in baptism and for men and women as well as children.

Thirdly, Pope Victor for confining baptism to Easter. Fourthly, Pope Pius for baptisterions. The spuriousness of all which decretals is learnedly by Osiander, Perkins, Rivet, etc. detected. And to whom I shall add what I find in **Mr. Fox in his Martyrology, Vol. 1, p.75** who speaking of these decretals, saith judiciously, if not prophetically, viz. *Most lamentable it is that the falsifying of such trifling traditions under the false pretenses of antiquity either was begun in the church to deceive the people, or that it hath remained so long undetected. For* (saith he) *I think the church of God will never be perfectly reformed before these decretal constitutions and epistles which have so long put on the vizard of antiquity shall be fully detected and appear in their colors wherein they were first painted*.

And concerning which the **Magdeburgenses** very excellently, **Cent 2, p. 111**, *that if it should be taken for granted that all this was true as is expressed in those decretals of these Roman Bishops, then what could be*

more certain than that even now the mystery of iniquity began to work in the Church of Rome in their so corrupting and contaminating the simple form of baptism, concerning which, nothing is so much as mentioned of in any other church.

Origen the Fourth Supposed Proof

The next testimony that is alleged for authentic proof in the case is that of **Origen** in the third century and on which there is so much stress laid by Austin and others. For from him, saith Dr. Taylor, he only had his proof of apostolic tradition for as yet, it seems, the former testimonies had not seen the sun. His words are these taken out of his Fifth Book in **his Homilies on Romans 6**. *Viz. The church received a tradition from the Apostles to give baptism to children.*

But whether this testimony ought any more to be regarded than the former, let these following considerations determine.

And first, it is to be considered that if this was Origen's own, as it is asserted out of his supposed Homilies upon Lev. And the Rom. (it being mentioned in both) yet that is but one single testimony in the case as Dr. Taylor well observes before, and that against so much positive witness to the contrary, who with one mouth do testify that none but the adult were either in the Apostles' times or the next centuries after baptized. Secondly, his writings, or at least those that are fathered upon him, are so notoriously corrupt and erroneous, as the **Magdeburgenses** do affirm in **Cent. 3, p. 262, 263, etc.**, and whereof they give several instances, viz. that he was not only very heretical and blasphemous about Christ, asserting two Christs and denying his Godhead, who was (as Epiphanius saith) the very head of the Arians, but as Jerom saith, holding very desperately about the Spirit and very corruptly about angels, devils, creation, providence, original sin, church government and the resurrection, a fearful allegorizer of scripture, but desperately erroneous about baptism itself, viz. first, *that the very act itself of baptizing in water, merits the Spirit*. Secondly, *that in that very act, all sin is taken away*. Thirdly, *that it enables to keep the whole law*. Fourthly, *that there is to be a baptism after the resurrection to purge away sin and that the baptized ought to be signed with the sign of the cross*. And upon the 5th of Matt saith *Peter by promise ought to be the foundation of the church*. And upon Luke 17 that *Peter was the Prince of the Apostles*. Whose writings wherefore (for a great part of them) for their corruption were impugned and rejected by Jerom and others. Yea, and not only several of the Greek fathers as Alexandrinus, Epiphanius, Theophilus, Cyrenius and others, but by some Greek Councils too as appears by the Magd., Eusebius and others. So that we may say of Origen, if these indeed were his own, as the Magd. Say of the former decretals, that they bespoken him an earlier factor for Antichrist and that the mystery of iniquity did word strongly in him. But what appears in the next consideration may give us to hope better of him.

But thirdly, and more especially, it is to be observed that many of Origen's works fell into ill hands and particularly those Homilies of Lev. And the Romans, if indeed there were any such, which Mr. Perkins and others doubt, because no Greek copies thereof have been extant and of which **Vossius in his book De Baptismo** saith *Sed de Origine minus laborabimus, quia que citabimus Graece non extant*. There being only a corrupt Latin piece called a translation of Ruffinus who ingenuously confesseth that he took so much liberty in his translation as to add and alter at his pleasure which gives Erasmus so much occasion to say that you know not when you read Origen and when Ruffinus. And therefore are those Homilies rejected as spurious and put by Perkins and others amongst his counterfeit works. And well they may if you consider the story the **Magdeburgs** tell us of this Ruffinus and his way of translation and writing of which I shall take the freedom to give you a brief account as I find it in **Cent. 4, c. 10, p. 1201, etc.** That you may better understand what trade was driven of this kind and what fine merchants we have to deal with about this Romish trash.

The History of Ruffinus and His Forgeries

This Ruffinus, you must know, lived about the latter end of the fourth century. He was an Italian Monk of Aquila, a wicked, though witty, learned man who went away with a famous Roman Curtezian into Asia and sojourned at Jerusalem with her above thirty years. At first a great friend and companion of Jerom's, but afterwards, when Jerom discovered his wickedness, especially in his abusing Origen's works, many whereof

he translated out of Greek into Latin, sophisticating them at his pleasure, and for which, and for several bastardly pieces he brought forth, Jerom, Anastasius and others write several pieces to detect and reprove him. Several corrupt heretical treatises he wrote and fathered upon others, viz. one containing diverse corrupt tenets of Origen he fathered upon Pamphilia a Martyr who lived about the third century, the better to put it of in the Martyr's name. Another whence the unity of the Priesthood ariseth, and that upon Peter the Church is founded, with much more such stuff, which the Magdeburgenses have collected out of his book called **De Ordine in Ecclesia, Cent. 3, c. 4, p. 84**. A violent impugner of Priest's marriages, **p. 86**. In his sermon of Alms, concludes, that sins committed after baptism were done away by alms and good works, **p. 80**. And again, that as water extinguisheth fire, so doth alms extinguish sin, **p. 81**.

And concerning baptism itself, very absurdly corrupt, saying that the water ought first to be consecrated by a Priest to make it more efficacious to take away sin. That the person baptizing conferred the Holy Spirit and the baptized was inwardly sanctified thereby. That chrism or anointing the baptized was absolutely necessary, **p. 82**.

That exorcisms were also necessary to drive away the Devil. That baptism should be done in Temples and that the kiss should be given by the Priest to the baptized infant and that sprinkling might serve instead of dipping, **p. 125**.

By all which you may understand that either Cyprian had been vilely ruffined and these things fathered upon him, or that he himself was a notable factor for Antichrist and that in him the mystery of iniquity did very strongly work.

But we could rather believe that these things were sorted into his writings by that villainous cursed generation that so horribly abused the writings of most of the ancient writers as appears by the Index Expurgatorius and who durst venture upon any forgery how impious soever for the benefit of the holy church, witness that impudent fable as Osiander calls it, of the baptism of Constantine before mentioned in the fourth century in the first chapter, part 2.

Thus you have the principal authorities urged for apostolical tradition, proved, forged, and fabulous. And what doth more refute that fond conceit of the uninterrupted tradition so much boasted of, to prove this practice than the testimony of Justin Martyr gives that the believers were in his days the only subjects of baptism? And the witness Tertullian gives against infants baptism in the third century and the advice that Nazianzen gives to defer it. The Decrees of so many Councils to that purpose and especially so many eminent Christians in the fourth century that did not baptize their children till they could give an account of their faith as hath been before so learnedly observed by Dailly, Grotius, Dr. Barlow, Dr. Taylor and others and which I humbly conceive are unanswerable arguments against it.

Objection

But 'tis said that by Tertullian's opposing it, it may seem that there were some that practiced it in the third century and can it be supposed that any did so except it had been warranted by such apostolical tradition?

Answer

It is granted Tertullian did oppose it, but who it was that asserted it and whether upon any such account, as supposed, is not mentioned. If any do affirm, it will be on their part to prove the one and the other. The Magdeburgenses and others, as you have heard, do tell us that *they meet with no instance of any that either practiced this or any other of these inventions fathered also upon apostolical tradition as chrism, exorcism, consignation, etc. in that Age*. But 'tis said *If they did, it would demonstrate especially in the practice of the latter that the Mystery of Iniquity did then begin to work in so corrupting that ordinance of Christ and had they not as good ground to do the one as the other?*

Whereby that word of prophesy 2 Thes. 3 concerning the taking place of the Mystery of Iniquity was so much fulfilled which was to come on *with all deceivableness of unrighteousness and with strong delusions to believe lies* and which in nothing more appears than in this very thing, having not only forged so many lies about it, but imposed their lies to be believed by others. As their forefathers, the Priests of old, that hired the

soldiers to tell a lie about the body of Christ and then imposed that their lie to be believed to delude others. Matt 28: 12-15.

The consideration whereof may, I hope, be of use to Protestants, though as to the hardened and deluded Papists, they are, as well observed before, utterly incurable herein.

Scripture Grounds for Infants Baptism *examined*

In the next place, we come to examine the scripture grounds urged for the practice and to envince that they have been no less mistaken in their scriptural, than in their ecclesiastical authorities to found upon it. Whereof we shall give you an account of some of the principal and leave you to judge of the rest.

Scripture Canon for Infants Baptism

Matt 19:14

The first we shall mention is that which was called (of old) the scripture canon for infants baptism and upon which much stress hath been laid since to prove the same, viz. Matt. 19:14 *Suffer little children to come to me and forbid them not for to such belongs the Kingdom of Heaven.* But may we not well say how doth baptism come to be concerned in this text except it can be made out that blessing was baptizing. And to which **Dr. Taylor** hath spoken so fully for us that I need say no more, **p. 230.** Who saith *From the action of Christ's blessing infants, to infer, that they were baptized, proves nothing so much as that there is a want of better arguments. For the conclusion would, with more probability, be derived thus: Christ blessed children and so dismissed them, but baptized them not; therefore, infants are not to be baptized.* But let this be as weak as its enemy. Yet that Christ did not baptize them is an argument sufficient that he hath other ways of bringing them to heaven than by baptism. He passed an act of grace upon them by benediction and imposition of hands. And therefore, although neither infants, nor any man, in puris naturalibus, can attain to a supernatural end without the addition of some instrument or means of God's appointing, ordinarily and regularly, yet where God hath not appointed a rule, nor an order, as in the case of infants, we contend he hath not, the argument is invalid.

And as we are sure God hath not commanded infants to be baptized, so we are sure God will do them no injustice, nor damn them for what they cannot help, viz. if the parent baptize them not.

Many thousand ways there are by which God can bring any reasonable soul to him, but nothing is more unreasonable than because he hath tied all men of years and discretion to this way, therefore we of our own heads shall carry infants to him that way without his direction. The conceit is poor and low and the action consequent to it is bold and venturous. Let him do what he pleases with infants, we must not.

John 3:5

A second scripture that hath been much leaned upon is that of John 3:5 *Except a man be born of water and the Spirit, he can in no wise enter into the Kingdom of God.* From whence it is concluded that there is no other way to regenerate and save infants and add them to the church, but by baptism and therefore have they baptized them as the Canons and Decretals of Popes and the opinions of the ancients do demonstrate. But the consequences drawn from hence, to infer the baptizing and saving of infants, savors so much ignorance and Popish darkness, that we need say little to it. For since the reformation, most of the Protestants have protested against this as erroneous. Yet for the sake of others that yet cleave to it, saying, that in analogy hereto, children are hereby made members of Christ, children of God and inheritors of the Kingdom of Heaven. I shall refer them to **Bish. Taylor** for solution whose words will have more weight than anything I can say in the case. Who in **p. 231** calls such a sense of the words a prevaricating of Christ's precepts. *For, saith he, the water and the Spirit in this place signify the same thing and by water is meant the effect of the Spirit cleansing and purifying the soul as it appears in its parallel place of Christ's baptizing with the Spirit and with fire. For although this was literally fulfilled in the day of Pentecost, yet morally there is more in it.*

For it is the sign of the effect of the Holy Ghost and his productions upon the soul. And you may as well conclude that infants must also pass through fire as through the water. And that we may not think this a trick to elude the pressure of this place, Peter saith the same thing. For where he had said That baptism saves us, he adds by way of explication (not washing away of the filth of the flesh, but the answer of a good conscience towards God) plainly saying that it is not water or the purifying of the body, but the cleansing of the Spirit that doth that which is supposed to be the effect of baptism.

But suppose it means external baptism, yet this no more infers a necessity of infants baptism, than the other words of Christ infer a necessity to give them the holy communion, John 6: 53. Except you eat the flesh of the Son of Man and drink his blood, you have no life in you. And yet we do nor think these words a sufficient argument to communicate them. If men therefore will do us justice, either let them give both sacraments to infants, as some Ages of the church did, or neither. For the wit of man is not able to show a disparity in the sanction or in the energy of its expression. And therefore they were honest that understood the obligation to be parallel and performed it accordingly and yet because we say they were deceived in one instance, and yet the obligation (all the world cannot reasonably say but) is the same, they are honest and as reasonable that do neither. And sure the ancient church did with an equal opinion of necessity give them the communion and yet men now adays do not. Why should men be more burdened with a prejudice and a name of obliquity for not giving the infants one sacrament more than you are disliked for not affording them the other? And farther, p. 242. If we must suppose grace to be effected by the external work of the sacrament alone, how doth this differ from the modus operandum of the Papists save that it is worse. For they say the sacrament doth not produce its effects, but in a subject disposed by all requisites and due preparatives of piety, faith and repentance though in a subject so disposed, they say, the sacrament by its own virtue doth it. But this opinion says it doth it of itself without the help or so much as the coexistence of any condition, but the mere reception.

Mr. Baxter, to this point, **p. 306 of his Plain Scripture Proof**, that baptism in itself can work no such cause. Or the water is not a subject capable of receiving grace or of conveying it to the soul. It cannot approach or touch the soul, nor infuse grace into it if it could.

Amerius, in Bel. Enervat. Tom. 3, l. 2, c. 3: *Outward baptism, saith he, cannot be a physical instrument of the infusing of grace, because it hath it not in any wise in itself.*

Zwinglius denieth baptism of itself worketh any grace or pardoneth sin, or reneweth, as **Tom. 2, p. 119121.**

Dr. Owen in his Theolog. L. 6, c. 5, p. 477 upon the point, saith that *the father of lies himself could not easier have invented a more pernicious opinion or which might pour in a more deadly poison in to the minds of sinners.*

Mark 16:16

A third scripture insisted on is the commission itself, Mark 16:16. *He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved.* But infants are believers therefore according to the commission they are to be baptized. In which though all parties (owning infants baptism) agree, yet how they do believe, and what faith this is there is great confusion and contradiction amongst themselves, viz. the ancients said they had the faith of the sacrament as Austin, the Papists the faith of the church, as Thomas Aquinas which is entailed to all within the pale thereof. The Lutherans say they have a proper faith which they hotly defended at the conference with the Calvinists at Montpelgart and therefore baptize all whether the parents be good or bad. The Calvinists say they have an imputative faith from the parent in covenant, as Musculus, Oecolampadius and others at that conference maintained and therefore baptize only the children of believers.

The Prelatic Protestants affirm they have the faith of the gossip or surety, but none of their own as the Com. Catechism tells us. Most of the Non-conformists do agree with the Calvinists that it is an imputative faith from the parent or pro-parent in covenant. **Mr. Baxter**, in his **Right to Sacraments**, as before saith they have a justifying and **Mr. Blake**, his Opposite, allows but a dogmatic faith. Some say it is physical, some a metaphysical and some a hyperphysical faith. Some saying, as before, that baptism is an instrument to convey real grace to infants, some say to all, as **Mr. Bedford** and others.; some only to the elect, as **Dr. Burges**. And thus you see they are not agreed in their verdict, nor who shall speak for them. But for an answer hereto, I shall again refer you to **Dr. Taylor, p. 240** speaking so much my mind and the truth herein, viz. *Whether*

infants have faith or no is a question (saith he) to be disputed by persons that care not how much they say and how little they prove.

First, personal and actual faith they have none for they have no acts of understanding and besides, how can any man know that they have since he never saw any sign of it, neither was he told so by any that could tell? Secondly, some say they have imputative, but then how so let the sacrament be too, that is, if they have the parents' faith or the church's, then so let baptism be imputed also by derivation from them and as in their mother's womb, and while they hang on their mother's breasts, they live upon their mother's nourishment, so they may upon the baptism of their parents or their mother the church. For since faith is necessary to the susception of baptism (and they themselves confess it by striving to find out new kinds of faith to daub the matter up) such as the faith, such must be the sacraments for there is no proportion between an actual sacrament and an imputative faith, this being in immediate and necessary order to that. And whatsoever can be said to take off from the necessity of actual faith, all that and much more may be said to excuse from the actual susception of baptism. The first of these devices was that of Luther and his scholars, the second of Calvin and his and yet there is a third device which the Church of Rome teaches and that is, that infants have habitual faith, but who told them so? How can they prove it? What revelation or reason teacheth any such thing? Are they by this habit so much as disposed to an actual belief without a new master? Can an infant sent into Mahumetan Province be more confident for Christianity when he comes to be a man than if he had not been baptized? Are there any acts precedent concomitant or consequent to this pretended habit? This strange invention is absolutely without art without scripture, reason or authority. But the men are to be excused unless there were a better.

To which (he saith) this consideration may be added. That if baptism be necessary to the salvation of infants (as the fathers of old and the Ch. Of Rome and England since) upon whom is the imposition laid? To whom is the command given? To the parents or the children? Not to the parents for then God hath put the salvation of innocent babes into the power of others and infants may be damned for their father's carelessness or malice. It follows that it is not necessary at all to be done to them to whom it cannot be prescribed as a law and in whose behalf it cannot be reasonably entrusted to others with the appendent necessity. And if it be not necessary, it is certain it is not reasonable and most certain it is no where in terms prescribed and therefore it is presumed that baptism ought to be understood and administered according as other precepts are, with reference to the capacity of the subject and the reasonableness of the thing.

And again to this purpose, p. 242. And if any man runs for succor to that exploded crespheugeton that infants have faith, or any other inspired habit of I know not what or how, we desire no more advantage in the world than that they are constrained to answer without revelation against reason, common sense and all the experience in the world.

The Argument from Federal Holiness Examined

The other scriptures we shall speak to are those that are supposed to hold out a covenant right to the children of believers and from whence arguments are drawn for the baptizing of them which are principally: 1 Cor. 7:14, Gen 17:7 compared with Rom 4: 11 and Acts 2:39. From whence it is asserted that *the children of believers being a holy seed and in covenant that to them therefore belong the seals of the covenant* which we shall examine with care and circumspection, so much stress being laid thereon. And as previous to our answer thereto, shall in the first place, take notice that this way of arguing hath been the new way which since the reformation hath been taken up to prove infants baptism by.

From when the unsoundness and rottenness of the ancient ground of infants baptism appeared, they being loath to part with the tradition, endeavored to build it upon this new foundation. For when it was discovered that infants might be saved without baptism, and that they were not damned if they died without it, and that the sacrament did not give by the bare work done, nor took away original sin, it was high time to lay a new foundation for it or else it would have fallen therefore is this new way of covenant holiness found out upon which our Congregational men, especially both in Old as well as New England seem to go, of which **Zwinglius** about 120 years since, (forasmuch as I can learn) was the first founder, wherein he was singular from all that went before him. And which he seems himself to own in his book of **Baptism, Tom. 2, Fol.**

57, saying that *all those who have from the Apostles' times written of baptism, have not in a few things erred from the scope*. He having it seems found out a way freer from error and exception than all the tracts of the ancients.

1 Corinthians 7:14

the first and chiefest is from 1 Cor 7:14: *Else were your children unclean, but now are they holy*. From whence this argument is raised.

*That the who are holy with a covenant holiness may be baptized. But the infants of believers are holy with a covenant holiness for it is said in the text **But now are they holy** therefore they may be baptized.*

In which argument we have two things asserted, but not all proved. First, that the holiness in the text is a federal or covenant holiness. Secondly, that federal or covenant holiness qualifies infants for baptism. Both which are positively denied upon the following grounds.

First, because the holiness in this text, be it what it will, whether moral, federal or matrimonial, is neither here or elsewhere assigned to be a ground of baptizing children upon, it being only the ground laid down in the institution that can warrant the same.

The female as well the male children under the law had all of them a legal or federal holiness, yet none of them be circumcised because God had not so ordained. And for twenty generations before the law, circumcision was neither administered to male or female for the like reason. It being God's word only, not our reason or the inventions or persuasions of learned men that can warrant our practice in God's ordinance. That profession of faith and repentance is a substantial ground to baptize upon is undeniably proved from the scripture and consented to by themselves. But that federal holiness, or any other qualification in infants, is any scriptural ground for the same, is yet to be proved this text being altogether silent herein.

But secondly, if it should be granted that federal holiness was a ground to baptize children upon under the gospel, as it was to circumcise them under the law, which must not be owned by any means, yet from substantial arguments it will appear that no such holiness is intended here.

First, because there is no such holiness in the New Testament as a federal holiness belonging to children, that because the parents are believers and in the new covenant, their natural seed must therefore be so esteemed and have the like right thereby to the evangelical as the children under the law had to the legal ordinances which as no where to be found, so not to be admitted upon the following considerations.

1. Because it contradicts the Gospel dispensation, as before;
2. Because such apprehensions entail grace to nature, regeneration to generation, in contraction to that of our Savior, John 3 *That which is born of the flesh is flesh*. And *that we are all children of wrath by nature*, Eph 2.
3. Because it contradicts all the experience, both of former and latter times wherein godly men have had wicked children and wicked men good children as Abraham had an Ishmael, Isaac an Esau, David an Absalom; and on the contrary, wicked Ahaz begat good Hezekiah, wicked Abia good Asa, wicked Amon good Josiah.
4. Because it necessitates an owning the doctrine of falling of grace.

Secondly, because the text intends another holiness, viz. a civil or matrimonial holiness in opposition to fornication, uncleanness, bastardly. And which doth fully appear:

First, from the scope of the place. The question propounded by the believing Corinthians for solution was whether their new spiritual relation to Christ in the Gospel did not dissolve their carnal relation entered into in unbelief and whether they could without defilement maintain their converse without any sin any more than they could in Ezra's and Nehemiah's time?

To which the Apostle replies that the Civil relation they had orderly entered into was clean now as before. The unbelieving husband was as much clean and sanctified to his believing wife and that she might as freely converse with him in the conjugal state now as before the spiritual difference happened between them. For religion breaks no bonds nor civil contracts, they being as true man and wife as before the marriage as honorable as before. And therefore the Apostle adviseth that they should abide in the state and calling religion findeth them in, ver 20. And that by no means the believer should depart and upon that account break the relation, but that he should maintain his civil, in expectation of gaining the other over to a spiritual relation. And in confirmation hereof, brings an argument ad absurdo, for otherwise the children that they had together

would be unclean, viz. if they should depart from their relations for the unlawfulness of the marriage and uncleanness of the bed what would they make their children but bastards or unclean. But in as much as they had no question of their legitimacy or holiness, neither had they any cause to scruple the other. And farther also, the believer had the least ground to doubt hereof because to him all lawful things are clean whether husband, wife, child, estate, etc. which is all the holiness I conceive can be meant in the text agreeable to holiness, 1 Thes 4: 3, 4 & Mal 2: 15. The bastard being amongst the unclean and unholy, Deut 32: 2 as Mr. **Calvin upon Mal. 2: 15** saith well, namely:

Wherefore hath God made one? To wit, seeking a Seed of God. A Seed of God is taken for legitimate as the Hebrews do name that divine which is pure from any fault or spot; therefore he sought a Seed of God, that is, appointed marriage from whence should be born a legitimate and pure offspring. Secretly therefore doth the Prophet here show that they are all bastards that shall be born of polygamy, because they neither can, nor ought to be accounted legitimate, but they who are begotten according to God's institution, but where the husband violates the faith given to the wife, and takes to himself another as he perverts the order of marriage, so also he cannot be a lawful father. Thus Calvin.

A second argument why it is a holiness of this kind and not such a federal holiness as suggested, because the holiness of the children is of no other nature than that spoken of the unbelieving parent in the text and if one will entitle to the ordinance, so the other.

A third is from the consideration that the word children in the text is not to be limited to infants or such children that they might have since the religious difference happened, but of grown children also. For a man's child is his child whilst he lives though 30, 40 or 50 years old and we suppose it would be as absurd to say a heathenish son should be baptized upon a federal holiness, as to say, the unbelieving parent should so be.

A fourth argument why this cannot be a new covenant holiness that must qualify and entitle to baptism, first, because that cannot be known, for if the parent professing faith be a hypocrite, and not in covenant themselves, then may you baptize a wrong subject as well as a right one. And secondly, such an absurdity would follow that no unbeliever's child is in covenant or elect which is notoriously false. For as before, Hezekiah was the son of wicked Ahaz, and Asa of Abia and Josia the son of wicked Amon. Thirdly, from the concurrent testimony and confession of many learned commentators and parties themselves.

Austin, a great asserter of infants baptism, as before, saith hereupon *It is to be held without doubting whatsoever that sanctification was, it was not of power to make Christians and remit sins.*

Jerom saith *because of God's appointment, marriage is holy.*

Ambrose thus upon the place *The children are holy because they are born of lawful marriage.*

Melancton in his commentary upon the place thus: *Therefore Paul answers that the marriages are not to be pulled asunder for their unlike opinions of God if the impious person do not cast away the other. And for comfort, he adds as a reason, the unbelieving husband is sanctified by the believing wife. Meat is sanctified for that which is holy in use that is granted to believers from God. So here he speaks the use of marriage to be holy and to be granted of God. Things prohibited under the law as swine's flesh, and a woman in her pollution, were called unclean. The connection of the argument is this: If the use of marriage should not please God, your children would be bastards and so unclean, but your children are not bastards therefore the use of marriage pleaseth God. And how bastards were unclean under the law shows Deut. 23.*

Musculus, in his commentary upon the place, saith that *he had abused formerly that place against the Anabaptists, but found it impertinent to that purpose.*

Camerarius, in his commentary upon the place, saith *(for the unbelieving husband hath been sanctified, an unusual change of the tense, that is) sanctified in the lawful use of marriage. For without this, saith he, it would be that their children should be unclean that is infamous and not legitimate who so are holy, that is, during the marriage, are without all blot of ignominy.*

Erasmus, upon the place, saith thus: *Infants born of such parents as the one being a Christian, the other not, are holy legitimately. For the conversion of either wife or husband doth not dissolve the marriage which was made when both were in unbelief.*

And to which we might add many more. For as a learned searcher into this controversy affirmeth, that all the ancients went this way and that none ever affirmed this new way of federal holiness till the controversy of Anabaptists in Germany arose. **Mr. Tombes in his Examen, p. 82.**

Objection

But you give another sense of the word holy than is to be found in scripture. For no where is holy the same with legitimate, but throughout the Bible (yea, in 600 places, saith Mr. Sydnam and Mr. Baxter again and again) holiness is taken for a separation to God, but never in a common sense.

Answer

To which I answer, first, that suppose it was so that the word in all places but this should have another sense. It followeth not but that it may have this sense properly enough here, the scope of the place leading to it. As for example, the word $\square\square\square\square\square$, signifying authority or power in all other places, yet in 1 Cor 11: 15 is rendered a veil. So the word $\square\square\square$ that generally and in most other places is translated to bless, doth in Job 1:5, 11 & 2: 9 signify a quite contrary sense, namely, to curse and of which we might give you many instances, but let one more serve for all in the very word itself, viz. (HEBREW), which generally signifieth holiness, yet in Deut 23:17, Hosea 4:14, 2 Kings 23: 17 is rendered whoredom or sodomy.

And secondly, neither are we to seek of some parallel place where the word holy signifieth this sort of holiness, viz. matrimonial or conjugal holiness, Mal 2: 15 A Holy Seed, viz. a legitimate seed, as Calvin and Camer. And others enlarge upon it in opposition to bastardly or unholy. For so were bastards to be esteemed Deut 23:17. And so 1 Thes 4:3-5 *This is the will of God even your sanctification and that you should abstain from fornication that everyone should know how to possess his own vessel in sanctification and honor* as 'tis said of the young men 1 Sam 21:5 and not in the lust of concupiscence, etc. where holiness is put in opposition to uncleanness and fornication.

But thirdly, neither can matrimonial holiness be said not to be a separation to God, for it is no other than a setting apart according to God's ordinance which is called honorable (or in this sense holy) and that to all whereby men and women are dedicated and devoted to each other by mutual solemn contract according to God's institution that of two they may be made one and fill up a relation to the holy ends God appointed, viz. to prevent uncleanness, for mutual help and propagation. And though we do not call a marriage a sacrament with the Papists, yet we own it as an honorable and holy state, God's ordinance having made it so.

Objection

But this seems to be a sense contrary to the express words. For is it not said that the unbelieving husband is sanctified by the wife? Which is a sanctification derived from the believer.

Answer

To which I answer that the word " $\square\square$ " translated "by" should be rendered "to" as it is Gal 1:16 "to me" 2 Pet 2: 5 "to faith" Acts 4: 12 "to men" which the scope overrules and which must needs be so here which **Mr. Marshal** grants **Tombs ex. P. 79**. For in no sense can it be sanctified by her for he is not spiritually sanctified being as yet an unbeliever, and one argument therefore of the wives' remaining to endeavor to convert him. Neither can it be a federal holiness for that, by this argument, would entitle him to baptism as well as the children. Nor can it be proper to say the unbeliever is sanctified in a matrimonial sanctification by his believing wife for that is only so by God's appointment. Therefore must it necessarily be to the wife, viz. to her use and lawful enjoyment as food and raiment and all God's blessings are, it being not (as Mr. Marshal grants) a holiness of state, but of use and therefore she did not sin in continuing in the station and place religion found her which is the answer to the scruple.

Objection

But is it not said *now are your children holy*, implying some present alteration for good to them upon the change of the state of the parent which did not belong to them before?

Answer

To which Beza's sense of the words may be a very proper answer, viz. *that the word is not to be understood an adverb of time, but a conjunction that is wont to be used in the assumptions of arguments and so the sense is "but now", that is, forasmuch as the unbelieving husband is sanctified to the wife, your children are holy, that is, lawfully begotten and born.*

Therefore notwithstanding your difference in religion, that although he be an idolater and you a Christian, yet the civil state lawfully entered into before this alteration may be conversed in without sin. For if the believer should depart and break the relation, it was either for the defect of the first bond or tie, or for unequal yoking with infidels as in Ezra's time, but as to the latter, there being no such law to the Gentiles to put away wives and children upon that account. And to the former, you having no doubt of the legitimacy of your children, but take it for granted they are holy. Neither need you doubt of your lawful marriage state, your new relations infringing neither. Therefore from the holiness both of bed and birth, continue together and let not the believing husband put away his unbelieving wife, nor let not the believing wife depart from her unbelieving husband which is all the holiness that is found in this text and no such thing as a federal holiness. Though if there was, it would be no ground to baptize an infant upon, as before.

The Arguments from Circumcision Examined

Another, and none of the least Argument that is urged to prove Infants Baptism by, is from pretended consequences from the Covenant made with Abraham, Gen. 17.

From whence it is thus argued:

Those to whom the Gospel covenant belonged, to them the seal thereof appertained, but to believers and their seed, the Gospel covenant belonged as Gen 17: 7 *I will be a God to thee and to thy seed.* And Acts 2: 39 *the promise is to you and your children.*

Therefore to them the seal thereof, circumcision (so called Rom 4: 11) did appertain, Gen 17:10. For the Faederati were to be signati, those in the covenant were to have the seal thereof. And therefore by consequence it naturally followeth that if circumcision, the seal of the Gospel covenant belonged to the seed of believers under the law, then doth the Gospel seal, baptism, much more appertain to the seed of believers under the Gospel which comes in the place, room and use of circumcision. Otherwise the privilege under the Gospel would be less than that of the law should children be denied such a benefit.

Answer

That this is fallacious and false reasoning (and that there is no natural consequence at all from this scripture to infer the baptizing of infants, nor any ground to build the Gospel ordinance baptism upon the command of the legal ordinance circumcision) may fully appear by examining the following particulars which are begged, but not proved in the argument:

1. Whether circumcision, called here the Gospel seal, did of old belong to all in Gospel covenant?
2. Whether the New (or Gospel) covenant, and that mentioned, Gen 17, be one and the same?
3. Whether the seed mentioned was Abraham's natural or spiritual seed?
4. Whether circumcision was a seal of the New covenant to the children under the law?

5. Whether circumcision was administered to believers as believers and to their seed only?
6. Whether baptism did succeed in the place, room and use of circumcision?
7. Whether the not baptizing infants makes the privileges under the Gospel less than the circumcising them under the law?

To the first, whether circumcision called the Gospel seal did belong of old to all in Gospel covenant?

'Tis answered that the contrary doth manifestly appear upon a double account: Firstly, because some that were in the Gospel covenant were not sealed therewith.

There were many persons in covenant that were not circumcised that were *faederati* but not *signati* as for instance all the believers from Adam to Abraham who received no such seal, nor did any of the believers out of Abraham's family, as Lot, Melchizedech, Job, that we read of, receive any such seal, neither did any of the believing *faederatis* in any age receive it.

There were some to whom the covenant did not belong that received that called the seal of circumcision. For of Ishmael God hath said that this covenant was not to be established with him, but with Isaac, and yet he was circumcised, Gen 17: 20,21,25; Gal 4: 29,30. And the same may be said of Esau, Rom 9:10-13. And as to all the strangers in Abraham's house or bought with money in Israel that were circumcised. It may well be doubted whether the New Covenant promises belong to them.

To the second, whether the New Covenant and that mentioned in Gen 17 be the same?

In answer whereto, it must be understood that as Abraham, by promise, stood in a double capacity, viz. the father of a nation, viz. the natural Israelites, so to be also a father of many nations, comprehending the spiritual, whether Jews or Gentiles throughout the world. And so accordingly the promises were of two sorts, sometimes respecting his natural seed, whether domestic or national, who were typical of the spiritual, as the birth of Isaac, the deliverance of his posterity out of Egypt, the possessing of the land of Canaan, with many outward temporal blessings and benefits annexed thereto as Gen 15: 13 &c 18:18:17 & 8:15, 16; Acts 7:3-6.

And others again, respecting in a peculiar manner the spiritual seed, the family of the faithful, viz. the elect, of whom, through Christ, he was father, and which are evangelical and in an especial manner belonging to the new covenant as Gen 12:3, 18:18 *In thee shall all nations be blessed* which is called a Gospel promise, Gal 3: 8, 9. So Gen 15:5 *So shall thy seed be*. Gen 17:5 *A father of many nations*. And verse 8 *to be his God and the God of his seed*. And therefore must the mind of wisdom rightly distinguish and truly apply the promises that are many times so mixed that the one may be taken for the other. And sure I am, much of the mistake and error lies here in this very thing by applying that to the one which belongs to the other.

But thirdly, what seed of Abraham is it to whom the promise doth belong, in the 7th verse whether the natural or spiritual and who are those children of promise?

To the clearing the first, namely, that of the seed, ver. 7, I shall refer you to the Exposition itself the scripture hath given us hereof with the concurring sense of many judicious expositors and all of them parties themselves.

Galatians 3: 16

The scriptures expounding this text are Gal. 3:16 *Now to Abraham and his seed were the promises made; he saith not to seeds, as of many, but as of one and to thy seed which is Christ*. And therefore saith in verse 29 *If you be Christ's, then are you Abraham's seed and heirs according to promise*. And farther in Romans 9:7, 8 *Neither because they are the seed of Abraham are they all children, but in Isaac shall thy seed be called*, that is, they which are the children of the flesh these are not counted for the seed, *but the children of the promise are counted for the seed*. And Romans 4:13, 14 *For the promise that he should be the heir of the world was not to Abraham or to his seed through the law, but through the righteousness of faith. For if they which are of the law be heirs, faith is made void and the promise made of none effect*.

Which so fully confirms the seed here mentioned to whom the promise belonged not to be the carnal but spiritual seed. And in farther confirmation thereof you have these following authors and all of them Paedobaptists, viz.

Calvin Confirms the Position

Calvin upon Gen. 17:7 saith *That it is manifest that the promise understood of spiritual blessing pertaineth not to the carnal seed of Abraham, but to the spiritual as the Apostle himself saith in Romans 4 and 9. For if you understand the carnal seed (saith he) then that promise will belong to none of the Gentiles, but to those alone who are begotten of Abraham and Isaac according to the flesh. Estius Ann. Gen. 17:7*

Ainsworth Confirms the Position

Ainsworth on Genesis 12:7 [thy seed] *That is all the children of promise (the elect) who only are counted Abraham's seed, Romans 9:7, 8. And in Christ are heirs by promise, as well the Gentiles as the Jews.*

Dr. Owen Confirms the Position

Dr. Owen in his book called The Doctrine of Saint's Perseverance in chapter 4, arguing from the covenant of grace to prove the unchangeableness of the love of God, begins with Genesis 17:7 saying that *the effectual dispensation of the grace of the covenant is peculiar to them only who are the children of promise, the remnant of Abraham according to election with all that in all nations were to be blessed by him and his seed Jesus Christ. Ishmael, though circumcised, was to be put out and not to be heir with Isaac.* And a little after he writes thus: *what blessing then was here made over to Abraham? All the blessings, saith he, that from God are conveyed in and by his seed Jesus Christ, in whom both he and we are blessed, are wrapped therein. What they are the Apostle tells you Ephesians 1: 13 they are all spiritual blessings of perseverance if the continuance of the love and favor of God towards us be a spiritual blessing. Both Abraham and all his spiritual seed, all faithful ones throughout the world are blessed with it in Jesus Christ. And if God's continuing to be a God to them forever will enforce this blessing (being but the same thing in another expression) it is likewise asserted.*

Amesius Confirms the Position

Amesius, De Praedest. Chap. 8, ser. 6 saith *There are many of the seed of Abraham to whom the word of promise doth not belong as Ishmael and Ishmaelites. But if so there be many of the seed of Abraham to whom the word of promise doth not belong, then the rejection of many Jews who are of the seed of Abraham doth not make void the word of promise. From whence may we not safely conclude that if the natural posterity of Abraham were not within the covenant of grace by virtue of the promise, Gen 17:7, then much less are our natural posterity. But the former is true, Rom 9:6-12. So is the latter.* To which we might add diverse others, but let these suffice.

The Evil Consequences of the Contrary

And from the contrary persuasion what dismal consequences would arise? For if God made his covenant of grace with the posterity of believers as this doctrine asserts, then all the posterity of believers should certainly have grace bestowed upon them. For it is the covenant of God which doth convey grace, Rom 4:

16, 2 Cor 1:30. None missing of grace from God's faithfulness which **Mr. Blake** doth so confidently affirm, **p. 6**, saying that *Christianity is hereditary, that as the children of a nobleman are noble, the child of a freeman free, of a Turk a Turk and of a Jew a Jew, so the child of a Christian is a Christian* in contradiction not only of scripture which saith *We are children of wrath by nature, but of all the former and latter experience.*

Then would grace be a birth privilege and regeneration (as before) tied to generation contrary to John 3: 3 & John 1: 12, 13. Then must all the posterity of believers be saved, without you will necessitate the doctrine to be true that men may fall from grace. Then must we tie up and confine the grace of God's covenant to the children of believers only and then what hope for the children of unbelievers contrary to the experience of all Ages. For was not grace extended to the Gentiles who were not the children of believers when the natural

branches, the children of believing Abraham, were cut off. Then is the covenant of grace itself overthrown concluding an interest without faith, Rom 4: 14, deriving a title by natural generation.

Acts 2: 38 Answered

And as to the other scripture of Acts 2: 38, 39 urged as a parallel to the other, it is so indeed rightly understood, but not all in the sense supposed.

For, first, it is to be observed that the promise there made is the giving of the Spirit called the promise of the Father prophesied of by Joel 2: 28 and doth follow the receiving of Christ in the Gospel Eph 1: 13; Gal 3: 14 and the obeying his commands, Acts 5: 32. Therefore in verse 38, Peter exhorts them to repentance and faith in order to the receiving of it, because the promise is to them and their children, viz. to the Jews and to them that are afar off, to the Gentiles also, even as many of both as the Lord should call. Therefore the promise is not made but upon condition of calling, of faith and baptism.

Secondly, it is remarkable that the Apostle doth first exhort to repentance, then to baptism showing the order that Christ had directed to in the commission. Neither is the promise mentioned as though of itself it gave right to baptism without repentance, but as a motive why they should repent and be baptized that they might also, as others had done before their eyes, be made partakers of the Holy Spirit which the Prophets had foretold and Christ had promised. Wherein infants[neither capable of faith, repentance and calling] are not concerned in the text and by children spoken of, are no other meant, than the posterity of the Jews. For who knows not that they are so called and that my child is my child though 40 or 50 years old? Upon which **text Dr. Hamond in his Resolution concerning Infants Baptism, sect. 81** hath to this purpose: *In the next place, saith he, is attempted the disproving of all arguments brought in defense of Paedobaptism from Peter's words in Acts 2: 39. To which, saith the Doctor, I answer that if any have made use of that unconvincing argument, I have nothing to say in defense of them. I think the practice is founded upon better basis than so and the word children there is really the posterity of the Jews and not particularly their infant children.*

And **Dr. Taylor upon this scripture, p. 233** saith that *the words mentioned in St. Peter's sermon (which are the only records of the promise) are interpreted upon a weak mistake. The promise belongs to you and your children therefore infants are actually receptive of it in that capacity. That is the argument, but reason of it is not yet discovered, nor ever will. For (to you and your children) is to you and your posterity, to you and your children when they are of the same capacity in which you are receptive of the promise. But he, that, whenever the word "children" is used in scripture, shall by "children" understand infants, must needs believe that in all Israel there were no men, but all were infants. And if that had been true, it had been the greater wonder they should overcome the Anakims and beat the King of Moab and march so far and discourse so well, for they were all called the children of Israel.*

Circumcision the Seal of the New Covenant?

The fourth thing to be enquired into, is, whether circumcision was a seal of the new covenant to believers and their seed?

To which I answer in the negative that it was neither a seal to them, nor much less a seal to them of the new covenant. It is true, it was a seal, confirmation or ratification of the faith that Abraham had long before he was circumcised, but so could it not be said of any infant that had no faith. It was a sign put into the flesh of the infant, but a sign and seal only to Abraham, witnessing to him that he not only had a justifying faith, but to the truth of the promises, viz. *That he should be the father of many nations*, Gen 12: 23, and, *The father of the faithful*, Rom 4: 11, and, *Heir of the world*, Rom 4: 13, *That in him all the families of the earth should be blessed*, viz. in Christ proceeding from him which was no ways true of any infants that ever was circumcised. For none had before their circumcision such a faith that entitled them to such singular promises. The scope in that place in Romans 4 being to show that Abraham himself was not justified by works, no, not by circumcision, but by faith which he had long before he was circumcised and so but a seal or confirmation of that faith which he had long before and to assure him of the truth of those special promises made to him and his seed, both carnal and spiritual.

And to which purpose you have both Chrysostom and Theophylact, as **Mr. Lawr, p. 168**, viz. *It was called a seal of the righteousness of faith, because it was given to Abraham as a seal and testimony of that righteousness which he had acquired by faith. Now, this seems to be the privilege of Abraham alone and not to be transferred to others as if circumcision in whomever it was were a testimony of divine righteousness. For as it was the privilege of Abraham, that he should be the father of all the faithful, as well circumcised as uncircumcised, having faith in uncircumcision, he received first the sign of circumcision that he might be the father of the circumcised. Now because he had this privilege in respect of the righteousness which he had acquired by faith, therefore the sign of circumcision was to him a seal of the righteousness of faith. But to the rest of the Jews, it was a sign that they were Abraham's seed, but not a seal of the righteousness of faith as all the Jews were not the fathers of many nations.*

Secondly, much less was circumcision a seal of the New Testament, as before. For nothing is a seal thereof but the Holy Spirit, Eph 1: 13 & 4: 30.

Thirdly, neither is baptism more than circumcision called a seal. It is called a figure 1 Pet 3: 21. And it is a sign, as before. But a sign and figure proper only to men of understanding, representing spiritual things and mysteries and not as circumcision which was a sign not improper for infants, because it left a signal impression in their flesh to be remembered all their days, but so cannot baptism be to any infants.

Circumcision Administered Only to Believers and their Seed?

The fifth thing to be examined is whether circumcision was administered to believers as believers and to their seed after them as such; to which baptism was to correspond?

It is answered by no means, for it was an ordinance which by the institution belonged to all the natural lineage and posterity of Abraham, good or bad, without any such limitation as was put upon baptism. *If thou believest with all thy heart, thou mayest.* Acts 8, or any such qualification to an infant capable to receive it that he should have a believing parent, but will you deny Abraham to be a believing parent? And was not he a father to them all? What then! He was a public common father which reaches not to the case in hand, for he was no such father to them, neither have they any other in his stead; therefore, the analogy holds not. Yet, if they had, would it avail? For that privilege would not stand the natural children of Abraham in any stead to admit them to baptism which, notwithstanding, they claimed the same upon that account, Matt 3. Yet John rejects them upon it calling them *a generation of vipers*, bidding them *bring forth fruits meet for repentance* and which only would give them admittance to the baptism of repentance and that it was not enough to say *they had Abraham for their father*. And to the same purpose doth our

Savior tell Nicodemus, a master of Israel, that without the new birth his birth privilege would not avail him in the Gospel privileges, John 3. And with more severity doth he tell the Jews that however they bore up themselves as the sons of Abraham, yet without believing in Christ, who could only make them free, they were bond slaves to sin and the children of the Devil.

Baptism Came Not in the Room, Place and Use of Circumcision

The sixth thing to be searched after is whether baptism did succeed in the room, place and use of circumcision? To which I answer by no means for the following reasons:

1. Not in the room and stead.
 - a. Because then only males, not females, would be baptized, because no other circumcised, but all believing women as well as men were to be baptized.
 - b. Because then some, not all believers should be baptized, because not only women, as before, were not admitted, but all believers out of Abraham's family, to whom he was a spiritual father, because he was a believer before he was circumcised, Rom 4: 11, 12. Whereas all believers, according to the commission, were to be baptized.
 - c. Because then the circumcised needed not to have been baptized if they had been already sealed with the New Covenant Seal, but Christ himself and all his Apostles, and so many of the Churches were circumcised, yet nevertheless were baptized.
2. Not to the ends and uses neither, as suggested upon the following grounds:

- a. Because circumcision was a sign of Christ to come in the flesh, and Baptism that he was already come in the flesh witnessing to his incarnation, death, burial and resurrection.
- b. Circumcision was to be a partition wall between Jew and Gentile. But baptism testified the contrary, viz. that Barbarian, Scythian, Bond and Free, Jew and Gentile, Male and Female were all one in Christ.
- c. Circumcision initiated the carnal seed into the carnal church and gave them right to the carnal ordinances, but baptism was to give the spiritual seed an orderly entrance into the spiritual Church and a right to partake of the spiritual ordinances.
- d. Circumcision was to be a bond and obligation to keep the whole law of Moses. But baptism witnessed that Moses' law was made void & that only Christ's law was to be kept.
- e. Circumcision was administered to all Abraham's natural seed without any profession of faith, repentance or regeneration whereas baptism was to be administered to the spiritual seed of Abraham, was only upon profession of faith, repentance and regeneration. And which appears more fully by the following instances compared.
 1. Because a carnal parent and a fleshly begetting by the legal birth privilege, gave right to circumcision, whereas a spiritual begetting by a spiritual parent gave only a true right to baptism.
 2. Because a legal, ecclesiastical, typical holiness (when land, mountains, houses, birds, beasts and trees were holy) qualified for circumcision; whereas only evangelical and personal holiness was a meet qualification for baptism.
 3. Because strangers and servants bought with money, and all ignorant children of eight days old, yea, trees and fruits were also capable of circumcision, Lev 19:23; whereas only men of understanding that were capable to believe with all their heart and to give an account thereof with their mouths were to be esteemed capable subjects of baptism.
 4. Circumcision was to be a sign of temporal blessings and benefits to be enjoyed in the Land of Canaan; whereas baptism was to be a sign (as before) of many spiritual benefits, viz. the remission of sins, justification, sanctification here and eternal salvation hereafter.

It is granted there are in some things an analogy between the one and the other, both signifying heart circumcision and an initiating into the church, though as a different church, so different subjects and church members, upon different grounds and to different ends as before. And in a far different manner, one to be done in a private house and by a private hand and the other in some public place and by the hand of some public minister appointed by the Church to administer the same.

But now because there is some analogy in some things, is there therefore ground to conclude it cometh into the room, stead and use thereof? By no means! For by the same argument we may as well conclude that it cometh in the room and stead of the Ark, Manna, Rock, etc. And from such like arguments drawn from analogies what Jewish rites may not by our wits be introduced to the countenancing the Papists in their High Priesthood. National Churches, Orders of Priesthood, Tithes and all other their innumerable Rites and Ceremonies that without any institution of Christ or pretence of New Testament authority, they have introduced or imposed upon the account of analogy with Old Testament Rites and Services. Concerning which, you have **the Lord Brooks in his Treatise of Episcopacy, p. 100**, saying very well, viz. *That the analogy which baptism now hath with circumcision in the Old Law is a fine rational argument to illustrate a point well proved before, but I somewhat doubt (saith he) whether it be proof enough for that which some would prove by it, since (besides the vast difference in the ordinance) the persons to be circumcised are stated by a positive law, so express, that it leaves no place for scruple, but if is far otherwise in baptism where all the designation of persons fit to be partakers, for ought I know, is only such as believe. For this is the qualification which with exactest search I find the scripture requires in persons to be baptized and this it seems to require in all such persons. Now how infants can be properly said to believe I am not yet fully resolved.*

And very full and most excellently you have to this point **Dr. Taylor, p. 228** who saith that *the argument from circumcision is invalid upon infinite considerations. Figures and types prove nothing unless a command go along with them or some express to signify such to be their purpose. For the deluge of waters and the Ark of Noah were a figure of baptism, said Peter, and if therefore the circumstances of the one should be drawn to the other, we should make baptism a prodigy rather than a rite. The Paschal Lamb was a type of the Eucharist which secedes the other as baptism doth to circumcision, but because there was in the manducation of the Paschal Lamb no prescription of sacramental drink, shall we thence conclude that the Eucharist is to*

be administered but in one kind? And even in the very instance of this argument, supposing a correspondency of analogy between circumcision and baptism, yet there is no correspondency of identity. For although it were granted that both of them did consign the covenant of faith, yet there was nothing in the circumstance of childrens being circumcised that so concerns that mystery, but that it might very well be given to children and yet baptism only to men of reason, because circumcision left a character in the flesh which being imprinted upon infants, did its work to them when they came to age. And such a character was necessary, because there was no word added to the sign, but baptism imprints nothing that remains on the body and if it leaves a character at all, it is upon the soul to which also the word is added which is as much a part of the sacrament as the sign itself. For both which reasons it is requisite that the parties baptized should be capable of reason that they may be capable both of the word of the sacrament and the impress made of the Spirit. Since therefore the reason of this parity does wholly fail, there is nothing left to infer a necessity of complying in the circumstance of age any more than in the other annexes of the type. Then the infant must also precisely be baptized upon the eighth day and females must not be baptized, because not circumcised, but it were more proper if we would understand it right to prosecute the analogy from the type to the antitype by way of letter, and spirit, and signification. And as circumcision figures baptism, so also the adjuncts of the circumcision shall signify something spiritual in the adherences of baptism. And therefore as infants were circumcised. So spiritual infants shall be baptized which is the spiritual circumcision. For therefore babes had the ministry of the type to signify that we must, when we give our names to Christ, become children in malice and then the type is made complete, etc. Thus far the Doctor.

Not Baptizing Infants Doesn't Make Gospel Privileges Lesser than Legal

The seventh thing to consider is whether the not baptizing infants makes the privilege under the Gospel less than under the Law who had then circumcision? To which I answer not at all for the reasons following:

1. Because they were not circumcised because they were children of believers or sealed with a new covenant seal as being in the new covenant thereby as proved, but upon the account of birth privilege, as being of the natural lineage and seed of Abraham as a typical shadowy thing. All whose posterity were to be marked therewith to distinguish them from the Nations and to keep the line clear from whence Christ, according to the flesh, should come and to oblige them to keep the law, etc. But no such thing in the Gospel, the body and substance being come, the shadow was to vanish and pass away. No common father then but Christ, and if Christ's, then Abraham's seed and heirs of promise, no birth privilege, but the new birth. Therefore to go back to the National birth privilege is so far from being a privilege that it is a bondage rather to return to the type and shadow, the antitype and substance being come.
2. Neither ought such a thing to be any more esteemed the loss of a privilege, than our not enjoying literally a Holy Land, City, Temple, a succession of a High Priest and a Priesthood by generation or lineal descent (for you know their children were priests successively in their generation, a Levite begat a Priest or Minister, as well as the other Tribes begat church members) since all those types are spiritualized to us the believers under the Gospel who are now the Holy Nation, the Holy City and Temple, the Royal priesthood, and all Church Members by regeneration, not generation. Therefore we are so far from being losers by the bargain, that as far as Christ exceeds Moses and Aaron; the Gospel, the Law; the Antitype, the Type; the Spiritual Birth, the Carnal; the Extent of all Nations, the Confines of Judea; so far are we better and not worse.
3. Nor thirdly, if it should be taken for granted that circumcision was a seal of the new covenant belonging to all the children of Israel, then would not the baptizing of the children of believers answer it, neither amount to so great a privilege, nor be equivalent to it, for these reasons:
 1. There were all the families and tribes of Israel (and all proselyted strangers) with their children without distinction of good or bad to be circumcised. But here only one of a City or two of a Tribe, for believers are thus known, and the children of unbeliever and wicked men, are to receive no such benefit in the judgment of so many.
 2. You would be very short in another respect as being at an utter uncertainty when you had a right subject. For if the parent was a hypocrite, or no elect person which is out of your reach to understand, you cannot know whether the child be fit for baptism. For the seed of a wicked man you must not

- meddle with by any means, whereas there was not the least doubt or scruple in Israel as to the subject. For the father being circumcised, it was an infallible mark they were right.
3. Neither can the child (when he is grown up) have any certain knowledge that such a ceremony hath passed upon him in infancy, he having no infallible mark thereof. Whereas the circumcised infant had an indelible character and mark in his flesh to assure him that he had received that rite. By all which demonstrations you may understand that we lose no privilege under the Gospel for not baptizing our infants though they were circumcised under the law.

Chapter IV

Wherein is made manifest that the Ordained Ceremony of Baptism is, in this of Infants altered and changed, and another Rite introduced, quite contrary both to the Signification of the Word, Nature of the ordinance, and manifest Practice thereof, not only in the Apostles' times, but many Ages after, as confessed by Parties themselves

The Manner of Baptism is by Dipping

That the manner and ceremony of baptism ought to be by dipping or plunging the whole body under water, and not by sprinkling or pouring a little water on the face or head, as hath commonly been used, especially since the subjects have been changed from men to babes, is thus made good, viz.

From the Signification of the Word

1. From the proper and genuine signification of the word so well agreeing with the ends and use of baptism, the ceremony to the substance, sign to the thing signified.

The word we call baptism and the Latins call *Baptismus*, is no other than the Greek word βαπτισμα [being so retained all along, as Gomarus observes in the Latin church] and in plain English is nothing else but to dip, plunge or cover all over.

The truth whereof will more fully appear from our best Greek Lexicons and by the observation of our most eminent Critics, and the Scripture use of the words.

Scapula and Stevens

Scapula and **Stevens**, two as great Masters of the Greek Tongue as we have any (and also great defenders of Infants Baptism) do tell us in their **Lexicons** that βαπτισμα, from βαπτω, signifies mergo, immergo, submergo, obruo; item tingo, quod sit immerendo, insicere, imbuere, viz. to dip, plunge, overwhelm, put under, cover over. To die in color which is done by plunging.

Grotius

Grotius tells us it signifies to dip over head and ears.

Pasor

Pasor, an *immersion, dipping or submersion*.

Vossius

Vossius, that it implieth a washing the whole body.

Minicaus

Minicaus, in his Dictionary, that *immersio* is in the Latin *Baptismus*, in the Dutch *Doopel* or *Doopen*, English *baptism* or *Baptime*, viz. to dive or duck in water and the same with the Hebrew *to dip*.

Liegh

Liegh, in his Critica Sacra, saith, *It's native and proper signification is to dip into water, or to plunge under water.* For which he cites these scriptures where so used, viz. Matt 3: 6, Acts 8: 38. *And that it is taken from a Dyer's fat and imports a dying or giving a fresh color and not a bare washing only, Rev 19: 13.* And for which he quotes Casaudon, Bucan, Bullinger, Zanchy, Spanbemijs. He saith withal *That some would have it signify washing and which sense Erasmus, he saith, opposed, affirming that it was not otherwise so, than by consequence. For the proper signification was such a dipping or plunging as Dyers use for dying of clothes.*

Salmatius

Salmatius in his book De Prim. Papa, p. 193, saith *That is not baptism they give to children but rantism.*

Causabon

Causabon, in his Annotat. Upon Matt 3, annexed to the New Testament, set forth by Stephens, saith *That immerging was the proper right in baptism which the word itself (he saith) sufficiently declares, which as it signifies not immersio a going down to the bottom without any ascending, so not natatio a swimming like a cork above the water, but immersio a going down and coming up again.*

Pindarus

Pindarus, in his Ode 2 calls a cork swimming upon the face of the waters, unbaptized, and Plutarch as ship floating on the water, unbaptized.

Beza

Beza, on Matt 3: 11, saith *the word immersio signifies to dye by dipping or washing and differs from the word natatio signifying to drown or go down to the bottom, as a stone.*

Selden

Selden, De Jure Nat. &c. L. 2, c. 2 saith that *the Jews (from whom this Rite is conceived to come) took the baptism wherein the whole body was not baptized, to be void.*

Daniel Rogers

Mr. Daniel Rogers, in his Treatise of Sacraments, Part 1, c. 8, p. 177, saith that *the Minister is to dip in water as the meetest act. The word βαπτισμα notes it. For the Greeks wanted not other words to express any other act besides dipping, if the institution should bear it. What resemblance or the burial or resurrection of Christ is in sprinkling? All antiquity and scripture, saith he, confirm that way. To dip therefore is exceeding material to the ordinance which was the usage of old, without the exception of Countries hot or cold.*

Dr. Taylor

Dr. Taylor, in his Rule of Consc. L. 3, c. 4: *If you would attend to the proper signification of the word, baptism signifies plunging in water, or dipping with washing.*

Joseph Mede

Mr. Joseph Mede, in his Diatribe on Titus 3:2, saith that *there was no such thing as sprinkling or rantism used in baptism in the Apostles' days, nor many Ages after them.*

Chamier

Chamier, Pan. Cathol. Tom 4, l. 5, c. 2, Ser. 6: *The ancient use of baptism was to dip the whole body into the element which is the force of βαπτισμα therefore did John baptize in a river which is nevertheless changed into aspersion, though uncertain when and from whence that custom was taken.*

I might add many more, but shall conclude with that observable remark that **Dr. Hamond** gives us hereon in **his Annotations, viz. upon John 13: 10** telling us that βαπτισμα signifies an immersion, or washing the whole body, and which answereth to the Hebrew word used for dipping in the Old Testament. And therefore, upon Matt 3: 1 tells us that John baptized in a river, viz, Jordan, Mark 1: 5 in a confluence of much water, as Aenon, John 3: 23 because it is added **there was much water**, upon which account he saith *That as the Greeks called the lakes where they used to wash βαπτισματα so the ancients called their baptisterions, or the vessels containing their baptismal water, Columbethras, viz. swimming or diving places, being made very large with partitions for men and women.* And upon Mark 7: 4 tells us that *the washing or baptizing of cups, vessels, beds, etc. was no other than a putting them into the water all over, rinsing them.*

I have carefully examined all the places in the Old Testament where the word dipping or baptizing is mentioned and do find it is expressed by the Hebrew word 7בטל as Minicaus and Dr. Hamond observe.

The Septuagint do render the word “tabal” in the Hebrew by βαπτισμα and which all the translators, both the Latin, Dutch, Italian, French and English do translate “to dip” and which always signifies to dip (the word rendered washing being another word) as the following scriptures will inform you: Gen 37: 31; Exod 12: 22; Lev 4: 6 & 17: 14 & 6:16, 51; Lev 9: 9; Deut 33: 24; Num 16: 18; 2 Kings 5: 14. Which are all the places I can find the word is used in, in the Old Testament.

The word generally used for washing in the Hebrew is XXX which signifies such a washing as taketh away filth from persons or things by swilling, rinsing or rubbing as Buxtorsius and Leigh, and which answereth to all these three words for washing that we meet with in the Greek, viz. $\lambdaουω$ a washing of the body;

$\πλυνω$ the hands; and $\βαπτισμα$ clothes as Stephens saith in his Thesaurus. Which word you will find in very many places in the Old Testament as Exod 30: 19, 20, Exod 25; Lev 14: 8, 9 & 16: 24 etc. Which signification and sense of the word is emphatically confirmed to us by the several metaphors used by the Holy Spirit in Scripture, in allusion hereto, viz. for persons to be plunged into great sufferings, they are said to be baptized therein, Mark 10: 38. And so for persons that were endued with great measures of the Spirit,

they are said to be baptized therewith, Acts 1: 5. The children of Israel being encompassed with the cloud over their head, and divided Sea on both sides were said to be baptized in the cloud and the Sea, 1 Cor 10. And baptized persons are said to be dead and buried in allusion to putting men into the earth and covering them therewith; none of which can hold good by sprinkling.

From the Scripture Practice Matthew 3

2. It appears to be so from the practice and usage we find hereof in Scripture and the opinion of the learned upon it.

a. In the story of Christ's baptism, we read, Matt 3: 5 That *Jesus came from Galilee to Jordan unto John to be baptized of him*. And verse 16 *And when he was baptized, he went up straightway out of the water*.

Cajetan

The learned **Cajetan** upon the place, saith, *Christ ascended out of the water; therefore, Christ was baptized by John not by sprinkling or by pouring water upon him, but by immersion, that is, dipping or plunging in the water*.

Musculus

Musculus on Matt 3 calls baptism dipping and saith *The parties baptized were dipped not sprinkled*.

John 3: 23

A second scripture considerable is that of John 3: 23 *And John was baptizing in Aenon near Salim* (and the reason why he pitched upon this place is given) *because there was much water there*.

Piscator

Piscator, upon the place, says *□□□□□□□□□□ signifies many rivers as □□□□□ in the singular number signifies the River of Jordan. This saith he, is mentioned to signify the ceremony of baptism which John used in dipping or plunging the whole body of man standing in the river. Whence he saith Christ being so baptized by John in Jordan, is said to ascend out of the water*.

Calvin

Calvin, upon these words, saith that *from this place you may gather that John and Christ administered baptism by plunging the whole body into the water*.

Acts 8: 36

A third scripture worthy of our notice is Acts 8: 36, 38 *As they went on their way, they came unto a certain water, and the Eunuch said, See, here is water, and they went both down into the water, both Philip and the Eunuch and he baptized him, and when they were come up out of the water*. Upon this place,

Calvin

Calvin saith *we see what fashion the ancients had to administer baptism. For they plunged the whole body into the water. The use is now, saith he, that the Minister casts a few drops of water only upon the body or upon the head.*

Romans 6: 4

A fourth scripture we shall mention is Romans 6: 4 ***Buried with him in baptism.*** Where the Apostle elegantly alludes to the ceremony of baptizing in our death and resurrection with Christ.

Cajetan

Cajetan upon the place, saith *Thus we are buried with him by baptism into death. By our burying he declares our death from the ceremony of baptism, because he who is baptized is put under the water and by this carries a similitude of him that is buried, who is put under the earth. Now because none are buried but dead men, from this very thing that we are buried in baptism, we are assimilated to Christ buried, or when he was buried.*

Keckerman

Keckerman, Syst. Theol. L. 3, c. 8 says that *immersion, not aspersion, was the first institution of baptism as it doth plainly appear from Rom 6: 3.*

Diodatius

Diodatius, in his Disputation, p. 886, 889, 890, a learned Protestant writer gives a most remarkable testimony in this case. *Baptism, saith he, is the first sacrament of the New Testament instituted by Christ, in which, with a most pat and exact analogy between the sign and the thing signified, those that are in covenant, are by the Minister washed in water. The outward rite in baptism is threefold: 1. Immersion into the water. 2. Abiding under the water, and, 3. Resurrection out of the water. The form of baptism, viz. internal and essential, is no other than the analogical proportion which the signs keep with the things signified thereby. For the properties of the water in washing away the defilements of the body, do in a most suitable similitude set forth the efficacy of Christ's blood in blotting out of sins. So dipping into the water doth in a most lively similitude set forth the mortification of the old man and rising out of the water, the vivification of the new. The same plunging into the water holds forth to us that horrible gulf of divine justice in which Christ for our sins sake (which he took upon him) was for a while in a manner swallowed up. Abiding under the water, how little so ever, denotes his descent into Hell even the very deepest of lifelessness. While lying in the sealed and guarded sepulcher, he was accounted as one dead. Rising out of the water holds out to us a lively similitude of that conquest which this dead man got over death which he vanquished in his own den (as it were) the is the grave. In like manner therefore (saith he) it is meet that we being baptized into his death and buried with him should rise also with him and so go on in a new life. Rom 6: 3, 4; Col 2: 12.*

Leigh

Mr. Leigh, in his Annotat. Upon Rom 6: 4 [Buried with him in baptism unto death] *Baptism, saith he, is an instrument not only of thy death with Christ, which is the killing of sin, but also of thy burial with him, which is a perpetual mortification, or abiding under that death. He alludes to the manner in which baptism was then administered, which was to plunge them in the water. The plunging of them into water which were baptized was a sign of their death and burial with Christ.*

Assemblies Annotations

The Assemblies Annotations upon the place do say that *in this phrase, the Apostle seemeth to allude to the ancient manner of baptizing which was, to dip the party baptized, and, as it were, to bury them under the water for a while, and then to raise them up again out of it, to represent the burial of the old man and our resurrection to newness of life.* The like saith Piscator and Diodate upon the place.

Dr. Cave

Dr. Cave, a great searcher into antiquity, in his late book called **Primitive Christianity**, saith, **p. 320**, *That the party baptized was wholly immersed or put under water which was the almost constant and universal custom of those times whereby they did most notably and significantly express the great end and effects of baptism. For, as in immersing there are in a manner, three several acts, the putting the person into water, his abiding there for some time. And his rising up again, thereby representing Christ's death, burial and resurrection. And in conformity thereto, out dying unto sin, the destruction of its power, and our resurrection to a new course of life. By the person's being put into water, was lively represented the putting off the body of sins of the flesh and being washed from the filth and pollution of them. By his being under it, which is a kind of burial into water, his entering into a state of death or mortification, like as Christ remained for some time under the state or power of death. Therefore it is said, as many as are baptized into Christ, are baptized into his death, etc. And then by his emersion, or rising up out of the water, is signified his entering upon the new course of life, that like as Christ was raised from the dead by the glory of the Father, so we should walk in newness of life.*

Bishop Jewel

Bishop Jewel, in his Apology, p. 308, brings the Council of Wormes, determining the manner of baptism, viz. *That dipping into the water is the going down into Hell (or the grave) and that the coming out of the water is the resurrection.*

And most remarkable is the testimony that **Mr. Baxter** himself gives to this truth wherein he also owns the changing of the ceremony in this **third argument against Mr. Blake**, in these words, viz.

Mr. Baxter

Quoad modum, to the manner, saith he it is commonly confessed by us to the Anabaptists (as our Commentators declare) that in the Apostles' time, the baptized were dipped over head in water. And this signifieth their profession both of believing the burial and resurrection of Christ, and of their own present renouncing the world and flesh, or dying to sin and living to Christ, or rising again to newness of life, or being buried and risen again with Christ as the Apostle expoundeth in the fore cited texts of Col 2 & Rom 6. And though, saith he, we have thought it lawful to disuse the manner of dipping and the use and signification of it, so then he that signally professeth to die and rise again in baptism with Christ doth signally profess saving faith and repentance, but this do all they who are baptized according to the Apostles' practice. Thirdly, From the use of the Ancients and the confessed change thereof, since this rite of dipping in baptism is confirmed.

Daille

Daille, on the Fathers, l. 2, p. 148, saith that *it was a custom heretofore in the ancient church to plunge those they baptized over head and ears in water as, saith he, Tertullian in his Third Book De Cor. Mil. Cyprian in his Seventh Ep. P. 211; Epiphanius, Pan. 30, p. 128 and others testify. And this, saith he, is still the practice both of the Greek and Russian Church at this day as Cassander, De Bapt. P. 193. And yet, saith he, notwithstanding this custom, which is both so ancient and s universal, is now abolished by the Church of Rome and this is the reason (saith he) that the Muscovites say that the Latins are not rightly and duly baptized because they are wont not to use this ancient ceremony in their baptism.*

Walfridus Strabo

Walfridus Strabo, De Reb. Eccles. Tells us *That we must know at the first, believers were baptized simply in floods and fountains.*

Mr. Fox

Mr. Fox tells us in his **Acts and Monuments, Part 1, p. 138 out of Fabian, c. 119, 120**, *That Austin and Paulinus did in the seventh century, baptize here in England great multitudes in the River Trent and the River Swol. Where note by the way, saith Mr. Fox, it followed there was no use of fonts.* The like also, as you'll hereafter find, Gernianus and Lupus, the two French Evangelists, did in the fifth century baptize multitudes in the River Allin near Chester.

Hieremias, Patriarch of Constantinople

Hieremias, Patr. Of Constantinople, ad Theol. Witeburgenses, Resp. 11, c. 4 saith *The ancients baptized not by sprinkling the baptized with water with their hands, but by immersion, following the Evangelist, who came up out of the water. Therefore did he descend, which must needs be immersion and not aspersion.*

Zepperus

Zepperus, De Sacramentis, *From the annotation and etymology of the word, it doth appear, what was of the old custom of administering baptism, which though we have changed into rantizing or sprinkling.*

Dr. Taylor

Dr. Taylor, in his Rule of Conscience, l. 3, c. 4, p. 644, 645: *The ancient church did not in their baptism sprinkle water with their hand, but did immerge and therefore we find in the records of the church that the persons to be baptized were quite naked as it is to be seen in many places, particularly in the Mystagogy Chat. Of St. Cyril and many others (as you have before in the second chapter of this part from Vossius, p. 133). And this immersion was of so sacred an account in their esteem, that they did not esteem it lawful to receive him into the Clergy who had been only sprinkled in baptism as the Epistle of Cornelius to Fabianus of Antioch, Euseb. Lib. 6, c. 43. It is not lawful that he who is sprinkled in his bed by reason of sickness should be admitted to Holy Orders doubting whether such a sprinkling should be called baptism.*

And therefore Magnus, in his Epistle, questions whether they are to be esteemed right Christians who are only sprinkled and nor dipped in water. And that Chrysostom saith that the old man is buried and drowned in the immersion under water and when the baptized person is afterwards raised up from the water, it represents the resurrection of the man to newness of life. And therefore concludes that the contrary custom, being not only against the analogy and mystical signification of the sacraments, is not to be complied with. The Church of Rome confesseth by a learned pen, the Marquis of Worcester, in his Certam. Relig. That she changed dipping the party baptized over head and ears into sprinkling upon the face.

What Clinical Baptism?

Until the third century, we find not any that upon any consideration, did admit of sprinkling. The first we meet with is **Cyprian in his Epistle to Magnus, l. 4, Ep. 7**, where he pleads *for the baptizing of the sick by sprinkling and not by dipping or pouring, called the clinical baptism. Magd. Cent. 3, c. 6, p. 126*, as also *for the sprinkling of new converted prisoners in the prison house.* And which by degrees afterwards they brought in use for sick children also, and then afterwards all children.

Acquinas, Scotus and others of the Schoolmen conclude that *dipping is most agreeable to the institution, but admit that in case of necessity, viz. when either many are to be baptized, scarcity of water, or sickness or weakness, they may sprinkle, Vossius, p. 38.*

All which arguments from the genuine sense of the word, nature of the ordinance and usage of the ancients were excellently inculcated by the learned **Dr. Tillotson, in a Sermon preached at his Lecture in Michael's Cornhil, London, April 15, 1673** from Rom 6: 4 Therefore we are buried with him by baptism into death. Proving from thence that dipping or plunging was the proper ceremony and rite in the ordinance and how naturally arguments did arise from that sign in baptism to enforce holiness and mortification, the thing signified thereby.

Objection

But the word βαπτίζω which you so much stand upon, signifies, if not to sprinkle, yet not only to dip and overwhelm, but also to wash as Mark 7: 4. The washing of hands, cups, pots, vessels, beds and tables which we hope you will grant may be done without dipping or plunging in water.

Answer

That baptism in a sense is washing, I no ways doubt. For you cannot dip a thing, but you may be said to wash it. Therefore in allusion hereto 'tis said in Acts 22 Arise, and be baptized and wash away thy sins. And Tit. 3 The washing of regeneration. And Heb 10 Bodies washed with pure water. And so in dipping of clothes, they wash them. And so here, by dipping of unclean hands, pots, cups, vessels and beds, for tables are not there, the word being βαπτίζω which, as in your margin, signifies a bed, but never a table (as a learned critic observes) they are also washed.

Objection

But hands, cups, vessels and beds may be washed, though not dipped.

Answer

It is true, they may (though not from this scripture, the word being βαπτίζω for though all dipping is washing, yet all washing is not dipping, in a proper sense; (for water sprinkled or poured upon a thing may be so called in an improper sense) though it is a very unusual thing so to deal with unclean hands, beds or vessels. And I presume you will account her but a slut and give her no thanks for her pains that having unclean hands, vessels, beds or clothes, to wash, doth only sprinkle or pour a little water upon them as though that would serve the turn. And doth not our familiar experience tell us that to dip our dirty hands in water is the most effectual way to wash them and that sprinkling or pouring a little water will not do the business? Therefore are we to take washing here in this Mark 7: 4 to be dipping in a proper sense as the word imports and as most agreeable to known custom and use. For neither the word βαπτίζω to wash, nor the word ἐπιβάλλω to pour, ἐπιρροήω to sprinkle, are ever taken to dip or baptize, nor is the word βαπτίζω simply taken for washing, by pouring or sprinkling, that I can find.

The diverse washings mentioned in Heb 9: 10 may well be explained from Lev 1: 9, 13 & 6: 27, 28 & 15: 5, 6; Exod 30:19 to be such as was done by baptizing in water, not sprinkling with or pouring water upon. **Ainsworth, upon Lev 15: 5, to baptize or wash his flesh as is expressed in verses 13 and 16 meaning his whole body and so the Greek translateth Shall wash his body. The Hebrews say every place where it is said in the law of bathing the flesh and washing the clothes of the unclean, it is not meant, but of baptizing the whole body in water, Maim in Makraoth c. 1, s. 2. Figuring out our sanctification by Christ and his Spirit, by whom we draw near to God having hearts sprinkled from an evil conscience and bodies washed with pure**

water, Heb 10: 22. Verse 11 If a man be baptized all over saving the tip of his finger, he is yet in his uncleanness. And if clay or any such thing cleave to the flesh of man, it is unclean still as it was and the baptizing profiteth them nothing, **c. 1, Ser 2, 7, 12.** And verse 12, about the washing of vessels, the Jews have these rules: that nothing must part the vessel. That if the vessel be turned the mouth downward and baptized, it is as if it were not baptized, because the water so comes not to all parts of it. Likewise a vessel full of any liquor except water, and baptized, is as if it were not baptized. **Maim in Makr. C. 3, Ser 1, 12, 18.**

And in 2 Kings 5: 10, the prophet bids Naaman go and wash in Jordan seven times. And accordingly, v. 14 'tis said in obedience hereto and in explanation of that kind of washing the Prophet intended he went and baptized himself seven times in Jordan.

Therefore for any to shun the proper true genuine sense and build a practice upon an uncouth, indirect, unusual and at best an allegorical sense, is no other than as the Proverb is, To leave the King's highway and to take hedge and ditch.

And besides, if you will follow the allusion, do you no wash all that is unclean whether of hands, cup, vessel or bed, but the whole man is all unclean, every member and every part; therefore, all and every part ought to be washed and not the head and face only, as you expect to have all your sins washed away, and every member cleansed by faith in Christ's blood, as well as in this figure, to represent that as every member hath lived to sin, should here also die, be buried, raised and quickened spiritually with Christ in firm assurance of Christ's resurrection and confident expectation of the whole man's being to be raised and glorified in the resurrection of the just. And to which purpose we have **Doctor Goodwin, in his Support of Faith, p. 54,** very excellently, viz. *That the eminent thing signified and represented in baptism is not simply the blood of Christ, as it washeth us from our sins, but there is a farther representation therein of Christ's death, burial and resurrection in the baptized being first buried under water, and then rising out of it and this is not in a bare conformity to Christ in that his death and resurrection. Therefore it is said (we are buried with him in baptism) and wherein we are risen with him, etc. and moreover, here it is that the answer of a good conscience, which is made the inward effect of this ordinance of baptism, 1 Pet 3:21 is there also attributed to Christ's resurrection as the thing signified and represented in baptism and as the cause of that answer of a good conscience, even baptism doth now also save us, etc.*

Therefore to alter this rite from dipping to sprinkling, spoils quite the symbol and makes it quite another thing. And you may as well take a wafer cake, or a while loaf to represent Christ's broken body as sprinkle a little water to figure out his and our death, burial and resurrection by.

And how cometh it to pass that many professor are so exactly curious in that ordinance, yea, to separation itself, both as to subject and circumstance, even to a table gesture of sitting, not kneeling, and yet so negligent and inconsiderate in this.

As for the cavils of unseemliness and hazarding of health to the weak, they are as the fruits of carnal wisdom, unbelief and shunning the cross. So no other than to reproach the wisdom of Christ that so ordained and himself so practiced, telling us, that (however the world may call it indecent) that it is a comely thing therein to follow him in the fulfilling of righteousness. And as for that of unseemliness, they that have, or shall see the decency of the practice, will sufficiently vindicate it from such a calumny and be able to convince Mr. Baxter, or any other Cavilers, of their unchristian slanders of that kind (already touched). And for hazard of health to the weak, the constant, known experience doth amply refute that vain imagination and suggestion.

Chapter V

**Wherein you have an account of several Mischiefs, Absurdities and Contradictions
that are justly to be charged upon the Practice.**

- I. By its altering Christ's order in the commission, Matt 28: 19. Where, in teaching, repentance and faith are required always to proceed or go before baptism which this makes to precede or follow after altogether.
- II. By its changing the subjects of Christ's appointment, viz. men and women of knowledge and understanding, capable to evidence faith and repentance, for ignorant unconverted babes that know neither good or evil, their right hand from their left.
- III. By frustrating all the holy and spiritual ends of the ordinance (which you have before at large) viz. to be a sign of present regeneration, a dying, burying, and rising with Christ, to be the answer of a good conscience, to be a mutual stipulation or contract then and there entered into between God and the party, as well as visible entrance into the church. All which, as applied to a poor ignorant infant, are but mock shows and utterly insignificant and invalid.
- IV. By its inverting the order and manner from dipping the whole man into sprinkling or pouring a little water upon the head or face, contrary to the sense of the word, nature of the ordinance and constant usage of the primitive times, as confessed by the parties themselves, obliging thereby the administrator to tell a lie in the name of the Lord, saying he doth baptize, when he doth but rantize.
- V. By introducing so much error and false doctrine into the world, viz.
 1. that it was to take away original sin;
 2. to work grace and regeneration and to effect salvation by the work done;
 3. that it was an apostolical tradition;
 4. that all children have faith and are disciples of Christ;
 5. that all children of believers are in the covenant of grace, and federally holy.
- VI. By defiling and polluting the church, viz.
 1. By bringing false matter therein, who are no saints by calling, neither being capable to perform duties, nor enjoy privileges;
 2. By laying a foundation of much ignorance and profaneness;
 3. By confounding the world and the church together, which Christ hath separated, bringing the world into the church and turning the church into the world.
- VII. By introducing and establishing many human traditions and inventions of Antichrist together with it as gossips or sureties, bishoping or confirmation, chrism, exorcism, consignation, etc. profaning thereby so solemn as ordinance, taking God's name in vain and making his commandments void.
- VIII. By being such a make-bate, such a bone of contention and that amongst themselves too that own it, as well as with those that oppose it. For what divisions and subdivisions are there amongst them, both as to subject, time, order, circumstances? What endless strifes about women's baptizing and whether bastards, or the children of apostates, heathens or excommunicated persons should be baptized?
- IX. By being an occasion to stir up much bitter hatred, wrath, strife, enmity and persecution against those that oppose it. Oh, how have they been loaded with calumny and reproaches, as the vilest of men, and how in all Ages have they been followed with stripes, imprisonments, confiscations, yea, death itself, as the historical part informeth you.
- X. By confirming hereby the whole Antichristian interest as made good in the preface XI. By ushering in great absurdities, viz.
 1. that persons may have regeneration and grace before calling;
 2. that persons may be visible church members before conversion;
 3. that persons may repent, believe and be baptized and saved by the faith of another
 4. that types and shadows are profitable after the antitype and substance is come, introducing thereby the legal birth privilege, the carnal seed, the typical holiness, the national church, etc. to the reviving Judaism, and outing Christianity;
 5. that the better to exclude believers baptism, new church covenants are invented to enter into the visible church by, instead thereof, especially amongst those that own infants baptism, yet deny then the right of church membership
- XII. By the manifold contradictions that attend the practice.
 1. By asserting that baptism is a symbol of present regeneration wrought and yet apply it to ignorant unconverted babes, so incapable of generation, as Jam 1: 18; 1 Pet 1: 23; John 1: 12,

13. And as so well defined by **Dr. Owen, in his Theol. L. 6, c. 4, p. 480**, viz. *To be a renovation, new creation, vivification, opening blind eyes, raising from death to life, etc.*
2. That it truly figures and represents a death, burial and resurrection, and yet do nothing but sprinkle or pour a little water on the face.
 3. That faith and repentance is required in persons to be baptized and that it is ridiculous, yea, impious and profane to do it without and yet confess that children to whom they apply it, have neither.
 4. That it is the declaration of the spiritual marriage, the stipulation that is mutually entered into between God and the believer, and yet assign it to subjects as incapable of either, as stocks, or stones, bells or church walls, that yet Antichrist makes capable subjects thereof, as well as infants.
 5. That the baptismal covenant enters into the visible church, and yet deny the church members the privileges thereof, or separate from them without any warrantable cause showed, or orderly proceeding either against them or that do own them as such.
 6. That separate from Rome as the false Church and yet own their baptism, the foundation stone thereof. And others that pretend separation from national and parish churches and to disown the baptizing the children of all, good and bad, with the sinful ceremonies attending it, yet if Papist or Protestant either, upon their terms, tender to their fellowship, they are received without renouncing their sinful baptism and performing it in the way they judge right.
 7. That they own the doctrine of perseverance and disown falling from grace, yet baptize all the children of believers because they conclude them in the covenant, and in case of unbelief, reject them as reprobates.

And to all which you may familiarly add by your daily observation, which Chapter we shall conclude with these high expressions of **Dr. Taylor, in his Lib. Pro. P. 244**: *And therefore whoever will pertinaciously persist in this opinion of the Paedobaptists, and practice it accordingly, they pollute the blood of the everlasting covenant. They dishonor and make a pageantry of the sacrament. They ineffectually represent a sepulture into the death of Christ and please themselves in a sign without effect, making baptism like the fig tree in the Gospel, full of leaves, but no fruits, and they invoke the Holy Ghost in vain, doing as if one should call upon him to illuminate a stone or a tree.*

Chapter VI

Wherein the Nullity and utter Insignificance of Infants Baptism is made to appear.

That it is no way safe for any to rest contented with that baptism which they received in their infancy, may appear, because such their baptism is a mere nullity, an insignificant nothing, in respect to the New Testament Ordinance of Baptism. And the reason is plain, because there is that wanting in it which is so essential to true baptism.

Neither Right Matter Nor Form

For first, there is, as the right subject of baptism wanting, so the true external form is wanting also, as practiced with us. For the external form, as before showed, is not sprinkling or pouring a little water upon the head or face, but a dipping the whole person under water and raising him up again to figure our death, burial and resurrection, as before.

If then the matter and form be wanting, which is essential to its being, it must needs be a nullity. For what is more effectual to the being of a thing than matter and form? And how is it possible to define baptism or

any thing else where they are wanting? And which is such a deficiency in that or anything else that makes it a non-entity, or a mere nullity?

Objection

But 'tis said there was the right words of baptism. It was done in the name of the Father, Son and Holy Spirit.

Answer

So there was also in baptizing of bells and churches which in your judgment is so far from making it a right ordinance, the true subject being wanting, that it is no less than a profanation thereof and a miserable taking of the name of God in vain.

And farther to demonstrate and illustrate this point, you know it is generally owned that baptism is no other than out mystical marriage, as being the solemnization of a mutual consent, and striking of a covenant (the essentials of marriage) between Christ and a believer, as **Mr. Baxter fully owns and acknowledges in his Ninth Argument to Mr. Blake** saying: *I conclude Christ hath appointed no baptism, but what is for a visible marriage of the soul to himself (as Protestants, saith he, ordinarily confess) therefore he hath appointed no baptism, but for those that profess to take Jesus Christ to be their husband and to give up themselves to him as his spouse.*

Now, mutual consent in marriage is so essential an ingredient that without it there is no marriage, being, as Beza saith, *the formal cause thereof*, because only *consent makes the marriage* as say the lawyers, so that if there should be only the consent of one party, it is but like a bargain wherein only one side is agreed. For, as is well known, there is no covenant where no consent.

And just so is it in the case of infants baptism, for if you dip an infant without consent or understanding, (that indeed is capable of neither) it no more makes baptism than a bargain a bargain, though one side only be agreed, or if made with an infant, or an idiot, or than a forced bed is lawful matrimony. For as Mr. Baxter before so ingeniously confesseth, that for person to be baptized without such a professed contract, is a baptism not of Christ's appointment. And that being done without repentance and faith, is an impious profanation, yea, ridiculous, saith Mr. Calvin, as before.

And in confirmation of this weighty point of nullity, we are yet farther beholding to **Mr. Baxter**, who is pleased in **his Christian Directory**, amongst the many cases of conscience, to give us the discussion of this, and which, in **p. 817**, you'll find managed after this sort, viz.

Question 41: Are they really baptized who are baptized according to the English Liturgy and Canons where the parent seemeth excluded and those to consent for the infant which have no power to do it?

Answer: I find (saith he) some puzzled with this doubt whether all our infants baptism be not a mere nullity, for, they say, the outward washing without covenanting with God, is no more baptism than the body or corpse is a man. The covenant is the chief essential part in baptism. And he that was never entered into covenant with God, was never baptized. But infants according to the Liturgy are not entered into covenant with God, which they would prove thus: They that neither ever covenanted by themselves, or any authorized person for them, were never entered into covenant with God (for that is no act of theirs which is done by a stranger that hath no power to do it), but, etc. That they did not themselves is undeniable. That they did it not by any person empowered by God to do it for them, we prove, 1. Because Godfathers are the persons (by whom) the infant is said to promise, but Godfathers have no power from God; 2. Not by the scripture, because the parents are not only included as covenanters, but positively excluded; 3. In that the whole office of covenanting for the child from first to last is laid on others; 4. In that the 29th Canon saith (no parent shall be urged to be present, nor admitted to answer as Godfather for his own child) by which the parent is excluded; therefore, our children are all unbaptized. To which he is pleased to answer to this purpose: That though the parent be absent, who yet may, if he please, be silently present, yet his consent is supposed, because he chooseth the sponsors and gives the minister notice beforehand and though my judgment be, that they should be the

principal covenanters for the child expressly, yet the want of that expressness will not make us unbaptized persons.

Now whether Mr. Baxter herein hath not most amply confirmed and not at all answered the scruple, let all men judge. For first, if it be so as scrupled, and by him not denied:

1. That the entering covenant with God is so the essential part of baptism, that without it, it is not;
2. That children cannot;
3. That the sureties (either by the law of God or nature) ought not;
4. That the parent by the Canon law must not.

How then is it possible (which our learned Casuist would impose upon us) that a parent's supposed consent can create a power in another to do a thing, which neither the Law of God nor Nature enjoins or approves. And therefore have we not good and substantial ground from this argument to conclude that forasmuch as children, by the Liturgy are baptized without any covenanting with God, either by themselves or others (authorized by God thereto) therefore their baptism is mere nullity.

And as to his saying (dictator and oracle-like) that a parent hath a covenanting power for his child inherent in him and which he may confer upon another, it is but begging the question in both parts and no less than opposing the Canon, but especially a contradicting the whole current of scripture.

As to the human invention of gossips, or sureties for children and bells, etc. you have before at large treated of both as to their origin and use and also how sinful and ridiculous by the Bishop of Down, p.84. Which chapter therefore I shall conclude with the words of **Mr. L.** A person of great learning and moderation as generally esteemed in his **Book of Baptism** upon this point, **p. 359.** *And the patrons of baptism I hope will pardon me. If Chamier affirms of baptism not given by a right minister, I with more equity and reason affirm here that it is not a sacrament, but a rash mockery or deceiving, by no means to be endured in the Church.*

Chapter VII

Wherein there is an account of some eminent witness that hath been born against Infants Baptism from first to last.

Tertullian's Witness

The first we shall mention is that excellent testimony **Tertullian** bore against it upon the first appearance of it in the third century in his book **De Baptismo, c. 18** wherein he dissuades from the practice by such like arguments as these, viz.

First, from the mistake of the scripture usually brought to enforce it which was afterwards called the scripture canon for baptism, viz. mat 19: 14 ***Suffer little children to come to me and forbid them not for of such is the kingdom of heaven,*** etc.

It is true, saith he, *the Lord saith do not forbid them to come unto me. Let them come therefore when they grow elder, when they learn, when they are taught why they come; let them be made Christians when they can know Christ.*

Secondly, from the weightiness of the ordinance which ought not to be trifled with. *For,* saith he, *they that do understand the weight of baptism, will rather fear the attaining it, than the deferring it.*

Thirdly, from the sinfulness of such a practice: *so rashly,* saith he, *to give such Holy things to dogs and to cast such pearls before swine and so headily to partake of other men's sins.*

Fourthly, from the absurdity of it, *to refuse to commit earthly and secular things to their trust by reason of their incapacity and yet to commit to and entrust them with heavenly and spiritual things.*

Fifthly, from the folly of exposing of witnesses *who by death may not only frustrate their promises, but be disappointed through the evil disposition of them they so largely undertake for,* **Magd. Cent 3, c. 6, p. 125.**

Sixthly, from the consideration that the adult were the only proper subjects of baptism, because, saith he, *fasting, confession, prayer, profession, renouncing the devil and his works is called for from them.* **Coron. Mil. 124.**

The Witness Born by the Novations and Donatists

The second we shall mention is the witness that the Novations and Donatists gave against it. Donatus, a learned man in Africa, taught that they should baptize no children but only those that believed and desired it. **Sebast. Frank. Chron. Fol 76.**

That the followers of Donatus were all one with the Anabaptists, denying baptism to children, admitting the believers only thereto, who despised the same and that non ought to be forced to any belief. **Twisk Chron, l. 6, p. 201.**

Austin's third and fourth books against the Donatists do demonstrate that they denied infants baptism wherein he manageth the argument for infants baptism against them with great zeal enforcing it by several arguments, but especially from apostolical tradition and cursing with great bitterness they that should not embrace it.

And therefore **Osiander in his Epit. Cent. 16, p.175** saith *that our modern Anabaptists were the same with the Donatists of old.* And **Fuller in his Ecclesiastical History, l. 5, p. 229** saith *that the Anabaptists are the Donatists new dipped.* **Bullinger** saith *the Donatists and the then Anabaptists held the same opinions,* **lib. 5, fol. 216, 222, of Baptism.**

And in farther confirmation thereof, Pope Innocent I, the first instituter and inposer of infants baptism, did banish this people (called Cathari) out of Rome, as **Socrates, l. 7, c. 9:** *We put the Donatists and Novations together because they did so well agree in principle (though of different regions: the Donatists in Africa, the Novations in Italy) as Crispin's French Hist. P. 17 (out of Albaspinus upon Optat. Milevitannus Observat 20.)* telleth us sating that *they hold together in the following things, viz.*

First, for purity of church members, by asserting that none ought to be admitted into churches, but such as were visibly true believers and real saints. Secondly, for the purity of church discipline, as the application of church censures and keeping out such as bad apostatized or scandalously sinned. Thirdly, they both agreed in asserting the power, rights and privileges of particular churches against Antichristian encroachments of Presbyters, Bishops and Synods. Fourthly, that they baptized again those whose first baptism the had ground to doubt.

Eckbertus and Emericus, two great opposers of the Waldenses, for denying baptism to children (as afterwards you'll find) do assert that *the new Cathari or Puritans (which they called the Waldenses) do conform to the doctrine and manners of the old Cathari, viz. the Novations.*

And Paul Perin in his History of the Waldenses, tell us that *the Fratricelli, or little brethren, another name given to the Waldenses, were time out of mind in Italy and Dalmatia and were the offspring of the Novations persecuted and driven from Rome about 400 and who for their purity in communion were also called Cathari.*

And as for **Cassander's Reason in his Epistle to the Duke of Cleve**, why the Donatists did not disown infants baptism, mentioned also by Mr. Cobbes, I conceive hath no weight at all in it, viz. because the 6th Council of Carthage decreed *that all that returned from the Donatists, should be received into the Catholic Church without rebaptization though baptized in infancy* which is but a supposition at best that they might be baptized in infancy or they might not and can signify nothing against all the former arguments.

Argument

But the Novations and Donatists were by popes and Councils adjudged and dealt with as heretics.

Answer

So were the Waldenses as you'll hear anon more. And so have been the Christians in all ages therefore all that have been so censured ought not so to be esteemed. Paul himself tells us that *in the way they called heresy, so worshipped he the God of his fathers.* And indeed what part of the purest Gospel way and worship

has escaped this censure? Neither doth it follow, if Christians should err or mistake themselves in some things, that therefore they must be rejected as heretics in others.

I could enumerate several gross errors and mistakes of Austin himself (their great opposer) as they are recorded amongst his Navi. Must he therefore be esteemed a heretic?

But as to the Novations and Donatists (so much one in principle and practice) however adjudged by Popes and Councils, I cannot find they were other than a very holy people especially the Novations whose great crime was that they pressed after purity in worship and to separate as you have heard from Antichristian defilement and therefore called Puritans or Cathari, concerning whom Socrates Scholasticus speaks so honorably and so largely vindicates from the calumnies cast upon them, defending then to be a holy, zealous, sincere and faithful people.

The Witness born by the Ancient Britains

The next we shall mention is that witness we find borne by the old Britains (of whose antiquity and purity in Christianity, you have a more particular account in the following history) who having, as you will find, received the Christian Doctrine and Worship from the Apostles' time, did entirely keep thereto, cleaving to the scriptures, utterly renouncing all Romish traditions and superstitions, especially the remains of them that after the Roman and Saxon invasions, inhabited Wales to whom the Austin the Monk, the Legate of the Pope Gregory, about the year 604, did address in two assemblies that he procured upon the borders of Wales to engage them as he had done many of the Saxons, to embrace the Romish Rites, especially in christening children and keeping Easter. But inasmuch as they utterly refused to be seduced by him therein, he not only threatened their ruin, but accomplished the same in short time thereafter.

Concerning which, **Mr. Fox in his Martyrology, p 153, 154, part 1**, tells us that *Austin having charged them to preach with him to the English and that they should among themselves form certain Rites and Usages in their church, especially for keeping their Easter tide and baptizing after the manner of Rome*, and for which he quotes Bede, Polichron, Huntington, Jornalenses and Jeff. Montriouth and Fabian, **part 5, c, 119 &c. Fabian** expresseth himself thus, **fol. 125, Part 5**, viz. *Then he said to them, since you will not assent to my hosts generally, assent you to me especially in three things. The first is that you keep Easter in due form and time as it is ordained. The second that you give Christendom to children and the third, that you preach to the Saxons as I have exhorted you. And all the other debate I shall suffer you to amend and reform amongst yourselves, but, saith he, they would not thereof.* To whom then Austin spake and said that *if they would not take peace with their brethren, they should receive war with their enemies. And if they disdained to preach with them the way of life to the English Nation, they should suffer by their hands the revenge of death.* And which Austin Accomplisheth accordingly by bringing the Saxons upon them to their utter ruin as you will hear afterwards at large. And thereupon saith Fabian that *that faith that had endured in Britain for near 400 years, became near extinct through all the land.*

And that the Churches in Britain did oppose the baptizing of infants and assert and practice that of believers is farther manifest by these following arguments:

1. Because, as you'll find in the history, that they received the scriptures, the old Christian faith, doctrine and discipline from the Apostles and Asiatic Churches who had no such thing as the baptizing of infants amongst them as you have largely heard.
2. Because it appears they so fully prized and faithfully adhered to the scriptures, both for doctrine and discipline, wherein no such thing is to be found, as also you have understood, and as is confessed.
3. Because they did so vehemently reject human traditions in the worship of God, especially all Romish innovations, rites and ceremonies, this, as before, undeniably appearing to come from Rome's ordination and imposition.
4. Because Constantine the Great, the son of Constance and the famous Helena (both eminent Christians) born in Britain, in the year 305, was not baptized till he was aged, as before. A clear proof that the Christians in Britain in those days did not baptize their children.
5. Because of the correspondency and unity that were between the French Christians after called Waldenses, and them who had colleges like them, communicated in the ministry with them, both in preaching and baptizing, viz. Germanus and Lupus, two famous French men, sent for to help against the Pelagian heresy, who were not only useful and serviceable to suppress that error, but were instrumental

to convert many and did baptize great multitudes amongst them upon confession of faith in the River Allin, near Chester.

6. Lastly, another argument why they did not baptize children in Britain, because Austin himself, the Romish Emissary, was himself so raw and ignorant of the rite when he came first into Britain, as appears by that question which he, amongst others, writ from thence to Pope Gregory to be resolved in, viz. How long the baptizing of a child might be deferred (there being no danger of death)? In his tenth Interrogatory, **Ex Decreta Greg. Lib. 1, Concil. Tem. 2.**

Some Witness born by several Eminent Persons in several ages against Infants Baptism.

That in the fourth century, Dadoes, Sabu, Adalpheus and Simonis, eminent learned men, were accused of heresy by the Romish church and amongst other things, *they were charged to have an ill opinion of the sacrament of the altar and of infants baptism.* **Eccles. Hist. Tripart, l. 7, c. 11, Sebast. Frank. Chron. Rom. Hereticks. Printed, Anno 1568. Fol 96.**

Vincentius Victor did oppose Austin in the point of infants baptism. **Austin, l. 3, c. 14. De Anima. Vicecomes l. 2, c. 1.**

Cresconius did also oppose Austin in the point of infants baptism and did maintain a rebaptization of those that were baptized by heretics or unbelievers and that there was no true baptism but that which was administered after faith. **Jacob Merning Bapt. Hist. P. 416.**

Faustus Regiensis, a Bishop in France, taught that personal and actual desire was requisite in every one that was to be baptized. **Merning, Bapt. Hist. P. 425.**

Albanus, a zealous godly minister in that sixth century, was put to death for baptizing of believers though baptized in infancy or by heretics. **Sebast. Frank. Fol 136, col. 3. Baronius Annal. 413, numb 6. Twisk Chron. L. 5, p. 149.**

In the year 538, in the time of Justinus and Justinianns, there were a sort of people called swermers who had persuaded and by reason convinced the Imperial Council and their servants that they should lay aside childrens baptism against whom and their doctrine the said Emperors did oppose themselves. **Jacob Merning, p. 487 out of Rulicius.**

Rulicius, p. 249 and Glanaus, p. 627 concerning the foresaid Swermers, say, that at that time there were risen a strange people called Swermers who were honest and godly teachers and Christians that from the example of Christ's baptism did reprove the evil custom of childrens baptism that like an inundation was then broken in. Who had by reason convinced the Imperial Council to leave off childrens baptism.

Nicephorus, **l. 17, c. 9** saith that in the year 550, one Peter, Bishop of Apamen and a Zeroaras, a Monk in Syria, did maintain and defend the point of dipping, rebaptization or weder-dipping. **Magd. Cent. 6, c. 5, p. 305. Twisk Chron. In the year 586.**

Adrianus, Bishop of Corinth, who flourished under the Emperor Maurice, in the seventh century, did publicly oppose infants baptism insomuch as he would neither baptize them himself, nor suffer them to be baptized by others, but wholly denied baptism to them. Therefore he was accused by Gregorius Magnus, Bishop of Rome, to Jo. Bishop of Larissa, as appears by Gregorius' letter to the said John, in which among other things, he complains against the said Adrian that he turned away young children from baptism and let them die without it. For which they proceeded against him as a great transgressor and blasphemous. **Magd. Cent 6, p. 655. Merning. Hist. Bapt. P. 496. Montanus, p. 80 Dutch Martyrol. P. 204.**

Sebast. Frank., fol 74, saith that about the year 610, childrens baptism was held in many places of little esteem by the learned endeavors of Adrianus and others; therefore, the Popes set themselves to uphold it. And particularly at the Council of Bracerene, Anno 610, it was ordained, concluded and published that young children must be baptized as being necessary to salvation upon penalty of damnation. **Jacob Merning. P. 546. Dutch Martyrol. P. 204.**

In Lower Saxony one Birinius, an eminent learned man, professed instruction to be necessary before baptism. **Bed. L. 4, c. 16.** And that without it, baptism ought not to be administered to high or low. **Bede, l. 4, c. 16, & l. 3, c. 7. Dutch Martyrol. P. 205.**

About the year 670, Christ's baptism after the preaching of faith in the right manner, was practiced in Egypt and in such esteem, that some in other lands did restore the Christian religion according to their example, who in this point differed so much from the Church of Rome, and who were therefore called the beginners of the Christian religion which makes Jacob Pamelius upon Tertullian say in these words that *the beginners of Christian religion who had separated themselves from the Romish church, had placed religion upon its first apostolical foundation in teaching faith before baptism as owned by the Egyptian divines.* **Jacob Vicomes, l. 2, c. 3 Pamelius upon Tertullian. Dutch Martyrol. Cent 7.**

Hinchmarus, Bishop of Landum in France, in the 9th century, renounced childrens baptism and refused any more to baptize any of them so that they grew up without baptism, yea, many died without it. Upon which he was accused by the Bishop of Rhemes, who sharply writes to him after this manner: *Though thou knowest that except a man be born of water and the spirit, &c., yet thou hast forbidden the baptizing of children although they were upon the point of death hazarding thereby their damnation. Whereas it is written that The Son of man came not to destroy a soul, but to save it. And hast also contradicted the decree of the African Council (viz. the Milevitan Canon by Pope Innocent) which I have heretofore signified to thee by writing therefore leave off such an abominable doctrine of refusing baptism to children, leave off dividing the church of God by such a schism, cut not thyself off by cleaving to thy own opinion and for which he and his diocese were accused in the Synod of Accinicus in France, in these words: Ne Missas celebrarent, aut infantes baptizarent, aut poenitentes absolvent, aut nortnos sopelirent; that they neither celebrated mass, baptized children, absolved the penitents or buried the dead.* **Bibl. Patrum, Tom 9, part 2, p. 137. Magd. Cent 9, c. 4, p. 40, 41, 43. Dutch Martyrol. P. 244, part 1.**

In the 9th century, one Gilbertus, a learned man, heretofore of another mind, opposed the Pope and Romish Church upon the point of baptism. For in general it is taught by them that upon the pain of salvation it is necessary to baptize young children although they be not regenerated, nor cannot desire it which nevertheless is required in those that are baptized. Matt 28. In opposition thereto, he therefore taught that baptism only accompanied salvation to those that were regenerated and did desire the same which he considered as the chief means with the grace of God to attain salvation. Yet, nevertheless, denied not salvation to a believer through the grace of God though he had not attained baptism an opportunity being wanting to him though concluding it very necessary and desirable to every believer to obey Christ therein.

Magd. Cent 10, c. 4. Merning Hist. Bapt. P. 567. Dutch Martyrol. P. 260

Smaradus, heretofore a defender, now an opposer of infants baptism, writing of the power, life and practice of baptism, upon Matt 28 saith that *they first were to teach and then to baptize with water after teaching.* **Dutch Martyrol. P. 263**

Heribertus and Lisonius and Stephanus with eleven Christians more were burned at Orleans in France for opposing childrens baptism. **Vignier Eccl. Hist. Anno 1022 and Abraham Mellin. Fol. 381. Glabar. Hist. L. 3, c. 8.**

At Gostar in the time of H. 3 Emperor, several were put to death for opposing infants baptism under the name of Manichees. **Abr. Mellin. Hom 8, fol 422.**

Peter Abalardus, a learned man. A great impugner of infants baptism, imprisoned and martyred in Rome. **Abrah. Mellinus, l. 2, p. 425**

At Parenze in Italy, many who opposed Paedobaptism and other articles of the Roman Church were condemned and suffered death. **Baron. Annals, T. 11, Anno 1095. Abr. Mel. Fol 395**

Gerardus Sagerellus, for opposing the Romish Church in holding against the doctrines of infants baptism was burned at Parma. **Abr. Mell. P. 470, col. 3. Balas, cent 4, c. 30.**

Dulcinus of Novaria, with his wife Margaretha, for holding the doctrine of the Waldenses, were cruelly tortured and burned at Novaria in Lumbardy. **Leon Krentz Chron. Prat. De Hares. Tit. Dulcin Ex Barnarda Lutzenburg. Twisk Chron. L. 14 Anno 1308, p. 649. Hen. Boxh. Fol 26.**

By the decree of Alphonsus, five men and three women were burned at Troyes in Champaigne Anno 1200. **Belgick Chron. Anno 1067, p. 189**

Nineteen persons were condemned and burned, witnessing against Paedobaptism in the bishopric of Tholouse. **Vignier, Anno 1232, Eccles. Hist.**

At Marseilles in France, four Monks which were converted from the Romish religion were by Pope John 22 burned for opposing Paedobaptism. **Abraham Mel. L. 2, fol 480.**

At Crema in Austria, in the bishopric of Passau, many of the Waldenses were burned for opposing Paedobaptism, Anno 1315. **Trithem. Chron An. 1315, p. 211. Hen. Boxb. Fol 27.**

A pious woman named Peronne of Aubicon in Flanders was burned in the profession of this faith witnessing against Paedobaptism in the year 1373. **Dutch Martyrol. Part 2, fol. 497.**

At Mompelier in France was burned in the year 1417, Katherine Van Thaw, a pious matron, witnessing to the same truth. **Dutch Martyrol. P. 405.**

At Ausburgh in Germany, Anno 1517 was burned Hans Koch and Leonard Meister as also the learned Michael Satler at Heb. In Germany and Leonard Keyser in Byren, all witnessing to the Waldensian faith in opposing Paedobaptism the same year. **Jacob Merning. P. 748**

Faelix Mautz, a faithful servant of Christ, owning the same faith was drowned at Zurich, Anno 1527. **Dutch Martyrol. 213 p. 9.**

Leonard Skooner, a Baptist teacher, was beheaded at Rottenburg in Germany and 70 more of the same persuasion were at the same place put to death, Anno 1527. **Dutch Martyrol. L. 2, p. 91.**

John Wouteriz, a prisoner at Dort, 1572, was by the scout required to be burned for departing from the faith, being baptized again, contrary to the Emperors edict which he denied saying he was never baptized but once after faith for the baptism of children he held for no baptism. **Old Dutch Book of Martyrs, p. 629.**

This instance is misplaced, being put into Cent 6, p. 144 which belongs to Cent 16.

Christian Gastiger at Ingelstad opposed infants baptism and was put to death for the same at Bern, Anno 1586. **Dutch Martyrol. Part 2, p. 16.**

The Witness born by the Waldenses

The next we shall produce, is the most eminent testimony that was borne by the Waldenses, those French Christians, who are so very famous in story for the defense of the Gospel against Antichristian usurpations, that the learned Usher in his book of the State and Succession of the Christian Church, doth trace its succession through them in a distinction from, and opposition to that of the Papacy, the Romish Church. And who, amongst other of Christ's ordinances (that they defended and witnessed to, to death and banishment and bonds) that of baptizing believers, in opposition to that of infants, was, you'll find by plentiful evidence, none of the leaving the history of this famous people as to the names they are known by in story, their origin, growth, excellency and suffering till the conclusion, we proceed to demonstrate to you what witness they gave unto this great truth, in the particulars following, viz.

1. In their public confession of faith;
2. In the particular witness that some of their principal men bare thereto;
3. In the more general witness borne by the body of people, as appears by decrees of Councils, the Decretal Epistles and general Edicts given forth against the whole party for the same.
4. In the footsteps that we find thereof in the several countries, where the have heretofore imprinted the same.

The First is the Witness we find hereof in their public Confessions of Faith.

In their ancient **Confession of Faith, bearing date 1120, Article 13**, they say: *We acknowledge no other sacraments but baptism and the supper of the Lord.* **P. Perin 87.**

And in **Article 28** of another confession: *that God doth not only instruct us by his word, but has also ordained certain sacraments to be joined with it as 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 to all the members of the Church under the New Testament, viz. Baptism and the Supper of the Lord.* **Morland B. 1, C. 4, p. 67.**

And in another very ancient **Confession of Faith, Art. 7**: *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, there protesting and declaring openly our faith and amendment of life.* **P. Perin, p. 89.**

Vignier, in his Ecclesiastical History, saith: *They expressly declare to receive the Canon of the Old and New Testament and to reject all doctrines which have not their foundations in it or are in anything contrary to it. Therefore all the traditions and ceremonies of the Church of Rome they condemn and abominate saying she is a den of thieves and the Apocaliptical Harlot, Usher, p. 374.*

And in their ancient **Confession, Article 11**: *We esteem for an abomination and as Antichristian, all human inventions as a trouble and prejudice to the liberty of the Spirit.* And in their ancient catechism, you have these farther principles about tradition and human inventions, as you'll find them in **P. Peron De Doct. De Vaud. Liv 1, p. 168, 169**: *When human traditions are observed for God's ordinances, then is he worshipped in vain as the Prophet Isaiah affirmeth, c. 19 And our Savior himself alledgeth, 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.*

But the Lord chargeth his to take heed of such false prophets to separate, avoid and withdraw from them, Mat 16: 6-13; Psa 26: 5; 2 Cor 6: 14; Rev 18. And,

In their ancient treatise concerning Antichrist, writ 1120. They say that *he attributes the regeneration of the Holy Spirit unto the dead outward work, baptizing children into that faith and teaching that thereby baptism and regeneration must be had, grounding therein all his Christianity which is against the Holy Spirit. P. Perin, l. 3, p. 267.*

The Second is the Witness we find borne hereto by several of their most eminent leading men.

Beringarius

The first we begin is the famous Beringarius of Turain in Anjou, one of their Barbs, as Morland, who in the 11th century did so eminently and learnedly oppose transubstantiation and other Popish innovations. And for which he was persecuted for above 30 years by no less than five Popes, viz. Leo IX, Nic. II, Alex. II, Greg. VII and prosecuted by five desperate persecutors, viz. Guitmund, Algerius, Fulbertus, Heilbrand, after Greg. VII and Launifrank Archbishop of Canterbury, and sentenced in no less than four Councils as the **Magdeburgs** tell us, viz. the first Lateran, the Vercellans, the Thirene and second Lateran, as **Cent 11, p. 454, 456, 457.**

Who with his witness against the real presence, doth also testify against that other of baptizing of children. **The Magdeburg. Cent. 11, c. 5, p. 240** tell us that *Beringarius did in the time of Leo the IX about the year 1049 publicly maintain his heresies which they set down to be denying transubstantiation and baptism to little ones* under five heads which **Launifrank Archbishop of Canterbury**, in his book called **Scintillaris**, answers at large. And as to that of his denying infants baptism, he answers by saying: *He doth thereby oppose the general doctrine and universal consent of the church. P. 243.*

Cassander, in his epistle to the Duke of Cleve, saith that *Guitmund, Bishop of Averse doth affirm that with the real presence in the Eucharist, he did deny baptism to little ones though no the latter so publicly as the former knowing (as he saith) that the ears of the worst of men would not brook that blasphemy.* In the **Bibliotheca Patrum, printed at Paris, p.432**, it is recorded that Durandus Bishop of Leodienses, hearing that Henry I King of France had called a Council to suppress the heresies of Bruno, Bishop of Anjou, and Beringarius or Teurionensis, writes a large epistle to him to this purpose: first, to applaud his wisdom in the calling of that Council to suppress those pernicious doctrines of the old heresies now modernly revived which had filled all ears through France and Germany. Then secondly, mentions the same to be, first, the affirming the Eucharist to be not the real body, but a shadow and figure rather of the body of Christ, and Secondly, the denying and as much as in them lay, the destroying the baptism of infants. Then thirdly, show the necessity of the Council's severity against them especially against the Bishop Bruno whose influence in his capacity might be of so evil consequence and therefore adviseth that they should not be suffered to much as to speak in the Council. And lastly, endeavors to confute the said opinions, viz. the first, from several authorities of the ancients as Leo, Ambrose, Hilary, Cyril, Basil and the second, concerning infants baptism, from a single quotation out of Austin against the Donatists, l. 4 which epistle you have at large in the said Bibl. Patr.

Mr. Clark, in his Martyrology, tells us, *that God raised up Beringarius who boldly and faithfully preached and witnessed to the truth against the Romish errors whereupon the Gospellers were called Beringarians for about 100 years after.*

Matth. Paris saith that *Beringarius had drawn all France, Italy and England to his opinion, 1087.*

Dr. Usher tells us in the **Succession of the Church, p. 252 out of Thuanus**, that *Bruno Archbishop of Tryers did expel several of the Beringarian sect that had spread his doctrine in several of those Belgic Countries and that several of them upon examination, did say that baptism did not profit children to salvation as (saith he) the authors of the Acts of Bruno (found in the Lord Carew's Library of Clapton) doth testify.*

But as to Beringarius, it is objected and said that he did recant and revoke his opinion as appears by the recantation itself recorded by Gratian.

To which I answer in the words of a learned man expressed in **Crispin's French History, fol 21**, *that if he did through frailty recant and deny the truth, it was no other than Peter did before him who yet repented of that evil and so did Beringarius too and wrote against his own recantation so violently extorted from him. For most conclude he lived some time after and dies in his former profession, a man of great worth and goodness as his epitaph by his scholar Heldebert, Bishop of Tryers discovers, mentioned by Malmsbury, p. 114:*

*Vir vere sapiens, & parte beatus ab omni
Qui caelos anima, corpore ditat humum.
Post obitum vivam secum, secum requiescam, Nec
sciat melior sors mea sorie sua.*

He was a man was blessed on every part.
The earth has his body, the heaven his heart.
My wish shall be that at that my end,
My soul may rest with this my friend.

Peter Bruis

The second eminent witness we meet with amongst the Waldenses was the famous Peter Bruis of Tholouse, another of their renowned Barbes who publicly and most successfully preached the Gospel in that City and the Provinces round about it for about 20 years. Who for his opposing the doctrines of the church of Rome was apprehended, imprisoned and burned in the fields of St. Giles near Tholouse about the year 1136. Whose doctrines and positions, for which he suffered, we have recorded by the **Magdeb. Cent. 12, 843 and L. Osiander, Cent 12, 262**. And amongst which we find these about baptism. First, *that infants are neither to be saved, nor to be baptized by the faith of another, all being to be baptized and expect to be saved by their own proper faith.* Secondly, *that baptism without proper faith saves not.*

These two positions, saith Osiander (the Lutheran) have no error in them the Papists being rather to be condemned who deny infants to have proper faith. Thirdly, that little children that are baptized in their infancy, after they are come to understanding, are to be baptized again and which is not to be esteemed rebaptization, but right baptism.

These two, saith Osiander, are heretical and Anabaptistical. Cent 12, l. 3, p. 262.

All which, with his assertions about transubstantiation, worshipping of images, purgatory, etc. are distinctly and at large answered by Peter Cluniensis whereof the Magdeburgs do give a particular account. And also you have the said Peter (writing to three Bishops in France about this time) saying that *neither Temples nor Altars are made by these people, neither are crosses worshipped, but rather broken and trodden under foot. The Mass is esteemed an abomination and that the benefits of the living did not profit the dead, &c. And that this heresy of the Petrobrussians was received in Gallia Narbonensis, complaining that the people were rebaptized, the churches, altars and crosses profaned, flesh eaten in Lent, yea, upon Good Friday itself.*

This Peter Bruis was supposed to have written the Treatise of Antichrist, whereof you have some account in the history and so eminent and worthy a person, that for many years the Waldenses were called Petrobrussians.

Arnoldus

The next we shall mention is the famous Arnoldus, or rather the Arnoldenses, there being three of that name.

The first, viz. Arnoldus of Brixia, was in the second Lateran Council with Peter Bruis, censured for the heresy of rejecting infants baptism, church blessings and the adoration of the cross. **Prid. Introduct. To Hist. Latin Councils, p. 23.**

The said Arnoldus was in the year 1155 as saith Usher out of Gerbobus, *at Rome put to death, being first hanged, then his body burned and his ashes flung into Tiber, lest the people of Rome following his doctrine should adore him.*

Another eminent man of this name, (and one of the Waldensian Barbes also) whom Eckbertus, as **Usher** tells us, **p. 292** calls the Arch-Cathari or Puritans, was with two of his associates, viz. Marsillyus and Theodoricus, who with him managed a public dispute at Cologne against one Eckbertus, were burned, Arnold, and eight more of his disciples at Cologne, August 2, 1163 and Theodoricus and Marsullyus afterwards at Bunnae near Cologne. Eckbertus saith that the principal argument they brought against infants baptism was Christ's commission, Mat 28: 19; Mark 16: 15, 16.

We read also of another Arnold who in the time of Honorius II, 1124, was burned at Rome for witnessing against the pride, pomp and luxury of the priests, as **Prid. In his Introduction and Baronius in his Annals, 1124.** Baleus saith he was an Englishman.

The Waldensian sect were also called Arnoldists as **Bishop Usher and P. Pirin** tell us after their names.

Henricus

Another eminent person we meet with, witnessing to this great truth, was one Henricus, a great friend and colleague of P. Bruis' whose doctrines and positions are also recorded by the **Magdeburgs**, under eleven heads. The first whereof was denying baptism to children. **Cent. 12, 843.** Which Bernard at large endeavors to answer and confute telling us that infants are to be baptized upon the faith of the church.

The same **Bernard, in his epistle to Heldefonsus, Earl of St. Giles**, saith: *The Henrici* (for so they called his followers) *did deny holidays, sacraments, churches and priests, complaining that the children of Christians were excluded the life of Christ whilst they denied them the grace of baptism and not suffered them to partake of grace and salvation thereby.*

Cassander in his epistle before the book of Baptism, saith: *that Peter Bruis and Henry, his disciple and colleague, were great propagators of the error of denying baptism to little ones, affirming that it did only belong to the adult.*

Thirdly, In the Witness borne not only by some particular men, but by the Body of the People, as appeareth by Decrees of Councils, Decretal Epistles and Edicts given forth against them, as well as the Testimony of many Learned Writers.

Dr. Usher

Dr. Usher, out of the Fragments of the History of Aquitain, written by P. Pithao, p. 81, 82, tells us *that in the time of Robert, King of France, that they of Aquitain and Tholouse (principal places of the Waldenses) did deny baptism* (for so they called denying baptism to little ones), *the sign of the cross, the real presence in the Eucharist and other rites of the church and that many of them were sentenced by Council and burned.*

Dr. Usher also tells us out of Papir. Masson, in his French Annals, *that fourteen citizens of Orleans, in the reign of King Robert, were convicted of the same heresy, for denying baptismal grace, and the real presence and were all burned alive and that the names of three of the chief of them were Herbert, Lisius and Stephen.*

Dr. Usher tells us *that in the time of the Emperor Henry II, 1017, many of this sect were about Milan fined and banished,* as he tells us, **Antonius in his History, 2 Tit. 15, chap. 23** informeth.

And also **out of Radulph. Ard. Homil.** tells us *that in German, under the reign of Henry IV about 1054, several of this people whom they called the Manchean sect (and the reason of it you will understand afterwards) did inhabit the Country of Aganensis, who denied baptism and the sacrament of the altar.*

Pope Gregory VII decreed, 1070, *that those young children whose parents are absent or unknown should accordingly to the tradition of the fathers be baptized.*

Bernard, Abbot of Clarawel, in the twelfth century, in his 66th sermon on Canticles complained that *the Cathari did deride them because they baptized infants and prayed for the dead and asserted purgatory and that the soul as soon as it is departed out of the body went to salvation or damnation.*

Eckbertus, a great Doctor about the same time, in his sermon against the Cathari, saith that *they say concerning the baptizing of children that through their incapacity, it nothing profited them to salvation. And that baptism ought to be deferred till they come to years of discretion and that then only they ought to be baptized when they can with their own mouths make a profession of faith and desire it* and which he largely endeavors to confute in that sermon, **Bib. Pat. Tom 2, fol 99, 106.**

Erbrardus

Erbrardus, another great writer of this age, in his book **contra Waldenses**, proves infants baptism (which he saith they deny) by two scriptures, namely, Mat 19: **14 Suffer little children to come unto me**, &c. And 1 Cor 15 **Baptized for the dead**. Whence he thus reasons: *If they of old baptized the living for the dead, for their eternal salvation, though they neither received it, nor were capable thereof, how much more doth the faith of the Gossips avail for spiritual grace and salvation in the baptizing the persons of the little ones themselves.* **Bib. Pat. Tom. 4.**

Dr. Usher in his foresaid book of the **Succession of the Church, p. 292**, tells us **out of Decretal. L. 5, tit. 6. C. 10**, that *Pope Alexander the Third, in the Turonensian Synod, held 1163, touching Albigenses, made the following Canon, viz. To damn any heresy that had so infected as a canker, all those parts about Gascogne, requiring the clergy of every sort to give their utmost diligence to detect and suppress it and to require all upon penalty of excommunication, not only to refuse harboring of them, but to avoid all civil communion and converse with them. And if taken by any catholic Princes, that they be imprisoned and their goods and estates confiscated. And in as much as multitudes under pretence of sojourning together in one mansion house (which was very much the custom of the Waldenses to do) do under that color carry on their errors in such co-habitations that all such conventicles should diligently be searched out and if found, to be proceeded with by Canonical severity.*

And further the said **Dr. Usher tells us out of Hoveden's Annals, fol. 319**, that *the said Pope Alexander III did in the year 1176 the better to extirpate the Albigenses, send a Cardinal and three Bishops, as commissioned inquisitors against them, under the names of the Cridentes, Lyonists, Patrinos, Bonhomes or Manichees (of the reason of which names you will understand afterwards) with a Creed to put to them for the better discovering of them. In which these following are some of the Articles, viz. We believe we cannot be saved except we eat the body of Christ and which is not so except consecrated in a church by a priest. We believe that one are saved except they are baptized and that children are saved by baptism and that baptism is to be performed by a priest in the church.* **Hoved. Annals 319.6.**

In the same year Pope Alexander calls another **Gallican Council** to convince and condemn the Albigensian heresy.

In **the Third Canon** whereof they say *they do convince and judge them of heresy by denying baptism to children or that they are to be saved thereby*, urging arguments from Christ's dying for all and from the circumcising of infants of old for their baptizing. And affirming that the faith of the Gossips is sufficient to baptize upon, &c. Which you have at large in the **Book of Decretals**.

Two years after, as saith **Mat. Paris. Viz. 1178**, *Cardinal Chrysoginus is sent inquisitor to suppress the heretics about Tholouse that had evil sentiments about the sacraments. In which inquisition many of them were persecuted and amongst the rest Roger d'Bodres.*

Also this same Pope Alexander III in the year 1179 in the general Lateran Council condemns the Waldensian or Catharian heresy and in Canon 27 anathematizeth the Cathari, etc. dwelling in Gascogne, Albi and other

parts about Tholouse and amongst the rest of their heresies, for denying baptism to children, and for their contempt of all the sacraments. Decret.

Favin, in his History of Navarre, p. 290, saith that *the Albigois do esteem the baptizing of infants superstitious.*

In the year 1181 Pope Lucius held his general Council at Verone, in the time of Fred. I, wherein the Albigensian sect and heresy were damned and *anathematized under the names of Cathari, Patrini, Humiliati, poor people of Lyons, Arnoldists, for daring to preach without apostolical approbation or mission publicly or privately and for teaching otherwise about the eucharist, baptism, confession, marriage and other sacraments of the church than the Church of Rome preacheth and observeth. Decr. Lib 5, Tit. 6. De Heret. C. 11, p. 126, confirmed by Urban. III 1185 Coelestin. 3. 1192 In. 3, 1200 as Flavin Hist. P. 290.*

Pope Innocent III, 1199, writes his Decretal Epistle to the Bishop of Arles (the principal city in Provence) respecting the Albigensian sect, to which **Baronius in his Annals** writes this preamble and which is also expressed by **Spondanus in his Epitome, 981, 1199,** viz. *Amongst the Arlatenses were heretics (saith he) who excluded infants from baptism, counting them incapable of that heavenly privilege.* Therefore did Innocent write this excellent Epistle to the Archbishop of Arles to confute and confound them. Which he recites at large (as it is also found both **in Gratian and the Book of the Decretals**).

Wherein having given many arguments to enforce the baptizing of infants, he makes this decree, viz. *That since baptism is come in the room of circumcision, therefore not alone the Elder, but also the young children which of themselves neither believe nor understand, shall be baptized, and in their baptism original sin shall be forgiven them.*

And then after the epistle, Baronius adds, *this Innocent wrote in a time of great emergency concerning the sacrament of baptism, which, saith he, the poor people of Lyons, those Albigensian Anabaptists did deny.* After this he sent a great number of Friars in imitation of the Albigensian Barbes, to go up and down those countries, to preach and dispute amongst them, Dominicus, Benedict and Francis being in the head of them. Then after them many Legates and inquisitors upon inquisitors, after them a Crusado of armed men which he supplied from time to time from all parts, and continued a bloody war against them all his days, but yet could neither vanquish, nor suppress them who by the help of strong allies, the Kings of England and Spain, Earl of Tholouse and Foix were enabled in a defensive way to maintain the war against his mighty armies that came against them a hundred-thousand at a time and by which means, as **Dr. Usher** observes, **p. 266,** *that as the persecution about Stephen, by that dispersion, proved much for the furtherance of the Gospel in other parts of the world, so was it here. For those that were not so fit for the war, went up and down with more freedom into most parts of Europe.* Insomuch that Aeneas Silvius, afterward Pope Pius II, in his **16th Chap.** confesseth in these words: *Nec ullis vel Romanorum Pontificum Decretis, vel Christianorum armis deleri potuisse.* That neither the decrees of Popes, nor armies of Christians could extirpate.

Having produced to you so much evidence to this point, I conceive it not unreasonable before I proceed farther, to present to you what I meet with from **Mr. Baxter** upon it, who, in his **Plain Scripture Proof, p. 157,** is pleased to tell us that *for his part, he cannot find in his small reading that any one Divine or party of men did certainly oppose or deny infants baptism for many hundred years after Christ.*

And again, **p. 261,** that *the world may now see what a cause you put such a face upon when you cannot bring the least proof so much as of one man (much less societies, and least of all godly societies) that did once oppose or deny infants baptism from the Apostles' days till about Luther's time.*

And yet farther, **p. 266,** *I am fully satisfied that you cannot show me any society (I think not one man) that ever opened their mouth against baptism of infants till about 200 years ago or thereabouts which confirms me much that it is from the Apostles' time or else someone would have been found as an opposer of it.* Though with what evidence and truth these confident assertions and severe reflections are made (in respect to what hath and is farther to be said hereto) is recommended to his own, and the consideration of the impartial reader.

And **Mr. Cobbet in p. 200** saith that *the doctrine of paedobaptism was never ex professo, opposed by any orthodox church or Christian in time of old, as far as I can learn.*

Lastly, From the Foot steps we find of This Truth, and the Sufferers from the Same in Several Countries and Places, We here the Waldenses had Heretofore Imprinted it, as Appears by the Following Instances.

By their Disciples in several Countries, Witnessing to these truths.

Germany

From what we meet with in Germany, where (by what you will find hereafter) the Waldenses were so conversant, that their Itinerant Ministers could travel through the whole Empire and lie every night at a Friend's House. Du Plessis, in his **Mystery of Iniquity, page 403**, said, They are spread abroad in Germany and France, as that their Footsteps are to be discerned through out the course of History.

In which Country we find, yea, and in most parts thereof, multitudes of this persuasion, down to this very time, (1675-REP) as may appear not only by the Sufferers already mentioned; but by the oppositions made against those persuasions, both by Popish Party, as by the Protestants also; witnesses not only the writings of the Papists, viz. Baronises, Cassander, Eckinus, Gretzerus, in contradiscintion and enmity thereto; but the several Canons of the Council of Trent, and the Catechism of Pope Pius Quintus, respecting that of Infant's Baptism, printed and annexed with the same Decretals to be read in every Parish. As also the cruel and bloody Edicts of the Emperors Charles the 5th and others.

Anabaptists in All Parts of Germany

But, by the several Disputations, Writings, and Oppositions made by the Protestants party also; yea, and that from those who were called Chief of the Reformation, viz. By Regius at Ansburg, about 1615; Luther in Saxony, 1522; Micarius in Thuringia, 1525; Zwinglius in Switzerland, in 1529; Brentius in Swevea, 1530; Calvin at Geneva, 1537; Junius about Limburg, and Heidelberg, 1750s; and Multitudes of Anabaptists in Basil, Ulme, Ansburg; against whom Oecolampadius disputed, 1527 and 1529. As Clark in his Lives and their respective Works manifests. Besides, the cruel and very bloody Edicts made by the Protestants against them.

German Anabaptists before Luther's Time

Whereby it is evident that they had a being in those parts before Luther's time. For it cannot relationally be supposed that they should all of a sudden be so spread over so great a Territory as the upper Germany; and therefore cannot be concluded to be other than the Remains and offsprings of those who the Waldenses had instructed in those times. As the Belgic Anabaptists do with one mouth assert and maintain.

The Baptists Persecuted in Germany

And in further confirmation hereof, we shall give you some more instances of the sufferings of those Waldensian Christians, both in Upper and Lower Germany, for their opposing Infant's Baptism, viz.

In the year 1105 several were banished out of the Bishopric of Tryers for opposing Pedobaptism, **Twisk, Chron. L, 12; Anno 1105; Hen. Montanus, page 83; Merning, page 592.**

Aizates

In the year 1182, many of the Waldensian faith suffered death in Flanders under the Earl Philip Elzates, for opposing Pedobaptism. Jo. Andriesz, History of Antiq. Twisk Chron. L. 12, Anno 1182, page 489. In the year

1200 many of the Waldenses who opposed the Church of Rome in the business of Infant's Baptism, were burnt in Germany, **by Coradeus Van Morpurgh, Abraham Bzov. Tom, 13, Baron. Annals, Anno 1232.**

Tryers

In the year 1230 many of the Waldenses suffered death in the Bishopric of Tryers, for opposing Pedobaptism; **Twisk Chron. L, 13, page 546; col 2.**

Stire

In the year 1315, many Christians were burnt at Stire in Austria, witnessing to the Waldensian Faith. **Abraham Mellin. L. 2, fol. 479, col. 4.**

Mentz

In the year 1390, there were 36 Citizens of Mentz burnt at Binger for owning the doctrine of the Waldenses. **Matth. Flac. Illyr. Catac. Test.**

Perermania

In the same year 1390 there were 443 persons put to death in Pomerania, witnessing to the doctrine of the Waldenses, **Dutch Martyrology, page 2, Fol. 497.**

Donau

In the year 1421 many of the Waldensian Faith were burnt at Donau in Germany, **Vignier Ecclesiastical History, Anno 1421.**

Eychester

In the year 1457, at Eucherster in Germany, many of the Waldensian Christians were put to death, **Twisk, Chr. Part 1, l. 15; upon 1457; page 829.**

Vienna

In the year 1471, one Stephanus, an Elder of the Waldenses was burnt at Vienna in Austria, under Johanna the Widow of George King of Bohemia; **Dutch Martyrology, L. 2; upon the year 1471.**

Schwas

In the year 1528, Hans Shaeffer and Leonard Freek, for opposing Infant's Baptism, were beheaded at Schwas in Germany.

Ansburg, Salsburg and Waltsen

And Leopold Snyder at Ansburg for the same; and eighteen persons of the same Faith, burnt at Salsburg. Wolfgang Ulmah and ten Christians more were for the same burned at Waltsen. Hans Prette and thirteen more were sometimes after burnt at the same place; **Dutch Martyrol, L, 2; pages 92-97.**

Palatinate

In the year 1529 where twenty persons put to death in the Palatinate, the men were, for the most part, beheaded, and the women drowned, **Dutch Martyrology, page 107.**

Altze

In the same year at Altze in Germany, 350 persons were by the Emperor's Edict put to death for asserting the Waldensian Doctrine. They by beheading and the women by drowning. **Dutch Martyrology, page 108.**

Harlem

Anno 1535, Hugh Crane and Margaret his wife, with two more were martyred at Harlem, the woman was drowned, the three men were chained to a post and roasted by a fire at a distance till they died, **page 112.**

Rome

Algerius, a Learned man of Padua, for opposing Infant's Baptism, had scalding Oil cast upon his body, and burnt to ashes at Rome, anno 1557, **Dutch Martyrology, L 2, page 246.**

An Abstract of the Cruel Placates and Bloody Persecutions of the Protestant Cantons in Switzerland, Viz. Zurich, Berne, Schashuifen, against the Anabaptists.

The Baptists persecuted by the Protestants in Helvetia

The First Edict of Zurich, 1525

The first Placaet we find was made by them of Zurich, in the year 1525. This was but five years after Zwinglius began the Reformation, after their own departure from Rome. About which Edict, commands all of all sorts to baptize their children, and to forbear Rebaptism upon the penalty of Pecuniary Mulcts and Imprisonment.

The Second Edict of Zurich, 1530

The other was in the year 1530, that rose higher, viz. To Banishment, Confiscation of goods, imprisonment and Banishment; that of Death being relaxed, **page 864.**

Upon Which Edicts Followed These Persecutions

Faelix Mentz

In the year 1526, a Baptist minister, one Faelix Mentz (before-mentioned) was drowned at Zurich, **page 90.**

Two Baptists Burnt

Anno, 1530, one Jurian Greenwalt, and one Alda, two of the Baptized brethren were burnt, **page 112.**

Six Baptists Burnt

Anno, 151, Martin De Schilder, Wolfgang Elmsger, Pain Melch, and three more of the Congregation of Baptists were Martyred in the same place, **page 112.**

The Placaet of 1639

In the Placaet they set forth in 1639, they did expostulate with the Anabaptists about the Schism they made from the Christian Church, the error of their Doctrine, and what prejudice it was to Reformation, and how disturbing to the Civil Peace, and Concept of Authority, **page 864.**

The Baptists Reply to the Third Manifesto of Zurich

Their Doctrine was no Heresy

Zwinglius and Dr. Hubmeier Controversy

In answer, whereto the Anabaptists did deliberate with them in each particular. And first, as to that of Error in Doctrine, in their baptizing professing believers only, they do remind them of the grant that **Zwinglius** himself made to Dr. Hubmeier, in his discourse with him in the beginning of that Controversy, wherein he did acknowledge that Little Children should not be baptized, but the Adult only, and that in ancient times they only baptized the Catechumens, wishing the same might be the practiced then (which you have also in **his Book of Articles, Art. 18, page 81, Part 1).**

Oeculampadius and Dr. Hubmeier

And that Oeculampadius did contest the same in a letter we wrote to Dr. Hubmeier, in these words, which they had to produce under his hands, viz. That we do not to this present find any place of the Scripture commanding to baptize any children. And in his Treatise upon Romans 6, said that every Christian should first confess Christ, and after to be baptized with the baptism of water.

The Minister of Schaufhuison

And that Sebestin Hosneyster, a Minister of Schaufhuison, in a Letter to the said Hubmeier, said: That they had publicly confessed to the Council of Schaufhuison, that if our B. Zwinglius will by any means have the Children baptized, that he errs from the Mark, and does not according to the truth of the Gospel; and that for his part, he could not let his little son Zachary be baptized; and therefore that he did very well and Christian-like, to bring to light, and assert the Baptism of Christians, which had been so longly Popercy suppressed; and assuring that they would also endeavor the same.

Christopher Hogendort, against Infant Baptism

And that one Christopher Hagedorf, another Minister and Learned man, upon I Peter 3:, writes, that Faith is to precede Baptism; for it is not Baptism, but faith in Baptism that saves.

Cellarius against Infant's Baptism

And that Cellarius also in his Letter to Hubmeier, writeth thus, that it is a horrible thing that young Children are baptized, which is neither witnessed in the Holy Scriptures, nor by any example of the Apostles.

The Nine Ministers of Strasburg witness against Infant's Baptism

And that the Ministers of Strasburg, viz., Wolfgang Capito, Cester Hedio, Meth. Pell, Symphones Polio, Theobald Niger, John Latonius, Ant. Fern, Martin Hack, and Martin Butzer, in their Book called the Grounds and Reasons, &c., page 1, say: "That in the beginning of the Church none were baptized or received into Church fellowship, but believers in Christ, that did voluntarily give up themselves to him." And the reason thereof, they say, is clear from Scripture and Experience: "because the beginning of our Lives are so sinful, necessitating repentance in every one; and that therefore, John Baptist, Christ Jesus, and the Apostles, preached the necessity of Repentance in the first place. And that in the Examples of the Baptized, Repentance did always precede, where the Adults, not Infants, were the Subjects. And, again, in page 2, and 3, they say: "That without the baptism of the Holy Spirit, the baptism of water profits not."

Pomeran and Bentius wrote against Infant's Baptism

And that Pomeran, Brentius, and others, have in the year 1530, written against Paedobaptism.

The Second Charge that they disturb the Civil Peace

And to the Second Charge, of their disturbing the Civil Peace, and resisting Authority, they plead their Innocencies; declaring their hearty and constant submission to Civil Rule and Government in all things respecting the Civil State, **p. 872, 873.**

These were given to the Lords of Zurich, in answer to their Manifesto aforesaid; which, notwithstanding did not assuage their cruel Persecutions. For,

At Zurich, Two Christians Starved to Death, other Killed

In the year 1640, two Christians, viz., Werner Phister and his son's wife, were cruelly imprisoned, and starved to death in Zurich, page 873. Again, also in the same year two faithful servants of Christ, Gallus Schinder was carried prisoner to Zurich, and after 16 weeks of cruel bondage in chains, perished there; and Rudolph Backer also in the same prison died the same year, **page 874.** Ulrich Mister, a faithful minister of the Gospel, died also in Prison the same year, **page 874.**

Others starved and beheaded

Anno 1640, Faelix Landis, the son of Hans Landis, formerly beheaded at Zurich for the profession of the gospel, was starved in prison at Zurich, the magistrates seizing and confiscating his goods to the value of 5,000 Guilders, **page 875.**

The Magistrates of Amsterdam Intercede

In the year 1642, the magistrates of Amsterdam interceded with them of Zurich for the relief of their oppressed countrymen. To which they made a slight and unfriendly answer.

In Anno 1643, Rudolf Sukner was starved in prison, and three women also, **page 876.** In 1644, Hen. Boller perished in prison at Zurich. In 1654, one Uli. Wagman, a faithful minister of the gospel died in the prison in Zurich. Several others remaining in their prisons.

The Placaet of Schaffhuisen

A Placaet or Manifesto was set forth by those of Schaffhuisen, Anno 1650, against the Anabaptists, upon penalty of imprisonment and banishment, **page 878**.

The Placaet of Berne

A Placaet also was set forth by them of Berne, Anno 1659, upon penalty of confiscation of goods, imprisonment and banishment. And that upon it, in the same year there were seven ministers of the Baptists in cruel bonds in that place, **page 880**.

The States General of the Low Countries

In so much ass the next year, the States General of the Low Countries, upon intimation of the Persecution there, did write their Letters to the Canton of Berne, to relax their said Persecutions; and wrote also Letters to the neighboring Princes to receive such as should be banished out of Berne, into their Protection, witnessing to he peaceable behaviors and good lives of those of their way in the provinces, **page 881**.

The Duke of Newburg Banishes the Anabaptists

In Anno, 1653, the Duke of Newburg banished all the Anabaptists out of his Country; who, thereupon disperse themselves into the Dukedom of Cleve and Brandenburgh, **page 878**.

Thirdly in Holland

Thirdly, we do not only find them in the upper Germany and Helvetia, but in the Lower Germany, being spread all over Flanders and the Low Countries.

Friezland abounding with Anabaptists

Cloppenburg, in his Epistle to his Gangrene, said, the troops of Anabaptists that dwell in Friezland, although they trouble not the Commonwealth, yet they suffer not the pure Reformed Churches to be edified, without daily conflicts.

Cassander about the Anabaptists

Cassander, in his Epistle to the Duke of Cleve, tell us, That the Anabaptists of the Belgic and Lower Germany, followers of Menno Simons and Theodoricus, have in them tokens of a godly mind, seeming to err more out of ignorance than malice; and therefore, said he, more worthy of amendments than persecution and perdition.

Beza's Honorable Testimony about the Anabaptists

Beza, in his Epistle to the Gallo-Belgick Churches at Embden, said, many of the Anabaptists are good men, servants of God, martyrs of Christ, and our most dear brethren, Hornbeck; **page 364**.

That they were considerable in all these parts may appear by the many Edicts against them, and their great sufferings in all quarters.

**AN ABSTRACT OF THE BLOODY EDICT OF THE EMPEROR CHARLES THE FIFTH, made
June 10, 1535, against the ANABAPTISTS OR WALDENSIAN CHRISTAINS (and the
execution thereof) in the Seventeen Provinces**

Commanding all persons to renounce those persuasions and practices, and to refrain the publishing the same, by preaching or otherwise, upon penalty of the forfeiture of life and goods, without mercy, the men to be burnt, the women to be drowned, and all that conceal, harbor, and do not, in their places, prosecute the law against the, to suffer the same Penalty. And that those that discover them, to have the third part of their Estates: forbidding all Meditation or Intercession, upon severe punishment; because they shall neither partake of Mercy, nor judgment and execution be delayed, **Dutch Martyrol. 1. 2; page 113.** Upon which these sufferings followed:

At Sardam and Horne

Peter Rester, a Baptist Teacher of Sardam in North-Holland, was apprehended in Amsterdam, and put to death there, Anno 1535. The same year, at Horne in West-Friezeland, three men and two women, by the Emperor's Placaet, were executed; the men by beheading, and their bodies put upon the wheel, and the women by drowning, putting stones about their necks, **page 116.**

At Leeworden, Gofdam and in North Holland

The 16th of March, the same year, one Andrew Clatssen was executed at Leeworden by the same Placaet. Anno 1536, at Gosdam, seven men were martyred and three men and two women at Zieterchze. Anno 1537, Jurian Vaser, a Baptist teacher, was executed, with two men more of the same persuasion, **page 110,** in North Holland.

At the Buss, at Rotterdam and also in North Holland

In Anno 1538, twelve persons burnt at the Buss, whose names, conditions, and circumstances you have, **page 120.** In Anno 1539, one Anakain, a gracious woman, was executed at Rotterdam, **p. 128.** A man at Leeworden and a man and his wife and son drowned in North Holland; **page 130.**

At Enchusen, Waterland and Wormes

In Anno 1541, four persons put to death at Enchusen in North Holland, and a man and his wife in Waterland, and at Wormes eleven more, **page 141.**

At Amsterdam

In Anno 1544, three were put to death at Amsterdam, **page 149;** and in Anno 1545, three more were martyred at Amsterdam; **page 153;** in Anno 1546, nine men more suffered at Amsterdam; and in 1547, six men and two women were burnt, at the same place.

Philip the Second and his Cruel Edict

In the same year, 1556, Philip the Second, King of Spain, renewed and enlarged that bloody Placaet that his Father Charles the 5th had before enacted in 1535. And upon which those after-sufferers followed amongst the Anabaptists in the 17 provinces viz., in Flanders;

Sufferings in Flanders

At Antwerp, from 1557 to 1575, 111 persons, men and women of the Baptists, were cruelly burnt and drowned. At Ghant, from 1559 to 1592, 70 men and women of the same persuasion were cruelly martyred in like manner. At Cortick, from 1558-1572, ten men and women of the same persuasion were burnt and

drowned. At Brussels, in the year 1574, four persons were burnt. At Burges, from 1562 to 1568, ten Anabaptists were burnt. At Collen, in 1562, six Anabaptists were burnt and drowned. At Armentier, from 1563 to 1567, seven were burnt. At Hanchela, in 1562, thirteen more were burnt and drowned. At Rizal, in 1563, twelve more were burnt and drowned. At Berhold, 1566, forty two more were so martyred. At Triers, in 1561, one person was burnt. In Juliers, 1562, one person was scaled with Oil and burnt after.

Sufferings in Holland

In Holland were the following Martyrdom's. At Dort, 1558, to 1570, were 26 Christians in like manner cruelly martyred. In Zealand, from 1560, to 1569, were nine in the same sort executed. At the Hague, from 1564, to 1568, were four persons also martyred. At Rotterdam, in 1568, one person was burnt. At Amsterdam, from 1569, to 1572, nine were cruelly martyred. At the Buss, again, in 1569, one was burnt. At the Brill, in 1569, one more was burnt. At Harlem, in 1570, three Christians were martyred. At Danventer, in 1570, were twelve persons burnt.

The Placaet of Groningen, in 1601

At Groningen, in Anno 1601, was a Placaet made against the Anabaptists, upon the penalty of pecuniary Mulcts and Banishments, and that the unbaptized children should not inherit; **page 856**. Which the States General afterward remitted.

Placaet of Danventer in 1620

At Danventer was a Manifesto fining and banishing the Anabaptists, in Anno 1620. Upon which the Anabaptists in those Provinces made a public Declaration of their Faith and Practice, and addressed it to the State's General by Messengers chosen out of all the Churches; upon which, they, by public Edict granted them their free Liberties, and remitted the former laws to their prejudice.

Van Braght's The Bloody Theater

All of which shows, with many hundred Martyrs and Confessors more (sealing to the truth of Believers and against Infant's Baptism, with their bloods) you have recorded, with many of their choice sayings at their deaths, and their excellent Epistles to their Friends, in that most elaborate and worthy collection, written in Dutch by **Theomen J. Van Braght**, in his Book called **The Bloody Theater**; being not only a continuation of their Ancient Books of Martyrs, but a confirmation of former and latter instances of the best historiographers and records; a piece done with great judgment and exactness.

(Editor's Note: at this time, 1675, neither D'Anvers nor the other Baptists considered the older and contemporary Mennonites and German Anabaptists as anything else but Baptists. At that time, there was no known distinctions made between the two on the mode of baptism. To argue that some of them sprinkled, therefore all of them did, is simply revisionism and/or Whitsittism. It is not denied that those who came out of the Paedobaptists did sprinkle and did baptize infants in whatever mode was then popular in their areas, when they were still Paedobaptists. What is denied is that they still did that when they became Baptists, Anabaptists, or Mennonites. Revisionists and/ or Whitsittites do not make this distinction.)

The Old Waldenses in Bohemia, Moravia and Austria

In the next place, we find (as **P. Perin** tells us) that the Waldenses of old were dispersed, and their Doctrines taught in Bohemia, Moravia and Austria, and continued there, till expelled thence by the Emperor about fifty years since.

1. In the year 1330, one Eckhardus with many others, were burnt in Bohemia for the profession of the Waldensian faith; **Vignier, Eccles. History, page 1130.**

2. **Scultetus in his Annals, upon 1528**, tells us that the brethren in Bohemia, and many Godly men in that time, were rebaptized, not that they did favor the many errors charged upon the Anabaptists; but they saw not (they say) how otherwise to separate themselves from the pollutions of the world; not owning a rebaptism, because they esteemed the former a mere nullity, and unlawful: and that one of their sufferers, being asked whether he was re-baptized? Answered, he knew no Anabaptists; for God's word required no re-baptizing.

The Eminent Dr. Hubmeier and his wife martyred at Vienna

3. Beltazer Hubmeier, a Doctor in Waldschout, (of whose Disputations and Conferences you have heard in Helvetia,) a great Preacher and a Learned man, was much in Bohemia and Moravia; whom Osiander calls a Fanatic and gross Anabaptist, was taken prisoner with his wife, by the Emperor's special command, and was himself burnt at Vienna in Austria, and his wife drowned, in the year 1528.

4. In the year 1536, three Bohemian Baptists, being betrayed by their host in their journeying through Tyre, were burnt in Vienna at Shrouertide. **Dutch Martyrology, l. 2, pages 117.**

Comenius' History of the Anabaptists of Moravia in his History of Bohemia

But that which is most considerable in the account we have to give of Bohemia, is what we meet with in the **History of Bohemia**, written by **Comenius, page 134.**

They Lived in Colleges

Who, giving an account of the distresses that fell them upon the defeat of Frederick, by the Emperor's Forces at Prague, tells us: *That when the enemy resolved to exercise their cruelty against us, they began the year after the victory with the Anabaptists in Moravia, who professing above 45 homes or Colleges (many families dwelling together in them) having all things managed in partnership, in a public stock or in common, according to their custom, lived in common, according to their custom, lived peaceable under their own Discipline, troublesome or grievous to none, but beneficial to all by their Trades or Callings. They vanished, said he, these first in the year 1622, about Autumn, being forced to leave their houses, lands and vineyards, though the time of Vintage was at hand, and carrying the weaker sort with them in some Hundreds of Carts, went in great troops into the neighboring countries of Hungaria, and Transylvania, where he said, they could find fit seats for themselves, and whereby they avoided those evils that were after to be suffered by us that were left behind.*

Bishop Usher on the Collegians

And that these were of the stock that had been instructed by the Waldenses of old, may appear by this custom of living together in houses or colleges, which was their custom, as **Bishop Usher**, in the **State of the Church**, tells us, **page 292**; *maintaining themselves by their manufactures. And living together, not only for the benefit and comfort of their souls, having the better opportunity for religious service,, eyeing also that primitive pattern, Acts 4, but to free themselves from more observation and persecution, which flocking together form several parts, might occasion.*

The Collegiants in Several Countries in 1675

In which way, upon good information, I find they continue together in Hungaria, Transylvania, Poland and in some parts of Germany to this day, (1675 REP).

Hungarian Scholar Reports to Gov. D’Anvers about the Collegiants in 1675

Concerning whom, an Hungarian scholar, that about five or six years since, came from those parts, and had lived amongst them, gave me, with a few days, this particular account: “That he himself knew four Colleges of them in those parts, viz., two in the lower Hungary, one at a place called Cosola, and another at Turkas Hida; and in the upper Hungary, another famous College in a place called Saras Patack, in which town he himself lived (as he told me) and knew the people very well, and that there were near 100 families in that College, who are reputed a very Holy, Harmless, Innocent People; and that they do support themselves by their manufactures, brought into one Joint stock, eat all together in one great Hall, worship God together twice a day; each several manufacture being arranged together, both as to their work Rooms, lodgings, and Table in the Common Hall, having public officers to manage all their affairs, and schools for their children.

Collegiants in Transylvania

In Transylvania, he said, he knows another, at a place called Alinez. All which, he said, are the remains of those who came out of Moravia and Bohemia, about 50 years since. I understand that near Heidelberg in the Palatinate, there is another great College, consisting of near 100 families, and that in Prussia there are others of them also.

The Collegiants were not Socinians

Vossius in his Book De Baptism, page 77, tells us *that the Ministers in Transylvania do reject infant’s baptism, and rebaptize only upon profession; but he withal said, that many of them are infected with Socianism;* though the Hungarian Gentleman tells me, that the Collegiants are very free from that infection.

Collegians or Fraterinian Waldenses in Poland

And further, that this truth was spread in Poland, (where the Waldenses as you will afterwards find, had much to do) appears from what we find out of **John a Lasco**, the Polonian Baron, in his book **De Sacramentis**; where he tells us, *That the Anabaptists do refuse to baptize their children, because they neither do believe nor understand the spiritual mystery thereof, and say there is no ground from circumcising children under the law, to baptize them under the gospel; because say they, there is a command for the one, and none for the other, and that God had other ways to save the children that died in their infancy, than by such external ceremonies. And that neither by circumcisions were children to be saved of old; for then would the Females as well as the Males have been enjoyed the same, and that it was God’s Covenant of Grace, and no outward rite or ceremony that were to be leaned upon to effect the same,* to all which as an enemy of their persuasion, he largely relies in the said book. He also in **his Theologia Museovitica, page 157**, tells us, *that the ministers of these Fraternities in Poland, do for the most part live single lives, though under no public vows, or constraint, admitting marriage to any that desire the same; and that they live very pious lives,* as **Dr. Usher, page 363**. **Crantz, in his History Valdenses, l. 8**, tells us of many Christians of the Waldenses faith, that were put to death at Zuidentze in Poland.

The Waldenses and their Recourses, Residences and Succession in England for Many Ages

And lastly, it does appear that in England itself, the Waldenses and their disciples out of France, Germany and Holland, had their frequent Recourse, Residence and Succession through many ages, as our Chronicles make manifest, viz.

Waldenses in the time of William the Conqueror

In the time of William the Conqueror, and his son William Rufus, it appears they did abound in England, as **Bishop Usher** tells us in **The State and Succession of the Church, page 242, out of Matthew Paris of Westminster**, that *the Beringarian (or Waldensian) heresies* (as the chronologer calls it) *had about that time, viz., Anno 1080, generally corrupted all France, Italy and England.* And further, the said Bishop tells us **out of Guitmond**, a Popish Writer of that time, that *not only the meaner sort in the Country-Villages, but the Nobility and Gentry in the chiefest towns and cities were infected therewith;* and therefore does Lanfrank, who was Archbishop of Canterbury in the time of both these Kings, about the year 1087, write a book against them.

Henry 1, and King Stephen's Times

In the time of Henry 1, and K. Stephen, the said **Bishop Usher** tells us **out of Popliner's History of France,, fol. 7**, that *the Waldenses of Aquitain did, about the year 1,100, spread themselves and their Doctrines all over Europe;* and; whereof he mentions England in particular.

Henry 2's Time

In the time of Hen. 2, about the year 1158, as said Mr. Fox out of Robert Guisburne, those two eminent preachers and Waldensian Barbs, Gerardus and Dulcintes came into England to propagate the Gospel. And **Bishop Usher** tells us, **page 290, out of Thomas Walden**, that *several Waldenses who came out of France, were marked in the foreheads with a Key or hot Iron. Which sect, as said William of Newbury, in his History of England, l. 2, c.13, were called the Publicans, whose origin, said he, was from Gascoyne; and who being as numerous as the Sand of the Sea, they did sorely infect both France, Italy, Spain and England.*

Roger Hoveden and his Annals

Roger Hoveden, in his Annals upon the year 1182, said, that *Henry 2, was then very favorable to the Waldensian sect in England; for whereas they burnt them in some places of France, Italy and Flanders, by great numbers, he would no in the least suffer any such thing here; he being in his own and wives' right protest of Aquitain, Poiclen, Guein, Gascoun, Normandy, &c., the principal places where the Waldenses and Albigenses inhabited, and who being his Subjects in France, had the free egress into his Territories here.*

Roger de Bedres, Governor of Gascoyn

Though, the same historian **Hoveden** tells us, *that he was by the Pope's influence, more severe in those parts. For at the instance of the Pope's Legate, he proclaimed that eminent man Roger de Bedres, then Governor of Gascoyn, a Traitor and an Excommunicate person for being so great a friend and favorer of those heretics; being indeed, as the story said, one of them himself, as well as wife, children, servants and soldiers; and made his Prisoner the Bishop of the Dioceses of Albi; for which the Pope was so much increased against him, Hev. Annals ad Ann., 1178; fol. 331.*

Richard I and King John

In the time of Richard I. and King John, we read of no opposition made against them, being times of great trouble, what by Richard's absence in the Holy Wars, and his Imprisonment by the Emperor at his Return, and the grievous Wars both Foreign and Domestic, that attended King John, and the great Contests he had

with the Pope, who interdicted his Kingdom, forbade all public worship in the nation for the space of six years, only admitting of private Baptism to Infants, procured the greater freedom to the Christians as well as the greater opportunity in those disturbances to propagate the Truth; He, himself, defended with his Arms the Waldenses in Aquitain and Gascoyn, that were so oppressed by the Popes Crusade-Army.

Pope Innocentius the Third established the Dominican and Franciscan Orders to Suppress the Waldenses

*Pope Innocentius the Third did, the better to suppress the Waldensian Sect, set up the Dominican and Franciscan Orders of the Mendicant and Preaching Friars, in imitation of the Waldensian Brethren, who with so great diligence in imitation of the Apostles (as you will hear) did propagate the Gospel in an Intenerate manner; and therefore (said **Gretzers**) did they design to expel that Heretical Darkness, by the setting up these two great Lights of those orders, **Usher, State of the Church, pps. 352, 353.** In the Time of Henry 3, about the year 1235, as said **Bishop Usher, out of Matthew Paris, pages 404, 405,** the orders of the Friars Ministries came into England to suppress this Waldensian heresy.*

Waldenses called Lollards in 1315

*In the time of Edward the Second, about the year 1315, (as **Fuller** tells us in his **Ecclesiastical History, out of Trithemius's Chron, upon that year**) that Walter Lollard, that German Preacher, or as **P. Perin in the History of the Waldenses, one of their Barbs, came into England, a man of great Renown amongst them; and who was so eminent in these parts, that as in France, they were called Beringarians, from Beringarius, and Petro-Brusians from Peter Bruis; and in Italy and Flanders; Arnoldists from the famous Arnoldus of Brixia; so did the Waldensian Christians in England, for so many generation after, bear the name of this worthy man, being called Lollards. And so where their tenets and opinions called the heresy of the Lollards. The civil laws and ecclesiastical laws made against them, were under that name. The usual prison in London to which they were sent, was called by the name of the Lollards-Tower, (and is so known to this day). And the obligation that was put upon public officers to extirpate them, specially the Sheriffs, in their Oaths, was by this name, which did continue in the Sheriff's Oath until King James' time.***

Lollards in the Time of Edward Third

*In the time of Edward the Third, the Lollards did very much increase, being much countenanced both by the King and his courtiers, and therefore **Caxton in his Chron.**, as said **Mr. Fox**, tells us, that Edward 3. Was against the Pope's Clergy, forbidding the Pope to intermeddle in his Kingdom, touching the dispose of Benefices; and who bore for good will to the Christians, that he employed John Wickliff himself as one of his Ambassadors, unto Italy, to treat with the Pope's Legate, touching his Usurpations.*

A Treatise of Lollardism

In whose time were written and published these two notable Treatises, the one called The Prayer and Complaint of the Plowman, written, as supposed, by Wycliffe; and the other called **Jack Upland**, written by that ingenious gentleman **Sir Jeffery Chaucer**, both of them **recorded at large by Mr. Fox**, so fully detecting the Pride, Ignorance, Covetousness and wickedness of the Romanish Church and Clergy.

An Account of that Eminent Servant and Confessor of Jesus Christ, Mr. John Wickliff

In whose reign it was that that eminent and worthy witness and confessor, Mr. John Wickliff, was raised up, so learnedly and successfully to oppose the church of Rome, both in doctrine and discipline. He was a man

of great prudence and piety, endowed with great Learning and Eloquence, as the whole University of Oxford did (as you will hear) so unanimously and affectionately testify; but especially one who was mighty in the Scriptures, a painful and faithful Preacher, and excellent Disputant, a laborious Writer, who wrote no less, as **Balaeus tells us from Aeneas Sylvas**, than 200 volumes. Though the most part of them were extinguished and burnt in their Manuscripts at Prague in Bohemia; so that so very little, said **Fuller**, remains of them to us, that we are beholding to some of his enemies to tell us the Titles of the Books, which you have in **Balaeus**. Only some few are to be found with us, which I have heard of, viz., Mr. Fox tells us of three that he had an intention to print, viz., **De Senus and Veritate Scripture; De Eucharistia Confessie Wicklevi; and De Ecclesia**. Mr. Fuller said, that his Translation of the Bible is a very fair Manuscript in Queens- College in Cambridge, and two more of the same in the University-Library in Oxford; a Book called his **Dialogues**, in Latin, a Quart; and another called his **Trilogy**, mentioned by Bishop Usher, written also in Latin; an English piece in Octavo, called his **Wicket**, and two Treatises in English **against Begging Friars**, printed in 1608; by Though. James, Library keeper of Oxford, with an Apology he annexes thereto. **A Comment upon the whole Book of the Psalms; and his Postils and Exposition upon the Decalogue; a Treatise of the Seven Deadly Sins; another of Blasphemy; a Treatise of Civil Government; a Book of Miscellanies; a Treatise of Equivocation**, which last six books, as all the rest, as Mr. James said, are in Oxford Library, with his English Translation of the Bible, fairly written and well bound.

Wycliffe and the old Waldenses

Of whose opinions and doctrines so well agree with the Waldenses of old, we have an account, as from his own writings, so from many authors who have collected the same from them, viz., Thomas Walden, an Englishman, who lived in his time, or presently after him; who wrote three great volumes against him; Cochlaus a German writer, who gathers out of his Book 303 articles and the Proceedings against his Works and Doctrines in the Council of Constance. Aentas Sylvas (after the pope Pius the Second) who gave the Titles of all his Books, to the number of 200, burnt at Prague. And Orthusmus, in his book called Fasciculum Rerum Expetendarum, Flat. Illyricus, Balem, Caxton, Walsingham, Wedifordus, Speed. All of which I have persuaded, and to whom Mr. Fox and Mr. Fuller, in their writings about him, have respect. As also Mr. James [the library keeper at Oxford] in his apology for him, printed with two of his books against the Mendicant Friars, wherein is made that good Collection out of several of his Books in that Library. And from among them [that you may have some further account of this Eminent Worthy, and Witness of Jesus Christ,] I have made this following collection of some of his Tenets.

For Two Sacraments

1. That he asserted and maintained two Sacraments only, viz., Baptism and the Lord's Supper; in opposition to the Popish seven; as appears by the **45, 46, 47 Articles** condemned by the **Council of Constance, James' Apology, page 31**.

For Believer's Baptism

2. That he taught, that Believers, after the example of Christ, should be baptized in pure water, *Flac. Illyricus, Cata. Test. Page 403*. And how well he esteemed the same, he further said, that it was not lawful for believers, though they had received the baptism of the Spirit, to omit the baptism of water; but that as opportunity and circumstances might concur, it was necessary to receive it; in his **Triolog. 4, c. 12**; in these, his own words, *Non licet Fidelibus supponendo baptismum flaminis, relinquere, sed necebe est, data opportunitate, circumstantia, ipsura accipets, ex Wald. Tom. 2. De Sacramentis, c. 107*.

For Believer's Baptism only

3. That believers are the only subjects of baptism; as appears in his **11th chapter of his Trialog**. Where he said, that persons are first to be baptized with what he calls the first or insensible baptism, viz., in the blood of Christ, before they are baptized in water; without which, their baptism in water profits not. Which he expresses in these words: *Ideo absq; dubitatione si iste insensibilis Baptismus assuerit, Baptizatus a crimine est mundatus; & si ille defnerit, quantumiunq; essent priores, Baptismus non prodest anima ad salutem.* Ex **Wald. Tom. 2, De Sacram. C. 97.**

For Churches of Saints

And therefore so positive for *Faith* and *Regeneration* to be first laid that in his book **De Veritate Scripture p. 490** he saith *That for any to bring wicked (or unregenerate) persons into the Church, they do wed Christ and the Devil together taking the members of a harlot coupling them to the Body of Christ.* **James, Apol p. 15.**

4. *That Baptism doth not confer, but only signifies (or is a symbol of) grace given.* So **Fuller out of Chocleus in his Eccl. Hist. Upon the life and doctrine of Wickliff. Cent 4, Ri. 2.**

That Baptism Signs, not gives Grace

Which definition and order is owned by those that assert adult Bapt. viz. *That baptism is a symbol of present regeneration wrought and of which there is something of the thing signified to be demonstrated in the party to be baptized before the sign be applied.* Therefore faith and repentance, or regeneration go first, baptism of water follows after, as p. 2, 3. In order to the baptism of the Spirit as Acts 3: 38 and which as necessarily excludes all children as it doth impugn the popish heresy upon which it was first founded and instituted, viz. To take away all sin, to confer grace, to work regeneration and to save the soul as still held fast by them that teach young children to say that by their baptism they were made children of God, members of Christ and Inheritors of the Kingdom of Heaven. And therefore must the midwife in case of necessity baptize the child lest its salvation be hazarded.

That Baptism saves not in itself

5. *That they are fools and presumptuous which affirm such infants not to be saved which die without baptism,* so **Fuller words it out of Chocleus.** And **Wickliff's** own words as **c.2. De Trialog Quod desinentes parvulos fidelium sine baptismo sacramentali, decedentes non fore salvandos, in hoc sunt presumptuosi & stolidi. For as to children's estates as to salvation or damnation he can say nothing what God will do with them. *Si Deus voluerit, potest ipset damnare infantes & si voluerit, potest ipset salvare. Nec audeo partem aliquam definire.* But for those that make baptism the thing to save them, and the parents omission thereof to damn them, he utterly denies because as God hath not appointed baptism to work grace or to regenerate, so it would be unreasonable to charge damnation upon little ones for the parents' neglect (which they cannot help) **Trialog, c. 12.** Which **Widford in Fasciculus Rerum** and **Walden** also do charge upon him as *a desperate error impugning,* as they say, *not only St. Austin who in his book De Fide, ad Petreus, is so positive for the damnation of unbaptized infants, but so expressly contrary to the words of the canon De Consecrat. Dist. C. 4.* Which asserts that young infants are only to be saved by baptism. And that it opposeth the judgment and practice of the Church in all ages. *And which,* saith he, *they esteemed of such absolute necessity that in case of peril of death, they permitted the midwife to do it. And that if it died without baptism, it was no more admitted to Christian burial, either to lie in the Church or Churchyard than a pagan or infidel.***

That nothing is to be received without Scripture authority

6. *That all truth is contained in the Holy Scriptures and that which is not originally there is to be accounted profane. L. De Verit. Script. P. 39. That Christ's law sufficeth by itself to rule Christ's Church. Expositio Decalog. P. 5.* And again, *that we must receive nothing but what is in the scripture and that whatever is added to it or taken from it is blasphemous. And that no rite or ceremony ought to be received in the church but that which is plainly confirmed by God's word, D Veritat. Script. P. 581.* And therefore saith, *Wise men leave that as impertinent which is not plainly expressed. Fuller out of Chochleus.* And which **Wald. Fol. 3. De Sacram.** Saith, *is one of the Lollards' great doctrines to be shunned. And further that we are to admit of no science or conclusion that is not proved by scripture testimony. And that whoever holds the contrary opinion cannot be a Christian, but flatly the Devil's champion. De Verit. Scrip. P. 128.*

And whether all this is not full-mouthed argument against infants' baptism, for which rite there is not the least scripture institution or instance, as confessed by so many of themselves, is left to consideration.

Against Traditions, Canons & Pope's Decretals

7. *That he slighted the authority of general councils, as Fuller out of Chochleus, Detested and abhorred all popish and inhumane traditions, saying that the popes decretals are apocrypha, and that none but fools study them. De Verit. Scripture, p. 487.*

And thence it was, saith Mr. James, p.15 of his Apology, that Wickliff rejected their popish superstitions and traditions of sale, oil, spittle, chrism, the five sacraments, monkish orders and all of that kind. And may not we from as good evidence say and infants' baptism also. For other than human tradition, decrees of councils and popes' decretals there was no authority for it as most papists and so many protestants do so full grant as before.

As a Lollard he denies Infant's Baptism

And therefore not only from this manner of consequential reasoning, but from his more positive assertions doth **Thomas Walden** in his book **De Baptismi Sacramentalibus, Tit. 5. C.53. fol. 118. C. 53.** So vehemently charge and inveigh against him as one of the seven heads that comes out of the bottomless pit for denying infant' baptism as also *that it was the heresy of the Lollards of whom he was so great a ring leader.* And that *he doth positively assert, as he saith, that children are not sacramentally to be baptized. And that if they have grace poured into their souls by the Spirit of Christ, they are sufficiently baptized.* And which, he saith, *it is very agreeable to the doctrine of the former heretics viz. Pelagius with whom Austin contended also who said that though they had original sin, yet without baptism they might enter into the Kingdom of Heaven. And that this was also the Albigensian heresy who were called of old Publicans who denied baptism to little ones as Wickliff and the Lollards do.* And therefore he tells us how well one *Petrus Blesinus did urge in one of their synods upon a complaining that the Amorites and Philistines do oppose us, the former heretics being risen up among us which were called of old the Publicani and Patrini who admit not of infants' baptism, nor the sacrament of the altar, etc. And who increase and multiply without number so that if you cut them off in one place, they like Hydra's heads do grow up in another.* And so, saith **Walden,** *This heresy we find which has been, as it were working underground for near 200 years, is broken out amongst the Wickliffians and appears more publicly. And therefore, saith he, if Austin did so contend with those old heretics, what would he do with these their offspring in this generation?* And therefore **Walsingham** in his **Ypodogma** Meustriae upon the year 1381, p. 139 saith, *That in this time it was that most damnable heretic John Wickliff reassumed the cursed opinions of Beringarius which was, as you have heard, to deny infants' baptism, transubstantiation, etc.*

Denies Confirmation

8. And as a further argument that he denied infants' baptism, may appear, because he did so vehemently impugn confirmation which was ordained together with infants' baptism with the same heads and hands and especially calculated for the ratification and confirmation thereof as you'll hear in a following treatise upon that subject. Concerning which, saith he, That as *there is not the least syllable from the Word of God, so not the least color from reason for the same.* **Triang. 4. C. 15.** And that *Bishops, Benedictions, Confirmations, Consecrations were but tricks to get money (Fuller out of Chochleus).* And that *the Pope's chrism whereby children were confirmed was not founded on the scripture, but was a relic of the Devil and blasphemy against God.* Art 8, condemned by the C. Const. And for which these two great Doctors do so vehemently oppose themselves against him, viz. **Walden** in his book **De Confirmat. Sacrament from p. 123 to p. 127.** And **Wediford** in his **second Tom. De Sacrament. C. 109, fol 102 to 124.**

No Head of the Church but Christ

9. That it is blasphemy to call any head of the Church but Christ alone.

Pope is Antichrist

10. That the Pope is antichrist, yea, Potissimus Antichristus, Antichrist himself and that abomination of desolation that stands in the Holy Place.

Pope's Infallibility is blasphemous

11. That the doctrines of the infallibility of the Church of Rome in matters of faith is the greatest blasphemy of Antichrist

Prelates diabolical

12. That from the words and works and silence of the prelates in preaching, it seemeth probable that they are devils incarnate.

Against Church Ornaments

13. That all beautiful building and adorning of churches is blame-worthy and savors of hypocrisy.

Against Patronage

14. That right of patronage and endowing of churches in Antichristian.

Against Nuns

15. That vowing of virginity is a doctrine of devils.

For Lay Preaching

16. That it is lawful for any layman to preach without ecclesiastical orders or leave from his ordinary.

Against Degrees of Divinity

17. That Christ hath no where appointed in his Word that his ministers should be nursed up in universities and colleges or that they should take there any degrees of divinity or be known by distinction of habits and orders.

Only Two Orders in the Church

18. That there are only two orders and degrees in the church, viz. Elder and Deacon. And that Elder, Bishop and Presbyter are all one.

The Church of Rome is the Synagogue of Satan

19. That the church of Rome is the synagogue of Satan.

Against Monks and Friars

20. That all the patrons of private religion as Benedict, Francis, Dominic, Bernard, etc. And those that enter therein, if not repent of their wickedness, are in a damnable state, And that all such as found and endow monasteries and all that enter therein are members of the devil.

Against Lordly Priests

21. That to enrich the clergy is against the rules of Christ.

Against Tithes

22. That tithes are but pure alms and therefore not to be exacted from the people. And who may dispose them as they please themselves.

Against Ignorant Worship

23. That to worship God in an unknown tongue and to keep the scriptures locked up therein is a heresy and blasphemy of Antichrist.

Against Canonical Hours

24. That to appoint canonical hours for worship is unlawful.

Against Set Forms of Prayer

25. To enjoin and bind to set forms of prayer through the Lord's prayer, etc. Derogates from the liberty God hath given his people.

Not to Fear Men in God's Service

26. That all who omit the hearing and preaching of the gospel for fear of popish excommunication are already excommunicated and in the day of judgment shall be accounted the betrayers of Christ.

For Abounding in Charity

27. That though the goods of Christians are not to be in common, yet that Christian charity should be common.

Against Unlawful and For Lawful Oaths

28. A great opposer of fallacious, blasphemous and equivocal oaths, but not against lawful swearing to end strife.

For Gracious Rulers

29. That dominion over the creature is founded in grace and that God divesteth him of all right who abuseth his power.

All which, and many more, you have out of Fuller from Chochleus, out of James his Apology. And in his articles condemned by the Council of Constance, and especially out of Fusciculus Rerum wherein there are answers to each of them by Wedifordus and others.

How Designed against and Preserved in Edward's Time

Great were the endeavors of the clergy in the time of Edward the Third to have crushed this good man and suppressed his doctrines, especially Simon Sudbury, Archbishop of Canterbury, Courtney, Bishop of London, and Wickham, Bishop of Winchester who designed against him, but he had such favor from the King himself, so much friendship from the Duke of Lancaster and Piercy, L. Marshal of England, and was so much in the hearts of the citizens of London, that they were not able to touch him all this King's days. It is observable that this King Edward 3, who so favored this good man and his party (the people that feared God in his time) was blessed with the greatest honor, success and longest life of any of the Kings we read of in all our chronicles.

Wickliff Persecuted and Cursed

In the time of Richard the Second, Wickliff's friends, especially the Duke of Lancaster and the L. Marshall, being withdrawn from the Court, his mortal enemies the Bishops, began to bestir themselves who therefore procured the Bull of Pope Gregory 11 against him, directed to the University of Oxford requiring him and all his adherents to be seized and imprisoned and his books to be suppressed with a letter to the King and Archbishop to the same purpose, with several articles against him upon which articles he was summoned to appear before the Archbishop at his Court in Lambeth with design to proceed with the greatest severity against him. But upon the day when they designed to have passed the definitive sentence, one Sir Lewis Clifford (so Walsingham calls him) came from the Queen as saith Mr. James (who, it seems was a true friend and favorer of Wickliff) and entering in amongst them, commanded them that they should not proceed to any definitive sentence against him. At whose words they were so amazed, that they desisted their purpose and so by his special providence, he escaped their clutches. The citizens of London were also (as the story saith) very zealous for his for his deliverance whose coming off in that manner tended very much to spread and promote his reputation and doctrine. The death also of Pope Gregory and the schism that so long attended the Chair by the Anti-Popes, viz. For 39 years, made much for the furtherance of the Truth and not a little for his preservation though the endeavors of his enemies at home were incessant against him as Mr. Fox in his first Vol. P. 565, etc.

An Earthquake

After this, the Archbishop summoned another convocation, June 11, 1382, in the Black-Friers,

London, to adjudge him and his sect. At which instant was that terrible earthquake mentioned in the Chron. Of St. Albons and of which Wickliff also takes notice in his writings. Which made them all astonished doubting whereto it should tend much discouraging them in their work. **Fox p. 570.**

Londoners Friends to the Lollards

Afterwards, fresh persecution was stirred up by the Archbishop who procured the King's Letter to the vice-chancellor of Oxford against him and many of his adherents and associates and who so hotly pursues several of them that some did recant of whom mention is made of Nicholas Hereford, a learned man, and Philip Repington,. After a Bishop in the next King's time and a great persecutor, one John Ashton withstood ('tis said) all their fury and was delivered from them by the Londoners who broke into their Conclave and took him from them by force who approved themselves such friends and favorers of the Lollards that, as **the History of St. Albons** saith of them, That they neither believed in God, nor in the traditions of their Forefathers, but were sustainers of the Lollards, depravers of Religion and withholders of tithes.

Government of the City Changed

And thereupon, the Bishops complaining to the King against them, they were several ways vexed and punished, viz. By altering their form of Government, removing their Mayor and Sheriffs from them and setting a Warden or Governor over them and removing the Terms and Courts of Judicature from London to York.

Wickliff's Death

After this, the Bishops summoned Wickliff again and designed by some that were to lay wait for him, to take away his life. Whereupon, he either concealed himself or withdrew for some time into Bohemia (as some say) though in that time he writes a letter to the King, another to the Pope and returns after to England and dies peaceably in his own house at Litterworth in Leicestershire, Anno 1387.

Bones Burned Forty Years After

Forty years after his death, he was condemned and sentenced by the Council of Constance to be taken up out of his grave, and burned for a heretic, and his books to be all burned that could be found in any place and which was performed accordingly. Most of his books were burned at Prague in Bohemia and many at Oxford and his bones took up and burned at Litterworth by the Priests and Suffragants. **Fox Part 1, p. 655.**

Concerning whom, you may please to take the most remarkable testimonial given by the University of Oxford, 19 years after his death, recorded by **Mr. Fox, p. 585**, from its original, but by whom procured not mentioned, viz.

The Great Testimony Given To Wickliff by the University of Oxford.

Great Learning

That the special and good will and care we bear to John Wickliff sometime child of this University, moving and stirring in us, we do with one mind, voice and testimony witness all his conditions and doings throughout his whole life to have been most sincere and commendable. Whose honest manner and conditions, profoundness of learning and most redolent renown and fame we desire the more earnestly to be notified and

known unto all the faithful. For that we understand the maturity and ripeness of his conversation, his diligent labors and travels to tend to the praise of God, the help and safeguard of others and the profit of the Church.

Exemplary Piety

Wherefore, we signify by these presents that his conversation, even from his youth unto the time of his death, was so praise-worthy and honest that never at any time was there any spot of suspicion noised of him. But in his answering, reading, preaching and determining, he behaved himself laudably and as a stout and valiant champion of the Faith vanquishing by the force of the scripture all such who by their willful begging, blasphemed and slandered Christ's religion, etc. And who, amongst all the rest of the University, has written in logic, philosophy, divinity, morals and the speculative art without peer.

The knowledge of all which we desire to testify and deliver forth to the intent that the fame and renown of this doctor may be the more evident and had in reputation amongst them into whose hands these present letters testimonial shall come.

In witness whereof, we have caused these our letters testimonial to be sealed with our Common Seal at Oxford, in our Convocation-House, the 5th of Octob. In the year of our Lord 1406.

This wonderful testimony was the more to be admired being given forth in the time of hot persecution under Henry the Fourth. And further, for the better preservation of the memory of this great man, take some brief account of his life as it was worthily collected by Mr. **James** out of several authors and put in the end of his **Apology for John Wickliff**, viz.

John Wickliff's Life by Mr. James

This John Wickliff, saith he, was born in the north where unto this day some of his name and family (as I understand) do yet remain. Brought up in Morton-College in Oxford where before him were the famous Bacon, Burly, Scotus, Occham, Perrham, Bradwardine and others. This John Wickliff nothing inferior to any of them, either in quickness of apprehension, sharpness of wit, shortness of delivery, greatness of industry, stoutness of courage and variety of all kind of good learning, and above them all in a full knowledge of the Truth of the Gospel and constant defense of the same unto the end; amidst so many troubles, vexations, accusations, imputations and columniations; so many denunciations, excommunications, anathemas and curses solemnly pronounced against him, at London and at Oxford by Archbishops, Bishops and Popes so that he was never free from their curses which God (evermore blessed be his name) turned into blessings as may appear by the Sequel of his Life and Doctrine. He was beloved of all good men for his good life and greatly admired of his greatest adversaries for his learning and knowledge both in divinity and humanity. He wrote so many volumes in both as it is almost incredible. He had a great hand in making those laws and statutes that came forth in the time of Edward the Third and Richard the Second to bridle the insolency of the Church of Rome as the Stat. Of Premunire against provisors and begging friars. He stoutly defended and maintained the civil Jurisdiction against the ecclesiastical by the laws of the Nation wherein he was excellently versed. And for this reason he was by Edward the Third sent Ambassador into foreign parts and by King Richard the Second consulted at home.

Favored by Princes

He was not so much hated of the clergy, but he was as much favored by the State Temporal. He was openly defended by King Edward and that Noble Duke of Lancaster and secretly abetted by King Richard notwithstanding he showed him but little countenance outwardly.

Great Deliverance

Twice was he convented before the Bishops and thrice summoned to appear. The first time he escaped by the Duke, the second time by means of the Queen, the third time he voluntarily absented himself because he knew the Bishops had plotted his death by the way devising means and encouraging men hereunto.

Great Success in His Ministry

Notwithstanding all their devices and plots, he lived a long time without death, bonds, banishment or imprisonment, writing, teaching and preaching openly in their schools and synagogues drawing both Prince and People, Scholars and others and all the world almost after him. He began to defend his opinions when he was very young and continued till he was very old constantly retaining and maintaining the same, some few excepted, which he reformed and refined the more as he grew in years and knowledge.

He began to be famous 1360 and died in the year of Grace 1387 in high favor with God and men.

Friars' Malice After His Death

In his lifetime, I find but one or two that wrote against him who demeaned themselves very respectfully to him, but after his death, many, I may say, the whole host and nest of monks and friars began to prey most cowardly upon his dead corpse disgorging their gall and bitterness both against his person and doctrine. Thus far Mr. **Thomas James**.

And would it not be a worthy and excellent work for some judicious head and hand to gather several pieces that in several places and libraries are dispersed wither in this Nation or other parts where they may be heard of, in manuscript or otherwise, and put both the Latin and the old English copies into English for public use and benefit who may well be subtiles our English apostle who was so eminently raised up by God (and preserved even to miracle) to be such a choice instrument to revive and maintain the truths of the Gospel in those days of Antichristian darkness and ignorance?

Persecution of Lollards

After him, we meet in this King's days with several of his friends and brethren that were sorely persecuted for Lollards as William Swindbury, Walter Brute and others. Concerning whom **the Bishop of Hereford** gives this account in **his Process**, viz. That *the Lollards were execrable offenders and did preach openly things that were heretical and blasphemous contrary to the sacred canons and decrees of the fathers expounding the scripture as the letter soundeth as did the Donatists of old.* **Fox Vol. 1, p. 608.**

Lucifer's Letter to the Prelates

At this time a notable letter was written and published by the Lollards In the Name of Lucifer, Prince of Darkness to the persecuting Prelates, mentioned at large by Mr. Fox. Much like a late piece called A Dialogue betwixt the Pope and the Devil.

Pope's Bull against Lollards

Pope Boniface the 9th gives forth his Bull against the Lollards upon which the King grants his commission to apprehend and imprison some of the chief of them. **Fox, p. 658.**

Though the persecutors were cruel, fierce and severe, to their abilities, so far as their bounds extended, yet no Law as yet being obtained to reach to life, none were as yet put to death for religion.

Queen Anne, a Friend to the Lollards

Queen Anne. The wife of Richard the Second, was a Bohemian, sister to the King of Bohemia who brought many of the Bohemian or Wadensian profession over with her and who 'tis supposed, carried and conveyed so many of Wickliff's works to Prague by the means whereof so much light and truth was promoted in those parts and sealed to with so much blood. This good Queen was a great friend to Wickliff and had the New Testament in the English tongue.

A Book of Conclusions for Reformation was exhibited to the Parliament by the Lollards and set upon the door of Paul's and other public places the 18th year of the King. **Fox p. 662**

The Statute for Burning of Heretics

In the reign of Henry the Fourth were cruel and bloody laws made against the Lollards. One particularly for the burning of William Sawtry for that heresy. And another general statute reaching the whole party called the **Statute ex Officio, de Heretico comburendo**, for the burning of heretics made **Anno secundo H. 4. C. 15**. Revived after by Queen Mary and which was passed at the particular instance of the clergy and therefore thus entered into the rolls, Petatio Cleri contra Hareticos, The petition of the Priests against the heretics. Which interest the King did the rather gratify herein that they might the better strengthen him in his usurpation. By which Statute it was that so much Christian blood was afterwards shed whereby the lay preachers were to be seized, viz. those that preached without orders and license and against the doctrine and sacraments of the Church of Rome with all their followers and adherents for heretics and in case of obstinacy (being convicted by their Ordinary) to be delivered to the Secular Powers to be burned alive and which was severely executed both in this King's reign and in several Kings' and Queens' after him.

Articles for Discovery of Lollards

And for the better discovering of the Lollards there were several Articles that the Inquisitors were to examine the suspected upon and amongst which the 12th Article is the, viz. Whether an infant dying unbaptized can be saved? Which the Lollards, as you have heard, always asserted in opposition to the Popes decree that enjoined infants' baptism to save them and that without it, no salvation, as you have heard. And therefore **Walsingham** (as saith the **Dutch Martyrol fol. 774**) tells us that one Sir Lord Clifford, an Apostate Lollard (viz. He that was, as you have heard, so great a friend to Wickliff in the former King's time) did discover to the Archbishop of Canterbury that the Lollards would not baptize their newborn children. Item, Si habaret piterum modo natum non baptizaretur.

Lollards Burned

Several Lollards were, upon the Statute aforesaid, sorely persecuted and some put to death amongst whom that eminent servant and martyr of Jesus Christ, William Sautry, was the proto-martyr, or first in this Nation that suffered that death. And after him, John Badby, etc. **Fox Act. And Monum. Printed 1632, prt 1, p. 682, 685, 687, 727.**

Cobham and 38 Hanged and Burned for Lollards

In the time of Henry the Fifth were several Lollards burned upon the former Statute at Tyburn in St. Giles' Fields, London. Viz. 36 men in Jan. 1413 and that eminent champion for the truth the Lord Cobham, or St. John Oldcastle 3 years after and John Claydon and Richard Turning. They were tied up in chains upon the gallows and fires after made under them to burn them. And from thence that place of

execution (saith Mr. **Fuller** upon this subject in the time of Henry the Fifth in his **Eccles. Hist.**) was called Tyburn. **Fox Mart. P. 775, 840, 842.**

Diverse Lollards Martyred

In the sixth year of the reign and age of Henry the Sixth, Anno 1428, there was a Warrant directed to the Keeper of the Castle of Colchester for the apprehending William White, William Northampton and Thomas Setling (who had been Priests, but then faithful preachers of the Gospel) and others they called Lollards. Upon which there were in Norfolk and Suffolk apprehended in four years space one hundred and twenty Lollards, men and women, whose names Mr. Fox gives you a list of and who suffered very hard things though some upon trial recanted. William White, Father Abraham of Colchester and John Waden were burned at the Norwich in Sept. 1428. With an account of the Articles that they and their fellow Lollards were charged with and for the defense thereof, they laid down their lives which you may take as followeth.

Lollards Deny Infant's Baptism, Tithes, etc.

1. That they slighted infants' baptism which they called slighting of Baptism itself (because to them in those days it was the principal, if not the only baptism) in their saying that the children of the baptized believers needed not be baptized and that if they died without baptism, they might be saved.
2. That the ministers of the Gospel should not be maintained by tithes.
3. That marriage did consist in the declaration of the mutual consent betwixt the man and the woman and that it was no sacrament, nor to be performed by a Priest in the Church.
4. Against auricular confession.
5. Against transubstantiation.
6. For the liberty of lay preaching and that because every Christian man being a priest might, if he was able, preach God's word.
7. Against keeping of Lent.
8. That the Pope is Antichrist and the prelates are his disciples and that they have no power of binding or loosing.
9. Against Holy Days.
10. That the Pope's ecclesiastical censures and excommunications are not to be regarded.
11. For priests' marriages.
12. Against common swearing.
13. Against pilgrimages.
14. Against crucifixes, images and image worship.
15. Against Holy water.
16. Against Thomas Becket's saintship.
17. Against worshipping or relic, shrines or dead men's bones.
18. Against dedications and holiness of places for worship.
19. Against praying to saints and angels.
20. That bells and ringing in the churches were ordered for no other purpose than to fill the priests' purses.
21. That all popish, ecclesiastical precepts and insinuations were to be withstood.
22. That the elect were only to be esteemed the church catholic.

Lollards Unanimous Herein

In which profession they did so generally agree as their uniform faith that whatsoever one did hold herein, all others did maintain the same.

It is true, Mr. Fox saith, that he did suppose that the papists did slander them in the two first. Not so well considering that they were not only the tenets of Wickliff himself, but of their forefathers the Waldenses, as you have heard. **Dutch Martyrol, l. 2, p. 582, 583, col. 1. Fox Act. And Monum. P.867, 868, 869.** In this King's reign, Anno 1431, were also burned for Lollards Richard Hoveden and Anno 1439, Richard Wich. **Fox p. 918, 919.**

In Edward the Fourth's time, An. 1473, one John Goose, or our English John Hus, Hus being Goose in the German tongue, was burned for a Lollard. **P. 939.**

In the time of Henry the Seventh, An. 1511, John Brown burned, 1512, William and James Seely and John Brewster burned, 1514, John Hunn murdered in the Lollards Tower, 1519, Thomas Man, John Tewksby burned and diverse others, etc.

Again, in the time of Henry the Eighth, in the year 1528, seven Dutch Anabaptists that came over with Anne of Cleve were apprehended and imprisoned of whom five bore the faggot and recanted and two of them, a man and a woman were burned in Smithfield. **Stow's Chron. 576.**

And again, in the 30th year of Henry the Eighth, An. 1539, sixteen men and fifteen women were banished for opposing infants' baptism who going to Delft in Holland were there pursued and prosecuted before the Magistrate for Anabaptists and put to death for the same, then men beheaded and the women drowned—Twenty-eight persons of the same persuasion having been put to death for the same crime the year before. **Dutch Martyrol, l. 2, p. 123.**

In the third year of Edward the Sixth, 1549, those Anabaptists who in the former King's time kept close, did now appear and publish their doctrines. To prevent the growth whereof, several of the chiefest of them were converted the second of April in Paul's Church before the Bishop of Canterbury and Westminster, Dr. Cox, Dr. May, Dr. Cole, etc. And being convicted, some were dismissed with admonition and some sentenced to bear the faggot at Paul's Cross. **Peter Heylin, History of Reformation. P. 73.**

In Queen Mary's time, about the year 1557, we find Anabaptists imprisoned, giving the following grounds against infants' baptism:

1. Because antisciptural;
2. Because commanded by the Pope;
3. Because Christ commanded teaching to go before baptism. **Fox, Acts and Monum. Vol 3, p. 606**

In Queen Elizabeth's time, in the year 1575, a congregation of Anabaptists were taken at their meeting within Algate. Twenty-seven of whom were imprisoned and of them, four recanted, two were burned in Smithfield and the rest were banished. **Stow's Chron. P. 676**

In the 16th year of King James, 1618, that excellent Dutch piece called **A Very Plain and Well-grounded Treatise concerning Baptism** that with so much authority both from scripture and antiquity proves the baptizing of believers and disproves that of infants was printed in English.

Since when (especially in the 1st 30 or 40 years) many have been the conferences that have passed and many the treatises that have been written pro and con upon that subject and many have been the sufferings both in old and new England that people of that persuasion have undergone whereby such light hath broken forth therein that not only very many learned men have been convinced thereof, but very many congregations of Baptists have been and are daily gathered in that good old way of the Lord that hath so long lain under so much obloquy and reproach and been buried under so much Antichristian rubbish in these Nations. Having thus carried you through the Waldensian story and the witness borne by them to this great truth, both in their confessions of faith, the particular witness of their eminent men, and the more general witness by the whole people with the footsteps we find thereof in the several Countries where they have heretofore imprinted it both in Germany, Switzerland, Holland, Flanders, Hungary, Poland and England.

Objections Answered About Contrary Confessions

It remains that I give you an account of some objections that are usually brought in contradiction to what hath been said of this people, out of **Perin**, who tells us of some of their confessions that do own and assert infants' baptism and upon which Mr. Baxter and others do bear themselves very high that these former are all mistaken stories. And of which I shall give you a particular account as you may find them in that **translation of Perin by Lenard** and a candid return to each of them.

The passages referred to by Mr. Baxter and others are principally four which you may take as follows with distinct answers to each of them and which, because so much stress is laid upon them, I beg the reader's patience to be more particular in them.

The Confession Not By the Waldenses

The first is the **Confession of Faith** that 'tis said the Waldenses of Bohemia presented to their King Ladislaus, Anno **1508**, and afterwards to Ferdinand, Anno 1513. Hinted at in **l.x.c.9, p.121**, but at large in **Morland** where, in the 12th article, they say, that they teach that children are to be baptized unto salvation and to be consecrated to Christ according to His word "Suffer little children..."etc. In answer whereto, we need to say nothing but what is contained in the very title itself, saying, that they were falsely called Waldenses justifying themselves from that aspersion being not of their tenets which you may take in their own words: *Lo petit tropel du le Christians appella per falce nom falsa ment panvers O Valdes.* **Osiander** tells us that the professors there were a mixed people. Some that only separated from Rome in the business of the cup called the Calixines. The other the Hussites that went farther than they and the Thaborites that were more thorough for reformation and more especially did comprehend those they called the Brethren or Picards, many of whom did oppose the baptism of infants, but the other two and the greatest part of the professors in that Nation did own it as appears by their profession which doth not weaken at all our assertion. For I presume it will not be denied that all the 45 Colleges belonging to Bohemia and Moravia, containing many thousands, were of another persuasion this being of so late a date as the sixteenth century. The second is contained in that 17th Article brought by George Morel as it was confirmed by them of Switzerland and Germany to whom he was sent by the Waldenses of Provence and which was so well approved of by them upon his return, Anno 1530, and so signed and swore to by the Waldenses of Piedmont, Anno 1535. Which Article we find to be as followeth:

Art. XVII. Touching the matter of the sacraments, it hath been concluded by the Holy Scriptures that we have but two sacramental signs the which Christ hath left unto us. The one is baptism, the other is the Eucharist which we receive to show what our perseverance in the faith is as we have promised when we were baptized being little ones. **L. 2, c. 4, p. 60, 61 out of Morel's Memoirs.**

ANSW. Concerning which last clause (being little ones) it is to be considered when this was made, by whom and why.

As to which, it appears that this was by the Waldenses in Provence, etc. That were now in a very declining condition and had so turned aside that about this time, many of them could satisfy themselves to go to Mass and other Antichristian abominations to save themselves, provided they kept their hearts right with God as appears by **Oscolampad, his letter to them** so sharply reproving them for such prevarications when it was that George Morel and Peter Masson were sent to those begun reformers in Switzerland and Germany for their advice. And who returned to them with books and letters and these 17 Articles confirmed by them. And of which transaction, for our better information, Mr. **Fox** gives this following account in his second **Vol. P. 186:**

The End of the Message

That these two messengers came in the year 1530 to confer with the wise and learned ministers of the churches in Switzerland and Germany in the doctrine of the gospel and to know the whole form and manner which these churches used in the service and worship of God, and particularly, to know their advice upon certain points which they were not resolved in.

With Whom to Confer

That after the conference had with the chiefest of the church of God, namely, with Oscolampadius at Basil, **Bucer and Capite at Stratsburg** and Hallerus at Bern, they returned back and that by the way, Peter was taken to Dyon by the Inquisition, but that George got safe with his books and letters to Mirindall which he brought with him from the churches in Germany and declared to his brethren all the parts of his

commission and opened to them how many and great errors they were in, and which their old ministers whom they called Barbes or Uncles had brought them into, leading them from the right way of true religion.

The Mystery Unfolded

Where, by honest **John Fox**, you meet with the whole truth of the story that will set us at rights herein and reconcile this seeming difficulty: That in this declined state, having left so much their former zeal and principles, and got some learned men to be their new teachers, they send for advice and to make a conjunction and association with them of the new reformation and who now found them upon the new Bottom they themselves began upon and which this little clause in the close of the Articles doth effectually do. And upon which they have been ever since being one therein with the Hugenots in France and protestants in Germany to this day.

For what was the point that they were not resolved in that their advice must be sought about (surely this very thing about infants baptism)? What was that error their old Barbes had brought them into so turning them from the right way of Religion? Surely this very thing, for all the rest of the Articles were every bit of them according to the doctrine of their old Barbes. What was it that would make the conjunction with them of the reformation? Why this very thing concerning which they of Switzerland did so hotly contend with their godly brethren: that nothing but bonds, confiscation of goods, nay death itself, should compensate such an error as they denying of infants baptism as you have before **p. 260, 261**. Though if our Dutch Story be true, both Ocolampadius, Bauer and Capito, yea Zwinglius himself were all at first upon those substantial grounds opposing it as **p. 262**: Because the scripture neither commands it, nor any scripture instance warrants it and that faith and regeneration ought always to proceed it. But how they quit this hold so to persecute those that received it, we find not.

The Assertion Nonsensical

Now therefore to make up this conjunction must this be foisted into their Articles how impertinent and nonsensical soever, for therefore they must say they do receive the Lord's supper to show their perseverance in that faith which they had promised when baptized in their infancy. But pray you what promise is it which an infant is capable to make either respecting faith or perseverance therein? For as to gossips or sureties (which is true, by reason of children's' incapacities to promise for themselves and the necessity of a promise to be made in baptism, were by the Pope ordained as you have heard) to promise for them we suppose were too Antichristian to be admitted either by our new or old reformers. And therefore to speak here of children's promising is no less dissonant to their former principles than to known reason and common sense.

Confirms, not weakens the Assertion

And doth not this censuring their old Barbes (those eminent worthies) as their misleaders into error and falsehood upon their signing of these Articles which in all things, but that only, did so fully agree to the doctrines they all along taught them, give a substantial ground to conclude that this of infants baptism the only thing altered was the error intended. And then nothing could be a greater confirmation to the truth we have affirmed: that for so many ages before, their ancient Barbes did only baptize the adult and reject that of infants, so positively enjoined by the popish Canons and Decrees and for which they suffered such hard things.

Another is mentioned in the **first book, part 3, c. 6, p. 43** under this head: What the Waldenses and Albigenses have believed and taught touching the sacraments. And in the conclusion 'tis said "And for this cause it is that we present our children in baptism which they ought to do to whom the children are nearest." And from whence it is concluded that the Waldenses were of old for this practice.

In answer whereto, that you may the better understand how this new doctrine was sacked on by their new doctors so their old confessions, though indeed, so contradict thereto, we shall give you a brief account of what they say respecting the sacraments in general and that of baptism in particular:

What a Sacrament Signs and in Whom a Sign: Two Only

1. Concerning a sacrament in general they give the following definition: That a sacrament is a sign of a holy thing which by God's grace is wrought in the soul of a believer by the preaching of the gospel. And of which but two in number: one by water the other by nourishment, bread and wine.

The Matter, Form, End and Subject of Baptism

2. As to baptism in particular, they say that baptism is a washing with water of the river or fountain in the name of the Father, Son and Spirit to the end that by the means of God's grace, participation of Christ and renewing of the Holy Spirit (in those that have a lively faith in their hearts) the sins of the baptized may be pardoned and they received into grace and promised salvation.

And, that the baptism wherewith they are baptized is the same wherewith it pleased our Savior himself to be baptized to fulfill all righteousness and the same wherewith he commanded his Apostles to be baptized.

Works Not Grace in Itself

And, that baptism in itself, by the deed done, maketh the party never the better as appears in the example of Simon Magus.

Receives Into the Church

And, that it is administered in the congregation of the faithful to the end that he who is received in the church, should be reputed and held of all for a Christian brother that all may pray for him that he may be a Christian at heart as outwardly so esteemed.

And then is this clause annexed in the conclusion of it (but by whom or how properly is left to judgment): And for this cause it is that we present our children in baptism which they ought to do to whom the children are nearest.

Infant's Baptism Opposeth Former Confessions

Upon which, in the first place, let it be remarked that all of the rest of the confession but this suits not only with the scripture, but so well with their old confessions, but this latter with neither bespeaking it of the same mold and piece with the former we have spoken of before.

And in the next place, we shall observe to you how little it agrees either with the definition here given of a sacrament in general or of baptism in particular.

No Coherence With the Rest of the Confession

It is said "And for this cause it is that we present our children in baptism." But for what cause we beseech you? Is it that the sacraments may be a sign of a holy thing to the infants, having as believers through the grace of God been made partaker thereof by the preaching of the gospel? No, surely that is not to be imagined from those that the scripture as well as known experience tells us have not so much understanding in common things as to know their right hand from their left, John 4: 11.

Or secondly, is it because they having a lively faith in their hearts by the grace of God, participation of Christ and renewing of the Holy Spirit, they might therefore be washed with the water of the fountain or river in the name of the Father, Son and Holy Spirit that they may have remission of sins, grace and salvation?

Infants know nothing

No, surely this cannot be the case why the children are presented to baptism that are so far from being capable to testify faith or repentance that they know neither good nor evil as the scripture tells us, Deut 1: 39. And to do it to work grace in them by the deed done, as ordained of old, is already renounced as popish and Antichristian.

Can Put Forth No Act of Righteousness

Or, thirdly, is it that in obedience to Christ's command and example they might thereby fulfill all righteousness? Surely not. That can no wise be said of them that must be wholly passive being no way capable to express the least activity in any service for Christ or any act of righteousness in his worship.

Not Capable of Church Membership

Or fourthly, that they may hereby be received into the church and as Christian brethren partake of the benefits thereof? No, by no means for that would as much oppose reason and scripture as contradict that former confession of faith founded upon both as you have it **l. 1, c. 13, p. 62** and as before mentioned, **p. 239**: That by baptism the believers are received into the Holy Congregation of the People of God there professing and declaring openly our faith and amendment of life so that by this confession none but those that are able to declare faith and repentance openly in the congregation are either capable of baptism or fit to be admitted visible members into the church of God. So fully agreeing with scripture precept and example as you have heard at large and which so undoubtedly excludes all infants through their utter incapacity so to do.

Whereby you may fully understand how inconsistent such a practice here insinuated (in the latter clause) is to the declared nature of the ordinance and all their former confessions about it. By which you may judge how these things came to be foisted into their confessions in this their defection by their new masters.

The fourth and last is mentioned in **l.1, c. 4, p. 15** where, among the Calumnies that **Perin** undertakes to wipe off, that of denying infant's baptism (as laid to their charge) is one, and which he doth out of a book called **the Spiritual Almanack, p. 45**:

That the Waldenses being constrained for some certain hundred years to suffer their children to be baptized by the Priests of the Church of Rome, they deferred the doing thereof as long as they could possible because they had in detestation those human inventions which are added to that holy sacrament which they held to be the pollution thereof.

And forasmuch as their pastors which they called Barbes were many times abroad, and employed in the service of the church, they could not have the sacrament of baptism administered to the infants by their own ministers.

And for this cause they kept them long from baptism which the Priests perceiving and taking notice of, charged them thereupon with this imposture which not only the adversaries have believed, but others also who have well approved of their life and faith in all other parts.

From which ill told story, may not every body see that hath but half an eye that what is here said is so far from wiping off that which he calls the calumny that it fixes it all together and substantially confirms what hath been before asserted about it.

For is it not fully owned that for many hundred years parents did use to defer the baptizing of their children? First, because their Barbes or pastors, that he saith should have done it, were absent in the service of the churches abroad. And secondly, that those popish Priests, that in their absence should do it, performed it with such human inventions added to it (which they had in such detestation) that they therefore so long deferred and kept them from baptism that gave the Priests occasion to complain against them and charge them herewith. So that if neither the popish Priests did it, nor their won Ministers, then surely it was not done. But in contradiction to themselves 'tis said they were constrained to suffer them to baptize them. What! Against their consciences? Being so courageous, zealous and faithful a people? That is improbable, but that they did it not, is clear because as confessed, they complain and raise the report that should have done it. And as to that other reason assigned why it was deferred: From the absence of their Barbs is a mistake. What, were they always absent? What, many hundred years absent? Not to be imagined for as

you'll find, though they were careful to send out evangelists to preach the gospel to others, yet they never left themselves destitute of Pastors to administer all the ordinances amongst themselves. And therefore if this for so many hundred years had been adjudged such an ordinance of Christ, they had not wanted administrators amongst themselves for charity begins at home. And as concerning the disposing their ministers both at home and abroad, you'll see more particularly in their following history. And therefore had not Mr. **Morel** (the **supposed author of the Spiritual Almanac**, and prime instrument, that, as before, had defiled them herein) better have said nothing at all than so much to so little purpose, yea, so much against himself?

Thus you have all these objections answered and the truth of the former assertions vindicated that do maintain that the old Waldenses were defenders of believers' and impugnors of infant's baptism as by their old Confessions of Faith and practice their eminent sufferings for the same in so many ages and Countries is by great authority confirmed to us.

And as for these quotations out of Perin, they amount only to thus much: that in the beginning of the sixteenth century, there were some Confessions that did own infant's baptism, but nothing (no, not one word that I can meet with) of any elder date about which time also, as it is manifest, they made a great defection from their former principles and integrities, and have too much gendered since into the formalities of the Huguenots.

Neither would I be thought to assert such a universal harmony amongst the Waldenses in this thing, but that 'tis possible there might be some difference amongst some of them even in this particular as there were many differences betwixt the Calvinists and Lutherans, but I profess to you ingenuously amongst all my search, excepting these two passages of so late a date, I find none.

And I must confess I cannot think it reasonable that any of them that lived up to their principles could embrace such a thing, for they were so zealously exact, none more for the letter of the scriptures, founding all thereon and rejecting whatever they found not contained therein. Whereas this practice by Confession of all sides in not to be found in the letter of the scripture and none more severe rejecters of traditions, especially popish traditions, whereof this is such a principle one.

Thus we have gone through the Waldensian story and witness evidencing a concurring testimony to this great truth from first to last.

The Succession of Believers Baptism

By all which you see by plentiful evidence that Christ hath not been without his witness in every age not only to defend and assert the true, but to impugn and to reject (yea, even to death itself) the false baptism. Insomuch that we are not left without good testimony of a series of succession that by God's providence hath been kept afoot of this great ordinance of believer's baptism even since the first times.

The Miscarriages of the German Anabaptists Examined, and the Reproach from thence Reflected upon that Way Removed

Lastly, it will be meet to say something of the Munster business and the German Anabaptists about whose miscarriages in Luther's time so much hath been rejected upon the whole party ever since.

Respecting which, I shall say these few things following: that take it for granted that things were so as to matter of fact that many Anabaptists did prove so horribly wicked as Spanheimim, Sleidan, Osiander and others do report, yet how unreasonable and uncharitable would it be to render all the people either in those times, or since, to be such persons also and to judge an error in the principle from the error in conversation of some that have professed it. For by the same rule may not the purest state, both in the Old and New Testament, be censured and judged who had their Choras, Judas and Diatrophes amongst them? But that others that owned the principle were men of another Spirit, both in that as well as former and latter times, you have most ample and authentic testimony from their greatest enemies. Witness that honorable character the Rainerium the bloody Inquisitor gives of them in those days, of those in France. Cassander, Ballarmine

and Barenius, of those in Germany. Mr. **Baxter** himself, one of their severest enemies in these Nations, yet hath done himself and his opposites that right as to witness to the innocency of their conversation which you may please to read in his own words in his book called **The Defence of the Princip. Of Love, p. 7**: that *Anabaptists are godly men that differ from me in a point so difficult that many of the papists and prelatists 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 **p. 827** 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. And therefore Tertullian and Nazianzen speak against haste and Augustine and many children of Christian parents were baptized at age (and if so, what greater argument against apostolical tradition), and, 3. That the controversies of so great difficulty that if in all such cases none that differ be tolerated, we may not live together in the world or the church, but endlessly excommunicate or persecute one another.*

But in the next place I think it will not be unnecessary, being upon this point, to give you some account from the best authors of the matter of fact itself that has occasioned to so much blunder in the world concerning which you must understand there are two things especially reflected upon: First, those many insurrections and disturbances that happened in Isuria and Swevia by times for the space of 22 years—from 1502 to 1525 called the Clowns or Rustics War wherein Munzer and several other Anabaptists were concerned in Luther's time.

And the other, those horrible things that are spoken of to have been in the City of Munster in Westphalia from the year 1532 to 1536 by a John Leyden, Matthias, Gnipperdoling, etc.

As to that of the Clowns War, I find in Baronius' his Annals that in the year 1502, there was a conspiracy of husbandmen against the Bishops and Canons which was called the Relic League which began from two Rustics. Of which conspiracy the principle article was that they should shake off every yoke and in imitation of the Helvetians, should recover their liberty. Which beginnings, saith **Osiander, Cent 16 p. 34**, were the Praludium of that great sedition of the Rustics which was in its vigor, 1525.

Gnadolius, in his **History of the Rustics in Germany**, in the year 1525, l. 1, saith *that in Swevia where they first began they did openly signify that they were not gospellers nor did flow together for the gospel's sake, but because of exactions. The first Boors that rose were against the Count Lypsius to whom after an infinite number of Rustics did join themselves, crying up gospel liberty as well as civil in both which they were so oppressed by their Lords and Bishops (which Spanhemius himself, in his Diatribe Historia, refers to Luther's book of Christian Liberty, as the occasion taken by them.)*

Bishop Jewel, In Defence of the Apology of the Church of England, part 4, chap. 1, divis. 1, to Harding, in his upbraiding the reformation, saying, What became of the hundred-Thousand Boors of Germany consumed by the sword of the Nobility for that their sedition and rebellion? Answers him thus: *The Boors of Germany, of whom you speak, for the greatest part, were adversaries unto Luther and understood no part of the gospel, but conspired together, as they said, against the cruelty and tyranny of their Lords as they had done 22 years before in the conspiracy called Liga Sotularia. The partners of which conspiracy had for their word the virgin Mary and in honor of her were bound to say five Ave Marias every day. And touching those latter rebels, Luther wrote against them. It is true, Munzer was a busy man in Thuringia and stirred up the people disposed to tumults by reason of oppression.*

Osiander gives us, in the **16th century, p. 36, 37, etc.**, *the twelve demands of the Rustics comprehending their Civil and Spiritual liberties wherein people of all persuasions concerned themselves which was no other than their neighbors, the Switzers, had successfully undertaken before them and had Geneva where they did the like or any of the famous men amongst the Cantons miscarried in their attempt, they and their religion too might have fallen under as much obloquy as the chiefest of those people did in their defeat which the papists you find nevertheless do reflect upon the Anabaptists because there were some of their persuasion concerned in that attempt for freedom.*

And as to the other at Munster in 1532, etc. It is manifest both by Spanhemius and Osiander that the first stir in that city was about the protestant reformation, the Synod siding with Mr. Rotomon and others of the Ministers against the papists and their Bishops and Canons that opposed them to arms and this before the coming in of Jo. Mathid and Jo. Becold of Leyden. In the latter part of the siege, (as they say) monstrous wickedness and villainy by horrid pride, tyranny and luxury in their communities was persecuted by them.

Though I must needs say, as to the truth thereof, there is good ground to doubt.

First, because the things are either written by the malicious papists, their old mortal enemies and who have said as bad things of Luther and Calvin themselves representing them no less monsters and devils than these poor people just as they used to deal with the Waldenses of old. Whereof Dr. Usher gives us a large account in the State of the Church, or else by some of their most inveterate enemies, the protestants, who 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 so vehemently contended. And alas! How far good men may be transported by prejudice or malice in this kind. We need not go far for instances for if **Mr. Edwards**, in his **Gangrene**, be to be believed (which it may be, other Nations do that have got it) what monsters of men hath he represented the Independents and Anabaptists to be. Or Mr. Baxter himself to be credited in that horrid calumny of the Anabaptists, being baptized naked in these countries, **mentioned p. 134**. What unnatural brutes would they be esteemed? By which we may guess, if matter of fact cannot better be told amongst ourselves at home what may we expect of it abroad at such distance?

And besides, there was secondly another thing by which people in all ages took an occasion to misrepresent this people which was found amongst them at Munster and that was that community of goods casting their estates into one common stock. Which, **saith Hornbeck, in his Summa Controversiarum, p. 334**, was the first thing that Bacaldus and Gerardus endeavored amongst them in the year 1533 and was the same thing that Osiander tells us Munzerius did in Mulhusium in Thuringia in the Rustic Tumults, 1524 and no other than the Waldenses did so much practice of old in their communities and their peoples do to this day, both in Poland, Hungaria, Transylvania and many parts in Germany, living in colleges in that very way, as you have heard, and will understand more thereof on the historical part, and which custom they observed, partly out of convenience, and partly out of conscience respecting the example, Acts 4: 34. And from hence they took occasion to reproach the Waldenses of old as though with their stocks and food they had their women in common too. And from hence also I persuade myself much of this clamor of the Munster business did arise.

But though it should be taken for granted that some Anabaptists in Germany did turn Ranters and were given up to such desperate courses as reported of them, can justly be respected upon the principle and upon the innocent in other parts of the world that hate and abhor all such ways and courses?

It is true those called the Ministers in Holland, the followers of Meno Symonia and Theodoricus, were so scandalized at it, whether from any reality that was in the report or at the odious slander that was raised upon the same, that ever since they have run another extreme refusing the learning of arms both offensive and defensive, or in taking of oaths, or bearing no rule, office or government in the Commonwealth, lest they should seem in the least to abet such principles charged upon them in Munster.

And in as much as the ancient Britains and the Waldenses have so large a share in this witness, we think it not inconvenient to join the history of the antiquity and purity of their Christianity hereto.

THE

History of Christianity

AMONGST THE
Ancient Britains

DISCOVERING

The Antiquity, Purity and Progress thereof with their great sufferings for the same by Popish, Antichristian Tyranny and Cruelty.

The ancient Britains and Waldenses, having born so early and so large a part among eminent and faithful witnesses that have stood up for Christ and His truths against Antichrist and his abominations, I conceive, it may neither be unreasonable, nor altogether unacceptable to give you a brief historical account of their Christianity from our best and most approved authors. Whereby it may be manifested that the gospel and the truths thereof did flourish in power and purity in these Western parts of the World as received from the purest times and were so far from being beholden to the romish Harlot for gospel light and truth, as then lyingly and vain-gloriously boasteth, saying, “Where was your religion, ministry, churches, ordinances before Luther?” That she hath all along not only been the abominable corrupter and contaminator of the gospel and all the parts thereof, but the malicious and murderous persecutor of all that have sincerely embraced and professed the same—a consideration not unworthy the present juncture wherein so much of her poisonous infection is so afresh cast about. And which you’ll find is no small antidote and preservative the worthy *Usher* prescribes against it in his excellent piece called *The Succession and State of the Church*, renouncing any the least succession from whorish Rome, but from these faithful churches.

The filthiness of whose fornications shall in due time be more and more detected. And that however she may dream of sitting still as a queen and as the lady and mistress of the Nations, yet must she certainly fall both mother and daughter, those that help and those that are helped, yea, as a mill stone into the Sea for strong is the Lord God that will judge her. When that doxology, Rev 19: 1, 2 must be sung by all the servants of God that fear His name, both great and small, Hallelujah, *salvation and glory and honor and power unto the Lord our God for true and righteous are His judgments for He hath judged the great whore who did corrupt the Earth with her fornications and hath avenged the blood of His servants at her hand, Amen, Hallelujah.*

The first we begin with is our Countryman, the ancient Britains concerning whom little is to be found from their own writers either before, or some ages after Christ who either through ignorance or sloth wrote nothing, or if they did, were by the revolutions of time devoured.

The most we find is from strangers especially the Romans, their first conquerors, whose writings tell us what a barbarous, savage people they found them with their naked bodies and painted skins (from whence, as Speed saith, their name Britains came: from Brit=paint and Tain=a region). And so inhumane that they offered man’s flesh in their sacrifices and kept their women in common. But afterwards, as the gospel came and prevailed amongst them, they cast away their heathenish abominations and which was so sincerely embraced by them and took such deep rooting amongst them, that they became instrumental in several ages to convert and conquer their conquerors to it: both Romans, Saxons, Danes and Normans.

Of the gospel’s first entrance and progress we have the following account from the best authors we meet with: the first I shall mention giving any account hereof is our Countryman **Gildas**, called by Baleus Bodonicus or Sapiens, the best and most authentic of all the ancient Britain historians, who (in his book called **De Victoria Aurelii Ambrosii**) affirmeth that Britain received the gospel under Tiberius the Emperor, under whom Christ suffered. And that many evangelists were sent from the Apostles themselves into this nation.

And that they came first out of France about the year 63 and who were the first pioneers of the gospel in this nation. And again in his book called **De Excidio Britannia** saith *that the precepts of Christ though they were received but lukewarmly of the inhabitants in general, yet they remained entirely with some, less sincerely with others until the ninth year of the persecution under Diocletian the Emperor which was about 290 in the third century.*

Out of an ancient book of *the Antiquities of England* (as Mr. Fox, p. 139, part 1, tell us) we find the epistle of *Elentberius* written to Lucius, the King of Britain, Anno 169 (in answer to his) recorded. By which we understand that Lucius had embraced the Faith of Christ, who wrote, it seems, to Eleutherius for the Roman Laws to govern by, who in his said epistle, as you may read at large, you have to this purpose: *you have received through God's mercy in the realm of Brittany the Law and Faith of Christ. You have with you within the Realm both the parts of the scriptures out of them, by God's grace, with His council of your Realm, take ye a law, and by that law through God's sufferance, rule your Kingdom of Britain, etc.* **Tertullian**, in his book **Contra Judaos**, *There are places of the Britains (saith he) which were inaccessible to the Romans, but yet subdued to Christ.*

Origen, in his **Fourth Hom. On Ezek**, saith, *The power of God our Savior is even with them which in Britain are divided from the world.*

Magdeburg, **Cent 3, c. 2, p. 6**, *We doubt no to affirm that the Churches of the Island of Britain did also remain in this Age.*

Baleus, **Cent. 1, fol. 37**, saith *That the British Churches received the Nicene Confession of Faith against the Arians. Whence it was that Basil, Chrysostome, and others of the Greek fathers make such frequent and great mention of the British Isles, their reception of the gospel and the divine sense they had of the power whereof that the Churches also were exactly constituted according to Christ's pattern.*

Jeffrey of Monmouth, in his book **De Britannorum Gestis, l. 8, c. 4**, tells us that *in the Country of the Britains Christianity flourished which never decayed even from the Apostles' time. Amongst whom, saith he, was the preaching of the gospel, sincere doctrine and living faith and such form of worship as was delivered to the churches by the Apostles themselves. And that they, even to death itself, withstood the Romish Rites and ceremonies and that about the year 448, the English Saxons began to possess Brittany. And that about 593, they having made a complete conquest of the Britains began to settle their Heptarcy. That in 596, Gregory, Bishop of Rome, sent Austin the Monk into England to bring the Saxons into a conformity to the Church of Rome. For as long as the British Churches possessed the Country, they kept themselves sound in the faith and pure in the worship, order and discipline of Christ as it was delivered to them from the Apostles or their evangelists.*

That they were great opposers of the Church of Rome, the ancient Bard **Taliessyn**, in his **Welsh Verses**, recorded in the **Chronicle of Wales, p. 254**, and translated by Fuller in his **Ecclesiastical History, Book 1**, doth testify:

*Woe be to the Priest yborne,
That will not cleanly weed his corne,
And preach his flock among.
Woe be to that shepherd, I say,
That will not watch his flock alway,
As to his office doth belong.
Woe be to him that doth not keep
From Romish wolves his sheep,
With staff and weapon strong.*

That about the beginning of the Seventh Century, Austin endeavored to reduce the Britains, as well as the Saxons, to a conformity with the Church of Rome. At which time, the old Britains were principally in Wales where Bauger on the North and Cair-Leon on the South, were the two principle seats both for learning and

religion. In Bangor was a College containing 2100 Christians who dedicated themselves to the Lord to serve Him in the ministry as they became capable to whom was attributed the name of the Monks of Bangor. Yet did they no ways accord with the Popish Monks of that or the following Age for they were not reduced to any ecclesiastical order, but were for the most part laymen who labored with their hands, married and followed their callings. Only some of them whose spirits the Lord stirred and inclined to His more immediate service devoted themselves to the study of the scriptures and other holy exercises in order to the work of the ministry. Who sent forth many worthy instruments, **Fuller, l. 1, p. 40. Balaus, Cent. 1, c. 70** Many of whom Austin got to a Council he kept around Worcestershire where he propounded to them the embracing the Romish Rites and to join with him in preaching and administering in their way which they refused. Then, *as Robert Fabian in his Fifth Part, c. 119, fol. 125, tells us, He said to them, Since you will not assent to my hests generally, assent you to me especially in these three things: First, in your keeping Easter-Day in the form and time as it is done to children; secondly, that you give Christendom to children; and thirdly, that you preach to the Saxons as I have exhorted you. And all the other debate I shall suffer you to amend and reform amongst yourselves. But, saith he, they would not thereof. To whom then Austin said that if they would not take peace with their brethren, they should receive war with their enemies. And if they disdained to preach with them the way of life to the English Nation, they should suffer by their hands the revenge of death. And which Austin accomplished accordingly by bringing the Saxons upon them to their utter ruin. And thereupon, saith Fabian, that faith that had endured in Britain for near 400 years became near extinct throughout the land.*

An account of the destruction of that famous monastery of Bangor and those worthy Christians inhabiting the same you have thus briefly from **Humphrey Lloyd**, the learned Welsh Antiquary, in his **Breviary of Britain, p. 70, 71**, as followeth:

In Denbigh-shire, saith he, near the Castle of Holt, is seen the rubbish and relics of the Monastery of Bangor while the glory of God flourished. In the same mere 2100 Monks very well ordered and learned, divided into seven parts, daily serving God. Amongst whom those that were simple and unlearned, by their handy-labor, provided meat and drink and apparel for the learned and such as applied themselves to their studies. And if any thing was remaining, they divided it unto the poor. That place sent forth (saith he) many hundred of excellently well-learned men amongst whom it also vomited forth to the world Pelagius. And afterwards by the envy and malice of Austin, that arrogant Monk and most cruel execution of his Minister Ethelfred. Those worthy men were destroyed, the whole house from the very foundation together with their library (more precious than gold) was razed down and demolished by fire and sword.

And hence it is manifest that this bloody massacre of those glorious witnesses of Christ did arise from their Christian courage and zeal against those Antichristian impositions of the Romish Church.

The History of Christianity

AMONGST THE

Ancient Waldenses

The other historical account we are to give you is that of the Waldenses that eminent and famous Christian People who have not only given so large a testimony to the truth before treated, but by the learned Usher and many of our Protestant writers are owned to have been the True Church and from whom the Protestants do derive, in opposition to the Papacy concerning whom the better to preserve the savor of their precious memory we shall observed in their story this following method:

1. Give you an account of their several names they are known by in history;
2. Their origin and antiquity;
3. Their excellent and worthy conversations as testified by their greatest enemies;
4. The progress and success of the gospel in their hands and the methods thereof;
5. Their faithful witness against and great sufferings under Antichrist as I have collected them out of the best Historians both of their own and others.

Though as to their own records (as **Perin and Morland** inform us) the Papists have used no small industry to raze and obliterate as they have had the opportunity. Though in spite of their utmost malice of that kind, providence hath preserved something amongst themselves.

First, As to the names by which they are known and distinguished in history you will find to be various: Sometimes from the places and Countries of their abode, sometimes from reproach and slander.

1. From the places of their abode therefore called Lyonists or the poor people of Lyons, from that City or County of Lyons in France. Albigenses from the City of Albi in Lanquedock; Tholousians from the City Tholouse in the same Province; Arletenses from the City Arles, the chief seat of the Kings of Burgundy in Provence; Picards from Picardy, Lumbards from Lumbardy in Italy; Gazars either from a City so called in Lanquedock or from the word of disgrace signifying execrable.
2. Sometimes by some of their principle leaders, as Waldenses, as many suppose, from one Waldo a citizen of Lyons. Though others suppose upon another account because they were so called long before his time as appears by the book of **Claudius Seiscelius**, a Counselor to Charles the Great, in the eighth century who mentions them by that name in his book **Advers. Waldenses**. Who, though a good man, and in many things holding with them, yet in some things against them which was 260 years before Waldo's time.

Sometimes they are called Beringarians from the famous Beringarius, one of their Barbs or Elders; sometimes Petro-Brussians from that worthy martyr Peter Bruis; sometimes Arnoldists from Arnold, another eminent Barb and martyr; sometimes Henertians from Henericus; sometimes Josephets from Joseph; Lollards from Lollard, another of their eminent Barbs.

Sometimes by nicknames or terms of disgrace: The Apostolics or the Apostolic men; the Cathari or Puritans; the old name of reproach by which the Novatians and Donatists were called in the Fourth Century Pefectionists because they pressed after holiness; Publicans because they said they were sent to publish the gospel; Fratracilli or the little brethren and Fraticelli, shifting companions; Passagenes from their itinerant preachings; Credentes, the believers; the Humiliati, the humble men; the Bon Homes, the good men; Piccars, cur purses; Gazars, execrable; Lutlupins because like wolves they inhabited woods, caves and mountains.

Sometimes from slanderous, lying reflections as the Paterines, as though they only worshipped the Father, but refused to adore the Son because they would not fall down to the Host, nor give reverence to their breaden God. And from the like reason also Arians, as denying thereby the divinity of Christ. Panichees, because they denied the Civil Magistrate's authority to depend upon the Popes as men asserting therefore two principles: deniers of baptism because they denied that of infant's baptism and their inventions to be Christ's ordinance and Deniers of marriage because they disowned that to be one of the sacraments and that many of their Barbs lived singular lives.

Secondly, as to their original and antiquity which you will find to be very ancient, **Eusibius** tells us in his **Ecclesiastical History, Lib 5, p. 74**, that there were Churches of them in those parts of France under Antonius Verus the Emperor, Anno 179, recording there a large epistle written by them and as a preamble thereto, he makes this following inscription-Of the Martyrdom of Saints and Cruel Persecution in France under Anton.

Verus, the Emperor. It was the Country of France wherein the theater of this wrestling before mentioned lay, whose chief cities and most frequented in respect of the rest in the same region are Lyons and Vienna by both which cities the River Rhodonus doth run, compassing that whole Country. The Holy Churches there sent their letter touching their martyrs unto the Churches throughout Asia and Phrygia making relation of their affairs after this manner:

The Servants of Christ inhabiting Vienna and Lyons, Cities of France, unto the Brethren throughout Asia and Phrygia, having with us the same faith and hope of redemption:

Peace and Grace and glory from God the Father and Christ Jesus our Lord, be multiplied.

Which excellent epistle they mention at large and which also you may read in the **Book of Martyrs**.

In the preface to the French Bible and the first that ever was printed, they say, That they have always had the full enjoyment of that heavenly truth contained in the Holy Scriptures ever since they were enriched with the same by the Apostles themselves having in fair manuscripts preserved the entire Bible in their native tongue from generation to generation, **Morl. Hist. P. 14.**

Their Conversation according to their Enemies

In the next place, you have some account of their conversation given by their enemies themselves. **Rainerius** the Inquisitor aforesaid saith this of them: *that there whereas all others procure horror by their blasphemies against God, this of the Lyonists hath a greater appearance of piety inasmuch as they live uprightly before men and put their trust in God in all things and observe all the Articles of the Creed. Only they blaspheme the church of God and hold it in contempt and therein they are easily believed of the people.*

And again, **Jacob de Riberia**, Secretary to the King of France, in his **Collections of Tholouse**, hath these words: *The Waldenses or Lugdenses have continued a long time. The first place they lived in was in Narbone in France and in the Diocese of Albie, etc. Who disputed of religion more subtilly than all others, were afterward admitted by the Priests to teach publicly, not for they approved their opinion, but because they were not comparable to them in wit. In so great honor was the Sect of these men that they were both exempted from all charges and impositions and obtained more benefit by the wills and testaments of the dead than the Priests. A man would not hurt his enemy if he should meet him on his way accompanied with one of these heretics insomuch that the safety of all men seemed to consist in their protection.* **Du Plessis Myst. Iniquit., p. 331**

Amongst the rules and directions **Rainerius** gives to discover these heretics by (as he calls them) these are written by him as you will find them in the **Bib. Pat., printed at Paris, 1624.**

Heretics, saith he, are known by words and manner. They are in manners composed and modest no pride in apparel because they are therein neither costly nor sordid. They transact their affairs without lying, fraud and swearing being most upon handicraft trades, yea, their Doctors or Teachers are weavers and shoemakers who do not multiply riches but content themselves with necessary things. These Lyonists are very chaste and temperate both in meats and drinks who neither haunt taverns or stews. They do much curb their passions. They are always either working, teaching or learning, etc. Very frequent in their assemblies and worships, etc. They are very modest and precise in their words avoiding scurrility, detraction, levity and falsehood. Neither will they say so much as verily, truly nor such like at bordering too much upon swearing as they conceive, but they usually say yea and nay.

Claudius, Archbishop of Turin in his Treatise against the Waldenses, gives this testimony of them: *That as touching their lives and manners, they have been always sound and unreprouvable without reproach or*

scandal amongst men giving themselves to their power to the observation of the commandments of God.

Perin's Hist. P. 40

The **Cardinal Baronius** attributeth to the Waldenses of Tholouse the title of Good Men and that they were a peaceable people. **Baron, Tom. 12, Anno 1176, p. 835.** However he elsewhere (saith **Perin**) imputeth unto them sundry crimes and that very falsely.

Bernard de Girard, Lord of Haillou, saith in his **Histor. of France, Lib. 10**, *The Waldenses have been charged with wicked things they are not guilty of. Because, saith he, they stirred the Popes and great men of the World to hate them for the liberty of speech which they used in condemning the vices and dissolute behavior of Princes and ecclesiastical persons.*

Viret, lib. 4, c. 13, p. 249, speaks of the Waldenses as followeth: *The Papists, saith he, have imposed great crimes and that very wrongfully upon those ancient, faithful people commonly called Waldenses or the poor people of Lyons whose doctrine makes appear that the Pope is Antichrist and that his doctrine is nothing but human traditions contrary to the Doctrine of Christ Jesus. For which cause also, they have dealt against them as the ancient Paynims did against the Christians, accusing them that they killed their own children in their Assemblies.*

Many more evidences might be brought from their enemies who have been enforced by the force of truth itself to give most honorable reports of them, but let this suffice.

Their Doctrinal Progress and Success

The next thing we shall acquaint you with is the great progress and success of their doctrine.

Bullinger tells us that *not only throughout France, but Italy, Germany, Poland, Bohemia and other Countries and Kingdoms of the World, the Waldenses have made profession of the Gospel of Christ Jesus.*

Bulling. In the preface to his Sermons.

Rainerius saith that *another thing that makes this Sect more considerable than all others is because it is more general. For there is not any Country almost whereunto this Sect hath not crept.*

Math. Parie saith in his **History of the Life of Henry the Third** in the year 1223, that *the Waldenses had goodly Churches in Bulgaria, Croatia, Dalmatia and Hungaria.*

George Morel in his **Memorials, p. 54**, asserts that *notwithstanding all the bloody persecutions that attended the Waldenses that in the year 1169, there was in those days above eight-hundred-thousand persons that made profession of the Faith of the Waldenses.*

The Sea of Histories tells us that *in the year 1315, there was in the County of Passau and about Bohemia to the number of fourscore thousand persons that made profession of the Faith of the Waldenses.*

Le Sieur de Popelinier hath set down in his **History** that *the religion of the Waldenses hath spread itself almost in all parts of Europe, even amongst the Polonians, etc. And that after the year 1100, they have always sowed their doctrine little differing from that of the modern Protestants and mangre all the powers and Potentates that have opposed themselves against them. They have defended it to this day.*

Rainerius saith that *in his time, there were Churches of them in Constantinople, Philadelphia, Sclavonia, Bulgaria and Digionia and in Albania, Lomardy, Milan and in Romania, Venice, Florence, etc.*

Vignier saith that *after the persecution of Picardy, they were dispersed abroad in Livonia and Sarmatia.*

Trithemius recounts that *they confessed in those times that the number of the Waldenses was so great that they could go from Cologne to Milan and lodge themselves with hosts of their own profession and that they had signs upon their houses and gates whereby they might know them.*

In the year 1200, they were in such a manner multiplied that they possessed at home the cities of Tholouse, Apamies, Montauban, Villimur, St. Antoin, Puech Laurence, Castres, Lambes, Carcasonen, Beziers, Narbonne, Beaucaire, Avignon, Tarascon, the Count Venicin, in Dauphine, Crest, Arnand and Monteil Amar. And had many great lords who took part with them as Earl Raimand of Tholouse, and the Earl of Foix, the Vicount Beziers, Gaston Lord of Berne, Earl of Carmaine and the Earl of Brigan. The Kings also of Arragon and England too did many times defend their cause by reason of their allegiance with Earl Raimond.
Hologury in the History of France.

The means by which the truth came to be so propagated by them were principally these:

1. By the diligent care they had to instruct their youth in the knowledge of the Scriptures and to train them up in the nurture, fear and admonition of the Lord as the nurseries, seminaries and seed plots of grace and truth.
2. The industrious care and pains they took not only to beget ministerial abilities, but the due improvement made thereof by those engaged therein in all parts and places whither they were sent.
3. By the violent persecutions of them whereby they came to be dispersed into most parts of the World, that old way, that knowledge and truth was propagated in the primitive times.

Waldensian Youth Taught the Scriptures

The first means blessed for the increase of knowledge was that care and pains they took in the catechizing of their youth instructing them in the knowledge of the scriptures. **Perin**, in his **Second Book, p. 16**, *And in this it was, saith he, that they have been blessed of God above all Christian people throughout Europe insomuch that their infants were hardly weaned from their mothers' breasts, but their parents took a singular care and diligence to instruct them in the Christian faith and doctrine until they were able to confound the ancient and learned. And of which you have a very pregnant instance but of Vessember in his Oration touching the Waldenses, who tells us the Bishop of Cavaillon in the time of the great persecution against the Waldenses, of Merindal in Provence, first sent a Monk among them to convert them. Who returned so convinced himself that he confessed he had not so much profited in his whole life in the scriptures as he had done in those few days of conference with them. The Bishop not being satisfied with this trial, sent a company of young Doctors that came lately from Sorbon to confound them by the subtlety of their questions, but one there was among the rest that said at his return with a loud voice that he had learned more touching the doctrine necessary to salvation in attending to the answers of the little children of the Waldenses in their catechizings than in all the disputations of divinity which he had ever heard in Paris. Then the Bishop sent for the children themselves and caused them in the face of a great assembly to be interrogated and so questioned one with another and which was done with that grace and gravity and understanding that it was marvelous to hear to the confounding of the Doctors and Learned men then present. The story whereof you may read at large in **Fox's Martyrol., Lib 2, p. 194.***

And thus it was that every family was as it were a College to instruct into the true learning that maketh wise unto salvation and furnisheth to every good word and work and which was the seed plot to their ministry.

Rainerius tells us that they had the Old and New Testament in the vulgar tongue and that they teach and learn it so well that he had seen and heard, he saith, a country clown recount all Job word for word. And

diverse others that could perfectly deliver all the New Testament and that men and women, little and great, day and night cease not to learn and to teach.

Secondly, As to they way of their ministry, that special means appointed by God to beget Faith and increase knowledge, you have it briefly set forth by **P. Perin** as he had **extracted it out of their ancient manuscripts:** *All those who are to be received as Pastors amongst us while they remain with their Brethren, are to instruct our people to receive them into the ministry as likewise that they would please to pray to God for them that they may be made worthy of so great a charge and this they are to do to give a proof or evidence of their humility. We also appoint them their lectures and set them their tasks that they may get by heart not only all the New Testament, but a great part of the Old, viz. The Writings of Solomon, David and the Prophets. And afterwards, having a good testimonial and being well approved of, they are received with imposition (or laying on of hands) and preaching. He that is received the last ought to do nothing without the permission of him that was received before him and in like sort, the former ought to do nothing without the consent of his associate. Our daily food and that raiment wherewith we are covered we have ministered and given to us freely, sufficient for us by the good people whom we teach and instruct.*

Waldensian Misisters are called Barbes

Their ministers were called Barbes or Uncles, as **Fox, p.186**, or as some suppose because bearded men, Elders or Fathers. *Of these, some were married to manifest thereby their approbation of the state of matrimony. Others kept themselves single for convenience's sake forasmuch as they were oft-times obliged to remove and shift their habitations and abodes and as occasion required, to undertake long and tedious voyages for the propagating the Gospel in remote and far Countries with whom they had a particular and constant correspondence, namely, into Bohemia, Germany, Calabria and Lumbardy, whither the abovesaid Barbes went by turns as itineraries to visit their brethren there and to preach the Gospel of Christ amongst them having not only houses of their own to entertain their Barbes, but schools also in diverse Countries.* **Vign. Mem. P. 15.**

Those Barbes who remained at home in the Valleys (besides their officiating and laboring in the work of the ministry) took upon them the disciplining and instructing of the youth, especially those that were appointed for the ministry in Grammar, Logic, Moral Philosophy and Divinity. Moreover the greatest part of them gave themselves to the study of Physick and Chirurgery and herein they excelled (as their Histories tell us) to admiration, thereby rendering themselves most able and skilful Physicians both of Soul and Body. Others of them dealt in diverse mechanick arts, in imitating of Paul, who was a tent maker, and Christ Himself, who was a carpenter. Once in the year, they used to have a general meeting in the Month of September to treat of their affairs. **Taken out of an ancient Italian Manuscript**, as you have it, **Morland's Hist. L. 1, c. 8, p. 183.**

Bucer, p. 159, saith, *Besides ministers of the Word and sacraments, they have a certain College of men excelling in prudence and gravity of spirit whose office it is to admonish and correct offending brethren, to compose such as disagreed and judge in their causes.*

And again, in **Morland's Hist. P. 179**, *their ministers were through God's grace endowed with excellent spirits and were for the most part a generation of humble, holy and harmless men of meek, peaceable and quiet tempers, exceedingly painful in their calling and carefully watching over their flock committed to their charge, laboring faithfully in the Lord's vineyard and employing their whole time and talents for turning souls unto righteousness. Which they did with much labor, watchings and fastings by suffering many buffetings, stripes and imprisonments, yea, and many times by death itself, sealing the truth they preached to others with their own blood. In sum, they were men mortified to all the pomp, glories and riches, to all the pleasures, honors and preferments that the world could offer them having their conversations as strangers, pilgrims and sojourners here below, conforming themselves as near as they could, to the scripture pattern*

and example of the Apostles and proportionable thereto were their labors blessed and succeeded to admiration in all places where they came.

Perin, Hist. P. 16, *Their pastors, saith he, did not only content themselves to exhort them on the Sabbath days, but went all the week to instruct them in their villages, preaching also in the fields to the keepers of the flocks.*

4. The other way whereby the gospel was thus promoted and spread was by the great suffering and persecutions that attended them especially from the Twelfth Century downwards. For until then, as observed by Fox, Usher and others, there was more calmness and serenity. Satan being as it was bound, as they conceived. And the reason thereof a learned pen observes to be that Antichrist till about this time was not arrived to his aim, or perfect stature having now attained as well a Temporal as Spiritual Sovereignty. His Temporal advantages accrued most to him by the Donation of Pepin and Charles the Great, etc. And his Spiritual, not only by the establishment of several orders of the regular Monks and Friars: the Benedictines, Franciscans and Dominicans which much advantaged and strengthened the Popish usurpations, but the ratification of the Canon Law about this time collected by Gravian as also the Sophistical School Divinity now begun by Lombard, Aquinas and Albertus Magnus, that gave no small addition thereto. Now it was they durst cope with Kings and Emperors for sovereignty and assert their bloody idolatrous masses, images, brea den god with all force, cruelty and violence imaginable.
5. Against whose pride, pomp, idolatry and Antichristian usurpation doth the Lord raise these witnesses even these poor, mean, contemptible people who by asserting and maintaining Christ's ministry and ordinances according to the simplicity and plainness of the scriptures, faithfully do oppose, impugn and confront all the Popish traditions, usurpations and inventions in all their grandeur. And so it may be said that against the Beast and his armies doth the Lamb and his army oppose themselves.

Waldensians Oppose Romish Errors

The Waldenses now standing up with a loud voice do call upon all to come out of Babylon, to have no fellowship or communion with her detecting her to be that Abomination that was to sit in the Temple of God and that should corrupt the earth with her filthiness. And about this time it was that that most excellent piece touching Antichrist was brought forth by them which deserves to be written in letters of gold, **supposed to be written by Peter Bruis**, the famous French martyr, and which hath been preserved in all ages since by the Waldenses in the Alps. Whence **Perin** tells us he received it and which he hath printed at large, **Part 3, l. 3, c. 1.** In which Treatise we have Antichrist described to be the mystery of iniquity or a lie under the cloak of the truth.

It is said, That this Antichrist is not one single person, but a confederacy of iniquity in opposition to Christ, etc. This Contrariety of Antichrist to Christ consists in his worldly wisdom, his pharisaical religion, managing, spiritual power by secular tyranny, riches, dignity, etc. By filling up the Churches of Christ with worldlings; that the perfection of Antichrist consists in a full usurpation of the authority of Christ according to 2 Thess 2: 4; That the work of Antichrist is to change truth into error and error into truth to rob Christ of His merits, placing sanctification of the spirit in externals and grace and salvation in the work done; neglecting discipline; by maintaining unity by tyranny; the subterfuges of Antichrist are laid open and its causes; The moving causes and scriptures loudly calling to come out from and not to touch her, etc.

Rome Persecutes the Waldenses

By such like exasperations did the Popes, whose interest and grandeur was thus struck at, come forth now with all the subtlety, malice and revenge that hell and their devilish natures could invent and that by several methods and stratagems to crush and suppress truth. Which the more they endeavored, the more it throve and got ground and increased in the Nations, the blood of the Martyrs proving the seed of the Church.

Whose cunning, murderous designs were much after this sort: First, the better to discover their person and principles, they sent forth missionaries in all points to imitate them in a plain, humble way to go up and down afoot amongst them, to dispute with them, preach to them, to gain upon them, of this sort was Francis, Dominic and Benedict. For whose excellent service then they have since sainted and set up orders in their names in imitation of the poor people of Lyons, or, as they would be thought, in an Apostolic guise, but when that would not do, when they could neither flatter, dispute nor preach them out of the truth, then they.

Secondly, came forth with Synodical Censures, Condemnations, Anathemas and Curses, Pope's Bulls and Decretals, with Emperors' statutes, decrees and injunctions. But they nothing prevailing,

In the next place, thirdly, they sent out their Inquisitors, empowered and commissioned to examine, censure and condemn, and to deliver up to the secular powers to all manner of tortures and cruel deaths which they exercised with great severity, but all in vain.

Fourthly, they betook themselves to surprises and massacres and to stir up Kings and Princes to raise armies to suppress and root up this generation and by fire and sword to lay waste their cities and Countries which they did with great devastation especially in Provence, Dauphine, Languedoc. But the effect was, as they drove them out of one Country and place, they went into others and wherever they came, they still met with the same measure from that spirit. But God carried them through wonderfully so that they could rejoice and glory in the tribulations that they were accounted worthy to suffer for Christ's sake and whose Titles of Honor, as they say in the Preface of their Bible, were injured, reproached, fugitives, forsaken, despised, abandoned, excommunicated, anathematized, confiscated, imprisoned, tortured, banished, publicly disgraced, wearing miters in derision, spit upon, shown upon scaffolds, their ears cut off, their flesh plucked off with pinchers, drawn with horses, dragged up and down, broiled, roasted, stoned to death, burned, drowned, beheaded, dismembered and other like glorious and honorable titles, they say, of the Kingdom of Heaven.

But the more they designed to suppress truth by these means, the more it thrives. These worthy confessors being found overcomers by the Blood of the Lamb and the word of their testimony, not loving their lives unto death, as it was experienced in the several Countries, in several ages hereafter mentioned, as at large is given you in **P. Perin's Hist.:**

The suffering of the Waldensian Churches in Dauphine, in the 12, 13, 14 and 15 Cent. C. 3;

Their sufferings in the Piedmont in the 14, 15, 16 Cent. C. 4;

Their sufferings in the Marquisate de Saluces, 16, 17 Cent. c. 5;

Their sufferings in the New lands, 16 Cent. C. 6;

Their sufferings in Calabria, 14 and 16 Cent. C. 7;

Their sufferings in Provence, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16 Cent. C. 8;

Their sufferings in Bohemia, 15 Cent. C. 9;

Their sufferings in Austria, 14 and 15 Cent. C. 10;

Their sufferings in Germany, 13, 14, 15 Cent. C. 11;

Their sufferings in England, 12, 13 Cent. C. 12;

Their sufferings in Flanders, 13 Cent. C. 13;

Their sufferings in Poland, 12, 14 Cent. C. 14;

Their sufferings in Paris, 13, 14 Cent. C. 15;

Their sufferings in Italy, 13, 14, 15 Cent. C. 16;

Their sufferings in Dalmatia, Croatia, Sclavonia, Constantinople, Greece, Philadelphia, Digonicia, Livonia, Sarmatia, Bulgaria, in the 12 Cent. C. 17;

Their sufferings in Spain, 13 Cent. C. 18;

Their sufferings by the cruel wars managed against them by Pope Innocent the Third for 18 years together in conjunction with many Kings and Princes in Cent. 13 together with other wars carried on by other Popes and Kings of France and Spain in Cent. 13, 14, with the wonderful detriment that accrued also to the enemy who lost sometimes an hundred-thousand men at a siege, you have largely set forth in **Perin's Hist. Of the Albigenses, in two books.**

Those dreadful sufferings by burning, drowning, heading, in Flanders, Germany, Holland, Switzerland in Cent. 15, 16, as particularly you have them in p. 258 to 275.

Their sufferings at Merindal and Cabriers, by **Fox, p. 201, Vol 2.**

Their late sufferings in our time by the Duke of Savoy, in the Valleys of Piedmont, 1655, is largely set forth by **Sir Samuel Morland** who was the Agent sent with the English contribution.

Having thus finished the historical account of these eminent worthies, I cannot but again remember you, that this was the people that bore so great a witness for believers and so firmly opposed infant's baptism as by so many arguments in the Seventh Chapter is made good to you.

AN

ANSWER

To Mr. Baxter's

PREFACE

READER,

It pleased Mr. Baxter, not long after the publication of the first impression of this book, so much to take notice of it, as to tell the World of some exceptions he had against it, in a preface to a late Treatise called Full and Easy Satisfaction which is the True and Safe Religion. But what cause he had for the same, I take myself concerned to examine and to give you the following account of.

Which preface is itself being but short, you have here in his own words:

Mr. Baxter's Preface

Reader,

*I hope the printer's errata are not many and I am discouraged from gathering them, because I see men had rather err themselves and calumniate the Author, than take notice of them. So hath Mr. D'Anvers done by me in a Book against Infant's baptism, where as an introduction to abundance of mistakes in History, he abuseth his Reader by several Scraps of a Book of mine, so curtailed as to be insufficient to signify the sense. And among them, feigneth me to write, **Christian Directory, p. 3.p.885. l. 13.** [To institute Sacraments] as that which man may do instead of [Not to institute Sacraments] and so maketh his credulous Flock to believe that I assert that very thing which I write against though the place was marked with a star in the errata and the Reader desired specially to correct it, but such dealing is now grown so common with such men that we must bear it as the effect of their Disease.*

Wherein you see he is pleased to reprove and reflect upon three things:

1. The many mistakes in history;
2. The abusive collection of those passages out of his book in the epistle;
3. The Calumny (by overlooking his errata, and) in feigning him to assert the thing he writes against.

To which I make a particular and distinct reply to each of them:

1. As to the first, that there are such an abundance of mistakes in history as hinted.

I say in the first place that if it should be taken for granted that the historical part was nothing else but mistakes, yet in as much as the scripture argument comprehending the body and substance of the book, stands firm and is without exception. We are safe enough for that of human history is at best but Argumentum ad hominem and offered only for illustration, not probation, as I have said, **p. 56**. It being scripture authority only that is of divine force and as coming from God, can only oblige the conscience and therefore of 14 chapters in the book, you find but three of them historical. So that inasmuch as Mr. Baxter's exceptions only lie against some mistakes in history, that upon which so little stress is laid and is altogether silent in the main argument so much leaned on (and upon which so much was expected from him), we may hope his silence therein gives consent to the truth thereof.

2. As to those abundance of mistakes he hints at, I can say nothing to except he had mentioned some which I think had been but fair. Though as I have already owned, 'tis very probable that through s great a search and tract of story, some mistakes and misapplications may be. Though for my own part, I can truly say that I am not conscious of any one willful mistake in the whole and that I have been very solicitous amongst my friends and acquaintance to procure me what objections they could gain from any. But as yet have never since the book came forth, met with any thing like an objection

which I had not before obviated. No, not from Mr. Baxter himself, though I have made particular applications to him for the same.

3. And that I am not so erroneous in the historical part, as may be supposed, you will the better judge when you understand what is principally affirmed and made good from history and which you'll find are chiefly three things:
 - a. That professing believers have by the ancients been owned to be the only and proper subjects of baptism for which you have such a multitude of instances and authorities. And which Mr. Baxter himself doth so fully confirm from antiquity, who, in his **Saint's Rest, Part 1, c. 8**, saith, That *Tertullian, Origen and Cyprian, who lived in the Second and Third Centuries, do all of them affirm that in the primitive times, none were baptized without an express covenant wherein they renounced the world, flesh and devil and engaged themselves to Christ and promised to obey Him.* And again, **Chap. 8, P. 8**, Having asserted believer's baptism from that most eminent and authentic testimony of Justin Martyr, in his Apol. 2. Concludes that this was no new way. So that I suppose in this part of history, he will have no reason to quarrel me.
 - b. That infant's baptism was not in use for two or three hundred years after Christ, nor enjoined as necessary till the Fifth Century, by Pope Innocent the First, in the Councils of Milevitan and Carthage. And as he afterwards confirmed and imposed by the decrees and Canons of many Popes and Councils, statutes and edicts of many States and Emperors.

And to make good the same, you have not only the testimony of diverse eminent and learned men, but the Canons and Decrees themselves for many Ages. And that I am not mistaken in this head neither that infant's baptism was not enjoined as necessary for so many ages after Christ, Mr. Baxter doth also confirm from substantial evidence from the ancients. Telling us in his **Defence of the Principles of Love, p. 7**, That he knows that in the days of Tertullian, Nazianzen 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 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.

And, in his **Christian Directory, p. 287**, tells us further that the ancient Christians had liberty to either baptize their children or to let them stay till age as they thought best. And that Austin and many Children of Christian parents were baptized at age, than which, what can be more pregnant evidence that infant's baptism was neither judged necessary by divine or human authority, because so indifferent and so left ad libitum..

- c. That diverse eminent men, churches and people have since its first appearing in the world been drawn forth not only by word and writing to witness against it, but by confiscation, death and bonds have sealed to the same in so many ages. And all which you have confirmed by so good authority and so great a cloud of witnesses that if any critic may carp and take advantage at some instances, we have so great a store of them that we can allow at least ten in the hundred for mistakes and yet make good each head by such undeniable evidence that cannot be gainsaid upon any historical account. And surely it may well be supposed that he that hath twenty

or thirty witnesses to prove the truth and justice of his cause need not despair a good issue upon the trial though five or six fail him or prove insignificant when all the rest hold good and stand by him.

It is very true, Mr. **Baxter**, in his third head, doth positively dissent from me having with so much positiveness affirmed that no authentic witness was born against infant's baptism for many hundred years after Christ. No, not before Luther's time as he hath told us in his **Plain Scripture Proof**, p. 157, 261, 266, in these words: That for his part, *he cannot find in his small reading, that any one divine or party of men did certainly oppose or deny infant's baptism for many hundred years after Christ.* And again, *That the World may now see what a cause you put such a face upon when you cannot bring the least proof so much as of one man (much less societies and least of all, godly societies) that did once oppose or deny infant's baptism from the Apostles' days till about Luther's time.* And further, *I am fully satisfied that you cannot show me any society (I think not one man) that ever opened their mouth against the baptism of infants till about 200 years ago or thereabouts which confirms me much that it is from the Apostles' time or else some one would have been found as an opposer of it.*

So that upon casting up the account betwixt Mr. Baxter and me, the principle difference in the historical account (I had almost said in the sum of the controversy contended for in the whole book and almost in every chapter therein) doth seem to lie mainly in this head of history though I think I may appeal to Mr. Baxter himself, and to every impartial reader, whether the witness he hath given in from antiquity mentioned in the two former heads is not express evidence against himself herein, proving with so much clearness that there was witness against infant's baptism before Luther. For doth not he tell us that Tertul., Orig., Cypr. In the 2nd and 3rd Century 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 to Christ and promised to obey Him. And what can be fuller evidence? For if none but such were baptized in those days, then surely no children who were so utterly incapable to renounce, engage, covenant and promise.

And again, that the ancient Christians had liberty to baptize children, or to let them stay till age as they thought best. And that Austin and many Children of Christian parents were baptized at age, etc. If so, what fuller evidence can be produced against the divine right of infant's baptism? For if it might be done or not done ad libitum, where was the rule, where the apostolical tradition? Which if true, must not be played fast and loose with. Persons might not be so arbitrary and indifferent in the matter of circumcising or not circumcising their children and if Moses' law ought not to be trifled with, neither much less must Christ's. Therefore none of his, wherein such freedoms were admitted.

Besides, Mr. **Baxter** knows in his **Scripture Proof**, etc. that he is not very well pleased with Tertullian for that large and express witness he bears against infant's baptism. So that notwithstanding our seeming difference in the matter of fact, yet are we come nearer together. And if this will not fully reconcile us, I hope the ample testimony produced will. Not only from so many eminent, learned men in so many ages that have so particularly and expressly opposed it, but so many Churches also as the Donatists, Novations, ancient

Britains, famous Waldenses in so many ages, Lollards, Wickliffians, Bohemians, Germans, Polonians, Hungarians, Transylvanians and Belgian Churches whose testimonies and witness by word and deed you have had exemplified at large from authentic story.

6. The second exception is against that collection of those passages out of his Christian Directory, mentioned in my epistle. Which he is pleased to call an abusing the reader by several scraps so curtailed as to be insufficient to signify the sense.

Whereby he would be thought to be of another mind and more orthodox than those passages seem to represent him. The sense being (as supposed) maimed and injured by not repeating other sentences that would explain them to be otherwise.

To which I say as in the former, that he would have done well to have given any one instance of such an abuse amongst all that are mentioned and which I doubt not if any such advantage had been given, he would readily enough have mentioned and improved that hath been so express in that oversight of the errata which with so much severity he hath aggravated and pursued (in the next place to be accounted for).

But secondly, there is no injury done and that the collection is genuine and candid and but a bare repetition of his own words or true sense that every one gives of them that reads them, the book itself compared with the collection will easily determine. To which I appeal for my vindication.

And thirdly, if there be any other words that may carry a better sense (respecting those things) than hath been mentioned, or than the words will fairly be understood to mean, otherwise than so generally taken, I presume Mr. Baxter cannot do himself and his offended brethren more right than to clear himself in these particulars which are indeed so heinous, not only to every one of his non-conforming brethren, but to most protestants that hear them. And I dare be bold to say hath given more general offense and lost Mr. Baxter more amongst his friends than anything he did in all his life.

Therefore, if he hath written so darkly or obscurely that may give his weak brethren occasion to scandal, stumbling or offense, why hath he not before this endeavored to rectify the same?

But if he indeed means as his words seem to import, that he doth design to reconcile us to so many popish principles and practices, why doth he seem to deny the same? Why is there this seeming halting betwixt the two? Of God be God, follow Him and let Baal plead for himself, but if Baal be God, if Antichrist (that calls himself so) be God, follow him.

Therefore to put the matter more out of doubt that Mr. Baxter hath no such injury done him as suggested, I shall give a more full and large account of some of the most remarkable instances, comparing them with the collection, and leaving you to judge of the rest, from the book itself, being too great a task to transcribe every particular.

The first we mentioned was what he has spoke so much favor of the Popish Baptism, p. 826. Whereof you may take this fuller account, where you'll find in query 49 he agitates this question: May one offer his Child to be baptized with the Sign of the Cross, or the use of Chrism, the white garment, Milk, Honey, or Exorcism, as amongst the Lutherans, who taketh it to be unlawful?

To which he answereth in the affirmative and amongst other arguments, saith, *That he must not offer his Child to be so baptized when he may have it done in a better manner on lawful terms, but when he cannot lawfully have better, he may and must offer his Child to them that will so baptize him rather than to worse, or not at all because Baptism is God's ordinance and his Privilege and the Sin is the Minister's and not his. Another man's sinful mode will not justify the neglect of our duty else we might not join in prayer or sacrament in which the Minister modally sinneth, that is, with none.*

That the milk and honey, white garment and Chrism are so ancient (called by Epiphanius and others the traditions and customs of the universal church) that the original of them is not known and he that would not be so baptized must not have been baptized at all.

But withal he saith, *he would have some witness born against what he judgeth sinful, provided it may be done without peril of Law, scandal or great inconveniency.*

And again, in like manner, upon the question, **p. 779**, Whether those that are in the Church of Rome are bound to separate from it, etc.? Saith, it is the duty of those that have children to be baptized or Catechized, to make use of more lawful or sound Ministers, when they may be had, rather than of a Popish Priest, but in case they cannot remove, nor enjoy better, I think it is lawful.

1. To let such baptize their children rather than have them be unbaptized;
2. To let their children to taught by them to read, instructed in arts, principles of religion, to hear them preach, read good books, join with them in prayer, etc. if good prayers and books.

Therefore, let it be judged whether I have done Mr. Baxter any wrong in my abridgment in saying, "That he judgeth it lawful to offer one's child to be baptized in a popish Country, in their way of baptizing with exorcism, chrism, milk, honey, white garments, rather than not have it baptized. The ceremonies of milk and honey, white garments, chrism being as he tells us so ancient that their original is not known called by Epipanius and others the traditions and custom of the universal church. **P. 826.**

Only this would I be informed of our learned Caviller:

1. By what law of Christ he judgeth it lawful to use those blasphemous though ancient Popish Rites of Chrism, Exorcism, etc.
- 2.

3. Whether if it be lawful to go to the Pope's baptism in case we cannot have a better elsewhere rather than go without. That it is not also as lawful to go to mass and their Eucharist also (that I dare avouch is not less polluted than the former) rather than go without the sacrament? For I presume by the same Rule and Reason we do the one, we may also do the other.

It may be it will be said there is some stress laid upon that word, as among the Lutherans, implying:

1. That they use Chrism and Exorcism. And,
2. That being amongst such Protestants, we may the better suffer them to use them upon our children.

To which I say that in the search, and upon the best inquiry that I have made, I cannot find that the Lutherans own any such practice, neither their Articles of Marberg, Anno 1529, as **Osiander's 16 Cent. P. 147**, nor their Augustine Confession, Anno 1530, **p. 147**, nor their Sinalkeldick Articles, **p. 253**, wherein the Lutheran faith and practice is expressed, do mention any such thing. And Osiander himself a great Lutheran, in his Descant upon the Articles of the Council of Trent about Confirmation, as also upon the Interim made by Charles the Fifth, utterly renounceth and disavoweth the same as superstitious, Popish and unscriptural. **P. 418, 451**. And I have spoke with some that have seen the Lutherans christen their children who say there is no such thing used by them..

But take for granted that they do so. Why would we more countenance them in those superstitions by so far complying with them therein, than in their images, in their churches, and in their corrupt consubstantiation which other Protestants so much dislike and disavow.

But in the next place, why need we make a question of this since he allows the baptism administered by a Mass-Priest in all the services and ceremonies thereof to be good.

Another we have mentioned is what he hath spoken to the Popish Minist. **P. 775**. Where he answereth this question:

Whether we must take the Romish Clergy for true ministers of Christ? And whether their baptism and ordinances be nullities?

Which he first answereth by distinguishing betwixt regularly true and really true. The first he supposeth they are not commonly, but the latter, as opposing nullity, he grants from the following grounds:

1. Because he saith we have sufficient reason to judge that many of them have all the qualifications which are essentially necessary to the office;

2. Because many of them have the consent of a sober Christian people;
3. Because many of them have ordination by able and sober Bishops;
4. Because in that ordination they are invested in all that is essential to the pastoral office.
So that (saith he) I see not that their calling is a nullity through defect of any thing of absolute necessity to its being and validity though it be many ways irregular and sinful.

Then 2. Answereth to the latter part of the question: whether any contradicting additions do make null that which else would be no nullity?

Whether (as doubted) that a Mass-Priest be a true minister, as having another work to do, either to make his Maker, and to give Christ's real flesh with his hands to the people and to preach the unsound doctrine of the church?

To which he answereth, *That the case is bad and sad. But inasmuch as many errors and heresies may consist with Christianity, when they overthrow it but by an undiscerned consequence, must be here also considered.*

Therefore concludes, *That though they are their great errors and sins, yet that for ought he sees, they do not nullify their office to the church as a Mass-Priest he is no minister of Christ, but as a Christian pastor ordained to preach the gospel, baptize, administer the Lord's supper, pray, praise God, guide the church, he may be. (As an Anabaptist is not as a rebaptizer, nor a Separatist as a Separator, nor an Antinomian, or any erroneous person as a preacher of that error.)*

And the same extendeth also to their erroneous doctrines, etc. which they preach which are but by consequence against the essentials of religion.

But secondly, *It is a great doubt, he saith, whether any power of the ministry can be conveyed by Antichrist or from him and whether God will own any of Antichrist's administrations. Therefore seeing they profess themselves to have no office but what they receive from the Pope, and their disowning his usurpation, the same man cannot be an officer in the King's Army and his enemy's?*

To which, he saith, we have the same solution with the former. For

If this Antichrist were the open professed enemy to Christ, then all this were true because their corrupt additions would not by dark consequences, but so directly contain the denial of Christianity or the true ministry, that it were not possible to hold both.

But antichrist (as he saith, our divines commonly note) is to sit in the Temple of God and the Pope's treason is under pretence of the great service and friendship to Christ, making himself his vicar general without his commission so that they that receive power from him do think him to be Christ's vicar indeed and so renounce not Christ, but profess their first

and chief relation to be to him and dependence on him. And that they would have nothing to do with the Pope if they knew him to be against Christ, etc.

So that the same man (as he concludes) may receive an office from Christ who yet ignorantly submits to the Pope and receiveth corrupt additions from him.

And therefore concludes that as the ministry of the Popish Clergy is no nullity, so neither are their baptism nor ordinations given by them nullities.

This is the substance of what Mr. Baxter hath spoken to this point, and what I before epitomized as the substance of it was briefly thus: *That the Romish Clergy may be reputed true Ministers of Christ by virtue of their ordination. P. 775.* And that *their erroneous saying of Mass or preaching their erroneous doctrines doth not nullify their office to the church. No, though they derive from Antichrist, the Head thereof, who sits not in the Temple of God not as Antichrist, but as God, and so not an open, but secret Deceiver. P. 776.* And that *neither the ordination or baptism that they confer are to be esteemed nullities. P. 777.*

3. A third was mentioned which hath given so much offense was that about crucifixes under the question What images and what use of Images is lawful? **P. 976.** Whereto, as amongst other things, he is pleased to tell us:

That it is not unlawful to make an image to be an object or medium of our consideration, exciting our minds to worship God, as a death's head, or a crucifix or an historical image of Christ or some holy man, etc. Which may be so holily used as to stir up in us worshipping affections.

But no creature or image, I think (modestly and warily spoke) may be made a worshipped medium, or the thing which we worship mediately on pretence of presenting God and that we worship Him in it ultimately, etc. (which I think no Papist affirms).

So that it is lawful (as he concludes) by the sight of a crucifix to be provoked to worship God, but it's unlawful to offer Him that worship by offering it to the Crucifix as the Sign, Way or Means of our sending it to God (which I know not that the Papists generally hold). And, p. 875, saith, That a Crucifix well befitteth the imagination and mind of a believer.

And therefore let it be judged whether I have misrepresented him in saying, "That a Crucifix or historical image of Christ is lawful to excite and stir up in us worshipping affections and that a crucifix well befitteth the imagination and mind of a believer."

As for the rest of the Collection about bowing, kneeling, homilies, apocrypha, vows, holiness of days, time, places, people, etc. is left (to any that shall doubt their truth) to be examined by the book itself. And they will find I have done no more injury than in the aforementioned passages.

And that Mr. Baxter speaks favorably not only of so much of the Popish Discipline, but their Doctrine also. Take this following account. In his epistle dedicatory to his Full and Easy Satisfaction, he hath these words:

*And as to Popery, I have certainly found that the cross' interests and passions have made us *though really too far distant) to seem commonly about many doctrinals, more distant than indeed we are, etc. I mean in the points of fore-knowledge, predestination, providence, pre-determination, concurse, original sin, free will, universal redemption, sufficient grace, effectual grace, the nature of faith, justification, sanctification, merit, good works, certainty of justification and of salvation, perseverance, etc.*

And **p. 74**, repeating these again adding imputation of righteousness and diverse others, concludes thus: *In all which I cannot justify them, but am sure that the difference is made commonly to seem to be that which indeed it is not, etc.* And again in the epistle: *For my part, knowing that to be true, I am censured by these on one extreme as too favorable to the Papists (being indeed and enemy to injury, calumny, uncharitableness and cruelty to any in the World) but I am much more displeasing to the Roman Party because I know that one man is naturally incapable of being the Monarch of all the world.*

An yet **page 72, reason 23**, he saith, *Their doctrine is not only contrary to many expressed texts of the Holy Scriptures, but also contrary to itself.*

And therefore, whether I had not good reason to conclude as I did is further submitted to judgment: “Oh, was ever the like heard from any Protestant writer so to palliate, if not to justify such abominations (and that at this time aday too in the midst of our fears of Popery) by such endeavors, not only to reconcile us to so many of the Idol Popish Names (so long spewed out) as Altar, Priests, sacrifices, etc., but so many of their things also. yea, and those too wherein so much of the heart and life of their religion consists: not only their baptism, that foundation stone though attended with so many impious and blasphemous circumstances as the following discourse makes manifest, but their ministry also those locusts and frogs that came out of the bottomless pit, the tip-stone of their building!

“But that which is most to be admired therein, is his plea for the validity of their ordination by the Pope, though Antichrist, because he doth not ordain them as Antichrist, but as God (as Christ's Vicar in the name of Jesus) as though the aggravation of the ting wherein the mystery of iniquity, antichristianism and great blasphemy lies, should be urged for its extenuation and to enforce its validity. For by the same argument are not all their cursed idolatrous Rites and Ceremonies to be vindicated with all their blasphemous Bulls and bloodiest Inquisitions and Massacres that have been imposed and perpetrated by the Pope's authority who never did them as Antichrist, but in the name of Jesus Christ and to promote His service and interest. And if this be a good argument for the Pope's, why not for the Turk's ministers also? The Muftis not being ordained from Mohammed as a blasphemer, but as the greatest Prophet of God. And could not Jeroboam have pleaded much of this kind for his calves? As Mr. Ainsworth's Arrow against Idolatry so

notably upon the point reasoneth which yet nevertheless would not execute them and their adherents for their worshipping and serving the Devil therein, nor deliver them from all wrath and vengeance that followed them for the same, but to be so great an advocate also for so much of their doctrine. But, alas, whereto will not men run left to themselves, who leave the Word for their rule to embrace the traditions and inventions of men? Oh! Were those twenty queries so much against the self-evidencing authority of the scriptures in favor of tradition, a heinous provocation to say no more of them? And is there not ground from hence to cry out with the Prophet Be astonished, Oh ye heavens, at this, and be ye horribly afraid! And admiringly to say is not this one of God's wonders we are to marvel at? Isa 29: 13 Forasmuch as their fear towards me is taught by the precepts of men, therefore behold I will proceed to do a marvelous work and a wonder, for the wisdom of their wise men shall perish and the understanding of their prudent men shall be hid and surely their turning things upside-down shall be esteemed as the potter's clay. With 1 Cor 1: 19 for I will destroy the wisdom of the wise and will bring to nothing the understanding of the prudent. Where is the wise? Where is the disputer? Etc.

The third thing that he is pleased to call the calumny in *feigning him to assert the thing he was against as though he gave men liberty to institute sacraments when as his errata restrains it altogether and saith though not to institute sacraments of our own.*

And for which fault he is not only pleased with so much severity to chastise the offender himself, but so sharply to lash his whole party also (who in contempt he calls his credulous flock) as so commonly it seems guilty of such crimes: reproach and calumny that it is become their habitual distemper (though concerning whom, when bespeaking them for his new catholic communion, he is pleased so highly to vindicate and to give such honorable characters of).

To which I say that reading Mr. Baxter's 127 question about church music: Whether church music by organs or such like be sinful? I found him answer it in the affirmative, asserting it to be lawful from several reasons and amongst others, *Because it is a natural help to the minds alacrity and therefore as it is lawful to use the comfortable help of spectacles to read the Bible, so of music to exhilarate the soul towards God.. And that it is a duty, not a sin to use helps of nature and lawful art. Though to institute sacraments, etc. of your own..*

These are his very words as you'll find them. **p. 885, l. 13.**

But it seems afterwards he was pleased, in the Errata, to put the word not, and quite to alter the sense (though not to institute sacraments, etc. of our own which I must confess I was not aware of, not suspecting in the least but that he meant as he said for some reasons following) which if I had understood, or had seen cause to question, I should not have omitted and therefore if I have given him just cause of offence for the neglect, I heartily beg his pardon.

But I presume, upon second thoughts, he may see cause to judge he might have spared his great severity and sharp reflections especially upon the whole party, when he shall please to consider:

1. that I could not willingly err in a thing that would afterwards so palpably discover itself. And
2. that no man is bound by any law that I know of to read and study errata's and so to doubt and question every to, not, or for he reads in every book, folio and others that he is obliged to examine it by the errata or else become a transgressor.
3. That he hath less reason to be so passionately concerned as to this particular when he considers what ground is given to suppose he meant as 'tis said.

Witness his maintaining and pleading the same thing (that we may institute sacraments of our own) in so many parts of his book. For doth not he not only erastian-like give to the Magistrate this power to ordain such like sacraments for us, but allow us to do it for ourselves also?

For as to the Magistrates is he not pleased to appropriate to him a privilege to appoint ecclesiastical canons and significant ceremonies? To stand up at the reading of the Gospel. **P. 858.** To kneel at the reading of the Decalogue. **P. 859.** To bow at the name of Jesus. **P. 858.** To stand up at the creed. **P. 864.** To receive the communion kneeling at the rails. **P. 859.** To turn the communion table altar-wise and to rail it in to show reverence to the table by keeping away dogs and boys from sitting on it. **P. 883.** To show reverence to holy places, persons, and things. **P. 915** To keep anniversary festivals in commemoration of saints departed. **P. 762.** To keep human holidays and lent. **P. 876.** Solemn days of fasting and thanksgiving. **P. 869.**

And as to ourselves, doth not he allow the liberty to appoint objects or mediums to stir up in us worshipping affections, such as crucifixes, historical images of Christ and holy men, etc. of the same nature, sort and kind with these natural helps of music to exhilarate the mind towards God. And that all these are to be esteemed sacraments, you have the learned as well as Mr. Baxter himself in this very book determining.

Mincaetus saith, It is called *sacramentum quasi sacre rei signum, because the sign of a holy thing or quod sacra mente sit recipiendum to be received with a holy mind vel quod as res sacras seu divinas pertines or because belonging to holy things.*

In the council of Trent, upon the dispute of the sacraments, it was urged that *St. Austin made every rite by which God is honored to be a sacrament.* **Hist C. Of Trent, l. 2, p. 234**

And in the rationale of the common prayer, you have it That not only the collects by some of the ancients were called sacraments, but the significant ceremonies which serve not only for decent order and godly discipline, but are apt to stir up the dull mind of man (or as Mr. Baxter, to stir up worshipping affections and exhilarate the mind towards God) to the

remembrance of his duty towards God by some special and notable significancy whereby they may be edified.

And Mr. **Baxter** himself in his book of **Confirmation**, p. **88**, tells us, It is a word not found in scripture, but of mere ecclesiastical use and a word that will stretch. And that although in a strict sense, it is only by our divines applied to those two great ordinances of baptism and the Lord's supper, yet in a large sense, comprehends many holy things. Whereof he gives us sacraments of several sorts and particularly, in his **Christian Directory**, p. **863, 864**, tells us, That there are several sacraments, civil, economical and ecclesiastical sacraments, sacraments properly, improperly and less properly so called. The latter of which he defines to be the renewing of Christianity by any arbitrary sign of our own without a solemn ceremony of divine institution as confirmation, standing up at the creed, solemn days of fasting and thanksgiving, public repentance before absolution and at the point of death, in which we may use any lawful, natural or arbitrary means or expressions to signify our mind by as speaking, subscribing, standing up, lifting up the hand, laying it upon a book, etc. Which are divine as to the renewing of our covenant, but human as to expressing signs and of which sort are ordination, marriage, contracts with master and servant, inauguration of Kings and Magistrates into their office by oaths.

Therefore may it not falsely be concluded that the word might as properly be so taken here as elsewhere and that it stood in as little need of errata in this as so many other parts of the book and that by Mr. Baxter's remarking of it here, he hath not only contradicted, but reproved himself for all that he hath said of this kind elsewhere as being by this rule nothing else but errata. And therefore whether he hath not more cause to be displeased with himself than to vent so much displeasure upon such a causeless occasion is recommended to himself and to all sober, discerning Christians to judge.

FINIS

A Postscript

Upon the closing of my papers, Mr. Bunion's Book in answer to Mr. Paul's coming to hand (called **Differences about Baptism no Bar to Communion**) defending still, that Churches may and ought to hold Fellowship with unbaptized persons.

I took myself concerned, having briefly hinted to his former, to give some short return to this also. leaving his manifold absurdities, contradictions, unbrotherly tauntings and reflections, contemptions, traducings the wisdom of Christ, and his holy appointments, to be called to account by that hand, that hath so well begun to reckon with him.

The folly, Isa 8: 20; Jer 8: 9, so nothing more dangerous and destructive to religion itself, as Mark 7: 7-9.

Secondly, in so positively thwarting and contradicting not only the wisdom and authority of Christ in his commission, who enjoins baptism to be the next thing after faith and conversion, Matt 28: 19.

But the constant practice of the saints in obedience to it as for instance, Acts 2: 1, it is said *Then* (vi. Immediately) *they that gladly received his word were baptized, and the same day added, and so continued in fellowship and breaking of bread, etc.* Where you have the direct order kept: 1. Teaching; 2. Baptizing; 3. Church fellowship and breaking of bread which is the standing directory to the world's end and not teaching, church fellowship and then baptism after.

So Acts 22: 16, Ananias exhorts Paul after his conversion *to arise and be baptized*, with a *why tarriest thou?* Though he had eaten nothing of three days, Acts 9: 9 being a duty that admits not of delays. It was not, Arise and go break bread with the church, but Arise and be baptized in the first place. And therefore the Jailer, Acts 16: 33, must after his conversion, *straightway*, yea, in the same hour of the night, without further delay, be baptized, as a thing not to be neglected for a moment.

And so also Cornelius in Acts 10: 47, though he was baptized so eminently with the Spirit, yet must forthwith *be commanded to be baptized with water*, a thing by no means to be deferred, as Peter's words imply, who upon his seeing him so filled with the Spirit saith *Can any man forbid water that these should not be baptized, etc.* No sure, no man of knowledge or conscience, can do it or will admit of delays therein.

And the reason hereof is plain, because this was the listing, espousing, covenanting, engrafting, implanting ordinance, believers being expressly said hereby to be *planted into Christ*, Gal 3: 27 and *baptized into Christ*, Rom 6:3. And which baptizing and planting into Christ is no other but an orderly entering into the visible church, or body of Christ as so fully expressed, 1 Cor 12: 12. An order faithfully to be observed as a fundamental practice, Heb 6: 2 &c which must be kept, Eph 2: 21 an duly regarded, 1 Cor 11: 1, 2 upon the severe penalties threatened, Mat 5: 19; 2 John 9; Acts 3: 22, 23.

And which lies so full and clear in the scriptures that it hath obtained an universal consent by most that have owned the Christian religion and in any form professed the same whether Papists, Protestants, Independents, Baptists. In so much that Mr. **Baxter** himself in his **Plain Scripture Proof**, p. 126, saith: *That if any shall be so impudent as to say it is not the meaning of Christ that baptizing should immediately follow discipling, they are confuted by the constant example of scripture. So that, saith he, I dare say this will be out of doubt with all rational, considerate, impartial Christians.*

So that Mr. Bunion, in his opposing this principle, may well be said, not only not to please God, but to be contrary to all men. And whose return to Mr. Paul hereupon is so ridiculous that it may not be unworthy your knowledge, as witnessing either his egregious ignorance or self-condemnation therein, which I shall give you in his own words, p. 98 who first sets down Mr. P.'s Question, viz Whether your principle and practice is not equally against others as well as us, viz. Episcopal, Presbyterians and Independents, who are also of our side for our practice, though they differ with us about the subject of baptism (viz. 1. To baptized, then to communicate) Do you delight to have your hand against every man?

Bunion's Answer

I own water baptism to be God's ordinance, but I make no idol of it. Where you call now the Episcopal to side with you, and also the Presbyterian, etc. You will not find them easily persuaded to conclude with you against me. They are against your manner of dipping as well as subject of water-baptism, neither do you for all you flatter them, agree together in all but the subject. Do you allow their sprinkling? Do you allow their signing with the cross? Why then have you so stoutly an hundred times ever condemned these things as Antichristian? I am not against every man, though by your abusive language you would set every one against me, but am for union, concord and communion with saints as saints and for that cause, I wrote my book.

This is that he calls his answer, but let all the world judge whether he hath so much as once taken the least notice of the question.

Mr. Paul tells him, his principle and practice opposes all those named as us, viz. who do own with us as a principle that baptism should precede church fellowship and therefore in their sense of baptism (which is not in question, either as to subject or circumstance) do practice it accordingly, not admitting any unbaptized person into their fellowship. And the truth whereof, if Mr. Bunion doubt, besides their writings, I could give him some late instances of grown persons, not sprinkled in infancy, that must not be admitted upon account of their saint ship into fellowship till they had water sprinkled or poured upon their faces and that by some that he hath leaned upon as patrons.

But what doth he reply to this? How doth he acquit himself from this singularity, so differing in principle and practice from all? They differ from you in the manner, as well as the subject. I am not against every man.....but I am for union, concord and communion with saints. But would any child, that could say anything for itself, have made a more ignorant return? Therefore you may judge of the rest by it. But to the next.

Bunion Asserts Ignorance absolves from Sins of Omission and Commission

A third fundamental mistake in his presumptuous asserting all along, that ignorance doth absolve both from the sin of omission and commission and which not only justifies the neglect of the true, but the exercise of false worship. And not only bears out in rejecting of Christ's, but the embracing of Antichrist's appointments and that not only to give a disputation to the parties themselves thus transgressing, but to the congregation also that shall receive and bear with them. A rule, if observed, what corrupt doctrine or practice might be introduced thereby? And which may pass for as good doctrine as theirs of old, if they could but say Carbon, they might be set free from their dutiful obligation to their parents, Mark 7: 11.

Bunion Denies Institutions by crying up Moral Precepts

A fourth is that under the pretence of crying up obedience to the X commandments, or moral precepts, he takes the boldness to decry and trample under foot Christ's instituted worship, as though it were possible to be guilty of false worship and idolatry and not violate the first and second commandment. Did not such daring presumption cost Israel dear in their following the rebellious inventions of Jereboam the son of Nebat who made Israel to sin? And what was that heinous provocation, but the perverting the right way of the Lord, by changing part of his instituted worship.

Bunion Asserts that Churches in the Apostle's time were not all baptized.

A fifth is, his asserting that the Churches in the New Testament, to whom the Epistles were written, were not all baptized to the vacating all the holy exhortations and spiritual obligations deferred and enforced from the same, almost in every Epistle. And which he grounds upon his vain imagination, that because it is said, Gal 3: 27 *As man of you as have been baptized into Christ, have put on Christ.* And Rom 6: 3 *Know you not, that so many of you as have been baptized into Christ, were baptized into his death,* implying that the words *so many*, import that some were not.

Not considering that the scope and the argument from the words which do necessarily enforce another sense and that such a sense, as he would put upon them, is altogether groundless and unreasonable. As for instance in Gal 3: 27, he tells them that they are all the children of God, baptized into Christ. For the Apostle having said, vs. 26, that they were all the children of God, he in the next words gives the reason of what he had said, for they had put on Christ by baptism.

But now if their putting on of Christ in baptism was to be esteemed as a proof of their relation to God as children, as the Apostle, you see, makes it to be, then that which he gives in by way of reason and proof that they were all the children of God by faith, would fall short of this end if only part of the members of their churches had been baptized and not all.

And so in like manner, in that other text, he presseth a general duty, viz. mortification and vivification, from a general and universal practice, otherwise those duties would not in this argument concern the unbaptized. And by as good argument may we conclude, that because the Apostle commands, that as many servants as are under the yoke, should count their own masters worthy of all honor, that the name of God be not blasphemed. That some servants, by the same inference might be under the yoke, and some not, and that some must honor their masters, and some might choose.

Bunion Asserts that Baptism is no Church Ordinance

Sixthly, by his declaring so often, and so positively that baptism is not a church ordinance whereby he bears up himself exceedingly in his notion. To which I would say, it must either be an ordinance left by Christ for the Church to manage and order, or to the world, for I know no medium. But that he left no such holy appointment to be managed by the ignorant profane world, but to the Church only, I thus prove:

1. Because he hath committed the ministry to them to teach and convert, which must precede baptism and qualify for it.
2. That to the Church belongs ordinarily to receive the account of such conversion that it may be better understood whether the party desiring baptism doth believe with all the heart and that he hath brought forth fruits meet for repentance before he be baptized with the baptism of it.
3. That to them belongs the appointing of the administrators and faithful witnesses to see it orderly performed, otherwise women, apostates, or any, as some hold, may do it. God is a God of order and not of confusion. And all things are to be done to edification.
4. Because it is an entrance and door into the visible Church, as hath been amply in the foregoing Treatise proved, and the foregoing scriptures evidence and which is so clear, saith Mr. Baxter, that they must deny scripture that deny it. It is true (as Mr. Paul affirms) that persons entered into the visible Church hereby, are by consent admitted into particular congregations where they may claim their privileges due to baptized believers, being orderly put into the body and put on Christ by their Baptismal vow and covenant, for by that public declaration of consent is the marriage and solemn contract made between Christ and the believer in baptism, as before at large. And if it be preposterous and wicked for a man and woman to cohabit together and to enjoy the privileges of a marriage state without the passing of that public solemnity, so it is no less disorderly upon a spiritual account for any to claim the privileges of a Church or be admitted to the same till the passing of this solemnity by them.

But 'tis now done in the Church? No more is visiting the sick or anointing with oil, are they not therefore Church ordinances? If any desire further satisfaction upon this argument, they may peruse two treatises, one written by **Mr. Allen, called Baptismal Abuses discovered, Disproving the Lawfulness of Infant, and verity of Believers Baptism, with the irregularity of mixed Communion, Baptized and Unbaptized, written 1653.** The other by **Mr. Lamb, called Truth prevailing against the fiercest opposition,** upon the same subject, the same year, both answering Mr. John Goodwin opposing the same. And which are done with that judgment, strength of argument and authority of scripture that notwithstanding they have both of them personally declined those truths so zealously and understandingly pleaded for by them and gone back to that they therein call human tradition, will worship and idolaters, fulfilling Dan 11: 35; Pro 28: 4; Gal 2: 18; 1 Pet 2: 21, 22. Yet will their books, not only live as a witness for God, and his reproached truths, but as a living testimony against themselves in their unreasonable and unrighteous departure from the same (without repentance) to all generations.

FINIS