



**Library of The Theological Seminary**

PRINCETON · NEW JERSEY



Library of  
Dr. W. H. Green  
1903

BV 813 .W3 1844 v.4  
Wall, William  
The history of  
infant-baptism







M.  
T. Ferry Green

Philadelphia

January 30<sup>th</sup> 1851



THE HISTORY  
OF INFANT-BAPTISM.

BY  
WILLIAM WALL, M.A.

VICAR OF SHOREHAM, KENT, AND OF MILTON NEXT GRAVESEND.

TOGETHER WITH  
MR. GALE'S REFLECTIONS,  
AND  
DR. WALL'S DEFENCE.

---

SECOND EDITION,  
BY THE REV. HENRY COTTON, D.C.L.  
LATE STUDENT OF CHRIST CHURCH.

---

IN FOUR VOLUMES.

VOL. IV.

---

OXFORD:  
AT THE UNIVERSITY PRESS  
MDCCCXLIV.



A D E F E N C E  
OF THE  
HISTORY OF INFANT-BAPTISM  
AGAINST THE  
REFLECTIONS OF MR. GALE  
AND OTHERS.

BY WILLIAM WALL,  
AUTHOR OF THE SAID HISTORY.



# A DEFENCE

OF THE

## HISTORY OF INFANT-BAPTISM.



WHEN, after I had for some years made it my business to observe in my reading, and to collect such passages in the ancient Christian writers, as did any way relate to the baptizing of infants; I published them, with some notes of my own upon them, in the year 1705, being then about sixty years old; I little thought that the doing of that would bring me under a necessity of writing any more books, which is a fatigue unfit to be borne by one of my age. The *History* itself, or Collection of Quotations, could not, I thought, admit of any exceptions, provided I recited them true; which I was careful to do. And for my notes upon them, or any thing that related to the defence of the cause itself of infant-baptism, I thought, that if there arose any necessity of vindicating that, some younger and abler men would undertake it.

But the book having had more said and published, by some for, and by some against it, than I could

have expected; these latter who have wrote against it, and especially Mr. Gale's large book of 'Reflections,' (so he calls them: he might have entituled them 'Reproaches,') have made it needful (in the opinion of some worthy men, to whom I owe a deference) for me, even in this my weak and superannuated state<sup>a</sup>, to write something in vindication, partly of the cause, and partly of myself: some people having, it seems, raised a report or suspicion, as if I myself had altered my opinion about the duty or the ancient practice of baptizing infants.

That honour which was publicly done to my book by those learned men of the lower house of convocation<sup>b</sup>, and by some others of great worth and station, as I ought ever humbly to acknowledge it to have been greater than I could deserve; and as it was in itself extraordinary; so it was a means of provoking the pen of somebody (I could never learn who it was<sup>c</sup>) presently to find faults in it. He in a

<sup>a</sup> [This was written in the year 1720, at which time the author was seventy-five years of age.]

<sup>b</sup> [See the introduction to vol. iii. for the terms in which this compliment was conveyed.]

<sup>c</sup> [This is now generally understood to have been Dr. White Kennet, (afterwards bishop of Peterborough,) at that time archdeacon of Huntingdon: who, publishing 'An Account of Proceedings in the Convocation, which began Oct. 25, 1705. so far as it could be given, by reason of the concealment of the acts of the lower house, and the Prolocutor's refusal to transmit them to the proper office.' 4to. London, (no printer's name,) 1706;—at p. 58. makes the following remarks: 'Their [the lower house] peculiar pleasure was, to sit judges of books and sermons, to approve some and condemn others, as should seem meet unto them.

'The book that had the honour of their express approbation, was the treatise of *Infant-baptism* by Mr. George (sic) Wall.



Pamphlet, called ‘An Account of the Proceedings in ‘Convocation, 1705,’ said; that I had therein reflected on a certain bishop, (and he spoke as if it had been a personal reflection on that bishop,) who, he said, was not a favourite of the lower house; but was, it seems, a favourite of the writer, and of the enemies of that house. But that being written not so much against me (who had only opposed a tenet of that bishop) as in anger and party-quarrel with them; and I having in the preface to the second edition answered what I thought needful, I have no more to say of that adversary’s objections.

‘The sermon that was censured by them was that of Mr. ‘*Hoadly*, preached before the lord mayor and aldermen of ‘London, and published at their desire.

‘Without entering into the merit or demerit of either of ‘these books, one can hardly forbear thinking, that the reason ‘why one was commended, was, because it contains several ‘reflections on some of the bishops who are not favourites of ‘the lower house: and that the other was censured, because it ‘expresses a great zeal for the honour of the revolution, and no ‘less concern for the present government, and the succession in ‘the Protestant line. As to Mr. Wall’s book, whatever com- ‘mendation it may deserve, there doth not seem to be any other ‘peculiar reason, why it should be singled out among so many ex- ‘cellent books as have been published within these few years; ‘amongst which we may justly reckon those that have been pub- ‘lished by Mr. *Hoadly* in defence of the established Church.’

It is well remembered, how much of division and of party-spirit appeared in that convocation; a portion of which may also be traced in the above remarks. Dr. Wall replied to them at length, in the preface to the *second* edition; but in that to his *third* he observes, ‘To which (rebuke) I in the preface to the ‘second edition gave what answer I thought needful. But that ‘pamphlet being now, I suppose, out of print and forgotten, I ‘do not think my answer to it worth reprinting.’

The passage objected to had occurred in part ii. chap. 5. sect. 9, of the *first* edition.]

What I would do now is, partly to own what I myself, before I was attacked by antagonists, had, upon a longer consideration and review, thought to be blamable in it; and partly to answer the objections which some writers, and especially Mr. Gale, have made against it. I myself had reflected on some passages as blamable, (and happy is that writer, who upon a sedate review of what he has said, has not occasion so to do,) and particularly such, wherein animadverting on some mistakes or misrepresentations of things, made by some authors, I had used a strain of language more censorious or satirical than should have been used toward men, who had been otherwise of great merit and worth.

When any one of great learning, judgment, and piety, has by the use of those good qualities, and by great pains and study, done considerable service to religion and the Church of God, (which is the case of the learned Grotius,) such a man is, even in the mention of his faults, (when the defence of any truth makes it necessary to mention them,) and in the confutation of his mistakes, to be treated with respect. He in his comment on Matt. xxviii. 19, set himself to establish a doctrine which is perfectly new, of the indifferency (*libertas* he calls it) of baptizing or not baptizing infants. And to that purpose heaped together several reasons and authorities, which, as he uses them, do make for the Antipedobaptists' side of the question, that they might balance those which he knew were for the other side. The producing any of these testimonies that were true, and could fairly be applied to the purpose for which he used them, is a thing which I of all men must not have blamed him for: for it was that which I pretended

to do myself. But he brings some, which, I think, I have shewn to be not so. As, not to mention his saying, ‘ that St. Austin, before he was heated with ‘ the Pelagian disputes, never wrote any thing of the ‘ condemnation of unbaptized infants, not even to ‘ those lesser pains in the world to come;’ which I have shewn from St. Austin’s own words to be otherwise, part i. chap. xv. sect. 3 and 5; nor his finding an argument against infant-baptism in the council of Neocæsarea, Can. 6, which when duly considered, has nothing *pro* or *contra* about it; nor his quoting some words of Balsamon’s comment on that canon, which might represent him as understanding it against infant-baptism, and leaving out other words in the same paragraph, which would have plainly discovered the mistake of such a representation; nor his saying, that in the Greek churches many persons ‘ from the beginning to this day, have ‘ the custom of delaying the baptism of infants, till ‘ they are able to make profession of their faith;’ which account of the modern practice is certainly wrong, and of the ancient practice (which is the thing disputed) he brings no tolerable proofs; nor his saying, that ‘ in the councils one shall find no ‘ earlier mention of pædobaptism, than in the council of Carthage, anno 418;’ whereas the council under St. Cyprian, that speaks of it as absolutely necessary, was nigh two hundred years before; he makes the most palpable mistake of all, in representing Gregory Nazianzen as speaking of infancy as a state incapable of baptism, in a sentence where Gregory only speaks of the mishap of those infants, who being *διὰ νηπιότητα*, *by reason of their infancy*, incapable of procuring it to themselves, have no

friends that will procure it for them : which children, as he judges, will by that means miss of heaven. Which is just as good arguing, as if from the history of the impotent man, John v, who for thirty-eight years had been unable himself to get into the pool time enough for cure, and had nobody to help him into it, one should conclude, that impotency is a reason why a man should not, or ought not to be cured.

This last mentioned perverting of the plain meaning of Gregory's words, to a directly contrary sense, I called *a foul imposture*<sup>d</sup>. What I blame myself for is, that the consideration of the merit of so great a man, shewn in the other places of his comments, did not prevail with me to use expressions of more deference and a more modest censure ; though of the incongruity of the argument, my thoughts be as they were then.

I had occasion to recite a discourse of St. Chrysostom's, which I thought, and do think still, to be manifestly inconclusive ; but expressed the censure of it in words which shewed too plainly, that I did not consider who he was, and who I am<sup>e</sup>. These words were, upon the admonition of a superior, (who had a large catalogue of such my faults presented to him, by some, who upon application refused to let me see it,) amended in the second edition.

Several other learned men, (it would be too long to name all the cases,) upon whose opinions or quotations my subject led me to make animadversions,

<sup>d</sup> [Part ii. chap. 2. sect. 9, in the first and second editions.]

<sup>e</sup> [Part i. chap. 14. sect. 1.]

did deserve to have been treated more respectfully.

The dispute that had of late been raised about the tenets of the Waldenses concerning infant-baptism, led me into a short history of those people; which, I understand since, had been much more distinctly and skilfully handled by others<sup>f</sup>. I did not sufficiently distinguish between the Waldenses properly so called, and the Albigenses. The Petrobrusians, whom I mentioned<sup>g</sup> (and I think they were so) as the first antipædobaptists were of the Albigenses. None of the Waldenses, I think, did deny infant-baptism.

What I said of St. Ambrose<sup>h</sup>, affirming that John the Baptist baptized infants, should have been expressed not so positively. The tenor of the quotation which I brought from his comment on Luke i. does (I think still) lead to that sense of his words. But it is better for a quoter, where the phrases have any ambiguity, to intimate what he takes to be the most obvious sense of them, and leave the more positive judgment of them to the reader. He that would pass a judgment, would do well to read all that he says there of the parallel between John and Elias.

These, and some more such reflections on some particular passages of my own book, I had made, before I was attacked by any adversary; and had drawn up a breviary of them for my own use, and shewed it to some friends, and they to others. One

<sup>f</sup> [See some account of writers who have treated on the history of these people, in a note at vol. ii. p. 246.]

<sup>g</sup> [Part ii. chap. 7. sect. 5.]

<sup>h</sup> [Part i. chap. 13. sect. 1.]

of which having seen it, said, where I have heard of it again, that he had seen a *recantation* of my book under my own hand. And this perhaps might give occasion to a report, which some have heard, that my opinion concerning paedobaptism was altered. I must not use again any such sharp language as I am now blaming myself for; (for this also is a man of worth;) but I wish him a better use of his faculty of distinguishing between a *review*, wherein any one acknowledges the faultiness of some particular expressions, as being too censorious, too positive, &c., and a *recantation* of a book, a doctrine, or a history. St. Austin wrote his *retractations* of the former sort, but not of the latter; neither did I.

Of those who have written against me, I do not take Mr. Bernard<sup>i</sup>, of Holland, to be one. On the contrary, I account it an honour done to me, that he thought my book one of those that it was worth his while to give an abstract of, in his ‘*Nouvelles de la République des Lettres*’ for the year 1708, But yet (as I think it always happens between writers) he thinks it necessary to differ from me in some things, and to give his censure of some passages; but of none in my first part, as I remember, that are of moment, save that on reading the hard words, which I mentioned just now, on Grotius, he says, p. 383, ‘Possibly Grotius might, without any design of imposture, cite that passage of Gregory

<sup>i</sup> [See the periodical literary review published by M. Jacques Bernard, under the title of *Nouvelles de la République des Lettres*, 12mo. Amsterdam, 1699, &c. In October 1708 this contained a review of Dr. Wall’s *first* part, and in Nov. of the same year one of the *second* part of his *first* edition, 1705.]

‘Nazianzen, writing in too much haste or heedlessness,’ ‘avec trop de précipitation.’ And I am content it should go so.

But he finds more faults in the second part. Upon my giving my opinion, chap. x. that that one example of Gregory, the father of Gregory Nazianzen, letting his son, born to him after his own baptism, grow up unbaptized, (which is the only instance that can be brought, and that not plainly to be proved,) ought not to be accounted of any great weight, for reasons there given: he, at p. 568, is of another opinion, ‘That my reasoning at that place is not solid, but warped. That this example shews, that at that time they did not take the baptizing of infants to be a law indispensable, since a priest was suffered to let his child go unbaptized.’ Now it seems to me no very solid conclusion, which he would draw from this one instance of a man, who is represented by the writers of his son’s life, (who are the only writers that mention him,) to have been of little judgment or capacity, against all the examples and advices of the other ancient Christians, especially when of fourteen instances, which some antipædobaptists had endeavoured to obtrude, of the children of Christians baptized at their adult age, I had, as he saw, there shewed the other thirteen to be mistakes in history; and indeed I question whether Mr. Bernard and others, should not rather blame me for too much easiness in yielding this one, viz. that Gregory Nazianzen was born after the year 325, which was the year of his father’s conversion from heathenism to Christianity. It was only one sentence, and one word in that sentence, (in the writing

whereof there may possibly have been an error,) that made me yield up all those many proofs and reasons in chronology to the contrary. For Suidas<sup>k</sup> makes him to be born twenty-five years before; and so does Papebrochius<sup>l</sup>, and so does Mr. Pagi<sup>m</sup>, and Mr. le Clerc. And Baronius<sup>n</sup> himself sets his birth three years before. By any of these accounts, the wonder that he was not baptized in infancy will cease. The word that puzzles all is *θυσιῶν*, in that sentence, where the father says to the son, ‘You have not lived so many years in all, as are the years of my sacrificing;’ by which must be meant, (if that word be allowed,) ‘of my officiating as a Christian priest.’ Which will make the son (who is often spoken of by himself, by the writers of his life, and by others, as one that lived to a very great age) to have lived no longer than sixty-one or sixty-two. For he died in 389. And there must be some time supposed to have passed between his father’s conversion, which was 325, and his ordination. Papebrochius thinks, that instead of *διήλαθε θυσιῶν*, it was *διήλαθ’ ἐτησίων*. Which will make the father say to the son, ‘You are not so old as I.’ I should rather think (if we may venture to amend) that *θυσιῶν* has been written instead of *πολιῶν*, (or for the verse sake *τῶν πολιῶν*;) which will make him say, ‘You are not so old as my grey hairs are;’ or, have

<sup>k</sup> [In voce ‘Gregorius.’]

<sup>l</sup> [See the Acta Sanctorum, volume the second, for May, at the ninth day, page 369, &c. &c.]

<sup>m</sup> [In his ‘Critica in Annales Card. Baronii, at the year 354, N<sup>o</sup>. xi. tom. i. p. 481. fol. Colon. Allobr. 1705.]

<sup>n</sup> [See ‘Baronii Annales,’ at the year 340, N<sup>o</sup>. xxxvi; and 324, N<sup>o</sup>. xxiii, &c.]



not lived so long as I have been grey-headed. The objection against this amendment, which arises from the construction of the verse, is not considerable in this case, because Gregory in that poem does commonly put an anapæstus for the fourth foot of his iambic. That is certainly the scope of the place. For the father there entreats the son's assistance in his weakness and extreme old age. And the father is by the history known to have been old before the son was born. I have since that time lighted on one proof more, that the son must be considerably older than sixty-one when he died. For St. Hierome mentioning him, (*de Scriptoribus Ecclesiasticis*,) calls him one of his *masters*, by whom he had in his younger years been instructed in the study of divinity. Whereas by this account St. Hierome was within four years as old as he. For at 389 he was fifty-seven, as is easily computed by the history of his life.

Mr. Bernard here adds, that he is 'convinced ' that infants are to be baptized.' But he does not think baptism to be 'of absolute necessity:' nor that it is this sacrament 'which makes us true (or proper, *veritable*) Christians.' This is wonderful cautious. As to the necessity; we should, methinks, account all our Saviour's commands to be necessary. And I had quoted to him Calvin's acknowledgment; 'We do confess the use of baptism to be *necessary*; ' that it is not lawful to omit it by negligence or ' contempt. We do not count it free, (or *indifferent*,) and we do not only strictly oblige Christians to the use of it, but do affirm it to be the ' *ordinary instrument* of God, to wash and renew ' us, and to communicate to us salvation. This

‘ only we except ; that God’s hand is not so tied to  
 ‘ the instrument, but that it can of itself effect our  
 ‘ salvation. For where there is no possibility of  
 ‘ baptism, God’s promise alone is abundantly suffi-  
 ‘ cient.’ Antidot. ad Synod. Trident. Sess. 7. de  
 Baptismo. Here it is owned to be necessary, not  
 only *necessitate præcepti*, but also *necessitate me-  
 dii*, in God’s ordinary way.

But they will not have it said, that we are ‘ made  
 ‘ Christians’ by it ; yet Calvin here says, it is ‘ the  
 ‘ ordinary instrument of God to communicate to us  
 ‘ salvation.’ And it may, one would think, be as  
 well owned to be the ordinary instrument of God  
 to ‘ make us Christians :’ and that this is a fitter  
 theological expression, than that which I quoted of  
 a new-fashioned English divine ; ‘ We are born  
 ‘ members of the Christian church :’ which is the  
 direct contrary to the maxim of the ancient Chris-  
 tians ; ‘ Christiani non nascimur, sed fimus.’ Cal-  
 vin says, Instit. lib. iv. c. 15 : ‘ The children of the  
 ‘ faithful are not baptized for that reason, that they  
 ‘ may then first be made children of God, &c. But  
 ‘ rather they are therefore received by that solemn  
 ‘ sign into the church, because they did before be-  
 ‘ long to the body of Christ, by virtue of the pro-  
 ‘ mise.’ The church of England, in the Catechism,  
 makes the catechumen say, ‘ In my baptism, where-  
 ‘ in I was made a member of Christ, a child of  
 ‘ God,’ &c. A like dispute might be raised about  
 the efficacy of sealing a deed of land. One may  
 say, it is the sealing that conveys the right to the  
 land ; another, it is not that, but the will of the  
 donor. Both will agree, that it is not the parch-  
 ment, wax, &c., but the will of the donor solemnly

signified by those tokens. Bishop Stillingfleet does well observe, in the place I there quoted, (Unreasonableness of Separation, part iii. sect. 36.) that the Church of England by requiring sponsors, ‘does not exclude any title to baptism, which the child has by the right of the parents.’ But he shews at the same place, that if the parents be supposed to have no right, yet upon the sponson of god-fathers, the church has right to administer baptism to infants (which Mr. Bernard, as we shall see presently, owns to be the sense of other protestant churches); and that those who think themselves bound to baptize children *only* by virtue of their parents’ right, will run into many perplexing scruples, of which Mr. Bernard will give me occasion to speak by and by.

As for the assurance which they express, that where baptism cannot be had, God will in mercy make up the defect, and take the sincere will of the parent for the deed; no protestant, that I know of, will dispute against them, but have hopes of the same. But this is by extraordinary mercy, and should have no effect to alter the offices of the church visible; which cannot properly (in an office for burial, or any other occasion) call a person one of her members, till he has been regularly received as such, by the ordinary way of God’s appointment.

At p. 572, where I had said, that all the ancient Christians (without the exception of one man) do understand that rule of our Saviour, John iii. 5, to mean baptism; and that I believed Calvin to be the first man that ever denied it so to be meant: Mr. Bernard not willing to let Calvin’s name pass, with-

out pleading something for him, makes this reflection; ‘It must nevertheless be owned, that there  
 ‘ are considerable difficulties in this explication of  
 ‘ that passage given by the ancients, and which our  
 ‘ author takes to be the true one. It is hard for  
 ‘ any one to think, that none of all this discourse of  
 ‘ Jesus Christ to Nicodemus is to be understood of  
 ‘ the true (or proper, *veritable*) regeneration: which  
 ‘ baptism cannot confer of itself, at least, unless one  
 ‘ would say, that all infants that are baptized, are  
 ‘ actually regenerate.’

Mr. Bernard seems here not to have a right conception of the meaning of these ancient Christians. They did not think, that the outward part of baptism was all that Jesus Christ understood or meant by this discourse; but that he comprehended in these words, *born of water, and of the Spirit*, both the outward part, the water, &c., and also the inward part, that operation of the Holy Spirit, by which the baptized person is, by God’s mercy, and his gracious covenant, received into a new spiritual state, translated out of the state of nature (to which a curse is due) into the state of grace and mercy in Jesus Christ: or (as Calvin’s words are) *renewed* and brought to a *state of salvation*. St. Austin, in the words which I cited, part i. chap. xv. sect. 5. §. 9. shews how he and the ancients understood the regeneration or new birth of an infant in baptism, as meant by our Saviour, in the plainest words possible: ‘Aqua exhibens forinsecus sacramentum  
 ‘ gratiæ, et Spiritus operans intrinsecus beneficium  
 ‘ gratiæ, solvens vinculum culpæ.’ &c. These taken together, he means, do regenerate the infant. And is not this a happy and desirable regeneration for

the infant? Is not the spiritual state of the child by this merciful method of God's appointment, so altered for the better, that he may well be said to be born anew, and entered into a new state? When he was by nature born in sin, in a state of spiritual pollution, subject to God's wrath, &c., are not the pardon of that sin or pollution, the release of the old bond, the admittance into a new covenant, the adoption into God's family, to be partaker of Christ's purchase, &c., sufficient to denominate a *veritable regeneration*?

But Mr. Bernard says, 'Baptism cannot confer 'this of itself.' Not the water of itself, for certain. But the water, and the grace or mercy of God, applied to the person by the Holy Spirit (whose good offices Christ has promised shall accompany his ordinances) can.

But then it will follow, he says, that 'all baptized 'infants are actually regenerate.'

In this sense of the word (*entered into a new spiritual state*, which is the old sense of it) they are; and they have consigned to them the promises of such assistances of God's Spirit, as they shall from time to time be capable of. And in that state they continue for ever, if they themselves do not by actual wickedness break, forfeit, and disannul the gracious covenant into which they are then entered.

Mr. Bernard argues, that if our Saviour had meant no more than this, 'that would have been to no 'purpose, which he speaks of the action of the *Spirit* 'upon the *heart* of those who are regenerated, and 'which he compares to *the wind*,' &c.

That grace of the Spirit, which we have men-

tioned, is given both in the case of the adult, and also of infants. There are some other graces of the same Spirit, which are given peculiarly to the adult in their baptism; as a present converting the heart, enlightening the mind, comforting the soul, &c. When we maintain, that this discourse of our Saviour concerning baptism, and the regeneration of the person, is applicable to infants, we do not think that it relates to them only. On the contrary, in this and most other texts, where our Saviour or the Apostles do speak of baptism, though their words do comprehend and reach to the case of infants, yet they seem to have a more especial eye to the case of the adult persons of that time. Inasmuch as (though both were to be done) the baptizing of the adult, and the converting and fitting them for it, was the first and chief thing which the Apostles had at that time to do. Now our Saviour's general words (born of water and of the Spirit) do comprehend both these gracious effects of God's Spirit, adapted to the several subjects according to their respective capacities.

And whereas Mr. Bernard brings in, as an objection against this, those other words of our Saviour there; *That which is born of the flesh is flesh; and that which is born of the Spirit is spirit*: St. Austin's explication of that place which I recited, is natural and plain; as it is applied by him to infants (as well as adult persons) baptized: for infants are born in a state of corruption and guilt, (which is called *born of the flesh*.) but in baptism *born again by the Spirit* to a state of grace, and favour, and blessing. Unless Mr. Bernard will deny, that the Spirit of God, beside his office of converting the

heart in the adult, does also in the case of baptized infants, apply to them the pardon of original sin, the favour of being received into the Christian covenant, consigning to them such grace as shall assist them as they come to years, &c. Which I shewed (in this very chapter on which we are treating) that the antipædobaptists themselves do allow to be done in the case of all infants, baptized or not, which, dying in infancy, are saved. And no Christian, I think, will venture to say, that any infant can go to heaven without this application of the merits of Christ to him.

Therefore that which Mr. Bernard says next, ‘The authority of the Fathers of the Church is of no force against an explication founded upon what goes before, and what follows, in the context, and upon the rules of the best critics,’ raises no objection against this explication of the Fathers, which is agreeable to the words, both of the text and context. On the contrary, I am glad to hear him say this; for if no such privilege be to be allowed to the Fathers, it will follow *à fortiori*, that much less is the authority of one man, Calvin, (though he be for the general, a good expositor,) of force against an explication of this text, which is both natural in itself, and was ever accounted so by all Christians, without exception, for fourteen or fifteen hundred years, and is accounted so still by most Christians. And I think, the disdain with which all Christians do receive that explication of the Quakers, whereby they evade the force of such texts as concern the other sacrament, and do by the words, *bread, wine, eating, drinking, &c.*, force themselves to mean some other mystical thing,—should make one have the

less regard to Calvin's way of interpreting this text, which is so very like it, who will have no material *water* to be meant in this text; as they, no material *bread* in the other. For the Apostle's words, *The Bread which we break is the Communion of the Body of Christ, &c.*, do not more plainly express the external, as well as internal part of that sacrament, than our Saviour's words, *born of water and of the Spirit*, do of this. Especially if they be compared with other like texts, as Tit. iii. 5, *The washing of regeneration, and renewing of the Holy Spirit, &c.* To say, that these do not mean baptism, is as great a paradox, as to say, that the other do not mean the Lord's Supper. And at this rate of altering words, or expounding away the plain sense of them, any texts of Scripture whatever may be eluded.

Mr. Bernard grants, however, that 'our Saviour 'does in these words make an *allusion* to baptism; 'to that baptism with water, which had been in use 'among the Jews, and which John Baptist administered to the Jews themselves.'

But surely, our Saviour's affirming in so solemn a manner, *Verily, verily, &c.*, that without it, none shall enter into the kingdom of God; should be taken for more than an *allusion*.

He adds, that 'Jesus Christ did mean nevertheless, the *proper* regeneration, which consists in the 'conversion of the heart.'

The question here between him and us is, whether no regeneration, which is not accompanied with present actual conversion of the heart, can be called *proper* regeneration? I think it may be solved thus: As the command of circumcision, which was given in general, (both to infants, and to such adult persons



as had not yet received it,) carried with it an injunction of present actual circumcision of *the heart* to the adult receiver of it, but not to the infant receiver, and yet was *proper* circumcision to both of them; so baptism carries along with it a present actual *conversion of heart* in the adult receiver, but not in the infant receiver; and yet is *proper regeneration* to both of them. If Calvin and some late writers will give the name of *proper*, or *veritable*, only to that to which they (without the consent of antiquity or the greatest part of Christians) have appropriated the word, it is but a dispute of words.

At p. 575, he asks, ‘Whether I, who would have  
 ‘ men have so great respect for the Fathers, can shew  
 ‘ any plain place of Scripture which may support  
 ‘ that opinion, concerning *a middle state*, (in which  
 ‘ unbaptized infants will be,) which I had shewn to  
 ‘ be held by some of them?’

Now I never pretended to that, nor to give any determination at all to that question; but shewed it to be a thing in which half the Church was of one opinion, (*viz.* the Greek church,) and half of the other. Only I gave a reason from what our Saviour says, Luke xii. 48, that if they do miss of heaven, and be under some degree of condemnation; it is to be hoped, that it will be (as St. Austin says) a very gentle one.

At p. 580, Mr. Bernard is more angry with me. I had said, part ii. chap. 6. sect 10, that some modern Calvinists would establish a rule (which I there shewed to be contrary to the practice of the Christians) in the baptizing of children; that none are to be baptized but the children of parents actually godly and religious: and that Bishop Stillingfleet

had fully shewn the absurdity and inconsistency of this opinion; and how they can never, in many cases that may be put, come to a resolution, what children they may baptize, and what not. For which I quoted his ‘Unreasonableness of Separation,’ part iii. sect. 36.

Mr. Bernard says, ‘He will not stand to recite  
 ‘ that part of the chapter, because it will be diffi-  
 ‘ cult to do it without angering (choking<sup>o</sup>) me, who  
 ‘ do set out as absurd the doctrine of some whom  
 ‘ I call *Calvinists*: and that he would not be ex-  
 ‘ posed to the tentation of returning injury for  
 ‘ injury (or reproach). That he believes I do not  
 ‘ understand their tenet. That they do not refuse  
 ‘ baptism to *all* the children even of infidels. They  
 ‘ give it to all such as the parents do abandon, or  
 ‘ whose education they will leave to Christians.  
 ‘ That in Holland they baptize infants found in the  
 ‘ streets, though there may be among them some  
 ‘ born of Jewish or Mahometan parents.’

If Mr. Bernard had read the discourse of Bishop Stillington which I there cite, he would have seen that the Bishop there speaks only of some separatists in our nation, who do make that one part of their quarrel with our church, the giving baptism to the children of ungodly parents, (which yet our church does not without sufficient sponsions,) and that he does not meddle with the practice of any foreign churches. Neither did I mean any thing of what I said there in reference to them; but only to those who trouble our people here by their unchristian schisms and cavils; seeking about for any handle to draw the people from our communion,

<sup>o</sup> [Sans choquer, peut-être, l’auteur.]

and using this for one: for which, as it seems, the foreign churches give them no occasion or encouragement. For if those churches which Mr. Bernard speaks of, do as he says, I do not see but that they do as the ancients did, and as the church of England does. For neither they nor we would baptize any children of infidels, but such as some Christian had the power or possession of, and did promise for their Christian education or instruction. So that, things being rightly understood, here was no occasion of choking either him or me or the Bishop, if living.

P. 585. Whereas I had noted (or rather had cited Mr. Russen as noting) the way of the English antipædobaptists receiving the sacrament (which he affirms to be) sitting at a common table, and handing the elements one to another, as shewing (outwardly at least) less devotion than most other Christians shew; Mr. Bernard says, ‘It is certain ‘this is the most ancient manner of receiving that ‘sacrament; for it was so, that Jesus Christ celebrated it with his apostles.’ He should have taken notice, that it was not at a common table, but in an *ὑπερωρον*, such as learned men have proved that the Jews and ancient Christians did set apart for holy uses. Nor did the apostles hand it to one another, but Christ gave it to them.

He says, ‘As this way of receiving is generally ‘enough used in Holland, Mr. Wall certainly will ‘not blame me for my reflection.’ I am easy; provided he will not blame me for applying the words of Christ, John iii. 5, to baptism; which the church of England (as well as the ancient church) does in her office for baptism so apply; nor for saying, that

an infant, when baptized, is *regenerate*, which she says in the same office. Nor for my reflection on his saying, that ‘it is not the sacrament of baptism which makes us Christians.’ For she does in the Catechism (besides what I cited before) say; that ‘we being by nature born in sin, and the children of ‘wrath, are hereby (by baptism) made the children ‘of grace.’ And one of the Thirty-nine Articles of our church is, that ‘by it, as by an instrument, they ‘that receive it rightly, are grafted into the church.’ And so say all the ancient Christians whom I cited. Particularly St. Chrysostom: Οὐδεὶς δὲ υἱὸς βαπτίσματος ἂν κληθεῖη χωρὶς<sup>p</sup>.

He says farther, that ‘he does not know what ‘the churches of Holland have done to me. But ‘it appears by some places of my book, that I am ‘not very much their friend.’ This is said with respect to a passage a little before in the same chapter, viz. part ii. chap. 8. sect. 5.

And forasmuch as others, beside Mr. Bernard, have animadverted on that passage, I will set it down here at large, as it was in the first edition, which Mr. Bernard had, (for in the second it is somewhat shortened,) that I may know the sentiments of the rest of my friends, how far I was blamable in it. I had spoke of the Mennonites, or Minnists in Holland, how apt they are to divide from one another. And then added:

‘The worst is, that not only the Minnists, but ‘the Holland people generally, have the humour ‘to run into divisions and schisms in religion upon ‘almost any difference of opinion. There is not the ‘like of them again in the world for this temper.

p [Homil. i. de Pœnitentia, quoted above at vol. i. p. 230.]

‘ Whereas the great aim and interest of religion  
‘ is, unity and communion in the worship of God,  
‘ notwithstanding different sentiments in points not  
‘ fundamental; and schisms and parties are forbid-  
‘ den, as courses that will certainly ruin it; there is  
‘ no sin that these people think to be a less sin  
‘ than schism is. They are generally of a temper  
‘ that is commendable in many other qualities;  
‘ but for this matter they are the subject of the  
‘ mockery of the papists, and the grief and shame  
‘ of the protestants. How far the ministers there do  
‘ their duty, in shewing the people the sinfulness  
‘ of schism, I know not. Some do think, that a  
‘ country so disposed as that, let what stranger  
‘ will come thither, and bring with him any odd  
‘ and singular opinion whatsoever, he shall find  
‘ there a church perfectly fitted to his humour;  
‘ has thereby a great advantage for alluring a  
‘ concourse of men, and promoting trade. If this  
‘ be allowed, I am afraid it is to little purpose to  
‘ preach there against the sin of schism. And  
‘ perhaps the ministers dare not do it.’

And in another chapter, chap. 11. sect. 2. speak-  
ing of the same thing, viz. of the temper of some  
Christians to set up a several church for every  
several opinion, I subjoined,

‘ This one may call the Holland way of Chris-  
‘ tianity. Not that the States of that country do,  
‘ I suppose, approve of this as best, or would have  
‘ it so. But many people there fell into that way.  
‘ And they have been imitated by another nation,  
‘ and, as some do now say, outdone in it. How-  
‘ ever that be, it is the most contrary to the nature  
‘ and design of Christianity, of any thing that

‘ could be devised. For Christ, as he is but one head, never designed to have any more but one body,’ &c.

The late Archbishop of Canterbury told me, that a statesman of England had said to him concerning these passages of mine, ‘ How comes a minister to meddle with the affairs of our allies?’ He did not tell me who it was. And though I could guess, yet I will not. Meddling in state-matters, I know, is dangerous; but preaching against schism is preaching a Christian doctrine. Against such a manifest wickedness, and so condemned by God’s word, as divisions in religion are, I humbly hope *a minister* may preach or write; and that, whether it be our own country, or a neighbour nation, in which they are rife. Especially if the example of that neighbour-nation does, as I said, infect and spread among our people; and the state of religion among us be the worse for our imitating them in matters of religion.

What Mr. Bernard remarks on these passages is at his 592nd page. To shew, that they do denounce to the people the sinfulness of schism, he says, that ‘ in the liturgy of the Lord’s Supper, which is in use in the Walloon churches, and is the same with that of the French church, they do excommunicate by name all that make sects, and break the unity of the church.’ I hope then that the people will mind this, and that the ministers there will apply their warnings to those whom they think in the fault, that they do not live and die in a state of soul subject to excommunication.

If it will be any satisfaction to Mr. Bernard to have us be as free and ready to acknowledge our own

blemishes, faults, and misfortunes, as we are to speak of those of other churches and nations; we must, I think, with sorrow and shame confess, that since this time of his, and my writing, there have been published in *England* more rank principles of schism than ever were in *Holland*; and that, not in any conventicle, but openly, avowedly, in the face of the world; and in such circumstances, as that our main hope left under God is, that the people themselves, even those that were otherwise inclined to separations, will see and consider the mischievous and destructive consequences of them; (destructive not only of that general unity which should be in the universal church, or any national church; but even of the unity, society, order, government, or authority of any church or Christian society at all;) and will start back from such an unskilful proposal as would dissipate the members, and dissolve the communion, not only of any established church, but of any congregation of ten or fewer Christians.

Upon the whole, I take Mr. Bernard's remarks on my book to be such as become a learned, and also a civil and friendly writer. As for the difference of opinion concerning some points of less moment in religion, it will always happen. And as a part of my book was to shew, that they ought not to break communion; so neither ought they to hinder friendship; especially when each does labour to defend and maintain the tenets and customs of that part of the church, or of that nation, whereof he is by Providence a member. A moderate degree of zeal in such a case is commendable, and a little excess of it pardonable: much more pardonable than in the case of those, who spend their zeal in opposing and

quarrelling with the usages, tenets, and ceremonies of their own church and nation.

In the year 1709 came out a pamphlet with a mock-title: ‘Mr. Wall’s History of Infant-Baptism ‘Improved.’ The author, Mr. Emlyn, thought that from one paragraph in my introduction (wherein I observed, that the Jews, who gave baptism to proselytes and their infants, did not use it for themselves, nor for their own children) he might gain some advantage to that which is his, and some other Sociinians’ opinion; that Christians might do likewise, i. e. give baptism to such as are newly converted from heathenism, and their infant children; but not use it themselves in a nation where Christianity has been for some time settled.

He observes in his first page, that many others before me have spoken of this use of baptism among the Jews: which observation renders the page before (viz. the titlepage) very impertinent. For if the Jews’ custom was such, and many others before me have spoke of it, the pretended consequence (or *improvement* as he calls it) drawn from thence should be called an improvement of that custom, or of the books of those that spoke of it first, rather than of

q [I have not been able to meet with Mr. Emlyn’s pamphlet, in this its *first* shape, as described by Dr. Wall. It appears that the author remodelled his piece, which was afterwards published in the ‘Collection of Tracts by Thomas Emlyn,’ 2 vols. 8vo. London, 1731, under the title of ‘The previous Question to the ‘several questions about valid and invalid Baptism, Lay Baptism, ‘&c., considered.’ vol. ii. p. 315—345. It was reprinted, with the addition of some few notes, and a letter in answer to objections, in Emlyn’s works, 3 vols. 8vo. 1746; vol. i. p. 391—428. The passages quoted by Dr. Wall do not occur in the tract as given in those volumes.]



mine, which spoke of it last : so that he acts unkindly to say, that my book gave him the *just occasion* he speaks of. And I had rather it should be taken from any body than from me: since I judge it such an improvement as all other errors are; a false and heretical consequence pretended to be drawn from premises which are true.

His main and only argument is, that since our Saviour gave his commission to his Apostles (of carrying baptism, together with the preaching of the Gospel, among all nations) in such short words; they must do with baptism, as had been always done in their nation, except such circumstances wherein he has given any particular order for alteration. And therefore that as the Jews baptized any new converted proselyte, and such children as he brought with him, but none of the posterity of them; and as the nation itself of the Jews was at first all baptized in Moses' time, men, women, and children, but none of their posterity afterward, so the Apostles, and succeeding Christians, should give the Christian baptism to all new converts, and to their infants. But in succeeding generations, a family or a nation, wherein the Christian religion has been for some time owned and professed, need not baptize their children at all, neither in infancy nor afterward. But the Christian baptism may wholly cease in such a nation, (as the Mosaical baptism did among the Jews, till there was set up a new baptism in the name of Christ,) except when any heathen convert comes over to Christianity.

And he is positive, that Christ in his Gospel has not given any rule for alteration in this matter, or any command which can oblige the posterity of

baptized parents to receive baptism ; but says, page 8, ‘ They are accounted as already baptized or cleansed, ‘ in their parents’ baptism.’ And in the next page he hugs that odd saying of Mr. Locke, ‘ They are born ‘ members of the Christian church.’ Which whether it were meant to promote this tenet, I know not.

He has brought nothing new to confirm this *improvement* unknown to Christians, till vented by Socinus about one hundred and fifty years ago : nor has said in effect any thing more than I in my introduction, sect. 3, mentioned as pleaded by the Socinians. So I need only refer to what I briefly said there to obviate their plea.

I observed there, after having set forth the Jews’ way of managing baptism, that ‘ it was our Saviour ‘ who first ordered by himself and by his forerunner, ‘ that every particular person, Jew or Gentile, or of ‘ what parents soever born, must be born again of ‘ water,’ John iii. 3, 5. He says, page 10, ‘ These ‘ words of our Saviour can only relate to such as ‘ were converted from infidelity. Nor could Nicodemus be supposed to have understood them otherwise ; since with the Jews only such were subjects of baptism.’

Such a skill in expounding Scripture is to be pitied. Our Saviour’s words are, All that do enter into the kingdom of heaven must be so born again. Is this only those that are converted from infidelity?

But Nicodemus knew of no other that were to be baptized. Then Mr. Emlyn would have Nicodemus understand our Saviour’s words thus ; ‘ All that you ‘ know are to be baptized must be baptized.’ Whereas our Saviour informs Nicodemus of what he knew

not before, that *all* must be baptized. And he adds, v. 7, *Ye must be born again.* Which *ye* being spoken to a Jew, includes those of that nation, as well as the heathens, who Nicodemus knew must be so born.

Our Saviour's next words (which I also cited a little after on the same occasion, *Introduct.* §. 5.) make it yet plainer: *That which is born of the flesh* (which I there paraphrased; whether of a Jewish or Gentile, baptized or unbaptized parent) *is flesh*; and must be *born again.* Mr. Emlyn takes no notice of this.

How he and the Socinians understood the point of original sin, or our natural generation in a corrupt state, I know not. But the catholic church has always understood this natural corruption to attend all that are born, not only of unbaptized or impious, but also of baptized and godly parents. I do, part i. chap. 19. §. 18, cite St. Austin urging the Pelagians with this absurdity, following from their doctrine; 'You that do affirm that of "parents  
'cleansed from the stain of sin, such children should  
'be born as are without sin," how is it that you  
'do not mind, that at the same rate you might say,  
'that of Christian parents there should be born  
'Christian children? And then why do you deter-  
'mine that they are to be baptized?' St. Austin thought this latter to be too absurd for a Pelagian or any other heretic to say. But he did not think of our Socinians.

Mr. Emlyn, p. 4, that he may enforce the necessity of Christians imitating the Jews in the point of baptism, says, 'He can see no argument for in-  
'fant-baptism so forcible as this, taken from the

‘ practice of baptizing Jewish proselytes.’ And adds, ‘ Nor does Mr. Wall seem to me to rely on ‘ any other *without this*.’ I guess he had wrote *but this*, (for that his argument required,) but seeing that would be too palpable, he altered it for *without this*. If a man use twenty arguments, none of the nineteen are *without* the twentieth.

The fourth, fifth, and sixth pages are spent in shewing the sufficiency of the proofs given by me and others of that custom of the Jews to baptize proselytes and their infants. ‘ There being,’ he says, ‘ so many testimonies of the Jewish writers ‘ who affirm the fact, and the nature of the fact ‘ being to be open and visible, he takes the proof ‘ to be of very great force, and not to be slighted ‘ by such as cannot say half a quarter so much, ‘ indeed can say nothing at all, for proof of the ‘ negative. That the Jews saying to John the ‘ Baptist, *Why dost thou baptize?* (meaning, thou ‘ who hast no authority,) shews that they well ‘ understood the nature of baptism, but questioned ‘ his authority. That no writer denies this custom, ‘ while so many affirm it; nor any of them who ‘ affirm it, do ever deny that it extends to infants. ‘ That all this taken together, ties the argument so ‘ hard, that the antipædobaptists cannot solve it. ‘ That sir Norton Knatchbull’s exception against ‘ it is of no force. That though the books that ‘ speak of it be written since Christ’s time, yet inas- ‘ much as they shew it to be the custom of their ‘ time, and speak of it as a thing that had always ‘ been the custom of their ancestors, he cannot ‘ think, that if it had not been really before Christ’s ‘ time, it would ever have become a custom among

‘ the Jews afterward.’ For, says he, ‘ Would they begin to proselyte persons to their religion by baptism in imitation of Jesus of Nazareth, whom they held accursed? They would never so far own him, as to bring in a new institution in conformity to his command,’ &c.

Now all this I would have him dispute with Mr. Gale; for though I think his reasons here are concluding, yet I must be no judge of my own arguments. And besides, had rather no use at all should be made of them, than that ill one which he makes. But I will say, as St. Austin did, of two opponents which attacked him on two contrary sides, ‘ Let each of them yield to the other so much, as there is of truth in that other’s argument; and they will both come to confess the whole truth.’

The use that he makes is, that these arguments from the Jewish baptism, do as strongly conclude, that none of the posterity of Christians are bound by Christ’s commission to be baptized, as they do, that new converts, and the infants which they bring with them, are to be baptized. And so both pædobaptists and antipædobaptists will, he says, be ‘ silenced at one blow:’ and, as he expresses it a little after, must ‘ yield the cause to the Socinians.’ A perfect Goliath, this.

He sets forth our argument thus: our Lord Jesus left his apostles to apply baptism to all the same subjects as the Jews were wont to do, and therefore to infants as well as others. And his own thus: by the same reason the Christian baptism was to have no other subjects than the Jewish baptism had, viz. none of the offspring of believers (‘ born of the church,’ as he calls it).

Whereas he should have laid down his general position thus: our Lord left his apostles to apply baptism, as the Jews were wont to do, except where he gave his own particular directions. But that he did in several things. He altered the form, making it to be, *In the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit*. And the extent of it, ordering it to be the religion of *all* nations. And among other things, that no person whatever should be exempted from the use of it, *ἐὰν μὴ τις*: Except *any one* have it, *he cannot enter*, &c. And whereas the Jews were apt to say within themselves, *We have Abraham to our Father*, and so Nicodemus might dream (as our author does) of a sufficient purity by births:— he adds the next words; *That which is born of the flesh is flesh*, i. e. is in a corrupt and evil state, till it be born again. Which declaration of our Saviour, concerning the state of our first birth, makes the expression here used by our author and some others, ‘born in the church,’ to be an improper speech. The church is a society of persons born again. Almost all divines express themselves so. And particularly they that by *the kingdom of God* in this text do understand *the church*, or dispensation of the Messiah, are by our Saviour’s express words tied down to that meaning. For he says, they cannot enter into that without it. ‘Born within ‘the pale of the church,’ is an expression that has been used in a sense that may be allowed, viz. within the reach of the opportunities of receiving baptism and Christian instruction.

This determination of our Saviour alone, and especially if there be added to it the other reasons, as that baptism is to us instead of circumcision,

which was always given to the infants of natural Jews, as well as of proselytes; and that the ancient Christians, who must know the apostle's custom, baptized their own children, &c., is a sufficient warrant and injunction to us to recede from the example of the Jews in this particular.

The proofs which Mr. Emlyn, p. 8, produces from Scripture for his notion, are but abuses of the texts he quotes: *If the root be holy, so are the branches.* Rom. xi. 16. Whence he concludes, the children of a holy parent do not need any such engrafting as baptism. St. Paul spoke those words concerning the nation of the Jews in his time; which he shewed to be not a people cast away of God, (as some objected,) for that some of them had received the faith and were baptized; and concerning the rest who were for the present blinded, and as *branches broken off*, there was hope they would not abide still in unbelief, but would be grafted in again; for which the gracious regard, which God had promised he would always have to that nation for the sake of their fathers, would probably be effectual. To them the Gospel and baptism into it, were first tendered: and the grace of God, which most of them had rejected hitherto, did yet wait for their return: which St. Paul there speaks of as a thing to be expected; and on that account the Scripture gives them those favourable epithets and characters, *the children of the promise; holy branches of the tree; beloved for the fathers' sake*: though at present shewing themselves enemies. The whole scope of the places shews, that the apostle speaks these things concerning the aptitude they stood in to receive the benefits of the Gospel, not that they

had as yet received them; nor ever would, except they did repent and were baptized. He calls them *holy*, because there was ground of hope that they would come in, and be baptized; not that they had already, and by birth, an *holiness* that would save them without baptism.

If Mr. Emlyn will compare the state of a Christian man's child with this state of the Jews; there is indeed a like *aptitude* and likelihood of his being received into Christ's Church. But there is in it no argument against, but rather an argument for, the baptizing of the child. For those Jews, of whom St. Paul does so prognosticate good things, were to be baptized before they obtained them.

On the other text, 1 Cor. vii. 14, *Now are your children holy*, or, your children now are saints, or Christians, (from whence most moderns conclude, they are to be baptized; and Mr. Emlyn, that they need not be baptized at all,) I have spoken so largely, both in the book he writes against, and in another<sup>9</sup>,

<sup>9</sup> [It is most probable, that the author here alludes to the 'Critical Notes on the New Testament,' which it appears he had composed previous to this *Defence*, although they were not *published* until the year 1730, some years after his death.—In that work is a long observation on 1 Cor. vii. 14, the most material part of which is here given: 'He means, it has commonly and for the most part been seen, that the unbelieving party has been brought over by the believing party: which was a great encouragement for the believing party to stay with the other: as he says in verse 16, *What knowest thou, O wife, whether thou shalt save thine husband*; and *è contra*. And then the sense of the next words (*else were your children unclean, but now are they holy*) is naturally this: else the children of such matches would be counted unfit to be dedicated to God by baptism: but now you see by the use of the Christian Church they are counted, as all other Christians are, *ἅγιοι*, holy, or saints.



(where I shew it to be a common interpretation of the ancients, that St. Paul meant by those words, that *they were then already baptized*, and calls them, as he does other Christians, *saints*;) that I shall not repeat it here. Only whereas Mr. Emlyn here makes one objection against that exposition, I shall give my answer to it. I (after the ancients which I here cite) take St. Paul's discourse to run thus; let not the Christian man or wife put away, or go from, his or her partner that is as yet an unbeliever, (provided the unbelieving party be willing to cohabit,) but stay, in hopes of converting (and, as he styles it, *saving*) him or her. For this effect does by the grace of God commonly follow, that the unbelieving party 'has been sanctified' (i. e. converted, made a Christian, brought to baptism) 'by the

' This is the sense in which the ancient Christians understood  
' and expounded this text of Scripture. And all other exposi-  
' tions have this fatal incongruity, that they make St. Paul call  
' an infidel man or woman *sanctified*, even while they continue  
' infidel: which is a thing he would never say. But to call  
' baptism, or a conversion to Christianity, a sanctification, is a  
' common phrase with the ancients.

' The antipædobaptists might perhaps think this to be a new-  
' invented explication of the place, were not the commentaries  
' of *Pelagius*, *St. Austin*, &c., who lived before the rise of an-  
' tipædobaptists, extant, expounding it just so. See *History of*  
' *Infant-Baptism*, part i. chap. 19.'

In confirmation of the substance of the foregoing note, the reader may consult a short piece published about this period, with a prefatory letter to Mr. Gale, entitled 'An Essay concern-  
' ing Infant-Baptism, &c., by a Layman of the Church of Eng-  
' land,' [John Crossfield]. 8<sup>o</sup>. London, 1718.—At page 12 to  
17 the writer comments upon this very text of 1 or. vii. 14,  
and refers to both Dr. Wall's and Mr. Gale's remarks on the  
passage.]

‘believing party. Else’ [if the unbelieving party were not ordinarily converted; or if he or she did go away with the children] ‘the children would be ‘unclean,’ [brought up in heathenism (which the Scripture commonly calls an *unclean* state) and without baptism (which the Scripture commonly calls a *sanctifying* of the person)]; ‘but now’ [by the colabitation of the parents, and the unbelieving party being converted] ‘they are saints,’ i. e. made Christians by baptism.

Here Mr. Emlyn says, ‘It is no good consequence which I make the apostle to draw; nor would it follow, that if the husband do not prevail upon his wife to be converted and baptized, the children would be left unbaptized: because though only the father were a believer, the child might be brought to baptism.’

It is true, it might possibly be so. But it was much more probable, if the other parent also were converted. Now the apostle does often advise some good thing to be done, in order to obtain a good effect, which will much more probably follow, if his advice be followed, than it will if it be not: though it might possibly have followed without it.

Page 9, he interprets a sentence of Tertullian one way, which I had interpreted another way. There is no end of reciting his and mine. A reader of tolerable skill and exercise in reading a Latin author will easily decide the matter.

Another argument against the baptizing the children of Christians, either infant or adult, he ventures to fetch from the practice of the primitive Christians: which surely will be found against him.

He observes first, ‘ That in the Acts of the Apostles we find not one instance of the baptizing any, either infants or adult, that had been born of Christian parents: though that history do run through a series of near thirty years; in which time many must have been born to them, and grown up to maturity.’

I had, part ii. ch. 10. §. 3, shewn how weak an argument this makes, when it is urged for antipædobaptism: and it is no less weak when urged for this antibaptism. I observed there, that St. Luke’s aim in that history is to give a summary account of the main and principal passages of the lives of some of the apostles; and of those passages especially, in which they found the greatest opposition; which was in *converting* heathens or Jews, and not in baptizing them (after they were converted) or their children, which was commonly left to deputies. Were it not for one word of St. James, Acts xxi. 21, (which was spoken merely upon occasion,) we should not know by the Acts, that the Christian Jews at Jerusalem (of whom there were many thousands, verse 20) did use to *circumcise* their children (which yet they generally did), for there is no instance of any particular man that did so. So little wonder is it, that there is no particular mention of their baptizing them. And yet (as I there observed) of the six baptisms (which are all that St. Paul is mentioned to be concerned in) three were of whole households, Acts xvii. 15, 33; 1 Cor. i. 16. Such an one, and *all his*; by which expression his *children* are especially understood. But these, Mr. Emlyn will say, ought to be baptized; because they had been born during the parents’

infidelity. The question with him is, concerning children born afterwards. Now inasmuch as these would be baptized in infancy, if at all; and St. Luke does not stand to rehearse the ordinary affairs of infants; their baptism cannot well be expected to be recited in the Acts, no more than the circumcising of the infants of the Jewish Christians. But that the Christians of Corinth had, in that interval of five years' time, which had passed from St. Paul's planting a church there, to the writing of his Epistle from Ephesus to them, been used to baptize their children, appears by the foresaid text; at least by a probable, and the ancient interpretation of it. For else why does he call the children *saints*, i. e. Christians?

We may note by the way, the great power of prejudice. Mr. Emlyn says, page 10, (and two or three times before,) 'that I have shewn well, that ' infants along with their proselyted parents are to ' be entered into the Christian society by baptism, ' but not shewn the same for their posterity.' The antipædobaptists think the proof clear for the *posterity* of Christians to be baptized, but not in infancy. The argument from the silence of the Acts of the Apostles presses hardest upon the antipædobaptists; for the cases of adult persons are more apt to be mentioned in a history, than of infants. And since no adult baptism of any descendant of Christian parents is recorded there, (not even of Timothy, whose circumcision at his adult age is mentioned,) it is a sign that they had been baptized before in their infancy.

Mr. Emlyn ventures farther into ecclesiastic history; and demands, how early instances I or any

other can give of the baptism of any person born of Christians. To which I answer, all the proof and evidence that I or any other have given of infant-baptism in those ancient times, is, of the baptism of children born of Christians. For wherever those ancients do speak of infants baptized, they mean infants of Christians. Irenæus, Tertullian, Origen, Cyprian, &c., for what they say of infants, do mean these. For the case of baptizing the infants of any heathen happened either never at all, or so seldom, as not to be brought to account. It could never be but when a Christian happened to have the custody of a heathen's child. At that time the heathens might, if they pleased, take away from the Christians their children; but not the Christians from them. Mr. Emlyn seems to be aware of this; and therefore strikes in here with the antipædobaptists; and says, that I have given no instances at all that are early enough. He makes some dispute about Tertullian; none against Irenæus or Origen, and expressly yields St. Cyprian. I shall not stand (now in my present discourse with him) to vindicate the former evidences. But only note these few things.

Tertullian, who disliked the baptizing the children of Christians *in infancy*, unless in danger of death, is positive in this; that they should however be baptized, when they come to understanding. 'Let them come to Christ when they are grown up; let them come when they understand; when they are instructed whither it is that they come: let them be made Christians when they can know Christ,' &c., as I quoted him (and this, by the way, shews he did not count them Christians, till baptized.) And at another place which I cited from him,

says, ‘ All believers from thenceforward’ (i. e. from Christ’s time) ‘ were baptized.’ And therefore the progeny of Christians, as well as converted heathens.

And Justin Martyr, born in the Apostles’ time, having set forth the manner of the Christians receiving the holy communion, adds, *Apol. 2. prope finem*, ‘ This eating and drinking is called the Eucharist; of which it is not lawful for any to partake, but one that believes the things taught by us to be true; and has been washed with that laver which is for the remission of sins, and for regeneration.’ These were, many of them, the descendants of Christians, and must have been baptized: for else, Justin says, they could not receive the Eucharist; so that Mr. Emlyn’s question at the end of his treatise, ‘ Whether a person may communicate at the Lord’s table, who is born *in Christianity*’ (so he words it; he should have said *in Christendom*) ‘ of baptized parents, but has not himself been baptized in person,’ (which question, he says, may be determined by what he has there said,) has been from the beginning already determined against him. For Justin says, ‘ None must partake but baptized persons.’ Not now to mention Mr. Whiston’s Scripture, which both expressly charges Christians to baptize their infants; and at another place forbids any unbaptized person to communicate at the Lord’s table, on pain of eternal damnation. But I have been too long in refuting so illgrounded and exploded an error.

I had said in my introduction, that all children admitted into covenant were wont to have some badge or sign of such admission. Some had circum-

cision, baptism, and sacrifice. The female children of proselytes, baptism and sacrifice. The female children of natural Jews had at least a sacrifice offered for them. This last Mr. Emlyn denies: saying, ‘It is not true;’ and (being a great judge) gives his warrant, that though I have confidently affirmed it, I cannot prove it. I can prove that it is the interpretation of Scripture, and of the books of the Jewish writers, given by far better judges than himself. I had it from the learned Dr. Allix, who being kindly pleased to make some notes, on what I had in the introduction written concerning the Jewish customs, added this; and could, I make no doubt, have given proofs. However, I myself had in my book, part i. chap. 5. sect. 1, quoted Origen affirming a sacrifice to be offered for every infant, and referring to that text, Levit. xii. 8, *A pair of turtle doves, or two young pigeons: one for a sin offering, the other for a burnt offering.* Where he adds, ‘For what sin is this one pigeon offered? Can the child that is new-born have committed any sin?’ He answers, ‘It has even then sin,’ &c., and proceeds to speak of the Christian baptism of infants as ordered by the Apostles for that reason among others. And Mr. Emlyn cannot escape, as the antipædobaptists do, by denying the book, when they cannot reconcile their practice to it. For besides that sayings to this purpose do so often occur in his translated works, that they cannot be all thought to be interpolated; his Greek works have the like. One whereof I there, sect. 7, recited out of the seventh book *contra Cels.* where he tells Celsus; ‘The Prophets’ (or books of the Jewish Law) ‘do order a sin offering to be offered’ καὶ περὶ τῶν ἄρτι γεγεννημένον, ὡς οὐ

καθαρῶν ἀπὸ ἁμαρτίας. Where ἄρτι γεγεννημένον is so exactly the same phrase with Rufinus' *super editus parvulus*, that there is little doubt but that it was the same word which is so translated in that Homily on the Romans. And when the blessed Virgin at her purification made this offering, Luke ii. 24, it is expressed v. 27, that Simeon came in when the parents *brought in the child Jesus to do for him after the custom of the law*. From which (and perhaps other proofs) learned men do conceive the offering to have been for the child then born; or partly for the woman and partly for the child. And though this was a child that could need no sin-offering; yet it pleased God, that in this, and in circumcision and baptism, there should be in his case *fulfilled all the righteousness of the law*. And though this was the case of a male-child, the law, Levit. xii. makes this obligation equal on the birth of a male or female child. Mr. Emlyn, if he meet with a thing which he does not understand, should not presently conclude; 'It is not true,' or, that nobody can prove it. He says, p. 12, that there is as plain testimony from St. Cyprian, that it was 'customary to give the Eucharist to infants' (and he speaks as one that means mere infants, or the youngest infants) 'as there is for baptizing them.' And, that he does not see 'any better authority from antiquity for one than the other.' Now though I *think* this is not true, and that he cannot prove it; I will not be positive, till I see whether he can or not. There is the more need he should, if he can; because two that have written since him, Mr. Gale and Mr. Whiston, have followed him in that affirmation. And what he has spoken doubtfully, they have said positively.



Since they all three have written against my book, they ought in all reason to have refuted the instances that I there, part ii. chap. 9. §. 15, 16, 17, give of the great difference between the evidence from antiquity which is brought for infants' baptism, and which is brought for their receiving the other sacrament, before they had so securely affirmed it to be alike. And it happens well, that I did there put in a caveat against allowing any evidence for the latter from Clement's Constitutions: and also that I shewed the mistake of those who have said (as Mr. Emlyn does here) that St. Austin pretended that the latter (the doctrine of giving the communion to infants) is an apostolic tradition as well as the former.

As to the consequence for baptizing Christians' children to enter them into covenant, taken from the circumcising of the children of the Jews, which was for the same purpose; Mr. Emlyn allows that St. Paul does speak of baptism as being to Christians instead of circumcision; and that St. Paul's words, Col. ii. 11, 12, are so to be understood (being a fairer disputant than Mr. Gale, who will not own that sense of the words, though it be very plain); but yet Mr. Emlyn says, 'It does not follow that the subjects of each must be the same;' and instances in the females. I answer, it does follow that they should be the same, except where the gospel rules do direct an alteration. But St. Paul, discoursing of baptism, Gal. iii. 27, 28, says, that in respect of it *there is neither Jew nor Greek; there is neither male nor female, &c.*; i. e. there is no difference between them.

As for the rest of his remarks, that I have given

too disrespectful a censure on Grotius. I have spoke my mind before; and do here add, that that is nothing to him, nor to his cause. That I have used expressions too sharp against the Socinians, (which, I fancy, gave occasion to his writing against me,) it is, because I take that opinion to be, not like theirs who differ from us in smaller matters, but so directly contrary to an infinite number of plain declarations of scripture concerning our blessed Saviour, that it deserves abhorrence, and has been in all ages abhorred by all Christians, not only Catholics, but Arians, and even Eunomians.

I shall not stand to answer any of his weak arguments for it, save that he takes more advantage than there is any good ground for, from the words of the Latin and English translations of Col. i. 15, where Christ is in those languages styled ‘*Primogenitus omnis creaturæ*;

*The first-born of every creature*; or, as he chooses to render it, ‘*The first-begotten of the creation.*’ The sense of which words, and consequence from them, he slyly insinuates to be, that Christ has no other nature than a *created* one. The Greek words themselves do not give any such occasion. For *πρωτότοκος πίσεως κτίσεως* was always understood by the Greeks (who best knew the emphasis of their own language) even by the Arians, to signify, not ‘*First-born of the creatures,*’ so as to include him among them: but ‘*Genitus ante omnem creaturam*;

*Begotten before all the creation.* And it was this very phrase of the apostle, Col. i. 15, which they in almost all their creeds paraphrased by those words, ‘*Begotten before all worlds.*’ Eusebius at the council of Nice recites the creed of his church, which gives

first the apostle's own words, *πρωτότοκον πάσης κτίσεως*; and immediately subjoins by way of explication, *πρὸ πάντων αἰώνων ἐκ τοῦ Θεοῦ Πατρὸς γεγεννημένον*, 'Begotten of God the Father before all worlds' [or ages]. And so it is in the Constantinopolitan creed, the Arian creed at Antioch, and in Arius' own creed: which is much more unexceptionable than to say, 'First-born of every creature.'

Mr. Emlyn seems at the end of his book to be solicitous, where, or in what church, he and his partners in this opinion shall be admitted to receive the communion, without believing the divinity of Christ, and without being baptized. He says, p. 16, that I, no question, take care 'to have no Socinian 'communicants in my parish.' I am glad he has that opinion of me. And p. 18, he is angry with me for saying, as I do at the end of chap. 9 of the second part; 'Among all the absurdities that ever 'were held, none ever maintained that any person 'should partake of the communion before he was 'baptized.' I quoted just now Justin Martyr saying the same.

But if the church of England will not, he should not, methinks, despair of finding some that will receive them. For we have of late in England great store of churches; and in the shops of religion, great store of new suits, that a man must have very ill luck, whom none of them will fit. As the course of trade for religions now goes, if he cannot fit himself in England, I question whether he can be fitted in Holland with any church; as the word *church* is taken for a society or body, consisting of pastors and people. But there is lately set up in England another notion, fitter for this purpose than

any that has yet been broached in Holland itself;— That the church of Christ is not a society, or a body that requires any union, or coherence, or government. It is only *the number*,—small or great, *dispersed* or *united*, of persons that adhere to king Jesus. And the less regard they have to any spiritual governors, ministers, rule or order, and the more close and *immediate* this adhesion is to Christ, the better. So that our author, if he can find no minister of Christ that will give him the communion, nor any one that will receive it with him, may take it himself alone, by virtue of that *close and immediate* dependence upon Christ.

This answers the wishes of all heterodox and self-opinionated men by one position. And as the flatterers of the Persian king, though they could not find any law for this or that lustful course which he followed, yet found one that was worth them all; that a king of Persia might do what he pleased; so, though there be no encouragement in Scripture for Socinianism, omission of baptism, &c., this lays open a gap for all at once, that every man may be of what religion he pleases, and interpret Scripture as he thinks fit, without any control from any church, or any governors, any articles, canons, or censures thereof; or from the received doctrines and interpretation of any ancient Christians or Fathers, those ‘weak men in several ages.’

This position, I confess, seems a desperate one for a man to venture his soul upon; because though according to it Christ has not any kingdom, nor does interpose in this world, yet the kingdom of the other world to which we must come, is all his;

and he has declared, that we shall be judged there at the last day by the word which he has given us here; and a great part of that word is, that we should in this world 'hear the church,' and obey them that have by his appointment the rule over us.

Mr. Whiston<sup>r</sup> was not the next that wrote against my book. Mr. Gale wrote before him. But because I have a mind to despatch at once, what I have to answer to all such of my antagonists as have written in the way of civility, candour, modesty, and argument, before I enter on answering Mr. Gale's Reflections, which are made up of declamation, insulting reproaches, and untruths; I shall next take a short view of what Mr. Whiston has observed concerning it. And it need be but a short one, for it is little that he has said. The account that he has given of the reasons of the change of his opinion about infant-baptism, seems to have been written in as much haste, as the change itself was made. I am concerned only in that part of it where he pretends to shew, that in the passages of the Fathers, which I produced concerning the baptism of infants, the word *infants* may be understood of children old enough to have been catechised, and capable of baptism upon their own profession, and faith of the Christian religion.

And first, as to the passage of Irenæus, lib. ii. c. 39, where *infants* are reckoned among those of the several ages [*'infants and little ones, and*

<sup>r</sup> [In a piece called 'Primitive Infant-baptism revived: or an account of the doctrine and practice of the two first centuries concerning the baptism of infants.' 8vo. London, 1712. (pp. 48.)]

‘ children, and youths, and elder persons’] which are by Christ regenerated unto God: he had before, p. 7, granted it to be undeniable ‘ that the word ‘ *regeneration* is generally, if not constantly, used ‘ with relation to *baptismal regeneration*.’ And it is indeed, as he says, a thing *undeniable* by any modest arguer. Neither does he, like Mr. Gale, fly to that pitiful subterfuge, of denying the passage to be genuine. He grants the place to speak of the baptism of infants. But says, [page 35,]

‘ Irenæus does so soon after this passage expressly ‘ reckon thirty years of age the beginning of *youth*, ‘ and forty of *elder age*, and by consequence must ‘ allow *infancy* to reach till ten; that this testimony ‘ only shews that such children as he calls *infants* ‘ were then commonly by ten years old regenerated ‘ in *baptism*.’

Now supposing that in Irenæus’ use of those words, a person were continued to be called an *infant* till he was ten, and a *little one* till twenty, and a *child* till thirty, and a *youth* till forty (as he does indeed toward the end of that chapter make the interval between youth and elder age to be ten). But to call them *infants* till ten, and *parvulos* till twenty, and *pueros* till thirty, is something more contrary to the common sense of words than the other. And I think to discourse that matter with Mr. Gale, the first inventor of that *salvo*. But supposing it were so, the word *infant* does still include all the time from birth to ten years. And there is no reason to take it here for *only* those of ten years, with an exclusion of mere infants. Especially when Irenæus’ argument at that place runs upon a supposal of taking in every period of man’s age, and every step

of that period. He says, ‘ Christ sanctified every  
‘ several age by the likeness that it has to him. For  
‘ he came to save all persons by himself. All, I mean,  
‘ who by him are regenerated unto God ; infants, and  
‘ little ones, and children, and youths and elder per-  
‘ sons ; therefore he went through the several ages ;  
‘ for infants being made an infant, sanctifying infants :  
‘ to little ones he was made a little one, sanctifying  
‘ those of that age,’ &c. [page 34.]

Now does Mr. Whiston think that Irenæus meant that Christ, by going through the several steps of human life, did sanctify infants only in the last step of their infancy? He uses the terms of Christ’s ‘ going through, saving and sanctifying’ the ages and the persons, and of the persons being by him regenerated, in the same latitude and extent: every age by the likeness it has to the several ages which he for our sakes took upon him to go through. Was Christ made an infant only in that sense of the word, whereby it signifies one of ten years? Was he not also made an infant in the common acceptation of it, so as to go through all the steps of infancy? Did he come to save and sanctify only the tenth year of infancy, that that only should be by him regenerated unto God?

And whereas Mr. Whiston here grants, that this testimony of Irenæus shews, ‘ that children were  
‘ then commonly by ten years old regenerated in  
‘ baptism ;’ but thinks that this was upon their own profession and faith : and to that purpose extols the care of Christian parents in those days to give their children early instruction ; so that great part of the children might be baptized at that age upon their own faith. The experience of the whole world shews

the contrary of this, in respect to the generality, or any considerable number of children : for though children do in these late ages arrive to a maturity of sense and capacities, rather sooner than they did in former ages ; yet there are none, or no considerable number of children, that would be fit at that age to receive adult baptism.

We find it to be so in the examining, preparing, and catechising of children in order to their being confirmed by the bishop. That office is, God be thanked, used with more care and frequency than formerly. But the bishops find a necessity of giving directions that none be admitted under eleven, (as some do order, or twelve or thirteen as others,) except some particular children of extraordinary forwardness. And (as I shewed in the Introduction) the rule of the Jews in receiving the children of any proselyte to baptism, was, if they were males, and under the age of thirteen years and a day, or females under twelve years and a day, to baptize them as infants ; because such an one was not yet ‘ the son of assent,’ i. e. not capable to give assent for himself. And indeed we find few that are capable to be confirmed so soon as eleven or twelve. They may be able to repeat the words of a catechism, or summary of the faith ; and to make the answers to questions put to them, with a ready and pregnant forwardness. And fond parents that are conceited of their children’s capacities, are sometimes importunate, and proud of the credit, to have them admitted to the ordinance. But they really do their children a prejudice, in making them receive it so young, when it has little effect on their consciences ; and thereby disabling them from



ever receiving it afterward; which might else have been done to great spiritual benefit, being received with a due degree of serious consideration. A child of that age may have memory and words ready: but seldom can have due sense and conscience of the weight and concern of the thing to his soul.

It must be noted, that Irenæus does not here speak of the case of some particular child, who by some extraordinary forwardness was baptized in infancy; but mentioning infants generally and indefinitely, speaks of them as ordinarily regenerated or baptized; so that Mr. Whiston is forced by the tenour of the argument to grant, that at that time children were *commonly* by ten years old baptized; which tenour of the argument Mr. Gale not perceiving, brings in at his page 528, 529, a story of 'some that he has known admitted to baptism at 'about fourteen: and heard of some much younger.' Which is impertinent and to no purpose here, to explain the sense of Irenæus, who speaks of the general case of infants baptized. But I hope to make it appear in my answer to Mr. Gale, that we have no reason to suppose, that Irenæus used the words in any other sense than all people do.

Mr. Gale had invented this notion of infant-boys of ten years, to evade this place in Irenæus. He was not so absurd as to pretend that the sayings of Tertullian, Origen, &c., could be so evaded. Because they (beside the word *infants*) do express such circumstances as do denote mere infants in the common sense of the word. But Mr. Whiston, having this hint given, fell so in love with it, as to venture (against common sense) to apply it to the

passages of other Fathers which I had cited ; who do as plainly describe the infants they speak of, to be children newly born, or not yet come to the use of reason, as it is possible in words to describe them.

The quotations out of Tertullian he recites just as I had done, at p. 36, 37, 38. Now the infants that Tertullian speaks of, (whom there was then a custom to baptize ; but he would have had it omitted, except in danger of death,) were infants in our sense of the word. For he speaks of them as such, as when they were brought to baptism, ‘ did not understand whither it was that they came ; did not know Christ ; whose guiltless age had no need, as he thought, of the forgiveness of sins.’

But the foulest work which he makes with my quotations, is at his thirty-eighth and thirty-ninth pages, with those out of Origen. He pretends that Origen’s words, as well as Irenæus’, are capable of being taken for infants of ten years. But see how he defends this pretence.

I had cited the *Hom. 8. in Levitic. cap. 12.* Of that he takes a part out of my translation ; but leaves out the other part, where Origen cites, as a reason for baptizing infants, the Septuagint Job xiv. 4, 5, *None is clean from pollution, though his life be but of the length of one day.* Which shews what sort of infants he meant ; but was not for Mr. Whiston’s turn to set down.

He deals yet worse with the passage cited from the *Comment. in Epist. ad Romanos, lib. v.* He recites the latter part of this out of my translation ; but leaves out the beginning. Which (to shew

Mr. Whiston's readers how he deals with them and with me) I must here recite<sup>s</sup>.

‘ In the Law it is commanded, that a sacrifice be offered for every child that is born: a pair of turtle doves, or two young pigeons; of which one is for a sin offering, the other for a burnt offering. For what sin is this one pigeon offered? Can the child newborn [*nuper editus parvulus*] have committed any sin? He answers, ‘ It has even then sin,’ &c. After which follows, that which Mr. Whiston sets down, of the apostle's ordering baptism even to infants; as knowing that there is in all persons the natural pollution of sin, which must be done away by water and the Spirit.

I would willingly (if the reader will consent to it) impute this way of quoting, not to insincerity, but to the haste in which Mr. Whiston wrote this little piece. If he will have patience to read it over again, he will see that the infants Origen speaks of are infants new-born.

I gave an instance before, in answering Mr. Emlyn<sup>t</sup>, that in other books of Origen the Greek words which are there preserved, have the same argument, and the same phrase [*ἄρτι γεγεννημένοι*] which St. Hierome and Rufinus do here translate, ‘ *nuper editi parvuli*,’ concerning new-born infants not being clean from sin. And indeed Mr. Whiston does not insist on the exception, that these books are but translations by the two said men. He gives his judgment concerning them, that though they are of less authority than those that remain in Greek, yet he thinks ‘ we may allow them in the main to

<sup>s</sup> [See vol. i. p. 105, 106.]

<sup>t</sup> [See above, p. 43.]

‘be genuine,’ (which is fairer than Mr. Gale, who shuffles off the argument, as if so many several places in several books, by several translators could all be interpolated). But he adds, that this account of Origen, where he speaks of such infants baptized, as did not ‘want it for the pardon of actual ‘sins done at years of discretion,’ is near to his own account, or his sense of the word. If so, if a newborn infant, such as is spoken of in Levit. xii. be near in the same case as one that is to be baptized upon his own faith; or if a youth that is not of years of discretion to have actual sins imputed to him, be of discretion to be baptized upon his own repentance, Mr. Whiston need never fear the reconciling of any thing to any thing.

Therefore in the next words, being conscious, I suppose, that this would appear inconsistent, he adds further, ‘Though if it implies more, (i. e. if ‘Origen must be understood of mere infants,) it will ‘only shew how early this *corruption* of Christian ‘baptism began to creep into the church of Alexandria, as well as we have seen [from Tertullian, I ‘suppose, he means] it began to creep into that of ‘Africa; and no more.’

He here yields up the times of Tertullian and Cyprian for the churches of Africa. And in a manner yields the time of Origen for the church of Alexandria. And at page 42, having owned infant-baptism used at Alexandria in the time of Didymus, he adds, ‘Possibly——even in the days of Origen, ‘as we have already observed.’

It were better for the antipædobaptists at once to yield, that it began in the apostles’ time; and help all by styling it, as Mr. Whiston here does, ‘a

‘ corruption creeping in.’ This would save a great deal of vain struggle. And it seems probable that they must at last come to this. Mr. Whiston (who is much more conversant in the books of those times than any of them) gives up the times of Tertullian and Origen, (within one hundred years of the apostles,) as using this ‘ corrupt practice’ (as he calls it) of baptizing mere, or new-born infants; and cannot deny that Irenæus himself (born in, or very near, the apostles’ times) speaks of *infants* baptized; saving himself only upon Mr. Gale’s device of another sense of the word *infant* as used by Irenæus; which I think by and by to evince to Mr. Gale, or at least to any impartial reader, to be a groundless notion.

And yet this same Mr. Whiston, who not long ago in his ‘ Essay on the Revelations ’<sup>u</sup> had spoken of the times, not only of St. Cyprian, but two hundred years lower down, as continuing in Christian purity, and being above the date of *Antichristian* corruptions; so that what doctrines and practices of the church we find to have been then generally received, we may depend upon, as sound, (among which he reckons by name the *divinity of Christ*, and the *baptism of infants*;) having since fallen first from the belief of one of these, and now of the other, tells us, page 45, that the baptism of infants [meaning infants in the common sense of the word] is one of those ‘ practices, doctrines, and customs, ‘ which appear to have begun in the West, near ‘ Rome, and particularly in Africa; and are to be ‘ looked upon as part of the Roman, Western, or

<sup>u</sup> [Published at Cambridge in 1706. 4<sup>o</sup>.]

‘ Antichristian corruptions: and to be accordingly  
‘ rejected by every Christian.’

As on the one side by yielding the times of Tertullian and Cyprian, (for those he means by the evidence of the African churches’ corruption,) and in a manner giving up Origen and the church of Alexandria, (as I shewed before,) he leaves but a very small space after the apostles for the antipædobaptists to pretend any claim to: so on the other side by calling these doctrines and practices of the church (and some other from which he has revolted) *Romish* and *Antichristian* corruptions, and yet owning them to have taken place so early; he gives a scandalous encouragement to the Deists and enemies of Christianity. By confessing it to have been generally corrupted in its doctrines so far up, he gives them a handle to say, it was never otherwise. These do apparently hug and value him and other heterodox men, for such sayings as these. Whatever serves to weaken the credit or the authority of Christ’s church, helps forward the designs which they are now carrying on.

But to make Origen an evidence only for the church of Alexandria, is a great oversight in the history of his life. He was indeed born there; and if his father held the same doctrine, (as we have not the least reason to question,) baptized there, eighty-five years after the apostles. But of the time of his mature age and writing, the least part was spent there. He conversed at times in almost all the noted churches in the world; and his testimony is an evidence for them all.

The censure of the churches of Africa, as holding *Antichristian* corruptions, for their being in the

*West*, and near *Rome*, is yet more absurd and un-historical. It is a known thing, and observed by almost every body, that no church in the world did more vigorously oppose the first encroachments of the bishops of Rome, than that of Carthage, and the rest of Africa. But the times we are now upon, were long before those encroachments and corruptions. Several of the bishops of Rome about the time of St. Cyprian patiently and humbly suffered death for their religion, as he himself also did. And as to the points he here calls *corruptions*, the Roman and African, and all other churches in the world, were then unanimous.

As for the following quotations alleged by me, which he says, at p. 41, he will ‘run over,’ and shew, that even the fourth century was not unanimous for baptizing infants in the common sense of the word; he runs so hastily and heedlessly, that it is not worth the while to follow him.

The council of Neo-Cæsarea affords, he says, no argument for infant-baptism. All that I pretended was, that it affords none for or against it; and to shew that Grotius perverted the true sense and meaning of the words of it, when he pretended an argument from them against it. Mr. Whiston only recites the words, takes no notice of what I had said to clear the sense of them; and though he does not offer to affirm, yet he poorly insinuates to the ignorant reader that conclusion from them against infant-baptism, which ought to be taken for a mistaken one, till somebody has pretended to defend it.

He observes, that I own that Gregory Nazianzen seems not to have been baptized in infaney, though his father was a bishop; which is very carelessly

expressed. That he was not baptized in infancy, does not *seem*, but is certain; neither in our sense of the word, nor in his. Whether his father was a Christian (for there is no pretence that he was a bishop) at the time of his birth, is a greater question than I at first thought; the reasons that make it doubtful, I gave above to Mr. Bernard. It is however but a single man's fact, differing from a custom and practice of the church, which is fully and plainly proved for those times.

This catching at twigs one would bear with in Mr. Whiston. But as for that passage in this Gregory's sermon, where he sets the several degrees of punishment to those that have died unbaptized; which he makes to be thus; some wholly scorned it, whose punishment will be the greatest; some miss of it by procrastination; who deserve not quite so bad; some 'have it not in their power to receive' it, (*οὐκ εἰσὶν ἐν δυνάμει τοῦ δεξασθαι,*) either because of 'their infancy perhaps, or by reason of some accident utterly involuntary.' Which last sort will neither be glorified nor punished; as being without the seal, but not through their own fault, (or wickedness). For this passage, I say, after Grotius had picked out those words by themselves, ('have it not in their power to receive it because of their infancy.') and had set them among the arguments against infant-baptism; and after that I had, by reciting the whole place, plainly shewn that dealing of Grotius to be either foul and imposturous, or at least, a gross mistake or heedlessness either in taking the quotation at second hand, or in not reading the whole place; or, as Mr. Bernard guesses, writing in too much haste. After all this, for Mr.



Whiston to put this again upon his reader, (whom he must think a very ignorant one,) as if it were meant by St. Gregory against infant-baptism, (when he plainly uses it as a reason for the parents to give it, lest the child lose all reward,) and to set it down just as Grotius had done; ('yet he speaks of some ' that have it not in their power (or are not capable) ' to receive baptism on account of their infancy;') thus to quote a scrap of a sentence to a purpose directly contrary to the import that it carries in the sentence, and which it had been plainly shewn to carry, is, I cannot help saying, in him (whatever it might be in Grotius) a prevarication which I thought no writer, pretending to sincerity, would have been guilty of.

And whereas Gregory at one place delivers, as his particular opinion, that if a child be in no danger of death, it may be fit to defer his baptism till three years, but otherwise to give it presently: he having observed that three years is the time of catechising in the *Constitutions*, ridiculously infers; ' So that we have here a witness against infant-baptism in the modern sense, excepting the case of ' danger of death.' What? does he think that the three years of catechising was the first three years of the child's life? Or would Gregory's child of three years be baptized by adult-baptism?

As for the other passages of the fourth century which I had quoted, of which he, instead of taking them in order, picks out here and there one, where he thinks the words may possibly be wrested to signify, not *infants* properly, but children fit to go to school, or to be catechised; I think the reading of the passages, and comparing what I have said,

with what he has said, will satisfy any one that thinks his labour worth his while, of the impropriety of the explication he puts upon them; and therefore shall not repeat them. The sense and meaning of the word *infant* was (for certain in that age, whatever may be questioned of the former) limited and known by common use, as will appear to those that read the passages.

There was indeed a custom of calling *converts* newly baptized (though they were middle aged, or old) *infants*, by way of allusion; and a sermon made to a congregation of such was called, *Sermo ad Infantes*<sup>x</sup>. But it is always evident at first sight, when the word is taken properly, and when in this borrowed sense, which it obtained only in allusion to those infants, properly speaking, who had ever been the subject of baptism. This I had noted in the chapter concerning Paulinus, part i. chap. 18. §. 1. And I believe it is to that note that I owe the greatest trouble that we have had from Mr. Gale, and all that we have had from Mr. Whiston. For Mr. Gale took occasion to evade the force of Irenæus's testimony by this distinction, (which I had noted, might take place in those verses of Paulinus,) and Mr. Whiston confesses, [p. 35,] that he took the hint from Mr. Gale, and he has ventured to apply it in the case of other passages, where the sense shews that it can have no place. The passage wherein he thought this application to be of most use, is that taken out of that spurious book called 'Clement's Constitutions,' which he values above all the genuine pieces of the ancient Christian writers,

<sup>x</sup> [See, for example, several of St. Augustin's so denominated.]

or any book of Scripture. There happens to be in that book no other mention of infant-baptism, than in those few words, ‘Baptize your infants, and bring them up in the nurture and admonition of God. For he says, *Suffer little children to come to me,*’ &c.

This, which I and all others have thrust down among the evidences out of spurious books, of little credit and value, he at p. 45 calls, ‘the only original law for infant-baptism.’ And finding that he could interpret this his own way, because there is in so few words no circumstance ascertaining their age, (though he should have noted that it first says, ‘Baptize your infants;’ and then ‘bring them up in the nurture,’ &c.,) he has endeavoured to sacrifice all the genuine testimonies of antiquity to his own improbable interpretation of a passage in a book, set out about the latter end of the fourth century, by somebody who forged the names of the apostles to it; containing indeed some good rules and sayings, and exhortations, such as might probably be remembered by tradition to have been delivered by some apostle or apostolical man; but some other things utterly inconsistent with history and with Scripture. And has the vanity to think, that the church of Christ will (now after it has been rejected as spurious for thirteen hundred years) take it on his recommendation as one, nay, as the chief, of their canonical books. And as to baptism, says, p. 46, (what one cannot read without pity,) ‘All modern ways of baptizing’ (he means, both of pædobaptists, and, as he had said in the same paragraph, antipædobaptists) ‘are very imperfect, and

‘ought to be reduced to the original standard in the ‘*Constitutions* immediately.’ He is in great haste, and would have us change our religion, church, and canon of Scripture, as fast as he has done.

At the time of his writing this little piece, 1712, he was a convert to antipædobaptism, but of a very small standing; and yet was even then become as great a proficient in his zeal against the doctrine of infant-baptism, as those of Munster; so as to impute it to the Devil. For at page 44, he concludes thus: ‘In short, this corrupt practice came in, &c., ‘till at last, &c., it came to be applied to babes of ‘three months or three days, &c., so successful was ‘the Devil and his agents in corrupting,’ &c. Does he consider whom he gives up (I mean, of such as he himself owns to have practised infant-baptism; not to say any thing now of the apostles; but St. Cyprian, St. Austin, &c., and the church of their times) as ‘agents for the Devil?’

Those, that I have hitherto been speaking to, have concerned themselves with my book but briefly and occasionally. But Mr. Gale in 1711, wrote professedly against it. And though the greatest part of his book be either of personal matters, some about my life, temper, actions, &c., not relating to the cause, and some about my way of writing when it is too long, or too short, or too censorious; or catching at here and there a passage of my book, which he thought might be represented so as to put me out of favour with the antipædobaptists, (as are his first two chapters, which he calls ‘My Character,’) or else on another subject, viz. not the *age* or *time* of receiving baptism, but the *way* of administering it;

with which I had meddled very little (as are his three next); yet he gave to the whole the title of ‘Reflections’ on my book.

And though he go no farther in any methodical way of answering, than to the *Introduction*, and first five chapters of my book, (not nigh one tenth part of it,) which answer begins at his ninth chapter, (and he has but thirteen in all,) yet it has gone among the men of his party as an *answer* to it <sup>y</sup>.

He deals not much with *argument*, (which the others have chiefly aimed at,) but writes in a way of declaiming and flourish, and much addicted to reproaching, taking a pride in shewing how easily and how naturally he can express a contempt of his adversary, or of any reason or argument. He writes in a style indeed sufficiently fluent, and with a good stock of philological learning; but does not keep very close to the rules of candour, modesty, or truth; but delights in vaunting, insulting, slighting, and laying odious and false imputations, not on me only, but on the clergy of England in general, and indeed our whole church; as that was a time in which some people found their advantage by raising such slanders.

His talent in rhetoric (which is not inconsiderable) he uses to false colouring, and ‘gaining his point,’ (as he calls it,) by wrested representations of things and passages.

Of his *impertinencies*, (to name but one sort of them,) an unparalleled instance is, his picking up stories of things said or done by me before he was

<sup>y</sup> [See, for instance, Crosby’s History of the English Baptists, vol. iv. p. 367.—The Life of Joseph Stennet, prefixed to his works.—Ivimey’s History of the Baptists, vol. iv. p. 214, &c.]

born<sup>z</sup>; and naming the people<sup>a</sup>, (whose names one would never have thought to have seen in print.) Nothing, thanks be to God, of which one need be ashamed. But it is a great shame to see such impertinent stuff brought into a controversy of religion. Of his *untruths*, I would beforehand instance in one flagrant and manifest one, (which, as I shall shew, he has affirmed above twenty times over,) his saying, that I have in my book yielded and owned, that there is no *Scripture-proof* for infant-baptism; though near half his book be spent in refuting (as well as he can) those proofs which I brought from scripture. The province which I had undertaken, was the history of the times near following; but I did not altogether omit those of scripture.

If I had followed my own inclinations, or the advice of some of my friends, in drawing up an answer to him; I should have made it shorter by half than it is, and taken notice only of those few reflections of his, that seemed to be of moment to the main point. The tyranny of custom obliges me, not only to take more pains than I needed, by the dry work of following him *κατὰ πόδας*, and answering to many things that are impertinent to the cause, or of small weight in it: but also, when I have done it, to make an excuse to any judicious reader why I did it.

Such an one will pardon me, if he consider, that some captious and litigious men would otherwise

<sup>z</sup> [It appears that Dr. Wall was about thirty-five years older than Mr. Gale.]

<sup>a</sup> [As Mr. Brown, and Mrs. Hall, brought forward in Mr. Gale's second letter, vol. iii. p. 90.]

have been apt to say, that I had passed over the most material objection.

To spare the time of those who are choice of it, (though I had not liberty to spare my own,) I must advertise them, that there is hardly any thing in Mr. Gale's first six chapters, or in my answer to them, that is very material to the point of infant-baptism. And it will be no great loss to step over them.

A vein of boasting and magnifying his own performance runs through all his book. With that he continues his work, and with that he ends; and contrary to Horace's rule, (who says of a vaunting prefacer, 'Quid dignum tanto feret hic promissor 'hiatu?') with that he begins.

For in an advertisement prefixed to his book, having taken notice that several great and worthy men (whom he names too) had given a favourable character of my book, he says, that he published these his Reflections, 'to inform the public, &c.—' and to let those learned gentlemen know, that 'they had been much too hasty in their judgments; and that this history is not by far what they take 'it to be.' Is not this youth a likely man, think you, to be able to inform their judgment of any considerable thing? I set down this as a specimen of the arrogance you are to expect all through the book.

In the same advertisement he says that these Reflections (though published in 1711) were written in 1705 and 1706<sup>b</sup>. Suppose that. But when he saw

<sup>b</sup> [But see a note to the introduction to vol. iii. p. v. where some reason is adduced for believing that at all events they were not written before 1707.]

in 1707 my second edition with some alterations, should he not have left out his needless remarks on those places of my first edition, which I myself had altered in the second?

He there adds, that he had hoped, that ‘a more learned advocate would have been engaged.’ If Mr. Stennet were once desired or pitched on to answer my book, and it was devolved upon this man; it was an unhappy change both for the antipædobaptists and for me. For if he had answered at all, he would have said more to the purpose, would have used a more rational, modest, and candid way of seeking the truth; and I should have had far more Christian treatment. His note, that I did not reply to ‘Mr. Stennet’s Answer to Mr. Russen’ is frivolous; since I was not at all concerned to do it, nor ever thought of doing it. He mistakes the matter, when he says, I was convinced by him of my mistake in charging him with a misrepresentation of the opinion of the followers of Gundulphus. We read Dr. Allix’s book (out of which the quotation was taken) together. The words were as I had said. All that I was convinced of was, that I should have spoken more respectfully of Mr. Stennet. (which I did in the contents of the second edition,) for that treatment his candour and ingenuous temper did deserve. The other ‘inadvertencies’ of mine, which he says Mr. Stennet rectified, were only some accounts of the present state, opinions, and usages of the English antipædobaptists, which must be had from themselves, and I desired him to give me. He gave me a truer and more skilful account of them, than I could have from the antipædobaptists my



neighbours, which I accordingly rectified in my second edition<sup>c</sup>.

Of his book the first pages, to p. 7, are a piece of his sermon on charity, moderation, candour, &c., which might pass well enough in the reading, provided one were not at the same time to read the rest of the book. But he that goes forward to read the next page, and so along, can hardly forbear calling to mind the amazement expressed by some people coming out of a church, where they had heard a good discourse, enforcing a certain virtue from a man who it seems was notoriously guilty of the contrary vice, ‘How can this man speak these things, and do as he does!’ For his first reflection on my book is at p. 8, where he reaches at a passage near the end thereof, (such a methodical answerer I have met with,) and having first observed that ‘a great many do traduce the antipædobaptists, as dangerous enemies to the state,’ he adds, concerning me, that ‘he has reason to fear that I am of the same mind too; though I endeavour to conceal it.’ What is his reason for this suspicion of me? ‘By my inserting among other things the scandalous story of Mr. Hicks, which I myself can scarce forbear confessing to be false.’

I had said at the place he refers to<sup>d</sup>, ‘The present state of the English antipædobaptists is this; they that are now, are as commendable as any other sort of men are, for a sober and grave, quiet and peaceable way of living: they profess obedience to magistrates, and they will commonly express

<sup>c</sup> [See that edition, p. 430, &c., 453, &c., or the present, vol. ii. p. 323, &c., 367, &c.]

<sup>d</sup> [See vol. ii. p. 323 to 325, of this edition.]

‘ a dislike and abhorrence of those plunderings and  
 ‘ other violences committed by some of their party,  
 ‘ as well as by the rest of the army of that usurper  
 ‘ aforesaid.’

I knew that there stood as an objection against this in the face of the world, the *Depositions* against many of their party, and the *Confessions* of some of them, as having been concerned in the Monmouth conspiracy. It was impossible (if one would speak to the purpose) not to take notice of this. If it had been some obscure story, he might have blamed me for mentioning it at all. But it was largely set forth in one of the most noted histories that was then (or is now) extant in the English tongue. I did however put in so many *ifs*, (as whether West swore true concerning what Roe told him; or if so, whether Hicks did ever say what Roe said he did, concerning the body of this people; or if so, whether Hicks himself did not give a reproachful account of them in his mentioning twenty thousand of them inclined to such a wickedness,) that I did in the main express my hopes that most of them were of another sentiment; which Mr. Gale expresses by this unhandsome turn, ‘ he can scarce forbear confessing it to be false.’ I observed, moreover, that but two men of the twenty thousand appeared to have been guilty, and that they were of the forwardest to make a free confession. And besides, in my second edition, (which Mr. Gale must needs have seen before he printed,) having in the meanwhile understood from Mr. Stennet, that king Charles himself had, upon a hearing of Hicks’ case in council, discharged him; I put in that also.

Yet still here he fears I am of the same mind as

others that have an ill opinion of them. Who can help that? I know no cure for a man that will think I take him for a villain, when I declare the contrary. There must be an ill conscience, or ill nature in such a fear.

That which I guess is, that he does not think this of me; but would so represent me to the anti-pædobaptists as their enemy, to hinder them from regarding what I have written. So much difference there is between the temper of this man and of Mr. Stennet, who owned to me, that I had treated the anti-pædobaptists with more civility than most had done. And I remember my answer was, that it was indeed my aim so to do.

His next reflection, in the same page, is a great deal worse: not an ill-natured insinuation, but a downright untruth. I said, in the place he refers to, only this: ‘that the way of setting up different churches for different opinions in lesser matters, (which way many people in Holland fell into, and has been imitated in another nation, and as some say, outdone in it,) is the most contrary to the nature and design of Christianity of any thing that could be devised.’ He alters the thing spoken of, and says, I assert ‘that the forbearance the States of Holland allow, &c., is the most contrary,’ &c. It is one thing to say schism is a great sin, another to determine, that forbearing to punish it is always so. This is the man that had just ended his sermon about candour, truth, charity, &c.

I must not continue the course I have taken with these first two instances of his way of quoting, to set down my own words, and then his; but the reader (if he thinks his book or mine worth the

reading) must make the comparison by looking in each himself. He will find many of a like nature with these two, which do not differ from Danvers' way. The very next is such, [page 8,] where he says, 'I cite in one paragraph Dr. Featley three 'times for setting forth the mischief of a toleration 'in any state:' if the reader turn to the place, he will see this to be false, as to the first two, (which are only historical, of antipadobaptism then beginning to spread, 1645,) and frivolous as to the third. For what hurt is there in saying, that 'in times of a general toleration' (he leaves out of my words, *general*) 'abundance of sects are apt to arise;' especially when I add, (which he likewise leaves out,) 'how necessary soever it might be in other respects.' Here he talks as if I justified the French king's persecutions.

Page 9. His next quarrel with me comes to this in effect; that I lived where I do before the toleration, and in king Charles' time. Who knows not that in those times the law was (and the courts and magistrates enforced it) that we should present, i. e. give an account to the church-court, of those that came not to church and communion? This I or the churchwardens did, not only in respect to the antipadobaptists or other dividers, but to such of our own church as were gross absenters. This he calls, 'taking so much care to perform his part with 'those who were endeavouring to plunder and root 'out the antipadobaptists in his neighbourhood.' And at other places<sup>e</sup> he names a man or a woman or two of Shoreham, who, about forty years ago, continuing obstinate in their schism, and contempt

<sup>e</sup> [See vol. iii. p. 90.]

of all the authority of the church, were excommunicated. As if that were an ill thing. It looks as if he had at the time of his writing some prognostic of what doctrines, in derogation of all church authority, and discipline of human excommunication, would come quickly to be preached in some of our pulpits, or as if he, and some such late preachers had conferred notes. And it shews what pitiful stories he has been picking up; such and such a person were forty years ago excommunicated; they were, as far as I can remember the cases, such as sufficiently deserved it; and one of them (who is yet living, and, I believe, is he that furnisheth him with stories) upon other accounts besides his schism. Here he mightily commends the present toleration, but considers not that it was never intended to embolden such as he, to fly in the face of the established church, as he does presently, at p. 10, where he has done with me for a while, and falls to railing at the clergy in general, or *many* of them, in such reproachful words as I shall not repeat.

Page 13. ‘ You may expect a complete answer to ‘ Mr. Wall by a very learned hand’] I do earnestly entreat and beseech the body of the antipædobaptists to take care that he be also a man of modesty and truth.

Page 15. ‘ That he has not suffered a single instance ‘ to escape his diligence’] By the very words of mine that he cites, it appears that I was not guilty of so much arrogance.

Page 15, 16. Here Mr. Gale is got out of his way, and into a talk of infant-baptism; which he seems not to have thought of before, since the titlepage. He

blames me for not producing all the passages that make *against* it; and instances in a passage of Justin Martyr, which yet I did produce. But he complains that I said, 'It did not make directly *for* it, nor *against* it.' If he think otherwise, there he has it. I said, the Martyr 'had no occasion there to speak of the case of infants.' He thinks he had; and gives for a reason this far-fetched one; that if Christians had then baptized infants, an apologist would have mentioned that to the emperor, in order to obviate a slander which then lay on them, as if they did use to murder and eat children. Now this is an argument for the apologists to have used, which I confess I should never have thought of: and I cannot wonder that they did not, seeing there are so many more forcible ones, which they did constantly use. As namely, the severe law of God and of our Lord Christ against all murder and bloodshed whatsoever. Insomuch as many of them doubted whether it were lawful to kill an enemy in war. And they must be far from eating human blood, that held it unlawful to eat any blood at all. These arguments they do produce in their apologies; which are much more obvious and to the purpose, than that which Mr. Gale would furnish them with.

Page 17—19. He complains that I have been disingenuous in my citing a passage in St. Cyprian. Let the reader see if he can find where the fault is; I cannot. I owned it did not name 'infants particularly; and therefore I would but just mention 'it,' (having given before plain and direct passages out of St. Cyprian, to which he thinks fit to say nothing.) I owned also that St. Cyprian does at

another place speak of communicating children of four or five years old. I said, it was plain that he here understands John iii. 5, to speak of baptism. And so it is by comparing the heads or contents with the chapter itself.

Pages 20, 21, are the seeking a quarrel where no handle was given. I cite Clemens' Constitutions; he cries out they are spurious, and proves it; and though I had put them no otherwise than in a chapter of spurious pieces by themselves, declared in the title to be spurious, and had there proved the spuriousness of them before him: yet, because I mentioned these spurious pieces at all, he calls it 'acting with the same artifice.' And observe his words, p. 20, 'They, like all the other boasted clear proofs, happen to be spurious.' Has not this man a good forehead?

Page 21—23. Having for a little while confined himself to cite passages picked up here and there out of my book, where he could not impute (that is, he should not have imputed) to me more than my words would bear; he here runs out into a freer way of giving the character of my temper in writing, without referring to any particular place, and tells the men of his opinion that I 'industriously take all advantages to blacken them,' and many more such malicious and false expressions he uses, for which I think to call him to account by and by. He sets himself here to give a character of a slanderous writer, and (whether he had a glass before him I know not) he describes it very lively; and then says, that 'if he can form any judgment, I have too near approached this method.' Then he says, his reader will be surprised at so severe a

charge from him, 'who has always so much talked 'of charity.' If he have any reader that formerly had any opinion of his charity, or justice, or truth either, this surprise must indeed be expected. How does he take it off? he assures the reader once again in words, that he is a man whom 'you must 'not upbraid with violating even the strictest rules 'of charity.'

Page 24—28. He takes upon him to censure my way of writing, that I often run out into too large digressions; what is that to him, or to the cause? that may be an unskilfulness in writing; but his business was to prove what he had said last, 'that I 'industriously took all advantages to blacken the 'antipædobaptists.' He says, I thought by those digressions to 'serve ostentation, to display my 'reading, to shew abilities,' and such prattle. That, sir, is the temper of boys and young men; people under the infirmities of age are seldom inclined to that vanity. If I had aimed at that, I will tell you, Mr. Gale, what I would have done: I would have put at the end of my book a catalogue of the authors cited, &c. And if I had mentioned any of the school-books, Horace, Juvenal, Ovid, Terence, &c., I would set down pompously the editions of them. And if I had cited such a book, for example, as Dr. Grabe's Irenæus, it should have been set down four times over: once under J, twice under G, once under F; and so Le Clerc's *Patres Apostolici* nine or ten times<sup>f</sup>.

Page 28. What he says here of my reflecting on Mr. Stennet, looks as if he could not apprehend the

<sup>f</sup> [See the table of authors subjoined to Mr. Gale's Reflections, at the end of vol. iii.]



sense of what he reads. I did not speak of his citing so largely Mr. Bossuet, (now Bishop of Meaux,) as a digression from the subject, but as giving too much regard to what a papist says in a cause wherein they do generally speak for their interest against their conscience. And for what I say of 'the vein of fine language,' Mr. Gale is the first reader that could, and will be the last that can, mistake my words so far as to say, I impute to Mr. Stennet the vanity of shewing that. All that I said was, that harangue of Mr. Bossuet had a vein of fine language, for which perhaps he might prize it, and count it worth a recital.

Page 29—46. Here he brings a long charge against me for my style, that it has been too censorious and sharp against some learned and great men that are pædobaptists; concerning which, having already said what I thought needful, and taken to myself the blame due to me from them, I need add here no more than to ask him again, what is this to him or to the cause? If I, being but a mean person, have been too presuming and arrogant toward greater men, forgetting the respect due to their character, I have been served just in my kind; for I also have lived to have a youth<sup>g</sup>, without any respect to my age, or to the office that I bear in the church, (though unworthy,) or to the church in which it is borne, or to the opinion of great men therein, (who have taken my mean endeavours in good part<sup>h</sup>), treat me very dirtily. But is this the best service he can do to his cause? If he has been

<sup>g</sup> [See a note, containing the relative ages of Dr. Wall and Mr. Gale, at page 54, above.]

<sup>h</sup> [See this alluded to above, at p. 2.]

employed by the antipædobaptists in the defence of their opinions; may they not say to him, ‘You defend Grotius, Mr. le Clerc, Chrysostom, and this or that father, or bishop, who are no friends of ours; but when will you remember us?’ Among the poets he quotes to no purpose, he should have thought of that scrap of Martial, ‘De tribus capellis.’

He talks of another man that is to answer my book; I hope that other will keep close to the main subject of it; for this man has meddled with every thing else, and has often reached for evils where no occasion was given. I mentioned the name of Archbishop Tillotson twice in my book<sup>h</sup>. In one of them it is written Archbishop, as it should be, in the other, Bishop Tillotson. This our author calls *quarrelling* with that prelate; and sets it so in his table of contents. Does not any man in hasty writing or speaking, say often, ‘Bishop Usher<sup>i</sup>’; ‘Bishop Laud,’ &c., without any intention of disrespect? Are these things matter for a book?

Concerning some of the others, he makes my words worse than they are. I said that Gregory Nazianzen probably gave his opinion of deferring a child’s baptism (if he were well) till three years, in some compliance with his father’s practice. He makes me represent the son, ‘persuading men against ‘his conscience,’ &c., he makes me call St. Chrysostom, ‘a leaden-headed logician.’ I only said of one argument of his, that it was (though golden-mouthed oratory) but leaden-headed logic. There is a great difference between these two sayings. And even that was altered in the second edition, of which it

<sup>h</sup> [See vol. ii. p. 408 and 526.]

<sup>i</sup> [See the note at vol. iii. p. 29.]

was unfair in Mr. Gale to take no notice. He says,

Page 31, That I make the Gregories ‘singular in the practice of deferring baptism for some time; and yet a few lines after do confess it was very common at that time.’ It is hard to find a reader eyes; and as hard to keep this man from cavilling at what he sees to be otherwise than he represents. I said, the Gregories were singular in practising or advising the delay of a child’s baptism till two or three years, as *by principle*. Of the many that I speak of afterward, my words are, that they delayed and put it off something longer than ordinary, not out of *principle*, that so they ought to do; but out of negligence and a procrastination which they themselves owned to be blamable. Is there any contradiction in this? And yet he brings the same again, p. 42.

Page 39. He would have it to be a contradiction, that I say, part i. chap. 11, that Grotius went about to disprove infant-baptism from a passage in Gregory Nazianzen, Orat. 40; and yet do, part ii. chap. 2. [sect. 9. p. 35.] repeat his words, that ‘all that he had brought is of no force to prove that infant-baptism should be denied, but only to shew the liberty, antiquity, and difference of the custom.’ Now both of these are consistent enough. For Grotius does (as is common) produce the arguments, or quotations on both sides (those that make *for* and those that make *against* it) by themselves. And among the latter he has brought a scrap of that fortieth Oration of Gregory (which in reality is all strong and positive *for* infant-baptism) among the arguments *against* it. And though he, having pretended

to weigh the arguments on both sides, does at last split the matter in dispute, judging it to be indifferent; yet still the arguments on one side taken by themselves, are brought to *disprove* it, as the others are to *prove* it. And my blame of his conduct is, that he set this quotation on one side, which should have stood on the other. And Mr. Gale's excuse that he makes for him, p. 42, makes the matter worse. For he says, 'Gregory might intend such children as missed of baptism through their parents' fault;' (and so I say he certainly did.) Does this excuse Grotius for putting such a quotation among those that make against infant-baptism? Or does it not rather aggravate his mistake?

For the criticism he talks of, and for which he tells you he looked into his Dictionary, p. 42, ('have it not in their power to receive it') as I said, or ('are not in a capacity to receive it') as he says, it is not worth the discussing; because Mr. Gale himself has not the confidence (though he have a good one) to say that Gregory means any other incapacity than this; that they in their infancy cannot procure themselves to be baptized, and must be without baptism unless their parents help them to it; and so it is not their own but their parents' fault if they miss of it; and therefore he thinks their punishment will be only *pœna damni*.

Page 43. The case is the same as to the contradiction, that he would here find in what I say of the words of the sixth canon of the council of Neocæsarea; in which Grotius, the first of all men, found an argument against infant-baptism. He curtails my words to make them appear contradictory. I said, the words of the canon are, 'as to the main

‘ of the determination,’ applicable to either of the senses there recited, viz. (as I there explain it.) The bishops, whether they had held *for* or *against* infant-baptism, would have determined that the woman might be baptized. But whereas from a phrase in the last clause Grotius would draw an argument that they held it unlawful to baptize an infant, as having no choice of will, I shewed the propriety of the phrase to be such as gives no ground to that interpretation of it. Now this man, leaving out the distinction I plainly expressed<sup>1</sup> ‘ of the main of the ‘ determination,’ and of ‘ the propriety of phrase in ‘ the last clause,’ represents me, both here and over again afterward, as contradicting myself. And he speaks of my fastening upon Grotius foul dealing in the matter, which I did not do in this matter of his criticism; but in his misrepresenting the words of Balsamon, of which Mr. Gale speaks next, p. 44.

Page 44. I did indeed say, ‘ I would set down ‘ Balsamon’s words at large, that the reader might ‘ see if he can acquit that great man (viz. Grotius) ‘ of the crime of prevarication.’ And I do still question whether he can. For when Balsamon says, that the child in the womb cannot be baptized, nor accounted as baptized, by his mother’s baptism; for this reason among others, ‘ because at baptism every ‘ one’s own profession’ (or promise) ‘ is necessary; ‘ and an embryo (or child unborn) cannot make that ‘ necessary profession;’ and he adds in almost the next words, ‘ an embryo cannot have sponsors;’ ‘ but infants’ (meaning when they are born into the world) ‘ do promise by their sponsors, and being ‘ actually baptized,’ &c. For Grotius to set down,

<sup>1</sup> [Namely, at vol. i. p. 153.]

among his arguments against infant-baptism, the former part of this paragraph, and omit the latter, whether it were prevarication, or a very great oversight in not reading the whole place, let the reader judge. Which soever it was, it was not so bold as Mr. Gale's attempt on the same place is (nor did Grotius, or any man of liberal education, ever venture on such an one). For he, when he comes here, p. 46, to account for these latter words, puts this shameless affront upon his reader, to say, 'Balsamon, ' or perhaps somebody else, has subjoined some ' words, which allow children may be brought to ' baptism by sponsors.' This outdoes Danvers: for he, when he rejected, as spurious, a quotation which he did not like, rejected it all; all the book, chapter, epistle, &c. But here is a defender of a cause in a new-fashioned way. He will take one part of a paragraph (which by itself may be drawn to his opinion) to be the author's own; and if the other part explain the author's meaning, will throw it away.

As for the shuffle that he makes about the word *κατατίθενται*, he must look into his dictionary again. For when, speaking of the baptizing of infants, an author says, that 'the infants *κατατίθενται* by their ' sponsors;' it can signify nothing but *do promise* or *do consent*. And *συγκατατίθεμαι* does commonly signify *consent*, as 2 Cor. ii. 16; and Origen, *Comm. in Joann.* p. 115, (in a discourse of which Mr. Gale, p. 398, quotes a part,) *συγκατατιθέμενοι διὰ τῆς σιωπῆς*, 'giving consent by their silence.'

But Zonaras, he thinks still, was an antipædobaptist. Zonaras writes just as Balsamon does in that former part, (as to the niceties Mr. Gale em-

pleys about the translation of their words, it is true, what he guesses, that I had only the Latin of their comments before me, he had the Greek; but I find the sense to be so perfectly the same as to any thing that may affect our subject, that I will not enter into any such trifling dispute; let the reader take his translation or mine, I am content;) their words are on the same canon, they were of the same church, and wrote in the same age, the twelfth century: so that when they do both speak of the promise or profession made by every one at his baptism; and one of them explains what is meant by that, viz. the profession which infants make by their sponsors, we cannot doubt but that is the meaning of the other also. Especially when we know that that church at that time did without any controul hold infant-baptism to be necessary. If Balsamon or Zonaras (who had, as Mr. Gale observes, each of them great places and offices) had been of another opinion, it had not been safe for them to publish it. Constantinople was not as Holland and England are now, where any one may preach or write any new or heterodox thing that comes in their mind.

Page 47. To what I urge, (that Pelagius and St. Austin, who must have heard of this council, do declare that they never read or heard of any Christians that were against infant-baptism,) Mr. Gale, according to a particular way that he has of giving a man the lie in other words, when there is no occasion for it, says, I should not have said as I did, ‘but which had been truer,’ &c.

Pelagius’ words in the place I refer to<sup>m</sup> are, ‘Men slander me as if I denied the sacrament of

<sup>m</sup> [See vol. i. p. 448, 450.]

‘ baptism to infants, or did promise, &c., which is  
 ‘ a thing that I never heard, no not even any wicked  
 ‘ heretic say. For who is there so ignorant of that  
 ‘ which is read in the gospel,’ &c. And for St.  
 Austin’s words, Mr. Gale owns that they are, that  
 he never heard of any that denied that baptism was  
 given for remission of sins. And if he look into the  
 place again, he will find that St. Austin is there  
 speaking of the case of *infants*, and that the remis-  
 sion of sins he speaks of, is the remission of *original*  
 sin : for so are the words ; ‘ When I was at Car-  
 ‘ thage, I heard a cursory discourse of some people,  
 ‘ who said, that infants are not baptized for that  
 ‘ reason, that they may receive remission of sins ;  
 ‘ but that, &c. I was startled at the novelty,’ &c.  
 This is in the same paragraph, where the words are ;  
 ‘ I do not remember that I ever heard any other  
 ‘ thing from any Christians, &c. I do not remember  
 ‘ that I ever read otherwise in any writer,’ &c. And  
 the very title of the book is, ‘ Of the Guilt and  
 ‘ Forgiveness of Sins, and Baptism of Infants.’  
 Would any man, pretending to decency, except  
 Mr. Gale, give a man the lie, for saying that  
 these men do declare, that they never read or heard  
 of any Christians that denied that infants were to  
 be baptized ?

Page 48. From a saying of Bilins, which I pro-  
 duce, he thinks I am hard put to it, when I profess  
 myself to believe that ‘ that was not his settled  
 ‘ opinion.’ If I had been hard put to it, had it not  
 been easy for me to omit the mention of it ? Did  
 ever any one in this controversy produce this place  
 before me ? Mr. Gale, I believe, cannot tell. But  
 some other antipedobaptists do know, that in this



and several other instances I have out of authors ancient and modern brought some passages, making against infant-baptism, which had not been observed before by any managers of that cause; and that this, which I met with by chance in Bilius, is one of them. It had been safe and easy to have left it out. But I think still, what I said there to be true, that it is not likely that this was Bilius' settled opinion; he being an abbot of the church of Rome. Let those that have leisure search his works, if they please. I count it not worth so much pains.

The other two instances that he gives there need no other answer, but that any one read his book and mine.

Page 49. He says, 'I insinuate that they countenance at least, and have among them, some who deny the human nature of our Lord Christ,' &c. He protests, 'He does not know so much as a single man,' &c., and that 'such an one can be no Christian.' What I said<sup>n</sup> was, 'Some of them (but I think it is but few in England) do hold that error which has of old been attributed to the antipædo-baptists of Germany, and is said to be still held by the Minnists of Holland; that Christ took not flesh of the Virgin Mary,' &c.

I do there urge against this opinion this consequence; that then Christ 'is not properly man; as not being made of a woman, nor of the seed of David<sup>o</sup>.' How far the Minnists, or others of that opinion, do own this consequence, I know not. As for the opinion itself, I said, there were but few in England of it; and I believe he will not maintain the contrary, but that there are, or lately have been,

<sup>n</sup> [Vol. ii. p. 335.]

<sup>o</sup> [Vol. ii. p. 337.]

some. And how far he does by these words deny the Dutch antipædobaptists to be Christians, let him consider. And let the reader judge what occasion there is for that charge of *spitefulness* which he brings against me here; or for that with which he begins his next chapter, saying; ‘What can be  
 ‘ more unfair than to represent and judge of a  
 ‘ whole body (of men) by the odd singular opinions  
 ‘ of a few particular men in it?’ It is unfair to do so; and it is not true to say, I did so. I said, there were *but few* among them of this opinion.



## CHAP. II.

Page 52. Here having vented his spleen upon bishop Bramhall, (as if it were a heresy to assert the real presence; or as if the confession of faith of one hundred churches of the antipædobaptists did not own and declare that worthy receivers do *really and indeed* receive and feed upon Christ crucified,) and upon Mr. Dodwell and bishop Ussher, he enlarges his foam against the present clergy, which they that love to hear such language may read if they please.

Page 54. He owns, there are perhaps among the antipædobaptists ‘some ill-meaning people;’ and, I think, he has convinced every body that there is one at least.

Page 54. Speaking of my ‘mischievous insinuations,’ he instances in my ‘silly excuse’ for Mr. Baxter. If the reader turn to it, (it is in part ii. chap. 9. §. 3 of my book,) he will see no harm or mischief meant to any body in it. Nor in what I

say of the antipædobaptists ‘maintaining their poor ‘liberally,’ (which is part ii. chap. 8. §. 6,) for which I say there, ‘they are particularly commended.’ He does not let his reader know where these sayings of mine are, but to prove the mischief of them recites a saying of mine, above three hundred pages from either of them, where I am speaking of separators in general; and applies it to the antipædobaptists, of whom I had no thought at that place.

Page 57. He uses more foul language than ordinary. That the things I say of the antipædobaptists are ‘so notoriously false, that he admires any ‘man, especially one of my order, could,’ &c. Here a reader would expect some great falsehood of mine. All that he instances in, is this; first he enlarges on this topic, how ‘black heretical a tenet Socinianism ‘is with most people;’ (but he does not here say much of his own dislike of it;) and then adds, that I say, ‘they have many Socinians among them;’ that is true, (save that he leaves out the word *underhand*: my word is, *underhand Socinians*;) he adds, ‘insinuating as if we countenanced them.’ That is false; for I say the direct contrary, as will appear presently. But here he brings over again what he had said, p. 49, (to which I answered just now,) and quotes some words of mine at a very distant place from the other, which any one that will turn to the place will see are not spoken of the antipædobaptists in general, or the Socinians in general; but only of those that to their Socinianism, or denial of Christ’s divinity, do add a denial that he took flesh of the Virgin Mary; of whom I say there are but few in England.

Page 58. He says I accuse the antipædobaptists

of holding those very opinions, which I at another place (which he there recites) do own they endeavour to root out, meaning *Socinianism*. Now I never accuse them any farther than by saying, ‘they have many underhand *Socinians* among them.’ And at the other place<sup>p</sup>, ‘*Socinians* they have some, that creep in among them.’ And is not this (if he had recited my words true) consistent with the other, that ‘they that profess it openly are rejected from their communion?’ So that the crime of false accusation returns on himself. He knows well enough that their own members, those of the *general assembly*, and those of the *general association*, have reflected on each other on account of the *Socinian* tenets, at a much higher rate than I have done.

Page 58. ‘Pelagianism, and the holding the mortality of the soul, are very falsely imputed’] If he mean imputed to *all of them*, it is false to say I imputed these tenets to them; if he mean to *any of them*, he will not have the face to deny, that some parties of them do deny original sin, and some do hold a sleep of the soul till the resurrection. ‘Mortality of the soul’ is his own word.

Page 59. Here is the first place where our author begins to argue; so that the reader might hope that he had done with his personal cavils and reproaches; but if he hope so, he will afterward find himself mistaken. From hence to p. 92 he labours to overthrow the argument of my last chapter; which I confess I valued the most of any, because it tends to peace and unity.

I endeavoured to shew, that which way of baptism soever be the fittest, yet the difference between the present contending parties, being not a fundamental one, is not of that moment as to justify their separation, and renouncing one another's communion. He makes these exceptions against the plea that I here use.

1. First, that I did not give a definition of *schism*, or of such separation as is *sinful*. One that writes a brief dissuasive from drunkenness, adultery, or any other sin, does not usually enter into a methodical treatise of the definition of those sins, because he reckons them commonly known, and so did I. Yet I shewed from St. Paul's discourse, Rom. xiv, and part of xv, that he earnestly commands Christians to *receive one another*, and not to separate for differences in opinion or practice, which are not such wherein *the kingdom of God* does consist; or, which are not (as I there expressed it) fundamental. And a plain consequence of that is, that to separate from an established church for differences that are not so, is a *sinful* separation or schism.

But he complains that I did not give a catalogue of fundamentals. That, I hope, was not, nor ever will be, expected of me; but I endeavoured to shew, that the difference between the pædobaptists and antipædobaptists is not such. I mentioned there the severe law of the Gospel against separations, divisions, &c. And whereas the Gospel itself makes some exceptions to that general law, I having observed, that some exceptions particularly mentioned in a law, do strengthen that law in all cases not excepted. proceeded to recite four instances of

excepted cases; and that they were all that I could find in Scripture; and that he that separates from any church upon any ground except one of those four, ought to be sure that he find his ground in Scripture. To all which this wretched answerer of a book says nothing; and if he could have said any thing to purpose, it had been more material than any thing he has said.

I recited also the acknowledgments of several pædobaptists and antipædobaptists, that this difference is not fundamental; and for the antipædobaptists, the public confession of one hundred churches of them. He answers not a word, but in effect condemns their opinion.

Page 60. He sets his own talent in logic to work. He defines *schism*; he makes the *genus* of it to be, 'the occasioning of schism.' One is bad enough, and the other very bad. But as rebellion, and the giving occasion to rebellion, are two things, so it is in schism.

Page 63. He defines *fundamentals*: they are 'such things as are plainly necessary;' which is just as much as to say, 'as are plainly fundamental.' This is the man that Dr. Whitby calls, 'the very learned Mr. Gale.'

P. 61. He says, that as the protestants separated from the church of Rome, so if any church 'degenerate into dangerous errors and corruptions,' &c. Should he not here have restrained the signification of that general word *dangerous* to the more limited sense of *fundamental*, as I had expressed it; or 'errors in points plainly necessary,' as he himself settles it?

Secondly, he answers, p. 64, that beside those

things that are fundamental or necessary to the constituting a true *Christian*, some other things are necessary to the constituting of a *church*. As, that it have the ecclesiastical offices performed by ministers lawfully called to preach, give the sacraments, &c.

I do not disallow of the distinction: but who could have thought it to be of any use here to the antipædobaptists? had ever any of them before this man the forehead to deny that the church of England has ecclesiastical officers to this purpose? He says,

Page 85. ‘ We do not assert so much; yet to some ‘ it will, it may be, seem a little probable, that she ‘ may perhaps have no bishops, presbyters, &c., no ‘ lawful ordinations.’] He does not pretend to find any fault in the manner or circumstances of the ordinations in the church of England, nor to urge or shew any fault in the derivation of the ministerial authority by succession from the apostles. And it had been indeed stark madness for one who can give no account at all, by whom, or by what hands the power or commission of their *elders* is derived from them, to touch on that point. On the contrary, he would have it believed, that neither they nor we do count that necessary, or of any use; for at p. 66 he speaks of those whom he calls ‘ the more judicious part of the church of England, ‘ as having given up the chimæra of an uninter- ‘ rupted succession.’ If he and those *judicious* men conferred notes, they should have bid him say, ‘ We will quickly give it up;’ and not have suffered him to pass for the first preacher of that doctrine. They should have reckoned that honour

to themselves. Now he is a leader, and they tamely follow him.

But as to his argument here, since he does not lay the blame on the manner of the ordinations; it is plain that all the meaning he has in saying, we have perhaps no bishops, no presbyters, &c., is, that they have never been baptized; and therefore cannot ordain, or be ordained. So that after a long talk about the difference between 'fundamental to a person's being a Christian, and fundamental to a church,' the question returns to just no more than it was; whether the age or manner of receiving baptism be fundamental to a person. For if it be not, he brings no new reason of its being fundamental to a church.

When he boasts, p. 83, that all the reasons I bring for the antipedobaptists joining in communion with other Christians in all things that they can, 'are sufficiently answered by the foregoing distinction between fundamentals of religion, and fundamentals in the constitution of a true Christian church;' and says of the age or time of receiving baptism; 'It is a fundamental with us in the constitution of a church;' the distinction here is of no use. For these circumstances of baptism can be fundamental to a church no farther than they are fundamental (or of the essence) to each particular man's baptism. If the baptism he received in infancy is sufficient to denominate him a Christian; it puts him in a capacity (if nothing else hinder) of receiving orders. And if Mr. Gale cannot truly say in the name of the antipedobaptists in general, these circumstances are fundamental *with us* to the being of a Christian (as he cannot; for they deny them to be



so); then neither is it true which he says in their names; they are ‘a fundamental with us in the ‘constitution of a church.’

And indeed here he deduces all the reason of our being *no church* from our having *no baptism*. For having premised, ‘Perhaps some may carry this so ‘far, as to question whether such a congregation is ‘a visible church. For if, as I will prove hereafter, ‘her (the church of England’s) baptism is not true; ‘that is, if she have no baptism,’ &c., then he deduces what I recited of ‘her having no bishops,’ &c.; and, p. 86, sets forth my persuasion to the antipædobaptists to join the church, as absurd; ‘telling us, ‘we ought to unite with persons we are persuaded ‘are not baptized.’ Which outrage of defiance is what none, or but few, of the antipædobaptists beside himself are guilty of.

If a *toleration* be a good thing, we see what mischievous effects are produced by the abuse of it in the minds, and by the mouths and pens, of proud and arrogant men. The church and nation of England has so long tolerated these congregations with their leaders, (under the notion of weak, misled, schismatical, improperly ordained, but yet still well-meaning, quiet, and modest men; such as would be glad and content with their own liberty, and would not affront the established church and government,) so long, I say, till at last she herself has no bishops, presbyters, &c., is no church, and her people no Christians. If such antipædobaptists, or other dissenters, as are really modest men, ever have the toleration taken from them by that power which lately allowed it them<sup>9</sup>, they will have reason to

<sup>9</sup> [See vol. iii. p. 89, 210.]

thank these few men of fury and impudence, who do render it intolerable, by their flying in the face of the established church and religion. Holland is the noted place for toleration; and yet this would not have been borne with there.

3. A third plea that he uses is, that a church may be right in all fundamentals, and yet it does not follow that it is a duty to join or communicate with her. For some of the dissenters in England, and (as I, he says, have granted) the antipaedobaptists particularly, are right in fundamentals; and yet the members of the established church do not think themselves bound to join them.

This man answers a chapter, and has not read it. I did in that chapter, sect. 5, give four instances, wherein the Scripture forbids us to join any Christians that are in any of those cases. The second is, false doctrine in fundamentals. And the fourth is this: ‘If a church be schismatical, i. e. in a state of unjustifiable division or separation from another church, from which she has withdrawn herself.’ For which I cite there, Rom. xvi. 17, where the Apostle commands us to avoid such. This answers all the trifling which here, p. 68, &c., takes up several pages, pretending to shew that my argument, of agreement in fundamentals, would as soon make it necessary for the established churches to join those that have separated from them, as for the separators to return to the established churches.

Page 71. He at last allows some little difference between the plea of the church of England and that of the dissenters; in that the former ‘is established by the civil authority of the land.’ This sort of men never make any thing of ecclesiastic authority;

but do, as St. Peter says, 2nd Ep. ii. 10, and St. Jude, ver. 10, *despise* that *government* or *dominion*; (in which presumption they have been lately hardened by doctrines preached where they ought not;) therefore he mentions only the civil: and to that he attributes very little. He says, in the next page, [p. 74.] ‘ If there is no other reason—the crime can be very ‘ little, if at all, less in the latter than in the former,’ i. e. in the church than in the dissenters. This is what many of them think; but this man speaks it out, directly against the Scripture, which lays a great stress on our obedience to governors.

And he forgets all the other differences: as that the said church had been established long before their ways were thought on. She did not come out from them, but they from her. For the antipædobaptists, I had shewed in that chapter, and in chap. 8, that their eldest separate churches in England were not yet of the age of a man, viz. seventy years. Besides that, in case there was as yet no established church, but it were now to be established by majority of voices, (which in such a case of agreement in fundamentals, and difference in lesser opinions, would be necessary for avoiding schism,) even so, he may be sure it would not be antipædobaptists; nor is there, nor ever was, a national church of that opinion in the world<sup>r</sup>.

These and other things, which shew on which side the guilt of schism lies, he omits; and speaks only of the civil power. And that, as it may seem, only that he might cast a slur upon it, and shew how little he regarded it.

Page 72. Whereas he urges here, that I ‘ must

<sup>r</sup> [See this argued at vol. ii. chap. 8. p. 278, &c.]

‘ take this along with me as the consequence; that  
 ‘ if any of the dissenting parties should become the  
 ‘ national church by the civil power; they would  
 ‘ have a right to the same privileges; and that the  
 ‘ same may be as justly claimed by the presbyterian  
 ‘ churches in Scotland, and those of the United Pro-  
 ‘ vinees,—Prussia, Sweden, and Denmark;’ he  
 knows, that I, for my part, have taken that conse-  
 quence along with me, and yielded to it thus far;  
 that in all such countries, an inhabitant is to hold  
 communion in all things that he can, provided there  
 be no idolatry, false doctrine in the fundamentals.  
 &c., nor no wicked thing required of him to profess  
 or practise. As for what he urges of English  
 churches built abroad, meaning, I suppose, Rotter-  
 dam; it may be, it is for the use of such as under-  
 stand not Dutch, or forty other reasons unknown to  
 me. He would have me answer for some great men  
 in England, that refused communion at Charenton.  
 I know not their case nor their reasons, and so can-  
 not either censure or justify their actions. Save that,  
 I think I have heard or read, that the noble lord  
 Clarendon<sup>s</sup> (whom he mentions for one) did it, be-  
 cause there they held correspondence with, and ad-  
 hered to, and justified the rebels in England. Which,  
 if so, was doubtless a good reason. For as I (in the  
 chapter which Mr. Gale is here answering) did allow  
 at sect. 5,<sup>t</sup> that ‘ if a church teach doctrines encou-  
 ‘ raging any wickedness, as fornication,’ &c., it is a  
 just cause to shun her communion; under that &c.,  
 any one would mean *rebellion* for one. Which  
 God preserve any church hereabouts from teaching.  
 Some, that call themselves of our church, have made

<sup>s</sup> [See vol. iii. p. 72.]

<sup>t</sup> [See vol. ii. p. 546.]

a scandalous beginning. And, which is worse, have gone about to justify it from those very places of God's word, which assign damnation to it.

Page 74. He takes refuge under the plea of *occasional* instead of *constant* communion; which plea was much in vogue among the shifting place-hunters at the time of his writing; but now every body is ashamed of it. And the antipædobaptists generally (as well as the honest men among other dissenters) did scorn it then. So that his pleading for it was not for their use; but shews the strength of his stomach to digest any doctrine that is for convenience. That is his word, 'communicate together 'as should seem convenient;' *lege*, for holding a place.

Then for five pages he answers by recriminating. That if the dissenters are to blame in separating for things not fundamental, yet the church is likewise to blame for imposing them; since they prove an occasion for the others' separating. How far some churches may be to blame on this account, I know not. The church of England imposes the least in order to lay-communion, of any church, I think, in the world. Nothing but the professions of baptism, and the Catechism, as I in that chapter shewed. And for ceremonies in prayer, &c., there have often been broad intimations given to the dissenters, that if they could agree on what would satisfy them, the church would receive any reasonable proposals. But what can satisfy so disagreeing parties? At the end of this answer, p. 79, he has forgot the case we are speaking of. He says, 'If the church by arbitrary 'impositions break in on fundamental laws,' &c.; which is contrary to the hypothesis; for we are

speaking only of men, or societies, agreeing in fundamentals.

Page 81, &c. He recites how I argue upon a supposition, that the antipædobaptists are in the right in their opinion; and yet ought not to separate. Which argument he represents absurd, and makes it so, by altering the supposition or case that I put. I put no other case but this; suppose they are in the right in thinking their way of baptizing by dipping at adult age, to be the better or more fitting way. I did (as plainly as a man can speak) distinguish between two sorts of them. As sect. 7.<sup>u</sup> ‘Some men of that way do think, that all such as have no other baptism but what was given in infancy and by affusion, are no Christians;—I hope there are not many such. And Mr. Stennet reckons it a slander on the antipædobaptists,’ &c. And such I there advise to read what I had written before, sect. 6, to prove that the point in debate between the pædobaptists and antipædobaptists is not a fundamental article. And there I had owned, that if it be, they must indeed separate in their communion; and the guilt will lie on those that are in the error. But had shewn that the far greater part of them are of the other sort, or of the other opinion, viz. that it is not a fundamental difference; but though they think their way of baptizing the more regular and fitting, do yet allow that men baptized in infancy are Christians. And I pleaded, that these, supposing that they were in the right in that opinion, that their way of baptizing were the fittest, and though they continued in that opinion, and did not baptize their children in infancy, yet ought to

<sup>u</sup> [Vol. ii. p. 569.]

hold communion with other Christians in other things.

Now Mr. Gale here owns plainly, of which of the said two sorts he himself is, (of the worst for certain, if one be worse than another,) viz. that his opinion (or ‘notion,’ as he calls it) is, that none are Christians (he calls it, ‘true members of the Christian church’) but themselves; (the very thing which Mr. Stennet disclaims with abhorrence;) and speaks as if I had put the case that those of ‘his notion’ were in the right, and yet ought to come to the communion of the church. If he had not minded what I said, he takes me for an idiot. And if he had, he does wilfully pervert my words, [p. 81.] ‘Our author,’ says he, ‘supposes us in the right in all this. He argues on a supposition that we are in the right.’ Whom does he mean by *us* and *we*? I meant only the charitable sort, (who take us to be Christians, and we them,) that they should communicate in prayers and the other sacrament, even putting the case they were in the right in refusing to bring their own children to baptism in infancy. As for the other uncharitable sort, I question whether they are fit to communicate any where. For whatever becomes of the question, whether he that is not dipped be no Christian; it is out of question, that he that in his debates about dipping or pouring has lost charity, is none. But as I said before, I hope there are not many of them such. This poor blunder or fallacy he brings, I think, ten times in his book, and builds his demonstrations upon it, and desires his friend ‘always to remember it.’ [p. 84, 86.] ‘All that I say is to proceed on that supposition; none are baptized but believers dipped, (which you

‘remember, sir, Mr. Wall always supposes).’ I never supposed any such thing. Nor could any understand me so, but some gross or malicious perverter of words.

Some other sophistical turns he gives to the phrases as he goes along in this argument; which every one that is exercised in arguing sees as soon as he reads them. For the sake of the unskilful they may be briefly noted.

Page 82. ‘Not of the essence, but wholly indifferent’] It does not follow that a circumstance, which is not of the essence, is therefore wholly indifferent. Dipping may be more fitting than pouring, and yet not absolutely necessary, or of the essence.

Page 84. ‘Alterations change the thing’] Alterations in circumstances do not change the essence.

Ibid. ‘A subject and a mode is necessary; therefore ‘the true subject, a *believer*, and the true mode, ‘*dipping*, is necessary to *true* baptism’] There is a distinction known to every body that studies logic, between *true* metaphysically, and essentially, and *true* morally. An honest man is the only *true* man morally; but every man is a *true* man metaphysically, i. e. he is truly a man. So for churches; one may be much better ordered, or *truer*; another faulty, and yet, if not corrupted in fundamentals, is a true church, or truly a church. So for the modes of baptism, or of receiving the other sacrament; one may be fitter, and yet the other does not cease to be *true*; and the baptism or Lord’s Supper so given or taken, to be true baptism or communion. This other poor fallacy also runs through all his book. As at p. 68, ‘true church,’ &c.



Page 85. He brings the definition of a church from our nineteenth article; ‘Wherein the sacraments are duly administered.’ And though he recite, yet does not sufficiently mind the last words; ‘In all things that *of necessity* are requisite to the same.’ Else, any difference of mode in administering either of the sacraments, in any two churches, would make one of them to be no true church. And so in the next words, ‘baptism duly performed.’ That which is performed in a way, which is not the most decent or fitting of all, may yet be duly performed ‘in all things that of necessity are requisite.’

Ibid. He quotes Tertullian, *de Baptismo*, cap. 15. ‘Baptismum, cum rite non habeant, sine dubio non habent.’ ‘They who are not duly baptized, are certainly not baptized.’ No man of tolerable sincerity, or reputation for it, would have brought that saying of Tertullian to the purpose that he here does. Tertullian is there speaking of the baptism of such heretics, as do not baptize in the name of the Trinity, nor believe it. His words are, ‘Non idem Deus est nobis et illis; nec unus Christus, id est, idem; ideoque nec baptismus unus, quia non idem; quem cum rite non habeant, sine dubio non habent.’ ‘They and we have neither the same God, nor the same Christ, and so not the same baptism; which since they have not aright, they have it not at all.’ To quote a scrap of this, and apply it to those that do, both of them, use the Christian baptism, differing only in mode or time, is the property of one who aims, not to inform his readers, but to blind them.

Page 87. ‘Baptism in general, without some

‘ particular modes or other, cannot be conceived or administered. ] True. But some modes or circumstances are absolutely determined and expressly enjoined by our Saviour; as that it should be with *water*, and in the form appointed. And yet some other circumstances, as of the age, and of the washing either of the whole body, or part, may be not absolutely limited.

Page 88. ‘ If only that form is true, which our Saviour prescribes; then only those subjects and that mode are lawful which he specifies. ] If our Saviour had so specified the subject and mode of baptism, as to have said expressly, ‘ baptize only the adult, and only by dipping,’ in like manner as he specifies the *form* in which we are to baptize: the one had been as necessary as the other.

*Ibid.* ‘ In short, we refuse to communicate with the church of England, for the same reason that she refuses to communicate with persons she can not esteem baptized. ] This is indeed short, full, and open. But then it is a desperate uncharitable tenet: like to that of the Donatists and papists; none saved, no Christians but themselves. What a poor price of our Saviour’s blood does this man set forth! None baptized in his name for many hundred years, but a few of the Albigenses at the year 1100, and a few straggling people in Holland and England since 1522. Even those in Holland are most, or many of them cut off. For they do commonly use affusion. He in this point forsakes most of those of his own communion. For they own it not to be a fundamental, as I shewed<sup>x</sup>. The go-

<sup>x</sup> [See vol. ii. chap. ii. sect. 5. p. 547—552.]

vernors when they tolerated these men, little thought they should come to be censured, as unbaptized.

Page 89, 90. ‘The church has no power over those that withdraw from her communion.’] She has power to declare them excommunicated, and so leave them under the consequences of that sentence, when they do in effect excommunicate themselves by withdrawing from her communion. Or else all those canons for excommunicating schismatics that would not return to the unity of the church, (whereof there are many in general councils,) were made to no purpose. Here he would make me a criminal, (for he is now returned to his vein of personal reproaches,) because I insinuated, he says, [p. 90,] that ‘the act of toleration does not (he makes it *cannot*) tie up the church’s hands from any proceedings of that nature,’ viz. of presenting to the spiritual court, and excommunicating those that are obstinate; but does only set aside temporal punishments. The common lawyers are the best judges of the sense of the act. As for my opinion, it is the same as it was. And as I there cited Bishop Stillingfleet, that ‘it is a fundamental right of any church to exclude out of itself, such as by the laws of a Christian society are fit to be shut out:’ so I do here cite a greater author, who, Rom. xvi. 17, commands that *those that cause divisions be marked and avoided*: which the church may now command to be done. He does not indeed say any thing of their loss of money, or goods, &c., neither did I.

Page 90. He repeats again what he had said, p. 9, that thirty or forty years ago, I or the churchwardens did present one Katherine Hall and one Joseph Brown, antipædobaptists, who continuing

obstinate, were excommunicated. Does he think that in forty years' time there has not been occasion to present several? some for schism, some for fornication, &c.; some of whom were excommunicated, some did penance, &c. Why has he not picked up all their names, and published their excommunications to the world? He says, I afterward asked pardon of the latter of these two. I remember something of it: one part of the presentment was, that he refused to repair a chancel that belonged to the house he lived in; and I questioned afterward, whether the repairs should lie on him or his landlord, and in that doubt asked his pardon. Are not these memorable things to be printed in a book of controversy on a question of religion? and for which he should write in the contents of his book, 'Mr. Wall a friend to persecutions for religion,' and should run on to the end of the chapter with an impertinent harangue about the British government, French dragoons, Judas and Pilate; and how 'close it touches him [poor man!] to see one whose 'function is to serve at the altar, &c., of a complexion so repugnant to meekness,' &c.? Whereas I meddled not with any of the temporal punishments which any of them suffered, (as the law then was,) by fines, forfeitures, &c., and presented dissenters no otherwise than those of our own persuasion, who scandalously absented themselves from prayers and sacraments; that they might be required either to join duly in them, or else be authoritatively cut off from them. and avoided: which is a thing that all who read the Scripture do know ought to be done in any well-ordered church; and which the anti-paedobaptists themselves, not regarding the act of

toleration, do towards such as are (as they call it) disorderly.

But all this personal blackening, which has run through these two chapters, seems plainly to be only for fear lest those of that persuasion should read what I have written for their use, without prejudice. Which if they will do, I am not unwilling they should read his book after it; and see in which of the two are the signs of that sly malice and hypocrisy which he would affix on me.

---

### C H A P. III.

AS the first two chapters have had very little in them about the cause, but a great deal about me, which concerns not the reader; they being as he calls them my 'character' (a pretty subject for a book of controversy, and he a fitting person to write men's characters); so this third concerns neither me nor the cause or matter of my book. What I had written was on the question whether *infants* are to be baptized, or have been in Christ's church usually baptized. He brings in here three large chapters (or 'letters' as he calls them) about another matter, viz. about the *way* of baptizing, whether by dipping or pouring; with which I have meddled as little as possible. I had indeed toward the latter end of my work (where I mention the several tenets of the English antipædobaptists<sup>y</sup>) put in *obiter* a few words (not two pages in all) of the answers which they that use perfusion do give to the arguments

<sup>y</sup> [See vol. ii. chap. 9. p. 396, &c.]

which the others do bring for an absolute necessity of immersion; granting at the same time, that that, 'where it may be safely used, is the most fitting manner;' and pleading at another place, as well as I could, for the retrieving of the use of it according to the rubric of the church.

Here he, though he calls his book 'Reflections on mine,' postponing what he had to say about infant-baptism, which was the subject of mine, to nigh the middle of his book, falls into a long discourse about *dipping* in baptism. I make no doubt but that he, or somebody else, had before collected these observations and criticisms in some *adversaria* or commonplace-book. But what makes him call them 'Reflections' on my History? Or what makes him crowd in my name here and there into them? Was that dealing honestly with those of his party, to whom he had, I suppose, promised to write against my book?

Yet all, that do content themselves with pouring or sprinkling in baptism, have reason to thank him for his long digression about dipping and pouring. Because he has in it said (and according to his way of proving, proved) such things, as being laid together, do fully yield up to them the cause for which he contends; as I shall shew presently. He begins,

Page 95, with a sort of syllogism, in which he triumphs, indeed a very transparent paralogism.

The substance of it, this:

'Adult baptism, and that by dipping, is delivered in Scripture *plainly* and *clearly*. Infant-baptism, and by allusion, but *obscurely*, if at all. Therefore *we* do what the Scriptures *expressly*

‘ teach ; while *they* do, at best, but what is very  
 ‘ *obscurely* taught. So *our* case is secure, and far the  
 ‘ most eligible.’

This argument runs upon a supposition that is not true in fact, viz. as if the pædobaptists did discard or disallow of the baptizing of adult persons, or of dipping in baptism ; and did set up affusion in opposition to dipping ; and did count an adult person superannuated for baptism. And at this rate Mr. Gale talks in many places, as at p. 255, ‘ boldly substituting it [infant-baptism] in the place ‘ of what our Lord did ordain,’ [viz. adult baptism.] But the pædobaptists do own and practise the baptizing of adult persons, whenever they meet with any that have not been already baptized ; and the dipping of them if they be able to bear it ; and do see the examples of this *clearly* and *frequently* delivered in Scripture.

They practise therefore that which he calls ‘ clear ‘ from Scripture.’ But they practise the other too, as being sufficiently shewn from Scripture to be God’s will ; though in words not so clear and express. So that his argument runs just as this would do ;

Giving the Lord’s supper to *men* is commanded in Scripture *plainly* and *expressly* : giving it to *women* but *obscurely*. Therefore they that should give it only to *men*, and refuse it to *women*, would act most securely.

Whereas the consequence is, they that give it to men are certainly in the right, so far as they go ; but yet they would do ill in refusing it to women.

And so, they that give baptism to adult persons

not already baptized, and dip them, if they are able to bear it, do well (provided they that give it be persons lawfully called and ordained to the office of baptizing; which I do not see how any among the present antipædobaptists are): but they do ill in refusing it to infants also, and that by affusion, if they are not able to bear dipping.

A servant employed in his master's business must do his master's will in all things which he understands to be really meant and intended by him; though some of the things be more plainly expressed than others of them, which he knows by the nature of the thing, and by good consequence from his master's words, to be his true meaning. Any one sees this author's argument to be of no force, unless we, who give baptism to infants, did refuse it to adult persons. And indeed arguing is not his talent. He tries at critical learning.

He pretends to wonder at me for offering to give to the word *baptizing* the signification of *washing*; and for saying that it does not necessarily include *dipping* in its signification, but is in Scripture taken for washing in general; such as may be done either by dipping, or pouring, or rubbing water on the thing washed. And he so speaks as if I were singular in, or the first broacher of, this notion of the word; which would be a just reason to like it the less. But all pædobaptists that I know of, say the same. It were frivolous to quote many. Chemnitius, *Exam. Concilii Trid.* part. ii. can. 3, brings in some papists, in their plea for the *Romish* alterations, arguing that the church has power to alter even the sacraments in the substantial parts; that Christ commanded absolutely to *dip*; and that the



word *baptize* does absolutely signify so. He answers, ‘If the word βαπτίζειν did signify (*simpli-citer*, absolutely, or necessarily) to *dip*, no man might or could have changed the custom. But Paul, an interpreter most certainly to be depended on, tells us, that to *baptize*, is to cleanse by the *washing of water*, Eph. v. Tit. iii. Acts ii. which is done by any sort of washing.’

Page 98. Mr. Gale undertakes to make it appear plainly, that the word does necessarily include dipping in its signification, and never denotes any thing less. To this purpose he makes a tedious recital of sixty or seventy places; most of them out of the Greek poets that never heard of any sacrament. And at last, to one’s great amazement, there is not one quarter of the places that have the word βαπτίζω, or any derivative of it, in them. Instead of that, they have the word βάπτω, a word never used in Scripture with any relation to baptism, and so nothing to this purpose. Of the rest, which have the word βαπτίζω, it is in some of them used for such washing as is by dipping, or putting the thing spoken of, all over into the water; and in some of them, not. Which comes up to all that I had said, that the word *to baptize* has, beside the signification *immergo*, that of *lavo* in general.

For his disappointing the reader by bringing citations of βάπτω instead of βαπτίζω, he makes an apology one hundred pages afterwards, [p. 230.] that they are synonymous; and having no proof of it, (as it is impossible he should,) he says that ‘I do seem to allow them to be so, because I argue promiscuously from both of them.’

I had in my first edition just mentioned, in six

or seven lines, two places out of the Old Testament, Dan. iv. 33, and Levit. xiv. 6, in which the Seventy have used βάπτω in the sense (as I then took it) not of dipping, but only of *wetting*. Not taking however βάπτω and βαπτίζω to be synonymous, but meaning thus; that if βάπτω itself did sometimes signify only *wetting*, or a *partial washing*, much more might βαπτίζω (which is but a diminutive of it) be so used. But I was quickly informed of my mistake in the sense of the latter of those texts; and in my second edition left them both out; and in a paper which I published for the use of those that had bought the first edition, owned my reason for so doing. And all this several years before Mr. Gale published his; and there can be little doubt but he had seen it. Men that are any thing versed in the ingenuous way of writing controversies, will judge how poor a thing it is in him to spend several pages (as he does in the next chapter, p. 144) in an operose proof of a thing which I had, so long before he or any adversary appeared, owned in a few lines. That these two words are synonymous, he must have some better proof; for I never took them to be so, nor ever heard of any one that did. His friend, whom he there persuades 'to take no exception at his using them so,' had need to be a very good-natured man.

It is needless to spend time in making such exceptions as might be made to the particular quotations that compose the rest of this chapter. I shall only make these three observations about them in general.

1. First, that he being stiff in maintaining that βαπτίζω does always necessarily contain in its

signification *dipping*; and being oftentimes troubled how to adapt the notion of *dipping* to some even of these passages here produced by himself, is forced to enlarge the sense of that word to as great a latitude as the pædobaptists ordinarily do give to the word *washing*; and does lay down rules by which the pouring of a small quantity of water on the face (or indeed any other part) of the baptized person is justified, as true baptism, and proved by his principles to be *dipping* the person. And so he has (as I said) yielded up the cause (for which he contends in this and the following chapters) to those who administer baptism by pouring. For here in this chapter, at

Page 122, Having cited a relation of Aristotle concerning a certain sea coast, which at low water is not *baptized*, (that is Aristotle's word,) but when the tide comes in, is under water; and having observed, as an objection against himself, that βαπτίζεσθαι is here used to signify the land's being under water, by the water's coming in upon it, and not by its being put into the water, he solves it thus;—  
 ‘ Besides, the word βαπτίζω perhaps does not so necessarily express the action of putting under water, as in general, a thing's being in that condition, no matter how it comes so, whether it is put into the water, or the water comes over it.’ And he speaks much to the same purpose in the next chapter, p. 150, about the dew in which Nebuchadnezzar was (as he would have it called) *dipped*. And though in the case of Aristotle's use of the word, he puts in here the word *perhaps*, the thing is *certainly true*, if βαπτίζω does always signify *to dip*: for there

is nothing surer, than that the shoal-coast was not put every tide into the water, but the water came over it.

Now add to this what he says, p. 145. where to an argument of mine he answers thus; ‘The most he can infer from it, is only that it does not always necessarily mean *to dip all over.*’——And a little after, ‘We readily grant that there may be such circumstances in some cases, which necessarily and manifestly shew, the thing spoken of is not said to be dipped all over, but it does not therefore follow, that the word in that place does not signify *to dip.* And I believe Mr. Wall will allow his pen is *dipped* in the ink, though it is not daubed all over, or *totally immersed.* So that after all he says, it still remains that the word does signify *to dip.*’ And after some further talk in the next page, p. 147, ‘the utmost, I say, that could be inferred from this passage, is only that the word does not always necessarily imply a *total immersion, or dipping* the whole thing spoken of *all over,* which I readily allow.’ (Mark that.) And a little after, ‘Thus, to use the familiar instance I mentioned before, we say, “Dip the pen,” meaning only the nib of it, which we really dip into ink. Though the whole pen is not *dipped all over,* yet the part particularly referred to is. And the pen may be truly said to be *dipped,* according to that known rule; “What is true of any one part, may be said of the whole complexly, though not of every part of the whole separately.” (There is a learned maxim of the private academies.)

He maintains the same thing, p. 153, concerning

the hyssop that was to be dipped. ‘The word here ‘ is βάψει, and plainly signifies *to dip*, though it was ‘ not *dipped all over*,’ &c.

Now to apply this to the question between the antipædobaptists on the one side, and the church of England, or other protestant church, on the other side, about the manner of baptizing.

*Antipæd.* We must not hold communion with you, because you are not truly baptized, in that you do not dip the person whom you pretend to give baptism to. Whereas *baptism* is *dipping*, and *to baptize* signifies *to dip*.

*Churchman.* We dip all such as do own themselves, or are by their parents owned, to have strength to bear it. On others we pour water, in the name of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit; and that is *baptizing*, or (if you will have the word,) *dipping*. For your own Mr. Gale teaches that a thing or person is *baptized*, or *dipped*, if it be ‘ under water; no matter how it comes so, whether it be put into the water, or the water comes ‘ over it,’ p. 122, 150.

*Antipæd.* This might be granted, if you did pour on water enough to cover the person’s body. But a man or a child cannot be said to be *baptized*, covered or *dipped*, with a handful of water poured on the face.

*Churchman.* Yes he may. For the same Mr. Gale does *readily allow*, and *readily grant* to us, and does teach you, that the word *baptize*, or *dip*, ‘ does ‘ not always necessarily imply *a total immersion*, ‘ or *dipping* the whole thing spoken of, *all over*.’ And he exemplifies this by a pen dipped in the ink. If only the nib of it be put in the ink, ‘ the pen,’

he says, 'may be truly said to be *dipped*.' And gives a general rule for it, 'What is true of any 'part.' &c., p. 145, 146, 147.

*Antipæd.* Well, but still Mr. Gale stands steady to that, that *to baptize* is *to dip*; and by a vast number of quotations, with his explanations of them, maintains his point for the word *dip*; and says, p. 178, 'If the word does but signify *to dip*, I ask 'no more. Let it relate to the whole body, or a 'part of it only; either way I gain my point.' The like he says, p. 183, 'It is all we ask.'

*Churchman.* True, but he could not apply the word *dip* to his own quotations, without yielding up the thing itself, which you and all men have been used to mean by *dipping*. He has kept the word, but has granted away the thing. If that which he allows be *dipping*, the controversy is at an end.

Indeed these principles of Mr. Gale will serve to justify, not only those that observe the rules of the church of England, and do *pour* water on such as cannot bear putting into it; but even the most disorderly baptizers of all, whom I confess I know not how to justify by any other. Those, I mean, who affecting to use as little water as possible, do purposely throw no more than a sprinkle or drop of water on the face of a child. The Scripture will never justify these, nor the ancient church, nor the rubric of the church of England, (for that requires *pouring* in the weakest child's case,) nothing but either the Directory, or Mr. Gale's criticisms. For even by a sprinkle or drop some part is under water, and then the whole man is under water by his 'known rule,' 'what is true of any one part,' &c.

And if the tip of a finger, or a nib of a pen be dipped, the man or the pen is dipped.

Whereas a truer notion is, that βαπτίζω may be used wherever the English word *wash* may be used ; but a person can hardly be said to be *washed* by a sprinkle or drop, or by dipping a tip of a finger ; or a pen by its nib dipped.

2. Secondly, I cannot but observe the preposterous way, which the antipædobaptists take in filling several pages with quotations out of secular authors, where the word βαπτίζω is taken for such washing as is by dipping the thing washed into water (which is the only aim of this long chapter, and part of the following). There are none of the pædobaptists but what do grant and own at the first word, that it is often used in that sense. And I think most of us do own that it is oftener found used so, than in any other sense of washing ; that way of washing being used in the case of most things that happen to be spoke of. Now when a debate stands so, that both sides do agree, that in secular books a word is often used for *washing by dipping* ; and there is no question made of that : but the only question between them is this, that one side affirms (but the other denies) that it is sometimes used for *other ways* of washing, as *pouring* or *rubbing water*, &c., (to lump the matter by guess ; say, three thousand times it be found used for this way, and one thousand times for the other ways ;) what an idle thing it is, for these deniers to bring instances of that which is confessed by both sides, instead of overthrowing or confuting the instances brought by the others for those other ways.

Thus they do in the case of the word μαθητεύω, to

*disciple, or make, or enter disciples.* No mortal denies, but that word comes in use *oftener* in the case of such disciples as are actually taught, or do begin to learn, at the very time of their entering, or first being called, or made disciples. The only question is, whether that word may not properly be used, or be not sometimes used, for such entering, or calling persons into discipleship as is in order to their being taught hereafter. And yet Mr. Gale in the following chapters spends fifty pages in giving instances where it includes *present* teaching; which any one would have granted him. And so here he has brought about fourteen instances of the word βαπτίζω, (beside near half a hundred of another word nothing to the purpose,) in most of which (but not all) it is used for such washing as must have been performed by *dipping*. None ever denied that it is often so used; nor would I deny to any disputant that it is *for the most part* so used. His task had been to shew that it is never used for washing in those other senses. Not that I would put it upon him to prove a negative absolutely. But he should have confuted or answered those instances to which I there referred the reader, viz. in Mr. Walker's 'Doctrine of Baptism.' He, at p. 136, recites my words, where I say, 'Mr. Walker has largely shewn ' from the Greek authors, and lexicographers, and ' critics. that besides the signification *immergo*, they ' give it that of *lavo* in general.' And subjoins in his own next words; 'Whereas you see, sir, I have ' fully baffled all that is alleged from any passages in ' the Grecian writers.' If he mean this baffling only of the places here alleged by himself, it is a mock fight. But if he mean it of those in Mr. Walker's



book, I declare in good earnest, I think this the most shameless saying that ever I read in the book of any man of tolerable repute. I verily believe that he never read (or perhaps never saw) the book: and that any one that reads it will guess the same. And if he have, it is so much the worse.

One thing indeed this chapter is good for. It has helped him to more authors to fill up his 'Table of Authors,' than perhaps any three other. So many Greek and Latin poets, with their editions, 'London, 1700,' as if they were not common in every schoolboy's hand. And so for *Milton*, *Dryden*, (but *Hudibras* is by some chance missing,) as if they also could teach us any thing about baptism or religion.

3. Thirdly, there is one thing in this chapter which I cannot observe without some disdain. The whole rhapsody of quotations in it is nothing to me, nor to my book. It must probably have been some collection made before. And to make it look as somewhat relating to me, he has in many places of it crowded in my name. But he has in most of them engaged me in such boyish disputes, that I am ashamed to have my name seen in them. To give an instance. At p. 117, he recites out of Aristophanes in his play called, 'The Parliament of Women,' a talk about *washing* of wool, *βάπτουσι*: where first he makes the argument run on my side, and says, 'No doubt if Mr. Wall knows of this place, he thinks it mightily for his purpose; and especially if he has but found,' &c., and so goes on for half a page. 'This will please Mr. Wall.' 'He will insist upon this.' But when he has at last learned out of Homer, Suidas, Phavorinus, and two

or three more, (what any old woman could have told him,) that wool is commonly put into the water to be washed; then he triumphs over me again, and says, ‘This can be of no service to Mr. Wall, unless to convince him,’ &c. Whereas the whole criticism, and indeed the whole chapter, do convince me of nothing but of this, that the author of it has mispent a great deal of time; the whole being of no other use than to shew, that the word does sometimes signify such washing as is by *dipping*; which nobody ever doubted of.

4. Fourthly, I will make one observation, a better natured one; tending to the commendation of him and of the antipaedobaptists: of them, for their generosity, and being easily pleased; and of him, for his abundant justice. It is to be noted, that this chapter was published a good while before the rest, as a specimen of what the book should be. They seemed very well pleased, and much taken with it, and encouraged him to go forward. Which was an instance of very good nature; since it is so little to the purpose, that if one were to expose him among judicious men, one would desire them to read this chapter. But he is to be commended for doing them more than justice, and making the goods delivered to be delivered better than the sample. For the following chapters are really something more to the purpose, and of a better strain. Always except the sixth and the ninth. In one of which he brings against some passages in my book an accusation so palpably false, that every reader must cry shame on him. In the other he brings (not trifling arguments out of poets and plays, but) the most loathsome and execrable blasphemies out of

some Jewish libels, without any relation to the question, without any occasion given, without any advantage to his argument, without any cause that can compensate for the mischief of publishing such scandals, except a pride which he may have in giving his admirers to understand that he is master of that sort of reading.

---

#### CHAP. IV.

WHAT I have already said of the signification of the word βαπτίζω, makes it needless to say any thing to what he produces here from two lexicons, and from Vossius, Casaubon, Grotius, Petavius, and Stennet. He would prove from them that its *proper and genuine* sense is *immergo*. At p. 149 he styles it, the *primary and general* sense. If he mean by these epithets only that it is the most *usual and ordinary* sense in which it is taken, I grant it; and his authors prove no more. Constantine, he says, ‘almost always renders it so.’ It is but *almost*. Stephens never fails, &c., ‘till in another period,’ &c. The rest, who are pædobaptists, confess no more than that it is the most usual sense; and Mr. Stennet has done what he himself has here done, given several instances where it is taken so, without pretending to overthrow the instances produced by Mr. Walker and others, where it is used for *washing* only some part of the body or thing spoken of.

In short, it is to no purpose for them to say any more of this matter, till they have answered to those instances in Mr. Walker’s ‘Doctrine of Baptism.’ If they expect that we should write them over again in answer to every new book of theirs, it is an

unreasonable demand : since there they stand ready for any one's examination ; and I referred them to them. And it is alike unreasonable to expect, that without their overthrowing the evidence of those there brought, we should spend time in looking out others ; and read books to so poor a purpose as is the search of a word.

However, because Mr. Gale is so positive, and ventures his reputation on it, saying here, p. 144, (and to the same purpose, at several other places, over and over,) ‘ that the word is never used to signify *pouring*, but always *dipping* ;’ I will endeavour to prick this bladder of confidence, and name him a place that shall affect the reputation, not only of his skill, but of his veracity ; and omitting those in Mr. Walker, (which would be too voluminous,) and any other which I cannot be sure he has seen, mention one which he must have seen (for he quotes a part of the sentence in which it is, in his tenth letter or chapter, p. 398). I do in my answer to that chapter and page recite it at large, (as perhaps he would have done, if it had not been for the shame to have it compared with what he says here, for the word is used by Origen for the action of *baptizing* the sacrifice and wood, which incontestably was only *pouring* water on them :) the reader may stay till he comes to the place, or turn to it beforehand.

Page 143. He is angry that I passed over this matter in so few words, (whereas he has spent more pages on it than I did lines.) and thinks it a sign that I am under some apprehensions that I am not in the right. And I on the contrary think a man's using a great many words, especially when he says

nothing new in them, a sign of such apprehension. To any other man my reason of saying so little of the manner of baptizing should be, because it was none of my subject. To Mr. Gale, how does he know but that I had some intimation that he had lying by him a long collection about that dispute, which (if I meddled with it) he would publish as ‘Reflections’ on me, and make the antipædobaptists believe it was written in answer to me, and expect that I should reply to it. To avoid that trouble, I said as little as possible on that matter, so little as would have prevented the occasion with any other man; but he was resolved to publish his lucubrations, and absurdly put my name in the frontispiece of them. He comes at last,

Page 144, to the use of the word in Scripture (which I had said was chiefly to be regarded); he mentions twenty-five instances which he will give out of the Old Testament and Apocrypha, and at last there are but four (two of the Septuagint, and two in the Apocrypha) that have the word in them. All the rest are of *βάπτω*. Of these two of the Septuagint, one, Isa. xxi. 4, is a figurative expression, and so nothing to the purpose. He thinks (and truly enough) that ‘nobody will urge that place ‘against him.’ So there is but one, 2 Kings v. Naaman’s washing himself in Jordan; which washing is expressed there four times; once in the command, once in Naaman’s refusal, once in his servant’s entreaty, and once in his actual obeying. In the first three it is *λούω*, in the last *βαπτίζω*: a sign that those words are used synonymously and promiscuously. And Naaman’s body does not seem to have been leprous all over, (that we need suppose

him to have gone all over into the water,) but some one place of it. For what he had expected of the prophet was, that he should have *stricken his hand over the place, and recovered the leper*, ver. 11.

Of the two in the Apocrypha, one is Judith's being washed (or as the word in the Greek is, *baptized*) in or at a spring, to make herself more acceptable to Holofernes, chap. xiii. 7; which whether it were by *dipping* herself, (note, that it was in the camp; for so are the words, '*ad fontem illum aquæ in castris*;' and it appears, from chap. 7, that the springs were especially guarded with soldiers.) or only *washing* her hands, feet, &c., we cannot know.

The other is a place of which Mr. Gale tells a lamentable story how it affrighted him for a while. It relates to the washing that was to be used by one that was unclean by touching a dead body. Syracides, Ecclus. xxiv. 26. *ὁ βαπτίζόμενος ἀπὸ νεκροῦ*, &c. 'He that is washed from (or, after the touching of) a dead body, and toucheth it again, what availeth his washing?' Mr. Gale having observed from Numb. xix. 18. and other places, that such a person was to have the water of purification *sprinkled* on him on the third day and on the seventh day, had thought that the word *βαπτίζόμενος* related to that *sprinkling*; and says, 'he remembers the time when he thought this a very formidable instance.' He recovered some degree of hope when he observed that the unclean person was (as he thinks) required, beside the sprinkling, to have another washing. He goes a great way about to prove this, partly from Scripture, partly from the customs of the Maho-

metans and of the Babylonians; and expresses a profane doubt, (whether the Jews borrowed it from the Babylonians, or they from the Jews,) and makes an imperfect proof of it at the last. If there were any such other washing, there is no doubt but the word βαπτίζόμενος refers to both.

But why did the appearance that the word might signify *sprinkling with water* look so formidable to Mr. Gale? All the tendency that it had, was to have convinced him that he must acknowledge his Christian neighbours, who had received this sacrament by sprinkling or perfusion, to be baptized persons as well as himself; and so the separation between them must not have continued. All the separators, who are of a sincere and charitable principle, do own it to be a desirable thing, that all Christians were of one body and communion; and that if they could be satisfied in conscience that it were lawful for them to join with the church, they should count it a great happiness so to do. But any appearance of such satisfaction or conviction is to Mr. Gale, it seems, a 'very formidable' thing. Such expressions, starting from a man before he is aware, do give the truest indications of his inward aims and fears. I had mentioned, at the latter end of my book, a sort of people who 'keep their consciences (as beggars 'do their sores) raw and unhealed on purpose.' The readers of this expression of his will be apt to make the application.

These four are all the instances where the word βαπτίζω is used by the Septuagint, or the Greek writers or translators of the apocryphal books. They used other words instead of it. For washing of clothes, πλύνω; of the body, or hands, or any

part, λούω; (as almost always where it is ordered, *He shall wash his flesh, or wash or bathe all his flesh in water*, they render it, λούσεται ὕδατι, or λούσεται τὸ σῶμα, or πᾶν τὸ σῶμα ὕδατι;) where a foot, or hand, or finger, or tip of a finger, or top of a bunch of hyssop, is dipped in water, they use mostly βάπτω. On that one instance which I brought (in my first edition, but left it out in the second) of Nebuchadnezzar's body being *wet* with *dew*, (which they render ἐβάφη,) Mr. Gale makes a long discourse, and would have it to be, *was dipped* in dew; and runs to St. Helena, the Leeward Islands, Ægypt, &c., to fetch in stories of dew, all to no purpose; since the words are ἀπὸ τῆς δρόσου, from, or by the dew. No writer whatsoever would speak of a body *dipped from the dew*, or *by* or *with the dew*.

Of the four instances which I (passing by others) had in half a page produced out of the New Testament, to prove that *to baptize* is a word oftentimes there so used as not to include *dipping* in its signification, the first was Luke xi. 38, where St. Luke says, *The Pharisee marvelled that our Saviour was not first baptized, οὐ πρόωτον ἐβαπτίσθη, before dinner*. Now all that the Pharisee expected, was that he should have washed his hands before dinner. I shewed this to be all that they themselves did, or required of others, from Mark viii. 5, and Mr. Gale makes it no otherwise.

I called this a plain instance, that St. Luke uses the phrase of a man's being *baptized*, in a case where there is no *dipping* of him, but only washing his hands. And I do still think it so plain an one, that nothing of good sense can be objected against it. And I am the more confirmed by the impertinence



of all that Mr. Gale brings in answer to it; which answer of his is at

Page 160, &c. I entreat the reader to mind well.

He says thus; ‘If the Jews washed their hands, as we usually do now, by dipping them into the water, this instance turns against him, and makes considerably for us.’ And then he labours for ten pages to prove that they did so.

If St. Luke had said that the Pharisee’s wonder was, that our Saviour did not *baptize his hands* before dinner, this answer had been sense; (though I think not true;) but is the washing of a *man’s hands* by dipping them, the dipping of *the man*? When any one in washing his hands puts them into the water, is *that man* then *dipped*? Or had it been proper for St. Luke to say that the Pharisee marvelled that our Saviour had not first been *dipped* before dinner, when he meant only washing his hands? But he does actually say, he marvelled that he *was not baptized*. A plain instance that St. Luke took the word *baptized* for a more general word than *dipped*. The English translators express it *washed*; but St. Luke’s own words are as I have set them down.

I know Mr. Gale will stand to this, that when a man’s hands or feet are dipped, the man is dipped, (for he does stand to it at p. 145, 146, 153, as was before observed,) and I had rather he should. For then, as I there shewed, he gives up all the cause at once. If that which the Scripture requires to be done in baptism be, that *the person* be *dipped*; and if he who has any part of his body *dipped*, (or which Mr. Gale, p. 122. 150, owns to be all one, *covered with water*;) be dipped; then we do

all of us, *dip* in baptism, (nay we are ourselves hemerobaptists,) and there is no reason for the separation on that account.

If St. Luke by ἐβαπτίσθη meant the washing of hands by putting them in the water, the argument will be as I here urge it. But if he meant, and if the Jews before meals commonly used, washing them by *pouring water* on them, then there will be still less to be said against this instance. And that this latter was their custom, I brought a plain proof for the times before our Saviour out of the Old Testament; and for the times after him, from the Jewish rabbins, Maimonides, &c., and from Dr. Pococke arguing out of them.

To the proof of the Old Testament, 2 Kings iii. 11, where it is used as an ordinary periphrasis of Elisha's having been a servant or disciple of Elijah, that he *poured water on the hands of Elijah*, he answers,

That this was long before our Saviour's time; and great alterations might happen in the mean time: and here he talks of the revolutions of states and kingdoms, and how the Jews had been conquered by the Babylonians and Romans; and you must think that they imposed new laws upon them for the ways of washing their hands. He proves also from the Old Testament and the New, that they were an obstinate, bigoted, stiffnecked race. From whence the reader must conclude, that they would not wash their hands as they should do. If this man were to write a large book, he would never want matter.

He would alter the translation, and have it to be 'who poured out water *for* the hands,' but the

Septuagint render it ἐπὶ χεῖρας: and so does the Latin, *super*. And so, I doubt not, do all the translations in the world. So that the common sense of mankind, concerning the meaning of a phrase in Scripture, must be altered to serve the purpose of a separation.

He talks here of the brasen sea, and counts how many barrels of water it held; and of the laver in the court of the tabernacle; and how the priests were to wash their hands and feet thereat; but he would have it said *therein*, contrary to the text, and all translations, (which render it ἐξ αὐτοῦ and *ex eo*;) but whethersoever it was, what is that to the people's ordinary washing before meals?

Our Saviour, he observes, poured water into a bason, and washed the disciples' feet. Here he tells you what is Greek for a bason, and for the water; but cannot tell us whether our Saviour put their feet into the bason or not. Nor is it material that he should; for our question is of washing *hands*. And that feet also were generally washed by water poured on them, appears probable by our Saviour's way of expressing it, Luc. vii. 44, ὕδωρ ἐπὶ πόδας μου, which properly signifies *upon my feet*.

Our Saviour, he says, [p. 165,] poured water into a bason. 'We see the water was not poured on their feet, but into the bason.' But does not he know that *πιτῆρ* commonly signifies those little vessels in fashion of small cisterns, which had a cock to let out or pour water on the hands or feet? And he himself cites here Eustathius<sup>g</sup>, where he says that χέρνιβα

<sup>g</sup> [The passage referred to is on the *Odyssey*, book I. 136.

Χέρνιβα δ' ἀμφίπολος προχόφ' ἐπέχευε φέρουσα,

Where the comment of Eustathius is, χέρνιβα τὸ κατὰ χεῖρὸς διδό-

are vessels that pour out water on the hands: though Mr. Gale (by a mistake, which one would think such a man incapable of) translates his words quite contrary, and takes χέρνιβα to mean, not the cisterns, but the water.

In the text, Mark vii. 3, *the Pharisees, and all the Jews, except they wash their hands oft, eat not*, he would have the word πνευμῆ to be rendered not *oft*, but *up to the wrist*, (and that indeed is what many learned men of late have thought to be the meaning of the word,) or *up to the elbow*, (for which he quotes some few); this he concludes ‘must imply ‘dipping.’ It was but to say so positively, and in short; for proof or reason for such conclusion there is none; since every body knows he can with water poured or running from a cock wash his hands up to the wrist without dipping them.

I had said at that place that Dr. Pococke had largely proved out of Maimonides and other rabbins, that this washing of hands before meals, used by the Jews, was by water running or poured out of a μενον ὕδωρ. τὸ δ’ αὐτὸ τινες ὕδωρ καὶ χειρόνιπτρον φασιν. Thus Pollux likewise interprets both νίπτρον and ποδόνιπτρον by the water, and Eustathius himself attributes the like sense to ἀπόνιπτρον. He then quotes Athenæus as defining πρόχοος to be ἀγγεῖον ἐν ᾧ τὸ ὕδωρ χέρνιβα δὲ τὰ εἰς χειρὸς νίμμα καταχέομενα.

There appears to be some uncertainty and indistinctness of signification between two cognate words here: the vessel, which held τὰ χέρνιβα, being sometimes expressed by χέρνιψ, χερνίβιον, and sometimes by χέρνιβον. (See the Lexicographers.)

Bishop Maltby, in his edition of Morell’s Thesaurus, gives χέρνιψ as signifying the water, and χέρνιβον the vessel, referring for proof to Homer, Iliad. Ω. 302.

After all, the argument in the text is not affected by the dispute; for the word χέρνιβα does not occur in the passage of St. John referred to.]

vessel or little cistern, or *poured* by some servant for that purpose. It was ill-fortune that I mentioned this. For it has brought upon Maimonides, and the rabbins, and Dr. Pococke too, a great deal of anger from our author, who thinks himself no mean judge. Dr. Pococke, he says, was a learned gentleman, &c. ‘But really, sir, I should have honoured his parts and learning much more, if he had trusted less to those fanciful authors the rabbins,’ &c. It is pity the doctor could not foresee this; for surely he would have altered the course of his studies. ‘Maimonides,’ he says, ‘was one of the greatest and most judicious that ever appeared among the rabbins; but a true rabbi notwithstanding, and perfectly besotted,’ &c. As for the other rabbins, he will ‘say more of them in another place.’ Now allowing that these rabbins are fanciful and absurd reasoners, (which is indeed their character with men of another size of judgment than our author, and with all men,) and that one would not depend upon them for any matter of moment: yet can he think that they are not capable of telling what is their own custom in washing their hands? That explication of *πρωγμῆ* in St. Mark, (to signify *up to the perek*, or *wrist*,) was never thought of by learned men till they learned from the rabbins that custom of washing their hands in some cases. For the word has naturally no such import. Shall we in our explications of a word in Scripture borrow the notion from a custom of theirs, and yet not believe that they had such a custom? Or shall we believe them when they say they washed to the wrist, and yet think that they themselves cannot tell how they do it; by dipping the hand, or pouring water on it?

He makes a greater matter of the difference between βαπτίζεσθαι and χερνίπτειν, and cannot see that in this very place, Mark vii. 23, as also in the parallel place, Matt. xv. 2, and 20, (which speak of the washing before meals,) the word is χερνίπτειν. For it is χερσὶν ἀνίπτους, and νίπτονται τὰς χεῖρας, where they speak of the same washing before meals, which St. Luke describes by ἐβαπτίσθη. And Dr. Pococke both says himself, and quotes Beza saying the same, that βαπτίζεσθαι here in St. Luke means the same as λούεσθαι and χερνίπτειν, *to wash, or to wash the hands.* And that, ‘since that washing of the hands might be done, either by putting them in the water, or by pouring water on them; there is (here in the text of St. Luke) a word used, ἐβαπτίσθη, which comprehends both the one and the other of those ways.’

He says at last,

Page 167, That I have abused Dr. Pococke in my quotation of his words; yet he does not deny the words which I cited, to be as I cited them; nor that he does in a great part of that long chapter shew at large from the rabbins, that this *pouring* of water was the Jews’ ordinary way of washing their hands: but only, that he observes (as he does indeed) that a Jew might, if he pleased, instead of *pouring on* water, put his hands into the water; and that it is likely enough that some of them did: and that the word βαπτίζεσθαι does comprehend both of these ways. ‘For,’ says the doctor, ‘though βαπτίζεσθαι does indeed especially (*præcipue*) suit to that washing which is by immersion; yet that it does not necessarily mean that, nor is used only for that, I think is plain from that which we read in Luke xi.

38. ‘The Pharisee marvelled that οὐ πρῶτον ἐβαπτίσθη<sup>h</sup>.’

This quotation, which he brings to confront that which I brought, is one that I might have well added to mine. For it shews the doctor’s sense most plainly, both concerning the matter in general, (that *to baptize* does not necessarily signify *to dip*,) and also its acceptation in this particular text.

But of these last words of his, wherein he appeals to this text, Mr. Gale says, [p. 169,] ‘It is a downright begging of the question, to instance in the ‘very case disputed:’ (oh! the man’s logic:) as if Dr. Pocke had wrote that book in a dispute between himself and Mr. Gale, (who was not then born,) about the meaning of that word in that text. Whereas he brings it in as a plain text, to explain another, on which he had been discoursing.

Mr. Gale has the courage thus to conclude this debate concerning Dr. Pocke’s opinion, at

Page 170. ‘It may be fairly gathered from the ‘doctor’s words, that in Luke xi. 38, and Mark vii. 4, ‘βαπτίζεσθαι does naturally and *principally* signify to ‘wash the hands by dipping, which is all I desire,’ &c. Now whoever shall read the doctor’s words, (even as they stand in Mr. Gale’s quotation, much more in those which I produced, and much more in the place itself,) and shall not perceive the doctor to say that βαπτίζεσθαι, though it is for the most part used for such washing as is by *dipping*, yet it is not *always* so used, and particularly not in this text of Luke xi. 38, I would advise him to go to some private academy.

And I should be sorry to have any reader, to

<sup>h</sup> [Not. Miscell. c. 9, p. 597.]

whom it may not be safely left to judge whether any or all of these exceptions of Mr. Gale against this text do take off the force of the proof, that St. Luke, speaking of a man as *baptized* when only his *hands are washed*, does use the word in such a sense as does not include in its signification the *dipping* of the person spoken of.

It was however necessary that this paragraph (on which Mr. Gale owns he has been very long) should end as the rest do, with a triumph, (as here, ‘in fine, ‘what the doctor says from the rabbins, &c., makes ‘nothing for Mr. Wall, but rather against him,’) or else how should his ignorant readers applaud, and say, ‘That’s brave for our side!’

The next instance of a proof that baptism in Scripture is used for other washings beside dipping, taken from Mark vii. 4, (which I had just mentioned in two lines, but several learned men have largely insisted on,) he, after his arrogant manner, treats with great contempt, and, at

Page 171, wonders what I mean by producing it.

St. Mark is there reciting how the Pharisees and all the Jews do (among other traditions, which, he says, *they received to hold*) hold *the baptisms of cups, and pots, brasen vessels, and tables*; which our English do rightly translate, the *washing* of cups, &c., but St. Mark’s word is *baptisms* of them. Now some of these things may be conceived to be put into the water when washed, but some of them cannot. And yet St. Mark calls both one way of washing and the other, the *baptism* of them. And so he recites our Saviour’s own expression of the same thing, ver. 8.



What the rest of them do oppose to this proof, I know not. Mr. Gale opposes nothing material, but (what he opposes to every proof) confidence, and some insulting expressions. He cites a place of Scripture nothing relating to this case, but to what the Jews were to do by the command of God, Levit. xi. 32, whereas St. Mark and our Saviour at this place are speaking of what they did (over and beside the command of God) by their own superstition, and from the tradition of their elders: *Teaching* (as our Saviour expresses it, at ver. 7, 8,) *for doctrines the commandments of men. For laying aside the commandment of God, ye hold the tradition of men, as the baptisms of pots and cups; and many other such like things ye do.* What God commanded at the place cited by Mr. Gale, Levit. xi. 32, was only in case of any vessel that happened to be under any legal defilement by the carcass of a mouse, or any other unclean creature falling in it. And that, if it were of wood, raiment, skin, or sack, was to be put into the water; if it were earthen, to be broken; if it were of brass, or any other metal that would abide the fire, they were (as is ordered, Numb. xxxi. 23.) to make it go through the fire, and sprinkle on it the water of separation. So that brasen or silver vessels, pots or cups, were not commanded in the law to be put into water at all. And consequently Mr. Gale argues against himself, if he apply this legal purification of them (which had no other use of water but sprinkling) to that which St. Mark calls the baptizing of them.

But besides, this is not the case our Saviour speaks of. Does Mr. Gale think that he would have blamed the Pharisees or Scribes for doing any

thing of this, which in such a case of uncleanness was commanded by God? The washings or baptisms here spoken of, were such as had been devised by the Jews themselves, to be used without the case of legal uncleanness, as often (as it seems by the context) as those pots, vessels, or tables were used at any meal. At which times they were much more careful to have the outside of the cups clean, than they were of the inside; as our Saviour told the Pharisee, at whose dinner he sat, and who marvelled at his omission of baptism or washing. So different are the cases that are spoken of in Leviticus, from that here spoken of by St. Mark. And yet Mr. Gale, applying them to this, urges that he 'has the express word of God for it.'

He quotes here, p. 172, a few words in my book, just at the same rate, and with the same misapplication that he does the Scripture. He says of me, 'He allows that the Jews did immerse the thing 'or person to be washed.' There are indeed those words at the place he quotes, expressing in short what was more fully spoken of in my Introduction, §. 7. Whoever reads those places will see, that the case there spoken of is that of any 'person or thing 'which was by the Jews' law to have a tevillah, or 'solemn washing; their custom was to do it three 'times over.' What is that case of a vessel which by God's law was to be put into the water, to this superstitious washing of vessels or tables before meals?

There is not a more palpable proof of the insincerity of any writer, than when he quotes some words of Scripture, or of any author to one sense, which, if one turn to the place, do there plainly

appear to be meant in another sense. As for my words, it is no great matter ; but God's word is not to be so used, nor ever is, unless by men that write for a side, or for some wicked purpose.

I mentioned another instance in the same text of St. Mark, where he says, of *the Pharisees and all the Jews, When they come from market, except they be baptized, they eat not.* Where common sense teaches us to understand it, (as our translators do express it,) *except they wash, they eat not.* For it is inconceivable, and an impracticable thing for men that live near a market, and have frequent occasions to go in and out, especially servants and officers of the market, who must go into it several times in a day, to undress and dip themselves as often as they eat.

So that St. Mark, speaking of this baptizing as used by all the Jews, does plainly use the word for such washing as is without dipping. And the Jews themselves, who used these washings, do not pretend that they used in this case any other but such washings as are without dipping ; for which I quoted Dr. Pococke. Most of Mr. Gale's readers indeed do not know who he was, nor how unexceptionable an evidence his verdict is, concerning any practice of the Jews ; but learned men do know it ; and Mr. Gale himself, a few pages before, viz. p. 166, had confessed, that ' he has taken a world of labour, &c., and has shewn himself very well versed in the rabbinical writings, which he understood, perhaps, as well as Maimonides did.' And yet now mind Mr. Gale's answer here to all this.

Page 172, &c. He owns that Dr. Pococke is positive in this, that they who washed coming from

market did not dip themselves all over; and that 'he calls the whole body of rabbins to his assistance,' &c.; but answers, 'That all this is but light and inconsiderable evidence, to build all on the authority of a thousand rabbins,' &c., and so he goes on to talk of 'the silly whimsies of these men,' and the insufficiency of their evidence.

If the question were about what we *ought* to believe or do, or what the Jews themselves *ought* to have believed or done, or what washings they *ought* to have observed; and any body had quoted the rabbins, or set any value on their judgment for that; this answer, shewing the shallowness of their judgment, had been pertinent. But the matter then before the doctor, and now before us, is not what the Jews *ought* to have held or practised, but what they *did* practise. It is the 'silly whimsies' of these men, that our Saviour and St. Mark in this text are speaking of, and which Dr. Pocoeke in that chapter does explain. If in a question of what *ought* to be held or practised, one should lay any stress on the opinions of the *Quakers* or *Muggletonians*, the argument will be weak enough; but in a question of what they *do* hold, the proof must be taken from themselves and from their writings. And in this case to answer by saying, 'They are an injudicious sort of people;' would be so trifling and impertinent an answer, that I question whether any rabbi or quaker ever made a weaker.

Though I am weary, and would be short, yet I must spend two or three lines in entreating the reader to mind the absurdity and inconsequence of this way of arguing or answering. [The rabbins are a fabulous and whimsical sort of men; therefore

they cannot tell us what whimsies they themselves do hold.] Because Mr. Gale, in some places before this, and in some after it, spends a great deal of time in shewing the vanity of the Jewish writers; where his argument must run to that effect, or else (as the reader will observe) it signifies nothing to the matter he is answering.

We do all grant the Pharisees, rabbins, and generality of the Jews to have been a superstitious and vain people. St. Mark says, that among other superstitions, they *baptized* upon coming from market to meals. If they, as superstitious and whimsical as they were, did not dip themselves in that case, then it plainly follows, that St. Mark does use the word in the case of such washing as is not dipping; and the enlarging on their folly does not avoid the force of the argument.

But Mr. Gale produces two writers, who, in their comments on the place, do say that the Jews did in such cases dip their whole body. As there is nothing in natural philosophy so absurd, but that some philosopher has said it; so I think there is hardly any interpretation of Scripture so improbable, but that one may find here and there some one or two commentators that have given it. The magazine of Pole's Synopsis has furnished him with two for his purpose.

The first is Vatablus. Mr. Gale says, p. 173, 'Against them [the rabbins, and those that build on their authority] and the doctor I produce Vatablus, a man so singularly versed in the rabbinical writings,' &c. An apt qualification! Did his skill in the writings of the rabbins (which was just now good for nothing) qualify him to give an

interpretation concerning their practice, contrary to what they themselves do all give? But the truth is, that Vatablus never wrote any comments at all, on this or any other part of Scripture; only as he read his lectures, some hearers took notes of what he said, and afterwards published them. In which case, what mistakes and blunders do happen, every one knows.

The next is, Grotius *in loc.* concerning whom I had largely shewn by several instances, part i. chap. 8. §. 7, and chap. 11. §. 9, and part ii. chap. 11. §. 9, what a partiality he every where discovers for the antipadobaptists, even to the manifest altering the sense of the authors which he cites. It is the less wonder, if in his ordinary expositions he wrested the sense of one text to their side.

But what is chiefly to be regarded in any such case of interpreters, differing in their opinions or expositions of any particular point, is, to mind which of them appears to have studied that particular matter most. Though Grotius was a man of universal learning, yet he, speaking his sense in a transient way, in the ordinary course of his expositions, in few words, and without any proof given, is not to be depended upon for any particular thing, so much as one that has applied himself to the study of that particular. Which Dr. Pococke is known to have done, and to have written largely and accurately on that subject of the customs of the Jews, and particularly their washings, proving every thing by many testimonies; yet after all, Mr. Gale concludes as he uses to do, 'These authorities are vastly beyond Mr. Wall's quotation.'

But he will prove by other ways, viz. from antiquity and from the sacred text, that the Jews coming from market, dipped themselves before they eat. His readers must blush for him, to see how he does it.

Upon the place of Scripture which he produces, he puts a broad and palpable abuse; and to call it the 'sacred text' while he is doing so, renders the abuse the more profane; he says, 'The priests were 'forbid to eat, unless they first washed their flesh in 'water.' [p. 174.]

That, if it were true, is nothing to the market; and if the priests had done so, that is nothing to the people. It is *all the Jews* (i. e. at least, the generality of the people) of whom St. Mark speaks. And he speaks not of any command of Scripture which they kept, but a custom of their own. But mind the text to which he refers, (for he dared not set down the words,) Levit. xxii. 6, where all that is commanded is, that the priests, when they had touched any creeping thing, or any man, or thing, that was unclean by the dead, should not eat of the holy things, till they had washed their flesh in water. Now what is all this to the people, who had not touched any creeping thing, &c., eating, not *holy* but ordinary food when they came from market?

The antiquity that he brings is nothing but this: that there was a sect of men among the Jews, who bathed themselves every day, called therefore *hemerobaptists*: which has no connexion with the thing we are talking of, but only in Pole's Synopsis it follows next after the forecited quotations out of Vatablus and Grotius; and Mr. Gale, though he

was come to the end of all that was pertinent there, yet would still write on. He values himself and his readers so little, as to spend time in quoting four or five authors for this, (which I think are all quoted by Pole too,) which is a commonly known thing. And it may be collected from the author's ascribing this practice as peculiar to this sect, that the generality of the Jews did not do so. He quotes indeed Tertullian, as saying, 'Though the Jews daily wash every part of the body, yet they are never clean.' But he names not the place. And if Tertullian do any where say so, it must be accounted only an over-lashing expression; saying of the Jews in general, what was true only of some one sect of them.

Page 175. He argues yet farther from the order of St. Mark's words. He had said in the words next before, *the Jews, except they wash their hands [oft, as the English, and, I think, all translations read it; or, up to the wrist, as some learned men of late expound it] eat not. &c.*, and then adds, *and when they come from market, except they be baptized, &c.* Now Mr. Gale thinks that St. Mark, after he had said, verse 3, *They eat not, except they wash their hands up to the wrist*, would not have presently added, *And when they come from market, they eat not, except they be baptized*, if he had not meant something more by this latter washing, which he names *baptizing*, than by the former, of washing their hands.

This observation, I confess, does confirm me in the opinion that the translations are right as they are; and that how true soever the account given by learned men from the rabbins may be, that



the Jews in some cases wash *up to the wrist*, yet that St. Mark had not any intention here of expressing that by the word  $\pi\upsilon\gamma\mu\hat{\eta}$ , (which has not naturally any such signification,) but that he meant by it, *often, diligently, thoroughly*, or the like, as almost all men till of late have expounded it. And the sense and order of the words is natural: thus the Pharisees and generality of the Jews have a superstitious opinion, that they must not eat without washing their hands *often* [over and over, or carefully], and they place religion in this; holding it as a tradition from their elders; and particularly when they come from market, they must wash (or be washed) before they eat.

Mr. Gale here, to prove that they washed their whole body when they came from market, runs as far as to the custom of the Mahometans. And yet even in their customs does not find at last any such thing. They, he says, before they go to prayers, do wash the face, the hands, the feet; and upon greater and extraordinary pollutions, the whole body. And so did the Jews by God's command wash the whole body upon some great pollutions: nor would our Saviour have blamed them for that. But neither Jews nor Mahometans do it upon a return from market to eating; nor does his author pretend that they do.

Page 177. He has yet one shift more, to evade this text; but so wretched an one, as shews how hardly he is driven; viz. that the words of St. Mark should be translated another way, without any relation to washing either body or hands, and be understood thus: 'The things which they buy at market, they eat not, except they baptize them;' that is, (as

he would have it,) dip them. And then he vaunts after his conceited fashion: ‘If this be the sense of ‘the words, they are directly against Mr. Wall,’ (thus he brings in my name to all his absurd conceits.) ‘for nobody will make a question how herbs are ‘washed.’ But will any body make a question whether other things beside herbs were sold at market? He should have altered St. Mark’s words more yet, and made him speak of a herb-market. Does he think that wheat, meal, honey, milk, salt, &c., were dipped in water before they were eaten? It is a great abuse of Scripture, to put such absurd interpretations upon it, merely to serve a turn; and because one is resolved not to take the texts in their plain sense. But, however, this paragraph must conclude as all the rest do. Whatever there be in the middle of them, they always end well. As the last words of this are, ‘Either way I gain my point.’ A few such victories will undo a better cause than his is. And the evasion, that he here again repeats and uses whenever he is at a dead lift, (that the Jews coming from market were *dipped*, if their hands only were dipped,) does, as I shewed before, plainly give it up.

I had cited also Heb. ix. 10, where the apostle says, the service of the Jewish tabernacle consisted *only in meats and drinks and divers washings, &c.* divers *baptisms*, *διάφοροι βαπτισμοί*, is the apostle’s word. Now those washings, I said, were some by dipping or bathing, others by sprinkling. And his calling both one sort and the other *baptisms*, proves that he used the word for *washing* in general, whether it be by dipping or sprinkling.

Mr. Gale’s first answer is, that though there were several sorts of washing used, some by bathing, and

some by sprinkling ; yet the apostle there meant to express *only the bathings*, and says,

Page 180, that it should be translated, ‘ divers bathings or dippings.’

This sense might possibly be forced upon the place if the apostle’s word for *divers* were not such as does necessarily signify *divers sorts* or *kinds* of the thing spoken of. The English language uses the word *divers*, wherever one may say, *many*, or *several* ; as *divers* men, *divers* times, &c., meaning *several* men, &c. But the apostle’s word here, *διαφόροις βαπτισμοῖς*, does, both by its etymology and constant use, signify *divers kinds of baptisms*, or *baptisms of divers sorts*. If his word had been, that the service consisted *ἐν πολλοῖς*, or *ἐν πλείοσι βαπτισμοῖς*, it might have been mistaken, as Mr. Gale here mistakes it, for *divers*, i. e. *many washings in number*. But the word signifies different in *kind*. So that here Mr. Gale’s skill in *genus*, and *species*, and *individuum*, (which he seems to value himself much upon, and spills it often on every occasion,) might have done him some service. Many *dippings*, one may say, the service required ; but one cannot say, *many sorts of dippings*. Since then the apostle applies to his word *baptisms* an epithet implying several *sorts* of them ; it is plain that he uses the word (as we use the word *washings*) for other washings beside dipping. And I, though I wrote but two lines on this text, set down the apostle’s word, *διαφόροις*, on purpose that it might prevent these two pages of Mr. Gale and this of mine.

A second answer that he gives is in these words,

Page 180, 181 : ‘ However, if we grant the sacred writer designed by the words all the Jewish purifi-

‘cations by sprinkling as well as by dipping:’ and a little after: ‘Granting for once that sprinklings are included in the writer’s design; yet the word only signifies *dipping*,’ &c.

This you see is an invincible man; and there is no disputing with him. He having said a little before, ‘For I still assert, the word does always, and here too, only signify *dippings*?’ I see the apostle may say what he will. He will grant for once that the apostle ‘designs by the words sprinkling as well as dipping;’ and yet will stand his ground, and carry his point. And all this, when the dispute is concerning the sense in which it is taken in Scripture. Therefore let who will answer his next two pages. For there he shews how Cicero in one of his letters (and at the foot of the page he names the very letter, and in the index, the edition) says, ‘charissimæ animæ;’ whereas the proposition to have been proved was this: that granting that St. Paul designs by the word *baptism* sprinkling as well as dipping; yet the word only signifies dipping.

I had in the first edition referred to Matt. xxvi. 23, *He that dippeth his hand with me in the dish*, &c., but left it out in the second, because the word there is not βαπτίζω, but ἐμβάπτω, which though it be rendered and do signify *to dip*, yet not in the sense that the antipædobaptists understand dipping, viz. to immerge the thing spoken of all over. For the whole hand was not dipped.

Now this Mr. Gale grants, and says, ‘The question is not about the whole, or a part of the subject, but whether the Greek word signifies only *to dip*?’ and concludes, ‘if it be true that βαπτίζω

‘ does only signify *to dip*, it is all we ask——and  
 ‘ our present dispute is at an end.’ [p. 182.]

He should have minded that the word he speaks of, is not in the text; but another word which is generally by the English rendered *to dip*; whereas βαπτίζω is never in the New Testament so rendered by them.

Yet for the word βαπτίζω, itself, if the dispute will end upon its being granted always to signify *to dip*, in Mr. Gale’s sense of the word *dip*, I see nothing to the contrary but it may end presently. He yields his word *dip* to mean the very same thing (neither more nor less than) we mean by our word *wash*, (as I shewed before in my answer to his third chapter.) The same definition will serve both for *washing* and for *dipping* in his sense. It is ‘ an application of water to the subject, or some ‘ part of it.’ All that I fear is, that the antipædo-baptists will not stand to the determination of this their manager, but will say, he has betrayed and given up their cause. If they do all mean by *dipping*, no more than he has yielded it to be, it is true what he says, ‘ the dispute is at an end.’ It is no matter whether we call it *washing* or *dipping*. But then the schism would be at an end too: which would be, as Mr. Gale knows, a formidable thing.

The same answer serves to take off the exceptions which he brings against the next observation that I made, viz. ‘ That the sacramental *washing* ‘ is often in Scripture expressed by other words, ‘ beside *baptizing*; which other words do signify ‘ *washing* in the ordinary and general sense.’ And I cited three or four texts, and might have done more, where λούω, *to wash*, and λουτρὸν, *the washing*,

is used in the case of baptizing. Which I did, as conceiving it probable that the Scripture would not, in the same case of administering this sacrament, use sometimes one of these words, and sometimes the other, if they were not of a signification alike as to the main. Mr. Gale's exception against this at

Page 183, &c. is to this effect; that *λούω*, *to wash*, is the *general* word, and *βαπτίζω*, *to dip*, is one kind or *species* of washing; so that the Scripture may well call baptism, or dipping, a *washing*, for 'all dipping is washing, though all washing is not dipping.' And here, having a great deal of time to spare, he runs out, and shews at large his learning in the doctrine of *genus* and *species*, (which they that have lately gone so far, and not much farther, are very apt to do,) quoting the very place of Aristotle, that the *species* contains the *genus*, but not *vice versa*.

But I suppose when he studied that, he learned something of *differentia* too. If *washing* be the *genus*, and dipping a *species* of it, this last must have a *difference*, which together with the *genus* must constitute it. And in the common acceptance of the word *dipping*, it has one; but in Mr. Gale's notion of dipping, it has none, (as I shewed before,) for there is no washing, but will be a dipping, as he has enlarged the sense of the word.

And if he had done this without being forced to it, the men of his opinion might have been angry with him. But neither could he, nor can any man maintain that in all places of Scripture where *βαπτίζω* is used, it signifies *to dip*, without admitting that, or some other such like absurdity.

## C H A P. V.

THIS chapter seems to me to have been written, not by Mr. Gale, but by somebody else, (and, I think, I have heard that some *Dutch Minnists* have had a hand in this work, some composing one part, some another; so that he does well to call them letters :) my reasons are,

1. He had, at the end of the last chapter, spoke as one concluding what he had to say on that subject. ‘Thus you see, sir, how little there is in what our author says——I hope I have acted very uprightly in examining all his instances, &c. Besides those he mentions, I have likewise considered all other instances that I could imagine,’ &c. [p. 187.] And yet here this author begins again anew.

Secondly, some of the last words of the last chapter are, ‘such metaphorical passages as Matt. xx. 22, *Are ye able to be baptized*, &c., and such like, are so manifestly figurative and obscure, that they cannot be thought to furnish any argument either way; and therefore I pass them by.’ The writer of this letter not knowing what Mr. Gale had said, not only brings the same saying of our Saviour, but several others less to the purpose than that.

However that be, Mr. Gale the publisher has here and there crowded my name into the dispute, and if this be not his, has owned it, by putting a line speaking of it, to the tail of the foregoing.

It begins with expostulating why I should appeal to Scripture for the sense of a Greek word, and says, ‘The poets and grammarians can give the sense of it as well as the Scripture,’ and wonders that ‘a gentleman of understanding should’ &c.

Now if he be one that does not know that the Scripture does use many words, especially those relating to the sacraments, in a peculiar idiom, and that this is observed and confessed by all readers of Scripture of tolerable learning; I am sorry I cannot return his compliment concerning *understanding*.

He uses arguments why God should not suffer this, which would render the Scriptures obscure, &c. But what signify reasonings against fact? At last he condescends, at

Page 190, to 'join issue with me here,' that the use of it in Scripture shall determine the sense of it.

But to what purpose does this trial begin *de novo*, if he knew that Mr. Gale had tried this issue before, and had, according to his own verdict, 'gained his point.'

What places of Scripture does he bring at last where βαπτίζω is used? Not one at present. But if you will take up with places where βάπτω is used, he brings three of them. The others, where βαπτίζω is used, shall, he says, 'be taken notice of by 'and by.' [p. 198.] But before he comes to them, he says here, at

Page 193, 'In the mean time you see, sir,'—'I 'have said enough now to satisfy any man in the 'world—that the word βαπτίζω does always, without exception, signify only *to dip*.' Then I would, if I were as he, never bring the places at all; for when they come, they are not half so strong as is this conclusion taken beforehand. What he brings is this:

Origen somewhere speaks of men ὑπὸ τῆς κακίας



καταβεβαπτισμένων, ‘baptized [or, as this author renders it, *given up*] to wickedness.’

Clemens Alexandrinus, of some, who through drunkenness are βαπτίζόμενοι εἰς ὕπνον, *baptized into sleep*: he renders it, *dipped in sleep*. And at another place, Strom. chap. iii. p. 473; ‘We [Christians] who formerly lived in these [wicked courses] ἀπελουσάμεθα, *have been washed*. But those who ‘wash themselves’ (ἀπολούοντες) in intemperance, ἐκ σωφροσύνης εἰς πορνείαν βαπτίζουσι, do from a state ‘of temperance wash themselves in fornication.’ He says, *dip* into fornication; though λούω used twice in the same sentence, and by himself rendered *wash*, should have directed him by the likeness of the phrase, and by the apodosis, to have rendered the last clause so too.

An anti-pædobaptist who should read this collection, would be discouraged, and think there are no places to be found, where βαπτίζω is used for proper dipping, since this poor author can find no better than these. But it is pretty to observe, that he does bring at last a passage of Gregory Thaumaturgus, where βαπτίζόμενος is really taken for a man in the water, sunk, or sinking, and so is for his turn, if he had known how to translate it. Gregory speaks, it seems, of somebody who ἄλλοις ὀρέγων χεῖρα διασώσοιτο, ὥσπερ βαπτίζομένους ἀνιμώνεμος, ‘to others stretching ‘out his hand should save them, as one that with a ‘rope hales out men that are sinking in the water’ [or sunk]. He renders it, ‘immersed in difficulties.’ It is pity a man should have in a collection of passages but one that was pertinent, and not know which it was. The loss however is not great, for we own that is often taken for being in the water.

But what places of Scripture does he produce, which was the thing expected?

Only these: *Can ye be baptized with the baptism &c.*, (which Mr. Gale had rejected :) *He shall baptize you with the Holy Ghost, &c.*: and *They were all baptized unto Moses, in the cloud and in the sea*: and he says, ‘Can these passages——  
‘justify any man in denying the word signifies only ‘to dip?’ I thought he would have brought some that should justify his affirming it. Mr. Gale had better have thrown away this letter.

Page 196. That which follows here for two pages, about *πίνω*, to drink; *in Belgium navigare*, to go to Holland; *haeredes morere*, &c., is such stuff, that if a Hollander wrote it, and thought we would read it in a question of divinity, he must think us men of great leisure and patience. At last he excuses himself for inserting these particulars, which may seem too trifling, &c., for ‘that Mr. Wall and others having urged them against us,’ &c. Has the man any modesty left? Did I ever urge any of these things?

Page 197, 198. He takes here a safe course to speak something to the purpose, by saying what hundreds of learned men have said before him, of whom I quoted several. He did ill to mix it in one chapter with his impertinent remarks. For it is a serious thing, that the argument has solidity in it, to evince that where baptism can with safety to the health be administered by dipping, it should be so done. How large a signification soever the word *βαπτίζω* may have, to signify *washing in general*; it is plain that the ordinary and general practice of St. John, the apostles, and primitive church was to

baptize by putting the person into the water, or causing him to go into the water. Neither do I know of any protestant who has denied it, and but very few men of learning that have denied that where it can be used with safety of health, it is the most fitting way. So that where he speaks of ‘little frivolous cavils,’ [p. 200,] that have been made against some of the texts he brings to prove it to have been the ancient practice, I know not whom he should mean, unless perhaps some few *presbyterian* writers. I hope he will not pretend that this too is written against me, who had owned and urged the same thing in the book that he is writing against; and therefore he spends time, and four or five pages to no purpose, in quoting not only several ancient books, but I know not how many now, or then, living, Dr. Whitby, Mr. Le Clerc, Mr. Jurieu, &c., to prove this. I suppose he thought to do the men an honour, and to gain their favour, by reciting their words with encomiums, (and from one of them he has obtained his purpose<sup>i</sup>;) however it is a frivolous thing for men to quote one another for a thing that is confessed by all.

But whereas he carries the argument farther, and says to this effect, p. 198, that the practice of St. John, the apostles, &c., has determined the signification of the word, as it relates to the sacrament of

<sup>i</sup> [Perhaps Dr. Wall alludes to the favourable manner in which Dr. Whitby speaks of Mr. Gale in his ‘Full Answer to the Argument of the Rev. Jo. Edwards,’ &c. 8<sup>o</sup>. London, 1712, where, in the preface, page 4, he says, ‘full worthy of a serious consideration are those words of a *very learned antipædobaptist*,’ quoting Mr. Gale, p. 1, and again, p. 6.]

baptism, that cannot be; for βαπτίζω may signify *washing in general*; though they used ordinarily that particular sort of washing. As in the other sacrament, when Christ gave the bread and wine, and commanded his apostles (and in them all Christians) to eat bread and drink wine in remembrance of him: this does not determine the sense of the words *eat, drink, bread, wine*, to all the particular circumstances then used; as that *bread* must signify only *unleavened bread*, or just such a degree of fineness, or such a quantity of the bread as they did then eat: or that *eating* and *drinking* must signify only such eating and drinking as is after supper in an upper room, and on a passover night, &c. So our Saviour's command here, has no more than the general word *baptize* or *wash*. And John's washing him in a river does not determine the sense of the word to any particular circumstance then used: as the quantity of water, a river, one of thirty years old, &c.

Our Saviour seems to have used in his command the general words, *eat, drink, wash*, that he might not determine any particular circumstances which may in some cases happen to be impracticable.

As to the manner of baptism then generally used, the texts produced by our author, and by every one that speaks of these matters, John iii. 23, Mark i. 5, Acts viii. 38. are undeniable proofs that the baptized person went ordinarily into the water, and sometimes the baptist too. We should not know by these accounts whether the whole body of the baptized was put under water, head and all; were it not for two later proofs, which seem to me to put it out of question.

One, that St. Paul does twice, in an allusive way of speaking call baptism *a burial*; which allusion is not so proper, if we conceive them to have gone into the water only up to the armpits, &c., as it is if their whole body was immersed.

The other, the custom of the Christians in the near succeeding times; which being more largely and particularly delivered in books, is known to have been generally, or ordinarily, a total immersion of the naked body; and that (as this author observes, and I had shewn) thrice repeated.

But no man will pretend that this practice has limited and determined the sense of the word *baptize*, to all these circumstances. Mr. Gale himself would not have it limited to a total immersion, nor most of the Minnists.

This was the way ordinarily used; but none of these evidences does evince that it was the *only* way then used, without exception for any extraordinary case, of sickness, tender constitution, coldness of season or climate; or of haste, want of a sufficient quantity of water, and many other cases which may be supposed, or rather must be supposed, sometimes to happen.

For 1st, as to the argument from St. Paul's allusion to a burial: if it were the *ordinary* way to bury the baptized person in the water, that is abundantly sufficient to ground an allusion upon. Such metaphorical speeches are never taken to be strictly argumentative in respect to all the particulars without exception. The apostle in those two places styles it *a burial*; but in one of them, Col. ii. 12, he calls it *a circumcision*, (*the circumcision of Christ*, i. e. appointed by Christ, or a *Christian*

*circumcision*.) in more direct words than he does a burial. For he is there satisfying the Colossians that in Christ they are sufficiently circumcised, &c., being *by the circumcision of Christ buried with him in baptism*. Yet from this place the men of our author's kidney cannot see that baptism must have any likeness to circumcision at all; but *a burial* it must resemble in all cases, without exception for any cause that is never so reasonable. But these are arguings, not of men that desire to be guided by Scripture, but that plead for a side. Besides, Mr. Gale, and those that allow of a partial dipping to be the *dipping* of the man, must find out some such interpretation for *burying* him too, or else they must not urge this allusion so close as they do.

2nd. Another reason, that from those few instances of baptism by the apostles, which appear to have been administered by going into the water, we should not absolutely conclude that they never in any case of necessity administered it otherwise, is taken from the practice of the ancient Christians; who lived nigh after their times, and had much better means than we have of knowing how the apostles or their deputies managed in such cases, and would not have used clinical baptism to the sick and weak, (as I shewed that they did,) if they had not had reason to judge, that the apostles did the like in such cases; though it be not recorded in Scripture: there being no instance in Scripture of any one at all baptized in cold countries, nor of any baptized in sickness, which yet must often happen.

3rd. A main and chief reason is, because our

Saviour has, as I said, given a rule, Matt. xii. 3, 4, 7, that what is necessary to preserve life, is to be preferred before outward ceremonies. This author grants, at

Page 208, that ‘this foundation is certainly very ‘good.’ But to shew that he makes this concession to an ill purpose, he adds, ‘And they might from ‘hence justify their forbearing to administer this ‘sacrament at all.’ What is this, but straining at a gnat, and swallowing a camel? Our Saviour has expressly commanded every one that would be saved, to be baptized; and every one that enters into the kingdom of heaven, must, he says, be born again of water, &c. Now shall any arrogant mortal determine that this need not be? And in cases of necessity, where the person cannot have it in that way that he thinks the fittest, not let him have it at all? God Almighty in the time of Moses determined otherwise in the case of the passover: and so did Hezekiah afterward. ‘The ancients,’ he says, ‘who ‘introduced affusion, seemed unwilling to carry the ‘matter so far. In present danger of death, they ‘thought it necessary that all should be made partakers,’ &c. God Almighty keep us in the same modesty and awe for our Saviour’s commands, that the ancients had.

Page 209. From this place forward to p. 212, he uses a ridiculous and tedious argument, (wherein his own comparisons make against him,) all built on a supposition that I should say, that it is perfectly indifferent in all cases, which way baptism is administered, whether by immersion or perfusion; and then fights against that supposition with arguments taken from the *Toleration Act*. The reader will have

the curiosity to see by what wonderful faculty he can fetch any thing thence to this purpose; and if he do, he will see a specimen of the gentleman's talent in that way.

But the supposition is all his own. I never said any such thing. In the book that he had before his eyes, I do plainly grant, and even urge it, that dipping where it may safely be used, is the *most fitting* manner. part ii. chap. 8; and in the next chapter had spent several pages to shew the *preference* of that before the other, (except in cases of danger to health,) and that preference owned by all churches, (except the *Roman* and *Generan.*) and particularly by the church of *England*. In the management of his argument, he observes, that a law should not be interpreted by the exceptions that are made in it. True. Not in ordinary cases. But in the excepted cases it should.

Page 213. He treats St. Cyprian with his usual dirt, as freely as he does any of us. And for no other reason, but because a letter of his is yet extant, wherein he gives his opinion to one that had asked it, that perfusion, or aspersion, in cases of necessity is sufficient baptism: of which letter I gave a copy. Presently this writer falls into a fit of slighting and vilifying in his arrogant way that great bishop and martyr, as arguing after a 'very 'frivolous manner,' &c.

Whoever reads it will see that St. Cyprian's reasons, 'That the main thing in baptism in God's sight  
' is the dedicating the person to God and his Gospel;  
' that the contagion of sin is not washed off by the  
' same measures that the dirt of the skin is, &c., so  
' that there should be a necessity for a large pool,



‘ &c. It is another way that the breast of a believer ‘ is washed ; that the mind is sanctified,’ &c. ; are much to the same purpose as St. Peter’s saying, *Baptism saves us, not the putting away of the filth of the flesh, but &c.* And as St. Paul says, The niceties about meats, &c., *have not profited those that have been exercised therein,* but he that in the main things serveth God, is accepted of him ; so St. Cyprian argues, that ‘ many who are baptized in ‘ sickness, when need so requires, are freed from the ‘ unclean spirit, and do live commendably, &c., and ‘ do by the increase of faith proceed,’ &c. This certainly is the substance, and the quantity of water with which one is washed, is but the outward ceremony. Yet our author, beside a great deal of other contemptuous language, says, ‘ he determines the ‘ matter, not only without, but directly contrary to, ‘ the whole tenor of the New Testament.’ [p. 214.] As if the ‘ whole tenor of the New Testament’ were about the quantity of water in baptism. But indeed this way of braving, hectoring, and vilifying any adversary, (be it a *Cyprian*, or be it a Quaker, it is all one with him,) is the best tool that this disputant has. Take this from him, and a much meaner man than a *Father* might stand the brunt of his arguments. He, at

Page 217, confronts St. Cyprian with an argument from one of the forementioned texts that speaks of burial. Rom. vi. 2, 3 ; *So many of us as were baptized into Jesus Christ were baptized into his death. Therefore we are buried with him by baptism unto death.* This, he says, ‘ is as plain as words ‘ can make it ; that all without exception,’ &c.

He is fain to patch two propositions into one to

make his argument. But the direct answer is, that *St. Paul* had not in his aim there the way or manner of baptism. And therefore the phrase, *so many as*, so far as it respects the metaphor of burial, is used (as the word *all* in Scripture very often is) in a sense that includes the *generality*, but not always *all without exception*.

Page 218. He excepts against the quotations, which I had brought from the ancients for baptism by affusion in cases of sickness or other necessity, as being too late, one hundred and fifty years after the apostles.

This, for want of any better defence, and because he cannot deny the facts, is said only to make a colour in the eyes of an ignorant reader. For all men of learning do know, and he himself knows, that this is an early date for any quotation; and especially for any thing that concerns the ceremonial parts of religion; the few books that are ancients, being taken up with matters of faith, practice, and exhortations to constancy, &c., too much to have any thing in them of the quantity of water used in the baptism of sick people. He himself will fill his pages with authors much later than *St. Cyprian's* time, and boast of them, if they speak of baptism by *immersion*, as he does in this chapter. And Mr. Gale, p. 538, 568. recommends the evidence of the first three centuries to determine this controversy.

Page 220. He observes, as I had done before him, that men baptized in sickness by affusion, were, by the rules of those times, not admitted, if they recovered, to holy orders. And makes a very ignorant blunder in translating a passage in Petavius to that purpose, *ibid*.

Petavius says, They that were so baptized, *were accounted irregular*. This author not knowing the meaning of the word (though it be of very common use in church-laws, to signify one *incapable of orders*) translated it, ‘such were thought irregularly baptized.’ That ran in the man’s head.

He should also have owned the true reason, why such were *irregular*, not for the manner of their baptism, but because they would not take baptism till they were affrighted by approaching death. This is both by some of the ancients, as I shewed, declared to be the reason, and is of itself of such weight as to make a good reason. For there is not nigh so good ground to hope well of a profession of faith and repentance first made in a fright, and by necessity, as there is of a voluntary one. Whereas the other is but a ceremonial difference.

And whereas he argues, p. 220, that the canon of Neocæsarea which I cited, being eighty years after that time, could not influence the judgment of the church at that time, I grant it. But that canon did not enjoin that as a new law, but established it as an ancient canon or rule of the church. Which Mr. Gale might have observed from the words of Eusebius which himself cites, who speaking of the times when Novatian’s case was debated, says, ἐπεὶ μὴ ἐξὸν ἦν τὸν ἐν κλίνῃ διὰ νόσον περιχυθέντα εἰς κλῆρον τινὰ γενέσθαι. ‘It was not lawful that any one, who *by reason of sickness* was baptized *in his bed* by perfusion, should be taken into any office of the clergy.’

He might have seen this to be their reason by what himself cites of the history of Novatus written by Cornelius (if he had understood, or would have

rightly applied the words). Cornelius there gives an account to Fabius, how this Novatus had been a heathen; and that the occasion of his believing was, his being possessed with a devil for a long time; in which he being something helped by the exorcisms (or prayers) of some Christian priests, would be baptized before he died. And having gone on to tell what sort of Christian he made in his conversation afterward, a trickish, juggling, and forsworn fellow, &c., and afterward returning to speak of his baptism, which he took in that fright of approaching death, and had so abused afterward, he says, ‘He received it by affusion in his bed, as ‘he lay, *εἴ γε χρὴ λέγειν τοιοῦτον εἰληφέναι*. If it be fit ‘to say, that such a one as he received it at all.’ Where the stress of Cornelius’ doubt or question concerning his baptism is plainly grounded on the ill temper of the man’s heart, and his receiving it by fright and necessity, and his ill life afterward, and not on the manner of washing.

I gave here the instance of St. Laurence out of Walafrid Strabo, baptizing with a pitcher of water in a case of necessity; and of Basilides out of Eusebius. To which he says nothing. Neither did I say that Novatian’s case is the earliest, (as he falsely quotes my words,) but that that and the rest there given are some of the earliest.

Page 221. He brings in Constantine’s baptism to no manner of purpose. For though he says of his own head that Eusebius affirms, that ‘he was not ‘baptized in his bed, but, as was usual, in the church, ‘called *Martyrium Christi*, in the ordinary way;’ there is nothing of that matter said in Eusebius, only that he went to the suburbs of Nicomedia,

called together the bishops, desired of them baptism, οἱ δὲ τὰ νόμιμα τελοῦντες, &c. ‘And they performing ‘the ceremonies, put in execution the Divine ordinance, and made him partaker,’ &c. ὅσα χρῆ προσδιασπειλάμενοι: which I render, ‘having enjoined (or ‘required of him) such things as ought to be enjoined,’ i. e. the baptismal professions.

Now from which of these expressions he concludes the immersion, I know not. I am afraid, because Eusebius says in the next words, ‘and so ‘Constantine the only man of all the emperors that ‘ever were Χριστοῦ μαρτυρίοις ἀναγεννώμενος, being ‘regenerated in (or by) the testimonies (or ordinances) of Christ, was baptized;’ this translator concludes from μαρτυρίοις Χριστοῦ that he was baptized in a church called *Martyrium Christi* (which name whether any church at Nicomedia had, I know not). We must not suspect such a thing of Mr. Gale; but I question, as I said, whether this letter be his. But if it were so, (as I think it probable he was baptized in a church,) might it not be by *perfusion*, if he was very weak? Neither was he so weak then, but that he had lately travelled from Constantinople thither. If he was baptized in a church, that makes a good proof that he was not baptized by immersion, but as sick men were wont, by *affusion* of water on his face. For Mr. Bingham has well proved by several ancient testimonies, that in those times the κολυμβήθραι, the cisterns or pools made for people to go into at their baptism, were not in the church, but in an out-building, called βαπτιστήριον<sup>k</sup> or φωτιστήριον, at some distance from the church. And indeed it cannot well be conceived

<sup>k</sup> [Compare what is said at vol. ii. p. 385.]

that such large ponds of water as they ordinarily had for hundreds of men to go in at a time, could conveniently be made in the body of the church.

Page 226. He brings in an English council in the year 816, (which I had helped him to<sup>1</sup>;) that children should be dipped in the font. And presently adds, ‘But what need is there to urge this?’ None at all, since he wilfully left out the word *infants*.

Page 228. He makes a great reach to fetch in a compliment (which I take to be a begging one) for bishop Burnet. He takes a saying of his, ‘That ‘the danger of dipping in cold climates may be a ‘very good reason for changing the form of baptism ‘to sprinkling.’ And says, ‘This excuse is now ‘become very common, and——has gathered considerable force by being used by men of his lordship’s good sense and learning.’ Fulsome! was it ever omitted by any, who, before he or the bishop were born, have pleaded for perfusion? As for *sprinkling* indeed, I am content that he should be counted one of the first of the church of England, who ever recommended it. After all, he brings not one word of refutation of the bishop’s reason from the coldness of the climate. There is nothing else here, save that at

Page 226 he repeats, as he had three or four times before, that slander on me, which I mentioned, that I ‘do pretend that baptism may be administered *indifferently* in any manner.’ I think he judges, that a false thing by being often repeated will become true. I have always held and taught, that where it may with safety be administered in

<sup>1</sup> [See vol. ii. p. 395, 396.]

that way of dipping, which St. John and the apostles in those hot countries used, that way ought to be preferred. In cases of haste, want of a quantity of water, or danger to health, *pouring* of water to be sufficient; and indeed in the case of danger of health, the best way; for *God will have mercy and not sacrifice*. As for *sprinkling*, I say, as Mr. Blake<sup>m</sup> did at its first coming up in England, ‘Let them defend it that use it.’

Our Saviour gave his last supper in unleavened bread. Many churches do therefore prefer that. But all (even those that use it) will agree that, when that cannot conveniently be had, it is sufficient to receive it in common bread. That common bread ought to be as fine and white as conveniently can be gotten, (for such, no doubt, the passover bread was,) but who will say, that in cases of necessity a coarser sort is not sufficient? The essence of the symbols, as to religious use, and our Saviour’s true meaning, does not consist in these things.

The Scripture recommends *pure* (or clean) water for baptism, Heb. x. 22, and such, no doubt, is the fittest. Yet the antipædobaptists, who stand so much on the *quantity*, are easily satisfied with the *quality* of the water; when (whether for necessity, or choice, I know not) they use the water at *Horsleydown*<sup>n</sup>, and such like puddled places. Shall any

<sup>m</sup> [See some account of Mr. Blake, a writer of the age of king Charles I. at vol. ii. p. 402.]

<sup>n</sup> [Horsleydown is a district of the borough of Southwark: it anciently belonged to the parish of St. Olave’s, but was formed into a distinct parish in the year 1733.]

It seems that the anabaptists had fixed themselves here in considerable numbers. In the year 1775 there were four

one start up a new schism among them, and endeavour to persuade some of their ignorant people that their baptism is invalid, because their bodies were washed not with *pure* water, (which the Scripture speaks of,) but dirty?

Page 227. This chapter concludes, like all the rest, with a boasting triumph. 'Thus have I made it plain—that the word βαπτίζω—always signifies 'only to dip or plunge.' And he has the confidence to say, that he has proved it 'from the constant use of it in the New Testament.' Whereas he has not brought one word of sense to weaken the proofs to the contrary, that I brought from the New Testament; and particularly that from Luke xi. But he has a new way of gaining his point, as he calls it. He sets up an image of a judge of his own making, (whom he calls *sir*;) and to him he makes a bow, and says, 'You see, sir, that I proved it all.' Then the image, I suppose, gives a gracious nod, and so the case is decided. Should not the antipædobaptists rather set up somebody that might write, as Mr. Tombes and Mr. Stennet did, better sense in more modest expressions; stronger reasons with less declamation? Would not that convince any rational inquirer sooner than this vaunting and insulting way, which always puts more in the conclusion than was proved by the premises or middle terms of the argument; a way that never prevails upon any but weak reasoners, and men prejudiced, right or wrong, for a side?

meeting-houses of that persuasion. In 1714 a school was established by Protestant dissenters of different denominations, for the children of poor persons.—*Manning and Bray's History of Surrey*, vol. iii. p. 613.]



If this letter were writ by another, and sent to Mr. Gale, he accounted it imperfect, as wanting an ornament with which all his are graced; and that is, a fit of railing at the clergy of the church. He would not have it omitted here, and therefore has inserted it even after the foresaid conclusion. He observes,

Page 227, 228, ‘The clergy allow that dipping was the ancient manner—in all common cases at least—and have wished that this custom might be again restored among us here in England, as it continued till about queen Elizabeth’s time.’ And then presently adds two falsehoods.

One, the forementioned one repeated again. ‘Why, after all these concessions, do they pretend it is indifferent?’

To order dipping in all cases where the party may well bear it; and pouring of water, only where he cannot, (as the church of England does,) is not to pretend it indifferent.

The other follows it at the heels. ‘They continue in the constant use and practice of aspersion, &c., and defend it in opposition to immersion.’

To defend aspersion in opposition to immersion, is as much as to say or maintain, that aspersion is fitting, is lawful, &c., but immersion is not: or, to refuse or dissuade people from the dipping of their children, though the parents own them to be able to endure it. Which whether any clergyman in *England* has been ignorant enough to do, I know not. If he has, he has gone contrary to his promise of conformity to the liturgy. But to affix this upon the clergy in general, as he does, is for certain a notorious reproach and untruth. Beside two lesser

untruths in that one sentence; one in saying, *aspersion* (which the church does not allow in any case) instead of *perfusion*. The other, when speaking of the clergy in general, he calls it their ‘constant use and practice.’ Whereas several clergymen have prevailed on some of their people to have their children dipped in baptism, as the rubric directs; and some of the people have of themselves desired it, and it has been practised accordingly<sup>o</sup>.

But none of these expressions have as yet come up to Mr. Gale’s usual strain. Therefore after much rambling talk on this matter, he at

Page 230 expresses it thus; ‘So that, notwithstanding their pretences, it is to be feared the clergy are a great cause of the corruption, and its continuance.’ And in the contents he says positively, ‘They in reality obstruct its (the ancient practice) being revived.’ [p. 189.] That I take to be Mr. Gale’s own language, and it resembles the style of an *observer*<sup>p</sup>, or *flying post*.

To what he would here beg, that we should take *βάπτω*, to *dip* or *dye*, instead of *βαπτίζω* the Scripture word, I gave answer before.

Now I have gone through the work that this writer has dragged me into, by putting my name to the top of his pages, and here and there into his reasonings about matters in which I was concerned

<sup>o</sup> [See vol. ii. p. 401, where Dr. Wall relates that he himself had in one instance administered baptism *by immersion*, with the parents’ consent.]

<sup>p</sup> [Probably the allusion is to a political publication of Roger L’Estrange, which under the title of ‘The Observer’ was issued during the years 1684 to 1687, amounting altogether to three moderate folio volumes.]

as little as possible. And almost half his book is over before he comes to speak of infant-baptism; the history whereof was my only subject. And he has gained this advantage, that he has made me weary before any trial of that begins.

If I do give any of my sentiments concerning the difficulties which the clergy do find in bringing the people to that way of baptism, which the rubric orders in the case of children that may well endure it: I would not have it taken as spoken in answer to this man's insolent demand. For I think that when one in his station does in a malapert and factious manner demand of his superiors an account of the reason of their actions, as if he were a bishop or a judge over them, (as he does here; 'Why don't they take proper methods? Why do they continue,' &c.,) he deserves no other answer than such as the Pharisees used to have from our Saviour to their haughty and illmeant interrogatives.

But if I may be admitted in a submissive manner to take this opportunity (which is the last I can have) to give to my brethren of the clergy a scheme of my thoughts on this difficulty:

I must own in the first place that many of the clergy seem to be of the opinion of the late bishop of Salisbury, (whom Mr. Gale here quotes,) that the coldness of our climate is a good reason to change *dipping* into (*sprinkling* he says, but a respect for the rubric would have directed him to say) *pouring* of water, in the case of all children weak or strong, and of all weathers, warm or cold; for so they seem to mean.

To these brethren I have no more to say, than to propose these few things to their consideration.

That our climate is no colder than it was for those thirteen or fourteen hundred years from the beginning of Christianity here, to queen Elizabeth's time; and not near so cold as Muscovy, and some other countries where they do still *dip* their children in baptism, and find no inconvenience in it.

That the apparent reason that altered the custom, was, not the coldness of the climate, but the imitation of Calvin, and the church of Geneva, and some others thereabouts.

That our reformers and compilers of the liturgy (even of the last edition<sup>9</sup> of it) were of another mind. As appears both by the express order of the rubric itself; and by the prayer used just before baptism, 'Sanctify this water, &c., and grant that this child now to be baptized THEREIN,' &c.; (if they had meant that pouring should have always, or most ordinarily have been used, they would have said THEREWITH;) and by the definition given in the Catechism of the outward visible sign in baptism; 'Water, *wherein* the person is baptized.' I know that in one edition it was said, 'is dipped or sprinkled with it.' I know not the history of that edition; but as it is a late one, so it was not thought fit to be continued. The old edition had the prayer before said in these words, 'baptized in this water.'

That if it be the coldness of the *air* that is feared; a child brought in loose blankets, that may be presently put off and on, need be no longer naked, or very little longer than at its ordinary dressing and undressing; not a quarter or sixth part of a minute.

If the coldness of the *water*, there is no reason,

<sup>9</sup> [Viz. in Charles the Second's reign. 1661.]

from the nature of the thing ; no order or command of God or man, that it should be used cold ; but as the waters, in which our Saviour and the primitive Christians in those hot countries which the Scripture mentions, were baptized, were naturally warm by reason of the climate ; so if ours be made warm, they will be the liker to them. As the inward and main part of baptism is God's washing and sanctifying the soul, so the outward symbol is the washing of the body, which is as naturally done by warm water as cold. It may, I suppose, be used in such degree of warmth as the parents desire.

2. As to those of the clergy who are satisfied themselves, and do in their own minds and opinions approve of the directions of the liturgy, and would willingly bring their people to the use of it ; it is too apparent what difficulties lie in the way. So that this quarreller has no ground in his assuming way to demand, ' Why they do continue,' &c.

The difficulty of breaking any custom which has got possession among the body of the people, (though that custom be but of two or three generations,) is known and obvious. And there being a necessity of leaving it to the parents' judgment, whether their child may well endure dipping or not, they are very apt to think or say *not* : and there is no help for it. For none, I think, will pretend that the minister should determine that, and dip the child whether they will or not. He can but give his opinion, the judgment must be theirs ; and they are for doing as has been of late usual.

But there are, beside this general, two particular obstacles, which it may be fit to mention.

1. One is, from that part of the people in any

parish, who are *presbyterianly* inclined. As the *puritan* party brought in this alteration; so they are very tenacious of it: and as in other church matters, so in this particularly, they seem to have a settled antipathy against the retrieving of the ancient customs. Calvin was, I think, (as I said in my book <sup>r</sup>.) the first in the world that drew up a form of liturgy that prescribed *pouring water* on the infant, absolutely, without saying any thing of *dipping*. It was (as Mr. Walker<sup>s</sup> has shewn) his admirers in England, who in queen Elizabeth's time brought *pouring* into ordinary use, which before was used only to weak children. But the succeeding *presbyterians* in England, about the year 1644, (when their reign began,) went farther yet from the ancient way, and instead of *pouring*, brought into use in many places *sprinkling*: declaring at the same time against all use of fonts, baptisteries, godfathers, or any thing that looked like the ancient way of baptizing. And as they brought the use of the other sacrament to a great and shameful infrequency, (which it is found difficult to this day to reform,) so they brought this of baptism into a great disregard. Now I say, a minister in a parish, where there are any considerable number inclined to this way, will find in them a great aversion to this order of the rubric. They are hardly prevailed on to leave off that scandalous custom of having their children, though never so well, baptized out of a bason or porringer in a bed-chamber, hardly persuaded to bring them to church;

<sup>r</sup> [See vol. ii. p. 400.]

<sup>s</sup> [An extract from Mr. Walker's publication on this subject is given at vol. ii. p. 398. 401.]

much farther from having them dipped, though never so able to endure it.

2. Another struggle will be with the midwives and nurses, &c. These will use all the interest they have with the mothers, (which is very great,) to dissuade them from agreeing to the dipping of the child. I know no particular reason, unless it be this. A thing which they value themselves and their skill much upon, is, the neat dressing of the child on the christening day<sup>t</sup>; the setting all the trimming, the pins, and the laces in their right order. And if the child be brought in loose clothes, which may presently be taken off for the baptism, and put on again; this pride is lost. And this makes a reason. So little is the solemnity of the sacrament regarded by many, who mind nothing but the dress, and the eating and drinking. But the minister must endeavour to prevail with some of his people who have the most regard for religion, and possibly their example may bring in the rest.

The consequence that would follow from baptizing children ordinarily by this old way, would, I believe, be this; that the schism of antipædobaptism would dwindle and cease. My reasons are,

One which I mentioned in my book, that most of the people that have scruples about their baptism, (as far as I have observed; and it has been my fortune to be often exercised in discoursing with such,) do not near so much question the validity of their baptism, for that it was received in infancy, as they do for that they were not dipped, or put

<sup>t</sup> [See some observations on this point at vol. ii. p. 405.]

into the water<sup>u</sup>; for which they see so clear examples in Scripture.

But what is far more considerable than any experience of mine, is the observation that may be made from the history of this schism, wherever it has arisen. The *Greek* church, in all the branches of it, in Europe, Asia, Ægypt, and Æthiopia, which has always preserved the custom of dipping infants in baptism, that were in health and able to bear it, has accordingly never been molested with any disputes about infant-baptism; nor ever have any antipædobaptists been heard of among them. In the *Latin* church, (which is for extent of countries, and, as I think, for number of Christians, much less than the *Greek*;) as France<sup>x</sup> was the first country that left off dipping in the ordinary baptisms; so there it was that the first antipædobaptists in the world (the Petrobrusians about the twelfth century) arose<sup>y</sup>. Germany and Holland afterward had their share of trouble with this sect; but not till they also had, almost generally, left off the dipping of infants. England all this while kept to the old way. And though several times some Dutch anabaptists came over hither during those times, endeavouring to make proselytes here; yet Foxe the historian in queen Elizabeth's time declares, that he never heard of any Englishman that was perverted by them. So that antipædobaptism did not begin here while dipping in the ordinary baptisms lasted. Then for two reigns pouring water on the face of the infant was most in fashion, and some few of the people turned antipædobaptists, but did not make a sepa-

<sup>u</sup> [See vol. ii. p. 327.]

<sup>x</sup> [See vol. ii. p. 239. 393.]

<sup>y</sup> [See vol. ii. p. 259.]



ration for it. They never had any considerable numbers here, till the *presbyterian* reign began. These men (out of opposition to the Church of England, I think) brought the external part of this sacrament to a less significant symbol than Calvin himself had done, (for he directs pouring of water on the face,) and in most places changed *pouring* to *sprinkling*. This scandalized many people, and indeed it was, and is really scandalous. So partly that, and partly the gap that was then set open for all sects that would, to propagate themselves, gave the rise to this: which I therefore think, as I said, would upon our return to the church of England way, cease. However, they cannot upbraid the pourers or sprinklers with the novelty of that fashion, for, as new as it is, it is older than their religion in England is. This history, with the annals and proofs of it, I gave more largely in my book, part ii. chap. 9. §. 2.

---

CHAP. VI.

HE first lays down an absurd supposition, p. 233. If Mr. Wall had argued such and such things, (which things are nonsense,) and then adds, ‘Of the same kind exactly—are the two main foundations of infant-baptism; I mean the celebrated arguments from original sin, and from circumcision.’ I would have any one that does not know this author, to guess at the make of his face by this and such-like insolent speeches of his.

The Scripture, and our own woful experience, makes us sensible of our original corruption; which

needs cleansing and forgiveness. And as baptism is the sacrament of cleansing and forgiveness; the Christians in all ages have understood it to have that effect in infants, whom the same Scripture and experience shews to have that corruption innate in them as well as others; except Pelagius and a few followers of his, who used infant-baptism for other purposes. This has been discoursed largely by several of the ancient Christians; particularly St. Austin in large volumes.

And so likewise the Scripture speaks of our baptism, as being the *Christian circumcision*, or the *circumcision of Christ*, Col. ii. And as circumcision belonged to infants, as a seal of entrance into covenant with God; and baptism has the effect of circumcision; the consequence of its belonging to infants is by Christians, ancient and modern, largely deduced.

Now here steps up a new author, who thinks to overthrow these doctrines by mocking at them, and at all the Christian world; and with a scornful smile at such ‘trifling foundations of infant-baptism,’ puffs them away at one breath, and in three or four lines. A vulgar reader presently thinks, surely this is a great scholar. Yes, or else a very proud and assuming boaster, such as is described, Prov. xxi. 24.

He says, these two arguments ‘have been often baffled.’

Was there ever any antipædobaptist that pretended to answer (to name no more) those books of St. Austin (which I mentioned) against the Pelagians, which though not written to prove infant-baptism, (which no Christian then denied,) yet do prove original sin to be the doctrine of the universal

church from its practice of infant-baptism ; and so do shew the connection between the two doctrines ? So far have they been from answering or baffling, that I believe none of them (except perhaps Mr. Tombes) ever read them.

Page 235. He comes to me. And after a smoothing compliment, he in the next words sets up against me one of the falsest accusations, and most abominable calumnies, that in all the seventy years of my life was ever thrown upon me by any lewd or slanderous tongue or pen. He makes me a teacher of false doctrine, contrary to the principles of the church of which I am a member, and contrary to what I have always taught therein, and contrary to what I declare in many places of the book he had before him. A doctrine that was never maintained by any Christian, (beside the antipædobaptists themselves,) but by some late papists; viz. that I ‘freely allow that it cannot be made appear from the Scriptures, that infants are to be baptized.’

He has in the foregoing parts of his book used many uncivil taunts and reproaches, unhandsome and rude expressions, and such as (considering from whom they come) may well be called arrogant ; some of which I have noted, some I passed by. He also spent his first two chapters on my character, as he calls it, picking up from any hands pitiful personal stories of no moment to the matter in hand, nor indeed to any thing else, but to shew a temper that is by all men counted scandalous and contemptible in a writer of controversy. But all these I count as nothing in comparison of this impudent slander.

His way is (as I noted before in another instance)

the falser any thing is that he says, to say it over and over again so much the oftener. This therefore being a notorious untruth, and contrary to what he saw with his own eyes, and to what he must think the reader would see, needed to be repeated a great many times to make it pass. And he does repeat it at least twenty times in this one chapter. All which repetitions are so many——.

I shall recite some of them. I thought to have set them down all, that they might fly in his face. But it is too tedious and loathsome. I will note the pages of them all.

Page 235. The words I now recited. Page 236. Having quoted some of my words, (but those curtailed,) he adds, ‘All which, is in short, to grant that ‘infant-baptism cannot be proved from Scripture.’ Page 237. ‘You may be pleased to observe his *concession*; which is a very unhappy one for him.’ Page 238. The same slander again: ‘Mr. Wall confesses,’ &c. Page 239. The same repeated three or four times. Page 241. ‘Mr. Wall has ruined ‘his whole design by what he lays down at first. ‘For if infant-baptism cannot be found in Scripture, ‘as he confesses:’ and another in that page of the same. Pages 243, 245. More of the same. Page 245. ‘Pædobaptism, which Mr. Wall confesses cannot be proved from Scripture.’ Page 246. Over again. Page 248. ‘Mr. Wall, or any man who owns ‘infant-baptism cannot be maintained but by the ‘traditions of the church, and yet practises it.’ Ibid. Over again. See more, page 251, 254, 259.

If I had said any such thing as these accusations amount to, I ought to take shame to myself. But if all this be notoriously false, the antipædobaptists

ought to disown such a defender of their cause, as could not do it without the help of a gross untruth in matter of fact, at the beginning; and to take care to employ next, one that, beside a faculty of declaiming, has learned to speak truth.

I have been forced by this foul and importunate cavil to look over those places of my own book, where I do enforce the proof of infant-baptism from several texts of Scripture. For though I declared in the preface, that ‘the arguments from Scripture for each side of this controversy having been so searched, and so often bandied to and fro, that not much more could be said to illustrate them,’ my purpose was to take it for my task to write the *history* of the *practice* of the ancient Christians in this matter; and accordingly I, as an historian, did in many places forbear arguing from Scripture: yet in some other places, where the Fathers, whose words I recited, did quote or refer to such texts of Scripture as do naturally confirm the doctrine of infant-baptism; it was necessary for me, in the *notes* on such passages, to shew how those texts do agree with, and illustrate the discourses of those ancients. Hence it came to pass, that though the main scope of my book was history, and not argument, yet I did (occasionally and by the way) bring many proofs from God’s word, which stand as so many evidences of the falsehood of this foul charge against me.

I need not repeat them, because Mr. Gale’s readers must of course have my book, or else they read an answer to they know not what; for he does greatly misrepresent it. I will refer to the places.

On the text, Matthew xxviii. 19, *all nations*, &c., I shew that it ought to be understood of *all the*

*persons* of which the nations are composed, infants as well as their parents. And do endeavour to clear this sense from the evasions of the antipædobaptists. Introduction, §. 5. Book, part ii. chap. 10. §. 1. N<sup>o</sup>. 1. item §. 3. N<sup>o</sup>. 4.

Of that saying of our Saviour, John iii. 3, 5, I have spoken more often and more largely, because the ancient Christians do hardly ever omit it; and shewn that it concerns *all* persons, infant or adult, and can be understood in no other sense than to mean, or connote baptism, nor ever was otherwise understood by the ancients: and that the new interpretation of Calvin and his followers (who expound the *water* mentioned there by our Saviour quite away) is unreasonable, far-fetched, and Quaker-like. Introduct. §. 6. Book, part i. chap. 11 §. 4. chap. 3. §. 2, 3, 4, 5. chap. 6. §. 14. part ii. chap. 6. §. 1. chap. x. §. 1. N<sup>o</sup>. 2, 3. item §. 3. N<sup>o</sup>. 5.

The proof from circumcision which was appointed to infants, and that St. Paul does call baptism the Christian circumcision, Col. ii. 11, 12, I do urge and apply part i. chap. 11. §. 2, where Justin Martyr himself applies it so. And likewise part ii. chap. 10. §. 1. N<sup>o</sup>. 5.

The command of our Saviour, that infants should be brought to him, Mark x. 13, &c., is insisted on, part i. chap. 4. §. 10. And at the same place I shew that infants are expressly ordered to be entered into God's covenant, from Deut. xxix. 10.

And in a larger manner than the rest, I do enforce to this purpose the argument from 1 Cor. vii. 14. And having learned from the Fathers the ancient interpretation of that text, (which to a diligent reader of the place will, I think, appear to be the

true one,) I do shew the reasonableness of that interpretation, (which directly proves the children of those Corinthian Christians to have been baptized,) and its agreement with the scope of St. Paul's discourse in the context.

I have had the acknowledgment of some great and learned men, that I have been instrumental in retrieving and confirming from the ancient Christians the true sense thereof, which had been unobserved by most moderns, and misapplied by the antipædobaptists to a very improbable, jejune meaning, inconsistent with the scope of the place. This was visible in my book, part i. chap. 11. §. 11. chap. xv. §. 2. chap. xviii. §. 4. chap. xix. §. 19. part ii. chap. 10. §. 1. N<sup>o</sup>. 9. item §. 3. N<sup>o</sup>. 6.

These proofs from Scripture Mr. Gale had not only seen in my book, but spends a great part of his in confuting and answering them, as well as he can after his way; which renders the falsehood of his saying that none were pretended by me, absurd as well as slanderous.

I had also, long before Mr. Gale wrote, published a little treatise on the question of infant-baptism, wherein I insist chiefly and almost only on *Scripture proof*<sup>z</sup>. I cannot be sure that he had seen it; but he will hardly persuade any one used to such sort of writings, that he had not, because those that write against any book, do generally take into consideration any other book written by the same man on the same subject, (but he indeed would not

<sup>z</sup> [The piece alluded to is Dr. Wall's 'Conference on the subject of Infant-baptism:' which appeared first in 1706, and again in 1708; and has been frequently reprinted to the present day.]

take notice of so much as my second edition of the same book). This also might have contributed to discourage him (if he had been troubled with modesty) from saying a thing of me which the world knows to be false; for two editions, of about two thousand each, of that little piece were then extant.

However, there is in what he had before him, enough to have made him ashamed to say in the contents of this chapter, and repeat it so many times in the chapter itself, 'Mr. Wall allows it cannot be made appear from Scripture. He owns it cannot be shewn to be founded in Scripture, nor be maintained but by the traditions of the church. That the Scripture is silent in the case.'

He himself at one place in the chapter, p. 240, owns enough to have shamed himself, and stopped his mouth from repeating the slander again and again afterward. He says there that 'I do *suppose* (so he in his proud and contemptuous manner calls my proofs) 'that in some general expressions infants are to be included, as in the commission, Matt. xxviii. 19, and perhaps in some other passages, and John iii. 5, which,' he says, 'I reckon the plainest argument for infant-baptism.'

Why then does he in all the chapter afterward say confidently, that I own that there is no proof (or argument) at all from Scripture? There needs no judges or witnesses, his own mouth condemns him of falsehood in that accusation.

He says of my proofs, that they are 'but suppositions at best.' And that 'to affirm infants are intended as well as adult, in these and such like places, is begging the question, and *asserting* the thing instead of proving it.'



But, good sir, that will not save, or bring off your untruth. For you here deny my *asserting* it. Whether a writer does solidly and effectually prove his point from Scripture, is one question, and whether he does disclaim any Scripture-proof, and *confess* there is none, is another. If I say, of any one that brings texts of Scripture for proof of a thing, and applies them as well as he can, that all his texts and arguments upon them do not amount to a good or full proof, that may be true, or it may be false, and be only my ignorance, or incapacity, or prejudice, or haughtiness, and confident censure. But if I say positively, and repeat it, and stand to it, that such a man does *own* and *confess* that there is no Scripture-proof for it, I am an open and bare-faced liar.

Therefore let that point be decided first, the matter of fact, whether I owned that there is no proof from Scripture. Then afterward, of the validity of the proofs there may be time enough to debate. I should not value myself much upon it, if it should be thought they are (though set down in short, as being not the proper business of that book) such as the man whom you propose to write an answer to my book, cannot solidly confute. From you, sir, I do not expect it, since I have seen your faculty of reasoning. If a loose vein of declaiming would do it, you might be the man.

In the next page, p. 241, Mr. Gale says of me, that ‘all that I pretend to is, not that I see it (infant-baptism proved by Scripture) by any necessary inference, but only that *probably* it may be comprehended in some of the more general passages.’

The reader might have guessed at the truth of this tale, by his telling it so many several ways. Is it not intolerable (I may appeal to his own favourers) that an answerer of a book should take the liberty to affix and impute to it what sayings soever he shall forge, and then run on in descant and triumph upon those his own forgeries? If he had said, that the proofs which I bring, are in themselves only *probable*; that, as I said before, might have been debated. Some of the inferences from Scripture are less, and some from other places are more plain.

But to say, that ‘all that I pretend to from any or all of the places, is, that I see no necessary inference,’ (plain enough, I mean, to satisfy the conscience of any sincere inquirer of tolerable learning and capacity,) is an injurious perverting of my words; especially when he backs and improves this falsehood by saying absolutely, in the following as well as foregoing parts of this chapter, that I ‘confess it cannot be proved from Scripture.’

He makes me by saying so, say that in earnest, which (as I shewed) the late Jesuits say out of a politic and wicked design to puzzle all protestants, and promote this schism. If the reader please to turn to part ii. chap. 8<sup>a</sup>, he will see that near the end of that chapter I do charge and prove this upon the papists, that they have of late taken upon them to say, that ‘infant-baptism cannot be proved from Scripture, but only by the custom and tradition of the church;’ that the old books of the papists, till about eighty years ago, do constantly prove it by

[See vol. ii. p. 371, and 379.]

Scripture; and what a weak thing it is in the anti-pædobaptists to be caught by this bait of our common enemies. And is it credible after all this, that I should maintain the same thing myself?

Now I have shewn sufficiently, that what he charges me with, is a heinous thing; and how contrary it is to the tenor of my book; let us see what are his proofs on which he grounds this accusation. And the way of managing his evidence is such as must needs shame him as much as the foulness of the charge itself.

He first quotes to this purpose three pieces of sentences in the first page of my *preface*. Which page I desire the reader to peruse, and see the tenor of the whole sentence.

One is this. I am there making what excuses the matter would bear, for the doubts of the unlearned men among the anti-pædobaptists; and after some other things do say, ‘that the coinmission, ‘Matt. xxviii. 19, is set down in such brief words, ‘that there is no *particular* direction given, what ‘they were to do in reference to the children of ‘those that received the faith.’

This he recites, p. 235, without any very material alteration of my words. But reciting them again, p. 239, he basely alters them; and makes me say, ‘that there is *no where* any particular direction,’ &c., and adds some words to the end of my sentence; those last indeed not very material. But the putting in the words *no where*, is a very gross forgery, and a very material alteration. For it is one thing to say, there is no particular direction concerning such or such a point of Chris-

tian practice in Matt. xxviii. and a very different thing to say, there is *no where* in Scripture any such direction. Let any one judge whether this man is to be trusted to quote the words of his antagonist, and then draw odious conclusions from them.

My own words are no more than any pædobaptist will say. They do not import that our Saviour in the command of baptizing *all nations* is not to be understood to mean *infants*, as well as *men* and *women*, (which I endeavour at other forecited places of my book to shew that he did,) only that they are not *particularly* there named, (for those are my words, ‘no *particular* direction,’) as indeed neither *men* nor *women* are; but only the aggregate word, *nations*.

Much less do they import that in *no other place* of Scripture there is proof that infants were, or ought to be baptized. There are many proofs of it, beside this commission; and which do help to explain the commission: the tenor of the whole Old Testament, that infants were (before our Saviour’s giving this commission) all along received into covenant with their parents, and were expressly ordered so to be, Deut. xxix: and those other places of Scripture which I just now mentioned as having been urged by myself: and that *the blessing* (or covenant) *of Abraham is come on the Gentiles*; which blessing or covenant of Abraham had plainly this advantage, to have the children entered into it: and many other places brought by those who purposely insist on Scripture proofs.

So far are those my words (that in Matt. xxviii.

there is no *particular* direction about infants) from implying what he says, 'I confess, that there is *no* *where* any proof from Scripture.'

My next words are, 'And among all the persons recorded as baptized by the apostles, there is no express mention of any infant; nor is there on the other side any account of any Christian's child, whose baptism was put off till he was grown up, or who was baptized at man's age.'

Of this he recites one part, and very unfairly leaves out the other. For all the question now in our time being about the children of *Christians*, whether they are to be baptized in infancy, or afterwards; my words, as they stand, make the failure of proof from the instances of persons baptized by the apostles, equal on both sides as to any that were born of Christian parents, infant or adult; for the apostles lived to see many children of Christians thirty or forty years old; and yet there is no *express* mention of their baptizing any such at their adult age (which, by the way, is a great sign they had been baptized before in their infancy). Mr. Emlyn might (if he had been as immodest as Mr. Gale) as well have charged me with 'confessing that there is no proof from Scripture for baptizing those who had Christian parents at all,' as Mr. Gale can charge me with what he does here. He did not so; he only pretended to draw consequences of his own, that children of Christians need not be baptized at all: he did not say, that 'I confessed it.' If Mr. Gale had done no worse than so, I might have blamed him for weak arguing, not for an unfair account of my words.

But suppose the first part of that saying of mine had stood without the latter part ; could any modest man have taken it for a ‘concession that there is no Scripture proof,’ &c. ? Among the few persons recorded expressly and by name, as baptized by the apostles, there is no mention of any infant : (as in the life written of any great bishop, archbishop Laud, &c., I do not think there is :) does it follow from thence that their baptizing of infants, or ordering it to be done, is not implied by circumstances, as the baptizing of households, &c. ? *Express* mention (which is the word I use) were as much as to say in so many words, ‘they baptized such or such an infant ;’ but there may be sufficient proof of a thing by circumstances without such express mention.

But however, to say, ‘I confess there is no Scripture proof,’ is to say, ‘I confess there is no proof from those recorded examples of the apostles, nor from any other place of Scripture ;’ which that I should ever say, is, I am sure, a very great falsehood. And there follows one worse yet.

In the same page, [p. 235.] (where I am still making excuses for the mistakes of such, who for want of learning or reading fall into doubts, or, (as I express it,) ‘contrary sentiments,’ concerning infant-baptism.) I say, that ‘the proofs drawn by consequences from some places of Scripture, for any one side of this question, are not so plain, as to hinder the arguments drawn from other places for the other side, from seeming still considerable to those that have no help from the history of the

‘ Scripture times, for the better understanding of the  
‘ rules of Scripture.’

This wretched quoter recites one half of this sentence, (yet in that half leaving out those material words, ‘ for any one side of this question,’) and then cuts it off at the word ‘ considerable,’ where there is no stop, not so much as a comma; and leaves out, ‘ to those that have no help,’ &c., and presently adds, ‘ all which is in short to grant, that infant-baptism  
‘ cannot be proved from Scripture.’

This is right Danvers, or worse than Danvers, For if I say, ‘ the exceptions made by the antipædo-  
‘ baptists against the Scripture proofs for infant-  
‘ baptism, may seem considerable to ignorant and  
‘ unlearned men;’ and another quoting my words shall take the liberty to leave out the last words, and conclude, that *I confess* or *grant* that there are no good Scripture proofs for it; all faith or credit to one man repeating the sayings of another is lost and destroyed. For it is a very different thing to say, an exception or argument is, or seems, considerable, meaning by its own real weight or force; and to say, it may seem considerable to *ignorant* men. When an ignorant man reads that our Saviour was baptized at thirty years of age; and many in heathen countries at their adult age; it may seem to him a considerable argument that infant-baptism was not then accounted lawful; for he thinks, if it were, why had not these men been baptized before in their infancy? But what are learned men appointed teachers for, but to do this office, among others; to make such an ignorant man understand the *history of those times*, that Christian

baptism was then but newly instituted, or but newly brought into those countries; and therefore they could not have received it in their infancy?

Besides all this difference, to say, there are exceptions against a proof, which do *seem considerable*, (which was my word,) is not presently to grant those proofs to be no proofs. Many texts of Scripture, and many other propositions, have objections against them, that may *seem considerable*, and yet do remain *true*. So weakly does he argue, as well as falsely quote.

There is another saying of mine, which he, at his

Page 238, recites from near the end of my book. It is too long to copy out his words and mine at large. The reader may see them in his book. He falsifies the import of my words by perverting the sense of them, as much as in the other instances. I am there mentioning the advantages which the antipædobaptists do take in their public disputes before *a multitude* of vulgar people. ‘Having plain  
‘ places of Scripture to produce concerning adult  
‘ baptism, and several examples of it, they work  
‘ much on such of the people as had not minded  
‘ this before,’ &c., and in accounting for the mistake of the force of the argument from thence, do say, ‘that in a nation newly converted to Chris-  
‘ tianity, (and such are all the cases mentioned in  
‘ the Scripture,) the adult people must be baptized  
‘ first, before their infants can be baptized.’ The improvement he makes from hence is,

‘Mr. Wall confesses, all the passages in Scripture  
‘ relate to the baptism of adult persons.’ Utterly false. I said, ‘they have plain passages for adult



‘ baptism;’ he makes me say, ‘ all the passages.’ I said that in such a state of a ‘ nation newly converted, the adult persons must be baptized first, ‘ before their infants.’ He represents me as ‘ confessing that the Scripture gives no proof of the ‘ baptizing their infants at all.’ The ignorant *multitude*, of which I there speak, are apt to think that we do by our principle deny *adult baptism* ever to have been used, or that it ever should be used; and consequently that every example in Scripture of adult baptism is an argument against *infant-baptism*. Whereas we do from those plain places and examples of Scripture urge the necessity of baptism to an *adult* person that has not been yet baptized, as much and more than they do, (for they will suffer a sick man, that cannot bear dipping, to die without it,) they would have *the multitude* to think those examples to make against us, when really they do not at all. Now then let any one judge whether that my saying, ‘ there are plain places of ‘ Scripture concerning adult baptism,’ be any better proof than the rest, of my ‘ owning that there is no ‘ proof of Scripture for the other.’

Having now recited all the evidence he brings against me for that vile accusation; I desire that I may have the justice allowed me, to charge him home with the falsehood of it. And because Colonel Danvers had a great name, and Mr. Baxter<sup>c</sup>, making a comparison between him and one Bagshaw, (who it seems was notorious for this faculty,) said, ‘ Mr. ‘ Bagshaw is now quite overdone in the quality of ‘ untruths;’ let us for this purpose compare some of

<sup>c</sup> [In his ‘ Confutation of the strange forgeries of Mr. Henry ‘ Danvers,’ &c.]

the worst of Mr. Danvers' untruths with this of the writer before us.

Mr. Danvers would falsely recite, or pervert the sense of some *old author*; so that by his management of a sentence, and making his own consequence from it, and then setting down that consequence as the author's words, or what that author *confessed*, some old council or author would speak antipædobaptism<sup>d</sup>. But he never, that I remember, had the face to do this with a book that he was answering, or writing against. He would never say that Mr. Baxter, for example, said, confessed, or owned, what he did not say or confess. Good reason. For his readers were supposed to have Mr. Baxter's book to compare, whereas the old books they would hardly ever examine.

Another difference: that gentleman understood Latin but very indifferently, and might mistake the sense, which cannot be said of our author, whose talent is philology.

So that upon the whole I should think that Mr. Gale has won.

He thinks he exposes me to some contempt, when he relates how I asked pardon of one whom I conceived I might have wronged, (who it seems told him of it; so greedy have they been to pick up frivolous stories;) but I would advise him, if he have wronged any one to such a degree as he has me in this untrue accusation, to ask his pardon; or else to read and apply to himself what our Saviour says, Matt. v. 23—26. As for doing it to me, I shall excuse him by giving it beforehand; only for

<sup>d</sup> [See instances of this unfair dealing given at vol. i. p. 259. 328; vol. ii. p. 7, 8, 10, 45, 214, 231, 408.]

the vindication of the cause and myself, I would have the truth of the matter of fact fairly examined, and I do not care if it be done by those of his own opinion, who have any due regard to common justice.

This pretended concession of mine is the groundwork of all this chapter of his, and all the rest is a declamation and triumph upon the supposal that 'we have no Scripture proof to plead;' that 'the Scripture is wholly silent concerning infant-baptism;' and twenty other ways that he has of expressing it. And to give him his due, grant him that, and he can go on, and build consequences upon it, strenuously enough, and approve himself a very *wordy* author. But the foundation being taken from him, all the superstructure falls of itself. So that I have no more to do with this chapter, than to make a few remarks on here and there a passage.

Page 234. He says, the antipædobaptists 'have been taken for a very strange sort of people;' but now the world is persuaded they 'are not that unreasonable mischievous sect they were represented to be'.] But the good opinion that was had of their sincerity is something lessened again by his unfair way of defending their cause; so far, I mean, as one man's foul dealing can go, to reflect a discredit on the general body, which does not go very far; for I believe a great many of them do disapprove of his disingenuous representations of things. And where he in the same page wishes 'a more impartial and learned examination of these matters might be seriously entered on,' it must be then with some better regard to truth than he

has shewn, lest it come (as Mr. Baxter complained it did in his days) to, ‘Thou liest,’ and ‘Thou liest.’

Page 241. ‘They must not surmise, but *plainly* shew us that infant-baptism is indeed contained in the Scriptures.’] Some writers, and particularly some of the antipædobaptists, do carry their demand of *plainness* in the Scriptures to such a degree of peremptoriness, as is inconsistent with that awe and reverence which is due to God’s word. We must take his word as it is, and not arrogantly demand why he did not cause such or such things to be expressed plainer, that there might have been left no possible room for cavils, doubts, or exceptions. Some things therein are so. But that some other things (even of those which God would have to be done) are not expressed with the same degree of plainness, but must be concluded by circumstances, &c., is confessed by all readers of it.

We must in such cases use humility and diligence in reading, weighing, comparing the several texts, and consequences from texts, or from the nature of the thing itself. And if from all these there be light enough to satisfy the conscience of an impartial inquirer, that such or such a thing is our Lord’s real meaning, we must do it without cavilling. If a master give a command to his servant in short, to take care of his flock, shall an arrogant servant excuse himself, that he did not in the commission *particularly* name the lambs?

Now what we say of the plainness of the proof from Scripture for dedicating and entering our infant children (as well as ourselves) into the covenant of God in Christ, (without which there is no salva-

salvation either to infants or adult,) and giving them baptism, the seal thereof, is this: that there is in God's word so much proof of this being our duty, as may satisfy the conscience of such an inquirer as I spoke of, though not such as will stop the mouth of an importunate and undutiful caviller. If upon such weighing and consideration, the reasons from God's word *for* the doing any thing do clearly outweigh those that may be brought *against* the doing it, our duty is to do it.

Page 243. 'Which (baptism of adult persons) is a thing very rarely seen or heard of now in the greatest part of the Christian world, their traditionary pædobaptism being substituted in its room.'] And should not such a matter of fact (setting aside his invidious epithets) startle the conscience even of a confident man, to see his opinion concerning the sense of God's word condemned by *almost all* his brethren of the Christian world? *Almost all* in this age, and *quite all* in most former ages. Can they think that there were not, or are not, in any or all the national churches that are, or ever were, any that can judge of the meaning of God's word? They should mind how St. Paul speaks to some among the Corinthians, who were very self-conceited: 1 Cor. xi. 16. *If any be contentious, we have no such custom, neither the churches of God: and again, ch. xiv. 36; What? came the word of God out from you; or came it unto you only?*

Page 244. 'Our author at his ordination—declared upon oath his free and full assent to the Articles.' And again, p. 247, 'All the clergy——their free assent to upon oath.'] This happens to men that

will talk confidently of things they understand not. The clergy do subscribe the Articles, but not at their ordination, nor upon oath. The exception that he here makes against mine, or their adhering to the doctrine of them, is too apparently frivolous (being founded on his foregoing untruth) to need any notice.

Page 251. He seems here to be writing for a *place*. I thought that some of them had gratified him for his pains, that he needed not to bring in any by-aims into a book of controversy. But how if that great man should read his second chapter, p. 85, 86, &c., where he would understand himself to be (as Mr. Gale pronounces the verdict upon us all) ‘no true member of a Christian church; not ‘baptized; one with whom it is not fit to have any ‘communion.’ &c.

Page 254. Speaking of the subjects of baptism. ‘And those you have already seen, sir, Mr. Wall ‘himself allows to be the adult only, as far as the ‘Scriptures can go to inform us of the matter.’] This is one of the twenty——I spoke of. But tell me, Mr. Gale, did your *sir* give his nod to this too? I can hardly think it of him. If he did, it is like pleader, like judge.

This calumny (since he stands in it thus) and some of his others are of such moment, and are such direct falsehoods, that it may be needful for me to do as Mr. Wills did against Mr. Danvers, viz. to put in an *Appeal*<sup>c</sup> against him to his own brethren. And I do in good earnest desire any

<sup>c</sup> [One of Mr. Wills’ publications on the baptismal controversy is entitled, ‘An Appeal to the Baptists against Mr. Danvers for ‘his strange forgeries.’ See the note at p. 492 of vol. i.]

of the antipædobaptists, who are lovers of truth, and do scorn to have their cause defended by base methods and untruths in matter of fact, to examine and give their opinion concerning this conduct of his. What I have to say to the body of them, any other reader may, if he pleases, pass over as a thing not concerning him.

I desire them to try, and judge, and declare, whether he has not done an open injury to me and the truth, and indeed to the credit of their cause, by this falsehood of which I have been speaking, and (because I would not incumber them with an inquiry into *all* his misrepresentations) by two more.

What he affirms positively, over and over, through this chapter, (that I do confess, or own, or allow, or grant, that infant-baptism cannot be proved from Scripture,) I charge upon him as a falsehood. Let the places of my book which he quotes, or any other that he can find to prove this my *concession*, (as he calls it,) be considered and canvassed. Please to observe, gentlemen, that the verdict or judgment to be given in this case, is not, whether there be, or be not, in your opinion, proof from Scripture for it: but whether I have said or granted that there is none. And if I have not, you see where the falsehood rests.

Of the other two things, one is, where he says, ‘ that I do industriously take all occasions to blacken ‘ the antipædobaptists, and render them the objects ‘ of resentment and contempt:’ and a great many other odious charges to the same purpose, (his way being, as I said, where a thing is untrue, to repeat it over and over). These are to be seen in his 21, 22,

and 23 pages. And again at p. 48, 49, where he refers to a page of mine, which page, if any one read, I desire them to mind whether I say any thing of *countenancing*; and whether I do not say, ‘there are but few of them in England that hold ‘that error.’ And again at p. 51, 52, where he speaks of me as ‘representing and judging of the ‘whole body by the odd, singular opinions of a few ‘particular men in it;’ which I did not do. And again at p. 57, that ‘I load them with some of the ‘most infamous and hated opinions,’ and instances in that of the Socinians, and says, ‘I insinuate as if ‘they countenanced’ such; whereas I neither say nor insinuate any such thing, but do say the direct contrary, (and he had seen it, and quotes part of it.) that ‘they that profess it openly are rejected from ‘their communion.’ I begin that paragraph thus: ‘Socinians they have some that creep in among ‘them;’ and end it as he says: and had, in my second edition, p. 449, mentioned a decree or resolution of their general body for that purpose<sup>f</sup>.

If any antipædobaptist will mind what expressions I use, when I speak of the general body of them, (as in those places of the second part of my book, which in the first edition are p. 216. 279, 280. 288. 402, 403, 404. 416;—in the second edition they are p. 430. 453, 454. 460. 549, 550, 551. 554. 561<sup>g</sup>;) he will see how falsely Mr. Gale represents the character that I give of them. And in reading that second edition every body will observe

<sup>f</sup> [This is found at vol. ii. p. 359 of the present edition.]

<sup>g</sup> [In the *present* edition these passages occur at pages 323. 367, 368. 380. 551. 552. 560. 573 of volume ii.]



that what I could learn concerning their several tenets, by discourse with Mr. Stennet, (who gave me better information than I could get elsewhere,) I have carefully and candidly inserted it.

For when my second edition was in the press, a good while before that chapter concerning the *present state* and *tenets* of the English antipædobaptists was printed off, I wrote to him, being then unknown to me by face, to this purpose; that however different our opinions were concerning what ought to be held or practised, yet that in an *historical* account of what they *do actually* hold or practise, I was desirous to be informed by themselves; and accordingly desired him to read that chapter, and give me his observations on it. But before he could well answer, I having occasion to go to London, called on him. He received me very kindly; acknowledged that I had treated the antipædobaptists more civilly than had been usual; said that he had not yet written any thing of what I had desired, but that if I would take pen and ink, he would, as he read the several paragraphs, tell me what he thought might be added or altered, which I might set down in short notes. I did so. He did not pretend, as this man does, that I had said any thing false of their tenets, but in many places where I had said that ‘some of them’ hold so and so, he told me, ‘there were but few, and those of least repute, that held so.’ I inserted in the several paragraphs the notes I had taken from his mouth, as may be seen in the second edition. As at p. 432. [vol. ii. p. 327.] ‘And I have received of late a credible account,’ &c.—p. 435. [333.] ‘I am told by one that should know,’ &c.—What I say.

p. 436. [335.] ‘I think it is but few in *England*,’ &c., stands as it did. He made no exception or addition to that, p. 445. [352.] ‘I am lately assured ‘by a man of chief note,’ &c., p. 447. [357.] ‘But ‘this account of Danvers,’ &c.—and another like note at the foot of that page. P. 451, 452, [364, &c.] there is a more exact account of the office of *teachers, messengers, representatives*, than I had had before. And what he could tell me, that tended to the clearing of Ilicks, I added as a P.S. p. 431. [324.]

Now what I desire in justice is, that such foul words as Mr. Gale uses against me on this point, (as where he says, p. 57, ‘If indeed the things he taxes ‘us with were true,’ &c., ‘but they are so notoriously false, that I admire any man, especially one ‘of Mr. Wall’s order,’ &c.) may be examined; and he required to shew the falsehood, or else to take the guilt and shame and imputation of it to himself. And that to that purpose, what I have said above, in answer to his first and second chapters, viz. to his, 21, 22, 23, and 48, 49, and 57, 58 pages, may be considered. And that they try whether they can fairly bring off this defender of their cause from the imputation of using base means to do it; and if not, consider how far they will approve of him.

I suppose he spread this character of me, on purpose to keep the antipaedobaptists from giving any impartial regard to what I said, or produced from antiquity: (for no man hears willingly one that hates and belies him;) but I hope they will search carefully where the lie is to be fixed.

The other is, that which I mentioned above in

my answer to his long discourse from p. 81 to p. 88, where he represents the sense of my words in a manner so gross and absurd, as to make it as bad as his other way of falsifying words.

In my ‘Dissuasive from Separation,’ part ii. chap. 11, I have argued, that Christians, whose opinions do not differ in *fundamentals*, ought not for other differences to separate or renounce communion with one another (owning at the same time that they that differ in *fundamentals* must separate). I gave there several reasons why the difference between pædobaptists and antipædobaptists should not be accounted a fundamental one. From the Scripture. From the Creeds. From the case of Tertullian, and Gregory Nazianzen. From the declared sense of many of the most noted men both of the one and the other side of this question, particularly of Mr. Tombes, Mr. Stennet, and of those one hundred churches of antipædobaptists whose *confession* is published 1699, and another 1701. With these I there argue, that they ought, by their principle, to hold communion with the church of the place where they live, in prayers and in the other sacrament, even on supposition *that their opinion be right*, that giving baptism to the adult only is the fittest, and though they continue in that practice themselves. My reason is, because the difference is confessed by them not to be *fundamental*. And this wretched perverter of my words, declaring himself for the other *uncharitable* opinion, says, ‘We (meaning himself, and I know not who else) do hold it to be fundamental; and that none but persons dipped at their adult age, are true members of the Christian church; and that none else are baptized.’

And Mr. Wall supposes us in the right in all this; 'and yet would have us unite with persons we are 'persuaded are not baptized,' p. 86: and p. 84, says of me, that I always, 'proceed on this supposition.' I had indeed said that there were some few such uncharitable men among them, who say (much as the *Donatists* did, and *Papists* do) that none are Christians but themselves. But any one that reads the place will see, that it is with the other (the main body of them) that I there argue, that they ought (even supposing their way of baptism be in itself better) to join with the church in other duties.

Let the men, to whose honesty I appeal, judge if this be not a base abuse of my words. The other slander he repeated about twenty times: this I think about ten. Let them say whether such tricking imposture be to be used in arguments for religious matters.

Worse than this. He at p. 84 calls it my *concession*. I never made a concession that the other, the charitable sort, are in the right in their opinion; but only a supposition or putting the case that they were so.

All this while, though he pretend to answer that chapter of mine, he takes not a word of notice of what I there produce from the *confession* of the one hundred churches, and from Mr. Tombes and Mr. Stennet, declaring the contrary to what he here declares to be the sense of the antipædobaptists. I believe indeed he does not like them. But I wonder that saying of Mr. Stennet, 'the reproach which 'Mr. Russen casts on them, (the antipædobaptists,) 'viz. that they judge none of the true church but

‘ those of their own way’, did not fly in his face and daunt him, while he was setting me forth as a *reproacher* of them ; for by Mr. Stennet’s account it is he, and not I, that casts a reproach upon them. I shall never forget what Mr. Stennet told me, (which I recite, second edition, p. 447,) vol. ii. [p. 357,] that ‘ the country where I live, is full of such of them as are of the least repute.’ For I see that the antipædobaptists in many other parts of England do speak and argue much more like Christians than this man.

These three instances of his conduct I do lay before the antipædobaptists, for their approbation or disapproving ; and I think it concerns the credit of their cause, and the reputation of their sincerity, to declare one or the other of them.

And when their hands are in, and his book is before them, it will, I know, be much expected of them to declare their sentiment concerning Mr. Gale’s notion of *dipping*, whether a thing or person be *dipped*, if a small part of it (as the nib of a pen) be dipped, or covered with water. A fair stating of this, and their free declaring their opinion, may go a great way toward adjusting and ending many contentious disputes. The pages where he treats of this, p. 122, &c., I noted above. In favour to that notion of his, I would give my humble advice, that they take this consideration along with them ; that without the help of it, they will never be able to maintain that the word *baptize* does always signify *to dip*.

Page 254. ‘ And our author himself has recourse ‘ to it so frequently.’] I thought I might have done with that grating complaint ; but here is another

necessary occasion given, another thing said of me, that is utterly false. For he is here speaking of some who use ‘a miserable cavil, that Christ has  
 ‘no where forbidden them to baptize infants, and  
 ‘therefore they infer they ought not to neglect it.’ He spends four or five pages in a trifling manner to expose this cavil, and exemplifies it by comparisons:  
 ‘Why does not our author baptize persons after  
 ‘they are dead——since the Scripture does not  
 ‘expressly forbid him? The Scripture does not say  
 ‘to the contrary, but that such a clod in a field is  
 ‘Adam’s body?’ nor ‘that the Roman is not the  
 ‘only true Catholic church;’ and such rambling impertinences. But at p. 258 he says he will ‘give  
 ‘an instance something nearer to the matter in  
 ‘hand. We are no where forbid to baptize our  
 ‘cattle, bells, tables,’ &c.

But I will give an instance nearer yet. We are forbid to——. For this (as said of me, that I ‘have  
 ‘frequent recourse to this argument’) is no other. I had argued in my *introduction* to this purpose: that there having been before Christ’s and St. John’s time a custom to baptize infants, we must not say that they altered any thing, or that Christ bade his apostles alter any thing from the usual way, unless we had proof from Scripture that they did so. And where Christ uses general words, *all nations, every person*, we must not make exceptions unless the Scripture do. And I produced Dr. Lightfoot’s words to that purpose. But this is nothing like the *cavil* that Mr. Gale speaks of, but has a direct contrary tendency. Yet he, without any regard to truth, imputes it to me; and goes on with aggravating the absurdity of this cavil, (which he

feigns me to use,) till at last he has heated himself to that degree of foul language as to say, at

Page 259, ‘ If our author argues well, and the  
‘ Scripture’s silence be sufficient reason for a thing,  
‘ he ought in honour and conscience to return to  
‘ *Rome.*’]

Most young men that are brought up to learning, are at the same time taught and inured to rules of civility, good manners, and to forbearing of scurrilous language. I wonder how Mr. Gale has attained the one of these, (for he has indeed a good faculty of philological learning,) and yet seems never to have been taught any thing of the other. Some of the country clownish disputants, when they are got on some heath or common one into one waggon, and the other into another, to brawl against one another before a rabble, are apt, after some provoking language, to say, ‘ Get you gone to Munster, ‘ from whence you came all of you;’ and the other to answer, ‘ Do you return to Rome.’ But in a printed book of a learned man, I have seldom seen such stuff before, as in this and in the next paragraph, ‘ Our author ought to follow his example,’ &c. Especially if the occasion was not real, but feigned, as it is here, and no provocation given. As to any given by me, I was so unfortunate as never to have heard of Mr. Gale before he wrote; and for the antipædobaptists in general, I am confident (and will refer it to any impartial reader) that what Mr. Stennet observed is true, that no book written in this dispute has been freer from any provoking or abusive expressions. But he has in this very chapter forged out of his own brain several things to fix upon me, and then pursues the

consequences of those forgeries with reproaches, such as are never used (at least without a preceding provocation) but by very ill-bred men. But why does he repeat this but three or four times? For it is as false as any of the rest.

I will not hastily believe of the antipædobaptists, many of whom (I have once said it<sup>h</sup>, and will not yet go from it) are ‘a sober and grave, quiet and ‘peaceable sort of men,’ therefore I will not believe of them, that they, perceiving that the history which I wrote of infant-baptism did, by all the testimonies which are to be found of the ancient Christians, shew their practice and doctrine to be *for* it; and that the summing up of the evidence did turn (whether I would or not) *against* their tenet; and that they were not able to bring any candid writer that could fairly contradict or overthrow the credit of the testimonies produced, did therefore contrive to set up against me one of their fierce creatures to bait me. I rather think they were mistaken in their man. For they might easily judge, that the satisfying the conscience of a doubting Christian (which is all that controversial books are good for) does not depend upon declamation and harangue, or an assured and masterlike way of talking, much less upon picking up stories, and making personal reflections on the writer, and less yet upon forgeries, taunts, and foulmouthed reproaches. Any history (and mine was nothing else) can be answered no other way, but by shewing the evidence of the facts or sayings to be either not true, or not pertinent; which has been the least part of this author’s aim. He has not pretended or attempted to answer in

<sup>h</sup> [See vol. ii. p. 323.]



that way any more than the first five chapters, not one tenth of the whole evidence ; and we shall see, when we come at it, how that is done.

---

C H A P. VII.

WHEN I read over the first ten pages of this chapter, I was under some difficulty in what method one must begin an answer to so long and rambling an argument, the force of which does all depend upon something which, at page 265, he says he will discover by and by. But when I came to p. 271, I was eased. For there he says of all before, ‘ But ‘ these are trifles. A more material objection is ‘ yet behind.’ I thought he never spoke a truer word, and should have been content to let them pass as such.

But they are indeed worse than *trifles*. For he cannot forbear to bring in by head and shoulders a malicious accusation against king Charles I, at pages 262, 263, that ‘ all people thought—he ‘ gave private instructions to his fleet sent to Rochelle, that they should not assist the town.’ And another false one against me, at page 270, (which I think may be the fortieth or fiftieth of that nature,) that I do ‘ insinuate more than once, that the commission, Matt. xxviii. 19, relates *peculiarly*’ (that is, as he presently after explains his meaning, *only*) ‘ to the adult.’ His confidence at some times is not strong enough to affirm that I *say* such or such a thing, (which I wonder at,) and then he says that I *insinuate* it.

His evidence against the blessed martyr is one

Leti; who, I suppose, knew nothing of the matter, but only echoed what the rebellious party then in England said; and yet at last does not say near what Mr. Gale does. And against me he quotes my book, part ii. p. 378, 379, (in the last edition it is p. 531<sup>i</sup>.) which whosoever reads over, be he pædobaptist or antipædobaptist, and does not see that I am so far from saying or *insinuating* what he says, that I endeavour to prove the direct contrary, (viz. that infants are meant as part of the *nations*;) that man and I shall never agree about the sense of plain words.

His boasting of his performance, which is not omitted in any chapter, takes up a good part of this. He begins it, ‘I hope, sir, I may venture to say that what was urged in my last’ (that was where he urged from the *concession* which he had forged in my name of the Scripture’s silence) ‘amounts to little less than a demonstration.’ It does not *quite*, it seems, amount to a *demonstration*. But I can tell him what it amounts to quite. And at p. 264, ‘the steps that I take are easy and sure, according to the method in use among mathematicians——: and therefore I may well enough call it a demonstration.’ It were really advisable for him to study something of the mathematics, for he could never then allow himself to argue so loosely as he does. The demonstration (all of it that is pertinent) comes at

Pages 267, 268, &c. The words of the commission, *Teach* (so he translates the word *μαθητεύσατε*) *all nations. baptizing them, &c.*, ‘are *equally* said

<sup>i</sup> [In the present edition, p. 513, 514, 520.]

‘ of all—without difference or exception. From whence it follows, that the same things are to be done to all, and that too in the same order.’ Then he infers to this purpose: But the adult must be taught *first*, before they be baptized: therefore infants must either be taught *first*, (which is impossible,) or else not baptized. This is the substance, for it is impossible to bring his demonstration into a syllogism.

And it is just as strong as this other would be: The commission, *baptizing them in the name, &c., teaching them to observe, &c.*, runs in the counter-order; and therefore demonstrates the direct contrary. Nay not so strong. For here the word *διδάσκοντες* does certainly signify *teaching*, and nothing else.

As strong as this: That command, Exod. xii. *Let all his males be circumcised*, is given for all males in the same words: therefore if the adult males must be taught the meaning of that seal of God’s covenant before they receive it, so must the infant males also, or else not be circumcised.

Page 271. To shew that all persons in the nations are not meant, he instances in unbelievers, blasphemers, atheists, debauchees, &c. Now these are that sort of persons whom our Saviour came especially to call, and sent his apostles to convert and baptize them. It is true, that if they would not be converted, they must not be baptized. The reason is, that they themselves did in such a case put a bar, which is not the case of infants.

Page 273, he gives as great an instance of pride and insolence, as one shall almost ever see in any haughty ill-bred young man. He attacks Mr. Dor-

rington, a grave divine, in a most contemptuous manner, for no other reason but his publishing a book to prove infant-baptism from Scripture, and particularly from this text, Matt. xxviii. 19; calling him ‘an author that affects wonders, and his whole book is one, in which he undertakes to prove infant-baptism from Scripture.’ And he concludes, ‘If the rector of Wittresham had better considered, —— he would not ‘have exposed himself so much ‘by the publication of this book.’

Has he in the midst of his haughtiness forgot who he himself is, and that a rector of Wittresham (which term he, according to the custom of ill-bred men in these times, uses in contempt) is a much better title than any he can pretend to? Or does he think things are come to that pass, that the schismatics shall publish what they please against the doctrines of the church, and it shall not be allowed to the ministers thereof to write the defence of them from Scripture, without being publicly insulted for so doing? Sure that is no part of the indulgence intended to dissenters by the present toleration. It was so perhaps in Oliver Cromwell’s time.

If he do not know that all others (as well as Mr. Dorrington) have been used to prove infant-baptism from Scripture, why have the antipædobaptists set up one to write, that has read nothing of what has been said before on the subject? Has not Mr. Baxter, for one, a large book, ‘Plain Scripture proof for Infants’ Church-membership and ‘Baptism?’ Colonel Danvers speaks, and I from him, of a papist, who going to hear a dispute about infant-baptism, told his friend, he was ‘going to

‘hear a miracle, viz. infant-baptism proved by ‘Scripture<sup>k</sup>.’ This has been counted an instance of a shameless papist mocking the protestants. But we see he is imitated.

He abuses Mr. Dorrington and me, both in that one paragraph; either of us, I suppose, old enough to be his father: him for undertaking to prove it from Scripture, and me by repeating again the forementioned vile slander, that I own, &c.

At page 274 begins the long dispute of above sixty pages, about the signification of the word *μαθητεύσατε*, Matt. xxviii. 19: whereas, to the argument for infant-baptism taken from that text, (which is in the English, *Go and teach all nations, baptizing them, &c., teaching them to observe, &c.*) viz. that infants are part of the nation, and so to be baptized by this commission, the antipædobaptists do retort, and say, infants are such a part of the nation, as are not capable of being *taught*, and so not to be baptized; I had answered in half a page, that the word which is translated *teach*, in the first of those clauses, has a peculiar signification in the original, and is not the same word as that which is translated *teach* in the second, but signifies much like what we say in English; ‘to enter any one’s ‘name as a scholar, disciple, or proselyte to such a ‘master, school, or profession.’ And that the Jews’ language, as it does not admit of this phrase, ‘an ‘infant is taught, or instructed,’ so it very well allows of this other, such or such an infant is ‘entered a disciple,’ or ‘made a proselyte’ to such a profession or religion. And I instanced in those children of proselytes, which when they were to-

<sup>k</sup> [See vol. ii. p. 377.]

gether with their parents circumcised and baptized, the Jews did commonly (as I had shewed) call *young proselytes*. And I added some other things in confirmation of that answer.

To overthrow this interpretation of mine given of that text, and of the word *μαθητεύσατε*, he (who through all the last chapter had boldly maintained that I pretended no Scripture proof at all) spends the most of this, and the next chapter, producing a number of quotations, in some of which that word is used in the case of present actual teaching.

I would (as before for the word *βαπτίζω*) have granted him that; that the word, *making disciples*, is far oftener used by authors in the case of such as are at that time actually begun to be taught. But the import of the word does not necessarily include that in its signification, and so need not be supposed to do it here.

I do not think fit to follow him in his long ramble through every paragraph and quotation, but shall here make such observations as I think necessary, and such as will, I think, take off the force of all that he in these two chapters brings against our sense of the word.

The word in its neuter intransitive signification (to *be* a disciple to, or under any one) had been used by others, viz. philosophers, historians, &c., before our Saviour's and St. Matthew's time; but I think St. Matthew (or rather his interpreter) is the first that ever used it in the active transitive signification, (to *make* any one a disciple, or to *teach* one as a disciple,) or with any accusative case. There is no instance of this transitive signification in any of the passages of the heathen authors pro-

duced by Mr. Gale, nor, I think, in any other<sup>1</sup>. The Christian authors that use it so have borrowed it from St. Matthew, of which the earliest is St. Luke, Acts xiv. 21. (which is the only instance beside St. Matthew that I remember in the Bible.) The Fathers continue the use of it from them.

So that it seems to have been a new word, made on purpose to express the sense of the command given by our Saviour to his apostles, of proselyting all the nations of the world to him and his religion. The sense of it therefore must be learned from the notion of the word *μαθητής*, from whence it is immediately derived.

1. *Μαθητής* is a *disciple*. And that *μαθητεύω* does accordingly, when it is used as a verb active, literally and in its immediate import, signify *to make disciples*; and when used as a verb neuter, *to be a disciple*, and *μαθητεύομαι*, *to be made a disciple*, is so plain a thing, that I will never spend time to prove it, unless I were to teach any one the grammar and analogy of that language. All that know them will, if they be not strongly biassed for a side, presently own it, and they that do not must take time to learn them. Even those that translate it *teach*, have done it only for this reason, because they obviously conceiving that the making men disciples is ordinarily done by teaching, have thought that to be the more intelligible word to stand in a vulgar translation. Mr. Le Clerc, who pretends to no small skill in these niceties, has (as Mr. Gale here quotes him, p. 310) owned this; that ‘the proper

<sup>1</sup> [The lexicographers at least are acquainted with none such. See the latest and fullest, namely, Stephens' Greek Thesaurus, enlarged by Valpy, &c.]

‘signification of the word μαθητεύειν is, *to make disciples*, and not *to teach* ;’ though he do there add, ‘it is true that disciples are not made but by teaching. And Episcopius (whom he quotes afterward, p. 323) speaks to the same purpose. And so does Limborch. Nor is it contradicted by any that he quotes, (as far as I remember.) when they speak of the proper and grammatical rendering of the *word* ; though the *thing* itself which they suppose our Saviour meant to command the apostles to do, they do many of them express by the words *teaching, instructing, &c.* ; but many do keep to the word itself, *make disciples, gather disciples, &c.* And the criticism is not, as Mr. Gale, p. 305, expounds it, that the word ‘primarily and immediately signifies *teaching*,’ and consequentially *making disciples*, but the direct contrary : the immediate signification is *making disciples*, and consequentially *teaching*, viz. in all cases where disciples cannot be made, but by present teaching, of which more must be said by and by. It is indeed true, what he there urges, that in the nature of the *things* ‘teaching is in most cases the cause, and being made disciples the effect ;’ but in the grammatical import of the *words*, μαθητεύω primarily signifies *making*, μαθητὰς, *disciples*, and *teaching* no otherwise but by a consequence backward from the effect to the cause.

2. Since the direct and strict translation of the word in the commission is *making disciples*, it is proper to examine what is the import of that word *disciples*.

1. First, the etymology of it is, we know, from μαρθάνω, *to learn*, as a man learns an art, a trade, a doctrine, or a language. And I think Dr. Whitby,



(as Mr. Gale quotes him here, p. 277,) saying, ‘ I desire any one to tell me how the apostles could μαθητεύειν make a disciple of an heathen, or unbelieving Jew, without being μαθηταὶ or teachers of them,’ has forgot himself; μαθητῆς never signifying a *teacher*, but a *learner*. And the apostles were not to be μαθηταὶ of the heathens, but the heathens of them. Else our Saviour’s command to the apostles would run; *make all nations μαθητὰς*, i. e. your teachers.

But for a true conception of the import of the word *disciples*; a thing much more considerable than the etymology, is to observe the use of it in the books of the New Testament, in what sense it is generally taken there. And by a diligent minding the several places where it occurs, it will appear to be used by them in much the same sense as the word *Christians* is with us. In Acts ix. 26, St. Paul, soon after he turned Christian himself, *assayed to join himself to the disciples at Jerusalem, but they were afraid of him, and believed not that he was a disciple*: and at Ephesus he finding certain *disciples, &c.*: in all which places we should have said *Christian, or Christians*. And what puts it out of doubt that they used these words as synonymous, is that St. Luke tells us, that those who had been hitherto called *disciples* began at Antioch to be called *Christians*, Acts xi. 26, *The disciples were first called Christians at Antioch*.

In the books of Scripture, even after this, the writers do seldom use the word *Christians*. St. Peter, who lived and preached at Antioch, where the word was first framed, uses it once; *If any man suffer as a Christian*. And king Agrippa was almost persuaded

to be a *Christian*. But our Saviour himself was the first author of the word in effect. Those, who were afterwards called *Christians*, he styled *Χριστοῦ ὄντας*, *belonging to Christ*. And (what is remarkable to this purpose) he uses it as equivalent to the word *disciples*. For that which St. Matthew expresses thus, chap. x. 42, *Whosoever shall give to drink unto one of these little ones a cup of cold water only*, εἰς ὄνομα μαθητοῦ, *in the name of a disciple*, or because they are *disciples*; St. Mark, ix. 41, has thus, *Whosoever shall give you a cup of water to drink*, ἐν τῷ ὀνόματί μου, ὅτι Χριστοῦ ἐστε, *in my name, because you belong to Christ*, or because you are *Christ's*, or *Christians*. And St. Paul, who never, as I remember, uses either the word *μαθητῆς* or the word *Χριστιανός*, does frequently use the word *Χριστοῦ ὄν* (which had been used by our Saviour) instead of them, for any one's being a *Christian*. 2 Cor. x. 7, *If any man trust to himself*, Χριστοῦ εἶναι, *that he is Christ's*, let him of himself think this again, that, as he is Χριστοῦ, *Christ's*, even so are we Χριστοῦ, *Christ's*; where without any deviation from the sense it might have been translated *Christian*; we are *Christians* as well as he: and the like, Gal. v. 24, οἱ τοῦ Χριστοῦ, *they that are Christ's*, or *Christians*; so Gal. iii. 29; 1 Cor. xv. 23. Another word commonly used by him to the same purpose, is ἁγίου, *the saints*. Almost all his epistles are so directed; τοῖς ἁγίοις, 'to the saints' at such or such a place, i. e. the *Christians* there. He chides the Corinthians that they went to law before the unbelievers, and not before *the saints*, the *Christians*. He made a collection for the poor *saints* at Jerusalem, i. e. the *Christian* poor of that place. And this last

word is used also by St. Jude, and often in the Revelation. Other words of like use, and to the same purpose, as μαθηταὶ, *the disciples*, in the New Testament, are οἱ ἀδελφοὶ, *the brethren*, οἱ τῆς ὁδοῦ, or ταύτης τῆς ὁδοῦ, *those of that way*, Acts ix. 2. item xxii. 4, that is, of the *Christian* way or religion.

These names compared together do give us somewhat a clearer notion of the import of the word *disciples*. They do all terminate in the Antiochian word, (which is now the common word to express them all,) viz. *Christians*. And consequently we do hereby understand more distinctly the sense of μαθητεύειν, (or as it is, John iv. 1, μαθητὰς ποιεῖν,) *to make disciples*. Whatever constitutes or makes a person τοῦ Χριστοῦ εἶναι, to belong to Christ, to be a *Christian*, or in St. Paul's word, τοῦ Χριστοῦ, Christ's, ἀδελφόν, a brother, ἅγιον, a *saint*; that makes or constitutes him μαθητήν, a *disciple*, in the Scripture sense of the word. And that does the blessed Spirit of God by the office of an apostle or other minister of Christ entering, dedicating, and baptizing him with water in the name which is by Christ appointed; by his own consent and faith, if he be adult; or by the consent and desire of his parents, or other guardians, or owners, dedicating him to Christ, if an infant. So that μαθητεύειν, *to disciple* any one, is equivalent to our English word, *christen* any one.

I think that the antipædobaptists themselves will grant that most of the other words which are equivalent to that of *disciple* may be applied to infants. They will not deny that infants may *belong to Christ*,

or be τοῦ Χριστοῦ, *Christ's*. How else, if they die in infancy, can they come to the kingdom of heaven, which is not given to men or infants, merely as being of human race, but as belonging to Christ?

The term of *saints* (or *holy*, which is all one) St. Paul gives to children as well as to men, 1 Cor. vii. 14. And whoever grants them these titles, of being *Christ's*, or *Christians*, of being to be *received in his name*, and of being *saints*, or *holy*, will not deny them the name of *brethren*, or the other names which I mentioned, as equivalent to disciples.

3. Whereas Mr. Gale represents (as he does many times in these two chapters) the paedobaptists as denying that the word μαθητεύω does include, or connote, or has any relation to, *teaching*, he imputes to them more than, for ought I know, they ever said. At p. 280, having spoken of his antagonists, (for he has a scheme in his head, in which he is a considerable man, and the Catholic church are his antagonists,) he says, 'Where is their ingenuity, who so irregularly, &c., arbitrarily pretend that these words have no relation to teaching?' He says it positively of me, p. 311, that I 'infer, since the word which signifies *to make disciples*, does not necessarily include teaching,' &c. But this is no news with him to say of me, that I say or infer things that I never said or thought.

I do think and own that it does connote, or has a relation to, teaching, or being taught. For as μαθητής, *discipulus*, and the English word *disciple*, are derivatives of μαθήω and *disco*, *to learn*, so (what one of his authors observes) *learning* and *teaching* are, I own, correlatives. He says, p. 275,

that if it do not include teaching, all his 'argument ' from this place unavoidably falls to the ground.' So that I think we must, if it be but for pity's sake, allow him that; that it has a reference to teaching.

What we pretend to is, that it does not necessarily follow from the signification of the word, that that *learning* or *teaching* must be *at that present time*, when one is made, or styled μαθητής, or μαθητευθείς. But sometimes it refers to that teaching which one *has had* a good while before, and sometimes to that teaching which one is entered, consigned, and covenanted *to have hereafter*.

1. That Mnason, mentioned Acts xxi. 16, is styled *a disciple* still, though he may be judged to *have learned* all that was necessary long before. And so is St. John himself, at a time when all the world had need to learn of him, viz. in his old age, when he was the only surviving apostle, and after he had written his Gospel. John xxi. 24, *This is the disciple who wrote these things, &c.* It would not be proper here so say, *the learner*. And in many of the quotations brought by Mr. Gale, the word is used for such as were not *then* learners, but *had learned*; as Aristotle, p. 318, and several others, p. 319, 320, &c.

2. Of the word μαθητής, applied to such as had not yet begun to learn, but were appointed, dedicated, consigned, or bound to learn, the examples in books cannot be so frequent, because it is a case that writers, holy or profane, have seldom occasion to speak of. I did in those few lines mention some. As that the Scripture does include the children of Christians in the notion of the word μαθηταί, *dis-*

*ciples*, in those words of St. Peter, Acts xv. 10, where he says of them that would have imposed circumcision on the *Gentile* Christians, that they thereby attempted to put a yoke on the neck of the *disciples*; whereas it was the *infants* of those Christians especially, on whom the weight of this yoke would have fallen. Mr. Gale, p. 311, makes an exception against this instance, in which I am pleased to see how little he has to say against it, and shall answer it when I come to it.

I mentioned likewise the custom of the Jews to call the infant children of a proselyte, who were circumcised and baptized together with their father, *young proselytes*, (which, as I shewed, is the same thing as to say, *young disciples*;) at a time when as yet they could not *learn* or know any thing; only they were then dedicated to learn and keep the covenant of the true God, when they grew up. And I produced the testimonies of the Jews themselves, and of their Misnah for proof of this custom.

I quoted also Justin Martyr using the very same word that St. Matthew does, ἐμαθητεύθησαν, and applying it to children, speaking of some old men of his time, who ἐκ παιδῶν ἐμαθητεύθησαν τῷ Χριστῷ, ‘were made disciples to Christ in (or from) their childhood.’

A very learned man has been pleased since to communicate to me some observations of his, which prove that the penmen of Scripture and other Christian authors have commonly used the word to signify the reception of any one to the degree and number of *disciples*, as preparatory to subsequent instruction: so as that the person so received in

order to be taught, was, before the instruction itself, styled a *disciple*.

As where Eusebius, discoursing of our Lord's authority as a teacher, says, 'A teacher professes 'himself skilful in some art or science; and his 'disciples being desirous to learn, submit themselves to his instructions:' Ὅτε γὰρ διδάσκων ἐπαγγελίαν μαθήματός τινος ἐπαγγέλλεται· οἷτε αὐὸ μαθηταὶ, μαθημάτων ὀρεγόμενοι, σφῶς αὐτοὺς τῷ διδασκάλῳ προσφέροντες ἐπιτρέπουσιν, *Evangel. Demonstr. lib. iii. §. 5.* He styles them *disciples* before they have yet begun to learn.

And concerning that man spoken of, Luke ix. 57, *It came to pass, as they went in the way, a certain man said unto him, Lord, I will follow thee whithersoever thou goest*; the same learned person observes that St. Matthew calls this man, and another, who offered himself at the same time, *disciples*. For he, chap. viii. 19, 20, 21, having recited the same that St. Luke does concerning the first man, subjoins immediately, *Another of his disciples* (ἕτερος δὲ τῶν μαθητῶν αὐτοῦ) *said unto him, Lord, suffer me first &c.* The latter is expressly styled a *disciple* by St. Matthew, who calling him *another disciple*, does implicitly call the former likewise a *disciple*. Though it seems to have been the first meeting that the first had with our Saviour; and neither of them seem to have gone (at least not as yet) any farther than to express a purpose of following him.

We have the more reason to observe how St. Matthew, of all the evangelists, or his interpreter, uses the word *μαθητῆς*, because he being the first

that ever formed from it the verb *μαθητεύω* in any active transitive signification, the import of that verb, *to make disciples*, is best learned from his notion of the word *disciple*. And we see he uses it for one that was designed, or had a purpose to follow Christ and learn of him, though he had not yet done it, and as most ancient expositors think, never did.

He shews likewise by several instances, that in other words of a like use it is a necessary way of speaking in all languages, to give the term of some *office* or *action* to one who is now entered, appointed, or obliged to it, even before he actually performs any thing of it. A man becomes his *servant* whom he undertakes to serve, before he has performed any act of service. Nay, an infant may be born *a slave*, or servant, by a preceding obligation of his parents. A *pupil*, entered as such, under a *tutor*, has the name, before he has yet heard any lecture. And he gives a very apposite instance of such an use of words in the Scripture, in the case of the Kohathites, spoken of Numb. iii. There were but eight thousand six hundred of them in all, from a month old and upward, and all of that number are called, ver. 28, *keepers of the charge of the sanctuary*; for so are the words, *In the number of all the males, from a month old and upward, were eight thousand six hundred, keeping the charge of the sanctuary*. Those infants, as well as their fathers, are styled *keepers of the charge*, because they were dedicated and appointed to be brought up to that office; as an infant baptized in Christ's name is to his religion, being ἀπογεγραμμένος τῷ Χριστῷ,



enrolled and listed under his banner, and a promise made for him that he shall be taught and educated in his doctrine.

And accordingly the Christians of all ages, ancient and modern, (the ancient without exception, the modern with the exception only of some presbyterians,) have and do express this stipulation at the baptizing of any infant, that he shall, if he live, be brought up to the learning of it.

There is a word in our own language, and in common use with us, of the very same signification and derivation as μαθητής, or *disciple*; each of the words denotes a *learner*, only one refers to secular, the other to spiritual things to be learned. A father, or guardian, or sometimes a parish, puts out a child an *apprentice* to a master of any trade; he is called, and is an *apprentice* from the time of his being bound, (which may be, and sometimes is, in very tender years,) though he does not yet begin to learn his trade, but is consigned so to do, when capable.

A Jew's child, from the time that he was circumcised, though then but eight days old, became a debtor (as St. Paul calls it) to perform the law, and an heir of the promises of it, and entered into the covenant of God, and might be called a *covenantant*, as it is said, Deut. xxix. 12, *You and your little ones, &c., do enter into covenant with the Lord, and into his oath, &c.* In the same sense and way of speaking, a Christian's child dedicated to Christ in baptism, may be called his *disciple*, or one *grafted into the body of his church*, or as he himself expresses it, Χριστοῦ ὄν, belonging to Christ, or a *Christian*.

Mr. Gale, at p. 306, concludes with this challenge,

‘ If they will make appear that μαθητεύω can once ‘ signify in any passage to *make disciples*, exclusively of *teaching*, I will not only alter my present ‘ opinion, but,’ &c. ; and is so fulsome as to begin the next chapter, ‘ Though I concluded my last with a ‘ challenge,’ &c. If by *exclusively* he mean *without any relation to teaching*, it is true what he says, ‘ No man will accept it.’ But if he mean ‘ without ‘ a necessary implying of a *present* or *precedent* ‘ actual teaching,’ I think enough may have been said to shew the vanity of his boasting. Yet I think fitting (as I did in the word βαπτίζω) to refer to a passage which I may be confident he himself has seen.

One may plainly trace him along Pole’s Synopsis, for the interpreters that have explained it *teach*; and for the versions (Syr. Arab. Æthiop. &c., with which he makes so long a flourish) that have translated it *teach*. And there he saw, no doubt, those that vindicate the more general sense, *make disciples*, or, as Beza there would have it, in one Latin word, *discipulate*. He who learned from thence that Vatablus expounded βαπτίσονται, Mark vii. 4, *se totos abluebant*, could not but see here his rendering μαθητεύσατε, *make disciples*, nor could miss of seeing the reference to Gataker’s vindication of that sense, Adv. iv. 29; and Dr. Lightfoot’s observation, that in the phrase of the Jews they are called *disciples* (not only who are actually taught, but also) who are put to be taught; and (what shews the vanity of his challenge) the doctor’s quoting to that purpose, Rabb. Schabb. fol. 31. And the heathen intreating Hillel, ‘ Make me thy proselyte, (or ‘ *disciple*,) that thou mayest teach me.’

It will be granted that in far the greatest number

of passages where this word is used, the circumstances and additions are such as do shew that the author is there speaking of such a disciple as was then in the state of actual and present learning; and the notions of *discipling* and *instructing* do for the most part accompany one another in the same discourse and sentence. And so they do in our use of the word *apprentice*. But the notions themselves are distinct, and may be separate. When we say such an one proves 'a diligent, a tractable, or useful 'apprentice,' or 'a good proficient in his trade,' or the like, such sayings carry along with them a connotation of actual and present learning. But if he be sick, or idle, or stupid all his time, the word as applied to such an one, shall intimate nothing beyond its own precise and proper signification, that he was *put apprentice bound to learn*. And as a direction given in those short words, *Bind your children apprentices* to such or such an one, expresses a notion of the word abstracted from, and preceding to, the notion of their actual learning; so St. Matthew's word, (which is as short,) *Disciple to me all nations*, expresses a notion alike abstracted, and may be understood, either with or without *present* teaching, according to the capacity or incapacity of the person at present; only this it necessarily implies and commands, that the person be *taught*. Which may be (and by the tenor of other texts, must be) at present, if he be in a present capacity, or otherwise when he shall be so. A distinction should be made between what the word denotes *strictly, directly, and of itself*, and what only *accidentally*, and according to the circumstances of the subject.

Mr. Gale, p. 270, 271, burlesques the pædobaptists' exposition of the command, and would overthrow it, if a grin would do it. '*Go teach all nations*, even infants too when they are grown up.' But he brings nothing of argument against such a paraphrase as this: *Go make disciples to me* (or bring and enter into my covenant) *all nations*, (the adult upon their faith, and their infant children upon their parents dedicating them to me.) *baptizing them in the name, &c., teaching them* (even the infants too, when they are grown up) *to observe, &c.*

4. It should be considered that the most important part by far of the work which the apostles were charged with by this commission, was to convert the unbelieving nations, to preach the doctrine of *Jesus* crucified, and raised again, &c., and in a word, to *teach* and preach the Gospel; and that this part of their business lay among the adult. For the apostles, when in any city they had preached and converted any number of the *Gentile* people, and prepared them for baptism, commonly did (as our Saviour had done before) leave the baptizing of them, and especially of their children, to deputies; as is plain by what St. Paul says of himself, 1 Cor. i. 17. And that therefore it was proper for the Evangelist to express this office by a word which in most cases comprehends the duty of teaching, which was the main and most difficult work which they were to do in their own persons; the pains which they were to take with the adult. For all writers in their expressions, and translators, in their rendering those expressions in another language, aim at words which may best imprint on the mind the chief and

most important part of the things they would signify. So that I do not wonder that the *English* translators, and others whom Mr. Gale here quotes, either of the eastern or western languages, have rendered it *teach*. For though St. Matthew's own word be of a more general and large signification, *make disciples*, yet as words in different languages do seldom exactly answer one another in the whole import of each, the English and other translators could hardly find any one word that did better denote the main of what our Saviour meant by μαθητεύσατε, than such a word as *docete, teach*; nor do we yet know of any one *English* word that will exactly render it, unless we make a new word on purpose, (as St. Matthew's interpreter seems to have done in *Greek*;) *disciple* all nations; or *proselyte* all nations; which would have been inconvenient in a translation which is chiefly for the use of the unlearned, who would not have understood the meaning of them.

And in *Latin* there is no word at all that fits it. Dr. Hammond is forced to paraphrase it, *in discipulatum vocate*, 'bring to discipleship.' And even in the *Greek*, that which St. Matthew's *Greek* interpreter expresses by one word, μαθητεύειν, *to disciple*, St. John chooses to express by two, chap. iv. 1. Ἰησοῦς πλείονας μαθητὰς ποιεῖ καὶ βαπτίζει, *Jesus made and baptized more disciples*. Mr. Gale, at

Page 308, is very angry with Dr. *Hammond* for comparing these two expressions of the two apostles as parallel, or the one explaining the other. But it is an anger that can do no hurt. For there is no man but himself, that understands the language, but will own at first sight, that they are

only two ways of expressing the same thing, as done by our Saviour, and ordered to be done afterward by the apostles; nor does he bring any reason to the contrary, but only that the doctor in his *Paraphrase* and *Annotations* speaks something differently from what he does in his *Six Queries*. Of which I must say more by and by.

That in the Greek of St. Matthew, μαθητεύσατε, ver. 19, has some difference in signification from διδάσκοντες, ver. 20, is plain from his using those two words, so presently one after the other, to different purposes. For else, if they were exactly synonymous, the sense would have run as incongruously in the *Greek*, as it does now in the *English*; *Teach all nations, baptizing them, &c., teaching them to observe, &c.* If he had taken them so, he would probably have said, ‘Teach all nations to observe, &c., baptizing them.’ But he uses different words to this sense, *Proselyte to me all nations, baptizing them, &c., teaching them to observe, &c.* Which difference the *English*, and other translators, for want of proper words in their respective languages, could not preserve. But the sense of Scripture is to be taken from the original, and not to lose its force for want of *English* words.

Another thing that has made the translators the less curious concerning the rendering of this word *teach*, instead of *make disciples*, was, that in the time of making the old translations there were no antipædobaptists (and when the *English* translation was made, none in *England*<sup>m</sup>) who should thence take occasion for their error, viz. to conclude, that infants, though a part of the nation,

<sup>m</sup> [Compare what is said at vol. ii. p. 309, 315, &c.]

must not be baptized, as not being yet taught. All people then understood it thus; That the apostles going into the heathen nations, must first *teach and convert* the adult persons, and baptize them; and then, at their request, baptize their children into the same covenant. And while all took it so, there was no hurt in letting the word *teach* stand, since it is true that the main thing required of the apostles was, to teach: their main business being, as I said, with the adult. But when there appear men, who catching hold of the word *teach*, are thereby scandalized, or drawn into the erroneous consequence aforesaid; it is then very necessary to make them understand, that St. Matthew's own word, *make disciples*, does not give occasion for that mistake, because though the way of making disciples which was more especially to be regarded and laboured by the apostles, was by teaching the adult; yet the Scripture word is of such a latitude, as to take in any other way of making disciples, which is allowable by the tenor of God's covenant in Christ, into which covenant if children be not by God's mercy admitted, they are in a woful condition.

It is plain that all the translators themselves took the thing to be so, (for I think Mr. Gale will not pretend that any translation was ever made by other than pædobaptists;) and also that all those many authors, whose words he quotes in these two chapters, (I mean the Christian authors,) understood it, that not these words, nor any other words in Scripture, are to be construed to exclude infants from baptism. For they are all pædobaptists; even Mr. Le Clerc and bishop Burnet, whom he so much caresses, and Dr. Whitby, in whom he is so wrapt

up, is so, or at least was so, the last time we heard him speak of this matter in print. For in a little pamphlet against Dr. Edwards<sup>n</sup>, having been urged by him, (as some people were formerly by St. Austin,) with the arguments for the doctrine of original sin drawn from the baptism of infants; and having seen in the mean time this book of Mr. Gale's, and in it so many elogiums of himself, he speaks, as nigh as I can remember the words, to this purpose; that he does think that 'infants ought to be baptized;' but yet he would gladly see an answer to the arguments of the learned Mr. Gale to the contrary.

Now to what purpose is it to quote some particular sayings of men to confirm a tenet, which, when we read their books, it appears they never held, nor meant their arguments to that purpose, but the contrary?

5. Whereas he obstinately contends at p. 281 and 291, that *μαθητεύω* is never used as a verb *neuter*, to be a disciple to any one; he shews his temper (or *character*, as he calls it, when he speaks of me) to be, to deny any thing, though never so plain, when it stands, or he does but fancy it to stand, in his way. For fear that *μαθητεύειν τινά* should be rendered, to make such or such an one a disciple; *μαθητεύειν τινά* shall not signify, to be a disciple to such or such; which yet both every man and boy, that reads the language, knows to be so, and every lexicon renders so; and many of his own quotations, (all, as I said before, that he brings

<sup>n</sup> [See 'A full Answer to the Argument of the Rev. Jo. Edwards,' &c., 8<sup>o</sup>. 1712. Preface, p. 4. I have extracted the words above, at chap. v. p. 151.]



from secular authors,) make no sense unless they be rendered so. The first that he brings, p. 283, has plainly the *neuter* signification, *to be a disciple*, or *scholar*, *to* (so happy he is in applying quotations); and if any one will bestow the pains to read (as I have been fain, to no purpose, to do) the rest of his quotations where it is construed with a dative case, he will find that in all of them it is used as a *neuter*, and cannot be translated *learn*, or *teach*, or *make disciples*, but *to be a disciple to*. As, p. 293, *being a disciple τῷ πατρὶ, to his Father*: and speaking of *Isocrates*; such an one, and such an one, ἐμαθήτευσεν αὐτῷ, *were disciples to him*. And in like manner μαθητεύσαι τισί. And p. 300, 301, 302, out of *Clemens Alexandrinus*, τοῖς Μάγοις, τῷ Ναζαράτῳ, γνώσει βαρβάρῳ, τῷ Κυρίῳ; and p. 303, out of *Origen*, τοῖς ἰδιώταις, are all to be translated by *being a disciple to*: to the *Magi*: to *Nazaratus*: to the learning of the *Barbarians*: to the *Lord*: to ignorant men. Unless Mr. Gale would have us say, Such a man *learned to the Magi*, or *taught to them*, or *was taught to them*. As μαθητῆς is *a learner*, not *a teacher*, (with every one but Dr. Whitby,) so μαθητεύειν, when it is active, (as it is often, since St. Matthew's time, in ecclesiastical writers,) is *to make people learners*, or *disciples*; and when it is *neuter*, (as it was always before,) to be *a learner* or *disciple to*, or *under, any one*.

I happened to look into the *Index* of *Clemens Alexandrinus*, and there is a reference to three several places of the book where μαθητεύω is found. Two of them are, where it is used in the *neuter* signification; and the index-maker might have noted several more such; but on one he makes a particular

note, that it there signifies, *docere ut discipulum*. Mr. Gale sets them down all three with this preface, ‘I remember I have read in Clemens Alexandrinus,’ (and, I suppose, would have done, if there had been ten,) though two of the three make directly against his notion. Such a man may be well enough employed in searching for quotations, but there ought to be somebody else to judge whether they are for his turn.

He would evade this absurdity of bringing several instances of its neuter signification, (when his business was to maintain that there are none.) by supposing, at p. 294, that when *μαθητεύειν*, is construed with a dative, there is a præposition, *σύν* or *παρά*, understood. And says, ‘The passage from whence I gather this, is a good instance against Stephens, ‘Constantine,’ &c. (under which *&c.* are comprehended all lexicons that ever were wrote; and Dr. Busby he had named, as being against him two pages before). The passage is out of *Origen*.

Now here one would have expected *Origen*’s use of *μαθητεύω* with such a præposition. But (to the laughter of all schoolboys that shall read it) he instead of it brings in, with a long preface, a quotation of *Origen* using the *passive* *μαθητεύομαι* so, *μεμαθητευμένοι παρὰ τῷ πατρὶ, edoctæ apud Patrem: having been instructed when with the Father*. And to expose himself yet more, says, ‘Here *Origen* ‘uses *μαθητεύειν*, for the same—as *μανθάνειν*,’ which is as much as to say, *to teach* is the same as *to learn*. The like work, or worse, he makes in the next paragraph with a passive of *Irenæus*, where there is no dative at all, *μαθητευθεὶς ὑπὸ τῶν ἀποστόλων*: as if he did not yet understand that though the

active, *to teach*, or *make any one a disciple*, or the neuter, *to be a disciple*, does not require a præposition, yet the passive, *to be taught*, or *disciplined by any one*, does.

Then there follow fourteen of his quotations more, that are nothing at all to the purpose, not having any thing of *μαθητεύω* in them.

These, you will say, are mean and poor observations. How can I help it, if I am set to answer such a book? He had begun this nonsense at p. 279, where he says, *μανθάνω* ‘signifies properly *docere*, as well as *discere*.’

There is in Scripture an instance of this word used as a neuter. St. Matthew, chap. xxvii. 57, speaking of *Joseph of Arimathæa*, says, *ὃς καὶ αὐτὸς ἐμαθήτευσε τῷ Ἰησοῦ*. Mr. Gale, if he had had the translating of this, would have rendered it (as he does all the rest of that very construction) without any mention of the word *disciple*. But this being translated to his hand, *was Jesus’ disciple*, he would have the translation altered; and if it were true, which he pretends, that *μαθητεύω* does always signify *actively, to teach*, then this must have been rendered, *who also himself taught to Jesus*. Into such absurdities do people run, when they will obstinately deny things that are plainly true. He would turn it into a passive, *had been instructed, taught, brought over*, or any thing, so it be not *was a disciple to*.

Let us see if St. John’s authority will convince him. He, chap. xix. 38, expresses the same thing: *ὢν μαθητῆς τοῦ Ἰησοῦ*, *being a disciple of Jesus*. It is pity this place was not shewed to Mr. Gale, that we might have seen how he would have exercised his faculty of twisting and warping upon it.

He was in the right (if it had been feasible, and if he was resolved, sense or nonsense, to carry his point) to deny that the neuter μαθητεύω (which was in use before St. Matthew's time) signified *to be a disciple*. For if that be granted, that that was the known signification of it before, and St. Matthew only turned it into an active, none will doubt but the active must be, *to make disciples*.

There needs nothing more to be observed of his rhapsody of quotations, but these few general things.

*First*, that a great many of them are, as I said, absolutely impertinent to the purpose; having not the word μαθητεύω, nor any derivative of it in them; but are about ἀκούω, *audio*, παιδεύω, *instituto*, &c.

*Secondly*, that of those which have the word, the far greatest part would have been *best* translated by *making disciples*, or *being disciples to*, or *being made disciples*. But he without any ground chooses to translate them by *teach*, *learn*, &c., which was the question. This any one will see, that peruses the places.

*Thirdly*, that there are indeed some of them that are *best* rendered by *teach*, or *being taught*. And that is nothing but what would have been granted him at first; that where the circumstances of the passage, and of the persons spoken of, do shew it to be meant of adult persons now in the state of learning, there *to make disciples* does import *teaching* of them. And in such places it does often best fit the construction of the sentence to express it *teach*. Because, as I said before, in most places where the word occurs, the *discipling* is by present teaching. But our Saviour, or St. *Matthew*,

or his interpreter, seem to have gone out of the ordinary road of words, to apply here a word of so large a signification as to include any way of *entering disciples*; which is, as I said, agreeable to the tenor of God's covenant, and receiving persons into his fold, or *peculium*.

And this very thing, of choosing a new word on purpose for this sacrament, (viz. *discipling* in general,) is of itself a proof that it is not to be taken in the same limited sense as the word *teaching*. For if it had been to express *teaching*, there were plenty of common and known words in use for that.

Some few passages I shall note as I go along, and so dismiss these two chapters.

Page 275, and again at the end of chap. vii. and again at the beginning of the eighth, he accuses Dr. *Hammond* of prejudice, partiality, and contradicting himself, when he translates *μαθητεύσατε*, *make disciples*. And yet he confesses at one of them, p. 309, that most pædobaptists, who argue from that text, do give the word that sense. All that he says of moment (beside his angry and unmannerly censures of that worthy man) is, that though in his 'Answer to Six Queries' he do contend for that sense, and argue from it for the capacity of infants to be discipled by baptism; and in his 'Dissertations on Episcopacy' render it *in discipulatum vocate*; yet in his 'Paraphrase and Annotations' he asserts the *direct contrary*, and thus paraphrases the words; 'Teach all nations the Christian doctrine,' &c.

I know not what edition of the Paraphrase and

Annotations Mr. Gale has met with<sup>o</sup>, nor have at present any opportunity of comparing the several editions; but I know there is some variety in them as to the notes on this text, and that in some of them the doctor does (as well as in the *Six Queries*) assert the proper signification to be, *make disciples*: which it is a wonder to me if Mr. Gale was ignorant of. I remember to have seen a pamphlet giving an account of those variations in the later editions, but they do not amount (as Mr. Gale represents) to a *contrariety*, or *contradiction*. It is to be noted that that great man lived a good part of his time before there were any antipædobaptists in England, or at least before there were any considerable number of them, so as to be taken much notice of (which indeed there were not till that great rebellion); and in those former editions (or one of them) he had, it seems, in his Paraphrase, expressed only that which was the *main* part of the office of the apostles given them by this commission, viz. teaching and converting. And there was not then any fear of any one's misunderstanding or perverting the sense, so as to think he meant the other to be excluded. But upon the rise and increase of

<sup>o</sup> [Mr. Gale professes to use that of 1659, which is the first folio, called by the author 'the second edition, corrected and enlarged;' the third, of 1671, the fifth, of 1681, and the sixth, of 1689, agree verbatim with that of 1659, in this passage. This work of Dr. Hammond was first published in an octavo volume, in 1653, (and with a reprinted title in 1656:) in 1657 the author put forth a tract entitled, 'Δευτέραι Φροντίδες, or a Review of his Paraphrase and Annotations on the New Testament.'—The fourth edition of the Paraphrase appeared in 1679; the seventh, in 1698; and the eighth, in 1702.]

antipædobaptists, he thought it necessary to guard against their mistake, by giving the full sense of the Scripture word. This is a thing that has happened to many even of the best writers, that before some sect or new opinion has arisen, they have used expressions more unguarded against that error, than they would do afterward. So it was with Eusebius in respect of the Arian heresy, and with many others. No man can think that Dr. Hammond ever took those texts, or any text, to be against the baptizing or discipling of infants.

Page 282, he says, that in all the passages wherein he has observed the word, it does necessarily include teaching, 'or at least may admit it.' And that if it ever signify 'to disciple, and exclude teaching,' (which he thinks it does not,) yet that is not 'the signification in which it is always, or commonly used.'

This is more modest than Mr. Gale uses to be. No doubt it does more *commonly*, i. e. in most of the places where one shall find it used, appear by the circumstances of the persons there spoken of, to relate to adult persons; and consequently must be supposed to be accompanied there with present teaching.

Pages 286, 287. Where in a passage of Clemens Alexandrinus Mr. Gale says *μαθητεύειν* is interpreted by *Clement* himself to mean *διδάσκειν*, as it relates to the angels, and *μανθάνειν*, as it relates to persons taught; he should have said *μαθητεύεσθαι* is interpreted *μανθάνειν* (for *to be taught*, is the same as *to learn*, but *to teach* is not). This mistake he makes ever and anon. And at the foot of that page, (287,) St. Justin's word, *μαθητευθῆναι εἰς τὰ θεία διδάγματα*

should have been translated, ‘*made disciples to the divine doctrine.*’ For *taught to it*, is neither sense nor language. And so in the pages before, (284.) the sayings of Ignatius should have been translated, ‘*I do now begin μαθητεύεσθαι, to be made a disciple; and I speak to you as fellow-disciples.*’ And the next, of giving good examples to the heathens their neighbours, that they might by their works, μαθητευθῆναι, *be made disciples*, or brought to Christianity. And so in most of Mr. Gale’s own quotations.

Page 287. That passage of Justin Martyr should be rendered, ‘*God has not, nor does as yet, bring on his judgment, (meaning the day of judgment,) as knowing that still some every day μαθητευομένους εἰς τὸ ὄνομα τοῦ Χριστοῦ αὐτοῦ, are made disciples (or do become disciples) to (or in) the name of his Christ, and do forsake the way of error.*’ (and the sentence should have been continued as it is in Justin,) οἱ καὶ λαμβάνουσι δόματα, ἕκαστος ὡς ἀξιοί εἰσι, φωτιζόμενοι διὰ τοῦ ὀνόματος τοῦ Χριστοῦ τούτου ὁ μὲν γὰρ λαμβάνει συνέσεως πνεῦμα, ὁ δὲ βουλήs, ὁ δὲ ἰσχύος, ὁ δὲ ἰάσεως, &c. ‘*Who do also receive gifts (every one as he is worthy) when they are baptized (or enlightened) by the name of this Christ. For one receives the spirit of understanding, another of counsel, another of strength, another of healing,*’ &c.

Mr. Gale talks of God’s delaying to ‘*pour down his judgments;*’ which neither agrees to the words nor the sense. But (what is material to our purpose) the place plainly speaks of baptism, viz. of some daily being made disciples, forsaking idolatry, and being baptized in the name of Christ, and receiving such gifts of the Holy Spirit as the Christians



at their baptism are known to have received; many of which (as learned men have proved from this and other passages in St. Justin) did continue in his time to be given Christians at the time of their being baptized, and of the bishops laying their hands on them.

Mr. Gale's exception, (p. 288,) that 'to disciple' or proselyte into the name of Christ' is a phrase never used, is a mere cavil; *εἰς τὸ ὄνομα* is to be rendered here as *βαπτίζοντες εἰς τὸ ὄνομα*, Matt. xxviii. 19. *in the name.*

And his other objection, p. 289, 290, that if *φωτιζόμενοι* signify here *baptized*, it will make a gross tautology, is a worse; for it is the same order of words as our Saviour used, *Disciple all the nations, baptizing them.* And his third, that *φωτιζόμενοι* did not signify *baptized* so early as St. Justin's time, is a shrewd proof of what some have thought, that he has read the fathers no otherwise than by searching such places as the *index* of certain words used in this debate directed him to. It is impossible to read Justin without perceiving that he uses it as an ordinary word for *baptized*. I myself had quoted to Mr. Gale his first apology; where having discoursed largely of baptism, he tells us, that this was one of the common names of it: *Καλεῖται δὲ τοῦτο τὸ λουτρὸν, φωτισμός: this washing is called φωτισμός.* And a few lines after, he repeats again, in what name *ὁ φωτιζόμενος λούεται, the baptized person is washed,* viz. of the Father, &c. And in the next page again, how after the baptism the people go to prayers, praying *ὑπὲρ τε ἑαυτῶν, καὶ τοῦ φωτισθέντος καὶ ἄλλων, &c., both for themselves, and for the baptized person, and all other Christians, &c.,* where he sets down the

substance of the prayers, much like those of our church on that occasion.

Page 291. He says, I bring no proof of that sense of *μαθητεύειν* which I give, part ii. chap. 10, nigh the end, viz. that it 'signifies much like what we say in English; to enter any one as a scholar, disciple, or proselyte, to such a master, school, or profession.' That it signifies *to make disciples*, needs no proving. I used the other words as explanatory. And though I mentioned all this matter but in half a page, yet I gave (beside other) one proof to which he can give no answer, from the Jews' use of the word *proselyte* (which is a parallel word to *disciple*) in that manner, calling the adult that were entered at their own desire, *proselytes*, or disciples to Moses, and their infant children entered at the parents' request, *young proselytes*, or disciples. To which I have now added some other proofs of the use of the word, communicated, as I said, by a learned hand. Mr. Gale himself, at p. 313, says, 'Ask a countryman what he means by the word *scholar*, he will tell you, he means one that goes to school to learn.' Right: *to learn*, i. e. that he may learn. But when he is first put to school, and before he has begun actually to learn any thing, he is such a man's scholar. So an infant is baptized, i. e. entered and consigned to Christ as a master, and obliged to *learn* and practise his religion; and though he has not yet, nor does as yet actually learn, he is put to be Christ's scholar or disciple. He is in Justin's phrase, *ἐκ παιδὸς μαθητευθεὶς τῷ Χριστῷ*, *discipled* to Christ from a child.

Page 299. He had been bringing there fourteen or fifteen instances of what the words *ἀκούω*, *παι-*

δέω, &c., do signify in passages of the authors there quoted; for which, as for an impertinent digression, he ought to have asked the reader's pardon. But instead of it, he says, 'This is a very home argument that μαθητεύω in all such places necessarily 'implies hearing and learning,' &c., and then adds, 'This is sufficiently demonstrated.' It must needs be, that the master to whom Mr. Gale went to school, taught his boys to conclude their declamations with some great boast of their performance. For the concluding, that because ἀκούω, παιδέω, &c., do necessarily imply present learning and teaching, &c., therefore μαθητεύω does, is much such a 'demonstration' as the countryman gave of the cause of *Godwin sands* P.

Page 305, he tells his 'sir,' that always sits by him, something of his mind. 'I would choose rather to lay that phrase (make disciples) aside.' And a little after, 'If it be rendered *make disciples*,

P [Namely, that the sand-bank was caused by the erection of Tenterden steeple. The *real* origin of this dangerous bank is thus recorded by Stow, in his Chronicle of England, at the year 1099:

'This year, as well in Scotland as in England, the sea brake in over the banks of the Thames and other rivers, drowning many towns and much people, with innumerable numbers of oxen and sheep. At which time the lands in Kent, that sometime belonged to Duke Godwine, earl of Kent, were covered with sands and drowned; which are to this day called *Godwyne sands*.'

The reader may likewise consult Lambarde's 'Perambulation of Kent;' or an extract from it given in Brayley's Beauties of England, vol. viii. p. 1025: where also is related, out of sir Thomas More's *Dialogues*, the anecdote which seems to have given rise to the vulgar opinion alluded to by Dr. Wall in the text.]

‘our adversaries take an advantage,’ &c. I commend him: and I suppose his friend wishes so too. But then they must contrive to have the *Greek* word itself laid aside too, and changed for some other word. I could tell them of texts of Scripture which several sorts of men would wish to be laid aside. Some, the first three verses of St. John; some, the first verses of Rom. xiii; but these are vain wishes: it is better to lay the schism aside. The phrase *make disciples* will always stand either in the text, or, as it does now, in the marginal notes of our English Bibles, both at Matt. xxviii. 19, and in Acts xiv. 21, as the proper and grammatical sense of the word.

Page 312, 313, he gives me very foul language. My ‘assertion grossly false.’ ‘A great dishonour ‘and disservice to religion, that any who are teachers ‘of it, and appointed to guide the people, should ‘endeavour to support their fancies by a fallacy.’ Thus I have lived to have an ill-behaved schismatic, and one whom for age I may account a boy<sup>9</sup>, affront and abuse me in respect of my office; and all, only for affirming a thing which every one that reads the Scripture must own to be a truth.

I had observed that St. Peter, speaking, Acts xv. 10, against the imposing of circumcision on the heathen converts, (*and their children*, so I had expressed it,) words it thus: *to put a yoke on the neck of the disciples*. He styles those on whom this yoke was intended to be put, μαθητὰς, *disciples*; and I said, that it was *infants especially* on whom this yoke was attempted to be put.

<sup>9</sup> [It appears that Mr. Gale was born in 1680, which would make him about five and thirty years younger than Dr. Wall.]

He says, it was disingenuous to express it, heathen converts ‘and their children,’ and ‘much worse, ‘to assert downright, that it was infants *especially* ‘on whom,’ &c. And his reason is, because ‘infants ‘are no where mentioned; nor is any thing said which ‘can be applied to them in the whole chapter.’ And because the men only are mentioned, he concludes, p. 313, that ‘by *μαθητῶν*, *the disciples*, the apostle ‘intends only the converts, exclusively of their infants, if they had any.’

Now I say, that every one that reads the Scripture, and the rules that it always gives concerning circumcision, must understand the attempt of imposing it, to have reached, and to have been intended, to the children as well as their fathers; and that (though they be not mentioned, yet) the nature of the thing does of itself evince it.

For whether it be *Jews*, the seed of *Abraham*, or proselytes to them, that receive circumcision; it is notorious that all of them received it on these terms, that they *and all their male children* of eight days old or above, were to undergo it. This might be proved from the case of Abraham, Gen. xvii. 12, 13. item xxi. 4; of any proselytes, Gen. xxxiv. 15, Exod. xii. 48. But I forbear to spend time in the proof of a thing, which every body, but he, understands.

Moreover these *Jewish* believers, who disputed among themselves whether this yoke of circumcision should be laid on the *Gentile* believers, or not, did practise it thus in respect to their own children: as appears from Acts xxi. 20, 21. And can any one now think that those sticklers for circumcision, mentioned Acts xv. 5, who held it was needful to circumcise the *Gentile* converts, did not mean that

those *Gentile* converts should do as they did, viz. circumcise their children too? The children are not mentioned; but a circumstance, plain by the nature of the thing, needs it not.

He imputes 'gross falsehood' to me. But either that, or else *gross ignorance* belongs to him, when he says, it was meant 'exclusively of their infants, 'if they had any.' Whereas no rule of circumcision was ever meant so. He seems to think that it was used, as the antipædobaptists would have baptism to be, 'exclusively of children.' But even they do know that circumcision, and all other Christians, that baptism, have been ever used *inclusively of them*.

And that which I said, that it was children *especially* on whom the weight of this yoke would have fallen, is so plain and easy to account for, that he must be shamefully dull, that needs the explanation. For if a man of adult age had received this doctrine, he himself must have been circumcised; but so must all his male children too. This may be counted equal. But in the succeeding generations it would have fallen on the infant children only. So that I had good reason to say, that they were *children especially* on whom this yoke would have come.

Page 337, he names another place of my book, where I 'insinuate' (but how is his confidence sunk! He was wont, when he affixed a false thing on me, to say, I *owned* it) that the commission, Matt. xxviii. 19, and the comment of St. Hierome on it, relate only to adult persons. I had the patience to turn to the place of my book that he refers to, and do find his accusation false. I think not to take that

pains again, but if he say such things of me, to conclude them to be false by the custom. The reader may consult the place if he please. But if I had ‘insinuated’ so, how absurd is he to spend two chapters against me, to prove what I myself had ‘insinuated’ or taught!

Next, having much leisure, he brings some texts to prove that the apostles were to preach the gospel where they came. And then concludes, not forgetting to assure us, that what he has said does ‘plainly demonstrate.’ So it does; something.

But it is pretty to observe what a liberty he takes in talking of the method of my book. He at the latter end of this chapter, and beginning of the next, brags that he has discovered ‘an error in my ‘very foundation, in the very groundwork of my ‘system.’ And he means this observation concerning the word *μαθητεύσατε* to be that foundation and groundwork. Whereas I never mentioned any thing about that matter, but in half a page near the end of my book; as in a history there was no occasion.

These two chapters were collections made, I suppose, before by him, or somebody; and he puts upon the antipædobaptists, by making them believe they were wrote against me.

---

#### CHAP. IX.

HERE is the first place that he brings his answers or reflections into any appearance of a method; and now above half his book is over, begins to answer my introduction, concerning the Jewish bap-

tism of proselytes and their children. He spends two chapters in opposing what I had said of that. If I could have foreseen that we should have had so full an account of that matter as the learned Dr. Wootton has since published<sup>r</sup>; I might well have spared my pains in answering these two chapters. But as I had drawn up the answers to the particular objections he makes against me, before I heard of that book published, let them stand. A reader that has perused that, will, I suppose, have no need of them, and may pass them by. Every body will see an instance of Mr. Gale's assurance in denying things that are so certain as this had been before shewed to be, and is now so incontestably confirmed by that elaborate work.

His first exception against the passages of the books of Jewish writers which I produce, is, that they are not so ancient as to be able to inform us of the customs of the Jews that lived in or before our Saviour's time; that the Misna, or text of the Talmud, (which is the ancientest that I cite,) was not compiled till about one hundred and fifty years after the destruction of Jerusalem; that is, two hundred and ten years after Christ's birth. So he says; but men of the best learning in that history prove that it was composed by Rabbi Judah Hakodesh, seventy years sooner, in the midst of the second century, in the time of Antoninus Pius. I refer myself to Dr. Prideaux<sup>s</sup>, *Connection of Hist.* part i. lib. 5. p. 257,

<sup>r</sup> [In a work entitled, 'Miscellaneous Discourses relating to the Traditions and Usages of the Scribes and Pharisees in the time of our Blessed Saviour.' 2 vols. 8<sup>o</sup>. London, 1718. i. e. published two years before this piece of Dr. Wall's.]

<sup>s</sup> [See the *Old and New Testament connected, in the history of the Jews and neighbouring nations*, by Humphry Prideaux,



who makes it plain by circumstances too long to be here repeated.

Now two hundred and ten years after Christ's birth is but one hundred and eighty after his and St. John's baptizing; and one hundred and fifty is but one hundred and twenty: which, in the scarcity of books that are left to us, is an early date for Jewish or Christian writers, (especially when seconded by so many following testimonies,) as he knows well enough, and fills his book with authorities of a much fresher date, though here he spend two pages in a showy flourish, and address to his *sir*; 'Now, sir, can any reasonable man take the reports of authors who wrote so long after,' &c., and yet at last says, p. 346, that he 'will not insist upon this.' And yet in the next chapter (if that be writ by the same man) resumes it again at p. 391, 392; observing that Philo and Josephus, who are something elder, have no mention of this custom of baptizing proselytes. To which an answer must be made here, if any where; and if one would bring his immethodical arguings into any brevity.

It is much such an argument as that of Mr. Tombes, which I recited, was against the antiquity of infant-baptism among the Christians; that among all the ancient Christians that mention it, Eusebius and some others have nothing about it. Philo was all taken up with allegorical and philosophical flights. Josephus wrote the History and Antiquities of the Jews in much the same way as Eu-

D.D. second edition, 3 vols. 8°. London, 1716, &c., vol. i. p. 326, &c.; third edition, fol. London, 1717, 1718. vol. i. p. 257, &c.; 8°. Oxford, 1820, vol. ii. p. 99.]

sebius of the Christians; their original, their kings, their high priests, their wars, &c. In no such books one can reasonably expect an account of their rituals, or the ceremonies of admitting proselytes into their religion. But the *Talmud*, and books of the rabbis, which I cited, do contain (as our Common Prayer Book does, for our religious usages) the rubrics for their ceremonies of this sort.

Mr. Gale, at that p. 391, refers us to two passages of Josephus, lib. xiii, where he thinks this initiatory baptism would have been mentioned if it had been in use in the time of the Maccabees and later kings. Hyrcanus having subdued the Edomites, suffered them to continue in that country, ‘on condition  
‘ they would be circumcised, and live according to  
‘ the Jewish laws. And they, out of love to their  
‘ native country, complied to receive circumcision,  
‘ and live after the fashion of the Jews.’ And the like expressions he uses in the next chapter but one, in relating the like terms required of the *Ituræans*, who had been conquered by Aristobulus.

Here Mr. Gale concludes, that at this time proselytes were not used to be baptized, but circumcised only; because Josephus, mentioning one, says nothing of the other. Indeed he does not make his argument so fair, as to say, ‘he does not mention  
‘ it;’ but boldly says, ‘Josephus informs us, that  
‘ Hyrcanus made and initiated them Jews *by cir-*  
‘ *cumcision only.*’ But the words are, as I have recited.

Circumcision is here by Josephus mentioned, as the chief and most remarkable circumstance whereby the Jews were distinguished. It was also the most difficult and painful of the things imposed,

and (as one Mr. Stokes<sup>t</sup>, a writer against Mr. Gale, whose book I have but just now seen, and who has dubbed him Dr. Gale, observes) it was most contemned by other nations; so that the chief difficulty was in forcing them to receive that. Baptism, as an easy thing, and not unusual among other nations, may well be supposed to be included in the general words, ‘the other Jewish laws.’

An argument which prevailed with Mr. Emlyn, (as I noted before,) and does prevail with most that speak of this matter, is, that since it is notorious that the Jews have such a custom now, of baptizing their proselytes; and it appears by their books that they had the same in the times within less than one hundred and fifty years of our Saviour, and they spoke then of it as a custom always used by their nation, and that it cannot be conceived that they would borrow it, or use it in imitation of our Saviour Christ, or the Christians, whom they dis-

[<sup>t</sup> Of this writer we have the following account in Ivimey’s history of the Baptists, vol. iv.

‘ Mr. Joseph Stokes, a Presbyterian minister at Horsham in Sussex, published in 1715 a little pamphlet in defence of infant-baptism, entitled “A Survey of Infant-baptism and the mode of baptizing, in a letter to a gentleman at London.”’ 8vo. (containing thirty-two pages.)

And again: ‘ Mr. Jos. Stokes of Horsham, a champion of pædobaptism.—published in this year (1717) an octavo work in reply to Dr. Gale’s treatise. It was entitled, “A Compassionate Plea for Infants; or Remarks on Dr. Gale’s Reflections on Mr. Wall’s History of Infant-baptism.” This book and his former pamphlet were answered by a Mr. John Tasker.’

I have not been able to meet with this latter work of Mr. Stokes, therefore have had no opportunity of verifying Dr. Wall’s quotations in this instance.]

dained and abominated : there is all reason to conclude that they derived it from their ancestors, as they say they did. None can maintain the contrary, but one whom his hypothesis forces; especially when the Scripture itself speaks of *baptizing* unto Moses.

Therefore Mr. Gale here says, he will not insist upon it. But he does a worse thing. He denies a plain matter of fact that was before his eyes. He says of the passages cited by me, ‘Not one does so much as assert or intimate that the baptism of ‘proselytes was in use in our Saviour’s time.’ Mr. Stokes has found him tardy; and has referred him to the first of them, which speaks of the use of it in David and Solomon’s time. And there are (as he tells him) several others. And indeed nobody that had eyes could miss them. Yet he, at p. 352, 353, says it over again.

Page 347. Another shift is, that perhaps ‘they do not speak of an initiatory baptism, but only a ‘purification from the blood of circumcision.’

His reader, that will read the passages over again, must be ashamed for him. They do all speak of entering *proselytes*; some, adult; some, infants; some, males; some, females. And whereas he would except those found in the Misna itself, there are none that mention *proselyting* plainer than they. And they also instance in *female* children; which makes his exception concerning the blood of circumcision to be absolute nonsense.

Page 348, he would prove a thing that is a direct contradiction to what he had said the page before. For there he had yielded that a passage there produced out of the Talmud did ‘shew indeed what

‘ was the method when that was written, but not  
 ‘ that the same custom had been observed for two  
 ‘ hundred years before.’ But here he produces two  
*Jewish* writers, from some of whose words he would  
 conclude that they knew of no baptism of prose-  
 lytes at all, as used by their nation, but took  
 it to be a ceremony first instituted by John or  
 Christ.

I shall by no means transcribe passages so im-  
 pertinent. Most of them speak of the custom of  
 baptizing *Jews* or any persons born of *faithful*  
 parents, as a new thing brought up by John or  
 Christ; and not then, or formerly, used by their  
 nation; which is nothing to the baptizing of prose-  
 lytes from among the heathens.

And besides, if these two had, in their spite to  
 the Christians, vented slanders which would have  
 recoiled upon their own religion, (as some eager  
 disputants commonly do, go on so fiercely in ruin-  
 ing other men’s foundations, that they undermine  
 their own,) should we thence conclude against plain  
 proofs that the *Jews* had no such religion? What  
 are two (as Mr. Stokes observes) against a cloud  
 of witnesses? What are conclusions drawn by con-  
 sequence from some raging blasphemous expres-  
 sions, to full attested matter of fact?—Two obscure  
 authors, to the *Talmuds*, and the generally owned  
 and received books of that time and ever since, and  
 the known present practice of the nation? If Mr.  
 Gale’s cause have no other hopes but in the denial  
 of such publicly attested facts, it is plainly despe-  
 rate. Besides, that one of his authors (whom he  
 styles ancient) speaks of the *Christians* as baptizing

their infants. Let Mr. Gale believe his *rabbi* for that, if he plead his credit as to the other.

The last shift to which he flies, at

Page 353, does not help. He would argue the insufficiency of the evidence which is taken from any writings of the rabbins, to prove what was their practice from hence, that those Jews are 'a despicable, ignorant, and whimsical sort of writers.'

To which I need give no other answer than that which I gave before to the very same objection in his fourth chapter, p. 172, which I entreat the reader for once to recur to.

From this p. 354, the next thirteen pages, to 368, are such as any Christian reader of Mr. *Gale's* book ought to tear out, and burn without reading them. They are nothing at all to the purpose of baptism, infant or adult, Jewish or Christian. They are a kennel of stinking blasphemies, and burlesque on the Christian religion. What conceit made him translate and publish them in *English*, it is hard to guess. It is just as if somebody lighting on some of the late *English* atheistical pamphlets of *Blount*, or of ——— or ——— should think it a good employment, instead of burning them, to translate them into other languages, and send them about the world. The book called *Toldoth Jesu*, (out of which he takes the most.) is a book commonly mentioned with abhorrence for its blasphemy, and scorn for its dulness. I think I remember some years ago an advertisement in the *Holland* prints, of somebody that had translated it into some vulgar language; and had a conceit of his skill in doing it

enough, and reverence for Christ little enough, to desire it might be published ; but his friends, being Christians, overruled him, and got him to burn it. I have forgot the man's name, I think it could not be Mr. Gale, because of his age ; but certainly some such friends Mr. Gale wanted at this time, when he resolved, at p. 344, ' to venture ' (as he calls it) to mention some of the least shocking of those blasphemies ; even these do shock every Christian reader.

The old blasphemous books of Celsus, Porphyry, Julian the Apostate, and others then written against the Christian religion, though set forth with a great deal of wit and learning, (such as makes our modern atheists and deists look in comparison, as a parcel of very sordid imitators,) and therefore thought fit by some Christians to be preserved ; were however, for the odiousness of the subject, by the far major part thought fitter to be burned ; and accordingly they (and also the books of the old blasphemous heretics) are (except some fragments, which by being confuted have been preserved) long ago extinguished. How much more ought this putid rubbish, which Mr. Gale here rakes together and translates, to have been so served !

Those rabbins, out of whom he fetches these blasphemies, are not (I think not one of them) those whom I had cited as mentioning the *Jewish* baptisms. And if they had, it had been nothing to the purpose. No more, than if I had quoted *Tacitus* upon any dispute of the *Roman* customs or history, he should for answer have recited and translated for the use of an *English* reader those vile reproaches

which that historian casts on the Jews and Christians; on God, and on our blessed Saviour.

The testimony of those Christian writers which he quotes, from that p. 368, to the end of the chapter, setting forth the character of the Jewish writers; as, that they are for the most part a vain, trifling, enthusiastic, perverse, and superstitious sort of people, (for which he cites Justin Martyr, Scaliger, Buxtorf, Lightfoot, Du Pin, Le Clerc, and especially St. John Baptist, and St. Stephen,) is certainly true, and known to be so by every body; and one that spends so many words in proving it, must be almost as trifling as they; especially where it is nothing to the purpose, as it is not here, since (as I have been forced often to say) we do not appeal to them for any thing wherein their candour, judgment, or sincerity is depended on, but only perceive by their writings, and ritual books, what their usages and tenets are. And this use of their writings, Mr. Gale knows very well, that several of these same learned men, particularly *Buxtorf* and *Lightfoot*, do make to good purpose. For though they have no opinion of the men, yet from their books and disputings they came to a more particu- lar understanding of their customs, to which customs the phrases of Scripture do often allude and refer, and the sense and meaning of such places of Scripture is thereby better understood.



## CHAP. X.

BESIDES the Jewish writers themselves, I quoted other ancient writers, some heathens, some



Christians, mentioning the *Jewish* custom of baptizing proselytes. One was Arrian, a philosopher living at Rome.

Mr. Gale excepts against his evidence, as not early enough; one hundred and fifty years after Christ.

Suppose it were so much after Christ's *birth*, (as it was almost,) is not this an evidence coming very near to the time of John's and Christ's baptizing?

He says again, that perhaps *Arrian* might mistake the *Christians* for the *Jews*; and spends several pages in reaching after probabilities for this conjecture: but those so rambling, and little to the purpose, that I, who knew that a learned man or two had spoken of this as possible, do count it less probable after having read these pages.

At best it is but a conjecture. The plain words, repeated several times, are, *the Jews*. The same answerer should not give both these answers: *first*, that it was too long after Christ's time; *secondly*, that it was not long enough after his time for the *Christians* to be distinguished from the *Jews*. If there were no other evidence beside this, that the *Jews* used baptism as well as the Christians, there were more room for this guess; but this, corroborated by so many more, renders the evasion very precarious.

Page 384, he is fain to use the very same shift for Gregory Nazianzen, that he lived too late to be an evidence. All learned men know how much his testimony is valued for the customs of Christians, and there is the same reason for his knowing those of the *Jews*, many of whom lived in that country.

Mr. Gale says, [p. 385,] his words may be understood (nay, he insults any one that understands them otherwise) of washings for uncleanness, and not of any initiatory baptism. This he confidently says, though the comparison be there purposely made between Moses' baptism and John's, which was an initiatory one; and Christ's, which was also plainly such; and though the words themselves (Moses baptized, but that was with water only; and before that, in the cloud and in the sea) do compare two several baptisms of Moses, that at mount Sinai, with that in the cloud and in the sea; which last St. Paul himself speaks of, as an initiatory baptism, and a type of the Christian baptism, and laying like obligations on the Jews, as the other does on Christians; which is a quite different purpose from that of washings for uncleanness.

I quoted St. Cyprian and St. Basil speaking of the same *Jewish* baptism. Mr. Gale did not care to repeat them; and has nothing else to say, but that they amount to no more than St. Gregory's; and if they amount to so much, it is sufficient; especially since St. Cyprian will surely be allowed for an ancient evidence. And he is there giving the reason why the apostles in instructing and baptizing a *Jew*, had no need of pains to teach him the doctrine and belief of the Father, but only of the Son. (Whereas a *Gentile* must be instructed concerning the Father as well as the Son and the Holy Spirit.) 'For the Jews had,' says he, 'already, and a long time ago, the baptism of the law and of Moses, and were now to be baptized in the name of Jesus Christ.' Now could any man living, beside Mr. Gale, have the forehead to say that St. Cyprian does

not here speak of such a *Mosaical* baptism, as was initiatory into a certain faith or profession, the faith of the true God?

Though this, and some of the rest, be exceeding plain, yet this answerer draws his conclusion, at

Page 385, 386, without altering his countenance at all, but turning confidently to his *sir*, tells him, ‘It is sufficiently evident Mr. Wall has said nothing which rises to any probable proof——For I leave you to judge whether every pretence to this has not been sufficiently refuted.’ He puts a great confidence in his judge.

I quoted Tertullian, ancients than any of the rest, and also St. Paul, testifying that *all the Jews*, at their coming out of Ægypt, (before the washings for legal pollutions were instituted,) *were baptized unto Moses*, 1 Cor. x. 1, 2, which same expression St. Cyprian (as I shewed) uses for their being baptized into the faith of Jehovah. To all this he says nothing.

Page 386, he will no longer be on the defensive, but will undertake to prove the negative, viz. that the Jews had no initiatory baptism. The Scripture, he says, makes no mention of it, though I had quoted St. Paul’s words just before. I added also another text, Exod. xix. 10, which the Jews themselves, as I shewed, understood of an initiatory baptism at their entering into the covenant of the Ten Commandments and other laws at mount Sinai or Horeb.

He proves that they could not then by that washing at Sinai enter into covenant, ‘for that they had done before by circumcision.’

This he says, though the Scripture does expressly

say, that they did *then* enter into covenant; and there be recited the particular interrogations and answers of it; and in a recital of another covenant forty years after, Deut. xxix. 1, it be said, that that covenant *in the land of Moab, was beside the covenant which he made with them in Horeb.* Though they had circumcision, as the seal of the covenant with Abraham, that does not hinder but baptism might be a seal of this; as the Jewish writers do all say, that their fathers entered into covenant by these three things: circumcision, baptism, and sacrifice; and of this last also the Scripture uses the same phrase, Psalm l. 5, *Those that have made a covenant with me by sacrifice.*

Page 388. Whereas the words of that text, Exod. xix. 10, 11, are, *Sanctify them, &c., and let them wash their clothes, and be ready against the third day, &c.* And I had shewn from *Maimonides*, the *Gemara*, *Aben Ezra*, *Selden* quoting a great number of rabbis, that (beside their understanding that *sanctifying* to be *washing*) the *Jews* did apprehend, that wherever in the law the washing of the clothes is commanded, it means much more the washing of the body itself: he denies that phrase to be so meant, and yet in the page before, p. 387, heedlessly recites one of the texts from which it is plainly proved; which is Numb. xxxi. 19, 24, there all that Eleazar prescribes to such as had killed any person, or touched any slain, was, *to purify themselves, &c. And ye shall wash your clothes on the seventh day, and ye shall be clean.* Now it is plain from Numb. xix. 16—19, that every person in their circumstances was to wash or bathe his whole body, as well as his clothes.

Page 391, 392. What he produces here out of Josephus and Philo, I shewed just now, in answering the beginning of his ninth chapter, (where this ought to have come in, if any where,) to be nothing to the purpose.

Page 392. If ever any man confuted himself, our author does it here. For his business was to deny that the Jews had any initiatory baptism, and particularly that the Scripture nowhere speaks of any such thing. And whereas I had produced two places of Scripture that do speak of it; he proves here, that the one does not speak of it, because the other does. St. Paul speaks of it, 1 Cor. x. therefore Exod. xix. does not. Whereas if either of them speak of it, his argument is lost. That *in the cloud and in the sea* St. Paul calls a *baptism*. But that having been done in a transient and typical way, and without express covenanting, there might be afterward at Horeb a more explicit performance of the ceremonies.

By just the same arguing he in the next page, p. 393, overthrows the testimony which I brought of Nazianzen, Orat. 39; where he refers to both the said texts of Scripture, and distinguishes the two times. Mr. Gale pleads that Nazianzen paraphrases 1 Cor. x. ‘The sea typified the water, the cloud ‘the Spirit.’ True. But does not he, beside this, speak of the other? ‘Moses gave them a baptism; ‘but that was with water only. And *πρὸ τούτου*, ‘before that, they were baptized *in the cloud and ‘in the sea.*’

Page 394, he falls again upon that plea, (which has been used two or three times, though not worth

once using,) that he can name writers that make no mention of this Jewish baptism. ‘Barnabas,’ he says, ‘has not one word.’ And then two pages more spent in shewing that Justin Martyr has not one word of it neither. Does he think any one will read them over to see whether he say true or not? What does it avail that they do not mention it, if St. Paul, and the Christian writers which I quoted, and so many of the Jewish writers themselves do?

But he produces a place in Justin, where he thinks it must have been mentioned, if there had been any such thing. *Trypho* acknowledges that the passover and other sacrifices could not be used, now that the *temple* was destroyed. *Justin* asks, what part of the legal ordinances did remain in use at such a time. *Trypho* answers, ‘The sabbaths, ‘circumcision, the new moons, and baptizing upon ‘uncleanness.’ Here Mr. Gale says, he would have mentioned this other initiatory baptism, if it had been in use with them.

He is so forgetful, or impertinent, as not to mind that this initiatory baptism was not by *Trypho* accounted necessary to the *Jews* themselves; but only to *heathens* proselyted. And *Trypho* was speaking only of what the *Jews* were to do.

And this, if he had thought of it, would have made him omit the quoting both that other place of Justin which he brings, p. 395, and the following one of Tertullian, p. 398, where he urges that Tertullian makes baptism to be ‘a new ordinance.’ But the sense of the place is only this, that it began but now at Christ’s time to be used on any posterity of the faithful.

Page 398. The saying of Origen, *Comment. in Joann.* p. 116, 117<sup>n</sup>, looks most plausible for his turn of any; where Origen says, ‘He [Heracleon] cannot shew that any prophet did baptize.’ Οὐ γὰρ ἔχει δείξαι τινα τῶν προφητῶν βαπτίσαντα.

But it is a proof, how a scrap of a line or two out of a discourse may be perverted by those that have the baseness to do it, to a sense quite contrary to the import of the discourse itself.

Origen is there commenting on that question of the Pharisees put to John Baptist, John i. 25; *Why baptizest thou then, if thou be not that Christ, nor Elias, neither that prophet?* He had observed before, p. 109, the difference between *προφήτης* and *ὁ προφήτης*, a prophet indefinitely, and *that prophet*; and that the question of the Jews is not to be understood concerning the ordinary prophets, but one particular one, whom they expected to come, that should be *like unto Moses*; as Moses himself had foretold, Deut. xviii. And having by the way blamed many passages in Heracleon’s comment on that text, and particularly that he had understood the word *ὁ προφήτης*, in that question, of *a prophet* at large; he says, p. 116, that there may very well be returned this answer to that insulting demand of the Pharisees, who seem to have thought that the Christ and Elias were to baptize in their own persons; but that he that was *the voice of one crying in the wilderness, &c.*, might not baptize at all.

‘You, sirs, do put to him who was sent as a messenger before the face of the Christ, to prepare his way before him, an unhandsome interrogation, being

<sup>n</sup> [Op. tom. iv. p. 125. Comment. vi. sect. 13. edit. Benedict.]

‘ ignorant of all the mysteries that belong to his office.  
 ‘ For *the Christ* (and Jesus was he, though you would  
 ‘ not have it so) did not baptize himself, (or in his  
 ‘ own person,) but his disciples. And he it was, that  
 ‘ was *that Prophet*. And what makes you think that  
 ‘ Elias when he comes will baptize, οὐδὲ τὰ ἐπὶ τὰ  
 ‘ τοῦ θυσιαστηρίου ξύλα, κατὰ τοὺς τοῦ Ἀχαιᾶβ χρόνους,  
 ‘ δεόμενα λουτροῦ, ἵνα ἐκκαυθῆ, ἐπιφανέντος ἐν πυρὶ τοῦ  
 ‘ Κυρίου, βαπτίσαντος; ἐπικελεύεται γὰρ τοῖς ἱερεῦσι  
 ‘ τοῦτο ποιῆσαι; who in Ahab’s time did not bap-  
 ‘ tize the wood upon the altar, which was to be  
 ‘ washed before it was burnt up, when the Lord  
 ‘ should shew himself in fire? For he ordered the  
 ‘ priests to do that; not only once; for he says, *Do*  
 ‘ *it the second time, &c.* Ὁ τοίνυν μὴ αὐτὸς βαπτίσας  
 ‘ τότε, ἀλλ’ ἐτέροις τοῦ ἔργου παραχωρήσας, He there-  
 ‘ fore who did not himself (or, in his own person)  
 ‘ baptize at that time, but left that work to others,  
 ‘ how was he likely to baptize, βαπτίζειν ἔμελλε, when  
 ‘ he, according to Malachi’s prophecy, came? There-  
 ‘ fore the Christ does not baptize with water, but his  
 ‘ disciples; and he reserves to himself the baptizing  
 ‘ with the Holy Spirit, and with fire. But Hieracleon  
 ‘ admitting this speech of the Pharisees as good sense,  
 ‘ περὶ τοῦ οφείλεσθαι τὸ βαπτίζειν Χριστῷ, καὶ Ἡλία  
 ‘ καὶ παντὶ Προφήτῃ, αὐταῖς λέξασί φησιν, Οἷς μόνοις  
 ‘ οφείλεται τὸ βαπτίζειν καὶ ἐκ τῶν εἰρημένων μὲν ἡμῖν  
 ‘ ἔναγχος ἐλεγχόμενος, μάλιστα δὲ ὅτι κοινότερον τὸν  
 ‘ προφήτην νενόηκεν· οὐ γὰρ ἔχει δεῖξαι τινα τῶν Προ-  
 ‘ φητῶν βαπτίσαντα:—that both the Christ, and  
 ‘ Elias, and *every prophet* ought to baptize: adds  
 ‘ in express words; *to whom alone the duty of bap-*  
 ‘ *tizing belongs.* Who is sufficiently confuted by  
 ‘ what I have just now said, especially where he



‘ takes the word for any ordinary prophet. For he  
 ‘ cannot shew that any prophet did baptize.’

Here the reader will observe these things :

*First*, what a trouble one has with such a quoter. For it is necessary to produce long passages *verbatim*, to shew the fallacy that lies hid in bringing a scrap of them to a purpose contrary to the true tenor of them. And therefore all ingenuous quoters, all that aim at truth, do scorn such a practice as much as they do false quoting.

*Secondly*, he will see that neither Heracleon, whom Origen confutes, nor Origen himself, do speak as if they thought there was no such baptism in the Jewish economy; but on the contrary they plainly suppose that there was such a thing, and that the *Pharisees* do here refer to it: only the *Pharisees* thought it was not to be administered to natural Jews by any, after Moses’ time, but the *Christ*, or *Elias*, or *that Prophet* whom they expected like unto Moses. And they thought *that Prophet* a different person from the *Christ*; but Origen shews them to be both one, and that *Jesus* was he.

And besides; Origen tells them that they had no reason to think that *Elias*, or the *Christ*, would baptize in their own persons, but by deputies; as *Elias* did not baptize the wood himself, but ordered it to be done; and as *Jesus* when he came, did not himself baptize, but his disciples.

Heracleon thought that not only these, but any prophet might baptize. Origen shews him to be mistaken in that; if he mean *κοινότερόν τινα προφήτην*, any ordinary prophet; since he cannot shew that any prophet (meaning such an one) did use to

baptize; nor the greater ones by themselves. So manifestly does Mr. Gale pervert the sense; when to Origen's words, *any prophet*, he (in spite of Origen's distinction expressed in the line before) adds Moses, rendering it, *not any prophet, neither Moses, nor, &c.*

Both Origen, and this heretic Heracleon, must have well known the customs of the Jews, for they both lived at Alexandria in Ægypt, where great numbers of Jews dwelt. Origen, one hundred and ten years after the apostles; and Heracleon, eighty years before, viz. thirty years after the apostles.

*Thirdly*, he will see that Origen here does plainly call pouring water on a thing, *baptizing* it. For what Elias ordered, 1 Kings xviii. 33, was, *Fill four barrels of water, and pour it on the burnt-sacrifice, and on the wood.* And this he styles the *baptism* of the wood and sacrifice. Which should have made Mr. Gale, when he read and quoted this place, for shame to have retracted what he so confidently had averred in his third, fourth, and fifth chapters, that *baptizing* never in authors signifies *pouring* of water, but always *dipping*.

What follows from this page to p. 401, and the usual boast with which he there concludes, I may well enough pass by. For what if St. Cyril, and the *Recognitions* and *Constitutions*, (which if I had quoted, he would have made an outcry of their being spurious,) and Mr. Hill<sup>x</sup>, do speak of other things, used by the Jews and omitted by Christians; as sacrifices, legal washings, &c., the want of which things baptism does supply to us; and they do not

<sup>x</sup> [See a quotation from his work 'De Presbyteratu,' at vol. ii. p. 400.]

at those particular places speak of this initiatory baptism of the *Jewish* nation at once, or of proselytes as they came in? Does it follow that a thing is not mentioned at all by authors, because it is not mentioned at every place where it might have been? or is it (as he would here, p. 400, represent) any absurdity in the pædobaptists to maintain that both circumcision and the *Jewish* baptism might be types and forerunners of Christian baptism? The other sacrament, of the Lord's Supper, was signified by more than one judicial rite. He indeed stoutly concludes with averring that the Fathers whom I quoted, 'do not afford the least intimation,' &c. But the reader by this time knows the man. He is the same that before would have made us believe that the rabbis themselves do not sufficiently confirm their own customs, because there were two or three that did not mention them. And if he were urged with the custom which the Jews to this day do observe of baptizing proselytes, he looks as if he would deny it. But this is all face. And so is what comes next,

Page 402, where he says, 'This custom of the Jews, though ever so true, can do no service, &c., for it does not in the least appear that infants were so admitted.' Any one that had read my quotations concerning this custom, must needs here be amazed, because they speak of infants very particularly. But he says, I bring not 'the least colour of an argument; but only cite,' &c. Do matters of history or ancient facts use to be proved by *arguments*, or by *citations* of books of those times? But he says, I cite only *rabbis*. If that be all he has to object, why did he put the case; this custom,

‘ though ever so true ?’ So it comes to the old evasion ; the *Jewish* writers are men of no great judgment ; therefore they cannot tell their own custom ; whether at the baptism of a proselyte they did use to admit his children to baptism with him.

At last, he will suppose it all to be true. And if by adding he can do any mischief, will put some more to it. He mentions two cases, p.403, 404, (which yet are really but one,) wherein the Christian baptism ought, he says, by my argument to imitate the *Jewish* ; which yet it does not, viz. the confining the use of baptism to new proselytes only. So that as the Jews, after the general baptism of their nation in Moses’ time, did not continue to baptize their own children, either in infaney or adult age ; but only proselytes and their children ; so Christians should, if my argument be good, omit the baptizing of all that are born of baptized parents.

And to enforce this absurd consequence upon me, he sticks not at a practice which is base in any writer. He takes five or six words of mine, (‘ our Saviour gave no direction for any alteration,’) which I had affixed to one sentence, to one purpose ; and affixes them to a sentence of another nature, and a contrary purpose. I had, in that page which he quotes of mine <sup>y</sup>, mentioned that custom of the Jews of omitting baptism in the case of the posterity of baptized persons ; and had shewed from John iii. 6, 7, that that was by our Saviour altered. But going on to speak of that practice of the Jews, ‘ that all persons, whom they baptized at all, they

<sup>y</sup> [Introduction, p. 25.]

‘baptized in infancy, if they had the power or possession of them in infancy,’ I add, ‘and in this matter our Saviour gave no direction for any alteration.’ What does our trickster do, but cut off the words, ‘and in this matter,’ that he might make the rest of the sentence serve any matter, and affix it at the tail of a sentence of his own, and quote me for it! And he does the same thing over again in the next page, 404.

Here he would take an advantage from something said by Dr. *Whitby*; for an answer to which, let him apply to him, if he please.

As for what else may be necessary in answer to this *Socinian* argument against the general use of baptism among Christians, because the Jews did not use it generally, but only to new converts and their children; I refer to what I said above to Mr. Emlyn, who (though managing it cordially for their interest, whereas this man treats it as absurd) yet scorned such unfair and imposturous ways of arguing.

But here Mr. Gale adds, that if we follow the Jews in baptizing infants, we might with as good reason give infants the Lord’s Supper; for they caused them to eat of the paschal lamb.

I know not whether that matter of fact be true. And I think Mr. Stokes has given a sufficient answer to that, ‘Compassionate Plea,’ p. 30, 31.

Page 404, he would prove that *St. John Baptist* baptized no infants. He brings from Scripture no proofs but what have been answered a hundred times. Such places of Scripture history, as do in a brief and general way give account in a few lines of the substance of what *St. John* did in several

years, cannot be supposed to descend to particular circumstances. Multitudes came in, and were baptized, confessing their sins. What children they brought with them, need not be mentioned; especially to the *Jewish* Christians, (and to them St. Matthew wrote,) who knew the custom of their nation to bring their children with them into covenant. If St. John had been sent to convert and *circumcise* any uncircumcised nation; so short an account of his success would hardly have had any mention of the children; and yet no man would have doubted of there being some among them. Mr. Gale would have the expression of St. Matthew to be, ‘As many as he baptized, confessed their ‘sins.’ But that is to serve a cause.

And so Acts xix. 4, which he quotes,

Page 407, *John baptized with the baptism of repentance*; is, as Mr. Stokes observes, no more than what is said of circumcision, Rom. iv. 11, that it is a *seal of the righteousness of faith*. Yet every one knows that it does not exclude infants, who are at present as incapable of *faith* as they are of *repentance*.

The places which he here cites of Josephus and Origen, are yet less to the purpose. There being nothing in them from which one can guess that they had at the writing of them any thought at all, *pro* or *contra*, about any children being there. They do only observe that it was necessary for the adult that came, to confess their sins, and amend their lives. At last,

Page 407, he brings the objection, which I had recited of Mr. *Stennet*; that if the *Jews* had such a custom of baptizing proselytes and their children,

it must have been an invention of their own, being not commanded in the law of God.

To that I gave two answers. Mr. Gale takes notice only of the first; that they quoted, as we see, texts of Scripture, such as I there mentioned. He says, [p. 408,] ‘What then?—They may cite the ‘whole Bible, though not a word in it makes for ‘them.’ And a few more such huffing expressions; but nothing to overthrow the interpretations they gave.

I answered, *secondly*; putting the case, that they mistook the sense of those texts; yet when they had upon that authority established a practice of baptizing proselytes and their children; and that practice had now continued many ages: if our Saviour had meant that the apostles, in baptizing proselytes of the nations, should have altered that practice, and denied baptism to the children of such proselytes as they baptized; we have all the reason in the world to think that he would have forewarned them of it. And I instanced in a like case that might have been put, if the nations had been required to keep the feasts, among which was the feast of dedication; not commanded by God, and yet kept for many ages, and observed by Christ himself.

To this Mr. Gale replies nothing at all; (though every antipædobaptist, who is convinced that they had such a custom, must be moved by it; to see that our Saviour, who must know of the custom, gives no caution against it;) but he only runs out to the end of the chapter in an account (not at all to the purpose here) of the distinction of several sorts of traditions of the Jews; how some were

more firmly grounded than others. Whereas our main question is of the matter of fact, whether there were such a custom or not.

The most trifling of all, is his attempt to evade the force of that passage in the *Talmud, Jevamoth*, cap. iv. concerning the dispute between rabbi Eliezer and rabbi Joshua, (of which I thought I had said enough in my *introduction* to hinder any one's running into the same paralogism.) He says,

Page 411, since those rabbins 'controvert the 'baptism of proselytes; it cannot be thought a tradition from Moses,' &c. Now he need but open his eyes to see, that they do not controvert the duty of such a baptism; no more than the duty of circumcision; but only the question, Whether one of these, and which of them, may denominate a man a proselyte, if the other of them be by some chance missing.

And the same oversight was at his p. 409, where he takes baptism (and he might as well have proved circumcision) to be established on the pronouncing of the wise men. Whereas it is only the determination of the foresaid question, which they found upon that.

The bragging conclusion, p. 413, 414, I would not have the reader overlook; nor would Mr. Gale, I suppose; because he is careful constantly to use it, so that one might know any book of his by it.

---

## C H A P. XI.

HERE begins (that with which his book should have begun, if he had meant it an answer to mine)



his ventilation of the passages which I brought of the *Fathers* or ancient Christians. He at first spends two or three leaves in talking backward and forward about the regard which ought to be given to the *Fathers*, concerning which he thinks it worth the reader's while to know his opinion. I think not: partly for other reasons; and partly, because one part of it destroys the other. The chapter itself begins at

Page 423, with a malevolent and ungrateful accusation of my performance in collecting their sayings; as if I had set down those which are (as he styles it) *for* my purpose; and omitted those *against* infant-baptism.

I made a profession that that collection should be impartial. And if it be valuable for any thing, it is for that. As it had been an ill thing in me to break that promise; so it is a base thing, if I have not, to accuse me falsely of doing so. I have received the acknowledgment of several readers, both of the impartiality used in collecting, and of the civil treatment of the antipædobaptists. But the talent of some writers consists in railing.

One thing is visible to every body; that I have produced several quotations, making for their side of the question, which none of their writers had found or knew of. On the other side, it is possible that some might escape me: I never pretended otherwise. Yet so it has happened, that none since, that I know of, have been produced, (and particularly none by Mr. Gale; which is a poor thing in an antagonist,) except such as I spoke of in the beginning of my second part, and gave the reasons for my omitting them, viz. such as are

either spurious, too late, nothing to the purpose, or, &c., under which last sort, of those nothing to the purpose, I comprehended all such as do speak of the baptism of adult persons, (which every body acknowledges was common at the planting of Christianity,) but without any note of denying it to infants.

Now whatever may be said of others, these two out of *Barnabas*, which he here brings as omitted by me, and making against infant-baptism, are plainly not at all to the purpose.

And the first of them is one, which I did quote at large; and I was the first, that I knew of, that discovered it to relate at all to baptism; not to the question of infant-baptism; but to that ceremony of giving a taste of milk and honey to the new baptized person, whether infant or adult. It is recited, (much fuller than he recites it,) in my part ii. chap. 9. §. 6. (so shameless is he for charging me with omitting it, even if it had been to his purpose,) he takes a scrap of the end of my quotation, and puts it among his authorities. It proves nothing but the foresaid ceremony.

The second does indeed speak of the baptism of adult persons, (to which purpose he might have produced a hundred in a day's time,) as if any one did not know that multitudes of new converts were at that time baptized; and that their baptism is more often, and more largely spoken of, than that of their children. Against which baptism of their children there is nothing in this, nor in any other passage of *Barnabas*.

The first two chapters of my book have (as I declared in the preface) no quotations that speak

*expressly* of infant baptism : but of original sin, as it affects infants; of the necessity of baptism to salvation; of baptism succeeding circumcision, &c. The first two, which I bring from *Clemens Romanus*, to shew how fully he owns original sin, or pollution in infants, are not, he says, at

Page 423, ‘plain to prove that.’ And in the first of them, he says, ‘*Clemens says* nothing of it, nor ‘seems to have had the least thought of it.’ Let any one read it; and particularly these words in it; ‘there is none free from pollution; no, not though ‘his life be but of the length of one day;’ and judge of this man’s face.

The other, which speaks of the woful state in which ‘we came into this world,’ cannot, he says, be meant of original sin; because *Clement* in the next words gives God thanks, which thanks are intended by *Clement* for our deliverance from that woful state. Which inference could not be made but by a man of great reach and judgment.

Page 423, 424, he gives us his own arguings and sentiments of the point of original sin. Which they that have an opinion of his skill in divinity may do well to read. The most observable thing in them is, the cunning to ingratiate himself with his neighbour antipædobaptists, many of whom deny it; and yet not displease the others who hold it, which are the far major part. And therefore he says, ‘baptism ‘is not *so much* intended for the remission of original, as of actual sins.’ This is mincing. What follows, shews his meaning to be, that it is not for the former at all.

Page 426, &c. On that vision of *Hermas*; where the tower, that is to say, the church, is built upon

the water; and the explication given, ‘because your ‘life is saved by water:’ he grants that the church triumphant is there built out of the church militant; and the church militant is indeed built on the water of baptism; and yet says, that *Hermas* does nowhere suppose that none can *be saved* who are not members of the church militant. Which any one of common sense (whether they have been at a private academy or not) does perceive to be ‘the denying ‘the conclusion.’ For what is the *church triumphant*, but the number of those that *are saved*?

But he objects, that the stones of which the church (or tower in that vision) is built, are only adult persons; which he proves by an induction of the particular sorts of stones there mentioned; and adds, at p. 430, that I have no ground to assert that my inference will more plainly appear from the next passage which I cite from *Hermas*, lib. iii. Simil. 9, which is nothing but a fuller and larger explication of this vision here; and in which what is here represented by sorts of stones, is there represented by so many sorts of hills out of which the stones are dug.

Now I say, that in that larger explication *infants* are particularly mentioned; (as I had quoted;) for in one of those hills, and in the best of them, the twelfth, called there *the White Hill*, it is said of that hill; ‘they are all as infants, *and are better than any ‘sort before mentioned*: for all that continue as infants without malice, shall be more honoured, &c. ‘For all infants are valued by the Lord, and esteemed the first of all.’ Now if we remember what he said before; ‘the church of those which are saved ‘is built on water.’ And, ‘before any one receives

‘ the name of the Son of God, he is liable to death ;  
 ‘ but when he receives that seal, he is——assigned  
 ‘ to life. Now that seal is water ;’ meaning the water  
 of baptism in the name of Christ ;—and subjoin  
 to it what he says here of infants ; this enforces a  
 conclusion, that *infants* (since they are of those that  
 are most capable of God’s kingdom) should have this  
 seal given them.

And whereas he would impute to us the harsh-  
 ness of that conclusion ; that if it be so, no infant,  
 or other, that dies unbaptized, can be saved ; he  
 knows, if he would own it, that we are farther  
 from determining absolutely cases of that nature,  
 than he and his partners are. We look on these  
 rules of Hermas, or the like of St. John iii. 5, to  
 be obliging *to us*, and directions *for our practice*,  
 without pretending to determine what allowances  
 God will make, either to heathen men and their  
 infants, or in the cases of Christians and their  
 infants, which are extraordinary.

I said, that this declaration in Hermas, ‘ that the  
 ‘ seal of the Son of God is necessary for all that  
 ‘ do enter into the kingdom ;’ and that ‘ that seal  
 ‘ is water ;’ is an expression of that definition of  
 our Saviour, which St. John did afterwards put  
 into writing, John iii. 5, *Except any one be born of  
 water, &c.* Upon which he grounds this inmodest  
 cavil, p. 431, that I seem to import that St. John  
 copied these words from Hermas.

It can seem so to nobody but to him. Nay I  
 believe it did not seem so to him ; but only he had  
 a mind to catch at an occasion of reproach. My  
 words import no more, than that our Saviour  
 having given such a rule, the Christians of Hermas’

time must needs know it; and Hermas (or the angel, if it were a proper revelation) might express the substance of it, before St. John had in his Gospel set down the words themselves.

Page 431, he says he will take this occasion to *examine* a little those words of our Saviour, John iii. 5; and gives his reason, because I, as well as the other paedobaptists, do ‘here and elsewhere argue ‘from them;’ and he spends fourteen pages upon it. And as if he had forgot whose words they are; his way of *examining* them is in a much like indecent manner, as he uses in examining the words of any antagonist that he had a mind to overthrow.

But before he began, should he not have heard the voice of his conscience saying to him; If you do set yourself to answer this, and his other proofs from Scripture, you ought to blot out all your sixth chapter, wherein you broadly said, that he brings no proofs at all from Scripture; nay, that ‘he owns ‘there are none.’ Else your readers comparing the one with the other, will perceive the falsehood! But he ventures that. And at

Page 432, first labours to defend the late bishop of Salisbury’s notion; that by *the kingdom of God* in that text is meant, not heaven, but the church on earth; and by some flattering eulogiums of his lordship’s ‘unanswerable arguings.’ &c., seems to have aimed at currying favour. And whereas I had said that all the ancients understand it in this place of *the kingdom of glory*; he says, ‘yet it may not be ‘the true sense, if they do. For the ancients were ‘fallible,’ &c. It seems he can find no *unanswerable arguments* among them. For they were all dead, and had no places to give.

Page 433, he says, the authorities I make use of, to prove the ancient interpretation to be *the kingdom of glory*, are ‘all too late, and of those centuries wherein pædobaptism prevailed. If I had cited the writers of the first three centuries, it had been considerable.’

To cite any writers of any centuries wherein pædobaptism did not prevail, is more than I can do. But if those of the first three centuries will satisfy him, I refer him to my second edition, part ii. chap. 6. §. 1. (which he must have seen; or else he is a very careless answerer of a book :) I shall not transcribe here the reasons and authorities which I there give. He will see there Hermas in the apostles’ time, and Tertullian a hundred years after, cited; beside others referred to. To which references may be added the explication of this text, given by Nemesianus in his suffrage delivered in the council of Carthage under St. Cyprian. He expounds it; *Salvi esse non possunt: sed in judicio Christi damnabuntur*. After all, I do not see (as I there said) what the antipædobaptists gain by the other interpretation; nor would I eagerly contend with any one that takes the words here to mean *the church*. I own, they are in many places of the gospel so taken.

Page 434, he begins a new dispute about the comprehensiveness of the particle  $\tau\acute{\iota}\varsigma$  in this text, (which he had yielded at p. 431,) and proves from Thucydides, &c., that  $\tau\acute{\iota}\varsigma$  does not signify *every*. But in the next page, after much belabouring himself, he recollects, (a thing which any boy could have told him at first,) that though in an affirmative proposition  $\tau\acute{\iota}\varsigma$  does not signify *all* or *every*, yet in a negative one,

ἐὰν μὴ τις signifies *not any*, or *none*; so that our Saviour's words amount to this, *none but those born of water, &c.*, can enter.

Page 436, he is at last forced to run to the same kind of answer to this text, as Mr. Emlyn before had used, viz. that though ἐὰν μὴ τις do in words make a general negative, yet it must be restrained to the subjects there spoken of. Which Mr. Emlyn would have to be, 'such as are converted from 'infidelity.' That fitted his turn best, that our Saviour should say, Except any one of those, that are newly converted from infidelity, be born again, &c., but the descendants of believers may have the kingdom without it. Whereas our Saviour's words are, *All that is born of the flesh.*

Mr. Emlyn's guess, as it had but little ground, so he expressed it with brevity and modesty. But here we have a ramble and a wildgoosechase, to find what is meant by *any one*. 'Any one what?' says Mr. Gale; 'any one *being*? any one *angel*? 'any one *man? woman? child*?' (This is his way of *examining* the words of our blessed Saviour, as if he had some sophister, his fellow, to oppose.) At last he fixes it for his own hypothesis, as the other had done for his; 'any one who is come to the use 'of his reason, and has heard the word,' &c. (as if they only were to be admitted to the kingdom of heaven.) 'And this,' says he, 'we assert, is *the only* 'genuine meaning of our Lord's words.'

I do not deny but that in many propositions of Scripture, however generally expressed, we must limit the meaning to such subjects as the context does shew to be the only ones there intended; provided those limitations be plainly grounded on the context.



As here. The discourse of our Saviour is plainly concerning human persons already born ; because he speaks of the necessity of their being *born again*. And their first birth was *of the flesh* ; as he says in the next words.

And they must be such as are in a capacity, or may be brought to a capacity, of being members of *the kingdom of God* ; for the main discourse is about bringing them thither.

And such as are in a capacity to be baptized with water (which our Saviour here expresses, *born of water*), and by the mercy of God put into a new spiritual state by the virtue and influence of the Holy Spirit (which he here expresses, *born of the Spirit*).

These qualifications are spoken of in the context, and no other : none concerning the age of the person, nor any concerning the state of his parents, heathen or Christian.

Therefore the words of Christ being universal for all such ; the *Socinians*, unless they can maintain that one descended of Christian parents is not at first *born of the flesh*, must not make limitations of their own, but must (if they would have the person come to the kingdom) bring him, as well as they would a converted heathen, to this *new birth of water and of the Spirit*.

And so the antipædobaptists,—if they do confess that their children are *born of the flesh* ; and yet do wish, pray, and hope, that being dedicated to Christ, they shall come to *the kingdom of God* ; and cannot deny but a child is capable of being washed *with water* ; nor will deny (but on the contrary hope) that their child is capable of having the

benefits of Christ's covenant sealed and applied to him by *the Spirit of God*;—must not make limitations of their own to this universal law and command of Christ; which requires this *new birth of water and of the Spirit* in order to their entering God's kingdom; and makes no exception or distinction of infant or adult; but allows to both of them an admission into his kingdom.

Of these qualifications mentioned, the only one of which they can make any doubt, is, how an infant can be *born of the Spirit*. Of this I had given the sense of the ancient Christians, part i. chap. 15. §. 8, and also in the explication and enforcement of this text, part ii. chap. 6. §. 1. and shewed that the antipædobaptists do own that the Spirit of Christ is applied to infants, and unites them to him; and quoted the words of Mr. Tombes and of Mr. Danvers.

Mr. Gale, at p. 445, recites some of my words; does not offer to deny that 'the Holy Spirit does seal and apply pardon of sin, and other promises of the covenant, to the infant;' but only mentions some other offices of the Holy Spirit in the adult, over and besides those which infants are capable of.

Now that does not hinder but that an infant may be *born again of the Spirit*, by those operations of the Spirit of which his state is then capable; though he have not at present some farther graces of the Spirit, of which the adult only are capable; of which those particular texts cited by Mr. Gale do speak.

In this rule of our Saviour, pronounced so solemnly, *Verily, verily, I say unto you, Except any one be born of water and the Spirit, he cannot*

*enter into the kingdom of God*; Mr. Emlyn adds, of his own head, and without any ground from the text, ‘A heathen converted cannot, nor can his ‘children: but a man or child *born of Christian ‘parents may.*’ And Mr. Gale, with no better ground than the other, is fain to add to Christ’s words, and make them run thus; no *adult* person can; but a child may.

The reasons he gives, why this rule cannot concern infants, are these:

Page 437. First, they do not know this law; therefore it cannot oblige them.

Just what might have been said of the infants of the Jews. They did not know the law of circumcision; yet God Almighty told their parents, that those of their children whom they refused or neglected to circumcise, should be cut off. A benefactor who promises to adopt a poor man’s child, and make him his heir, if he will give up his child to him, is not bound to do it, if the parent refuse. Christ promises the kingdom of heaven to our children, if we will dedicate them to him in the sacrament of dedication which he has appointed. He does not promise it, if we refuse. It is not a thing due to them by nature. This benefit, or this loss, concerns the child, although at that time he know it not.

Page 438. He makes his second reason by confronting a saying of St. Peter to this of Christ: 1 Pet. iii. 21, *Baptism saveth us, not the putting away of the filth of the flesh, but the answer of a good conscience toward God.*

Mr. Stokes serves him in his kind. He bids him

do with this text, as he did with John iii. 5, put in the word 'adult' here, as he did there.

Dr. Whitby had given a better answer to their argument from hence. That St. Paul, Rom. ii. 28, 29, says of circumcision the same thing in effect that St. Peter does here of baptism; that the true circumcision *is not that which is outward in the flesh, but the inward circumcision of the heart and spirit*; and yet none would argue from thence that circumcision should not be given to infants, who could not at that time have the circumcision of the heart.

Mr. Gale labours to shew a difference; but in vain, as any one will see; the aim of St. Paul being to inculcate this; that any one's circumcision which he had received in infancy, would not avail him, if after he grew up, he did not circumcise his heart, and keep the covenant which circumcision had sealed to him. And St. Peter's words running in the same style are plainly capable of the same sense, that baptism received in infancy would not save the man, who did not, after he came to age, with a good conscience make good the engagements of the Christian religion, into which he had been by it entered. Therefore as St. Paul's words cannot be made an argument to prove that circumcision was not then received in infancy, (it being notorious that it was,) no more can St. Peter's words argue, that baptism was not then given in infancy by the Christians to such children as they had.

Nay, further, if St. Paul do so speak of circumcision, which was then administered to infants only, and had been by himself received in infancy; much

more might St. Peter so speak of baptism, which at that time had more subjects which had received it at their adult age, than they were who had received it in infancy; (and St. Peter himself was one of them;) and yet not imply any denial of the benefit of it to the children of Christians, provided they did, when they came to age, perform the duties of it.

And this comparison and parallelism of St. Paul's words about circumcision, with those of St. Peter about baptism, does not only take off the objections of the antipædobaptists raised from this text of St. Peter; but all that they raise from other texts, where baptism, and the following duties and effects of it, are put together in the same sentence. Such as Matt. xxviii. 19, 20, *Baptize, &c., teaching them, &c.*: Rom. vi. 4. *Buried with him in baptism, &c.: that we should walk, &c.*: and at other places; *the baptism of repentance*, and the like.

For as when St. Paul says here, *Circumcision profiteth, if thou keep the law*: and a little after speaks of such as *by the letter and circumcision do transgress the law*; he does not, though he join them in one sentence, mean that *at the same time* when they were circumcised, they did either *keep* or *transgress* the law; but only that as they grew up, they did some of them keep, some of them transgress. So the forecited texts, and such other, though they join them together in one sentence, do not necessarily imply that *at the same time* they were *baptized* and *taught*; *baptized* and *walked in newness of life*; *baptized* and *repented*; but that, as they grew up, they had these consequences of teaching, walking, repenting, &c.

Such expressions would fit, not only those that had been baptized when adult, (as most of the Christians in the apostles' time had,) but (as we see by St. Paul's speaking in just the same phrase concerning circumcision) those who had received baptism in infancy.

Mr. Gale pleads that the cases of St. Peter's and St. Paul's discourse are not parallel. First, because St. Paul does not say of circumcision, (as St. Peter does of baptism,) *Not this* has the good effect; *but the other*. Which is broadly to deny St. Paul to say that which he plainly does say.

Secondly, because St. Paul does not speak this of circumcision while it continued in force; but now it was abolished.

But (as Mr. Stokes well answers) the Jewish Christians (to whom St. Paul here speaks) did even then use it, and reckon it to be still in force as to Jews, though not to Gentiles, Acts xxi. 20, &c.

And St. Paul says here, *Circumcision profiteth if thou keep the law*. By which it appears that his argument to them is, *ad hominem*; supposing, and speaking to them of it, as it was when it was in full force.

And besides; what St. Paul here says, is in effect the same with what is said, Deut. x. 16, and xxx. 6, Jer. iv. 4, when it was in full force.

Page 441. His third exception against my arguing from this text, is that trite one; that our Saviour, John vi. 53, makes the same necessity of *eating his flesh, and drinking his blood*, as in John iii. 5. he does of being baptized. Therefore since it is confessed that that eating and drinking (whether it be understood of the sacramental eating, or of faith in Christ) does

not belong to infants; we should by the same reason account them to be excepted in the other command of baptism.

This has been answered a hundred times. That all commands of God or man (how general soever the words are) are to be understood as meant and directed to such only as are capable of the thing commanded. Mr. Gale often urges this rule. I said, we do not deny it. The command of actual faith (which he thinks is the meaning of eating in John vi.) is plainly impossible to infants; but their baptism, their being dedicated to Christ, is not at all. The command to all *Jews* to worship, offer sacrifice, &c., did by the nature of the thing concern only the adult. The command that all males be circumcised, concerned all without exception, infants as well as adult; because of that they were capable. So in the case of these texts. Infants being excepted in the application of the command, John vi, of which they are (if actual faith be there meant) as yet in no wise capable, is no argument that they should be excluded from the benefit of John iii. 5, of which they are capable.

Neither do the expressions of our Saviour run alike in both the places. That of John vi. was spoken to persons that could hear and be admonished; *Except ye eat, &c.*, and can concern only such. That of John iii. is a general definition of the state of all persons born of the flesh; *Except any one be born again.* Baptism is the sacrament of initiation, or entering into covenant; and of that infants are capable. And whereas Mr. Gale in the next pages brings more instances of things of which infants are not capable; Mark xvi. 16, *He that believeth not,*

*shall be damned*; John iii. 18, *He that believeth not, is condemned already*; where infants cannot by the nature of the thing be meant; they avail him nothing toward a proof that they are not meant here.

Page 443. He will needs give us his opinion, what God will do in reference to the eternal state of those adult among the heathens, who have neither faith nor baptism. In which matters so far out of human reach, the more forward anyone is to obtrude his opinion, the less it is to be regarded. This however he gives but as an opinion, 'We have great reason to hope,' &c. But concerning the eternal state of *infants*, dying unbaptized, (as he would have all that die in infancy to do,) he is more positive, and talks with as much assurance of the decrees of God, as any confident man can do of matters of his trade, or any mountebank of his skill in receipts; so that no pope with St. Peter's keys in his hand can more peremptorily dispose of places in the kingdom of heaven. For,

Page 443, he makes that his fourth reason against the baptizing of infants in order to their admission into heaven, that 'all infants' (meaning, as his words shew, baptized or not, of heathen or of Christian parents, of the wicked as well as of the godly) 'shall assuredly be saved.'

If modesty be necessary anywhere, it is when we speak of the future judgments of God in cases not revealed. Godly parents in all ages have been solicitous for the salvation of their children; and inasmuch as they have been under God the authors of their being; nature itself, as well as God's word, has strongly inclined them to wish, pray, and endeavour



that that being might become a happy and advantageous, and not a miserable being to them. And accordingly have been careful to use any means prescribed by God Almighty for that purpose.

The godly Jews, to make use of that seal of circumcision to enter them into God's gracious covenant, whereby he had promised them *to be a God to them and their seed*; to use their own prayers; and to bring them to any prophet or holy man, and desire him to bless them in the name of God, &c. The godly Christians, to bring them to Christ to be dedicated to him and the Father and Holy Spirit, to be baptized in that holy name, for the forgiveness and washing off that stain and pollution which is by corrupt nature, in which they were conceived and born; to implore the mercy of God to receive and admit them into that his merciful covenant made to mankind, by which he will *for Christ's sake, and to all that are his*, give an eternal life, which is a greater and higher advantage than could naturally be expected for them; and to desire that in order to obtain this inestimable benefit, there be used, beside their own prayers, the prayers and offices of Christ's minister, and of his church.

Now this man would have nothing of this to be done; but says in effect, it is more than needs. The child without all this, is as safe as with it; and after all this the child of an atheist, who regards not Christ or his covenant, or any prayer to him, or sacrament of his, is as safe as this child.

If you inquire for the ground of this strange assurance, you have his dictate; 'If there be any mercy in God, — all infants, who could never offend him, shall assuredly be saved.' And by

*being saved*, he does not mean only, (as some of the *Greek* church did, and as the *Roman* does now,) that unbaptized infants, and heathen men's infants, shall be in a state of little or no punishment or suffering; but he means, (as appears by his other words,) shall have *the kingdom of hearen*. And this without inserting any thing of Christ's mediation and death as the meritorious cause of their salvation; but so pleads their cause at this place, as if they needed it not. Let him therefore be the man to answer the challenge which St. Austin fourteen hundred years ago made to any impious person, who, when infants were brought to church to be baptized, should 'dare to affirm that they may be 'saved without that regeneration, as if Christ had 'not died for them; for it was sinners that he died 'for,' &c.——and to say, (as he there sets him a form,) 'Carry back from hence these innocent creatures; *the whole have no need of a physician, but they that are sick. Christ came not to call the 'righteous, but sinners.*' St. Austin thought there would never be any Christian presumptuous enough to accept this challenge. He says there; *De peccat. meritis*, lib. i. c. 18. 'Such a thing never was said, 'nor ever will be said, in the church of Christ.' There was never a Mr. *Gale* at that time, and he thought never would be.

But thou, Christian reader, if thou hast children, especially such as are in danger of death; and hast that pious concern for their everlasting welfare, and for their obtaining that heavenly purchase of Christ, even *eternal life*, which every good parent ought to have: depend not on any such mountebank assurances, or arrogant dictates of men that make so

bold with God's judgments, as if they themselves were judges; but humbly apply to Christ himself, (who has procured this wonderful favour,) and to his word; and seek for such assurances for thy child's soul as are grounded on that, and not on men's bold reasonings; use earnest prayers to God in the name of *Christ*, that for *his sake* (and not merely because it has never actually offended him) it may be received into those everlasting habitations which he has prepared for all that are *his*, and for none else: do not conceive of heaven as of a place *due* to human nature, though it could be conceived innocent; much less in the corrupt state that it is now in. Remember what David says of our natural birth, Psalm li. 5.

Pray particularly that God would not remember thy sins, or the sins of its other forefathers; but that its soul may be washed from all pollution in the blood of that immaculate Lamb, which only can make a soul pure enough to be received into the place that was purchased by it. Read that record of God, 1 John v. 11, 12, *That God hath given to us an eternal life; and this life is in (or by) his Son. He that hath the Son (or has an interest in the Son) hath this life: he that hath not the Son of God hath not life.* No man will, or dare, say, infants shall be excepted in that sentence which requires that they be in Christ, or *have Christ* for their Saviour: nor can give any good proof that they shall be excepted in this before us. For which way come they to *belong to Christ*, or to *have him*, but as they are dedicated and entered into his covenant in the way that he has appointed for all whom he will save, to be entered?

Read that godly saying of the pious and judicious Mr. Hooker, (which I recited, part ii. chap. 6, §. 1.) in his Eccles. Polity, lib. v. 59, 60. ‘If Christ himself, which giveth salvation, do require baptism; it is not for us that look for salvation to sound and examine him, whether unbaptized men may be saved: but seriously to do that which is required,’ &c. The words of Christ are general; *Except any one*. And Matt. xxviii; *All nations*. He does nowhere except infants.

Mr. Gale says, ‘They never could offend him.’ No more could the brute creatures. Shall they therefore go to heaven? But he will say, these are of *human* race. Has human race any *claim* to heaven? It is the peculiar purchase of our blessed Saviour for all those of human race that are *his*. He procured it, and has granted a possibility and promise of it to mankind under certain limitations and conditions (without excepting infants), one of which conditions is this of the text.

He says, if it be so, then ‘millions of infants will not be saved.’ And he had made before the like objection concerning all the heathen world, the adult heathens.

To all which sort of bold inquiries, we can return only this; Christ has told *us*, to whom his word is come, what *we ourselves* are to expect. Concerning those to whom it never came, whoever busily inquires of him, *And what shall these men do?* or, *What shall become of them?* does in effect receive from him this answer; *What is that to thee?* He has said in general; *The servant that knew not his master’s will, and did things worthy of stripes, shall be beaten with few stripes*. And more

than that he has not told us of their fate; and of their children nothing at all. He will, we need not fear, deal with all men, adult and infant, according to rules of justice and equity. But if a man, a worm, will not trust him with the ordering of those rules; but will demand beforehand, what he will do with such, and what with such; *He giveth not account of any of his matters.* A modest and humble speculation about such things may be useful, or however excusable. But to talk and determine after this arrogant rate; 'If there be any mercy in him,' he will do so with these, and so with those, is good for nothing, but to create in us an abhorrence of the bold presumption of the determiner.

He says, 'Infinite mercy cannot make the happiness of any of his creatures to depend upon conditions that were impossible for them to perform.'

As for any happiness that was *due* to them, this may indeed be a rule. But the kingdom of heaven is not *due* to all his creatures. And where it is not *due*, he may do what he will with his own; and set what conditions he thinks fit. And as for this condition of receiving baptism in his name, he may well say to any parent, If you will dedicate yourself to me by baptism, and live accordingly, you shall be admitted to that happiness; and so shall your children, if you will dedicate them, and they do not afterward by their own rebellion forfeit it.

This condition, Mr. Gale says, is *impossible* for the child to perform. True; if he has an antipædobaptist parent, or a heathen parent, or a very careless Christian parent. But even in that case, the child (suppose he do miss of the kingdom of

heaven; as all the ancient Christians when they expound this text, do think he will) does not lose any happiness that was *due* to him. And for other children, whose parents or sponsors desire baptism for them, and it becomes impossible by reason of sudden death, or other accident; it is the hope of most protestants that God does in such case accept of the *will* for the *deed*, and give them the kingdom of heaven; because here was the heart and purpose to do what God commanded.

In short, this arrogant rule, as he lays it down, strikes at God's justice in the case of circumcision, as well as of pædobaptism; and with the same assurance as he here tells us, our explication of this text supposes a thing which God cannot do, he may, upon hearing Gen. xvii. 14, say, That is what God could not do. For circumcision was as impossible for the child to perform, as baptism is; and yet without it he was cut off.

It is worth the while to observe how strongly, and with what sinews, this argument, which determines so positively concerning what God can, or cannot do, is built.

Our Saviour's rule, *Except any one, &c.*, cannot concern infants, proved thus:

Page 443. As it does not concern angels, who, 'we are sure,' shall, though not baptized, enter, &c., so it does not concern infants, who, 'we may reasonably suppose,' shall, whether baptized or not, all of them enter, &c.

This was as yet lame; because between 'we are sure' and 'we may reasonably suppose' there is some difference. Therefore within three lines it is mended; and instead of 'we may reasonably sup-

‘pose,’ it is put ‘shall assuredly.’ That does it. Only there is this difference; the angels are there already; but that unbaptized infants, such as their parents refuse to enter into Christ’s church here, shall enter there, we have no other proof than this man’s ‘shall assuredly;’ and his giving a rule to God Almighty’s power in the following words; ‘God our Saviour cannot ordain such unreasonable laws.’

He brings at last another argument. In Mark x. 14, Christ, speaking of infants, says, *Of such is the kingdom of heaven.*

Why did not he quote all the text; *Suffer them to come to me: for of such, &c.*? Lest we should understand it thus: Infants are capable of being members of the kingdom of heaven: therefore bring them to me, and do not forbid them for their infancy. Whereas he would have us expound it, (quite contrary to our Saviour’s inference,) *Of such is the kingdom of heaven;* therefore bring them not to me; they need it not.

Page 444, comes his last exception against our argument from the foresaid text of John iii. 5, that our Saviour there requires their being ‘*born of the Spirit, as well as of water;*’ which cannot be meant of infants.

To which I gave answer twice or thrice in the book he is answering. And here above, once to Mr. *Bernard*, once to Mr. *Emlyn*, and once or twice to Mr. *Gale*. What I there shew that the antipædobaptists confess of the gracious offices of the Holy Spirit in the case of infants; Danvers says, ‘Who doubts it? I am sure I never affirmed the contrary.’ And if our author will deny it, let him speak out.

Instead of that, he recites some texts where are mentioned several other operations of the Spirit, (which are indeed peculiar to the adult,) but says nothing to overthrow what I had said; that the Holy Spirit, beside his office of converting the heart, &c., does also ‘apply pardon of sin, and other ‘promises of the covenant,’ of which an infant is capable.

Where he says, p. 445, that I take this for *all* that is meant in the text by *born of the Spirit*; I answer, that that cannot be said to be *all*. Because the words being general, of *any one’s* being *born of the Spirit*, and applicable to the baptism both of an adult person, and of an infant; there may be several other effects and operations of the Spirit on the heart of an adult, beside those that are common to the adult and infants.

And whereas he quotes Dr. Whitby, who would not have an infant’s case comprehended in this text; Dr. Whitby, when he animadverts that the church in the office of baptism does directly quote and apply these very words of our Saviour to the baptism of every infant, will not deny that they are applicable to it.

Now at last he returns to what I quoted from Hermas; and,

Page 447, excepts against any inference for pædobaptism that can be drawn from that part of the vision, where the patriarchs and other holy men, that had died before the Christian baptism was instituted, are represented as baptized by the apostles in the separate state.

I owned that it does not speak directly of infants; and all that I pretended to conclude from it,



was, the necessity of water-baptism to salvation, or to entrance into the kingdom of God, in the opinion of the then Christians, i. e. the Christians of the apotles' time. Those are my words.

He says, I concluded ; ' therefore the church of ' that time practised the baptism of infants.' I did not say that. But left it to the reader to judge, how far it would follow from the necessity of baptism to *all* that do enter ; since the patriarchs themselves could not enter without it. Therefore I need say nothing to those three pages, wherein he talks of want of connexion, &c., as if I had made a syllogism of it ; or parables not being argumentative, not running on all four ; and such pedantic stuff.

He says, those patriarchs had been adult, and had had actual sins in their former life ; and for them might need baptism. He should have minded that Hermas (or the angel) does not make that the reason ; but says, ' they died in great purity ; only ' this seal was wanting to them.' He concludes this head at

Page 450, with a merry scoff ; if this ' proves any ' thing in favour of infant-baptism, it is only, that ' they shall be baptized in the other world. But be ' this as it will : it is sufficient that they are not to ' be baptized here ; which is all we insist on.'

If the schism can be supported, and hold up its head, till that time ; he is indifferent what becomes of the question itself. And if he ' gain his point' here ; let who will gain it there. But it is bad venturing this, lest those, whose parents refused for them here, be refused there. It was granted to those patriarchs there ; because it had not been instituted here during the time of their mortal life.

Page 450, 451. Here he first would willingly deny that by the word *infants*, in a passage of *Hermas* there recited, are meant infants in age. Which evasion the mere reading of the place does plainly confute. So not insisting on that, but saying with his usual modesty, ‘perhaps it may be so;’ he pleads still, that that declaration of God’s compassionate love to infants, ‘all infants are valued by the Lord,’ &c., does not signify any thing to their baptism; for that there is no necessary connexion between God’s love and baptism.

There is, as we have seen, a connexion made by our Saviour, between admission into his kingdom, and baptism. And we think admission into his kingdom to be an effect of, and connected to, his love.

He observes that the words are, ‘All infants;’ which he paraphrases; ‘All, upon the same level, ‘merely as infants, baptized, or not.’ Forgetting that *Hermas* had said before, that all who enter must have ‘that seal, and that seal is water.’ And our Saviour before him had spoke to the same purpose.

He says, *Hermas* calls infants *innocent*. So does the church of *England* in the Office of Baptism; where yet it owns their being conceived in sin. It means only, innocent in comparison; of a meek temper, &c.

He says, it is strange that *Hermas*, in his representations of the several materials of which the church was built, should never give infants one place, but constantly neglect them.

And yet this very place that we are upon, is a mention of them in that ‘white mountain,’ which

was the chief of all that afforded any stones to the building.

Page 452. To prove that *Hermas* had no notion of infant-baptism, he quotes an exhortation of his, that is, as he thinks, inconsistent with it; ‘I say unto you all, whoever have received this seal; Keep simplicity,’ &c.

This is your man for ‘connexion’ in an argument. Though such an exhortation be (as Mr. Stokes also observes) but the same that any pædobaptist preacher does commonly use to his people; yet he (lest the reader should take the inference from it against pædobaptism to be shamefully weak and trifling) with his usual countenance tells us; ‘It is not possible any inference should be more direct and necessary.’

I had observed that this saying of *Hermas*, ‘All infants are valued by the Lord,’ is to the same effect, as our Saviour’s embracing infants, and saying, *Of such is the kingdom of God*. Mr. Gale says, that I supposed this a *plain* argument for their baptism.

I have not that lucky talent (in which he does so excel) of cramming down the reader’s throat inferences from any premises. What I said, was, that it is ‘one of the reasons used to prove that they are fit to be admitted into the covenant of God’s grace and love by baptism.’ And I do still think it a stronger one than any the antipædobaptists can bring for the negative; and such as they do not give any solid answer to.

But he says, I did not reason from the words, (and indeed it was not the province that I had undertaken,) but only *cite* them, as if they were

plain to the purpose. He therefore undertakes the reasoning part. [p. 453.] And his reasons are, (such as he is used to,) ‘The pædobaptists do much pervert ‘the place.’ The words ‘have no relation to baptism ‘at all, nor to any thing necessarily connected with ‘it.’ ‘What is there, I beseech you, in the whole ‘matter, which can make them fasten upon this ‘place?’ And so he goes on ranting and insulting over the pædobaptists (and Dr. Hammond for one) till he comes to Dr. *Whitby*, whom he never passes by without a compliment; which here runs thus; he ‘is pleased to improve the passage to the ‘utmost advantage; and he being in general so ‘very fair and sincere a writer, and comprehending ‘the whole substance of what can be urged from ‘the place; I will examine what he has said.’ And in that examination he begins gently, and forces himself to civil language; but before he has done, nature returns upon him, and he tells the doctor; ‘his argument is grounded on a mistake;’ ‘the ‘doctor gives no reason;’ ‘this is directly begging ‘the question,’ &c.

Now because since that time the doctor has published his wish to see an answer to this book of ‘the learned, the very learned Mr. Gale<sup>z</sup>;’ I think it concerns him to answer this part himself. And since he has given up to them the other text of John iii. 5, (which the church of *England* does not, and the ancient Christians would not have done,) to vindicate at least his own argument from this. For I, though I think it a very easy thing to

<sup>z</sup> [See above, p. 228, and the note there, describing the tract of Dr. Whitby against Dr. Jo. Edwards, in which these expressions of commendation occur.]

shew the weakness of all that is said against it here, had rather for some reasons that he should do it himself. It is certainly more to the purpose to write in his own vindication against this ‘very learned man,’ than to write against Dr. Snape, in vindication of another ‘very learned man <sup>a</sup>.’

<sup>a</sup> [Dr. Wall evidently alludes here to the share which Dr. Whitby appears to have taken in that which is well known as ‘the Bangorian controversy.’

The commencement of this, and its progress, so far as these parties were concerned, was as follows :

Bishop Hoadly having preached before the king, on the 31st of March, 1717, a sermon on the nature of Christ’s church and kingdom, great excitement was the consequence, and the bishop was speedily attacked from various quarters. Some of the earliest publications against him were those of Dr. Andrew Snape : which were replied to by the bishop himself, by Francis de la Pillonniere, a reformed Jesuit whom bishop Hoadly at that time entertained in his house,—by Dr. Whitby, and others.

The following are some of the pieces in question :

1. A Sermon on the Nature of Christ’s Church, &c., by Benjamin [Hoadly] Lord Bishop of Bangor. 8vo. *London*, 1717.
2. A letter addressed to the Lord Bishop of Bangor, occasioned by his Lordship’s sermon, &c., by Andrew Snape, D.D. 8vo. *London*, 1717.
3. An answer to the Rev. Dr. Snape’s letter, &c., by the Lord Bishop of Bangor. 8vo. *London*, 1717.
4. A second letter to the Lord Bishop of Bangor, by Andrew Snape, D.D. 4to. *London*, 1717.
5. An answer to the Rev. Dr. Snape’s accusation, &c., by Francis de la Pillonniere: with a preface by the Lord Bishop of Bangor, 8vo. *London*, 1717.
6. An answer to Dr. Snape’s second letter to the Lord Bishop of Bangor, by Dan. Whitby, D.D. 8vo. *London*, 1717.
7. A Vindication of the passage in Dr. Snape’s second letter, &c., by the Rev. Dr. Snape. 8vo. *London*, 1717.
8. A reply to Dr. Snape’s Vindication, &c., by Fr. de la Pillon-

Page 456. The exposition of this text given by the late Bishop of *Salisbury*, (which he here likewise attacks,) may (because he is dead) be here (for want of a better hand) freed from that little which he objects against it. That bishop had, both in the other text and in this, by *the kingdom of God* understood the church here, or, as he styles it, 'the dispensation of the Messiah.' Mr. Gale, who was eager for this sense of the word in the other place, and said, his lordship had 'unanswerably argued' that that is the sense in which *the kingdom of God* does stand *almost universally* through the whole Gospel; is utterly against it here, for a reason of much less weight than was that of St. Austin's, (which I cited,) to prove that not the church on earth, but the kingdom of glory was meant in John iii. 5. which Mr. Gale there called a frivolous one. St. Austin on those words, John iii. *shall not see the kingdom of God*, concluded the kingdom there spoken of to be the kingdom of glory, and not the church here; because of the church here, it cannot be denied, but a wicked or unbaptized man might see it. Mr. Gale said that was a frivolous argument. And yet in Mark x. 15, *shall not enter into the kingdom*, he concludes here, it must be the kingdom of glory; for into the

niere: to which is prefixed a Letter to Dr. Snape by the Lord Bishop of Bangor. Svo. *London*, 1718.

9. A Defence of the propositions contained in the Lord Bishop of Bangor's sermon, &c., by Daniel Whitby, D.D. Svo. *London*, 1718.
10. A third Defence, containing a reply to Dr. Snape and Mr. Mills' new calumnies, &c., by Francis de la Pillonniere: with some remarks on Dr. Snape's letter; by the Lord Bishop of Bangor. Svo. *London*. 1718.

church here, 'the greatest villains may *be admitted*, 'if they conceal their wickedness.' If that was frivolous, this is much more so. For in what sense soever a wicked man, or unbaptized person, may *enter* into the church; much more he may *see* it.

He ventures farther; and puts the case, suppose *the kingdom of God* do mean *the church*; and (as his supposition must be, if it be pertinent) suppose infants were to be admitted into it; yet 'how does it appear they were to be admitted by baptism? Baptism is the only way of admitting adult persons, but is nowhere prescribed to infants.' And then he proposes a method for a new sect; that should admit into their church adult persons by *baptism*, and infants by doing to them as our Lord did to those here mentioned, viz. by *laying on of hands, and prayer*. This, he says, he 'should rather imagine, if they are to be admitted at all.'

This were certainly better than their present practice of not receiving infants into the church at all. For the *receiving* them some way or other is plainly directed and encouraged by our Saviour, upon an occasion like to this, Matt. xviii.

And whereas Christ at this time is said to have received these by blessing and laying on of hands, without any mention of the baptizing of them; that is no otherwise expressed than it is often in the case of adult persons who came to him to be healed, and who professed their belief in him, and upon whom he sometimes laid his hands; and yet none of them is said at that time to be baptized by him; though none doubts but that they were baptized by his disciples.

If the antipædobaptists be once convinced of

their duty of 'receiving little children in Christ's 'name' by any ceremony at all; they will rather receive them by the sacrament which he has appointed for all that enter, than by this of Mr. Gale's proposing. However, this ought seriously to be laid to heart by those who will not at all receive one such little child in Christ's name.

Supposing that the bishop's interpretation of *the kingdom of heaven* signifying *the church* here, does not hold; but it signifies the kingdom of glory: yet his main argument from these words for the baptizing such infants does continue firm; since by the other text, all that are to be members of that must be baptized.

He brings also against the bishop that argument, that if they be received to baptism, they must also to the Lord's supper. Which, having been answered over and over, is now grown threadbare.

Page 457, he and his *sir* having had this imaginary triumph over, not me only, but the said doctor and bishop, do as two cocks, here, as at all other conclusions, clap their wings and crow.

---

## CHAP. XII.

MR. GALE, because next to Ihermas I pass to Justin Martyr, and so do 'pass over (as he calls it) [p. 461.] 'half the second century without any attempt upon it;' begs that all the space left out by me may be given him. And because the antipædobaptists can bring no evidence at all from these times; if we leave out any author, as having



nothing *pro* or *contra* about the age of baptizing; they claim them as being our leavings. Whereas the truth of the matter is, that (if we except *Ignatius*, who as he was going to martyrdom, wrote some short letters of his last advice to the neighbouring churches; and *Polycarp*, who wrote one such short letter) there is never a book of the fifty years, he mentions, left. Of which if Mr. Gale were aware, you may see, he will make a flourish to his ignorant readers of a thing which he knows has nothing in it.

My chapter of quotations out of *Justin* has not, as I owned in the preface, any *express* mention of infant-baptism; but of original sin, as it affects infants; of baptism succeeding circumcision, &c.

He says, the proof of their holding the doctrine of original sin (and that, beside actual sins, there is in our nature, since the fall, something that needs *redemption and forgiveness* by the merits of Christ) ‘concerns not the baptizing of infants.’ For, though we do say that that redemption and forgiveness is ordinarily to be applied to every one *by baptism*; that signifies nothing; unless *Justin* say so. Nor is it sufficient to say, the Scripture teaches it; for the question here immediately is not what the Scriptures teach; but what *Justin* teaches.

Now this is very subtile arguing; but (as most of your subtile notions) being a little weighed proves very light. There wants nothing to see through it, but to remember that *Justin* knew the Scriptures. If they do teach, that original pollution does, in order to its forgiveness, require baptism; and he knew and believed them; our proving that he held

pollution in infants, proves by consequence that he must hold their need of baptism.

To stop this dispute about original sin, he refers to what he had said at his 424th page ; where the most that I can make of it, is, that he believes no such thing. And here he questions whether *Justin* and the ancients had any notion of it.

Page 462, he falls foul on my translation of a sentence which I quoted to shew that Father's sense of it, Dial. p. 94. ed. Steph.<sup>b</sup> where it is said that Christ condescended to be *born, and baptized, and crucified*, not being under any necessity or want upon his own account, of any of those things ; but he did them *ὑπὲρ τοῦ γένους τοῦ τῶν ἀνθρώπων, ὃ ἀπὸ τοῦ Ἀδάμ ὑπὸ θάνατον καὶ πλάνην τὴν τοῦ ὄφeos ἐπεπτώκει, παρὰ τὴν ἰδίαν αἰτίαν ἐκάστου αὐτῶν πονηρουσάμενον.* Which I translated : ‘ for mankind, which by ‘ Adam was fallen under death, and under the guile ‘ of the serpent, beside the particular cause which ‘ each man had of sinning.’ He says, it ought, he thinks, to be translated thus ; ‘ for mankind, which ‘ from (not *by*) Adam was fallen under death and ‘ the guile of the serpent, by their own act and ‘ deed, every one having done wickedly.’

This were tolerable, even though the mistake be his own : if he did not add to it some of his natural impudence, and abusive language. My translation, he says, is ‘ such as no schoolboy would have made.’ Whether ‘ I did it out of ignorance, or inadvertency, ‘ he will not determine.’

The only difference is about *ἀπὸ* and *παρά*. How

<sup>b</sup> [Justin. Dialog. cum Tryphone Judæo, sect. 88. edit. Benedictin.]

they are in this place to be rendered. Every one knows that an author speaking of mankind ‘fallen ‘under death and the guile of the serpent’ ἀπὸ τοῦ Ἀδάμ may be understood either thus; *from* (or *by*) Adam, as the cause or origin of that fall, and death; as I translate. Or thus, ‘from the time of Adam,’ as Mr. Gale translates. They know likewise that *παρὰ* with an accusative does signify generally *præter*, *beside*; and sometimes (but very seldom) *propter*, *by reason of*. And that it is the sense and scope of the place, that must determine how these prepositions must be rendered here.

Now all that I have seen, that have had occasion to take notice of this saying of Justin, and, I believe, absolutely all that did ever translate or interpret it, have understood and rendered it as I did.

Perionius, whose Latin translation of Justin is in the *Bibliotheca Patrum*, Colon. 1618, renders ἀπὸ τοῦ Ἀδάμ, ‘Adami opera; by the means (or fault) ‘of Adam.’ And *παρὰ τὴν ἰδίαν αἰτίαν ἐκάστου*; ‘*præter privatam ac propriam uniuscujusque culpam*’; ‘beside every one’s particular and peculiar ‘fault’ (or sin). In the Paris edition, 1636, the translation given by Langus, is; ‘*Sed humani generis causa, quod per Adam in mortem, et fraudem seductionemque serpentis conciderat: ut interim propriam pro se maligne agentis cujusque culpam taceam.*’

Dr. Hammond, having occasion in his Annotations on Psalm li. to quote the former part of this sentence, translates ἀπὸ τοῦ Ἀδάμ, ‘by Adam’s fall.’ And that shews also how he must by the tenor of

the sentence have translated the other part too, if he had recited it.

Of learned men that have collected the testimonies of the ancients owning and bewailing our original corruption, none, I think, have omitted this of Justin. However Vossius in his *Hist. Pelagiana* has not. Nor the learned Spencer, *Annot. in Origenem*, p. 54. Whose putting this among the other passages of the Fathers which speak of *original sin*, shews how he would have translated it. For according to Mr. Gale's translation it speaks nothing about it. He curtails the sense of it, that it should not.

The reverend and learned Mr. Bingham, in that elaborate work of his, *Origines Ecclesiasticæ*, vol. iv. chap. 4. §. 7, translates it; 'By reason of Adam's sin; 'beside the particular guilt which each man,' &c.

The reader sees what men I have named; and will judge what a forehead that man must have, that will not allow them to understand the sense of a passage in a *Greek* Father as well as himself or the 'schoolboys.'

He would give a colour to his own translation from the connexion which this sentence has with the words next following. Which are, 'For God 'did this, willing that these (men as well as angels) 'should act with a free choice and a free power to 'do what he enabled every one to do: that if they 'did choose what was pleasing to him, he might 'preserve them immortal; but if,' &c. Now Mr. Gale says, 'For Justin to say this, and connect it 'by the illative particle, *for*, to another sentence 'wherein he says, All fell in Adam, is so great 'an absurdity,' &c.

But he perverts the words; and there wants nothing but reading them, to see, that Justin does not argue, that all fell in *Adam*, and so men had a free choice. But thus; ‘God did this (i. e. caused ‘his Son to be born, to be baptized, and to be crucified; which are the very words of the disputed ‘sentence) for men; that they might once more ‘have a free choice.’ Mr. Gale in his *English* gives no rendering, but only a — for ἐποίησεν, *did it*. Which would have made the sense not so easy to be perverted. He that will warp one sentence, must commonly bend the next.

He spends the next pages in telling us stories of ἀπὸ and παρὰ. Ἀπὸ often signifies *from*; as *from* such a place, or *from* such a time; (who doubts it?) and St. Paul says, *Death reigned ἀπὸ Ἀδάμ μέχρι Μωσέως, from Adam to Moses*. And if the construction of the sentence had been alike here, it must, I grant, have been so translated here. But he will not deny that it often signifies *from*, i. e. *from*, or *by*, such a *cause*, such an *occasion*, such a man’s *fault*. As the learned men I mentioned, and, I believe, all translators of St. Justin have here rendered it.

For παρὰ he is more put to it. Yet the *lexicon* does furnish him with a few examples. And then he goes to the books; *Dionysius, Thucydides*, tells us long stories of two or three fights, where παρὰ is so used. The property of one that loves to hear himself talk.

Had it not been more natural, if he had sought the true import of it here, to see how *Justin* himself uses it? Of which this dialogue would have given him forty or fifty examples, where it always

signifies, *beside*. There are four or five in the space of a page, p. 69, *edit. prædict.* Another God, *παρὰ τοῦτον*, ‘beside him that was seen by ‘Abraham.’ Christ does nothing *παρὰ γνώμην τοῦ Ποιητοῦ*, *beside* (or without) the will of the Creator. Again, *παρὰ τοῦτον*, *beside* this. And again, *παρὰ τὸν νοούμενον Ποιητὴν*, *beside* him that is understood to be the Maker of all things, &c., so p. 78, another covenant *παρὰ τὴν ἐν ὄρει Χωρήβ*, *beside* that made at the mount Horeb.

If Mr. Gale had amended my translation of the word *αἰτίαν*, there had been more room for his criticism (but that would not have advantaged his plea). I expressed it, ‘beside the particular cause ‘which each man had of sinning.’ It is better rendered, ‘beside the peculiar guilt (or crime) of ‘every one of them that had sinned.’ But this makes Justin not less plainly speak of original sin derived from Adam, beside every man’s particular and actual offences. *Αἰτία* sometimes is the *cause* or *reason* of any thing; sometimes a *crime* or *guilt*; but never, what Mr. Gale renders it, an *act* and *deed*.

Page 466. In answering the next passage, where Justin speaking of the Jewish circumcision, and comparing with it the spiritual circumcision, says of the latter; ‘And this, we being sinners have ‘through God’s mercy received by baptism; and ‘every one is permitted to receive it in the same ‘way.’ He first manfully proves that circumcision and baptism are two things; and that Justin’s saying, we receive circumcision *by* baptism, is not saying, that circumcision itself *is* baptism.

What readers, and what answerers, must this

man have? Did ever any one pretend that the *formalis ratio* of them is the same? Or any more, than that one is to the Christians the initiating ceremony instead of the other which was so to the Jews? This disputant would confute any of the Christian Fathers that should say that *Christ crucified* is to us *the passover lamb*; because one was a lamb, and the other is a man.

He observes that Justin in the same place says, that Enoch and the other holy patriarchs had the spiritual circumcision; and yet, says he, ‘when, where, and by whom, was Enoch baptized?’

The sense is plain to any reader, that *Enoch* received it without any external ceremony; *Abraham* and the *Jews* by external circumcision; and the Christians (as his express words are) by baptism.

Then through three pages he cites sentences out of Justin and other Fathers, (and he might have brought a hundred more,) where they speak of the circumcision of the heart, the putting away the evil of our doings, the purification from all error and wickedness, &c., as being the ‘true circumcision chiefly intended by God;’ the ‘spiritual circumcision, our circumcision,’ &c. And he would argue from thence, that they cannot account baptism to be instead of circumcision; because purification of heart and life is instead of it.

But both of these may well consist. Purity of heart and life is the chief import and aim both of circumcision in the *Old Testament*, and of baptism in the *New*. That does not at all hinder, but that as circumcision was the external sacrament to import this purity in the *Old*, so baptism may be instead of it, for the same purpose in the *New*.

And though the Fathers may in many of their sayings express only the comparison between the carnal circumcision and the spiritual; without mentioning at those places baptism as the sacrament of it; yet it is sufficient that they at several other places do expressly mention it; as Justin does here. For he has been here shewing that almost all the ordinances of the *Old Testament* were types of something under the *New*. As the passover-lamb roasted, of 'Christ crucified:' the scape-goat, of Christ bearing our sins, and made a curse for us: the fine flour used at the cleansing of a leper, of the bread in the eucharist: the twelve bells on the high priest's garment, of the twelve apostles: and several more. After which follows this; how the *Jewish* circumcision was a type of the true circumcision, which we receive, says he, by baptism.

Mr. Gale lays a particular stress on one of the places which he brings [p. 470]; which is a saying of Lactantius; 'that there was to be another circumcision, not of the flesh, as was the first, which the Jews still practise; but of the heart and spirit.' Upon which he turns to his *sir*, 'You see, sir, he expressly says, the second circumcision is not of the flesh; but baptism is plunging the flesh into water, and is therefore of the flesh.'

His *sir* might have had the sense to have told him, that as St. Paul saying that the *true circumcision is that of the heart, in the spirit, and not in the letter*, does not mean to deny the being of the outward circumcision in the letter, or flesh, but only that the other was the chief: so Lactantius, saying what he does there, does not mean to deny the being of the outward washing of the flesh; but



only that the other was much more to be regarded.

Page 471, where I had said that this saying of Justin is to the same sense as that of St. Paul, Col. ii. 11, 12, where he calls baptism (with the putting off the body of the sins of the flesh, which attends it) *the circumcision of Christ*, or (as it might more agreeably have been rendered) *the Christian circumcision*: he answers, first,

‘The Scriptures nowhere call baptism circumcision.’

A pretty way of arguing. As if that were not Scripture, which I cited. He proceeds, ‘Now if baptism is never called circumcision in Scripture, &c., how natural and necessary does it appear, to understand the circumcision, Col. ii. to mean, not baptism, but purity of heart?’

This is not against me, but against St. Paul; who, notwithstanding that it is nowhere so called in Scripture, ventures to tell those Christians that they *were circumcised with the circumcision of Christ, being buried with him in baptism.*

Secondly, he answers, that St. Paul cannot mean baptism there; because he calls the circumcision he there speaks of, *the circumcision made without hands*: now baptism is not *made without hands.*

This might have been used for an argument (though a weak one) that St. Paul did not mean baptism; if his words had not *expressed* baptism. But as his words stand, it has no other inference, than that St. Paul spoke improperly.

But the propriety of his words may be well defended. Partly because he here joins together

the outward and the inward part of baptism; and speaks of them as considered together. And partly because χειροποίητος may very well be taken (as χειρουργικός, a word of the same grammatical import, commonly is) not for every work or thing in which men's hands are at all used; but for a thing done by chirurgical operation, as circumcision was.

He says, if the circumcision here called *the Christian circumcision*, do consist both of the internal and external part of baptism; it cannot be called circumcision *without hands*; because one part of that is performed with hands; but St. Paul's direct assertion is, that that, which he speaks of, is done without hands, and consequently cannot be baptism.

But could he not see that St. Paul does as directly assert that it is by *being buried with Christ in baptism*, as he does the other? What avails arguing that the words should not be so, when they plainly are so? If one of these two consequences must be allowed; either that St. Paul contradicts himself, or else that this is a cavilling argument; I doubt our author and his *sir* will come by the worse.

Pages 473, 474. Whereas I had said that the ancients, in conformity to this phrase of St. Paul, were wont to call baptism περιτομήν ἀχειροποίητον, *the circumcision done without hands*; he says, if my meaning be, that they called the outward part of baptism, circumcision without hands; he has a more honourable opinion of them, than to suppose they could be so grossly absurd. I gave at this very place references to the following chapters of my

book, in which chapters I set down at large their own words where they do call it so. He has the forehead to say, ‘The passages of the ancients, our author refers to, I have consulted particularly, and I am sure they say no such thing.’

I am not much afraid that any that know me and him, will count me to be indeed a liar upon his giving me the lie. But I will set down here again so much of them as is necessary for the reader to see whether he be one, or not.

In my twelfth chapter, part i. [sect. 5. p. 211.] here referred to, I recited the chief passages of St. Basil’s sermon ‘against the delaying of baptism.’ He that reads either the sermon itself, or the sentences which I recited out of it, will see that it speaks of the outward part; i. e. the baptism itself of their bodies. I do not say, that he excludes the inward graces that God would work in their souls, but uses the word as comprehending both. And to those who put off their baptism from day to day, he addresses himself thus:

‘A Jew does not delay circumcision because of the threatening that *every soul that is not circumcised on the eighth day shall be cut off from his people*; and doest thou put off the circumcision made *without hands*, (*ἀχειροποίητον περιτομήν*), in the putting off the flesh, which is performed in baptism, when thou hearest our Lord himself say; *Verily, verily, I say unto you; Except one be born of water and of the Spirit, he shall not enter into the kingdom of God.*’

In the fourteenth chapter, [sect. 2. vol. i. p. 230.] (there referred to likewise,) I shewed how St. Austin quoting this passage in his disputes with Julian,

lib. ii. *contra Julianum*, cap. 9. (but mistaking it to be a sermon of St. Chrysostom's,) after reciting the foresaid words, speaks himself thus; 'You see how  
' this man established in the ecclesiastical doctrine  
' compares circumcision to circumcision, and threat  
' to threat. That which it is *not to be circumcised on*  
' *the eighth day; that it is not to be baptized in Christ:*  
' and what it is *to be cut off from his people; that*  
' it is, *not to enter into the kingdom of heaven.* An  
' yet you [Pelagians] say, that in the baptism of  
' infants there is no putting off the flesh, i. e. *no*  
' *circumcision made without hands; when you affirm,*  
&c.

I quoted also in the same chapter St. Chrysostom himself, in his fortieth homily on Genesis, taking notice of 'the pain and trouble' that was in circumcision; and how favourable God is to Christians in the baptism that he has appointed them in lieu thereof, in these words; 'Ἡ δὲ ἡμετέρα περιτομή, &c.  
' But our circumcision, I mean, the grace of baptism, gives cure without pain, &c. And it has no  
' determinate time as that had; but one that is in  
' the very beginning of his age, or one that is in  
' the middle of it, or one that is in his old age, may  
' receive (τάωτην τὴν ἀχειροποίητον περιτομήν) *this*  
' *circumcision made without hands.*'

This is meant plainly of baptism itself; and not merely of the internal effects.

These places Mr. Gale says he had 'particularly consulted;' and, not daring to recite them, he assures the reader (who will never hereafter give him credit) that 'they say no such thing.'

More of the Fathers speaking of baptism being to us instead of circumcision, I referred to, part ii.

chap. 10. §. 1; as, Origen, Cyprian, Gregory Naz. *Quæst. ad Orthodoxos*, St. Ambrose, &c.

At last he says, that if the Fathers, and St. Paul too, do speak of baptism as I pretend; yet this does not affect *infant*-baptism: and then runs on vapouring about the want of consequence from infant-circumcision to infant-baptism.

But then why did he not say this at first? A man that has true grounds to defend any proposition, is a mad sort of disputant, if he strive a long time to defend it by such as are manifestly and notoriously false. For whatever becomes of the consequence, it is notorious that St. Paul and the ancient Christians do speak of baptism as being instead of circumcision; and a man does but disgrace his cause by denying it.

The rules by which he would overthrow the consequence, are, if one mind the logic of them, extremely ridiculous. We argue, that the Scripture ordering *circumcision* to be given to *infants* as a covenanting and initiating seal; and ordering afterward *baptism* to be the covenanting and initiating seal instead of it, does by consequence order baptism to be given to *infants*. He says, this consequence does not hold, because 'it is not ordered' to be given to infants. Which every one sees to be the woman's reason, the denying the conclusion.

Therefore, p. 475, that he may give something like a man's reason, he maintains that the principle upon which the argument proceeds, (viz. that what was done in respect to circumcision, must be done now in respect to baptism,) does not hold in two other particulars. One of the *time*, the eighth day; the other of the *male sex*, to which circumcision

was limited. And so need not be supposed to hold in this.

To the first of these ; I had shewed him, chap. vi. what a large and full answer was given by St. *Cyprian* and the council in their epistle to *Fidus*, who had made a like objection concerning the eighth day as he does here : not to oppose infant-baptism, but to tie it to the eighth day. They shew that ignorant disputer, that the circumstance of the day was typical ; and had not, by the nature of the thing, the same reason in the ‘spiritual circumcision’ (so they call baptism) as it had in the carnal circumcision. Now this does not prove but that the principle may hold in all points that are material, substantial, and of moment.

The second, concerning the sex, is, we allow, a difference of moment ; as it determines the admitting or rejecting all females from the seal of the Christian covenant ; in like manner as this present dispute determines the admitting or rejecting all males and females too under such an age. But he should have considered that we hold the forementioned principle, (what was done in respect to circumcision, must be done in respect to baptism,) with this exception ; *unless where Christ has ordered an alteration*. As he has in this point expressly. For St. Paul, speaking of the Christian baptism, Gal. iii. 27, 28, tells us, that whereas there had been a difference made between *Jews* and *Gentiles*, and between males and females ; there should be no difference made in either of these cases as to baptism into Christ : *So many of you as have been baptized into Christ, &c., there is neither Jew nor Greek, &c., there is neither male nor female ; for*

*ye are all one in Christ Jesus.* Now such an express exception in these particular cases strengthens the law (or principle) in all cases not excepted. Mr. Gale should, if he could, shew us an exception as clear as this concerning *infant* and *adult*; that though infants were admitted to the one seal, they should not be admitted to the other.

Though all this be plain and obvious, and such as not only any clergyman, but almost any ordinary layman, could have told him; yet he with his usual insolence insults all the clergy upon it. And says,

Page 477, ‘if they were to consider the matter ‘more deliberately, they would be ashamed of all ‘they have urged upon this head.’

True genuine arrogance! He thinks himself capable of making all the clergy ashamed of their arguments. It brings to one’s mind the character which Mr. Stokes (p. 51.) gives of the antipædobaptists (which I would not apply to all; but some, I see, can come up to it). He having there concluded that infant-baptism must have been at the time he speaks of, universally received, not only by some particular churches or men, as they pretend, but by all Christians, from hence; that there do not appear to have been any debates or disputes against it; adds,

‘There were certainly no antipædobaptists in ‘those days; or else their temper was quite different from ours. Ours are, many of them, so ‘positive in this controversy, as to unchurch all ‘that differ from them; and of such martial souls, ‘as that a diminutive fellow of scarce common sense ‘shall challenge men of the brightest parts.’ And

a little after, 'Was there not a Danvers——nor a  
'Gale?'

Page 477, where I had brought a passage of St. Justin's Apology, (owning at the same time that it does not make directly or immediately for or against infant-baptism,) he will have it to make against it; and that for these miserable reasons:

First, if the Christians then had baptized infants, he would have mentioned it, in order to remove out of the emperor's mind all suspicion of their murdering infants and eating them. To which far-fetched imagination of his, vented before in his first chapter, and brought here again, I answered there more than such a groundless guess could deserve.

Secondly, he would have this passage to make against infant-baptism, because Justin there describes only such circumstances as are proper to adult persons, as making their voluntary choice and professions, &c., and does not mention their bringing their children to baptism.

This is no wonder; since he did not go about to instruct the emperor and senate in all the principles and tenets of the Christian religion, but only to shew that their sacraments had no harm in them, but were innocent and pious. What he here talks of my making and the church of *England* making two baptisms, one for the adult, another for infants, is nothing but a sample of the insolent liberty he takes to say any thing, true or false, of any man or any church. They use some prayers and exhortations differing in the different cases; and that he calls 'two sorts of baptism.'

And what he observes [p. 480.] of Justin's saying that our first generation is 'without our know-



‘ledge or choice;’ but that a heathen man (for of such he there speaks) comes to this baptism (which is his regeneration, or second birth) of ‘his own will and choice;’ is no more than he would have said of any proselyte’s voluntary entering into God’s covenant by circumcision (which the Jews, as I shewed, did also call his regeneration). The adult proselyte did partake of this regeneration by his own choice. This is no proof but that his infant children had the same circumcision and regeneration, by their parents’ dedicating them, and God’s gracious acceptance.

Page 480. I had said that this passage of Justin is ‘the most ancient account of the way of baptizing next the Scripture.’ Mr. Gale adds, ‘and that was *by dipping.*’ Which I do not deny to have been generally and ordinarily so. And whereas he adds farther; ‘Justin here mentions only adult persons:’ I grant that too. But his next words, ‘he elsewhere plainly excludes infants from being then baptized in the church,’ are an open falsehood. And the next, ‘he says that adult persons only can or ought to be baptized,’ are a downright forgery; and just like those of Danvers, which I mention in a like case, part ii. chap. 1. §. 5. Let him for shame find where Justin says so; or else take to himself the name of *a forger of sayings for the Fathers.*

Page 481. I had observed that Justin in that passage uses the word *regeneration*, (or being born anew,) for baptism; and so he does plainly. ‘We bring them (the new converts) to the 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, &c. For  
 ‘Christ says, *Except you be regenerated, you cannot  
 ‘enter,*’ &c.

Mr. Gale objects, ‘that though he talks of their  
 ‘being *regenerated*, and joins it pretty closely with  
 ‘their being *baptized*; yet he does not say *baptism* is  
 ‘*regeneration.*’ And then he brings two places more  
 of the same dialogue: one, where Justin says, ‘We  
 ‘are *regenerated* by him, by water, faith, and the  
 ‘tree.’ Another; ‘Him that is washed with the laver  
 ‘which is for remission of sins and *regeneration.*’  
 And thinks that these and the like expressions  
 make against my assertion; whereas they are so  
 many confirmations of it. He says, ‘Justin only  
 ‘thought that we, some how or other, obtained or  
 ‘sealed, &c., our *regeneration* by *baptism*, as a mean  
 ‘or sign, &c., just as we also obtain remission of  
 ‘sins thereby; but not that baptism *is* remission of  
 ‘sins or regeneration.’

Thus he would escape. As if our argument de-  
 pended upon a formal or logical identity of the  
 things. When I say, that by *regenerated* they  
 always mean *baptized*; I mean no more, nor does  
 the argument need any more, than that *regeneration*  
 does in their sense of the word always imply or  
 connote *baptism*: so that if any author of these  
 times do speak of any person, infant or adult,  
*regenerated*; we are to suppose him *baptized*. I  
 expressed it so at several places, as chap. 11. §. 4.  
 ‘They so appropriated that word to baptism, as to  
 ‘exclude any other conversion or repentance that is  
 ‘*not accompanied with baptism*, from being signified  
 ‘by it.’ Of which I give there several plain proofs.  
 The authors which I cite there, and through all the

book, do not stand upon the metaphysical quiddity or *formalis ratio* of the things; but do sometimes call it *the regeneration of baptism*; sometimes *the regeneration by baptism*; sometimes *the baptism of regeneration*, (which is St. Paul's phrase, Tit. iii. 5,) or, *baptism for regeneration*. They generally understand by it a complex notion of the outward act of baptism, accompanied with that grace or mercy of God, whereby he receives the person into a new covenant, or new *spiritual state* (so grossly quibbling is Mr. Gale's evasion here; 'he must doubtless mean 'some farther regeneration than *bare washing*;' as if I had ever argued that the *bare washing*, which is only the outward part, were the whole, either of *baptism* or *regeneration*); regeneration, in the sense of the Fathers, is, (if we must formally define it,) 'the change of the spiritual state of any person 'granted by God in baptism.' And what is fairly concluded from their general use of the word is this, that they give that term of *regenerated* to none but baptized persons.

Of this observation, he says, I mean to make some use afterward. And why should I not, since it is an undeniable one? And the same may be observed to a good and fair purpose, of the term *ἅγιος*, *a saint*, or *holy*, and several others which are never given but to baptized persons, and are in Scripture or the Fathers given to some infants.

Page 483. When I observed that Justin does here understand that rule of our Saviour, John iii. 5, *Except any one be born again, &c.*, of water-baptism; and that all the writers of those first four hundred years, not one man excepted, did understand it so;

he finds out my design, viz. to have it believed that Justin thought that that rule includes infants. Which, he says, is absurd, when I had owned before, that Justin is speaking there of adult persons.

But there is no absurdity in it; for Justin, though speaking there of adult persons, may give a rule out of Scripture for the necessity of their baptism; which rule may reach to the case of all persons, adult or infant, that shall enter the kingdom.

Page 484. In another passage of Justin's Apology, concerning some Christians of his time, sixty or seventy years old, who, he says, ἐκ παιδῶν ἐμαθητεύθησαν τῷ Χριστῷ, 'were' (as I translated it) 'discipled' (or made disciples) 'to Christ in their 'childhood;' he would have ἐμαθητεύθησαν be translated, 'trained up,' (so then ἐμαθητεύθησαν τῷ Χριστῷ must be *trained up to Christ*,) or *instructed*, (and then it is, *instructed to Christ*,) and ἐκ παιδῶν to be, not *in their childhood*, but *from their childhood*. And on the later difference makes a great outcry, and spends two pages.

For μαθητεύομαι, to *be made a disciple*, enough has been said. And since the word joined with it is τῷ Χριστῷ, it is more proper to say, *discipled to Christ*, than *instructed to him*.

And whether this be said to be done *in childhood*, or *from childhood*, is no material difference; save that of a continued act which must last some years, (such as is instruction, learning, or training up,) it is more usually said to be done *from childhood*; but an act done at once is more properly said to be done *in childhood*. Now these are said to have been μαθηταί, or to have been made μαθηταί, to Christ

(which term is, I think, never given but to baptized persons) in, or from, their childhood. Mr. Gale brings a great many instances, where a course of *learning, teaching, studying, &c.*, is said to have been from childhood; but there is not among them, nor I believe any where else, an instance of any one that has been said to be *μαθητῆς*, or *μαθητευθεὶς* to Christ, in or from childhood, except he were baptized then. And this sense of Justin's word, speaking of children *discipled to Christ*, in the midst of the apostles' time, (for so far the seventy years do reach back,) is much confirmed by Irenæus<sup>c</sup> (who lived nigh the same time with Justin) using the word 'regeneration unto God by Christ' (a word that constantly implies baptism) in the case of *infants*. Against which testimony of Irenæus, Mr. Gale next brings his exceptions.

Page 488. Because I said that this testimony of Irenæus, reckoning *infants* (as well as little ones, and children, and youths, and elder persons) among those who 'by Christ are regenerated unto God,' was the first *express* mention that I had met with in the Fathers, of *infants baptized*; Mr. Gale (as he did once before) in a precarious manner craves all the time before to be yielded to him; because none of the passages before are in *express* words for *infants baptized*; but only such as from which their baptism is concluded by consequence.

But proofs by consequence for any affirmative do give that the advantage against a negative of which there are no proofs at all. And a thing which now is, and beyond the memory of any history

<sup>c</sup> [Irenæus, lib. ii. c. xxii. (al. xxxviii.) sect. 4. edit. Benedictin.]

has been, the practice of the church of Christ, if it be *clearly* traced up to Irenæus, and by *obscurer* footsteps farther in the scarcity of books that are left, is (if there be no better proofs of the contrary) rightly concluded (as St. Austin argues in this very matter) to have been from the beginning.

Irenæus wrote this about the year 180, that is, eighty<sup>o</sup> years after the apostles' time. And so Mr. Gale would conclude, that 'the baptism of infants ' does not appear to have been practised till about ' the latter end of the second century.' But what then will become of antipædobaptism, which does not appear to have been practised till after the middle of the eleventh century; and that by a people few, ignorant, and quickly converted?

Besides, though Irenæus wrote this at one hundred eighty; yet sixty years before that, he had been a hearer of Polycarp, who had been an acquaintance of St. John. And what he says of infants being regenerated, or baptized, he does not speak of as any new or controverted thing; but as a known and uncontroverted practice. So that his evidence who was born in, or very nigh the apostles' time, must be allowed very early. Whether he was born of Christian parents, and baptized in infancy, we know not. But he was a Christian at 120, and remembered from that time.

Therefore because this passage (however he seems to slight it) sticks in his teeth, he labours to overthrow the force of it for forty pages together.

He makes four several attacks against it; but those of a nature so contrary to each other, that if he thought any one of them to be valid, he would have forborne the other three.

The first is, to deny that part of the chapter to be genuine. Which is always accounted a miserable subterfuge, in a book so well known, so constantly read and owned for above fifteen hundred years. And to disown one particular chapter, allowing the rest; nay, one part or sentence of a chapter, (where his error is confuted,) owning the rest, makes the *postulatum* still more beggarly. He first says, 'It is questioned:' next, 'It seems 'to be:' then, 'It is *undeniably* spurious.' And all this for no other reason, but because it appears that Irenæus was in that chapter (but not nigh the place where he speaks of infants regenerated) mistaken in a point of chronology; by which reason he might condemn the books, not only of all the ancient *Christian* writers, but of all writers whatsoever of those times.

They having in those times no common æra to reckon by, (as we have now the year of our Lord,) but some reckoned only by the consulships of the city of *Rome*, (as if we had no other way of dating, than by the mayoralties of the city of *London*,) and some by the years of their kings, or of the emperors of *Rome*, whose years were always in diverse countries diversely computed, according as their conquests extended to each country:—they, I say, having no better method than these, did never write the history of any thing much before their own time, with any accuracy of chronology.

This all chronologers know to be the case; and even Mr. Gale (though he seems to be but little versed in that study) must know so much of it, as to be sensible that all men of learning would slight

this his exception. But what cares he for that, so it pass with his people?

He says, cardinal Baronius has observed this; *Annal. Eccl. ann. 34.*

He and many other chronologers have given their opinion against the determination of Irenæus in this chapter, and elsewhere in his book, that our Saviour lived to above forty years of age. But he, it seems, not minding that this is said by Irenæus at other places as well as here, did cast in some doubtful words, whether this thirty-ninth [twenty-second] chapter were not interpolated at that place; but not any concerning the place which we are upon, that speaks of all ages regenerated.

Mr. Gale says, the cardinal's reasons have, *he thinks*, never yet been answered.

Nobody is able to help his thinking. But the reasons, as they were at first absurd, have been answered, not only by Casaubon, Dodwell, Petavius, (whom Mr. Gale himself mentions as answering,) but by Feuarentius, who in his second edition of Irenæus<sup>d</sup> shews irrefragably, that one cannot judge this chapter to be spurious from Irenæus' wrong computation of the years of Christ's life, that is made in it; because the same mistaken computation is in the fortieth chapter, where he not only says the same as he does here, but also brings a text of Scripture. John viii. 57, *Thou art not yet fifty years old*, to strengthen his opinion.

This Mr. Gale should have seen, and spared himself, and his reader, and me, the trouble of a cavil

<sup>d</sup> [Folio, *Colonic*, 1596.—a portion of Feuarentius' notes, but not the whole, is inserted in the Benedictine edition, *Paris*, 1710.]



of ten pages against the authenticity of this passage about *baptism*, only because there is in the same chapter a computation (which is perhaps a mistaken one) about the *length of Christ's age*. He shews Irenæus' mistake in chronology, (which is nothing to our purpose,) and his own skill in it, at such a rate, that if a book were to be accounted spurious for having mistakes and contradictions in that art, his, as well as Baronius', must be counted so. There are many great difficulties in that study; and not more in any part of it, than in that which is employed in enumerating the years of our Saviour's life.

Baronius could solve them no better than by making *Herod* live nine or ten years longer than he did. Which is a more palpable mistake than any of Irenæus; and in which Spondanus would willingly have forsaken him; but he excuses himself, that he was an epitomizer of Baronius, not a critic upon him. Dr. Allix calls it, 'Baronius' dream.' And Mr. Gale has dreamed more absurdly, as we shall see.

But first he recites here, as against himself, what Casaubon, and Mr. Dodwell, and Petavius have said in excuse for Irenæus.

What the first two pleaded, does not so pertinently come in here. But the answer that Petavius gives, is certainly and plainly the true one. Irenæus was engaged against the *Valentinians*. These heretics made some advantage for their wicked and blasphemous tenets, of the notion (which though a mistaken one, was then common) that Christ preached but one year after his baptism. Irenæus overthrows, not only the wild opinions which they

built upon this notion, but the notion itself; and tells them, that they who pretended to have found out the deep things of God, had not the sense to observe in the plain text of the Gospel, how many passovers our Lord after his baptism is mentioned to have kept at Jerusalem. And he instances in three. One mentioned, John ii. 13, 23: another, John v. 1: and the third, that at which he was crucified. And adds, that the *Valentinians* making him to have lived but one year after his baptism, do take away that which was *the most necessary and honourable* part of his life, viz., that in which he had the age of a *master*, or *teacher*, (*magistri*, *διδασκάλου*, I suppose,) and was *senior*, an *elderly man*. For that at his baptism he was not full thirty, but as St. Luke expresses it, *beginning to be about thirty*. Now the age of thirty, says he, is the age of youth; and it reaches to forty. Then at forty or fifty a man comes ‘in ætatem seniore[m], to his elderly age; and that age our Lord had when he was a teacher. ‘*Quam ætatem habens Dominus noster docebat.*’

Petavius owns this account to be a mistaken one; yet shews that here is nothing wherein Irenæus can be said to contradict himself; he observes that he owns our Saviour at his baptism to have been but thirty, or not so much; nay, that he urges it. And, that he quotes the mention of three passovers after that: which was enough to confute the opinion of his living but one year after. But that he supposes at the same time, that between Christ’s baptism and his beginning to preach, there passed so many years as did make up the years after his baptism to amount to above ten, and perhaps twenty, i. e. that after he was baptized, he stayed several years

before he entered on his office of preaching; so that he lived in all above forty, and perhaps nigh fifty.

This Petavius takes to have been Irenæus' hypothesis concerning the years of Christ's life. Mr. Gale says, 'he does not attempt to prove 'this;' and does not, or will not see that Irenæus' own words do plainly prove it. 'Triginta quidem 'annorum existens, cum veniret ad baptismum; 'deinde magistri ætatem perfectam habens, venit 'Hierusalem,' &c. 'He was but thirty years old 'when he came to baptism. Then afterward, when 'he had the complete age of a master, or teacher, '(which he in the same chapter defines to be forty,) 'he came to Jerusalem<sup>e</sup>.'

So that it is plain Irenæus thought, there passed ten years (the difference between thirty and forty) between his baptism and his first going up to Jerusalem. Now that first going to Jerusalem was at, or presently after, the beginning of his preaching: as appears, John ii. 13.

Though this be very plain; and though it be justly accounted a base thing for any writer in a dispute against an author of credit, not to grant so much as that author makes out plainly and convincingly; but to brawl and contradict eternally right or wrong; yet Mr. Gale, not regarding who Petavius was, and how much the learned world owes him in point of chronology; not only slights his account of the sense of this place, which is a very just one; but throws at him (as he does every where round about upon any that he thinks it his

<sup>e</sup> [Irenæus, lib. ii. cap. 22. sect. 4. edit. Benedict. aliis cap. 39.]

interest to vilify) some of that dirt and contempt which is so natural to him. 'It amounts to nothing.' 'It is too wild and fanciful a conjecture to pass, founded purely on Petavius' imagination.' 'Very pleasant indeed.' 'It is only begging the question,' &c.

When a disputant has nothing of sense or truth to oppose to an argument; this faculty, of contemptuous facing and brawling it out, is of considerable use before an ignorant mob; but nowhere else.

If the plea be, that Irenæus was wrong in this computation; and that the time of Pontius Pilate's continuance in his office of governor having been but ten years (or a little above) in all (as the Roman histories and Josephus do shew); and John's baptism having begun in Pilate's time, Luke iii. 1, our Saviour's death, which was also in Pilate's time, could not be much above ten years after his baptism:—this must be confessed; nor does Petavius deny it. But Irenæus might be ignorant of these chronological characters, how long Pilate held the office, (for there are no plain footsteps of them in the Gospels,) or might not remember them, or not animadvert to them. And so this chapter may be genuine. As it appears plainly to be by the style and method, and its coherence with the next chapter, and by these two chapters being the only ones that treat on one of the heads proposed in the first chapter of the first book to be treated on.

What Irenæus adds, that ancient men who had been in company with St. John in Asia, did testify that he did use to speak of our Saviour as of one that had arrived before his death *ad ætatem se-*

‘niorem,’ ‘to an elderly age;’ and that some other of the apostles, whom some of the said ancient men had seen, did speak to the same purpose; is without ground made another proof of the spuriousness of the book.

It is not said that St. John, or the other apostles, named any number of years; only used the general word, *ætas senior*. And that that must imply forty or more years, is only Irenæus’ notion of the word. The several stages of man’s life, childhood, youth, mature age, &c., have, in different countries, different measures by the use of the place assigned to them.

Beside that in the truth of the matter Irenæus was not so much mistaken as many have thought. By making our Saviour live to forty, he is, if mistaken at all, yet nearer the truth than Mr. Gale, who talks of thirty or thirty-one. So that his severe imputation on Irenæus, [p. 489,] ‘if he was guilty of ‘so palpable a contradiction, he is not to be trusted ‘in any case,’ redounds on himself. And put the case, that Irenæus had fallen into a contradiction of himself in this computation of years long past; would it follow from thence that he could not give an account of things of his own time, that infants did use to be regenerated, or baptized?

Mr. Gale thinks that at that time they could not be ignorant of the circumstances of time relating to Christ’s birth. That is so far from being true, that at that time they did not know those circumstances that were more obvious than the years of his age. They knew not then, nor do we know yet, whose daughter the blessed virgin, his mother, was; nor whether those that are called his brothers and

sisters, were only his kinsmen, or kinswomen, or were the children of his reputed father, or even (as some now venture to say) of his mother. The number of years that he spent in preaching was a thing much more obvious and likely to be known, than those of his age. And yet many, before Irenæus, thought it continued but one year; and some afterward, even learned men, continued in that vulgar error. Tertullian, Africanus, Clemens Alexandrinus, &c., such poor chronologers they were; and so incurious were they, (provided they remembered the miracles, and practised the precepts,) concerning the time or year in which they were done, or delivered.

Page 492. Our author will no longer fight under Baronius' banner, nor encounter Petavius alone in single combat on his behalf; but will set up for himself a chronological demonstration. And it seems to be the first of that nature that ever he ventured on. A man never exposes himself so much, as when he will needs talk confidently of things he understands not. Declaiming here will not do; nor a good face and assurance. He has the same fate that another adversary, which Petavius had in his lifetime, came to<sup>f</sup>; who having

<sup>f</sup> [The person alluded to is Joseph Scaliger, whose work 'De Emendatione Temporum,' was severely attacked, and the author himself very roughly handled, by Petavius; who possibly, being a Jesuit, could not forgive the animosity which Scaliger had ever exhibited towards that order.

Petavius' large chronological work, entitled 'Opus de Doctrina Temporum,' was published first in 1627; and afterwards, with additions and improvements, by the Jesuit Hardouin, at Antwerp, in 3 vols. folio, 1703.—The author's mean opinion of

published a chronology, for which he highly valued himself, (as some ignorant readers think our author has shewed great learning in this), Petavius, taking it to task, discovered most egregious blunders in it, advised him never more to pretend to a mastership in that sort of learning; but such a chronologer, says he,

Discipulorum inter jubeo plorare cathedras.

I shall not trace the demonstration along by its several steps. It takes up eight pages. It, I mean, and the large encomium of the ‘late glorious,’ &c., in the belly of it; whose coming into England is pertinently brought in, to illustrate the notoriety of the time of Christ’s coming into the world. One, he says, ‘could no more be forgot than ‘the other.’ [p. 492.]

It traces in a notable manner the years of Christ’s life compared with those of the emperors, sometimes upward, sometimes downward. He demonstrates Christ to have lived, sometimes but thirty-one years; sometimes but thirty; sometimes thirty-three. And Tiberius’ time after the death of Augustus, (which is known by every historian to a day,) sometimes twenty, sometimes twenty-three. As if a difference of three years were nothing in a dispute, which is but about five or six in all. In the search after the year of Christ’s birth, he ridiculously takes it for granted that he was born the first year of the common *æra*. And many such proofs of his skill there are.

Many disputes of learned and unlearned, of ancients and moderns, have been concerning our Scaliger’s acquirements in this department of literature is seen in his preface, and in almost every page of the work itself.

Saviour's age. Whoever of them be in the right, it is certain Mr. Gale is in the wrong; who in spite to Irenæus making it to be but of thirty, or thirty-one, or thirty-three years, does by consequence make him to be born after Herod was dead; and so by another consequence does, instead of proving Irenæus' book spurious, prove St. Matthew's (which places his birth in the days of Herod) to be so. For it is so plain by circumstances, as to be now uncontroverted, that Herod died in the year of the Julian Period 4710. And hardly any do maintain the contrary, but that our blessed Saviour died in the year of the same period 4746, from which thirty-three or thirty-four reach back but to 4712, or 4713. And yet the circumstances of the star; the wise men coming from the East; the forty days of the blessed virgin's purification; the return to Nazareth; the flight into Ægypt, and stay there; are proofs that the nativity of Christ was a considerable time before Herod's death.

This ignorance is the more palpable and shameful, because, though he had no skill in chronological calculations, (as it is plain he has not, and therefore should not have pretended to discuss such things,) yet he may be supposed acquainted with our *English Bible*: in several editions whereof, for the use of readers unskilful in such matters, the years of Christ's life are set in the margin against the several passages of it; and he might have seen the thirty-sixth year set to the last of them. If this were only in the church Bibles, he might be supposed never to have seen them. But the lesser editions with the same chronological notes are common in the hands of children that learn to read the Bible.



There have been Christians so ignorant of this matter, as to think our Saviour lived but thirty-one years, (whom Irenæus here confutes,) but none for these last thousand years. And there have been since some, that thought he lived but thirty-three. But none that had studied that point (except Mr. Gale) for these hundred years. The thirty-third year of the common *æra* is indeed the year on which almost all do place his death. But he that does not yet know that the beginning of that *æra* is several years below the real year of his birth, should not have meddled with this question.

Were it not for one passage in St. Luke, iii. 23, (that our Saviour in the fifteenth year of Tiberius, when he was baptized, *began to be about thirty years of age,*) all the other circumstances mentioned in the Gospel-history are such from which one would have guessed, as Irenæus does, that he had lived to an elder age. That passage has tortured all chronologers who have gone about to reconcile it with Matth. ii. 1, &c., that his birth was in the days of Herod the king. For the fifteenth of Tiberius (taking it according to the common construction) began Aug. 19th, in the year of the *Julian Period*, 4741, (fourteen years then expiring, and the fifteenth beginning from the death of Augustus; which was Aug. 19th 4727). Now Herod having died (as I said) in the year 4710, (a little before the passover, as Josephus shews), thirty years reckoned upwards from Aug. 19th 4741, reach back no farther than to Aug. 19th, in the year 4711; which is a year and upwards after Herod's death. So that some greater skill in these matters, than our author

shews, is necessary to explain these two places of Scripture so as that one of them may not be contrary to the other.

Bishop Pearson (who had studied this matter as deeply as any one) does in his *Lectiones in Acta Apostolorum*<sup>g</sup>, shew the difficulties which still remain in this computation. Some of which I will here set down, that they may abate the confidence of any writer of our author's scantling; who is so far from being able to overcome them, that he does not know of them; and yet reproaches St. Irenæus for being in some mistake in a calculation which no man then or since has been able certainly to fix; but in no mistake so gross as Mr. Gale's own are.

Bishop Pearson had said that the beginning of the Christian church is to be fixed at that Pentecost mentioned, Acts ii, and then adds,

‘But what year that was in,’ (or, which is all one, what year it was in which Christ died,) ‘does not, I think, appear from the Scripture. Nor is there any character left, which does certainly and determinately fix it.

‘That Christ was born under the reign of Herod, we know. How many years he (Christ) lived, is not certainly known. We know that he was born in the time of the taxing made by Cyrenius. But what year that was, the annals do not teach. Therefore there can no certain and undoubted epocha be made from the true time of our Saviour's birth.

‘That John began the office of baptizing in the

<sup>g</sup> [These are contained in the volume published under the title of ‘Opera Posthuma,’ 4<sup>o</sup>. Lond. 1688. p. 27, &c.]

‘fifteenth year of Tiberius, is certain. But how long he had exercised it, before Christ was baptized by him; how soon Christ after his baptism began to preach the Gospel; how many passovers there were between his baptism and his death; does not yet fully appear — &c.

‘The most ancient Fathers have delivered nothing certain about the years of Christ’s life. The opinion of his preaching but one year, (which is manifestly false,) as it began too early, so it veiled a long time.

‘That Christ was crucified under Pontius Pilate, is certain. But Josephus briefly passes over the affairs of Pilate in Judæa, and does not distinguish his several years.

‘That the vulgar *æra* is not true (as to the time of Christ’s birth) we may be sure; since it does not reach back to the time of Herod; nor to thirty years above the fifteenth of Tiberius.’

These are the things which Mr. Gale thinks Iræneus must know, all of them. Though he himself knows none of them.

As for the year of Christ’s death, which bishop Pearson thinks not ‘certainly and determinately’ known; he himself a little after (because one that would recite the history of any passages in a chronological order must fix some *epocha* or other) fixes it on the nineteenth of Tiberius, which is of the vulgar *æra* 33, of the *Julian* period 4746, as the most probable. And so indeed do all chronologers of late. But how old he was then when he died, or how many years before the beginning of the vulgar *æra* his birth was; he says nothing there. And I know not whether he did ever afterward

discuss that point at large. But in his *Vindiciae Epistolarum S. Ignatii*, [4to. Lond. 1672.] part. ii. cap. 1. he does just mention his opinion, (and his opinion is preferable to some men's demonstrations,) that the seventh year of the common *æra* was really the thirteenth of Christ's life; and consequently the thirty-third (in which he died) must be the thirty-ninth. And how little does this differ from Irenæus, from whose words all that one can conclude is, that he thought Christ to have lived in all forty or more years? And how little reason had one that is really a learned man (whether exercised in this study I know not) to reckon it amongst the *nævi* or blemishes of Mr. Dodwell, that he thought Christ to have lived to thirty-eight? [p. 499.] Other chronologers do place the nativity, some five, some four years before the first of those which we call *anni Domini*, which was *per. Jul.* 4714. But not one that was ever called 'learned' (beside Mr. Gale) so late as that year.

There is no possible reconciling the two fore-said texts without raising the fifteenth of Tiberius higher, or bringing down the death of Herod lower, than they commonly stand in the chronological tables. Many of the ancient Christians, either having no knowledge of, or else not minding, the time of Herod's death, nor having observed the several passovers mentioned during our Saviour's preaching, set his birth lower, and his death higher, than is consistent with history.

Of the moderns, Baronius, by the most absurd and inconsistent guess that ever was made, brings down Herod's death nine years; Scaliger two years.

The rest generally finding that the times of

Herod are so connected in history with the years of Augustus (with whom he had a constant intercourse of visits, letters, embassies, &c.) and with the Roman affairs, that his death is set down by Josephus with so many circumstances, (an eclipse for one,) that there is no moving it from its year, have thought there is some mistake in our understanding what St. Luke says of the fifteenth of Tiberius, and our Saviour being then but thirty years old.

Mr. Pagi<sup>h</sup>, having observed that Augustus, four years before his death, invested Tiberius with a proconsular power, thinks that the fifteenth year of Tiberius' *ἡγεμονία* may be understood by St. Luke as dated from that time. And then that fifteenth is but the eleventh year of his full imperial power from the death of Augustus; which eleventh year begins Aug. 19th, *anno Domini* 24, and ends Aug. 19th, *anno Domini* 25, *Assinio et Lentulo Coss.* So that our Saviour was thirty-four in that year of Tiberius, which we now commonly call his fifteenth, *anno per. Jul.* 4742, and consequently was born anno 4708, which is two years before Herod's death; which reconciles St. Luke with St. Matthew; and allows our Saviour thirty-seven years complete, and part of the thirty-eighth.

But as one that alters any thing in old accounts to stop one gap, does often before he is aware, make another; this way of reconciling St. Luke with St. Matthew, makes St. Luke disagree with himself: for he, chap. iii. 1, says, that at this fifteenth of Tiberius, Pontius Pilate was governor of Judæa.

<sup>h</sup> [See his 'Critica historico-chronologica in Annales Eccles. Cæs. Baronii,' 4 tom fol. *Colon. Allobr.* 1705. tom. 1.]

But in that year, *anno Dom. 25*, he was not yet come to that government. Valerius Gratus as yet held it.

Bishop Ussher is the man who in this and other parts of chronology seems to have considered every circumstance, and to have provided against all objections. He numbers that fifteenth year of Tiberius, not from the death of Augustus indeed, (for thirty years counted back from thence do not reach to Herod's death,) nor yet from the proconsulship; but from that act of the senate mentioned by Suetonius, *in Tiber. c. 21*: and *Velleius Patereulus*, lib. ii. c. 12: and referred to by Tacitus, *Annal.* lib. i. c. 3, when Augustus being very old, the senate did at his request confer upon Tiberius an equal power with him in governing *the provinces*. This gave to the *provinces* a reasonable ground to compute the beginning of his 'government' (St. Luke's word is, not *reign*, but *ἡγεμονία*) from that time; and to St. Luke being a *provincial*, to follow that date. This was two years before Augustus died, *anno Domini 12*. And the fourteenth year of this government of Tiberius ended, and the fifteenth began, sometime toward the latter part of *anno Domini 26. per. Jul 4739*. And at that time Pilate may well be supposed to have entered on his office. Then our Saviour was baptized. And thirty years reckoned back from that time, make him to have been born the latter part of *ann. per. Jul. 4709*, the fifth year before the beginning of the common *era*, the fortieth of Augustus, reckoning his reign from the murdering of Caesar. So by this account, *anno Domini 26*, our Saviour was thirty, and entered his thirty-first

before the end of that year; and *anno Dom. 32*, was thirty-six, and entered his thirty-seventh before the end of the year; and being put to death at the passover, viz., April 3, of the next year, *anno Dom. 33*, was then thirty-six years old and about a half.

Of the seven years that were between his baptism and his crucifixion, bishop Ussher supposes (as Irenæus does) that several of them passed before he began his public preaching. And it is a very probable supposition. Irenæus indeed supposes too many. But bishop Ussher three and a half. For he reckons that this last seven years of Christ's life was the last week of Daniel's seventy weeks of years; one half whereof was taken up with the preparatory ministry of John, (our Saviour, though then baptized, living a private life the while,) and the latter half with the ministry of Christ himself; who by this account was thirty at his baptism, *anno 26*: thirty-three and a half at the first passover of his ministry, *anno 30*: and (as he supposes four passovers in all) thirty-six and about a half at the last of them, when he offered up himself.

Dr. Allix (the last who has wrote a treatise purposely on this subject; *de Anno Christi Natali*) agrees with bishop Ussher both as to the year on which Christ was born, and that in which he died; but differs about the month of his nativity, and in the distribution of the years of his life. He reckons St. Luke's fifteenth of Tiberius to be the fifteenth from the death of Augustus; the latter part of which falls in the forepart of *ann. per. Jul. 4742. anno Dom. 29; Duobus Geminis Coss.* And that

[See 'Dissertatio de Jesu Christi Domini nostri anno et mense natali, authore P. Allix.' 8vo. *Londini*, 1707.]

our Saviour was then baptized. He would have no new interpretation put on Luke i. 3, concerning the fifteenth of Tiberius; but instead of it, helps himself into the road of other chronologers by explaining in his own way Luke iii. 23, which says, Christ was then *beginning to be about thirty*. He says, he was thirty-three. And that St. Luke's word *ὡσεὶ τριάκοντα*, *about thirty*, (he speaking *ἀκυρολόγως*, not pretending to exactness of the number,) will bear that. And that after his baptism there were five passovers before his death; which make up the years of his life completely thirty-seven.

His reason for not allowing bishop Ussher's account of the baptism of Christ, *anno Dom. 26*, (which was the fifteenth of Tiberius' consortship in governing the provinces; but no more than the thirteenth of his full imperial power,) is, that Pilate's government in Judæa could not begin so soon as *ann. 26*; because he, as Josephus says, continued but ten years in the place; and being sent for by Tiberius to answer for his crimes, saved his neck by Tiberius' dying before he arrived at Rome. Now Tiberius' death was March 16th, *anno Domini 37*: therefore Dr. Allix thinks Pilate must have held his office till the end of *ann. 36*, and consequently, having been in it but ten years, could not have begun it in any part of *ann. 26*.

But bishop Ussher had answered this objection before it was made. That the hinderances and delays in the navigation to Rome in that winter-time might be more than three months. And besides, the number of ten years in Josephus need not be taken so precisely, as not to admit of six or seven months over. What he says in a cursory



way, is, that ‘ Pilate, δέκα ἔτεσι διατρίψας, having ‘ continued ten years, was driven,’ &c., which is what any historian would say, speaking in brief of the time of so hated a governor, though he had continued for any fraction of months that did not make it eleven. So that being discarded toward the latter end of thirty-six, he might have begun in twenty-six.

Whereas there is an objection obvious against Dr. Allix’s scheme; that if our Saviour had been thirty-three at his baptism, St. Luke, though he might have said *about thirty*, yet would never have used the word ἀρχόμενος, he *began* to be, or *was near*, if he were three years *above* it. He answers, that Clemens Alexandrinus, *Strom.* 1, reads it, not ἀρχόμενος, but ἐρχόμενος, (as he does indeed, Ἦν δὲ Ἰησοῦς ἐρχόμενος ἐπὶ τὸ βάπτισμα ὡς ἐτῶν λ.) and that the *Codex Vaticanus* has the text so. To which may be added, that it is pretty plain that Justin Martyr read the text without ἀρχόμενος in it. For he in his *Dialog. circa medium*, p. 94. *ed. Steph.* <sup>k</sup> laying before Trypho a short account of the passages of our Saviour’s life, says, that he ‘ having ‘ stayed τριάκοντα ἔτη, ἢ πλείονα, ἢ καὶ ἐλάσσονα, thirty ‘ years, or some more, or some fewer, until John ‘ came,’ &c. And it is more intelligible to say, ‘ He was about thirty,’ than ‘ He began to be about ‘ thirty.’

Some chronologers have made much more bold with these texts, to make them agree to their account of time. Some have thought that in Luke ii. 2, which speaks of the *census* or taxing under

<sup>k</sup> [Section 88, p. 185, of the Benedictine edition.]

which Christ was born, (which Mr. Gale thinks might have directed Irenæus to the time of the birth: shewing thereby his own ignorance; for the time of that taxing is harder to settle than of the birth itself,) the name of Cyrenius, or Quirinius, has been by mistake of transcribers written for Quintilius; meaning Quintilius Varus, who is much spoken of by Josephus as the ordinary governor of Syria in the latter end of Herod's time, and is mentioned as such by the Roman historians. And others would have the name Saturninus substituted, who likewise had that place next before Varus; whereas there is not in Josephus, or any Latin historian, any mention of Quirinius (or Cyrenius) having that government any thing near that time. Ten or twelve years afterward indeed, Sulpitius Quirinius was made governor of *Syria*, and was ordered to take possession of *Judæa*, (which borders on it,) and is accounted the first governor of *Judæa*, (which till that time was governed by its own kings,) and he taxed the people. But this cannot be the time that St. Luke means; for our Saviour was by this time ten or twelve years old.

If we were to admit or suppose any mistake committed by transcribers, in the texts concerning Christ's age; I should think it more likely to have been in the numerical word or figure of thirty, than in any other word of the text. It being more ordinary for scribes to mistake in those figures than in other words; and there being several *errata* of that nature in the copies of the Scripture itself: as in 2 Chron. xxii. 2, the number forty-two is kept in the text, though it be plain it should be twenty-two. In this place of St. Luke the mistake of a  $\lambda$  for a  $\mu$ .

or (if it were in words) of *τριάκοντα* for *τεσσαράκοντα*, might create all the difficulties we have been speaking of. For there is no other text, nor any other circumstance, from which one would have computed our Saviour's birth to have been so late as it is commonly computed, but this place. There are many, from which one would have guessed it earlier. The only reason that Irenæus or others had to fix or suppose it on the forty-first year of Augustus, (before which year, if we reckon his years from his triumvirate, or first consulship, as Irenæus does, Herod was dead,) was, their reckoning back twenty-nine or thirty years from the fifteenth of Tiberius as ordinarily placed, which cannot be a true reckoning.

Of the many texts, and many circumstances, I spoke of, these are some :

1. From St. Matthew's account one would be inclined to think that our Saviour Jesus was born (not only before Herod's death, as he certainly was, but) a considerable time before it. Epiphanius and others, who had not considered the distance between Herod's death and the said fifteenth year, but allowed the spaces of time, as they thought the circumstances in St. Matthew did require, concluded that his nativity was four years before Herod died, Baronius eight.

2. If more time were allowed, one would reasonably have supposed from the text, that John had begun and continued his baptizing a considerable time before Christ came to be baptized of him. For as Isaiah and Malachi had spoke much of the preparation that he should make for the Messiah by converting the people to repentance : so the three

Evangelists who give the history of Christ's baptism by him, do speak of things that might seem to require some time, as done by him, before they relate his baptizing of Christ. As namely, that *he came into all the country about Jordan*, Luke iii. 3: and that *there went out to him Jerusalem and all Judæa, and all the region round about Jordan, and were baptized of him*, Matth. iii. 5, 6. And St. Luke having said, verse 15, *All men mused in their hearts of John, whether he were the Christ or no*; says, verse 21, *Now when all the people were baptized, it came to pass that Jesus also, &c.* And St. Paul, Acts xiii. 24, *John first preached, before his coming, the baptism of repentance to all the people of Israel.*

Now it was the fifteenth of Tiberius, that *the word of God came to John*; and *he went out, &c.* One might think it was some following year on which Christ was baptized, beginning then to be about thirty. But that cannot be, if that date of time be taken precisely. For it is the hardest matter in the world to bring the fifteenth of Tiberius, within thirty years of Herod; and to bring any later year within that space must not be attempted. The chronologers are forced to connect, as close and immediately as possible, the nativity to Herod's death; and the baptism to the calling of John.

3. There would have been no need of stretching the number of the passovers in Christ's ministry after his baptism (which some make three; and that does pretty plainly appear: some four, and some five): nor of supposing that St. Luke counted the years of Tiberius otherwise than from the

death of Augustus; if more time were allowed before the baptism.

4. That saying of the Jews to our Saviour, John viii. 57, *Thou art not yet fifty years old*, would make any reader apprehend, that they took him then to be forty or upward. For when they were to express the absurdity of the supposition that he had seen Abraham, being no older than he was; they would not, one would think, call his age much more than they thought it to be. If they had taken him to be but little above thirty, they would have said, *Thou art not yet forty*. Therefore the putting of the case, that he was then forty or more, makes that saying of theirs a much more reasonable answer.

Not to say any thing now of what Irenæus had heard those ancient men say of St. John's speaking of our Saviour, as having lived to 'an elderly age.'

I am far from thinking these reasons sufficient to conclude there has been any alteration in the word *τριάκοντα*, (which was read by Justin, Irenæus, Clement, &c., and is in all the copies that are extant,) but that there is more appearance of reason for that, than for altering the names of the governors of Syria aforesaid.

For as to the difficulties that arise in settling the time of that ἀπογραφὴ (the numbering, enrolling, or taxing) mentioned by St. Luke, ch. ii. 2, to have been at Christ's birth; they are more easily removed; not by any alteration of the names or of the words; but of the translations that have been given of the phrase. The translations represent St. Luke's meaning to be, that this taxing was made, *when* Cyrenius

(or Quirinius) was governor of Syria. But it is much more probable that his meaning was on the contrary, to contradistinguish this taxing from that which was in Cyrenius' time; and to signify that this was *before that*.

It is to be noted, that there was a very remarkable change of the government in Judæa, *anno Domini* 7. (which was of our Saviour's true age, according to bishop Pearson, as I quoted before, the thirteenth year; according to bishop Ussher, the eleventh); a *revolution*, accompanied with a taxing of the persons and their estates; which, at the time that St. Luke wrote, many could remember. And of this taxing in Judæa, Cyrenius, a man of consular dignity at Rome, (he had been consul eighteen years before,) being made governor of Syria, (which was a province adjoining to Judæa,) was ordered by Augustus to have the management. The history of it is at large set down by Josephus, lib. xviii.

He had said before, how at Herod's death, the chief of the people having been wearied out by his cruelties, and the grievances which they had suffered under him, (for he had utterly corrupted their church-government, and had made the high-priesthood (which their law accounted most sacred) venal and mercenary; putting in and turning out the high-priests at his pleasure, and choosing for that office men the most hated by the priests and people,) had petitioned Augustus, that they might have no more kings; but that they might be governed immediately by the Romans: to whom they were already tributary. Augustus would have them try once more; and confirmed the kingdom (or

*ethnarchy*) to Archelaus; and the tetrarchies to the other sons, as Herod had left it by will. They bore with Archelaus for nine years and part of the tenth. He proving no better than his father, they renewed their complaints and petition. Augustus sent for him, heard the matters, banished him into another part of the world, and reduced the kingdom to a province.

Then, as Josephus relates, lib. xviii. cap. 1, Quirinius was sent to be governor of Syria, and to come into Judæa, which was now annexed to Syria, to seize on Archelaus' money, and to 'tax the people's estates.' One Judas, (whom in the next chapter he styles *Judas of Galilee*,) together with Saddoc the Pharisee, stirred up the people to rebel; telling them, that 'this taxing was a mere bondage; and that they ought to stand up for their liberty; or else God would not help them. And the people rebelling accordingly, this proved a beginning of infinite mischiefs.' He goes on to reckon up the governors of Judæa from that time to Pontius Pilate, and from thence to the end of the *Jewish* state.

This taxing was so remarkable a time, that when in any writing or any discourse, there was mention of 'the taxing,' or 'the time of the taxing;' it would of course be understood of this. Some former numberings and enrollings of the people had gone through all the provinces of the empire: but without any paying of money at the time; but this was a money-tax. So Gamaliel, in that speech of his, Acts v. 37, *After this man rose up Judas of Galilee in the days of the taxing*, means undoubt-

edly this; which had been about twenty-six years before.

When St. Luke was mentioning that numbering or enrolling (for it was not a *taxing*) of all the empire, (not of all the *world*;) by order of Cæsar Augustus, under which Christ was born; it might be necessary for him to advertise his reader, that he did not mean this taxing of Judæa by Cyrenius when he was governor of Syria; but one before it. For if the reader had taken it for this, it must have created an utter confusion in his mind concerning the order of time: a mistake of ten years at least, which would have made the history of Christ's life inconsistent.

And he does, as I take it, so advertise his reader; if his words be construed in a sense of which they are well capable, and which is consistent with history; though all the translations have rendered them otherwise. But Dr. Whitby<sup>1</sup> has, I see, taken notice of this construction, and endeavoured to confirm it; and so perhaps may several other authors whom I have not seen.

St. Luke's words are, chap. ii: having mentioned a decree of Cæsar Augustus that there should be a *census*, or registering, or enrolling of all the empire, he adds, *Αὕτη ἡ Ἀπογραφὴ πρώτη ἐγένετο ἡγεμονεύοντος τῆς Συρίας Κυρηναίου*. The word *πρῶτος*, with a genitive, sometimes has, both in Scripture and in other authors, the sense and property of *πρότερος*, *prior to*, or *before* the thing next mentioned. In John i. 15, and again, ver. 30. it is of necessity so construed (as

<sup>1</sup> [See his annotation on the passage, Paraphrase, vol. i. and the note in Dr. Hammond's Paraphrase there referred to.]



Dr. Whitby observes, *πρῶτός μου ἦν, he was before me.* And Nonnus in the paraphrase of that place uses both it and *πρώτιστος* so :

Πρῶτος ἐμεῖο βέβηκεν, ὀπίστερος ὅστις ἰκάνει,  
Ὅτι μὲν ἦν πρώτιστος.—

And there are several examples of the like in the Greek writers ; some of which Dr. Whitby quotes in his comment on this place.

The sense, I think, requires that it should be so rendered here ; *In those days there went out a decree from Cæsar Augustus that all the world should be taxed. This taxing πρώτη ἐγένετο was before that Cyrenius was governor of Syria ; or, before that taxing which was made by Cyrenius when he was governor of Syria.* Everybody then remembered that taxing. If Christ had been born but then, he would not have been near thirty when he suffered.

Tertullian must needs have understood it so. For he, lib. 4. *contra Marcion.* c. 19, speaks of the enrolling or registering at which Christ was born as being known to have been in the time of Saturninus' government of Syria. 'Constat,' says he, 'census actos sub Augusto nunc (lege tunc) in Judæa per Sentium Saturninum.' 'It is known that there was at that time (the time of Christ's birth) a registering of the people in Judæa made under Augustus by Sentius Saturninus.' Now if he took it to be in the time of Saturninus ; he must know that it was not in the time of Quirinius, (for there was about twelve years' distance between Saturninus' going out of that office, and Quirinius' coming into it,) and consequently must have understood this

text of St. Luke, not *when*, but *before* Cyrenius was governor of Syria.

This interpretation of the place is confirmed by the difficulties which all, even the most skilful chronologers, that have taken it in the formerly received sense, have found in reconciling it with the history of those times. Baronius finding the times of Quirinius' government of Syria too late for Christ's birth, thrusts it up eight years without any other reconciling of passages, than saying broadly, 'Josephus is mistaken.' Others being aware that this is too gross, (for this revolution of the state of Judæa is connected by circumstances with the Roman affairs,) do allow this taxing to have been at this time, as Josephus sets it, after Archelaus' banishment. But then they think that there was another registering or taxing of the whole empire before this, in Herod's time, under which Christ was born; in which they are certainly in the right (Tacitus says, that Augustus made such rolls or reviews more than once): but then they suppose farther that Quirinius was governor of Syria then too. And so the words of the English and other translations would infer.

Now this last is a very improbable thing. Josephus particularly names the governors of Syria during the latter part of Herod's reign. Not the years indeed of each of them; but by circumstances. Titius must have been five or six years before Herod's death: presently after he speaks of Saturninus, with whom Herod had much converse and business; and he seems to have held the place three or four years. And he says expressly that Saturninus was succeeded by Varus, in whose time Herod died:

after Varus had been his neighbour (as one may judge by the circumstances of their converse) about a year. So that here is no room for Quirinius. Some suppose therefore that Quirinius never was the *ordinary* governor of Syria in any part of Herod's reign, (for that would have been mentioned,) but that while Saturninus, or one of the other, was the *ordinary* governor, Quirinius was sent with an *extraordinary* commission to tax Judæa<sup>m</sup>. But this is very hard to suppose, while Judæa had its own king. These sort of governors were not sent, except into such countries as were reduced to *provinces*; as Syria had been now for a long time, but Judæa not yet. But suppose it; still there does not seem any reason that, in order to tax the people of Judæa, he should be made governor of Syria.

The translations do not make very good sense. They do not know what to do with the word *πρώτη*. The vulgar, 'Hæc descriptio prima facta est a præside Syriæ Cyrenio.' Some mean by it, 'Hæc prima descriptio.' Others, 'Hæc descriptio primum facta est.' As ours, *This taxing was first made when, &c.* Concerning any one taxing it cannot properly be said to be *first* made at such or such a time; for one taxing is made but once. They who think Quirinius was twice governor, would, I suppose, if the words would bear it, translate; 'This taxing was made when Cyrenius was governor the *first* time.' But neither will the words bear that construction; nor is there any appearance that he was twice governor.

But if we understand it; *This was a taxing* (or registering) prior to (or before) *that which was*

<sup>m</sup> [See Dr. Hammond's note upon the place.]

when *Cyrenius* was governor of *Syria*; both the word *πρώτη* is necessary in the sentence; and it agrees with the history of the times.

I know that *Justin Martyr*, in his *Apology* to the emperors, does suppose *Christ* to have been born at that time when *Quirinius*, being made the ordinary governor, did tax *Judæa*. His words shew that he means that time. For he calls *Quirinius* the first governor of *Judæa* for the Romans. During the time of the kings, the Romans had no other governors in *Judæa* but the kings. But when *Archelaus* (the last king, or ethnarch, there) did, as we call it, abdicate; then the Romans sent governors to receive the taxes and tribute. And of these *Quirinius* was the first. But for *Justin* to set the date of *Christ's* birth at this time, is a mistake of above ten years, and proves nothing but (what I said before) that the Christians of those times had no skill in keeping the account of time. *Irenæus* made no mistake comparable to this. And yet nobody for this has judged *Justin's* *Apology* to be spurious; nor even for his mistake of making *Ptolomy Philadelphus* contemporary with *Herod*, which is a mistake of above a hundred years.

I have been larger in this than was needful for answering *Mr. Gale*. Every one sees how poor an evasion it is, to deny the authenticity of any ancient Christian book, because it has mistakes in the chronology of the years of *Christ's* life. The explication I have given of *St. Luke's* words concerning the taxing, does not, I confess, settle the time of it; it shews it to have been before *Quirinius's* time, (and so removes a puzzling difficulty,) but not *how long* before. I do not write these

things for Mr. Gale, to whom they are useless ; nor for the learned in chronology, to whom they are needless : but that the ordinary reader may have a conception of the years something nigher the truth. Let us see some of Mr. Gale's arguments.

Page 494. He says, 'It was commonly known ' from the censual rolls of Augustus, both at what ' time and in what place, our Lord was born.' And therefore he thinks Irenæus, or any of the ancient Christians, could not mistake the time.

To say, 'It was *commonly* known,' is gross ignorance, if he thinks so ; and a gross abuse of his ignorant reader, if he say it without thinking so. That there were rolls of the number of citizens or freemen in each province, laid up for some time in the Capitol, or such like place, is very probable. But there is no account of any Christian that ever saw them ; nor likelihood that they might have had the sight and searching of them, to find the name of any particular person, if they had desired it. But he talks as if they were common in everybody's hands. If any Christian had ever seen them, and had seen our Lord's name *Jesus* registered, as the son of Joseph and Mary, born in such a year of Augustus, and had declared to his fellow-Christians such his account ; this had at once ended all disputes and mistakes ; and all Christians after that would have agreed in one account. Whereas we see on the contrary, that those few of the ancients that about a hundred and fifty or two hundred years after the time have said any thing about it, have differed very much ; not only Irenæus, but all the rest. Neither they nor we having any plain proof of the very year when Christ was born, or

when that *census* or taxing was, but these two: it must have been in Herod's time; and it must (if the words are taken strictly, and no mistake be in the copies) have been at or under the distance of thirty years reckoned back from the fifteenth of Tiberius computed from some *epocha*; but it is not certain from *which*.

He says, Justin Martyr and Tertullian do appeal to these rolls kept at Rome.

Justin does, at the place I just now mentioned, (*Apol. 2. circa med.*) tell the emperors, that it had been prophesied that the Christ should be born at Bethlehem, a village nigh Jerusalem; and that our Jesus was accordingly born there, 'you may,' says he, 'learn from the tax-rolls made by Cyrenius, 'your first governor in Judæa.' He supposed or guessed that there were then remaining in the emperor's custody such rolls, which they might, if they please, search; but it does not follow, that any one that would, might search them; much less that any one had searched them upon this account. And the saying of Tertullian imports no more. He speaks of them as of rolls, which one might suppose to be kept in the Roman archives; not as though he had seen them, or had any account of any one that had; much less as though he knew what they contained concerning Christ's birth, or the time of it. And indeed, if there were then any in being, and Justin and he had been permitted to search them; one of those two would have searched in the time of Quirinius, and the other in the rolls of Saturninus, as I shewed from their several words.

It is probable enough that both of them were mistaken in their guessing that the names of par-

ticular persons were set down in them. Suppose the names of every one, and the parents of every child, were set down in the first copies drawn up in the several provinces; yet it is likely that in those copies sent to Rome and laid up there, there was recorded only the number of persons in each city, tribe, &c., and the value of the estates. Else, the account of all the provinces and kingdoms of that empire would have filled books too many for one house to hold. In short, these rolls, if they had been searched, might have given some light: but since nobody did search them, neither did Irenæus know, nor do we know, what was in them. Besides, that Irenæus' mistake was not in the date of Christ's birth. He sets that at the forty-first of Augustus; which is the time, or within a year of the time, that the chronologers would have it; and which they think those rolls, if they had been searched, would have confirmed. His mistake was in the number of about ten years which he supposes our Saviour to have lived after his baptism, and before his preaching; which number of years the time of Pontius Pilate, reckoned by Josephus to be but ten years, will not allow. He had not read, or did not mind, that limitation of ten years in Josephus. Just as Mr. Gale had not read, or did not mind, that of St. Matthew, that he was born in Herod's time, which will not allow him to have been so young as thirty at the fifteenth of Tiberius, taken by the ordinary account.

Page 495. 'If Christ lived but forty years from the forty-first of Augustus, he could not be crucified in the reign of Tiberius.'] Why not? The forty-first is indeed too late upon other accounts.

But if he had been born *ann. per. Jul.* 4710, (in which Augustus began his forty-first year,) since Tiberius lived to 4750, *anno Dom.* 37;—there is the distance of forty years. Our Saviour did not indeed live to that last year of Tiberius. But why does Mr. Gale say, that if he had, he would not have been forty?

Page 495. ‘Pilate was removed from his government at least a year before Tiberius died.’] Whence comes this news? Josephus relates how Vitellius, governor of Syria, hearing of Pilate’s villainies, sent Marcellus to take care of Judæa, and ordered Pilate to be carried to Rome to answer for his crimes before Tiberius; but before he was brought thither, Tiberius died. That sailing to Rome could not take up nigh a year.

Page 496. ‘He was made governor in the twelfth of Tiberius, and continued but ten years.’] Bishop Ussher shews that it must have been ten years, and some months over. Now from the latter end of Tiberius’ twelfth year, to his death, are but ten years seven months.

Ibid. Mr. Gale runs downward seventy years to the destruction of the *temple*, to find the time of Christ’s birth; reckoning backward up again the years of the emperors that were between; not one of them being truly accounted. The aim is, that since that destruction happened *anno Dom.* 70. he may, by subtracting out of seventy the years that passed between Christ’s death and it, leave but a few for the time of his life. He cites authors that say forty (or some of them forty-two) years were between the passion and that destruction. This would leave for Christ’s life but thirty or twenty-



eight. Our chronologer himself was ashamed of this foot of the account. By adding some scraps to the emperor's years, he makes the sum (which really was seventy and no more) seventy-one. So he leaves our Saviour thirty-one. And, to the shame of all chronologers, and of St. John, (who recites at least three (probably four) passovers after the baptism at about thirty,) says, p. 497, 'about which age (viz., thirty-one) he was crucified.'

Could not this poor accomptant perceive where the mistake of all this lies? The destruction of the temple by Titus was indeed *anno Domini* 70. That is, seventy years, and no more, had passed from the beginning of the common *æra* by which we reckon the *annos Domini*, to the time of the destruction. But does it follow that no more years had passed from the *true* time of Christ's birth? Every body that has spent an hour in these studies knows that *æra* is too short, and that our Saviour was born several years before the beginning of it; six, or five, or four at the least. Else nobody need study for the time of Christ's birth; but depend upon it, that it was from this present year 1719 years. And our disputant seems to know no better.

In the same page he very seriously quotes Clemens Alexandrinus, Origen, and Phlegon, as authors by whose computations the erroneous account of Irenæus may be made apparent. There Phlegon places the fifteenth of Tiberius (when St. Luke says our Saviour was baptized) forty years before the destruction of Jerusalem, *anno Domini* 70. And Clemens and Origen place our Saviour's *passion* forty-two years before it. And he takes notice that Phlegon says so *expressly*; and that Irenæus cannot be supposed

ignorant of it. Does he think these accounts to be true and consistent? If not, why does he dwell upon them to the reproach of Irenæus? But if he do, (and he seems to think so in earnest,) then our Saviour died two years before he was baptized.

Rather he might have seen by this, that all men in those times, as well as Irenæus, were at a loss in counting the years of our Saviour's life.

That he may shew some of his own skill in chronology, beside what he quotes from authors; he says here, that this Phlegon wrote a little before Irenæus was born; and the next page but one, says, he wrote but in Hadrian's time. Does he think that Irenæus was not born before Hadrian's time; and especially the latter end of it, anno 138, to which year Phlegon brings down his chronicle? This cannot be Mr. Gale. This must be spurious.

Page 498, he runs over the same computation again, out of Josephus, after a more absurd manner than before. He gives us a table of the years of the emperors; wherein the reign of Tiberius is twenty, which every one knows was twenty-two and above a half; and which he himself in the page before had set down twenty-three. The foot of this account is in the next page, 'Christ must have suffered at near thirty years of age.' Boys that are taught arithmetic, if they perceive the total sum to be certainly wrong, cast it over again and amend it, before they shew it their master. Here is a proficient who shews his calculation to all the world, the foot whereof stands as you see.

Page 497, he has given us an *εῦρηκα* of his own, (which if it had been true, would have compensated

the *tædium* of reading all this trash,) that there are observations of *eclipses* that will settle all this matter. How ignorant have all chronologers been, who have in volumes disputed a question which this young master in the art can demonstrate at once! ‘It is plain,’ he says, ‘from, &c., and from ‘the observation of eclipses, that Augustus died ‘fourteen years after the birth of Christ.’ Now the year of Augustus’ death we all know; that it was *per. Jul. 4727. duobus Sextis Coss.* which is *ann. Dom. 14.* and the day *Aug. 19.* So then Mr. Gale’s eclipse will fix our Saviour’s birth some time in the year before *ann. Dom. 1. per. Jul. 4713.*

I should be unwilling to have so mean a thought of this corrector of Irenæus, as that he should intend no more than that Augustus died in the year aforesaid, (which every one knows,) and that an eclipse that year at a certain distance before his death, and another in the same year at a certain distance after it, do confirm that to be the year which the historians who mention his death, do mean: but that if he be asked, how old our Saviour was at that year, *ann. Dom. 14,* whether fourteen, or sixteen, or eighteen, or twenty; and desired to prove his answer by the history of some eclipse happening at a known distance from our Saviour’s birth; he should have nothing to say, but only that Augustus died in the fourteenth year of those called ‘the years of our Lord.’ We must not think so poorly till we hear farther from him about the eclipse. He himself has said four or five times over, that the birth was the forty-first of Augustus; and says in the next page, that Augustus reigned fifty-seven years (so he did, reckoning from the death

of his uncle; and something over): the eclipse, when it comes, will make these pages spurious. Or else, that fifty-seven exceeds forty-one but by fourteen.

Page 500. Mr. Gale makes a second exception against this passage in Irenæus, wherein infants are reckoned among those who ‘by Christ are regenerated unto God;’ that we have not the original words of it, (as indeed we have not of any of his works, except a few fragments,) but only a translation in Latin.

But since this translation is so ancient; made either in the author’s own time, (as Dr. Grabe thinks,) or at least (as he proves) soon after; and has been quoted, owned, and acknowledged all along ever since; this must appear, to any reader of those ancient books, a very frivolous evasion; made only for the necessity of an hypothesis, which cannot stand a fair trial. But this it is to have to do with an adversary that runs from the matter in hand into long disputes and cavils about the authenticity of the books.

All, or in a manner all the quotations that have been made by the Latin Fathers from Irenæus have been taken from this translation, and have been allowed; and it is too late now to demur to its authority; especially in such a place as this, which runs agreeably, and pertinently, to what goes before, and what follows.

It is indeed composed in an uncouth and barbarous *Latin* phrase; partly for that the translator had but a mean faculty in that phrase, (which is no exception against the truth or faithfulness of the translation,) and partly for that he has aimed to

keep in his *Latin* all the idioms of the *Greek* which he translated; and to render every sentence *verbatim* (which will make any translation barbarous). But this rather assures than overthrows the repute of its fidelity; and is the case (though not perhaps in the same degree) of all in that time, who translated the books of the Gospel, or any book which they accounted of awful authority; as is apparent in the fragments that are left of the old *Italic* version, and in the whole *vulgar Latin* translation of the Bible; and much more in the *Greek Septuagint*.

This is it, which the writers whom Mr. Gale quotes here, do note as a fault in the translation; that it is in a dull, barbarous, impolite style. They do not impeach the honesty of the man. His fault was, aiming at an excessive exactness. That unhandsome expression of Scaliger's, (which nobody but Mr. Gale would have expressed with an air of seriousness,) that 'the translator was an ass,' is taken out of a book, which has done Scaliger a great deal of discredit<sup>n</sup>; as the like usage has done to Luther, and some others. Both these men gave their pens too much liberty in censorious and extravagant expressions; but it seems they gave their tongues more. And they have had, after their death, friends or else enemies, who have published to the world all their rash sayings spoken in passion, dispute, or table-talk. Which course, if it were taken with the best men that are, would expose their character. It is well when a man's sedate thoughts are worth publishing. Nobody's tattle is.

<sup>n</sup> [The collection entitled 'Scaligerana:' see the passage alluded to, quoted at vol. iii. p. 500.]

As for the instances which Mr. Gale has picked out of the whole five books, where there is some variety between this translation and some transcripts of the original, found in Eusebius, Epiphanius, &c., they are not more considerable for sense, nor more in number, than are found in the copies of any book whatever, that has had so many copies transcribed of it, as this book and translation must be supposed to have had. Epiphanius might transcribe from one copy which had some various lections, which the copy made use of by this translator had not. There are none that alter any doctrine, history, &c., delivered by this holy Father. Mr. Gale, who excepts against any doctrine of Irenæus being proved by this translation, might with the same face except against any one translation of the Bible. For in comparing that one with some other copies and some other translations, there would more various lections be found. And whatever various lections there are of any other place of Irenæus, there are none of the place before us.

To one that is so endless in his cavils and exceptions against books and translations, we must, I think, stop his mouth with that answer of Mr. Stokes, p. 43. ‘It is your common method to evade  
 ‘ the authority of the Fathers, by saying, they are  
 ‘ but translations, &c. But you have neither ori-  
 ‘ ginals nor translations of those early times, on  
 ‘ your side.—Were there no antipædobaptists  
 ‘ then, to translate?’ &c.

Page 504. If the place must be allowed for genuine; yet Mr. Gale will not be found without something to say. His third exception is, ‘that by  
 ‘ the word *regenerated* in it, there is no reason to

‘understand *baptized*.’ And whereas I had said that the word *regeneration* does in the usual phrase of those times signify *baptism*; this he not only denies, but with that rudeness which seems natural to him, says, it is a sign that ‘I never read the ‘books of those times;’ and, that ‘nothing can be ‘more apparently false.’

To satisfy the reader, who might not be acquainted with those books, (for they that are, do know it themselves,) I referred to what I had said in the *introduction*, concerning the *Jews* applying this word *regenerated*, or *born again*, to the proselytes whom they baptized; and concerning some places of Scripture, where it is so used: and I added at the place itself for the present some sayings both of the *Latin* and *Greek* Fathers, which do plainly shew, that they not only used that word for baptism, but also that they so appropriated it to *baptism*, as to exclude any other conversion or repentance, that is ‘not accompanied with baptism,’ from being signified by it. That I did it in that chapter itself, where I quote Irenæus; but the whole book afterward is full of quotations, (I think above a hundred,) where this sense plainly appears. Which the reader must turn to, if he would see which of us is guilty of the ‘apparent falsehood.’

What he has to overthrow them, is,

Page 505, *First*, for the *Jews*. He first broadly denies that they used any initiatory baptism of proselytes at all, (by which you see what an adversary I have got, that will deny what every body knows to be true,) and faces it out, that he has proved they had none. Those that will, may take a journey to *St. Alban’s* to see his proofs. But it will be to no

purpose; since he declares beforehand in effect, that he will not lose, if none be found. For he adds, ‘However if it should be allowed they had such a baptism; I believe they nowhere call it *re-generation*.’ I had shewed him where they call it so. He observes; the word there is *new-born*. And that any one becoming a proselyte is not said to *be* new-born neither; but *as* new-born.

I suppose he has some disciples whom he can convince that *new-born* and *regenerate* are not the same thing; because one begins with an *N*, and the other with an *R*. And some Nicodemuses, who will not believe they could be *new-born* or *regenerate* without entering the second time into their mother’s womb. When our Saviour says, *born again*, is it not meant, *as* born again?

If they were *new-born* and *regenerate* too, Mr. Gale will not yield. He denies that they were put into that state by *baptism*.

But it had been largely shewn before, that they accounted them to be made proselytes by *baptism*. And therefore to say, ‘If any one become a proselyte, he is like a child new-born;’ is as much as to say, ‘If any one be baptized.’ But he observes, that in one of the places ‘the same is said of a slave made free,’ that he also is as a child new-born.

Maimonides does express that resemblance between a *Gentile* proselyted, and a *slave* made free; that each of them is like a child new-born: which comparison does the more lively express the regeneration spoken of. A slave, when made free, is *regenerate*, i. e. brought into a new state, in respect of temporal concerns; as a proselyte, when baptized,



is, in respect of spiritual concerns. It is the spiritual regeneration we are speaking of.

But he pleads, ‘Why should not their circumcision——be the regeneration, as well as baptism?’

I grant it. A proselyte, or a proselyte’s child, was at that time to be circumcised and baptized; and both together were the symbol of his regeneration. And so it would be now to a Christian’s child, or a man turning Christian, if Christ had appointed both to be used. But as he has appointed baptism only; that only now is the symbol of the new spiritual state entered into, i. e. of the regeneration. But to conclude, as Mr. Gale does, that the passages which I there produced, intimate no such thing of either of them, is like him. For they speak it plainly.

Being no better able to maintain his denial of this phrase used by the *Jews*, he turns the dispute into railing; ‘If all the rabbins did assert this; is it becoming a Christian divine to forsake the Scriptures, to follow the rabbins?’ A calumny this is; to call that the forsaking of the Scriptures, which is used as a help for the better understanding the language of them.

*Secondly*, for the Scripture.—Mr. Gale, who had before told his reader that I pretended no proof from Scripture, comes the second time [p. 507.] to attack my proof from John iii. 5, *Except any one be born again, born of water and of the Spirit, &c.*, that the Scripture does call our baptism our *new birth*, or *regeneration*. He confesses those words ‘are a little obscure since the prevailing of infant-baptism.’ For, he says, since that time ‘all that

‘ were baptized, were spoken of as regenerated. ‘ And then infants being baptized, they must be ‘ taken to be regenerated too.’

Now by this chronological calculation of the time when persons baptized were spoken of as *regenerated*; that it was since the prevailing of infant-baptism; it appears that not only Irenæus (who in the place we are upon speaks so) lived since that time; but our Lord also. For that which is in other places expressed, *baptized with water*, and *baptized with the Spirit*, he in this text expresses, *born* (or regenerate) *of water and of the Spirit*.

Page 507, he says, ‘ the mistake may be easily ‘ seen. For our Lord does not say, *born of water ‘ alone*, but *born of water and the Spirit*. He ‘ does not speak of two new births, one by water ‘ and one by the Spirit; but only of one, which was ‘ to be of water and the Spirit in conjunction.’

Now these are indeed the plain words; and this is the very sense of the place. And it is what we urge against the antipædobaptists; and what, if they would keep it in mind, would set them right. Therefore see how long he is able to stand to this. Within the space of a page he has these words, in contradiction to our Lord, and to himself. ‘ The ‘ baptizing in water is not the regenerating’—(Not that alone, we know. But he adds farther)—‘ The ‘ regeneration really consists but in one,’ &c.— ‘ He speaks *only* of being born of the Spirit.’ And again, p. 510, ‘ Our Saviour means only being born ‘ of the Spirit, by or in the use of baptism with ‘ water, as the external symbol and seal of such ‘ regeneration.’

Our Saviour certainly means as he says, *Born of*

*water and of the Spirit.* And it is Mr. Gale's own mistake in the import of the word, that makes him think our Saviour's speech must be construed otherwise than the words stand. He thinks that *baptism* means only the outward part, the external washing; whereas it is (as he had better expressed it before, in explaining the new birth) one *baptism*, or one *regeneration*, of water and the Spirit in conjunction. This mistake appears to hang in his mind by what he says,

Page 509, 'Christ speaks of *spiritual* regeneration, and no other. For had he by *born again* meant baptism,' &c.

He speaks indeed of a *spiritual* regeneration, i. e. of the persons coming into a *new spiritual state*. Which is effected by the outward action appointed by Christ, accompanied with the grace and operation of his Spirit. As for the sense in which a baptized infant is *born of the Spirit*, I have been forced to speak of it twice or thrice already. Mr. Gale will not seem to understand that there is any efficacy at all of God's Spirit extended to infants to put them in a new spiritual state; but yet he dares not openly deny it.

He refers here, p. 508, to the twenty-fifth article of the church of *England*, as if that made for him. There is nothing there for his purpose. Our church plainly owns two parts in one sacrament; the outward visible sign, and the inward spiritual grace. If he pleaded only, that the 'inward spiritual grace, 'the being born of the Spirit,' is the chief, no man would oppose him. Every one knows it.

Page 510. From another place of Scripture, which I cited to shew that the Scripture applies the word

*regeneration* to baptism, it will appear by Mr. Gale's rule, that St. Paul also lived 'since the time 'that infant-baptism prevailed.' For he uses it so; Tit. iii. 5. *He saved us by the washing* (or baptism) *of regeneration.*

Mr. Gale allows that 'by the *washing of regeneration* is meant *baptism*; that is,' says he, 'by the 'whole phrase;' but then he brings in a logical quibble about the quiddities of the things; that *washing* denotes baptism; but *regeneration* does not.

This metaphysical distinction is grounded on that mistake of his, (which I mentioned just now, and which runs through all his arguings,) that the sacrament of baptism consists only in the outward part, the corporal washing: and it is nothing pertinent to our argument. For the argument requires no more, than that the word *regeneration* does generally in the Scripture (as here) and more constantly in the ancient Fathers, carry along with it a supposal of baptism, (whether as a cause, or effect, or necessary adjunct, is nothing to the purpose of our argument,) so as that wherever any Christian author speaks of any persons *regenerated*, (as Irenæus here speaks of infants regenerated,) we may conclude they were *baptized*. That regeneration does connote baptism, the reader saw before at his p. 481, and sees here, and will see again; that whenever he is put to a shift, he flies to this logical quirk for an evasion. I gave a solution of it, in answering his foresaid page 481.

Page 512, he objects that baptism is often called *the baptism of repentance*; and yet that repentance does not signify baptism.

This then shews the difference between the use of the word *repentance*, and the use of the word *regeneration*, or new birth; that the name of *penitent* is often in the Scripture and the Christian writers given to persons not yet baptized; or is given to them in respect of some great change and recovery from a sinful course into which they had after baptism fallen; but the name of *regeneration*, or *regenerate*, never. In this very chapter concerning Irenæus, I gave the words of Gregory Nazianzen, warning a baptized person against falling back into courses of wickedness; ‘There is not another *regeneration* to be had afterward; though it be sought with never so much crying and tears.’ And yet he grants in the next words that there is repentance after baptism. The baptism of John is often called *the baptism of repentance*; (and all the three places of Scripture, which Mr. Gale produces here, Mark i. 4, Acts xiii. 24, and xix. 4, speak of that;) but none but the baptism of Christ is called *the baptism of regeneration*. Whatever epithets may be common to baptized and unbaptized persons, the term *regenerate* is not.

Page 513. Concerning the use of this word among the ancient Christians; whereas I had said that in their *usual phrase* it signifies baptism; he in *his usual phrase* says, ‘It is one of the most groundless assertions that I ever met with,’ &c.

Now the thing is what every one that has read them knows to be true. But how shall one convince his readers? If any of them has read but so many of them as are recited in my book, he must see that this answer of their defender is not true. Mr. Whiston, though he be engaged on the same

side, yet having read what I say, and what he says here, owns in his 'Primitive Infant-baptism,' p. 7,

'That regeneration is here [viz. John iii. 3, 5.] 'and elsewhere (generally, if not constantly) used 'with relation to baptismal regeneration, is undeniable.'

Mr. Whiston adds, 'not as supposing the bare 'outward ceremony to deserve that name.' Which we all know. To disprove this use of the word, he tells his *sir*, that he has already shewn him that Justin by the word *regeneration* cannot be understood to mean baptism.

The words of Justin which I produced, [part i. p. 68.] concerning new converts that came to be baptized, were; 'Then we bring them 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,' &c. The reader must pardon me for troubling him with the words over again; for I must declare, and I do it in cool blood, I never met with any one of so finished effrontery to deny things that are plain and visible. When Mr. Whiston said, this use of the word was *undeniable*; he meant it could not be denied by any man of tolerable modesty.

For other Fathers after Justin, he has been searching the *indexes*; and though nineteen in twenty of the places to which they directed, must have been plain for this sense; he has found some that may bear a cavil.

There is hardly any word whatever of so determinate and constant a meaning, when it is applied

to one subject, but that, if it be used in relation to another subject of a different nature, it takes a different sense. The word *baptism* itself is found sometimes used in relation to *sufferings* or to *vices*; *baptized* with afflictions, or in voluptuousness, &c. This does not hinder us to say, that the word *baptism* has a constant signification, viz., the *sacramental washing in the form appointed*. So if I say that the word *regenerate* has a constant sense among the ancient Christians, to mean, or connote baptism; no man of sense will challenge me with instances, where the *world*, or the *earth*, &c., is said to be *regenerated*, i. e. *new made, new moulded*, &c., because he naturally knew I was to be understood concerning the sense of the word, when it is applied to men; and in their religious concerns.

And even when they are applied to the same subject (as *regeneration* to men) it is also common for all words to be used sometimes metaphorically, and by way of allusion. In which cases no man expects a strict account of the same sense of a word as it has in its ordinary signification. But such differences as these do always appear by the scope of the place. Now must I follow Mr. Gale in an impertinent ramble which he has made to pick up some such instances. They begin at

Page 514. There he brings two places of Origen, where, by his own confession *παλιγγενεσία* is taken for the *resurrection*, the *day of judgment*, the *world to come*. Our *English* translation, in one of the places which Origen there quotes, Matt. xix. 28, renders it, the *regeneration*. But Origen takes it (and, I suppose, rightly) for that time of *new-making*, or (as St. Peter, Acts iii. calls it) *restitution of all*

*things.* To what purpose does Mr. Gale bring these places here?

Yet they might have been of some use to him. For they might have taught him to construe and translate that passage of Clemens Alexandrinus, Strom. 3. of which he had just before made nonsense. Clement's words are good sense; speaking of the Brachmans. Καταφρονούσι θανάτου, καὶ παρ' οὐδὲν ἠγούονται τὸ ζῆν' πείθονται γὰρ εἶναι παλιγγενεσίαν. 'They fear not death, nor esteem life; for they believe that there is a resurrection.'

The place that he quotes, page 518, of Clemens Romanus, may most fitly be considered here beforehand; because the sense of it is like these other. He says, 'Noah preached παλιγγενεσίαν to the world.' Which is meant either (as Junius, the first editor, understands it) a *resurrection*; or else, that he by preparing the ark admonished men of that destruction and *renovation* of the world, which was then coming and did quickly come; *whereby the world that then was, being overflowed with water, perished*; and the restoring it was a παλιγγενεσία. Mr. Gale is angry with Junius for spoiling one of his quotations; and accosts that learned man with his usual rudeness: 'it is strange what could be in 'Junius' mind.' In a case where every reader sees that himself is in the wrong.

These places, where *regeneration* is applied to the world, should not have been set down at all in a question concerning the sense of that word when it is applied to the spiritual concerns of a person.

He has found two places where it is applied to a person; but in a very metaphorical way, which



runs out from the common road of the use of words, and they are both in Clemens Alexandrinus, who generally gives himself a latitude in that way.

One is, that recited by Eusebius, *Hist. Eccles.* lib. iii. 23. In that example shewn by St. John of the recovery of the young apostate from a state of soul that might have been thought desperate, by a repentance as extraordinary as the fact had been, Clement aims to express it in words also alike extraordinary. In the description of the repentance, among other expressions, he has this, (which Mr. Gale should not have omitted,) that he ‘was βαπτιζόμενος ἐκ δευτέρου, baptized the second time ‘with his own tears.’ And in carrying on this hyperbolic allegory, he says, St. John shewed in this performance μέγα γνῶρισμα παλιγγενεσίας, καὶ τρόπαιον ἀναστάσεως βλεπομένης, ‘a great pattern of ‘a regeneration, and instance of a visible resurrection.’ In the same sense that he calls it a *regeneration*; he calls it also a *baptism*, and a *resurrection*; both one and the other hyperbolically expressed. For as, properly speaking, there is but one *baptism*; so Gregory Nazianzen (as I there cited him) says, ‘there is not a *second regeneration*.’ Not but that they allowed *repentance* afterward; but they in ordinary speech called no repentance by the name of *regeneration*, but that upon which any one was *baptized*.

The other is *Strom.* ii. p. 425. He had been speaking of the duties of matrimony, and the great guilt and mischief of adultery. And then says, τί οὖν νόμος; ‘what provision does the law make ‘against this?’ The substance of the answer is, that in order to clear the world from such mischiefs, the

law orders the adulterer and the adulteress to be both put to death. And then he pretends to shew that the provision made by the Gospel is not inferior to this; that the law and the Gospel do agree, &c. Ἡ γὰρ τοι πορνέυσασα, &c. ‘For a woman that has fallen into adultery, is indeed as yet alive in (or to) sin; but she is dead ταῖς ἐντολαῖς to (or by) the commandments (dead in law). But she, when she has repented, οἶον ἀναγεννηθεῖσα, being, as it were, born over again by the change of her manners, παλιγγενεσίαν ἔχει ζωῆς has a resurrection to life. The former harlot being dead; and she that was begotten by repentance, coming to life again.’

Mr. Gale, not observing the occasion of these words, (which was not in the *index*.) has lost the emphasis of them; and translated them wrong [p. 516.] For τεθνηκυίας μὲν τῆς πόρνης τῆς παλαιᾶς can never be construed, ‘she is dead to the former adulteries;’ but ‘the former adulteress being dead.’

Nobody would seek for the ordinary sense of a word from such a sentence as this, which all runs upon a *quasi*. She is, *as it were*, another woman; and so is, *as it were*, born again. And in the following words, αὐτίκα λιθόλευστοι γίνονται, ‘they are at present stoned,’ he means, they are by the sentence of condemnation in the Gospel, *as it were*, or in effect, stoned.

There are none of the other instances which he gives of the use of the word (which are at all pertinent to this matter) but what may, I think, be fairly supposed to have in the author’s meaning a relation to baptism; though he has picked out one or two where this relation is not at that place expressed. Tertullian says, ‘We are born in the

‘space of ten months; which is the number of  
 ‘the commandments, by which’ (or in which, or  
 unto which) ‘we are regenerated.’ Which may  
 be paraphrased, or baptized. For the baptismal  
 sponson was, as, to believe in God; so also, to  
 keep his commandments. In which respect, as they  
 often say, we are *regenerated* (or baptized) to, or  
 into, the *creed*, or faith; so here Tertullian means;  
 we are *baptized* to, or unto, the keeping of the  
 commandments.

The rest of the places he cites, either have not  
 the word at all, (as that of Barnabas, which he calls  
 a very remarkable one,) or have it in a sense which  
 is plainly enough, and in some of them expressly,  
 applicable to baptism.

In Clement’s *Epitomæ et Eclogæ* there is much talk  
 of baptism; mostly concerning the Valentinians’ way  
 of explaining the doctrine thereof. And it appears  
 that they, as well as the catholics, gave it the name  
 of *regeneration*. There are such sayings as these:  
 Epitom. p. 802. ‘Our regeneration is from water  
 ‘and the Spirit.’ And a little after; ‘Therefore  
 ‘our Saviour was baptized, though not needing it  
 ‘himself, that he might sanctify all water to those  
 ‘who should afterward be regenerated.—By it  
 ‘(meaning this *regeneration*) we are cleansed not  
 ‘only in body, but also in soul. And it is a proof  
 ‘of even our invisible (or inward) parts being sanc-  
 ‘tified by it, that unclean spirits, which are infolded  
 ‘in the soul, are purged away by this new and  
 ‘spiritual birth. The water above the heavens.  
 ‘For as much as baptism is performed by water  
 ‘and the Spirit,’ &c.

All this stands together in Clement. And yet Mr. Gale,

Page 516, leaves out all the rest, and quotes that scrap out of them; 'This new and spiritual 'birth, (or generation):' and would make his reader believe they are spoken without any reference to *baptism*.

And at the same place he quotes out of the preceding page of Clement, p. 801, 'Baptism, which is 'the sign of regeneration;' as words making for his turn; and says, 'Clement is so far from leaving any 'room to imagine baptism was called *regeneration*, 'that he expressly says, It is the sign of it.'

All such places do, as I said before, help to prove that the ancients connected the notion of regeneration with that of baptism; not limiting themselves to one logical idea of the word; but using it sometimes for the inward part of the sacrament, and oftener for the whole complex notion of it; as it is not half a page from this, where the words I last quoted are, 'Our regeneration is by 'water and the Spirit;' but never speak of it as a thing that can be separate from baptism. Mr. Gale's business was, to prove that the word is used without including, supposing, or connoting baptism: so as that the infants, which Irenæus speaks of, might be called *regenerate* without being baptized.

One more observation he makes,

Page 516, out of these Excerpta, p. 800, which is a notable one. Clement, he says, 'instead of calling 'baptism *generation*, or *regeneration*, directly on the 'contrary calls it *death*, and the end of the old 'life.'

Now see the whole sentence. ‘Therefore baptism is called *a death* and the end of the *old life*; since we renounce all evil powers; but *life* according to Christ, who is the only Lord of it.’ Did not he make a hard shift for this quotation? And is it not a learned argument, that baptism, if it be *a death unto sin*, cannot be *a new birth* unto righteousness?

For other books of Clement, where he speaks, not the sense of the Valentinians, but his own, Mr. Gale, at

Page 515, quotes his Pædagog. lib. i. p. 90, saying, ‘God receives those that fly to him, καὶ ἀναγεννήσας τῷ πνεύματι εἰς υἰοθεσίαν, and having regenerated them by the Spirit to the adoption of sons, ἡπίους οἶδεν, finds them to be of a good disposition, and loves them,’ &c.

What difficulty could Mr. Gale find in apprehending the *regenerating of them by the Spirit* to be in the use of baptism; and in the same sense that our Saviour expressed, *Except any one be regenerated by water and the Spirit*? Is it because Clement does not mention the water at this place? But he does at forty other places; as in the same book, p. 133, ‘God has made man of the dust, regenerated him of water, perfected him by the Spirit, instructed him by his word,’ &c.

Mr. Gale says, ‘Here ἀναγεννήσας πνεύματι, I hope, cannot be thought to mean *baptized*, especially since it is said that those who are so regenerated are ἡπίοι.’ Is not such arguing intolerably impertinent? Does baptism hinder people from being good, meek, or humble?

The same Clement, Strom. 5, p. 552, for a proof

that the notion of *regenerating* by baptism is general, says; ἐπεὶ καὶ παρὰ τοῖς βαρβάρους φιλοσόφοις τὸ κατηχῆσαι τε καὶ φωτίσαι, ἀναγεννῆσαι λέγεται. ‘Since even among the heathen philosophers, to instruct and baptize, is called to regenerate.’ Mr. Gale, that he may turn this (which is indeed a proof of our sense of the word) to a proof against it, translates it, ‘to instruct and enlighten the understanding;’ not knowing, or not willing to own, that φωτίσαι in Clement and other the most ancient Christian writers, is used for baptizing. That Clement uses it so, is apparent from forty places; but particularly from one which Mr. Gale saw, and quoted a little before a part of the paragraph, in the story of the young man whom St. John recovered from his lost condition. The first part of that story was, that St. John committed him to a bishop, who (as St. Clement relates it) took him home to him, educated and instructed him, &c., καὶ τὸ τελευταῖον ἐφώτισε, ‘and at last baptized him.’ And (that Mr. Gale may be sure that is the meaning) the next words are; ‘but after that remitted of his care; for that he had now given him the perfect preservative, the seal of our Lord.’

And that the heathens did use a baptism, such as St. Clement here speaks of, and did call it *regeneration*, he saw in that passage of Tertullian, (which I cited, *De Baptismo*, cap. 5, ‘Tinguntur, idque se in regenerationem et impunitatem perjuratorum suorum agere præsumunt.’ ‘They are baptized: and say they do it for their regeneration,’ &c. And adds afterwards; ‘This is the aim of the Devil imitating the things of God.’ By which he must refer to the *Jewish* baptism.

Page 516. He brings a place of Origen on John, p. 124, and gives a translation of it at large. But to what purpose in this question, no reader can guess. There is nothing in it against, but rather for, the notion of regeneration by the Christian baptism. The substance of it is, that as the cures wrought by our Saviour on the *bodies* of men did promote a *spiritual* good; inasmuch as they invited to the faith those who were benefited by them; so the baptism of *water* is, even of itself, a principle of heavenly gifts to him that yields himself up to the divine power of the invocations of the adorable Trinity. That the Spirit came upon those who were baptized, as is related in the *Acts*, so visibly (the water preparing a way for him in those who came in sincerity) that Simon Magus being amazed, &c. That the baptism of John was inferior to that of Jesus. That the effect of *regeneration* was not had with John, but with Jesus baptizing by his disciples. Then follow the last words, ‘ And it (*viz.*, *the Christian baptism*) is called the washing of *regeneration*, being performed with the renewing of the Spirit; who being the Spirit of God, is now also carried (or moveth) upon the face of the water, but does not come upon all men after the water.’

The term *regeneration* is here mentioned. But is it not here, as it is every where else, referred to *baptism*? Mr. Gale does not tell us what he cited this sentence for. If he lays his stress upon the last words, which he translates, ‘ which is now also preferred above the water,’ (as if that were any news, that the Spirit of God is preferable to the water,) that, though undoubtedly true, is a mis-

taken and ignorant translation of Origen's words here. For ἐπιφερομένου ἐπάνω τοῦ ὕδατος does not signify that; but is a recital of that expression, Gen. i. 2, καὶ Πνεῦμα Θεοῦ ἐπεφέρετο ἐπάνω τοῦ ὕδατος: *And the Spirit of God moved upon the face of the water.* Origen meaning to express how in the sacrament of baptism the Holy Spirit is present and does ratify the promises thereof, does (in allusion to that Scripture phrase, of his being at the creation *carried* (or moving) *upon the face of the water*) speak of it as being so in the case of baptism also. Τοῦ καὶ νῦν ἐπιφερομένου: 'who is now also, i. e. in this case also of baptism, accompanying the water.' But to say, that 'now also (i. e. in the administration of baptism also) the Spirit of God is preferred above the 'water,' is too insipid a sense for Mr. Gale to ascribe to Origen. And if it were the sense, it avails nothing to the proof of that which he brings it for, viz., that Origen mentions here *regeneration* without connoting baptism; for it is the *baptismal regeneration* that he is speaking of.

Thus I have had the patience to follow him, and trace all the quotations he has brought against me; which, after all, do prove utterly impertinent to the purpose he brings them for. And indeed it was impossible to disprove a thing so certainly true, as this is; that this word is constantly used by the ancients with a relation to *baptism*. Or if there were, among thousands of instances, one or two where that sense did not appear, (as it happens in the case of almost all words, that a man may light on some few places where they are used in an odd and improper sense,) yet that ought not to be accounted sufficient to overthrow a general rule.



The sense was so known and universally received both in the Greek and Latin church, (which concurrence of the two churches in the use of their phrases does not happen always,) that a writer citing a place out of another author, or out of the Scriptures, will sometimes (quoting by memory) use one of those words, where his author had used the other. As Clement, in one or two of the places which I have recited, quoting the Scripture where Christ was *baptized* by John, expresses it, '*regenerated* by him.' And St. Hierome does the same. And so on the other side, The Constitutions, lib. vi. cap. 15, citing John iii. 5, *Except any one be born of water, &c.*, expresses it; λέγει γὰρ ὁ Κύριος, ἐὰν μὴ τις βαπτισθῆ ἐξ ὕδατος, &c. 'The Lord says, *Except any one be baptized with water and the Spirit.*'

Beside the drudgery, I must bear with his reproaches :

Page 518. 'And now could any body, sir, that had read these passages, fairly pretend, &c. If Mr. Wall had not read these books, he ought not so readily, &c. If he has read them, what excuse can be framed for him ?'

I have read so much of them, that I am sure of one of these things; that either he has not read them any other way than by *indices*; or else does not understand them; or else against his conscience faces out a sense contrary to what he sees in them. For in several of these places which he cites, the sentences before, or after, make it palpable that this word is taken in that sense against which he contends. Most that he here brings are out of Clemens Alexandrinus. No writer can shew the sense in which he takes the word *regenerated* more clearly

or positively. To give one instance; to which others, if they be searched, will prove like. Mr. Gale brings a passage out of his *Pædagog.* lib. i. p. 90, where he would pervert the sense, as I shewed just now. If he had read on, he could not have mistaken. For in the next page but one, p. 92, where Clement disputes against some who pretended that baptism does not put us into a complete state of Christianity, (they required something else; I know not what,) he has such sayings as these; ἀναγεννηθέντες οὖν εὐθέως, &c. ‘When we are regenerated, (by which he means plainly there, *baptized*,) we presently receive the perfection, &c. When our Lord was baptized, αὐτὸς καὶ γοῦν βαπτίζομένῳ τῷ Κυρίῳ, presently came the voice from heaven, declaring him *the beloved*, &c. Let us then ask these wise men; was Christ, as soon as he was *regenerated*, ἀναγεννηθείς, perfect, or not, &c. As soon as baptized by John, he is perfect, &c. He is perfect by the laver alone; and sanctified by the coming of the Holy Spirit on him.’ And a little after. Ὁ μόνον ἀναγεννηθείς, ὡσπεροῦν καὶ τοῦνομα ἔχει. καὶ φωτισθείς, &c. ‘He that is once regenerated (as the name of that thing is) and enlightened, is presently freed from darkness, (or the state of darkness,) and receives from that time light, (or the state of light).’

Beside that the words *baptized* and *regenerate* are here used promiscuously; and that Christ himself is here said to be *regenerated* (which it were blasphemy to assert in any other sense than *baptized*); here are the very terms of the question. ‘Regeneration,’ Clement says, ‘is the *name* for baptism.’ Which is the direct contradictory of what Mr. Gale would prove out of him.

This question, whether the word *regeneration* does always imply *baptism*, is but subservient to the main question; whether infants were at this time baptized. But there is in this same *Pædagog.* of Clement, lib. iii. c. 11. p. 247, a passage which speaks of them not only as baptized then in Clement's time, (after the apostles 90,) but also as baptized in the apostles' time, and by the apostles. I am ashamed I had not found it, when I published my *collection* of such passages. I have been lately advertised of it by learned men. I shall not recite it here; but in an *appendix* at the end of this defence, which shall contain that, and one or two more quotations fit to be added in another edition of my 'History of Infant-baptism;' if it ever have another<sup>a</sup>.

Page 518. Mr. Gale says of me; 'What excuse can be framed for him? For it is apparent from these instances, &c., that the most ancient Fathers, by *regeneration* mean something *spiritual* and *internal*, and very different from *baptism*.'

Now the dream is out. It seems he has disputed against *regeneration* in baptism all this while; as supposing that there is not, or that we hold that there is not, any thing *spiritual* or *internal* in baptism. Whether any book whatever could have taught this man modesty, civility, or humility, I know not. But a catechism (if his mother had had the grace to teach him it) would have instructed him, that the sacrament of baptism consists of two parts: 'the *outward visible* sign; and the *inward spiritual*

[<sup>a</sup> This is added to the third and the present edition, forming the ninth section of the third chapter. See vol. i. p. 84, &c.]

‘ grace ;’ the one done, or used, by men, by Christ’s appointment ; the other conferred by his own merciful covenant and promise. The Fathers take it no otherwise. All Christians, protestants and papists, take it no otherwise. If he had ever been at church, and had seen any person, adult or infant, baptized ; the sentences, prayers, and thanksgivings, used in that office, do all express this. He has so long studied what βαπτίζω signifies in the heathen poets, when they talk of *washing* wool, &c., that he has quite forgot what it imports in the Scripture and in the Fathers ; when it is a holy sacrament, and the outward action is attended with God’s heavenly grace and mercy, putting the person into a new spiritual state. So here is half his book written on a wrong and ignorant supposition ; and must be begun again.

Since this testimony, concerning *infants regenerated unto God by Christ*, is taken from Irenæus ; I had shewed that, as the other Fathers, so he particularly does in all other places of his book, which I had seen, use the word *regenerate* so as to include the notion of *baptism* in its signification. And I recited one place, lib. iii. c. 19, where he plainly does so. And Dr. Grabe had made the same observation on the same place.

Mr. Gale,

Page 518, 519, insults me, as having not read the several places where Irenæus has the word. And for the place which I had cited, attacks Dr. Grabe for understanding it so. ‘ I am surprised that the ‘ learned Dr. Grabe should refer to it also with the ‘ same design as our author.’—ὁς τὴν Ἀθήνῳ.

There is no dealing with such a face, but reciting

again the passage. The title of the chapter is, ‘De eo, qui descendit in ipsum, Spiritu. Of the ‘*Spirit* which came down on Jesus.’ It is to be noted that the *Cerinthian* and the *Valentinian* heretics divided *Christ* from *Jesus*; and said, that *Jesus*, of himself, was a mere man; but that at his baptism *Christ* (meaning a Divine power, or a Divine person) came down upon him. Irenæus maintains the Scripture doctrine, that *Jesus* and *Christ* are the same one person; and that *the Holy Spirit* came down upon him. And the substance of the chapter is, to recite such texts of Scripture, as do teach us the nature of *the Holy Spirit*. It begins thus:

‘The apostles might have said, that Christ came down upon Jesus, &c.—But they neither knew of, nor said any such thing, &c.—But what was true, that they said, *That the Spirit of God came down upon him like a dove.* That Spirit, which was spoken of by Isaiah, *The Spirit of the Lord shall rest upon him.* And again, *The Spirit of the Lord is upon me; because the Lord hath anointed me.* That Spirit, of which our Lord says, *It is not you that speak, but the Spirit of your Father which speaketh in you.* Et iterum, potestatem regenerationis in Deum demandans discipulis, dicebat eis; euntes docete omnes gentes, baptizantes eos in nomine Patris, et Filii, et Spiritus Sancti.’ And again, when he (Christ) gave his disciples the commission of *regenerating* unto God; he said to them, *Go and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit.*’

He goes on to recite ten or twenty texts more,

where *the Spirit* is mentioned, as Joel ii. Ps. li. Acts ii. John xiv. &c.

Now that in this text of Matt. xxviii. 19, (where he observes that *the Holy Spirit* is one of the Divine persons, in whose name we are baptized,) that commission which he calls the commission of *regenerating unto God*, is the commission of *baptizing*, is so plain by the very words of the sentence itself, *baptizing them in the name*, &c., that instead of spending time in proving it, or in answering the cavils that he raises from some words of the other texts, not at all pertinent to the explication of this. I shall only desire any one to read them, as a specimen of the property of an everlasting caviller against things that are plain.

He observes that Irenæus, commenting upon other texts recited in the same chapter, speaks of this Holy Spirit ‘working in men the will of God, and ‘renewing them *a vetustate in novitatem Christi*, ‘from their old (or natural) state to a new state in ‘Christ.’ No doubt but these are offices and operations of the Holy Spirit, wrought partly in baptism, and partly at other times. But none of his offices have, in the phrase of the ancients, the name of *regenerating*, except those which he does at baptism. At another place in the same chapter, Irenæus says, ‘Our bodies have received that union ‘which is to immortality by the laver (or *washing*) ‘but our souls by the Spirit. So that both of them ‘are necessary; since both do profit us to the life ‘of God.’ Upon which Mr. Gale says, this shews that ‘he argues here chiefly upon that which is ‘spiritual; and implies the regeneration he has before spoken of was such.’ If that will do his cause

any service, we will grant, that both of these together do constitute and make up the *regeneration*; and no doubt but the office of the Holy Spirit is by far the *chief* of the two.

Dr. Grabe in his notes on this place of Irenæus, where infants are said to be *regenerated to God*, (by which, he, as I think all that know the ancient phrase, understands *baptized*,) did in confirmation of that sense refer to another book, where Irenæus uses the same phrase and applies it to baptism, viz., lib. i. c. 18.

There Irenæus relates, how corrupt and abominable doctrines the *Valentinians* held concerning the sacrament of baptism. It is to be noted, that they called baptism *redemption*; or (as some of them seem by Irenæus' words to have explained themselves) the outward part they called *baptism*; and the inward and spiritual grace *redemption*. And he says, they had as many several ways of this redemption, as there were leaders or mystagogues among them. But all so corrupt, that he affirms (and says it will appear when he comes to refute their particular tenets) that 'this sort (or generation of heretics) has been sent out by Satan *εἰς ἐξάρνησιν τοῦ βαπτίσματος τῆς εἰς Θεὸν ἀναγεννήσεως, καὶ πάσης τῆς πίστεως ἀπόθεσιν*, for the frustrating of the *baptism of regeneration to God*, and 'the destruction of the whole faith, (or Christian religion).'

This phrase, where Irenæus calls the regular Christian baptism (which the *Valentinians* went about to corrupt and alter) *the baptism of regeneration to God*, Dr. Grabe referred to, as confirming that sense of the other place (where infants

are said to be *regenerated to God*) to be, that they were baptized, and had that their *regeneration*, which Irenæus mentions, by baptism.

Pages 520, 521. Mr. Gale faces it out to that most learned, judicious, and modest person; ‘It is, ‘I think, directly to the contrary sense.’ And that, for no better reason than that Irenæus does not here say, that baptism *is* regeneration; but only calls it ‘the baptism *of* regeneration.’ Let the reader scan this reason, and be amazed at the degree of assurance of this man.

Irenæus says in the next words, that the *Valentinians* do say, that this *redemption* of theirs (i. e. those profane and blasphemous rites which they set up instead of the Christian baptism, and of which I gave some account in my book) ‘is necessary for ‘all that have received the perfect *γνώσις* (all true ‘Gnostics), that they may be *regenerated* unto that ‘power which is above all.’ By which they meant a power, or God, far above the God of the Christians, the maker of the world.

Here Mr. Gale says; ‘This being said of those ‘who deny baptism, the word *regenerated* cannot ‘mean *baptized*.’

But cannot he see, that though they denied (or frustrated) the true Christian baptism, (as Irenæus in the words before charges them,) they set up ceremonies and forms of words, to be used with the water, which they called the true baptism, and *redemption*, and that which gave them the true *regeneration*?

By this we may see that these heretics as well as the catholics (and as we have seen before, the Jews and heathens) did attribute to their several *baptisms*



the name and power of *regeneration*. So general was this notion.

Mr. Gale perusing the account of the fancies of these heretics, catches hold of another twig. They said, ‘Baptism is of the *Jesus* that was visible, for ‘forgiveness of sins; but *redemption* is of the *Christ* ‘that came down upon him, for perfection.’ (This, by the way, shews who they were, whom Clement speaks of in the place I recited just now, that said baptism alone did not make us *perfect* Christians, without some other rites; the *Valentinians* said, their mysterious words and rites were needful for *perfection*.) They said moreover, that ‘one of ‘these (*baptism*) is a carnal thing; the other ‘(their *redemption*) is a spiritual thing.’ Mr. Gale says, ‘This sufficiently distinguishes *baptism* from ‘*redemption*.’

So it does. Just as he did even now; when he said, p. 518, ‘The ancient Fathers by *regeneration* ‘mean something spiritual and internal, and very ‘different from *baptism*.’ It looks as if he meant these for his ‘ancient Fathers.’ For I know of none but them and himself, that have taken baptism for only the outward (or as they call it, *carnal*) action; or that argued, as he does, any thing ‘spiritual and ‘internal’ to be ‘very different from baptism.’ And since, as they divided *redemption* from *baptism*, so they did *Jesus* from *Christ*; even let him take them. And let him make much of them; for none in all antiquity talk of baptism so like him as they do.

At the foot of this account, p. 521, he is, he says, ‘pretty well assured (I never knew him otherwise) ‘that this word does never in Irenæus mean *baptize*.’

Yet he begins again ;—having found out of himself two places in Irenæus, where this word is. One, lib. iv. c. 59, the other, lib. v. c. 15.

The latter of these, nothing but an extraordinary fit of honesty could make him publish. Irenæus is there speaking of Christ's curing the man born blind, by making clay with his spittle, and anointing his eyes, and bidding him wash, &c., and thus descants upon it; that as Christ, working the will of his Father, did at first make man's body of clay, so he here made, or repaired, the organs of sight with it. 'And because man, being in his first formation, in the human way of *generation*, formed (or born) in sin, did need the *washing* (or *laver*) of *regeneration*; after he had put the clay on his eyes, he said to him, Go to Siloam, and *wash*; restoring to him at once both the formation (viz., of his eyes) and the *regeneration* which is by *washing* (or the *laver*).'

If this washing was not to him the sacramental baptism; yet it is plain that Irenæus says what he says here, in allusion to it. In the same sense that it was a *regeneration*, it was a *baptism*: both perhaps but by way of allusion.

Mr. Gale comes here again with his quiddity; and says, *regeneration* which is *by* the *laver*, is different *from* the *laver*. Not minding that the force of his objection is equally taken off by its so accompanying the *laver*, as never to be without it in the sense of the ancients. He may see here, that they did not regard logical niceties of expression. That which is called in the first part of this sentence 'the *laver* of *regeneration*,' is two lines after styled '*regeneration by the laver*.'

In the other place, lib. iv. c. 59, I can sooner see that it makes nothing to Mr. Gale's sense, than I can, what sense it does make. The sentence is certainly mangled. The text, both in Feuardentius' and Dr. Grabe's edition; 'Quemadmodum [Dr. Grabe reads *quomodo*] autem relinquet mortis generationem, si non in novam generationem mire et inopinate a Deo, in signum autem salutis datam, quæ est ex virgine ( ) per fidem, regenerationem?' These are words that can have no construction at all<sup>b</sup>. If there be inserted (as Dr. Grabe guesses there should; and Mr. Gale makes it the text) within the *unci* which I have left, the words 'credens eam recipiat quæ est' it may be construed; but so as to have but a very obscure sense or emphasis; not to be understood, but by minding the title and scope of the chapter.

The chapter is against the *Ebionites*; whose infidelity consisted partly in disowning the Divine nature of our Saviour; and partly in disbelieving his birth of a virgin: they took him to be born and conceived in the ordinary way. The words immediately preceding these are of the necessity of our believing him to be God and man. 'How can they be saved, if he that on earth wrought their salvation were not God?' &c.

These words must be understood of the other point of their unbelief. And 'novam generationem' must mean that *new way of generation*, which God caused our Saviour to be conceived and born by. And the words, 'in signum salutis datam,' refer to that prophecy made to Ahaz, who for a *sign of his*

[<sup>b</sup> Compare the note at vol. iii. p. 522, where this proposed emendation is considered.]

*deliverance* had it said to him, Is. vii. 14, *The Lord himself shall give you a sign: behold a virgin shall conceive,* &c. And then I think it is;

‘How shall any one leave the generation of death (escape that death which attends the natural generation), if he do not (believing in that new way of generation which was given by God for a sign of salvation, to be in a miraculous and inconceivable manner by a virgin) receive that *regeneration* which is by the faith’ (or Christian creed, or belief)? If he do not receive that *regeneration* or baptism, which is, into the true faith, or creed? ‘To receive that regeneration which is by the faith,’ is a like phrase to that which he uses, lib. i. c. 1. *prope finem, τὸν κανόνα τῆς ἀληθείας—ὄν διὰ τοῦ βαπτίσματος εἴληφε*. ‘Who holds steadfast that rule of truth, which he received at his baptism.’ For all the creeds of the churches of catholics in those times, into which they were baptized, whatever article they omitted, had that of the *conception*, or *birth of a virgin*; and that the rather for the sake of these *Ebionites*, who had begun in the apostles’ time; Irenæus’ admonition to them to ‘receive their *regeneration* by,’ or according to, the *faith*, or belief of Christians, may well enough be understood to be, by baptism into the true faith. Mr. Bingham and others have shewn, that *πίστις*, *the faith*, is a common name for the creed.

However, if Mr. Gale (who gives no paraphrase or explication at all, how this sentence is to be applied to the *Ebionites*) do not approve of this, one instance, in a sentence which has been so mangled,

‘ [Page 44 in Grabe’s edition: but in the Benedictine, chap. ix. sect. 4. p. 47.]

cannot set aside a general rule, otherwise known, concerning the use of a word. The next words are, ‘What adoption shall they have of God, if ‘they continue in that generation (or birth) which ‘is according to man (or natural to man) in this ‘world?’

Page 523. Here Mr. Gale concludes more modestly than ordinary; and the assurance sinks in one and the same sentence, from a very high to a very low pitch. ‘If there should be *some* instances, ‘where it (regeneration) does *sometimes* signify baptism; there are *many more*, or at least *some*, where ‘it plainly signifies quite another thing.—If it ‘does not mean baptism *always*; then *perhaps* it ‘may not in this place.’ How, alas! is this Mr. Gale altered from that Mr. Gale who in the page before was so *assured*!

I gave this for one reason that Irenæus, when he speaks of infants *regenerated*, must mean *baptized*; because an infant is not capable of regeneration in any other sense of the word.

He answers first, ‘This is only begging the ‘question.’ Which is a term that he gives to any argument, when he has nothing else to say. He seems not to know what a ‘*petitio principii*’ is; for here is no sign of it.

But he says, I have contradicted this myself at another place, where I say, ‘God does by his Spirit ‘at the time of *baptism* seal and apply to the infant ‘that is there dedicated to him, the promises of the ‘covenant of which he is capable, viz., adoption, ‘pardon of sin, translation from the state of nature ‘into a state of grace,’ &c. [vol. i. p. 281.]

He understands no better what is a ‘contradiction,’

and what not; than he does a ‘*petitio principii.*’ To say, that an infant may be regenerated by *baptism*, or *at the time of baptism*, by such graces or favours of God, as I there mentioned, [vol. i. p. 79.] bestowed on him in that sacrament; but is not capable of it in any other sense of the word, than as it signifies the *grace of baptism*, is nothing like a contradiction. Especially when I added at that very place (what he in reciting my words omits) — ‘in any other sense of the word than as it signifies baptism; I mean, the outward act of baptism accompanied with that grace or mercy of God, whereby he admits them into covenant, though without any sense of theirs.’ His *epiphonema*, ‘How came Mr. Wall to be so overseen, as to say,’ &c., returns on himself. And this argument alone, without fetching proofs of the meaning of the word *regenerate* from other places, sufficiently proves that it must mean *baptized* here; because none of the modern notions of the word can be applied to *infants*.

I have done with his objections against that sense of the word; and must take notice of an omission of his. I there cited the sayings of several Fathers, Gregory Nazianzen, St. Hierome, St. Austin; which do exclude any conversion, repentance, &c., that is not accompanied with baptism, from being signified by the name of *regeneration*. Such sayings as these; Gregory says; ‘There is not another *regeneration* to be had afterward [after baptism], though it be sought with never so much crying and tears.’ Though the next words do shew ‘there is *repentance* after baptism.’ St. Austin, speaking of sins after baptism, says, ‘Such are not to be done away by

‘*regeneration* ; but by some other way of cure.’ And some more such.

Now for Mr. Gale to write forty pages, as he does here, of ‘*reflections*’ upon a chapter of mine, which had but four and a half in all ; and yet say nothing to those quotations that nailed the matter closest, is like the ‘*notæ variorum*’ on some books, which explain largely all the easier passages, but let the hardest alone.

And I must also needs tell him, that such ways of answering books as he takes, to fill so many pages with an answer to so few, (as we are now at his four hundred ninety-eighth [five hundred and twenty-third] page, in answer to my twentieth [seventy-ninth,]) are what we use to account cowardly. His book goes no farther in any methodical way of answering mine, than to the first two chapters, (which I owned had no *express* mention of infant-baptism,) and three more. He speaks of somebody that is to write a full answer to it<sup>d</sup>. If they write in his long declaiming way, the book will be unanswerable indeed ; not for the strength, but for the bulk of it : as the Turks conquer their enemies, by thrusting on so many of their men to be killed by them, as shall blunt their swords, and tire them out with killing.

Page 524. If nothing will do ; but infants by the testimony of Irenæus must be baptized ; he will dispute the last inch of ground ; and question, who are *infants*. If *regenerate* do signify here, as it generally uses to do ; the term *infant* must not. He says now, that ‘the whole business between

<sup>d</sup> [See vol. iii. p. 13.]

‘ us is reduced to this ; to determine the period of ‘ infancy.’

We thought we had known that ; that *infants* are persons below the age of reason, faith, &c. And he will not deny that to be the ordinary meaning of the word. But he will persuade us that Irenæus took the word in a sense by himself ; to denote not only such young infants, as are incapable of knowing and believing the principles of Christian religion ; ‘ not only those of two or three months, or years,’ &c., but to comprehend ‘ such as can know, and believe, ‘ and make a profession of their faith.’ And that he may be noted for saying the most paradoxical thing that ever was said ; he says, ‘ it may very well mean ‘ *only* such.’

He makes an attempt to persuade us, that *infancy* extends to *fourteen* years of age ; having found an odd sort of dictionary<sup>e</sup> that tells of somebody that used the word so. But he stands to it, that it reaches to *ten* years.

He does not produce any author that ever used to speak so. He brings indeed some quotations concerning certain cases, where in a general and indefinite way of speaking, the words *πάσης ηλικίας*, *omnis ætatis*, *of all ages*, have been sometimes used by authors, where yet it is plain by circumstances they did not mean to include *infants*. And because they were not meant there ; he would have us think that Irenæus here, though mentioning expressly them among the rest that were baptized (‘ Infants, ‘ and little children, and boys, and youths,’ &c.) yet did not mean *infants* properly so called ; nor

<sup>e</sup> [Danet’s Dictionarium Antiquitatt. Græc. et Roman.]



that any under ten years old were baptized. But those instances which he brings are very different ways of speaking from this. He finds Origen speaking of some who ἐκ παιδων καὶ πρώτης ἡλικίας ‘from ‘their childhood and first age, are called to do ‘the works,’ &c. Nobody by those words would understand *infants*. But Irenæus mentions them particularly.

He says, that Irenæus in his Epistle to Florinus, mentioning the time when he heard Polycarp, calls it the time of his πρώτη ἡλικία. That is a mistake. He does not use that word, (and if he had, it had been nothing to the purpose,) but παῖς ὧν ἔτι, ‘being ‘but a boy;’ and afterward, αἱ ἐκ παιδων μαθήσεις, ‘what we learn, when we are boys.’ But that is no otherwise than everybody speaks. Irenæus reckons here, under *boys*, little children; and *infants* under them.

In short, Mr. Gale does not bring any thing that makes the least appearance that *infantes* in this place should mean any otherwise than it does in ordinary speech and everywhere; except that observation which he makes at

Page 526; which is indeed an acute one, though not solid. Irenæus, in reckoning the steps or periods of human age, happens to use five words and no more; *infants*, *little ones*, *children*, *youths*, *elder* (or mature) *men*: (it is likely he would have used more, if more words had readily occurred to him at that time:) which several steps of age Christ, he says, did in person go through, that he might *save* and *regenerate* all human persons of those several ages. And following on his discourse of Christ’s age, in order to confute the *Valentinian* heretics,

who said that he lived but one year after his baptism; he argues *ab absurdo*, that if that were true, then Christ at his baptism being but in the beginning of his thirtieth year, would have been but full thirty when he suffered; and so would have died being yet a young man, not arrived at a mature age: for at the age of thirty any one is counted but a youth, or young man; and that appellation of *a youth* continues, Irenæus says, till a man be forty. Then after the fortieth or fiftieth year one declines to an elderly age; which elderly age our Saviour, he says, was of, when he taught, or was a teacher. The words must be set down.

‘Quia autem triginta annorum ætas prima indolis  
 ‘est juvenis [l. *juventus*] et extenditur usque ad  
 ‘quadragesimum annum, omnis quilibet confitebi-  
 ‘tur. A quadragesimo autem et quinquagesimo  
 ‘anno declinat jam in ætatem seniore[m]; quam ha-  
 ‘bens dominus noster docebat<sup>f</sup>.’

Now Mr. Gale,—because here are five periods named; and one of them, viz., that of *juventus*, youth, is measured by Irenæus at ten years from thirty to forty;—thinks that he would have measured all the rest so. And consequently the first of them, *infantes*, must have ten years allotted to it. And then his speaking of ‘infants regenerated,’ will (though *regenerated* do mean *baptized*) infer no more than this; that some infants, viz., some persons that were ten years old, were baptized. Which

[<sup>f</sup> Irenæus, lib. ii. c. 39. edit. Grabe, lib. ii. c. 22. sect. 5. edit. Benedict.—The Benedictine editor corrects Dr. Grabe’s misconception of the construction of the passage, and thereby shews that we have no occasion to adopt Dr. Wall’s proposed change, of *juvenis* into *juventus*.]

he thinks might be upon their own faith and profession; for that some children of ten years old might by the help of an early and careful education attain to such understanding, knowledge, and faith, as is necessary for adult baptism.

This calculation (beside that such consequences as he draws from it, would not follow from it, if it were true) has two faults.

One, that Irenæus does not say what he makes him say. Mr. Gale says, that in Irenæus, '*juvenes*' extends to between thirty and forty; '*seniores*' between forty and fifty;' and adds, 'As he has thus assigned ten years to each of the last two stages; nothing can be more probable than that the first three were of the same length.' Now this is indeed true for one of the stages he mentions; but not of the other. *Juvenes* he does speak of, as extending from thirty to forty; but says no such thing of *seniores*; as any one will see by the words. And indeed it were absurd. For though it may properly enough be said, that at forty a man loses the name of *a young man*, and begins to be *a senior*; it were nonsense to say that at fifty he ceases to be *a senior*. For that name will continue to him as long as he lives; though it be fifty years longer. And besides, even of that stage of *juventus* he speaks uncertainly whether it should be extended to forty or to fifty.

Another fault of it is; that whereas Mr. Gale concludes by parity of reason, from Irenæus' assigning ten years to *youth*, that he would have assigned the like number to each of the other four; there is not a parity of reason in it. For one of these appellations to continue ten years, is agreeable

to common apprehension and the custom of speech. For the other to do so, is not. We, and all people, after we have begun to call any one *a young man*, do continue to give him that name for about ten years. When any child is new-born, we give him for some time the name of *an infant*; but do not continue to call him so for more than two or three years. Nobody styles a schoolboy, or catechumen, an infant. Or if they do, it is counted a straining of the word.

Besides: these passages in Irenæus (that, where he uses the five appellations aforesaid, and that, where he speaks of youth lasting ten years) are not nigh one another. He does not number five periods, and then quickly speak of the length of one of them; but after other long discourse intervening, at the end of the chapter, (when probably he had forgot how many words for the periods he had used,) being got into a dispute, whether Christ died a young man or not, speaks of the limits which common use gives to the name of youth. This last is in that part of the chapter which Mr. Gale just now would have proved to be spurious.

This exception, concerning the meaning of the word *infant*, would have been read by a hundred people without much regard, if it had not had a casual effect upon Mr. Whiston. He is used to ancient books and the phrase of them, too well to allow any of Mr. Gale's cavils against the book, or translation, or meaning of the word *regenerate*. But this device, of the division of the stages of man's life, and invention of a new set of *infants*, being surprising, pretty, and arithmetical, took with him so, as that he presently, from this place, and

from something in the *Constitutions*, took the hint of a new scheme of doctrine concerning baptism, neither to be administered in infancy, nor put off to adult age, (as the words are ordinarily taken,) but to be given between them both. And he says of himself thus; ‘This passage of Irenæus (as discoursed upon by the learned Mr. Gale) will be to me *ever* most remarkable; because it was the first occasion of my making the discoveries,’ &c. *Ever* is a long time. There may some other new passage or criticism happen.

For shewing the emptiness of this, when it comes to be weighed, I must refer to what I said above in answer to Mr. Whiston; who pretended to explain the term *infants* in some other Fathers, as Mr. Gale has done in Irenæus. I there made it appear, I think, how unnatural that explication is here; and utterly impossible to be fixed on the words of other Fathers, where he pretends to fix it. How impossible it is likewise to suppose that children of ten years should be generally, or in any considerable number, capable of baptism on their own profession. How unreasonable it is to take the *infants*, who, as Irenæus says, were baptized, or regenerated, to mean *only* those of about ten years old, (whom by this stretch of the word they will have to be so called,) with an exclusion of those who are certainly meant by the word. How Irenæus does not merely name *infants*, but adds such epithets as must include the youngest infants; ‘All whom he came to save’ (which particular, I see, Mr. Stokes also has observed upon this quotation, and has well enforced); and some other things which I there noted.

What I have to add is, that in reading Irenæus since, I have minded that in several places (in all where I can find the word) he takes the word *infant* in the same sense as we and all others do. And I know no other way to be sure of the meaning of any word in any author than to do as I did with the word *regenerate*, viz., observe how other writers of that time do use it; and how the author himself uses it at other places.

Tertullian and Origen lived at the same time with Irenæus; though he was older than either of them: and they both, though they differ from one another in resolving the question of infant-baptism, yet do agree in stating of it, viz., who are meant by infants. Tertullian describes them, ‘such as cannot yet learn; nor know Christ; nor whither it is that they are brought, when brought to baptism.’ Origen’s word is, ‘Nuper nati parvuli, ἀρτιγέννητα βρέφη, *new-born infants.*’ They neither of them seem to have any notion of Mr. Gale’s or Mr. Whiston’s infants. Much less can this be doubted of the following Fathers.

Irenæus himself uses the word *infants* (I mean his translator, who commonly keeps close to the very words of his author, and makes this the translation of βρέφος) in the case of a very young child, often; in the case of one of ten years old, never, that I know of.

Lib. i. cap. 11, when there is talk of the *ragitus* of new-born children, and the *Greek* is ἀρτι γεννώμενα βρέφη, the *Latin* is *infantes*.

Lib. iii. cap. 18, speaking of Christ, when forty days old, presented in the temple, he uses the word *infant*. And of the children murdered by Herod at Bethlehem, he says, ‘It was happy for them that

‘ they were born at that time; that he (Christ) while he was an *infant* might send before into his kingdom those infants slain upon his account, as martyrs,’ &c.

And, cap. 26, speaking of the child mentioned Isa. vii. 16, and reciting the words, *Butter and honey shall he eat, &c., before the child shall know to refuse the evil, and choose the good*; he says, ‘ *Hæc signa sunt hominis infantis*; these are properties of a human infant.’

But above all, the place itself (as I see upon reading it over again) affords a plain token, that by *infants* he means there such as have not yet the use of understanding. For he makes a remarkable difference between the infants and the rest, in the words which he immediately subjoins to each of the several sorts of persons there reckoned up.

After he had said of all of them in general; ‘ Sanctifying every age by the likeness that it has to him; for he came to save all persons by himself: all, I mean, who by him are regenerated unto God; infants, and little ones, and children (or boys), and young men, and elder men.’ Then he runs them all over again particularly, (save that under the name of *parvuli, little ones*, he includes those also whom he had called *pueros, boys*, (or *children*), and says of every sort, except the infants, that they had the benefit of *taking example* by the behaviour that Christ had shewn in those several periods of his age. The words are :

‘ Therefore he went through the several ages. For infants, he was made an infant, sanctifying infants.’ That is all he says of them.

‘ To little ones, he was made a little one; sancti-

‘fying those of that age.’ Now here he adds, ‘And  
‘also giving them an *example* of godliness, justice,  
‘and dutifulness.’

‘To young men, he was a young man; giving an  
‘*example* to young men, and sanctifying them to the  
‘Lord.’

‘So also to seniors, he was a senior; that he  
‘might be a perfect master to all; not only by  
‘teaching the truth, but as sanctifying the seniors  
‘also according to that age, being made an *example*  
‘to them likewise.’

There can be no reason why he should name the benefit of *example* to all the rest, who were capable by their age of taking or following an example, (not omitting the repetition of that word in any of their cases,) and should not say any thing of that benefit, when he speaks of the *infants* but this; that the persons he meant by *infants* were not capable of that lesson of imitation, (as the rest were,) being not yet come to the use of reason.

This Mr. Gale should have taken notice of, (which appears in the place itself,) if he desired to know how Irenæus took the word; and not have run to the end of the chapter, to find, by the space of the continuance of youth, who are infants. Especially Mr. Whiston should have examined the whole passage better, before he had changed his religion upon it.

Whereas in this recapitulation of the ages, he makes but four of them all, which he had just before expressed in five words; it is manifest that he had nothing in his mind of the nicety they dream of, to divide by those five words a man’s age into five decads; but used the words, more or fewer, as they



occurred to his mind. So that this ten years' infancy, as built on his words, is a groundless whimsey.

What Mr. Gale, p. 528, quotes from St. Austin, of a boy dying at seven years old, of whom his sister, a martyr, had dreamed, that she saw him carried to heaven; and St. Austin had a question put to him, how that could be, since there was no appearance in the story that he had been baptized, (the father being a heathen;) and St. Austin's answer, That possibly the thing was not true; or if true, it was not impossible that he might have been baptized by his own choice: Mr. Gale should have either told all the story as I (from whom he had it) did, or none of it. For it is one thing for a man, when he is put to a plunge in a question concerning an odd case, to say, 'Such a thing is not impossible;' and a very different thing, to think it to be ordinarily practicable. Irenæus does not speak of some one infant that was baptized, but of infants indefinitely as being ordinarily *regenerated* (or *baptized*).

---

### CHAP. XIII.

I HAD desired the favour from any of my readers, that if they lighted on any passage in any author of those times, making *for* or *against* infant-baptism, which I had missed, they would be so kind as to let me know it. Mr. Gale thinks he has found one, which he sends to me in print.

[P. 531.] Polycrates, bishop of Ephesus, about *ann. Dom.* 190, (who probably had Christian parents, for there had been seven of his kindred bishops,) says in a letter to Victor, bishop of Rome, 'that he 'was now sixty-five years old in the Lord.'

Mr. Gale thinks that expression ‘*in the Lord*’ plainly distinguishes between his natural age and ‘his age in the Lord.’

They are distinct in the nature of the things, for certain. And if Polycrates was not baptized in infancy, they must have been distinct in time by a considerable number of years; and he must have been now above eighty in all. But if he was baptized in infancy, his years from his natural birth, and his years in the Lord, ran parallel.

The question then remains, how old he was now in all; and whether he was baptized in infancy. And that is the question we began at; and Mr. Gale has nothing to say to it. If he was but sixty-five in all, (which is most probable,) he must have been baptized in infancy.

I did consider of this bishop’s case, and another, something more to the purpose than this, viz., Polycarp’s, when I was writing. They seemed to me (as for what weight they have either way) to make most *for* infant-baptism. But the arguments from them being not conclusive, I chose to omit them. But since he has proposed to consideration that which has the least weight of the two, I will mention the other.

Polycarp, constituted bishop of Smyrna by St. John, and who was probably that *angel* of that church, to whom the letter of Christ in the Apocalypse is directed, was martyred there *anno Domini* 147, as bishop Pearson has demonstrated the time. The proconsul offered him his life, ‘if he would curse (or revile) Christ.’ He answered, ‘Eighty-six years I have served him, and he never did me wrong.’ &c.

Now Mr. Gale must choose whether he will suppose him to have been fifteen or twenty years old, before he entered into the service of Christ, (i. e. before he was baptized,) and so above a hundred now, (which is not probable, since the history written by his people that saw him die, shews him to have had considerable strength of body at that time); or else, that his *service*, or dedication to Christ began in his infancy, i. e. that he was baptized then, and was now but eighty-six years old in all. Whichsoever it was, it was early in the apostolic age. He must have been in that bishopric about fifty years. For St. John, who placed him there, had been dead forty-six. His Christianity, and probably his life, began twenty-seven years after our Saviour's death. If his birth was twenty years before his baptism, he must now be a hundred and six years old, and must have been born but seven years after Christ's passion.

When I came in chapter fourth to speak of Tertullian and Origen, I gave the English reader some account of their character; that they were both very learned men, but both inclined to be singular in their opinions; and accordingly both fell into great and monstrous errors in the faith. And I instanced in the errors of each. But I said, they might however be cited as witnesses of the practice of the church in their times. Mr. Gale, at

Page 533, tells his *sir*, that I 'begin with lessening Tertullian's reputation;' and intimates that to be an artifice of mine, because his opinion was against infant-baptism.

If that *sir* of his be a schoolmaster, he will commend his scholar for this. For though the thing that I said be a known truth; a schoolboy in his

declamation must put the colour of false upon it, because it is his exercise and trial of skill; as a lawyer does in his pleading, because it is his trade. But is this fitting, where one seeks the truth in a matter of conscience? Is not the thing I said notoriously known to all men of reading? Was not *Montanism* as blasphemous an heresy as most of that time? Did not I advertise this in the case of Origen, who is *for* infant-baptism, as well as of Tertullian, who would have it left off in children that were not in present danger of death?

I mentioned Tertullian's speaking inconsistently with himself. As, at some places, if a person not yet baptized be ready to die, a layman must do the office of baptizing him; else he will be guilty of the person's perdition, or damnation. That it is 'a standing rule,' that none can be saved without baptism, grounded on that sentence of our Lord, *Except one be born of water, he has no life.* And he inveighs against some that said, 'Baptism was not necessary for those that have faith; faith is sufficient,' &c.

At other places he advises several sorts of people to delay baptism. Infants till they are grown up; and then farther, till they are married; and if they do not marry, or their consort die; then farther, till the danger of lust is over. And to encourage them, says, (the very thing he had condemned before,) 'An entire faith is secure of salvation.'

Mr. Gale would salve the contradiction by supposing that what he says of the necessity of baptism to salvation, is meant only in the case of adult persons; as many general sentences in Scripture are.

Then however, as to adult persons, such as widowers, widows, virgins, and all unmarried persons, he contradicts himself. But as to infants also; at one place his sentence is; ‘What need their *guiltless* age make such haste to the forgiveness of sins?’ In another book he determines, that all infants of heathens are unclean. And infants of Christians are *holy*, or *saints*, only inasmuch as they are ‘designed for holiness,’ or saintship: for that the apostle, who calls them so, knew well enough what our Lord had determined; *Except any one be born of water, &c., he shall not enter, &c.,* ‘that is,’ says Tertullian, ‘he shall not be *holy*, or a *saint*.’ And he concludes; ‘Thus every soul is reckoned as in *Adam*, so long till it be enrolled in *Christ*; and so long unclean, till it be so enrolled; and *sinful* because unclean.’ That infants before baptism are *sinful* and yet *guiltless*, is a contradiction too plain.

It is in vain for Mr. Gale to recite, as he does here, several propositions expressed universally, in which yet infants are not meant. For Tertullian is here speaking of their case particularly; of the state of their birth from *Adam*. And applies to them, even to the seed of the faithful, that sentence of our Lord, John iii. 5. He states the case of their birth thus: heathen men’s infants are unclean by birth; Christian men’s infants, though they have an advantage by birth, yet till baptized, are not *holy*, or *saints*. This appears plainly his decision, to any one that reads the places I there produced. Some divines go a shorter way, and say, they are *born holy*.

Page 535. To the argument of the paedobaptists,

that Tertullian's words, even while he brings his objections against infant-baptism, do shew that it was practised by the church at that time, Mr. Gale answers; 'that it at most only proves, there were ' some persons at that time, who among many other ' wild notions were *about* to introduce this. Not ' that it was the opinion of the church, or that they ' practised infant-baptism.'

Does not Tertullian plainly ask, why they *did* it? Does he not mention the godfathers, &c.?

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 he not 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. He never saw an edition of his works without a large catalogue of his *paradoxa*. If there had been any church in Tertullian's time (especially at or near Carthage, where he lived) that had not practised infant-baptism, St. Cyprian, and his fellow-bishops, who fifty years after being assembled at that place, had a question put to them concerning the baptizing of a child before the eighth day, would have had some among them (one at least of the sixty-six) that would have remembered it; and would have been less positive, that it must, if in danger of death, be baptized before the eighth day; and that the salvation of the child did depend upon it. Some of these bishops must have lived there in

Tertullian's time, which was but fifty years before. But St. Cyprian says, there was not one of the sixty-six but what held the baptism of it necessary. By which we may be sure that the contrary tenet was Tertullian's singular opinion.

St. Austin also was a bishop in the same province. He had not heard of Tertullian's opinion; (for he says, he had never read or heard of any that denied the baptism of infants to be for forgiveness.) He could not have missed of hearing or knowing it, if it had been so lately the practice of that church wherein himself was conversant. It is possible that one single man's opinion may be unheard of or forgotten; but not the general practice of a church. These things Mr. Gale saw largely made out, and the quotations of their sayings in my book.

As to the question, whether Tertullian would have the baptism of infants delayed only in case of no danger of death; I shewed that to be the explication of his words given by several of all parties; Vasquez, Baxter, Tombes, Danvers; and I think by all, till Rigaltius set forth an edition of his works, and left out the words 'si non tam necesse.' Which were in the first edition that ever was printed, and in Pamelius' edition.

Mr. Gale [p. 536.] says, that Rigaltius in his first edition, 1634, gives for a reason of his omitting them, that 'the copies differ.'

He says no such thing in his second edition, 1640<sup>g</sup>; nor gives any reason at all. And if in his first (which I have not) he give only those general words, and do not name the particular copies, which

<sup>g</sup> [Nor in his *first*. See the note at vol. iii. p. 536.]

leave out that clause, we know not of what credit they are. He that alters the text in any book ought to give good reasons or authorities for so doing; especially if he be a man that otherwise appears to have a bias for a side; as I, and not only I, but much greater men, whom I quote, have shewn Rigaltius in this case to have; though nobody denies him his deserved reputation of great learning.

Mr. Gale says, ‘Pamelius had it only from Gagnæus.’ Whom should the succeeding editors of books have their authority from, but from the first editors? Rigaltius had his, as far as appears, from nobody at all<sup>h</sup>.

<sup>h</sup> [With reference to this passage of Tertullian, adduced by Dr. Wall in vol. i. p. 98, objected to by Mr. Gale in vol. iii. p. 536. and here defended,—I have examined all the editions of that Father which I could meet with, and subjoin the readings of each as follows :

1. The *first* edition of the author, folio, *Basilea*, 1521, by B. Rhenanus, does not contain the treatise *De Baptismo*.
2. Edit. Jo. Gagnæi, fol. *Parisiis*, 1545, reads, ‘Quid enim necesse ‘ si non tam necesse est sponsores etiam periculo integri’ (sic).  
N.B. This is the earliest edition containing the treatise *De Baptismo*, which, with several others, Gagnæus printed from a manuscript belonging to the antiquary John Leland.
3. Edit. S. Galenii, fol. *Basilea*, 1562, omits the disputed clause.
4. Edit. Renati de la Barre, fol. *Parisiis*, 1580, omits the clause, observing in a note that the MSS. vary.
5. Edit. Pamelii, fol. *Franckeræ*, 1597, contains the clause; and in his notes the editor defends it, not only by the authority of Gagnæus, but by a manuscript.
6. Edit. Pamelii repetita, fol. *Paris*. 1598.—follows the preceding.
7. Edit. De la Cerda, 2 voll. fol. *Parisiis*, 1624, 1630, contains the clause, and defends it, from MSS.

N.B. The first volume of this edition sometimes wears a reprinted title, with the date of 1641.



Mr. Gale treats the sentence, if it have those words, ‘*Quid enim necesse, si non tam necesse:—*’ ‘What need is there, except in case of necessity?’ as absurd.

But that is his arrogant way. Tertullian says a little before, of lay-baptism, that there is no need of it, except in case of necessity. And Mr. Gale might burlesque that saying just as he does this.

He says here, that I have it from bishop Fell, that Tertullian was as much against the baptism of unmarried persons as of infants.

I think he dreams. What need I have from bishop Fell that for which I recited Tertullian’s own words? The very next words to his dissuasive from baptizing infants are, ‘*Non minori de causa,*’ &c. ‘For no less reason unmarried persons ought to be kept off.’ Mr. Gale says, ‘He opposes that upon quite different topics.’ I grant it; but he says, the topics or reasons for one are as good as for the other. Indeed neither of them good for any

8. Edit. Rigaltii, fol. *Parisiis*, 1634, omits the clause, but has not a word of observation upon it.

9. Edit. Rigaltii repetita, fol. 1640. Dr. Wall quotes in the text. I have not seen it.

10. Edition of the notes of Pamelius adjusted to Rigaltius’ edition of the text, fol. *Paris*. 1635, contains the clause, and defends it, from the early editions.

11. Edit. Pamelii repetita, fol. *Rothomagi*, 1662, contains, and defends it, as before.

12. Edit. Priorii (Le Prieur) fol. *Parisiis*, 1664, 1668, or 1675, omits it: and does not notice the variety of reading on the place.

13. Edit. Semleri, Svo. *Hala*, 1770, &c., omits the clause in the text, but prints it as a various reading.]

thing. Would any man paraphrase, (as Tertullian does,) *Suffer little children to come to me*, ‘i. e. Keep ‘them away, because they are as yet little children?’

Page 537, he recites some sayings of Tertullian, and some of Scripture; which speak of some properties and advantages of adult baptism, which cannot indeed be applied to the case of infants at the time of their baptism.

But this does not at all prove that infants can have no spiritual advantages by baptism; though they have not all the very same with the adult. Tertullian says, ‘Baptism is the seal of faith,’ &c. Does not Mr. Gale remember that St. Paul says just the same of circumcision? *a seal of the righteousness of faith*. The descants he makes upon this, will as soon prove St. Paul denied infant-circumcision.

Ibid. Whereas I (having prepared a collection of the interpretations given by the ancients of that text, I Cor. vii. 14, most of whom do interpret the holiness (or saintship) there spoken of, to be baptismal holiness) did here observe that Tertullian in one of the places here cited, viz., *de Anima*, c. 39, 40, does so interpret it; only he differs from the rest in that he thinks the apostle speaks of that baptismal holiness, not as then belonging to the infants when born, but designed for them. Having cited this place, as saying, that of either parent *sanctified* (or Christian) the children that are born are *sancti*, *saints*, (or *holy*.) he corrects himself; and says, the apostle there by his word *sancti*, *saints*, would have us understand, *sanctitati designati*, *designed* by their parents *for saintship*; and I said,

his words here do shew that he means, ‘when they ‘ come to be baptized :’—

Mr. Gale here answers, ‘I do not see Tertullian ‘ gives any intimation that he understood this pas- ‘ sage to relate to baptism at all.’

I suppose he thought the reader might want one instance more of the laudable faculty he has of manfully denying things that are before his face. Tertullian having said that by *sancti, holy*, in that text, must be meant *sanctitati designati*, gives for his reason; that the apostle ‘meminerat Dominicæ ‘ definitionis, &c., knew well enough what our Lord ‘ had determined, *Except one be born of water and ‘ the Spirit, he shall not enter,*’ &c., that is, says Ter- tullian, ‘non erit sanctus, he shall not be holy.’ This is what our author could not see. Or else, he must deny (as Calvin did) John iii. 5, to relate to baptism at all. Which the antipædobaptists have not yet been so absurd as to do. And Mr. Gale him- self does often speak of it, as meaning baptism.

Page 538. Whereas I had at another place of my book, viz., chap. 11, recited a great part of Gre- gory Nazianzen’s oration *de Baptismo*, (where he frequently uses the word *sanctification* for *baptism*, and *sanctified* for *baptized*,) and had observed that he does the like in other orations; and that the ancients generally (both those before Nazianzen, of whom I cited there Cyprian, and here Tertullian; and those in and after his time; St. Austin, St. Hierome, Paulinus, Pelagius, &c.,) do so use the word; and had shewn that in several places of Scripture it is so taken; and had referred to Mr. Walker, who has filled a good part of a book with such quotations; and indeed they would fill a

volume. So that it is no wonder that the ancient exposition of 1 Cor. vii. 14. should render *has been sanctified*, by ‘has been brought to Christianity and ‘baptism,’ and *holy*, by ‘Christian and baptized;’ since it was their common phrase in all their writings, speeches, and sermons :—

Mr. Gale answers, first, that I produce none of the first three hundred years, who do so explain that text, 1 Cor. vii. 14.

I produced Tertullian, *anno Domini 200.* and St. Cyprian, *anno 250.* The one confessing the sense of that text to be, that children of Christians are not born actual *Sancti, Christians*; nor can be called actually so, till baptized. The other saying directly, that an infant is in baptism *sanctified*, or made a saint, or Christian. And to them that take the words so, the text explains itself. Read it so far right, and you cannot read the rest wrong. Besides, that the current interpretation of the times a little after confirms that sense in the former.

He says again, the word *sanctify*, in the Old Testament, does often signify other things beside *washing*. Which I grant, and did there give St. Austin’s distinction between the *visible* sanctification and the invisible. But he cannot deny that in the places I mentioned, and abundance more, it does signify *washing*: nor that in the New Testament the word *ἅγιοι*, when it is applied to persons, (as it is in this text,) means *saints*, i. e. *Christians*; and *ἡγιασμένοι*, *those that have been sanctified*, means such as have been entered into the Christian covenant, or religion, by baptism; generally and almost without exception.

That expression of the apostle, *The unbelieving*

(or an unbelieving) husband has been sanctified by his wife, which I after the ancients do paraphrase, ‘has been converted, brought to the faith, and so to ‘baptism,’ (and so saved, as the following words are;) he says, why may it not be read, ‘has been ‘prevailed on to forsake his former vices and irregular course of life, and so saved?’

He does not care how palpably he perverts the scope and aim of the apostle’s discourse. Do not the very words of the text lay the stress of the change from *unbelieving* (or heathen) to *believing* (or Christian)? and does not a Christian wife save her husband by bringing him off from *infidelity* to Christianity?

The *quære* put by the Corinthians to St. Paul, was not whether a godly wife should separate from a husband of ill morals; but whether a *Christian* wife should go away from a *heathen* husband. For a wife by her persuasions to reduce a husband, heathen or Christian, from his irregular courses to sobriety, is a good thing; but it is not the thing spoken of in this text.

Here he cites a place where Origen mentions this case of a woman converting her husband, or *e contra*. But he betrays a shameful degree of partiality, or else of ignorance, in translating it; and in saying, it is, ‘thus Origen seems to understand it.’ *Thus*; that is, (as Mr. Gale had in the preceding paragraph explained it,) the believing wife *sanctifies* and *saves* her husband (not by making him a Christian, but) by ‘prevailing on him to forsake his former vices ‘and irregular course of life.’

Whoever views the place in Origen, or reads but so much of it as Mr. Gale himself has transcribed of

the Greek, will see a notable pattern of warping. For the sense is as directly contrary to his 'thus,' as one thing can be to another.

I thank him for finding it for me. For here Origen (who is another within the three hundredth year) paraphrases this text of St. Paul exactly to the same sense, as I shewed St. Austin and Pelagius, &c., to have done; and keeps the emphasis which most of the modern translations and expositions have lost. I will transcribe it here; though it must have a place also in the *Appendix*, I promised, of quotations to be added to those in my *History*. For a quotation that translates this text right, is as much to the purpose as one that expressly speaks of infant-baptism. The occasion and context of the words may more fitly be set down there. But the words are, Comment. in Matth. p. 332. [edit. 1668.—tom. iii. p. 608. edit. Benedictin.]

Ἄνδρὸς καὶ γυναικὸς ἀμφοτέρων ἀπίστων, ὅτε μὲν ὁ ἀνὴρ πρότερον πιστεύσας τῷ χρόνῳ, σώζει τὴν γυναῖκα· ὅτε δὲ ἡ γυνὴ ἀρξαμένη ὑστερόν ποτε πείθει τὸν ἄνδρα. 'Of a husband and wife, both unbelievers, sometimes the husband believing first in time saves his wife: and sometimes the wife believing first, does afterward persuade her husband.' Mr. Gale translates it, 'When the husband believes first, he *sometimes* saves his wife: and when the wife believes first, she persuades her husband.' He leaves out the first words, Ἄνδρὸς καὶ γυναικὸς, ἀμφοτέρων ἀπίστων, 'When a husband and a wife are both unbelievers;' which regulate the sense of the following words; and plainly shew the conversions spoken of in them to be from *unbelief* to *Christianity*. This I do not call *ignorance*, but something worse. In the re-

maining words, (which himself sets down,) that he should not understand that ὅτε μὲν ὁ ἀνὴρ, and ὅτε δὲ ἡ γυνή, should have been rendered, *sometimes* the husband, and *sometimes* the wife, looks very like ignorance. In the former clause, he (though he had the *Greek* before him, and wrote it down) follows the *Latin*; where some printer or compositor has transposed the words, (for Huetius was not capable of such blunders,) and instead of ‘aliquando vir qui prior credidit, uxorem servat,’ has printed, ‘vir qui prior credidit, uxorem aliquando servat.’ But in the latter clause, where the ‘aliquando’ is set right, (‘aliquando autem initium faciens uxor,’ &c.,) he has followed neither the *Greek* nor the *Latin*.

Origen, we see here, understands St. Paul’s words of an unbelieving husband being *sanctified* and *saved* by his wife; and of an unbelieving wife *sanctified* and *saved* by her husband; to be meant, of the one being converted from *unbelief*, being made a *Christian* (or as St. Paul’s common word is, a *saint*) by the means of the other. Which, added to what I and others have cited from other Fathers, confirms this to be the current interpretation given to this place by the ancients.

He does not here go on to the following words, *else were your children unclean, but now they are saints*, (or holy,) as not being pertinent to the matter he was discoursing of. But he that went so far as to paraphrase ἡγίασται in the former part of the verse, ‘has been made ἅγιος, a saint, a Christian,’ could not miss of translating the last words, ἐπεὶ τὰ τέκνα ὑμῶν ἀκάθαρτά ἐστι, *else would your children be unclean*, i. e. kept in the heathen state; unbaptized; ἡν δὲ ἅγιά ἐστιν: *but now they are saints*, i. e. Chris-

tians; which can be meant no otherwise than by being baptized into Christ.

I have endeavoured to make this sense of that text plain, in a little piece which I believe Mr. Gale has seen<sup>i</sup>. But he, who had so openly accused me of giving up all proof from Scripture, could not with any credit own the sight of it. And indeed shames himself by letting his reader see by one attack before, and this a second one, upon my argument from this text, that I had not omitted all the proofs from Scripture.

He says at last, that ‘Dr. Whitby, and bishop Burnet are very accurate in proving, that the words, *now are your children holy*, do speak only of *seminal* holiness.’

Yet, as much as he worships those two men, he says in his *Contents*, ‘their sense cannot be the true one.’ And he tells them, their argument for infant-baptism from *seminal* holiness is a *petitio principii*. By which I should guess that they have said something beyond his reach; for that is the common name that he gives to all arguments that he cannot answer.

I remember something of that sort of argument from seminal holiness. But, as I never used it, it is not my present business to defend it. Let those that will, derive their children’s saintsship from their own. I question whether it be a rule in the heavenly city, (as it is in some cities here,) that a man may claim his freedom by his father’s copy. A parent that has an infant child like to die, may, if he please, say to God; ‘Thou wilt save this

<sup>i</sup> [Namely, ‘A Conference on the subject of Infant-baptism,’ described above, p. 179.]



‘ child, because he is mine, and derived from me.’ I had rather have it to say, ‘ because he is Christ’s; dedicated to him; and cannot be saved but for his sake.’

If this doctrine be true, David had ill luck in his conception and birth, to be *shapen in iniquity*, and that *in sin his mother did conceive him*; when these fathers can beget their children in *seminal holiness*, and their mothers *conceive them in saintship*. Yet I do not dislike that sentence of Mr. Baxter, where (as I cited him) speaking of a child dying before actual baptism, he says, ‘ Believing that our heart-consent and dedication qualifies infants for a covenant-right before actual baptism.’ A devout dedication of a child to Christ, to be received into his covenant of forgiveness and regeneration, joined with a sincere purpose of sealing this by baptism, may, we hope, (though the child be suddenly snatched away,) be accepted by God for the deed.

Pages 540, 541. He would retrieve the credit of that exploded interpretation of this text given by some antipædobaptists; *sanctified by the wife*; that is, says he, *to the wife*, meaning, for the use of the bed; so as that he, though an unbeliever, is not an adulterer to her; nor she a harlot to him. And the children are *holy*, i. e. *not bastards*. And he is so void of shame, as to say, twice in one page, that this explication is built ‘ on my principles.’

My principle is, that St. Paul by the word *ἅγιοι*, *saints*, or *holy*, when applied to persons, does always mean *Christians*. And by *ἡγίασται*, and *ἡγιασμένοι*, does always mean such as have been made or are become *Christians*; and that he never styled an unbeliever *a saint*, or *sanctified*. Mr. Gale’s

exposition would have St. Paul to mean, that the unbelieving wife, or husband, continuing such, is *sanctified*. But St. Paul explains *ἡγιάσται* in the fourteenth verse, by *saved* in the sixteenth. Does Mr. Gale think that *saved* means nothing but *allowed the use of the bed*?

The *quære* put by the Corinthians to St. Paul, was not, whether it were fornication for two such parties to cohabit; so that the children would be bastards. Nor does St. Paul answer it, as he would do a question of lawful or unlawful; but only of expedient or inexpedient. If the question had been whether it was a sin or not, he would never have said, To this question *I speak, not the Lord*; nor would have advised the Christian husband to cohabit with the unbelieving wife, *if she be willing to dwell with him*. The woman's willingness to stay, would not, if the question had been about fornication, have mended the matter.

Let Mr. Gale try how this bed-sanctification will fit Origen's paraphrase, which he just now commended; which was, that sometimes the unbelieving wife is sanctified, saved, or persuaded by her husband, a believer; and sometimes the unbelieving husband by the wife, a believer. That is, we will say, sometimes the man is sanctified to his wife's bed, and sometimes she to his. Nonsense. Whereas to say, sometimes an unbelieving husband is brought to Christianity by his wife; and sometimes the wife by the husband; and then by the consent of both, the children are made *holy*, or *saints*, i. e. *Christians*, by baptism; is good sense, and a good reason why St. Paul should advise them to continue together.

In short, not only this explication of the antipædobaptists, but all the modern ones that forsake the ancient interpretation, have this fatal absurdity; that they make St. Paul speak of the man, or the woman, and the children, as *sanctified*, or *saints*, without Christianity. Which he never did, nor would have done.

Page 541. Mr. Gale asks, ‘what can this holiness of the children be, that springs from the Christianity of the parents? The baptism of the parents cannot serve for the children.’ True. But the Christianity of the parents may make them baptize their children. And then they are in St. Paul’s sense *ἅγιοι*, *holy*, *saints*, or *Christians*.

Page 544. The passages which I produced from Origen do, as Mr. Gale confesses, speak ‘directly and clearly’ of infant-baptism. They speak of it as a known principle of Christians, and ordered by the apostles. And whereas Mr. Whiston, having before his eyes the places themselves, has ventured to say, and to print, that it is not plain from them that the *infants* he speaks of were such as we commonly call so; but that his words may be understood of lads big enough to make catechumens; he could not have more shamed his eyesight. And it ought to be a warning to him, not to print any thing in such haste; for the words are, *nuper nati parvuli*; and *what sin could they have?*

Mr. Gale’s only exception is, of the authenticity of the passages, of which I had spoken largely; which the reader must see<sup>k</sup>, if he would understand the dispute between us.

He wonders that all the passages about infant-

<sup>k</sup> [See vol. i. p. 106, &c.]

baptism should be in the *Latin* translations; and none in the *Greek* remains, which are, he says, larger than of any *Greek* Father before him.

The thing were no wonder, if it were so. Since he having written above twenty times as much as any *Greek* Father before him; the *Greek* remains, though larger than of those before him, are yet not the twentieth part of what were extant in St. Hierome's time; who, as I shewed, had read in the *Greek* his sentiments of infant-baptism.

Page 545. One passage which sir Peter (now lord chief justice) King brought from the *Greek*, and I from him<sup>1</sup>, Mr. Gale in many words labours to prove to be nothing to the purpose; as speaking only of new converts compared to *infants*. Neither did I, nor do I, positively maintain the contrary. I was the first that shewed the doubtfulness of the phrase. But whereas he puts into my mouth those rude expressions and reflections on that great man, of 'artful leaving out of words,' &c., let him take them to himself; they are his natural talent. I said no such thing; but only acknowledged that that sentence by being compared with the following ones is rendered ambiguous.

I have since found a passage in the *Greek*, viz., Comment. in Matt. tom. xv. which speaks manifestly of infants in the proper sense, (for, to satisfy Mr. Whiston and Mr. Gale, it names those of one day old,) and, I think, shews plainly Origen's sentiments of the necessity of their baptism. I shall not transcribe it here, but in the *Appendix* I mentioned<sup>m</sup>.

<sup>1</sup> [At vol. i. p. 114.]

<sup>m</sup> [It is incorporated into the third and the present edition, forming sect. xi. of vol. i. chap. 5.]

If it be allowed, it makes all my answer to the exceptions he here brings against the places in the *translations* needless. But as I had drawn up the substance of my answer to those his exceptions before I found that passage, and as it is the last trouble I shall have with him, I will not grudge the pains of transcribing that also, that both together may give the fuller satisfaction.

Page 547. Mr. Gale, not content with what I had owned, that Ruffinus (out of whose translations several of the passages which I brought were fetched) took a great liberty in translating; sometimes abridging, paraphrasing, &c., sometimes omitting, or altering a place where Origen had vented any of his singular and heterodox opinions; thinks it worth his while to get together and recite, not only all the censures of Ruffinus' translation that he could find in Huetius, Daillé, Du Pin, Tarinus, &c., but any thing that tends to discredit the translations of the Fathers in general. 'They have,' he says, 'a very bad name.' And where Grotius says, 'some pieces ascribed to Origen are not his, and some interpolated;' Mr. Gale, turning the word *some* into a *great deal*, would have us believe none.

One that had not read the works of these modern learned men, which he here cites, would think by this account that they had a much worse opinion of Ruffinus' translations than they had really. They, notwithstanding the fault they find with his paraphrastical way, do upon many occasions quote his translations, and depend upon them, as being Origen's sense in the main. And Mr. Gale himself, in the chapter before, viz., p. 497, (when he sought for evidence against Irenæus,) thought the *Tractat.* in

Matth. (which is a translation of Origen of far less credit than Ruffinus' are) a good authority.

Huetius, who knew best of any one what credit was due to each translation, though he give the preference by far to those done by St. Hierome, yet he more than a hundred times recurs to those done by Ruffinus, either to confirm or to explain the sense of some place in the *Greek* tracts on which he is making notes. And particularly when he is vindicating Origen against Jansenius, bishop of Ypres, (who accused him of a thing he was not guilty of, viz., the denial of original sin,) he does it by one of the same quotations, which I brought for proof of his holding infant-baptism. For Origen speaks there, and at other places, of both those points together.

I said, whatever Ruffinus might add of his own in his translations, he would not add any of this sort of sayings which express an acknowledgment of original sin; because he himself was inclined to the contrary opinion; as I have shewed plain enough, and Huetius more largely.

Of this Mr. Gale takes no notice. And he does wisely. For it renders all that suspicion which he would raise of Ruffinus' inserting these passages of his own head, utterly incredible.

Mr. Whiston, though he be engaged on the same side of the dispute with Mr. Gale, and had seen his objections, confesses, p. 40, of his *Primitive Infant-Baptism*, 'I think we may allow them in the main 'to be genuine.' And the worthy Dr. Grabe declared to me, that he had met with so many fragments of those lost pieces of Origen, quoted by *Greek* writers or in the Catenas, as do manifestly

shew the *Latin* of Ruffinus to have been taken from them, though after a more loose and paraphrastical manner than is usual in a translator.

If there were found in these translations but one or but two places, and those in Ruffinus alone, that did speak of infant-baptism; there might have been some reason for this suspicion. But when they are found in several places, brought in on several occasions, in translations made by several men who were of several parties, and enemies to one another, (as Ruffinus and St. Hierome were,) and upon no temptation; (for Mr. Gale himself will own that there was no dispute then about infant-baptism;) to say, that they be all forged, is a thing that will sink with no man that considers and weighs the reasonableness of any plea. And thus to except sometimes against the book, as in Irenæus; and sometimes against the translations, as here; is in effect to say that he will not stand to the voice of antiquity.

Of the passages cited, one is from the *Homilies on St. Luke*, translated by St. Hierome, which speaks to the same purpose as the rest. Mr. Gale having no other escape, fights his way through, and pelts St. Hierome with reproaches for a translator as bad as Ruffinus.

I had, from Erasmus, quoted St. Hierome's own words, that in that translation of the homilies on St. Luke he had 'changed nothing; but expressed 'every thing as it was in the original'' Here Mr. Gale,

Page 549, sends his 'sir' to 'compare the translations with the originals;' and tells him what he shall find there.

<sup>n</sup> [See vol. i. p. 108.]

He is either so very ignorant as to think, or else would have the ignorant reader think, that those homilies on St. Luke are extant in the original, (for of those he must be understood to speak ; or else it is no answer to what I said,) and that he had compared them. If they had been at all extant in the *Greek*, I must have been very dull to cite them in the *Latin*. Such homilies as are extant both in the original, and in St. Hierome's Latin, (as for instance, some on Jeremy,) answer so well to one another, that Huetius sets no other *Latin* over against the *Greek* than St. Hierome's ; and where the *Greek* copies have some words vitiated so as to mar the sense, he very often corrects them in his notes by the *Latin*. The *Latin* shews what the *Greek* must have been ; and Huetius, who says, 'the *Latin* does ' in many places recede from the *Greek*,' imputes that to the variation of the *Greek* copies since St. Hierome's time. And bishop Pearson, in his *Vindiciæ Ignatianæ* concludes that St. Hierome must have been very exact in the translation of the Homilies on Luke by this ; that Ruffinus, who had the original, and out of envy sought to find what faults he could in the translation, mentions no interpolation but one of two words, (*atque naturæ*.) which shews he could find no more.

Mr. Gale says, St. Hierome, in translating Eusebius' *Chronicon*, and *De locis Hebraicis*, owns that he altered some of the chronology and geography.

That is quite another case. The skill in chronology improved by degrees. And for the geography of the Holy Land, St. Hierome, living on the spot many years after Eusebius was dead, might



naturally come to know the names and circumstances of many cities and places there, which Eusebius had omitted or mistaken. And any one, that is able, does well to correct mistakes in those matters. Especially when he owns the alterations that he makes. But in matters of religion any thing that is new is faulty for being so; and the perfection of it is, to keep close to the primitive patterns.

But Mr. Gale cites some sayings of St. Hierome, where he confesses that in the translation of some books even of Origen he had omitted what was bad or erroneous, and kept in only what was sound and useful.

But, *first*, that is not adding any thing. And *secondly*, there are two different aims in translating. And he at several times had both of them, viz., either to satisfy the curious what it was that Origen held (and in such cases he sets down all, sound or unsound); or to publish some tract or discourse of Origen for the use of vulgar Christians: in which if there were many useful things, and some unsound tenets, he did well to omit the latter. And this Mr. Gale should not call St. Hierome's 'confession' that he did so. He *pleads it* in his own vindication against those that accused him of disseminating Origen's errors. But even this is not adding any thing. And besides, in the Homilies on St. Luke, (which is the only book I quoted,) he declares he took the former course.

Mr. Gale [p. 547.] cites Mr. Du Pin, vol. i. p. 132, [or 100,] where, after he had given instances of Ruffinus' licentious way of translating some pieces, he adds, 'St. Hierome's versions are not more exact.' And there Mr. Gale cuts off the sentence; and makes

much use afterward of this verdict of Mr. Du Pin against St. Hierome. Whether he do say just so, and do not add any expressions in abatement of what he had said, I know not. A reader that has Du Pin by him may do well to see<sup>o</sup>. But it is certain, the expression taken strictly is not true. St. Hierome may in some books have made some paraphrastical alterations, or omissions, (though none, he says himself, on St. Luke,) but not nigh so many as Ruffinus.

Mr. Gale tells us over and over again, that these translators 'do confess and own the alterations' they have made, and warn the readers of them.

There is then the more credit to be given them, when they say they have altered nothing. They do in some books of Origen own that they have left out many things that were unsound; and abridged some books that were too long (as Origen's style is indeed redundant); but there is no sign of their adding any thing of their own (except in those books where they declare they have supplied some particular chapters that were missing); I mean, not any material thing. Transitions they must make for the gaps where they left out any large passage. But this is nothing to the Homilies on St. Luke, in which St. Hierome says he altered nothing.

Of the Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans (out of which one of the passages concerning infant-baptism is taken,) there are two fragments preserved in the *Greek*, viz., *Philocal.* c. 9. and c. 25. Mr. Gale tells us, twice over, that of that in c. 25, there are

<sup>o</sup> [The citation from Du Pin is made fairly. See his *Ecl. Hist.* vol. i. p. 100, both in the text and the note r, edit. 1692 or 1696.]

in Ruffinus' version hardly any footsteps of the original preserved.

Suppose they had been both wanting in Ruffinus; what wonder? Since, as I said, he professes that he had shortened that work by one half. All that can be argued from hence is, that as there is in that half which he has preserved, one place that mentions infants' baptism, probably in the whole there were two.

And just such an advantage accrues to his argument from that which he quotes,

Page 552, of Ruffinus, complaining that several volumes or tomes of this *Comment* were wanting, before he took it in hand, 'fere apud omnium 'bibliothecas,' (which he in translating augments to *all libraries*.)

This argument weighs backward. Therefore he, to make it turn the right way, does in the next page call this *deficiency* an 'interpolation;' which is quite the contrary.

Those two sentences of Ruffinus, which Mr. Gale here recites out of the *peroratio* of his translation of Origen on *Epist. ad Romanos*, were not meant by him for any serious account of what he had done in that work; but for a jeer on St. Hierome, who had set out tracts in his own name, whereof all the substance was (as Ruffinus would insinuate) taken out of Origen. So that Ruffinus pretended, he might as well have called this translation, *Ruffini Expositio*, &c., as St. Hierome had entitled some works of his, *Hieronymi Libri*, &c., which were little more than translations of Origen. But he says, he would not get himself a reputation by such tricks of a plagiarist.

Though this appears by the sentence itself, and by his putting the name *Hieronymi* into it; and though Huectius (out of whom, I question not, Mr. Gale had it) do note the drift of it; yet he, like a true representer of things, sets down the sentences, but leaves out the note.

Page 553. Whereas one of the passages I cited was from Origen's Homilies on Joshua, ('Thou 'wast an infant, when thou wast baptized,') concerning the translation whereof I produced Ruffinus' declaration, that he had in that translation neither added nor omitted any thing; but truly rendered what he found in the Greek books:—Mr. Gale would here prove Ruffinus a liar; because in one part of a chapter (not that which I cited, but another) there is found the difference of a few words between Ruffinus' translation, and a quotation of that part in the *Philocalia*.

But, first, the difference is of no moment. And secondly, there is no knowing by the *Philocalia* how the original was.

For their way, when they entitle a chapter as taken out of such or such a tome, is, after they have recited something out of that tome, to run to another tome where there is any thing to the same purpose, and then go back to where they left off. And this commonly several times in one chapter; as appears in all the *excerpta* which they have taken out of the books against Celsus; and would, no doubt, appear in the other, if the original of the other were extant, as it is of them.

Mr. Gale gives instances of some chapters in the *Philocalia*, which are there said to be transcribed from such or such a homily of Origen's on such or

such a book of Scripture; whereof one shall not find any footstep in Ruffinus' *Latin*.

Huetius will tell him the reason of this. Origen composed several sets of sermons or homilies on the same book or epistle. One perhaps when he was young. Another volume of sermons on the same epistles when he was old. St. Gregory and St. Basil sometimes lighted on one of these volumes, Ruffinus on another. *Vide Huetii Præfat. in Origeniana, p. 4.*

They that can think that these passages concerning infant-baptism in the translations of Origen's works were put in by the translators, who lived but a hundred and fifty years after Origen's time; and yet do maintain, that in Origen's time there was no infant-baptism, do make them more absurd men than we can conceive them to have been. For the practice of the church could not have been changed from antipædobaptism to pædobaptism in that space of time, but that such learned men, as St. Hierome especially was, must have known it. Eusebius' Church History, written in the intermediate time, and translated by Ruffinus, must have taken notice of it. Or the very tradition from father to son must have carried a memory of it. And then, for them to make Origen several times over speak of a thing which all the world knew was not in use at his time, must have made them ridiculous.

Mr. Gale observes twice or thrice, how dipping of infants, in the ordinary baptisms in England, began about two hundred years ago to degenerate into pouring or sprinkling. It is true, it did so; but everybody knows it, and the time of it. And

therefore he that should in translating a book written before that time, put in any thing of sprinkling as used ordinarily in England in the author's time, would be hooted at. The like would have been in the case of these men. If Ruffinus had first fallen into such a blunder, he would not have escaped the lash of St. Hierome. Nor if St. Hierome had been guilty, would Ruffinus have spared him. But the contrary is true. For not only both of them do translate Origen so speaking of infant-baptism as being ordered by the apostles; but all of that time, St. Austin, St. Chrysostom, &c., that do speak any thing of it, speak of it as practised, not only in Origen's time, but from the beginning.

If Mr. Gale had been a candid inquirer after the truth in this question concerning Origen's holding or not holding the doctrine of infant-baptism; he would have taken notice of a passage in St. Hierome; who being the greatest reader of Origen's works in the original, of any Christian that ever was, brings in, in his discourse of him, such circumstances as do plainly shew, not only that he held it, but also built some of his particular tenets upon it.

And since his works (which were more than all the *Bibliotheca Patrum* that we have now) are lost, (the Greek of almost all; the translations of the greatest part,) suppose we could not be sure of the authenticalness of this or that passage in the translations, nor find any passage in the remaining Greek to that purpose; yet these two things concurring together, that there are several plain places in the translations, and a plain testimony from one that had seen the originals, that this doctrine was held

by him, and was then visible in his books; would convince any body, except it be one that has a task set him to maintain the negative, and maintain it he must.

The passage in St. Hierome, which I mean, was in my first edition not set down in this fifth chapter which is concerning Origen, and which Mr. Gale is here answering; but it was in the nineteenth chapter, (which speaks of St. Hierome and the Pelagians,) §. 26. And in the second edition I put a note of it into the fifth; because it clears up the doubt concerning Origen's holding infant-baptism. Mr. Gale, I doubt not, had seen both.

It is St. Hierome's jeering advice to the Pelagians, who were put to it how to give any good account of the reason of baptizing infants, since they would not own that they had any original sin or corruption. He in a mocking way advises them to march over to Origen's opinion; 'Qui præterita in cœlis et antiqua delicta solvi dicit in baptismo.' 'Who holds that their sins committed in a former state, (the state of præexistence,) in the cœlestial regions, are forgiven them in their baptism.'

This is a plain proof that Origen did use to speak of infant-baptism; and that St. Hierome had seen the places where he did so; and that the doctrine of baptizing infants was current in his time; since he endeavoured to link his tenet of præexistence to it.

But we have found, as I said, in the original text of Origen a passage, which will, I think, clear up any difficulty that remains, and stop the mouth of all objections or evasions concerning the sense and practice of the church in his time; which was

about *anno Domini* 210 : after the apostles 110. The passage is so much to the same sense and purpose with those translated by St. Hierome and Ruffinus ; the style and phrase so much the same ; the same texts of Scripture quoted, &c., that it is not only itself an evidence, but also confirms those other to be genuine translations.

It shall be recited at large in the Appendix<sup>p</sup>, which I think to set at the end of this Answer ; meaning also to print a considerable number of them for the use of those who have the first or the second edition of my history.

My next chapter was quotations out of St. Cyprian, who flourished a hundred and fifty years after the apostles. Him, and his time, and all that comes after, Mr. Gale yields as practising infant-baptism. So that I wonder what work he means the man, who, he says, is to write an answer to my book, shall have. For he himself has in these ‘Re-  
‘flections’ answered the first five chapters, to p. 125. And that, if we believe him himself, sufficiently. But if the other man be to answer all the rest, Mr. Gale has done ill to yield it all beforehand. What is the consequence of this concession, we will consider presently. But he throws in some disparagements of the men and times which he yields up.

Page 554. First, St. Cyprian speaks as plainly of infant-communion, as he does of infant-baptism.

Concerning this matter I have spoken three or

[<sup>p</sup> As was observed above, p. 424, this passage is incorporated into the present edition in its proper place, at vol. i. chap. 5. sect. 11. The *Appendix* spoken of contained 25 pages 8vo. Its contents are all disposed in their due places, in the third and the present edition.]



four times in this answer; and also had shewed largely in my book, that there is no proof of mere infants (but only of children of four or five years old) being admitted to the communion in St. Cyprian's time; and that, except that time and place, there is no account (at least, that I know of:—I do there refer myself to such as had studied that point more; no account, I say) before the year *four hundred*, of children being admitted at all in any church. Of which since he will take no notice, I shall not repeat the same answer to all his *crambes*, but add this general reply:

That this is at best but an argument *ad hominem*. It is a question in the present Christian church, whether giving the communion to infants be an error or a duty. The present *western* Christians think it an error. The *Greek* church, which is, I think, the biggest half of Christendom, think it a duty. To these last, an argument against infant-baptism, drawn from the practice of those times which gave the communion as well as baptism to infants, weighs backward; and confirms the thing which it would overthrow. To us and all Christians hereabouts, it weighs but very little. It proves only that those churches and those times which did so, were, in our opinion, in an error in one thing. Does that overthrow the force of an argument taken from their doctrine and practice in other things? It is not, in the opinion of any Christian, a *fundamental* error. If providence should place any of us in *Muscovy*, or any country of the *Greek* Christians, where this custom is used; we should not (do, as Mr. Gale, and *another*, would have the antipædobaptists and other dissenters do here) renounce

their communion ; unless we had some greater reason than that. There is no good argument to prove any thing, which does not prove it to one Christian, as well as to another.

Secondly, St. Cyprian he says was an *African* ; and so were the sixty-six bishops whose testimony is joined with his ; so that probably infant-baptism began in the church of *Carthage*.

Does Mr. Gale take his readers for such idiots, as to think a testimony is disparaged, because he can tell where the people that give it, lived ? So Origen lived at *Alexandria* ; and Mr. Whiston thinks it began there. And Irenæus at *Lyons* in Gallia. By that account it began there. Those Christians, whose children, St. Paul says, were saints, lived at *Corinth*. And the places where he is mentioned to have baptized the whole households were all in *Greece*. Some perhaps will think it began there. But our Saviour, who commanded *little children to be received in his name*, was, according to the flesh, a *Jew*. So that the Christian baptism began there. Antipædobaptism began among the *Alps*, or in *Germany*. Will that be taken for a refutation of it ?

Thirdly, ‘The Africans were generally men of weak understandings. And St. Austin, another African, thought it an apostolical tradition.’

St. Austin concludes partly from proofs of Scripture ; partly because it had been ever used from the beginning by all Christians, that it was ‘apostolica auctoritate traditum,’ ordered (or delivered down) ‘by the authority of the apostles.’ Is there any thing in this whereon to ground a note of contempt upon St. Austin ? Does not Origen say the very

same in the places we were last speaking of? Can the antipædobaptists account it decent in their champion to insult, as absurd, sometimes the present divines, sometimes the ancient Christians, for saying that which all Christians in the world say, and ever said, except themselves.

Page 555. For a parting blow, he has preserved a testimony against infant-baptism; which ought in policy to have been one of his best. He says, ‘Though the *African* bishops were no wiser, &c., ‘the *Greek* churches seem very plainly to have ‘been still of another opinion.’

Here one would expect something that according to his promise should ‘seem very plain.’ It is this at last:

Dionysius, bishop of Alexandria, writing a letter concerning the character of Novatian, (whom he makes a monster of impiety,) says of him, after a great many worse things, that he did ἀθετεῖν ἅγιον λουτρὸν, ‘make void holy baptism,’ (which words Mr. Gale translating, adds a crime that he was never accused of, making him a Quaker; ‘he utterly disallows of holy baptism,’) and, τὴν πρὸ αὐτοῦ πίστιν καὶ ὁμολογίαν ἀνατρέπει, ‘subverts the faith and profession that goes before it.’ Here Mr. Gale sets his thumb. Dionysius speaks of the profession of faith *going before* baptism.

Now this is a known thing; that a profession of faith was usual before baptism (I, after others, had spoken largely of it) in the case of persons baptized at full age, (as Novatian was,) made by themselves as the faith they then actually had; in the case of infants, made by their sponsors, as he might see in Tertullian, (for there were then no *presby-*

*terian* baptisms without sponsors,) as the faith into which the infant was baptized, and in which he was to be instructed, and which he must hereafter hold and keep, if he expected any benefit by his baptism.

This was abundantly enough to make Dionysius say what he did. And is no more than any one would now say concerning such a case, that a Christian turning to wickedness or apostasy, renounces his baptism, and the profession of faith, that went before it. This might well enough be said even of one that was baptized in infancy, in respect to the profession made in his name by sponsors at his baptism. But Dionysius was now speaking of a man who was known to have been baptized at age. He represents him as one who, having been an infidel and a very wicked man before, and then in a fear of death desiring to be baptized, and in order thereto making the professions, and being baptized in his bed of sickness, had afterward been as bad as ever before. That was ‘frustrating holy baptism, and perverting the faith and profession made before it.’

This is all that Mr. Gale has to prove that ‘the Greek churches were of another opinion’ than St. Cyprian and his dull Africans.

His clients must needs think this but a very indifferent plea to close their cause with. But he, to excuse himself, and put them out of hopes of any better from any other pleader, plainly tells them, they must not ‘expect to find any passages more inconsistent with that practice (the practice of infant-baptism) than this is.’

I do not love boasting, to the degree that he does.

Yet this, I think, I may say; that I, though their adversary as he would represent me, produced several passages more plausible for antipædobaptism than this, or indeed than any he has brought; and those such as had never been made use of in that dispute before. I produced impartially all that I found.

As for Dionysius; there is a particular reason to satisfy us that neither he and his church of Alexandria, nor the church of Rome, nor that of Cappadocia, did take the doctrine and practice of infant-baptism to be any error in St. Cyprian and his church of Carthage. For all these (and indeed all the noted churches in Christendom) were engaged at that time in a question and dispute about baptism; not in any question whether infants are to be baptized, (of that, as I have often said, there was never any question made by any church nor by any man, except Tertullian, for a thousand years,) but in a question whether baptism received from the hands of heretics or schismatics was valid, or not. Cyprian of Carthage, Firmilian of Cappadocia, and many other bishops and churches said it was not; but that men baptized by heretics must, if they would be admitted in the church, be baptized anew; and they practised accordingly. Stephen bishop of Rome, and some with him, maintained the contrary. The contention increased to a great height, and lasted a long time. Councils were held on each side, in Europe and Asia, as well as in Africa. Many messages and letters sent. Stephen carried it so high, as to renounce in great measure communion with Cyprian, Firmilian, &c. This Dionysius of Alexandria, (whom Mr. Gale here would make an

antipædobaptist,) acted the part of a mediator, and wrote pacificatory letters, whereof good parts are preserved by Eusebius<sup>9</sup>.

Now I say, if the practice of baptizing infants, which is known to have been then used by the churches of Africa, had been at that time by any of the other accounted an error; it could not have missed of being censured, or taken notice of, in the dispute. When they were inveighing each against the other's mistakes about the nature and use of baptism; Stephen, who reproached Cyprian for an abuse of baptism in one respect, viz., for giving it to men who had already a baptism which Stephen thought (though received in a blameable way, yet) valid, would also not have failed to have censured the abuse of it in this other respect, if he had thought the giving it to *infants* to be an abuse. But so it is, that in the whole dispute there is not one word said about it. A certain sign that there was no difference in their tenets and usages in that particular. So that the proof of the African church using it, and the silence of the rest, is a proof for all of them, that they used it; and for Dionysius and his church among the rest.

Page 556. Here he enters on the recapitulation, or summing up of what he has done: of the arguments he has used; of the texts of Scripture he has explained or cited; with which he has done, as he has with his table of authors. For as in the one he has given you the name and edition of every dictionary or school-book; so in the other, if he has mentioned or occasionally referred or alluded to any

<sup>9</sup> [See his 'Ecclesiastical History,' book vi. chap. 40 to 46. book vii. chap. 26, &c. &c.]

text, he puts that text down in the *index* to fill up the number.

I shall not follow him in the recapitulation; but leave him and his ‘sir’ (to whom he ever and anon addresses, ‘you see, sir’) to applaud and crow over their *egregia facinora et res præclare gestas*; as knowing that whatever I may do with his arguments, I can never stop or quell his humour of boasting.

Instead of that, I crave leave to address myself in a few words to the antipædobaptists, and in a few to my brethren of the clergy.

The first, if they cannot from the evidence, and the pleas *pro* and *contra*, determine their opinion concerning the times of Origen, Tertullian, Irenæus, &c., should at least weigh in their minds the consequence that follows from this very thing that is granted concerning the practice of infant-baptism, viz., that it can be plainly traced up to St. Cyprian’s time. The force and weight of the consequence or argument from thence does not lie, as Mr. Gale would represent, that it began in that time, but since it was not used from the beginning, we ought not to use it: but it lies thus; that which we can plainly trace so far up, we have all reason to think was from the beginning.

We are now at above sixteen hundred years distance from the time that all the apostles had left the world. Of these sixteen hundred, one thousand four hundred and fifty are granted and yielded. Not to mention now the improbable things which the deniers of it are forced to say, to stave off the evidence for one hundred farther up—(‘The books ‘are not genuine; such a part of the chapter is interpolated: they by *infants* do not mean as we do:

‘ the translations are not right; which is the plea  
 ‘ that the papists use when we urge to them texts of  
 ‘ Scripture,’ &c.)—but to speak of the time that is  
 yielded.

Of the sixteen hundred, the first two hundred (which, with the hundred years of apostolic times, make the first three centuries) are owned by all learned men of all persuasions, to have been the most pure both in doctrine and practice. They that except against the canons, the councils, the customs, since Constantine’s time, (when the empire turning Christian, the riches of the world came into the church, and by degrees corrupted it,) as not so safely to be relied on; do yet extol the purity of the first three centuries, (i. e. the time of Christ and the apostles, and two hundred years more,) when there was no temptation from the love of the world to warp men’s consciences.

That which depraved the church, when it did come to be depraved, was the same place-hunting that has since depraved and ruined every particular church, and state too, that has been ruined; and will do more. But in the times we speak of, there was no place worth standing for; but that of a martyr, to make a glorious end of a life which would have been, as St. Paul says, *if in this life only they had hoped in Christ*, the most miserable.

Now the times of St. Cyprian, which are yielded, were far within that space, and in the midst of the persecution. He himself at the head of his people, and multitudes of them with him, and after him, (as many of them had done before him,) gave up their lives as a sacrifice to the testimony of the truth of our holy religion: butchered by the cruelty of their



heathen governors in their hatred to the Christian name and doctrine; which they saw did by the constancy of such men increase, in spite of all their opposition.

These were the men whom Mr. Gale represents to you, as ‘the dull Africans.’ And these were the times which he, at p. 568, would have you comprehend under the name of ‘the more corrupt centuries.’ If you were to read this holy martyr’s learned works, and pious letters, you would be sufficiently angry with your advocate, for styling (as he does, p. 555) the letter he there speaks of, (which to read would be for your better information,) ‘a trifling and empty reply.’

Honest men, that have, or think they have, an honest cause, hate to have it defended by pleas that are not true. He tells you in the next words, p. 555, that they used infant-baptism, ‘perhaps only as an indifferent thing, or in cases of danger.’ I desire no other judge than one of yourselves, to see, by reading the place itself, where they speak of the necessity of it in terms as high and higher than we do now, if that be not as directly false a representation of it, as can be given by any man of any thing. He has undertaken to defend you. I desire you to defend him, if you can. And if you cannot, you know what you ought to do.

Mr. Danvers himself did not say but that this place spoke of infant-baptism as a thing, not indifferent, but necessary and ordinary. He thought of it (as Mr. Gale does now of Origen’s and Irenæus’ sayings) that it was forged. That thought, though it be so plainly confuted that such a plea will never

be used any more, might at that time be his *mistake*. But to deny a book before one's face to say what it does plainly say concerning the danger to the soul of an infant dying without baptism, is a thing that needs a better defence than that which saved Danvers.

Mr. Gale himself uses commonly to speak of the first three centuries as early times, and fit to be appealed to. But here, seeing this to be fifty years within them, would have it to avail nothing, unless testimonies be brought for the same practice within the other two hundred and fifty. And though that have been done, yet he knows how to get a verdict that it has not. It is but saying so positively, and four or five times over, p. 568, 'The authority of ' the primitive Fathers for at least two hundred and ' fifty years gives no countenance,' &c., and then appealing to his 'sir,' p. 568, 'You see, sir, there is ' indeed nothing in whatever they advance, which ' can in the least favour their opiniou,' &c.

But should he not mind, or could he think that you would not mind, that even this question and answer in a meeting of sixty-six bishops, at the year after the apostles a hundred and fifty, concerning the baptizing of an infant before the eighth day, does carry in it an evidence for seventy or eighty years higher? It cannot be thought but several bishops among so many, were seventy or eighty years old, (which reaches up to seventy or eighty from the apostles.) and it is plain by the discourse, that not one of them had any doubt or question of baptizing in infancy; which yet they must have had, if it had not been in use ever since they could remember; or if they themselves (such of them

as were born of Christian parents) had not been baptized in infancy. For St. Cyprian tells Fidus, that there was not one in all the number who doubted but that a child must be baptized before the eighth day, if need require. Much less then did they doubt but that they must be baptized in infancy.

Mr. Gale would have you conceive of St. Cyprian as an obscure bishop, of no greater converse than with his Africans. But it appears by his books and letters that he had great correspondence and communion with the most noted churches and bishops then in the world. In all which churches his memory was also afterward honoured, as of a glorious martyr.

Whereas Mr. Gale, at p. 568, would have you insist upon proofs within the first fifty years, or less: if he mean other than Scripture-proofs, he mocks you; and takes you for more ignorant than I hope you are. At the year of Christ fifty, i. e. after his ascension about seventeen, whether any book of the *New Testament* was written, is not certain. But for certain no other book of any Christian, of which we have any memory; nor in a long time after. And indeed very few are left, either of the apostles' times, (beside their own,) or of the hundred years following. The persecution and opposition against Christianity itself, hindered them from any leisure to write of any thing but the defence of the fundamentals of their religion. There is little in those few that remain, about the rituals of it. Of those remains that are left, elder than St. Cyprian, I have told you what Justin, Irenæus,

Tertullian, and Origen do say; and intend to give in the Appendix a quotation or two out of Clemens Alexandrinus<sup>r</sup>; and do wish you could read the books yourselves.

When the world became Christian, (which was chiefly in the fourth century,) more books were written. And accordingly the testimonies are many, full, and undeniable. Neither does one of them speak of it as new, or as a thing that needed proof: but as of a thing supposed and ordinarily known. No council ever enacted it, or made canons to enjoin it; because no church or sect of Christians had ever denied it. On the contrary, they occasionally instance in it as a thing that had ever been.

Pelagius, who set up a sect that denied original sin, was galled with that argument of the catholics; ‘Why are infants baptized for the remission of sin, ‘if they have not *original* sin? *Actual* sins they ‘can have none.’ And some that aggravated his error, accused him of it, as a consequence of his tenet, that he pleaded against the baptizing of infants. He declared an abhorrence of the slanderous imputation; and said, they accused him of saying a thing which ‘he never heard any Christian, no not ‘even any sectary, say.’

And if there had ever been any church in any time, or any part of the world, that denied infant-baptism, he must have heard of them. For he was a learned man; and had lived in the most noted churches of Europe, Asia, and Africa. And they

[<sup>r</sup> These quotations are incorporated into the work itself, forming the eighth and ninth sections of chap. iii. in the first volume.]

had then but three hundred years, or under three hundred and twenty, to look back to the time of the apostles.

These, and many such decisive evidences, were in that part of my book, which Mr. Gale gives up and cannot deny.

Now this fourth century, in which Constantine the emperor became Christian, was none of the corrupt times of the church, nor the next century to it; I mean, not to any high degree. I said before, that the world with its pomps coming into the church, corrupted it by degrees, with ambition, factions, schisms, parties, &c. But that was not done to any high degree presently. It was that fourth century that had those shining lights, Constantine the first Christian emperor, Eusebius, Athanasius, St. Basil, the two Gregories, St. Hierome, St. Chrysostom, St. Austin, &c. These Mr. Gale himself, when he quotes them, styles *saints*; ‘St. Cyprian, ‘St. Basil, St. Gregory,’ &c. Do you think he accounts them saints? Does he allow them to be Christians? Will he own that there was any church of Christ at that time? Would he have held communion with the church then, or any part of it?

His answer, either affirmative or negative, will fly in his face, so long as he holds that uncharitable and unchristian opinion (which he has professed in this book of his, and which was the only one he could find to confront and defeat the exhortation I gave you against separating from the church, though you thought her to be in an error in points not fundamental); I mean his opinion and assertion, that pædobaptism is a *fundamental* error in the constitution of a church: that the age and manner of

receiving baptism are of the *essence* of it: that baptism so given as the pædobaptists give it, not only is blameable in its circumstances, but ‘becomes no ‘baptism:’ that persons so baptized ‘are not true ‘members of the Christian church; have no baptism; no title to church-membership; but should ‘be disclaimed; no more to be communicated with, ‘than one would communicate with persons he cannot esteem baptized.’ These positions he maintains, p. 82, &c., to p. 86, and without any shame or modesty, pretends that I supposed all of them to be right. And he intimates worse, and speaks them as far as he dare; that the church of England has ‘no bishops, presbyters,’ &c.

Now I say, a man holding these desperately uncharitable positions, could not have held communion with the church of the time we were speaking of. For in all that time, by all the footsteps found in reading the numerous books then published, there is no appearance of any church, nay, not of any sect, but what were pædobaptists.

I know, you generally do not hold so uncharitable a tenet (but only he and some few). If you did, I would never advise you to come to church, nor any church to receive you.

St. Paul, when he spoke, 2 Thess. ii, of the *falling away*, or degeneracy, ἀποστασία, that should come in the church, or greatest part thereof, said: there was something that did then *let*, or *withhold*, i. e. put a stop to the coming of that *apostasy*, and to the *revealing of that man of sin, who should sit as God in the temple of God*, i. e. in the church, which he should defile. And he said that *that which did then let, would let until it were taken*

*out of the way.* And, that they knew what it was; for he had told them, when he was present with them. That is, he had told them in private: it being not a thing fitting to be published. For it was the power of the Roman empire; of the destruction of which, or its being taken out of the way, it was not proper for St. Paul at that time publicly to speak or write. But it came abroad among the Christians afterward; and they knew what it was, that he had told the Thessalonian Christians, viz. that when the Roman empire should be destroyed, then that wicked should be revealed, &c.

Now that empire was not destroyed at once; but by degrees. And accordingly some modern divines have placed the beginning of the apostasy sooner, some later: but none so soon as the end of the fourth century; in which (or before which) lived all the Fathers that I cited speaking so fully and plainly of infant-baptism, that Mr. Gale yields St. Cyprian (who lived in the middle of the third century) and all downward.

Some did of late, with great assurance of their skill in computing the history of the prophecies, fix the beginning of the apostatical times about the middle of the fifth century, viz., at the year four hundred fifty-five, or six<sup>s</sup>. But most readers of

<sup>s</sup> [Probably the person principally alluded to is Mr. Whiston; who maintained this position strongly, in his 'Essay on the Revelation of St. John,' 4to. *Cambridge*, 1706. See Mr. Whiston's interpretation and arguments examined by Dr. Wells, both in his 'Explanation of the Revelation.' (4to. *Oxford*, 1717.) more especially at page 102; and likewise in his 'Explanation of the Book of Daniel,' (4to *Oxford*, 1716.) especially at page 80.—According to Whiston's theory, a great advancement and

Scripture did then think even that date to be by many years too soon, (for the Scripture does not for every decay of the church impute *apostasy*, or *falling away*, to it; but then when the corruption becomes a gangrene. And the Roman empire held a considerable degree of power, even in Italy, to a much later date.) And now they themselves may see their own mistake. For it was by their hypothesis to last but 1260 years, (which with the 456 make 1716,) and then a great advancement, or resurrection, of true religion and of Christ's kingdom was to begin. Which he that thinks to be now, or does not see that Christendom is yet in the dregs of that degeneracy, does not know what religion, or Christ's kingdom is. But none, as I said, did ever conceive it to have begun during the fourth century.

I mention these things to you, for this reason; that you (who perhaps may not be acquainted with the character of the Christians that lived in the several ages or centuries of the church, by reading the books and histories of each century) may be able, by such general accounts as lie open to all readers of Scripture, to understand that the centuries which we quote, and which Mr. Gale yields, were not within the space of that *falling away*, but were times wherein the true spirit and genius of Christian religion and piety did continue to a degree, to which we may wish we could see any thing equal in our time. And that consequently you may perceive, that not only those that have improvement in the state of the church and of religion was expected to take place in the year 1716, a point here touched by Dr. Wall.]



told you, that infant-baptism began but of late under such or such a pope of Rome; but also Mr. Gale, who insinuates to you that it began in ‘the corrupt centuries,’ do abuse you.

You perceive and mind, that I speak now only of the time that he yields, from St. Cyprian and downward. Not but that there is evidence, both from Scripture and from the elder Fathers, (such as may satisfy any impartial inquirer,) of its being from the beginning.

Suffer me to advise you of one thing, wherein the writers against infant-baptism take advantage of your incapacity to read the ancient Christian authors yourselves. There are some of the Fathers, who in their books that are left have not happened to say any thing about the baptizing of infants; there having not been any dispute about that in their time; and yet they have perhaps occasion, by reason of the frequent baptisms of adult converts then, to speak of the sacrament of baptism in general. And when they do so speak of it in general, it is common with them to mention faith, and a serious purpose of amendment of life, &c., as necessary for those who are by that sacrament entered into the Christian covenant.

Now it is usual with the antipædobaptist writers to collect a number of these sayings, concerning the necessity of faith, &c., as there are thousands of them. Those of the said writers who are cautious not to discover the weakness of their plea, pick them out of such Fathers, in whose books there is not any mention of the case of infants; and they would have an unlearned man conclude from them that those Fathers must have thought baptism of

infants impracticable, because they do in those general sentences speak of faith and repentance as requisite to baptism.

Now all such arguings are shewed to be inconclusive by this one observation, viz., that those Fathers who were uncontestedly pædobaptists, and in whose time the practice is notoriously known, do, when they speak of baptism in general, speak in the same language, and insist upon the same qualifications.

A learned friend has sent me a collection of several such sayings, of such Fathers as the antipædobaptists themselves do own to have practised infant-baptism; and advised me to let you see some of them.

St. Cyprian, who lived in the hundred and fiftieth year after the apostles, is now well known to the antipædobaptists, as one maintaining the doctrine of pædobaptism; and yet he, when he is discoursing of baptism in general, has sentences concerning the necessity of faith, repentance, &c., to baptism, as positive as can be found in any Father whatsoever.

As for example. *Epist. 75. ed. Oxon.*<sup>†</sup>

‘Qui cum Noe in arca non fuerunt, non tantum  
 ‘purgati [et salvati] per aquam non sunt, sed statim  
 ‘diluvio illo perierunt. Sic et nunc quicumque in  
 ‘ecclesia cum Christo non sunt, foris peribunt; nisi  
 ‘ad unicum et salutare ecclesie lavacrum per pœni-  
 ‘tentiam convertantur.

‘They who were not with Noah in the ark, ob-  
 ‘tained no purgation or cleansing by the water, but  
 ‘even perished by that flood. So also *whoever* they

<sup>†</sup> [ P. 225. and p. 148. of the Benedictine edition, with the addition of the words *et salvati.* ]

‘ are that are not with Christ in the church, will  
 ‘ perish as men out of it ; unless they do come, *with*  
 ‘ *repentance*, to that only salutary sacrament [wash-  
 ‘ ing] of the church.”

Here one of the writers, I mentioned, would from the universality of this sentence, ‘ whoever they are,’ have concluded that no person whatsoever was in Cyprian’s judgment capable of that sacrament of baptism without *repentance* ; if we had not otherwise known his sentiment concerning infants being baptized, from those places of his books where he treats particularly of their case.

The like use they would make of his seventieth Epistle, where he is speaking of the interrogations made at baptism ; ‘ Dost thou believe,’ &c., if he had happened never to write any thing concerning the baptism of infants.

Gregory Nyssen lived in those times and places, when and where the antipædobaptists themselves now do not deny that infant-baptism was in use, viz., more than a hundred years after St. Cyprian. He mentions faith and prayer among the things that complete the sacrament of baptism. Orat. Catechet. cap. 33<sup>u</sup>.

Ἐνχὴ πρὸς Θεὸν, καὶ χάριτος οὐρανίας ἐπίκλησις, καὶ ὕδωρ, καὶ πίστις ἐστὶ, δι’ ὧν τὸ τῆς ἀναγεννήσεως πληροῦται μυστήριον. ‘ Prayer to God, and the imploring  
 ‘ of the heavenly grace, and the water, and *faith*,  
 ‘ are the things that make up the sacrament of  
 ‘ regeneration.’

St. Cyril, St. Chrysostom, St. Austin himself, when they speak of baptism in general, use sayings like

<sup>u</sup> [See Gregorii Nysseni Opera, Gr. Lat. 3 tom. fol. Paris. 1638. tom. iii. p. 95.]

to these. Yet we are sure from other places in their books, that they understood the case of infants to be a particular and excepted case; and that they were to be baptized though they had not at present those qualifications; but that they were by baptism dedicated to that religion which would teach them, and which did require of them, these conditions as they grew up.

And I gave in my book, part ii. chap. 1. §. 2, a pattern of two sayings; one of St. Basil, and one of St. Hierome. Which, if we were not sure of the contrary, might make one think that they were antipædobaptists, viz., a place where St. Basil says, ‘one must believe first; and then be sealed with ‘baptism.’ St. Hierome says of the apostles, that they first taught the nations, and then baptized them. ‘For it cannot be, that the body do receive ‘the sacrament of baptism, unless the soul have ‘before received the true faith.’ And the Catechism of the Church of England speaks at the same rate; ‘There is required of persons to be baptized *faith* ‘and *repentance*.’ Yet it is known that all these knew, and allowed of, the baptizing of infants.

And therefore, when we meet with such sayings in the book of some other Father, who perhaps has not occasion in any part of his book to speak of the case of infants: yet we have no sufficient reason from such sayings of his, to conclude his meaning to be that they should not be baptized; any more than it can be concluded from the like sayings of St. Austin, St. Chrysostom, &c.

Mr. Danvers, and some other antipædobaptists, that have made it their business to collect great numbers of quotations from the Fathers, have, if

they aimed at convincing men from thence that those Fathers were against the baptizing of infants, done very imprudently to set down, among the rest, such sayings of St. Austin, and others who are known pædobaptists: because these betrayed the mistake of the sense which they would have put on all the rest.

This answer may satisfy the doubts of some who have been staggered by such quotations; and might have satisfied Mr. Gale of the invalidity of that argument which he brought from such a saying of Dionysius of Alexandria, which I a little above rehearsed.

As to the other dispute, concerning the *manner* of administering baptism, into which he has dragged me by putting my name into that part of his book; I need not do as he does; recapitulate what I have said: for he himself has given up your plea; so far as it makes immersion *absolutely* necessary. *Dipping*, he says, it must be. The word *baptize* necessarily signifies that. But he cannot maintain that sense of the word to be constant, not even in his own instances, but by yielding that if *any part* of the thing be covered with water, (it is no matter whether put into the water, or the water put over that,) the thing is *dipped*. And he instances; by dipping the nib of a pen in ink, the pen is dipped. Which will justify, not only the sprinklers, but him that should baptize by putting the tip of the person's finger in water. A thing reproachful to baptism, both in your sense and ours. And which if I had said, I should be ashamed ever to shew my face in any dispute about baptism.

If I do address to my brethren of the clergy, I

ought to do it as to them from whom it is fitter for me to receive advice, than give any to them. But as it has happened to be my lot to spend a good deal of that time which they do much better employ, in thinking, talking, reading and writing about this matter; I would humbly hope that a few words of the result of my thoughts, concerning the question, and the schism raised upon it, and the way to heal it, or prevent its spreading, may be not unkindly taken.

I am clearly of opinion, that it was not any scruple or offence taken at the baptizing persons in infancy, that raised this schism. As that has been from the beginning in our church, and in all churches; the unity and satisfaction of all people in it, from the beginning till of late, is a proof that it must be some new thing at which the offence was taken. There has no novelty or alteration, that I know of, in the point of baptism, been brought into our church, but in the *way* or *manner* of administering it. The way that is now ordinarily used we cannot deny to have been a novelty, brought into this church by those that had learned it in Germany or at Geneva. And they were not contented to follow the example of *pouring* a quantity of water, (which had there been introduced instead of *immersion*,) but improved it (if I may so abuse that word) from *pouring* to *sprinkling*; that it might have as little resemblance of the ancient way of baptizing, as possible.

It is that, I verily believe, that has given the occasion. And by all the search that I have been able, in discourse with the vulgar people, to make into the grounds of the dissatisfaction which they

have conceived concerning their baptism received in the church in their infancy, the main hinge has turned, not upon the *time*, but the *manner* of its administration. Mr. Gale (as well as the rest of their writers) seems to have been sensible of this. And therefore, though he entitled his book ‘Reflections’ upon mine, which had not meddled (or but in a few lines) with the *manner* of baptism; he sought his advantage by drawing in, by head and shoulders, a dispute about that; wherein he knew that the examples of Scripture and other antiquity, and the full persuasion of that people, and of all the *Eastern* church to this day, is on his side: and I had the disadvantage to plead for a way of baptism, of which the best I could say, was, that it is sufficient for the essence of baptism; but could not deny the other (except in the case of danger of health) to be the fittest.

The solemnity of the circumstances in the administration of baptism (as also of the other sacrament) does very powerfully strike and affect the mind of any devout Christian that sees it administered. The baptism of an infant cannot have all the solemnity which that of an adult person may have. The previous fasting and prayer, the penitent confessions, the zeal and humility and deep affection of the receiver may be visible there; which cannot be in the case of an infant. But for that very reason we ought not to deprive the administration of this sacrament to infants of any solemnity of which it is capable.

The *immersion* of the person (whether infant or adult) in the posture of one that is buried and raised up again, is much more solemn, and expresses the

design of the sacrament, and the mystery of the spiritual washing much better, than pouring a small quantity of water on the face. And that *pouring* of water, is much better than *sprinkling*, or dropping a drop of water on it. If it be done in the church, in or at the font, and the congregation do join in the prayers there used, it is much more solemn than in a bedchamber, out of a basin or pipkin, a teacup or a punchbowl; and a bedchamber is perhaps not quite so scandalous as a kitchen or stable; to which things look as if they would bring it at last.

These innovations and alterations for the worse, these *vilipendiums* of the holy sacrament shewn and used in the baptizing of infants, I take to have been the occasions of the disgust and dissatisfaction conceived by the people concerning the baptism they had received in infancy; and to have given rise to the schism of the antipædobaptists, (which never spread much in *England* till these abuses were notorious,) and to be to this day causes of the growth of it. And consequently, that the reforming of them would be by God's grace a good and likely means for the healing of it. And we have reason to give God thanks, that the present orders and rubrics of our church are all calculated for the reforming of these abuses, and preserving the dignity of this holy sacrament; and that there wants nothing but the due execution of them, and our conscientious performing of that which we all solemnly promised before God and the bishop, when we had the charge of souls committed to us, that we would conform to the Liturgy of the church of *England*, as it is now by law established.



That excellent Liturgy orders the priest, (and accordingly he is bound in conscience,) that (if the godfathers and godmothers shall certify him that the child may well endure it) he do *dip* it in the water discreetly and warily, &c. I know that they are generally of late very backward in certifying this, or consenting to it. But that is nothing but an ill custom. Many of them are satisfied that the dipping or bathing a child in water has no such danger to the health, as has been pretended. But they are unwilling to do otherwise than has of late been done. A few examples of the old Scripture way would cure this prejudice. And the curates of parishes, as on one side they are no fit judges of the strength or weakness of the child, and so must not do this against the parents' or godfathers' will; so on the other side might, if they would, much influence the godly people to consent to it. I do not say that any one curate (if all round about him do shew a contrary temper and inclination) can do much in it: but the joint endeavours of any competent number in a neighbourhood, having both such plain truth, and the Liturgy, and all ancient practice on their side, would easily convince the people, that that which all our fathers in this island practised, till few years ago, without any damage to their children's health, cannot be impracticable now.

I propose this, not for the case of such children as are weaker than ordinary, but only in the case of such as have as good a degree of strength to bear it, as children ordinarily have. And having spoken my sense of this matter to my brethren more largely above at the end of my answer to Mr. Gale's fifth chapter, shall not trouble them with repetition.

To those who use *sprinkling* instead of *dipping*, or even of *pouring* water, (which last is enjoined by our church even in the weakest child's case,) I would humbly represent the consideration of the duty of obedience which they owe, not only to the rules of the church, to which they have promised to conform; but also and chiefly to our Saviour himself, whose word of command is *baptize*. I wish they would study the notion and emphasis of that word. We are forced to some pains in defence of our practice against those who pretend that it does necessarily and absolutely include *dipping* in its signification. I think we must not, and cannot, deny that it includes *washing* in its signification. They will do well to consider, whether they shall be able to justify before our Saviour, that a *drop*, or a *sprinkle* or two, of water can be so fairly understood to be a *washing* of the person in his sense, as pouring water is. I know that it may be justified in Mr. Gale's sense of the word *baptize*. As a pen, he says, is *dipped*, if the nib of it be dipped. I hope none of the church will think fit to use such quibbles in a serious and sacred thing. Suppose that such a washing by *sprinkling*, or a *drop*, be sufficient in case of some necessity that may happen, (as I hope it is,) shall we thereupon in ordinary cases go as near to the breaking of Christ's command as possibly we can? *Do we provoke the Lord to jealousy? Are we stronger than he?*

I know that some midwives and nurses do on the christening day (which they think is observed, not so much for the sacrament itself, as for their shewing their pride, art, and finery) dress the child's head so, that the face of it being hid deep under the

lace and trimming which stands up high on each side, the minister cannot come at the face to *pour* water on it, so as that it may run off again; but what water he pours, will run in among the head-cloths (which really is likely to do the child more hurt than *dipping* would have done). But he must make them remedy this inconvenience: and give them to understand, that if they will have their children baptized, they must bring them in such a dress as to be capable of it.

Concerning the other abuse of this sacrament, the administering it in private houses, bedchambers, &c., to children that are well, I spoke my sense in my book in the notes I made on St. Austin's account of the devout people running to church with their sick children that were in danger of death, to have them speedily baptized<sup>x</sup>. I have this more, to lay to the consciences of those my brethren of the clergy that use themselves to give these bedchamber baptisms; that they would consider, both the profanation and indignity they bring on Christ's sacrament, and also how directly contrary their practice is to the Liturgy which they are obliged in duty and by solemn promise to conform to. The Liturgy appoints two several offices for baptism of infants in two several cases. One more solemn for *public* baptism, to be used nowhere but in the church; to which all children that are in an ordinary state of health are to be brought. The other to be used *in houses* in cases of necessity, and not else. And these are very different (not different baptisms, but have different circumstances) one from the other. Now for any clergyman that is under

[<sup>x</sup> See vol. i. p. 302, &c.]

the obligation of conscience I spoke of, to take one of these, (that of *public* baptism,) and use it *in houses*, is plainly contrary to the said obligation. And some of the prayers so misapplied become absurd and ridiculous. For example; the minister standing at the font in the church is to say that prayer; ‘Grant that whosoever is *here* dedicated to thee by our office and ministry,’ &c. Can he think that that ‘*here*’ is applicable to this parlour or bed-chamber? is it not scandalous so to apply it? or has he any authority to omit or alter the form?

The profanation and indignity in general on this sacrament on occasion of this house-baptism, is so notorious, that I do appeal to the experience and conscience of all that use it, if they themselves be not scandalized at the indecent circumstances that do almost always attend it. All the regard is commonly given to the preparations for eating and drinking; very little to the sacrament. Very few of the company join in the prayers; but only in the feasting and carnal jollity, which is too often carried on to such excess, as is more likely to bring a curse than a blessing upon the whole undertaking. This is commonly yet worse, when it is in an ale-house or other lewd house. Those who in such cases are chosen for godfathers and godmothers, are generally persons ignorant of the terms of the baptismal covenant themselves; and when they should make answer in the name of the child to the holy interrogatories, they neither mind the substance of the thing asked, nor do know what answer is fit to make; but do only in a ridiculous manner give a bow, a curtesy, or a nod; and that often not without apparent signs of mockery: and

they frequently shew a very vain, irreverent, and wanton behaviour before, and in, and after the sacred administration. Is not this enough to turn the stomach of any serious Christian that is present? And if they reflect with themselves, and think, ‘Is this the way that I was baptized in?’ to occasion perhaps their falling into the error we are speaking of, and resolving to be baptized again? Can a minister of Christ take any comfort, or can he think that the dignity of the holy office which he is performing is preserved, in such a management?

In all parishes where baptism at the church is generally left off, the people are so ignorant of what is to be done and said at baptism (many of the young people having hardly ever been present at one), that if a child be brought to church to be baptized, neither are the congregation sensible of their duty of joining in the prayers, nor do the godfathers know what answer they are to make; but there are holy questions publicly put without any one to answer: which, however it passes in a bedchamber, is a great scandal and absurdity when a sacrament is administering in a Christian congregation. And when the young people of such a parish come to the Curate, to be prepared for confirmation, they are found to have but a slender apprehension of what was stipulated in their name at baptism (which is the chief thing that should make them capable of confirmation); because, though they have learned the words in the Catechism, yet having never seen the thing transacted, they have not near so lively an idea of the holy covenant. But where baptisms are duly administered in the

church in the time of divine service, all the congregation do both learn to understand the office of a godfather; and it is usually performed with such decent seriousness as the nature of the thing requires; and the whole congregation (as St. Austin expresses it) ‘of the saints (or good Christians) does ‘this office of offering the infant to God for the ‘receiving of the spiritual grace.’ And there is also that more momentous advantage, (with which, as with one of the reasons why baptism should always, if possible, be administered in the sight of the people, our church does enforce the command,) that ‘every man present is put in remembrance of ‘his own profession made to God in his baptism.’

No serious Christian, that has considered these advantages, would have his child miss of them; nor would have him baptized in that disadvantageous way, if the minister would. If any man desire baptism for his child that is well, and yet has so little value for it, that he thinks it too much, and refuses to bring him to the right and proper place of receiving it; what I might do for the sake of the child, (who, as Nazianzen says, is not in the fault,) is a question by itself; but if the man himself had not yet been baptized, and did ask it with such an irreligious coldness, and insisting on such haughty terms, I am sure I would not give it him, (of what degree soever he were, from an emperor to a beggar,) but let him keep his pride with his heathenism; for it agrees very ill with Christianity.

In the primitive times, if any heathen man, high or low, noble or ignoble, would turn Christian, and be baptized, the Christians did not admit it to be done privately. He must some time before the

baptism come into a full congregation of Christians, and there standing up in a place in the church provided for that purpose, openly repeat the Christian creed, and declare his owning of it. Some, that had been in repute, and in great stations among the heathens, were ashamed to do this; but the Christians would not believe him to be sincere till he did it. Our Christian ancestors in *England*, though they had, in large parishes, chapels and oratories, for the ease of such as lived remote from the mother church, for hearing God's word, and praying, &c., yet none of them would lose the privilege of receiving the communion, and of having this other sacrament of baptism conferred on their children, in the mother church; to which they would bring their children, though it were a long journey, to be baptized by *dipping* in the font. And do we, their degenerate offspring, turn not only the font into a bason, but also this mother-church into a bedchamber?

I know that if any curate of a parish do insist upon having all children of rich and poor, that are in health, brought to church, and do refuse to shew the respect (so those ignorant half Christians call it) of bringing the sacrament to their houses, and do plead the rubric and order of the church in his own vindication; he shall in some parishes of haughty, rude, and ill-bred people, meet with a great deal of obloquy; and among other things they will object to him, not only the example of such or such a neighbour curate, who complies in this matter; but also that such or such a one of those that are in the highest station in the church does many times shew that condescension, which he refuses to do.

And we must blush, that such things can be said, and we cannot deny them. But every one in the holy orders ought to reckon his commission to be received from Christ; and under Christ, from that church in which, and by whose rules and canons he is called and sent; and not to follow the example of any particular man or men, in how great station soever, in things wherein they deviate from that which should be their rule as well as ours.

What must be done, or can be done, in places where presbyterians lie in wait to draw people from the church into separations, and do offer their service to any humoursome man or woman, that if the parish curate will not baptize their child at home, they will; is more than I am able to determine. It must be left to the bishop of the place, to direct which of the two evils must be chosen. I have been credibly informed that the late pious bishop of *London*<sup>y</sup> found it necessary to advise his clergy in the city to comply in this matter with their people, rather than let them fall into the hands of those seducers: but that in his visitation in the country places, he advised them to keep steady to the rubric. Certainly those leaders of the separation will have a good load of guilt; who neither will reform abuses among their own followers, nor suffer us to do it among our people. These are the men, who, when the church made an order for private baptism of children in danger of speedy death, did so clamour against it<sup>z</sup>, that one

<sup>y</sup> [Bishop Henry Compton. See the point briefly touched in his '*Episcopalia*, or letters to the Clergy of his Diocese,' 18mo. *London*, 1686, p. 3 to 7.]

<sup>z</sup> [This took place at the Savoy Conference, just before the



of them said, it was *unlawful*, even though the child was to be damned for want of baptism. I know that many of the parochial clergy do wish and desire that the bishops would in open court, and in the audience of the people, lay a strict charge upon them, not to baptize any child that is well in a house. Because otherwise the people are apt to tell the curate, that he might do this, if he would; and endeavour to bring the more envy upon him for refusing.

There is one thing that I am loath to speak of; that some of the clergy are thought by some people to use this compliance for their own sordid gain; and for the sake of the *present*, which is given to the baptizer for submitting the sacrament, and his own holy office, to the humour of some irreligious parents. St. Paul speaks of some who did keep alehouse with God's word; that is his phrase, 2 Cor. ii. 17. *καπηλεύοντες τὸν λόγον τοῦ Θεοῦ*, *sell* it, *prostitute* it, in the same sense as authors use the word *καπηλεῦειν τὴν δίκην*; or *τὴν εἰρήνην*, *to sell justice*, or *sell a peace*, as a *κάπηλος*, an alehouse keeper sells his ale. God Almighty keep us from doing this with his sacrament. It is more than enough, it is to a dreadful degree too much, that benefices, places, offices, promotions in the church are trucked. If we can keep any thing unprostituted, it should be God's word, and his sacraments. St. James shews the mischief of having any respect of persons, rich and poor, in concerns of religion. It will certainly have the same effect there, which

revisal of the Liturgy in the reign of Charles II. See an account of all the objections urged against various parts of it, by Richard Baxter and others.]

Solomon says it has every where, where it is admitted. *To have respect of persons is not good* (he means it is a very mischievous thing). *For a piece of bread that man will transgress.* These clergymen (if there be any such, for I own, I know of none, only there runs in some people's discourses such a censure) do every Lord's day say that prayer; 'That God would give ' grace to all bishops and curates——rightly and 'duly to administer his holy sacraments.' They pray this for themselves among the rest. They should not by undue administrations defeat their own prayers.

I could wish also, that the usual feasts at christenings, and the customary presents then given by the godfathers, &c., were left off; and that the clergy would persuade their parishioners to leave them off. They may very well be called *nehushtan*<sup>a</sup>. How innocently or commendably soever, for a sign of spiritual congratulation, they were first used; as they are used now, they bring more disgrace than credit to the sacrament. Beside the sinful excesses too common, they do, like the popish ceremonies, swallow up all the regard that should be given to the substance of the sacrament itself. They are also the cause of the difficulty of procuring godfathers to poor people's children.

The sum of what I would propose to the consideration of my brethren and of all pious members of our church on this head, is; that whatsoever brings a discredit, a contempt, an indignity, or

<sup>a</sup> ['A mere piece of brass.' The name by which in contempt Hezekiah designated the brasen serpent set up by Moses, which the Israelites in process of time had converted into an object of idolatrous worship. 2 Kings iv. 18.]

profanation on the sacrament, as it is administered to infants, does help to increase the doubts of those who are inclined to be dissatisfied with their baptism received *in infancy*; and so is an occasion of promoting the schism; and should be reformed on our side.

Another thing that I think useful for any of the clergy whose ill fortune it is to be under a necessity of being concerned with any of their people in this question, is; that they make a difference between three sorts of antipædobaptists; for there is a different sort of management fit to be used toward them.

Some few of them do still continue to hold communion with the established church in the public prayers, and in the other sacrament; and in this too, as far as is consistent with their opinion, i. e. when their children are *adult*, and desire baptism, they advise them to receive it in the church, at the hands of the lawful minister. They are sensible, that whatever becomes of the question of pædobaptism, schism is certainly a great sin. I did, in my book<sup>b</sup>, give my thoughts, (but professing to submit them to the judgment of those who are over us in the Lord,) that such men, though in a mistake in that one opinion, should be received as brethren; and that, as they do not excommunicate us, so we should not them. And that in this case, where there is no difference in the fundamentals of the faith, nor any self-willed spirit of opposition, that rule of St. Paul does hold, Phil. iii. 15, *If in any thing ye be otherwise minded, (i. e. of different opinions,) God shall reveal even this unto you. Nevertheless whereto we have*

<sup>b</sup> [Vol. ii. chap. xi.]

*already attained*, (or in things wherein we agree,) *let us walk by the same rule*: let us be unanimous. These men give a good proof that they have not that self-willed spirit of opposition that I spoke of, by this: that they do not run into the separation. For that is a thing which all proud self-conceited persons love above all things. And it is for the sake of that, (that they may have the honour and pride of setting up, or keeping up, a party by themselves,) that most of them do value the opinions for which they stickle. St. Paul says, *There must be sects* (or heresies) *in a church; that they which are approved may be made manifest*, or distinguished from the rest. He means, I think, that the sects will take off all the proud, self-conceited, schismatically disposed people. And that he that is not drawn away with this temptation, does so far *approve* himself a solid, humble, and good Christian. And we may add this particular, that he that withstands that temptation in *England*, may be ventured any where. For there is no place in the world, where Christ is named, (or if I except one, that shall be all,) in which the sinfulness of schism is so little considered; or the encouragements and temptation to it so great. These men therefore, even where they err, are to be thought to act in the sincerity of their heart. And there is a very different deportment due toward such, from that which is to be used to wilful opposers. The determining of the question, whether they shall be continued in communion, will belong chiefly to the bishop of the place. (if ever it please God that the discipline and authority of the church be restored,) and not to those of my brethren to whom I pretend to offer

this my advice. But the bishop himself will regard the character of the men which the parochial clergy shall give.

I do not mean that they ought to be flattered by any one that has the cure of their souls, as one of late with his new divinity flatters them and all erroneous Christians<sup>c</sup>; that whatever their errors in religion be, yet if they be sincere in the choice of their tenets, and judge as well as they can, and practise accordingly; they are then (though in an error) in as good case as those that hold the very truth according to the real meaning of Christ in the Scripture, and practise accordingly. Or, as he expresses it, and calls it a *demonstration*, that wherever the sincerity is equal, it must have equal effect in justifying the person.

Such an untheological opinion (that ignorance, or error, excuses not only *a tanto*, but *a toto*) will make St. Paul (who *always lived in all good conscience*, and in those *many things which he did contrary to the name of Jesus*, was sincere, and did what he *verily thought with himself he ought to do*) to have been as unblameable and as much justified in that opposition to Christianity, as he was in holding the truth afterward. This makes a *Soci-nian*, a *Quaker*, a *Papist*, and for ought I can see, a *Turk*, if they be sincere, to be in as good case as the most orthodox Christian.

<sup>c</sup> [The allusion is to *Hoadly*, bishop of Bangor: whose doctrine on the point may be seen in his 'Preservative against the principles and practices of the Nonjurors in Church and State.' 8<sup>o</sup>. p. 54, 55 of the edition, *Dublin* 1716. The bishop did not escape censure for his remarks. See *Law's* 'Letter to him, on his Sermon, and on some dangerous doctrines in his *Preservative*,' 8<sup>o</sup>. 1718. p. 4—10.]

The antipædobaptist himself, of whom I am speaking, will not, if he be a man of tolerable sense and understanding, accept of comfort to his conscience on such a ground as this, which will justify the Quaker in the denial of all baptism, as soon as him in the denial of it to his children under age; and the other antipædobaptists who make a *schism* for their opinion, as soon as him who owns and desires to keep *the communion of saints*.

All that I would say to represent such a man as fit to be admitted to communion, is, *first*, that his error about the time or age of giving baptism is not a fundamental one; and, *secondly*, that he does not make a schism for it: and, *thirdly*, that he is much more likely to have his erroneous opinion rectified by his continuing in the unity of the church; and we have much more encouragement to take pains with him, while he does so.

The *first English* antipædobaptists, that made any considerable number, were of this sort. They held communion with the *presbyterians*, (for it was in their reign that they sprang up,) and the *presbyterians* did not reject them from communion; though they wrote and disputed eagerly against their tenet. And I believe that a total breach of communion had never been made, had it not been for a wicked contrivance and mischievous circumstance of those times, which I wish had been peculiar to them.

There was then a sort of atheistical state-politicians, and military officers, (that aimed at the ruin of church and state, and effected it,) who were not willing that the doctrine, or discipline, or authority of any church at all, should bear any great sway;

for none could be for their turn. And therefore, as they had encouraged the *presbyterians* (who formerly under the name of *puritans* had lived in communion with the church of England) to separate from it, and fight against it; and had sufficiently weakened all the authority of that: so now, not meaning that the *presbyterian* discipline should have power enough, or regard enough among the people, to check or thwart their impious designs any more than the other had been able to do, they set up and encouraged all the dissenting parties of men they could, against that establishment too; and amongst the rest, the antipædobaptists.

The *dissenting* of these men was not enough for their turn. They must *separate*<sup>d</sup>, and set up one church against another, if they would have any *place* of advantage in the state, or the army. If they would do that, they were capable of being captains, colonels, major-generals, &c. Too many of the antipædobaptists went into the separation. The honestest, and most sincere and judicious of them (and particularly Mr. Tombes) protested and remonstrated against their doing so; and continued in communion with the established church. The few that, as I said, do now continue with us, are of that stamp.

The contrivance and aim that I spoke of, to weaken and frustrate any church authority, was carried on in those times upon a very different principle from that which has been made use of for the same purpose since. As for the authority of the church to censure, judge, and, if need be, excom-

<sup>d</sup> [See Crosby's History of the Baptists, vol. i. p. 147, &c., and Ivimey, vol. i. p. 137, &c.]

municate men for heretical and blasphemous tenets published, as well as for immoral actions committed, I do not remember that any sect then denied it; but each sect assumed it to themselves: the *presbyterians* and *antipædobaptists* as high as any. This served the purpose of the men I spoke of, as well then, as the new hypothesis does now. For if forty churches in a nation do oppose and slight each other's censures and authority; a libertine, a deist, and enricher of himself by the spoils of the public, a Socinian, &c., is as safe, as if no church at all had that power. And the old way was the more artificial, and did not nigh so plainly contradict the Scripture, as they do, who deny that Christ ever gave such power at all; when it is notorious, and seen in Scripture by all the sectaries themselves, that he did.

The abounding of sects was a thing very much for their turn then. But they had not then, as I remember, any advocate<sup>e</sup>, who recommended this as a desirable thing, and that they were all of them well-pleasing to God. But every party owned (what is indeed plain in Scripture) that there ought to be no divisions; and so counted all the rest blameable, except their own.

Such of us clergymen as are old enough to have any memory of those confusions<sup>f</sup>, have been apt to comfort ourselves with hopes that we should not leave the church of *England* in worse case than we found it; and yet it recovered out of that. But really they startle us, when they talk of making the church of Christ only a *number*, without any cohe-

<sup>e</sup> [See above, p. 417.]

<sup>f</sup> [Dr. Wall was born in the year 1645.]



sion, government, or discipline; for that is a higher degree of debasing it, and tends more directly to the dissolving of it, than any of the pretences of those men; who always confessed it to be a *body*, or *society*, or, as the article expresses it, a *congregation*, which required union in the parts, and a subordination of some members to others. The mischief *then* was, that each of their several composures pretended to be that *body*, with an exclusion of almost all others.

This sort of antipædobaptists, which I am now speaking of, were commendable then, for that, however they dissented in this particular tenet, they would not be carried by any of those ignorant, rash, and selfish leaders into that dreadful extremity of separation, which is of far greater guilt than the error itself. And since they could see through all the hypocritical pretences of the seducers of those times, they may, I hope, be trusted with scanning the present scheme made for division; which has a cover of godliness a great deal thinner, and more transparent than those had; and indeed seems calculated, not for catching scrupulous or tender consciences, but for encouraging sceptics, deists, &c., or those that aim to get money by their separating.

To antipædobaptists of this temper, the curate of a parish should, I think, carry himself as to candid dissenters. And as they still own themselves of his flock, and preserve in most parts of religion a Christian brotherhood with the rest of his parishioners, and do continue to give him any opportunity of applying what proofs, reasons, and arguments he is able, for their satisfaction; he ought to do it in the

most mild and friendly way. And if at last he fail of success, yet to hope that our blessed Saviour, who has severely threatened those that break the unity of his body, will more easily pardon a sincere, though erroneous member in it.

*Secondly*, of those antipædobaptists that do *separate*, all are not of one sort. For some, and those far the greatest number, have, even in their separation, so much of Christianity, modesty, and charity left; as to take and own the church of *England*, and other protestant pædobaptist churches, to be *Christians*, and not to want any *essential* or *fundamental* requisites of a *Christian Church*.

I quoted some of the most noted antipædobaptists that have been in *England*; Mr. Tombes<sup>g</sup>, declaring an abhorrence of those that carried the dispute to unchristian extremities; Mr. Stennet<sup>h</sup>, calling it a reproach cast on the antipædobaptists; ‘That they judge none of the true church, but ‘those of their own way.’ And, more than that, the public *confessions*<sup>i</sup> and *declarations* of the hundred churches, as they style themselves, professing ‘their *consent* with other protestants in all the *fundamental* articles of Christian religion.’ And, ‘that ‘all persons throughout the world, professing the ‘faith, &c., not destroying their own profession by ‘any errors *erecting the foundation*, &c., are bound ‘to maintain an holy fellowship and communion in ‘the worship of God.’ These are, for general principles, sounder than some lately vented by one or two that profess themselves of our church.

<sup>g</sup> [See vol. i. p. 559, and 566.]

<sup>h</sup> [Vol. i. p. 551, 552.]

<sup>i</sup> [Vol. i. p. 359, 552, 553, 571.]

It is true, they do, for all this, continue in actual separation. I do not mean Mr. Tombes did; but most of these present subscribers of the *confession* which I mentioned, do. What reason they have to give, or how, after such declarations, they do endeavour to justify their separation, I know not. If I had had the good fortune to have had my book answered by one of those, instead of Mr. Gale, I must have known their ground. He would not say a word concerning that *confession*, or concerning the declarations of Mr. Tombes or Mr. Stennet.

I did once propose the question to Mr. Stennet; how they did count it consistent with such declarations, to renounce communion? He answered; that they should not refuse to admit a pædobaptist, against whom they had no other objection, to their communion. I remember, he was pleased to instance in me: so that he must mean, one that had no other baptism, but in infancy, and by pouring water. There was not then time (for we were just parting) for the question that ought to have followed next; why, if they could admit us, if we came to their assemblies, they might not with as good conscience come and communicate (in the prayers and the other sacrament) at ours? And I never after had opportunity before his death to renew the conversation.

It must be, either that they hold something in which they must join, in our prayers, or way of worship or of communicating, to be sinful: or, that it is sinful in them to be present at the baptizing of an infant, though they do not join in those particular prayers: or else, that those who have different opinions in things *not fundamental*, must

set up several communions, or churches. Which last is a very mistaken notion; has done unspeakable mischief in hindering many sorts of protestants, *Lutherans, Calvinists, Presbyterians, &c.*, from communicating with the national churches where providence has placed them: and will, if it be followed, propagate divisions *in infinitum*: and yet, to our shame, is encouraged in some even of our own pulpits.

This sort of antipædobaptists, though they separate themselves from us, yet do it not upon so uncharitable a principle, nor do shew so obstinate a temper, but that there may be some hopes of reducing them to a right sentiment, either of the essentials of the sacrament of baptism; or at least, of the article of the *communion of saints*: and hopes, that pains spent with them in conversing, discoursing, arguing and recommending books to them, may be not in vain. Which pains should be taken, and used with them, in all patience and meekness, so long till they appear incorrigible in their schism.

*Thirdly*, there is another sort, who do not only separate from, but rail at our church, clergy, and people, and all other protestants, as being either *no Christians*, (as many of them do shew their real sentiment to be) or *no church*; having no bishops, no Christian presbyters, no sacraments, &c. As you see Mr. Gale and that sort do broadly intimate their censure.

There are, God be thanked, but few of them so far gone in the spirit of uncharitableness. They that are, deserve to be thought as far from Christianity, as they censure all others to be. He that

excommunicates all Christendom, except himself and so very few, does stand *ipso facto* excommunicated from them whom he so renounces. As Firmilianus told Stephen bishop of Rome, that by excommunicating so many as he did, all that he got, was, that he had cut himself off from so many churches of Christ. Whatever becomes of the questions of baptism, he that has lost charity, has lost his Christianity.

I do not say, but that some pains of admonishing should be used even with these. But I think such a temper of obstinacy, arrogance, and censorious self-conceit to be that very disposition which St. Paul meant by the name of *heresy*, when he ordered Titus, that such men he should after the first and second admonition reject. *Αἰρεσις* does grammatically signify that temper; and I believe St. Paul took it in that sense at that place.

I have known some of the other sorts recovered. None ever of this. None, I mean, of such as were quite gone off from us, and herded with them, and had imbibed that censorious spirit with which they infect one another. Many that were wavering, and half way seduced, have been reclaimed.

Any of my brethren that shall have occasion, or think it necessary to *write* any thing in this controversy, may comfort themselves, that they cannot have worse luck than I have had. I set myself to speak of the antipædobaptists in the civilest language I could. The answerer represents me as a spiteful slanderer of them: picks up personal stories of my actions nothing to the purpose: pretends to publish a character of me: runs from one end of my book to the other, to single out passages upon

which he thinks he can declaim : faces down the world, that I have said things there, which I never said ; as, that there is no proof of infant-baptism from Scripture : gives very insulting and reproachful language, &c. I fancy they will not employ him again ; but do rather hope, they will call him to account for using, in the defence of their cause, affirmations of matters of fact which are not true.

My opinion was, that there needed no answer to his book. Some very worthy men thought that for the sake of the people it might be needful. I told them, they must then think of some younger man, fitter to bear the fatigue of writing books : and I thought for a long time that that course had been taken ; and depended upon it. It came however to be devolved on me, and the English proverb made good, *Wear out the old one first*. The reader, that sees the imperfection of the performance, must consider the defects of age.

I thank God who has enabled me to come to the end of it a little (God knows how little) before the end of my life<sup>k</sup>. For I have been apprehensive of dying in a circumstance, in which archbishop Tillotson somewhere says<sup>l</sup>, none would be willing to

<sup>k</sup> [Dr. Wall lived however six or seven years after writing this paragraph, dying in 1727, at the age of 82.]

<sup>l</sup> [Namely, in the preface to his sermon on Steadfastness in Religion, being the 49th in the first volume of the folio edition. —His words are these : ‘ For this reason a good man should not ‘ be very willing, *when his Lord comes*, to be found *so doing* ; and ‘ as it were *beating his fellow-servants* : and all controversy, as it ‘ is usually managed, is little better. A good man would be ‘ loth to be taken out of the world reeking hot from a sharp ‘ contention with a perverse adversary : and not a little out of

be surprised with death, viz., in the midst of a controversy, or reeking hot from one.

I would not have any one that shall write, flatter himself, that they will let him have the last word, with what strength and evidence soever he write. I have some particular reasons to be satisfied that some monied men among them, both have, and will again, if need be, contribute largely to keep the press at work. In which case, reasons and answers will never be wanting to authors.

---

There is, while I am writing this presage, a new instance given of the incessant attempts of their preachers to write against any thing that is said for their conviction; whether they have any thing rational in argument, or true in fact, to oppose to it or not.

One Mr. Davye of Leicester, in a book called ‘The Baptism of Adult Believers only<sup>m</sup>,’ &c., undertakes to shew, that there have been antipædobaptists in ‘every age of the church’ from Christ’s and the

‘countenance, to find himself in this temper translated into the calm and peaceable regions of the blessed, where nothing but perfect charity and good-will reign for ever.’]

<sup>m</sup> [I have not been able to obtain a sight of this publication; therefore cannot answer for the correctness of the citations from it.

In Ivimey’s History of the Baptists there is the following brief notice of it and its author :

‘Mr. Stokes found an able antagonist also in Mr. *Thomas Davy*, who published a work of 158 pages, dated “Leicester, 29th September 1718,” entitled “The baptism of adult believers only, asserted and vindicated, and that of infants disproved,” &c., with a postscript and appendix.’]

apostles' time till now. Which if he can do, he shall be the champion of their cause.

He saw this to be needful; because (as he observes) Christ's church must have had a being in all ages. From which the true conclusion being, since many ages have been without ever an anti-pædobaptist, there must have been in all those ages a true church of pædobaptists: he, not liking this conclusion, labours, in spite of all history, to find some anti-pædobaptists in all the several ages.

This he declares in his preface to be the thing which he is *largest* on, and labours *chiefly to make out*. He does however treat of the arguments from Scripture; but owns, they have been 'so fully and 'nicely canvassed' that they are come to their *ne plus ultra* in matter of argument. And, as he does not pretend, so he has not on that head any thing but what has been often considered. I shall pass most of that by. What he wishes to discourse of is their antiquity.

And for the first two hundred years, (i. e. after the apostles a hundred,) of which there are few books left, he depends upon the failure of proof given by the pædobaptists for the baptizing of infants, and the testimonies of Scripture concerning adult persons baptized, that there was then no infant-baptism, all were anti-pædobaptists; and says, p. 52, 'that there is nothing of it to be found in 'the writings of St. Barnabas, Clemens Romanus. 'Ignatius. Polycarp, Irenæus, Justin Martyr, or 'Theophilus Antiochenus. In Tertullian's time, about 'the latter end of the second century, it began to 'appear,' &c.

For all this, I suppose, he depends upon Mr.



Gale or some others of them. He himself would begin, where Mr. Gale ends, at the time of St. Cyprian. And there being for his time and the following (of which there is plenty of books) full proof of infant-baptism, he undertakes however to find some in every age that opposed it.

If there had been any such thing to be found, it would have been found before now, by some learned men that they have had.

Mr. Tombes reckons St. Cyprian's time to be the spring-head (as he calls it) of infant-baptism; and St. Austin's authority in after-times carried it 'almost without control.' And all the pretences of proof that any one then, or for many centuries after, did oppose to it, have been shewn to be gross mistakes. It could not be St. Austin's authority that carried it; because St. Austin says, he never knew, nor heard of, any that denied that infants are baptized for forgiveness of sins. And Pelagius, who lived at the same time, owns, that he never heard of any that denied it to be given.

But as to its obtaining universally, Mr. Tombes need not have put in the word 'almost.' For for seven hundred years after St. Austin there is, in all the numerous books then written, no account of any church, any sect, any author, any Christian, that rejected it; nor none before Austin, but Tertullian.

Mr. Davye, after a slight attempt of expounding some words in a canon of the council of Neo-Cæsarea to the purpose of antipædobaptism (which have been fully shewed to be impertinent to it), and having recited some words of Balsamon's Comment on it, (but leaving out those in the same paragraph that speak directly of infant-baptism,) seeks for proofs on

his side among the heretics of the following times; the *Noratians*, the *Donatists*, and the *Pelagians*.

He had before told his readers at page 4, that one main part of the controversy between those sects on the one side, and St. Cyprian and St. Austin, &c., on the other side, was concerning infants' baptism. And whereas every one must wonder how he could venture to say this; after that Mr. Danvers had been so shamed for pretending to proofs of it, and after it had appeared upon a diligent canvassing, that they never had one word of difference about that matter; he proves it there no otherwise than by saying, 'I cannot but believe it was so.' And so he says afterward at page 50, 'to *me* it is apparent.' But here he runs out into argument.

At page 9, 10, he reckons up several mischiefs of infant-baptism. One is, that 'by this practice so many human inventions have been invented.' Among which he reckons *chrism* and *unction* as two. And says, 'none of which we read of in primitive antiquity for the first three hundred years at least after Christ.'

To such a writer there needs no other weapons but his own to overthrow him. For if *chrism* be one of the consequents of infant-baptism, who is there so ignorant as not to know that that was in use long before the times he speaks of?

He says there, the argument for infant-baptism from circumcision 'was not insisted on by those called ancient Fathers.' And though he might have instanced in some of them, who indeed do not mention its succeeding circumcision, he unluckily picks out for his only instances St. Cyprian and St. Austin, who are known to have mentioned it.

But he says, it was not insisted on by them 'for ought he finds.' That salves all.

Page 15, he grants, that infants were church-members under the pædagogy of Moses; and page 16, that they were brought to the ordinance of the passover as soon as they were capable to eat it. And page 17, that under the Gospel 'infants dying' (he means, all infants dying) are in the covenant of 'grace.' And ten lines after, says, 'Where faith, repentance, &c., are wanting in the recipients; there cannot be right church-membership; nor can they be in the covenant of grace; let men pretend what they please.' And page 16, that 'the *New Testament* church is wholly of a new frame;' that we are not concerned now with what was done under the *Old Testament*. Forgetting that St. Paul tells the *Gentile* Christians that the *blessing of Abraham is come on them*; and that they who were of the wild olive-tree are grafted among the natural branches.

Here in ten pages he disputes against the independents. And it is pretty to see how they confute one another. He concludes with quotations from bishop Burnet, Dr. Whitby, Continuers of Pool's Annotations, Assembly's Annotations, &c. And what is most ridiculous, he quotes here, and in twenty places more, bishop Taylor's 'Liberty of Prophesying;' a book written in Oliver's time to puzzle the schismatics then in power, by shewing that even the papists and anabaptists had as much to say for themselves as they had; and produced their arguments, which himself shewed afterward to have no solidity in them.

Chap. ii. To disprove the Jewish baptism of pro-

selytes, he transcribes Mr. Gale; and (what Mr. Gale thought not fit to do, since the place has been examined) sir Norton Knatchbull; and (not knowing who speaks for him, and who against him) Godwyn's 'Moses and Aaron,' which plainly asserts this custom of the Jews; and says, page 37, that he cannot understand, if the custom had been to baptize *proselytes*, why the Pharisees should ask John, why he baptized Jews.

On Matth. xix. 14, and 1 Cor. vii. 14, he brings over again some of the most trite pleas which the antipædobaptists have used in their descants on those texts.

There is nothing else in this chapter, but that he catches hold of that subtle and airy distinction of *fundamentals*, which Mr. Gale, I think, has invented for them, whereby to justify their separation from the protestant churches, with whom they would yet seem to agree in all *fundamental* points of *faith*. It is a device which, I see, takes with them. He manages it page 47, to this purpose:

'There are some things or doctrines, which  
' though they are not *fundamental* points of *religion*,  
' or necessary to *salvation*; are yet *fundamental*, or  
' essentially necessary, to the *constitution of a church*.  
' And here we say, baptism is *fundamental*, or essen-  
' tially necessary.'

And he says, 'baptism of infants by sprinkling  
' (and I suppose he would say, by pouring water, or  
' even dipping of them) is indeed no baptism. And  
' therefore, though we honour them (the protestants)  
' as *brethren*, love them as *children of God*, and  
' *believers*. &c., yet we cannot join with them in a  
' church state.'

They seem to have had some cue given them by somebody, that separate they must; or else they do nothing to purpose. And they strive for far-fetched pleas to justify their so doing. As for this new-invented one, it is the emptiest that ever was used to justify so great a sin and wickedness.

For it appears on the first weighing it, that any defect in baptism, if it does not hinder any single person from being a *Christian*, does not hinder a body of such as have that defect, from being a *church*. If a man be once a Christian, there is no new use of baptism to make him a priest (or, as they call it, an elder), or to make him a bishop. So that if they were a number of Christians before, (which a new preacher would have to be the definition of a church,) they may without any new trial of the validity of their baptism have church officers, and be a *church* in the sense of that word which is acknowledged by all.

This author manages this argument a great deal more weakly than Mr. Gale himself did. He says, p. 48, ‘It is proved by Heb. vi. 1, 2, 3, and Matt. xxviii. 19, 20, that baptism is fundamental to church-communion, and to the constitution of a *church*.’ What those texts do speak of baptism tends to shew its necessity for one’s being a Christian, or being saved; but they have nothing particular in reference to *communion*, or the constitution of a *church*.

And he has spoiled the whole argument by saying, ‘We do not unchurch all other protestant churches. —There is scarce any thing more distant from our thoughts.’

Mr. Gale would not have taught him to have

said so. He would have taught him to say; We do not *unchristian* them, or deny their salvation; but *unchurch* them we must; or else we cannot justify our separation; which is the main point of all.

The third chapter has (beside the common pleas which have been answered a hundred times) nothing new that is material, but these absurd propositions.

Page 49. That the doctrine of original sin began to be disputed *anno Dom. 250*.

Page 50. That the *Novatians* (which is true) and the *Donatists* (which is false) were before Constantine's time. Of both of them he says, that it is 'to him apparent,' that they before that time opposed the growing errors or heresies of the times. And, that the *Waldenses* and *Albigenses* sprang from the *Novatians* and *Donatists*.

Page 54. That Mr. Wall (meaning me) confesses that Justin Martyr excludes infants from being baptized, and in the church; and says, that only adult persons can or ought to be baptized.

Mr. Davye had said in his preface, that he was not conscious that he had wronged any of the authors cited. By which it appears, he does some things that he is not conscious of.

Page 57. That St. Cyprian taught that the church of Rome was the mother-church. And here he quotes Daillé observing from St. Cyprian's fifty-ninth Epistle, that St. Cyprian thought the eucharist necessary to infants for their salvation. Which (as proved from that Epistle) has been shewn to be Mr. Daillé's oversight in reading *sacrificandum* for *sanctificandum*, admitted to the

*eucharist* instead of *baptized*<sup>n</sup>. And though Mr. Davye was told of this, yet he had rather follow the oversight than consult the place. The eucharist was called a *sacrifice*; but the recipients never were said to *be sacrificed*.

Page 58. That the *Novatians* and *Donatists* kept their distinct congregations from St. Cyprian's, because of his infant-baptism. This, as to infant-baptism, is as true of the *Donatists* who did not arise till near a hundred years after St. Cyprian was dead, as it is of the other, who in his time made a schism, but disputed not one word of infant-baptism.

Page 59. Having shewn that the *Novatians* differed from St. Cyprian in several other things, he infers, 'From all which we have *very great probability* on our side, that they rejected the baptism 'of infants.' This argument will fetch in the whole legion of heretics to be of Mr. Davye's side. For they, all of them, differed from St. Cyprian in many things.

Page 60. He cites one Gabriel Prateolus as saying of the *Novatians*, that they affirmed that infants did not stand in need of baptism<sup>o</sup>. He that will be at the pains to search the place in Prateolus, p. 125, will know which of the two, Prateolus, or Danvers, was the first that forged this on the *Novatians* (for Danvers once said this of them, and was soundly

<sup>n</sup> [See vol. i. p. 139.]

<sup>o</sup> [The words of G. Prateolus in his book entitled 'De vitis, sectis, et dogmatibus omnium hæreticorum,' 4<sup>o</sup>. *Colonia*, 1581, arc, (he is speaking of the *Cathari*;) 'Aiebant infantes absque peccato esse, ideoque non egere baptismo'.]

shamed for it); I do not think the reputation of either of them worth the pains.

From p. 61, to the end of the chapter, he pillages that chapter of my *History*<sup>p</sup>, wherein I mentioned some moderns who have made objections against the opinion of infant-baptism being used *generally* or *universally* from the beginning. Many of whom answered their own objections, or recanted them. But Mr. Davye recites their objections, and omits their answers; and so brings in Dr. Hammond and Mr. Baxter among the antipædobaptists; and bishop Taylor, who declared what he wrote to have been only some objections easy to be answered; and bishop Barlow, who had in his youth in a letter to Mr. Tombes, said some things of the ancient history, which being without his knowledge printed long after, he recanted as having been written in the time of his ignorance. Yet Mr. Davye reprints the letter at large, but not the recantation; though he saw them both together in my book. And having recited out of Mr. Stennet a saying of one Vansleb concerning the ancient practice used at Alexandria, which has nothing of probability in it, nor is confirmed by any ancient historian; he, to put some mark of antiquity on it, quotes Socrates for it, lib. vi. c. 7, 9. and lib. 7. c. 7. meaning, I suppose, Socrates the historian: but he might as well have cited Socrates the philosopher: one says no more of any such matter than the other. And this is Mr. Davye's way.

Chap. iv. He enters upon his task of bringing

<sup>p</sup> [Namely, part ii. chap. 2.]



proofs that the *Donatists* were antipædobaptists. And having first premised, what I mentioned before, concerning the council of Neocæsarea and Balsamon, and coming to speak of his *Donatists*, he makes several gross mistakes of their tenets about other matters; as that they rejected chrism, &c., p. 65, and then asserts of their tenets concerning infant-baptism things absolutely false; as, that they held that infants ‘needed not to be baptized.’ p. 66. He quotes Vincentius (who held only that infants who had missed of baptism might yet by God’s mercy be saved) as an antipædobaptist. He says, p. 67, ‘That Fulgentius the *Donatist* and Cresconius denied infants baptism, and asserted only ‘that baptism which is after faith, as saith the ‘Magdeburgensian history. Augustin also in his ‘Epistle to Marcellus writes against them for denying baptism to infants.’ And many other such strange things, copied, I think, mostly out of Dauvers.

Now there is not one word of all this true. Neither St. Austin nor the Magdeburgenses have one syllable of what he here quotes from them. St. Austin has no epistle written to any one of that name. And Mr. Davye has given me the trouble of reading all his epistles to Marcellinus. In all which he has nothing about the *Donatists*, save that in one or two of them he entreats Marcellinus (the emperor’s commissioner) in his court of judicature to abate of the rigour of the law against some of them that were convicted of sedition, outrage, and murder; that the church might have the repute of moderation. Of their tenets about baptism not one word.

If these proofs will not do, he demands proofs of the other side from us that the *Donatists* were for infant-baptism. Several of us, and I for one, gave proofs from the councils of that time, and other evidences; to which he has nothing to oppose.

Page 69. He would however get the *Pelagians* of his side. He owns that St. Austin speaks of them as allowing and practising infant-baptism; though they denied original sin. But he says, ‘I cannot help hesitating a little about it.’ And because they said that an infant dying unbaptized may have an eternal life somewhere, though not in the kingdom of heaven, (into which, as they confessed, no infants but baptized ones could enter,) he thinks ‘it can hardly be believed they were for infant-baptism.’

He concludes a little more modestly, that if what he says of Pelagius be not a proof, it must be allowed for a strong probability; and says, ‘for my own part, I believe, he and his followers were for believers’ baptism only.’—So the bell chinketh.

Page 70, he questions whether Pelagius’ creed, and Celestius’ *Confessio Fidei*, of which I gave copies out of St. Austin, be genuine. And what is worse, says, it may be questioned by my confession. They were authentical pieces sent or given by them in their own defence to the bishops of Rome. No man can suppose, even if he thought St. Austin to be a forger, that he would forge or mis-recite public records kept at Rome.

Page 71, he would prove, from some canons or synodical epistles of the councils of Carthage and Milevis, anno 416, directed against the *Pelagians*, that the *Pelagians* or some people of that time opposed the baptism of infants; because those canons

do, as he says, anathematize some that did oppose it.

Now there wants nothing but the reading of the canons and epistles, by any one that can read them, to see that they do not speak of any that opposed it; but only of some that thought it must not be given to *new-born* infants before the eighth day; and of some others (viz., the *Pelagians*) who denied that any original sin derived from Adam was forgiven to infants in it.

Page 72, he says, those against whom these canons were made must have held, that infants, though unbaptized, might enter into the kingdom of heaven.

The distinction the *Pelagians* made between an eternal life somewhere, and the kingdom of heaven, is beyond Mr. Davye's skill. They held that infants who missed of baptism might have an *eternal life* somewhere, they knew not where, as being without sin; but that baptized infants did enter into the *kingdom of heaven*, as being not only without sin, but also regenerated in Christ.

Page 75. For the following centuries, he finds that the council of Gerunda decreed, that infants newly born, if sick, or not able to suck the breast, should be baptized, though it were not Easter time. Would any one but he conclude from hence, that either the bishops of that council or any one else of that time denied that they were to be baptized at all?

Another synod Mr. Davye has found quoted.

The Bracarenian synod in the seventh century condemned the errors of the *Manichees* and *Priscillianists*. Now Cassander says, that in the twelfth

century in Bernard's time, arose the *Albigenses*, who to the rest of their errors borrowed from the *Manichees* and *Priscillianists*, added this, that the baptism of little ones is unprofitable.

From hence this notable arguer concludes that there were antipædobaptists in the *seventh century*; whereas the proof is only of the *twelfth*, when some people holding some ancients errors added to them this of antipædobaptism.

Chap. v. p. 77. Having renewed that absurd pretence of Danvers, that the old *Britons* denied infant-baptism, and quoted nothing for it, but that edition of Fabian<sup>q</sup> which Danvers had lighted on, (wherein the misprinting of three words makes all the mistake,) he concludes, page 81 :

‘ If all this will not be allowed for proof,——  
 ‘ I must let my opposers enjoy their contrary opinions ; it is not much material,——yet I must tell  
 ‘ the reader, these considerations weigh with *me*, to  
 ‘ make *me* believe these *Britons* were really for  
 ‘ believers’ baptism only.’

It is an advantage to have a faculty of believing what one will, with reason or without.

Page 81. For an evidence in the ninth century, he is not ashamed to bring upon the stage again that blunder which Danvers made in the story of Hincmarus<sup>r</sup>, bishop of Laudun ; which has been exposed even to ridicule. And finding in Danvers’ book the *Bibliotheca Patrum* and the *Magdeburgenses* quoted for things not there to be found, he copies the quotations just as they were in Danvers.

<sup>q</sup> [See vol. ii. p. 127. for the difference of reading in several editions.]

<sup>r</sup> [See vol. ii. p. 233.]

A thing that he did not think of here, but argues at large in his recapitulation, at page 122, and says, he cannot omit it, is a manifest instance of his venturing to affirm confidently matters of fact which he only guesses at, and which are not true. He observes that I in my *Preface* do say, that St. Austin has whole books against the *Pelagians*, wherein he proves the doctrine of original sin from the practice of infant-baptism.

Mr. Davye positively asserts the contrary, viz., that *from* the doctrine of original sin in infants St. Austin infers the necessity of their baptism; and says, 'his works do plainly shew this to every reader.' And, that mine is a 'wrong construction' of them. And, that he 'vehemently in several places condemns the *Pelagians* for suffering infants to die without baptism.'

Could any man, in a thing that had been true, and which he had read himself, have expressed a greater confidence than he does in this, which is notoriously untrue? Every man that has read any thing of St. Austin against the *Pelagians*, (if it were only those places which I quoted, which are not the hundredth part,) must see with his own eyes that St. Austin all along, and many times over, speaks of the *Pelagians* as owning and practising infant-baptism; and argues with them, that the custom used by the whole church and by themselves of baptizing infants ought to convince them, that they have original sin which needs to be washed away.

Mr. Davye says, this is not a *congruous* way of arguing; nor to reason with them like men of sense. 'Is not,' says he, 'the same argument used

‘ against us now? And do not the pædobaptists  
 ‘ argue *from* original sin to the necessity of infant-  
 ‘ baptism? The other is a thwarting way of arguing,  
 ‘ and very unlikely.’

But, good Mr. Davye, if there be something which may be seen with one’s own eyes by any one that will be at the pains to go and see it; and some do go and see it; for you to sit at home, and guess by *congruities* and *likelihoods*, how the thing must be; and not only to disbelieve them that have seen it, but to face them down that they give wrong accounts; is to take too great a liberty to yourself. What will become of your credit, even with your own party, if these books of St. Austin should be translated into *English*; or if any of them be able to read them in *Latin*? The pædobaptists do indeed argue with you *from* your confession of original sin, to convince you of the necessity of baptism to infants; and good reason; because you do (many of you) *own* the former, but *deny* the latter. St. Austin argues with the *Pelagians* *from* their confession of infant-baptism to convince them of the doctrine of original sin, with the like congruity on the other side; because they (not some, but all of them) did *own* infant-baptism, but *deny* original sin. And whereas you say here, that he ‘vehemently ‘ in several places’ condemns them for suffering infants to die without baptism; bring one of those places; or else take shame to yourself, and never meddle any more in matters of antiquity which you understand not. In the mean while you may read, if you please, the places that I have brought in my History, part i. chap. 19, where you will find Pelagius, Cælestius, and Julian, owning the necessity

of infant-baptism, (not for the cure of original sin from Adam indeed, but for entering the kingdom of heaven,) and some of them anathematizing any that should deny it, if there were any such; but they say, they never heard of any that did. One of them says, he never knew any one *so ignorant or so impious* as to say, or to have a thought, that infants are not to be baptized. Another allots an *eternal anathema* to any one that should say it is not *necessary for infants*. And see if you can find me misquoting or misrepresenting the words of my author in any of those places; a course too common with you.

You go upon *congruities*. When you at one place insinuate of St. Austin that he forged those confessions of the *Pelagians* wherein they own infant-baptism; do you think that *congruous*, that the same man should represent them as owning it, and yet vehemently condemn them as disowning it?

Page 83. Mr. Davye comes at last to the twelfth century, the time of the *Waldenses* and *Albigenses*. Some of the later (*viz.*, the *Petrobrusians*) did indeed (as I, among others, have shewn) deny baptism to infants: the first body of people in the world, that we read of, that did so.

After all, I know not how it happens, but I cannot be very angry with Mr. Davye. A man that writes in such a fashion as can do nobody any hurt, (because he discovers at the very first sight that he has no skill in the things he talks of, nor has taken any care of the truth of his quotations,) does not near so much provoke one's indignation, as one that in a more plausible and

cautious manner perverts the truth. A reader is apt to make allowances for the temper of a man, his incapacity, and his open way.

————— Hunc ego fatis

Imputo, qui vultu morbum incessuque fatetur.

Mr. Gale spoke of somebody that should answer my book. Was it Mr. Davye? Was he to account for the times after St. Cyprian with as much success as the other had done for those before? It may seem so. For he concludes, p. 140, as Mr. Gale uses to do: ‘All which, I think, has been made apparent ‘ in the preceding treatise; which may be a sufficient ‘ answer to — and to the historical part of Mr. ‘ *Wall’s* book of infant-baptism.’



I crave pardon of my brethren, the clergy, for inserting this digression about Mr. Davye’s book, (which is just come to my hand, and which I am satisfied they will never read over,) in the address I was making to them. It is to convince them of what I was saying; that if any of them do write in this cause, the antipædobaptists will never suffer him to have the last word. For if such an answer as this can find one that will print it, and men that will buy and read it, the antipædobaptists will never want authors.

I crave leave to go on with a few words to the clergy.

I hope those that shall write in defence of infant-baptism will not drop, or suffer to sink, the argument from antiquity; now that we have carried it so far, and produced plain evidence of its use among Christians, from authors so nigh the apostles’ time.



There are, beside the time spent in arguing, disputing, and talking each man for his side of a question, (in which eagerness seldom suffers men to weigh things soberly and impartially. But there are, I say, beside these,) times, in which every serious man considers the reasons and proofs of things by himself. Now a man that does this, will see it impossible to be conceived, that in a practice so public and notorious as baptism is, they whose fathers or grandfathers lived *in the apostles' time*, should not know what was done *in that time*, as to this matter.

The testimonies so far up, as to a hundred and fifty years after *that time*, they do now yield and own; and make, I think, but very weak opposition against those which are brought from authors within the hundred. They that have formerly been told by their leaders, that the baptizing of infants began under such or such a pope of Rome, will see things with another view, when in following the plain footsteps of it, they come, not only up to Constantine's time, but do pass or shoot the gulf, as I may call it, that is between that and the age of martyrs; and can trace it there as plainly as in the ages below. They yield Cyprian. I have, if I do not flatter myself, vindicated the testimonies of Origen; and of Irenæus, who was born in or about the end of the apostolic times. Higher they cannot expect to have the express mention of so particular a thing, for want of books between that and the Scripture-times.

There is indeed one of our own order, one by profession of the church of England, who has meddled in this point, and has to our disgrace said

in print, page 15, that ‘till Cyprian’s time none but ‘adult persons were baptized; and even in his time ‘baptizing of infants was very rare.’ One would wonder what should make him say this, or from whom he had it. He himself, I can easily guess, knows little of the matter. He has either shot his bolt blindfold, or else he has had it from somebody. It could not be his father, he never lighted on *that* paradox. I do not think he has it from the man whose cause he is there defending. He, for a very good reason, avoids any talk of the tenets of ‘those ‘weak men in several ages.’ Mr. Le Clerc, or any of that sort, have not said any such thing that I know of. Let me be far enough, if I do not think he has taken it on trust from Mr. *Gale*; and thinking it might help, among the other odd things that he has said, to do some prejudice to the church of England, has put it in at all adventure. If I guess right, that he has learned it of Mr. *Gale*; he is a pregnant scholar, and has already outshot his master. For even *he* never ventured to say that in St. Cyprian’s time it was rare.

To those that shall write to enforce the arguments *from Scripture*, I would humbly recommend one advice or two.

One is, that although many of the late *English* writers in defence of infant-baptism have thought fit to omit the arguments from John iii. 3, 5, and from I Cor. vii. 14, yet they would not be discouraged from using them. A right translation, and explication of the words, in those two texts, would contribute much to satisfy the doubts concerning the baptizing of infants.

In explaining the sense of both of them there is an instance how much the alteration (which happens in process of time) of the use and meaning of words in common language, does, with illiterate men, weaken the force of an argument taken from a text of Scripture or any ancient book, where any words are used that have had their use so altered.

I consider who I am speaking to now. And to them I do not think it needful to say any thing concerning the ancient meaning of the word *regenerate*, or *born again*; or of the words *saints*, or *sanctified*. Whereas I and Mr. Whiston and several others have positively affirmed that the word *regenerate* is in the ancient phrase used constantly (or, as Mr. Whiston cautiously expresses it, *almost constantly*) in relation to baptism; and Mr. Gale has so positively denied this; that he, or else we, must be guilty of a notorious untruth, in matter of fact; I speak now to those that know, or can know when they please, by minding, as they read the ancient books, where that guilt settles.

They know also how new, and unheard of in the ancient church, that interpretation of some late expositors is, who by *water*, in John iii. 5, would have us understand not *material water*, but some mystical thing; such as our Saviour compared to water in his discourse with the Samaritan woman, John iv. 13, 14: and by *saints*, 1 Cor. vii. 14, not *Christians*, or *persons christened*, (which is St. Paul's constant use of the word,) but *children, saints, or holy*, i. e. *born holy* by a holiness previous to their baptism: and by *sanctified*, (when a heathen wife is sanctified by her husband a Christian,) not con-

verted to Christianity, and brought to baptism ; but the man is sanctified *to* his wife, i. e. the husband ‘ potest bona conscientia uti infidelis conjugis vase.’

Beza, one of the first that gave that interpretation, adds, after he has said this, ‘ This place makes ‘ against the Catabaptists’ (which is his name for antipædobaptists). It did so indeed, till he marred it by his wonderful explication ; which the antipædobaptists are so far from thinking to make against them, that they have taken it into their scheme ; only improving *born holy*, i. e. in covenant, into *born holy*, i. e. not bastards.

If those two texts were read in the ancient sense, (which I think may be made out to be the true one,) the one, *Except any one be born of water, &c., i. e. baptized into the religion of Christ, he cannot enter, &c.,* (always understanding this to be a rule in *God’s ordinary way* ; not to limit his mercy in cases extraordinary) ; and the other, *an unbelieving husband has been sanctified* (i. e. brought to Christianity and baptism) *by his wife, &c., else your children would have been unclean, i. e. brought up heathens ; but now they are ἅγιοι, saints, i. e. Christians, or christened, or dedicated to Christ by baptism ;* the dispute would be at an end.

Dr. Hammond, whose treatise on this subject in his ‘ Six Queries’ it is advisable for any clergyman that studies this point, to read, was the first of the moderns, who retrieved the sense of this latter text from the unnatural glosses of some late writers. He did it by observing what is the constant use of the word *saints* and *sanctified* in the language of the New Testament, viz., *Christians*. I have shewn that several ancients (before there was any dispute

of infant-baptism) do paraphrase it just as he does. Which must needs be a great confirmation.

It was perhaps not without reason that the Christians of the middle times left off the phrase of calling the men of their profession *saints*; because the word was abused by some sectaries who made an hypocritical cant of it, to distinguish themselves by. But yet when we read any text of the New Testament, or of any ancient Christian book written while that word was in constant use; we must take the words *saints*, and *sanctified*, or made saints, as it was used at that time; or else we lose the sense of the place.

Mr. Bingham, who to a very good purpose makes it his business to acquaint us with the general customs, and use of words, among the ancient Christians, does in his book i. chap. 1. p. 3, (without having any discourse or any thought at that place of infant-baptism, or of this text,) give us this account:

‘ The names, *ἅγιοι, πιστοὶ, ἐκλεκτοὶ, &c.*, occur frequently in ancient ecclesiastical writers; and signify, ‘ not any select number of Christians (as now the ‘ words *saints*, and *elect*, are often used to signify only ‘ the prædestinate); but *all Christians* in general who ‘ were entered into the communion of the church ‘ by the waters of baptism. For so Theodoret and ‘ others explain the word *ἅγιοι, saints*, to be such ‘ as were vouchsafed the honour and privilege of ‘ baptism.’ Theodor. Comm. in Phil. i. 1.

It is but reasonable then to let the word have here the sense that it always had in those times. And then it will be; ‘ Now are your children vouch-

‘safed the honour of baptism;’ or, ‘entered into the communion of the church by the waters of baptism.’

All the difficulty is, for a minister to satisfy the vulgar people, who understand no other phrase but that of their own times, and of the common translations, of the matter of fact; that this was the ancient sense of the words. They are shy of any thing that is told them more than they see in the translation; especially if they have any writer of their side, that will confidently tell them that it was not so. The word was not so used, &c.

Whether they will find any that will deny the word *saints* to be used by St. Paul for *Christians*, I know not. But I know of one that has denied things as plain and certainly true as that is, in cases where he knew they could not search the books. If there be such a necessity, they must be shewed the several places where St. Paul uses the word *saints*; which if they read with attention, they will see by the sense of the place that it is there (as also in the Creed) put instead of the word *Christians*.

One other thing I would recommend, which will be more obviously conceived by all ordinary readers of Scripture. And that is, that those who have an occasion to argue on this matter, do keep their antagonists, or any whom they would convince, close to that question or consideration; *how*, or by *what means*, or by *what merit*, or *title*, infants do ever obtain the kingdom of heaven. There is no method of arguing or of meditation that will sooner bring, an antipædobaptist to think rightly of this matter

than this; if it be well pursued in his own thoughts, or by the conduct of a Christian guide.

If he be a man at all versed in the Scripture, and in the mystery of the salvation of mankind, as there taught; he will presently understand and grant, that it is *by Christ, by his merits, his purchase, &c.*, that there is no way by which any of human race can come to that kingdom, but by an interest in him.

Mr. Gale indeed talks, p. 444, with great confidence of the state of all infants, that they must needs go to heaven, as having no actual sin, by virtue of God's general justice and mercy ('If there be any mercy in God, &c., God our Saviour cannot ordain such unreasonable laws,' &c.; and such like rants). But no pious and well studied Christian, antipædobaptist or other, will think or speak at this rate of the kingdom of heaven, as any one's natural right, or to be conferred on any, but by *Christ*, and for his sake; by virtue of his merits and death.

They must be urged then to consider, that the infants as well as the adult, who are admitted thither, must be *members of Christ*, united to him *by the Holy Spirit*, included in his *covenant and purchase*, of his *fold*, his *kingdom*, his *peculium*, his *body*; *fellow-heirs*, as St. Paul expresses it, *and of the same body*, and *partakers of God's promise in Christ through the Gospel*; *such as obtain an inheritance among them that have been sanctified* (*ἡγιασμένους*, as the word is in both the places where that phrase is used, Acts xx. 32, and xxvi. 18): that is, among *the Christians* that have been baptized; not *strangers or foreigners*, but *fellow-citizens with*

*the saints, or Christians, and of the household of God.* To say of any one, that he shall enter the kingdom, is as much as to say all this of him.

These terms signify neither more nor less, than being of *his church*, which the Scripture calls *his body*; and him *the Saviour of the body*. The consideration that infants are capable of being admitted to these spiritual privileges, (which admission is the same in substance with that *spiritual grace* or favour which makes the *inward* and *spiritual* part of the sacrament of baptism,) will easily incline any one that considers it, to believe that they are capable of the *outward* part, which is but the seal of the other. Who can forbid water to those who are capable of receiving with the water such spiritual favours as well as we? Since our Saviour has established the terms of his covenant so ample and merciful, as to include them, and to testify his love and tender regard to them; and has bid us suffer them to be brought to him; who are we, that we should exclude them from the outward tokens of his favour, as if they did not *belong to him* and to *his kingdom*?

I wish some good man would be at the charge of an impression of a small picture, that might be given to such as need instruction and satisfaction concerning the will and purpose of our Saviour in this matter. The proverb is true, that pictures have with vulgar men the use of books; especially if they represent some useful history of the Gospel, such as this which I am going to recommend, is, being recited by three Evangelists, Matt. xviii. 5, Mark ix. 37, Luke ix. 48, our Saviour holding a little child in his arms, and saying to his disciples, *Whosoever*



*shall receive this child* (in Matthew and Mark it is, *one such little child* ; or, one of such children) *in my name receiveth me.*

If our Saviour be drawn in that posture, holding forth the child in his arms, and those words subscribed, *Whosoever shall receive such a child in my name receiveth me* ; and over against him be drawn two men standing by a font, both pretending to be ministers of Christ ; and some people offering such a child to them ; and one of them reaching out his arms to receive it, and the other thrusting it back : I would fain see what countenance the painter will give to that man, who seeing our Saviour look upon him, and hearing him say those words, does dare to reject it.

The ordinary meaning of the word *receive* in the books of the New Testament, even when it stands alone, is well known to all readers of Scripture, to be, to receive or admit to a brotherhood, or fellowship in Christianity ; as (to name one place of forty) Rom. xv. 7, St. Paul commands those dissenters in opinions to *receive one another.*

But when Christ does moreover add here those words, *in my name* ; it more plainly still imports that they should be received to be as *his members*, his *children, belonging to him* ; or, as I once before deduced the import of the like phrase, as τοῦ Χριστοῦ ὄντες ; being *Christ's*, or *Christians.*

And the sanction here given to the command of such a receiving of them is the highest that is ever given : even the same that is given to the command of *receiving* the apostles themselves. For as it was said to them, *He that receiveth you receiveth me ; and he that receiveth me receiveth him that sent*

*me*; so the very same is said here of *receiving children in his name*.

The dispute is concerning a considerable part of Christ's flock: and it is, whether they shall be admitted into his fold, or not. The infants of mankind, taken together with all such as are under the age at which the antipædobaptists receive them, do make, I believe, a third part of the whole people.

Our blessed Saviour will certainly at his coming be *much displeased* (for he was so once upon earth on a like occasion) either with us for *receiving* them, or else with them for *rejecting* them. It behoves us all therefore to mind what things displeased him here; and with such care and impartiality to study and learn his true will and meaning; and with such sincerity to follow it; and for our performance of both these things, so to implore his heavenly direction and assistance, *that when he shall appear, we may have confidence, and not be ashamed before him at his coming.* Amen.

---

#### POSTSCRIPT.

SOME of the antipædobaptist writers do give us occasion to observe the great mischief to religion that comes by any one's forging words, and attributing them in print to any ancient father: so great, that though the first forger should repent, and publicly recant what he has said; yet the mischief and ill consequence would continue by ignorant men's taking him at his first word, and commonly adding to it.

Justin Martyr is (a very few excepted) the eldest of the Christians whose books are left to us. He was born in the apostles' time, and wrote about forty years after it. A testimony of his is more considerable than of five or six later ones. Any words of his, that should plainly and expressly determine, either *for* or *against* infant-baptism, would be a more material and decisive evidence than any that has as yet been produced from antiquity on either side. The greater must the impiety be of any writer in this controversy, who should forge such decisive words in his name.

Mr. Gale writing his 'Reflections' on a passage which I had cited out of Justin's apology, (where he speaks of some circumstances, used at the baptizing of adult converts,) adds these words, at his page 481 :

' St. Justin here mentions only adult persons : and elsewhere plainly excludes infants from being then baptized in the church ; and says, that " adult persons only can or ought to be baptized." ' This, if true, is a very positive evidence.

Mr. Davye, having mentioned the same passage of Justin, and knowing nothing to the contrary, but that what Mr. Gale had farther attributed to him might be true, recites Mr. Gale's words, (as if they were from his own knowledge or reading,) and adds to them another forgery, of *my confessing* the thing to be so : in these words, at his page 54 :

' St. Justin mentions only adult persons, and (*elsewhere*, as Mr. *Wall* himself confesses) excludes infants from being baptized, and in the church ; and says, " that only adult persons can or ought to be baptized." '

If Mr. Gale can produce no such words of St. Justin, (as I am confident he cannot,) and Mr. Davye can produce no such ‘confession’ of mine, (as I am sure he cannot,) they are both of them forgers of evidences. And it concerns not only the cause of religion and truth in general, but particularly the credit of the antipædobaptists, that they be called to account, whether they can or not : and if they cannot, that they be disowned. Otherwise they will be worse than the papists : for whereas some impostors formerly did, for the maintenance of popery, forge *decretal epistles*, under the name of bishops as ancient as Justin Martyr ; they were credited for some time : but when the cheat came to be detected, all the honest papists did themselves join in condemning and exposing it ; and they now disown, and are ashamed of the epistles.

I did, as I passed along, take notice of this foul dealing of both of them, at page 205, and page 432, of this ‘Defence.’ But I had a mind to give a *memorandum* of it here by itself. Because the attempt being extraordinary ; and the evidence for the antiquity of antipædobaptism far more considerable, if it be a true one, than ever was heard of ; it is pity but it should be brought to light, and into a fair view. I do not know whether Mr. Davye can find the place in Justin’s works ; but Mr. Gale can, if it be there.

THE END.

## ADDITIONAL NOTES.

### VOL. I.

P. 139, 140. *sanctificandum*.] On the various reading of this passage, *sanctificandum* and *sacrificandum*, see a full discussion by Mr. Joseph Clarke, in his preface to ‘*Waterland’s Sermons*,’ published in the ninth volume of his works, edited by Bishop Van Mildert, p. xxvi, &c.

P. 196. *act.*] The Act, 10th William III. cap. 35, [alias 32,] entitled, ‘An Act for the more effectual suppressing of ‘Blasphemy and Profaneness,’.....enacts, that, ‘Whereas ‘many persons have of late years openly avowed and published many blasphemous and impious opinions, contrary ‘to the doctrines and principles of the Christian religion, ‘&c. .... Be it enacted.....that.....if any person ‘having been educated in, or at any time having made ‘profession of, the Christian religion.....shall by writing, ‘&c.,.....deny any one of the persons in the holy Trinity ‘to be God.....and shall be duly convicted, &c. &c., he ‘shall be disabled from all places, civil, ecclesiastical, or ‘military; and for the second offence shall be further disabled, and imprisoned,’ &c. &c.

### VOL. II.

P. 127.<sup>2</sup>. The edition of 1542, as I find by a copy in the Cathedral Library of Chichester, leaves out the passage relating to the Church of Rome, and reads, ‘the second, that ‘ye geve Chrystendom to chyldren.’

P. 131.<sup>1</sup>. *Mehring*.] Walchius has taught me, that the book quoted under this title is a German version (by Jacob Mehrning) of a Dutch treatise, ‘On the Vanity ‘of Infant-baptism,’ composed by Hermannus Montanus.

—Mehrning's Version was published at Dortmund, in 1646, 1647.—It may be noticed, that a tract under the same title appeared in English in the year 1642, and was answered in 1644, by William Cooke.

P. 149,<sup>b</sup>. It should have been noticed, that the tracts here cited, as well as that mentioned at p. 167, form a portion of that Collection which was published by the Unitarians, in 3 vols. 4<sup>o</sup>. in 1693, 1695, &c.

P. 375. By the kindness of the present Bishop of Rochester, I learn that the manuscript in question has *not* been restored to the repository from which it had been purloined; so that all hope of recovering it, after so long an absence, must now, I fear, be given up.

#### VOL. IV.

P. 28,<sup>a</sup>. *Emlyn*.] The full title of this piece is, 'Mr. Wall's 'History of Infant-baptism improv'd: or a just occasion 'taken from thence to enquire, whether there be any 'Necessity (upon his principles) for the continual use of 'Baptism among the posterity of baptized Christians.' (Anonymous.) 8<sup>o</sup>. London, 1709, 19 pages.—The author argues, that if Dr. Wall's assertions be true, there is *no* necessity for continuing baptism *now*, to the descendants of such as have been once truly baptized.

The tract seems to be little known. The old edition of the Biographia Britannica does not notice it at all: and the later one, by Kippis, knows it only in its altered shape, as published with the author's name in 1710, calling that 'one 'of Mr. Emlyn's most curious productions.'

P. 163,<sup>n</sup>. *Horsley-down*.] In Crosby's 'History of the 'English Baptists,' vol. iv. p. 189, there is given a particular account of the great βαπτιστήριον, or 'baptizing-'place,' with a preaching-house, &c., which was erected here, and duly registered according to Act of Parliament, in the year 1717.

# I N D E X.

## A.

- ABARBANEL**, Isaac, iii. 344.  
**Abassenes**, or Abyssinian Christians, ii. 143. baptize infants, and give them the eucharist, 291, 417, 491. circumcise both sexes, 291. See *Abyssinians*.  
**Aben Ezra**, quoted, i. 10. iv. 256.  
**Abgarus**, king of Edessa, ii. 468.  
**Abraham Ben David**, a rabbi, iii. 344, 345.  
 ‘**Abraham’s bosom**,’ how understood, ii. 344, 346, 347.  
**Abyssinians**, their baptism, ii. 143, 291, 417, 491.  
**Acacius**, ii. 469.  
**Acholi**, or **Ascholi**, bishop of Thessalonica, ii. 70.  
**Act of parliament against blasphemy**, i. 196. iv. 513.  
**Act of Toleration**. See *Toleration*.  
**Acta Sanctorum**, ii. 79.  
**Adamantius**, i. 107.  
**Adelman**, ii. 237.  
**Adeodatus**, St. Augustine’s son, ii. 121. was baptized on the same day as his father, 122.  
**Adult-baptism**, not used exclusively in ancient times, ii. 8, 9, 10. the English office, when added, and why, 321.  
**Ægypt**, chrism used in, ii. 433.  
**Ælian**, the historian, iii. 317.  
**Æneas Sylvius**, his ‘*History of Bohemia*,’ ii. 267, 297.  
**Æra**, Christian, does not commence from the true time of our Saviour’s birth, iv. 331, 333, 338, 357.  
**Æra Augusti**, what it was, i. 313.  
**Æschines**, iii. 293.  
**Æschylus**, iii. 109.  
**Ætius**, a heretic, called ‘*the Atheist*,’ ii. 457. iii. 295.  
**Affusion**, used anciently in cases of necessity, ii. 385, 390. England, though a cold country, was one of the last to adopt it, 392. France the first, 393, 394, 396. then Italy, Germany, Spain, *ibid.* attempted in England so early as A.D. 816, 395. first publicly prescribed by Calvin, 400. not *much* used in England till A.D. 1641, 403. the last order of the church of England on the point, 404. See *Sprinkling, Perfusion*.  
**African bishops** remonstrate with pope Zosimus on the countenance shewn by him to Cœlestius and Pelagius, i. 377, 378, 458, &c. they excommunicate those two men, 459.  
 ——— Christians rebaptized a schismatic who came over to them, ii. 571.  
 ——— churches, iv. 56—59. strenuously opposed the encroachments of Rome, 59.  
**Ἅγιος**, *holy*, its meaning in the text I Cor. vii. 14. explained: from Tertullian, i. 101. generally, 183. from St. Austin, 241, &c. 385. from Jerome, 342—344, 388. from Origen, 387. from Chrysostom, 389. from Ambrose, *ibid.* Calvin’s and the antipædobaptists’ view of it, 344—346. iii. 567.  
**Ἄγιος**, signifies *baptized*, or *Christian*, iv. 414, 416, 419, 421, 503, 504, 505.  
**Ainsworth**, H., his commentary on Genesis, i. 4, 44, 184.  
**Ἄρπεις**, heresy, what it precisely means, iv. 481.  
**Aix**, the synod of, i. 306. ii. 394.  
**Akiba**, rabbi, iii. 358, 359, 364.

- Alanus, writes concerning the Cathari, ii. 262.
- Albanenses, ii. 253, 269.
- Alban's, St., a synod holden there, i. 455.
- Albigenses, ii. 239, 502, 507. iv. 9, 102, 490, 496, 499. numerous in France, ii. 246, 266.
- Albina, i. 379, 452.
- Alexander de Ales, ii. 208, 212. iii. 433.
- Alexander, bishop of Alexandria, ii. 163. his creed, 453.
- Alexander Polyhistor, iii. 513.
- Alexander, an historian, iii. 298, 300.
- Alexandria, the church of, iv. 56, 58, 492.
- the council of, ii. 466.
- Algerus, ii. 237.
- Allen, Wm., two books of his commended by Rd. Baxter, ii. 560.
- Allix, Dr. P., ii. 263, 307, 505. iv. 68, 325. his dissertation on Tertullian, i. 102. his notes on Dr. Wall's introduction, iv. 43, 238. his work on the time of our Saviour's birth, 339, 340, 341.
- Alting, Jacobus, i. 4.
- Alvarez, Fr., ii. 417, 491.
- Alypius, was baptized together with St. Augustine, ii. 122. his character, *ibid.*
- '*Ἀμαρτία* and *ἁμάρτημα* signify *actual sin*, i. 234.
- Ambrose, St., i. 28, 78. ii. 168, 169, 191, 196, 433, 496. iv. 9, 313. his testimonies on baptism, i. 220—226. quoted, 338, 450. his ghost said to appear, 347. his commentaries, 389, 506. is persecuted by Valentinian, ii. 63. sent as a mediator to Maximus, 65. his funeral oration on Valentinian, 66, 98. and on Theodosius, 67, 68. cited, 134. account of him, 97. is elected bishop before his baptism, 98. why not baptized in infancy, 98—100.
- Ammianus Marcellinus, ii. 62.
- Amphilochius, his life of St. Basil, ii. 73, 74. that which goes under the name is a forgery, *ibid.*
- Anabaptists, the meaning of the word, ii. 134. do not own themselves rebaptizers, 143, 144. a 'short history' of them published in 1642, 311.
- Anabaptists of Munster, iv. 64, 172, 203. of Holland, 86, 172.
- Anacharsis, iii. 320.
- '*Ἀνακτισμός*, used to denote *baptism*, i. 69.
- Anastasius, bishop of Rome, i. 112, 313, 333.
- Anaxagoras, iii. 299.
- Anaximenes, iii. 297.
- Angiers, the synod of, ii. 393, 400.
- Anianus the deacon, a Pelagian, i. 348.
- Anne, queen, eulogized for the Toleration Act, iii. 89, 90, 92, 492.
- Anointing, used in baptism, ii. 137, 429, 431, 432, 434.
- Anselm, ii. 207.
- Anthusa, the mother of Chrysostom, ii. 92, 94, 95.
- Antioch, the council of, ii. 455, 466.
- Antipædobaptists (see also *Anabaptists*), i. 21, 22, 55, 66, 70, 100, 101, 108. some would allege that the use of the word *man*, in John iii. 5, excludes infants from baptism. There were none in the Greek church in the twelfth century, 155. their interpretation of the passage 1 Cor. vii. 14, 182, 186. the opinion entertained by some moderns on the origin of the soul, 298. are unfair quoters, 328. none were ever heard of by Augustin, by Pelagius, or Cælestius, 383, 450, 466. quote the early Fathers as opposers of infant-baptism, ii. 2. what is their strongest argument, 46, 47. their argument about Nectarius falls to the ground, 91. that about Chrysostom, 93. about St. Ambrose, 98. they reject the name of 'anabaptists,' 134, 144. therefore Dr. Wall never calls them by it, *ibid.* their interpretation of the text John iii. 5, 181, 186. they use it against Quakers and others, 188. their opinion of unbaptized infants, 224. claim the Waldenses as on their side, 239, 241, 247. hold that *all* infants are saved, 258. no national church ever held the doctrine of antipædobaptism, 279, 292. some few individuals in different countries hold these opinions, *ibid.* 292. as, in Germany,



beginning in 1522, *ibid.* in the Low Countries, 293, 294. whether the practice were then new, 294. the protestants disown the sect, 299. but few are left in Germany, 300. they are favourably received in the Low Countries, *ibid.* their disorders there, *ibid.* the Minnists, and their divisions, 301, &c. some Dutchmen of that opinion in England, 306, 314. the convocation, A. D. 1536, takes notice of the opinion, 307. some Dutch burnt in London, 309, 314. their proceedings in England, during the reigns of Henry VIII, 311. of Edward VI, *ibid.* of Mary, 312, of Elizabeth, 313. not numerous till about the year 1641, 315. the first book written in favour of their tenets, *ibid.* they are encouraged by Oliver Cromwell, 317. their address to king Charles II, 318. their confession of faith, A. D. 1644, 322, 333. their state in our author's time, 323. their general good character, *ibid.* charged to be concerned in the duke of Monmouth's plot, 323. they decreased during Charles III.'s reign: but afterwards increased; chiefly in the eastern parts of England; and in London and its suburbs, 325. their tenets on many points besides denying infants' baptism, 326. *viz.* they separate from all other Christians, *ibid.* require complete immersion as an essential, 327. do not baptize naked, 333. their indifference as to the form, *ibid.* many Socinians among them, *ibid.* some few (of this kind) hold that Christ took not flesh from the Virgin Mary, 335. they expect a personal reign of Christ with the saints for a thousand years, 343. abstain from blood and things strangled, *ibid.* an opinion ascribed to *some few* among them, that the souls of infants die with their bodies, 352. this denied of the great body, *ibid.* one party deny any sleep of the soul, 353. many of them reject psalm-singing, *ibid.* some reject the Lord's Prayer, 354. some use extreme unction, *ibid.*

a peculiar way of marriage used by some of them, *ibid.* receive the Lord's supper in a sitting posture, 355. some are sabbatarians, *ibid.* differ among themselves about Confirmation, 356. on prædestination some hold the opinion of Arminius, and are called *general* baptists; others, that of Calvin, and are called *particular*, 357. their schisms and divisions on this ground, *ibid.* many of the *general* sort are Pelagians, 358. individuals among them are Socinians, 359. their 'confession of faith,' 358. a more recent one, 359, 552. their 'general assembly,' *ibid.* 365. they love public disputings about religion, 362. with the Quakers, *ibid.* their form of church-government, 364. their mode of settling differences among themselves, 367. their treatment of immoral or scandalous members, *ibid.* some Jesuits have crept in amongst them, 371. account of them in Poland, 380. in Bohemia and Moravia, &c., 382. in Hungary and Transylvania, *ibid.* whether or not they are schismatical in separating from the church of England, 547. they admit that the differences between it and them are not of the *essentials* of religion, 551, 554. particulars of their 'confession of faith,' 552, 571. 'articles' drawn up by them in 1702, 554. these approach very near to the Articles of the church of England, *ibid.* they ought to join in communion with the church of England, 556. and we ought to communicate with them, *ibid.* no national church of them, 557. when the separation began in England, *ibid.* they ought to unite with the church, 562. difficulties in their way, 563—572. what persons alone they admit to the Lord's supper, 570. a good character given of them by the author, 573. earnest advice to them, *ibid.* Mr. Gale complains that they are traduced as enemies to the state, iii. 7. they are loyal to the sovereign, 9. Balsamon and Zonaras

- speak rather against infant-baptism, 46. the term *antipædobaptist* adopted by Dr. Wall, 47. the controversy between them and the church of England consists of two heads, 94. their practice of dipping agreeable to scripture and primitive antiquity, 95. Mr. Gale states the case between the church of England and them, 80, &c. Dr. Wall seems to suppose them to be in the right, 81, 86. iv. 450. Mr. Gale justifies their separation, ii. 85, 88. they were once considered a very strange and mischievous party, 234. the controversy will do good, *ibid.* an amicable adjustment desirable, perhaps practicable, *ibid.* Socinians amongst them, 289. iv. 196. their mode of receiving the Lord's supper, 23. how far they admit the force of the Jewish baptism of proselytes, 40. Dr. Wall vindicates his manner of speaking of them, 69, 70. always wished to treat them with civility, 71, 196, 204. the confession of their churches, 86, 90, 478. their differences among themselves, 88. they pay no regard to ecclesiastical authority, 94, 95. they never had a national church in any part of the world, 95. Dr. Wall's reply to the assertion that he allowed them to be in the right, 98, 450. some few of them very uncharitable, 99, 102, 450, 480. antipædobaptism probably would decrease, if the custom of *dipping* were restored, 171, 172, 458, &c. first arose in France, or Germany, or Geneva; and why, 172, 438, 458. none in England when the English version of the Bible was made, 226. it has sprung in a great measure from the change in the ancient manner of baptizing, 458, &c. three sorts of antipædobaptists, and how a clergyman ought to conduct himself towards each sort, 471, &c. their history, *ibid.*
- Antiphon, iii. 293.
- Antoninus, Marcus, quoted, iii. 131, 134, 380. iv. 244.
- Antony, St., his picture at Padua, iii. 259.
- Apelles, ii. 335.
- Apollinarians, ii. 123.
- Apollinaris, i. 436.
- Apollinarius, ii. 336, 337.
- Apostasy, when it may be said to have begun, iv. 450, &c.
- Apostles, their careful choice of successors, ii. 171. they knew precisely the age of our Saviour, iii. 492. employed themselves in *teaching* much more than in *baptizing*, iv. 224.
- Apostolicals, ii. 245, 260, 270.
- Apprentice*. This word may illustrate the meaning of the word *μαθητής*, iv. 221.
- Aquileia, the creed of, i. 434, note.
- Aquinas, Thomas, his quotation of a passage in St. Austin, i. 406. ii. 208, 212, 391.
- Aratus, quoted, iii. 124, 125.
- Archelaus, a natural philosopher, iii. 298.
- Archelaus, son of Herod, iv. 346, 347, 352.
- Archontici, an ancient sect, ii. 141.
- Argobastes, a noble of the Greek court, ii. 66. his death, 67, 99.
- Arians, i. 186. the catholics would not baptize them, 186, 200. their dealing with the emperor Valens, 217. some of their opinions, 434, 437. favoured by the Greek emperors, ii. 62, &c. 456. they re-baptized catholics, 69, 134. their disputes, 163, 164. they accuse the catholics of Sabellianism, 164, 165, 167. are by some called anabaptists, 133, 313. did not oppose infant-baptism, 134. some of the Dutch Minnists were Arians, 305. some of their opinions, 452. their creeds, 454, 455. partly approved the Nicene Creed, 457. often altered their creeds, 460. go beyond their founder, 462, 463. iii. 35. iv. 46.
- Arias Montanus, iii. 328.
- Ariminum, a council at, ii. 469.
- Aristobulus, his treatment of the Ituræans, iv. 246.
- Aristophanes, quoted, iii. 106, 109. his scholiast, 111, 116, 117, 119, 126. iv. 117.
- Aristotle, quoted, i. 154, 298. iii. 106, 108, 109, 120, 126, 127, 187, 318. iv. 111, 146, 217.

- Arius, his first secession from the church, ii. 163, 451, 452, 457, 462.
- Arles, council of, i. 207. some Petrobrusians in the province of, ii. 275.
- Armenian Christians, ii. 281. baptize infants, 283. and give them the eucharist, *ibid.* 291, 491.
- Arminian tenets differ from Pelagian, i. 372. their tenets as expressed at the synod of Dort, *ibid.*
- Arnold of Brescia, a follower of Peter Bruis, condemned by the Lateran council, ii. 265.
- Arnoldists, ii. 245.
- Arrian the philosopher, ridicules the Jews, i. 9.—iii. 375, 380, 381, 382, 383, 558. iv. 253.
- Arsenius, his scholia on Euripides, iii. 105.
- Artemon, a heretic, i. 198.
- Articles of the Church of England, ii. 554. iii. 85, 245, 508. See *Burnet*.
- Ascher, rabbi, iii. 369.
- Asclepiades, iii. 293.
- Ascodruti, an ancient sect, ii. 141.
- Asphaltites, the lake, iii. 129.
- Assembly's Annotations, iv. 487.
- Athanasius, i. 57, 186. his *Questions ad Antiochum*, 390.—511, 533. was persecuted by Constantius the emperor, ii. 58, 145, 334, 336, 338, 342, 458. iv. 449.
- Athenæus, iii. 119.
- Atticus, bishop of Constantinople, i. 414.
- Attiniacum, or Acciniacum, a synod there, ii. 233.
- Audientes, who were so called, i. 36.
- Augustin, i. 78, 99, 102, 103, 112, 133, 136. comments on St. Cyprian, i. 143, 145.—159, 161, 184, 225, 230—233. his testimonies on baptism, 241—306. wrote against the Manichees, Arians, Donatists, and Pelagians, 241. his full evidence for the antiquity of infant-baptism, 259. he had no notion of transubstantiation, 275. his sentiments on regeneration, 277, &c. on original sin, 261, 283. on the origin of the soul, 282.—313, 320, 338. somewhere states *fourteen* as the usual age of receiving baptism, 340. his account of Dinocrates, *ibid.* 351. quotes Pelagius, 355, 356. his writings against the Pelagians, 358, &c. 374, 379, &c. to 468, 472. never found a Christian who did not own that infants were baptized for pardon of sin, 383. ii. 116. was learned in church-history, i. 384. his opinion on the 'swearing' of the gospel, 401. was not very conversant in the Greek language, 417. respected Pelagius highly, except for his heterodox opinions, 432. doubts of his meaning in a certain passage, 449. he defends Zosimus against the Pelagians, who claimed him as their friend, i. 462. his letters against Julian, bishop of Eclanum, 472. his opinion on particular prædestination, 416, 479. his books against Vincentius Victor, 481. his account of the Pelagians' ground for infant-baptism, 510. quoted by Walafrid Strabo, ii. 13. cited, 35. at what age he was baptized, 115. some account of his parents, 116, &c. he becomes a Manichee, 120. a sceptic, *ibid.* at length a Christian, *ibid.* cited, 130, 132, 133, 134, 135, 139, 141, 168, 169. attacked by M. Le Clerc, 173—180. his explication of the text John iii. 5, 186, 190, 191, 196, 197. his opinion of infants dying unbaptized, 200—206, 210, 212, 224, 225, 226, 229, 334, 347.—438, 476, 477, 478, 479, 484, 485, 487, 496. iii. 25, 47, 432, 433, 518, 528, 554, 569, 573. iv. 7, 10, 16, 21, 31, 33, 45, 64, 83, 84, 174, 228, 286, 298, 311, 322, 394, 405, 411, 415, 416, 418, 434, 438, 449, 455, 457, 466, 485, 486, 493, 494, 497, 498, 499.
- Aurelius Victor, ii. 71.
- Auxentius, an Arian, bishop of Milan, ii. 63, 69, 97, 134, 312.
- Auxilius, ii. 229.
- B.
- Babylonians, their customs, iv. 123, 126.
- Bagshaw, a writer quoted by Mr. Baxter, ii. 132. iv. 189.
- Balsamon, a Greek canonist, i. 155. his gloss on Photius, 157. ii. 34. iii. 44, 45, 46. iv. 7, 81, 82, 485, 493.

- Baluzius, an editor of the Councils, i. 149.
- Bampfild, Francis, his book on the sabbath, ii. 355, and note.
- Bangorian controversy, short remark on its rise and progress, iv. 297, note.
- Baptism, our Saviour's law concerning it, i. 2. the author's design concerning it, 3. baptism of Jewish proselytes differed from their other baptisms, 9. the mode adopted by St. John not minutely set down, 27. baptism of Jewish proselytes called their *new birth*, 30. the foolish fancy of the Talmudical doctors on this, 31. a parallel instituted between Jewish and Christian baptism, 33. Justin Martyr considers it to be instead of circumcision, 65. called by the ancients *περιτομή ἀχειροποίητος*, 66. denoted by the early Christians by the words *ἀνακαισμός, καινοποιία, φωτισμός*, 69. called by Irenæus *λύτρωσις* and *ἀπολύτρωσις*, 71. was used by heathens as a religious rite, 101. baptizing a woman with child, 150, &c. was sometimes delayed by half-Christians, 210. the baptisms of Moses, John, and Christ contrasted by St. Basil, 215. private baptism, in houses, unknown in St. Austin's time, 302. conditional, used by the church of England, 320. the set times for it anciently were Easter and Pentecost, 326, 329. reasons for that custom, 331. strange modes adopted by the early sectaries, 497—510. private baptism disliked by Cartwright and others, ii. 183. the *baptisms* or *washings* of the Jews, 329—331. 'baptism of blood,' what it is, 189, 190. persons dying without it, 182, 189, 190. delaying it till too late, 193, &c. prevented by sudden death, 195. the opinions of the ancients as to infants dying unbaptized, 197, 199. 'baptism of fire,' what it is, 250. opinions concerning the state of persons dying unbaptized, both infants and adults, 180—230. lay-baptism allowed by the Lutherans, 221. the Calvinists' opinion of the value of baptism, *ibid.* John Frith's 'Declaration' of it, 306. the convocation, A. D. 1536, sets forth articles concerning it, 308. the convocation, A. D. 1662, adds an office for adult baptism, 321. the chief rites of it, in various countries, 383, &c. at first was by *immersion*, 384. in rivers or ponds, 385. in *baptisteries*, *ibid.* the English offices for, 397. who baptize *naked*, 417. what, in Mr. Gale's opinion, is true Christian baptism, iii. 83. what is essential to it, *ibid.* 84, 86, 88. was administered in England by *dipping*, till queen Elizabeth's time, 162. baptism of adults plainly spoken of in scripture, 238. but that of infants not only not mentioned, but positively disallowed, 263. teaching must necessarily precede baptism, 264, 266—341. baptism called *σφραγίς τῆς πίστεως, sigillum fidei*, 289. no initiatory baptism among the Jews spoken of in scripture, 386—390. nor in any other authentic ancient history, 391, 505. Dr. Wall's answer to these assertions, iv. 243, &c. 253, &c. 257, &c. his censure of Mr. Gale's definition of true baptism, 100. metaphorical uses of the word *baptism*, 371.
- Baptize, must signify *to dip* (according to Mr. Gale), iv. 457.
- 'Baptized for the dead,' its meaning, i. 53, 506, 507. ii. 471.
- Βαπτίζω*, its sense in scripture, ii. 328—334. always signifies *to dip*, iii. 94, &c. synonymous with the word *βάπτω*, 97, 230. iv. 109. ancient authorities cited, iii. 99, &c. critics, 139, &c. the scriptures of the Old Testament, 144, &c. the Oriental versions, 177, 193. the Greek, 177. the New Testament, 191, &c. Dr. Wall's remarks on these points, and answers to them, iv. 108, &c.
- Baptisteries, ii. 385.
- Βαπτιστήριον*, iv. 161, 514.
- Barker, Rev. Dr., ii. 375.
- Barlow, Dr. Thomas, bishop of Lincoln, i. 98. he is quoted as a friend by the antipedobaptists, ii. 27. his letter to Tombes, *ibid.*

- this was printed against his will, 28. his explanation of it to Mr. Wills, *ibid.* iii. 30. iv. 492.
- Barnabas, St., his Epistle, ii. 426. iii. 201, 394, 421, 422, 518, 560. iv. 258, 270, 375, 484.
- Baronius, cardinal, his Annals, i. 103, 313, 314. ii. 53, 70, 74, 79, 83, 105, 235. abuses the emperor Constantine, 59, 60. his condemnation of Maximus, 68. his habit, *ibid.* iii. 489, 490, 491, 492. iv. 12, 324, 325, 336, 350.
- Barthius, Caspar, iii. 383.
- Basil, St., quoted, i. 13. his testimonies on baptism, 208—220. concerning his baptism, 162. and life, 164, &c. his treatment by the emperor Valens, 217. a passage supposed to be in favour of anti-pædobaptism, ii. 5. his age uncertain, 86. Danvers asserts that he was not baptized in infancy, 73. false ground of this assertion, *ibid.* cited, 134, 145, 159, 193, 421, 425, 512. iii. 335, 385, 487. iv. 254, 311, 433, 456.
- Basil of Ancyra, his opinions, ii. 458.
- Basilides, i. 501. ii. 390. iv. 160.
- Basiliscus, the emperor, ii. 461.
- Basnage, M., his history of the church, i. 477.
- Batenburg, John, a leader of the anabaptists, ii. 300.
- Batrachomyomachia, whether Homer be the author, iii. 100.
- Baxter, Richard, i. 97, 138. reproves Danvers, 259. ii. 10. his dispute with Danvers, respecting Vincentius Victor, i. 492. notice of his pieces on baptism, *ibid.* (note.) is unfairly cited, ii. 3, 4. his opinion as to the ancient practice of infant-baptism, 39. accuses Danvers, 45—124, 131. vindicates Wickliffe, 214. cited 224—232, 234, 241, 243, 248, 264, 458, 551. writes earnestly to dissuade his followers from separating from the church of England, 560. iii. 54, 56. iv. 86, 189, 190, 192, 208, 411, 421, 492.
- Bechai, a Jewish rabbi, cited by Selden, i. 11.
- Bede, Ven., his 'Church history,' ii. 126, 128.
- Beghards, or Pyghards, ii. 251, 267, 271, 295, 297. their confession, 298. what the name may mean, 299.
- Begines, or Beguines, female Beghards, ii. 298.
- Belgic Confession, ii. 335.
- Bellarmino, Cardinal, ii. 74. iii. 52.
- Βῆμα, its proper signification, i. 167.
- Benjamin, rabbi, iii. 175.
- Benson, a Jesuit in disguise, ii. 372, 373, 374.
- Berengarians, afterwards Waldenses, ii. 238.
- Berengarius, archdeacon of Angers, ii. 235. his opinions on the real presence, and on baptism of infants, 236—238, 257.
- Bernard, Jacques, his review of Dr. Wall's History, iv. 10—27, 60, 291.
- Bernard, St., ii. 198, 212. opposes the Waldenses, 259—262, 276, 278. iv. 496.
- Bernardus Lutzenbergensis, ii. 268.
- Beveridge, bp., iii. 202, 204, 214, 219.
- Beza, Th., ii. 266. iii. 178, 291. iv. 130, 222, 504.
- Bible translations, and how far correct, iv. 140, 145, 222, 225, 226, 240, 351, 361, 362. various versions in Walton's Polyglott, iii. 513. the Syriac version of, 151. English, the authorized version, in Mr. Gale's opinion loose, 180, 182, 196. said not to express truly the original, 274. various versions, 331. published in English, 244. opposed by the church of Rome, *ibid.* chronological notes in its margin, iv. 332. English, 371.
- Bibliotheca Patrum, ii. 234, 235. iv. 303, 434, 496.
- Bilius, I., i. 165. his opinions on baptism, ii. 28. some account of him, *ibid.* (note.) 78, 82, 217, 218. iii. 30, 48. iv. 84, 85.
- Bingham, Joseph, his 'Antiquities' cited, i. 338. iv. 161, 304, 392, 505.
- Binius, an editor of the councils, i. 313.
- Births, three several ones reckoned to every Christian by ecclesiastical writers; Gregory Nazianzen, &c. i. 123.

- Blake, T., his pamphlets on sprinkling, &c. ii. 402. iv. 163.
- Bleau, a printer, burns a Socinian book, i. 351.
- Blount, Jo., iv. 250.
- Bobovius, Albertus, his account of the Mahometan washings, iii. 176. some particulars of his history, *ibid.*
- Bochart, iii. 328.
- Bochellus, L., his 'Decreta Ecclesiæ Gallicanæ,' i. 306. ii. 368, 394.
- Boëmus, Jo., cited by Danvers, ii. 41. some account of him, note, *ibid.* 124.
- Bonaventure, ii. 391, 393.
- Bonfinius, Ant., ii. 268.
- Boni Homines of Thoulouse, ii. 243. were Manichees, 244.
- Boniface, bishop of Rome, corresponds with St. Austin, i. 260—273.
- Bonosus, a heretic, i. 199.
- Bossuet, M., iii. 246, 378. iv. 77.
- Boval, Mr., ii. 302.
- Bracara, synod of, (sæc. vii.) iv. 495.
- Brachmans, the, iii. 300, 513. iv. 372.
- Bramball, abp., iii. 52. iv. 86.
- Brayly, his 'Beauties of England,' iv. 239, note.
- Bread. Many churches prefer unleavened bread at the eucharist, as most agreeable with our Saviour's practice, iv. 163.
- Brewerwood, Ed., ii. 143, 281, 282, 283, 286, 291, 417, 491.
- Bridekirk, an ancient stone font there, i. 86, and note; ii. 43. iii. 205.
- Brown, rev. Edw., ii. 375.
- Brown, Joseph, presented by Dr. Wall for nonconformity, iii. 90. iv. 66, 72, 103, 190.
- Brownism, derived from the old Puritans, ii. 561.
- Bruno, bishop of Angers, ii. 235, 236, 238.
- Brute, John, a scholar of Wickliffe, ii. 215.
- Bucer, ii. 545. iii. 324.
- Bullinger, H., ii. 130.
- Burigenus, a writer of the Low Countries, ii. 298. and note.
- Burnet, bp., his interpretation of the text John iii. 5. ii. 184, 310. his life of sir M. Hale, ii. 317.
- Burnet on the Articles, iii. 29, 228, 245, 258, 276, 309, 322, 432, 439, 444, 456, 539. iv. 162, 167, 227, 274, 298, 300, 420, 487.
- Busby, Dr., his Greek Grammar, iii. 292. iv. 230.
- Button, a zealous nonconformist, ii. 372.
- Buxtorf, his 'Synagoga Judaica,' i. 35. his Lexicon, iii. 149, 346, 363, 370, 543. iv. 252.
- C.
- Cæcilian, an early bishop, i. 249.
- Cæsarea, the ancient creed of, ii. 452.
- Cæsarius, brother of Gregory Nazianzen, ii. 87. was baptized, but not in infancy, 88.
- Cajans, an ancient sect, i. 502. ii. 138.
- Cajetanus, cardinal, ii. 217, 218.
- Callimachus, iii. 124, 125.
- Calvin, J., his Psychopannuchia, &c. i. 299. his explication of 1 Cor. vii. 14, 344. of John iii. 5. ii. 180. the mischief of it, *ibid.* his interpretation (of John iii. 5.) condemned by Hooker, 183. adopted by Cartwright, *ibid.* by the modern antipædobaptists, *ibid.* his opinion on the sleep of the soul, 344. on sprinkling in baptism, ii. 400. cited, 116, 221, 222, 266, 545. iv. 13—16, 19—22, 168, 170, 173, 178, 415.
- Calvinists, iv. 480.
- Camden, John, i. 86. ii. 43. his history interpolated, *ibid.* 53, 54. ii. 373. iii. 205.
- Cameron, Lud., iii. 276, 324.
- Canisius, P., ii. 336.
- Canons, apostolic, ii. 334, 344. iii. 202.
- Canterus, G., his version of Lycophon, iii. 126.
- Capellus, Lud., iii. 175.
- Cappadocia, the church of, iv. 441.
- Carpocrates, i. 501, 502. his followers' manner of baptism, 503.
- Carthage, synod of, i. 126, 135, 307. iv. 446. council of, (A. D. 412.) i. 112, 357. difficulty in fixing the precise times of the more ancient ones, 307. variation in the MSS. 311. council, (A. D. 416.) 358,

424. iv. 494. it sends an epistle to Innocent, bishop of Rome, i. 425. another council, (A. D. 417.) 469. another, (A. D. 418.) 468. a canon recited, 470, 494. iv. 7. another, (A. D. 419.) i. 495. ii. 132.
- Carthage, a great persecution at, i. 141.
- the church of, iv. 56, 59.
- Carthusians, ii. 363.
- Cartwright, Tho., his controversy with Whitgift, i. 304. ii. 223.
- Casaubon, I., iii. 140, 204, 228, 489, iv. 119, 324, 325.
- Cassander, G., i. 227. ii. 132, 217, 219, 258, 272, 300. iv. 495.
- Cassianus, i. 479, 518.
- Cassiodorus, ii. 139, 140. iii. 546.
- Castalio, iii. 328.
- Castellus, E., his *Lexicon*, iii. 149, 328, 543.
- Catabaptists, so called by Beza, iv. 504.
- Cataphryges, Montanists, i. 509.
- Catechism of the Church of England, i. 328, 332. ii. 567, 568. iii. 218.
- Catechumens, who were so called, i. 36, 148, 216, 277.
- Catena Patrum, iv. 426.
- Cathari, or Puritans, ii. 239, 249, 252, 262, 269, 270, 336.
- Cave, Dr., his 'Historia Litteraria,' i. 307, 313. ii. 76. his account of Jo. Philoponus, 166, 412. reflects on M. Le Clerc, iii. 35.
- Celecyth, the synod of, ii. 395, 396. iii. 226, 346, 570. iv. 162.
- Celsus, ii. 340.
- Celsus, a child; his history, i. 330.
- Census, difficulties attending the fixing of that mentioned in the Gospel, iv. 341—352. rolls of it laid up as records, 353, &c.
- Cephisodorus, iii. 318.
- Cerda, La, i. 501, 502.
- Ceremonies, any difference in, is no just ground for separation, ii. 537, 539. the church of England's declaration, 539.
- Cerinthus, Cerinthians, i. 57, 195, 501, 505, 506. iv. 385.
- Cevennes, the inhabitants supposed to be descendants of the Waldenses, ii. 247. the wars there, 256.
- Chalcedon, the council of, ii. 461, 475.
- Chaldæans, a branch of the Muscovites, ii. 142.
- Chardin, sir John, his remarks on the Georgians and Mengrelians, ii. 287, &c. account of a christening there, 289.
- Charenton, protestant church of, iv. 96.
- Charles I. king, iv. 205.
- Chemnitius, M., iv. 108.
- Χέρυβα*. The meaning of this word discussed, iv. 127, 128.
- Chilmead, Edmund, his translation of Leo Modena, i. 7.
- Christ, given to infants, i. 334, 335. See *Anointing*, *Chrysome*.
- Christ, Jesus. To what place his soul went, ii. 344, &c.
- Christendom, an old expression for baptism, ii. 127, 128.
- Christening-day, iv. 171. *μαθητεύειν* is 'to christen', 215.
- Christening, modern usages as to the infant's dress, &c. iv. 462, 464. on the usual feasting and presents, 470.
- Christians, primitive: their custom as to baptizing infants, i. 3. ii. 417. their ancient writers speak of the Jewish baptism of proselytes, i. 12. had an eye to Jewish rites and ordinances, 33. this instanced in several particulars, *ibid.* in early times there were many waverers, or half-Christians, and these deferred their baptism, 210. some ancient Christians were not baptized in infancy, ii. 48—125. Greek Christians practise infant-baptism, 280. and by *immersion*, 414. Asiatic Christians, of various sects, all hold infant-baptism, 281, &c. of St. Thomas, in India, practise infant-baptism, 284. the primitive baptized by *dipping* only, iii. 199, &c. 206, 207, 212. accused of child-murder, 16, the word *Χριστιανός* not used by St. Paul, iv. 214.
- Chronicon Alexandrinum, i. 58. ii. 71.
- Chronology, iv. 323, &c. 332—340, &c. 428.
- Chrysome-cloth, a description of it, ii. 404, and note.
- Chrysostom, i. 58. his testimonies on baptism, 226—237, compares

- circumcision with it, 227. speaks of a dispute between a Christian and a Greek, 300. his interpretation of 1 Cor. vii. 14. 389. cited, 416. of 1 Cor. xv. 29. 505, 508. a work ascribed to him, 534. was baptized when adult, ii. 92. his parents not Christians at his birth, *ibid.* arguments brought forward on both sides, 92—96. — 192, 193, 418, 422, 429, 437, 471, 496. undeservedly spoken of by Dr. Wall, iii. 31, 32. quoted, 201. iv. 24, 78, 312, 434, 449, 455.
- Church. What constitutes a true church, iii. 61, 65, 66. the extent and bounds of the church's power, 78. what is Dr. Wall's notion of a true church, 84. a new notion respecting a church of Christ lately set forth in England, iv. 47, 48. Church authority attacked, 474—477. some of the objects of the attack, 477. church government, a point of the ancient discipline commended by Dr. Wall, ii. 366. that of the English anti-pædobaptists, 364.
- Churches of Africa, iv. 56—59.
- of Alexandria, iv. 492.
- of Britain, in the times of Pelagius, i. 467. before the arrival of the English, ii. 126. their conversion by Austin, *ibid.* they baptized infants, 128, 129. iv. 496.
- of Cappadocia, iv. 441.
- of Carthage, iv. 56, 59.
- of Denmark, iv. 96.
- of England, her office of baptism, i. 186, 273, 320. ii. 397. iv. 294, 461. suffers from schism, i. 202. allows private baptism, in certain cases, 303. her *conditional* baptism, 320. her Catechism, 328—332. ii. 567. a point in it examined, 568. iii. 268. her liturgy, i. 332. deems that the Fathers need not to be defended from the attacks of Socinians, ii. 150. her interpretation of our Saviour's words at John iii. 5. 186. her ordination, iv. 91. uses *regeneration* as synonymous with *baptism*, ii. 187. her opinion of the necessity of baptism, 222. of the state of infants dying unbap-
- tized, 223. a rubric in her baptismal office objected to, 226. her moderate opinions, 280. one of the last to admit baptism by *affusion*, 392. her latest order on the subject, 404. her office of confirmation, 434, 567. iv. 52. her excellence in the matter of subscriptions, ii. 535. iv. 97. her declaration as to rites and ceremonies, ii. 539. iv. 97. is in communion with foreign protestant churches, though she differs from them in ceremonies, &c. ii. 542. she and the dissenters ought to unite, 563. a character drawn of her, iii. 5. she is not chargeable with the strange opinions or evil deeds of individuals, 52, 53. most of the clergy called by Mr. Gale non-juring Jacobites, or high-flyers, 53, 66. he judges that those who own the church of Rome for a true church ought to join themselves to her, 62. her definition of a true church, 65. whether she ought to conform to the dissenters, 70. or to conciliate them, 78. her definition of a true church, as given in her Articles, 85. iv. 101. a question whether she herself may be a true church, iii. 85. iv. 90, 450. her order of confirmation, iii. 86. iv. 52. she has no power over dissenters, iii. 89. iv. 103. her baptism not real baptism, 86, 88, 98. whether she is tolerant, 211. some rank Socinians among her adherents, *ibid.* admits infants to baptism without a personal profession of faith, 212. why does she still continue baptism by sprinkling? 227. if the wish of her clergy for restoring dipping be real, not pretended? 229. her Articles cited, to prove that the scripture is her only rule of faith, 245, 247. said to have two baptisms, 478. this repudiated iv. 316, 463. her Catechism, 14, 383, 456, 465. her Articles, iii. 85, 245, 247. iv. 24, 101, 194, 245, 247, 367. baptizes children of infidels, but with certain engagements, 23. follows the ancient church in applying Christ's words, John iii. 5. to baptism.



- ibid. her Articles cited, 24. her Ordination Service, 460, 462, 463. her Office of Baptism, 461, 463. her Office of Private Baptism, 468. objected to by the presbyterians, at the Savoy conference, *ibid.*
- Church, Greek, knew no antipædobaptism in the twelfth century, i. 155. believed that infants dying unbaptized would miss of heaven, but not be punished, 533. ii. 199. still baptizes infants, 280, 285. abstains from blood and things strangled, according to the apostle's precept; in which the antipædobaptists of England join it, 343. uses *immersion*, 414, 416. differs from the western in one clause of the Nicene Creed, 464. whether she now uses the Nicene or the Constantinopolitan, 466. how soon she began to give the eucharist to infants, 489, 490.
- of Muscovy, baptizes infants, ii. 280.
- of Prussia, iv. 96.
- of Rome, fabricates the Decretal Epistles, i. 322, her liturgy, 332. has grown latitudinarian on the Pelagian tenets, 460. and has allowed the Jesuits to undermine the doctrine of original sin, *ibid.* anciently was zealous for the prædestinarian side, 480. her *limbus infantum*, 224, 497. ii. 200.—279. seeks to embroil protestants with each other, 33, 36, 40. a fit answer to one of her objections against us, 59. her conduct towards emperors, ancient and modern, 60. is pædobaptist, 279. but recently has adopted the opposite course, to gain a point, 378. papists in disguise undermining our church, 377. her custom of anointing, 432. did not rebaptize believing converts, but anointed them, 433. it cannot be known what form of creed they used in the most ancient times, 467. they received the Nicene Creed, *ib.* but probably had a form of their own, which they used in baptism, *ibid.* Rufinus' comment on it, *ibid.* how her creed, faith, and see, came to bear the title of *apostolic*, 472. she has often tried to *force* all men into unity, 530. whether protestants may join in her service, 545. maintains that there is no scripture-proof for infant-baptism, 551. iv. 182. an argument from thence, *ibid.* she encourages animosities and divisions, iii. 3. an union with her thought practicable by Mr. Dodwell, 10. she *compels* persons to separate from her, 61. opposed the publication of the Bible in English, 244. vehemently assaults the Reformation, 246. argues from infant-baptism in favour of tradition, *ibid.* the consequences of arguing solely from the silence of scripture, 255, 258, &c. by what means her innovations gradually prevailed, 570, 571.—iv. 90, 102, 172, 202, 203, 286.
- Church of Rotterdam, iv. 96.
- of Scotland, iv. 96.
- of Sweden, iv. 96.
- Cicero, quoted, iii. 22. 181. his life, 299, 314, 318, 319, 321, 485. iv. 144.
- Circassia, ii. 279, 282, 283. their sad state of religion, 288, &c.
- Circumcellions, ii. 170.
- Circumcision, Abyssinian, ii. 291. baptism never so called in scripture, iii. 471. two kinds spoken of there, *ibid.* 473.
- Clarendon, Edward earl of, his history, ii. 318. called 'the English Thucydides,' iii. 56. refuses to communicate with the French protestants, 72. iv. 96.
- Clarus, an African bishop, iii. 336.
- Claude, M., iii. 73.
- Clemens Alexandrinus, i. 53. quoted, 82—86.—512. ii. 496. iii. 194, 285, 296, 299—301, 331—333, 487, 495, 496, 498, 513—516, 538, 546. iv. 149, 229, 230, 235, 341, 343, 357, 372, 373, 375—378, 381—383, 448.
- Clemens Romanus, quoted, i. 47—65. his writings formerly not thought genuine, 55. his epistles were written before the Gospel of St. John, 56, 62, the time of his death inquired into, 58. he was not the Clement mentioned by St. Paul, Philipp. iv. 62.—325. referred to,

- ii. 90, 496. iii. 334, 399, 400, 423, 518, 525, 560. iv. 271, 372, 484.
- Clement's Constitutions, account of this and similar early forgeries, i. 524. ii. 480. iv. 45, 61, 62. its character, 63, 64, 75, 262, 381.
- Clericus, or Le Clerc, John, i. 99, 187, 202, 205. his history of Pelagianism and Lives of the Fathers, 349. 350, n. 432. ii. 147. his mistakes in it, i. 352, 410, 440, n. 442, n. and misrepresentations, 367, 371, 373, 378, 380, 416, 417. fancies a contradiction in Gregory Nazianzen, ii. 77, 81, 175. his ill designs, 81. false charge of tritheism, 148, &c. his 'Critical Epistles,' 149, 155. misrepresents St. Augustin, 170, 173, 175. his 'Bibliothèque choisie,' 173. is not fit to translate or expound Scripture, 174. his 'Comedy,' 175. his Eulogy on Locke, *ibid.* his censure of Stillington, 176. finds fault with St. Hilary, 177, 178. cited, 463. his ill design against the Fathers, 478. iii. 32, the reason of so many enemies attacking him, 33, 34. he is accused by Dr. Cave, 35. defends himself, 36. quoted, 205, 309. his edition of the New Testament, 310. his opinion of the rabbins, 368, 445. iv. 78, 151, 210, 227, 502.
- Clerk, Samuel, iii. 327.
- Cobbett, Thomas, ii. 132, and note.
- Cælestinus, Pope, i. 517.
- Cælestius, i. 102, 112, 320, 348. was an Irishman, 354. some account of him, *ibid.* 357, &c. 377, 380. his *Syllogisms*, 392. his *Definitiones*, 402. at Constantinople, 414. his *Libellus fidei*, 430. is not the same piece as that by Pelagius, 431. nor is it the same with St. Austin's *Sermo de tempore*, 440, n. his creed not extant, except in part, preserved by St. Austin, 451. it was more open and undisguised than that of Pelagius, 452. an extract given, 451. he would not easily be put down, 453, 454. the Pelagian heresy called the *Cælestian* in the East, 455. he flattered Zosimus, yet would not be guided by him, 455. maintained that his doctrines were not heretical, 464. iv. 494, 498.
- Coleman, a Jesuit in disguise, ii. 372, 373, 374.
- Cologne, the council of, ii. 394.
- Colomesius, P., his 'Letters,' ii. 295.
- Combefis, F., ii. 74.
- Common Prayer, book of, iv. 246.
- Commons, House of, their declaration A. D. 1620, iii. 73.
- Communicating infants, iii. 554, 573. iv. 44, 436, 437. See *Eucharist*.
- 'Communion of saints,' its meaning, ii. 527.
- Communion, received daily in some ancient churches, i. 275. remissness of modern protestants in this point, 276. See *Eucharist*.
- Competentes, who were so called, i. 36.
- Compton, Dr. H., bishop of London, his instructions to his clergy respecting private baptism, iv. 468.
- Computing time, some ancient modes of, iv. 323.
- Confessions of the Waldenses, ii. 241, 280. of the antipædobaptists, ii. 322, 333, 358, 359, 552, 571. iv. 86, 199, 200, 478.
- Confirmation, the Anabaptists disagree about its practice, ii. 356, 433. the English office for it, 434. iv. 52.
- Conradus de monte puellarum, a writer, ii. 298.
- Constance, council of, i. 324. ii. 215, 218.
- Constantine the emperor, was not baptized in infancy, ii. 52. his vices, 59. yet he was chosen by God for an instrument of good, *ibid.* his baptism, iii. 221. iv. 160, 444, 449, 501.
- Constantine, H., his Lexicon, iii. 126, 139, 291, 292, 294, 322. iv. 119, 230.
- Constantinople, iv. 83. council of, ii. 451, 460, 462.
- Constantinopolitan Creed, i. 422, 434, ii. 460, &c.
- Constantius Chlorus, was not a Christian, ii. 53, 56. forced his subjects to become Arians, 133. was a bigoted Arian, ii. 456.

- Constantius, son of Constantine, was not baptized in infancy, and why, ii. 57. was baptized afterwards, 58. persecuted Athanasius, *ibid.*
- Constitutions of Clement, i. 524.
- of the Apostles, i. 524, 525. iii. 20, 165, 174, 201, 334, iv. 401.
- Cophti (Ægyptian Christians), baptize infants, ii. 291. and give them the eucharist, *ibid.* 491.
- Cornelius, bishop of Rome, his Epistles, i. 325. ii. 195, 385, 433. iii. 220, 222, 224. his history of Novatus, iv. 159, 160.
- Cornelius Nepos, iii. 296, 315, 319.
- Cornwell, Mr., a baptist minister, ii. 357.
- Costelecius, Jo. S., ii. 295.
- Cotelerius, his note on Hermas, i. 50, n. edits the ‘Constitutions of the Apostles,’ 524. iii. 174.
- Council of Alexandria (A. D. 362.), ii. 466.
- of Antioch (A. D. 341.), ii. 455. another (A. D. 378.), 466.
- of Ariminum (A. D. 359.), ii. 469.
- of Arles, i. 207.
- of Carthage. Synod of, (A. D. 253.), i. 126. 135. iv. 446. (A. D. 412.), i. 112, 357. several ancient ones cited, 306—316, 320. one (A. D. 416.), 358, 424. iv. 494. another (A. D. 417.), i. 469. another (A. D. 418.), 468. a canon of this council recited, *ibid.* remarkable various reading of it in some copies, 471, 494. iv. 7. another (A. D. 419.), i. 495. ii. 132.
- of Chalcedon (A. D. 451.) ii. 461, 475.
- of Cologne (A. D. 1536.) ii. 394.
- of Constance, i. 324. ii. 215.
- of Constantinople (A. D. 381.), ii. 451, 462, 466.
- (or synod) of Diospolis, (A. D. 415.), i. 409—413.
- of Eliberis (A. D. 305.), i. 148. ii. 108, 431.
- or synod, an ancient one in England, ii. 395, 396. iii. 226, 346, 570. iv. 162.
- of Ephesus (A. D. 431.), i. 415, 455, 517. ii. 461.
- Council of Florence (A. D. 1439.) ii. 219, 415.
- of Gerunda (A. D. 517.), i. 519. iv. 495.
- of Hippo, i. 314.
- of Ilerda (A. D. 524.), i. 519.
- of Illyricum (A. D. 367.), ii. 466.
- of Laodicea, ii. 384, 430.
- of Lateran (A. D. 1139.), ii. 265. another (A. D. 1215.), *ibid.*
- of Milevis (A. D. 416.), i. 424. ii. 484. iv. 494.
- of Neocæsarea (A. D. 314.), i. 150. ii. 108, 386. iii. 43, 44. 220. iv. 7, 59, 80, 159, 485, 493.
- of Nice, i. 250. ii. 145, 164. iv. 46.
- of Orange (A. D. 441.), ii. 432.
- of Rome (A. D. 370.), ii. 466.
- of Toledo (A. D. 630.), ii. 424, 432.
- of Trent, i. 18, 280. ii. 210, 488.
- of Tribur (A. D. 895.), i. 330.
- in Trullo, i. 302, 317. ii. 343.
- of Vienna, under Clement V, ii. 299.
- Creed, the Nicene, i. 187. is disowned by the unitarians, 201, 206. Mr. Le Clerc’s slander of it, 206. the most ancient creed now extant, *ibid.* ii. 439. the clause ‘the Maker of heaven and earth,’ when added, and why, i. 503. the form of this creed, ii. 450. some expressions in it directed against Arius, 451. the orthodox Christians maintain it against the various creeds of the Arians, 454. is used by the catholics in the East, 460, 461. approved by the council of Ephesus, *ibid.* of Chalcedon, *ibid.* by the edicts of Justinian, of Basiliscus, and Zeno, *ibid.* some additions to it made at Constantinople, 463. so that by the words ‘Nicene Creed’ from that time the Constantinopolitan is generally understood, *ibid.* it is received by the church of Rome, 473. is on the whole preferable to the Roman, 474.

- Creed, that of Eusebius, ii. 451.  
 — of the church of Cæsarea, ii. 452.  
 — of Alexander, bishop of Alexandria, ii. 453.  
 — the Constantinopolitan, i. 422, 434, n. ii. 460. is merely that of Nice, with some additional clauses, 463. a copy of it, *ibid.* is used now almost universally, *ibid.* one clause added afterwards by the church of Rome, 464. its difference from the Nicene, 465. baptism is named in it, 549. iv. 47.  
 — of Jerusalem, mentioned by St. Cyril, ii. 460, 461.  
 — of Aquileia, i. 434, n. ii. 469, 471.  
 — of Arius, ii. 453. iv. 47.  
 — of the Arians, numerous, ii. 454, 455. often altered, 460, 469. iv. 47.  
 — of Eunomius, ii. 457.  
 — the Apostles', or Roman, i. 201. ii. 466. a copy of it, 468. Rufinus' exposition of it, i. 441, n. ii. 467, 469. differences in it, *ibid.* 470. why called 'The Apostles' Creed,' 472. no foundation for the current story, 473. at what period it took its present form, *ibid.* is received by the Greek church also, *ibid.*  
 Creed of Athanasius, i. 205. ii. 469, 474. its age and character, *ibid.*  
 — that of Pelagius, i. 432. is very express in reference to the Trinity, *ibid.* note. opposes Arius and Sabellius, 435. also Photinus and Apollinaris, 436. differs from Origen and St. Jerome, 440, n. 442, n. 443, n.  
*Creeds*, a Socinian pamphlet on the subject, ii. 360. all the ancient ones agreed in substance, though not in form, 439. no copy of a very ancient one remains, *ibid.* the Nicene the oldest, *ibid.* the substance of Christian profession of faith gathered from writers more ancient than any creed now extant, 440, &c. why creeds became necessary, *ibid.* numerous among the Arians, 454, 469. whether the modern antipædobaptists have any settled form, 475. the ancient ones contained every article deemed fundamental, 549. baptism was named in some, *ibid.* all ancient creeds contained the article of Christ's being born of a Virgin, iv. 392. *πίστις*, a common name for the creed, *ibid.*  
 Crellius, Jo., his book, iii. 28.  
 Cresconius, a Donatist, i. 161. iv. 493.  
 Critolaus, iii. 318.  
 Cromwell, Oliver, iv. 208.  
 Cross, infants were anciently signed with it, at baptism, i. 237.  
 Crossfield, John, his pamphlet on infant-baptism, iv. 37, n.  
 Crull, Dr., his 'State of Muscovy,' ii. 142, n. 143. 280, 414.  
 Cudworth, Ralph, ii. 148, 149, 150, 174.  
 Curcellæus, ii. 148, 149, 150, 151, 168, 174, 176. iii. 30.  
 Cusanus, cardinal, rejects the old Decretals, i. 323.  
 Cyprian, St., quoted, i. 12, 125—147. a various reading in the editions of his works, 139. cited, 207, 260. ii. 145, 334, 387, 425, 430, 437, 449, 471. a false reading, 480.— 492, 496, 497, 572. iii. 15, 17, 18, 19, 87. 141, 203. an advocate for sprinkling, 207, 213—216, 222—226. a friend to the clergy, 224, 237, 385, 525, 554, 555, 568. iv. 7, 41, 44, 56—59, 64, 74, 156—158, 254, 255, 275, 313, 314, 410, 411, 415, 416, 436—444, 447, 451, 453—455, 485, 486, 490, 491. 500, 501. a high character of him and of his works, 444.  
 D.  
 Dacherius, his 'Spicilegium,' ii. 263.  
 Dadosius and other leaders of the Messalians, ii. 139.  
 Daillé, his work 'De Usu Patrum,' i. 139. his opinions on infant-baptism, ii. 38, 48, 51, 124, 416, 478, 484. iii. 18, 30, 204, 417, 547. iv. 425, 490.  
 Dale, Antony van, his 'History of Baptisms,' ii. 29.  
 Danetus, his lexicon, iii. 527. iv. 396.  
 Danvers, Henry, i. 97, 107, 133. he misunderstands St. Austin, 257. accused of unfairness, 328. his dispute with Wills and Baxter respecting Vincentius Victor, 492. notice of the pieces published on both sides, *ibid.* n. cites Eusebius, ii. 7. Jerome, 8. Hilary, 10. Jo-

- annes Boemus, 41. and several other authors, all of whom he misrepresents, 44. was publicly accused of forging quotations, 45. thinks Constantine's father was a Christian, 55. quotes the centuriators of Magdeburg, *ibid.* more unfair quotations, 73. cites a great many names of persons little known, 123, 124. further mistakes, 126, 139, 188, 212, 214, 216, 217, 231, 233, 248, 264. asserts that the German anabaptists only continued an ancient doctrine, 294. that anabaptists were early found in England, 306. quoted, 356, 377, 408. his most unfair quotations condemned, *ibid.* 410. iv. 72, 82, 187, 189, 190, 194, 198, 208, 278, 291, 316, 317, 411, 445, 446, 456, 486, 491, 493, 496.
- Dauphiné, some of the Waldenses there, ii. 259, 262, 274.
- Davye, Mr. Thomas, of Leicester, his book against infant-baptism, ii. 133. a review of it, iv. 483—500, 511, 512.
- Dean, captain, ii. 318.
- Decretals of Clement V., i. 305. of Siricius, 321, &c. general history of them, *ibid.* 330. ii. 2. iii. 24. iv. 512.
- Deists, ii. 251.
- Delaune, Thomas, his 'Plea for Nonconformists,' ii. 124, and n.
- Delphos, the Oracle at, iii. 388.
- Democritus, iii. 299.
- Demosthenes, iii. 283.
- Dempster, Thomas, mistakes in his 'History of Scotland,' i. 354, and n.
- Denmark, the church of, ii. 539. iii. 72.
- Denne, John, ii. 123.
- Deodwinus, bishop of Liege, ii. 235—237.
- Dervises, ii. 363.
- Dew, very abundant in the East, and in hot climates, iii. 150. iv. 111, 124.
- Didymus, his Scholia on Homer, ii. 334. iii. 105, 119, 128, 153, 165. iv. 56.
- Dinmock, Roger, ii. 307.
- Dinocrates, a boy, i. 340. whose case is discussed between Vincentius Victor and St. Austin. i. 487, &c.
- Diodati, iii. 328.
- Diodorus, a philosopher, iii. 318.
- Diodotus, a Stoic, iii. 314, 485.
- Diogenes Laertius, iii. 297, 316, 485.
- Dion, of Syracuse, iii. 298, 319, 320.
- Dionysius, bishop of Alexandria, ii. 7. iii. 525, 555. iv. 439—442, 457.
- Dionysius the Areopagite, his works supposititious, i. 527. opinions of baptism given in them, *ibid.* ii. 498.
- Dionysius Halicarnassensis, iii. 128. 316, 318, 464, 465. iv. 305.
- Dionysius, bishop of Rome, iii. 555.
- Dionysius, of Syracuse, iii. 298.
- Diospolis, (or Lydda,) the synod of, i. 379, 409, 453.
- Dipping. Dipping three times in baptism used by the Jews, i. 37. dipping of children first left off in France, ii. 239, 393. whether *baptizing* in Scripture is always to be understood of *dipping*, 329. it was the ancient practice, 384. defended, *ibid.* in cases of sickness, &c. affusion was used, even in ancient times, 385, 390. both were occasionally used in the ancient *French* church, *ibid.* 391. dipping the custom in England, 392, 393. its progress in France, 394. in England, 395, &c. left off in the reign of queen Elizabeth, 398. first by people of high rank, 399. Calvin's influence on the point, 400. Dr. Wall knew some few who had been dipped, and himself had dipped one infant, 401. Mr. Blake's pamphlets on it, 402. it is still used in countries not subject to the pope, 404, 414. the present order of the church of England on the point, *ibid.* endeavours to restore the use of it, 407, 410, 411. it is still used in the Greek church, 414. and by many other Christians, *ibid.* 416. the only true way of baptizing, iii. 84. Dr. Wall said to admit this, 86. allowed to agree with the commands of Scripture, 95. βαπτίζω always signifies to *dip*, 94, &c. βάπτω the same: with allusion to the art of *dyeing*. 109. authorities for this signification. from classic writers, 99—136.

- from critics, 139, &c. from the Old Testament, 144, &c. from the Oriental versions, 177, 193. from the Greek, 177. from the New Testament, 191, &c. St. John baptized by dipping, 198. the primitive Christians did the same, 199. authorities from the Fathers, 200, &c. from modern authors, 203, &c. from several modern versions as quoted by bishop Nicholson, 205. whether *aspersio* was used till one hundred and fifty years after the Apostles? 218. and even then it was only admitted as an alternative in peculiar cases, 220, &c. 226. how it came into use in England, 346. how suddenly laid aside, 554, 570. Dr. Wall's reply to Mr. Gale's remarks on the point of dipping, iv. 105, &c. it was the primitive mode of baptizing; and most learned men own it for the more fitting way, 151, 153, 155, 156. all churches used it except those of Rome and Geneva, 156. why no very early authorities are cited for sprinkling, 158. the English clergy defended in their practice, from Mr. Gale's remarks, 165. and the order of our church on the point vindicated, *ibid.* Dr. Wall's fuller thoughts and suggestions on the practice, 167, &c. and 458, &c.
- Directory, the Presbyterian, i. 304, n. iv. 114. it orders baptizing in a basin, ii. 403, 404.
- Disciple, its true meaning, ii. 514, &c. iii. 314. farther discussion of its meaning, iv. 211, &c.
- Dissenters. Whether they ought to join the church of England, or she ought to go over to them, iii. 70, 74, 82. are obliged in conscience to separate themselves, 79. protected in the exercise of their religion, iii. 210. a loose political body of them in England induced the presbyterians and others to separate from the church of England, iv. 474, 475.
- Diverse, its meaning, iv. 143.
- Dodwell, Henry, i. 58, 59, 79, 80. his opinion of the Jewish rabbis, iii. 369. cited, 491, 499, 501, 527, 532. iv. 324, 325, 336. a reproof of him by Mr. Gale, iii. 10, 66. quoted, 52.
- Donatists, i. 103. their schism, 248. St. Austin writes against them, *ibid.* 408. their tenets, 252, 257, 258, 311, 319. the sect declines, 307, 311, 467. rebaptize catholics, ii. 69. their controversy with Optatus, i. 160. their opinions on baptism, ii. 129. did not reject infant-baptism, 132, 170. accounted schismatics, 543. iv. 102, 200, 486, 490, 491, 493, 494.
- Dorrington, Rev. Theoph., his work on baptism censured by Mr. Gale, iii. 273. vindicated, iv. 208, 209.
- Dort, the synod of, i. 372. ii. 305.
- Driedo, Jo., ii. 209. iii. 433.
- Druids, the, iii. 300.
- Drusius, Jo. quoted, i. 8. iii. 175.
- Dryden, Jo., his Virgil quoted, iii. 99.
- Dugranicia, a country so called, ii. 253.
- Dulcinus Navarrensensis, ii. 264.
- Du Pin, his edition of Optatus, i. 162, n. his opinion of the Decretals, 330. of the canon of the council of Carthage (A. D. 418.), 494. ii. 74, 84, 85, 95, 505. iii. 369, 501, 547, 549, 550, 569. iv. 252, 425, 429, 430.
- Durandus, bishop of Liege, ii. 235.
- Dutch anabaptists in London, ii. 314.
- Dutch Martyrology. See *Martyrology*.
- Dutch Mimists. See *Mimists*.
- Dutch torture the English at Amboyna, ii. 423.
- E.
- Easter, the principal season of baptism among the Jews, i. 36, 93, 94. one of the two also among early Christians, 326—332, 347.
- Ebion, i. 195. the first Socinian, 196.
- Ebionites, i. 75, 199, 501. iv. 391, 392.
- Eckbertus Schonangiensis, ii. 249, 263.
- Eclipses, the exact time of our Saviour's birth pointed out by them, iv. 359.
- Edessa, records of the church of, ii. 468, 469.
- Edomites, conditions imposed on them by Hyrcanus, iv. 246.

- Edwards, Dr. Jo., his book on the Canticles quoted, iii. 215, iv. 228.
- Eleutherus, bishop of Rome, his time, i. 80.
- Elias, the rabbins' idea of his power, iii. 411.
- Elias Cretensis, ii. 87, 159.
- Eliberis, council of (A. D. 305.), i. 148, ii. 108, 431.
- Eliezer, rabbi, quoted, i. 39, iii. 358, 363, 364, 408, 411, iv. 268.
- Emlyn, Thomas, his pamphlet in reply to Dr. Wall, iv. 28, 514. (a review of it. 28—48.) 185, 247, 265, 276, 279, 291.
- Encratites, i. 502.
- Enoch, his spiritual circumcision, iii. 467, iv. 307.
- Epaminondas, iii. 298, 315.
- Ephesus, council of (A. D. 431), i. 415, 455, 517, ii. 461.
- Ephrem Syrus, i. 219. a life of St. Basil ascribed to him, ii. 74.
- Epicurus, his doctrine, iii. 486.
- Epiphanius, i. 62, 109, 198, 504, 509, 512, 513, 514, ii. 139, 142, 460, 470, iii. 20, 255, 335, iv. 343, 362.
- Episcopius, iii. 204, 323, iv. 212.
- Erasmus Tusca, ii. 123.
- Erasmus, his opinion of some works attributed to Origen, i. 107. his edition of Origen, 118. of St. Ambrose, 346. his conjecture about St. Jerome, ii. 102, 106, 178, 204, 205. his Colloquies, 392, iii. 326, 330, iv. 427.
- Erbrardus, ii. 263.
- Ermingardus, ii. 263.
- Establishment, what privileges an established church is entitled to, iii. 72, iv. 94.
- Estius, ii. 407.
- Evagrius, ii. 475.
- Eucharist, anciently given to infants, i. 139, 147. in some ancient churches was received every day, 275. given speedily to baptized persons, both adults and infants, ii. 478. Daillé's remarks, *ibid.* the Fathers quoted for the practice, *ibid.* origin of it, 485. alteration made in it, 487. taken away by the council of Trent, 488. how soon it prevailed in the Greek church, 489. Dr. Wall's opinion on the matter, *ibid.* the modern mode of giving it, 490. argument drawn from this custom by antipædobaptists, 491, 493. it is still used by many Christian nations, *ibid.* is not so ancient as infant-baptism, 492, 503. many persons delay their coming to receive it, 513.
- Eudoxius, an Arian bishop, ii. 62.
- Everard, Robert, his pamphlet, ii. 375.
- Evervinus, of Cologne, ii. 256.
- Eugenius, a Greek usurper, ii. 66. is slain, 67, 99.
- Eunomians, St. Basil writes against them, ii. 6, 165, iv. 46. one sect of them baptized in the name of the Father only, ii. 335. mode of baptism, 422. their creed, 457, 462, iii. 295.
- Euripides, quoted, iii. 104. his Scholiast, 126.
- Eusebius, the historian, i. 55, 62, 63, 81, 124, 125, 504, 512. cited by Danvers, ii. 7. his account of Constantine's baptism, 52, 55, 56, 57, 170, 195, 347, 390. his creed, 451. quoted, 458, 468, 518, iii. 36, 221, 333, 376, 405, 419, 493, 496, 549, iv. 46, 159, 160, 219, 235, 245, 362, 373, 428, 429, 433, 442, 449.
- Eusebius, bishop of Nicomedia, iii. 222.
- Eustathius, a Greek bishop, ii. 165. his Comment on Homer, iii. 105, iv. 127.
- Eutyches, ii. 475.
- Eutychnianism, ii. 279, 281.
- Eutychnians, i. 437, n.
- Euzoius, an Arian bishop of Antioch, ii. 58.
- Exorcising, the original use of it. the later abuse, ii. 438.
- Ezechias, rabbi, iii. 365.

## F.

- Fabian, Jo., his 'Chronicles,' various readings in different editions, ii. 126, 127, iv. 496, 513.
- Fabius, bishop of Antioch, ii. 386.
- Fabri, Joannes, ii. 416.
- Facundus, his opinion of pope Zosimus, i. 463.
- Falkland, lord, iii. 56.
- Fasting, usual before baptism, ii. 383.
- Fathers, the ancient, slanders on

- them, ii. 146—179. their real excellence, 172.
- Fathers, the primitive, Mr. Gale thinks they loosely expound and misapply scripture, iii. 216.
- the early, the credit due to them, iii. 417. iv. 269. their statements on the point of infant-baptism, iii. 418, &c. Fathers of the second century, 461, &c. 518.
- the earliest, say little about infant-baptism, and why, iv. 447, 453. concerning those of the next age, 453—457.
- Fausta, wife of Constantine, not a Christian, ii. 57.
- Faustus Rhegiensis, i. 519.
- Faydit, l'abbé, his book against Le Clerc, ii. 174. and n.
- Featley, D., ii. 316. iii. 8, 56, 309. iv. 72.
- Fell, John, bishop of Oxford, his edition of 'Passio S. Perpetuæ.' &c., i. 489, n. some notice of his small pieces published almost annually at Oxford, *ibid.* his judgment of Rigaltius, ii. 20, 194. iii. 30, 203, 221, 536. iv. 413.
- Ferrandus, Fulgentius, i. 519. his letter concerning a negro slave, 520.
- Ferrarius, Jo., his lexicon, iii. 294.
- Feuardentius, an editor, iii. 527. iv. 324, 391.
- Ficinus, his translation of Plato, iii. 486.
- Fidelis*, the difference between it and *Catechumenus*, i. 149, 277, 381. the term never given but to a baptized person, ii. 69. a baptized person, 117.
- Fidus, an African bishop, i. 126, 137. iii. 555. iv. 314.
- Field, Dr., his book 'of the Church,' ii. 32, 124, 209.
- Firmilian, bishop of Cæsarea, ii. 194. bishop of Cappadocia, iv. 441, 481.
- Firmin, Thomas, an English unitarian, his life, i. 189.
- Fisher, the Jesuit, ii. 378.
- Florence, the council of, ii. 219, 415.
- Florentius Christianus, his note on Aristophanes, iii. 117.
- Floyer, sir John, his book on bathing, ii. 412. iii. 206.
- Font, ancient one at Bridekirk in Cumberland, i. 86. iii. 205.
- Fonts in our churches exchanged for basons, ii. 403.
- Foxe, John, his 'Martyrology,' ii. 128, 215, 264, 267, 306, 310, 314, iv. 172.
- 'Foxes and Firebrands,' a book so called, ii. 363, 372.
- France, the clergy of, opposed prædestinarian opinions in the fifth century, i. 480.
- Louis XIV., the king of, forces his subjects to become papists, ii. 133, 175.
- full of Albigenes, ii. 246.
- the French king drives away the Waldenses, 247.
- persecution of the protestants there, ii. 530. iii. 8, 92. their kind reception in England, *ibid.* iv. 72.
- first left off dipping. First antipædobaptists arose there, ii. 239. iv. 172.
- Frank, Sebastian, an author frequently cited by Danvers, ii. 44, 130, 140, 295.
- Frith, John, ii. 349, 350, 397, 485.
- Fulgentius, i. 479, 519. ii. 190, 206, 226. iii. 433. iv. 493.
- Fuller, his 'Church History,' ii. 54, 130, 308, 309, 314, 315.
- Fundamentals, what are fundamental points, in Mr. Gale's judgment, iii. 63—76, 82. what in that of Dr. Wall, iv. 90, 91, 97, 98, 199, 449, 478, 488.
- G.
- Gagnæus, an editor of Tertullian, i. 98. iii. 536. iv. 412.
- Gale, John, memoir of him, Introduction, p. xix. &c. i. 79. he writes merely until a more full answer to Dr. Wall shall appear, iii. 13. feels compelled to tax Dr. Wall, 23. is no Socinian, nor Tritheist, 27. denies that there are any Socinians among the antipædobaptists, 49. or that the perverse opinions of a few are justly chargeable on the body, 54. examines Dr. Wall's Dissuasive from Schism, 59—92. the controversy consists of two parts; one, about the *mode* of baptizing; the other, about the *objects*, whether



- infants or adults*, 94. he argues that βαπτίζω always signifies to dip, 94, &c.—230. the second branch of the dispute entered on, 233.—iv. 33, 44, 49, 50, 53, 56, 57, 62. his 'Reflections' examined and answered by Dr. Wall, 64 to the end of the volume.
- Gale, Dr. Thomas, his 'Opuscula Mythologica,' iii. 128, 135.
- Galenus, a Dutch Minnist, chief of the Galenists, ii. 305.
- Gamaliel, his observation, iv. 347.
- Ganz, rabbi D., iii. 345, 358, 392.
- Garnier, John, a Jesuit, i. 114. mistakes a passage of St. Jerome, 353, 355. mentions twenty-four synods holden against the Pelagians, 455. cited, 462, 495. his opinion on infant-baptism, ii. 40. his design in it, *ibid.* his oversight, 41.
- Gascoigne, some of the Waldenses from thence, ii. 259, 264, 275.
- Gataker, T., his edition of M. Antoninus, iii. 134. iv. 222.
- Gaudentius, bishop of Brescia, i. 338.
- Gaufridus, his 'Life of St. Bernard,' ii. 277.
- Geddes, Mich., ii. 284.
- Geles, John, a German anabaptist, ii. 300, 311.
- Gemara, the Jewish, quoted, i. 8, 10, 15, 16, 17, 30, 39. iii. 345. iv. 256.
- Gematra, a cabalistic art, iii. 366.
- Geneva, the church of, ii. 537. iv. 168, 170.
- Gennadius, i. 276, 341, 519. ii. 336, 337, 390, 393. his list of the writings of Pelagius, i. 433, n.
- George, patriarch of Alexandria, ii. 92.
- Georgia, ii. 279, 283.
- Georgian Christians, ii. 34. how first converted, 285. still adhere to the Greek church, though imperfectly, 286. sometimes delay baptism, not from principle but neglect, 288.
- Georgirenes, Joseph, his history of Samos, ii. 415.
- Gerhardus, a leader of the Gascon Waldenses, ii. 264.
- German antipædobaptists, ii. 502.
- Gerson, John, ii. 217, 218.
- Gerunda, the council of, i. 519. iv. 495.
- Ghebers, the Quakers resemble them, ii. 363.
- Gisburnensis Historia, cited by Jo. Foxe, ii. 264.
- Gnostics, i. 82, 502. ii. 335. iv. 388.
- Godfathers, or sponsors, ii. 437, 477.
- Godwin Sands, the vulgar story of their origin, iv. 239, and n.
- Godwyn, Morgan, author of a book called 'the Negro's Advocate,' i. 523, n.
- Godwyn's 'Moses and Aaron,' i. 4. 8. iv. 488.
- Gorgias, the orator, iii. 317.
- Gorgonia, sister of Gregory Nazianzen, ii. 87. her baptism and death, 88.
- Gospel of the Nazarenes, a book cited by St. Jerome, i. 445, n.
- Grabe, Dr., his various reading of a passage in Irenæus, i. 75, 80, n. cited, ii. 460. iii. 296, 501, 502, 519, 520. iv. 361, 384, 387, 388, 391, 426.
- Grævius, Theodorus, his edition of Callimachus, iii. 125.
- Gratian, the emperor, account of him, ii. 62. is slain, 63. it is probable that he had been baptized, 68. iii. 437.
- Greek church, knew not antipædobaptism in the twelfth century, i. 155. the Pelagians endeavour to make a party in it, 414, 415. Grotius' mistake as to its practice, ii. 33. they baptize infants, 280. receive the Roman (or Apostles') Creed, but baptize by the Nicene, 474. practise dipping, iii. 122. iv. 21. has never had any disputes about infant-baptism, 172. some members of it held that unbaptized and heathen infants shall have little punishment or suffering, iv. 286. it gives the eucharist to children, iv. 437.
- Gregorius Ariminensis, ii. 208, 210.
- Gregorius Presbyter, his life of Gregory Nazianzen, ii. 76, 78, 80, 84.
- Gregory, the father of Gregory Nazianzen, some account of him, ii. 76—87. and of his children, 87. is a singular instance of a man purposely deferring baptism, 88.

- 501, 506, 550. iii. 31. iv. 11, 60, 78, 79.
- Gregory Nazianzen, i. 12, 77, 123. quoted 162—208. calls baptism our 'diurnal generation,' 164. his account of St. Basil, *ibid.* ii. 74, 86. concerning his own baptism, i. 168. ii. 51. he strongly urges the baptism of infants, i. 170, &c. combats the common excuses for delay, 176. a summary of his tenets on baptism, 180—218.—224. misquoted by Grotius, ii. 35. quoted 39. was not baptized in infancy, 76. some account of his father, 77, 78, 82, 85, 87. whether he was born before his father's conversion, 78—87. a singular opinion of his, 84. resigns his bishopric, 90. called a *tritheist* by M. Le Clerc, 155, 175. his real tenets, 156, &c.—191, 192, 193, 195, 197, 201, 231. iii. 31, 39, 40, 42, 384, 393, 433, 558. iv. 7, 11—13, 59, 61, 78, 79, 80, 199, 253, 257, 313, 369, 373, 394, 415, 433, 466.
- Gregory Nyssen, his life of St. Basil, ii. 74. cited, 168, 193, 195. iv. 449, 455.
- Gregory, pope, the Great, i. 319. ii. 206, 210, 392, 423, 432, 487.
- Gregory Thaumaturgus, ii. 159. iii. 194, 202. iv. 149.
- Greiser, J., his writings against the Waldenses, ii. 244, n. 268, 298.
- Grotius, i. 135, 150, 155, 158. his mistakes, 136, 180, 247, 274, 471. ii. 330. his opinion as to the ancient practice of infant-baptism, 31. his design vindicated, 33. but he is in error, *ibid.* 47. his mistake about Chrysostom, 93—125. cited, 206, 379. iii. 32, 39. defended against Dr. Wall, 40.—141, 173, 178, 179, 200, 276, 326, 445, 510, 514, 536, 547. iv. 6, 10, 46, 59—61, 78—82, 119, 138, 139.
- Grunnius, a name given to Rufinus by St. Jerome, i. 112.
- Gryneus, an editor of Origen, i. 118.
- Gütmund, ii. 237. his opinions, 238.
- Gaudulphus, his sect, ii. 263. iv. 68. II.
- Hades, Christ's descent to, i. 76. its true meaning in the Bible, ii. 344. &c.
- Hale, judge, his behaviour to anti-pædobaptists, ii. 317.
- Hall, bp., his 'Honour of the married Clergy,' ii. 83.
- Hall, Mrs., excommunicated, iii. 90. iv. 66, 72, 103, 190.
- Halley, captain, his experiments on dew, iii. 151.
- Hallingham, a Jesuit in disguise, ii. 372, 373, 374.
- Hammond, Dr. H., i. 4, 13, 18, 19, 39, 44, 140, 182, 184, 416, 531. his judgment of bp. Taylor's 'Liberty of Prophesying,' ii. 23. and answers to it, 23—27. cited, 551. iii. 168, 172, 175, 178, 200, 275, 305, 308, 322, 354, 382, 439, 445. iv. 225, 233. editions of his 'Paraphrase,' 234. variations in them accounted for, *ibid.* 235, 296, 303, 492, 504.
- Harding, John, ii. 313.
- Harpoeration, his lexicon, iii. 119.
- Heathen temples overthrown, A. D. 399, i. 314.
- Hegesippus, iii. 174, 376, 419.
- Helena, the mother of Constantine, some account of her, ii. 57. became a Christian late in life, *ibid.*
- Hell, its meaning in our Bible, ii. 344, &c.
- Hemerobaptistæ, an ancient sect, iii. 174, 376. iv. 126, 139.
- Henricians, ii. 270, 278.
- Henry, of Lyons, ii. 248, 256, 259. is banished, 260, 262. his history, 273, &c.
- Heracleon, iii. 398. iv. 259—262.
- Heraclides Ponticus, iii. 122, 319.
- Herbert, lord, his History of Henry VIIIth, ii. 311.
- Hereford, register of the church of, ii. 215.
- Heresies, or sects, lists of the earlier ones, by Irenæus, i. 499. by Epiphanius, 512, 514. by Philastrius, 515. by Theodoret, *ibid.* by Tertullian, *ibid.*
- Heretics, how received into the church in ancient times, ii. 145.
- Herman, archbishop of Cologne, ii. 394.
- Hermas, quoted, i. 48—65. his work formerly not thought genuine, 55. it was written before St. John's Gospel, 56. he is not the person mentioned by St. Paul at Romans

- xvi. 63. cited, ii. 184, 192. Dr. Wall's arguments from him examined, iii. 426—431. and 446—453, 457, 561. iv. 271—275, 292—295, 330.
- Hermians, or Seleucians, an ancient sect, ii. 141.
- Hermolaus, quoted, iii. 126.
- Herodotus, quoted, iii. 123, 387.
- Hervetus, G., an editor of Clemens Alexandrinus, i. 85.
- Hesychius, his lexicon, iii. 108.
- Hethe, a Jesuit disguised as a Puritan, ii. 373, 374.
- Heylin, P., his 'Animadversions on Fuller's Church History,' ii. 54. his 'History of Presbytery,' 373. his works, 281, n. 283, 286, 290, 291, 311, 491.
- Hezekiah, a Jewish rabbi, quoted, i. 20.
- Hicks, Mr., his account of the anabaptists, ii. 323. vindicated, 324.
- Hicks, Mr., his story, iii. 8, 49. iv. 69, 70, 198.
- Hieracites, a sect described by Epiphanius, i. 512.
- Hilary, complains of the emperor Constantius, ii. 58. cited by Danvers, 10, 176, 177, 178. consults St. Austin, i. 240. on some doctrines of Cælestius, i. 392, 409, 517.
- Hilary, the deacon, his 'Commentaries,' ii. 198, 228.
- Hill, Mr., his work 'De Presbyteratu,' iii. 400. iv. 262.
- Hillel, rabbi, iv. 222.
- Hincmarus, abp. of Rheims, i. 329. his opinion concerning infants dying unbaptized, ii. 211, 232, 234.
- Hincmarus, bishop of Laudun, ii. 211. his violent conduct, 232, iv. 496.
- Hippo, a council at, i. 314.
- Hippocrates, iii. 527.
- Hoadly, bp., iv. 5, n. his latitudinarian doctrine, 473. the Bangorian controversy, 297, n.
- Hobmeier, Baltazar, a German anabaptist, ii. 292.
- Holiness, whether it can mean *legitimacy*, iii. 541.
- Holinshead, R., his 'Chronicles,' ii. 264.
- Holland, mode of baptism there, iv. 22. mode of receiving the Lord's Supper, 23. Dr. Wall's remarks on the Minnists, &c. 24. and on the Hollanders generally, *ibid.* 47.—71, 83, 86, 94, 102, 150, 172. toleration in the states of Holland, iii. 8. iv. 71.
- Holland. Dr., interpolated Camden's Britannia, ii. 43.
- Holland, rev. Mr., i. 84.
- Holy, meaning 'baptized,' iv. 414, 416, 421, 503—505.
- Homer, quoted, iii. 100, 102, 118, 128, 186. iv. 117.
- Homilies, English, ii. 349.
- Hooker, Richard, ii. 183. iv. 288.
- Hooper, bp. George, his 'Discourse of Lent,' i. 4, 37.
- Hooper, bp. John, a letter by him, ii. 312.
- Horace, quoted, iii. 103. iv. 67.
- Horsleydown, a place of resort of the anabaptists, iv. 163, 514.
- Hortentius, ii. 311.
- Hoveden, Roger, ii. 243.
- Huetius, his edition of Origen, i. 107. ii. 338. iii. 547. iv. 419, 425, 426, 428, 432, 433.
- Hugo de S. Victore, ii. 212, 487.
- Huss, John, ii. 217, 218.
- Hussites, their opinion of unbaptized infants, ii. 217.
- Hyde, Dr., iii. 348.
- Hyginus, bishop of Rome, cited by Platina, i. 535.
- Hyperides, a scholar of Isocrates, iii. 283. of Plato, 317.
- Hypsistarians, a religious sect, ii. 77.
- Hyrceanus, John, iii. 391. iv. 246.
- I.
- Ἰδιος*, its meaning strictly defined, i. 153, 154.
- Ignatius, i. 511. iii. 283—285. iv. 236, 301, 484.
- Ilerda, the council of, i. 519.
- Illyricum, the council of, ii. 466.
- Immersion, (baptismal) a conjecture that it was the ancient method used in England, ii. 308. considered absolutely an *essential* by the English antipædobaptists, 327. was the usual mode in the primitive church, ii. 384. is used by the Greek church, 414, 416. iii. 226. Dr. Wall much in favour of it, 143.

- Immersion, *triae*, used by the Jews, and from them by the primitive Christians, i. 37, 38. ii. 434. ordered by the *first* Common Prayer Book of Edward VI., ii. 397. was the general practice in ancient times, 419. doubts about its necessity, 423. the Roman catholics prefer it, 424. spoken of by bishop Fell, iii. 203. See *dipping*.
- Imposition of hands, used by the Jews on solemn occasions, i. 36.
- 
- or Confirmation, ii. 433. the English office for it, 434.
- Independents, iv. 474, 475, 487.
- Indians, conversion of, ii. 5.
- Indian Christians, ii. 284.
- Infants. The word sometimes refers to *age*, sometimes to the profession of Christianity, i. 116, 118, 337, 341. what it may fairly mean, iii. 524. iv. 49—53, 61, 62. who are really meant by it, iv. 395. especially by Irenæus, 396, 402. the eucharist anciently given to them, i. 139, 147. dying unbaptized were supposed by many writers of the Greek church to go to some middle place, 224. acknowledged to have *original* sin, 235. used to be marked with the sign of the cross, 237. dying before actual sin after their baptism were supposed to be undoubtedly saved, 274. ii. 225. christm given to them, i. 334, 335. the Pelagians' opinion of infants dying unbaptized, 424. that of Vincentius Victor, 484, &c. other opinions, ii. 107.
- Infant-baptism, first expressly mentioned by Irenæus, i. 72, 79. allowed by the Pelagians, 133. was acknowledged in the synod of Carthage (A. D. 253.), 126, 136, 138. owned by Cælestius, 466. it was practised by all the ancient sectaries, who owned any baptism at all, 498. some few learned men among the moderns do not allow its full antiquity, ii. 12. no *certain* evidence of any who denied it, till about the year 1522, 206. the modern Jesuits assert that it cannot be proved from scripture, 378. a summing up of the evidence in its favour, 494. of that which is or *seems* to be against it, 502. why there is so little mention of it in the more ancient Fathers, 508. why St. Luke in the *Acts* does not name it, 510. the particular *age* of receiving baptism is not a fundamental point, 548. persons ought not to break communion for it, 555, 557, 558. but Mr. Gale asserts it to be a fundamental, iii. 82. according to Mr. Gale, Dr. Wall allows it cannot be proved from scripture, 235, 238, 240. the value of this admission, 237, 241, 242. the argument of the Romanists from thence, 246, 247. the fair consequence of the scripture's silence, 250, &c. Dr. Wall's inference from our Saviour's silence, 253. the dangerous consequences of such a mode of arguing, 255, 258, &c. the scriptures rather conclude against it, 261, 340. all who were to be baptized were also to be *taught*, 264, 266—340. infant-baptism cannot fairly be founded on the Jewish baptism, 402—413. it was not practised in the primitive times: the ancient Fathers cited, 416, &c. the question, for what are infants baptized? 426. Dr. Wall states that the ancient Christian church had two baptisms, 478. Mr. Gale's summary of his arguments against it, 556. his idea of the mode in which it became prevalent, 571. he asserts that all infants will be saved, 443. Dr. Wall's remarks on this, iv. 284. in what country it began, 438.
- Innocent I., pope, i. 333, 377. a synodical epistle to him on the subject of Pelagius, from Carthage, 425. another, from Milevis, 427. another epistle from five bishops, 428. his replies, 429, 456. a letter to him from Pelagius, 430, 432. ii. 432, 479, 484, 485, 487, 489, 492.
- Innocent III., pope, ii. 207, 265.
- Innocent XII., his reception of the book of cardinal Sfondrata, i. 461.
- Irenæus, i. 56, 57. his account of the tunes of Clemeus Romanus, 59. quoted, 71—82. a various read-

- ing by Dr. Grabe, 75. the time of his living and writing, 79, 80.—137, 195. his account of sects, 499—509. ii. 7. his account of the Valentinians, 136, 171, 347, 348, 430, 441, 474, 496, 511. iii. 295, 469, 488—529. badly translated, 500, &c. 538, 565. iv. 41, 49—53, 54, 62, 230. his testimony respecting our Saviour's age examined, 321, 323—355, 358, 360. the Latin translation of his works, 360, 366, 369, 376. iv. 384, 386—404. further examination of a corrupt passage in his text, 391.—438, 443, 445, 447, 484, 501.
- Isaac, rabbi, iii. 351.
- Isæus, iii. 283.
- Isidorus Hispalensis, ii. 89.
- Isidorus Pelusiota, his opinion of the sin attached to infants, i. 234. supposed the forger of the Decretal Epistles, 330.—416, 417, 518.
- Isocrates, iii. 283, 293, 316—318. iv. 229.
- Ituræans, conditions imposed on them, iv. 246.
- J.
- Jacobite Christians, ii. 281.
- James, St., his meaning at chap. i. 6, 7, 8. ii. 192.
- Jansenius, iv. 426.
- Jarchi, R. Solomon, iii. 364.
- Jehuda Ben Levi, a rabbi, iii. 344.
- Jenkins, Rev. Dr., i. 84.
- Jeremias, ii. 491.
- Jerome, St., i. 56, 57, 62, 63, 78, 110, 133, 135, 182, 183, 195, 224, 275. his opinion of Origen, 88. of Tertullian, 102, 103. a translator of Origen, 107, 108. a great reader of his works, 118. his testimonies on baptism, 238—240. concerning his own baptism, 241. he writes on the origin of the soul, 290—298. was of a hasty temper, 291. educated in the Roman church, 325.—341, 342. his great reputation, 343. his writings against the Pelagians, 352, 370, 391. 418. called a semi-Pelagian by M. Le Clerc, 373.—388. a passage in his works corrected by Dr. Wall from an ancient edition, 433. writes against Rufinus and the Origenists, 439. note. Pelagius' opposition to him in his creed, 442, n. &c. quoted, as apparently in favour of antipædobaptism, ii. 5. misquoted by Danvers, 8, 78, 87. little ground for doubting that he was baptized in infancy, 100—115. Erasmus fancied him baptized at Rome, 102. he wore a monk's habit, 103. greatly extolled religious vows, 104, 106. and virginity, 106. ordained at Antioch, 103. the errors of his early life, 107. cited, 140, 168, 169, 173, 421, 428, 430, 434, 477, 488, 497. iii. 268, 327, 336, 337, 548, 549, 567. iv. 13, 55, 242, 381, 394, 415, 424, 426—436, 449, 456.
- Jerusalem, a synod, or meeting of bishops there, concerning Pelagius, i. 407. again, 414. the creed of its church, ii. 460, 461. the destruction of, iii. 496, 497. iv. 356.
- Jesuits, some say that they originated the sect of the Quakers, ii. 363. some have crept in among the English antipædobaptists, 371. their shifts and disguises, to make proselytes, or to divide protestants, *ibid.* they feign themselves dissenting preachers, *ibid.* 380.—iii. 55. iv. 182.
- Jesus Christ, his command to his apostles, to 'go and disciple all nations,' explained by Jewish customs, i. 21. illustrated farther, 22. he adopted baptism for a general sign of his religion, 27. his words to Nicodemus illustrated, 32, 101, 345, 364. ii. 495. how understood by all the ancient Christians, 180, &c. the antipædobaptists' use of the passage, 181. Bishop Burnet's interpretation of it, 184. some defenders of infant-baptism omit to use it among their proofs, 187. Dr. Wall's argument from hence examined, iii. 431. Jesus Christ is thought by some not to have taken any part of the substance of the Virgin Mary, ii. 335. his descent into Hades, *when* inserted into the Apostles' Creed, 468, 469. what other creeds have this clause, 469. whence it was taken, *ibid.*

- the fact universally admitted, *ibid.* doubts respecting his exact age, iii. 489, 493, 494, &c. these more fully discussed, iv. 323, &c. 332, &c.
- Jewel, bishop, proves the old Decretals to be forgeries, i. 324. cited, ii. 74, 313.
- Jews, their custom of baptizing infants, Introduction, i. 3, 8, 25. ii. 494. they defend the custom, out of the Mosaic law, i. 9. their writers defend it on other grounds also, 14. believed that they themselves did not stand in need of baptism, but their proselytes only, 19. ii. 494. baptized all children accidentally found, and such as were taken in war, i. 20. ii. 494. used to bring away the children of the nations whom they conquered, i. 20. these customs do not affect the question of Christian paedobaptism, 24, 25. the whole body of them were baptized in Moses' time, 26. called the baptism of a proselyte his *new birth*, 30. ii. 495. the absurdities of the Talmudists upon this notion, i. 31. a parallel between their baptism and that of Christians, 33—38. ii. 502. required sponsors at baptism, i. 34. ii. 500. in baptism dipped *thrice*, i. 37, 38. ii. 434. do still continue the baptism of infants, i. 42. anointed the newly baptized, ii. 434. gave milk and honey to the newly baptized, *ibid.* Dr. Wall's arguments from the Jewish baptism examined by Mr. Gale, iii. 343—373, 375—385. Mr. Gale denies that the Jews baptized proselytes, 401. or if they did, that it will favour infant-baptism, 402—413. they had no initiatory baptism, 505. Dr. Wall's defence of himself, iv. 218, 238, 241, 248, &c. Jews and Christians confounded together by Pagan writers, iii. 376. the precise meaning of the word 'Jew,' 379.
- Jewish doctors or rabbis, their character, as given by Mr. Gale, iii. 146, 166. their opinions on baptism, 349, 353. instances of their writings, 354, &c. 363—373.
- Joachim, abbot, ii. 167.
- Joannes Floriacensis, ii. 263.
- Jochanan, rabbi, iii. 345.
- John Baptist, it is probable that he baptized children as well as adults, i. 27. iii. 253. this denied, 272, 404—407. St. Ambrose is of that opinion, i. 28. why the Pharisees asked, 'Why baptizest thou then?' 43. baptized by dipping, iii. 198.
- St. John the Evangelist, his Gospel when written, i. 56. the text 1 John v. 7. seemingly acknowledged by St. Cyprian, 208. the text John iii. 5. illustrated, 32, 101, 345, 364. ii. 180, 495, 521. iv. 503, 504.
- John, bishop of Jerusalem, a friend of Pelagius, i. 407—409.
- John Becold, or John of Leyden, his excesses, ii. 293, 300.
- John of Lyons, a follower of Peter Waldo, ii. 272.
- Johnson, his 'Julian the Apostate,' ii. 85.
- Joseph, a Jewish rabbi, quoted, i. 17.
- Josephus, iii. 174, 391, 405, 496, 498, 514, 565. iv. 245, 246, 257, 266, 328, 333, 337, 340, 342, 346, 350, 355, 358.
- Joshua, a Jewish rabbi, i. 40. iii. 358, 408, 411. iv. 268.
- Judah Hakodesh, rabbi, iv. 244.
- Judas of Galilee, iv. 347.
- Julian the emperor, i. 102, 231, 232. ii. 61, 79, 459. iii. 379. iv. 251, 311.
- Julianus, a Pelagian bishop, i. 348, 414, 416. maintains a dispute with St. Austin, 472, 475. ii. 202. iv. 498.
- Junius, Franc., iv. 372.
- Jurien, M., iii. 20, 204, 569. iv. 151.
- Justellus, i. 313.
- Justin Martyr, i. 22. quoted, 64—71. asserts baptism to be in place of circumcision, 65. his account of the way of baptizing is the most ancient of any, next to the scripture, 69, 73—332. ii. 180, 348, 383, 429, 436, 440, 496. iii. 15, 17, 174, 277, 287, 289, 333, 367, 376, 395, 396, 461—471, 477—488, 494, 512, 513, 542, 563—565. iv. 42, 47, 74, 218, 235, 236, 237, 238, 252, 258, 300—309, 316—321, 341, 343, 352. his mistake in chronology, 352, 354, 370.—447, 484, 490, 511, 542.

- Justina, mother of Valentinian II, ii. 63, 69.
- Justinian, ii. 461.
- Juvenal, iii. 314.
- Juvenis*, what age it designates, iii. 527.
- K.
- Kawποοία*, used to denote baptism, i. 69.
- Kennet, Dr. White, iv. 4, n.
- Kenwolf, a synod holden under him, ii. 395, 396. iii. 226, 346, 570.
- King, sir Peter, 'On the Primitive Church,' i. 114. iii. 545. iv. 424. his History of the Apostles' Creed, ii. 473.
- Kircherus, A., iii. 159.
- Kiss of peace, anciently given to all newly-baptized persons, i. 139.
- Knatchbull, sir Norton, his annotations on the New Testament, i. 39—43. wishes to restore dipping in baptism, ii. 409. iv. 32, 483.
- Koran, the, iii. 157.
- L.
- Labbe, an editor of the Councils, i. 311, 317.
- Lactantius, iii. 193. iv. 308.
- Læta, daughter of Albinus, i. 388.
- Lambarde, his 'Perambulation of Kent,' iv. 239, note.
- Lanfranc, ii. 237.
- Langus, his translation of Justin Martyr, iv. 303.
- Langres, the synod of, ii. 393, 400.
- Languages, differ from each other so much, that scarcely an exact equivalent for an idea is found in any two, iii. 196. instances given, *ibid.*
- Laodicea, council of, ii. 384, 430.
- Lateran council, (A. D. 1139,) ii. 265. (A. D. 1215.) *ibid.*
- Latin Church, iv. 172.
- Laud, archbishop, his conference with Fisher, i. 288. ii. 223. 377. iv. 78, 186.
- Laurence, a martyr, ii. 389, 395.
- Laurence, St., baptizes by affusion, iv. 160.
- Leger, J., his 'History of the Vaudois churches,' ii. 242, n.
- Leigh, E., his 'Critica Sacra,' iii. 322.
- Lent, one occasion of keeping it immediately before Easter, i. 332.
- Leo I, pope, author of some pieces ascribed to St. Ambrose, i. 225, 316, 517. his works published by Quesnel, 495. ii. 228.
- Leo Modena, his history of the Jews, i. 7, 8.
- Leonilla, three sons of, ii. 123.
- Leti, G., his history, iii. 263. iv. 206.
- Libanius, was preceptor of Chrysostom, ii. 93, 94. his praise of his pupil, 95.
- Libertines, freethinkers, iii. 402.
- Lightfoot, Dr., i. 4, 9, 19, 21, 25, 28, 29, 44, 160, n. 184. iii. 370, 371, 376, 389, 455, 562. iv. 202, 222, 252.
- Limborch, P., his History of the Inquisition, ii. 239. iii. 324. iv. 212.
- Limbus puerorum*, a popish doctrine, i. 224, 497. ii. 208, 219.
- Lipsius, J., iii. 382.
- Liturgy of the Walloon churches, iv. 26.
- of the French church, iv. 26.
- English, iv. 168. a remarkable edition noted, *ibid.* revisal of, iv. 468.
- of Geneva, iv. 168, 170.
- Locke, John, his 'Paraphrase of St. Paul,' i. 345. 'On the human Understanding,' iii. 114, 257, 528. iv. 30.
- Lokman, his Arabian fables, iii. 310.
- Lollards, ii. 216, 306, 307.
- Lombard, Peter, ii. 207. iii. 433.
- Lucas Brugensis, iii. 178, 326.
- Lucas Tudensis, his writings against the Albigenses, ii. 267.
- Lucian, quoted, iii. 131, 320, 378, 380, 381.
- Lucifer, bishop of Calaris, ii. 58.
- Luciferians, ii. 251, 254, 270, 271.
- Ludolphus, J., his lexicon, iii. 328.
- Luigerus, ii. 123.
- Luther, objects to conditional baptism, i. 320. rejects the Decretals, 324. ii. 221, 241, 266, 292. protests against the excesses of the anabaptists, 293. iv. 361.
- Lutheran divines, opinion of certain, on the faith of infants, i. 278.
- Lutherans, allow lay-baptism in certain cases, ii. 221. iii. 72. iv. 480.
- Lycophron, quoted, iii. 99, 126.

- Lycurgus, iii. 317.  
 Lydius, Balthazar, his 'Waldensia,' ii. 298.  
 Lyndewode's 'Constitutions,' ii. 396.  
 Lyonists, ii. 239, 252, 254, 261, 270.  
 Lysias, iii. 296.  
 Lysis, his epistle quoted, iii. 135.  
 M.  
 Mabillon, ii. 235, 256.  
 Macaire, or Macarius, an author produced by Mr. Stennet, i. 523. ii. 42  
 Macedonians, an ancient sect, ii. 170. condemned by several councils, 463, 465.  
 Macedonius, ii. 462, 463, 465.  
 Magdeburg, the centuriators of, i. 140, 316. ii. 73, 232, 234, 268, 483. iv. 493, 496.  
 Magnus, a friend of Cyprian, ii. 387. St. Cyprian's letter to him, iii. 213, 214, 222, 224.  
 Mahomet, i. 199. ii. 138, 146.  
 Mahometans, iii. 156. their abolutions, 176, 177, 348. iv. 122, 141.  
 Maimonides, quoted, i. 4, 6, 8, 10, 11, 17, 19, 20, 30, 34. iii. 165, 166, 344, 345, 347, 366, 388, 409—412, 505, 560. iv. 126, 128, 129, 135, 256, 364.  
 Maldonatus, ii. 479.  
 Malebranche, his singular opinion about original sin in infants, i. 278.  
 Malt, a Spanish Jesuit, ii. 374.  
 Man, ought to have been rendered 'any person,' in John iii. 5.—iii. 436. iv. 276.  
 Manichees, i. 241, 244, 247, 501. St. Augustine was one, ii. 120. they condemn all baptism, 121. are opposed in Pelagius' creed, i. 441, ii. 446—473. their tenets, especially on baptism, ii. 138, 244, 245, 249, 253, 256. 261, 263, 264, 268. their opinion on Christ's flesh, 336. some sectaries who preceded the Waldenses, held their opinions, 268, 271. iv. 496.  
 Marcellinus, a Carthaginian nobleman, i. 359, 365—367.  
 Marcellus, a bishop at the council of Nice, ii. 470.  
 Marcellus, governor of Judaea, iv. 356.  
 Marcion, i. 501. iii. 255. his doctrine on baptism, ii. 142, 335, 336.  
 Marcionists, i. 312, 319, 505, 506, 508. ii. 142, 143, 336.  
 Marius Mercator, i. 114, 199, n. 378, 414, 476, 478, 517. ii. 487.  
 Marlborough, the duke of, the wording of his patent, iii. 251.  
 Maronites, ii. 281. baptize infants, 283. and give them the eucharist, *ibid.* 491.  
 Marriage, a peculiar form used by some among the English anti-pædobaptists, ii. 354.  
 Marshall, Steven, i. 140, 155, 511. ii. 116, 322, 559. iii. 44.  
 Martial, iv. 78.  
 Martyr, P., ii. 545.  
 Martyrs dying unbaptized, ii. 189, 190.  
 Martyrology, Dutch, a work often cited by Danvers, ii. 45, 131, 216, 234, 295.  
 Mary, the Virgin, a text of St. Austin concerning her, i. 405. various readings of it, 406. the modern papists' opinion concerning her holiness, 405. that of the ancient fathers, *ibid.* her being without sin, iii. 26.  
 Masson, Dom. ii. 263.  
*Μαθηρέω* means *to disciple*, or *make disciples*, i. 70. ii. 514, &c. what its real meaning is, iii. 265, 274, &c. authorities cited, 275, &c. etymology, 279—282. classic authors, 293, &c. it cannot signify *to make disciples*, 306. what is the true meaning of *μαθητής*, 311. modern critics cited, 322, &c. its sense argued from the ancient and modern versions of scripture, 328, &c. from the Fathers, 331, &c.—485.—557. Dr. Wall's interpretation of both words defended against Mr. Gale's objections, iv. 209, &c. further illustrations, 213, &c.  
 Matthew, John, an anabaptist leader, ii. 300.  
 Maxentius, Joannes, i. 519.  
 Maximus, the Cynic, ii. 79.  
 Maximus, a bishop of Jerusalem, ii. 73.  
 Maximus, an usurper, sets up for emperor, ii. 63. attacks Valentinian, 64. is slain, *ibid.*  
 Mechilta, a rabbi, cited by Selden, i. 11.



- Mede, Joseph, ii. 407.  
 Mehrning, Jacob, ii. 131, 295.  
 Melancthon, P., ii. 545.  
 Melania, i. 379, 452.  
 Meletius, ii. 76, 92, 93, 101, 165.  
 Menander, i. 501, 503, 516.  
 Mengrelia, or Circassia, ii. 282, 285,  
 &c. the ignorance and neglect of  
 the people in religious matters,  
 288, &c.  
 Menno, of Friezland, an antipæ-  
 dobaptist, founder of the Men-  
 donites, or Minnists, ii. 300, 501.  
 Mentz, the church of, ii. 395.  
 Mercator. See *Marius*.  
 Messalians, i. 234. their tenets, espe-  
 cially on baptism, ii. 139.  
 Middle state, between heaven and  
 hell; notions of it, i. 224. ii. 344,  
 &c. for infants and others dying  
 unbaptized, 197, 199, 201.  
 Milevis, council of (A. D. 416.), i.  
 424. ii. 484. iv. 494.  
 Milk and honey given to newly-  
 baptized persons, ii. 426, 428, 434,  
 488. iii. 421, 422.  
 Milk and wine given to the newly-  
 baptized, ii. 488.  
 Milton quoted, iii. 107.  
 Minchas, a rabbi, iii. 344.  
 Minnists, the Dutch, ii. 29, 253, 301.  
 their present state, opinions,  
 differences, &c. 302, &c. ii. 335.  
 iv. 24, 85, 147, 153, 172.  
*Miraculum*, what the word properly  
 signifies, ii. 175.  
 Misnah, the Jewish, quoted, i. 15,  
 208. iii. 344, 346. 347. iv. 218,  
 244, 248.  
 Mnason, how a disciple, iv. 217.  
 Monica, St. Augustine's mother, ii.  
 121.  
 Monk's habit, worn by religious in  
 the time of St. Jerome, ii. 104.  
 Monnulus, bishop of Girba, iii.  
 203.  
 Montanism, iv. 408.  
 Montanists, i. 87, 99. put much  
 faith in dreams, 490. Tertullian  
 was one, 491.  
 Montanus, i. 87.  
 More, sir Thomas, his 'Dialogues,'  
 iv. 239, n.  
 Morley, bp. George, his refusal to  
 join French presbyterian congrega-  
 tion, iii. 72, and n. iv. 96.  
 Moschus quoted, iii. 124.  
 Moses Mikotsi, a rabbi cited by  
 Selden, i. 8, 11.  
 Muggletonians, an English sect, ii.  
 191, and n. iv. 136.  
 Munzer, Thomas, a German ana-  
 baptist, ii. 292, 293.  
 Muscovites, their practice as to  
 baptism, ii. 142, 280, 414, &c.  
 491.  
 Muscovy, iv. 47, 118.  
 Musculus, W., ii. 400.  
 N.  
 Nachmanides, a rabbi cited by  
 Selden, i. 11.  
 Naclerus, Jo., his 'Chronicon,'  
 ii. 268. iii. 370.  
 Nazarat, a master of Pythagoras,  
 iii. 300. iv. 229.  
 Nazarenes, i. 199.  
 Nazarius, ii. 123.  
 Nectarius, is chosen bishop before  
 he is baptized, ii. 90. nothing  
 known of his parents, 91. so that  
 the argument of the antipædo-  
 baptists fails, *ibid.* 97.  
 Negro's Advocate, a book so called,  
 i. 523.  
 Nemesianus, an African bishop, iv.  
 275.  
 Neocæsarea, council of, i. 150. ii.  
 108. 386. iii. 43, 44, 220. iv. 7,  
 59, 80, 159, 485, 495.  
 Nestorianism, ii. 279, 281.  
 Nestorius, is joined by Cælestius  
 and his party, i. 415, 438. one of  
 his errors, 437, n. ii. 475.  
 Neubrigensis, Gulielmus, his *His-*  
*toria Anglicana*, ii. 264.  
 Nicander, the scholiast on, iii. 126.  
 Nice, council of, i. 250. ii. 108, 150,  
 164, 450. iv. 46.  
 Nicene Fathers, abused, ii. 170.  
 Nicephorus, his account of Con-  
 stantine's baptism, ii. 53.  
 Nicetas, his comment on Gregory  
 Nazianzen, i. 164.  
 Nicholson, bishop, his letter on the  
 font at Bridekirk, i. 86. ii. 44. iii.  
 205, 309.  
 Nicodemus, our Saviour's discourse  
 with him, iii. 507, 510.  
 Nicolaitans, i. 501.  
*Νεπτήρ*, its usual signification, iv.  
 127.  
 Nizzachon, a Hebrew book, iii. 349,  
 350, 352.  
 Noëtus, ii. 162.

- Nonjurors, no friends to the church, iii. 10. many of the English clergy charged by Mr. Gale with being so, 53, 66.
- Nomus, iv. 349.
- Noris, cardinal Henry, quotes the disputed canon of the council of Carthage (A. D. 418), i. 494.
- Novatian, ii. 385, 386, 433, 450. the first person baptized by sprinkling, iii. 219, 221, 555. iv. 159, 439.
- Novatians. Pelagius' creed is opposed to them, i. 441—467. their opinions on baptism, ii. 129. did not reject infant-baptism, 132. ever accounted schismatics, 543.—iv. 486, 490, 491.
- Novatus, iv. 159, 160.
- Nye, Stephen, ii. 174, n.
- O.
- Observator, a work (by R. L'Es-trange?), iv. 166.
- 'Ομολογία, the baptismal profession, iii. 46.
- Optatus Milevitanus, quoted, i. 160, 258.
- Oracle portending the overthrow of Christianity, i. 314.
- Orange, the council of, ii. 432.
- Orders, who were anciently to be admitted to, i. 336.
- Ordibarians, ii. 252, 254.
- Origen, i. 54, 63. a Platonist, 87. quoted, 103—125. is accused of Pelagianism, 110. St. Jerome's opinion of him, 88. which of his works are authentic, 106, 107. attests infant-baptism, 118. translations of his works by St. Jerome and Rufinus, 107, 108, 112, 119, 122. his parents were Christians, 124. his father a martyr, *ibid.* Jerome's version of his book *περὶ ἀρχῶν*, 343. his opinion on infants' souls, 360—387. speaks of infant-baptism, ii. 21. a passage from him on the word *baptize*, 331. quoted, 334, 337, 347. his opinion on Christ's soul, 338. debate whether his works should be received or condemned, 339. apologies for him, *ibid.*—436, 446, 458, 496, 505. iii. 192, 194, 294, 295, 296, 302, 331, 398, 406, 454, 469, 486, 496, 497, 514, 516, 526, 539, 544, &c.—554, 567. iv. 41, 43, 53—58, 82, 120, 148, 229, 230, 258, 259, 261, 262, 266, 304, 313, 357, 371, 379, 380, 397, 402, 407, 408, 417, 418, 422, 423. why some things are found only in the Latin version of his works, 424, 425, 426—436, 438, 443, 445, 448, 501.
- Original sin, in the primitive times was judged to affect all Adam's descendants, i. 64. Irenæus' opinion, 71. Origen's, 110. that of the Pelagians, 133, 159, 282. infants acknowledged to lie under it, 235. St. Austin's opinion, 261, &c. his difference with Pelagius on the subject, 381, &c. the opinions of the more ancient Fathers, 416. of St. Jerome, in opposition to that of Pelagius, 422. of late years the Jesuits have undermined the doctrine; and the court of Rome winks at it, 460. is denied by those inclined to Socinianism, ii. 18. what kind of death was thought by the ancients to have been brought on mankind by it, 198. Mr. Gale's remarks on this subject examined by Dr. Wall, iv. 301, &c.
- Orosius, a scholar of St. Austin, comes to Jerusalem and accuses Pelagius, i. 407. writes his 'Apo-*logetic*,' 409, 432, 517. his account of Theodosius, ii. 71.
- Ortlibenses, ii. 252, 254.
- Osiander, his 'Epitome,' ii. 73, 130.
- Osorius, Hieronymus, ii. 284.
- Ottius, J. H., his History of Ana-baptists, ii. 297, 312.
- Ovid, iii. 125, 127.
- P.
- P., E., antipædobaptist preacher, ii. 377.
- Pacianus, ii. 199.
- Pagi, A., ii. 81. iv. 12, 337.
- Παλιγγενεσία, iv. 371, 372.
- Palladius, his life of Chrysostom, ii. 91, 92.
- Pamelius, an editor of Tertullian, i. 98. iii. 536. iv. 411.
- Pamphilus, his defence of Origen, ii. 339, 458.
- Panatius the philosopher, iii. 321.
- Panceratius, ii. 123.
- Papebrochius, D., compiler of the Acta Sanctorum, ii. 79, 81, 83. iv. 12.

- Papists have earnestly laboured to embroil protestants with each other on the question of infant-baptism, ii. 33, 36, 40. object to protestants the bad character of Henry VIII, 59. their opinions of unbaptized infants, 217. called all protestants anabaptists, 299, 311.—iv. 182, 200, 208, 384, 473, 512.
- Paraus, ii. 226.
- Parvulus*, to what age it reaches, iii. 527.
- Paterines, ii. 239, 252, 253.
- Patripassians, ii. 163.
- Patritius, father of St. Austin, ii. 116, 120, &c.
- Paul, St., his meaning of the word *holy* in 1 Cor. vii. 14, i. 181, 346, 385, 386. ii. 118, 230, 520. iv. 36—38, 178, 414, 417, 503, 504. what he meant by the 'falling away' in 2 Thess. ii. iv. 450.
- Paul Sarpi, father, ii. 210.
- Paulianists, i. 195, 250. ii. 145, 170, 171.
- Paulinus, bishop of Antioch, ii. 101, 102.
- Paulinus, bishop of Nola, i. 182, 183. his testimony, 336, &c. ii. 43, 497. iv. 62, 415.
- Paulinus, the deacon, i. 112. his life of St. Ambrose, 346. ii. 98, 99, 100. suspected of being a forger, 99. he challenges Pelagius, 112, 357, 388, 517.
- Paulus Samosatenus, i. 192, 198.
- Pearson, bishop, his 'Annales Paulini,' i. 58, 62, 80. ii. 459, 471, 474, 483. iv. 334, 335, 336, 346, 406, 428.
- Pelagian bishops (eighteen) send a letter to the bishop of Thessalonica, i. 444, n. 445, n. 472.
- Pelagian controversy, i. 102, 238.
- Pelagian heresy, a short account of its rise, &c. i. 348, &c. only one account of it (M. Le Clerc's) in English, 350. Pelagianism has been accounted heretical doctrine in all ages and all churches, 372. in the East it was called the *Calestian* heresy, 455. is favoured by the court of Rome at present, 460, 461. Mr. Gale asserts that it is falsely charged on the antipædobaptists, iii. 58.
- Pelagians. The sect began (A. D. 410), i. 241, 348. denied original sin, 133, 349, 366, 381, &c. practised infant-baptism, 133, 159, 349, 366. asserted *actual* sin in infants, 282, 366. object to certain doctrines of catholics, 301. held a middle state, between heaven and hell, 360. asserted that unbaptized children might be saved, but should not come to the kingdom of heaven, 360, 429. assert the redemption of baptized infants, 367. exalt man's free-will, 367. their opinion concerning the rich man, 396. concerning swearing, 400. mistranslate St. Chrysostom, 416, 417. are much pressed with the argument from infant-baptism, 465. their opinions declared heretical in England, ii. 309. cast odium on the doctrine of original sin, 201.—227, 484, 485, 499. iii. 23. iv. 31, 174, 312, 486, 494, 495, 497, 498, 499.
- Pelagius, author of the heresy, i. 102, 103, 182, 183. some account of him, 348, 353. ii. 129. his confession of faith, i. 352. none of his works (though a Briton) have been translated into English, 353, 432. called *Pelagius Brito*, by way of distinction, 355. wrote some learned works before he adopted his new opinions, *ibid.* denied original sin, ii. 313. denied God's grace, i. 373, 376. spoke reservedly on the point, 376. persuades pope Zosimus to befriend him, 377. St. Austin's controversy with him, 355—468. his 'Commentaries on St. Paul's Epistles,' 387. his book 'of the Abilities of Nature,' 403. lived much at Jerusalem, but wrote in the Latin tongue, 407, 409. is arraigned at Jerusalem, 408. and at Diospolis, 409. recants certain opinions, 410, 452. writes to Innocent, bishop of Rome, and sends his *Libellus fidei*, or *Creed*, which (Innocent being dead) is delivered to his successor Zosimus, 430, 446. this Creed supposed by some to be the same as Jerome's *Explanatio symboli*, 431. given at length, 433—446. the letter is

- lost, except some fragments preserved by St. Austin, 447. he confesses that he never heard any one deny baptism to infants, 450, 466, 475. at length owns that they are baptized for remission of sins, 452. maintains that his doctrines are not heretical, 464. John Philpot erroneously asserts that he denied infant-baptism, ii. 312, 313. thinks infants will be in the 'middle state.' i. 225, 234, 238. See ii. 497. iii. 25, 47. iv. 83, 174, 415, 418, 448, 485, 494, 498.
- Pelopidas, iii. 298.
- Pericles, iii. 465.
- Perionius, his translation of Justin Martyr, iv. 303.
- Perizonius, iii. 280.
- Perkins, ii. 226.
- Perpetua, a martyr. her case discussed between Vincentius Victor and St. Austin, i. 487, &c. Bishop Fell's edition of her martyrdom, 489.
- Perrin, J. P., his history of the Waldenses, ii. 240, 242, 265.
- Perron, cardinal, i. 313. his 'Reply to King James,' ii. 32, 53, 378.
- Petavius, D., i. 313, 373. ii. 53, 70, 148, 149, 150. 174. iii. 142, 204, 220, 227, 377, 382, 383, 489, 490. iv. 119, 158, 324—328, 330.
- Peter, St., cited as a strong witness against infant-baptism, by Mr. Gale, iii. 438.
- Peter Bruis, ii. 248. accused of denying infant-baptism, 256. burnt, 257. his opinions, 259, 262. his history, 273, &c.
- Petrobrusians, a sect of the 12th century, i. 514. ii. 17, 239. accused of various errors, especially the denial of infant-baptism, 256, &c. 270. charged with Manichean principles, 261, &c. 266, 272. it is probable that they did reject infant-baptism, 273. they were the first who taught that the Lord's supper ought not to be continued, *ibid.* whence their name, 256, 278, 294. reject psalm-singing, 353. extol the Lord's Prayer, 354—507, 560. iv. 172, 499.
- Petrus Blesensis, ii. 212.
- Petrus Cluniacensis, i. 331. ii. 256, 262, 270, 274, 275, 278, 353, 569.
- Phavorinus, his lexicon, iii. 108, 118. iv. 117.
- Phereponus, John, a name assumed by M. Le Clerc, ii. 173.
- Philastrius, i. 509, 514.
- Philip, St., his baptism of the eunuch, iii. 200, 338.
- Philo Judæus, iii. 392, 514, 527. iv. 245, 257.
- Philoponus, J., the first tritheist, ii. 166.
- Philpot, John, his letter on baptism, ii. 312, 313.
- Phlegon, iii. 497, 498, 565. iv. 357, 358.
- Phœbadius, i. 437, n.
- Photinians, i. 188, 195. iii. 35.
- Photinus, i. 192, 199, 436. ii. 146, 455. his belief, 459. iii. 35.
- Φωτισμός, used to denote *baptism*, i. 69, 348.
- Φωτιστήριον, iv. 161.
- Φωτισόμενος, signifying *baptized*, iii. 289.
- Φωτίζω, signifying *to baptize*, iv. 378.
- Photius, his Bibliotheca cited, i. 477. his high reputation, *ibid.* 531.
- Picards (or Beghards), ii. 251, 267, 295, 297, 298.
- Picolominæus, Jac., ii. 268.
- Picture. Dr. Wall wishes for a cheap picture (print) of our Saviour with a little child, iv. 508.
- Pigres, whether author of the *Batrachomyomachia*, iii. 100.
- Pilate, Pontius, difficulties as to the exact time of his government, iv. 328, &c.
- Pilichdorf, P., ii. 251, 267, 268, 271, 298.
- Pillonniere, F. de la, iv. 297, n.
- Pindar, quoted, iii. 103, 297. his scholiast quoted, 103, 297.
- Pinianus, i. 379, 452.
- Piphles, ii. 249.
- Pithæus, P., ii. 263.
- Pius IV., ii. 489.
- Platina, his Lives of the Popes. i. 535.
- Plato, his opinion concerning infants' souls, i. 360. iii. 110, 133, 297, 208, 318, 319, 485.
- Phny, ii. 435. iii. 118, 151.

- Plunge*, its etymology from *πλύνω*, iii. 118.
- Plutarch, iii. 100. 106, 107, 109, 130, 131, 135, 283, 293, 296, 298, 317, 486.
- Pococke, Dr. Edward, ii. 329. iii. 156, 165—170, 172, 175, 177, 178, 412. iv. 126, 128—131, 135, 136, 138.
- Poland, antipædobaptists in, ii. 380.
- Politian, his version of Callimachus, iii. 126, 127.
- Pollux, J., his lexicon cited, iii. 104, 108, 135.
- Polycarp, i. 81. ii. 171, 347. iii. 526. iv. 301, 322, 397, 406, 484.
- Polycrates, a bishop of Ephesus, iii. 531, 532. iv. 405, 406.
- Polygamy, an argument against, i. 154.
- Pontius, ii. 123.
- Poole, M., his *Synopsis*, iv. 137, 139, 140, 222, 487.
- Porphyrius, his slander of Origen, i. 124. iv. 251.
- Possevinus, ii. 74, 143.
- Possidius, i. 518. his life of St. Austin, ii. 116, 117.
- Pouring, or Perfusion, the church of England allows it, iv. 166. this does not justify mere sprinkling a few drops of water, 114. Dr. Wall allows perfusion to be sufficient, but prefers dipping, 162, 459. further remarks, 167, &c. 458, &c. it was introduced by the followers of Calvin, 170.
- Prædestinarians, the followers of St. Austin so called, i. 479. the church of Rome anciently was zealous for this side, 480. that of France the contrary, *ibid.* modern, ii. 225, 239.
- Prædestination, whether the more ancient Fathers agreed with St. Austin respecting it, i. 416. Cardinal Sfondrata's book on the subject, i. 460. the church of Rome anciently maintained the opinion, 460, 480.
- Prateolus, Gabriel, his work on heretics, iv. 491.
- Praxeas, Tertullian's writings against him, ii. 151, 152, 153, 162.
- Prayer, Book of Common, of Edward VI., ii. 397, 405. review of it, A. D. 1661, 404.
- Prayers for the dead, advised by Vincentius Victor, i. 491. an ancient custom relating to the dead, *ibid.*
- Praylius, a bishop of Jerusalem, i. 457.
- Preachers ought to subscribe Articles of Religion, in order to detect disguised papists, &c., ii. 380.
- Prejudices arising in illiterate persons, ii. 519.
- Presbyterians, opinion of the ancients respecting private baptism, i. 303. of the moderns, 304, 305. iii. 72. iv. 170, 173. their baptism, 440. their tenets, 474. they separate from the church of England, 475. they were formerly called Puritans, 480.
- Pretender, the, many of the English clergy charged by Mr. Gale with favouring him, iii. 53.
- Prideaux, Dr., his *Connexion of History*, i. 15. iv. 244.
- Priorius, an editor of Tertullian, iii. 250, 378.
- Priscillianists, are opposed in Pelagius' creed, i. 441, n. iv. 496.
- Private baptism in houses, unknown to St. Austin, i. 302. its abuse very great at the present day, *ibid.* the church of England's injunction concerning it, 303. presbyterians formerly objected to it, ii. 183. but at present use it almost exclusively, i. 303—305. and will so baptize the children of churchmen, when their own clergyman has refused it, *ibid.* was first granted as a privilege to royal persons alone, *ibid.* Dr. Wall's opinion of it, ii. 118. iv. 170. his objections to it, 463, &c. difficulties attending it, 467, 468. bishop Compton, 468.
- Prodicus, iii. 300, 317.
- Professions made at baptism, ii. 435, 437, 439. two professions made by adults, 476. one for infants, 477. See *Creed*.
- Proselytes, Jewish, were baptized as well as circumcised, i. 4. 26. Mr. Gale denies this, iii. 401. their infant children also were baptized, i. 14. 26. if a woman

- great with child be baptized, her infant needs not baptism, 160. 'proselytes of the gate,' 30.
- Prosper, author of some pieces ascribed to St. Ambrose, i. 225. quoted, 378, 415, 479, 495. his works against Pelagianism, 516. ii. 226, 228.
- Protestants designedly embroiled with each other by the papists, ii. 33, 36, 40. their opinion of the salvability of persons dying unbaptized, 182. as to infants, 219, &c. whether a protestant may join in a popish service, 545.
- Prussia, the king of, prohibits M. Le Clerc's writings, ii. 175.
- Psalm-singing, rejected by many English antipedobaptists, ii. 353.
- Psychici, the catholic Christians so called by Tertullian, i. 86.
- Ptolemy Philadelphus, iv. 352.
- Publicani (or Popelican), some of the Waldenses, ii. 264, 270.
- Puer*, what age it designates, iii. 527.
- Purchas, his *Pilgrims*, ii. 417.
- Puritans, or Cathari, ii. 239, 245, 249, 252, 253. in queen Elizabeth's reign, 372, 534, 561.
- Pythagoras, iii. 296, 300.
- Q.
- Questiones ad Antiochum, ascribed to Athanasius, i. 390, 511, 533.
- Questiones ad Orthodoxos, a work ascribed to Justin Martyr, i. 66, 531. iv. 313.
- Quakers, their opinions on the subject of baptism, i. 26, 137. ii. 188, 217, 355. disputes with the antipedobaptists, 362. their enthusiasm, 363. they prevail most in England, *ibid.* said to have been devised by the Jesuits, *ibid.* their tenets, 364. ii. 135, 249, 251, 253, 255, 263, 273, 299, 302, 325, 337. iii. 209, 402, 472. iv. 19, 136, 157, 178, 439, 473, 474. how they elude the eucharist as set forth in Scripture, ii. 522. refuse baptism, 547. some would fain deny them to be Christians, 570.
- Quesnell, P., i. 330. his edition of the *Canons*, 494, 495, n.
- Quintilla, a preacher on baptism, ii. 138.
- Quirinius, governor of Judæa, his census, iv. 341, &c.
- R.
- Rabbins, their estimation in Mr. Gale's eyes, iii. 146, 166, 353, 363. their character, 365—371, 413, 558. iv. 129, 136, 137, 250, 252.
- Radulphus Ardensis, ii. 263.
- Rebaptizing, ancient disputes in the church on this point, ii. 144, 145.
- Regenerate*, how Cyprian understood it, iii. 18. for *baptized*, iv. 503.
- Regeneration. Baptism often signified by this term, both among the Jews and early Christians, i. 30, 32, 69, 170. St. Paul's use of the word in this sense, 32, 70. the Christians of the first four centuries always denoted baptism by it, 70, 73, 77, 170. the term applied to the *world*, the *body*, the *flesh*, &c., 75. spoken of by Origen, 122. by St. Austin, 277, &c. used as synonymous with *baptism* by St. Augustine, ii. 187. and by the church of England, *ibid.* Baptism so called by the Jews, 495. also by the heathens, *ibid.* understood in this sense by the ancient Christians, *ibid.* 522. meaning of the word altered in modern times, *ibid.* in the sense of baptism? iii. 482, 504, 566. its occurrence in Scripture? 505, &c. 513. Mr. Bernard's views and reasoning on the meaning of it, iv. 15—21. Mr. Gale's arguments examined, 362, &c. difference between regeneration and repentance, 369.
- Reinerius, his writings against the Waldenses, ii. 252, 261, 263, 268, 269, 271, 336.
- Reland, A., iii. 157.
- Remonstrants, of Dort, i. 372, 380. their opinion on infant-baptism, ii. 40, 226. a confession of two ministers, 305.
- Rieaut. See *Rycaut*.
- Rigaltius, N., an editor of Tertullian, i. 98, 137. ii. 194. his opinion on infant-baptism, 18. some notice of his edition of Cyprian, *ibid.* note. quotes Tertullian, 19. bishop Fell's judgment of him,

20. his want of fairness, *ibid.* 21.  
 iii. 30, 201, 219, 276, 325, 382,  
 536. iv. 411.
- Rivetus, A., i. 155. ii. 32, 74, 378.  
 iii. 44.
- Rochelle, the siege of, iii. 262. iv.  
 205.
- Rochester, an ancient register be-  
 longing to the see of, ii. 373. de-  
 tected some designs of the Jesuits,  
 and was stolen away in the time  
 of king James II., 375. It has  
 never been recovered, iv. 514.
- Rogers, Rev. Daniel, wishes to re-  
 vive dipping, ii. 408, 410.
- Rome, a council at, ii. 466. account  
 of it from the 'Talmud,' iii. 362.  
 church of. See *Church, Papists.*
- Romilius, a Roman consul, iii. 465.
- Roque, M. de la, ii. 379.
- Rotterdam, church of, iv. 96.
- Rufinus, i. 55. a translator of Ori-  
 gen, 107. the freedoms taken by  
 him, 108, 118. an enemy to the  
 doctrine of original sin, 112. called  
 a Syrian, and why, 114. his  
 exposition of the Apostles' Creed,  
 441, n. his account of Gregory  
 Nazianzen, ii. 80, 84, 285, 425,  
 426. his comment on the Creed,  
 467, 469. iii. 500, 501, 547, 551—  
 554, 567. iv. 425—436.
- Runcarians, ii. 251, 252, 270, 271.
- Rupertus, a writer of the twelfth  
 century, ii. 394.
- Russen, David, his 'Fundamentals  
 without a Foundation,' i. 41, n.  
 42. ii. 354. his borrowing from  
 Ware's 'Foxes and Firebrands,'  
 372. he alludes to the register of  
 Rochester, 375, quoted, 417. iii.  
 56. iv. 23, 200.
- Rycaut, sir P., his History, ii. 280,  
 281, 283, 286, 290, 491.
- S.
- Sabæans, their practice as to bap-  
 tism, ii. 143.
- Sabbatarians, some English anti-  
 pædobaptists are such, ii. 355.
- Sabellians, ii. 155, 156, 162.
- Sabellius, ii. 162, 164.
- Sabinus, a Macedonian, ii. 170.
- Sacheverell, Dr., his sermon quoted,  
 iii. 75, note.
- Sadoc, a Pharisee, iv. 347.
- Saffold, a London empiric, ii. 378.
- Saints, its meaning in ancient times,  
 iv. 505. why left off, *ibid.* diffi-  
 culty of restoring it, 506.
- Salmasius, his letter to Justus Pa-  
 cius quoted, ii. 29, 30, 483.
- Samaritans, modern, their daily ab-  
 lutions, iii. 175.
- Sanctification, used to denote bap-  
 tism, i. 139, 140, 181, 242, 243,  
 342. the scripture 1 Cor. vii. 14.  
 to be so interpreted, 181. so the  
 Jews interpreted the word in the  
 Old Testament, 184. so all the  
 ancient Christians, 346.
- Sanctius, his 'Minerva,' iii. 280.
- Sanhedrim, Jewish, its character, iii.  
 367.
- Sardinia, 'Epistola Episcoporum in  
 Sardinia exulum,' i. 519.
- Saturninus, governor of Judæa, iv.  
 341, &c., 354.
- Saturninus, a heretic, i. 501.
- Saville, sir H., his edition of Chrys-  
 ostom, i. 226.
- Savoy conference, iv. 468.
- Scaliger, J., his opinion on baptizing  
 for the dead, i. 506.—iii. 99, 127,  
 369, 445, 500, 550. iv. 252. roughly  
 handled by Petavius, 330, 336. his  
 'Scaligerana,' 361.
- Schelstratus, E., i. 313.
- Schism, different opinions of its  
 guilt holden by the ancients and  
 the moderns, i. 150. a thing too  
 general: its guilt, ii. 303. a dis-  
 suasive from it, 524, &c. its sin-  
 fulness urged by our Saviour and  
 by the apostles, 525. what errors  
 justify separation, 528. some per-  
 sons think best to set up differ-  
 ent churches, 531. its sad extent  
 both in England and Holland, 537.  
 cannot be justified from mere dif-  
 ference of church ceremonies, 537  
 —540. who are schismatics, 542.  
 543. a case argued, 543—545.  
 whether the antipædobaptists are  
 guilty of schism, 547. what points  
 are fundamental articles of faith,  
*ibid.* the particular *age* of receiv-  
 ing baptism not fundamental, 548,  
 555. how parties who differ on  
 such points ought to settle the  
 difference, 555. men ought not  
 to divide for mere mistaken opin-  
 ions, 557. the antipædobaptists  
 ought not to forsake the commu-  
 nion of the church of England,

558. schism so common in England, that it is very hard to repent of it, 561. common in Holland, *ibid.* schismatics tolerated among Christian nations, yet not guiltless in the sight of God, 562. Christians of Africa and Europe differ as to the validity of baptism given by schismatics, 571. Dr. Wall's remarks on this subject censured by Mr. Gale, iii. 59, &c. his definition of schism, 60. those are truly schismatics, who give just cause for separation, 60, 61, 62. its guilt. It ought to be preached against and written against, iv. 26. its recent spread in England, 27, 47, 71, 83, 93. Mr. Gale's exceptions to Dr. Wall's remarks considered, 88, &c. more prevalent in England (and Holland) than in any other country, iv. 472. See *Separation*.
- Scoti* and *Scotia* refer to Ireland, i. 354, 355.
- Scripture, a rule in religious controversies, iii. 242, 243, 244. its authority acknowledged, 248.
- Sendamore, lord, iii. 73.
- Seal-ring, Clemens Alexandrinus recommends an impress for one, i. 84.
- Sebastian, C., ii. 395.
- Secundus, the father of Chrysostom, ii. 92.
- Selden, John, i. 4, 11, 13, 16, 17, 18, 19, 38. iii. 388. iv. 256.
- Seleucians, an ancient sect, ii. 141.
- Semipelagians, quote St. Austin as in their favour, i. 246, 247. M. Le Clerc reckons St. Jerome to be one, 373. admit original sin in infants, 479.—ii. 228.
- Senior*, what age it designates, iii. 527.
- Separation*, a dissuasive from it on account of religious differences, ii. 524. what errors overthrow the foundation of Christian faith, 527. unity to be diligently studied, 530. many separate without reason, 531. the evil of this, 532. Christ ought not to be divided, 533, 537. difference of opinion no sufficient ground for separation, 533. difference in rites and ceremonies no sufficient ground, 536.
- the primitive Christians thought so, 537. a case whether or not a man ought to separate, 543, 544, 545. the only cases in which scripture justifies separation, 546. good men wish all Christians to be united, iv. 123. pride leads people to it, 472. very prevalent in England, *ibid.* the guilt of it, 477, 489. See *Schism*.
- Serira Gaon, a rabbi, iii. 344.
- Sfondrata, cardinal, his book on original sin, i. 460. some account of it and other pieces to which it gave rise, *ibid.* n.
- Shem Tob, rabbi, iii. 365.
- Siccus Dentatus, a Roman general, iii. 465.
- Simeon Metaphrastes, ii. 92.
- Simeon, rabbi, iii. 366.
- Simon Magus, i. 500. iv. 379.
- Simplicianus, bishop of Milan, i. 309. baptizes St. Ambrose, ii. 98.
- Simplicius Verinus (i. e. Salmasius), his letter to Justus Pacius quoted, ii. 29, 30.
- Siricius, pope, i. 309. his decretals, 321—333. iii. 24.
- Sirmondus, his publications, i. 518.
- Siscidenses, ii. 252, 254, 261.
- Sleep of the soul, the opinion of some modern antipædobaptists on the point, i. 298. opinions of various persons and parties on it, ii. 344, &c. viz. Calvin's, 344. that of the Dutch Minnists, *ibid.* the German antipædobaptists, *ib.* the English antipædobaptists, *ib.* that of the primitive Christians, *ibid.* 347. of the English protestants at the reformation, 349. in Q. Elizabeth's reign, *ibid.* some antipædobaptists deny it, 353.—iv. 88.
- Sleidan, J., ii. 299, 311.
- Snape, Dr. A., his writings against bishop Hoadly, iv. 297, n.
- Socinians, some would now abolish baptism in Christian nations, i. 25. have lately changed their doctrine, 192. Ebion and Cerinthus were the first, 196. their opinion of the atonement, 203. attempt to discredit the Fathers, ii. 146, 147, 148, 167. their tracts, 167, n. 334. many of them among the English antipædobaptists,



- 333.—453. expelled from Poland, 304. enter Holland, and join the Minnists, *ibid.* these were anti-pædobaptists, *ibid.* but the first Dutch Socinians did not absolutely refuse infant-baptism, 305. all in Poland called anabaptists, 382. needlessly lashed by Dr. Wall, iii. 26. they are not so despicable as he thinks, 27. Mr. Gale's anger at the charge of there being some among the anti-pædobaptists, 57. he asserts that some very rank ones are found in the church of England, 211. See ii. 251. iii. 37, 402, 403. iv. 28, 46, 47, 48, 85, 87, 88, 196, 265, 473, 476.
- Socinians, modern English, fancy that Pelagius quite agrees with them, i. 432. their mean opinion of Jesus Christ, ii. 459. some individuals among the English anti-pædobaptists, 359. iii. 389. they rail and scoff at the most awful truths, ii. 361.
- pamphlet, on Creeds, ii. 360.
- work burned by a Dutch printer, i. 351.
- Socinus, quoted, i. 26, 380, 381. ii. 381. iv. 30. the reason why he wished to abolish baptism, ii. 333.
- Socrates, the historian, i. 187, 219. ii. 62, 71, 72, 73, 92, 146, 163, 164, 165, 170, 285, 469. iv. 492.
- Socrates, the philosopher, iii. 116, 297, 298, 486.
- Socrates Scholasticus, iii. 295.
- Solomon, a Jewish rabbi, quoted, i. 12. iii. 344, 345.
- Sophocles, quoted, iii. 99.
- Soto, D. a, ii. 407.
- Sozomenus the historian, ii. 60, 73, 92, 95, 96, 164, 335, 418, 457.
- Spanheim, his notes on Callimachus, iii. 126, 127.
- Spanish church, uses one immersion, ii. 424.
- Spelman, sir Henry, ii. 395.
- Spencer, his notes on Origen, iv. 304.
- 'Spirits in prison.' Many of the oldest Christians conceived that the gospel and baptism were communicated to the patriarchs in their separate state, i. 77.
- Spondanus, i. 313. iv. 325.
- Sponsors, were required by the Jews as well as Christians, i. 35. more ancient than the anti-pædobaptists allow, 100, 273. ii. 437.
- Sprinkling, or aspersion, when first used, iii. 207. why, 208. St. Cyprian its earliest advocate, 207, 212. iv. 156. whether used within two hundred and fifty years after Christ, iii. 218. Novatian the first instance, 219. the church never justified it from scripture or antiquity, 226, 227. why do the clergy of England still continue it? 227, 228, 229, 230. it may perhaps be allowed in certain cases, but cannot be urged as an ordinance of Christ, 255. Dr. Wall's remarks on Mr. Gale on this point, iv. 105, &c. his own opinion of it, especially of such ministers as sprinkle as *little* water as possible, 114. no very early quotations in favour of it, and why, 158. bishop Burnet's remark on it, 162, 167. Dr. Wall's own suggestions, 167—173. was first introduced by the presbyterians, 170, 433. further remarks, 458, &c.
- Stennet, Mr. Joseph, his 'Answer to Russen,' i. 41, 42, 523. ii. 22, 31. cites an author named Ma-caire, 42. thinks Constantine was born of Christian parents, 54. his interpretation of the text John iii. 5, 181. asserts that some denied infant-baptism in the year 1025. 262, 263. quoted, 324, 327, 333, 352, 354, 378, 509, 551. vindicates the anti-pædobaptists from an uncharitable opinion, 569. is said to give numerous instances of βαπτισμὸς signifying *immersion* only, iii. 142. cited, 28, 206, 246, 407. iv. 65, n. Dr. Wall's handsome remarks on him, 68, 71, 77, 99, 119, 164. an account of a personal interview and conference with him, 197, 199, 200, 201, 203.—266, 478, 479, 492.
- Stephanus, H., his Thesaurus, iii. 108, 118, 119, 139, 230, 292, 294, 314, 322. iv. 119, 210, n. 230.
- Stephanus, Rob., iii. 178.

- Stephen, pope, ii. 571. iv. 441, 442, 481.
- Stesimbrotus, an historian, iii. 299.
- Stillingfleet, bishop, i. 186, 192, 202, 206, 207, 227. restores a passage of St. Austin, 287. ii. 149, 151, 162, 168, 169, 175, 176, 230, 368, 371. detects the Jesuits, 373, 529, 564. iv. 15, 21, 22, 103.
- Stoics, iii. 486.
- Stokes, Joseph, his 'Survey of Infant-Baptism,' iv. 247. his 'Compassionate Plea,' *ibid.* n. 248, 249, 265, 266, 279, 282, 295. his description of some antipædobaptists, 315, 362, 401, 483, n.
- Storek, Nicholas, a German ana-baptist, ii. 292, 295.
- Stoup, M., a Dutch writer, ii. 302.
- Stow, J., his History of England, iv. 239, n.
- Strabo, quoted, iii. 129, 157, 378, 387.
- Strabo, Walafrid, ii. 390, 394.
- Strato, of Lampsacus, iii. 316, 318.
- Subscription to doctrines. Those churches the best, which require the fewest, ii. 534.
- Suetonius, iii. 382. iv. 338.
- Suicerus, ii. 483.
- Suidas, his lexicon, ii. 78, 84. iii. 118, 119. iv. 12, 117.
- Sulpitius Severus, i. 336.
- Symmachus, the father of St. Ambrose, ii. 100.
- Synod of Aix (A. D. 1585), ii. 394.
- of St. Alban's, in Britain, (A. D. 429), i. 455.
- of Angiers (A. D. 1275), ii. 393, 400.
- of Attiniacum, ii. 233.
- of Bracara (sæc. VII.), iv. 495.
- of Carthage, i. 126, 135. iv. 446.
- of Celecyth, in Great Britain (A. D. 816), ii. 395, 396. iii. 226, 346, 570. iv. 162.
- of Diospolis, i. 379. 409.— 413.
- of Dort, i. 372. ii. 305.
- of Jerusalem (A. D. 410), i. 407.
- another (A. D. 418), i. 414.
- of Langres (A. D. 1404), ii. 393, 400.
- Synods, twenty-four, holden against the doctrines of Pelagius, i. 455.
- T.
- Tacitus the historian quoted, i. 31. iii. 381. iv. 251.
- Talmud, the Jewish (see Gemara), quoted, i. 7, 8, 11, 19, 20, 31. iii. 344, 348. extracts, 358, 359, 360, 362—365, 376, 408—413, 505, 560. iv. 218, 244, 246, 248, 256, 268.
- Targum, of Jonathan, iii. 146, 149, 348, 389. of Jerusalem, 149. of Onkelos, 149, 389.
- Tarinus, an editor of Origen, iii. 548. iv. 425.
- Tartars, their mode of baptism, ii. 415.
- Taylor, bishop Jeremy, i. 19, 151, 355, 551. the antipædobaptists will have him to be on their side, ii. 22. his 'Liberty of Prophecy,' *ibid.* iv. 487, 492. Dr. Hammond's judgment of it, ii. 23. he explains his opinions more fully, 24. his 'Dissuasive from Popery,' 36, 47, 124, 407. iii. 30, 573.
- Teaching joined in scripture with baptism, iii. 264. the verb *μαθητεύω* signifies *to teach*, 265, and not '*to make disciples*,' this point discussed, 265—306.
- Tellier, Le, archbishop of Rheims, i. 460, n.
- Terence, iii. 315.
- Tertullian, i. 13. quoted, 87—103. his seeming contradictions, *ibid.* advises delay of baptism in certain cases, 96, 181. ii. 38, 46. various reading of a passage in his treatise *de Baptismo*, i. 98. ii. 21. was baptized in adult age, i. 124. quoted, 182, 183, 329, 387, 436, 482, 503, 506, 508. ii. 138, 148, 151, 152, 154, 162, 163, 179, 190, 191, 193, 200, 231, 334, 338, 346, 383, 385, 419, 424, 425, 426, 428, 430, 436, 437, 443, 458, 476, 477, 492, 497, 501, 504, 549. iii. 85, 139, 174, 201, 202, 203, 219, 230, 250, 256, 335, 397, 398, 419, 470, 494, 514, 529, 531, 533, 554, 566. iv. 38, 41, 53, 54, 56, 101, 140, 199, 255, 258, 275, 349, 354, 375, 378, 402, 407—416. various editions compared, 412. n. 443, 448, 484.
- Tertullianists, a sect, i. 87, 99.

- Texerant (probably Tisserands), ii. 249.
- Theatine monks, their custom of fraudulently baptizing the Georgian and Mengrelian infants, ii. 289.
- Thecla, was baptized by St. Paul, ii. 123.
- Themistius, i. 220. iii. 135, 320, 377, 378.
- Theocritus, quoted, iii. 123, 126.
- Theodectes, iii. 293.
- Theodoret, the historian, i. 199, 217, 218, 234, 390, 417, 510, 514, 518. ii. 69, 92, 139, 140, 141, 146, 165, 469. iii. 150. iv. 505.
- Theodoric, an anabaptist, succeeds to Menno, ii. 301.
- Theodoras, bishop of Mopsuestia, a Pelagian, i. 443, n. writes against St. Jerome, *ibid.* 477. his singular opinions, 476.
- Theodorus Presbyter, maintains the works of Dionysius the Areopagite to be genuine, i. 531.
- Theodosius (father of the emperor), ii. 71.
- Theodosius I., the emperor, ii. 63, 66. defeats Eugenius, 67. his death, *ibid.* he was baptized, but not in infancy, 70. why? 72.
- Theodotus, bishop of Antioch, i. 414.
- Theodotus, a heretic, i. 198.
- Theophilus Antiochenus, iii. 486. iv. 484.
- Theophilus patriarch of Alexandria, i. 109. denounces Origen as a heretic, ii. 341.
- Theophrastus, iii. 318.
- Theophylact, iii. 175.
- Theopompus, an historian, iii. 293. 316.
- Thevenot, M., ii. 143. a mistake in his account of the Abyssinian Christians, 291.
- Thief, the penitent on the cross, the argument of Vincentius Victor on his case, i. 486. St. Austin's answer, *ibid.* opinions as to his being saved, ii. 196, 198.
- Thorndyke, Dr. Herbert, his opinion on infant-baptism in ancient times, ii. 37.
- Thuanus, his history, iii. 117, 173.
- Thucydides, quoted, iii. 101, 435, 465. iv. 275, 305.
- Tillotson, archbishop, ii. 526. iii. 29. iv. 78. his remark on controversy, 482.
- Tis, ought not to be translated 'any man' in John iii. 5, ii. 188, 189.
- Toldoth Jesu, a rabbinical book, iii. 254. iv. 250.
- Toledo, the council of, ii. 424, 432.
- Toleration Act, ii. 564. iii. 89, 90, 92, 210. iv. 72, 73, 83, 93, 155, 208.
- Tombes, John, his pieces against infant-baptism, i. 18, 98, 107. his opinion on some works ascribed to Origen, 110, 111. on a passage in Cyprian, 132. quoted, 511, 512, 513. writes against Baxter, ii. 4—12. bishop Barlow's letter to him, 27. his talents, 44. quoted, 122, 188, 231, 248, 322. is more liberal than many of his party, 327. 509, 551. wrote against separation from the church of England, 559. and continued in communion with it till his death, 560, 566. iv. 164, 175, 199, 200, 245, 278, 411, 475, 478, 479, 485, 492.
- Towerson, Dr. Gabriel, wishes to revive dipping, ii. 411.
- Translations of scripture, not sufficient to secure all persons from error, but the originals to be consulted, ii. 513, 517, 520, 523, 548.
- of the Fathers very incorrect, iii. 546. iv. 425.
- Transubstantiation, when it sprang up, ii. 488, 490, 492.
- Trent, council of, i. 18, 280. curious anecdote of its decrees concerning original sin, ii. 210. declares the eucharist not necessary for children, 488, 489.
- Tribur, council of, i. 330.
- Trinity, the, ancient heresies concerning, ii. 161, &c.
- Tritheism, charged unjustly on the Fathers, ii. 148, 161, &c. Philoponus the first tritheist, 166.
- Trophonius, his oracle, iii. 388.
- Turks, iv. 395, 473. See *Mahometans*.
- Turretine, M., iii. 322.
- Twisk, a chronicle cited often by Danvers, ii. 44, 130, 295.

- Twiss, ii. 116. [qu. if not Twisk?]  
 Tyndale, Wm., ii. 349, 350, 351.  
 U.
- Union, recommended between our church and the antipædobaptists, ii. 524, &c. difficulties in the way, 563. examples of such on both sides, 563—572. unity recommended too by Mr. Gale, iii. 79, Dr. Wall's plan unfair, 91. another proposed, *ibid.*
- Unitarians, in England, i. 188, 193—200. their published tenets, *ib.* the difficulties of their doctrine, 197. hold an opinion half Mahometan, 200. oppose the scriptures, *ibid.* are to be carefully watched by parochial ministers, 203.
- Ussher, archbishop, his 'history of Pelagianism,' i. 349, 352, 354, 415, 463, 482, 495. ii. 235, 236, 238, 243, 249, 263, 268. iii. 52. iv. 78, 338, 339, 340, 356.  
 V.
- Valens, the emperor, an Arian, i. 217. persecutes St. Basil, *ibid.* 220. ii. 61, 71. his baptism, 62. forced his subjects to become Arians, 133, 134. his death, 462.
- Valentinian I., some account of him, ii. 61. he was baptized, 64. at what period, 69. his death, 63, 70.
- Valentinian II., his birth, ii. 62. is made emperor, 63. favours the Arians, *ibid.* persecutes St. Ambrose, *ibid.* is reconciled to him, 66. is murdered, *ibid.* had wished to be baptized, *ibid.* 196. St. Ambrose's funeral oration over him, *ibid.*
- Valentinians, i. 59, 73, 74, 76. deny the resurrection of the body, 76. refuse to give baptism, *ibid.* their errors, 82, 500. Irenæus' account of them, 500, 504. ii. 7, 136, 335, 430, 441. iv. 325, 326, 375, 377, 387, 388, 389, 397.
- Valentinus the heretic, i. 501, 502.
- Valesius, editor of Ecclesiastical Historians, i. 219. iii. 220.
- Vansleblius, iv. 492.
- Vasquez, Gabriel, a commentator on Thomas Aquinas, i. 98. an editor of St. Austin's works, 406. ii. 392, 407. iv. 411.
- Vatablus, iii. 173. iv. 137, 138, 139, 222.
- Vaucel, Louis de, writes against the book of cardinal Sfondrata, i. 461, n.
- Vaudois. See *Waldenses*.
- Velleius Paterculus, iv. 338.
- Versions of scripture quoted, for the sense of *μαθητεύω*, iii. 328, &c. iv. 222.
- Viccomes, Joseph, his false charge against Luther, Calvin, and Beza, ii. 266.—383.
- Victor, bishop of Rome, iii. 531. iv. 405.
- Victorinus, ii. 476.
- Vienna, the council of, ii. 299.
- Vincentius, Bellovacensis, his 'Speculum,' ii. 73. its character, *ibid.*
- Vincentius Victor, an opponent of St. Austin, i. 41. quoted, 480. his character, and opinions, 481. his books, 482. is the first who advised church prayers for any who had died unbaptized, 491. did not deny infant-baptism, 492. is the first (except Tertullian) who said that infants might be saved without baptism, 493. ii. 130, 200, 211, 224, 499. iv. 493.
- Virgil, iii. 186, 194.
- Visitation, episcopal, not sufficiently attended to, ii. 368. this objected to the church of England by dissenters, *ibid.* difficulties in the way, *ibid.*
- Vitalis, candidate for the see of Antioch, ii. 101, 102, 103.
- Vitellius, governor of Judæa, iv. 356.
- Vives, Ludovicus, ii. 12. cited, 16, 36. some account of him, 16, n.—47. 124. iii. 30.
- Vorstius, iii. 358.
- Vossius, his work 'De Baptismo,' i. 26, 320. ii. 191, 212, 229, 377, 417, 424. iii. 127, 139. his Pelagian history, i. 415, 463. ii. 15. iv. 304. 'De tribus Symbolis,' ii. 473. his Etymologicon, iii. 204, 230, 280. iv. 119.
- W.
- Wake, archbishop, his translation of the Epistles of the Apostolical Fathers, i. 55. iii. 450.
- Walafridus Strabo, his opinion on infant-baptism, i. 523. ii. 12. not

- over-learned, *ibid.* his mistakes, 15. 47.—424. iv. 160. See *Strabo*.
- Waldenses, their rise, ii. 238. opinions, *ibid.* disputes whether at first they were for or against infant-baptism, 239, 247. at present they practise it, 240. some of their books, *ibid.* 242, 243. their confessions, 241, 243, 280. Catechism, 243. formerly inclined to Manichean opinions, 244, 245. their numerous opponents, *ibid.* their chief seat, 246. notice of some works describing them, 246, n. various charges against them, 244, 247. there were several sects of them, holding different opinions, 249. whether any denied infant-baptism, 256, &c. certainly several sects of them did not deny it, 267, &c. some sectaries who preceded them held objectionable opinions, 268. whence perhaps arose the charges against the Waldenses, 269, 270, 273.—iv. 9, 490, 499.
- Waldensis, or Waldo, Petrus, founder of the Waldenses, ii. 272, 273.
- Waldensis, Thomas, a Carmelite, his work on Baptism, i. 492. ii. 130.
- Walker, Wm., his Modest Plea for Infant-baptism, i. 19, 140, 181. an argument used by him, ii. 50. his explanation of the text, John iii. 5, and observations on it, 185. has proved that no national church is antipædobaptist, 279, 280. his interpretation of the word *immergo*, 329, 331, 398, 401, 408, 410, 412, 417. iii. 136. iv. 116, 119, 120, 170, 415.
- Wall, Dr., memoir of him, Introduction, p. v, &c. quotes his defence, i. 64, 79. jocosely speaks of his correcting the text of an ancient author, 433. his judgment of the genuineness of a disputed canon of the council of Carthage (A. D. 418), 495. protests his impartiality in citing ancient testimonies, ii. 11. the occasion of his writing on the subject of baptism, 325. his preference of baptism by immersion, 402. iii. 86. he himself had dipped one infant, i. 402.
- Wall, Dr., as represented by Mr. Gale, secretly traduces the antipædobaptists, iii. 8. is very fond of Dr. Featly, *ibid.* laboured to root out the anabaptists in Kent, 9. is not a formidable adversary, though the best defender of infant-baptism, 13. will be fully answered by Mr. Stennet, *ibid.* is a writer not to be depended on, 14. cites Cyprian unfairly, 17, 18. also the Apostolical Constitutions, 20. he endeavours to defame his opponents, 21. affects impartiality, 22. needlessly introduces irrelevant matter, 24. as the history of the Decretal Epistles, and of Pelagius: this latter partial, 25. his reproof of the Socinians, 26. he enters on controversies too deep for him, 27. reflects on Mr. Stennet, 28. slights men of high station in the church, 29. is rude to the ancient Fathers, 31. also to Grotius and Le Clerc, 32. these latter two defended, 33—47. he is to be read cautiously, 47. is hollow in his show of candour, *ibid.* is eager to relate every thing to the disadvantage of the antipædobaptists, 48. prefers dipping in baptism, 86. is accused of persecution, 90. of ill-temper, 90, 91. his dissuasive from schism censured, 59—92. his proposal for union an unfair one, 91. he is accused of disingenuity, 94. his account commended and examined, 235, &c. is guilty of prevarication, 248. his interpretation of *βαπτίζω* examined and disputed, 275—340. the same defended, iv. 115. his account of Jewish baptisms discussed, iii. 343.
- his reasons for writing his *Defence*, iv. 4. the honour paid to his history, *ibid.*, 77. he acknowledges some blamable expressions in it: as respecting Grotius, 6. St. Chrysostom, 8. Gregory Nazianzen, *ibid.* St. Ambrose, 9. was reported to have *recanted* his opinion, 10. the charge unfounded, *ibid.* he discusses Mr. Bernard's remarks on his book, 10—27. Mr. Emlyn's, 28—48. refers to his 'Critical

- Notes' on the New Testament, 36, and note : his compliment to Mr. Stennet, 68, 71. his kind feeling towards the antipædobaptists, 70, 196, 481. defends himself from the charge of persecution, 72, 104. of slander, 75. notices Mr. Gale's pomposity of quotations, 76, 115, 116, 117. and his abuse of him, 77, 87, 175. his captious complaints, 78, 86, 100, 202. his false charges, 87, 88, 100, 105, 118, 162, 175, 195. has no doubt that Mr. Gale's three chapters on the subject of *dipping* were observations made, either by him or some other person, at some former period, 106, 121, 243. owns a mistake in his first edition, 110. his published supplement to his first edition, *ibid.* his opinion of sprinkling, and of such as use as *little* water as possible, 114. mentions that one chapter of Mr. Gale's book was published before the rest, by way of specimen, 118. suspects that his fifth chapter was written by some Dutch Minnists, 147. his suggestions to the clergy on the subject of sprinkling, 167—173. his 'Conference on Infant-baptism,' 179. defends himself from the charge of admitting that there is no scripture-proof for infant-baptism, 175, &c. notices Mr. Gale's ill manners, 175, 203, 240, 242, his pride and insolence, 207, 222, 268, 315, 316, 328, 443. the emptiness of his quotations, 210, &c. 232, 442. the unfairness of them, 264, 506, 510. maintains that his collection of testimonies is most impartial, 269. the fact acknowledged by others also, *ibid.* his remark on Mr. Gale's assertion, that 'all infants shall assuredly be saved,' 284, &c. examines at large Mr. Gale's arguments on the subject of regeneration, 362—405. he notices that 'a full answer' to his history was promised, 395, 436, 500. speaks of his intended appendix to former editions, 418, 424, 436, 448. refers to his 'Conference on Infant-baptism,' 420. his address to the antipædobaptists on the value of testimonies from the Fathers, 443—457. his motives for offering suggestions to the clergy on the subject of infant-baptism, 457, &c. wishes that the ancient method could be gradually restored, 461. his objections to the frequent use of private baptism, 463, &c. his distinction of English antipædobaptists into three classes, 471—481. his conference with Mr. Stennet on separation, 479. recapitulates Mr. Gale's unfairness towards him, 481, 482. the reason for his replying by his 'Defence,' 482. his thankfulness at being able to finish it before the approach of death, *ibid.* his review of Mr. Davye's book in answer to him, 483—500. continues his advice to the clergy, 500, &c. especially to those who intend to write on the subject of infant-baptism, 500, 502, 506. he wishes that a picture were engraved and distributed, exhibiting Jesus Christ calling little children to him, 508.
- Walloon churches, their liturgy, *iv.* 26.
- Walton, his Polyglott Bible, *iii.* 513.
- Ware, Robt., author of 'Foxes and Firebrands,' *ii.* 363, *n.* his detection of the Jesuits, 372.
- Water, the meaning attributed to it by some expositors in the text John *iii.* 5.—*iv.* 503.
- Watson, bp. of Lincoln, his sermons, *ii.* 399.
- Wemmers, J., his *Æthiopic Lexicon*, *iii.* 327.
- West India planters. their spiritual neglect of their slaves reproved, *i.* 522.
- West, Mr., *ii.* 323.
- Whiston, William, *i.* 79, 524, *n.* *iv.* 42, 44. review of his answer to Dr. Wall's history. 49—64. his interpretation of the word *infants*, 49—53. his 'Essay on the Revelations,' 57, 451. he became a convert to antipædobaptism, 64. the immediate cause of this, 400. quoted, 369, 370, 401, 402, 404, 423, 424, 426, 438, 503.
- Whitaker, W., his opinion on sprinkling, *ii.* 401.
- Whitby, Dr. Daniel, wishes to revive

- the use of dipping, ii. 411. cited, iii. 28, 175, 179, 198, 200, 205, 217, 252, 277, 288, 322, 346, 404. 433, 439, 441, 445, 453, 539, 562. iv. 90, 151, 212, 227, 228, 229, 265, 280, 292, 296. some remarks on his opinions, and on his tract against Dr. Edwards, 296. his taking part in the Bangorian controversy, 297.—348, 349, 420, 487.
- White garments, newly baptized persons anciently clothed in, i. 337. ii. 429.
- Whitgift, archbishop, his reply to Cartwright, i. 304. ii. 223.
- Wickliffe, John, rejects the forged Decretals, i. 324. his opinion of infants dying unbaptized, ii. 212, 216, 298. of the proper mode of baptism, 396.
- William III. of England. Some persons declined to join in the prayers for him, ii. 572.—iii. 492. iv. 331.
- Wills, Obed, rebukes Danvers, i. 328. his dispute with Danvers on infant-baptism, 492. notice of his tracts on the subject, *ibid.*, n. his appeal against Danvers, ii. 11. accuses Danvers, 28. his 'Infant-baptism asserted,' 128, 130, 232, 234, 241, 551. iv. 194.
- Wotton, Dr. Wm., his *Miscellaneous Discourses*, i. 15, 16. high character of them, iv. 244.
- Z.
- Zampi, F. M., a missionary in Georgia, ii. 287.
- Zanchius, ii. 226.
- Zeno, the emperor, ii. 461.
- Zizka, John, ii. 296.
- Zoilus, the critic, iii. 317.
- Zonaras, a Greek canonist, i. 155. his *Gloss on Photius*, i. 157. ii. 34.—iii. 44, 45. iv. 82.
- Zoroaster, iii. 300.
- Zosimus, pope, a weak man, is persuaded to encourage Pelagius, i. 377, 378. deals with Cœlestius, 455—463. his inconstancy, *ibid.* his story of the emperor Constantine, ii. 60. shewn to be false, *ibid.*
-











