



3/6 7145

Library of the Theological Seminary,

PRINCETON, N. J.

Presented by Mr. Samuel Agnew of Philadelphia, Pa.

Division

Section

Number

SOC
8306





PÆDO-BAPTISM

DEFENDED, &c.



4
25

PÆDO-BAPTISM

DEFENDED:

OR, THE

ANTIQUITY

OF

INFANT-BAPTISM

FURTHER MAINTAINED.

In ANSWER to

DR. GILL'S REPLY,

ENTITLED,

John Erskell

ANTIPÆDO-BAPTISM, &c.

By *Michael Toogood*

Parvulos baptizandos esse, concedant, qui contra auctoritatem universæ Ecclesiæ *proculdubio* per Dominum et Apostolos traditam, venire non possunt.

Augustin. de Peccator. Merit. et Remiss. lib. 1. cap. 26.

LONDON:

Printed for J. WAUGH, at the *Turk's-Head* in
Lombard-Street. M.DCC.LIV.


ERRATA in PÆDO-BAPTISM.

PAGE 8. line 24, 25. for *Believer's*
Baptism displayed, read baptism dis-
covered. Page 59. in the Notes, line 8. for
Levit. read Luc. Page 92. line 8. read *Bar-*
desanes.



PÆDO-BAPTISM

DEFENDED, &c.

 Infant-baptism should pass for an *innovation*, or such a late and novel invention, as its opposers pretend it to be, this might *prejudice* them, and others, against any argument that might be offered in support of its *authority*. Therefore, to prepare the way for proving its authority, it was judged a proper step, in the first place, to discuss the point of its *antiquity*. And so, this was the design of the tract, entitled *Pædo-baptism*, which Dr. Gill has honoured with his remarks, beginning where it ends, and inverting the order of the whole argument.

Towards the close of *Pædo-baptism* [a] are these words: “ Thus, from the beginning of the fifth *century* backward, either
“ expressly, or in respect to the common
B “ grounds

[a] Page 93.

“ grounds of it, (those very grounds, upon
 “ which, the *Antipædo-baptists* themselves
 “ say, it was founded) we have traced up
 “ the practice of Infant-baptism to the
 “ time of the Apostles”. — Now, these
 grounds were the supposed necessity of bap-
 tism to salvation, either as a mean of *cleansing*
from sin, particularly *original sin*, or of
 gaining admittance into the kingdom of God.
 These are acknowledged to be the common-
 ly received grounds of Infant-baptism in
 the *primitive church*; whether right, or
 wrong, was no question with the author,
 who was only enquiring into the *matter of*
fact: For, as he adds, “ it is only the *fact*
 “ itself, as attested by the *antient writers*,
 “ not their *reasonings* about it, in which
 “ we are concerned at present”. — Says
 Mr. Stennet, [b] (one of the most ingenious
 and learned writers on that side) “ The opi-
 “ nion of the absolute necessity of baptism
 “ to salvation, from a misunderstanding of
 “ those words of Christ, *Except a Man be*
 “ *born of water, &c.* Joh. iii. 5. seems to
 “ have introduced Infant-baptism into the
 “ Christian Church.” But, with submis-
 sion, as it does not appear that the *antients*
 misunderstood those words of Christ, by
 understanding them of *baptism*; so, it fol-
 lows not, that *Infant-baptism* was introdu-
 ced into the Christian Church upon any
 mistake,

[b] Answer to Tussen, p. 77.

mistake, merely because a wrong notion of baptism was taken up; *supposing* that to have been the case. For, people might very easily take up such a notion, *after* they had received Infant-baptism, and though they received it as a divine institution. When any of the philosophers (e. g. *Plato*) made use of weak arguments to prove the *immortality* of the *soul*, it seems to be a just observation, that they must have received that doctrine *before*: otherwise they could not have been induced, upon such slight, insufficient *grounds*, to embrace it at all [c]. In like manner, if wrong notions, and weak reasons, of baptism in general, or of Infant-baptism in particular, prevailed in the *primitive* church, it is easy to conceive, that the thing itself was in use, before any such insufficient grounds of it were assigned. And thus, according to this view of the case, the practice of Infant-baptism was not *introduced*, (as is imagined) or originally grounded upon those reasons; but those reasons were grounded and grafted upon the practice of Infant-baptism, already received in the Christian Church. This being premised, let us now attend to Dr. *Gill's* remarks upon Pædo-baptism.

Mr. *Bingham* (a name of so much note for learning and skill in ecclesiastical mat-

B 2

ters,

[c] See *Haliburton's* Insufficiency of Nat. Relig. ch. 14. p. 45.

ters, that, if it should not secure a person from error, it might very well screen him from *contempt* with all men of candour) was quoted [d] for *this* remark; “The
 “ most antient writer, that we have, is *Cle-*
 “ *mens Romanus*, who lived in the time of
 “ the Apostles; and he, though he doth
 “ not expressly mention Infant-baptism,
 “ yet says a thing, that by *consequence*
 “ proves it: For, he makes Infants liable
 “ to Original Sin, which in effect is to say,
 “ that they have need of baptism, &c.” [e].
 The passage to which Mr. *Bingham* refers, is a quotation from *Job* xiv. 4, 5. which, according to the *Greek* version, *Clemens* reads thus: *No man is free from pollution, no not tho’ his life is but of one day.* But, Dr. *Wall* observes [f], that in the next chapter *Clemens* brings in, to the same purpose, the saying of *David*, *Pf. li. 5. I was shapen in iniquity, &c.*—Now, Dr. *Gill* takes notice of the former passage, but says not a word of the latter, passing over it to *another*, mentioned by Dr. *Wall*. And all that he has to urge, with reference to the passage in *Job*, is, that “it might be brought
 “ to prove Original Sin, but is not brought
 “ by *Clemens* for any such purpose” [g].
 However, it is as much brought in for such
 a purpose,

[d] Pædo-baptism, p. 92.

[e] *Antiq. of the Chr.* Ch. B. II. Ch. 4. S. 6.

[f] *Hist. of Inf. Bapt.* P. 1. Ch. 1.

[g] *Antipædo-baptism*, p. 5.

a purpose, as the saying of *David*; and, as both these passages are commonly alledged by the primitive writers in proof of Original Sin, so, it is presumed, Dr. *Gill* himself supposes, that *Clemens* also understood them in the same light; therefore, he cannot fairly deny, that in this *apostolical* father we may trace *one* of the received grounds of Infant-baptism in the primitive church, when he remembers his own account of *Austin's* saying, “*This the church has always had, has always held.*” For, says he [b], “it was the doctrine of Original Sin, and the Baptism of Infants for the remission of it, he speaks of.” And indeed, of all men, one cannot but wonder most at *those*, that hold Original Sin, and yet disown Infant-baptism; that look upon all infants as *lost* in *Adam*, and left destitute, at the same time, of any appointed *sign*, or token of their concern with Christ, under the *clearest revelation*, and the brightest display, of redeeming love and grace. But, that any such persons existed in the *primitive* church, does not appear. It is to no purpose then, for the Doctor, to alledge *any* such in *our* days, unless he had produced some instances of this kind in the *earlier* ages of the church, and particularly in the time of *Clemens Romanus*.

The

[b] Argum. from Ap. Trad. p. 26.

The same learned *Bingham* was also cited [i] for *this* observation, “ *Hermas* Pastor lived about the same time with *Clement*, and hath several passages to shew the general necessity of water, that is, *Baptism*, to save men.” Now, says the Dr. [k] “ surely he could not mean real material water, &c.” and yet, he does not pretend to know, what *Hermas* does mean. But, whatever the true meaning be, the words plainly allude, at least, to Baptism, and that as necessary to salvation: for, there is no accounting for his way of speaking upon any other supposition, when that author expresses himself thus [l]: “ Hear therefore, why the tower is built upon the water: because your life is, and shall be saved by water”. And again, [m] “ before a man receives the name of the Son of God, he is ordained unto death; but when he receives the seal, he is freed from death, and delivered unto life. Now, that seal is water, into which men go down under the obligation of death, but come up appointed unto life” [n]. Therefore, we have here the general ground and foundation of Infant-baptism, as received in the primitive church, either clearly expressed, or plainly referred

[i] Ibid.

[k] Antipædo, p. 6.

[l] Lib. 1. Vision 3. Sect. 3.

[m] Lib. 3. Simil. 9. S. 16.

[n] See *Wall's* Defence, p. 237. &c.

referred to, *viz.* the *necessity* of Baptism to life and salvation. And this is all that *Hermas Pastor* was cited for.

Now, says Dr. Gill [o], “ our author “ upon the above passages concludes after “ this manner; “ Thus—we have traced “ up the *practice* of Infant-baptism to the “ time of the Apostles;” when those wri- “ ters give not the least hint of Infant- “ baptism, or have any reference to it, or “ the practice of it;” and then adds, “ It “ is amazing what a *face* some men have!” which is really very true; otherwise, how could the doctor deal so unfairly, as to quote the author’s words imperfectly, by leaving out the *alternative*, *viz.* “ *either ex- “ pressly, or in respect to the common grounds “ of it.*” Besides, he has removed the words out of their proper place; for, they came in as they were cited above, upon a review of the *connected* evidence for Infant-baptism, from the beginning of the fifth century, backward to the first ages of all. “ In all which period, (as it is added) “ [p] the Antipædo-baptists cannot produce “ one single author to disprove the fact.” Nor has Dr. Gill himself yet produced any such author, as will appear by the sequel. Therefore, the *preponderating* evidence, whether more or less, does still lie on the side of Infant-baptism. It is true, the

[o] Pag. 7.

[p] Pædo-baptism, p. 94.

the testimonies from *Clemens Romanus*, and *Hermas Pastor*, are not direct and express proofs, nor are they alledged as such, but only as proving Infant-baptism by *consequence*; (even upon the principles of its opposers, by pointing out the acknowledged *grounds* of it in the primitive church). It was thus that the argument was stated, in the words of the learned *Bingham*; and the Doctor, if he pleases, may wonder at *his* face: But, as Dr. *Wall* observes [q], “Proofs by consequence for any *affirmative*, do give *that* the advantage against a *negative*, of which there are no proofs at all.”

Dr. *Gill* says [r], “nothing out of *Barnabas*, *Polycarp*, and *Ignatius*, in favour of Infant-baptism, is pretended to.” But, if that had been thought necessary, or consistent with studied brevity, the same *grounds* of Infant-baptism might have been pointed out in these writers also. *Ignatius* mentions *Original Sin* [s], as the learned *Vossius* understands his words [t]. And *Barnabas* speaks more than once of the use and efficacy of Baptism to *cleanse* from sin [u]. As for *Polycarp*, I do not find, upon a cursory review, that he says any thing of Baptism at all. And this also (to note that by the way) is the case with some other antient writers,

[q] Defence, p. 281.

[r] Pag. 4, 5.

[s] Ep. ad Trallian.

[t] Hist. Pelag. lib. 2. P. 1. Th. 6.

[u] Sect. 11.

writers, that are sometimes mentioned, as having nothing in favour of Infant-baptism: [x] but their scheme might therefore be as *pertinently*, and properly alledged, to disprove *all* baptism in the same period.— But, speaking of *Barnabas* and *Hermas* upon another occasion [y], the Doctor observes, “ the learned Mr. *Stennet* [z] has “ cited some passages out of them, and as- “ ter him Mr. *David Rees* [a], which are “ manifest proofs of Adult-baptism, and “ that as performed by immersion.” And what *Pædo-baptist* doubts of either? The only question is, whether Adult-baptism was the *only* Baptism, and immersion the only *mode* of baptism? As to the *latter*, we shall say no more of it at present: but, in relation to the *former*, it is acknowledged, that Adult-baptisms were very frequent and common in the *first*, and some following ages, by reason of the great number of *new* converts to the Christian faith. But this concludes nothing at all against Infant-baptism; because, as plain *instances*, and as clear descriptions, of Adult-baptism may be produced from those very writers who were *Pædo-baptists* themselves, and lived at that time when *Pædo-baptism* prevailed, by the confession of it's most sanguine op-

C

posers;

[x] Divine Right of Inf. Bap. p. 22.

[y] Ibid. p. 20.

[z] Anf. to *Russen*, p. 142, 143.

[a] Answer to *Walker*, p. 157.

posers ; as will be shewn in a proper place. At present I must observe, that Mr. *Stennet*, and Mr. *Rees*, as referred to by Dr. *Gill* himself, understood the words of *Barnabas*, which have been considered, of *Baptism*, and consequently as spoken of *real material water* ; though the Doctor would now shuffle them off to something else, he knows not what. *Before*, they were *manifest proofs* of Adult-baptism, &c. but now the Doctor can properly see no Baptism at all in them, no *real material water*, something *mystical* must surely be designed ; and what it is, he leaves to those who better understand these visionary things ! Thus Doctors differ ! And thus can the same Doctor differ from himself ! understand the same passages different ways ; or *affect* not to understand them at all, just as it serves a present turn ; and still *keep his countenance* ! Proceed we now with him to

The second century.

Of the *Recognitions*, says Mr. *Bingham*, [b] “ it is an antient writing of the same “ age with *Justin Martyr*, mentioned by “ *Origen* in his *Philocalia*, and by some “ ascribed to *Bardesanes Syrus*, who lived “ about the middle of the second century. “ This author speaks of the *necessity* of “ Baptism,

[b] Ubi supra, Sect. 8.

“Baptism, in the same stile, as *Justin Martyr* did, &c.” [c]. Dr. *Gill* here replies, with some warmth, saying [d], “whenever this wretched tenet, this false notion of the absolute necessity of Baptism to salvation is met with, the *Pædo-baptists* presently smell out Infant-baptism, &c.” And why should they not? when the *Antipædo-baptists* themselves have lent us their noses, to smell it out? But some people have a wonderful faculty, and a strange command over their senses. (happy for them, and others, if they had the same over their passions!) They can *understand*, or not understand; *smell*, or not smell, just as it suits their present occasion; otherwise, what imaginable reason can be assigned, why those, who believed the absolute necessity of Baptism to salvation, should defer one moment, to administer it to Infants, at least in case of danger?—In respect to the notion itself, whether it was true, or false, is not the question; but whether such a notion did really obtain in the most primitive times: and that it actually did, we have seen before in *Barnabas* and *Hermas*. Therefore this is none of the *dotages* peculiar to the *Recognitions*; nor was *Bardesanes Syrus*, (if he was the author, and the contrary is not proved) ever charged with heresy for holding

C 2

ing

[c] See *Pædo-bap.* p. 92.[d] *Antipædo.* p. 9.

ing this *tenet*: so that all, the Doctor suggests upon this head, is nothing to the purpose.—But, he has one salvo yet; he says, “the mystery of iniquity worked by degrees, &c.” which is very true, in respect to the general corruption of religion: but, if by the *mystery of iniquity* he means *Infant baptism*, we deny his supposition, and despise the calumny. However, “true it is, (as he says) that one error leads on to another;” and this may account for the introduction of *Antipædo-baptism*, which upon enquiry will be found to be a *mystery*, which worked by very *slow* degrees. I shall only add, *Bardesanes Syrus* was a writer of great note; as appears from *Jerome’s* account [e]: *Eusebius* has given us ‘a large extract from some of his writings [f]; and if he *was not wholly free from heresy*, even to the last, Dr. *Gill* should not bear too hard upon him on that account, for the sake of his favourite author, *Tertullian*. But, if *Antipædo-baptism* may be upheld; *no matter* by what weak arguments it is supported.

Pass we on now to *Justin Martyr*, from whom a passage was alledged [g], to confront the Doctor’s assertion [b], (speaking of the time of *Irenæus*, junior to *Justin*) viz.
“that

[e] Catalog. de Script. Eccles.

[f] De Pracp. Evangel. lib. 6. num. 10.

[g] Pædo-baptism, p. 84.

[b] Argum. from Apost. Trad. p. 14.

“ that it had not as yet obtained among the
 “ antients to use the words, *regenerated*,
 “ and *regeneration*, for *baptized*, and *Bap-*
 “ *tism*.” The passage is this; “ We bring
 “ them (*i. e.* the *new converts*) to some place,
 “ where there is water, and they are rege-
 “ nated by the same way of regeneration, by
 “ which we were regenerated: for they
 “ are washed with water in the name of
 “ God, the Father, &c. because Christ
 “ says [*i*], unless you be regenerated, you
 “ cannot enter into the kingdom of hea-
 “ ven, &c.” [*k*]. Observe now, (1.) *Justin*
 says of the *new converts*, (*after* they were
 made such) “ we bring them to some place,
 “ where there is water, and they are rege-
 “ nated, &c.” (2.) In proof hereof he
 adds, “ *for* they are washed with water,
 “ &c.” Thus he describes the *way* of re-
 generation. And then, (3.) he assigns the
reason of this practice: “ For, or because,
 “ Christ says, Unless you be regenerated, &c.”
 Can any thing in the world be plainer; than
 that *Justin* here uses the term, *regenerati-*
on, and also understands those words of
 Christ, of *baptism*? How then could Dr.
Gill have the *face* to say [*l*], “ that the per-
 “ sons *Justin* speaks of are not represented
 “ by him as regenerated *by* baptism!” and
 who can but wonder at the reason he gives
 2 for

[*i*] Job. iii. 3. 5.[*k*] Apol. 2.[*l*] *Tracts*, p. 11.

for it? *viz.* “because they are spoken of
“before, as converted persons, and belie-
“vers!” Before what? why, before they
are spoken of as regenerated by Baptism;
therefore, they were not regenerated by
baptism! excellent logic! This is the *strong*,
and *nervous* reasoning of the *Antipædo-bap-*
tist! In vain would the Doctor avail him-
self here of the *modern* use of the word *re-*
generation, as implying the same thing
with *conversion*: but that word had no such
use among the *antients*, without a refer-
ence to Baptism [*m*]. In vain also would
he burlesque the sense given of *Justin's*
words, by pretending, that it makes him
say, “they were baptized, because they
“were baptized.” — For, the present ques-
tion is not about the *thing*, but the use of
the *word*, regeneration. And we do not
say, that regeneration, and baptism, are
identically the same; but that the former
word is so used, as to *connote* baptism, and
refer to it, *viz.* as the *way*, and mean of
regeneration. So says *Justin*, “we bring
“them to the water, and they are rege-
“nerated by the same *way* of regeneration,
“by which we were regenerated; *for*
“they are washed with water, &c.” —
When Dr. *Gale* had quibbled upon the
words of *Justin Martyr*, in the same man-
ner, as his brother *Doctor* now doth; Dr
Wall

Wall said [*n*], “ I must declare, and I do
 “ it in cold blood, I never met with any
 “ one of so finished effrontery, to deny
 “ things, that are plain, and visible.” — In
 short: *Justin* puts the very same construc-
 tion upon our Saviour’s words, *Job*. iii. 3. 5.
 as the author of the *Recognitions* did [*o*]:
 therefore “ that then no such constructi-
 “ on of the words obtained, that baptism is
 “ necessary to salvation,” is a groundless pre-
 tence, and a manifest error. — Before we
 dismiss this passage, it is proper to consider,
 what *Dr. Gill* has suggested from it, (after
Dr. Gale) in disfavour of Infant-baptism.
 It is very plain, that *Justin* is speaking of
new converts from *heathenism*; and it is al-
 lowed, on all sides, that such persons must
 be baptized at adult-age. But this makes
 nothing against Infant-baptism. However,
 let us hear what is offered upon this head.
 It is alledged [*p*], that “ if Infant-baptism
 “ had been practised in those days, it is
 “ not consistent with that sincerity, which
 “ *Justin* sets out with, when he proposed
 “ to give the *Roman* Emperor an account of
 “ Christian Baptism, not to make any men-
 “ tion of it, &c.” — To which I reply, there
 was no insincerity, or unfair dealing in the
 case, if *Justin* said so much of baptism,
 and the other Christian rites, as was suffici-
 ent,

[*n*] Defence, p. 325.

[*o*] Lib. 6. num. 9.

[*p*] Antipædo, p. 10.

ent, to answer the Emperor's expectation, and the proper design of writing his *apology*; which was to shew, that the Christians were not such vile; and seditious persons, as their enemies represented them, but worthy men, and good subjects, and that there was nothing in their religion, which had a tendency to make them otherwise. It was therefore quite impertinent for *Justin* to say any thing of infants; who could lie under no suspicions of that kind [q]. Besides, as the *Romans* had a solemn form of lustration for infants [r], the *Roman* Emperor, without being told of it, might naturally conclude the same of the Christians.—It is further urged from the same quarter, that, “he had occasion to speak of it—had it been used; since the Christians were charged with using their infants barbarously, &c.” But this is a *far-fetched imagination*; as *Dr. Wall* properly enough calls it [s]: besides, *that* calumny, among others, *Justin* refutes in another part of his *apology*; and so had no occasion to recur to it again [t]. To which let me add, if, as these writers are wont to contend, *immersion* was the only *mode* of baptism; had *Justin* told the Emperor, that they *plunged* their infants, this might rather have confirmed, than

[q] See *Cobber's* Just Vindication, P. 3. ch. 4. p. 1.

[r] Vid. *Macrob.* Saturn, lib. 1. c. 16.

[s] *Ibid.* p. 275.

[t] P. 70. E. Colon.

than removed the suspicion of *using them barbarously*: and for my part, I cannot conceive, how such a notion should get among the *Heathens* concerning the Christians, if their Infants had nothing to do with their *sacred rites*.——In reply to what is further recited from *Justin Martyr*, after *Dr. Gale*; it will be sufficient for me, if I transcribe *Dr. Wall's* answer, (of which *Dr. Gill* takes not the least notice; an endless way of writing controversy!) [*u*] “ what he observes of “ *Justin's* saying, that our first generation “ is without our *knowledge*, 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 *profelytes*, entring “ into God's covenant by circumcision, “ (which the *Jews*, as I shewed, did also “ call regeneration). The adult profelyte “ did partake of this regeneration by his “ own choice. This is no proof, but that “ his Infant-children had the same circum- “ cision, and regeneration, by their parent's “ dedicating them, and God's gracious ac- “ ceptance.”

In his *Dialogue* with *Trypho* the Jew, it was observed [*w*] there is a passage, “ where “ *Justin Martyr* says, that concerning the “ influence and effect of *Adam's* sin upon
D mankind,

[*u*] Defence, p. 276.[*w*] Pædo-Bap. p. 85.

“ mankind, which the antient writers re-
 “ present as the ground and reason of In-
 “ fant-baptism.” “ Now (says Dr. Gill) [x]
 “ allowing that this is spoken of Original
 “ Sin, as it seems to be, what is this to In-
 “ fant-baptism?”—To which I answer, if
 Original Sin is any thing to Infants; why
 should not the words of *Justin* make for
 Infant-baptism, when the antient writers
 represent the former, as the ground and rea-
 son of the latter? But says the Doctor, “ I
 “ have already exposed the folly of arguing
 “ from persons holding the one, to the prac-
 “ tice of the other.”—Has he so indeed!
 But how? Why, by telling us of some *mo-*
derns that hold Original Sin without prac-
 tising Infant-baptism! And could not I tell
 him of many others, that both hold the one,
 and practise the other? But, *what is this to*
the antients? And let it be remembered,
 that it is not the *reason* of the thing, much
 less any *modern* opinions about it, but the
 sense of the *antients* concerning the matter
 in question, which is the subject of this pre-
 sent disquisition.—Again, in the same book
 another passage was referred to, as pointing
 out some *analogy* between baptism, and cir-
 cumcision. This the Doctor will not al-
 low, though *Justin* speaks of Christians
 receiving the *spiritual* circumcision by bap-
 tism; but from hence he infers, “ that it
 “ must

“ must be different from baptism :” which is just such another cavil, as he made before in distinguishing between *baptism*, and *regeneration*. But it is plain, that, as according to *Justin*, regeneration was performed, or effected *instrumentally* by baptism ; so, when he says of the spiritual circumcision, “ we have received it *by* baptism,” (in whatever way *others* had received it) he refers to what was done for *Christians* in their baptism. But, for a more particular answer to the Doctor’s exceptions, I refer the reader to Dr. *Wall* [y].

Says *Justin Martyr* [z], (as was also observed [a]) “ Several persons among us of “ both sexes, of sixty or seventy years of “ age, οἱ ἐκ παιδῶν ἐμαρτυροῦσθαι τῷ χριστῷ, “ who were *discipled* to Christ *in*, or *from*, “ their childhood, &c.”—Dr. *Gill* contends, it should be read *instructed* in Christ : but this was shewn to be an improper way of speaking ; as it would be to say, that *Antiphon*, the son of *Sophilas*, was *instructed* in *his* Father [b]. The phrase, as the Doctor thinks, might better be rendered, *instructed by his father* ; which is indeed agreeable to the *English*, if it would suit the *Greek* idiom ; but some good critics are of another opinion [c], and judge it more proper to

D 2

say,

[y] Defence, p. 267. &c.

[z] Apol. 2.

[a] Pædo-bap. p. 86.

[b] See Pædo-bap. p. 86.

[c] See *Walker's* Modest Plea, p. 207.

say, *Antiphon* was a *disciple* to his father, *Discipled*, or (which is the *Doctor's* phrase, though of the same import) *profelyted*, to his father, I think, is not so well expressed. However, I could see no impropriety in it, if *Sophilas* had set up for the head of a religious sect; and it is only in the sacred, or Christian sense, that we affix the idea of *profelyting* to the *verb* in question. Now, what we urge is this, that the persons described by *Justin* must have been *baptized* in their childhood, or Infancy; because the word, *discipling*, in the Christian notion, includes baptism: for which an *authority* was produced, that *Dr. Gill* cannot well object against, *viz*, his own [*d*]. Nor doth he yet retract what he said; only, he tells us, what his *meaning* was, which was *clear* enough before, as expressed in his *comment*; but, leaving him to *enjoy his own sense*, we accept of his concession, that the word, *discipling*, includes *baptism*. And this notion was confirmed by *Acts* xiv. 21. But *here* the *Doctor* would have the word, *discipling*, to signify only an *effect* (not an *act*) wherein, I fancy, he is very singular. And yet, if he would honestly tell us, what that effect was, (provided he may enjoy his own sense) he would undoubtedly say, it included baptism; which is the thing we contend for. This construction of the word was
further

[*d*] His Commentary on *Acts* xix. 1. 3.

further supported by *Mat. xxviii. 19, 20* [e]. “Go ye, therefore, and *disciple* all nations, “&c.” where the word, *disciple*, is manifestly a *general* term, which includes *baptizing*, as well as teaching. But of this, the Doctor takes no notice, nor makes any attempt, to justify his former *criticisms* on the text [f]. Admit then the notion, we advance, is just; the persons, abovementioned, must have been baptized in their infancy, as they were *discipled* to Christ *in*, or *from*, their childhood: for, as was observed [g], baptism not being a *continued*, but a *transient* act, to say they were *baptized* from their infancy, would be improper; as Dr. *Wall* had hinted before [h]. But, Dr *Gill* (p. 14.) would turn this off with a laugh, by saying, this “reason—is merry “indeed; when *Justin* is not speaking of “the baptism of any person at all.” However, he must not think, to escape thus; for, if baptism is included in the notion of *discipling*, (which the Doctor cannot deny without contradicting himself) when *Justin* speaks of certain persons being *discipled* to Christ, he must consequently speak of their *baptism*. Therefore he must *give* us, or we shall *take* leave, to conclude, that “in “the passages of *Justin* quoted, if there is
“no

[e] Pædo-bap. p. 89.

[f] Divine Right of Inf-bap. examined, p. 79.

[g] Perib. p. 29, 33.

[h] Defence, p. 280.

“ no exprefs mention of Infant-baptifm; “ yet there is *abint* given of it, and some *reference* unto it;” contrary to what the Doctor afferts. — But he would willingly warp himfelf off, by fuggelting, that *Juftin* ufed the word, *discipling*, in a *different* fenfe from the fcripture notion of the thing. “ From whom (fays he p. 13.) can we better learn his meaning than from himfelf?” and complains of his *opponent*, that he takes no notice of feveral paffages in *Juftin*, which the *Doctör* had alledged, to *confirm* his *new* fenfe of the word under confideration. Therefore, to eafe him of his complaint, we will now examine all thofe paffages, and fhew, that the *Greek* word for *discipling*, admits the fenfe, contended for, there alfo. Let us begin with that paffage [i] where *Juftin* fpeaks, (as it is cited and expreffed by the Doctör [k]) “ of Chrif’t’s “ fending his difciples to the *Gentiles*, who “ by them *μαθητεύσαν* (it fhould be, *ἐμα-* “ *θήτευσεν*) *instructed* them.”—Now, who does not fee, that *Juftin* here alludes to the words of the *commiffion*, *Mat.* xxviii. 19, 20. where, as has been fhewed, the word, *μαθητεύσατε*, *disciple*, includes *baptifm*. Thus then, *Juftin* fpeaks not any peculiar dialect of his own, but the language of the *New Testament*; and fo from thence *we are to*

2 *learn*

[i] Dialog. cum Tryph. p. 272. Colon.

[k] Argum. from Apolt. Trad. p. 12.]

learn his meaning, which is *this*, viz. that Christ by his disciples, sending to the *Gentiles*, discipled them. And how did they disciple the *Gentiles*; but by baptism, and by teaching them; according to Christ's direction [l]? — Again, in another passage alledged [m], *Justin* speaks of persons “ being “ μαθητευομενους, *instructed* in the name “ (person, or doctrine) of Christ, and leaving the way of error;” as the *Doctor* gives the words. But here also μαθητευομενους εις το ὄνομα τοῦ χριστοῦ (which is *Justin's* phrase) aptly signifies their being *discipled* to Christ, so as to be *baptized* in his name; agreeably to these words, *Acts* xix. 5. ἐβαπτίσθησαν εις τὸ ὄνομα τοῦ Κυρίου Ἰησοῦ, i. e. they were baptized in (or into) the name of the Lord Jesus. This notion is confirmed by what *Justin* adds of their leaving the way of error; which implies their renouncing the *Pagan*, and embracing the Christian religion: and when they left their old church (into which they, and their children had been *initiated* before) surely they would carry their children along with them. — Once more; *Justin* “ speaks [n] of persons μαθητευθηναι, “ *instructed* into divine doctrines.” So the *Doctor* renders the words; but methinks, *instructed* into divine doctrines, is an harsh expression. I should rather read it, *initiated*
into

[l] See Pædo-bap. p. 89.

[m] Ibid. p. 258.

[n] Apolog. i. p. 43.

into divine doctrines, *i. e.* the *Christian religion*. And thus, *baptism*, the Christian rite of initiation, may be referred to in *this* place, as well as in the two foregoing.—After all; “we grant, the word, *disciple*, “has a reference to *teaching*, and instruction:” and that *new* converts from *heathenism* were (and ought to be) instructed first, before their admission to baptism. But, this concludes nothing against the baptism of infants, nor disproves the notion that children were (and should be) baptized, “and “so far made disciples to Christ, in order “to be taught; as (*Discipulus*) a scholar is “put to school, that he may learn” [o].

We now attend the *Doctor* to the next writer in this century, *viz.* *Irenæus*.

Irenæus says [p] of Christ, “that he “came to save all by himself; all, I say, “that by him are *born again* unto God, infants, and little children, young men, and “old men.” Upon which passage (it was observed) [q], “the learned *Fenardentius* has “this remark, that by *the name of regeneration*, according to the phrase of Christ, “and of his Apostles, he understands baptism, &c.” Now here *Dr. Gill* is out of patience; he will not allow this *monk* (as he calls him in contempt, p. 15.) to be a man of learning; though all the proof, he gives of

[o] See *Pædo-bap.* p. 88.

[p] *Lib. 2.* p. 39.

[q] *Pædo-bap.* p. 76.

of it, is, that he was a great *bigot* to a party: a *man of large assurance*, and *uncommon boldness*, &c. But, if this is the peculiar character of a *monk*, and the sign of an unlearned man; one might perhaps, find more monks, and fewer scholars, in the world, than is imagined; yea, some famous Doctors themselves might be in danger of being undubbed, and put on the hood. 'Tis presumed, however, that Dr. *Grabe* will be allowed, to be a man of learning, and moderation: and yet, he thought the observation of *Feuardentius* aforesaid, worth retaining in his edition of *Irenæus* [r]. Nor is it, I think, a *false gloss*, as Dr. *Gill* pretends, but much truer than his own assertion, “that Christ and his Apostles no where call baptism by the name of the new birth;” if his meaning be, that they no where have *reference* to baptism, when they speak of regeneration. The words of Christ, *Job. iii. 3. 5.* most plainly, and *literally*, refer to baptism. Accordingly, *so*, we have proved, beyond all rational contradiction, *Justin Martyr* understood them: and he must be a man of *monkish* assurance, that can say, without some equivocation, “the passage in *Justin* before-mentioned, falls short of proving,—that in *Irenæus's*

E

“ time,

[r] P. 161. where Dr. *Grabe* not only espouses the opinion of *Feuardentius*, but confirms it, by some remarks of his own.

“ time, it had obtained among the *antients*,
 “ to use the words *regenerated*, or *regenera-*
 “ *tion*, for *baptized*, or *baptism*.” [s]—’Tis
 pretended (*ibid*) “ the passages in *Tertullian*,
 “ and *Clemens of Alexandria*, concerning
 “ being *born in water*, and *begotten of the*
 “ *womb of water* [t], are too late.” But
 how can they be *too late*; when both these
 writers, though younger men, lived at the
same time with *Irenæus*?—The *Doctor*
 goes on; “ beside, the one is to be interpret-
 “ ed of the grace of God compared to wa-
 “ ter; this is *clearly Tertullian’s* sense; for,
 “ he adds, “ nor are we otherwise safe, or
 “ saved, than by remaining in water, which
 “ surely can never be understood literally of
 “ the *water* of baptism.” But if he had
 not been in too much haste, to consider the
 sense, and design of the words, the *Doctor*
 might have *clearly* perceived his own mis-
 take. For, *Tertullian* is there expressly
 treating of *water-baptism*, which some per-
 sons, as he says, were for laying aside [u].
 This was the case of one *Quintilla*, who, as
 he tells us, “ destroyed baptism according
 “ to her *nature*; for he calls her a venomous
 “ viper; and observes, that such kind of
 “ creatures frequent dry *unwatery* places.”
 Then follow the words before us; “ *But*
 “ *we*

[s] Antipædo, p. 15.

[t] See Pædo-bap. p. 79.

[u] Tertul. de baptismo, which book begins thus, Felix sacramentum aquæ, &c.

“ we are born in the water like little fishes,
 “ after the example of Jesus Christ, &c.”
 Therefore, by remaining in the water, is
 plainly meant retaining the salutary use of
 water baptism in the church. Accordingly
Pamelius observes, “ that these words are
 “ to be chiefly remarked against those, who
 “ deny the necessity of water in baptism.” [w]
 To the same purpose says *De la Cerda* [x],
 “ Observe the necessity of water in baptism
 “ against the *Paulicians*.” This last writer
 refers to a parallel place [y], where *Tertul-
 lian* says, “ There is one kind of flesh of
 “ birds, that is, the martyrs, who soar to
 “ the higher regions; another of fishes, that
 “ is, those, whom the water of baptism
 “ suffices.” But there are other passages,
 which plainly shew, that *Tertullian* con-
 sidered baptism as a kind, or mean, of rege-
 neration; and so made use of this word to
 express baptism. Says he [z], “ the law
 “ of baptizing is enjoined, and the form
 “ prescribed. Go (says he) teach all nati-
 “ ons, baptizing them in the name of the Fa-
 “ ther, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost.
 “ Parallel to this law is that definition, Ex-
 “ cept a man be born of water, and of the
 “ Spirit, he shall not enter into the kingdom
 “ of heaven.” And again [a], “ Blessed
 E 2 “ are

[w] Pamel. Not. in loc.

[x] Not. ibid.

[y] De Resurrect. Carnis, Cap. 52.

[z] De Baptismo.

[a] Ibid. sub fin.

“ are ye whom the favour of God attends,
 “ when you ascend out of the most holy
 “ *laver of the new birth.* [*novi natalis*]”——
 Dr. Gill is as far wide of the truth, in say-
 ing, (p. 16.) “ as for *Clemens* [*b*], he is
 “ speaking not of regeneration, but of the
 “ natural generation of man, as he comes
 “ out of his mother’s womb, &c.” For,
Clemens is *allegorizing*, in his way, upon the
 words of *Job* [*c*], *Naked came I out of my*
mother’s womb; and naked shall I return.
 “ Not naked (says he) of possessions, for
 “ *that* is a small and common thing; but,
 “ as a just man, he returns naked of vice,
 “ and wickedness, &c. For this is what is
 “ said, *Unless ye be converted as little chil-*
 “ *dren, pure in body, and holy in soul, by*
 “ *abstaining from evil works; shewing that*
 “ *he would have us to be such, as he begot*
 “ *us of the womb of water.* For, *generation*
 “ *succeeding to generation,* will advance us
 “ to immortality.” Now, in this *allegori-*
cal discourse, the *womb of water* plainly an-
 swers to the *mother’s womb*; and so, these
 cannot signify one, and the same thing,
 without destroying the *allegory*, and losing
 the whole *spirit* of the discourse. There-
 fore, when *Clemens* speaks of Christians be-
 ing *begotten*, or born, of the *womb of wa-*
ter; he must intend something else, than
 the *natural generation of man*; and what
can

[*b*] Strom. lib. 4.[*c*] Job. i. 21.

can that be, but baptism? that generation *spiritual*, which succeeded the generation *natural*. And what must *that* generation be, which *succeeded* another; but a *regeneration*? — Besides, there are other passages in *Clemens*, which may be seen in *Dr. Wall*, [d] where he speaks of *baptism* under the notion of regeneration. Thus, *e. g.* he speaks of Christ himself being *regenerated*, in discoursing of his *baptism* [e]. This may perhaps seem a very odd notion; but *Cyprian* also says [f], “the master himself submitted to be *baptized* by his servant; and he, who was to confer upon us the remission of sins, vouchsafed to be washed in the *laver of regeneration*.” All which agrees with *Tertullian’s* saying before, “*We are born in the water* like little fishes, after the example of, or conformably unto, *Jesus Christ*.” [g] And in what other sense could Christ be said to be *born in the water*, or *regenerated*; but with a reference to his *baptism*?

It was observed [b], “a like notion *Tertullian* mentions [i], as maintained by the *heathens*, no doubt long before the time of *Irenæus*.” Upon this, says the *Doctor*, p. 16. “To have recourse to *heathens*, to ascertain the name of christian baptism, is
“monstrous.”

[d] Defence. Appendix, p. 7.

[e] Pædagog. lib. i. c. 6.

[f] De Bono Patientiæ.

[g] Secundum ἰχθῆν nostrum Jesum Christum.

[b] Pædo-bap. p. 79.

[i] De baptismo.

“ monstrous.” But, where is the wonder, if persons, just converted from *Paganism*, did not immediately change their *language* with their religion, but still retained some of their old terms, (if not their *tenets*) and applied them to the Christian *mysteries*? *Priests, sacrifices, altars, &c.* are words very familiar with the antient writers, when they speak *e. g.* of the other Sacrament of the *Lord’s Supper*.—If the *Doctor* had as much of a *disposition*, as he had reason to retract, what he said about the custom mentioned by *Barnabas*, of giving *milk* and *honey* to persons just baptized; he would at least have dropped that matter. For, as this ceremony was used by the antients in token of such persons being *new-born*; [k] it is plain, they considered baptism as a *new-birth*, and a kind, or *way* of regeneration. It is therefore perfect trifling, to infer, “ that the words *regeneration*, and *re-generated*, are neither of them mentioned “ by *Barnabas* ;” nor can it answer any other end, but to discover, how well some persons are skilled in the ingenious art of equivocation or evasion. The question is not, whether *Barnabas* useth those words; but, whether in *Irenæus’s* time it had obtained among the antients to use them for *baptized*, and *baptism*. Now, if so much earlier than *Irenæus*, as the time of *Barnabas*,

[k] See *Pædobap.* p. 80.

nabas, the notion of baptismal regeneration obtained among the antients; does not *this* over-throw the *foundation* of the Doctor's hypothesis? He had better suppose with *Vossius* [l], that the words of *Barnabas* have no reference to the antient custom aforesaid: and so withdraw his former plea for the high *antiquity* of that custom [m]; if he can prevail with himself to *retract* any thing. But even *this* will not help him much; since the said custom of giving *milk* and *honey* to new-baptized persons, is mentioned by some of *Irenæus's* cotemporaries, particularly, *Tertullian* [n], and *Clemens Alexandrinus* [o].

Irenæus was also cited for *this* passage [p],
 “ giving the power of *regeneration* unto God,
 “ to his disciples, he said unto them, Go,
 “ and teach all nations, baptizing them in the
 “ name of the Father, &c.” [q]. “ By which
 “ power or commission (says the *Doctor*, p.
 “ 16.) is meant *not* the commission of bap-
 “ tizing, &c.” Astonishing! he might as
 well say, with equal modesty and truth,
 that *baptizing* is not in their commission
 at all. But since it is a *part* of their com-
 mission, it must be one branch of their
 power of regenerating persons unto God, ac-
 cording to *Irenæus*.—It was also observed, [r]
 “ that

[l] Not. in Barnab.

[m] Argum. from ap. trad. p. 37.

[n] De Corona milit.

[o] Pædagog. lib. 1.

[p] Lib. 3. c. 19.

[q r] Pædo-bap. p. 81.

“ that *Irenæus* mentions by name the “ *baptism of regeneration unto God.*” [s] Here the Doctor only repeats (p. 17.) Dr. *Gale*’s quibbles [t], which have been sufficiently obviated before, by observing, that we do not take baptism and regeneration to be identically the same thing; but that, according to the sense of the antients, the latter has a reference to the former, as the way and mean of regeneration. It is evidently thus, that *Irenæus* explains himself [u], when he expresses the same thing by the *laver of regeneration*, and *regeneration by the laver*. Says Dr. *Wall* [w], “ 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 “ it’s so accompanying the laver, as never “ to be without it in the sense of the antients.”—And yet this is one of the two places, to which Dr. *Gill* refers, as where “ *Irenæus* uses the word *regeneration* in a “ different sense from baptism:” he should have said, without any reference to baptism; if he would have spoke to the purpose. In the other passage [x], (where the sense is observed to be imperfect. [y]) *Irenæus* hints, “ that a man cannot leave the generation of “ death,

[s] Lib. 1. c. 18.

[u] Lib. 5. cap. 15.

[x] Lib. 4. cap. 51.

2

[t] Reflections, p. 487.

[w] Defence, 343.

[y] Vid. Grabe in loc.

“ death, but by a *new generation*.” Now, this is so far from contradicting the sense of the word, *regeneration*, for which we contend, as that it really confirms it. For, we have here *generation succeeding generation*, as *Clemens Alexandrinus* speaks, with an eye to Christians being *begotten of the womb of water* : which, as we have shewed before, signifies *baptism*. And *Tertullian* [z] calls baptism “ the blessed sacrament of water, because, the sins of our former blindness being washed away, we are delivered unto *life eternal*.” Here then we have the *new generation*, whereby a man is delivered from the *generation of death*; as mentioned by *Irenæus*. 'Tis true; he represents the thing as effected by the power of God : but still his account is consistent with the notion of *baptism*, as being referred to by him. For (to mention that once for all) the *antients* distinguished between the *instrumental* and *efficient* cause of regeneration; and so, betwixt the *material* and the *spiritual* part of baptism [a]. “ *Regeneration is by the water, and the spirit, even as all generation. For the spirit of God moved upon the face of the deep* [b]. “ And for this reason our Saviour was baptized, not that he needed baptism, but

F

“ that

[z] De baptismo.

[a] Clem. Alex. Epitom. p 802. Edit. Paris.

[b] Gen. i. 2.

“ that he might sanctify all water to the
 “ *regenerated*. Hereby we are purified not
 “ only in *body*, but in *soul*, &c.—For, *bap-*
 “ *tism* is by *water*, and by *the spirit*.” Agree-
 ably to this account, *Clemens Alexandrinus*
 represents Christians as *pure in body*, and
holy in soul, when he speaks of God’s beget-
 ting them of the womb of water: as we
 have seen before. Now, all this confirms
 the notion, that in the time of *Irenæus*, it
 did obtain among the antients, to use the
 words *regenerated*, and *regeneration*, for
baptized, and *baptism*.

But to return to the first quotation from
Irenæus, upon which the chief stress is laid
 in the present controversy. Says Dr. *Gill*,
 (who is as capable of saying very surpriz-
 ing things, as most men) [c] “ *Irenæus*—
 “ most clearly uses it (viz. the word, *regene-*
 “ *ration*) in another sense in this very pas-
 “ sage; since he says, Christ came to save
 “ all, who *by him* are born again unto God,
 “ who are regenerated by Christ, and not
 “ by baptism; and which is explained both
 “ before and after by his *sanctifying* all sorts
 “ of persons, infants, little ones, young men,
 “ and old men; which cannot be under-
 “ stood of his baptizing them, for he bap-
 “ tized none, &c.” Most admirable rea-
 soning! as if Christ might not be properly
 said to do *that*, which is done by the virtue
 and

[c] Antipædo, p. 17.

and influence of his ordinances, and appointments! [d] Thus, what is done by baptism, may be said to be done by Christ himself. As for his *sanctifying* all sorts of persons, &c. *this* also (if, as the Doctor supposes, it relates to the same thing,) corresponds with the nature, and design of baptism, as a sacred rite of *dedication*, or consecration, to the service of God; which is a proper notion of sanctifying *persons*, and *things*. Accordingly, the Apostle makes mention of Christ's *sanctifying* his church by the *washing of water*, &c. [e]. And the antient christian writers often speak of baptism by the name of *sanctification*. [f] But, it is the Doctor's misfortune to confound the antient, *ecclesiastical*, with the modern, *systematical* sense of words. — He goes on in his own way thus: “ And I “ say it again, to understand *Irenæus* as “ speaking of baptism, is to make him “ speak what is absolutely false; that Christ “ came to save *all*, and *only* such, who are “ baptized unto God, &c.” Well! and what if *Irenæus* was not more infallible in points of doctrine than the rest of his *brethren*, called *Fathers*? Here the good Doctor breaks forth into declamation, and expresses an *extraordinary* concern for the reputation

[d] Joh. iv. 1, 2.

[e] Eph. v. 26.

[f] See *Walker's Modest Plea*, ch. 28, 29.

putation of this *good old Father* [g]. But it is no breach of charity to say, it is all grimace. For, why should he be so very solicitous to advance the character of *Irenæus* so much above many other of the *good old Fathers*, who held the *necessity*, and *efficacy* of baptism to salvation as strongly, as *Irenæus* can be supposed to do upon our hypothesis? No, no; take my word for it, it is a zeal, a flaming, though disguised zeal for his own *system*, so nearly interested in the case, that has inspired him upon this occasion with such a mighty regard for the rules of *honour, justice, truth, and charity*. (tho' taken out of that *sphere of attraction*, I make no question, but the Doctor is a very worthy Gentleman). However, he seems to have taken a false alarm, from his own mistaking the sense of *Irenæus*. He says, "to understand *Irenæus* as speaking of baptism, is to make him speak what is absolutely false; that Christ came to save *all*, and *only* such, &c." Now, it happens, that the *exclusive* word, *only*, is an addition of the Doctor's; who would call this, *management*, in another. And then, as for the word, *all*, it does not strictly refer to *individuals*, but to *all sorts of persons*, (to use the Doctor's phrase, p. 17.) that is, persons of all ages, *infants, little ones, young men, and old men*; as *Irenæus* himself explains it.

it.—It was observed [b], that Christ speaks the same kind of language, that we suppose *Irenæus* to speak, so far as relates to baptism [i]. And his words plainly include this proposition, “*He, that is baptized, shall be saved.*” But this *parallel* displeases the Doctor: he calls it *mean* and *stupid*: a plain sign it pricked him: but, he should have shewed, wherein it fails; instead of which, he has only involved himself in fresh difficulties. He says of Christ’s words, “they need no qualifying sense; the meaning is plain and easy; that every baptized believer shall be saved, and leave no room to suggest, that unbaptized believers shall not.” But do not the words of Christ as much suggest this, as the words of *Irenæus*, according to the sense, we put upon them? Let the Doctor lend us his hand, to slip in the *exclusive* word, (*only*) here, as he did in the other case; and the thing is plain to be seen by every body. Besides, his assertion, that *every baptized believer shall be saved*, (which he lays down, as the *plain* and *easy* meaning of our Saviour’s words) must be understood with some *restriction*, by his own account. For, *Simon Magus* he gives up for lost. And yet was he a *baptized believer*; for the sacred history says expressly [k], that “*Si-*
“ *mon*

[b] Pædobap. p. 83.

[i] Mark. xv. 16.

[k] Acts viii. 13.

“ *mon* himself also *believed*, and was *bap-*
 “ *tized*.” Such inconsistencies will men
 fall into, when their prejudices, and pas-
 sions, get the better of their reason! Here
 one might return the Doctor some of his
 fine *rhetoric*, and say, “ what a wretched
 “ cause must the cause of *Antipædo-bap-*
 “ *tism* be, which requires such *managing*
 “ (I add such *blundering* too) as this, to
 “ maintain it?” I say, what a wretched
 cause must this be, which is attended with
 such a complication of ignorance, fraud,
 and dissimulation?

The passage cited from *Clemens Alexan-*
drinus [l], where he makes mention of an
Apostle drawing children out of the water [m],
 yet sticks in the Doctor’s teeth; he chews it,
 and criticises upon it, but can make nothing
 of it, after all, without altering the text up-
 on his own authority. “ However, (says
 “ he, p. 21.) if this instance is continued to
 “ be urged, I hope it will be allowed, that
 “ baptism in those early times (he might
 “ have added in those *warm climates*) was
 “ performed by immersion.” Thus, what
 he loses one way, he hopes to gain in an-
 other; nor ought we to grudge him so small
 an advantage after his other losses. Let us
 then compromise the matter with him, and
 allow, that Infants were not the only *sub-*
jects of baptism; provided he will grant,
 that

[l] Pædobap. p. 76.

[m] Pædagog. lib. 3. cap. 11.

that immersion was not the only *mode* of baptism, in those early times. For neither side can pretend to more from *this* particular instance. But, the Doctor seems to have forgot one thing, *viz.* that Christ made his Apostles *fishers of men* [n]; and why not of children? particularly those under their parent's command; unless, when the parents were received into the christian church, their children were to be of *another*, or of *no* church. Besides, it must not be forgot, that *Tertullian* compares baptized persons to *little fishes*; which confirms the notion that *Clemens* alludes to the *baptism* of children. This may satisfy the Doctor without his *insisting* upon any further account of the matter. But, "that he should believe, that Infant-baptism is here referred to;" this, to be sure, is more than can be expected from a man of his *temperate* brain, *cool* imagination, and *unprepossessed* mind! However, to infer from such lame premisses, as he has laid down for the two first centuries, that Infant-baptism must be an *innovation*; (p. 21.) is very extraordinary. It is amazing to think, that any man of character could *propose* such forced, and unfair constructions, as he has put upon many passages, that have occurred in the course of this debate. But, that he should lay any *stress* on them, and pretend to

[n] Mat. iv. 19.

to draw a conclusion, *such* a conclusion from them: this surpasses all wonder! On the other hand, let the impartial reader review the incontestable evidence, that has been produced, that in *Irenæus's* time, the ancients used the word *regeneration*, so as to *connote* baptism thereby; and his testimony alone is a sufficient proof of Infant-baptism in that age. Besides, the remarkable testimony that was bore to the universal, and *immemorial* practice of Infant-baptism, in the *Pelagian* controversy, when a much greater number of primitive writers were extant; is such a corroborating circumstance as furnishes us with an unanswerable argument for it's antiquity. But if, notwithstanding this, any one will conclude that *Infant-baptism* is an *innovation*; because there is *no more* said of it in this period: we may say with Dr. *Wall*[o]; " what
 " then will become of *Antipædo-baptism*,
 " which does not appear to have been prac-
 " tised 'till after the middle of the eleventh
 " century?" Proceed we now to

The third century.

" At the beginning of which *Tertullian*
 " lived;" according to the Doctor, p. 22.
 And if, as he pretends, *Tertullian* is the
 first person, that ever mentioned Infant-bap-
 2 tism;

tism; he must also be the first person, that ever *spoke against* it. Therefore, by the Doctor's confession, there is no evidence for *Antipædo-baptism* in the two first centuries. Thus, his own argument turns against him. But, it does not appear, that *Tertullian* did so speak against Infant-baptism, as *absolute-ly* to oppose it; on the contrary, he allowed of it in cases of necessity [p]. And though the Doctor would make nonsense (p. 23.) of that exceptive clause; "what necessity is there, if it be not however necessary:" the turn of expression is very agreeable to *Tertullian's* stile and manner. For, the like exception he makes about *Lay-men's* administering baptism, which he allows of only in cases of necessity [q]. He says [r], "If thou hast the right of priesthood in thyself; thou mayst have it when (or where) it is necessary." But then he also observes [s], "No necessity may be excused, which may be no necessity." Is there not as much nonsense in *this*, as in the other clause? and does it not imply the same sentiment that is *there* expressed, *viz.* that it is not necessary, except in cases of (*real*) necessity.—Besides,

G this

[p] See Pædobap. p. 73.

[q] Sufficiat scilicet in necessitatibus, ut utaris. *De baptismo.*

[r] Si habes jus sacerdotis in temet ipso, ubi necesse est habebas. *Exhort. ad Castitatem.*

[s] Nulla necessitas excusetur, quæ potest non esse necessitas. *Ibidem.*

this is the *oldest* reading we know of ; and *Rigaltius*, who first dropt it, is not always the happiest critic [t] : but sometimes altered the reading for the worse. And though the *Antipædo-baptists* catch at his *needleless* correction here, (for, I hope we shall now hear no more of the pretended *nonsense*, and *impertinence of the reading*) *Rigaltius* is deserted, and the *older* reading of *Gaignæus* is preferred, not only by *Pamelius*, but others. [u] It is a further confirmation of the *genuineness* of this reading, that *Tertullian* [w] asserts the *necessity* of baptism to salvation, from those words of Christ, *Except any one be born of water, &c.* [w]. And though he says, “ true faith is secure of salvation,” as the Doctor observes : (p. 24.) this does not destroy his other assertion : however difficult it may seem to reconcile them [x] ; nor can the difficulty reach the case of Infants, unless the Doctor will suppose them to have *true faith*.—It was observed [y], that the words of *Tertullian*, in what he says of Infant-baptism, imply, that it was actually *practised* in his time. But this the Doctor denies ; (p. 23.) and says, “ *Tertullian* “ *might* say all that he does, though as yet “ not one Infant had ever been baptized,

“ &c.”

[t] See *Wall's* Hist. P. 1. ch. 4. S. 8.

[u] Vid. De la Cerda in loc.

[w] De baptismo.

[x] See *Wall's* Hist. ibid. Sect. 7.

[y] Pædobap. p. 71.

“ &c.” Now, what a strong imagination may possibly do in this case, I cannot say. One may indeed, by the help of a lively fancy, suppose, that *Tertullian* was present upon the spot, when the first *child*, (as well as the first *Virgin*, and the first *Widow*, was converted from Paganism; for he advises the delay of baptism in all these; and, as himself says, for *equal reason* [z],) came to be baptized; and that he delivered his discourse about baptism on that occasion. This is the imaginary sense, which the Doctor paints before his reader’s eyes, by the case he supposes. But, can any man of cool thought and reflection conceive, that *Tertullian* (as mad a *Montanist* as he became afterwards) would sit him down to *write a book*, or in a book deliver a grave discourse about a *non-entity*? a thing that was not! — Besides, there is some reason to interpret his words of Infants of *Infidels*, though he makes no distinction; because, he is discoursing of new converts from heathenism. And he not only says, that the children of believers are holy, as they are *designed for holiness*; but that holiness he explains of *baptism* [a]. Now, if such children could not be admitted to baptism without previous instruction; where was their *prerogative*, *Tertullian* speaks of, above the children of Heathens? Nor is this contradicted

G 2

by

[z] Non minori de causa.

[a] De anima.

by his saying, "Men are not *born*, but "*made christians*:" [b] because baptism is a mean of *making christians*; a mean of their *regeneration*, according to *Tertullian*: and thus, they are not *born*, but *born again*, or made, Christians. So, when he says, *fiant Christiani, cum Christum nosse potuerint, &c. let them be made Christians, &c.* his meaning plainly is, *let them be baptized.*

It was observed [c], that *Tertullian* does not mention Infant-baptism among the *unwritten* customs in a book, which was wrote *after* his book of *baptism*, where we have discovered plain evidence of the *practice* of baptizing Infants. From whence it is inferred, that he looked upon Infant-baptism as a *written custom*, &c. But the Doctor's account of the matter is, (p. 24.) that "as yet no such custom had obtained, "*&c.*" agreeably enough to his own hypothesis, but contrary to fact, in our humble opinion. And perhaps his brethren will not thank him, for making the *Antipædobaptists* or Non-pædo-baptists, the authors of all those *innovations* in religion, mentioned by *Tertullian* there [d], as they must be upon the Doctor's supposition: tho' at other times [e], these consistent writers can represent Infant-baptism as the *leading* mischievous

[b] Apolog.

[c] Pædobap. p. 74.

[d] De Corona milit.

[e] D'Anvers's Treatise of Bapt. p. 211.

chievous cause of these very corruptions, and what introduced them into the Church.

Concerning *Origen*; the Doctor takes a great deal of pains, (p. 25, &c.) to prove what no-body denies, *viz*: that his works are *interpolated* in the *Latin* translations; though the charge seems to be too much exaggerated [*f*]: and what is quoted from *Ruffinus's* peroration, at the end of his translation of *Origen* on the epistle to the *Romans*, “ was not meant by him for any serious account of what he had done in that work; but for a jeer on St. *Jerome*, &c” as Dr. *Wall* observes [*g*]. So that “ the quotation from *Marshall* [*b*], is still good for something.” But the Doctor having made the most of these interpolations, (and perhaps *more*, than the matter will well bear) very gravely asks, (p. 27.) “ and now, where's his *probability*, and *moral certainty*, that there are *no* additions, and interpolations in *Origen*?” *No* additions, and interpolations! But who said so? This is gross misrepresentation. The words, here referred to, were spoken of the particular passages in question. And that they could be no interpolations of *Ruffinus's*, was proved by several arguments [*i*]. (1.) “ *Ruffinus* could have no temptation, or occasion,

[*f*] See *Wall's* Defence, p. 374.

[*g*] *Ibid.* p. 379.

[*b*] *Pædobap.* p. 62.

[*i*] *Pædobap.* p. 64, 65.

“ on, to *coin* any passages for him to that
 “ purpose, since it was never made any part
 “ of *Origen's* accusations, that he was a-
 “ gainst Infant-baptism.” [k] (2.) It is ab-
 surd to suppose, and ridiculous to suggest,
 that *Ruffinus* would *coin* any such passages
 for *Origen*, as imported that *original sin* was
 the ground and reason of Infant-baptism, di-
 rectly contrary to his own private opinion ;
 as *Ruffinus* was inclined to the *Pelagians*, ac-
 cording to the doctor's quotation from *Vos-*
sius [l]. If then it was not *unlucky* for his
 hypothesis, that he started such a notion in
 his reader's way ; he must be one of the
luckiest men alive. But, says he, “ it is
 “ *lucky* on my side, that *Vossius* a *Pædobap-*
 “ *tist* should suggest, that this passage is in-
 “ terpolated, &c.” Now here, I suspect,
 the Doctor's good fortune fails him : for,
Vossius seems not to suggest any such thing.
 The words, referred to (as I suppose) are
 these [m] ; (speaking of Original Sin as the
 ground of Infant-baptism) “ *Origen* truly
 “ has mentioned it, in his eighth Homily
 “ on *Leviticus*, and he, whose authority
 “ should be of greater weight in *this part*,
 “ because of *Origen's* books being interpo-
 “ lated by *Ruffinus*.” Now, if *Vossius* sup-
 posed,

[k] See *Marshall's* Cyprian, P. 1. p. 120. Notes.

[l] *Hist Pelag.* lib. 2. P. 1. Thel. 5.

[m] *Meminere sane ejus Origines Homil 8. in Levit. et is, cujus, ob interpolatos a Rufino Origenis libros, major etiam hac parte esse debet autoritas, p. 155. 4to.*

posed, that the passage itself was an interpolation; how could he refer to it as *Origen's*? But it is not worth one's while to contend about this point; as the private opinion of a particular person is of little consequence either way. (3.) *Jerome* and *Rufinus*, though at great difference among themselves, perfectly agreed in giving the same sense of *Origen* upon the point, in their *Latin* translations. The Doctor says, (p. 26.) “ the passage in *Jerome's* translation of *Origen's* homilies on *Luke*, speaks indeed of “ the baptism of Infants, and the necessity “ of it, (he should have added, *for cleansing “ from original sin*) but not a word of it's “ being a custom of the church, and an “ apostolical tradition.”—However, it speaks of Infant-baptism as the *practice* of the church; and founds it upon the words of Christ, *Except any one be born of water, &c.* which is, in effect, the same as making it an apostolical tradition, or institution. Therefore, *these parts* of the *Latin* translations of *Origen* may well pass for *genuine*, and consequently be *admitted an evidence in any court*, fit to try *such* a cause, and where questions of *fact* are determined by such *moral* proof, as the nature of the case admits. But, if the Doctor is for proceeding by the *civil forms* of judicature in deciding the point of Infant-baptism; this rule will do him little service upon the whole; when

it shall be remembered, that parents can *contract* for their children in *civil affairs*. — *Cyprian*, a cotemporary of *Origen*, speaks the same language with these *Latin* translations of his books, so as to suggest, that Original Sin is a *ground* of Infant-baptism; and if he does not expressly say, that it was a *custom of the church*, or an *apostolical tradition*, the nature of his discourse *implies*, and supposes it [n]. Nor had he any occasion to *refer* to *Origen*, as *saying these things*; because they were no matter of debate in his time; a plain sign that *Origen*, as his sense is given by his *Latin* translators, speaks the common sentiments of that age. As little necessity was there for *Austin*, if “he made a bluster about Infant baptism being “an *apostolical tradition*,” (though it was not the thing itself, but the *reason* of it, that came into question [o]) to *appeal* to *Origen’s testimony* of it; and for the same reason also. But, how does the Doctor’s *insinuation*, (p. 28.) that there was no such testimony in *Austin’s* time, agree with his former suggestion [p], that *Austin* might take up his notion (*viz.* “that Infant-baptism was an antient and constant usage of “the church, and an apostolical tradition) “from the *Latin* translations of *Origen* by “*Jerome* and *Ruffinus*?”

2

Dr.

[n] See *Pædobap.* p. 63.[o] *Argum. from Ap. trad.* p. 20.[p] *Ibid.* p. 26!

Dr. Gill having said [g], (speaking of the Greek of Origen) “ that many things may “ be observed from thence in favour of “ adult-baptism :” somebody had the courage to tell him [r], the assertion was either *false*, or *impertinent*: the latter, if it was not meant *exclusively* of Infant-baptism; and the former, if this *was* the Doctor’s meaning; and he was challenged to make good his assertion. This was a bold stroke; and if it was a little *smart* upon the Doctor, he should make some allowance to the author, as a *junior*, (such as the Doctor takes him to be, p. 15.) considering the *manners* of *youth* [s]: especially as it becomes them to imitate their *seniors*; and the Doctor (who by *his way of speaking* seems to have an indisputable claim to that character) must know, who is the person, that first *beckoned most manfully* upon this occasion, by giving out words of *defiance* [t]. But, the good Doctor is highly affronted, (though, as *Plato* says [u], *No man should be offended at the truth*) and, as *revenge* is sweet, he gratifies his spleen in so mean a manner, as himself thought stood in need of an apology. (p. 23.) He knows well enough, so much has been said in this argument on

H

both

[g] Ibid. p. 17.

[r] Pædobap. p. 66.

[s] Φιλοτιμοὶ μὲν εἰσι, μᾶλλον δὲ φιλόνοιοι. Arist. Rh. lib. 2. cap. 12.

[t] See Pædobap. p. 49.

[u] Τῷ γὰρ ἀληθεῖ χαλεπαίνειν οὐ θέμις. Plato de Rep. lib. 5.

both sides the question, that no one, senior or junior, can now write upon the subject with any propriety, without recurring to many *testimonies*, already alledged by Dr. Wall, and others. But, if by *taking quotations at second hand*, (which he imputes to the writer, he is opposing, and *abusing*) the Doctor means, *taking them upon trust* altogether, without having recourse to the *original authors*; I can assure him upon very good grounds, that he unhappily trespasses at once upon the laws of *candour* and *truth*. Besides, what is all this to the purpose of the argument; if the passages produced from the *antients* are truly and properly alledged? But to be sure, the Doctor cannot be *impertinent*! However, he cannot but be *conscious to himself* of one thing, *viz.* that he has repeated many things, that were said before by Dr. Gale, and others. What then? shall we suppose, or *insinuate*, that he has not examined with his own eyes both *Greek* originals, and *Latin* translations? By no means; on the contrary, we will allow that he has read them all; and from hence he will permit us to conclude, that he has picked, and culled out the strongest *passages*, he thought to his purpose. Now, if upon enquiry, these very passages shall prove *nothing* to his purpose; how simple must the grave Doctor look, after all these big words. (p. 28.) “ to stop the mouth of this *swag-gering*

“gering blade, whoever he is, I’ll give him
 “an instance or two out of the *Greek* of
 “*Origen*, in favour of adult-baptism, to the
 “exclusion of Infant-baptism, and as mani-
 “festly against it.”—This is doing some-
 thing: and if the Doctor is as good as his
 word; he will be the bravest man that ever
 appeared upon the stage of this controversy.
 But, though he says it with champion-like
 assurance; it will prove a mere flourish
 after all. He did well “not to insist upon
 “*Origen’s* interpretation of *Mat. xix. 14.*
 “as not of Infants literally, but metapho-
 “rically.” For, he must have read *Origen*
 to very little purpose, if he does not know,
 that in his *allegorizing* way *Origen* put a
double sense upon the scripture; and so, by
 the *allegorical*, he did not destroy the *li-*
teral sense. Therefore his *metaphorical* sense
 of that text does not *destroy* the argument
 of the *Pædo-baptists* from thence, (as is pre-
 tended) because it does not destroy the *li-*
teral sense, upon which their argument is
 founded (w). Besides, it were easy to make
reprisals upon the Doctor, by reminding
 him, that the author, on whom he would
 lay so much stress, *viz. Tertullian*, under-
 stands *St. Paul’s* words, (*1 Cor. vii. 14.*)
else were your children unclean, but now are
they holy: in a different sense from what the

[w] See *Divine Oracles*, p. 60. and 80.

Antipædo-baptists put upon it [x]. — The Doctor proceeds thus: “ It is to be observed, “ says *Origen*, that the four Evangelists “ saying, that *John* confessed he came to “ baptize in (it might be read, as usual, “ *with*) water, only *Mathew* adds, *unto re- “ pentance*; teaching that he has the *profit “ of baptism*, who is *baptized of his own “ will and choice.*” [y] Now here, it is acknowledged, we have a description of *adult-baptism*, and an account of the proper qualifications for it: but not a single word *exclusive* of *Infant-baptism*, or *manifestly against it* (which is the point the Doctor had to prove). For, in like terms the Apostle *teaches us* [z], who has the *profit of circumcision*; and will the Doctor pretend that the profit of circumcision is so *tied* thereby to the adult, as to exclude *Infant-circumcision*? But he goes on, (p. 29.) “ and “ a little after he says, “ the laver by the “ water is a symbol of the purification of “ the soul, washed from all the filth of wickedness; nevertheless, also of itself it is “ the beginning and fountain of divine gifts, “ because of the power of the invocation “ of the adorable Trinity, *to him that gives “ up himself to God;*” which last clause excludes *Infants, &c.*”—Does it so indeed! but

[x] See *Pædobap.* p. 72.

[y] *Orig. Comment.* in *Joan.* p. 124. Edit. Amst.

[z] *Rom.* ii. 25.

but how? just as the other passage excluded Infants; when neither *there*, nor *here*, is the least syllable, nor so much as the little word, *only*, to exclude them, without some of the Doctor's legerdemain to slip it in here also, as he did upon a former occasion.

If the honest reader is not yet convinced how much Dr. *Gill* has trifled with him, in putting him off with such passages as these, after such large promises; let him attend to the following observations already made by Dr. *Wall* [a]. “ It is usual with the Anti-
 “ pædo-baptist 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 Fa-
 “ thers, 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 the baptism of Infants impracti-
 “ cable, because they do in those general sen-
 “ tences speak of *faith*, and *repentance*, as re-
 “ quisite to baptism. Now, all such arguings
 “ are shewed to be inconclusive by this one
 “ observation, *viz.* That those Fathers, who
 “ were uncontestedly *Pædo-baptists*, and in
 “ whose time the *practice* is notoriously
 “ known,

[a] Defence, p. 399. &c.

“ known, do, when they speak of baptism
 “ in general, speak in the *same language*,
 “ and *insist upon the same qualifications*.”—
 “ St. *Cyprian*, who lived in the 150th year
 “ after the Apostles, is now well known to
 “ the Antipædo-baptists, as one maintaining
 “ the doctrine of Pædo-baptism; and yet
 “ he, when he is discoursing of baptism in
 “ general, has sentences concerning the ne-
 “ cessity of *faith, repentance, &c.* to bap-
 “ tism, as positive as can be found in any
 “ father whatsoever. As for example, *E-*
 “ *pist.* 75. *Ed. Oxon.*

“ Qui cum Noem. &c. They, who were
 “ with *Noah* in the ark, obtained no pur-
 “ gation or cleansing by the water, but even
 “ perished by that flood. So also, *whoever*
 “ they are, that are not with Christ in the
 “ church, will perish as men out of it; un-
 “ less they come with *repentance* to that
 “ only salutary sacrament of the church, &c.

“ *Gregory Nyssen* lived in those times and
 “ places, when and where the Antipædo-
 “ baptists themselves now do not deny,
 “ that Infant-baptism was in use, *viz.* more
 “ than an hundred years after St. *Cyprian*.
 “ He mentions faith and prayer among the
 “ things, that compleat the sacrament of
 “ baptism. *Orat. Catechet. c. 33.*

“ *Ευχὴ πρὸς τὸν Θεόν, &c. i. e. Prayer to*
 “ *God, and the imploring of the heavenly*
 “ *grace, and the water, and faith, are the*
 “ *things,*

“ things, that make up the sacrament of re-
 “ generation. St. Cyril, St. Chryſoſtom, St.
 “ Auſtin himſelf, when they ſpeak of bap-
 “ tiſm in general, uſe ſayings like 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 qua-
 “ lifications ; but that they were by bap-
 “ tiſm dedicated to that religion, which
 “ would teach them, and which did require
 “ of them, theſe things, as they grew up,
 “ &c.” [a].

Where now are the *inſtances*, which Dr.
 Gill promiſed from the *Greek of Origen*,
 in favour of adult-baptiſm, to the *excluſion*
 of Infant-baptiſm &c.? Or, what has he
 yet done, to *ſtop the mouth* of the ſwagger-
 ing blade, (as he called his antagoniſt) and
 to take down his mettle? Here a fair op-
 portunity offers, to rally the Doctor up-
 on his ſuperior acquaintance with originals,
 and tranſlations. But, as he ſeems to think
 himſelf too roughly handled already, it
 ſhall ſuffice for the preſent to mention Dr.
 Wall's answer to Dr. Gale upon a like occa-
 ſion [b]. “ 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 *indexes* ; or elſe does not un-
 “ derſtand

[a] Defence, p. 399. &c.

[b] Ibid. p. 335.

“ *derstand* them; or else against his con-
 “ science faces out a sense *contrary* to *what*
 “ *he sees* in them.”—But I must advertise
 the reader of a certain fallacy, which lies in
 this phrase, the *Greek* of *Origen*, and in ap-
 pealing to it in opposition to the *Latin* trans-
 lations of his works. If we had now those
Comments of *Origen* in *Greek*; the *Latin*
 translations whereof, by *Jerome* and *Ruffinus*,
 are alledged in favour of Infant-baptism;
 (*viz.* on *Leviticus*, *Luke*, and the *Romans*)
 and found, that the passages, cited from the
 latter, were not in the former; this would
 be a strong proof of their being *interpolations*.
 But this is not the case! Therefore, the
 Doctor’s way of arguing *from* the *Greek* of
Origen, against the said *Latin* translations,
 proceeds upon *this* principle, that if *Origen*
 did not make mention of Infant-baptism as
 an apostolical tradition, *e. g.* in his Com-
 ments on *Mathew* and *John*; he could not
 mention it in his Comments on *Leviticus*,
Luke, and the *Romans*. A plain inconse-
 quence! as if *Origen* must always say the
 same things in every Comment, or book,
 he wrote. However, Dr. *Wall* has refer-
 red [c], to some passages in the *Greek* of
Origen, very agreeable to what is cited from
 the *Latin* translations; and though the bap-
 tism of Infants is not there particularly and
 expressly mentioned, there seems to be a re-
 ference

I

[c] Ibid. Appendix, p. 11.—13.

ference to it, as a thing *necessary* for them; if *Origen* supposed they had an equal concern with others in *Original Sin*; and a *resurrection*; for, he represents *baptism*, as standing in connexion with these things. I shall only add one thing more, *viz.* that in some of the *Latin* translations of *Origen*, there are as strong descriptions of adult-baptism, as those produced by Dr. *Gill* from the *Greek* of *Origen* [d]. From whence it appears, that his *translators* did not consider such passages as *exclusive* of Infant-baptism; since they also mention the latter as an apostolical institution. Therefore, for any thing the Doctor has said to prove the contrary, “ we have the clear testimony of “ the great *Origen* for Infant-baptism, as “ practised in his time, and that too under “ the notion of an *apostolical tradition*.”

“ Of *Cyprian* the Doctor says, (p. 29.) “ that he is the first pleader for it (i. e. *Infant-baptism*) that we know of.” But he widely mistakes, or grossly represents the case. For, *Cyprian* was no pleader for Infant-baptism, *as such*; nor had he any occasion to plead for it; because no body had any doubt about it, and much less opposed it: the only question in debate being, (occasioned by the doubt of *Fidus*, an *African* bishop) Whether Infants should be baptized before the eighth day, according to the time

I
of

[d] Vid. *Origen*. Homil 8. in *Exod.* Homil 21. in *Luc.*

of circumcision [e]. As for the Doctor's pretence, (p. 30.) " that though Infant-baptism now *began* to be practised, it appears " to be a novel-business (*and novel-business* " *it questionless was, if it then began to be* " *practised*) from the time of it's administration being undetermined:" the weakness of this argument was so fully exposed; that he is in danger to expose himself by repeating it [f]. The Doctor further urges, that " the exceeding weakness of the arguments " then made use of for baptizing new-born " Infants, of which the present *Pædo-baptists* must be ashamed, shew that *Pædo-baptism* was then in it's *infant state*." By this sort of reasoning one would be lead to suspect that those, who use it, are not far from their *second infancy*. Why are not the *Antipædo-baptists* ashamed, to confound two such *different*, and *distinct* questions, as, Whether *new-born* infants were to be baptized? and, Whether Infants should be baptized *at all*? If *Cyprian* argued weakly for the *former*; in the name of good sense, what has this to do with the *latter*? Therefore, the long citation from *Cyprian*, (p. 30.—32.) is mere parade, and nothing to the purpose, but only as it served to introduce a most curious remark of the Doctor's, *viz.* " Every one that compares what *Cyprian* " and his colleagues say for Infant-baptism, (here

[e] Pædobap. p. 57.

[f] See Pædobap. *ibid.*

(here he falls again into an *ignoratio elenchi*; he should have said, for baptizing Infants at any time under eight days old) “ and “ what *Tertullian* said against it as before “ related, will easily see a difference between “ them, between *Tertullian*, the *Antipæ-* “ *do-baptist*, and *Cyprian*, the *Pædo-baptist*; “ how manly and nervous the one! how “ mean, and weak the other!”—A very good jest! When *Cyprian* neither argued *for*, nor *Tertullian* argued *against* Infant-baptism, *absolutely*, and as such! Here I cannot but congratulate the Doctor upon the felicity of his *genius*, and the dexterity of his address. Infant-baptism, according to him, must be a novelty in *Cyprian*’s time, because he is the *first pleader for it*, that we know of! And it must be a novelty, or *non-entity*, in *Tertullian*’s time, because he is the first, that was ever known to speak *against* it! However, the Doctor doth not deny, (p. 24.) that this *strong* and *nervous* reasoner “ might have some odd notions, “ and singular opinions; about which he “ talked wrong, and weakly:” and it is pretty plain, that he had some odd, and superstitious notions of *baptism* itself.—The Doctor owns at last, “ that *no doubt* was raised “ about Infant-baptism at this time:” which utterly spoils all, he had said before, of *Cyprian*’s pleading for it. And this is a clear evidence, that the practice of baptizing Infants

was, at least, a thing of some standing in the church, and so did not then first *begin*, as is pretended. But this, says the Doctor, “ does not prove it then to be an *antient* “ custom; since the same observation, which “ may be made, would prove *Infant-com-* “ *munion* to be equally the same.”—Well: supposing *that*; what follows from it? (though, perhaps, there may not be the same ground, to make the observation of Infant-communion, if nothing relating to it was not upon the carpet) The higher it can be traced; so much the more it makes for the *antiquity* of Infant-baptism; none being admitted to that ordinance, but those that were baptized; as we learn from *Justin Martyr* [g]: (who says not, however, that *all*, who were baptized, had admittance to it). The *incidental* way of mentioning a particular instance of Infant-communion, in *Cyprian* [b], is an argument that it was not the *first* of the kind. And if Infant-communion itself was at that time a thing of some standing; *Infant-baptism* could not then be a novelty: as it must be the older of the two.

The fourth Century.

Here the Doctor makes the Pædo-baptists *welcome* to the greatest lights of the church

[g] Apol. 2.

[b] Cyprian, De Lapfis.

church in this century, as vouchers for Infant-baptism; (he should have added, as practised not only in *their time*, but under the notion of an *apostolical tradition* [i]) for, says he, (p. 33.) “they have need of them “to enlighten them in this dark affair, &c.” Now, this is a mere flash of fancy, where we have a little wit, but no argument. Besides; he was told [k], (and he does not now gainsay it) that “he has in effect given “us all the rest: for, he has not been able, “to produce one single author in this period on the other side of the question.” What a *dark affair* then must that be, which has no light at all on it’s side? *but clouds instead, and ever during dark.* In relation to the testimony of *Pelagius*, that he never heard of any Christian whatsoever, that denied Infant-baptism [l]: nothing further needs be said upon that head, since *about this* the Doctor *will not contend*; which is fairly giving up the point. But he would impute it to the ignorance of *Pelagius*, without any shadow of proof; nor has the Doctor proved himself a more knowing man, by producing any such instances; which it was his business to have done; and not content himself with calling *Pelagius* an *arch heretic*; as if giving him a nick-name were sufficient to destroy the weight of his testimony:

[i] See Pædobap. p. 53.

[k] Ibid.

[l] Ibid. p. 24, &c.

mony: an artifice unworthy of a dignified *Protestant* Divine. Says Dr. *Wall* [*m*], “if
 “ there had ever been any *church* in any
 “ time, or any part of the world, that de-
 “ nied Infant-baptism; he (i. e. *Pelagius*)
 “ must have heard of them. For he was a
 “ learned man; and had lived in the most
 “ noted churches of *Europe, Asia, and A-*
 “ *frica, &c.*”—What a wild imagination then
 must it be, to suppose, that Infant-baptism
 was an invention of the third century!—
 The Doctor does what he can, (p. 34, &c.)
 to support the reasons he had alledged [*n*],
 to prove, that *Austin* must have heard of
 some that *denied* Infant-baptism. But, how
 poorly he acquits himself upon this head,
 any judicious reader will easily perceive, by
 comparing the critical examination of those
 reasons [*o*], with his lame defence of them.
 Therefore, to avoid prolixity, we shall
 only make here a few cursory remarks.
 (1.) *Tertullian* did not *contradict* or op-
 pose Infant-baptism in the same *sense*, as
 Dr. *Gill* and his friends oppose it: so that
 there is no arguing from the one case, to the
 other. And whatever Dr. *Wall* thought;
 the author, Dr. *Gill* had to do with, did
 not subscribe to his opinion, *viz.* that nei-
 ther *Austin*, nor *Pelagius*, had seen *Tertul-*
lian's

[*m*] Defence, p. 395.[*n*] Argum. from Ap. trad. p. 24, 25.[*o*] Pædobap. p. 27.—38.

lian's book of baptism [p]. And indeed, they might both have seen it, and yet have said what they did: the *latter*, that he had never heard of any Christian that denied Infant-baptism; for *Tertullian* did not *absolutely* deny it; and the *former*, that Infant-baptism was *always* administered in the church, for *original sin*: for *Tertullian's* phrase, *innocens ætas*, as Dr. Gill himself understands it, (p. 22.) imports no more than the *comparatively* innocent age of infants. (2.) In respect to the controverted *canon*, made in the council of *Carthage*; the Doctor had here another convincing proof, that his antagonist was not a mere copier of Dr. *Wall*; but, following the direction of *Photius*, pointed out a different sense of the said canon. And, after all his shuffling, he cannot obscure, much less expunge, this self-evident truth, that the canon relates not to infants at *large*, but to *new-born* Infants alone. Therefore, he attempts to put a *fallacy* upon his readers, by slipping into his *conclusion* another *term*, and saying, that *Austin* must know of some persons that denied baptism to *babes*. This is pure equivocation. For, if *Austin* knew of some, that denied baptism to *new born* Infants, does it therefore follow, that he knew of any, that denied baptism to babes *indefinitely*? that is, denied *Infant baptism*; which

is

is the point the Doctor was to prove. (3.) It was only for *argument's* sake, that his author *supposed*, that the persons, who asked the question, about the *reason* of baptizing Infants (because many of them *die young*, &c.) were *Christians*: and it was the Doctor's business to have *proved* them to be Christians, in order to make the instance *pertinent* to his purpose. But even *this* would not answer his end; for, after all, these persons might be as *good friends* to *Infant-baptism*, as those were good friends to *Infant-propagation*, who asked the other question, mentioned by St. *Austin* in the same place, for their own information, concerning the *reason* of those Infants being *born*, that *die young*. (4.) The Doctor is here put to his *guesses*, and he guesses wrong. For, his supposition of the *Pelagians* saying, "that the infants of believers unbaptized enter the kingdom," is a flat contradiction to what St. *Austin* says of the *Pelagians* in the very passage referred to [9]. But the Doctor is loth to own himself in an error; however, if he is mistaken, he is not *ashamed* of it, because it is in good company; a pretty excuse for being *lead astray*. (5.) Sparing, as he is, of his concessions, he is forced to acknowledge, that the words quoted by him out of *Jerome*, are spoken by way of *supposition*. "But then (says he) they suppose a
" case

[9] See Padobap. p. 23, 24.

“ case that *had been*, &c.” Well ; but how does that *appear* ? not merely from *Jerome’s* supposing it : and the Doctor offers no other proof of this contested fact, but a *critic* upon the word *noluerint* ; which, after all, may import no more than a *wilfull* omission in *refusing* to get their children baptized in due time ; without implying that they *denied* infant-baptism. But, let the meaning be as the Doctor would have it ; yet still, as mentioned by *Jerome*, it is not a matter of *fact*, but a bare supposition. Nevertheless, the Doctor settles his countenance, and gravely says, (p. 38.) “ from *all* these *instances* put together, we cannot but conclude, that there were some persons, that did oppose, and *reject* infant-baptism in those times !” But, if any *one* of his pretended instances proves any such thing, I am much mistaken. The appeal lies before the learned world [*r*], and let them judge. — As to what he subjoins from Mr. *Marshall*, concerning some in those times that *questioned* it ; Mr. *Marshall* does not say, that there were any in those times that *denied* and refused it ; for, he tells us, [*s*] “ that the *first*, that ever made *head* against it, or a *division* in the church about it, lived in a much later age.” Nor do the words of St. *Austin* referred to, imply, that any persons in his time *denied Infant-*
K
bap-

[*r*] *Ibid.* p. 39.[*s*] Sermon on Inf. bap. p. 5.

baptism, or so much as *doubted* of it, but the contrary: for he says, that *even those, who contradicted it in some sort, did not doubt of it.* 'Tis true, in that discourse [t], he sets up a *fictitious* person to argue with the *Pelagians* in their own way; and then asks them, how they would answer such a Disputant, but from the *Scripture*: and so he exhorts *them* also to submit to Scripture authority, and not trust to their own *subtile reasonings* upon the point in question. But therefore his saying, “*Let no one doubt, whether Infants are to be baptized, &c.*” does not imply, that any one did *really doubt* of it; this was only a wise precaution, which *Austin* thought proper to use in a popular discourse *concerning baptism of Infants against the Pelagians*; in order to avoid the raising of unnecessary scruples in the minds of the people, and to prevent their *suspecting* that any body did doubt of it. This is the plain and obvious sense of his words; nor can we put any other construction upon them, without making *Austin contradict* himself in the same breath.

“*Austin*, we allow, (says the Doctor) frequently speaks of infant-baptism as an antient usage of the church, and as an apostolical tradition.” Why did he not add here, (what he urged upon a former occasion

[t] De Verb. ap. Serm. 14. Nescio quis, &c.

caſion [u]) *for original ſin?*—To the Doctor's queſtion then, “ What proof does he “ give of it ?” I anſwer ; he appeals to the authority and practice of the univerſal church in all paſt ages. But, he had no occaſion to *produce teſtimonies* for Infant-baptiſm itſelf : becauſe no one ever denied it ; no, not the *Pelagians* themſelves, with whom he was deeply engaged, not about the *ſubjects*, but the *end* of baptiſm, by the Doctor's own confeſſion [w]. The Doctor aſks again, (p. 39.) “ Does he produce “ any higher teſtimony than *Cyprian* ?” I anſwer ; for what ? For infant-baptiſm itſelf, he does not produce the teſtimony of *Cyprian* at all ; having no occaſion to do it, as was hinted before : but for the *reaſon* of it. So that all, which the Doctor can conclude from hence, is *this*, that the doctrine of *original ſin* was a novelty in *Cyprian's* time : and if this doctrine gave riſe to *Infant-baptiſm* in *Cyprian's* time, as the Doctor ſuggeſts, (though we have deplumed him of his *infallibility*) why was not the *one* as much a *novelty* as the *other* ? But, he all along confounds two *different* and diſtinct queſtions : for, it is one thing to argue *for Infant-baptiſm from original ſin* ; which is the caſe, which the Doctor here ſuppoſes, contrary to *fact* ; and another thing to ar-

[u] Argum. from Ap. trad. &c. p. 26.

[w] Ibid. p. 20.

gue for original sin from Infant-baptism: which was really the state of the question between St. *Austin*, and his opponents. Thus Infant-baptism was a common *data*, a thing agreed on by both sides.—The same observation may be made of *Cyprian* and his colleagues: and therefore he had no occasion to *urge* it, as an *apostolical tradition*: however, what he says about it, *implies* so much; as has been remarked before.—In short: *Austin* appeals to *Cyprian*, and St. *Paul*, *Rom. v. 18.* for *one*, and the same thing, *viz. original sin*, as the *reason* of Infant-baptism: for, as he understands that text of original sin, so he refers to it as exhibiting the *ground* and *reason* of Infant-baptism; for, according to him, it is by *baptism*, that Infants are made partakers of the *grace of Christ* [x]. But, observe! neither was Infant-baptism, the *thing itself*, nor original sin, as the *reason* of it, any matter of doubt, or debate in *Cyprian's* time. *This* is the very thing, that St. *Austin* hinges upon; and from hence he draws his observation, “That blessed *Cyprian* did “not make any *new* decree; but only pre- “served the *established* faith of the church:” [y] that is, with respect to the *reason* of baptizing Infants, which *supposes* the thing itself.

[x] Ep. ad Hieronym. Ep. 28. De Verb. Apost. Serm. 14.

[y] See *Pædobap* p. 42. Nam de origine peccati nulla erat quæstio; et ideo, ex ea re, unde nulla erat quæstio, &c. *Augustin* *ibid.*

itself.—Our worthy Doctor seems not to be aware, that his way of arguing will conclude too far; unless he is turned as arch a heretic as *Pelagius*. For, if the main design of *St. Austin* is to support the doctrine of original sin by the *established faith of the church*; and yet “he produces *higher testimony than Cyprian* :” let the Doctor look to the consequence, if there is any force in his way of reasoning upon the head of *appeals*. And here the difficulty, he starts about *Austin’s* not appealing to *Origen*, and the argument he would draw from *this* circumstance, to prove that *Origen* must have been *unfairly dealt with*, — returns home upon himself. For, if any one should argue, that, because *Austin* never appeals to *Origen*, nor to any other antient writer before *Cyprian* in proof of *original sin*; therefore those writers *must have been unfairly dealt with*, and the passages *interpolated*, where they speak of original sin: What answer would the Doctor shape to this argument? Perhaps he would think it sufficient to say, *Cyprian’s* authority alone, at the head of a whole council of bishops, was of weight enough, to decide a question of this nature, without any other testimonies. And as for *Origen*, he lay under some reproach for his heterodox opinions, on which account he is censured by *St. Austin* himself [x]: and there-

[x] De Civitate Dei. lib. 2. cap. 23. lib. 21. cap. 17. &c.

therefore this good bishop of *Hippo* might judge it improper to appeal to his *obnoxious* books for any thing at all. Now, the same answer will serve our turn; without further animadverting upon the Doctor's *inconsistency*, in *formerly* supposing, that *Austin* might take up his notion that Infant-baptism was an apostolical tradition, from the *Latin* translations of *Jerome* and *Ruffinus*; and *now* suggesting, that the passages in *Origen* relating to this point are *interpolated* since the time of *St. Austin*. Thus the Doctor founders himself, and his argument at once.

The pretence, “that there is equally as *full*, and as *early* evidence of apostolic “tradition for *Infant-communion*, &c.” was shewn to be without foundation [a]: a little further wants to be said upon that point, as the Doctor has yet *stated* the *case*; and it was only to the state of the case, as he had put it, that the reply was made.

(1.) As to *infant-communion*: “it was, “(as the Doctor says p. 40.) in use beyond “all contradiction,” in *Cyprian's* time; but such clear evidence has been produced, that Infant-baptism was practised *before Cyprian's* time, as that none can reject it, but those, who have a peculiar faculty of denying things *plain* and *visible*.—If *St. Austin* argues for *Infant-communion* from the *Scripture*, as the rule and standard of the *Christian*,

[a] Pædobap. p. 47.—53.

tian, and *catholick* faith ; he does not testify of it, as he does of infant-baptism, that it was the *antient* and *universal* practice of the Christian church. Whether the *Punici Christiani* be the christians of *Carthage*, or of *Africa* ; *Austin* says not (as he was represented by the Doctor) that *they took* it to be an antient apostolic tradition : nor does he *positively* say, that Infant-communion (if that was the thing intended, and not the particular *mode* of *speech* used concerning the *Eucharist*) was such a tradition ; but only *supposed* it ; which, as every one must perceive, is a more *cautious* and reserved way of speaking, than he uses, when he speaks of infant-baptism under that notion [b].

(2.) The *other particulars* were taken notice of in the gross, as mentioned by St. *Basil*, under the notion of *unwritten* traditions. But it was observed [c], that Infant-baptism is not ranked in that number ; and consequently, the antients looked upon it as having a better foundation in the *Scripture*, than any of those other *Rites*. Now here the Doctor rejoyns, (p. 41.) “ neither
“ are infant-communion, sponsors at bap-
“ tism, exorcism in it, and giving milk and
“ honey at that time, mentioned by *Basil*
“ among them, &c.”—To which the reply is, (1.) As to *Infant-communion*, the objecti-
on

[b] Pædobap. p. 47.—49.

[c] Ibid. p. 51.

on was allowed, and considered [d]. (2.) *Sponsors at baptism*, in one shape or other, being a natural *circumstance* of Infant-baptism, are presumed to be an apostolical appointment, conformably to the practice of the Jewish church in the like case [e]. These sponsors, among other things, gave names to children [f]; a custom transferred from the Jewish to the Christian church.

(3.) Forms of *exorcism* are as antient as the Apostles time; but *exorcism* in *baptism* is not called an *apostolic tradition*, nor an *unwritten* tradition by *Austin*, to whom the Doctor refers [g]. He speaks of it indeed, as an *antient tradition*; and might properly enough appeal to it for the *general sense* of the church; but he does not urge it as of *apostolical authority*; so far as yet appears. The same remark may be made on the passages cited from the other antient writers, mentioned by the Doctor. (4.) If *Basil* does not, yet (which is the same thing in this argument) *Tertullian* does mention the
giving

[d] Pædobap. p. 52.

[e] — Minorum vero nomine idem ipsum profitebatur præfectura ipsa, uti in Christianismo *susceptores* minorennium, seu parvulorum, &c. *Selden de Synedriis, &c. lib. 1. cap. 3.*

[f] Luk. i. 59. &c. ii. 21. a like custom obtained among the antient *Persians*, of giving names to their children at baptism. Hyde *Relig. Vet. Pers.* cap. 28. Other nations also made a ceremony of imposing names. Vid. *Aristoph. Aves. Polyæn. Stratagem. lib. 6. cap. 1. S. 6. Lucian. Contemplantes, &c.*

[g] Argument from *Apost. trad. f. 32.*

giving *milk and boney* to the baptized persons among the *unwritten* customs and traditions [b].

(3.) It was observed [i], that, “ it does not appear, that the *unwritten* traditions were ever put to the same *test* of their Apostolical authority, as Infant-baptism was, and stood the trial as it did.” By which was obviously meant, it’s obtaining the *strongest* and most *express testimony* of it’s *immemorial*, and universal use in the Christian church, even from those very persons, that were urged with an argument from it. Therefore, there is little force in the observation, that the *Pelagians* were also pressed with an argument from the *exorcisms*, and *exsufflations* used in baptism. For, as these are not called *apostolical traditions*, (which was not noted before) so there is no evidence produced, that the *Pelagians* bore the same *testimony* in favour of them, as they did of Infant-baptism. What the Doctor says there about any particular rite, standing the test of all ages, in respect of *continued use*, is not to the purpose; unless it were attended with a declaration of it’s *apostolic authority*; which is not the case.

“ Upon the whole then it is clear, there is no *express mention* of *Antipædo-baptism* in the *two first* centuries, no nor any *plain hint* of it, nor any *manifest reference* to

L

“ it;

[b] De Corona M litis.

[i] Pædcbap. p. 14.

“ it ; and that there is no evidence of it’s
 “ being *praētised* in the *third*, or in the
 “ *fourth* century, &c.” On the other side,
 we have traced up the acknowledged *grounds*
 of *Pædo-baptism* to the times of the Apostles.
 In the next age we read of Infants (con-
 structively) *made disciples* to Christ, and *re-*
generated, that is by baptism. In the *third*
 century that Infant-baptism was *praētised*,
 and *prevailed* in the *fourth*, is confessed by
 it’s greatest opposers. *And so rests the state*
of the controversy.

The Public will now judge, what ground
 Dr. *Gill* had for his candid insinuation, (p. 3.)
 that the *nameless* author, or *anonymous* writer,
 with whom he is engaged, was ashamed of
 his *cause*, or *Name*, because he appeared un-
 der that character; as some Writers on his
 own side have had the modesty, or pru-
 dence to do, without blame or censure.
 And perhaps it may occasion some specula-
 tion, that the Doctor *likewise* was not an
 anonymous Writer upon this subject, either
 on his own account, or for the sake of his
 friends; many of whom may be so much
 influenced by the authority of his *name*, as
 implicitly to believe any thing he says, how
 remote soever from truth, and fact. It
 should seem, that he himself hath no great
 confidence in his argument, though he en-
 deavours to put a good face on’t; since he
 hints

hints so often at the *uncertainty* of *tradition* : as if he wanted to *secure his retreat*, in case of any disaster. But the instance he refers to, *viz.* the observation of *Easter*, is not parallel. For, if two *contrary* traditions were pleaded in *that* case, (which might affect the credit of both) no such thing can be pretended in *this* case ; as *one* uniform tradition carries it for *Pædo-baptism* ; and not a single testimony can be produced from the antient writers in favour of a tradition for *Antipædo-baptism*, *Originals*, or *translations*. Therefore, upon a fair summing up of the *historical* evidence, it appears, that not *Pædo-baptism*, but *Antipædo-baptism* is an innovation.

Hæc Hactenus.

F I N I S.



BOOKS Printed for J. WAUGH,
at the TURK'S-HEAD, in *Lombard-Street*.

A Dissent from the Church of *England* fully justified: And proved the genuine and just Consequence of the Allegiance due to Christ, the only Lawgiver in the Church. Being the dissenting Gentleman's three Letters and Postscript, in Answer to Mr. *John White's* on that Subject. Pr. 2s. 6d.

The Baptism of Infants, a reasonable Service; founded upon Scripture, and undoubted Apostolic Tradition: In which its moral Purposes and Use in Religion are shewn. Price 8 d.

Dipping not the only Scriptural and Primitive Manner of Baptizing. And supposing it were, yet a strict Adherence not obligatory on us. Price 6 d.

Pædo-baptism: Or, a Defence of Infant-baptism in Point of Antiquity. Against the Exceptions of Dr. *John Gill*, and others. Price 1 s.



