



Journal of the Theological Seminary,
PRINCETON, N. J.

Presented by Mr. Samuel Agnew of Philadelphia, Pa.

Division

Section

Number

500
2306

Maria Orville

12
E.



Published by the same AUTHOR.

THE
B A P T I S M
O F
I · N F A N T S,
A

Reasonable Service ;

Founded upon SCRIPTURE, and undoubted
APOSTOLIC TRADITION :

In which

It's Moral Purposes and Use in Religion are shewn.

Printed for *J. Waugh*, at the *Turk's-Head, Lombard-Street.*

3
D. H.
95

PÆDO-BAPTISM:

O R, A

D E F E N C E

O F

I N F A N T - B A P T I S M,

In Point of

ANTIQUITY.

Against the,

E X C E P T I O N S

O F

John Brekell ✓

Dr. JOHN GILL, and OTHERS.

By Michael Tugood —

Baptizandos esse parvulos nemo dubitet; quando nec illi
hinc dubitant, qui ex *parte aliquâ* contradicunt.

Augustin. de Verb. ap. Serm. 14.

L O N D O N:

Printed for J. WAUGH at the *Turk's-Head* in *Lombard-Street*. MDCCLIII.





PÆDO-BAPTISM:

OR, A

DEFENCE

OF

INFANT-BAPTISM, &c:

SECTION I.

A general View of the Argument.



WHEN God gave to *Abraham* the *Covenant of Circumcision* [a], this religious Rite was administred, upon the ground of his own faith [b], to all the males, i. e. all the capable members of his family, from

B 2

eight

[a] Acts vii. 3.

[b] Rom. iv. 2.

eight days old and upwards, according to their several and respective ages [c]: *Abraham* himself being ninety years old and nine when he was circumcised, *Ishmael*, his son, thirteen years old, &c [d]. But, for the future, the appointed time of Circumcision, in ordinary, was the eighth day from the birth; excepting the case of new Profelytes, e. g. the *Sechemites* [e], and others, whose families were circumcised together, as *Abraham's* had been [f]. In like manner, when the *Covenant of Baptism* [g] was given to the Christian Church, it seems very natural to suppose, that this sacred rite also was administered to persons of every age both old and young. For, *Christian* baptism came in the room of Circumcision, so as to supersede it [h]; and we find, at the beginning of the Gospel Dispensation, whole *households* baptized together [i], as *Abraham's* household had been circumcised together. (though there is no express mention of any young children being *then* admitted to the ordinance, in the one case more than in the other.) But, it is *analogous* to think, that the usual time of administering baptism, *afterwards*, (excepting here again the Case of new Profelytes) was in the state of Infancy. Because,

[c] Gen. xvii. 23. [d] Gen. xvii. 24, 25.

[e] Gen. xxxiv. 24. [f] Gen. xvii. 23. [g] 1 Pet. iii. 21.

[h] By *christian baptism* I mean baptism, as administered in the *christian church*, commencing after the death of Christ, whereby circumcision &c. was vacated.

[i] Acts xvi. 15, 33. 1 Cor. i. 16.

Because, there is no particular direction in the Gospel to defer baptism ordinarily even to the eighth day from the birth, and much less beyond it, and lest of all to riper years; and therefore it might well be judged lawful and expedient before. However, in this light the matter hath always appeared to me, and I believe to most other men.

Nevertheless, as the sacred History often speaks of adult baptism (which, as every one must perceive, was a thing unavoidable at the first institution of christian baptism, even supposing, not only that children also were to be baptized, but that baptism, as a standing ordinance in the *christian* church, like circumcision in the *Jewish* church, was chiefly designed for children) I say, because the sacred writings of the new Testament make frequent mention of adult baptism, without expressly naming the baptism of children; this hath lead some persons to conclude, that none, but the adult were, or ought to be baptized. Now, this, I imagine, is to turn an *accidental circumstance* into a standing rule, as the descendants of *Ismael* did, who circumcised not their children before the 13th year of their age, because *Ismael* himself happened to be so old, when he was circumcised, at the time of the first institution of the rite of circumcision [k]. And, if the *Ismaelites*

[k] Joseph. J. antiq. lib. i.

elites could commit such a mistake, as to the time of administering circumcision, contrary to an express command, fixing it to the eighth day; it is possible that *others* might fall into a like error about the time of admitting persons to baptism, though the proofs for *Infant-baptism* in the *christian* church, were as clear, and strong, as the evidence for *Infant-circumcision* in the *Jewish* church. It is therefore no sufficient ground of prejudice, or objection, against *Infant-baptism*, if some persons dislike, or refuse it; especially when it shall be considered, how many *more*, on the other side, have declared for it, and *how long* it hath been practised in the *christian* church.

The *Antiquity* of this practice is the Subject of our present Enquiry. And here again, so far as I am able to judge, want of attention to the state and circumstances of persons and things, in the Primitive Church, hath proved the cause of error and deception. For, it was by *degrees* that the *christian* religion gained ground in the world; and so, from time to time, *new* Converts came over to the *christian* church, and, by consequence, adult baptisms were very common of course in the earlier ages. But, to conclude from *hence*, as some persons would do, that *Infant-baptism* was not in use at that time, is evidently a wrong conclusion. For, it by no means follows, that Infants were not ordinarily baptiz-
zed

zed in those days, only because adult persons, not born of christian parents, were admitted to baptism. The Antipedo-baptists themselves vouchsafe, to grant “ that Infant-baptism “ began to spread in the third century, and “ generally prevailed in the fourth [1].” And yet during that period, there are some remarkable instances, and examples of adult baptism. ’Tis true ; these cases have been mistaken, and misrepresented. For, the persons, so baptized, were not born of baptized christian parents, as some have supposed, and upon that supposition denied the general use of Infant-baptism in the first ages of the christian church. The pretence, I own, was very plausible at the first, and before the matter of fact came to be critically examined by the light of history. To read, or to hear, that such eminent and illustrious personages, as *Constantine, Constantius, Gratian, Theodosius* the first, &c. were not baptized in their infancy ; *this*, upon a slight and superficial view, might be apt, to raise a strong suspicion, that Infant-baptism was a thing little known, or practised, at the time of their nativity. But, upon a particular examination of these and the like instances, it appears, that most, if not all of them relate to persons, whose

[1] “ Infant-Baptism was moved for in the third Century ; “ got footing, and establishment in the fourth and fifth ; and “ so prevailed until the time of the Reformation.” *Dr. Gill, The Divine Right of Inf. Bap. examined, &c. p. 24.*

whose parents (one, or both) at the time of their birth, were not *baptized Christians* themselves [m]. Consequently, no argument can be drawn, or *pertinently* urged, from such examples, to disprove the constant use of Infant-baptism, in relation to the children of professed christians. A single exception, or two, if any such be found, cannot be thought of sufficient force, to set aside a general rule, or to prove a contrary custom; especially considering that a delay of baptism, in some cases, may be otherwise accounted for, without supposing Infant-baptism not to have been generally practised in the same period.

This Point, I presume, hath been cleared up by other hands, particularly by the useful labours of *Dr. Wall*; to the conviction of the most judicious and learned Antipedo-baptists themselves; because, they are now silent upon this head. There is, I confess, one *Norcot* (to say nothing of *others* [n]) who hath again made a flourish with these great names in a book called, *Believer's Baptism displayed* [o]. But, he hath *displayed* little wisdom, or modesty in so doing. His leader seems to have been Colonel *Danvers* that noted

[m] See *Wall's Hist. of Infant-Baptism. Part. 2. Ch. 3.*

[n] Some of the more illiterate among the Antipædo-baptists are often haranguing upon the same subject, both in public, and private.

[o] See his Postscript.

ted romancer [p]. In short, all the instances; referred to before, have been shewed to be nothing to the purpose, excepting *one* only, and that a dubious one at the most; viz. the case of *Gregory Nazianzen*; at the time of whose birth, that his father, (though afterwards a Bishop) was a christian, is far from being certain [q]. The general stream of history would prove the contrary, but for one single passage in his life, writ by himself [r]; which therefore hath puzzled all the Critics. So that that the learned Dr. *Wall* could find no way, to reconcile it with historical truth, but by supposing a *corruption* of the text, and offering an emendation [s]. But, as I am not fond of such expedients, I would humbly propose another method of removing the difficulty, e. g. *thus*: When *Gregory Nazianzen's*

[p] Dr. *Wall* hath given his character. Hist. of Inf. Bap. Part 2. ch. 2.

[q] That *Greg. Nazianzen's* father was once a Heathen, appears from what himself says of him. De Vitâ suâ.

[r] Οὐπω ἰσθῆλον ἐκμεμέτρηκας βίου,
 Ὅσος διήλθε θυσιῶν ἐμοὶ χρόνος. i. e.
 Nondum tot anni sunt tui, quot jam in sacris
 Mihi sunt peracti victimis.—

[s] “ If one were to amend by the sense without any book, or manuscript, I should think that θυσιῶν has crept in by mistake for πολιῶν, &c.—*You are not so old, as my gray hairs are,*——is to the purpose of the Father’s argument at that place.” Hist. of Inf. Bap. p. 2. ch. 3. sect. 5. Edit. 3. It will yield as congruous a sense, if, for θυσιῶν, we read φουσιῶντ’ a participle agreeing with ἐμοῖ, which is an easier correction. φουσιῶν, ἀδμαίνων, πνευστιῶν. Hesych. Thus, the sense will be, *I have been troubled with an asthma before you was born.*

zen's father speaks of the *time of sacrifices*, he might refer, not to the time when himself was made a Bishop, (which probably was at a very advanced age, as he was a heathen in his younger days) but to what was the most usual time, in those days, of Bishops entering upon their office; and this, according to the *Constitutions* [t], was at fifty years of age, though that rule was not always observed [u]. Thus then, the good old Bishop, urging his son to assist him in his weighty charge, may be conceived, to tell him, among other Arguments, "that he had survived (*the commencement* of) the Episcopal age, more "years than his son had lived:" and not, that his son had not lived so many years, as himself had been a Bishop, according to the Latin translation.—I submit this remark to the judgment of the critical, and candid Reader. And if, after all, it shall not appear of sufficient weight and force, to serve the purpose intended; yet, from the single instance of *Gregory Nazianzen*, no argument can be drawn (as I hinted before) to disprove the general practice of Infant-baptism in that age; for, by the confession of Antipedo-baptists themselves, it generally prevailed in the fourth Century. But, that it

then

[t] *Constit. Apost. lib. 2. cap. 1.*

[u] See *Bingham. Antiq. of the Chr. Ch. B. 2. Ch. 10. S. 1.*

then first began to prevail, or received it's establishment, as is pretended [w]; this is a mere presumption, without any historical proof, as I hope to shew in the Sequel, by considering the practice of the primitive church, with reference to *Infant-Baptism*; in the time of St. *Augustin*, and from thence tracing it back to the first ages of all ††.

S E C T I O N II.

A View of Infant-Baptism in the fourth Century.

IN order to fix the antiquity, and trace back the original, of *Infant-Baptism*, we shall begin at the time of St. *Augustin*, who

C 2

flou-

[w] See Dr. Gill, *ubi supra*.

†† The order of *Catechumens* in the primitive Church has been alledged as a proof, that *Infant-Baptism* was not practised in these days. But this can be no proof at all. For that order subsisted in the time of St. *Austin*: [Vid. *Augustin de Fide Catechumen, &c.*] when *Infant-Baptism*, as its opponents acknowledge, was in common use. The truth is, the order of *Catechumens*, (properly so called, viz. those who were instructed in the Christian religion to prepare them for baptism,) were not persons born of baptized Christian Parents, but such, (or their children) as *relinquished Paganism, and came over to the Christian faith*: as Lord King observes. [Enquiry into the Constitution, &c. of the Primitive Church. P. 2. Ch. 3. S. 3. Compare the learned Beza's note on 1 Cor. vii. beginning.]

flourished about the end of this century, and in whose days the practice of Pædo-baptism did confessedly prevail. But, when it is pretended, that it was chiefly owing to his influence, and authority, that it did so generally prevail, either then or afterwards [x]; this pretence is a contradiction both to history and to common sense. For, St. *Augustin* himself speaks of it, as the *antient* practice of the *universal* church [y]. And how could he be so rash and stupid, as to affirm such a thing, if Infant-Baptism was generally known in his days, to be a *novel*, or late invention, which owed it's *establishment* to himself? Let me farther observe, when the *Pelagians* were strongly pressed with an argument, in proof of Original Sin, from Infant-baptism; they never denied it to be an apostolical institution, or the perpetual practice of the christian church; which, being the shortest way to get clear of the difficulty, they would undoubtedly have taken it, if they had any ground for such a pretence, as they must have had according to the modern hypothesis of our Antipædo-baptists. Their hypothesis therefore is groundless and absurd. For any one to say, that the *Pelagians durst not deny*

[x] See *Tambes Examen*. p. 12.

[y] Ut antiquitus universa Ecclesia pertineret fideles parvulos originalis peccati remissionem per Christi baptismum consecutos. *Augustin cont. Pelag. lib. 3.*

deny Infant-Baptism [z], is an idle conceit, and plainly saying nothing, for want of having something to say. For, what *durst* not *they* do, who had the courage, to deny Original Sin? which was generally considered, at that time, and strenuously urged, as the ground, and reason of Infant-Baptism; so that upon this very score they were charged with denying Infant-Baptism, as a consequence of their denying Original Sin, but they disowned the charge; and acknowledged the necessity of Infant-Baptism, though upon a different ground [a]. It was not therefore, for want of *courage*; for, they were *men of mettle*; but for want of *evidence*, that the *Pelagians* did not deny Infant-Baptism. The plain truth of the matter then is, they *could not* deny it. But, the fact itself is enough for our purpose, viz. that the *Pelagians did not* deny Infant-Baptism [b], when the fairest opportunity was offered, and they had the strongest temptation to deny it, if they could have done it consistently with honour and truth. This appears to me an unanswerable argument, that the practice of Infant-Baptism was far from being a *new* thing, or looked upon as a *human invention*, in those days; but, on the contrary, was considered, on all sides, as a divine institution, and the in-

[z] *Tombes Examen. P. 2. Sect. 2.*

[a] *Vid. Hieronym. advers. Pelag. lib. 3. sub. tit. 1.*

[b] *Vid. G. J. Voff. Hist. Pelag. lib. 2. par. 2.*

morial practice of the christian church [c]. It is an argument which I suspect the Anti-pædo-baptists do not care to look in the face; and, though the celebrated Dr. *Gill* hath been lately forced to attack it, or give up the cause; we shall presently see, that it stands firm against all his artillery.

One method taken to invalidate the force of this argument, is alledging *other* Ecclesiastical customs, which prevailed as generally in the primitive church, as Infant-Baptism, under the notion of *unwritten traditions*; and yet are not held by us to be apostolical institutions. But before any great execution can be done this way, it must be first shewn, that the said Ecclesiastical customs have the same evidence from the *testimony* of the antients for their apostolical institution; that they were put to the same *test* with Infant-Baptism, to try their true antiquity and authority; and that they *stood* the trial, as Infant-Baptism did. For, if these things cannot be made to appear, 'tis evidently not *right*, but very wrong, to put them upon the same foot, as if we were equally obliged to receive the one, as the other, that we may preserve the character of *honest* men [d]. But more of this matter hereafter. At present I shall apply myself to
a par-

[c] See this argument well urged. The Baptism of Infants a Reasonable Service. Arg. 5.

[d] See Dr. *Gill's* Remarks on the Bap. of Inf. a Reas. Serv. p. 27.

a particular, and distinct consideration of all, that Dr. Gill hath advanced, in order to evade the force of our argument, as stated above.

1. Says the Doctor, “ However embarrassed *Pelagius* might be with the argument, it did not lead to a controversy about the *subject*, but the *end* of baptism, and about the latter, not the former *was* the dispute. [e].” Very well! then both sides were agreed about the *subject* of baptism. However, the dispute with the *Pelagians* did *in fact* lead to a controversy about the subject of baptism, so far as that they were actually pressed, and even teased with an argument from Infant-Baptism; as the learned Doctor cannot but know. And how easy a matter had it been for them, to crush this argument at once, and get clear of it for ever, without any more ado, only by denying Infant-Baptism, if they could have denied it with a safe conscience? I appeal to the Doctor himself, whether this was not the shortest way, and the most effectual method, to silence all his opponents. This may serve, as a proper answer to what follows [f]. “ Nor was he under so great a temptation, and much less necessity, nor did it so greatly concern him to deny the baptism of Infants, on account of his tenet; since he was able upon his principles to point out other ends of their
“ baptism,

[e] *Ibid.* p. 20. [f] *Ibid.*

“ baptism, than that of remission of sin ; and
 “ particularly their receiving, and enjoying
 “ the kingdom of heaven, &c.” There is
 nothing in all this, that affects our argument,
 in the least. We readily grant, that *Pelagius*
 was not obliged by his principles to deny
 Infant-Baptism. On the contrary, we affirm,
 and maintain, that he neither did, nor could
 deny it. But, what we urge is this, that, when
 he was vehemently pressed with an argument
 from Infant-Baptism in proof of original sin, In-
 fant-Baptism was considered as a *medium* al-
 lowed on both sides, and it is what *Pelagius*
 never disputed, when he had a fair *occasion*
 given him to deny it, if he could have done
 it with any appearance of modesty, reason,
 and truth.—The Doctor proceeds.

2. [g] “ It should be known, and observ-
 “ ed, that we have no writings of *Pelagius*
 “ extant, &c.”——But, where is the use, or
 importance of *knowing and observing* this, in
 the present case, when Dr. *Gill* doth not de-
 ny “ that he hath been used fairly, and is
 “ willing to allow his (i. e. *Austin's*) authori-
 “ ties.” Why, it is here, that we join issue
 with him ; for, it is only upon such evidence,
 as we *have*, that we can proceed, in deciding
 any controverted point of this nature. If the
Doctor can produce any better ; we are ready
 to attend to it. But he goes on thus,

3. “ How-

3. [b] “ However acute, learned, and fa-
 “ gacious *Pelagius* was, yet falling in with
 “ the *stream of the times*, and not seeing him-
 “ self concerned about the *subjects*, but the
 “ end of baptism, might give himself no
 “ trouble to enquire into the rise of it; but
 “ take it for granted, as *Austin* did, — that
 “ it had been the constant usage of the church,
 “ and an apostolic tradition.” — Upon which
 it is obvious to remark. (1.) We have here
 a fair concession that *the stream of the times* ran
 in favour of Infant-Baptism, as the *constant u-*
sage of the church, and an apostolic tradition,
 in the days of *Austin*; and of *Pelagius*, who
 began in the year 400 to teach his errors at
Rome, as says *Dupin* [i]. (2.) That *Pelagius*
 should fall in with *the stream of the times*,
 whatever *Austin* might do, is highly impro-
 bable. Nor can it be supposed that *Austin*
 himself acted in this manner, without grant-
 ing at the same time, that the practice of In-
 fant-Baptism was a prevailing custom before
 he came into play, which therefore could not
 be owing to his influence, and authority [k].
 For, though we allow him to be a very acute
 man; yet surely he could not be the author
 of such an ingenious contrivance, as first to
raise the stream of the times, and then suffer
 himself to be *carried away* with it. But, in
 D respect

[b] *Ibid.* p. 21. [i] *Hist. Eccles.* [k] See *Wall's*
Answer to Calc. p. 427.

respect to *Pelagius*, I say, it is highly improbable that he should fall in with the stream of the times, and take the thing, in question, for granted without examination. So that there is no weight, or force in the Doctor's suggestion, viz. " that *Pelagius* might give " himself no trouble to enquire into the rise " of Infant-Baptism." For, we are not enquiring into mere *possibilities*, but *probabilities*, and facts. And whatever *Austin* was, it is certain that *Pelagius* was not of that temper, and complexion, as to fall in with the stream of the times. Witness his open opposition to the vulgar doctrine of original sin. In this case *Pelagius* went *against* the stream of the times, and particularly against *Austin* himself, whether at the head, or in the midst of the stream. (3.) If *Pelagius* saw himself no ways concerned about the subjects, but the end of baptism; as Dr. *Gill* says; this implies, that Infant-Baptism was no point of controversy between him, and his opponents. It was a point in which both sides were fully agreed; otherwise, when he was urged with an argument from Infant-Baptism, he might have dispatched it at once, and struck all his adversaries dumb, by denying Infant-Baptism; as, I am persuaded, Dr. *Gill*, or any other skilful disputant, would have done in the same case; and *Pelagius* appears to have been a man of sufficient *sagacity*, I add
of

of *spirit* too, not to have let slip such an advantage.—But let us attend the *Doctor*.

4. “Tho’ *Pelagius* complained, that he
 “ was defamed, and slandered by some, who
 “ charged him with denying Infant-Baptism ;
 “ yet this, *Austin* observes, was only a shift
 “ of his, in order to invert the state of the
 “ question, that he might more easily an-
 “ swer to what was objected to him, and pre-
 “ serve his own opinion [1].” —Now, for my
 part, I cannot conceive, with what view *Dr.*
Gill mentioned this, or with what pertinency
 it is brought in here, unless with a design to in-
 sinuate, that *Pelagius*, notwithstanding his
 pretences to the contrary, did really deny In-
 fant-Baptism. For, the *Doctor* immediately
 adds ; “ And certain it is, according to *Auf-*
 “ *tin*, that the *Pelagians* did deny baptism to
 “ some Infants, even to the Infants of Believ-
 “ ers, &c.” — But, I must leave the *Doc-*
tor, to reconcile this with what he had
 said, under the last article, of *Pelagius fal-*
ling in with the stream of the times, and not see-
ing himself concerned about the subjects of bap-
tism ; and so proceed to examine the truth
 of his round assertion, “ that, according to
 “ *Austin*, the *Pelagians* did deny baptism to
 “ some Infants, even the Infants of Believ-
 “ ers.” A strange assertion indeed ! and a
 very false one ; as I shall shortly prove, I hope

to the Doctor's conviction. At present, let us consider, what the *complaint* of *Pelagius* really was, and *Austin's* reflections upon it, in order to set the matter in a true light, that the Reader may not be mislead by the *Doctor's* representation of the case. *Pelagius* then said [*m.*] “ that he was defamed, and slandered by some men, as denying the sacrament of baptism to Infants, and promising the kingdom of heaven to some without the redemption of Christ. But (says *Austin*) these things are not so objected to them, as he hath put them. For, neither do they deny the sacrament of baptism to Infants, nor promise the kingdom of heaven to any without the redemption of Christ. Therefore, what he complains of being defamed
“ for,

[*m.*] In literis etiam, quas Romam misit (sc. *Pelagius*) ad beatæ memoriæ papam Innocentium (quoniam eum in corpore non invenerunt, et sancto papæ Zozimo datæ sunt, atque ad nos inde directæ) dicit se ab hominibus infamari, quod negat parvulis baptismi sacramentum, et absque redemptione Christi aliquibus cœlorum regna promittat. Sed non sic illis hæc obijciuntur, ut posuit. Nam neque parvulis negant baptismi sacramentum, neque absque redemptione Christi aliquibus cœlorum regna promittunt. Itaque unde se queritur infamari eo modo proposuit, ut facile posset crimini objecto, salvo suo dogmate, respondere. Objicitur autem illis, quod non baptizatos parvulos nolunt damnationi primi hominis obnoxios confiteri, et in eos transisse originale peccatum regeneratione purgandum, quoniam propter accipiendum regnum cœlorum tantummodo eos baptizandos esse contendunt, &c. — Ecce quod eis obijcitur de baptismo parvulorum! non quod ipse ita proposuit, ut possit suæ propositioni, quasi adversantis objectioni, secundum sua dogmata respondere. Denique, quomodo respondeat advertite, et videte latebras, &c. *Augustin. de Peccat. Orig. cont. Pelag. et Celest. lib. 2.*

“ for, he hath *stated* in such a manner, as
 “ that he might easily answer to what was
 “ objected to him, and preserve his own opi-
 “ nion. (i. e. *as to original sin*) Now, that,
 “ which is objected against them, is *this*,
 “ that they will not acknowledge unbapti-
 “ zed Infants to be liable to the condemna-
 “ tion of the first man, and that *original sin*
 “ hath passed upon them to be purged by re-
 “ generation; because they maintain, *that*
 “ *they are to be baptized only* that they may
 “ receive the kingdom of heaven, &c.—Be-
 “ hold what is objected to them concerning
 “ the baptism of Infants! &c.”—— Thus,
 whatever shuffling *Pelagius* might use, it was
 not to disguise any private opinion he enter-
 tained against Infant-Baptism, as *Dr. Gill's*
 way of introducing this matter would lead
 one to suspect. For, as *Austin* affirms, this
 was not the thing laid to his charge; on the
 contrary, *Austin* expressly says, that the *Pe-
lagians* did not deny the sacrament of baptism
 to Infants, but held that they were to be bap-
 tized, that they might receive the kingdom
 of heaven.

Let us now examine the truth of our learn-
 ed Doctor's assertion, viz. “ and *certain* it is,
 “ according to *Austin*, that the *Pelagians*
 “ did deny baptism to some Infants, even to
 “ the Infants of Believers, and that for this
 “ reason, because they were holy.” Here,
 upon a little enquiry, it will appear, that the
 Doctor

Doctor was lead into a great mistake, by understanding *absolutely* what was only spoken *hypothetically*. For, the *Pelagians* did not absolutely deny baptism to the Infants of Believers; but they only denied the necessity of it upon the *supposition* of their antagonists, viz. that the design of baptism was *to cleanse from sin*: still insisting upon the necessity of their baptism on another account, viz. *that they might enter into the kingdom of heaven*. It is a disadvantage in this argument, that we have none of their writings entire, and compleat, but are obliged to take up with small scraps, and quotations from them, without the benefit of seeing them in their due order, and connexion. However, by a narrow inspection of the passage upon which Dr. Gill hath grounded his mistake, we shall easily detect, and expose his error. St. *Augustin* introduceth the discourse thus [n]: “ But
 “ what we have said above, in answer to
 “ those that say, If a sinner begets a sinner,
 “ a righteous man should beget a righteous
 “ man; the same we also say in answer
 “ to those, who affirm, that one born of a
 “ baptized person should be considered as al-
 “ ready baptized, &c.”—Now, this argument
 affects

[n] Quod autem supra respondimus adversus eos, qui dicunt, si peccator genuit peccatorem, justum quoque justum gignere debuit: hoc etiam his respondemus, qui dicunt de homine baptizato natum, jam veluti baptizatum haberi debuisse, &c. *Augustin. de Peccat. merit. et remis. cont. Pelag. lib. 2.*

affects the adult children, as well as the Infants, of baptized christians. But to proceed: a little after we have these words [o]; “ But
 “ the apostle says, *your children would be un-*
 “ *clean, but now are they holy*: and therefore
 “ say they, the children of Believers ought
 “ not now to be baptized.” This is the
 passage upon which Dr. Gill hath grounded
 his assertion, that the *Pelagians* denied baptism
 to the Infants of Believers. But (not to in-
 sist, that the words do not mention Infants,
 but children at large, and so may include the
 adult children of Believers; and consequently
 make as much against adult Baptism, as In-
 fant-Baptism) that the *Pelagians* did not *ab-*
olutely deny baptism to the Infants of Believ-
 ers, is evident from what follows in answer to
 their argument; which is only *argumentum*
ad hominem. Says *Austin* [p] “ It is not con-
 “ trary to our assertion, although holy chil-
 “ dren are born of Believers, that we say, if
 “ *they are not baptized, they go into condem-*
 “ *nation; to whom (viz. the unbaptized chil-*
 “ *dren*

[o] At enim ait apostolus, Filii vestri immundi essent, nunc autem sunt sancti; et ideo inquit fidelium filii jam baptizari minime debuerunt. *Augustin. ibid.*

[p] Et contra nostram quidem non est assertionem, etiam si ex fidelibus sancti propagantur, quod eos dicimus, *si non baptizantur*, pergere in damnationem, quibus et ipsi regnum cælorum intercludunt, quamvis eos dicant non habere ullum vel proprium, vel originale peccatum. *Augustin. ibid.* Upon another occasion St. *Augustin* says, that the *Pelagians* never denied, that Infants could not enter into the kingdom of heaven without baptism. *De Peccat. Origin. cont. Pelag. et Cælest. lib. 2.*

“ *dren of Believers*) even they themselves
 “ (viz. the *Pelagians*) shut the kingdom of
 “ heaven, though they say, they have no
 “ sin, personal, or original.”—And now, let
 any impartial Reader judge, whether, as I
 said before, the learned *Doctor* was not lead
 into a great mistake, by understanding *absolu-*
tely, what was only spoken *hypothetically*.
 For, it manifestly appears, from the very
 words of *Austin* in the place referred to by the
Doctor, that the *Pelagians* held Baptism to be
 necessary for the Infants of Believers. There-
 fore, they could not deny Baptism to such In-
 fants *absolutely*, but only upon the supposi-
 tion of their opponents, viz. that the design
 of Baptism was *to cleanse from sin*. And thus,
 the direct contrary of what *Dr. Gill* asserts is
certain according to Austin. We shall take
 him tripping again, under the next article,
 and in a yet more egregious manner.

5. “ *Pelagius* says *no such thing*, that he
 “ never heard, no not even any impious he-
 “ retic, who denied Baptism to Infants [q].”
 This is a surprizing assertion in the *Doctor*.
 For, we shall presently prove, and out of his
 own mouth, that *Pelagius* said the *very thing*
itself. His words are [r], “ that he never
 “ heard, no not of any impious heretic, who
 “ would say this concerning Infants, which
 he

[q] *Ibid.* p. 24.

[r] Nunquam se vel impium aliquem hæreticum audisse
 qui hoc, quod proposuit, de parvulis diceret.

“ he had *proposed*, or mentioned.” — “ The
 “ sense, as the *Doctor* rightly observes, de-
 “ pends upon the phrase, *quod proposuit, what*
 “ *he had proposed, or mentioned, of whom,*
 “ and what that is to be understood.” But
 the same or the like phrase is used several
 times in the discourse, and plainly refers eve-
 ry time to the same person, and thing, viz.
 “ to *Pelagius* himself, and to the state of the
 “ question, as he had put it [s];” to borrow
 the *Doctor*’s words again. Accordingly, the
Doctor says, *this seems to be the sense* [t].
 Well! thus far we are agreed. Nothing now
 remains, for clearing up the whole matter,
 but to consider, how *Pelagius* had, in fact,
 stated the question. “ Representing (says the
 “ *Doctor*) that he was charged with promi-
 “ sing the kingdom of heaven to some with-
 “ out the redemption of Christ [u].” But oh,
 good *Doctor*! Is this the *whole* of his represen-
 tation? (or *proposition*, to use *St. Austin*’s phrase)
 Have you not (I am loth to say *designedly*)
 dropt the *first part* of it? the part, which ex-
 pressly mentions the *Baptism of Infants*? the
 very part, in short, upon which the present
 question depends! For, *Pelagius* had repre-
 sented, and complained [w] “ that he was
 E “ unjust-

[s] *Ibid.* p. 23. ut posuit—eo modo proposuit—ita propo-
 suit, ut possit sue propositioni, &c. Vid. supra not. [m].

[t] *Ibid.* [u] *Ibid.*

[w] Dicit se ab hominibus infamari, quod neget parvulis
 baptismi sacramentum, et absque redemptione Christi hæc ali-
 quibus cælorum regna promittat. Vid. supra not. [m].

“ unjustly charged with *denying the sacra-*
 “ *ment of baptism to Infants*, and promising
 “ the kingdom of heaven to some without the
 “ redemption of Christ ;” as we have seen be-
 fore. Therefore *this* is, in part, what *Pelagius*
 said, he never heard, no not of any impious he-
 retic that would say concerning Infants, viz.
 that they were to be denied Baptism; which
 was one thing falsely laid to his charge, as *Pela-*
gius complained: and the words refer to the
state of the question, as he had put it, by Dr.
Gill's own confession. Consequently, the
 learned *Doct̄or* is mistaken again, or (which
 I would hope is not the case) willing to lead
 others into a mistake, when he affirms, that
Pelagius says *no such thing*. And to what
 can we impute the *Doct̄or's* quoting by halves,
 and his leaving out the main words of the
 sentence, upon which the present debate
 wholly turns? but to his *excessive* modesty,
 which could not bear the mortification of a
 most glaring self-contradiction? But, upon se-
 cond thoughts, he may see reason to retract
 his following words [x], “ take the words
 “ which way you will, they can't be made
 “ say, that he never heard, that any heretic
 “ denied Baptism to Infants.” For, taking
 the words in *his own way*, they as plainly say
this, as the other thing he mentions; because
 both are equally included in the *proposition*,

OR

[x] *Ibid.* p. 24.

or in the *state of the question*, as *Pelagius* had put it. And if the Baptism of Infants was not included in the proposition; how comes their *Baptism*, and *regeneration in Christ*, to be mentioned afterwards with *reference* to it [y]? whether *putat*, or *vetat*, be the right reading. Having set this matter in a proper light; let us now follow the Doctor a step farther.

6. “ *Austin* himself doth not say, that he had never heard, or read of any catholic, heretic, or schismatic, that denied Infant-Baptism [z].” — To which I answer, it is not material to the purpose in hand, whether *Austin* himself says so, or not. We have already seen him quote *Pelagius*, saying the strongest thing, that any man could say, for the *perpetual* and *universal* practice of Infant-Baptism in the christian church from the beginning. But, the Doctor adds; “ He *could* never say any such thing;” and gives several reasons for it, which we shall examine in their order.

(1.) Says the Doctor [a], “ He must know, that *Tertullian* had *opposed* it.” — Here the Doctor hath changed the *terms* of the proposition. For, he gives it, as a reason to prove,

E 2 that

[y] “ Dum eos baptizari, et in Christo renasci putat. — So it is in my edition of *Austin*; *putat*, and not *vetat*, as “ Dr. *Wall* quotes it.” Dr. *Gill*. *ibid.* p. 23. Vid. *Wall*'s Hist. of Inf. Bap. p. 1. ch. 19. sect. 30.

[z] *Ibid.* p. 24.

[a] *Ibid.*

that *Austin* had heard of some body, who *denied* Infant-Baptism, that he must know, that *Tertullian* had *opposed* it. But, whatever *Austin* might know of that matter, one thing he certainly knew, viz. how to distinguish between persons *denying* Infant-Baptism, and their *opposing*, or *contradicting* it, in *some sort* [b]. Of this kind was *Tertullian's* opposition to it. For, whatever he said against it, he did not properly *deny* Infant-Baptism; but, on the contrary, allowed of it in cases of necessity; as will be shewn in its proper place. Therefore the Doctor's first argument falls to the ground. For, St. *Austin* might know, that *Tertullian* had some way *opposed* it, and yet have never heard of any one that *denied* Infant-Baptism.

(2.) “ And he himself (says the Doctor [c])
 “ was at the council of *Carthage*, and there
 “ presided, and was at the making of that can-
 “ non, which runs thus; *also it is our plea-*
 “ *sure, that whoever denies, that new-born*
 “ *Infants are to be baptized — — let him be*
 “ *anathema*: but to what purpose was this
 “ canon made, if he, and his brethren knew
 “ of none that denied Infant-Baptism? To
 “ say, that this respects some people, who
 “ were still of the same opinion with *Fidus*,
 “ an *African* Bishop that lived 150 years be-
 “ fore

[b] See his words in our Title-page.

[c] *Ibid.*

“ fore this time, that Infants were not to be
 “ baptized until they were eight days old, is an
 “ idle notion of Doctor *Wall* [*d*] : can any
 “ man in his senses think, that a council,
 “ consisting of all the Bishops in *Africa*,
 “ should agree to *anathemize* their own bre-
 “ thren, who were in the same opinion, and
 “ practice of Infant-Baptism with themselves;
 “ only they thought it should not be admi-
 “ nistred to them, as soon as born, but at
 “ eight days old? *Credat Judæus Apella, &c.*”

—Now here let it be observed (1.) It appears by the instance of *Fidus* (whose opinion might possibly survive himself 150 years; there is no *absurdity* in the supposition) that some persons might be against the baptizing of *new-born* Infants; and yet not deny Infant-Baptism, unless they could both deny, and practise it at the same time. For, *Fidus* himself was for having Infants baptized, when they were eight days old; at which age they surely were Infants still. Accordingly (2.) The *Canon* before us relates, not to Infants at large, but only to *new-born* Infants. For, so it is expressed, both in the *Greek* [*e*], and likewise in the old *Latin* copy, in a Treatise bound up with *St. Austin's* works [*f*]. Therefore, to extend

[*d*] Hist. of Inf. Bap. part 1. ch. 19. sect. 37.

[*e*] Τὰ μιστὰ, ἢ νεογέννητα ἐκ τῶν γαστέρων τῶν μητέρων.
 Canon. 112. Synod. Carthag. Balsamon.

[*f*] Quicumque parvulos recentes ab uteris matrum baptizandos negat, &c. *De Ecclesiast. Dogmat.*

tend the canon farther, than to *new-born* Infants, is evidently to pervert it's meaning, and to put a sense upon the canon, which the makers of it never intended. For, if they meant Infants at large; why did they use such a restrictive term, as *new-born* Infants! It must then be a wrong conclusion, for any one to infer from hence, either that *Austin*, or any of his brethren, knew of some, that denied Infant-Baptism. For, if any persons were against the baptizing of *new-born* Infants; it by no means follows, that they denied Infant-Baptism. Because, as appears by the instance of *Fidus*, those, that were in the same opinion and practice of Infant-Baptism with themselves, might nevertheless think, that it should not be administered to them, *as soon as born*. It is observable, that *St. Austin* himself [g] makes mention of *new-born* children, by way of contradistinction from children *eight days* old, with an eye to the scruple of *Fidus*. (3.) It is demonstrably *certain*, that this canon was not made against any persons, that denied Infant-Baptism. Because, it was made against *Pelagius*, and *Celestius*, as is noted by *Photius*, who mentions this canon [b]. But, neither of these men denied Infant-Baptism. What then did they deny? The resolution of this point will lead us into the

[g] *De peccator. merit. et remis. lib. 3.*

[b] *Bibliothec. Cod. 53.*

the true meaning, and design of the canon; and so furnish us with a proper answer to the Doctor's question, (viz. "to what purpose was this canon made?") without receding in the least from our hypothesis, that the makers of the canon, even their grand president himself (tho' the council consisted of all the Bishops in *Africa*) *knew of none, that denied Infant-Baptism.*—Now, though *Pelagius* denied, *Celestius* confessed that, according to the usual form of Baptism, Infants were to be baptized *for the remission of sin*; and both agreed in this, that Infants derived no *original sin from Adam*. Let us then consider the canon, which was made against them jointly, with proper attention; and it will appear to be judiciously, and accurately framed, in few words, according to this double occasion. The canon bears this *title* [*i*], "That Infants are, or are to be, baptized *for the remission of sin.*" And it runs thus [*k*]: "It is also our pleasure, that whosoever *denys* that Infants *new-born* are to be baptized, (e. g. *Pelagius*) or says that they should be baptized, (e. g. *Celestius* [*l*]) *for the remission of sin*; but that they derive no original sin from *Adam*,
" which

[*i*] Ὅτι τὰ μικρὰ εἰς ἄφεσιν ἁμαρτίων βαπτίζονται.

[*k*] Ομοίως ἤρσαν, ἵνα ἕως δῆποτε τὰ μικρὰ, καὶ νεογέννητα ἐκ τῶν γαστέρων τῶν μητέρων βαπτίζόμενα ἀρνεῖται, ἢ λέγει εἰς ἄφεσιν ἁμαρτιῶν, ἀλλὰ βαπτίζεσθαι, μηδὲν δὲ ἐκ τῆς τοῦ Ἀδάμ, &c.—ἀνάθεμα ἔστω.

[*l*] Vid. *Augustin. cont. Celest. &c. lib. 2. de peccat. orig. cap. 5.*

“ which ought to be cleansed by the laver
 “ of regeneration, &c. (e. g. both *Pelagius*,
 “ and *Celestius*) let him be *anathema*.” Thus,
 according to the *title*, and to the *occasion*, and
 to the *construction* of this canon, it is so fram-
 ed, as that the *remission of sin* stands in con-
 nexion with the *first*, as well as with the se-
 cond clause; there being a plain contrast be-
 tween *Pelagius’s denying*, and *Celestius’s con-
 fessing*, the Baptism of Infants for the *remis-
 sion of sin*. Therefore, that part of the canon
 was not made against any person, that abso-
 lutely denied the Baptism even of *new-born*
 Infants; but against *him*, who denied, that
new-born Infants were to be baptized for the
remission of sin; as is well known *Pelagius* did,
 tho’ he held their baptism to be necessary up-
 on another account, viz. *that they might enter
 into the kingdom of heaven*. This discovers
 the reason of the council’s so particularly spe-
 cifying *new-born* Infants. (or, Infants *new-
 born from their mother’s womb*; as the canon
 expresses it) Because, as such Infants could
 not be supposed guilty of any *actual*, or *per-
 sonal* sin of their own; this precision in word-
 ing the canon was intended to limit the rea-
 son of their Baptism to *original sin*. In short,
 the whole emphasis lies in *this* circumstance
 of Infants being *new-born*. And no one
 could rationally pretend, as the council itself
 thought [*m*], that such Infants stood in need
 of

[*m*] For, upon that supposition they say, (ὅθεν γίνεσθαι
 αἰώνιον)

of Baptism in it's then *usual* and *common* form, that is to say, *for the remission of sin* [n]; if they derived no *original sin* from *Adam*. And this explains the meaning of what the learned *Photius* says of the council at *Carthage*, who made the canon under consideration, viz. [o] “ that they *anathematized* those, who said, “ that *new-born* Infants stood in no need of “ Baptism, because they derived no original “ sin from *Adam*.”—Therefore, tho' we have no occasion to suppose with *Dr. Wall*, “ that “ the canon respects some people, who were “ still of the same opinion with *Fidus*, an “ African Bishop, that lived 150 years before “ this time;” (*Dr. Gill* may call this an *idle notion*, if he pleaseth; we want it not) Yet (wonder it, who will) “ a council consisting “ of all the Bishops in *Africa*, did, in fact, “ agree, to anathematize their own brethren, “ who were in the same opinion, and practice “ of *Infant-Baptism* with themselves;” only they differed about the *reason* of the thing. Nay, we see by an express clause in the canon,

F that

ἀκόλαστον, ὅτι ἐν τῆσιν ὁ τύπος τῷ εἰς ἀρετὴν ἀμαρτιῶν βαπτισμοῦ ἐκ ἀληθείας, ἀλλὰ πλαστὸς νοεῖται) *Ibid.*

[n] Infantes autem debere baptizari in remissionem peccatorum *secundum regulam universalis ecclesie* — confitemur : says *Celestius*. *Augustin. de peccat. orig. c. 5.* Hence that question, *Quid festinat innocens ætas ad remissionem peccatorum?* *Tertullian. de Baptismo.*

[o] Ὡσαύτως τὸς τὰ βρέφη τὰ ἀπίστοκα μὴ χρεῖαν ἔχειν βαπτισμοῦ, διὰ τὸ μὴ ἔλκειν αὐτὰ προγονικὴν ἀμαρτίαν ἐξ Ἀδάμ, ἀναθεματίζει. *Synodus Carthag. contra Pelagium, & Celestium. Phot. Biblioth. cod. 53.*

that the members of this council were not satisfied, if a person owned, that Infants were to be baptized *for the remission of sin*; unless he acknowledged that they were to be baptized on the account of *original sin* also. And doth not Dr. Gill himself say, and say truly, (St. *Austin* having testified the same thing [p].)

“ that the controversy with the *Pelagians* was
 “ not about the *subject*, but the *end* of Bap-
 “ tism, and about the latter, and not the for-
 “ mer was the dispute [q].”—This, I presume, any competent, and candid Reader will judge a sufficient answer to what the Doctor hath advanced, both lately, and on a former occasion [r], with reference to the *Cartbaginian* council, and their famous *canon*. For, it is manifest upon the whole, “ that tho’ St. *Au-*
 “ *stin* presided in that council, and was at
 “ the making of this canon; he might not-
 “ withstanding, have never heard, or read of
 “ any catholic, heretic, or schismatic, that *de-*
 “ *nied* Infant-Baptism.”—Let us now consider, what farther props, the Doctor hath, to support his tottering hypothesis.

(3.) [s] “ *Austin* himself makes mention of
 “ some, that argued against it after this man-
 “ ner.

[p] Concedunt parvulos baptizari oportere. Non ergo quaestio est inter nos, et ipsos, utrum parvuli baptizandi sint, sed de causâ quaeritur, quare baptizandi sint. *Augustin. de verb. apost. serm.* 14.

[q] *Ibid.* p. 20.

[r] *Divine right of Inf. Bapt. examined, &c.* p. 35.

[s] Remarks on Infant-Bapt. a reasonable serv. p. 25.

“ ner [t].” “ Men are used to ask this question, says he, of what profit is the sacrament of christian-baptism to Infants, seeing when they have received it, for the most part they die, before they know any thing of it.” — But neither doth *this* come up to the point, or prove, what it is alleged for, viz. that *Austin* had heard of any one (I mean any christian, *whether catholic, heretic, or schismatic*) who *denied* Infant-Baptism. For (1.) men might ask such a question for their own information, without *denying* Infant-Baptism, or so much as *arguing against* it. In the same place St. *Austin* makes mention of another question, which some *ignorant* people were used to ask, in reference to the *death* of Infants, and their bodily pains. “ What occasion was there for one *to be born,* “ who departed this life, before he could “ merit any thing?” This question he hath no sooner answered, but he mentions the other question produced by the Doctor, and mentions it in such a manner, as to put it upon the same foot with the former [u]. Now, if that question was asked by any christian, it could only be for the sake of information. (and when persons are *ignorant*, it is very commendable in them to desire, to be informed.) For, it is very absurd to sup-

F 2

pose,

[r] *Augustin. de libero arbit. lib. 3. cap. 23.*

[u] *Quo loco etiam illud perscrutari homines solent, sacramentum baptismi Christi quid parvulis profit, &c.*

pose, that any christian would ask the question, with a design to *argue against* the *birth* of children, dying in Infancy. But, there is the same reason to suppose *this*, as the Doctor hath to suppose, from the like question concerning the *Baptism* of children, dying in infancy, that the persons, who asked the question, *argued against* it. (2.) If they did thus argue against Infant-Baptism; it is incumbent upon the Doctor to prove, that they were *christians*. For, there is some reason to doubt of it, considering in what manner St. *Austin* introduces the *similar* question going before, calling it a *calumny* [w]: And truly, if it was meant as an *objection*, it is such calumny, or reflection upon divine Providence, as could proceed from the mouth of none, but men of atheistical principles. (3.) They might even *argue* in this manner against Infant-Baptism; and yet not *deny* it: nay, be so far from denying it, as to practise it themselves, supposing them to be christians. For, there is such a thing, as *arguing* for *arguing's sake*: and this very way I have known the same question asked among, and *by* those, who do practise Infant-Baptism. And I would gravely ask the Doctor, whether he really thinks, that any of those men, who raised the *other* difficulty about the *birth* of Infants, would scruple, upon the strength of

[w] Huic autem disputationi objici ab *imperitis* solet quædam *calumnia* de mortuis parvulorum, &c. *Augustin. ibid.*

of their own objection, *to render due benevolence?* The application is easy, and I haste to the next thing.

(4.) “ And as before observed (says Dr. Gill [x]) he brings in the *Pelagians* saying, “ that the Infants of believers ought not to “ be baptized [y].” But, in relation to what he hath *before observed* as to this matter; we have *before proved* that our learned Doctor is under a gross mistake. And so we proceed to his last argument, (which will prove faulty, like the rest) to prove, “ that *Austin* could “ not say, what he is made to say.”

(5.) “ And so *Jerome* [z], who was a contemporary of his, speaks of some christians, “ *qui dare noluerint baptismum, who refused to “ give baptism to their children; so that tho’ In- “ fant-Baptism greatly obtained in those times, “ yet was not so general as this author re- “ presents it. Austin* therefore could not “ say, what he is made to say.” Thus far the Doctor [a]. But, as his *conclusion* is now come to it’s last legs; so it will be hard set, to maintain it’s ground. The small scrap of *Latin* words, cited from *Jerome*, may seem, perhaps, to make for his purpose, detached, as they are, from the rest of the sentence; but, considered in their due connexion, they will appear with a different aspect. For, upon examining the passage, the Doctor will be found,

[x] *Ibid.*

[y] *Augustin. de peccator. merit. l. 2. c. 25.*

[z] *Ep. ad Lætam.* [a] *Ibid.*

found, to have repeated his former mistake, by understanding here again *absolutely*, what was only spoken by way of *supposition*. Because, St. *Jerome* is not *relating a fact*; as the Doctor's manner of quoting him would insinuate; but only *putting a case*; in order to illustrate, and enforce a point, which he had to manage with *Læta*, about sending her daughter *Paula* to *Bethlehem*, &c. And having urged that parents are accountable for their children, during their *minority*, he adds [b]; "unless, perhaps, you suppose, the children of christians, if they should not have received *Baptism*, themselves only to be guilty of sin, and the fault not to lie also upon those, that would not give them *Baptism*." Thus, it is plain, St. *Jerome* doth not say, what Dr. *Gill* would make him say; nor is he stating a *matter of fact*, but only arguing upon a *supposition*; and in this manner either he, or any other man, might have argued, if he had never heard of one single christian, that *denied* Infant-Baptism. Besides, if we should suppose, without any necessity, the *case*, which St. *Jerome* puts, to be *fact*; this will not prove, that any christians *denied* Infant-Baptism in those days, but only that they *neglected* it in some instances.

[b] Nisi fortè existimas, Christianorum filios, si *baptisma non receperint*, ipsos tantum reos esse peccati, et non etiam scelus referri ad eos, qui dare noluerint, &c. Hieronym. *Epist. ad Lætam*.

ces [c]. For, it sometimes happens in our days, that children miss of Baptism, and die without it, through the *neglect* of parents, who are far from denying Infant-Baptism nevertheless. By the way, it is obvious to remark, that the great St. *Jerome* thought, that christian parents could not neglect to get their children baptized, without being guilty of a culpable omission.

We have now gone through all the Doctor's proofs, to support his assertion, "that *Austin could not say*, what he is made to "say:" and whether he hath not failed in every one of them, I appeal to all the learned world. Therefore, I will venture to affirm, that for any thing he hath *said* himself to prove the contrary, *Austin could say*, what he is made say; whether, in fact, he did say it, or not; which is not very material. It is sufficient for our purpose, that St. *Austin could say*, if he had any occasion, "that he had never "heard, or read of any catholic, heretic, or "schismatic, that denied Infant-Baptism." And I am amazed to think, that, in attempting to prove the contrary, Dr. *Gill* could satisfy himself, or expect to convince others, with such slight, and superficial arguments. This to me appears very wonderful in a person of his approved learning, and unsuspected integrity

[c] See *Wall's Hist. of Inf. Bap. P. 2. ch. 3. on Greg. Nazian.*

integrity ; nor can I otherways account for it, than from the power of prejudices or hurry of precipitation.

What the Doctor next adds, is of little force, speaking still of *Austin* [d]. “ But
 “ what then doth he say, that he never re-
 “ membered to have read, in any catholic,
 “ heretic, or schismatic writer? why, that
 “ Infants were not to be baptized, that they
 “ might receive the remission of sins, but that
 “ they might be sanctified in Christ, &c.”
 I think the Doctor is here in the right; and also in what follows [e], “ in the same sense
 “ are we to understand him, when he says,
 “ and this the church has *always* had, has
 “ *always* held [f].” “ What? why, that
 “ Infants are diseased thro’ *Adam*; and stand
 “ in need of a physician; and are brought to
 “ the church to be healed. It was the doc-
 “ trine of original sin, and the Baptism of
 “ Infants for the remission of it, he speaks
 “ of in these passages.”—I say, in my opini-
 on, Dr. *Gill* hath here given a true represen-
 tation of *Austin’s* sense. But then, I must de-
 sire the favour of him, to resolve me one
 question, (whether Infants were to be bapti-
 zed for the *remission of sin*, or for their *sancti-
 fication*) viz. How could any christian, ca-
 tholic, heretic, or schismatic, believe, that
 the

[d] *Ibid.* [e] *Ibid.* p. 26.
 [f] *De verb. apost. serm.* 10.

the Baptism of Infants was of any use, or efficacy for *either* purpose, without supposing, at the same time, that Infant-Baptism was of *divine authority*, or an apostolical institution, and consequently that it had been *always* practised in the christian church? Accordingly, thus much seems to be *implied* in St. *Austin's* saying, "This the church has *always* had, has *always* held." And though, as the Doctor observes [g], "it is one thing what *Austin* says, and another, what *may be thought* to be the consequence of his so saying;" yet, where is the difference between what *Austin* says, and what *is* a natural consequence of his saying it? such a consequence as *Austin* himself would own, and acknowledge [h]. And, "it is true indeed, says the Doctor [i], "he took Infant-Baptism to be an antient, "and constant use of the church, and an "apostolic tradition." But then the Doctor's way of accounting for this notion of *Austin* is very extraordinary, and such only as might be expected from a writer, that is at a loss what to say. For, thus he proceeds; "which *perhaps* he had taken up from the "Latin translations of *Origen* by *Jerome* and "Ruffinus, &c."—But, I must tell the learned

G ed

[g] *Ibid.*

[h] *Consuetudo tamen matris Ecclesiæ in baptizandis parvulis nequaquam spernenda est, neque ullo modo superflua deputanda, nec omnino credenda, nisi apostolica esset traditio.* Augustin. de Genes. ad lit. lib. 10.

[i] *Ibid.*

ed *Doctor*, a *perhaps* will not do in this case. As to the business of the *Latin* translations of *Origen* by *Jerome* and *Ruffinus*; we shall settle that account with the *Doctor* in due time. At present, since *Jerome*, and *Ruffinus* were his cotemporaries, it is natural to ask, how *they* came by the notion, that Infant-Baptism was an *apostolic tradition*, or *institution*? (words of the same import in the ecclesiastic stile) And, why might not *Austin* come by the notion the same way, that they did, without being beholden to them for it? But, if *St. Austin* took the notion from any particular writer of the church; he had a much *carlier* author (an *original* too) than these *Latin* translators of *Origen*. For, he says himself [k], “ Blessed *Cyprian* indeed, not
 “ making any *new* decree, but preserving the
 “ established faith of the church, to rectify
 “ the mistake of those, who thought, that
 “ a child was not to be baptized before the
 “ eighth day from the birth, said not that
 “ the flesh, but the soul was [not] to be lost;
 “ and

[k] Beatus quidem Cyprianus non aliquod decretum condens novum sed Ecclesie fidem firmissimam servans ad corrigendum eos, qui putabant ante octavum diem nativitatis non esse parvulum baptizandum, non carnem, sed animam [non] dixit esse perdendam, et mox natum rite baptizari posse, cum suis quibusdam co-episcopis censuit. Sed contra Cypriani aliquam opinionem, ubi quod videndum fuit fortasse non vidit, sentiat quodque quod libet: tantum contra apostolicam manifestissimam fidem necesse sentiat, qui ex unius delicto omnes in condemnationem duci predicat, ex qua condemnatione non liberat, nisi gratia Dei per Jesum, &c. *Augustin. Hieronymo Ep.* 28.

“ and judged with his fellow-bishops, that a
 “ *new-born* child might be rightly baptized.
 “ But against any opinion of *Cyprian*, where
 “ he did not see, perhaps, what should be
 “ seen, let any one think, what he pleaseth ;
 “ only let no man think against *the manifest*
 “ *faith of an Apostle*, who declares, that by
 “ *the offence of one, all were brought into con-*
 “ *demnation, &c.*” It is thus, that St. *Austin*
 writes, in an epistle to *Jerome* himself. Is it
 likely then, that he learned his notion of In-
 fant-Baptism, as an apostolical tradition from
 St. *Jerome*, or *Ruffinus*? And was not St.
Cyprian, whom he quotes, a much earlier
 writer than either of them? And yet, we see,
 he did not consider the Baptism of Infants,
 particularly for original sin, as a *novel thing*
 in *Cyprian's* time, nor did he found it merely
 upon *Cyprian's* authority, but referred it to a
 much higher original, even the authority of
 an *apostle*. Again: St. *Austin* says [1] “ that
 “ *antiently, the universal church* held, that
 “ Infants of Believers obtained the remissi-
 “ on of original sin by the Baptism of Christ.
 “ Whence not without reason blessed *Cyprian*
 G 2 “ suf-

[1] Ut antiquitus universa ecclesia pertineret fideles parvulos
 originalis peccati remissionem per Christi baptismum consecu-
 tos. Unde non immeritò beatus *Cyprianus* tatis ostendit quam
 hoc ab initio creditum, et intellectum iervet Ecclesia, qui
 cum parvulos a materno utero recentissimos jam idoneos ad per-
 cipiendum baptismum asseret; quoniam consultus fuerat utrum
 hoc ante octavum diem fieri deberet. *Idem. de peccat. merit.*
lib. 3.

“ sufficiently shews, how the church pre-
 “ serves this, as it was believed, and un-
 “ derstood *from the beginning*; who, when
 “ children are *new-born*, asserted that they
 “ are fit for the Baptism of Christ; because,
 “ his opinion had been asked, whether this
 “ ought to be done before the eighth day.”
 Once more; speaking of the same thing, and
 referring to the same epistle, viz. that to *Fidus*,
 he says again [*m*]: “ Holy *Cyprian*, what
 “ he thought of the Baptism of Infants, yea,
 “ what he hath showed the *church always*
 “ *thought*, hear in a few words, &c.” — And
 now, what becomes of the Doctor’s *perhaps*?
 Or, what force, what truth can there be, in
 his reason to support it, when he adds, “ since
 “ no other ecclesiastical writer speaks of it
 “ as such in those days.” For, St. *Austin*,
 we see, without appealing to *Origen* at all,
 translated, or untranslated, hath found ano-
 ther ecclesiastical writer in the same age, speak-
 ing the same language, and assigning the same
ground of Infant-Baptism, that *Origen* is made
 to do.

But the Doctor grows more positive: for,
 still speaking of “ *Austin’s* taking Infant-Bap-
 “ tism to be an antient, and constant usage
 “ of the church, and an apostolic traditon.”

Dr.

[*m*] Sanctus Cyprianus — quid senserit de baptismo par-
 vulorum, immo quid semper Ecclesiam sensisse, monstraverit,
 paululum accipite. *Idem. de verb. apost. serm. 15. Confer*
Cyprian Ep. ad Fidum.

Dr. Gill says [u], without a *perhaps*, “ but
 “ in this *he was deceived, and mistaken*, as he
 “ was in other things, which he took for
 “ apostolic traditions; which ought to be
 “ equally received as this, by those, who
 “ are influenced by his authority.”——Now,
 this is plainly *begging* the question; a great
 sign of an *impoverished* cause. It is roundly
 asserting the very thing, which is to be prov-
 ed, and which, I am sure, never can be prov-
 ed by such an argument, as the Doctor hath
 here advanced. For, in the name of *Logic*,
 where is the consequence? that, because St.
Austin was *deceived, and mistaken* in *other*
 things (supposing him to be so) therefore he
 was deceived and mistaken in *this*, “ that In-
 “ fant-Baptism was an antient and constant
 “ usage of the church, and an apostolic tra-
 “ dition?” Is not this arguing without a
genus, from one *particular* to another, con-
 trary to the rules of the Logicians? The Doc-
 tor himself is deceived, if he imagines, that
 we are *influenced* solely by *Austin's* authority
 in this question. And, perhaps, upon second
 thoughts, he will permit us to join with *Au-*
stin at least *Jerome* and *Ruffinus*; and to cast
 the weight of their authority into the same
 scale; when he remembers, what he hath
 said of their *Latin* translations of *Origen*.
 However, if *Austin* was mistaken in *some*
 points;

[u] *Ibid.* p. 26, 27.

points ; this proves indeed that he was not *infallible* ; but it doth not prove, that he was *always* in an error, nor, consequently was his being deceived in other matters any proof, that he was mistaken in his notion of Infant-Baptism, as an apostolical institution. I hope, Dr. *Gill* is sometimes in the right, though, I have shewn, I think, that he is often in the wrong. But, what a strange *principle* doth he reason upon here ! viz. that we must believe a *fallible* man in *nothing*, unless we will believe him in *every thing* ! Nay, that an *honest man* is obliged to it ! What ! is it come then to *this* ? that all men must be *knaves*, for using a judgment of discretion ; or *fools*, and believe every thing at random ! But surely, *est modus in rebus* : there is a *medium*, proper to be observed, between being *wholly* influenced by any man's authority, and paying *no regard* to it at all.

But the Doctor insists [o], “ Every *honest man*, that receives Infant-Baptism upon the
 “ foot of tradition, ought to receive every
 “ thing else upon the same foot, of which
 “ there is equally as *full*, and as *early* evi-
 “ dence of *apostolic tradition*, as of this.” —
 All which we readily grant. But, when he says afterwards [p], of *several* other rites, and usages, by him specified, not only “ that they
 “ claim their rise from *apostolic tradition*, but
 “ have

[o] *Ibid.* p. 27. & 38.

[p] *Ibid.* p. 37.

“ have equal *evidence* of it, as Infant-Baptism has;” this we utterly deny, and shall now try the strength of his hypothesis, not doubting but, whatever equality of evidence may appear in *some* respects, we shall discover a plain inequality of evidence in *others*; as the *Doctor* hath stated the case. For,

(1.) In respect to *Infant-communion*, with which the *Doctor* begins his detail [q], the *evidence*, which he hath produced, of it's being an *apostolic tradition* is not *equally* as full, and as early, as of Infant-Baptism. In the words alledged by the *Doctor* from St. *Austin* [r], he is indeed *arguing in his manner* for Infant-communion, and urging it from the *regard* which all christians owed to the *authority* of Christ, and his apostles, as the proper ground, and standard of the *catholic faith*. But, when St. *Austin* only *argues* for Infant-communion, or delivers his *own opinion* about it, tho' in the strongest terms; every one must see, that this is a very different thing, from his *testifying*, and declaring what was the *antient*, and *universal* practice of the christian church; as he doth in the case of Infant-Baptism. But, the *Doctor* affirms [s], “ that of the necessity
“ of

[q] *Ibid.* p. 27.

[r] “ If they pay any regard to the *apostolic authority*, or rather to the Lord and Master of the apostles, &c. — No man that remembers that he is a christian, and of the catholic faith denies, or doubts that Infants, &c.” *Augustin.* Ep. 106.

[s] *Ibid.*

“ of this, as well as of Baptism to eternal life;
 “ *Austin* says [t], the *African* christians took
 “ to be an *antient apostolic tradition.*” Now,
 here I might borrow the Doctor’s words, and
 say point blank, “ *Austin* says no such thing.
 “ What then does he say? Why, that the
 “ christians of *Carthage* very well call Bap-
 “ tism itself nothing else but *health*; and the sa-
 “ crament of the body of Christ, nothing else
 “ but *life*. From whence? but, *as I suppose,*
 “ from an antient and apostolic tradition.”
 — Thus, what *Austin* delivers only as his
 own *private* opinion, Dr. *Gill* represents him,
 as declaring it to be the general opinion, not
 only of the christians of *Carthage*, but of the
African christians at large. Is this quite fair
 dealing? But, how differently St. *Austin* ex-
 presseth himself, when speaking of Infant-Bap-
 tism as an apostolic tradition, is extremely evi-
 dent from what hath been said before. To which
 let me add the following passage in the same
 book, to which the Doctor hath here referred
 us [u]. “ Moreover, because they grant, that
 “ Infants are to be baptized, who cannot go
 “ against

[t] Optime Punici christiani baptismum ipsum nihil aliud
 quam *salutem*, et sacramentum corporis Christi nihil aliud
 quam *vitam*, vocant. Unde? nisi ex antiqua, *ut existitro,*
 et apostolica traditione. *Augustin. de peccator. merit. & re-*
mis. lib. 1. c. 24.

[u] Porrò quia parvulos baptizandos esse concedunt, qui
 contra auctoritatem universæ Ecclesiæ proculdubio per Domi-
 num et apostolos traditam, venire non possunt, &c. *Augustini*
ibid. cap. 26.

“ against the authority of the *universal church*,
 “ *without all doubt, delivered by the Lord*
 “ *and his apostles, &c.*” Thus then, of In-
 fant-Baptism, as the antient and *universal*
 practice of the church, and an apostolic tra-
 dition St. *Austin* speaks with the utmost con-
 fidence; but not so doth he express himself
 concerning Infant-communion under the same
 notion. Therefore, upon the foot of his tes-
 timony, Infant-communion hath not an *equal*
claim to apostolic tradition, or the *same evi-*
dence of it, as Infant-Baptism hath.

The Doctor adds [w] “ *Innocent* the first, his
 “ cotemporary, was also of the same mind.”
 What mind? Was it that Infant-communion
 was an apostolic tradition? Granting this;
 doth it therefore follow, that it hath the same
 evidence on it's side, that Infant-Baptism
 hath? Or, doth *Innocent* the first, or *Cyprian*,
 whom the Doctor mentions afterwards, ever
 testify of Infant-communion, what St. *Austin*
 declares of Infant-Baptism, viz. that it was *the*
antient, constant, and universal practice of the
 church? and consequently an apostolical insti-
 tution? The Doctor vainly swaggers, when,
 speaking of the case of a child mentioned by
Cyprian, he says [x], “ Now here is a plain
 “ instance of Infant-communion in the *third*
 “ century; and we *defy* any one to give a
 H “ more

[w] *Ibid.* p. 23.

[x] *Ibid.* p. 29. Confer *Cyprian. de lapsi.*

“ more early instance, or an instance so early, of Infant-Baptism.” — This is a mere bravado; bullying, not arguing. For, if by an *instance* he means a particular fact, so circumstantially related, as *that other*; what can he *infer* from it? Is it, that Infant-Baptism was not practised, *before* that case happened? No: this he doth not pretend: for the Doctor himself supposes, “ that this very child was baptized, or otherwise, says he, it would not have been admitted to the Lord’s Supper.” Very well! then by the Doctor’s confession, Infant-Baptism was practised *before* Infant-communion: none being admitted to the Lord’s Supper before they were baptized [y]. However, he adds, “ it is reasonable to suppose, they both began together.” But he produceth no proof, or evidence of it.—Therefore, if the Doctor’s *challenge* hath any meaning at all, it must be *this*; that there is no *sufficient evidence* that Infant-Baptism was practised before *that* time. And, if this is what he intended to suggest, I accept his challenge, and hope shortly to give him *satisfaction*.

(2.) If those other rites, and usages, mentioned by St. *Basil* [z], to whom the Doctor next refers us [a], are called *apostolical traditions*, in
common

[y] *Vid. Justin Martyr. Apol. 2.*

[z] *De Spiritu Sanct. C. 27.*

[a] *Ibid. p. 29.—35.* As for the custom of giving a mixture

common with Infant-Baptism; yet there is *this* remarkable *difference* between *it* and *them*, that St. *Basil* speaks of *them*, as *unwritten* traditions, but he doth not mention Infant-Baptism under that notion, or as one of that number. This, I say, makes a *remarkable* difference in the case. For, we see, that Infant-Baptism was none of those rites, which the primitive church built upon a *mystical* sense of *scripture*, or which in St. *Basil's* time were only *presumed* to be apostolical institutions, on account of their having early and generally obtained [b]; otherwise, they had ranked it also among the *unwritten* traditions. Therefore *they* considered Infant-Baptism, as having *stronger evidence* on it's side, than any of those *unwritten* traditions; and consequently, it's apostolic authority is *better* supported, than that of those *other* rites, and usages, even upon the foot of *their testimony*.—If any one should object, that by this argument, *Infant-communion*, spoken of before, would be put upon the same foot with Infant-Baptism; I freely

H 2

grant

mixture of milk and honey to a person just baptized, mentioned by Dr. *Gill*, p. 36. it stands upon the same ground with the rest. And let me observe, the *higher* it can be traced; so much the *earlier* proof there is, that Baptism was considered under the notion of *regeneration*. Because *milk* and *honey* was the food of Infants. And so, the giving this mixture to a person just baptized, denoted his being *new-born*: ad Infantia significationem, says St. *Jerome*. adverb. *Luciferian*. C. 4.

[b] See *Divine Oracles*, in answer to two Catechisms. sect. 3.

grant it, and therefore acknowledge that there is more to be said for it, than for any of the *unwritten traditions*, as they are called [c]. But then, what hath been already said, under the preceding article, and what will be farther observed hereafter, when we come to St. Cyprian, plainly shews a visible *disparity* between it, and Infant-Baptism.

(3.) Infant-Baptism, as I can assure the Doctor, appears to many persons, who pass for men of sense and *probity* among their neighbours, a more *rational* thing, upon the whole, than any of the *unwritten traditions*, mentioned by him, and therefore *more likely* to be an apostolical institution. So that, in the judgment of discretion they verily think, that a *superior* regard is due to the *testimony* of the primitive church on it's behalf. For, the *matter* of Infant-Baptism, whatever may be said of the *subject*, is a divine ordinance, as may be proved from *scripture*; but none of the *unwritten traditions*, tho', perhaps, originally founded upon *scripture*, by one *sort* of construction or another, can be proved from it. Now, doth not this material circumstance make a very wide *difference*? Doth it not appear in this view more *probable* that Baptism, which can be proved to be a divine ordinance, should be applied to Infants by an apostolic tradition, than that any of those things should be apostolic traditions,

[c] See Mr. James Pierce's treatise upon that subject.

ditions, which can in no shape be proved to be divine institutions? In the one case, only the *subject* is the matter in question; in the other, the *very things* themselves. If any one should here renew the former objection about *Infant-communion*; I refer him to my former answer.

(4.) It doth not appear, that the unwritten traditions were ever put to the same *test* of their apostolical authority, as Infant-Baptism was, as we hinted before, and stood the trial, as it did, particularly in the *Pelagian* controversy. And thus, we are come round to the *Pelagians* again, where we began.

Upon the whole then, I imagine, that an *honest man* may be an honest man still, and yet think in his conscience, that the testimony of the primitive church deserves more regard in favour of Infant-Baptism as an apostolical institution, than in behalf of the unwritten traditions under that notion. The attentive, and judicious Reader must have observed in the process of this argument, that *Dr. Gill* hath expressly given us up by name some of the greatest lights of the church in the *fourth* century, as vouchers for the apostolic authority, and *antiquity* of Infant-Baptism: viz. *St. Jerome, Ruffinus, and Augustin*. And he hath in effect, given us all the rest. For, he hath not been able to produce one single author in this period on the other side of the question. If any one should suppose,
that

That *Gregory Nazianzen* was an Antipædo-baptist, because he advised the delay of childrens Baptism till they were three years old ; he would be much mistaken : for he approved of their Baptism at any age in case of danger [d].

S E C T I O N III.

A View of Infant - Baptism in the third Century.

HAVING seen how the case stood in the *fourth*, and in the beginning of the *fifth* century ; let us now carry our enquiries back into the *third*, and so upwards, 'till we come to the *times of the apostles*, and to the *Holy Scriptures* themselves, from whence the *right* of Infant-Baptism (which we reserve, at present for the subject of another dissertation) must be derived. (Though as to the *fact*, the matter now in hand, I might leave it to rest upon the evidence already produced, 'till better evidence can be offered on the contrary side, without giving ourselves any farther trouble

[d] Τι δ' ἂν ἔποιε περὶ τῶν ἑπιτηπίων—ἢ καὶ ταῦτα βαπτίσομεν ; πάλυ γε, ἔπειρ τις ἐπέσει κίνδυνος. *Greg. Nazian. de baptism. Orat. 140.*

ble about it.) In this century we find a question, relating to the Baptism of Infants, unanimously resolved by a synod of sixty-six Bishops, with the famous St. *Cyprian* at the head of them, who flourished about the *middle* of it. But, what was this question? Why, not absolutely concerning Infant-Baptism itself; or, whether Infants were to be baptized at all, (for this point was no matter of doubt, or dispute among them) but, whether *new-born* Infants were to be baptized, particularly whether it was lawful to baptize a child before the eighth day, according to the time of circumcision among the *Jews*. This was what one *Fidus* scrupled; but *Cyprian* [e] tells him, “ We are all, here assembled in council, of another mind; and no one of us
 “ came into your sentiments; but, on the
 “ contrary, we all concluded, that the grace,
 “ and mercies of God were to be denied to
 “ none, who should come into the world.” Upon which Mr. *Marshall* makes this pertinent and just remark, in his *notes* upon the place: “ The unanimity, wherewith this
 “ question was carried, shews that Infant-
 “ Baptism was at *this time* no novel usage;
 “ there was no manner of dispute whether
 “ Infants should be baptized; but whether
 “ before the eighth day, or not: To which
 “ the unanimous resolution was, that the
 “ grace

[e] *Cyprian. ad Fidum. Ep. 64.*

“ *grace of God should be denied to none.* ”
 —And now, what have the *Antipædo-baptists* to say to this? Why, a desperate case requires a desperate cure. Having therefore no other way left, to deal with the argument, from *Cyprian*, for the indisputed practice of Infant-Baptism in his time; they, at least some of them [*f*], will needs question the *genuineness* of his epistle to *Fidus*; without any sort of proof, or pretence, fit to be opposed to the testimony of *Austin*, who, as we have seen before, refers to that epistle, as *Cyprian's*, over, and over again. Nor, have we only his authority for the genuineness of the epistle itself, but also his testimony for the proper *sense* and meaning of it, so far as relates to the matter in hand, with this farther declaration concerning it, that the *resolution*, therein mentioned, was not any *new decree*, introducing a *novel* custom, but agreeable to the constant opinion, and practice of the christian church from the beginning; as manifestly appears by his words, already cited in the preceding section. Now, if it was an *antient* custom in *St. Cyprian's* time to baptize children, particularly before the eighth day, Infant-Baptism could not *then* be a *new* thing, or a *late* invention.

What becomes now of *Dr. Gill's* open *challenge* aforesaid? Doth it not already begin, to
 look

[*f*] *D'anvers: Treatise of baptism. Blackwood: Storming of Antichrist.*

look a little out of countenance? But says the Doctor [g] “ by *Fidus*, the country Bishop, “ applying to the council, to have a doubt “ resolved, whether it was lawful to baptize “ Infants until they were eight days old; “ it appears to be a *novel* practice, and that “ as yet it was undetermined by council, “ or custom, *when* they were to be baptized, “ whether as soon as born, or on the eighth “ day, &c.”—Now, granting all this, what doth it signify, in reference to Infant-Baptism at large? For, the doubt of *Fidus* had no relation to Infant-Baptism, *as such*; but only to the particular time of administering it, as the Doctor himself hath stated the case. Therefore, to invert his argument, since *Fidus*, the country Bishop, did *not* apply to the council, to have any doubt resolved, whether it was lawful to baptize Infants *at all*; by this Infant-Baptism appears not to be a *novel* practice. Besides, the particular day, or time, when Infants *should be* baptized, is a circumstance not yet positively determined, but *left to every one's liberty*. Doth it therefore follow, that Infant-Baptism in *these days* is a *novel practice*? Persons now differ about the particular *time* of administering the *Lord's Supper* [b]. And doth it from hence follow, that the celebration of this holy ordinance is a *novel practice*

I in

[g] *Argum. from apost. tradit. &c. p. 18.*

[b] *See Dr. Gill's answer to a Welch Clergyman. ibid. p. 103.*

in the present age? Or, would this be a just inference, 1500 years hence, from the different customs, or scruples, which now obtain amongst christians, in relation to that matter?—But, the Doctor adds; “ it should al-
 “ so be observed, that in this age Infant-com-
 “ munion was practised, as well as Infant-
 “ Baptism; and very likely both began to-
 “ gether, as it is but reasonable, that if the one
 “ be admitted, the other should.”—To which I answer; as to the *reasonableness* of the thing; this is not the subject of our *present* enquiry; but only the *fact*. And, though Dr. Gill is pleased to say, *very likely both began together*; yet he offers no proof of it. This matter hath been considered before. And to what hath been already said upon it, I shall here add the words of Mr. Marshall [i]. “ Infants
 “ were admitted, ’tis plain, in our author’s
 “ time and country, to receive the holy Eu-
 “ charist; which indeed was a just conse-
 “ quence of interpreting John vi. 53. (*except*
 “ *ye eat the flesh of the Son of man, and drink*
 “ *his blood, ye have no life in you*) of the ho-
 “ ly Eucharist; since, upon the foot of that
 “ principle, children could with no more
 “ safety be deprived of the holy Eucharist,
 “ than of Baptism. And, as to the prepara-
 “ tions necessary, the same objections might
 “ seem to lie against Infant-Baptism, as against
 “ Infant-

[i] Cyprian. P. 1. pag. 129.

“ Infant-communion. But, tho’ this prac-
 “ tice obtained in our author’s time, *Tertul-*
 “ *lian’s* filence in it, where he had a juſt
 “ occaſion of mentioning it (upon his advi-
 “ ſing againſt Infant-Baptiſm) gives ſome
 “ reaſon of ſuſpecting, that it was not much
 “ earlier than our author, nor therefore very
 “ general, &c.”

Proceed we now to *Origen*, who flouriſhed about the year A. D. 230. He mentions Infant-Baptiſm on ſundry occaſions [*k*], but never otherwiſe than as a thing in *common* uſe, and practice. And, not only ſo; but he ſpeaks of it as a *tradition*, or (which is the ſame thing in the ſacred, and eccleſiaſtical ſtile [*l*], tho’ Dr. *Gill* [*m*] ſays, “ If Infant-Baptiſm is
 “ a tradition of the apoſtles, then — it is
 “ not a ſcriptural buſineſs”) an *inſtitution*, which the church received from the apoſtles; and, conſequently, as what had been always

I 2

prac-

[*k*] Quia nemo mundus a ſorde, nec ſi unius diei fit vita ejus. Addi his etiam illud poteſt, ut requiratur, quid cauſæ fit, cum baptiſma Eccleſiæ in *remiſſionem peccatorum* detur, ſecundum Eccleſiæ obſervantiam etiam parvulis baptiſmum dari, &c. Origen in Levit. Hom. 8. — Et quia per baptiſmi ſacramentum nativitatæ ſordes deponuntur, propterea *baptizantur et parvuli*. Niſi enim quis renatus fuerit ex aquâ, &c. Idem in Levit. Hom. 14. Pro hoc et Eccleſia ab *apostoſis traditionem* ſuſcepit etiam parvulis baptiſmum dare. Sciebant enim illi, quibus myſteriorum ſecreta commiſſa ſunt divinatorum, quia eſſent in omnibus genuinæ ſordes peccati, quæ per *aquam*, et *ſpiritum* ablui deberent. *Idem. Comment. in Ep. ad Roman. lib. 5.*

[*l*] See this point lately diſcuſſed. Divine Oraçes.

[*m*] Page 40.

practised from the beginning. Thus, we have the clear testimony of the great *Origen*, not only for the practice of Infant-Baptism in *his own days*, but for the *constant* use of it all along from the time of the apostles. But weak, and tender eyes cannot bear a strong light. No wonder then, if all methods are tried, to evade the force of such bright and glaring evidence.

Says Dr. Gill [n]; "It should be observed
 " that these quotations are not from the *Greek*
 " of *Origen*."—True; they are only *Latin*
 translations from the *Greek*; but are they
false translations? This the Doctor doth not
 venture to affirm. But, he tries another way
 to get clear of the argument, drawn from
 these passages. For, speaking of *Origen* he
 says [o]; "His *Homilies* on *Leviticus*, and
 " exposition of the epistle to the *Romans*, out
 " of which *two* of them are taken, are tran-
 " slated by *Ruffinus*; who with the *former*,
 " he himself owns, he used much freedom,
 " and *added* much, and took such a liberty
 " in both of adding, *taking away*, and chang-
 " ing, that, as *Erasmus* says, whoever reads
 " these pieces, it is uncertain whether he
 " reads *Origen*, or *Ruffinus*."—But, notwith-
 standing *Erasmus's* censure, if we attend
 to what *Ruffinus* himself says; it will appear,
 that there is no such mighty matter in it, as,
 perhaps,

perhaps, may be imagined. For, as a learned writer of the last age hath observed [p],
 “ *Ruffinus* acknowledges, in translating *Origen’s* Homilies on *Leviticus*, that he added
 “ some things to what *Origen* said, and *what*
 “ *they were* he expresses, ea quæ ab origine
 “ in auditorio Ecclesiæ ex tempore, non tam
 “ explanationis, quam ædificationis intensi-
 “ one perorata sunt [q], the things, *which were*
 “ *spoken by Origen* to his auditory, he tran-
 “ slated them by way of explanation, or did
 “ more fully lay them forth in a popular way;
 “ and therein *Ruffinus* dealt candidly, telling
 “ us what were the things he added; in this
 “ *Erasmus* acknowledges his fair dealing.
 “ But, as for his commentary on the *Romans*,
 “ *Ruffinus* confesseth [r], se hoc opus totum
 “ ad dimidium traxisse, there was *no addition*
 “ of *Ruffinus*; *Erasmus* here blames him for
 “ cutting off what *Origen* delivered more at
 “ large, but neither doth *Ruffinus* confess,
 “ nor *Erasmus* challenge him *here* for, any
 “ addition to what *Origen* said.” Thus then,
 this great out-cry about *additions*, and *inter-*
polations in the *Latin* translations of *Origen*
 by *Ruffinus*, comes to nothing!

But,

[p] *Mr. Stephen Marshall. Answer to Tombes. p. 16, 17.*

[q] *Ruffini peroratio in Ep. ad Rom. Confer Wall’s answer to Gale, p. 371.*

[r] *Idem pæfat. ad Rom. Confer Erasmi Cens. de Homil. in Levit. For, traxisse, l. contraxisse. Confer Wall. hist. P. 1. ch. 5. sect. 6.*

But, let us *suppose*, that both *Ruffinus* in the *Homilies* on *Leviticus*, and in the *Commentary* on the *Romans* made some additions of his own; and also that *St. Jerome* did the same in translating the *Homilies* on *Luke*, out of which is the other passage, alledged for Infant-Baptism; I say, supposing all this, What doth it signify in the present case; unless it could be proved, that the particular passages under consideration are *additions*, or *interpolations*? *Dr. Gill* makes a feeble attempt this way, saying [s], “it looks very *probable*, that these
 “ very passages are additions, or interpola-
 “ tions of these men, since the *language* agrees
 “ with those times, and no other; for, no
 “ cotemporary of *Origen’s*, nor any writer
 “ before him, or after him, until the times
 “ of *Ruffinus*, *Jerome* and *Austin*, speak of
 “ Infant-Baptism as an *usage* of the church,
 “ or an *apostolical* tradition.”—But, the weakness, and fallacy of this way of reasoning must obviously appear to any one, that considers, how few writers, cotemporary with *Origen*, are now remaining; and yet neither out of those few, nor out of any writer before him, or after him in the primitive times, hath *Dr. Gill* been able to produce one single author that speaks a *contrary* language of Infant-Baptism, or plainly denies, what *Origen* is made so clearly to affirm, concerning it. Besides, doth it
 not

not appear with undeniable evidence, from what hath been already remarked on St. *Cyprian's* epistle to *Fidus*, that Infant-Baptism was the *common usage* of the church in his time? And doth not the same St. *Cyprian* in the same epistle, suggest the same *ground* of Infant-Baptism, that *Origen* himself is represented to do in these *Latin* translations? Saying [*t*], “*remission* of *sins* be granted to these most
 “ heinous offenders, who have long ago sinned
 “ against God; and if none of them be de-
 “ nied access to the *grace of Baptism*; how
 “ much less reason is there for denying it to
 “ Infants; who, being but *newly-born*, can be
 “ guilty of no sin, except that, by being deriv-
 “ ed from *Adam*, according to the flesh, their
 “ birth hath communicated to them the in-
 “ fection, and punishment of his offence, &c.”
 — Thus, in effect, *Cyprian* declares Infant-Baptism to be an *apostolical tradition*; for, otherwise, neither he, nor any other sensible man, could suppose it to be of any use or efficacy for the *remission of sin*, or any *signification* of the *grace of God*. Therefore the language of *Origen*, in the *Latin* translations, agrees with the language and sentiments of the *Cyprianic* age, that is to say, *his own*. To all which let me add from Dr. *Wall* [*u*]. “*In*
 “ the *Greek* remains there are sentences, and
 “ expressions so alike and parallel to those—
 and

[*t*] *Cyprian. Ep. ad Fidum.*

[*u*] Answer to Gale. Appendix. p. 11.

“ and citations of texts of scripture applied so
 “ much to the same purpose; that they do
 “ confirm these to be *genuine* translati-
 “ ons, &c.”

Having now, I think, overthrown Dr. Gill's pretended grounds of *probability*; I shall shew, in the next place, it is so far from being probable, that the passages under consideration are *additions*, or *interpolations* in *Origen*, as that there is not only the *bigbest probability*, but a *moral certainty* of the contrary. Says Mr. Marshall [w] (speaking of the passage in the commentary on the epistle to the *Romans*. *For this reason the church of Christ received it as a tradition from the apostles, to baptize children, &c.*) “ Nor could *Ruffinus*
 “ easily be supposed to palm this passage up-
 “ on *Origen*, with whom he took, indeed,
 “ great liberties, where he had occasion to
 “ defend his favourite author from some im-
 “ imputations; but here, I say, he had no
 “ such occasion: since it was never made any
 “ part of *Origen's* accusations, that he was
 “ *against* Infant-Baptism, and therefore *Ruf-*
 “ *finus* could have no temptation thence, to
 “ represent him as a friend to it, if he were
 “ really not so; nor to coin any passages for
 “ him to that purpose.”—Besides, as to the
other passage, in the *Homilies* on *Leviticus*; Dr. Gill himself hath unluckily observed “ that
 “ *Vossius*

[w] Notes on Cyprian. P. 1. page 120.

“ *Vossius* [x] thinks that the passage cited was
 “ of the greater authority against the *Pela-*
 “ *gians*, because *Ruffinus* was inclined to
 “ them.” Is it not then absurd to suppose,
 and ridiculous to suggest, that *Ruffinus* would
 coin any such passages for *Origen*, as imported
 that *original sin* was the ground and reason
 of Infant-Baptism, directly contrary to his
 own private opinion? Here *Ruffinus* hath ex-
 hibited a remarkable proof of his honesty,
 which must give the greater authority to his
 translations of *Origen*, and at the same time
 confirm the *genuiness* of the *third* passage in
 his *Homilies on Luke*, as translated by *Jerome*;
 especially considering that these two great
 men, *Ruffinus*, and *Jerome* were bitter ene-
 mies to each another, and yet perfectly agreed
 in giving the sense of *Origen*, upon the point
 in question, the same way [y].

And now I appeal to all unprejudiced, and
 impartial men, whether the testimonies alledg-
 ed from *Origen* do not stand good, as authentic
 proofs, not only of the practice of Infant-Bap-
 tism in his time, but as practised under the no-
 tion of an apostolical tradition. But what proof
 so early, or what evidence so strong, can our
 mighty champion (to remind him again of
 his noble *challenge*) produce for Infant-com-
 munion? It is in vain to seek for his proofs

K

against

[x] *Hist. Pelag. P. 1. lib. 2. Confer Wall. hist. of Inf. Bap. P. 1. ch. 5. sect. 8.*

[y] See Dr. Wall. *ibid.*

against Infant-Baptism in this period ; for he hath none at all. 'Tis true, speaking of the *Greek of Origen* Dr. Gill says [z], “ many things may be observed from thence in favour of adult-baptism:” an assertion either false, or very impertinent ! It is quite *impertinent*, and nothing to the purpose, if he means not adult-baptism *exclusive* of Infant-Baptism ; for in that sense many things of the same nature may be observed from St. *Austin*, and other writers, who lived in those times, when Infant-Baptism, by the confession of it's adversaries themselves, undoubtedly prevailed [a]. But if the Doctor's meaning be, that many things may be observed, from the *Greek of Origen* in favour of adult-baptism *exclusive* of Infant-Baptism, or in opposition to it, and *against* it ; then, what he says is utterly *false*, and, to play the Hero in my turn, I *challenge* him to make good his assertion.—Therefore, as for Bishop *Taylor's* [b] observation here cited by Dr. *Gill*, concerning *Origen* (who, by the way, was never accused of

[z] P. 17.

[a] e. g. When they speak of the qualifications of *new converts* requisite in order to baptism. See Wall's answer. p. 399, &c.

[b] Liberty of prophesying, p. 320. This is a book often cited by the Antipædo-baptists, who affect, upon all occasions to bring in the name of Bishop *Taylor* ; tho' “ he declared what he wrote to have been only some objections easy to be answered ; and which afterward he did answer himself.” See Wall's hist. of Inf. Bapt. p. 2. ch. 2. and Defence. p. 433. But it was not for Dr. *Gill's* purpose, to take notice of these things.

by *heresy* for holding Infant-Baptism) it may be strongly retorted. For, *one* plain authority on the one side is a *fuller testimony* than *no authority* at all on the other side.

S E C T I O N I V .

A View of Infant - Baptism in the second Century.

WE have seen how the case stood in the *third* century. And if “ out of “ the mouth of two, or three witnessess every “ word shall be established ; ” especially when they are not confronted by any *cross* evidence ; proper proof, I presume, hath been produced of the *practice* of Infant-Baptism in that period. Let us now rise a step higher, and look back into the *second* century, the age next to that of the apostles. At the end of this century we find *Tertullian* ; whose testimony for the *practice* of Infant-Baptism in *his* time is clear enough ; tho’, as to the *right* of the thing, the Antipædo-baptists are wont, to alledge his authority on *their* side of the question. It is only the *fact*, that is the matter of our present enquiry. But we shall here take occasion, to consider, *en passant*,

K 2 what

what is commonly alledged from this antient writer against the *right* of Infant-Baptism also. There is one thing I would premise, which perhaps is not duely attended to in this argument, but deserves consideration, as it may throw some light upon the question before us. It is *this*, that, though the stated time of *circumcision* was fixed to a certain day so precisely, that it was neither to be administered *before* that day, nor *after* it; yet the time of *Baptism* was not so limited to any particular age. From hence the primitive christians might easily conclude, that Baptism was *lawful* at any age; and yet differ in their opinions about the particular time when Baptism was *necessary*.—Now, the *lawfulness* of Infant-Baptism, or it's *validity*, is all that we need contend for in this debate. And *this*, as will be shewn, *Tertullian* himself allowed; and not only so, but in some cases he held it to be *necessary*, though in *other* cases he thought it *lawful*, and *expedient* to defer the Baptism of children for a time. *Gregory Nazianzen*, as we have observed before, was of the same opinion: And so, the Antipædo-baptists can claim neither the one, nor the other of them to their party.—But says Dr. *Gill* [c], “*Tertullian* is the first man, that ever made
 “ mention of Infant-Baptism, that we know
 “ of; and as he was the first, that spoke of
 “ it,

[c] Argum. from apost. tradit. p. 15.

“ it, he at the same time spoke against it, “ &c.” Now, whether *Tertullian* is the first man, that ever *made mention* of Infant-Baptism, as the Doctor affirms, we shall consider hereafter. At present, let us enquire how far *Tertullian* spoke *against* Infant-Baptism; and I doubt not, but it will appear, that what he said of Infant-Baptism doth not amount to an absolute *denial* of the thing, in point either of *fact*, or of *right*, but the contrary. Let us examine his words with care, and attention, as we have them already translated to our hands by Dr. *Wall* [*d*]. *Tertullian* then says [*e*]— “ according to every one’s “ condition, and disposition, and also their “ age, the delaying of Baptism is *more profi-* “ *table*, especially in the case of *little children*. “ For what need is there [] that the godfa- “ thers should be brought into danger? because “ they may either fail of their promises by “ death, or they may be mistaken by a “ child’s proving of wicked disposition. Our “ Lord

[*d*] Hist. of Inf. Bap. p. 1. ch. 4. sect. 5.

[*e*] *Tertullian* de baptismo. c. 18. Says Dr. *Wall* *ibid.* sect. 13. “ It is plain, that St. *Austin*, and *Pelagius*, and “ several others, that managed the *Pelagian* controversy, had “ never seen *Tertullian’s* book of baptism.” But, when *Tertullian* asks, “ Why doth their *innocent* age make such “ haste to the *forgiveness* of sins?” his question implies two things: (1.) That Infants *were* baptized; as Doctor *Wall* justly observes. And (2.) That they were, *in fact*, according to the usage of the church, baptized *for the remission* of sins. Therefore I can see no great necessity for the Doctor’s supposition; as these two facts remove the difficulties he mentions as the ground of it, at least in a good measure.

“ Lord says indeed, *Do not forbid them to*
 “ *come to me.* Therefore, let them come
 “ when they are grown up: let them come
 “ when they understand: when they are in-
 “ structed whither it is they come; let them
 “ be made christians when they can know
 “ Christ. What need their *guileless age make*
 “ *such haste* to the forgiveness of sins? Men
 “ will proceed more warily in worldly things;
 “ and he that should not have earthly goods
 “ committed to him, yet shall have heavenly.
 “ Let them know how to desire this salvation,
 “ that you may appear to have given to one
 “ that asketh. For no less reason *unmarried*
 “ persons ought to be kept off, who are likely
 “ to come into temptation, as well those,
 “ that never were married, upon account of
 “ their coming to ripeness; as those in wi-
 “ dowhood for the miss of their partner: un-
 “ til they either marry, or be confirmed in
 “ continence, &c.”

As I have here copied Dr. *Wall*; so I have
 left a blank, in the same manner as he did,
 at the place where, in the older editions, these
 words come in, *si non tam necesse* [*f*], accord-
 ing to which *reading Tertullian's* meaning is
 plainly this [*g*], “ What occasion is there,
 “ *except*

[*f*] For *tam* I should read *tamen*, supposing it was for-
 merly written with an abbreviation, thus $\bar{t}n$, (as the word is
 sometimes printed. Vid. Ruffini Perorat. in Rom. old Edit.)
 and the letter n mistaken for an m by the transcriber.

[*g*] Quid enim necesse est, si non tam [vel tamen] necesse,
 sponsores,

“ *except in case of necessity*, that the sponsors,
 “ &c.” This being premised, I proceed to
 observe (1.) The words of *Tertullian* seem fair-
 ly to imply, that Infant-Baptism was not only
moved for, but actually *practised* in his time.
 “ For when he says, *Why does that innocent*
 “ *age make such haste, &c.* His words shew
 “ the *matter of fact* to have been so, together
 “ with his opinion against it [*b*].” But yet
 (2.) *Tertullian* doth not absolutely condemn
 Infant-Baptism as *unlawful*, or *unprofitable*;
 he only gives his private opinion (wherein, for
 any thing that appears to the contrary, he
 was very singular as he was in some of his
 other notions) for the delay of Baptism, as
more profitable, not only in children, but in
 the adult also. Particularly, he was for hav-
 ing the Baptism of *young women* deferred ’till
 marriage, as well as of *widows*, &c. And
 will any one infer from hence, that it was a
novel custom in those days for unmarried per-
 sons of either sex, men or women, to be baptiz-
 ed? But, you might as well infer *this*, as con-
 clude from the words of *Tertullian* that Infant-
 Baptism was a *novel custom* in his time. (3.) If
 (as some learned writers have suggested [*i*])
 the words of *Tertullian* may reasonably be in-
 terpreted

sponsors, &c. The turn of expression here is very agreeable
 to *Tertullian’s* style, and manner; tho’ Dr. Gale is pleased to
 censure it. Reflections on Wall’s history, &c. p. 511.

[*b*] Wall *ibid.* sect. 9.

[*i*] Mr. Steven Marshall. *Answer to Mr. Tombes Examen.*
 p. 36, 37.

terpreted of the Infants of Infidels; then, however his reasoning may seem to conclude, his advice about delaying Baptism can relate only to such children. In relation to those Infants, whose parents, one or both, were christians, he allows them a *prerogative*, or privilege, by *birth*, and *institution* [*k*], above the children of heathens, referring to the words of St. Paul [*l*]: *For the unbelieving husband is sanctified by the wife, &c.* which by the way shews, that the construction, which the Antipædo-baptists put upon those words, is a *novel* interpretation, when they understand the *sanctification*, there spoken of, as denoting lawful wedlock, or cohabitation, and by the *holiness* of the children, so procreated, only their *legitimacy* [*m*]. For surely *Tertullian* did not suppose all the children of heathens to be *bastards*. However, he represents the children of idolaters as *born with an evil genius*; but the children of christians, as *holy by birth and institution*: i. e. as *candidates for holiness by birth*, and as *made holy by Baptism*: for so he afterward explains the matter. Therefore, it doth not certainly appear, that *Tertullian* was for having the Baptism

[*k*] Adeo nulla ferè nativitas munda est, utique Ethnicorum. Hinc enim et apostolus ex sanctificato alterutro sexu sanctos procreari ait: tam ex feminis prærogativâ, quam ex institutionis disciplinâ: cæterum, inquit, immundi nascerentur, &c. *Tertullian. de anima. c. 39, &c.*

[*l*] 1 Cor. vii. 14.

[*m*] See Dr. Gill's commentary in loc, &c.

tism of *Believers* children delayed at all ; and much less do his words imply any such *custom*. But, (4.) Whoever these Infants were, he was not *absolutely* against their Baptism ; but, on the contrary, allowed of it in *case of necessity*. Nay, in this case, “ he pronounced “ him guilty of murder, who should refuse “ it to any. He held that Baptism was so “ necessary for all, that even *laymen* should “ administer it, when a *clergyman* could not “ be had, rather than any one should *die* “ *without it* [n].” Therefore *Tertullian* was properly no Antipædo-baptist ; for he allowed, and even required Infants to be baptized in case of necessity, or danger of death. (5.) To what hath been said, I shall add two considerations to prove, that *Tertullian* himself looked upon Infant-Baptism, as no *human*, or *late* invention, but a *scripture* institution ; though left at large, where no urgent necessity, or immediate danger appeared, and not limited, as circumcision was, to any particular day. (1.) Those words of Christ [o], *Except a man be born of water, and of the spirit, &c.* I say, these words *Tertullian* understood of *Baptism*, and from thence inferred it to be necessary to salvation [p]. Thus, he put that very construction upon the text, which, as

L

the

[n] *Tertullian. de baptism. c. 17.* [o] John i. 5.

[p] Cum vero præscribitur nemini sine baptismo competere salutem, ex illâ maxime pronuntiatione Domini, qui ait, nisi natus ex aqua quis erit, &c. Tertul. de bapt. c. 12.

the Antipædo-baptists pretend [q], gave rise to the practice of Infant-Baptism. Therefore, they cannot fairly deny, that it was practised in the time of *Tertullian*, that it was then practised as a *scripture* institution, and that *Tertullian* himself considered it under this notion; at least, if they allow, that he believed Infant-salvation. (2.) When he produces sundry instances of *unwritten customs* in another *treatise*, and methodically begins with the administration of Baptism [r]; *Tertullian* makes no mention of *Infant-Baptism*, (tho' he mentions other things of less moment) as any of those *unwritten* customs. From whence *one* of these two things naturally follows, either that Infant-Baptism was not practised at that time; or that he looked upon it as a *written custom*; that is to say, a custom founded upon the *written* rule of God's word, and consequently a *scripture* institution. But the former supposition hath been proved to be false from his book of Baptism, which was written *before* [s]; and so the latter must be true.

Having given Dr. Gill, I hope, *proper satisfaction* upon this point; we are now at leisure to attend to his *other* assertion, viz. "that *Tertullian* is the first man, that ever made mention of Infant-Baptism, that we know of." — Upon which I observe, that those words

[q] Mr. Stennet. Answer to Ruffen. p. 77.

[r] *De coronâ militis.* [s] *Vid. Dupin Hist. Eccles.*

words are *equivocal*, and must be understood with caution ; for, other writers, before *Tertullian*, speak of the same thing, though not precisely in the same terms. And if Dr. Gill will not be so candid, as to admit of this distinction ; I wish he would be so kind as to inform us, who was the first man, that ever made mention of *original sin*, e. g. that is, used this very term, or phrase, *peccatum originis*: to instance in no other particulars, as I might in several, which the Doctor holds by no better tenure, than what depends upon the distinction aforesaid. Have we not already seen, that *Origen*, his cotemporary, though somewhat younger than *Tertullian*, says of Infant-Baptism, that it was a *custom*, a tradition, or institution, which the church derived from the apostles ? And how could *Origen* know this, but by the testimony of other writers ? Therefore, whatever we know of the matter (and indeed we know very little of the authors, that lived in those days, so few of them now being extant) we have no room to doubt, that other writers before *Tertullian* (the sacred writers are out of the present question) had made mention of Infant-Baptism as the *usage* and *practice* of the christian church derived from the apostles, and consequently as what had obtained from the beginning. Accordingly, *Clemens Alexandrinus*, *Tertullian's* senior, plainly refers to Infant-Baptism under

that notion, saying [t] “ If any one be by
 “ trade a fisher-man, he will do well to think
 “ of an apostle, and the children taken out
 “ of the water.” — “ An apostle’s *taking*,
 “ drawing, or lifting, *a child out of the water*,
 “ cannot refer to any thing, that I can think
 “ of, but the *baptizing* of it:” says Dr.
Wall [u]. And so say I too; being the
 more confirmed in this sentiment, by a passage
 in *Tertullian* [w], where he compares baptized
 persons to *little fishes*; and so points out the
 apt propriety of the sign, or *seal*, which *Cle-*
mens Alexandrinus proposes to fisher-men:
 and by his mentioning an *apostle* in the case,
 it evidently appears, that this antient writer
 looked upon Infant-Baptism as an *apostolical*
practice.

Come we now to *Irenæus*, who flourished
 about A. D. 167, thirty years or more before
Tertullian. The words, usually cited in this
 debate from *Irenæus*, will appear to contain a
 clear testimony to Infant-Baptism, if persons
 could, and would consider them without
 prejudice, and prepossession. For he says of
 Christ [x], “ that he came to save all by him-
 “ self; all I say, that by him are *born again*
 “ *unto God*, Infants, and little children, youths,
 “ and older men.” Upon which the learned

Feu-

[t] *Pædagog.* lib. 3. cap. ii.

[u] *Wall's Defence, &c.* Appendix. p. 9.

[w] *Sed nos pisciculi* ——— in aquâ nascamur. *Tertullian.*
de baptisimo.

[x] *Iren. lib. 2. cap. 39.*

Feuardentius hath this remark; “ that by the
 “ name of *regeneration*, according to the
 “ phrase of Christ, and of his apostles, he
 “ understands *Baptism*, clearly confirming
 “ the apostolical tradition concerning the
 “ Baptism of Infants.” Let us now have
 the patience to hear, what Dr. *Gill*, after
 others, hath objected against this testimony of
Irenæus. “ The passage (says he [y]) is only
 “ a translation of *Irenæus*, and not expressed
 “ in his own original words.” Again [z]:
 “ It is only a translation, as almost all his
 “ works be, and a very foolish, uncouth, and
 “ barbarous one.”—But yet, the doctor doth
 not pretend to say, and much less attempt to
 prove, that it is a *wrong*, or *false* translation;
 which he should have done, if he would
 have said any thing to the purpose. It is ob-
 served by a learned and judicious writer [a],
 “ that the old translation, which we have of
 “ *Irenæus* is close, and unpolite, and for that
 “ reason may often discover to us the *origi-*
 “ *nal*, as might easily be shewed in a multi-
 “ tude of places.” And thus, the *coarseness*
 of the translation, objected by Dr. *Gill*, is
 really an argument in favour of it’s truth,
 and fidelity.—But, he adds [b], “ and the
 “ chapter,

[y] Divine Right of Inf. Bap. examined, &c. p. 22.

[z] Argument from apost. tradit. p. 14.

[a] Jortin. Disc. 1. on the Christian Relig. Compare
 Wali’s Defence, &c. p. 315, 316.

[b] *Ubi supra*.

“ chapter, from whence it is taken, is by “ *some* learned men judged to be spurious.” Which words imply, that *all* learned men do not judge so; and the Doctor must allow us, to think, that at least *one* learned man hath said what is sufficient to prove the contrary, until Dr. *Wall's* answer to Dr. *Gale* upon this head [c] hath received a proper reply. But this is a common artifice with writers *in distress*, when they meet with any thing, which they cannot reconcile with their own dear prejudices, and prepossessions, to raise groundless scruples, and suspicions about it. Thus, *Charles Blackwood*, that doughty champion, who bravely undertook the *storming* of *Antichrist*, would needs have St. *Cyprian's* epistle to *Fidus*, though so often quoted by St. *Austin*, be suspected to be spurious [d]; (because, I suppose, it speaks too plainly for *him* of Infant-Baptism) but upon the weakest grounds, that can be. No more solid, or substantial is Dr. *Gill's* following remark upon the passage under consideration [e]. “ It is but a single “ passage out of him (as if *Irenæus* could “ not mention Infant-Baptism at all, if he “ speaks of it but once) and that depends “ upon a single word, the signification of “ which is *doubtful* at the best.” — So much the better, if there is but *one* word in the sentence

[c] *Wall's* Defence, &c. p. 280, &c.

[d] *Blackwood*. *Storming of Antichrist*. p. 30.

[e] *Ubi supra*.

sentence of doubtful signification! But, worthy Doctor, why is the signification even of *this* word so very doubtful? Hath not Dr. *Wall* [f] produced abundant evidence, to prove, that the antients commonly spoke of Baptism under the notion of *regeneration*? Nay, what better evidence can be desired, than the poor evasions, and pitiful shifts, to which Dr. *Gale* was reduced in vainly attempting to prove the contrary; and whereby he justly merited the character given of him, viz. *an everlasting caviller against things, that are plain* [g]? We have seen before, that *Tertullian*, cotemporary with *Irenæus*, understood the words of Christ John iii. 5. of Baptism. He also says that christians are *born in water*, like fishes; and to what can this refer, but Baptism? Thus, he speaks of Baptism under the notion of regeneration:—*Clemens Alexandrinus* also speaks of christians being born, or *begotten of the womb of water*. Γεννηθεν εκ μητρας υδατος.—Genuit ex matrice aquae. *Strom.* l. 4. And a like notion *Tertullian* mentions, as maintained by the *beatbens* [h]: no doubt long before the time of *Irenæus*. But, we need not have recourse to the *beatbens*: several christian writers, who lived *with*, or *before* *Irenæus*, speak the same language; as will be shewn here-

[f] History of Inf. Bap. p. 2. ch. 6. and Defence p. 318, &c. Appendix. p. 3. &c.

[g] Wall's Defence, &c. p. 339.

[h] *Tertullian de baptismo, cap. 5.*

hereafter. At present, I shall only remind Dr. *Gill* of what he hath himself alledged [*i*] concerning the antiquity of the “*custom* of giving a mixture of *milk* and *honey* to a person just baptized.” For, as milk and honey were the food of Infants; so the giving of this mixture to a *person just baptized*, was a signification, or symbolical sign of his being *new-born*, or born again [*k*]. Now, the Doctor says [*l*], even *Barnabas*, a companion of the apostle *Paul*, is *thought* to refer to this practice, in an epistle of his still extant [*m*]. Let me ask then; doth Dr. *Gill* himself really *think* so; or doth he not? If he doth not; Why did he alledge *this* as a proof of the high antiquity of that custom? On the other hand, if the Doctor is of that opinion; if he looks upon the epistle of *Barnabas* to be genuine, and supposes it to refer to the custom of giving a mixture of milk, and honey to a person just baptized: then must he retract his own words, when he adds [*n*], “nor had it as yet obtained among the antients, to use the words *regenerated*, and *regeneration*, for
“*baptized*,

[*i*] Argument from apost. tradit. p. 37.

[*h*] *Hieronym. adv. Luciferianos. Bochart. Hierozoic. lib.*

4. cap. 12.

[*l*] *Ibid.*

[*m*] C. 5.

[*n*] *Ibid.* p. 14. Dr. Gale also says (Reflections on Wall's history, &c. p. 489.) “I do not believe it (i. e. the word *regeneration*) is ever so much as once used in the antientest times for baptism, at least not till their *zeal for Infant-Baptism* betrayed them into that absurdity, which was not near the time of St. *Irenæus*.” — But, a zeal for Infant-Baptism will prove, upon his hypothesis, much earlier than the Doctor pretends.

“ *baptized, and baptism.*”—Let us now return to *Irenæus*; and by examining another passage, or two in *this* antient writer, it will manifestly appear, that he himself used the words *regenerated* and *regeneration* in the sense contended for. In one place [o] he speaks thus; “ And again, giving the power “ of *regeneration* unto God to his disciples, he “ said unto them, *Go, and teach all nations, “ baptizing them in the name of the Father, “ and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost.*” This passage seems too plain to need any comment, or to be capable of any evasion. In another place [p], *Irenæus* mentions *by name*, “ the *Baptism of regeneration to God.*”—The Doctor cannot say of *this* passage, that it is only a *translation* of *Irenæus*; for, we have it *expressed in his own original words*, if that will please him. Well then! *Irenæus* expressly speaks of the *Baptism of regeneration* unto God, and of *Infants being regenerated* unto God. From whence it is natural for any man of plain sense, to infer that *Infants were baptized.*—But says the Doctor [q] “ the true “ sense of *Irenæus* seems to be *this*, that

M “ Christ

[o] Et iterum potestatem regenerationis in Deum demandans discipulis, dicebat eis: Euntes docete omnes gentes, baptizantes eos in nomine Patris, et Filii, et Spiritus Sancti. *Iren.* lib. 3. cap. 19.

[p] —τῆ βαπτίσματος τῆς εἰς θεὸν ἀναγεννήσεως, i. e. baptismatis ejus, quæ est in Deum regenerationis. *Iren. lib. 3. cap. 18.*

[q] Divine right of Inf. Bap. examined, &c. p. 23.

“ Christ came to save all, that are regenerate-
 “ rated by his grace and spirit, and none but
 “ they, according to his own words. John iii.
 “ 3, 5.” Now, this is granting all we desire,
viz. that the words of *Irenæus* refer to the words
 of Christ in those texts of scripture, particularly the last.
 For, this is plainly giving up the point; as those words
 were always [r], and I think rightly [s], understood of
 Baptism by the antient christian writers.
 —But the Doctor is not yet easy; he says, that
 “ to understand *Irenæus* as speaking of
 “ Baptism, is to make him at least to suggest a
 “ doctrine, which is absolutely false, as if
 “ Christ came to save *all*, and *only* such, who
 “ are baptized unto God.” The like objection
 is made by another learned writer [t], who should
 have understood the sentiments and language of the
 primitive Fathers better. Did not he know, that
Tertullian as well as *St. Austin*, &c. spoke of
 Baptism as necessary to salvation? How came the
ecclesiastical historian then to forget, that it is agreeable
 to the *ecclesiastical stile*, to understand *Irenæus* also
 as speaking of Baptism under the same notion?
 And

[r] See Wall's History, &c. p. 2. ch. 6.

[s] The words of Christ, *Except a man be born of water,*
 and of *the spirit*, &c. are parallel to the words of *St. Paul*,
Tit. iii. 5 by the *washing of regeneration*, and renewing of
 the Holy Ghost. And those, who would confine the words
 wholly to *spiritual* baptism, put a manifest force upon them,
 at the expence of a *tautology*: which is *Dr. Gill's* way. See
 his commentary, &c. Conf. Mar. xvi. 16.

[t] *J. Cleric. Hist. Eccles. ann. 180. sect. 33.*

And thus, what is urged as an objection, is really a confirmation of the given sense of *Irenæus* : which cannot be disproved by the *consequence* drawn from it, unless the infallibility of *Irenæus* in points of *doctrine* be first established. Besides, hath not the *Oracle of truth* himself declared [u]? “ He that believeth, and is baptized, shall be saved.” And is not this the same kind of language, that we suppose *Irenæus* to speak, so far as relates to *Baptism*? I hope, Dr. *Gill* will not here say, that “ to understand *Christ* as speaking of “ *Baptism*, is to make him at least to suggest “ a doctrine, which is absolutely false, &c.” But, if the words of *Christ* admit of a qualified sense ; so do the words of *Irenæus*. There is nothing therefore in his manner of expression, that argues that he doth not speak of *Baptism*, when he speaks of Infants *being regenerated* unto God ; but the contrary. For, his way of speaking, thus understood, is quite agreeable to the *ecclesiastical stile*, and to *scripture language* also. So much then for the testimony, the plain unexceptionable testimony, of *Irenæus* for the practice of Infant-Baptism. And as this antient writer flourished about sixty seven years after the apostles, so that he may well be supposed, as he is said, to have been born some time before the death of St. *John* : his testimony therefore carries up the

M 2

evi-

[u] Mark xvi. 16.

evidence for Infant-Baptism very near to the apostolic age.

But farther to corroborate this evidence, let us proceed to *Justin Martyr*, whose time is fixed only forty years after the apostles. And the better to connect our observations on him with our remarks on *Irenæus*; we shall begin with a passage, where *Justin Martyr* plainly enough speaks of Baptism under the notion of *regeneration*, though he is describing to the heathens the manner of adult-baptism only, having no occasion to descend to any farther particulars: nor do we alledge the passage as a proof of Infant-Baptism directly; but only to shew that this antient writer also used the word *regeneration*, so as to connote Baptism, and thereby confirms the sense already given of the words of *Irenæus*. *Justin Martyr* then says [*w*], “ We bring them
 “ (viz. the *new-converts*) to some place, where
 “ there is water; and they are *regenerated* by
 “ the same way of *regeneration* by which we
 “ were *regenerated*: for they are washed with
 “ water in the name of God the Father and
 “ Lord of all things, and of our Saviour *Je-*
 “ *sus Christ*, and of the Holy Spirit. For,
 “ *Christ* says [*x*], *unless you be regenerated, you*
 “ *cannot enter into the kingdom of heaven, &c.*”
 Thus, as *Justin Martyr* useth the term *rege-*
neration, so he understands these words of our
 Saviour,

[*w*] Apolog. 2.

[*x*] John iii. 3, 5.

Saviour, of *Baptism*. Therefore, though he here describes the manner of administering Baptism only to the *adult*, as we are often told; yet his words cannot be thought to exclude the Baptism of Infants in those days: because, we see, that construction of our Saviour's words did *then* obtain, which, as the Anti-pædo-baptists themselves say, *introduced Infant-Baptism into the christian church*. So little reason had Dr. *Gill* to say, speaking of the time of *Irenæus*, near thirty years younger than *Justin Martyr*, "nor had it as yet obtained among the antients to use the words *regenerated*, and *regeneration*, for *baptized*, and *Baptism!*" As for Dr. *Gale's* quibbles upon this head, I scarce need to refer the Reader to Dr. *Wall's* reply [y] for a proper answer; the plain words of *Justin Martyr*, above cited, being a sufficient answer of themselves.

The next passage I shall mention is in his *Dialogue with Trypho the Jew* [z]; where *Justin Martyr* says *that* concerning the influence and effect of *Adam's* sin upon mankind, which the antient writers represent as the ground and reason of Infant-Baptism. In the same book he speaks of Baptism being to christians in the room of circumcision; and so points out the analogy between these two initiatory rites. Dr. *Wall* hath quoted both

[y] *Wall's Defence*, &c. p. 277.

[z] *J. Martyr Dialog. cum Trypho*, &c.

both the passages at large, and made proper reflections upon them [a]. To him therefore I shall refer the curious and inquisitive Reader: for I hasten to another passage in *Justin Martyr*, upon which I must dwell a-while longer. *Justin Martyr* then says [b].

“ Several persons among us, of both sexes, of
 “ sixty, and seventy years of age, οἱ ἐκ παιδῶν
 “ ἐμαθητεύθησαν τῷ χριστῷ, *who were disciplined*
 “ *to Christ in their childhood, &c.*” Dr. Gill
 renders the words thus [c], “ who from their
 “ childhood *were instructed in Christ*: for so
 “ (says he) the phrase, on which the whole
 “ depends, should be rendered, and not *dis-*
 “ *cipled, or profelyted to Christ*, which render-
 “ ing of the words as it is unjustifiable, so it
 “ would never have been thought of, had it not
 “ been to serve a turn.”—Now, by expressing
 himself thus, the Doctor seems to be aware,
 that the *turn* of Infant-Baptism *would be serv-*
ed, if that construction of the word, ἐμαθη-
τεύθησαν, which he disallows, were admitted:
 and yet, if he also had not a turn to serve in
 his way, it is probable that he would never
 have thought of any other rendering of the
 word: nor can he justify his own sense of the
 phrase, ἐμαθητεύθησαν τῷ χριστῷ, by any rule
 of grammar, or parallel example. e. g. “ *An-*
 “ *tiphon, the son of Sophilus—μαθητεύσας δὲ*
 “ *τῷ πατρὶ, was disciplined, or a disciple to his*
 “ *father;*”

[a] Hist. of Inf. Bap. p. 1. ch. 2. [b] *Apol.* 2.

[c] Argument from ap. tradit. &c. p. 12.

“ father ;” says *Plutarch* [c]. But according to Dr. *Gill*'s rule of construction, we should say, *Antipbon* was *instructed in his father*. And would this be good sense, or a proper way of speaking? The Doctor himself, when perhaps he was off his guard, and *had no turn to serve*, sometimes supposed, that in the *christian* sense of the word, *disciple*, it includes *Baptism*. For, says he [d], “ The apostle takes it for granted, that they were *baptized*, since they were not only believers, but *disciples*.” And this sense of the word, as including the idea of *Baptism*, is confirmed by the following passage [e]; “ When they had *preached* the gospel to that city, and *μαθητεύσαντες* taught (*discipled*) many, &c.” that is, made many disciples. By this expression the sacred writer must intend something more than bare *instruction*; otherwise it is a mere *tautology*. And what can this something more be, but *baptizing* them? Dr. *Gill* himself being judge. Therefore, since according to the *christian* sense of the word in question, it comprehends *Baptism*, when *Justin Martyr* says of certain persons *ἐν παιδῶν ἐμαθητεύθησαν τῷ χριστῷ*; his words imply that they were *baptized in their infancy*, or *childhood*: for, the *Baptism* of any persons being not a *continued*, but one single transi-

ent

[c] *Plutarc. de vit. decem Rhet. Op. Vol. 2. p. 832.*

[d] Dr. *Gill*'s commentary in *Acts* xix. 1, 3.

[e] *Acts* xiv. 21.

ent act, to speak of their being baptized *from* their childhood, would be improper [*f*]. We grant, the word, *disciple*, hath a reference to *teaching*, and instruction. But then, whereas the Antipædo-baptists pretend that all persons must be *first* taught before they are baptized; we, on the contrary maintain, that children rightly *may* be, and in fact *were*, baptized, and so far made disciples to Christ, in order to be taught, as a scholar is put to school, that he may learn.

With respect to the *matter of right* in this case, it is beyond the compass of my *present* design, to discuss the question in that view. However, as it may contribute something toward supporting the given sense of *Justin Martyr*; I shall here anticipate myself so far, as to offer some considerations upon the words of the *commission* [*g*]. “ Go ye therefore, and “ *teach (disciple)* all nations, *baptizing* them “ in the name of the Father, and of the “ Son, and of the Holy Ghost; *teaching* “ them to observe all things whatsoever I “ have commanded you, &c.”—Here, say the Antipædo-baptists, *teaching* is set before *baptizing*; and so, from hence they argue, and would conclude, that *all* persons must be taught, before they are baptized. But, from a strict, and impartial examination of the words of the commission, the contrary will appear

[*f*] See Wall's Defence, &c. p. 280.

[*g*] Mat. xxviii. 19, 20.

appear to be true, and that *baptizing* is really set before *teaching*, in the proper order of words ; though I shall not argue from thence, that *all* persons must be baptized, before they are taught, but only that there is no ground from the words of the commission for the contrary supposition. For (1.) we have the *general matter* of the commission laid down in these words ; *Go ye and disciple, or professyte, all nations*. For so, I insist, the original word ought to be rendered, to express its true meaning, and to avoid a *tautology* ; not *teach* all nations ; as *teaching* is mentioned afterward by a more proper, and known term, διδάσκοντες [b]. Accordingly, thus it is, that our translators have very properly rendered the word in another place of the same gospel [i]. Nor can Dr. Gill, remembering his own observation above mentioned, disallow, how much soever he may *dislike*, this interpretation ; or confine the sense of the word to mere *teaching*, but at the expence of a palpable self-contradiction. Therefore, *discipling* is a general, and comprehensive term, including both *teaching*, and *baptizing*. For observe (2.) the *particular method* of executing this commission, appointed in *two directions* ; viz. *baptizing*, and *teaching* : that is to say, *by baptizing*, and *by teaching* : for, the

N Greeks

[b] See Wall's Defence, &c. p. 135, 136.

[i] Mat. xxvii. 57.

Greeks use the *participles* for *gerunds* [k]. Our learned Doctor over-acts the *grammarian*, when he says [l], “the antecedent to the “relative *them* (after *baptizing*) cannot be all “*nations*,——but *disciples*, &c.” The reason he gives for it, is of no force at all, viz. the disagreement of *gender*. Such inaccuracies, or *atticisms* [m], are not uncommon. The Doctor may find the same construction in other places [n], yea, the very same phrase [o]. And let me ask him, what is the antecedent to the second *them*? (after *teaching*) Will he say, as before, *disciples*? Then, by his own confession, *disciples* are *persons to be taught*! I give the Doctor free liberty, to chuse his own antecedent. And whether it be *all nations*, or *disciples*; this is plain, that *baptizing* is set before *teaching* in the express words of the commission. ——Therefore, to return to *Justin Martyr*, no sufficient reason appears, why the aged persons, mentioned by him, as having been *discipled to Christ in*, or *from their childhood*, may not be supposed, to have been made *disciples to Christ in* their infancy by *Baptism*, and afterwards *taught from* their infancy; according to that observation of the
learned

[k] *Vid. Spanham. Dubia Evang. in loc.*

[l] *Divine right of Inf. Bap. &c. p. 79.*

[m] The construction of a *relative* is of the same nature with that of an *adjective*; concerning which the rule is: *positivè, et atticè, nec casu, nec genere, nec numero consentit.*

[n] 2 Kings xvii. 41, 70. Acts xv. 17.

[o] Mat. xxv. 32.

learned Dr. *Lightfoot* [p], “ Baptism makes
 “ disciples, and discipling sets the way to be
 “ taught.” This to me appears to give us
 the full import of *Justin Martyr’s* phrase.
 And, considering the time, when he writ,
 the persons, of whom he speaks, must have
 been *discipled to Christ*, and consequently
 baptized, in the apostolic age, and near the
middle of it [q].

I shall not here insist upon the *questions*
 and *answers* to the *Orthodox*; a book which
 goes under the name of *Justin Martyr*, but
 is the work of a later author, in the fourth
 century perhaps [r]. However, Infant-Bap-
 tism is there spoken of, as a thing vulgarly
 known, and practised in the christian church,
 and the right of children to Baptism on the
 foot of the faith of those, that present them,
 is plainly, and positively asserted [s]. We
 may rank this book in the same class with the
Apostolical Constitutions, which expressly order
 the Baptism of Infants [t]. And so, from
both we may conclude, that Infant-Baptism
 was practised in the *Greek* church; a fact
 which the Antipædo-baptists have sometimes
 denied.

N 2

Perhaps,

[p] Sermon on Matth. xxviii. 19. Op. Vol. 2. p. 1124.
 This is according to the rule, *Baptize your children, and
 bring them up in the nurture and admonition of the Lord.* A-
 post. Constitut. ubi infra.

[q] See the Baptism of Infants, a reasonable service. p. 32.

[r] *Vid. Quest.* 74, 126, &c.

[s] *Quest. & Respons.* 56.

[t] *Apost. Constitut. lib. 6. cap.* 15.

Perhaps, according to my proposed method, I should have mentioned the *Recognitions* before *Justin Martyr* in order. However, says the learned and laborious Mr. *Bingham* [u], “ It is an antient writing of “ the same age with *Justin Martyr*, men- “ tioned by *Origen* in his *Philocalia*, and by “ some ascribed to *Bardesenes Syrus*, who “ lived about the middle of the second cen- “ tury. This author speaks of the necessity “ of Baptism in the same style, as *Justin Martyr* did, &c. — So that if Infant-Bap- “ tism was founded, as *Salmasius* pleads, up- “ on the opinion of the necessity of Baptism “ to salvation; this author must be an assertor “ of Infant-Baptism; because he was unde- “ niably an assertor of the general necessity “ of Baptism to salvation [w].

To conclude in the words of the same author [w]. “ The most antient writer, that “ we have is *Clemens Romanus*, who lived in “ the time of the apostles. And he, though “ he doth not directly mention Infant-Bap- “ tism, yet says a thing, that by consequence “ proves it. For, he makes Infants liable to “ original sin, which in effect is to say, that “ they have need of Baptism to purge it “ away, &c [x]. — *Hermes Pastor* lived “ about

[u] Antiquities of the christian ch. B. xi. ch. 4. sect. 8.

[w] *Clement. Recognit. lib. 6.*

[w] *Bingham antiq. ibid. sect. 6.*

[x] *Clemens Roman. Ep. 1. ad Corinth.*

“ about the same time with *Clemens*, and hath
 “ several passages to shew the general necessi-
 “ ty of *water*, that is Baptism, to save men,
 “ &c [x]. — Therefore, they who represent
 “ this doctrine of the necessity of Baptism
 “ as a novelty, or an error, first introduced
 “ into the church in the age of St. *Austin*
 “ against the *Pelagian* hereticks; do mani-
 “ fest wrong both to the doctrine itself, and
 “ to St. *Austin*, and to the antients, who
 “ embraced, and delivered the same before
 “ him.”

Thus, from the beginning of the *fifth* cen-
 tury backward, either expressly, or in res-
 pect to the common *grounds* of it (those very
 grounds upon which the Antipædo-baptists
 themselves say, it was founded) we have tra-
 ced up the practice of Infant-Baptism to the
 time of the apostles [y]. (And it is only the
fact itself, as attested by the antient *writers*,
 not their *reasonings* about it, in which we are
 concerned at present) Our testimonies upon
 this head might have been expected to be
 more full for the *first* ages, if there had *then*
 been any *controversy* about Infant-Baptism,
 and

[x] Hermes Pastor lib. 1. & 3. See Wall's History, &c.
 p. 1. ch. 1. and Defence. ch. xi.

[y] Quòd autem apud simplicem vulgum disseminant, lon-
 gam annorum seriem, post Christi resurrectionem, præteruisse,
 quibus incognitus erat pædo-baptismus; in eo *sædissime* *menti-*
untur: siquidem nullus scriptor tam vetustus, qui non ejus
 originem ad *apostolorum seculum* pro certo referat. J. Cal-
 vin. Instit. lib. 4. cap. 16. sect. 8.

and we had now a greater number of primitive writers extant. So that what our *evidence* may seem to lose in *one* view, it gains in another. The main question is, on which side the *preponderating* evidence lies. And to judge of this, I desire the Reader to consider, that in all the forementioned period the Antipædo-baptists cannot produce one single author to *disprove* the fact [y]. For, the first man, that ever suggested any thing of that kind, was *Wilfrid Strabo*, a writer in the ninth century; and what he says is grounded upon a palpable mistake. Because, he builds his opinion, against the early practice of Infant-Baptism, upon no historical memoirs, or authentic testimony; but only on a passage in St. *Austin's* book of *Confessions*, which speaks of his being baptized at adult-age. Nothing at all to the purpose! For, from the same book of St. *Austin* we also learn, that, when he was born, his *father* was a heathen [z]. And, if his *mother* was then

[y] “ Mr. Gale says, *Had it been the settled practice, &c.* it cannot be imagined, that Tertullian should venture to oppose it. Why not? Why might not he have the confidence, and self opinion, that Mr. Gale has now, when it is undoubtedly the settled practice? He knows well enough (though he would conceal it from any ignorant Reader) that, That is *Tertullian's* character among all men; to oppose his singular opinions to the practice, and tenets of the church of his time, &c.” *Wall's Defence* p. 361.

[z] See Marshall's Defence of Inf. Bap. in answer to Tombes. p. 47. and Wall's history, &c. p. 2. ch. 3. sect. ii. and ch. 2. sect. 2.

then a christian ; his being not *baptized* in infancy can no more prove, that Infant-Baptism was not the common practice of the *christian* church at that time (as we know it was by St. *Austin's* own testimony) than *Timothy's* not being *circumcised* in infancy (whose father was a *Greek*, and his mother a *Jewess* [a]) is any proof that Infant-circumcision was not then the common practice of the *Jewish* church. Wherefore to conclude all in the words of St. *Augustin*, in his epistle to St. *Jerome*, contra *Ecclesiae fundatissimum morem* nemo sentiat, i. e. “ let no body think “ contrary to *the most firmly established custom* “ of the church.”

[a] Acts xvi. 1, 3.

F I N I S.

A D V E R T I S E M E N T.

THIS Defence of the Antiquity is designed to prepare the Way for the Defence of the Authority of Infant-Baptism, in Answer to the common Objections against it.

BOOKS Printed and Sold by J. WAUGH at
the *Turk's Head* in *Lombard-Street*.

I. **T**H E Dissenting Gentleman's THREE LETTERS, with a POSTSCRIPT, in Answer to the Reverend Mr. *White's* THREE LETTERS; in which a Separation from the Establishment is fully justified; the Charge of Schism is refuted and retorted; and the Church of *England* and the Church of *Jesus Christ*, are impartially compared, and found to be Constitutions of a quite different Nature. The LETTERS and POSTSCRIPT may be had separate.

II. The BAPTISM of INFANTS, a Reasonable Service; founded upon Scripture, and undoubted Apostolic Tradition: In which its Moral Purposes and Use in Religion are shewn.

III. DIPPING not the only Scriptural and Primitive Manner of Baptizing: And supposing it were, yet a strict Adherence to it not obligatory on us.

IV. EUROCLYDON: Or, the Dangers of the Sea considered and improved, in some Reflections on St. *Paul's* Voyage and Shipwreck, *Acts* xvii.

V. LIBERTY and LOYALTY: Or, a Defence and Explication of the Subjection to the present Government, upon the Principles of the Revolution.

VI. DIVINE ORACLES: Or, the Sufficiency of the Holy Scriptures, as a Rule of Religion, asserted, according to the sixth Article of the Church of *England*. And the concurrent Testimony of Scripture and the Fathers, in Behalf of Tradition, discussed; in Answer to a Book intitled, a full, true and comprehensive View of Christianity, &c. during the four first Centuries——laid down in two Catechisms.

VII. HOLY ORDERS: Or, an Essay on Ordination.





