

In Vindication of Henry D'Anvers

or

**The Baptist Answer to
Mr. Obed. Wills,**

and

His

APPEAL

Against

Mr. H. Danvers

London,

Printed for Francis Smith, at the Elephant and Castle

in Cornhill,

Near the Royal Exchange,

1675.

**The Baptists Answer to Mr. Obed. Wills, his Appeal
Against Mr. H. Danvers:**

Sir:

We have seriously considered your *Appeal* against Mr. *Danvers*, and have also heard, and carefully weighed the *Defence* he makes thereto; and in order to give an Impartial *Judgment*, as you call us to, have desired some of your *Number* diligently to examine the *Authors* cited by you both; and though it appears to us, that Mr. *Danvers*, has earnestly endeavored an accommodation, in a more private and friendly manner, between you and him, so to rectify mistakes on any hand, which (had it been accepted of) might have saved this *trouble*; and that the Method you have used in this *Appeal* be unusual, and unlike the *Pattern* you seemed to take; an Appeal in these Cases being then only *proper*, when the Party appealed against, appears to be so *contumacious*, and *stubborn*, as to reject, and stand out against just *conviction* and *admonition*; which we find not to be justly chargeable upon Mr. *Danvers*, and whether it be not rather your own oversight, we hope you will in time be sensible of; yet we say, we shall not insist upon that *Consideration*; and to give you, and the World that satisfaction *expected* from us, some of us whose names are subscribed, have examined the Particulars you charge him with, and find some mistakes and escapes on Mr. *Danvers'* side, which he ingeniously acknowledges; and we hope may be to your full *satisfaction* as it cannot (in justice) but be to ours, since (as you seem to hint) a *public owning*, is what you expect.

Some of the Particulars in your *Appeal*, we find to be so *trivial*, and *insignificant*, that they deserve not to be *mentioned*, and deem his Answers returned to them *respectively*, sufficient to satisfy the Reader.

Others of your Charges he *traverses*, and joins issue with you at the *Bar* you have brought it to, and the most material of these we now remarks to you; so that what he *acknowledges*, and what is *inconsiderable*, and what is here further *examined*, comprehends your whole *Appeal*.

And we must observe to you, that you lie *obnoxious* to the Return you make to Mr. Danvers, when he charge you with leaving out part of the *Sentence* of *Nazianzer*, *viz.*, *sialiquid periculiimmineat*, call it, page 7 of your *Vind. A frivolous Charge*; excusing yourself after such a manner as you will not be satisfied with from others; therefore if we say many of your Charges are *frivolous*, your Reason in your own behalf will Justify us, you being Judge.

I.

And therefore, 1. we desire you to consider, whether the **stopping your Translation out of Calvin, where you did**, page 162. *Appeal*, be not unfair, and a misleading of an *English* Reader.

II.

You charge Coll. *Danvers Appeal*, p. 166. to add the words, *[for it cannot be, that the Body should receive the Sacrament of Baptism till the Soul has before received the truth of Faith]* and say they are not *Jerom's* Words, but of Mr. *Danvers* Adding: But upon Examination of that place [Matt. 28. *Tom. 9. Edition Paris, Anno 1546.*] we find them to be *Jerom's* Words Verbatim, as Mr. *Danvers* cites them. And we observe in your *Quotation* of Mr. Danvers, in that place you add, [*Magd. Cent. 4, c. 6, 418*] as if *Mr. Danvers* had particularly *Quoted the Magd.*

there, which indeed he does not; but only *Jeremy* upon *Matthew*, which *Double Injury* we conceive deserves your *Double Consideration*, in order to a Candid **acknowledgment**.

III.

You charge him, p. 169, with Abusing Calvin, fathering Estius's Words upon him, though he has owned it a mistake in his Reply, But we observe also, That he Quotes Estius Annot. Gen. 17:7, at the end, which you leave out, though you took all his words to that, and yet reprove him so often for the same, which seems neither ingenious nor fair.

IV.

You charge him with abusing Dr. *Hamond*, p. 107, in affirming, *That βαπτισμος signifies an immersion, or washing the whole body answering the Hebrew* whereas you say the Dr. tells us, *λασαις* signifies *the washing the whole body, and answer to the Hebrew* &c. We have *examined* the Doctor's Book, printed for R. *Rouston*, Anno 1653 and find Mr. *Danvers'* quoted his words truly, and the mistake to be yours, which we hope will convince you of the untrue and just reproach you subjoin, *That he understands not English Authors*, &c.

V.

You charge Mr. *Danvers* for affirming from *Waldens*, That the *Wicklavian*s, in agreement to the Doctrine of *Pelagius* and others, denied Infant Baptism, he acknowledges it to be his mistake to allege, That it was agreeable to *Pelaius* and others, (said to be for Infant Baptism) but if *Walden* is to be believed, it appears, That the *Wickliffits* judged Ecclesiastical Baptism unprofitable to little ones, in these words [*nostrī Wiclivistae Baptismum Ecclesiasticum inutile judicant parvulis contra omnes praedictos*] against all the aforesaid, viz. *Pelagius, Vincentius Victor, and those that Baptized Children, as born of Believing Parents*. And we must remark to you, that in your Quotation, p. 172, *Appeal*, you leave out [*parvulis*] the principal word there, and with what design or end we leave you to consider.

VI.

You charge him, p. 179, 180, for adding the Words [*it is our will, That all that affirm, That young Children receive Everlasting Life, albeit they be not by the Sacrament of Grace or baptism renewed*] to the *Milevitan Decree*. We have examined that 4th *Tom. in Coll. Reg.* and find the *Canon* quoted by Mr. *Danvers* in page 559 of it, taken out of a very *ancient Copy*, immediately following the Words you cite, thus *Item placuit, ut siquis dicit ideo dixisse dominum; In domo patris mei mansiones multe sunt, ut intelligatur, qui in regno Coclorum erit aliquis medius, ant ullus alicubi locus, ubi beate, vivant parvuli, qui sine Baptismo ex hac vita migrarunt sine quo in reno Caelorum quod est vita aeterna intrdre non possunt, Anathema sit, An. Christi* 424. Now for you to affirm, that the said Clause was of Mr *Danvers'* own adding; whereas, as he says, *Here is an express Anathema against those that assumed Children might be saved without Baptism, is an Instance* (to give the favorable conjecture of it) that you have made but a lame search: So that it is very just for us to acquit Mr. *Danvers* of this Charge. We presume you know, that the *Magdeburgs* give an account when they speak of that *Milevitan Synod*, of some that affirmed Infants Salvation without Baptism, as by the Instances Mr. *Danvers* gives from them, undeniably appears; And in opposition to them was that *Anathema* enacted, and every Circumstance concurs to evidence it as genuine as the other *Canons*; And therefore upon a review of the place we question not but you will be satisfied here is no *forgery* or *prevarication* in Mr. *Danvers* in this Particular.

VII.

Under the Head of his *fathering upon Authors that which they say not*, you charge him with abusing *Basil. Appeal* p. 181. in fathering those Words upon him, [*must the faithful be sealed with Baptism? Faith must precede, and go before*] whereas you say, there is no such speech in what the *Magd. repeat of Basil*, contra Eunom, which we conceive to be a very weak ground for your Charge. For must it follow, that the Words are not *Basil's* because you find it not in the *Magedburgs*? We have searched *Basil*, and find his Words to be lib. 3. p. 84, *contra Euniom.* to the sense he is Cited by Mr. *Danvers*, viz. *πιστευσαι γαρ δει προτερον ειτα το βαπτισμασ επιστηραγισασται*, i. c. **It is necessary first to believe, and afterwards to be signed with Baptism.** So that this is also your own error and oversight.

VIII.

You charge him with a notorious untruth, p. 185, for affirming from the *Magd. That Gulielmus added the Virgin Mary to the form of Baptism.* We have examined the *Magd. Cent.* 12, p. 419, *cap.* 4, *Edit. Basil Anno* 1574 and find the words, *Male Gulielmus ad formam Baptismi addit Mariam Baptizo te in nomine patris omnipotentis, & filli & spiritus sancti, & Beate Parie Virginis*, as Cited by Mr. *Danvers*; and therefore for you to affirm the contrary is a gross mistake.

And thus, Sir, we have given a true and impartial representation of the Particulars as we find them, being, as we conceive, the principal matters under our *Cognizance*, omitting the less material, & do recommend them to your Christian consideration, hoping that your serious review of them, will discover them to be your *errors*. And as Mr. *Danvers* has publicly owned what of mistake he is convince of in his *Answer* to Your *Appeal*, So it is justly expected, you will also, *according to your promise in the Preface to your Appeal*, do the same in these Particulars. (This was published as *A Rejoinder to Mr. Wills*, London; 1675; R. E. P.)

And since you Charges do not appear to be true to the satisfaction of all impartial persons; but on the contrary great mistakes of your side, you will not, we hope, *think it unjust if we acquit him, & reflect the bland of the Charge upon your self, as you desire, in case you be found in the error.*

The Particulars Mr. *Danvers* owns in his said *Answer* to your *Appeal*, we bring not under our discussion or censure, concluding it to be enough that he acknowledges them.

And such petty Charges as he *sufficiently answers*, and are indeed of little weight, save to *enhance* the number of your Particulars, as also things controverted, and only *collateral* to the grand proposition in dispute, (as are *those things you call strange doctrines*, &c.) we think do not so properly offer themselves to our Considerations. And therefore we conclude we may be excused if we wave them.

And lastly, we propose, That if the Return we give to your *Appeal* should be deemed *insufficiently* by you, or *short in* anything, (which we are not conscious of) and that thereupon you take your self concerned to appear any further in *this Controversy*, you would be persuaded, that things may be transacted in an *amicable* and *friendly* way; which we hope may tend to our *mutual satisfaction* in the clearing up of Truth, and to Cherish that love, that all that fear the Lord

should bear each other, though differing in some things, which is our very earnest desire; and to promote which, we shall endeavor to contribute the utmost we can.

London, the 13th of the 5th Month, 1675.

Hansard Knollys, *John Gosnold,*

William Kiffen, *Henry Forty,*

Daniel Dyke, *Thomas De Launne*