

Library of the Theological Seminary PRINCETON, N. J.

Presented by Mr. Samuel Agnew of Philadelphia, Pa.

Agnew Coll. on Baptism, No.

SCB 10446



Digitized by the Internet Archive in 2011 with funding from Princeton Theological Seminary Library

AN ABRIDGMENT

OF

WALL'S

HISTORY OF INFANT BAPTISM.

BY THE

REV. WILLIAM HENRY SPENCER.

LONDON:

FRANCIS & JOHN RIVINGTON, ST. PAUL'S CHURCH YARD, AND WATERLOO PLACE.

1848.

LONDON:
GILBERT AND RIVINGTON, PRINTERS,
ST. JOHN'S SQUARE.

PREFACE.

THE commission given by our Saviour, in the time of His mortal life, to baptize in the country of Judea, is not at all set down in Holy Scripture,—only it is said they baptized (John iii. 22-26; iv. 1, 2). And the repetition of the commission, in Matt. xxviii. 19, is conveyed in general terms, and gives no directions with respect to either the age or manner of baptism. It does not command infant baptism, but it does not forbid it; it defines neither at what age a person is qualified to receive this sacrament, nor the manner in which it is to be administered. Among the persons baptized by the Apostles, there is no express mention of infant baptism; nor is there, on the other hand, any mention of a Christian child's baptism being deferred till adult age. The proofs for infant baptism drawn from Holy Scripture, are not so plain but that arguments against infant baptism should have considerable weight with those who have no help from the history of Scripture times, and no critical knowledge of the original Greek text. It is no wonder at all that at this distance of time from the Apostles many men should have fallen into error in this matter. But the practice of the early Christians who lived near the Apostles' times is more easily known and is more largely related, and, provided the accounts of those times are fairly and impartially given, they ought to have much influence in deciding the controversy.

The command of Holy Scripture to proselytize and baptize all nations is plain, but the method of doing this in all its particulars is not expressly stated in Scripture; but there is no doubt but that the Apostles knew what to do, and that the Christian Church did in their time the right method, and as they had taught them.

Some of the Apostles lived nearly to the end of the first century; St. John lived beyond it; and it is probable that those Christians who lived a hundred or a hundred and fifty years after the Apostles, must have known the practice they established. The fathers of some of them, and the grandfathers of others, would have lived in or very near the Apostles' times; and if their parents had been Christian, they would have received baptism in infancy. It was a rite public and notorious, and practised, not only by one man, but by all,—not by one Church only, but by every Church in the world, and therefore could not have lain hid, nor have been so soon forgotten.

If it had been an innovation of the second or third century, some account would have certainly been recorded of it. It would not have been received without opposition. But none such is mentioned; nor could Pelagius nor any heretic charge it with being of recent origin, nor deny it to be the apostolic practice. Besides, the Apostles before they died chose men of whom they had good proof, to teach the same things as they had done themselves, many of whom lived till a long while after the Apostles themselves were deceased, and saw the customs continued which they had directed and taught. This is an

argument which no one can really slight, -and assuredly, where a command in Holy Scripture is given in a brief and general manner, the practice of the early Church gives the best comment on its meaning, and for this reason Wall has examined what historical evidence of their practice is to be found in the earliest writers, and accordingly he has gone through the writings of the Fathers, and drawn up a collection from them on this subject. This he has done fully and impartially. He quotes the passages bearing on both sides of the question; he has not recited mere scraps of sentences, but given them fully, and as they are all quoted in his "History," they are open to the examination of every one. He takes the first four centuries. His object is to give a history of the custom of the primitive Christians on the subject of infant baptism, and it is no part of his plan to treat of the manner in which it was administered, nor to give Scripture proofs 1;

¹ He refers those who desire Scripture proofs to a little work he had written, called "A Conference," &c. It will be found abridged in Appendix I. and II.

and these are introduced only here and there, and by the way, in order to illustrate the passage quoted. His "History" is allowed to have brought forward conclusive evidence. He had read the previous modern works written on this subject, as Hammond, Selden, &c., and has made use of their suggestions and wisdom; and for many years he had studied the Fathers with reference especially to the subject of his "History." The House of Convocation publicly thanked him for it, and the University of Oxford conferred upon him the degree of a Doctor of Divinity as a token of their approbation.

The anti-pædobaptists are of opinion that infant baptism arose in St. Cyprian's time, gradually extended, and had become the general practice in St. Austin's time. They consequently allow the evidence only of the times antecedent to St. Cyprian, and concede all the subsequent dates. During these two hundred and fifty years they pretend that there is no proof or warranty for it. But Wall remarks that the practice of infant baptism can clearly be traced back to the

time of St. Cyprian; and hence he infers, not that it began at that time, but, as it is found established then, he supposes that there is every reason to infer that it had existed for a long time previously, and from the beginning. It is mentioned distinctly by Irenæus, who lived eighty years before St. Cyprian; and indirectly, by writers of the first century, who were contemporary with the Apostles. No council ordained it. So convinced was Wall with the arguments from antiquity, that, in the conclusion of his work, he hopes now that it has been carried so far, and such plain evidence of the practice of the early Christians produced, that it will not be suffered to drop.

Arguments from Holy Scripture also enforce the practice of infant baptism. It is very easy to argue, as some do, that infants have never offended God—that God is a God of mercy, and designs the happiness and not the misery of His creatures—and will not impute to infants sins that they never committed, nor punish them for not performing conditions that they neither know

nor understand-and so to conclude that all infants shall be saved, whether baptized or not. Such arguing seems plausible, but is directly opposed to Scripture (1 John v. 11, 12; John iii. 5;) and to reason—for the kingdom of heaven is not due to them, they have no merit, nor promise, nor right to the kingdom of heaven, merely because they are born of human racebut only as being entered into and interested in the covenant of God; and this covenant does require, as a condition of all that are to enter into the kingdom, that they be "born again of water," &c.; and thus in baptism only is there some ground of safety for their children founded on God's word. "You would have us believe a monstrous thing," says Gregory Nazianzen, "if you think that God, because He is merciful, will count him enlightened that is not, and will take him into the kingdom who wishes for it, but does not perform the things that make the way to it." The Fathers do accordingly speak of it as a great sin in those who have the care of children to suffer them to die unbaptized, and

they represent it as great piety and compassion in those who bring to baptism infants found exposed and cast out. When they had established a more orderly administration of baptism for adult converts at a fixed season, they excepted infants and sickly persons; and rather than that they should die without baptism, some allowed this sacrament to be given by laymen. To those, therefore, who reject infant baptism, we propose one question for their consideration. "By what means, and by what merit or title, infants obtain the kingdom of heaven?" Is it by the parents' holiness?—the child's holiness? -or by Christ's purchase? If by Christ's purchase, they must fulfil the conditions which Christ requires. He requires in those who are admitted into heaven, that they be "members of Christ," united to Him by the Holy Spiritincluded in His covenant and purchase—of His fold, of His kingdom, of His body, -fellow-heirs, fellow-citizens with the saints, &c. Our blessed Saviour, at His coming at the last day, will be much displeased either with the Church

for receiving them, or with those who reject them.

It has been said by the Baptists, that baptism requires faith and repentance as necessary preliminaries, and consequently cannot possibly be given to infants. Much is said on this question in the course of the work, and Wall has set it in the right light; he has shown that these are required only in adults; and that the faith and promise of sponsors is allowed for infants till they come of age to take upon themselves the fulfilment of the baptismal vow. The Fathers, Austin and Tertullian, speak of sponsors, and they show that they have considered the reasons which the anti-pædobaptists object against infant baptism, viz. that they have no faith, no sense, no actual sin, &c., and do not count them sufficient cause to prevent the baptizing of infants; and they discourse about godfathers professing in the name of the child, and vowing for it that part of the covenant which the child is bound to believe and perform, if it live. Wherefore, with the pious and judicious

Hooker, we say, "If Christ Himself, who giveth salvation, do require baptism, it is not for us who look for salvation to sound and examine Him whether unbaptized persons may be saved, but seriously to do what is required."

Holy Scripture requires the use of water in baptism, and that it be done in the Name of the Blessed Trinity. The age and the manner, whether adults or infants—whether by dipping or pouring, is not determined; and the general terms in which the commission is given would leave those things optional, did not the further question of original guilt render its speedy administration expedient. The analogy of circumcision is no weak argument for the practice, and is constantly referred to by the Fathers and commentators on the Bible; and Christ's own expression, "Suffer little children to come unto me, and forbid them not, for of such is the kingdom of heaven," indicates that they are capable of obtaining heaven; and consequently they are fit and proper subjects for that holy sacrament, without which no man can enter in.

PREFACE.

The sentence of those learned men who have read the Fathers is, that those books do give clear proof that infant baptism was customary in the times of their authors and of the Apostles. There are but two or three who think otherwise; and Menno himself, the father of the present anti-pædobaptists (says Wall), granted this to be true. The evidences of the first four hundred years do so speak. Only two men urge delay; the reason for their doing so will be found related in the following pages. no society or Church thought or practised with them, and no one during that period said it was unlawful or invalid; and the reasons urged for deferring it had reference to the obligation of the baptismal vow, and the difficulty of performing, and the danger of breaking it. So for the next seven hundred years there is not so much as one man to be found that either spoke for or practised such delay. About A. D. 1130, one sect among the Albigenses, an ignorant people, declared against infant baptism; but their opinion soon dwindled away, till the rise of the German anti-pædobaptists, A. p. 1522, of whom something will be said by and by.

Objections against infant baptism are of two kinds. They are given near the end of this book.

Wall's "History of Infant Baptism" gave rise to many replies. It spoke too distinctly, and its arguments were too stringent, to be allowed to pass unanswered. Wall takes notice of three of these books—one by a Mr. Emlyn, a Socinian; one by Gale, a Baptist minister; and one by a Mr. Davy, of Leicester. Gale is the chief, and is answered most fully: for he has a popular way of pleading, being very positive and very declamatory, never allowing himself to be beaten; wresting places of the Fathers, and shifting from one objection to another, as: e.g. the books are not genuine-such a chapter is interpolated—they, by infants, mean infants in innocency, and not in age-translation not correct, &c. Yet Gale is a man of much learning, and was highly esteemed by the Baptists and Dr. Whitby. Wall does not value so highly either his learning or his accuracy. Gale's "Reflections" are in some sort valuable, as showing what objections and arguments can be raised in opposition to infant baptism; and by affording Wall an opportunity of answering them, Gale has made the evidence for infant baptism two-fold; viz. direct proof, such as Wall intended to give, and has given in his Introduction and History; and negative proof, based on the refutation of objections. The value of the evidence thus derived is, undoubtedly, very important and weighty, and is consequently included in this Abridgment, as it is given in full in the third and fourth volumes of the original work.

In the following pages, Wall's own language is used as much as possible.

The author of this Abridgment by no means desires that this little work should supersede the larger one by Dr. Wall, but would rather that the notice of his arguments and suggestions, here stated very briefly, should excite those who read these pages to the study of the original. The quotations, which Wall has transcribed at

full, are most deserving of attentive study, and decide the matter most satisfactorily, as far as the evidence of the practice of the Church is concerned. And it does not need much wit to perceive the great value of this evidence, as a commentary upon a rule stated so briefly as the institution of baptism is in the Gospel.

AN ABRIDGMENT

OF

WALL'S

HISTORY OF INFANT BAPTISM.

INTRODUCTION.

THE Institution of the rite of Baptism is stated very concisely in Holy Scripture. No directions defined either the manner in which it is to be administered, or at what age it is to be received. But the meaning of a rule expressed in very short and general words (as the rule for baptism is) may be illustrated by considering

- 1. The History of the times in which it was instituted:
- 2. How it was understood and practised at or near the time of its institution;

The 1st, viz., The custom of the Jews at and before our Saviour's time, is the subject of this Introduction.

The 2nd, viz., The practice of the early Christians, is the subject of the History, and includes the first four hundred years of the Christian æra.

The evidence derived from these two sources is satisfactory and conclusive; for a rule given in general words seems to take it for granted, that those to whom it was addressed did previously understand some things requisite to the apprehending its meaning; so that it was needless to mention them, and the practice of those who published it would sufficiently illustrate it.

But after so great an interval of time as has since then elapsed, many things may have become obscured, which can only be cleared up and understood by recurring to the history of the times in which the rule was given. This is evidently the case with baptism; and hence the great advantage of adverting to the history of the times of its institution.

The Jews, from the very giving of the Law, according to the assertions of their own rabbins, baptized as well as circumcised proselytes, in order to enter them into covenant. This they called, "baptizing to Moses." It was an initiatory rite, and required for males, circumcision, baptism, and a sacrifice; for females, baptism and a sacrifice. The baptism must be performed in the presence of three men, according to

Maimonides,—of two grave men, according to the Talmud of Babylon,—of three rabbins, according to the Jerusalem Talmud. It was administered after the wound of circumcision had healed. The above-named authorities, and many others, considered baptism, as well as circumcision, necessary for *initiation* into the Mosaical covenant.

Baptism for proselytism was given only once; and in this it differed from baptism for purification, which was administered often. Baptism for proselytism was never reiterated on a proselyte or any of his posterity.

The existence of the custom prior to the institution of the Christian rite is obvious. The question in which we are concerned is not, whether they had a good and lawful warrant for the practice, but whether they did practise it. The writings of the rabbins, the Talmud, &c., distinctly declare that this practice was customary, and their evidence is conclusive as to the historical fact. The grounds on which the Jews based it are not to the point. If it was an invention of their own, still they refer to the law of Moses in proof of it. Thus, (Num. xv. 15,) "One law and one manner shall be to you and the stranger." Now the Jews reckoned that when they entered into covenant at the time of

receiving the Law at Sinai, they were all baptized; and this they infer from Exod. xix. 10, "Sanctify the people to-day and to-morrow, and let them wash their clothes, and be ready the third day." They interpret "sanctify" to mean, "wash the body;" and that to wash their garments, implied also the washing of the whole body. This is seen in Maimonides, Gemara Babylon, and others, quoted by Selden. And supposing the Jews mistook the sense of these texts, yet when they had upon that authority established a practice of baptizing proselytes and their children, and that practice had now continued many ages-if our Saviour had meant that the Apostles in baptizing Christian converts should have altered the practice, and refused baptism to the children of such proselytes as they baptized, we have all the reason in the world to think He would have forewarned them of it. Our Saviour, who must have known of the custom, gives no caution against it.

As they themselves were initiated, so the Jews were accustomed to initiate proselytes by a similar ceremony. Gregory Nazianzen alludes to this initiatory baptism as typical of Christian Baptism: he calls it the baptism of Moses. So Cyprian, Basil, Tertullian. Selden and Dr. Hammond also concluded the same, from 1 Cor.

x. 1, which would have been difficult for those to whom St. Paul wrote to have made anything out of, except by reference to this custom of the Jews.

The children of proselytes were also admitted into covenant by baptism, with their parents. The child's inability to promise was no bar against his being admitted; and the desire of the parent was counted available, and sufficient to justify admission; and they judged that as it was for the child's good, they need not wait till his mature age 1 for his own consent, but that delay in giving baptism would be as impious as to delay circumcision. This is seen in the Gemara Babylon, and in the Jerusalem Talmud. The "House of Judgment 2" became to an orphan child in the stead of a parent—i. e. sponsors.

Those children *only* were baptized who were born *before* their parents were proselytized: all born after were reckoned clean from their birth; their parents having been initiated, and so natural Jews, and consequently standing in no

¹ They considered infancy in a male to be under thirteen years and a day; in a female, under twelve years and a day.

² The "House of Judgment" was the court before which profession of obedience to the law of Moses was made by the proselytes, previous to receiving the sacred rite.

further need of this baptism. Such children were only circumcised.

The Jews baptized children found exposed, or taken in war, and all others of whom they had power or possession in infancy, and when baptized they accounted them proselytes. "The baptizing of infants (says Dr. Lightfoot) was a thing as well known in the church of the Jews as ever it has been in the Christian church."

By understanding the existence of this custom we obtain a clearer light of the commission of Christ, "Go, disciple all nations, baptizing them." Those sent so to do would regulate their practice according to the manner they had been accustomed to, unless a command was given to the contrary, which does not appear. If this commission had been, "Go, circumcise all," &c., circumcision would have been given to infants as well as adults, and why not baptism also; and they would apply that name to the persons who received that rite at their hands which they had been accustomed to see given among their own nation; they would call them proselytes, or μαθηταί. It cannot be doubted that the Apostles knew what to do; and the practice they established we may reasonably suppose that the Church retained and continued to use

That the Jews considered themselves clean,

and gave baptism of proselytism only to new proselytes, does not affect the question of Christian baptism; for St. John and Christ baptized Jewsa thing which was quite contrary to the Jewish custom, for they baptized only proselytes from other nations; but they seemed to expect as soon as Messias came, that their own nation should receive baptism from Him; and the baptism of John and Christ did not excite their surprise. The Jews made no question of the thing itself, but of the person who did it, and merely inquired why John baptized if he were not the Christ? They asked, "Who art thou?" "All men mused," &c. The privilege which the Jew had, or supposed that he had, above other people is, as to the Christian dispensation, abolished. Christ has declared that every man individually needs baptism. When Christ abolished all the Jewish ceremonial law, there was nothing left but baptism. This He retained as initiatory. "He took it" (says Dr. Lightfoot) "into his hands, such as He found it; adding only this, that He exalted it to a nobler purpose and larger use. St. Paul calls it 'Christian circumcision,' Col. ii. 11."

We have no proof that St. John and the early Christians did in any way alter the custom they found existing among the Jews. The *onus* probandi on this point lies upon the Antipædobaptists. We have no means of judging what they did but by observing what was done before them, and what was practised after them, in the Church. The people who flocked to John's baptism were not surely so forgetful of the manners and customs of their nation as to omit to bring their children along with themselves to be baptized. That the baptism of adults only should be mentioned is reasonably to be expected in the first preaching of the Gospel. It was the first step. But St. Ambrose takes it for granted that John Baptist baptized infants. Origen, Clemens Alexandrinus, and Austin, speak of infant baptism as ordered and practised by the Apostles.

If infant baptism had been something new, there would have been an express command for it given to the disciples, as there was for circumcision to Abraham. But as it was ordinary in all ages before to baptize infants, if Christ had intended to abolish the usage, the need would have been for a command forbidding it.

The Jews called *infants initiated by baptism*, proselytes or disciples. Apply this to Matthew xxviii. 19, and considerable light is thrown upon this text.

They called such initiatory baptism of a pro-

selyte, his regeneration. They told the proselytes, that however unclean and sinful he and his children were before, they were now by this baptism dedicated to the true God, entered into a new covenant with Him, put into a new state, and were in all respects as if they had been new born. The Heathens also had a form of baptism (of which Tertullian speaks) in the mysteries of Apollo and Ceres, which they called regeneration. In this they imitated the Jewish initiatory rite.

The Jews supposed proselytism to cancel and abolish all previous natural relationship, whether of parents, friends, &c.; and hence, 2 Cor. v. 17, "If any man be in Christ, he is a new creature." 1 Pet. ii. 2, "As newborn babes." The rabbins carried this idea of disannulment to an extravagant degree. It is referred to in 1 Cor. vii. 10, et seq.

The Christian Fathers have retained the term regeneration as equivalent to baptism, and, indeed, as convertible terms. This is proved clearly in the "History," by numerous quotations; and it elucidates our Lord's words to Nicodemus, in John iii. 5, and puts it beyond a doubt that our Saviour is to be understood there of baptism.

Clement says, "Christ was regenerated by John." Hierome says, "Except a man be baptized with water and the Spirit;" thus explaining

"born again," in John iii. 5, by "baptized." Baptism is called regeneration by Hermas Pastor, Justin Martyr, Irenæus, Clemens Alexandrinus, Austin, Gregory Nazianzen, Chrysostom, &c.

By instituting a parallel between the Jewish and Christian baptisms, and the modes and circumstances attending each, it will more plainly appear that John the Baptist and our Saviour, and the Apostles and primitive Christians, had an eye to the Jewish baptism in many of the circumstances which they used in the Christian sacrament. The parallel between the two is as follows:—

1. The Jews required before baptism a profession of obedience to the Law. Exod. xix. "If thou wilt keep my covenant," &c. "And the people answered, All that the Lord hath spoken we will do." They were then baptized.

So Christians are required to profess faith, to renounce the devil, &c., and are then baptized.

- 2. Both Jews and Christians used interrogatories before baptism; and both used them *twice*, at two distinct times previous to administering the rite.
 - 3. Both baptized infants.
- 4. The Jews allowed two or three grave persons to answer as sponsors.

So does the Christian Church.

- 5. Both apply regeneration as synonymous with baptism.
- 6. Both understood baptism to remove the recipient from a state of uncleanness to a state of holiness; and thus, "sanctified," "holy," "saints," are terms applied to "baptized" proselytes.
- 7. The Holy Spirit conveyed at baptism³ corresponded to the Sheckinah, under which the Jews considered the baptized proselyte to be placed.
- 8. The Paschal season was appropriated by both to the purpose of admitting proselytes.
- 9. The Jews had Proselytes of the Gate, and of the Temple.

The Christians had Audientes, Catechumens, Competentes, and Fideles.

10. Certain customs obtained among the early Christians, which were probably derived from the Jews: viz., Trine immersion; a little milk and honey; Chrism.

The degrees of preparatory admission in both Churches did so resemble one another, that it is plain that the first Christians imitated the Jews in the steps that they made towards admitting

³ This outpouring of the Holy Spirit was more palpably discerned in the early times of the Christian church, when baptism conveyed sensible and miraculous powers.

a proselyte to baptism; and the ceremonies and circumstances attending it were so similar in both Churches, that we must come to the same conclusion again, and acknowledge how much the Christian Church owes to the Jewish in these respects.

If it be objected that baptism for proselytism is not enjoined in Holy Scripture,—we have seen

- (a) That the Jews did adduce texts in support of it.
- (b) Even if they mistook the meaning of the texts, the practice was established; and our Saviour *retained* it, and exalted it to the nature of a sacrament.

[The authorities which Wall has especially made use of in this Introduction are, Ainsworth, Dr. Hammond, Selden, Lightfoot, Jacob Alting, Godwyn's "Moses and Aaron," and "A Discourse on Lent," by Hooper, Bishop of Bath and Wells.]

THE HISTORY.

CHAPTER I.

The short pieces by the Fathers of the first century which have come down to us are about other subjects than infant baptism. The times were too troubled, and the Church in too great danger, and exposed to too great calumnies, to allow any thing else but Apologies and Vindications to be written.

The earliest writer who gives positive evidence of the practice of infant baptism is Irenæus, (A. d. 167). But Clemens Romanus, Hermas Pastor¹, and Justin Martyr, though they do not speak directly of infant baptism, do, nevertheless, mention such things, from whence the practice may be inferred. Thus:

CLEMENS ROMANUS speaks of original, or birth sin, and the necessity of baptism for the

¹ Wall does not consider this Clemens and Hermas to be the persons mentioned by St. Paul in his Epistles, Phil. iv. 3, and Rom, xvi. 14.

forgiveness of it in infants. He refers to Job xiv. 4.

HERMAS PASTOR, who (as Clement also) wrote before the Gospel of St. John was written, has set down the substance of John iii. 5. In two very remarkable visions of a tower 2 which he describes, he shows the necessity of waterbaptism for salvation; and declares, that "the Church of those who are saved is built upon water." He calls baptism "the seal of the Son of God, which brings from death to life:" and he declares infants capable of being admitted into covenant³.

Justin Martyr (a. d. d. d. 140), in the "Dialogue with Trypho," speaks of original guilt, and declares the necessity of its forgiveness as well as of actual sins; that this forgiveness is applied ordinarily by baptism. He understands John iii. 5, as referring to baptism; and uses "the

² The "White Hill" in one of these visions, which was the chief of all that supplied stones for the Tower, represents infants.

³ Hermas, in one vision, has spoken of the baptism of the patriarchs, &c., of the Old Testament, who were dead, by Christ and the Apostles; and Wall, without defending this (except by referring to 1 Pet. iii. 19, iv. 6, and 1 Cor. xv. 29, a passage in Clem. Alex. and Origen having a similar tendency), infers from it the strong notion which the early Christians must have had of the necessity of water baptism.

water of regeneration" as synonymous with baptism. All the writers of the first four hundred years do so likewise without any exception-much in the same way as we do the word "Christened." He certainly understands Christ's commission (Matt. xxviii. 19) to apply to infants; for when he speaks of persons who from childhood had been Christ's disciples,4 he uses the same word as is in the commission,—(οί ἐκ παίδων ἐμαθητεύθησαν τῷ Χριστῷ). This most ancient Father speaks of baptism being to Christians in the stead of circumcision; and the analogy between these two is much insisted on by pædobaptists, to prove that one ought to be given to infants as well as the other. He speaks of baptism as spiritual circumcision, such as Enoch had; and in this agrees with Col. ii. 11, 12, where St. Paul speaks of the Christian converts as circumcised with "the circumcision of Christ;" which can only mean such a rite, analogous to circumcision, as Christ appointed, i. e. baptism; and so St. Paul goes on to say that they were circumcised, "being buried with Him by baptism." Both Justin and St. Paul refer to the inward and

⁴ The Anti-pædobaptists argue that an infant cannot be baptized because it cannot be discipled. But in this place Justin speaks of them as "disciples." See infra, "Letters" VII and VIII.

outward part of baptism, whereof the inward part was done without hands.

IRENAUS (A. D. 167) had conversed with Polycarp, the intimate and beloved friend of St. John, and accordingly much weight must be given to his authority. He speaks of original guilt affecting all mankind and born with them, and that it is only in and through Christ that it is forgiven. He speaks of baptism as the means by which this forgiveness is conveyed, and, accordingly, calls baptism "redemption" and "regeneration." He considers it necessary for infants, and reckons them among the "regenerated "." He distinguishes between regeneration and conversion. So also Gregory Nazianzen says, there is no other regeneration to be had but such as is conveyed by water-baptism. He grants that there is repentance after baptism, and forgiveness on repentance: but he shows this to be different from the forgiveness conveyed by baptism. Austin, Hierome, and Ambrose, make the same distinction.

Irenaeus speaks of infant baptism as being the common practice in the Churches of France; and

CLEMENS ALEXANDRINUS (A. D. 192) speaks of infant baptism as commonly practised in the

⁵ By "regeneration" Wall understands the outward act of baptism, accompanied with that grace and mercy of God whereby he admits the recipient into covenant.

Churches of Alexandria, and takes it for granted that the Apostles baptized infants. This Father expressly states that regeneration means baptism, and thus determines the use of the word which Ireneus has applied to infants. He recommends for the device of a seal, "an Apostle drawing an infant out of water," by which he represents infant baptism.

TERTULLIAN (A. D. 200) was a very learned man, but fell into great and monstrous errors of faith. But this does not invalidate the force of his testimony concerning the practice of the Church in his own times; and his authority is adduced merely as evidence of facts, and no use is made of his particular religious opinions. He speaks of baptism as the "sealing of faith," and as absolutely necessary to salvation; and paraphrases "cannot enter," in John iii. 5, by "non habet salutem:" and rather than that it should be omitted, he allows it to be administered by a layman in cases of extremity. Nevertheless, he recommends baptism to be deferred till all danger of sinning from lust, &c., is past; and therefore he disputes as much against the custom of baptizing virgins, young widows, &c., as of baptizing infants: and yet, with all this, he acknowledges the danger of infants dying without having received it, and would have it administered

at once to a dying child to save it. There is much perplexity involved in the opinion of Tertullian, and it is hard to reconcile several passages in his works with one another. He at one time calls infants, "ætas innocens;" at another he calls them sinful and unclean. WALL thinks that his real sentiments were, that those who slighted baptism, if they died without it perished everlastingly; but that those who from fear of offending against the baptismal vow, and from a sense of its very great importance, deferred to receive it till they could attain a holier life, and consider themselves in a condition to keep it, were allowed to do so; and if they died in the meanwhile, the will and purpose of being baptized would be accepted by God for the deed. Such being his doctrine, he explains Matt. xix. 14 to mean, that they are to come when grown up, (which is the very thing Christ reproved in his disciples); and he would make "holy," in 1 Cor. vii. 14, to mean "sanctitati designati." In all this, however, he indirectly attests the custom of baptizing infants; for he so gives his reasons and opinion against the custom as that one plainly perceives by his words that it was then actually the custom to baptize them. He further speaks of sponsors, which are required only for infants.

ORIGEN (A. D. 210) was competent to judge of the practice of the Church. He was a learned man, and had travelled in Egypt, Arabia, Greece, Rome, Cappadocia, and Palestine. He declares infant baptism to be the common usage of the Church, and thinks it was ordered by the Apostles. So did Ambrose, Clemens Alexandrinus, and Austin. He held the doctrine of original guilt, and cites in proof of it Job xiv. 4, above forty times. He held that baptism was ordained for its removal and forgiveness. And Hierome imagines that Origen devised his theory of the pre-existence of the soul 6 in order to account for original guilt. Origen was born of Christian parents, and was baptized when an infant. His grandfather very probably lived in apostolic times, or at least very near it, and must have known the practice of those times. No proof of infant baptism can be adduced from his comment on Matt. xviii. 10,

⁶ The works of Origen which are extant are chiefly translations by Hierome and Rufinus, which have been made so freely that they are much open to cavil; yet they contain so many allusions to infant baptism that they cannot all be interpolations, and the authority of Origen on this point may be received as decisive. In those of his Greek works which have survived he mentions infant baptism. See infra, Letter XII. That he, or any other ancient, mentioning a practice as received, should give an erroneous reason for it, is as good a witness of the practice itself as the most orthodox mention of it.

as it is uncertain whether he refers to infants in age or innocency. This is unfortunate, as this passage is in the original Greek.

CYPRIAN (A. D. 250). A very important Council was held, A. D. 253, in Africa, under Cyprian. There were sixty-six bishops present. They deliberated on two points. The one was De Lapsis; the other was on certain questions proposed by Fidus, a bishop; one of which was, whether the analogy of circumcision was to be so strictly adhered to that baptism should not be given till the eighth day. Cyprian and the bishops assembled with him decided that the child might be baptized under eight days old, and held that to suffer a child to die unbaptized was to endanger its salvation. Of these bishops we may safely suppose that some of them were seventy or eighty years of age; and it was very easy for them, because of the short interval of time which had elapsed since the days of the Apostles, to have known the practice of the first Christians. Some of them were probably born within seventy or eighty years after the death of the last Apostle; and in their young days there must have been members of the Church still alive who had been born in the very age of the Apostles. It is improbable in the extreme that they should have erred in this matter; and in

the account given of this Council it is plain that there was no uncertainty or doubt entertained by any member of it about the validity and efficacy as well as usefulness of the practice. There was an unanimity among them on the point which could not have been expected if it had been an innovation, or even of recent institution. Cyprian's letter says, that "there was not one of Fidus' mind," that the baptism of infants must be delayed till the eighth day. They acknowledge baptism to be in the place of circunícision, and call it spiritual circuncision. Fidus, in this matter, alludes also to the "holy kiss," mentioned 1 Cor. xvi. 20, 1 Pet. v. 14, and objects to it, as being disgusting to give it to an infant not a week old. This Council did not enact infant baptism, but took it for granted. It was assembled at Carthage, at a date antecedent to times when the acts of Councils were registered; hence has arisen the mistake of Grotius, who has said that no Council speaks of infant baptism earlier than the Council of Carthage 8, A. D. 418.

⁷ St. Austin lays it down as a rule, that what the whole Church does practise, but has not been instituted by a Council, has existed from the times of the Apostles and been settled by their authority.

⁸ This Council was convened against the Pelagian heresy, and declared that baptism was for remission of original guilt. It did not decree infant baptism.

Cyprian asserted the absolute necessity of baptism for salvation; and both he and the sixty-six bishops explain John iii. 5, of baptism.

The Council of Elleberis in Spain (a. d. d. 305) has been quoted on the subject of infant baptism. It was held in the time of the persecution under Diocletian, and referred rather to the lapsed: for adults lapsed it decreed a penance of ten years, but would at once re-admit *infants* who had been carried over to heathen sacrifices.

The Council of Neocesarea (a. d. d. 314) has given occasion to much disputation on the question of infant baptism. Grotius has found in it an argument against infant baptism, and he quotes Balsamon and Zonaras ⁹ as considering it against infant baptism. Grotius is mistaken. The Council proves nothing pro nor con. The question argued was, whether baptism administered to a woman who was with child affected the child, and whether its baptism after its birth would be re-baptization¹. They decided it would not; that the woman desired baptism for herself,

⁹ Wall asserts these two authorities to be on the side of infant baptism, and that they further speak of "sponsors" for the infant. Gale, of course, sides with Grotius.

¹ The Jewish doctrine was, that the first proselyte required to be baptized, but that all his posterity were clean, and needed not the baptism of proselytism; and, consequently,

and the resolution $(\pi \rho o a i \rho \epsilon \sigma i c)$ which is made at the baptismal profession is peculiar to the individual only $(i \delta i a)$, and that in this matter the mother communicates nothing to the child. That such a question should have been raised seems to argue for infant baptism; but the antipædobaptists contend that the Council was opposed to it. If this Council, which consisted of seventeen bishops, had declared infant baptism unlawful, it is strange that Pelagius made no use of it, and that St. Austin about seventy or eighty years after asserted that he could discover no traces of any sect which denied infant baptism.

OPTATUS, BISHOP OF MILEVIS (A. D. 360), calls baptism "a garment swimming with water," alluding to Gal. iii. 27; and he says this garment was "not too big for infants." He wrote against the Donatists, who disputed not against infant baptism, but against the validity of baptism by evil ministers: otherwise the doctrine and practice of baptism was the same with them and the Church catholic.

Gregory Nazianzen (a. d. 360) was not baptized in infancy, and had some reason for

they would not have allowed a child under these circumstances to be baptized, but would have considered the baptism of the parent, before its birth, to be sufficient. This doctrine does not apply to Christian baptism.

being prejudiced against infant baptism; for he could not urge it himself, nor hear it urged by others, without some reproach thereby cast on the conduct of his father. He would defer it till the age of three years, from principle and not from neglect; probably in compliance to his father's practice, who, perhaps, kept him so long unbaptized purposely, and then, seeing no danger of death, delayed it yet further. Yet he speaks of infant baptism. He calls baptism "the gift," "the grace," "the anointing," "the laver of regeneration," "the amending of our make," "the seal." He speaks of birth-sin; but adds, that "God has not left his creatures without a remedy; for as He made us at first, so He renews us by the Divine formation" of baptism, by "a regeneration which cannot be had a second time," (oùs ούσης δευτέρας αναγεννήσεως). He urges, accordingly, the necessity of receiving it, and the danger and wickedness of those who wilfully neglect it. He, like St. Austin, declares that those who miss of baptism through carelessness or contempt are certainly lost; but he considered that infants dying unbaptized, and adults who missed baptism by some accident 2 and unavoid-

² The intention is allowed for the deed. Ambrose, in his funeral sermon on Valentinian II., allows the same thing. (II. 66.)

able impediment, and not through their own fault, would not indeed be punished, yet would not be glorified; he allotted them a third or middle state. He would not, however, have any die unbaptized, but would administer it at once to infants, however young, in cases of danger. Gregory speaks of circumcision as being the type of baptism, and given to those who had no sense of it, or understanding of the reason of it. He speaks of the baptism of St. Basil in infancy, and compares him to Samuel, who was dedicated to the Lord in infancy.

He explains 1 Cor. vii. 14, of baptism; and constantly uses $\dot{a}\gamma\iota a\sigma\theta\tilde{\eta}\nu a\iota$ for "to be baptized," and $\ddot{a}\gamma\iota o\iota$ for "saints, or Christians." In this he agrees with the ancients generally.

Gregory Nazianzen has the words οδ οὐδε εἰσιν ἐν δυνάμει τοῦ δεξασθαι διὰ νηπιότητα, &c. The meaning of δυνάμει has occasioned some dispute. Wall contends that it should be translated "power," and he makes the meaning to be this: "They have not the receiving of baptism in their power, either because of their infancy," &c., and intends not that their infancy is any bar to their receiving this holy Sacrament, but prevents their coming to baptism unless some one helps them and brings them to it. But Gale contends that it means "capacity," and, accordingly, he

vindicates and supports the assertion of Grotius, that Gregory was opposed to infant baptism. But the whole of the sermon in which these disputed words occur is taken up with the matter of baptism, and in numerous places asserts directly and expressly infant baptism; only Gregory would have it deferred till three years of age, except in cases of peril and extremity; with this exception the authority of Gregory is decidedly on the side of infant baptism, and his sentiments are consistent with the analogy he draws between it and circumcision, and with his views of the necessity of it to wash away original sin.

Basil. (A. d. 360.) The practice of Basil was for infant baptism, as Theodoret mentions; he urged the baptism of the child of the Emperor Valens, and in a sermon, which is extant, he complains of the laxness of the Christian converts, who put off their baptism through indifference. There were at this time many persons who had been instructed in Christianity, and were convinced that it was true, and had resolved to be baptized into it; yet they did put this off from time to time, (as lukewarm men do now-adays their repentance, and the receiving of the other sacrament,) knowing that baptism would engage them to a strict course of life. In this

state they lived for many years after their conversion, being in some sense Christians, yet not fideles. They did not delay it from the idea of its being unlawful, but they wished to live a little longer in the indulgence of their lusts, and accordingly demurred to bind themselves by the baptismal vow; whilst their own minds were in this unsettled state, it was not likely that they would bring their children to be baptized. Many such children (since they were not baptized in their infancy, because their parents, though believers, were not baptized,) when they grew up, delayed the baptism of their children as their fathers had done; and so the mischief was continued. This is no argument against infant baptism, but a sign of the evil and corrupt manners of the men who at that time called themselves Christians.

Basil speaks of little children joining in the divine offices. He explains John iii. 5 of baptism, and compares it to circumcision. He held the doctrine of original guilt, and the necessity of baptism for its forgiveness.

Ambrose (A. d. 374) speaks of infant baptism as being the common practice of the Church in his own times, and as having been instituted by the Apostles³. He supposes that it was practised by John the Baptist. This

³ So Origen and Clemens Alexandrinus.

Father, in common with all the others who preceded and have followed him, held the doctrine of original sin, and that baptism was the appointed means for removing it. "No time," he remarks, "ought to be void of the remedy, because none is void of the guilt." He adds the authority of his opinion to the common interpretation of John iii. 5, and sees in that text the necessity of baptism for admission into God's kingdom. He makes no exception in favour of infants dying unbaptized. "Suppose," he says, "that such have freedom from punishment,which is not clear,—yet I question whether they shall have the honour of the kingdom." Though well acquainted with the works of the Greek Fathers, he does not seem to have adopted the notion which some of them entertained of a third or middle state; he speaks of it as a thing not certainly revealed or known, and he would not have any one build a hope upon it, that children dying unbaptized will be saved.

He calls baptism "spiritual circumcision."

Chrysostom. (A. d. 380.) This Father has not many passages on the subject of baptism; nevertheless, there are sufficient to indicate his sense of it; he also speaks of it as being the common practice in the Churches of Antioch and Constantinople. He draws the analogy (which

we have frequently had occasion to notice in other Fathers) between baptism and circumcision, and observes how much more favourable God has been to the Christians than to the Jews, and how much better baptism is than circumcision. "Baptism," he remarks, "has no determinate time, like circumcision, but it is lawful that one in infancy, or in middle age, or in old age, do receive it;" by which he means, that it is better that it should be received at some time in life. rather than not at all; and it is plain, from the remarks he makes upon original guilt, and the necessity of baptism for its remission, and the great danger of dying without having received that sacrament, that he would have it administered in infancy. He considered baptism indispensable for entrance into the kingdom of heaven, and that it must be received before any one can obtain the "inheritance," or be called "sons." He calls the effect of baptism "redemption and regeneration."

Chrysostom has been cited by Julianus the Pelagian, as denying original guilt; but Austin has shown that he asserts this doctrine in many parts of his works. The same charge has been brought also against two other Greek fathers, Isidorus and Theodoret. The charge is based on mistake, and it is easy to account for its

origin. The Greek Church had no word for original guilt corresponding to the expression used by the Latin Church. They could not use $\dot{a}\mu a \rho \tau i a$ or $\dot{a}\mu \dot{a}\rho \tau \eta \mu a$, for these express actual sins; but they do speak of original pollution inherited from Adam, which is all that is meant by original guilt.

HIEROME. (A. D. 378.) Before he took any part in the Pelagian controversy, Hierome had expressed his opinion decidedly on the subject of infant baptism. He maintained its necessity, and declared that those who omitted to bring a child to receive it were guilty of a great sin. He gives the usual interpretation and force of John iii. 5, and refers it to baptism.

After Hierome had taken up the refutation of the Pelagian heresy, which was now beginning to be agitated, and was the occasion of much controversy concerning infant baptism, as well as original guilt, he became much more explicit and larger in his statements; and without referring to the arguments which were then urged by the defenders of the Catholic doctrine, we, after this long interval of time since the controversy occurred, can deduce from it two great evidences on the side of infant baptism; the one is, that infant baptism was the common and universal practice at that time; and the second, that

neither Pelagius, nor Julianus, nor Celestius, could charge the practice with being of recent introduction.

AUSTIN. (A. D. 388.) St. Austin also took an active part in the Pelagian controversy; but before this subject began to be agitated, St. Austin had maintained the necessity of infant baptism, and declared the utter condemnation of infants dying unbaptized. Grotius has remarked, that before he was heated by the Pelagian controversy, he did not speak much nor strongly on this point; but Wall, by referring to treatises * written by 'Austin some time previous to the breaking out of this controversy, has shown Grotius to be mistaken. It is not denied that this controversy has drawn from his pen further and fuller arguments and statements of the doctrine than he had given before any dispute was raised concerning it. He has considered the question in almost every point of view, and his opinion is this: he speaks very earnestly on the side of infant baptism, and urges its necessity on account of original sin; and rather than that a

⁴ These are, a treatise on the Sermon on the Mount, another on Free-will, another on Baptism against the Donatists, an epistle to Boniface, all of which were written, according to the chronology of the Benedictine editors, before the breaking out of the heresy of Polagius.

child should miss it and die without having received it, he allows it to be administered by an heretical or schismatical church ⁵.

That baptism was the remedy for original sin, he declares to be confirmed by antiquity, and the authority of the Catholic faith, and notorious in the practice of the Church. The works of this Father give full evidence of the universality of the practice. He knew of no sect that denied it. He speaks of it as having been enacted by no council, but delivered from the authority of the Apostles; and he pronounces that the order of the Apostles is sufficient warrant for it, and obligation to it, even though no direct command is given in Scripture about it. In St. Austin's time there were no doubt still extant many

⁵ St. Austin argued against the Donatists that baptism in the name of the Trinity was valid, however impure and heretical the Church might be which administered it. The validity of the Sacrament he considered to depend, not on the worthiness of the minister, but on the authority and commission of God. Baptism, received even with a wicked heart and purpose, as in the case of Simon Magus, was valid; such persons must repent and reform their opinions, but may not be baptized again.

It is to be remembered that the Donatists did not dissent from the Church on the validity of infant baptism, but of baptism administered by an impure and heretical church. The Donatists, as much as the Catholic Church, held and practised infant baptism. records and much evidence, both in writing and in unwritten tradition, which has been since lost. These might, in the days of St. Austin, have been easily referred to; and it was not difficult for him and for Pelagius to have traced back the practice for three hundred years, which was all the time which had elapsed since the Apostolic age. It is impossible for us to do it after a lapse of eighteen hundred years; but we must be content with their authority and word for it, and such proof as we can find in the remains of the Fathers.

The essentials for baptism St. Austin held to be faith and the outward rite of water; but where one of these cannot be had, through some unavoidable impediment, he held that the other alone was sufficient for salvation, through the mercy of God ⁶. In this way he accounts for the validity of infant baptism where the infant has not actual faith; and for the salvation of the thief on the cross, who had not received waterbaptism: but he advises us, that the case of the thief is no argument that water-baptism may be dispensed with ordinarily, any more than the case of infants obtaining salvation without actual

⁶ Enoch is said by Justin Martyr to have received spiritual circumcision, which must have been, says Wall, without any external ceremony.

faith is any argument against the pecessity of faith where the subject is capable of it. It is to be observed that Abraham was justified before he received circumcision. Cornelius received the gift of the Holy Ghost before he was baptized; but in Isaac the seal went first: so, in infants baptized, the mystery of baptism goes first, the conversion of heart follows; but the salvation of the person may be completed by either, if the one wanting has not been wilfully omitted. If either be wilfully wanting, it involves the person in guilt.

St. Austin allows sponsors. The faith of those who bring the child profits the child. The sponsors are not necessarily parents, but sometimes the masters stood sponsors for their slaves; any one who would have the compassion might stand for a child found exposed, and so on. He cites the case of the widow's son at Nain as an instance of this vicarious faith. He allows even the faith of the congregation to be sufficient. The answer of the sponsors was available for the "Sacrament of Faith," and does avail up to such time as they by reason can understand their baptismal vow, and live accordingly. He does not pretend that infants have faith, or repent-

⁷ The Lutherans suppose that the child has faith after a manner, but not as adults have.

ance, or conversion; yet he maintains the regenerating Spirit to be imparted to the child, though the child is a passive subject, and in no way co-operates, nor is conscious of the indwelling of the Holy Spirit. He allows interrogatories at baptism to be necessary even to infants.

A child dying unbaptized he held to be lost, John iii. 5, Rom. v. 12: a child dying baptized before it committed actual sin, he held to be undoubtedly saved—so the Church of England.

THE THIRD COUNCIL OF CARTHAGE (A. D. 397) indirectly proves the custom of infant baptism among the Church Catholic and Donatists. At this time Donatism was giving way, and many wished to return to the Church. The Council decreed that they might be admitted as laymen, but not to any office in the Church; it however excepts those who in infancy had been baptized by Donatists, regarding them as not free agents, and would admit them to holy Orders.

THE FIFTH COUNCIL (A. D. 400) decrees that those who had been carried captive in

^{*} The Council of Trent decreed the same. The faith of the parent stands good for the child, but the apostasy of the parent does not injure the child, who is not a consenting party, because by baptism there is one Holy Spirit given to both; but the spirit of a human being cannot be so communicated to another.

infancy, if there was no one who could tell whether they had been baptized, might be baptized when recovered from captivity °.

A COUNCIL OF HIPPO (A. D. 390) decreed that those who had no proof or knowledge of their baptism in infancy should be baptized.

Leo I. (A. D. 440), Rusticus, bishop of Narbon, Gregory the Great, and the Council of Trullo (A. D. 691), came to the same resolution.

At a COUNCIL AT CARTHAGE (A. D. 411), Celestus the Pelagian thought to escape the brand of heresy by acknowledging infant baptism.

The Decretals of Siricius, (a. d. 384, 1) declare the order of the Church respecting baptism to be, that baptism be administered only at Easter and Whitsuntide², except to *infants*, sick, &c. For adult baptism he required forty days' notice, and that these forty days should be spent

⁹ All Christians, except the Marcionists, regarded rebaptization as profanation of that Sacrament. The Church of England, in cases of uncertainty, uses a conditional baptism.

¹ The decretals prior to A. D. 384 are proved to be spurious by Wickliffe, Luther, Jewel, &c. Those of Siricius are allowed to be genuine.

² He objects to Christmas, Epiphany, and the festivals of the Apostles and Martyrs, for the general administration of baptism.

in fasting 3 and prayer 4; and the clergy made it their business, during that season, to catechize and instruct and prepare the candidates for baptism. He required baptism in infancy as a necessary qualification for admission into holy orders. The same was required by Innocentius, A. D. 402. A decree of Innocent's allows presbyters to baptize infants, but confines the giving of the chrism and confirmation to Bishops.

PAULINUS, Bishop of Nola (A. D. 393), sent as an inscription to a font,

Inde parens sacro ducit de fonte sacerdos Infantes niveos corpore, corde, habitu.

About this time it was not unusual to call newly baptized persons *infantes*; but there is abundant evidence of baptizing infants in age. Paulinus speaks of a child named Celsus, who died aged seven, as "bis infantem spatio ævi et fontelavacri."

He explains John iii. 5, of baptism.

Paulinus, deacon of the church at Milan, in mentioning St. Ambrose's death, speaks of some infants baptized.

- ³ This is probably one of the chief occasions for keeping the forty days of Lent.
- ⁴ Thus showing that faith and repentance were necessary preliminaries for the holy rite.
- ⁵ This seems to indicate that the baptism of infants was more frequent than the baptism of adults, the latter receiving the name of infants, in allusion to the former.

THE PELAGIAN HERESY is a very strong evidence of the fact of infant baptism, not only as existing then, but as having been handed down from the earliest times. Pelagius confesses that he never heard of any sect which denied it; and when pressed with the argument, "Why are they then baptized?" did not offer to deny that they were to be baptized, but granted it 6. He acknowledged the practice and necessity of infant baptism. He did not even dispute the received meaning of John iii. 5, but acknowledged that baptism was necessary for entrance into heaven. What he disputed was the doctrine of original guilt, and the necessity of baptism for its remission; and his heresy consisted chiefly in his denying that baptism was so necessary that a child could not be saved without it; and he maintained that, though a child dying unbaptized would not be admitted into heaven, yet it would not be condemned, but live in some third or middle state. This controversy of Pelagianism agitated both the western

⁶ Gale contends that the subject of dispute in this controversy was not concerning the proper *subjects* for baptism, but the *end* for which baptism was administered. But if the inquiry chiefly turned on the "end" for which baptism was instituted, still it would necessarily touch upon the subjects of it; and the common practice of baptizing infants was one of the chief arguments adduced in reference to the proof of the "end" of baptism.

and eastern Churches; it gave rise to many councils, and to voluminous treatises from the pens of Hierome and Austin, in all of which the Church maintained against him the doctrine of original guilt, and that its remission was ordinarily conveyed by baptism. The whole of this controversy proves most satisfactorily, and has put beyond the possibility of dispute and doubt, that the origin of infant baptism belongs to Apostolic times, and has been preserved and practised by the Church ever since. It is most invaluable evidence, because it shows that this question could stand the most searching investigation, and by it be proved the more convincingly.

Vicentius Victor (a. d. 419), though he was affected by the Pelagian controversy, yet owned original guilt, and considered the soul a new creation, and then endeavoured to explain that these two were not inconsistent. St. Austin and St. Hierome had both declined to meddle with this question. Vicentius boldly gave his sentence, that in baptism God gave his divine grace to remedy original guilt, and so make amends for having put a clean soul into an unclean body.

He thought that a child dying unbaptized would, like the thief upon the cross, be admitted

⁷ For further remarks on this controversy, see Appendix V.

to Paradise, but not to heaven; but even this opinion he soon extended, and thought they might possibly go to heaven after the resurrection; but he afterwards recanted. He seems to have considered that the phrase "in my Father's house are many mansions" implied that there was a place in heaven for infants dying sunbaptized. For children so dying he would have daily prayers in the Church, as a remedy for the deficiency of baptism.

The Cerinthians and Marcionists used to baptize some living persons in the place of the dead. The third Council at Carthage condemns some who in the Church Catholic did this.

In the time of Tertullian and Cyprian, there was a custom of commemorating the dead at the time of celebrating the Holy Communion; but this did not at all resemble the prayers for the dead of the Romish Church,—they were prayers of thanksgiving.

The opinions of Vicentius are wild and foolish, and he is referred to in this place merely as a witness of the practice of infant baptism.

The authors hitherto adduced in this matter of infant baptism have for the most part belonged

⁸ This opinion generally was anathematized by a Council at Carthage (A. D. 418).

to the Church Catholic, and only here and there mention has been made of tenets of some heretics and schismatics, as Donatists, Arians, Pelagians,—for these men practised infant baptism, and did not differ from the Catholic Church in respect to the age fit to receive baptism.

Irenæus, Epiphanius, Philistratus, Austin, Theodoret, wrote catalogues of all the sects and sorts of Christians which they knew or had ever heard of; but none of them make mention of any that denied infant baptism, except those who denied all Scripture, or the greater part of it, or denied water-baptism altogether.

If the Catholics had not baptized infants, and the sectaries had, they would have certainly noted it; they mention differences of much less moment than this is.

Epiphanius mentions a sect called Hieracites, who denied that infants, whether baptized or not, were capable of entering into heaven. So the Petrobrusians (A. D. 1150).

CHAPTER II.

Almost all learned men conclude from what they read in the Fathers, that infant baptism was the universal custom of the Church. Some few, however, whose opinion is much to be respected, have thought that it was not at first the universal practice, but was introduced gradually, but very early. Others have supposed that it was practised from the beginning, but not universally.

Walafridus Strabo (a. d. 849), a Benedictine monk of the abbey of Fulda, in Germany, acknowledges the necessity of baptism for the remission of original guilt; yet considers that it was not used at first in the Church. Wall considers his opinion of little value, and shows that the argument on which it was founded is incorrect in very many particulars.

Ludovicus Vives (A.D. 1492) considers infant baptism not to have been the primitive custom; but he brings forward no proof for his opinion.

Curcelleus considers it to have begun in

the third century; but he produces no quotation for proof, and brings it in to maintain another tenet as paradoxical as this itself is. He denied original sin, and brings as an objection against his own doctrine the custom of baptizing infants for remission of sin; and then he says it was introduced in the third century. Whether this assertion be true, the foregoing pages will determine.

RIGALTIUS speaks doubtingly whether it was the primitive custom or not, but thinks it was practised variously and indifferently from the time of the Apostles to the time of Tertullian.

Bishop Jeremy Taylor, in a treatise called "The Liberty of Prophesying," has collected all the arguments pro and con. He considers infant baptism to have been the custom of the primitive Church, and delivered from the Apostles; and he declares anti-pædobaptism to be an error. Nevertheless, the Bishop has set forth so elaborate a system of arguments which make against infant baptism, that he is thought to have said more for the cause of the anti-pædobaptists than they ever said for themselves. But Dr. Hammond soon answered and refuted his arguments,

⁹ He is generally thought to have written this treatise with a political intention, to divide the adversaries of the

and Bishop Taylor himself also did the same. After all, the Bishop appears, by his later works, to be in the number of those who considered infant baptism to have been practised in primitive times, but not universally. Grotius and Thorndike were of the same opinion.

BISHOP BARLOW (A. D. 1656) thought infant baptism was introduced in the second or third century, but afterwards changed his opinion.

Dr. FIELD speaks of infant baptism as having been from the first the practice of the Church; the reason and necessity of which is contained in Holy Scripture, though the rite itself is not there expressly stated.

F. Garnier, a Jesuit, thought that infant baptism could not be proved from Scripture. Garnier's object, in some degree, is to force the Protestants to acknowledge the necessity of tradition in determining points of religion. But in his commentary on Rom. vi. 3, he supposes infant baptism to have been practised from the first.

CAMDEN'S "BRITANNIA" was misquoted by Dr. Holland, as denying infant baptism 10. But

Church of England among themselves, and for that purpose put arguments into the mouths of one sect in order to puzzle the others

¹⁰ Dr. Holland, the translator of Camden's Britannia, has

the font in Bridekirk church, Cumberland, of which Camden is speaking, had carved on it a device which represented a priest dipping a child in the water, and a dove, the emblem of the Holy Ghost, hovering over it, &c.

All the above authorities are pædobaptists, notwithstanding their remarks concerning ancient usage. These are the only writers of note whom Wall knew of, as holding the opinion that infant baptism was not from the beginning, or not universal. All other authorities maintain it to have been the universal and primitive custom, and are of opinion that this is sufficiently proved in the Works of the Fathers.

Most of the learned men who have considered infant baptism to have been either not from the beginning, or not universal, have been led to this conclusion by supposed instances of holy men who had not received baptism till riper years. This is a fair argument, if true; for if many who were sincere Christians and baptized themselves did omit to have their children baptized, though

inserted abundance of his own additions, and among the rest a faney of his own against the antiquity of infant baptism, to which Wall here alludes. Camden had remarked, that adult baptism was not uncommon; and Dr. Holland makes his words to mean that infant baptism was unlawful—a doctrine which Camden never maintained.

upon erroneous grounds, the argument from the general practice is lost. That men of loose lives should omit it does not make against the practice of it, but rather condemns their sin.

Wall remarks, that it is necessary to prove that their parents were baptized themselves at the time their children were born, otherwise the example adduced cannot be valid proof; for many men who had been converted to Christianity, but had not consented to receive baptism, would while in this state have children born, whom they would not bring to a rite which themselves had declined to receive. [See supra, what is said on this point under "Basil."] But Wall, by studying the history of the persons usually referred to, found the objection insufficient, and that all the cases, but one or two, were mistakes, or failed of proof.

The instances commonly adduced are—

Five Emperors: Constantine, Constantius, Gratian and his brother Valentinian II., and Theodosius.

Four persons of the Greek Church: Basil, Gregory Nazianzen, Nectarius, Chrysostom.

Three persons of the Latin Church: Ambrose, Hierome, Austin.

Constantine (a. d. 337) was not born of Christian parents. His father, Constantius

Chlorus, was a heathen, and never embraced Christianity. Constantius certainly favoured Christianity, and Eusebius has spoken in his praise, and hence has arisen the mistake that he was a Christian. Eusebius, at the same time, asserts that Constantine was the *first* emperor baptized and made actually a Christian, and that his mother Helena was a heathen till converted by Constantine himself. Constantine did not become a Christian till after his son

Constantius was born; and, therefore, as was likely, his son Constantius would not be baptized in infancy. The mother of Constantius was not a Christian. She was the daughter of Maximianus Herculeus, one of the most cruel enemies of Christianity.

VALENTINIAN II. was never baptized, being assassinated by Argobastes while St. Ambrose was on his way to baptize him.

Gratian was baptized some time or other in his life, but it is not known at what time. St. Ambrose speaks of his baptism. It cannot be proved whether Valentinian I., the father of Gratian and Valentinian II., was baptized before they were born.

Theodosius. His father was not baptized

¹ Socrates (lib. v. cap. 6,) seems to call his parents Christian; but this is a phrase commonly used in the case of those

till he was twenty-five years old, according to the account given by Orosius.

Basil. There is no proof that he was not baptized in infancy. Amphilochus's Life of Basil, from which Danvers quoted, is a forgery, and some of the passages are unfairly quoted. No confidence can be placed in the story of Vicentius, that he was baptized in Jordan by Maximus, Bishop of Jerusalem. Baronius, Bellarmine, Jewel, Osiander, &c., reject the story. Nazianzen seems to refer to his baptism in infancy. Basil, in his own practice, used infant baptism.

Gregory Nazianzen was not baptized in infancy, though born of Christian parents. This is the only instance which Wall can find of a baptized person leaving his children unbaptized. But this depends upon an obscure point of chronology. Yet it would seem that he was twenty-five years of age when his father was baptized. There is some uncertainty on this point: it turns on a single word $(\Im v \sigma \iota \omega v)$. But Wall does not consider this example of much weight, because his father was a man of weak judgment. At the most it is but the instance of one man's practice. It is probably in compliance with this his father's

whose parents became Christians any time before their death, though they were not so at the time their children were born. practice that Gregory Nazianzen advises the delay of baptism till three years of age. His sister Gorgonia and brother Cæsarius were certainly adults when baptized.

NECTARIUS was baptized only a few days before he was made Bishop of Constantinople. It is not known who his parents were, much less whether they were Christians.

JOHN CHRYSOSTOM. Ancient historians say that his parents were heathens at the time of his birth. His father died while he was a child, and John was baptized before his mother ³. Grotius declares his father to have been a Christian, but without any proof or authority.

AMBROSE was baptized but a short time before he was made Bishop of Milan. There is no proof that his parents were Christians at the time of his birth. His own words, that "he was not brought up in the bosom of the Church," imply that his parents were then heathens⁴.

HIEROME. There is no proof that he was not baptized in infancy. The expression, that he

³ His mother (Anthusa) allowed him to attend the lectures of Libanius, a heathen master of rhetoric. This man was a great enemy to Christianity; and it is not probable that the mother who could let her son go to his lectures was at the time a Christian.

⁴ The Life of St. Ambrose by Paulinus is probably a forgery of some late monk. So think Wall and Erasmus.

"took upon him the garment of Christ" at Rome, does not mean (as Erasmus thought) his baptism there, but the garb of a monk—a state which he esteemed very highly. Wall thinks that he was baptized at Stridon, in infancy.

Austin. His father was a heathen when he was born. Austin was thirty-three years of age when he was baptized; and he had been a Manichee and a Deist before he became a Christian⁵.

Monica, the mother of St. Austin, is adduced as an example of adult baptism; but it is not known whether she was born of Christian parents and baptized in infancy, or born of heathen and baptized in mature age.

Adeodatus, who was born while his father was a Manichee, was baptized the same day as his father.

⁵ St. Austin has said, that he never heard or knew of any Christian who was an anti-pædobaptist. Therefore neither his father nor mother were Christians. St. Austin's own words assure us that his father did not believe in Christ when he was born. His mother, Monica, if a Christian in belief, (for it is uncertain whether she was baptized,) could do nothing against the will of an imperious and choleric husband, such as St. Austin describes his father to be; and baptism was not in those days a thing which could be done in parlour or bedchamber, but was a public rite, attended by much solemn ceremony. Wall compares his case to that of Timothy, who, as his father was a Greek, though his mother was a Jewess, had not received circumcision in infancy.

So much for these examples, which the antipædobaptists adduce. Little dependence can be given them; and as little use can the antipædobaptists derive from the misquotation which Danvers has made from Bede's Ecclesiastical History (lib. ii. c. 2), from which they would prove that the ancient Britons did not practise infant baptism. The Britons held certain rites and ceremonies peculiar to their own Church; but Austin, when he came over to England in A. D. 600 to convert the Angles, attempted to introduce the customs of the Roman Church: but having failed in this point, he proposed three things for their acceptance—one of which was, that they should "perform the office of baptizing according to the custom of the holy Roman Church and the Apostolic Church." This the Britons refused. Fabian's Chronicle, copying from Bede, has omitted the words, "according to the manner of the Roman Church," and this omission makes the sentence run thus-"that ye give Christendom to the children." Danvers having lighted on this passage in Fabian, makes infant baptism to have been unknown in England till A. D. 600, which is a great mistake. Pelagius, who was a Briton, maintains the contrary, when he says, "he never heard of any Christian who denied infant baptism." Neither can any argument be derived from the practice of the Donatists and the Novatians, for they did not deny the validity of infant baptism, but practised it. But they considered baptism administered by the Church Catholic so impure, that it required to be repeated. So the Arians⁶.

⁶ The child of the Arian Emperor Valens was baptized.

CHAPTER III.

St. Austin remarks, that all who do receive the Holy Scriptures of the Old and New Testament do acknowledge infant baptism for the remission of sin, and that those only denied water-baptism who denied generally the Holy Scriptures, as the Manichees and Valentinians.

Quintilla, a woman (A. D. 200), preached at Carthage, that faith was sufficient without waterbaptism. The same doctrine was held by the Messalians (A. D. 360), a sect which was given to raptures and revelations. So the Seleucians and Hermians.

The Marcionists have run into the opposite extreme, and allowed three baptisms each for remission of sins.

Certain Muscovites and Abassenes have been found to baptize themselves on Epiphany—not as a sacrament, but a memorial of Christ's baptism in Jordan.

⁷ Tertullian wrote his Treatise on Baptism to put a stop to this heresy.

The question of re-baptization is connected with the validity of baptism by a corrupt or heretical Church. And the party, whether belonging to the Catholic or a schismatical Church, which administered the rite the second time, pleaded that the former baptism, given by (what they considered) a corrupt Church or by heretical clergy, was not valid or effectual; and that the person so baptized had in reality not received that sacrament, and that to baptize such a person again was not re-baptization.

It is to be remarked, that no Church or sect of the Church questioned the validity of infant baptism. This was universally allowed. The question of heretical baptism was for a long time a bone of contention in the Church Catholic. In Cyprian's time the Churches of Africa, Egypt, and many in Asia, and one of the Apostolic Canons, enjoin a new administration of the rite, the former being invalid. The Church of Rome ⁸, and of Europe generally,

⁸ Stephen, Bp. of Rome, contended against Cyprian; but Firmilian, Bp. of Cappadocia, Dionysius, Bp. of Alexandria, and Tertullian, are on the side of Cyprian, and consider baptism given by heretics null and void. But Leo I. (Λ. D. 440), Gregory I. (Λ. D. 600), Council of Trullo (Λ. D. 691), allow it to be valid. Gregory Nazianzen and Austin allow all baptism in the name of the Trinity to be valid.

allowed it to be valid, but required the laying on of hands by a Catholic bishop to make it complete. It came at last to be a standing rule, that those who had been baptized in the name of the Trinity had received true baptism, and might not be baptized again. For some remarks on the doctrine of the Trinity, see Appendix VI.

Hooker (Eccles. Pol. v. 62) remarks, that Tertullian and Novatus re-baptized those baptized by the Church Catholic, as being no true baptism.

The Donatists re-baptized, because they considered baptism given by unworthy ministers to be no baptism.

Anabaptists re-baptize because infant baptism is unscriptural.

⁹ The Paulianists were excepted from this rule; for though in administering baptism they used the names of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, yet they meant by them so different a thing from what the Catholic Church understood, that they were judged not to be baptized into the right faith.

CHAPTER IV.

ALL ancient Christians (without the exception of one man) do interpret John iii. 5 of baptism. Among the Fathers we may mention Justin Martyr, Cyprian, Ambrose, Augustin, Tertullian, Basil, Hierome—authorities of themselves sufficient to decide the question. But, notwithstanding this "cloud of witnesses," Calvin introduced another interpretation; and, by abandoning this text, he has given opportunity to the anti-pædobaptists to deny its force as evidence. Yet Calvin allowed infant baptism and the necessity of baptism for salvation; he held it was not to be neglected, but was obligatory on all Christians, and necessary both necessitate præcepti and necessitate medii, i. e. both because of Christ's command, and because it was the appointed means and instrument to make men Christians. Only he held that God's hand is not so tied that He cannot save without it. The Church has ever held that baptism is God's ordinary rule of salvation. The Church of England uses the text as the ground for infant baptism; and St. Austin thought that, but for it, Pelagius would have denied infant baptism.

All the ancient Fathers do interpret "the kingdom of heaven" in this passage to mean "the kingdom of glory hereafter in heaven;" but some modern divines have chosen to suppose that it means "the Church, or dispensation of the Messiah:" among these Bishop Burnet may be reckoned, who so interprets it, although he grants that without baptism a man cannot ordinarily be saved, and that the Fathers understand by it the kingdom of glory.

Wall suggests the following reasons, which convinced him that the passage means a future state of glory.

- (a) All ancient expositions and Fathers, both Greek and Latin, do so understand it.
- (b) The new interpretation is shown by Mr. Walker to have been invented by the anti-pædobaptists to serve a purpose.
- (c) In ver. 3 the words "cannot see" are, in ver. 5, "cannot enter;" now if "kingdom of heaven" mean the Church on earth, a man may see it even though he be not baptized; and the most wicked men may be admitted, and continue in communion, if they conceal their wickedness.
 - (d) Our Saviour would not have introduced

the text in so solemn a manner as "Verily, verily," &c. if He had meant nothing more than a temporal kingdom. ""Regeneration" is used by St. Austin (says Wall) as another word for 'baptized' or christened." This is the old sense of the words, and in this sense it is used by the Church of England. If it be objected that it is not easy to conceive how an infant can be born anew of the Spirit, as well as of water, since he is not capable of any operations of the Spirit on his will, Wall remarks, that it is owned not only by all other Christians that the Holy Ghost, besides the office of converting the heart, does seal and apply the pardon of sin and the other promises of the covenant, but also by the antipædobaptists, Danvers and Tombes, that the Spirit of Christ is given and applied to infants.

The ancients did think that the words were peremptory, and declared the absolute necessity of baptism for salvation; yet that God, in some extraordinary cases, dispensed with His own law. The Fathers agree in excepting:

1. Martyrs; their martyrdom being to them a baptism of blood. This opinion was owned by Tertullian, Cyprian, Cyril, Fulgentius, Austin, Gennadius, and it coincides with Matt. x. 39 and xx. 22.

2. Those converts ' who had arrived at some degree of belief and confession in Christ, and had fully resolved to be baptized, but missed it by accident and not through carelessness or neglect. Some of the ancients thought such men went not to heaven, but to a third or middle state, as Gregory Nazianzen, Gregory Nyssen; others, as Austin, Ambrose, that they went to heaven.

St. Austin seems to give a satisfactory reason for these exceptions, and he quotes the instance of the thief on the cross. He supposes that faith, and, at least, the intention to receive baptism, are necessary to salvation; and that where the external sacrament of water cannot be received through some unavoidable accident, faith will be allowed in its stead.

But all the Fathers agree, that where there is neither faith nor the outward rite, entrance into heaven will not be granted; and hence they universally declare, that infants dying unbaptized

¹ In such men faith and the intention of baptism were thought to be sufficient: so Austin, Gregory Nazianzen. Where baptism was missed through neglect, or unwillingness to give up the indulgence of lust, the Fathers held out no hope. Tertullian, Ambrose, Gregory Nazianzen, Austin, &c. were of this opinion. And it appears from the sermons of Basil, Gregory Nazianzen, Gregory Nyssen, Chrysostom, and others, that they spoke continually against this practice.

² Tertullian and Gregory Nazianzen, who recommended

do miss of heaven. But they do not agree as to what state is allotted to them. Some thought there was a third or middle state appointed for them: some thought they were cast into hell.

Gregory Nazianzen, the Greek Church generally, Pelagius³, the Schoolmen (A. D. 1250), allow a middle state for them.

HILARY seems to think that they are not eternally lost.

VINCENTIUS (A. D. 420) thought they went to heaven; but quickly recanted.

The Latin Church thought they are eternally lost: and St. Austin, although he has hopes for converts dying unbaptized, has no hopes for infants dying unbaptized.

If infants dying unbaptized are excluded from heaven, the next question is, are they in punishment? and what is the degree of their condemnation?

For the first four centuries it was thought their punishment would be very mild, and preferable to no existence at all. This was Austin's opinion. After these times the opinion became much more rigid and severe.

delay of baptism, do nevertheless own, that "without baptism there is no salvation for any one."

³ Pelagius's opinion was that children were baptized not for eternal life, but for admission into the kingdom of heaven.

FULGENTIUS (A. D. 510) declared their utter condemnation to fire; and

GREGORY I. (A. D. 600) held the same opinion.

Anselm held a moderate punishment; so did the

Church of Rome about A. D. 1050.

THOMAS AQUINAS and THE SCHOOLMEN held a place of Hades, which they called *limbus puer-orum*, where they would be in no other condemnation than the loss of the sight of heaven ⁴. So ALEXANDER DE ALES and Innocent I. (A. D. 1200); and the Council of Florence (A. D. 1440).

Gregorius Ariminensis tried to revive the opinion of Fulgentius, but found no followers.

The opinion of no positive punishment, or a very mild one, at length so prevailed, that the 5th Council of Trent (A. D. 1546) was very nearly anathematizing all who held the contrary opinion. They would thus have condemned their pope, Gregory I.

The LUTHERANS held that the punishment for original guilt was hell fire.

Some, however, held that infants dying un-

⁴ Pana damni, non pana sensús—loss of the sight of God and of heaven, not actual torment.

baptized went to heaven: but this opinion is not supported by the Fathers; and the Scriptures are silent upon the subject, or rather seem opposed to it. The Church of England leaves them to the uncovenanted mercies of God. It determines nothing concerning them, except that it forbids them *Christian* burial; but this is because they have not been admitted into the visible Church by baptism, and must not be taken as declaring the opinion of the Church on this point.

Those who thought they went to heaven are: Hincmarus, Archbishop of Rheims (A. D. 860); Vincentius, who soon recanted.

THE SCHOOLMEN allowed this hope to infants born dead.

Vossius quotes some passages out of St. Austin, St. Bernard, Petrus Blesensis, Hugo de Sancto Victore, as supporting the opinion of their admission into heaven; but Vossius is mistaken, for the passages refer to adults desiring baptism but missing it by accident.

Wickliffe would not define any thing in their case, but would leave their destiny to the mercies of God, and has hopes of their being saved; but in case they are condemned, he thought then their punishment would not be loss only of heaven, but sensible punishment.

The LOLLARDS and HUSSITES (15th century) appear to have hopes for them, and that God will accept the faithful desire of the parents to have them baptized. Cassander quotes some doctors of the Romish Church, as Gerson, Biel, Cajetan, as having an inclination to this opinion, and expressing it as far as they dared. As the ancients thought that the personal desire of an adult would be allowed instead of the actual receiving of the rite, so Protestants, since the Reformation, have thought that the desire of the parent or sponsors to have the child baptized would not be unheeded by God. This is Wall's own opinion: and he remarks that the most learned divines in the Church of England hold this opinion, but speak moderately, rather not determining the negative than asserting it absolutely, as Wickliffe, Archbishop Laud, Whitgift. It is the refusal of the rite which they look upon as the refusal of the covenant. But the Lutherans lay more stress on the actual rite, and allow it to be administered by a layman 5 rather than not at all.

Calvinists allow baptism to be necessary, not only by God's command, but as God's or-

⁵ In extraordinary cases, baptism by a layman is allowed by Tertullian and Richard Hooker. The Calvinists hold that nothing can justify lay baptism.

dinary means of salvation; but they think, also, that the children of *godly* parents dying unbaptized (provided it do not happen by neglect or contumacy) will be saved. They refuse to baptize the children of ungodly parents ⁶.

Of the anti-pædobaptists, some deny the necessity of baptism altogether; some allow it as a necessary condition for entering into covenant; others think that their state will vary on account of the decrees of election and reprobation.

Infants baptized, dying before they commit actual sin, are undoubtedly saved. This opinion is held by the Fathers and the Church of England, and the Predestinarians of the first four centuries, as Austin, Prosper, Fulgentius, &c. They thought that if a child was baptized when it died, it was manifest that it was elect; or put it thus, those infants which were predestinated were brought by God's providence to baptism. But certain other Predestinarians, since that time, have thought that some are so reprobated by the eternal decree of God, that though they

⁶ The Church of England would give baptism to the children of Jews or infidels with *sufficient sponsors*.

The Calvinists found their opinion on a mistaken interpretation of 1 Cor. vii. 14.

be baptized and die without having done actual sin, yet they will be damned. But all, whether Predestinarians or semi-Pelagians, agree that infants dying unbaptized miss heaven.

CHAPTER V.

It is proved undoubtedly, that between A.D. 400 and A.D. 1000, infant baptism did prevail as the common custom. The doubt concerning the practice lies in the first four hundred years; but during that time the only Fathers who seem opposed to it are Tertullian and Gregory Naziauzen, who would defer it, the former, till danger of sinning from lust is past; the latter, till three years of age: but, in cases of extremity, they would have it administered to infants.

There are no pretences against infant baptism since A.D. 400 till the time of the Waldenses, but have been proved mistakes. Bruno of Angiers and Berengarius (A.D. 1050) are said to have been opposed to infant baptism, but this is very uncertain; and Guitmund, an opponent of Berengarius, acquits him of denying it, and at the same time states that the doctrine is supported by ancient testimony and universal practice. It is probable that these men (as did the Waldenses) denied that baptism conferred grace

ex opere operato, which would have been sufficient to have occasioned the report. here enters into a history of the Waldenses, because it was much agitated in his time whether they used infant baptism or not. Several societies of men began in the twelfth century to make a figure in the world. They differed from one another in many points, but all agreed in denouncing the Romish corruptions. The general name given these men was Waldenses. Wall distinguishes the sects of the Waldenses by the names of Berengarians, Cathari, Petrobrusians, Albigenses, and Arnoldists, &c. Wall allows that there is much uncertainty with regard to their practice, and much calumny and misrepresentation made concerning their opinions by those who have written their history. These historians were Romanists, and their bitter hostility against the Waldenses has given a colour to their histories. It is well known that the Waldenses exposed and opposed papistical abuses, and denounced transubstantiation, extreme unction, worshipping of images, and all the other corruptions of the Roman Church. Some writers have consequently represented them as lewd, turbulent men; others, as men of good And these monkish writers have charged them, among other heterodox doctrine, with denying, some baptism generally; others,

infant baptism 7. But it is probable that the Waldenses, being a generic term applied to all the various sects which were opposed to popish doctrines, the whole have suffered for the ill reputation and evil doings of a part or sect of them. In this way some Manichees have been saddled on them; and certain Runcarians and Beghards, who said that Lucifer made the world. But with regard to their practice of infant baptism, it is probable that some adopted it and other sects rejected it. That many sects of them practised it is proved from this, that authors who diligently collected and recorded their erroneous opinions, mention nothing about their denying infant baptism. The Waldenses practised it; but the Albigenses and Petrobrusians, the Cathari, Popelicans, Apostolici, The Waldenses of Piedmont See did not (A. D. 1530) certainly were accustomed to practise it, and several of their old confessions acknowledge it. These were by far the larger part of those who were called by the general name Waldenses. Peter Bruis and Henry (A. D. 1126) were the first who set up a sect

⁷ Vicecomes, a learned monk, has recorded that Luther, Calvin, and Beza, were adversaries to infant baptism! ex hoc uno disce ownes.

⁸ The Albigenses were founded chiefly in the south of France; the Waldenses in the north of Italy and the valleys of the Alps and Piedmont.

denying infant baptism. They were men of low birth and worse morals. They were both in holy orders. Peter held a small living, out of which he was turned for some misdemeanour. Henry deserted his monastery. They then began to preach their heresies in Gascony and Toulouse, denied infant baptism, and declared that infants, whether baptized or not, could not be saved. In 1170 some of their Gascon converts came to England, but were discountenanced.

The Lateran Council, under Innocent II. (A. D. 1139), and another, under Innocent III. (A. D. 1215), were held to establish the doctrine of baptism in general, and particularly that of infants. These things, Wall remarks, evince that there were some about the twelfth and thirteenth centuries who denied all baptism, and others denied particularly infant baptism, among those men who are called Waldenses.

Every Christian Church does now practise infant baptism, as the Church of England, the Greek Church, the Churches of Muscovy, of Georgia and Circassia ⁹, of Armenia ¹, of Rome.

⁹ The Churches of Georgia and Circassia had been founded by missionaries from Constantinople about A. D. 330, but Wall describes them as being ignorant, and that Christianity was almost lost among them.

¹ The Church of Armenia and the Maronites gave the eucharist to infants.

The Maronites and some Christians discovered (A. D. 1500) at St. Thomas, on the Coast of Malabar, baptized males on the fortieth day, and females on the eightieth ² day. The same custom prevails among the Abassenes, and Cophti of Egypt.

² This was the time appointed by the Levitical Law for the purification of the mother. (Lev. xii.)

CHAPTER VI.

Wall having remarked that no national Church rejects infant baptism, and that there are only some sects, and those of modern date and few in number, who do, proceeds to trace the rise of the anti-pædobaptists, and it may be as well to notice it here, as it shows with what a worthy company the idea originated, and was supported. It was preached in Gascony by Peter Bruis and Henry, who, by the history Wall gives of them, were "certain lewd fellows of the baser sort "." Germany it was preached by men equally turbulent and seditious. When Martin Luther had set on foot the Reformation in Saxony and Germany in 1517, one Nicholas Storck and Thomas Munzer and Baltazar Hobmeier, in A. D. 1522, preached that infant baptism was a corruption which must also be corrected: Luther was

³ Whether anti-pædobaptism was handed downfrom the time of the Petrobrusians or not is uncertain. They are not heard of during the interval between Peter Bruis (A. D. 1260), and Luther (A. D. 1520).

horrified, and protested against them. These men, by preaching against the rich and noble, and by persuading the lower orders that they were unlawfully oppressed, were soon followed by flocks of discontented boors, who excited insurrection and much disturbance; they defied the lawful authority of the magistrates. The disorderly army thus collected, and which those who excited it could not control, committed great ravages, especially on the estates of the rich. They treasonably seized Munster (A. D. 1534), and in that city pretended to revelations and prophecies. They practised many enormities and cruelties, as polygamy, plundering, &c. From this place they were driven out by the regular troops, and dispersed into the Low Countries. In Upper Germany they found no favour: both Romanists and Protestants disowned them and wrote against them. Those who had retired into the Belgic provinces endeavoured to seize on Amsterdam (A. D. 1535), but they were quickly put down by the magistrates, and their leader, John Geles, was slain. One Battenburg began a second time the sedition at Munster, A. D. 1536.

Menno, a countryman of Friezeland, is a famous anti-pædobaptist; from him were named the sect of the Minnists in Holland. He con-

fessed that infant baptism was practised in the Apostles' time, but was introduced by false Apostles. Menno was a man of quiet temper, and protested against the seditious practices of those of Munster and of Batenburg. The Minnists taught that the kingdom of Christ must be set up by patience and meekness. They affect a plain garb like Quakers, deny original guilt, deny that Christ took flesh of the Virgin Mary, but from heaven. They think that it is possible to live without sin; that the soul after death sleeps till the resurrection. They are found chiefly in Holland. Other Minnists in Poland are Socinians, others are Arians*.

Some Dutch anabaptists came to England in the reign of Henry VIII. (A. D. 1533), at which time the denial of infant baptism was unknown in England. John Frith, in A. D. 1533, speaks of anti-pædobaptism as a new thing in England, and of about twelve years' standing in Germany and Holland.

The first anabaptists came to England in two ships, after their failure to seize Amsterdam, under John Geles. In A.D. 1535 ten anabaptists were burnt as heretics and seditious. Danvers would maintain that the Lollards were

⁴ The Synod of Dort (A. D. 1618) condemned the "horrid and execrable blasphemies of Sociaus and the Anabaptists."

anti-pædobaptists, but he is mistaken; they only held that infants dying unbaptized might nevertheless be saved.

In the year following (A.D. 1536) both houses of convocation take notice of its rise in Germany and Holland, and of certain irreverent sayings which were beginning to be handed among the people of England concerning baptism, and pass decrees against it. These precautions show that if this false doctrine was not prevalent, yet there was some apprehension concerning it. In the time of Elizabeth they seem to have been suppressed in England, Germany, France, Scotland, Denmark, and Sweden; indeed, their opinions had not yet taken any root in England, nor had it many converts till the rebellion in A. D. 1642. They were encouraged by Oliver Cromwell, and became very numerous during the Rebellion, and were as popular as the "Independents,"-so much so, that, at the restoration of Charles II., when the prayer-book was reviewed, an office for adult baptism was added. After the Restoration, the numbers of the anabaptists decreased, many returned to the Church⁵, and had their children baptized.

⁵ When this opinion first began to increase, those who adopted it did not proceed to renounce the Communion of the Church. They held it sufficient to declare their sentiments

Wall represents the anabaptists of his own time, (i. e. the reign of Queen Anne,) as orderly and peaceful dissenters, yet hostile to the Church; and he recounts their tenets, for which see Appendix VII.

Anti-pædobaptists in Poland must reckon among their number Socinus and his nephew Faustus (A. D. 1550); they were expelled by public decree from Poland, Bohemia, and Moravia; they abound in Hungary and Transylvania; they are chiefly Socinians.

against infant baptism, and keep back their children from it. In 1645, Tombes declared separation to be the fault of the men, and not of the principles of anti-pædobaptism; and at this date they were as a body in communion with the established Church. They separated under Cromwell, and still continue in separation.

CHAPTER VII.

The rites and ceremonies attending baptism in the ancient Church were these: adults spent some time in fasting and praying before they received baptism,—the Church fasted and prayed with them. This is mentioned by Justin Martyr and Tertullian; and this is the great reason why baptism was administered at Easter, and the forty days preceding Easter were appointed at Lent for fasting and for preparing and instructing the catechumens previous to admission into the covenant.

The ordinary manner of baptizing was immersion or dipping, but in cases of sickness affusion or pouring on water was allowed. Before the Christians had churches, they baptized in rivers, ponds, &c. This is mentioned by Tertullian,

¹ Novatian had received clinical baptism, and this the ancient Church considered a sufficient reason to exclude him from being made bishop. This was about A. D. 220, and it shows that the custom of the early Church was not to allow any one who had been privately baptized to be admitted to holy orders. They supposed that such a person came not willingly, but from necessity, but never disputed the validity of such baptism.

and is seen in the baptism of the eunuch by St. Philip, the baptisms of John in Jordan; when they had built churches, they had the baptistery, which was a large reservoir of water, into which many might go at the same time. Into this the converts went naked 2, and the priest dipped their heads three times 3 under water, at each immersion pronouncing a name of the Trinity. But since trine immersion is not enjoined by Christ, the Church does not consider its use absolutely necessary; and Gregory (A. D. 590) writes to the Church in Spain that three immersions represent the three Persons in the Trinity, and one immersion the one substance in the Godhead.

Affusion in clinical baptism was used both in the Church and by several sects, as appears from a letter 'written by St. Cyprian to Magnus, concerning Novatian's baptism. St. Lawrence, the martyr (A. D. 259), baptized with a pitcher

² Wall remarks that this was customary in Muscovy in his own time.

³ Tertullian uses this as an argument against Praxeas, who held but one person in the Trinity. Hierome, Basil, Tertullian, and Chrysostom, upheld the trine immersion by ancient custom and universal practice.

⁴ St. Cyprian, in this letter, allows the validity of clinical baptism, and he refers to Ezek. xxxvi. 25, Numb. xix. 13, viii. 7.

of water. Basilides was baptized in prison (A. d. d. 230). The jailor, at Philippi, and "all his " (Acts xvi. 33). These are cases of affusion. Gennadius (A.d. 495) speaks of both immersion and affusion being used indifferently in France. Thomas Aquinas (A.d. 1255) speaks of immersion being commonly used in Italy, but also of affusion.

Immersion ⁶ is more natural in warm climates, yet it was commonly used in cold climates. It was common in England, as we find mentioned in the records of a convocation in the reign of Henry VIII. Dipping was left off first in France, and affusion became common about the thirteenth century; water was poured on thrice. Immersion and affusion are mentioned by a Council at Angiers ⁷ (A. d. 1275) as being used indifferently. A Synod at Langres (A. d. 1404) mentions pouring only; it was done with a ladle, and was not mere sprinkling. Sprinkling in this way, with the right hand, the child being held in the left arm, is mentioned in the agenda of the

⁵ Wall might have added the baptism of Cornelius at Cæsarea, and of St. Paul at Damaseus, which were most probably by affusion.

⁶ Immersion represented in a more lively way a burial by baptism unto Christ.

 $[\]bar{\tau}$ This Council, the Synod of Langres, and the Council at Cologne (a. d. 1536), mention trine in mersion.

Church of Mentz by Sebastian. The custom of trine immersion is also mentioned. Affusion was afterwards introduced into Italy about A. D. 1420, into Germany about A. D. 1550, into Spain, and last of all into England.

In England, as early as A. D. 816, some priests tried to introduce affusion, but were rejected by the Church.

Lyndewode, who had lived in France with Henry V., and was Dean of the Arches in that reign (A. D. 1422), speaks of immersion and affusion as being in reality indifferent, and governed rather by the custom of the Church than by any other respect. However, the liturgies of England do all along enjoin immersion, without mentioning affusion. The Manuale ad usum Sarum, printed A. D. 1530, the treatise of John Frith on baptism, A.D. 1533, speak of trine immersion; and in the Book of Common Prayer, put forth in A. D. 1549, the order stands thus, "shall dip it in the water thrice." But another edition, put forth A. D. 1552, omits the word "thrice." Watson, the Romish Bishop of Lincoln in Queen Mary's reign, mentions dipping, but does not think it necessary that it should be done thrice; he allows affusion only in cases of peril and necessity. Affusion was becoming more common in the reign of Elizabeth; yet dipping was still used in the reigns of James I.

and Charles I., and Wall had dipped a child himself. The privilege of baptism by affusion to sick children was beginning to be abused; ladies first claimed it, then the common people, and when those who fled to Germany in Queen Mary's reign brought back with them the fashion of sprinkling, the practice of dipping began rapidly to decline. Calvin, in Geneva, had enjoined affusion, which might be done either once or thrice, and Dr. Whitaker, Regius Professor at Cambridge, gave it his sanction. The Directory (A. D. 1644) had the font changed to a bason, thus effectually preventing immersion; but at the Restoration dipping was re-established. Prior to the Restoration the rubric ordered that the priest was to dip, unless there was an allegation made that the child was weak, and unable to bear it. After the Restoration the order was, not to dip it unless it was alleged that the child was strong enough to bear it. Wall considers this best adapted to our climate, and he remarks that immersion had gone out of use by the parents not asserting that the child can bear it, by bringing it dressed up, and by the smallness of the fonts. But many learned men pleaded for its restoration, as Mede, Jeremy Taylor, Rogers, Walker, Towerson, Whitby,—and Sir John Floyer, physician, considered it not only safe, but useful to the health. The Greek

Church still use immersion, says Wall, but it is the Latin Church, and those subject to Rome, who have more generally adopted affusion.

Though the English did not receive this custom till after the decay of popery, yet they have since received it from such neighbouring nations as had begun it in the times of the pope's power. But those Christian Churches that never acknowledged the pope's dominion ever did and do continue to use the primitive custom.

The Churches in Thrace, Servia, Bulgaria, Walachia, Russia, and Muscovy, use immersion in cold water. At Samos, in A. D. 1440, they used warm water.

There were no anti-pædobaptists in England till some time after *sprinkling* was used; and Wall attributes their rise to the discontinuance of dipping, rather than disagreement about age.

Tertullian, Chrysostom, Basil, Cyprian, and Rufinus, speak of the sign of the cross in baptism.

Barnabas, Tertullian, and Hierome, speak of a little milk and honey being given to persons immediately after baptism. There is no later mention of this than A.D. 380; the custom bore allusion to "a land flowing with milk and honey," as if by baptism they were brought to

that land. This custom was used also by the Marcionists.

Gregory Nazianzen, Cyril, and Optatus, speak of the albs, or white robes, put on persons just baptized. This is not mentioned by the earliest writers.

There were two anointings: one with oil, which was all over the body, used just before immersion, mentioned by Cyril and Chrysostom; another after baptism, called the chrism, made of rich ointments or balsam, mentioned by Irenæus, Tertullian⁸, Innocent, Cyprian, and Council of Laodicæa, A.D. 367. The parts of the body anointed with the chrism were not in all Churches the same, but the forehead was universally one part. None but a bishop in the Roman Church might put the chrism on the forehead; a presbyter might on the breast, and, in case of long absence of the bishop, on the forehead.

Imposition of hands by the bishop if the per-

⁸ Tertullian remarks that Aaron was anointed by Moses, and that Christ means anointed.

The first mention of this oil is, that Irenæus speaks of its use by the Valentinian heretics, A.D. 167, who esteemed it "a type of that sweetness which surpasses all things;" but it is plain that it was also used generally by the Church Catholic about the same time.

son was an adult was customary. As a general rule, a presbyter could not confirm, a deacon never; but a presbyter might in cases of extremity, and when the bishop was delayed in coming; this was allowed by the Council of Eliberis, A.D. 305, and the first Council of Toledo, and is mentioned by Ambrose in his Comment on Eph. iv.

This imposition of hands and anointing was, by the Church of Rome, given to those who had been baptized by schismatics and come over to the Church.

The anointing, the trine immersion, and the honey and milk, were customary among the Jews in baptizing a proselyte, whether infant or adult; from them the Christians probably derived the custom. They are not enjoined in Scripture.

A custom used at baptism was the "holy kiss" mentioned by Fidus. St. Austin speaks of interrogatories used at baptism.

The most usual times for administering baptism were Easter or Whitsuntide. Gregory Nazianzen speaks also of Epiphany. In cases of extremity any time was allowed.

CHAPTER VIII.

The most important part of the administration of baptism was the profession of faith. This was made by adults by their own mouth; by infants, by their sponsors; and in no case was this personal or vicarious profession dispensed with.

This profession was of two sorts, relating to the general duties of a Christian, viz. 1. To renounce wickedness; 2. To have faith and obedience.

1. Pliny, in his letter "De Christianis," and Justin Martyr, speak of this profession. Some Fathers have recorded the words used: thus

Tertullian, "We renounce the devil, his pomp and angels."

Origen, "We renounce the devil and his works;" and again, "his pomp, his works, his services, his pleasures."

Cyril gives the form used at Jerusalem, "I renounce thee, O Satan! and all thy works, and all thy pomp, and all thy services."

Chrysostom at Antioch, "I renounce thee,

O Satan! and thy pomp, and thy services, and angels."

Cyprian calls it "renouncing the devil and the world."

The requiring this profession was called *exorcising*, or putting on oath.

2. Profession of faith was at first according to the form of creed used in each particular Church. No copy of any of the ancient creeds has survived; some clauses have been left, but no entire form remains. The earliest is the public one drawn up at Nice, A.D. 325. In the oldest books, the articles of faith are found scattered up and down, and not collected into any short summary or form.

The earliest form of creed was, probably, simply, "I believe in the Father, and in the Son, and in the Holy Ghost." This is all that is gathered out of Justin Martyr. The creeds stated by Irenæus and Tertullian somewhat resemble the Apostles' Creed. Ambrose, Origen, and Tertullian speak of a creed delivered down from the Apostles. Other forms are found in Cyprian, Cyril, Gregory Thaumaturgus; they treat of different points concerning the Trinity. The Creeds spoken of by these Fathers are rather a concise account and statement of the faith held by the Christian Church, and the

writers of them do not say that these were the very forms of creed by which the interrogatories were put. Tertullian mentions expressly that the custom was for the baptized person "to answer some few words more than those which our Saviour in the Gospel has enjoined." Clauses were added to the creeds, as heretics obscured or perverted the doctrine concerning any person in the Trinity. These clauses were not in every Church the same in words, but they agreed in substance. Belief in the "Church Catholic¹" is found in the most ancient creeds, and was recited at baptism.

The most ancient form of creed established publicly is the NICENE, A.D. 325. It is acknowledged by the Council of Constantinople, A.D. 381, to be the oldest. During the interval between the Council of Nice and of Constantinople the Macedonian heresy had sprung up, which denied the Holy Ghost to be God and the Giver of life, but asserted Him to be a creature and a ministering Spirit. And for forty years during this interval the Roman emperors had been Arians. They had forced upon the Church

¹ Belief in the Church Catholic meant, "I am of no sect or schism, but belong to the communion of the Church." Cyprian considered Novatian baptism invalid, because it could not profess the true Catholic Church.

Arian bishops and Arian creeds. Some Churches, however, still persisted during this time in adhering to the form put forth by the Council of Nice. But on the death of Valens, the Church again assembled from the east and west at Constantinople, A.D. 381, and made no delay in opposing the Arian heresy, and re-establishing the Nicene Creed. This council formed a second edition of that creed, and added clauses to meet these heresies. They published the form which we now call the Nicene Creed.

The creed, as drawn up by the Council of Nice, was founded on others already existing; thus Eusebius offered what he had been taught by the Church of Cæsarea. The creed of Alexander (Bishop of Alexandria) is expressed strongly against the Arians², and includes points which Arius had omitted in his form of creed, and in which he was unsound. But neither the creed of Eusebius, or Alexander, are to be supposed to be the form used by their Churches, but a statement in their own words of the faith they had been taught.

The Greek (or Eastern) Church required

² Arius held that there was a time when Christ was not; that He was made out of nothing; that He was not very and true God; nor of the same substance as the Father; and differed from a human being only in being more highly endowed by God.

baptismal profession by the Nicene Creed. The Council at Ephesus (A.D. 43i), the Council at Chalcedon (A.D. 451), the edict of Justinian (A.D. 451), and the Emperor Zeno (A.D. 476), decreed that it should be so used. Cyril wrote a catechism, which embodied this creed, for the use of the Church of Jerusalem.

Where the Nicene Creed was thus required, no Arian could be baptized by the Church, and thus Gregory Nazianzen was not singular in refusing to baptize Arians.

The Roman Church received and owned the Nicene Creed, and renounced all who would not own it, but they did not adopt it for the baptismal profession; they appear to have had a form of their own—but it cannot be known what form of creed they used in those times. During all the contest about creeds which occurred in the years between the Councils of Nice and Constantinople, we hear nothing said of the creed used by that Church.

Prior to A.D. 400, we have no record what form they used. It is first mentioned by Rufinus, a presbyter of the Church of Aquileia. But by certain additions a made between this date and A.D. 600, it came into its present form.

³ As, "the descent into hell," "everlasting life."

The origin of the name, Apostles' Creed, Wall accounts for thus: the Roman was the only Church in the West founded by an Apostle, and consequently it was called the Apostolic Church, and its bishop was called the apostolic bishop, its see the apostolic see, &c.; and in this way its creed was called the Apostolic Creed.

Thus the Nicene Creed is older than the Apostles' Creed, and is acknowledged and enjoined by the four famous councils; and Wall gives it the preference, as stating more distinctly the divinity of the Son and Holy Ghost.

The Athanasian Creed embodies clauses against the Arians, Nestorians, and Eutychians, but was never used for profession of faith at baptism.

Adults made profession twice; once in the congregation, some time before the day of baptism, and again immediately before going into the water. This is mentioned by Tertullian, Austin, and Hierome. Infants made profession only once, and then sponsors answered in the name of the child.

The Eucharist was given immediately after

⁴ The Greek Church receives the Apostles' Creed; and thus the two Churches (the Western and Eastern) show their unity of faith, by each receiving the other's creed into their liturgies.

baptism to adults, and, in some Churches, to infants. Children four or five years old (but not mere infants) sometimes received it, in Cyprian's time, in the African Church. In the Western Church, Innocent I. (A. D. 417) first enjoined it to be given to infants, and after him Austin⁵, Mercator (A. D. 435), Gregory I. (A. D. 600); and the custom was continued in the Western Church till the doctrine of transubstantiation sprang up in the 11th century, when it was discontinued, and, indeed, the Council of Trent (A. D. 1560) actually anathematized ⁶ any one who declared it to be necessary for salvation.

The Greek (Eastern) Church began to give the Eucharist to infants some time between A. D. 500 and A. D. 1000, and probably derived the custom from the Church of Rome, but not

The Greek Church have the custom of mixing the bread with the wine, and put into the child's mouth a drop or two

⁵ St. Austin more often quotes the authority of Innocent than he does of Holy Scripture in support of this doctrine.

⁶ They thus condemned their pope Innocent.

⁷ The manner in which this was done in the Church of Rome, we learn from Hugo de Sancto Victore, was this: the priest dipped his finger in the chalice, and then put it into the child's mouth for it to suck. After some time this was left off, and, instead of it, they gave the newly baptized infant some drops of wine not consecrated.

allowing the doctrine of transubstantiation, they still continued to use it in Wall's time.

The anti-pædobaptists would destroy the weight of antiquity by an argument drawn from the custom of giving the Eucharist to infants. They argue thus: The ancients gave the Eucharist, as well as baptism, to infants. All Christians consider the first was an error; therefore their opinion is to be disregarded with respect to the latter. But this is not correct, for Christians do not all consider the first to be an error, and many do still use it, as the Eastern Church, Armenians, Muscovites, &c. Again: the custom of giving the Eucharist to infants was not so early nor so general as baptism; and Tertullian, who pleaded against the custom of baptizing infants, except under circumstances of danger and necessity, would much rather have objected to their partaking of the Eucharist, if any such custom had in his time existed. Again: the grounds for baptism and the Eucharist are not the same—the one is initiatory; the passover, which is the type of the other, was not understood to belong to the youngest infants. However, the anti-pædobaptists cannot make any use of this argument till they

of the mixture quickly after baptism. After which he receives it no more till the age of discretion.

have granted that the ancient Christians did baptize infants, and that pædobaptism is no new thing. No Church gave the holy communion to any person not baptized.

CHAPTER IX.

The publication of Wall's History soon provoked a reply from a Mr. Gale, an anabaptist. His treatise is entitled "Reflections," &c.; but from the reproaches, untruths, and declamations which it contains, Wall suggests that its title should have been Reproaches. Gale's objections are inserted here: 1st, because they are published with Wall's History; and 2nd, because Gale, having raised every objection and cavil he possibly could against the arguments and passages from the Fathers whom Wall had cited, and having been answered and refuted by Wall, the authorities of Wall may be more certainly relied on. Gale's work compelled Wall to review his references, and to assure himself of their correctness; and in his Reply or Defence of his History, he shows the fallacy of Gale's arguments and the fidelity of his own quotations. We may, consequently, receive with the greatest confidence all that Wall says on the subject. Nevertheless, Gale represents both the history which Wall gives of infant baptism as disingenuous, based on false translations and misrepresented passages; and the character which Wall gives of the anti-pædobaptist, Gale complains of as being unfair, and that he has saddled on the whole sect the disorders of a few baser members, of whom they cannot rid themselves, and that he has raked up old stories and scandals to defame them.

Gale's Reflections are a series of thirteen letters. In the first letter he sets out with a tirade against Wall as unfair, ignorant, and wilfully deceiving, &c.; as a man who has distorted Scripture, the Fathers, and common sense; and he cannot forgive Wall for scolding one Le Clerc and Grotius, the former of whom was something between an Arian and Socinian. complains that Wall has called the anabaptists schismatics, without understanding or defining what schism is; that Wall has aimed at a reputation of wisdom by criticizing great and learned men, and by introducing histories foreign to his subject, as the history of Pelagianism, &c. After all the complaints which Gale makes against Wall, we are astonished to find him distorting the meaning of Wall's words, by omitting parts of a sentence entirely, perverting the drift of the passage, and by misapplying

others; he vilifies all who are opposed to him, whether Fathers, rabbins, or more modern divines. His favourite authorities are Grotius and Le Clerc. Now Grotius had undertaken to show that it was a matter indifferent whether infants were baptized or not, and he accordingly has collected arguments pro and con. He has a manifest inclination to anti-pædobaptism, and in many of his remarks he is quite wrong. Wall instances some of his errors: (a) He thought that St. Austin, before heated with the Pelagian controversy, wrote nothing against infants dying unbaptized; (b) that the Council of Neocæsarea was against infant baptism; (c) that adult baptism was customary with the Greek Church; (d) that no earlier council than that of Carthage (A. D. 418) speaks of infant baptism; (e) that Gregory Nazianzen speaks of infants as incapable of baptism. Wall, in his history, has shown wherein Grotius has erred, and has corrected his mistakes.

In Letter II. Gale still complains of Wall, and proceeds to settle the question and definition of schism, which, together with Wall's "Dissuasive from Schism," will be given below, in order that the subject of baptism may not be interrupted.

In Letter III. Gale remarks the whole con-

troversy between pædobaptists and anabaptists comes under two heads; viz. the age for baptism, and the manner of administering it.

The evidence of Holy Scripture Gale takes to be decisive and explicit. It requires dipping 8, and that the recipients should be adults who have been first instructed and believe. This he considers to be Christ's institution and the practice of the Apostles, and that affusion, or sprinkling, is contrary to this institution and practice. He thinks it better not to baptize at all, and to suffer the person to die without receiving the outward rite, hoping the intention to receive it will avail and be more useful than such an invalid administration as affusion. He thinks no baptism valid except the person be plunged under water, for this is the only meaning he can get out of $\beta a\pi\tau i \zeta \omega$. He first of all considers $\beta a\pi \tau i \zeta \omega$ to be synonymous with $\beta a\pi \tau \omega$: and, on this supposition, he brings forward innumerable examples (the greater part of which are on $\beta \acute{a}\pi\tau\omega$) to prove his point, and he declares that in no case can he find them to signify to pour or sprinkle, but always to "dip," or its correlative, to "dye," and that all the figurative meanings of the word imply the same.

⁸ Examples: Christ's baptism, John's baptism, the baptism of the eunuch by Philip.

 $Ba\pi\tau i \zeta \omega$, when used synonymously with $\pi\lambda \dot{\nu}\nu\omega$, to wash linen, or $\nu i\pi\tau\omega$, to wash the hands or feet, does still include the idea of dipping; and thus, that $\beta a\pi\tau i \zeta \omega$ is translated by "lavo," is no argument against this sense, but rather implies it.

Wall remarks upon all this, that Gale, instead of showing that $\beta a\pi \tau i \zeta \omega$ means dipping, should have shown that it never means any thing else. Walker has shown that it does mean something else, and Gale has not answered the examples Walker has adduced. Wall considers that some of the examples which Gale has brought forward rather favour the idea of pouring; thus, βαπτίζεσθαι is used by Aristotle in the sense of "to lay under water," when the coast was covered by the coming in of the tide; and thus it means "to put into water" or "put water on:" so the dew which fell on Nebuchadnezzar (Dan. iv. 33). It is to be remarked that Wall himself favours dipping, and considers it the best way of baptizing; all he contends for is, that baptism by affusion is equally valid with baptism by dipping. He contends for the matter used, viz. water; and not for either the quantity or quality. He does not at all like the practice of sprinkling, but condemns it as unwarranted, yet not as invalid.

Wall remarks that the word $\beta\acute{a}\pi\tau\omega$ is never used in Holy Scripture with reference to the sacrament of baptism, and nearly all Gale's instances are of $\beta\acute{a}\pi\tau\omega$, and not $\beta a\pi\tau i\zeta\omega$. He contends that $\beta\acute{a}\pi\tau\omega$ and $\beta a\pi\tau i\zeta\omega$ are not synonymous; and Gale himself, at the conclusion of Letter V., seems to have been under some apprehension, and accordingly adduces instances of similar formation, as $\beta\lambda\acute{\nu}\omega$ $\beta\lambda\acute{\nu}\zeta\omega$, $\delta\rho\kappa\acute{\nu}\omega$ $\delta\rho\kappa\acute{\nu}\zeta\omega$, $\mathring{a}\lambda\acute{\nu}\gamma\omega$ $\mathring{a}\lambda\acute{\nu}\gamma\acute{\nu}\zeta\omega$, $\mathring{\nu}\ell\omega$, \mathring

Letter IV.—Gale contends that $\beta a\pi\tau i\zeta \omega$, in its primary and general sense is *immergo*; so it is explained by Vossius, Stephanus, Constantine, Petavius, and Grotius⁹; that it always in Holy Scripture means to dip,—sometimes all over, sometimes partially, yet always to dip. Gale finds twenty-five places in the Old Testament ¹ where the word occurs; out of these it undoubtedly means in eighteen places to dip, the other seven are uncertain. In Ecclus. xxxiv. 25, it seems to signify "to sprinkle;" but purification for touch-

⁹ Grotius cites John iii. 23, Acts viii. 38, Rom. vi. 3, 4, Col. ii. 12.

¹ Wall remarks, of these twenty-five four only have the word $\beta a\pi \tau i \zeta \omega$, the rest have $\beta a\pi \tau \omega$. Of these four, Isaiah xxi. 4, is metaphorical, and therefore cannot be urged on either side. Another is 2 Kings v. Judith xii. 7, the fountain at which Judith washed herself was in the camp. The fourth is Ecclus-xxxiv. 25, which Gale allows to be uncertain.

ing a dead body was performed by sprinkling and dipping (Numb. xix. 18, Lev. xi. 32); and that only sprinkling is mentioned is agreeable with what occurs in other passages, as Numb. xix. 9, viii. 7, xxxi. 23, and Lev. xxii. 6, where washing only is mentioned, and the sprinkling omitted. The Mahometans in such cases wash all over. Again, in Lev. xiv. 6, "As for the living bird, he shall take it, . . and shall dip them and the living bird in the blood of the bird that was killed over the running water,"the Hebrew word here used certainly means to dip,-probably all over,-for it was customary to mix the blood with water; if the bird was not dipped all over, yet it was dipped partially, in the same way as we speak of dipping a pen in ink; and Gale gives as the rule for such interpretation, "what is true of any part may be said of the whole complexly, though not of every part of the whole separately." This is an unfortunate concession for Gale to make, as by it he virtually has yielded the argument. He now only can contend for the word,—he has conceded the thing itself.

Out of the New Testament, Wall had adduced four passages, showing that $\beta a\pi \tau i \zeta \omega$ does not necessarily mean to dip. He had compared Luke xi. 38 with Mark vii. 5 and 2 Kings iii. 11,

and from them concludes that $\beta a\pi \tau i \zeta \omega$ means any kind of washing ², and in these places by pouring on water ³. Against this Gale brings three objections: first, that during the long interval between the time of Elijah and of Christ the custom had not probably been changed; secondly, that the literal translation of the passage requires for ⁴, and not on, the hands of Elijah; thirdly, that priests washed their hands and feet by dipping (See John iii. 5, 2 Chron. iv. 8).

Mark vii. 4. Gale asserts that those who came from market washed by dipping; that the pots certainly were washed by dipping; and he quotes Grotius as averring that those who came from market washed by dipping; and Gale cites Lev. xxii. 6⁵, and a passage from Tertullian, showing that they immersed the whole body; and he thinks that the context requires this meaning,

² Dr. Pocock had proved this from the Rabbins and Maimonides; but Gale contends that the authority of the Rabbins is worthless, yet, in Mark vii. 4, he claims Maimonides as on his side, and cites Dr. Hammond as being of the same opinion.

³ In Luke vii. 44, the water was poured on the feet. The Greek is, "δωρ ἐπὶ τοὺς πόδας μου οὐκ ἔδωκας.

⁴ The Septuagint has ἐπὶ χεῖρας, and the Latin version super.

⁵ This passage refers to the Jewish *priests* only, and not to all the people. Gale does not name the place from which he quotes the authority of Tertullian.

for the third verse mentions that they washed their hands ordinarily up to the wrist or elbow, $(\pi \nu \gamma \mu \tilde{\eta},)$ and when they came from the market they used the larger purification of washing the whole body 6 . He also gives another construction to the passage; he considers $\ddot{\sigma}\tau a\nu \ \ddot{\epsilon}\lambda \theta \omega \sigma a\nu \dot{\epsilon}\lambda \theta \omega \sigma a\nu \dot{\epsilon}\lambda \dot{\epsilon$

Wall asks whether salt, honey, milk, &c., when bought at market, were dipped.

Heb. ix. 10. Gale considers Wall to be begging the question, when he interprets διάφοροι βαπτισμοὶ to mean washings by dipping or sprinkling, the usual manner in purification. He finds Grotius and Whitby on his side, and contends that the English translation is too loose, and that the Greek words require "divers dippings." But Wall maintains the present translation, and replies that διάφοροι means washings of "divers"

⁶ Dr. Pocock says they did not wash the whole body; and Wall considers that the washings of pots, &c., which our Saviour here condemns, had nothing to do with the ceremonial purification appointed by Moses, and mentions Lev. xi. 32.

sorts," i. e. whether by dipping or sprinkling, and does not refer to the number of times.

Matt. xxvi. 23 7. Wall shows from hence that he did not dip his whole hand. This, Gale says, is nothing to the purpose; he cares not whether it was done wholly or partially, all that he contends for is that it means to dip.

Gale allows that sacramental washing is expressed by other words besides $\beta a\pi\tau i \zeta \omega$, as, $\lambda o i \omega$, $\lambda o \nu \tau \rho \delta v$, $\pi \lambda i \nu \omega$, $\beta a \pi \tau \omega$, but maintains that these words thus used always imply dipping. But in this Gale is mistaken, for to "dip" is the proper sense of $\beta a \pi \tau \omega$, and not of $\beta a \pi \tau i \zeta \omega$; and even if $\beta a \pi \tau i \zeta \omega$ means to dip, yet Constantine, and Stephens, (Gale's own authorities for the contrary,) allow also "to wash by pouring or rubbing;" and Origen has a passage where the word means "to pour water on a sacrifice."

In the passage, from 2 Kings v., concerning Naaman, "to wash" occurs four times,—in the first three it is $\lambda o \dot{\nu} \omega$, in the other $\beta a \pi \tau i \zeta \omega$,—thus showing $\lambda o \dot{\nu} \omega$ and $\beta a \pi \tau i \zeta \omega$ to be synonymous; $\nu i \pi \tau \omega$ is used in the same way (Matt. xv. 2).

St. Paul says to baptize is by the washing of water (Ephes. v. 26, Titus iii. 5, Acts ii.)

⁷ Wall had omitted this text in his second edition, because the word used is $i\mu\beta\dot{\alpha}\psi\alpha_{\rm S}$, and not $\beta\alpha\pi\tau i\zeta\omega$.

Wall considers that $\pi \nu \gamma \mu \tilde{\eta}$, in Mark vii. 3, is rightly translated "often"; the sense is natural; "the Jews have a superstitious opinion that they must not eat without washing their hands often, and they place religion in this, and particularly when they come from market they hold that they must wash before they eat."

The Mahometans, before going to prayers, do wash their faces, hands, and feet, and, upon greater pollutions, their whole body. So did the Jews on similar occasions, by God's command; and our Saviour would not blame them for this. But neither Jews nor Mahometans did as Gale would make out that they did.

Letter V.—Gale, having said what little he was able, to overthrow the texts which he attacks in Letter IV., claims a right of appealing to classical authors ⁸ about the meaning of $\beta a\pi\tau i\zeta \omega$, and maintains that the evidence he has thus derived is fair and conclusive. He contends that even if the meaning of $\beta a\pi\tau i\zeta \omega$ is sometimes ambiguous, yet, when applied to baptism, it means to dip, and to dip only; and in support of this he ap-

peals to the practice of St. John the Baptist and

⁸ Wall remarks that the classical authors from whom Gale quotes were unacquainted with the sacraments, and the words used in Holy Scripture are often used in a peculiar signification.

the Apostles,—to such expressions as "buried 1 with him in baptism," (Col. ii. 12, Rom. vi. 3,4,) to the practice of the early Church, which enjoined trine immersion, to the opinion of learned men, as Bishop Beveridge, Casaubon, Le Clerc, Whitby, from all which authorities he collects that baptism by dipping is the legitimate way of administering the rite, and that immersion and affusion were not used indifferently, as Wall would pretend. But he forgets that Wall did not make opposition to the use of immersion. Just the contrary; he upholds the fitness of dipping where the person can bear it, but maintains that other modes of administering the water are equally valid, and allows the pouring on of water where the person cannot bear dipping. This he found to be the custom of the early Church, and it was adopted as a matter necessary in cases of ill health, where the person was in danger of death, in cases of haste where little water was found, or in cold climates. Wall earnestly supports the practice of immersion, and he declares that most of the clergy were of

¹ Wall remarks that this expression and the practice of the early Christians do not limit the sense of baptism. They indicate that immersion was the ordinary way, but no more; and in the passage here referred to (Coloss. ii. 11) baptism is as much connected with Christian circumcision as with burial.

his opinion on this subject; but the habit of affusion had become so confirmed since the Revolution of the Puritans that it was impossible to remove people's prejudice, and restore the primitive practice. Affusion was perhaps used in the case of the jailor at Philippi, and of Cornelius at Cæsarea, and St. Paul, when baptized by Ananias at Damascus. There is nothing in the history to lead one to suppose they were dipped, -just the contrary. Affusion was given in the early Church in cases of clinical baptism, and that no mention is made of it directly in Holy Scripture is because there is no instance of a person baptized in a cold climate or in sickness; yet the early Fathers so speak of it as if it had the sanction of Apostolic practice. Cyprian wrote an Epistle to Magnus on this subject, in which he urges that baptism is the dedication of the person to God and to the Gospel, and the washing away of sin; and the efficacy of baptism consisted, not in the quantity of water used, but in using water as the outward part of the rite [together with the appointed words of declaration]. Bishop Beveridge considered the reasoning of St. Cyprian in this Epistle to be quite conclusive, and to prove satisfactorily the validity of baptism by affusion. But Gale is not so easily convinced, and does not hesitate to

declare St Cyprian's letter to be futile and farfetched; and he triumphs loudly that this Father does not argue from Christ's institution, or Apostolic order or practice, nor from the sense of $\beta a\pi \tau i \zeta \omega$, but from types and allusions in the law and the prophets; and he quotes with delight the case of Novatian, who was debarred from holy orders on account of his clinical baptism. He claims Cornelius, the Bishop of Rome, who rejected him, as being opposed to baptism by affusion; but the true story gives another reason; it is this,-Novatian had been a heathen, and the occasion which brought about his conversion to Christianity was his fears that he was possessed by a devil, and being helped by the prayers of some Christian friends, he desired to be baptized before he died. He received that holy sacrament accordingly in his bed by affusion. Afterwards recovering, he lived evilly and not in accordance with his baptismal profession. Now the stress of the objection of Cornelius concerning his baptism is evidently grounded on the evil temper of the man's heart and his ill life afterwards, and not on the manner of his baptism. He had received baptism in apprehension and necessity,this was the bar against him.

Gale would have it that affusion was allowed on the principle that God would have mercy and not sacrifice, i. e. that positive duties must, under certain circumstances, give way to moral duties; and that there is no record of its practice earlier than A.D. 250. But Wall remarks that this is an early date for any such quotation concerning the ceremonial parts of religion; the few books that are more ancient being taken up with matters of faith, practice, and exhortations to constancy, &c. The Church was too harassed by persecution to be able to discuss the quantity of water necessary to be used; they might as well have raised a question about the quality of the water, and declared no baptism valid but such as was given in "pure" water, Heb. x. 22; or, in a similar question concerning the Lord's supper, have declared its elements inefficacious unless "unleavened" bread was used. The bread no doubt ought to be fine and white, but who will say that in case of necessity a coarser sort is not sufficient? or who would dispute the quantity to be eaten? The essence of the symbols as to a religious use does not consist in the quantity and quality, but in the material used. Our Saviour seems to have used in his command concerning both sacraments, "Eat, drink, wash;" that He might not determine any particular which may in some cases happen to be impracticable.

All that Wall contends for, is the validity of baptism administered by affusion.

Of sprinkling, Wall speaks with abhorrence and doubt. It was introduced, he says, from Geneva.

The Church form of baptism evidently contemplates dipping, for it has the words, "now to be baptized herein," not "herewith;" and again, "water wherein the person is baptized," not "wherewith;" and Wall is so much an advocate for immersion, that he would have the water warmed; and he complains much against the fashion in which nurses dress up the infants, and the display affected at a christening, as obstacles to the use of immersion.

Letter VI.—Wall had argued in support of the indirect proof of infant baptism which Holy Scripture supplies, from those two very important points, original sin, and the analogy of circumcision.

Natural corruption needs cleansing and forgiveness; and Christians in all ages have understood baptism to be the appointed means of this remission, and that it has this effect upon infants, whom Holy Scripture and experience show to have that corruption in them as well as others. This has been discoursed upon largely by St. Austin, in the Controversy with the Pelagians; and he has argued from the practice of infant baptism to original sin as the basis for it, and no one has refuted his books.

So likewise Holy Scripture speaks of our baptism as being Christian circumcision, or the circumcision of Christ. (Col. ii. 11.) And as circumcision belongs to infants as a seal of entrance into covenant with God, and baptism has the effect of circumcision, we must infer that baptism belongs to infants. This is no new opinion, but has been held from the earliest times.

The next argument is derived from the practice of the Jews, on which Christian baptism was based in form at least, and the practice of the early Christians. This latter is the subjectmatter of Wall's history, and he has searched among the Fathers of the first four centuries to discover what their practice was; and to any one but Mr. Gale the evidence is conclusive that infant baptism was practised from the very first, and for remission in infants of original guilt. Gale however obstinately resists all these arguments. He will not allow analogy or deduction from plain texts to be of any force in deciding the question; he requires a plain and peremptory command. Adult baptism, he says, is mentioned in Scripture, and the very silence of Scripture

on infant baptism is tacitly acknowledging it to be unlawful; and indeed he pretends to find in Letter VII. that infants are positively excluded from receiving it. Now, the silence of Scripture is the very argument which Wall uses to show that Christ did not change the custom which was already existing, but intended to include in the general terms in which the commission is given all (even infants) to whom the Jews were accustomed to give baptism. Mr. Emlyn¹, a Socinian, has inferred, that because Scripture does not mention the baptizing of infants, therefore they are not to be baptized, but are by birth holy and clean; and thus Emlyn would have baptism given to new converts, and none others. But to return, Gale contends further, that though Christ

¹ Mr. Emlyn had argued from the Jewish custom of baptizing only the first converts, and considering all their posterity clean by virtue of this one baptism; and he supports his opinion on Rom. xi. 16, "If the root be holy, so are the branches;" but this is opposed to such texts as those which say, "a clean thing cannot come out of an unclean," Job xiv. 4, and that "which is born of the flesh is flesh." He argues on the idea that Christ did not change the custom He found already existing, and this was the Jewish custom. But Wall remarks that Christ did change much of the rite. It was to be given to all who would enter the kingdom of heaven; it was to be in the name of the Holy Trinity, and to "all nations."

does not forbid infant baptism, it does not follow that He therefore enjoined it; and he quotes a maxim of Tertullian, "Negat Scriptura quod non notat." And thus Gale, having satisfied himself that Scripture is on his side, will not allow any evidence from the Fathers to be adduced; for it is tradition, says he, and tradition is popish, and gives the Romanists a handle against the Church and the Reformation, and is opposed to Art. VI. Now, all this is very false reasoning, and shows a determination not to be convinced. It indicates much ignorance of the Scriptures and the Fathers-both of which he handles very roughly and unceremoniously; and to crown it all, he charges Wall himself with allowing that there is no Scripture proof for infant baptism. Wall is very angry at being taxed with such a slander and falsehood, and wonders how the man can make such an assertion who has exhausted nearly half a book in refuting (as well as he can) Wall's Scripture proofs. Wall complains of the wilful misrepre sentations Gale makes of his "History," and that he affixes to his "History" any stories he chooses to forge, then descants on his own forgeries, and triumphs in refuting them as if they had been Wall's arguments.

Wall's object in his "History" is not to

prove infant baptism from Scripture, but to write a history of the practice of the early Christians. In doing this he was obliged occasionally, and by the way, in order to elucidate the work, to introduce passages from Scripture on the subject, such as Matt. xxviii. 19; John iii. 3. 5; Col. ii. 11, 12; Mark x. 13; Deut. xxix. 10; 1 Cor. vii. 14. The Scripture proofs he had stated in his "Conference." (See Appendix I. and II.) But let us see what Wall does grant, and on which Gale makes this barefaced assertion; Wall allows that there is no direct and peremptory command for infant baptism, totidem verbis, but that it is implied in the aggregate word "all nations," and is plainly deducible from Scripture, and consonant with the tenor of the Old Testament, which received infants into covenant with their parents, and is the accomplishment of the "blessing (i.e. covenant) of Abraham which has come upon the Gentiles." The proofs are convincing to those who have the means of studying them, and what the Fathers say on them. Though the arguments against infant baptism are plausible, and might persuade those who have not the opportunity of investigating the subject, yet the proof is sufficient to satisfy the conscience of any honest inquirer, but not to stop the mouth of an undutiful and

irreverent caviller. Wall remarks we must receive with humility and reverence such plainness as God has been pleased to give; and judicious Hooker and Bishop Butler recommend the same course, viz. diligence in searching, weighing, and comparing texts, in order to attain the truth.

Letters VII. and VIII.—Gale brings us in for a long philological treatise on $\mu a \theta \eta \tau \epsilon \acute{\nu} \omega$. He states all the arguments and examples he can remember: and as Wall completely overthrows him, and clears up the Scripture meaning of the word in a satisfactory manner, the strength of the evidence so derived must be our apology for stating at some length what they have to say.

The word μαθητεύω occurs in Christ's commission which He gave the Apostles to baptize. The passage is Matt. xxviii. 19: "Go ye, therefore, and teach (μαθητεύσατε) all nations, baptizing teaching (διδάσκοντες) them to observe," &c. We remark at once two distinct words used for "to teach," thus clearly showing that they differ in meaning. To avoid confusion, Gale shall first state what he has to say, and Wall then reply; and the reader shall draw his own conclusion. We would only premise, that Gale would make out that teaching must go before discipleship,—Wall, that teaching is implied in μαθητεύω, but may follow discipleship.

Gale considers that this text determines the question almost conclusively against the pædobaptist, for the words of the institution of baptism require such conditions as infants are unable to fulfil, viz., faith and teaching, previous to baptism. It is an evasion, he thinks, to suppose that the words refer to adults only, and that previous teaching is necessary to them alone, but that infants are excepted. If teaching is required in any one case it is indispensable in all, for the commission makes no distinction. The very phrase, "all nations," necessarily excludes infants; otherwise it would also include infidels, unclean livers², &c. It does not mean "all of all nations," i. e. " every person of every nation;" but "all" is a generic term, meaning "the most part;" as, e. g. "Then went out unto him Jerusalem, and all Judea, and all the region," &c. (Matt. iii. 5.) It means only adults.

Now μαθητεύω means, primarily, "to teach," and secondarily, "to make disciples or proselytes by teaching." In whatever sense it is taken, it always includes teaching; and this holds good of this verb, even in its neuter³ sense when followed

² These were the very persons Christ came to call, and sent his Apostles to convert and baptize.

³ This Wall denies, and brings examples to the contrary. Wall has the advantage.

by the dative case. "To teach," is its essential signification, as is seen from its etymology from μαθητής, μανθάνω, and from all the compounds and derivatives implying "to teach;" and he quotes Grotius, Burnet, Whitby, Rigaltius, Le Clerc, as being of the same opinion. The idea that terminations in εύω must be translated by the substantive and sum is an error (as, $\kappa \epsilon \lambda \epsilon \dot{\nu} \omega$, βουλεύω). Even if μαθητεύω signified "to proselytize," without implying teaching, the εἰς τὸ ονομα which follows shows that a previous profession of faith is required into which they are baptized, for which reason, baptism is called σφραγίς πίστεως (See Rom. vi. 3, Gal. iii. 27). That it means "to teach" is further shown by ἀκούω and παιδεύω being used as synonymous and equivalent to it. From all this, Gale concludes that μαθητεύω must necessarily exclude persons not capable of being taught—μαθητής can be said of such only as are capable of being taught; and he ridicules Wall's idea of the analogy, "entering one's name as a scholar," or "binding apprentice," and is very angry with Wall for referring the word "disciples" in Acts xv. 10, to infants—upon whom the yoke (N. B. the yoke is circumcision) would fall. He con-

⁴ Wall objects to these words as proving nothing.

tends, from verses 1, 5, and 19, that adults are meant; for the disciples had been taught.

Disciple is "one who is taught;" the Greek word $\mu a \theta \eta \tau \dot{\eta}_{\mathcal{C}}$ signifies the same as discipulus in Latin, which is used by Cicero, Terence, Juvenal, and many others, to mean "one who is taught;" it is used as synonymous with $\dot{\alpha} \kappa \rho o \alpha \tau \dot{\eta}_{\mathcal{C}}$, $\dot{\alpha} \kappa \rho o \dot{\omega} \mu \epsilon \nu o c$, $\dot{\alpha} \kappa o v \sigma \tau \dot{\eta}_{\mathcal{C}}$; and further, disciple and teacher are used as correlatives.

Gale, having quoted largely from classical authors, and recited analogous words, proceeds to find the same meaning of μαθητεύω in the English, Latin, Hebrew, Syriac, Italian, Saxon, &c. versions of the New Testament; in the Fathers, as Origen, Clemens Alexandrinus, Epiphanius, Austin, &c.—in the parallel places of the commission, Acts xiv. 21, Mark xvi. 15, Luke xxiv. 47, Acts x. 42.

Gale brings a goodly array and a bold face, but, unfortunately, his examples do not all hold good. Some are misinterpreted,—in some the passive is mistaken for the active.

Wall goes through Gale's examples, and considers he has not made out a good case.

Concerning "all nations," Wall merely remarks that Dorrington, Baxter, and others, have considered it to include infants.

"No mortal," says Wall, "would think of

denying that $\mu a \theta \eta \tau \epsilon i \omega$ signifies 'to teach,' or make disciples by teaching;" but contends that its *primary* meaning is "to make disciples," its *secondary*, "to teach." It means, to make disciples in order to teach them, and does not necessarily imply any present or precedent teaching. To disciple, and to teach, are notions which accompany one another, but are distinct and may be separated.

Maθητεύω, before our Saviour's time, was always used as a neuter intransitive verb; but St. Matthew's, and after him St. Luke in the Acts, used it in an active transitive sense, with an accusative following it; and all the Fathers have since used it so. From this new usage Wall argues that it has a new and peculiar sense. It certainly is distinct from διδάσκω, the word used in the next verse. The teaching may be subsequent to making disciples, or some time antecedent; for in Acts xxi. 16, and John xxi. 24, persons who had learned long before are called "disciples." The person who in Luke ix. 57, offered himself as a disciple, is called in Matt. viii. 19 "a disciple." Acts xv. 10 cer-

⁵ St. Matthew, however, (xxvii. 57) has, ης καὶ αὐτὸς ἐμαθήτευσε τῷ '1ησοῦ—"who was Jesus' disciple." St. John xix. 38, "Ων μαθητής τοῦ '1ησοῦ—" being a disciple of Jesus."

tainly applies "disciples" to infants-for on them especially the yoke would fall—they would have been included in it at the then time with their fathers; but in succeeding generations it would have fallen on infant children only. For whether they were Jews, the seed of Abraham, or proselytes to them, that received circumcision, it is notorious that all of them received it on these terms, that they and all their male children of eight days old or above were to undergo it. The Jewish believers, who disputed among themselves whether this voke should be laid on the Gentile believers, did practise it in respect to their own children, as appears from Acts xxi. 20, 21: and can any one think that these sticklers for circumcision, mentioned Acts xv. 5, who held it was needful to circumcise these Gentile converts, did not mean that they should circumcise their children? The children are not mentioned, but the nature of the thing plainly implies them. Thus the "yoke" which includes the parents would afterwards especially fall upon the children, if the Jewish custom was retained. But to return: Justin Martyr has, ἐκ παίδων ἐμαθητεύ- $\theta_{\eta\sigma\alpha\nu} \tau_{\tilde{\omega}} X_{\rho\iota\sigma\tau\tilde{\omega}}$; and Eusebius has a phrase which Wall cites, applying $\mu \alpha \theta \eta \tau \eta c$ to persons before they had begun to learn. Dr. Hammond, Bishop Nicholson, Dr. Featly, &c., make $\mu a \Im \eta \tau \epsilon i \omega$ to signify "to proselytize" antecedently to the idea of teaching. Wall shows that this is agreeable to analogy—a man becomes his servant whom he undertakes to serve; a pupil may be so called before he has taken one lesson; an apprentice is so called from the time of his being bound. A Jewish child by circumcision entered into a covenant with God; so, by baptism, Christian infants enter into covenant with Christ. The Jews called an infant "a proselyte, or disciple."

Thus μαθητεύω, though it implies "teaching," does not necessarily require it to be present or precedent. The sense of this word is further elucidated by the meaning of $\mu a \theta \eta \tau \eta c$. $Ma \theta \eta \tau \eta c$ is "a learner," and is used in the New Testament as synonymous—with Christian, (the disciples were first called Christians at Antioch, Acts xi. 26,)—with Χριστοῦ ὄντες, "Whosoever shall give one of these little ones a cup of cold water in the name of a disciple" (εἰς ὄνομα μαθητοῦ), Matt. x. 42; and in Mark ix. 41, "In my name, because ye are Christ's" (ἐν τῶ ὀνόματί μου, ὅτι Χριστοῦ ἐστε—with ἀδελφοὶ, "brethren;"—with αγιοι, "saints," 1 Cor.vii. 14); and infants are made all three, viz. "saints," "brethren," "Christ's," by the Holy Spirit at baptism, and therefore "disciple" is appropriately given to them. St. Paul uses $Ma\theta\eta\tau\eta\dot{\varsigma}$, $X\rho\iota\sigma\tau\iota a\nu\dot{\varsigma}\dot{\varsigma}$, and $X\rho\iota\sigma\tau\dot{\tilde{\upsilon}}\dot{\tilde{\upsilon}}\nu$, as convertible terms.

Thus $\mu \alpha \theta \eta \tau \epsilon \dot{\nu} \omega$ is, "to make a disciple," or, "to make a *Christian*," and this was to be effected by baptism.

Wall remarks that there is no word in Latin equivalent to $\mu\alpha\theta\eta\tau\epsilon\dot{\nu}\omega$. Dr. Hammond translates it "in discipulatum vocare." John iv. 1, has $\mu\alpha\theta\eta\tau\dot{\alpha}\varsigma$ $\pi o\iota\epsilon\tilde{\iota}$ $\kappa\alpha\dot{\iota}$ $\beta\alpha\pi\tau\dot{\iota}\zeta\epsilon\iota$.

Letter IX.—Gale is determined to overthrow the authority of the Rabbins, and to reject their evidence that the Jews baptized as well as circumcised proselytes. He at once denies the custom; but he denies a matter of fact, since it is notorious that the Jews still retained in his own time such a custom of baptizing their proselytes; and it appears by their books that they had it within less than one hundred and fifty years after our Saviour, and they spoke then of it as a custom always had by their nation; and it cannot be conceived they would borrow it from Christians, or use it in imitation of Christ or the Christians, whom they hated; there is also reason to conclude that they derived it from their ancestors as they say they did. Scripture itself speaks of baptism unto Moses. Gale, nothing daunted, contends that if they had such

baptism it was not initiatory, but only purificacation from the blood of circumcision, and thinks he has some of the Rabbins on his side. But they speak of *entering proselytes*, adults, infants, males, *females*, especially in the Misna; and that they instance *female* children excludes at once the idea that it was a purification from circumcision.

Gale is driven to another shift, they are too late, -viz. the Misna, A.D. 210; the Jerusalem Talmud, A.D. 250; Gemara, A.D. 500; and Maimonides, A.D. 1100. But Wall states the Misna to be A.D. 150, in the reign of Antoninus Pius, which, in the scarcity of books which are left us, is an early date for Jewish and Christian writers; and quite sufficient, especially when seconded by so many subsequent testimonies. Philo and Josephus say nothing upon this subject; not because it was not customary, but Philo was taken up with allegorical and philosophical flights; Josephus wrote a history of the origin of the Jews, their kings, their wars, &c., and in such books one cannot reasonably expect to find an account of their rituals, &c. But the Talmud and books of their Rabbins do speak of their ceremonies, and state this matter distinctly; and it is for this reason Gale objects

against their date. However, he has yet another objection, for he is determined to have nothing to do with them; he condemns them as impious, scandalous, and senseless writers; he has collected certain legends in support of what he wishes to prove, and sums up the evidence against them with quoting the condemnation which Christ pronounced upon the traditions of the elders!

Wall allows that there are many whimsical and extravagant stories in the Rabbins; but remarks that Gale has selected his stories not from the reputable Rabbins, but from certain low and blasphemous books, which are no criterion of the Rabbinical works. He does not wish to defend them in this point, but contends, that their evidence as historians in matters of fact is legitimate and satisfactory, especially when many agree in the same assertion. He does not urge the authority as to what the Jews ought to do or believe, or what washing they ought to have observed, but in a question of what they do hold, the proof must be taken from themselves and from their writings

Letter X.—Besides the Jewish writers themselves, Wall had quoted other ancient authors, some heathen, some Christian, who mention the Jewish custom of baptizing proselytes. One was ARRIAN, a philosopher, who lived at Rome. But Gale as usual disputes that he is too late, though he wrote about A.D. 150, and further contends that he alludes only to purifications from legal pollutions; that he confused together Jews and Christians, just as Lucian and Suetonius have done. But Wall replies that all this is mere conjecture; and it is as easy to make an assertion one way as another, especially when the caviller has the impudence to care little what he says, provided it favours his views. The plain words repeated many times by Arrian are, the Jews, and he refers to their baptism for proselytism. Now, if Arrian was too late after Christ to be evidence of this kind of baptism, he must have lived in such a time as the distinction between Jew and Christian had become well understood. However, the matter does not rest on the evidence of Arrian alone, he is but one of many.

Gregory Nazianzen Gale considers too late, and to speak of baptism for purification, and not for initiation. This is easily asserted, and Gale speaks confidently, even though the comparison in the passage quoted from Gregory be purposely made between the baptism of Moses, of John, and of Christ (all of which are plainly initiatory); and though the words themselves do compare two several baptisms of Moses 6, that at Mount Sinai, and that in the cloud and in the sea, which last St. Paul himself speaks of as initiatory baptism, a type of the Christian rite, and laying like obligations on the Jews as the other does on Christians, which is quite a different purpose from that of washings for uncleanness. Wall had also quoted St. Cyprian and St. Basil to the same purpose, and Tertullian and St. Paul (1 Cor. x. 1, 2), to all which Gale says nothing.

Gale asserts that Holy Scripture makes no mention of initiatory baptism, and rejects the evidence of Exod. xix. 10 (see Appendix IX.): and in spite of all Wall has said and collected in his two volumes, Gale says that there is no authentic ancient history which mentions initiatory baptism, and that it is improbable that the Jews had any such ceremony, for St. Paul says they were all baptized to Moses "in the cloud and in the sea," as if there was no other; and he refers to Gregory Nazianzen, who on this passage remarked that the sea typified the water; the cloud, the Spirit: as if, says Gale, this baptism

⁶ The initiatory baptism unto Moses preceded the institution of washings for ceremonial pollutions, &c.

alone corresponded to the Christian baptism: but Gale has omitted half the sentence, because it at once refutes him. "Moses (says Gregory) gave them a baptism, but that was with water only. And before that, they were baptized in the cloud and in the sea." Gale appeals, also, to the words of St. Peter, "The ark in which few were saved;" and remarks that it is strange that St. Peter, when showing the ark to be the type of Christian baptism, should not allude to the ceremony from which our baptism is borrowed. His meaning is, that St. Paul and St. Peter, when treating expressly of Christian baptism, do not intimate that they thought it was derived from any such original: and then Gale says that some deny that the Jews had initiatory baptism, as Justin Martyr, Tertullian, St. Barnabas, Origen, Cyril. But Wall examined the passages Gale referred to in order to prove this position, and finds them of no use to him; they do not deny it, for they do not mention it at all: but what does it avail that they are silent about it, if St. Paul, and other Christian writers, and many of the Jewish writers do mention it? Does it follow that a thing is not mentioned at all by authors, because it is not mentioned at every place where it might have been? or is it any absurdity for the pædobaptists to maintain

that both circumcision and Jewish baptism might be types and forerunners of the Christian sacrament? The other sacrament, the Lord's Supper, was typified by more than one judicial rite; and many of the Fathers, in the same way, speak of baptism being typified in Jewish rites.

Letter XI.—Gale professes greatly to esteem the Fathers, and deems them very good authorities, and faithful in relating what took place in their own Churches; and immediately proceeds to handle them most unceremoniously, cavilling against them; asserting the text of their works to be corrupted, and that as their opinions on doctrines are only their opinions still, and their Churches soon became full of errors and innovations, he intends to use them only so far as suits his own purpose; and declares plainly, that even if they asserted universally the practice and validity of infant baptism, yet he will not allow their evidence. Such is the man who has attacked Wall's history! His Reflections compose nearly the entire third volume of the four in which Wall's History is published.

Gale has charged Wall with omitting the evidence of St. Barnabas, whom he makes to be against infant baptism. But Wall had cited

the passage (vol. ii. ch. ix. § 6); it merely speaks of a little milk and honey which was given to persons baptized, whether infant or adult, and therefore is nothing to the point.

Clement does speak of original guilt, though Gale denies it. Let any one judge, if only from the words quoted by St. Clement: "There is none free from pollution, no, not though his life be but the length of one day."

Letter XII.—Gale disputes whether Justin Martyr and the ancients had any notion of original guilt: but when we remember that Justin was acquainted with Holy Scripture, and Scripture does teach the necessity of baptism for the forgiveness of it, we may suppose that his holding infants to have original sin proves by consequence that he held the need of baptism. But Gale will not allow that original guilt concerns the baptism of infants; and further, disputes the analogy of baptism and circumcision, though he allows spiritual circumcision to be by baptism (baptism being the medium or instrument by which it is received). Did ever any one, says Wall, pretend that the formalis ratio of them is the same; or any more than that the one is to Christians the initiatory rite, instead of the other, which was so to the Jews? We argue that the Scriptures ordering

circumcision to be given to infants as a covenanting and initiating seal, and ordering afterwards baptism to be the covenanting and initiating seal to Christians instead of it, does by consequence order baptism to be given to infants. Spiritual circumcision, says Gale, is to cease to do evilbaptism is merely plunging into water; baptism is of the flesh, but Christian circumcision is of the heart; and Gale quotes Origen, Lactantius, Tertullian, as speaking after this manner. Gale would make baptism (i.e. the outward rite) and the inward gift of the Holy Spirit, to be two things by no means necessarily united; he considers baptism to be a mere outward rite, without any inward grace necessarily accompanying. But the Fathers (including those whom Gale quotes), when speaking of the inward purity, do not deny the outward rite, but speak of baptism as comprehending both, and that the outward ceremony and the purification of the heart may well consist together; purity of heart and life is the chief aim both of circumcision in the Old Testament and of baptism in the New: but this does not hinder but that as circumcision was the external sacrament to impart this purity in the Old, so baptism may be instead of it in the New; and though the Fathers may in many of their sayings express only the comparison between carnal and spiritual circumcision, without mentioning baptism at those places, yet it is sufficient that they, in several other places, do expressly mention it. Justin, after showing that the Jewish types correspond with Christian rites, does mention that Jewish circumcision was the type of the true circumcision which we receive at baptism. That true circumcision is of the heart, does not deny the existence and necessity of the outward ceremony, but only makes the former the chief part. Wall never argued that the washing was the whole, and by itself baptism; though he maintains stoutly that by baptism the recipient is regenerated.

Gale goes on: The Scriptures no where call baptism circumcision, and contends that Col. ii. 11, 12, does not mean baptism, but purity of heart; and then he denies that the ancients call baptism "circumcision without hands." A pretty way, says Wall, of making an assertion in the very face of Scripture and the Fathers. St. Paul, in Col. ii. 11, 12, tells the Christians that they are "circumcised with the circumcision of Christ, being buried with him in baptism." "Made without hands," in the same text, means "without surgical operation," and is explained by "being buried with him in baptism." Basil, Austin, Ambrose, all speak in the

same way; and Origen, Chrysostom, Gregory Nazianzen, Ambrose, speak of baptism as succeeding circumcision.

Gale still fights on: If the parallel between baptism and circumcision holds good, it would require baptism to be given on the eighth day—and not to females; but he forgot the council of Cyprian and Fidus, and that the Gospel has done away with all difference between male and female, &c. Gal. iii. 27, 28.

Gale raises another dispute: he asserts that Justin of could not, and does not call baptism regeneration; for though baptism is the sign or symbol of regeneration, yet it is not itself regeneration. Now neither Justin nor Wall made any such logical identity: but the Fathers do call baptism regeneration, because regeneration is conveyed by baptism, and to distinguish it from repentance and conversion. They use regeneration as excluding all notion of repentance that is not accompanied by water-baptism: thus we meet with such phrases as regeneration of baptism, regeneration by baptism, the baptism of regeneration (Tit. iii. 6), baptism for regene-

⁷ Justin's words are: "We bring them (i.e. the new converts) to the water, and they are regenerated by the same regeneration by which we were regenerated; for they are washed with water in the name of," &c.

ration; and they understand by it the complex notion of the outward act of baptism, conjoined with that grace and mercy of God, whereby He receives the person into a new covenant or new spiritual state. They apply the word regenerated to none but baptized persons.

Irenæus is the first who speaks directly of infant baptism. The others, who preceded him, speak of original guilt and the necessity of baptism to remove it; but Irenæus speaks expressly of "infants regenerated unto God by Christ." But Gale cries out that he is too late, having written about the close of the second century. He claims all the time antecedent to this as yielded to him, because none of the passages before are in express words for infants baptized; but proofs, by such consequences as these afford, possess an advantage over a negative of which there is no proof at all. And a thing which now is, and beyond the memory of any history has been, the practice of the Church of Christ, if it be clearly traced up to Irenæus, and, by obscurer footsteps, further, in the scarcity of books that are left, is rightly concluded (as St. Austin has argued in this very matter) to have been from the beginning. Irenæus had been acquainted with Polycarp, and Polycarp with St. John; and what he says of infants being baptized or regenerated, he does not speak of as a new and controverted thing, but as a known and received practice. Irenæus was a Christian, A. D. 120, and could remember earlier than that day, and had conversed with men of apostolic times.

Gale shifts to another ground: the place is corrupt, and the Latin translation of Irenæus, which alone is extant, is bad, and not to be trusted. The passage, he says, is not genuine, because it contains a glaring error of chronology, making Christ in one place to be 33 æt., and at another, in the same chapter, 50 æt. Wall remarks on the difficulties that ancient authors had to contend with in points of chronology. They had no starting point but the uncertain data of the reigns of kings, consuls, &c. Petavius has attempted to explain the apparent discrepancy; and Wall has shown, in a very long and elaborate argument, that the age of our blessed Lord is full of difficulties and uncertainty. Learned men have much disputed his age (as they have the parents of the Virgin, his brethren, &c.), and that therefore a passage must not for this reason be rejected. Casaubon, Dodwell, and Petavius have asserted the passage to be genuine; and all, or in a manner all, the quotations that have been made by the Latin Fathers from Irenæus, have been taken from

this translation, and have been allowed. It is, indeed, composed in an uncouth Latin style; and the author has adhered very closely to the *Greek idiom*, and tried to render every sentence verbatim—this rather assures us of its fidelity.

Gale next denies that Irenæus by regenerated means baptized, and repeats that baptism is not identical with regeneration, but regeneration in Scripture language is conversion; and so he runs off in the usual Calvinistic notions of regeneration, proving them as well as he can. Regeneration is spiritual, but baptism bodily; and so Gale wants to prove that regeneration is used without signifying or connoting baptism, and that a person may be regenerated without being baptized-which he is unable to do. He forgets that Christ made regeneration to consist of two parts, of an outward sign as well as inward grace-the two go together, and may not be separated; but Gale would make regeneration to be the effect of the Spirit only, and baptism to consist in water only. He identifies it with conversion, in opposition to the doctrine of the Church and the plain language of the Fathers. Our Church clearly teaches that there are two parts in this sacrament, an outward visible sign and an inward spiritual grace; the one being done by men, by Christ's appointment, the other

conferred by his own merciful covenant and promise, contemporaneously with it: so the Fathers take it (see App. X.). So commonly was regeneration applied to baptism, that the Valentinians called their profane baptism * "regeneration."

Gale is determined to hold out to the last: and he would have it that Irenæus calls infancy up to ten years of age; but in this opinion Wall shows that he is quite mistaken. Tertullian and Origen lived at the same time with Irenæus, though he was older than either of them; and they both, though they differ from one another in resolving the question of infant baptism, yet do agree that infants are such "as cannot yet learn nor know Christ, nor whither it is they are brought; when brought to baptism." Origen says: "nuper nati parvuli; ἀρτιγέννητα βρέφη."

Suffer me, says Wall to the anti-pædobaptists, to advise you of one thing. There are some of the Fathers, who happen to say nothing in their books which are left about the baptism of infants, there having not been any dispute about it in their times; and yet they have occasion,

⁸ Their baptism consisted of two parts: the outward element, water; and an inward grace, which they called redemption.

perhaps, by reason of the frequent baptism of adult converts, to speak of the sacrament of baptism in general; and when they do speak of it in general, it is common with them to mention faith and a serious purpose of amendment of life, &c. as necessary for those who are by that sacrament admitted into the Christian covenant. Now it is usual with anti-pædobaptists writers to collect a number of these passages; they pick them out of books in which there is no mention of infant baptism, and would have an unlearned man, who cannot read the authors for himself, conclude from them that those Fathers must have thought baptism of infants impracticable, because they do in those general sentences speak of faith and repentance as requisite for baptism. But those Fathers who are known to maintain infant baptism do, when they speak of baptism generally, speak in the same language, and insist upon the same qualifications; and Wall illustrates this fact by passages from Cyprian, Gregory Nyssen, Basil, Hierome, Cyril, Austin, who were professedly pædobaptists; and, therefore, when we meet with such sayings in the book of some other Father, who perhaps has no occasion in any part of his book to speak of infant baptism, we have not sufficient reasons to conclude that he would not have them baptized,

any more than it can be concluded from similar sayings in Austin and Hierome.

Letter XII.—Gale thinks that in Polyerates, Bishop of Ephesus, A. D. 190, (who calls himself "sixty-five years old in the Lord,") he has an instance against infant baptism. But Wall had considered this instance, and had passed it (as he had also the case of Polycarp) as being indistinct and very uncertain.

Gale supposes that Tertullian objected to infant baptism; and that when he argued for deferring it, it was because the Church was then beginning to introduce it. Now Tertullian does not object to infant baptism any further than this,-he would have baptism delayed, not because it was invalid, but because of its great solemnity, and the solemn obligation to purity and holiness of life which it required. He argues no more against the baptism of infants than against the baptism of unmarried persons, and of those who are likely to sin through lust, &c. In case of danger, he desires baptism to be administered to infants; thereby indicating his sense of its validity: and if the necessity was very urgent, he would have it administered by a layman, that it might not be missed, and that no one might be guilty of the perdition of the person if he died unbaptized.

Gale further supposes that Tertullian, by interpreting "holy," in 1 Cor. vii. 14, to mean "designed for holiness," intends that they are to be baptized at some future time; and then Gale confidently asserts that not one of the Fathers understands this text of baptism. It is as well to hear Gale's own explanation. "Holy," he says, does not mean "washed," "saints," or "baptized," -and would except this one text from the many where ayou is translated "saints," which it is in almost every other place; but as the verb means in Ezek. xxii. 26, "to consecrate," and in Matt. vi. 9, "to hallow," he contends that this text may well mean, "the unbelieving husband has been prevailed on by his wife to forsake his former vices," &c.; and rejects the interpretation of Burnet and Whitby, who refer it to "seminal holiness," i. e., that those who are born of Christian and faithful parents are, by that birth, holy; but he pronounces it to mean "legitimate," as if the proselytism of one party dissolved the tie with the other who did not proselytize, and their offspring became thereby illegitimate.

Concerning Tertullian's opinion, Wall first remarks that he broached many odd and unsound doctrines, and that every catalogue of his works is replete with his paradoxa. That Tertullian's opinion concerning the age of baptism was new is clear, because infant baptism was determined unanimously in the council of Cyprian and Fidus, and St. Austin mentions that he had never heard of any Church or Christian sect which denied it. It is impossible that the general practice of the Church should have been unheard of and unknown.

Tertullian stands alone in his interpretation of 1 Cor. vii. 14. Wall has shown this by passages from Cyprian, Austin, Chrysostom, Ambrose, Hierome, Paulinus, Pelagius, Origen, Gregory Nazianzen, and even Tertullian himself: and Mr. Walker has a book full of quotations, proving that the common use of "sanctified" was "converted and brought to Christianity and baptism," and of "holy" ("aylor) was "Christians," "baptized." There are other places where it means invisible sanctification; but this does not preclude it from having the other meaning likewise. Dr. Hammond has observed that the constant use of the word "saints" in the New Testament is "Christians." Bingham remarks, "the names "ayıoı, ἐκλεκτοὶ, πιστοὶ, occur frequently in ancient ecclesiastical writers, and signify "all Christians generally who are entered into the communion of the Church by baptism."

Wall does not at all like the idea of seminal holiness, as if holiness was hereditary, and God would save the child of a faithful Christian, because it was that man's child; but He would rather it should be saved because it was *Christ's*, dedicated to Him, "and saved for his sake." The holiness of the parent cannot save the child otherwise than it secures its being brought to baptism.

The question put by the Corinthian Church was not whether it was fornication for two such parties, as are mentioned in ver. 14, to cohabit, and whether their children would be bastards; nor does St. Paul answer it as a question about lawfulness or unlawfulness, but as a question of expediency. The whole context shows that the stress is between "believing" and "unbelieving," between "Christian" and "heathen;" and the passage manifestly means an unbelieving wife (or husband) has been converted and brought to Christianity and baptism by the husband (or wife); and does not a Christian wife save her husband by bringing him from infidelity to the true faith? and does not the belief of the parents imply that their children will be baptized into the same faith according to the custom of the Church?

Origen (Gale allows) does speak of infant baptism, but he objects against the works re-

maining that the original text is lost, and only a few translations remain by Ruffinus and Hierome, which latter are not translations, but paraphrases with very extensive interpolations; this is Gale's sentence: but Hierome says himself that he has added nothing, and though he has omitted much that was erroneous, he has retained all that was sound and useful. In the Homily on St. Luke, Hierome had altered nothing. This was the opinion of Erasmus. Hierome had studied Origen's works, and was well acquainted with his opinions, and his authority may consequently be relied on as faithful and sufficient. Daillé, Du Pin, Huetius and others, quote from the translation of Ruffinus, and depend upon them as Origen's sense in the main. Whatever is found in Ruffinus's translation acknowledging original guilt, we may be sure was Origen's, as Ruffinus was inclined to the contrary opinion. Yet the remains in Greek of Origen's works state the doctrine of infant baptism.

Cyprian did practise infant baptism. This Gale allows, but he says it had probably arisen about this time; and he condemns the African Church as being dull and without understanding. And this is all he has got to say. He yields the following ages, considering that whatever they

may happen to affirm is too late; and thus he confines the limit of evidence of the Fathers to the first two hundred and fifty years.

But Wall observes that the fourth and fifth centuries supplied many burning lights, men of research, deep wisdom, and undoubted fidelity, as Eusebius, Athanasius, Basil, Hierome, Chrysostom, Austin, Gregory. These ages are not to be considered corrupt, nor is their testimony to be rejected. The Church during the first three centuries was certainly the purest; persecution did its work in refining and purifying it from its unfaithful members. A persecuted Church held out no temptations from the love of the world to warp men's consciences—the only reward it could offer was martyrdom. In Cyprian's time, persecution was still in energy, and the learned works and pious letters of this Father which remain, make one angry when a prejudiced writer calls him a "dull African," and in the letter in which he speaks of infant baptism, to which Gale alludes, "trifling and empty." It appears, by his books and letters, that Cyprian had communication with the most noted Churches and bishops then in the world. His memory was held in reverence by all the Churches with which he was acquainted.

Concerning the earliest ages, persecution pre-

vented the Christians from writing any thing but defences of the fundamental doctrines of religion. They wrote little about rituals, and of that little still less remains. Wall has quoted what the Fathers of the first three centuries do say, and it is satisfactory and conclusive.

In the fourth century, the world became more Christian and more settled, and accordingly the testimonies became more numerous and full. They do not speak of infant baptism as a new thing, or as needing proof, but as a thing ordinarily known. No council enacted it, or made canons to enforce it. On the contrary, they occasionally instance it, as a thing that had ever been in the Church. Pelagius and St. Austin, we have seen, had heard of no Church which denied it.

The task of refuting the anti-pædobaptists is a modern task. The sect is a modern one; and they have given a modern interpretation to texts of Holy Scripture, which ancient expositors knew not, such as John iii. 5; 1 Cor. vii. 14. If these two texts were read in the ancient sense, which Wall thinks is the true one, the dispute would be at an end. The former one declares baptism to be the ordinary way (not to limit his mercy in case extraordinary) by which God admits men into heaven; and the latter one means, "an

unbelieving husband has been brought to Christianity and baptism by his wife," &c.; and thus they had brought their children also to baptism, and so they had been made Christians and dedicated to Christ; whereas otherwise, while they continued heathens, their children remained unbaptized, and consequently "unclean." Dr. Hammond has retrieved this text from the unnatural glosses of modern expositors.

Wall, determined to investigate this subject thoroughly and impartially, has stated what objections could be urged against the practice of infant baptism. They are as follow:

The reasons against infant baptism are of two sorts.

Those which really have all the force which they seem to have.

Those which are founded on a misunderstanding of some texts of Scripture, but which lose their force when one searches into the original Scriptures, or comprehends the history of the state of religion in the world at the time when the New Testament and books of the ancient Christians were written.

The evidences of the first sort are:

1. It does not appear that the Jewish baptism of infants (according to which the pædobaptists suppose the Apostles were to regulate theirs) was in all respects like that which the Church did practise; for the Jews baptized only proselytes, and not their children, as if the baptism of the first proselyte made all their posterity clean. But this makes nothing for the antipædobaptists, and is as much against them as the pædobaptists; for both acknowledge that every person, whether proselyte or descendant of a proselyte, must be baptized.

2. It is some weakening of the force of this practice, that some (not many, and those none of the most ancient,) gave infants the Eucharist also; for though it is to this day a controverted point between the Western and Eastern Churches, yet it may be urged against the pædobaptists, because they do not use it. If the anti-pædobaptists urge that the Eucharist was given in very early times to infants, they yield at once the practice of infant baptism, for the Eucharist was never given to any one who was not baptized.

3. Tertullian advised baptism to be deferred. But his opinion is of little value, for he had many odd, rash, and heterodox opinions, and at last became a downright heretic. His testimony of facts may, however, be received, and this is on the side of infant baptism.

4. Gregory, the father of Gregory Nazianzen,

about one hundred and fifty years after Tertullian, and in another part of the world, probably practised it; but he seems to have been a man of mean capacities, placed in an obscure place, and not mentioned by any one but the writer of his son's life (six hundred years after). It was not for the son to reflect on his father's conduct. It was, perhaps, out of compliance with his father's practice, that he would have baptism deferred till three years old. But three years of age is really infancy, and therefore this little helps the cause of the anti-pædobaptists.

5. The argument, from the universal consent of antiquity, which is taken from the declaration of St. Austin that he never heard of any Christian who denied infant baptism, is somewhat weakened by this, that Tertullian, two hundred years before, is found to have spoken against it.

So that henceforth that rule must proceed with the exception of one man, viz. Tertullian, who was at last a heretic.

The second sort of evidences against infant baptism are:

1. There are several ancient books that say nothing at all about infant baptism, neither for it, nor against it. But in the first place there was no controversy in the primitive times on the

subject. The practice was not disputed, but universally received, as derived from the Apostles, and warranted by Christ's authority. That this in some degree accounts for the little notice taken of infant baptism in the earliest Fathers. seems borne out by the fact that, as soon as the Pelagian controversy was agitated, we meet with much more frequent notices and fuller statements of the doctrine. And secondly, ancient writers were too much taken up in writing apologies against the slanders of the heathens and Jews, and in encouraging their fellow-Christians to bear persecution, &c., so that a man, instead of wondering that there are no more evidences, will wonder that there are so many. So in the Acts of the Apostles, St. Luke's aim is to give a summary account of the main and principal passages of their lives; and, in a history so short, who can look for any account of what children they baptized? The main business of St. Paul was to preach and not to baptize (2 Cor. i. 17), yet of those baptisms which St. Paul administered, three were of whole households, Acts xvi. 15. 35; 1 Cor. i. 16, such an one, and all his. It might be argued that there is no mention in the Old Testament of a child having been circumcised for six or eight hundred years, yet no one would be so foolish as to deny the institution

or its common practice. The argument of silence in both circumcision and baptism stand on the same footing.

- 2. Irenæus, who is the eldest of the Fathers in whom the pædobaptists find any positive mention of infants being baptized, does not use the word "baptized" but "regenerated;" but it has been already explained sufficiently that these two words are synonymous.
- 3. St. Basil in a certain sermon speaks so, as plainly to suppose that many of his audience were adults, and had been instructed in Christian doctrine, but had not been baptized. This may appear to those who have not studied the work to be against infant baptism. But it shows rather the weakness and corruption of human nature, which prevents a man who has been convinced of the truth of Christianity from receiving baptism, because it would oblige him to abandon his lusts and evil courses. Such men who thus put off their own baptism, would not be likely to bring their children to receive a rite which they had declined. It is such St. Basil is addressing.
- 4. Another argument brought against infant baptism is the misconception of Matt. xxviii. 19. This has been fully explained and cleared above.

- 5. Another, from the misconception of John iii. 5, which has also been cleared up.
- 6. Also of 1 Cor. vii. 14, which has also been cleared up already.

Wall closes his second volume with a dissuasive against schism. Gale has answered it, and attempted to vindicate the schism of the anabaptists.

Wall having remarked how sinful Scripture represents schism to be (Rom. xiv. xv., 1 Cor. iii. 3, 4, Gal. v. 19—21, Phil. ii. 1), and how excellent unity of communion is, so that it is even made an article of the Creed, shows that the difference between the pædobaptists and anti-pædobaptists is not such as to justify separation, for the matter on which they disagree is not fundamental. The only cases in which holy Scripture allows separation are:

- 1. From an idolatrous Church (2 Cor. vi. 17).
- 2. From a Church holding false doctrine in fundamentals (2 Tim. ii. 18).
- 3. From a Church which requires some conditions of communion which are sinful.
- 4. From a Church which is itself schismatical (Rom. xvi. 17).

Matters of ceremony are not fundamental, and errors in them cannot justify schism, nor the setting up of different Churches (Rom. xvi. 17, 1 Cor. i. 10); and he would have such communities put a stop to by public authority. He remarks, that to keep in communion with the Church of England does not require any very difficult conditions. She is satisfied with merely the baptismal vow, and thus would "receive those who are weak in faith."

See Appendix VIII. for the reasons whereby Wall considers the age and manner of baptism to be not fundamental.

Gale could not see that the drift of Wall's remarks was merely to show that the difference between the pædobaptists and anti-pædobaptists was not such as to justify separation, and that Wall had not intended to give an elaborate treatise and strict definition of schism. So he taxes Wall with being ignorant of what schism is, and sets about supplying the supposed defect by stating his own notions of it.

Schism he allows to be a great sin. It is a needless separation of the body of Christ into distinct communities: it is *mutual*, and concerns both sides; and the sin consists, not so much in separating, as in unjustly causing it. He makes a distinction between schismatics and separatists: he says schismatics are those who unjustly *give* occasion for division or unjustly

take occasion; separatists are those who "come out from among them," according to St. Paul's injunction. On this ground, the Reformation and the throwing off the yoke of Rome is justified: for a true Church is that which has most properties of a Church; and where a Church errs in fundamentals, from that it is lawful to separate. Now fundamentals are those things which the ignorant, but sincere, may discover by mere reading and plain consequence; and in this it is requisite to distinguish between things necessary to the salvation of a Christian, and things necessary to the constitution of a Church. The two things are quite distinct; for a single man or a body of men may be good Christians, and yet not able to form themselves into a Church; as the parliament are supposed every man to hold and believe the things necessary to salvation, and yet are no Church. There is required, therefore, something more than sound doctrine to constitute a Church: now the chief thing is the edification of its members, and, therefore, if a Church has ceremonies, &c. which prevent this, it is no true Church. To deny an ordained ministry is not fundamental! and the idea of apostolical succession is a chimera!! and so great is the difference between a true Church and a true Christian, that the latter is

a member of the Church universal and invisible, even though he cannot, from conscientious motives, belong to the communion of the Church visible. An error in fundamental doctrines, and an error in the fundamental constitution of a Church, are, either of them, sufficient ground for separation; for in neither case is such a Church a true Church. Agreement in fundamentals of religion is not a sufficient ground against separation, for if there be error in the constitution of the Church, it is right to come out from it; and it is for this reason the anabaptists have separated from the Church of England; for the age and manner of baptism is fundamental in the constitution of a Church. He thinks it as obligatory on the Church to conform to dissenters as dissenters to the Church! and that the Church has the advantage only in being established by law 9. Gale makes little account of ecclesiastical authority 1. He thinks that if collects, forms, &c., are the occasions of offence, they are no longer matters indifferent, and to continue them, under such circumstances, is unlawful and to be blamed, and a just cause

⁹ Wall remarks that Gale forgets the antiquity and origin of the Church, and that the anti-pædobaptist Church was scarcely seventy years oid.

¹ See 2 Pet. ii. 10; Jude 10.

for separation! The Church form of baptism he considers to be opposed to Christ's institution, and therefore it is wicked to force people to agree to it. Christ's institution, he thinks, requires dipping, and teaching previous to baptism, and that to act strictly in the age and in the manner is fundamental; and that difference in these points is as fundamental as baptism itself; and even if it were not so in reality, yet, while the anabaptists believe it, they ought for conscience sake to separate: and Gale thinks that in this matter the Church of England is opposed to her own definition of a Church in Art. XIX.: and that infant baptism being, in his opinion, no baptism, all who have received such baptism only are not truly baptized, and therefore no Christians: and so all the bishops and clergy, &c. of the Church of England are no better than heathens! for none are baptized but believers dipped.

With this comfortable assurance we will take leave of Mr. Gale, wishing him those three things which Wall mentions in his preface—a greater fear and reverence for God's word, a better judgment, and a meeker temper.

Deo soli gloria.

APPENDIX.

APPENDIX I.

This Appendix contains the principal arguments adduced in the "Conference," and are chiefly such passages of Holy Scripture which, when rightly understood, clear up the matter, and are sufficiently satisfactory evidence for the custom of infant baptism. It is not indeed expressly commanded to be used, but is manifestly deducible from them.

- 1. The first text adduced by Wall is Matt. xxviii. 19; but as Wall has sufficiently discoursed of this in the "History," we need not now repeat his commentary upon it.
- 2. This remark applies also to John iii. 5, which is discussed and set in its right light in the "History."
- 3. Baptism (to give the most restricted meaning to this holy rite which Christ instituted) is an instrument by which the person baptized is admitted into covenant with God. And if the analogy between baptism and Jewish circumcision can be in any way shown, the conditions required by the one may be reasonably applied to the other. Now the Jewish children were capable of being admitted into covenant, and were actually admitted, as appears from Deut. xxix. 10—12;

and in the covenant made at Horeb ¹ (Deut. v, 2, 3) children were included. This covenant was not merely a carnal one, in which God, on the one side, promised to give to them the land of Canaan, and imposed upon them certain outward and ritual observances as their part in it; but it was in the strictest sense a spiritual covenant, requiring man, on the one side, "to love the Lord, to walk in His ways, and to keep His commandments," and God, on his part promising to be "a God unto them." (Compare Gen. xvii. 1, and Deut. xxx.) And therefore it is no absurd or ridiculous idea to suppose that infants are capable of entering into covenant,—and into a spiritual covenant.

4. This covenant, in the first instance, was made with the posterity of Abraham. It was not, however, confined to them, and accordingly, we perceive, from Exod. xii. 48-49, that a proselyte, on his receiving the rite of circumcision, became "as one born in the land." The admission of aliens into it was not left even optional, but made obligatory; thus (Gen. xvii. 12, 13) God requires of Abraham that "he that is born in thy house, or bought with money of any stranger, which is not of thy seed, ... must be circum-

¹ Forty years after the giving of this covenant in Horeb, Moses says, "The Lord made a covenant with us in Horeb, ... even with us who are all of us alive here this day." Most of those to whom Moses spoke must have been children at the time that covenant was made, for all who were above twenty years old at the giving of the law were now dead (Numb. xvi. 32, 33.)

cised." The Abrahamical covenant consequently embraced all who sought admission into it. It was a spiritual covenant, and circumcision, which was the outward part of it, was "the seal of the righteousness of faith (Rom. iv. 11.); and St. Paul, in Rom. x., when he is going to quote some passages from the recital of the covenant in Deut. xxx., premises the quotations with these words: "But the righteousness which is of faith speaketh on this wise;" and then, having recited the passages, he concludes with, "This is the word of faith which we preach." The covenant thus referred to included infants, (Deut. xxix.) and circumcision was to them a seal, not of actual faith, but of an engagement to live according to God's law when they came to years of discretion. In adults, actual faith and obedience was required as their part of the covenant, God on his part promising eternal life (Matt. xxii. 31, Acts xxiv. 15) to those who obeyed Him.

Now the Abrahamical covenant agrees in its requirements with the Christian. Both alike require faith and obedience. And if these were necessary in infants as preliminaries for circumcision under the covenant of Abraham, they may be required of infants also under the Christian dispensation. If infancy in the one case did not exclude a child from the privilege of the covenant, neither could it be reasonably objected against their admission into the Christian covenant; an infant can no more understand

the spiritual things covenanted at circumcision than at Baptism².

5. When the covenant of circumcision was annulled, it does not appear that some outward and visible sign of admission into covenant was not any longer required. It certainly is not mentioned in the New Testament that Christ ordained baptism to be given to infants proportionably with the use of circumcision. He did not order infants to be baptized, neither, on the other hand, did He forbid it; and as no directions are recorded concerning the age for baptism, Wall supposes that Christ did not intend to alter the rite in this respect, but allowed infancy to be a sufficient and fit age for admitting proselytes into the Christian as it had been into the Jewish covenant. He consequently examines what was the custom of admission of proselytes used by the Jews in our Saviour's time.

He finds that it was customary to baptize as well as circumcise proselytes. This fact is mentioned by many Jewish writers; and quotations from their works, proving the existence of this custom, have been produced by Dr. Hammond, Dr. Lightfoot, Selden, Ainsworth, &c. The Gemara Babylonia Chetubeth has these words: "If with a proselyte, his sons and his daughters be made proselytes, that which is done by

² If an infant can be esteemed sinful without having done actual sin, it may be also esteemed righteous without having actual righteousness.

the father redounds to their good." And Maimonides, Helach. Aibdim. has, "An Israelite that takes a little heathen child, or finds an heathen infant, and baptizes him for a proselyte, behold, he is a proselyte:" and the "House of Judgment," (i. e. the synagogue or church of the place) made profession for the child; they were sponsors for it.

Those who had been brought up in a Church which used this custom of baptizing as well as circumcising proselytes, would, if sent out as missionaries among heathen nations, adopt the same rite of initiation as they had been accustomed to in their own Church; and they would call those who were thus initiated by the same name as they were called by their own nation.

Now, the Jews did baptize proselytes, whether infant or adult, and denominated them proselytes (which is much the same word as disciples); and, consequently, Christian missionaries, who were of Jewish extraction, would understand the words, "Go, disciple all nations, baptizing them," &c., to apply to proselytes of such ages as was usual in the Church in which they had been brought up. The Apostles knew that circumcision was given to infants, and would therefore judge that baptism, the corresponding rite, might be given them with equal suitableness and efficacy; and the word "to teach," is by the Misna and Talmud explained by to "proselytize 3."

³ Justin Martyr uses "discipled" for converted; and

Now, as this is the legitimate interpretation of the word "teach" or "disciple,"-and as it was the custom to make infant children of proselytes disciples (as well as their parents), and to call them so and baptize them,—the onus probandi in the dispute about infant baptism lies with the anti-pædobaptists. They must prove that Christ annulled the custom of proselytizing infants which was existing in the Jewish Church, and forbad baptism to be given them. This they cannot do; and the silence of Scripture on this point is decidedly against them. "The baptizing of infants," Dr. Lightfoot 1 remarks, "was a thing commonly known and used, as appears by incontestable evidence from their writers; there needed not express assertions that such and such persons were to be the objects of baptism," &c.; and again, in his Hor. Heb. on Matt. iii., having shown largely that this was the custom, he concludes, "that since it was ordinary in all ages before to have infants baptized, if Christ would have had that custom abolished, He would have expressly forbidden it: so that His and the Scripture's silence in this matter does confirm and establish infant baptism for ever."

It appears further, that the Jews designated this baptism of proselytes "their regeneration," a term adopted by the Christians, and applied to baptism.

Christ, in Matt. x. 42, seems to apply the word "disciple" to infants.

⁴ Harmony on St. John, i. 25.

This not only shows the identity of principle involved in this initiatory rite of the Jewish and Christian covenant, but it also sufficiently explains John iii. 3. 5.

In the early ages of Christianity it was customary to use three ceremonies, viz., anointing, trine immersion, and the giving a little honey and milk; now, these were all used by the Jews in the baptism of a proselyte, whether infant or adult; and that they were adopted from them into the Christian Church tends to confirm the idea that the early Christians reckoned their baptism to succeed (with some alterations) in the room of the Jewish baptism of proselytes.

The evidence is strong and emphatic which declares baptism to succeed circumcision; and that when our Saviour instituted the Christian rite, He intended it to take the place of the Jewish rite of initiation into covenant. Justin Martyr, Cyprian, Ambrose, Gregory Nazianzen, Basil, Chrysostom, Austin, Origen, &c., speak distinctly and unanimously on this point.

Baptism serves the same use and purpose as circumcision, viz. to confirm the truth of the promises on God's part,—to place the partaker of it in the privileges of the Church of God, and to denote the obligation of the party to faith and obedience.

Again, baptism is the seal of the covenant, which is for substance the same as was made with the

Jews; and, therefore, God's command to give the seal in infancy then does still continue in force, unless it can be proved that Christ altered it. It was to be given to all—neither sex, nor condition, nor nation, made any difference, Gal. iii. 28. There needed no declaration of age, as the custom of the Jewish Church was still to be retained in the Christian. St. Peter shows (Acts iii. 25, and ii. 29) that the former covenant established with the Jews was not altered by Christ, and, consequently, infants were still included in it.

Although baptism was typified in the ark, and in the sea, and in the cloud, yet it especially takes the place of circumcision. This is distinctly intimated by St. Paul in Col. ii. 11, 12, where baptism is called the "circumcision of Christ," i. e. Christian circumcision. And the language of the ancient Christians concurs in calling baptism "the spiritual circumcision," "circumcision done without hands," "Christian circumcision," "our circumcision," &c. If when the Jewish seal of circumcision was annulled, no other sign had been established which could have been identified with it, how great would the anger of the Jews have been? In Acts xxi. 21, we find the Jews, who had lately been converted to faith in Christ, contending with St. Paul because he had preached against the necessity of circumcision; how much more would they have objected against him if he had refused their children baptism, as well as

circumcision? But since we do not find such objections raised, we may conclude that he never taught them not to baptize them. But, on the contrary, Rom. ii. 17, Gal. iii. 14, imply that all the privileges of the Jewish Church were imparted to the Christians. The admission of infants into covenant was a chief part of these privileges. These privileges were not cancelled by the preaching of John Baptist, when he cried to the Pharisees and Sadducees, "Think not to say within yourselves, we have Abraham to our father." Matt. iii. 7-9. They had by actual sin forfeited their right to the covenant, and needed repentance. It does not follow that infants were sent away. The Jewish books speak of it as a so common occurrence, for proselytes to bring their children to baptism with themselves, that they take it for granted that those who came to John did so likewise. Ambrose and Austin speak of infants baptized by John; and it would appear more reasonable to suppose that the rejection of infants from baptism by John, would have been the matter to be recorded rather than their baptism. It would have been the more extraordinary and rare of the two.

- 6. The consequences of anti-pædobaptism are absurd.
 - (a) The child could not be a member of the Church, and therefore in a worse condition than under the old covenant.

- (b) Christ, when on earth, received little children and blessed them; but now that His own covenant is completed, He refuses to receive them.
- (c) They have angels in heaven, but are refused sponsors on earth.
- (d) That in many families and households 5 baptized there were no infants.
- (e) That all the Christian Churches, whether they be Protestant, Roman, or Greek, have been in error, till the anti-pædobaptists arose to set them right.
- 7. Baptism being a Christian sacrament, there was need of a positive command for it, and this command is recorded in St. Matthew; but for the age of the subjects, and the manner of administration, the rule of the Jewish Church already existing was still retained by Christ. St. Peter thought that Gentiles, unless circumcised, were not fit subjects for baptism; but the history recorded in Acts x. concerning Cornelius, convinced him that persons capable of the ends of baptism should be baptized. Children, we observed above, are capable of such ends (see Appendix II.), and ought not to be kept back from receiving it.
 - 8. The anti-pædobaptists think they have a strong

 $^{^{\}it 5}$ l Cor. vii. 14, is distinct evidence that children were baptized.

argument in Acts viii. 12; "They were baptized, both men and women." They contend that "children" might easily have been added if they were to be baptized. But in a history which is so short, the particular things that were of course would not be all set down, and we must not lay down rules how Scripture ought to have been expressed; and no doubt difficulties are left to make men study and search them more diligently, and that, as St. Paul says, "They which are approved may be made manifest."

It is no argument against infant baptism, that no case of it is recorded in the Acts, for there is also no mention of their having been baptized when grown up; we might, by parity of reason, conclude, that because there is no instance mentioned, they were never baptized at all. Quakers and Socinians would be glad of such a handle.

- 9. The anti-pædobaptists claim the Church of England as being on their side. Her Catechism, they have discovered, requires faith and repentance of persons coming to be baptized. But as all baptism is on covenant, the conditions are required at present of adults, and of infants, when old enough. This is the intention of the Church; and at the time the Church Catechism was composed, no one in England denied infant baptism, and consequently its expressions are not so definite as they would probably have been under other circumstances.
 - 10. Anti-pædobaptism is quite of modern date.

For the first thousand years of the Christian æra, there is little doubt of the universal practice of infant baptism by the Church of Christ. St. Austin, who wrote about sects which were then existing or had been, knew of no sect that denied infant baptism. Pelagius has added his testimony to the same assertion. If Pelagius could have urged that infant baptism was uncommon in the Church, it would have been his best argument when pressed with the question: "Why are infants baptized if they have no Tertullian and Gregory Nazianzen speak against it, but this objection was their own private opinion, and not held by any Church. Holy Scripture, reason, the analogy to the Jewish rites of initiation, the works of the Fathers, are all united in their testimony concerning infant baptism, and universally allow it.

- 11. The words used by the Fathers to express baptism are, "to regenerate," "renew," "sanctify," "grace," "seal," "illumination," "initiation," "laver of regeneration," "circumcision made without hands."
- 12. Baptism is spoken of as necessary to remission of sins, whether original or actual, by Clemens Romanus, Hermas Pastor, Justin Martyr, Irenæus, Tertullian, Origen, Cyprian, Gregory Nazianzen, Basil, Ambrose, Chrysostom, Austin, &c.

APPENDIX II.

From the "Conference."

INFANT baptism is of water and the Spirit; and though infants have no actual faith, repentance, and conversion, yet God does apply in baptism pardon of original guilt—does transfer the child into a state of grace (from which he may fall) and of Christian covenant, and into the mystical body of Christ, and does accept him for His child, &c. These things are said to be done and applied by the Holy Spirit. And such phrases as "repent and be baptized," "he that believeth and is baptized," "baptized confessing their sins," do not militate against this doctrine, for they refer to adults, who, in the first preaching of the Gospel, were first converted and offered themselves for baptism. They had no fathers who believed the Gospel, to bring them as infants to baptism.

Now John Baptist (and Jeremiah) are said to have been filled with the Holy Ghost from their mother's womb, and thus infants are capable of receiving the gift of the Holy Spirit. Wherefore, persons capable of the great ends of baptism wrought by the Holy Spirit may be baptized. Our Saviour was baptized, not for regeneration or remission of guilt, but for the other ends for which baptism was designed.

To miss baptism by sudden death, &c. applies as much to grown persons as to infants. Baptism is the ordinary condition to salvation, and Holy Scripture gives no promise of salvation to children dying in infancy unless they are baptized. Where circumcision was omitted, it was said, "that soul shall be cut off;" yet where His providence made it impracticable, God did not execute the penalty. That infants dying unbaptized would be saved was Pelagian heresy; but Pelagius did not dare to say that they would go to heaven, but to some third or middle state. That unbaptized children should go to heaven would include heathen children, and give them an equal interest in Christ's death with those who were baptized, which is contrary to Holy Scripture (Eph. ii. 12).

If the doctrine of the salvation of unbaptized infants was true, there could be no Church, which is Christ's body; and Christ would be the Saviour, not only of His own "body," but of those who were not of His "body," and there would be no difference between the kingdom of Christ and the kingdom of darkness.

St. Paul (1 Cor. vii. 14) expressly calls unbaptized infants unclean. The term "unclean" does not mean "illegitimate," as some would have it, for then St. Paul must have condemned the cohabitation of the parents as unlawful. Whereas he advises them to live together (ver. 12, 13). "Unclean" means "out of covenant with God."

Baptized children St. Paul calls "holy," i. e. not merely federally holy, or having a right to Church privileges, but it means "accepted of God"—"set apart to God."

"Sanctified "," in the same passage, means "converted" or "embraced Christianity." "Holy" $(\tilde{\alpha}\gamma\iota\sigma\varsigma)$ is more generally translated "saints" = brethren.

Thus, "children holy," in this text, is an instance of infant baptism; and this is the usual interpretation given by early Christian writers.

APPENDIX III.

The doctrine of original guilt led to a strange inquiry concerning the origin of the soul. Some maintaining it to be by propagation,—some a new creation,—some substantial,—some pre-existent,—some a part of the substance of God,—some an effect arising from the peculiar combination of the body. The question was started during the Pelagian controversy. Austin suggested the question to Hierome, who refused to meddle with it, and considered it very injudicious to examine it at such a

⁶ The Greek word ἡγίασται is "has been sanctified." Sanctified is the common word used by Austin for baptized, just as we use the word "christened" for baptized.

time. Hierome seems, however, to incline to the idea of a new creation. St. Austin inclines to the idea of propagation, and this as being most consonant with the doctrine of original guilt, for he saw the difficulty of maintaining a new creation; for it was apparently inconsistent with God's justice to put a pure soul into an impure body, where it immediately contracted guilt; and it in a way makes God the author of sin, and of a sinful creation. Tertullian, Apollinaris, and many of the Western Church, held the theory of propagation; but the idea of a new creation has since prevailed in the Western and Eastern Churches. Origen held the pre-existence of the soul. The Manichees and Priscillianists held the soul to be a part of the substance of God.

Concerning the discussion of the origin of the soul, Hierome suggests that it is sufficient to know that the soul will be disposed of hereafter as it lives now, without inquiring how it came into being. All speculations must be unsatisfactory; nothing definite can be known concerning the origin of the soul, but Hierome's advice conveys the best and most practical suggestion.

APPENDIX IV.

CYPRIAN considered clinical baptism valid. But in the case of Novatian, the Roman Church decided

that private baptism incapacitated a man from holding office in the Church. St. Austin would not allow private baptism, except in cases of extreme necessity; he would have even the 'sick brought to church to receive that sacrament. The General Council of Trullo ordered that baptism should not be administered in private chapels, but publicly in church.

The Church of England allows private baptism, but requires the child afterwards, if it live, to be publicly received into the congregation. The first privilege of private baptism was granted to kings and kings' sons by Clement V. and the Council at Cologne (A. D. 1536); but every body began gradually to claim it after it had been once conceded. The Synod of Aix (A. D. 1585) forbade private baptism, except in cases of extreme necessity.

APPENDIX V.

THE matter of infant baptism is intimately connected with the doctrine of original guilt, and the denial of it lays the axe to the root of infant baptism.

Pelagius, who was born in Britain, first denied original guilt. Celestius, Julianus, and Arianus, are

⁷ Constantine the Emperor thought so much of public baptism, that, although he was very ill, he preferred going to Church to receive this Sacrament rather than in bed.

other prominent persons who sided with Pelagius, and disseminated his doctrine.

Pelagius thought that the doctrine of original guilt cast a reflection on the honour and justice of God; and rationalism soon suggested many plausible arguments in support of his theory. One error led to another, till at length he denied the need of divine grace, and asserted that man was capable naturally and of himself to do good works. He thus asserted the goodness and independence of human free will, and that man by it, without divine aid, could avoid sin, and easily keep the commandments of God if he will. He nevertheless could not entirely do away with the doctrine of grace, yet he quite explained it away, and by arguing logically and sophistically he altogether evaded the arguments of common sense. He held that divine grace is given according to men's merits,-that it is not given in every action, but it consisted in the internal illumination of man's spirit, in doctrine and revelation, in rules and promises; and it is so he explains Phil. iii. 12, that God works on the will only by proposals, and not by internal grace.

The arguments which Pelagius adduced in support of his theory were some such as follow:

If Adam's sin hurts those who do not sin themselves, Christ's righteousness may profit those who do not believe.

If the parents are baptized and washed clean from original guilt they cannot transmit what they have not.

If the soul is not by propagation, but the flesh only, then the flesh only sins and deserves punishments.

God, who forgives us our sins, would not impute to us other people's.

If infants were sinners, it would be needful for them to repent.

Infants new-born are in the same state that Adam was before his fall.

Sin is by imitation of Adam, and not innate.

The sin of Adam hurt only himself and not mankind.

They who cannot sin are without sin.

The natural issue of such reasoning was a denial that baptism of infants was for forgiveness of sin. But Austin and Hierome both contended against this, and argued from the practice of infant baptism to original guilt; and St. Austin declares that he never heard of any one, whether churchman or sectarian, who taught any other doctrine than that infants are baptized for remission of original guilt,—much less had he heard of any who denied that they were to be baptized at all.

The indignation excited by the heresy of Pelagius was very great. His opinions were condemned by the Churches of Africa and Rome; and when he was called upon by them to recant, he made an equivocal recantation, which St. Austin exposed. By a synod at Diospolis, A.D. 415, he was compelled to ana-

⁸ He afterwards unsaid all that he had here confessed.

thematize all those who declared unbaptized infants dying, to be saved. Pelagianism was condemned at Jerusalem, Thessalonica, Ephesus¹, Constantinople, at Carthage, at Milevis, and by Innocent of Rome, A.D. 417.

Hierome, in a treatise which he wrote against this heresy, shows that Pelagius must hold either that baptism is for original guilt, or he must hold two kinds,—one for infants for admission into heaven,—one for adults for forgiveness of sins. But Pelagius declared that he held only one baptism, as the Council of Constantinople, A.D. 381, had decreed, and he owned that baptism of infants was to be administered in the same words as to adults.

Pelagius was at last driven to confess that infants do receive baptism for remission of sins. He then held his tongue; but Coelestius still went on till he was denounced as a heretic at Ephesus. Coelestius owned that infants are to be baptized for remission of sins, according to the rule of the Church Catholic, but he denied that they derived any sin from Adam².

Twenty-four synods were held at different places to denounce this heresy.

The Pelagians were driven to great shifts, and

¹ At Ephesus, Cœlestius joined Nestorius in order to make a stronger party, but was quickly condemned.

² Theodorus endeavoured to reconcile the two opinions—that infants were to be baptized for remission of sins, and that they had no sin. St. Austin refuted him.

numerous evasions, to account for infant baptism, but in no case did they deny its necessity. This would have been their best and strongest argument if they could have proved it. They were great travellers; and had visited the Churches between Britain and Syria and Africa, and must have heard if there had been any anti-pædobaptists. They found none; and Pelagius's own acknowledgment is, that he knew of no one, either Catholic or sectarian, who denied its necessity or practice.

Julianus afterwards continued the Pelagian controversy against St. Austin, and is in a great rage that any one should charge him with denying infant baptism.

The matter of predestination was also canvassed in this controversy, and gave birth to a sect of semipelagians, who acknowledged the doctrine of original sin, and the necessity of baptism for entrance into heaven; but they argued that God foresaw that some infants would be faithful and live good lives, and so He brought them to baptism, but He suffered others to miss it. This makes God to prejudge infants not by what they have done, but what they would do. St. Austin seems to have held this doctrine of predestination, except that he considered it absolute, and without any regard to the life they would lead.

APPENDIX VI.

THE doctrine broached by Paulinus, and after him by Photinus, was universally condemned by Catholics, Arians, &c. They took the Son to be a mere man. The modern Paulianists, as Petavius, Le Clerc, Curcellæus, Cudworth, and others, have attacked the Church Catholic with being Tritheists, or holding the three persons in the Trinity to be three Gods equal and distinct, i. e. that the substance of the Father and the Son and the Holy Ghost are specifically one, but numerically three; and this they persist in, though answered and refuted by Bishop Stillingfleet. They quote a passage from Tertullian when arguing against Praxeas, who taught that the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost were one person; he says, "Qui tres unum sunt, non unus, quomodo dictum est Ego et Pater unum sumus, ad substantiæ unitatem non ad numeri singularitatem." He means that "unum" denotes one substance, but "unus" would denote one person; and in this same treatise against Praxeas there are many passages which declare the numerical unity of the essence or substance; and thus he is opposed to Tritheism.

Le Clerc tries to represent Gregory Nazianzen as a Tritheist, but Gregory maintains the numerical unity of the essence in the Trinity, although in his Treatise against the Arians and Sabellians there are some expressions which might be taken that way. Gregory having no adversaries of the tritheistical opinion to contend against, and not fearing to be himself suspected of it, has not guarded his language enough perhaps—as is very likely to happen under such circumstances—still he in very many places speaks with abhorrence of the idea of three distinct Gods. His comparison of the Trinity to a spring of water which supplies a pond, to the pond itself and the stream which issued from it, was against the Sabellians, who asserted the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost to be merely different names for the same cne person. Gregory says elsewhere, ἀμέριστος έν μεμερισμένοις ή θεότης: and again, "The three are one in Godhead or essence. The one is three in properties and persons; that they be not one in the Sabellian sense, nor three in the Arian sense 3." That the Church Catholic held numerical unity of the Godhead is clear from the arguments they adduced to refute Praxeas on the one side, and Philoponus on the other. Praxeas, Noetus, and Sabellius, held that there was only one Person, and they charged

³ If the Church had held that the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, had each a distinct essence, as any three men have, the Sabellians would never have so mistaken the Church's meaning, as to suppose they held only one person, yet they maintained this to be the very sense of the Church; and in the Arian controversy the Church maintained one substance and three persons.

the Church Catholic with holding the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, to have a distinct numerical essence as any three men have; but thus it would be no more a mystery that the Son should have taken flesh and the Father not. Whereas the Fathers do find it a difficult thing to answer them, and fly to the incomprehensible nature of the Divine essence. After a time, the Arians choosing to misunderstand one substance $(\hat{v} \hat{v} \sigma \hat{a})$ as meaning one subsistence $(\hat{v} \pi \alpha \rho - \xi \iota_{\mathcal{C}})$, i. e. person, charged the Church Catholic with Sabellianism.

Philoponus, in the sixth century, was the first tritheist. He thought that each Person in the Trinity had a distinct substance as well as subsistence. He was led into this error by taking $i\pi i\sigma \tau a\sigma i\varepsilon$ for natura (as it is used in Aristotle), and not for persona, as it is used by the Church Catholic.

Le Clerc would also bring in Hilary as a tritheist, who acknowledges $\delta\mu oo \delta\sigma oc$, but yet would let $\delta\mu oo \delta\sigma oc$ pass, as capable of being explained in a catholic sense, and meaning likeness, not by unity of person, but equality of nature: $\delta\mu oo \delta\sigma oc$ had been inserted into the Creed by the Council of Nice, it means co-essential—of one substance; and this does not favour Sabellianism, nor take away the $\delta\sigma ac$ or distinct personality of the Trinity, nor does it countenance tritheism. Yet both Arians and Sabellians have attacked the Council of Nice, and each charged the defenders of it with the other's heresy;

but all that has any appearance of truth in this accusation of the Fathers is this: they have used a style which is fitter to an honest man than to a logician; and yet, being forced to speak much of the Trinity, do ofttimes so express themselves, and use such comparisons and paraphrases, as a captious man may take advantage of and use against them. Those Fathers whose style is Asiatic and loose are most capable of being distorted; but Austin, Hierome, and Ambrose have written in a more logical style, with closer reasoning and definition, and declare incontrovertibly the numerical Unity of the Essence and three Persons.

APPENDIX VII.

Wall represents the following tenets as held by the anabaptists in his time:

A few baptized in the name of Jesus Christ only 4, adducing as authority Acts viii, 16; xix. 5. But they are not liked by their own party.

⁴ Though in these passages, where the matter is related short, the name of Jesus Christ only is mentioned, because that was the name which the Apostles found it most difficult to persuade the Jews to own, yet interpreters take it for granted that the Apostles used the whole form which our Saviour appointed.

They require total immersion, and considering clinical baptism to be invalid, will let a man die unbaptized rather than give baptism by affusion.

They baptized adults only in the name of the Trinity.

A few (like the Minnists of Holland) denied that Christ took flesh of the Virgin, and though He came into the world through her, yet His Body was made from the stars; and in this way they explain "coming from heaven," "coming forth from the Father."

Some hold a millennium, in which Christ will reign personally on earth, and the saints will arise and live. See Rev. xx. 4, 5.

Some abstain from eating blood. See Acts xv. 29. Some hold the sleep ⁵ or insensibility of the soul from death till the resurrection.

⁵ The primitive Church held that the soul went to Hades, and not to heaven at once, and was sensible; that at the resurrection, the body and soul would be united. And, in proof of this, they remark that Christ's soul went to Hades—that the patriarchs went there, and not at once to heaven; and that it was a place quite different from heaven or hell, where the soul remains till God unites it to the body again; and the parable of Dives and Lazarus is against the idea of the sleep of the soul. The placing the soul at once in heaven, and not in Hades, destroys the argument by which Christ and St. Paul prove the resurrection (Matt. xxii. 32; 1 Cor. xv. 12; 1 Thess. iv. 13–18). Again: Matt. xxv. 24 shows the final sentence had not been given; in Acts ii. 34, St. Peter said that David was not yet ascended.

Some dislike singing psalms—some allow it.

A few will not use the Lord's Prayer.

A few do not like to be married in Church.

A few anoint the sick with oil, not as the Romanists do, but where there is hope of recovery. Mark vi. 13; James v. 14, 15.

They receive the Holy Communion sitting. Some keep the seventh day as Sabbath.

Some use confirmation—some do not.

Concerning predestination, some are "general men," and hold the Arminian doctrine of general redemption through Christ. Others are "particular men," and hold the Calvinistic doctrine of personal election and reprobation. Many of the "general men" are Pelagians, and deny original sin, and use baptism only for admission into the kingdom of heaven.

They have elders, who govern their congregations, and deacons to look after their poor. They have teachers, and messengers, and representatives ⁶, who form a general assembly.

They adjust among themselves their differences, and thus prevent many lawsuits and quarrels.

They turn out the disorderly and immoral.

Socinians sometimes creep in among them, but are turned out as soon as discovered 7. The "Confession

 $^{^{\}rm 6}$ The elder chooses the representative with the approbation of the people.

⁷ Gale, in Letter II., indignantly complains that Wall, in

of one hundred Churches" shows them to be catholic in their understanding of the Trinity.

Jesuits have crept in among them, who, by maintaining infant baptism cannot be proved from Holy Scripture, lay great stress upon tradition. They join them with the design of turning them to Rome, and making dissensions among Protestants. But Wall remarks that the old books of the papists, to within eighty years ago (i. e. about A. D. 1620), do constantly prove it from Holy Scripture.

APPENDIX VIII.

Age for baptism is not a fundamental doctrine; for

- 1. It is nowhere directly enjoined 8 in Holy Scripture.
 - 2. It is not stated in any of the ancient creeds.
 - 3. Tertullian speaks of it as a minor question.

stating the tenets of the anabaptists, has made the whole community answerable for the disorders of a few, and those the worst sort; and that the same remark might apply to any community, even the Church, where base members will cling to it, notwithstanding all their endeavours to cleanse it. Gale's remark is incorrect, for Wall has spoken merely of facts, and his remarks have received the sanction and assent of Mr. Stennet, a famous anabaptist minister.

⁸ But is inferred from 1 Cor. vii. 14; Matt. xxviii 19; John iii. 5, &c.

- 4. Tertullian and Gregory (the father of Gregory Nazianzen) were not excommunicated nor deemed schismatics for not practising infant baptism.
- 5. The modern Roman Church holds that there is no proof at all in Scripture for infant baptism, but that it is founded on tradition.
- 6. It is declared not to be fundamental by Bp. Taylor, Dr. Hammond, Baxter, Wills (who were pædobaptists), and by Tombes and Stennett (who were anti-pædobaptists).

APPENDIX IX.

Exop. xix. 10, in Gale's opinion, does not refer to initiatory baptism, but to the common legal purifications usual after circumcision. The Jews, he says, did not by this washing at Sinai enter into covenant, for that they had done before by circumcision. To "sanctify," in this text, does not mean to wash only, but to abstain from their wives (ver. 15), and refers to 1 Sam. xxi. 4; Lev. xx. 7. If washing the body had been meant, it would have been mentioned, as well as washing their clothes, as it is in Lev. xv. 5. 13; xiv. 8.

But Wall replies that they did then enter into a covenant, and the particular interrogations and answers are recited; and in Deut. xxix. 1, we read,

that the "covenant in the land of Moab was beside that covenant which He made with them in Horeb." The Jewish writers do all say that their fathers entered into covenant by three things, circumcision, baptism, and a sacrifice.

Maimonides, the Gemara, Aben Ezra, and Selden (who has quoted many rabbins), do show that where washing of their clothes is mentioned, the Jews did understand the washing of the body to be implied. See Numb. xxxi. 19. 24; xix, 16—19.

APPENDIX X.

John iii. 5. See ch. iv. supra.

Wall, Whiston, and others, have positively affirmed that the word "regenerated" is, in the ancient phrase, constantly used in relation to baptism. Gale has as positively denied this. The ancient writers, also, knew of no other interpretation of "water" than material water, and not some mystical thing; and they declare this water to be a necessary part of the sacrament, without which no man shall enter the kingdom of heaven. By this water-baptism, accompanied by the gift of the Holy Spirit, the person is regenerated; this is the opinion and constant language of the Fathers. Wall has referred in his "Introduction" to the use of the word regeneration, which the Jews

applied to proselytes whom they baptized, to places of Scripture, and to the Greek and Latin Fathers, which show that they so appropriated the word regeneration to baptism, as to exclude any other conversion or repentance that is not accompanied with baptism. But the modern interpretation of the word regeneration has so altered its ancient meaning, that he who reads the modern books cannot recognize it again. In modern Calvinistic language it means "conversion;" but the Fathers continually distinguish it from conversion, and declare that an infant may be regenerated without having actual faith and repentance: and Wall understands by regeneration that operation of the Holy Spirit by which the baptized person is, by God's mercy and covenant, received into a new spiritual state, translated out of a state of nature (to which the curse is due) into a state of grace and mercy through Jesus Christ. When a child is by nature born in sin, in a state of spiritual pollution, subject to God's wrath, &c. are not the pardon of sin and pollution, the release of the old bond, the admittance into a new covenant, the adoption into God's family, to be partaker of Christ's purchase, to be an inheritor of the kingdom of heaven, &c. sufficient to indicate a veritable regeneration? This is conveyed to the person baptized by the water, conjoined with the gift of the Holy Ghost (whose gracious offices Christ has promised shall accompany the outward rite); and thus

all infants baptized are regenerated, *i. e.* entered into a new spiritual state, and receive such assistance of the Holy Spirit as they from time to time are capable of, and pray for its renewal and abundance. This state they may fall from by continual wickedness; and, unless they repent, they lose the inheritance altogether, and disannul the gracious covenant. By repentance they may arise again, and recover the spiritual inheritance to which they were admitted by baptism. Thus repentance is quite distinct from regeneration.

There are other graces of the Holy Spirit which infants are not capable of, but which are given peculiarly to adults at baptism, as present conversion of heart, enlightening the mind, comforting the soul. As the command for circumcision which was given in general (both to infants and adults) carried with it an injunction for present actual circumcision of the heart to adults, but not to infant receivers, and yet was proper and veritable circumcision to both—so it is in baptism.

This text, though it seems to have a more especial reference to adults (whose conversion and baptism was the chief thing the Apostles had to do), yet comprehends and reaches the case of infants; and our Saviour's general words are adapted to both infants and adults, according to their respective capacities. An infant may be born again by those operations of the Holy Spirit of which he is capable.

"A man," in the original Greek, is "any one," man, woman, or child; and even if this word used affirmatively leaves any doubt about the necessity of baptism for infants, the negative preceding it in the Greek renders the passage equivalent to "No one shall enter, except he be born again," &c.; and thus it makes the rite obligatory on us, without our pretending to determine what mercy God will show towards heathens and their children, and the children of Christians dying unbaptized.

Gale gives certain reasons why this rule cannot apply to infants. He says:

1. They cannot know the law, and a law is not binding except on those who know it, for "where there is no law there is no transgression;" and how shall they believe on him of whom they have not heard?

This, says Wall, is just what might have been said of Jewish children. They did not know the law of circumcision, nor had actual faith, yet God had told their parents, that those of their children whom they refused or neglected to baptize, should be cut off. A benefactor who promises to adopt a poor man's child, if he will give him up to him, is not bound to do it if the parent refuses. So the kingdom of heaven is not a thing due by nature. It is a benefit or loss which concerns the child, though he know it not.

2. It excludes infants, for St. Peter (1 Pet. iii. 21)

says, baptism is the answer of a good conscience. But St. Paul (Rom. ii. 28) says the same of circumcision; and by Gale's reasoning, infants are excluded from circumcision. The aim of the words of both these Apostles is, "that neither circumcision nor baptism, received in infancy, profit a man when he is grown up, unless he be pure in heart, and observe the part of the covenant which belongs to him to do;" and this explains those texts where the two are put together, as Matt. xxviii. 19, "Baptizing teaching them;" Rom. vi. 4, "Buried with Him by baptism that we should walk;" "baptism of repentance;"-and thus such phrases as "baptized and taught," "repented and baptized," &c., would fit those who were baptized as infants as well as those baptized as adults.

3. Gale argues from Mark x. 14, "of such (infants) is the kingdom of heaven," that they will be saved even without baptism; and he proceeds to lay it down as a rule that God will not be so unmerciful as to punish children for sins not their own, &c.; which Wall calls an "arrogant rule," and opposed to the plain words of Scripture, 1 John v. 11, 12. The sentence of Holy Scripture requires all to be "in Christ, to have Christ, to belong to Christ," in order to go into heaven. Hermas has a similar phrase, "all infants are valued by the Lord." Now Wall thinks that admission into the kingdom of heaven is the effect of, and connected with, God's

love, for it is a free gift of an inestimable treasure to which they have no claim—and to Wall this text shows that infants are fit to be admitted into the covenant of God's grace and love by baptism; a stronger evidence than any the anti-pædobaptists can bring for a negative, or give any solid answer to.

THE END.

LONDON:

GILBERT AND RIVINGTON, PRINTERS, ST. JOHN'S SQUARE.

NEW BOOKS

VERY LATELY PUBLISHED

BY

MESSRS. RIVINGTON,

ST. PAUL'S CHURCH YARD, AND WATERLOO PLACE.

ı.

The GOSPEL NARRATIVE of OUR LORD'S MINISTRY HARMONIZED; with REFLECTIONS. By the Rev. ISAAC WILLIAMS, B.D., late Fellow of Trinity College, Oxford. In small 8vo. 8s.

II.

A GREEK GRAMMAR; intended as a sufficient Grammar of Reference for SCHOOLS and COLLEGES. By the Rev. T. K. ARNOLD, M.A., Rector of Lyndon, and late Fellow of Trinity College, Cambridge. In 8vo. 10s. 6d.

** Mr. Arnold is preparing a Complete Series of the Greek Authors usually read in Schools, with short English Notes, and copious References to this Grammar; including Homeri Ilias, Books I. to IV.: Selections from Xenophon, Thucydides, Demosthenes, and Æschines.

III.

The KING'S MESSENGERS; an Allegorical Tale. By the Rev. WILLIAM ADAMS, M.A., Fellow of Merton College, Oxford; Author of "the Shadow of the Cross." In square 18mo. (With Ornamental Border.) 2s. 6d.

IV.

A SEQUEL to the LETTERS to M. GONDON, on the DESTRUCTIVE CHARACTER of the CHURCH of ROME: containing fresh Proofs of the Arguments in the Letters, and a Reply to the Dublin Review and other Periodicals. By CHRISTOPHER WORDSWORTH, D.D., Canon of Westminster. In crown 8vo. 7s. 6d.

Lately published,

A Second Edition of the LETTERS to M. GONDON. In crown 8vo. 8s. 6d.

v.

A THIRD SERIES of SCRIPTURE BIOGRAPHY. By the Rev. ROBERT WILSON EVANS, B. D., Author of the "Rectory of Valehead." In small 8vo. 6s.

VI.

FIVE SERMONS, preached before the University of Cambridge, the first Four in November, 1845, the Fifth on the General Fast Day, Wednesday, March 24, 1847. By the Rev. J. J. BLUNT, B.D., Margaret Professor of Divinity in the University of Cambridge. In 8vo. 5s. 6d.

VII.

LETTERS from a FATHER to his SON on the ROMAN HISTORY and OTHER SUBJECTS. By GEORGE DAVYS, D.D., Lord Bishop of Peterborough. In 18mo. 2s.

Lately published, by the same Author,

A HISTORY of ENGLAND for Children. Eighth Edition. 2s. 6d.

VIII.

THINGS AFTER DEATH; Three Chapters on the IN-TERMEDIATE STATE; with THOUGHTS on FAMILY BURYING PLACES, and HINTS for EPITAPHS in Country Churchyards. In 18mo. 3s. 6d.

IX.

The HANDBOOK of GRECIAN ANTIQUITIES. By Professor BOJESEN. Translated from the German Version of Dr. Hoffa, by the Rev. R. B. PAUL, late Fellow of Exeter College, Oxford; and Edited, with Notes and Questions, by the Rev. T. K. ARNOLD, M.A., Rector of Lyndon, and late Fellow of Trinity College, Cambridge. In 12mo. 3s. 6d.

Also (uniformly printed), the HANDBOOK of ROMAN ANQUITIES. 3s. 6d.

The pupil will receive from these works a correct and tolerably complete picture of Grecian and Roman life; the political portions (the account of the national institutions and their effects) appear to be of great value; while the very moderate extent of each admits of its being thoroughly mastered—of its being got up and retained.

In preparation, by the same Editors,

A SERIES of HANDBOOKS, on JEWISH ANTIQUITIES, ANCIENT and MODERN HISTORY, and the HISTORY of the MIDDLE AGES.

x.

The NINTH VOLUME of PLAIN SERMONS; containing LECTURES on the CHURCH CATECHISM. By CONTRIBUTORS to the "TRACTS for the TIMES." In 8vo. 6s. 6d.

XI.

THOUGHTS on PASSAGES selected from the FATHERS, By the Rev. J. BURLEIGH JAMES, B.A., Incumbent of Knowbury. In small 8vo. 3s. 6d.

XII.

SHORT HELPS to DAILY DEVOTION, selected and arranged for EVERY DAY in the YEAR, by the Rev. THOMAS KERCHEVER ARNOLD, M. A., Rector of Lyndon, and late Fellow of Trinity College, Cambridge. In 12mo. 8s.

XIII.

CONSTANCE; a Tale for the Daughters of England. By the Author of "Recantation." In 18mo. 3s. 6d.

XIV.

THEOPHILUS ANGLICANUS; or Instruction for the Young Student concerning the CHURCH, and our own Branch of it. By CHRISTOPHER WORDSWORTH, D. D. Canon of St. Peter's, Westminster. Fifth Edition. 8s. 6d.

xv.

LAYS of CHRISTMAS; with Notes. By the Rev. T. B. MURRAY, M. A., Rector of St. Dunstan in the East, and Prebendary of St. Paul's. In ornamental binding, with Woodcuts. Is, 6d.

XVI.

The SICK MAN'S GUIDE to Acts of Faith, Patience, Charity, and Repentance. Extracted from Bishop Taylor's Holy Dying. By W. H. HALE, M. A., Archdeacon of London, and Master of the Charter House. In large print. Second Edition. 3s.

XVII.

A FIRST VERSE BOOK, PART II.: containing additional Exercises in Hexameters and Pentameters. By the Rev. THOMAS KERCHEVER ARNOLD, M.A., Rector of Lyndon, and late Fellow of Trinity College, Cambridge. In 12mo. 1s.

Lately published, by the same Author,

The FIRST LATIN VERSE BOOK. Third Edition. 2s.

XVIII.

The CHRISTOLOGY of the OLD TESTAMENT, and COMMENTARY on the MESSIANIC PREDICTIONS of the PROPHETS. By Professor HENGSTENBERG. Abridged from the Translation of Dr. Reuel Keith. By the Rev. THOMAS KERCHEVER ARNOLD, M.A., Rector of Lyndon, and late Fellow of Trinity College, Cambridge. In 8vo. 18s.

In this Work we have the pattern of an investigation, founded upon distinct principles, of the most scrupulous, laborious, and minute examination of the very letter of the text, combined with an honest endeavour to make the analogy of Scripture an important rule of interpretation.—Editor's Preface.

XIX.

The IMAGE WORSHIP of the CHURCH of ROME proved to be contrary to HOLY SCRIPTURE and the Faith and Practice of the PRIMITIVE CHURCH, and to involve Contradictory and Irreconcileable Doctrines within the Church of Rome itself. By JAMES ENDELL TYLER, B.D., Rector of St. Giles's in the Fields, and Canon Residentiary of St. Paul's. In 8yo. 9s.

XX.

A READING COMPANION to the FIRST GERMAN BOOK; containing Extracts from the best Authors, with a copious Vocabulary and explanatory Notes. By the Rev. T. K. ARNOLD, M.A., Rector of Lyndon, and late Fellow of Trinity College, Cambridge, and J. W. FRADERSDORFF, Dr. Phil. In 12mo. 4s.

Lately published, by the same Editors,

The FIRST GERMAN BOOK, on the Plan of Henry's First Latin Book. In 12mo. 5s. 6d.

XXI.

The WARNINGS of the HOLY WEEK; being a COURSE of PAROCHIAL LECTURES for the WEEK before EASTER, and the EASTER FESTIVALS. By the Rev. WILLIAM ADAMS, M.A., Fellow of Merton College, and Author of "The Shadow of the Cross," and "The Distant Hills." In 12mo. Second Edition. 5s.

Just published, by the same Author,

The OLD MAN'S HOME; a Tale. Fourth Edition. 2s. 6d.

XXII.

AN ANALYSIS of BISHOP PEARSON on the CREED.

By W. H. MILL, D.D., Chaplain to his Grace the Archbishop of
Canterbury. Second English Edition. In 8vo. 5s,

XXIII.

A SEVENTH VOLUME of PLAIN PAROCHIAL SER-MONS, preached in the Parish Church of Bolton-le-Moors. By the Rev. JAMES SLADE, M.A., Vicar of Bolton, and Canon of Chester. In 12mo. 6s.

XXIV.

SELECTIONS from CICERO, with ENGLISH NOTES.
PART I. From the ORATIONS, containing the Fourth Book

of the Impeachment of Verres, the Four Speeches against Catiline, and the Speech for the Poet Archias. By THOS. KERCHEVER ARNOLD, M.A., Rector of Lyndon, and late Fellow of Trinity College, Cambridge.

The Notes are taken from several excellent Editions well known in Germany, including those of Orelli, Zumpt, Mattheæ, and Klotz. In 12mo. 4s.

PART II. containing SELECTIONS from the EPISTLES, is in the press.

XXV.

A SECOND SERIES of SERMONS preached at BRIGHTON. By the Rev. C. E. KENNAWAY, M.A. 7s. 6d.

Of whom may be had, by the same Author,

SERMONS preached at BRIGHTON. (First Series.) 7s. 6d.
 SERMONS to the YOUNG. In small 8vo. 5s. 6d. (Just published.)

 COMFORT for the AFFLICTED. Selected from Various Authors, With a Preface by SAMUEL WILBERFORCE, D.D., Lord Bishop of Oxford. Third Edition. 5s.

XXVI.

SERMONS. By WILLIAM NICHOLSON, M.A., late Rector of St. Maurice, and Master of Magdalen Hospital, Winchester. In 12mo. 7s.

XXVII.

ECCLESIASTICAL and CIVIL HISTORY philosophically considered, in Reference to the future REUNION of CHRISTIANS. The Three first Books; comprising the period from the Ascension to the Death of Wycliffe. (Dedwated to LORD LINDSAY.) By the Rev. GEORGE TOWNSEND, D.D., Canon of Durham. In 2 vols. 8vo. 11. 12s.

XXVIII.

A PRACTICAL INTRODUCTION to GREEK CON-STRUING. By the Rev. THOMAS KERCHEVER ARNOLD, M.A., Rector of Lyndon, and late Fellow of Trinity College, Cambridge.

This work is intended to be used simultaneously with the "Practical Introduction to Greek Prose Composition," either as a

Reading Book or for written Exercises. In 8vo. 6s. 6d.

Also, by the same Author,

1. A PRACTICAL INTRODUCTION to GREEK ACCI-DENCE. With Easy Exercises and Vocabulary. Third Edition. 5s. 6d.

2. A PRACTICAL INTRODUCTION to GREEK PROSE COMPOSITION. Sixth Edition. 5s. 6d. (A Second Part is

in the press.)

XXIX.

The CHRISTIAN OBLIGATIONS of CITIZENSHIP:
A DISCOURSE. By the Rev. JOHN G. SHEPPARD, M.A.,
Fellow of Wadham College, Oxford, and Second Master of Repton
School. In small 8vo. 7s. 6d.

XXX.

LETTERS to M. GONDON, Author of "Mouvement Religieux en Angleterre," "Conversion de Cent Cinquante Ministres Anglicans," &c. on the DESTRUCTIVE CHARACTER of the CHURCH of ROME, both in Religion and Policy. By CHRISTOPHER WORDSWORTH. D.D., Canon of Westminster. Second Edition. In post 8vo. 8s. 6d.

Also, by the same Author,

A DIARY IN FRANCE; principally concerning Topics of Education and the Church. Second Edition. 6s. 6d.

** A French Translation of the Diary has been received from Paris. *Price* 6s. 6d.

XXXI.

EARLY INFLUENCES. By the Author of "Truth without Prejudice." Second Edition. In small 8vo. 3s. 6d.

XXXII.

SERMONS, chiefly preached in the Chapel of Rossall College, Fleetwood, by JOHN WOOLLEY, D.C.L., late Fellow of University College, Head Master. In 8vo. 10s. 6d.

XXXIII.

ASHTON HALL; or, Self-seeking and Self-denying: a Tale of Daily Life. By Mrs. ALFRED MONTGOMERY. In small 8vo. 3s. 6d.

XXXIV.

A SELECTION of PSALMS and HYMNS for PUBLIC WORSHIP. Compiled by the late Rev. THOMAS COTTERILL, M.A. New Edition. In 32mo. 1s, 6d.

** The EDITION in LARGER PRINT may still be had, price 2s, 6d.

XXXV.

An ALPHABET of EMBLEMS. In Verse. Contents:—
Ark—Bible—Crown—Dial—Eagle—Fruit—Garden—Hen—Inn
—Judge—King—Lion—Myrtle—Nest—Oak—Peacock—Quail—
Rainbow—Sower—Turtle-Dove—Usurer—Viper—Well—Xerxes
—Yoke—Zaccheus. By the Rev. T. B. MURRAY, M.A., Rector of St. Dunstan in the East, and Prebendary of St. Paul's.
(With 28 Illustrations beautifully engraved on Wood.) Second
Edition. 2s. 6d.

Also, by the same Author,

The TWO CITY APPRENTICES; or, Industry and Idleness exemplified. (With numerous Woodcuts after Hogarth.) Price 1s. 6d.

XXXVI.

The DISTANT HILLS. An Allegory. By the Rev. W. ADAMS, M.A., Fellow of Merton College, Oxford. Fourth Edition. In square 18mo. (With Ornamental Border.) 2s. 6d.

Also, by the same Author, (uniformly printed,)

The SHADOW of the CROSS. Sixth Edition. 2s. 6d.

** These SACRED ALLEGORIES may be had, bound in one Volume, price 4s. 6d.

XXXVII.

A FIRST LATIN VERSE BOOK. By the Rev. THOMAS KERCHEVER ARNOLD, M.A., Rector of Lyndon, and late Fellow of Trinity College, Cambridge. *Third Edition*. In 12mo. 2s.

Also, by the same Author,

A PRACTICAL INTRODUCTION to LATIN VERSE COM-POSITION. Second Edition. In 8vo. 5s. 6d.

XXXVIII.

PRAYERS for the Use of FAMILIES; to which are added others for Private Devotion. By the Rev. WILLIAM JOHN HALL, M.A., Rector of St. Benet's, and St. Peter's, London; and Priest in Ordinary to Her Majesty. Second Edition. In 8vo. 3s.

XXXIX.

PAROCHIAL SERMONS, preached in the Parish Church of St. Many the Virgin, Dover. By the Rev. JOHN PUCKLE, M.A., of Brasenose College, Oxford; Incumbent of the Parish. and Rural Dean. In 8vo. 10s. 6d.

XL.

The HISTORY of the OLD TESTAMENT; its LEADING CHARACTERS, and PRINCIPAL EVENTS, arranged in Chronological Order; together with some Observations on its Prophecies and their fulfilment, more especially on those relating to the Messiah. For the use of Families. By the Rev. BARRINGTON JAMES TRIMMER, B.A., Domestic Chaplain to the Most Noble the Duke of Sutherland, K.G. In 2 vols. 12mo. 12s.

XLI.

The HAPPINESS of the BLESSED, considered as to the Particulars of their State; their Recognition of each other in that State; and its Difference of Degrees. By RICHARD MANT, D.D., Lord Bishop of Down and Connor. Sixth Edition. In 12mo. 4s. 6d.

XLII.

An EXPLANATION of the TEN COMMANDMENTS, considered as the RULE of CHRISTIAN OBEDIENCE. By W. VICKERS, M.A., Archdeacon of Salop. In small 8vo. 4s. 6d.

XLIII.

The ÆNEID of VIRGIL, translated into English Verse. By the Rev. J. M. KING, Vicar of Cutcombe, Somerset. In two vols. 12mo. 10s. 6d.

XLIV.

The COMMISSION and CONSEQUENT DUTIES of the CLERGY, in a Series of Discourses. With Notes and Illustrations. By HUGH JAMES ROSE, B.D., late Principal of King's College, London. Fourth Edition. In 8vo. 9s.

XLV.

A SHORT and PLAIN INSTRUCTION for the Better Understanding of the LORD'S SUPPER. To which is annexed, the OFFICE of the HOLY COMMUNION, with Proper Helps and Directions. By THOMAS WILSON, D.D., Lord Bishop of Sodor and Man. A New Miniature Edition. In royal 32mo. 1s.



Date Due NO4 355



