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TO THE READER.

In Jan. 1738 was published in the Gentleman's Magazine, a letter from one who subscribed himself Marcus; endeavouring to prove dipping essential to Baptism. In April following, an answer thereto was published by another who subscribed himself J.L. He endeavoured to prove dipping not essential to Baptism. One part of the controversy turning upon a citation, taken by the first from me*, I thought it proper in the same way to reply, and accordingly in August ensuing wrote a letter to Mr. Urban, the supposed author, and directed the same to Mr. Cave the printer of the said Magazine. But no notice having yet been taken thereof, I shall oblige my readers therewith in this place.

Marcus having taken notice of the express testimony of Luther, shewing dipping to be the proper baptism, adds, "† A late author from whom the last authority is taken, tells us from Bugenhagius Pomeranus, That he was desired to be a witness of a baptism at Hamburgh in the year 1529; that when he saw the minister only sprinkle the infant, he was surprized: in a general assembly, therefore, of all the ministers of the word, he did ask of a cer-

To the R E A D E R.

"certain minister, John Fritz, who was sometime mini-
ster of Lubec, bow baptism was administered at Lubec,
who piously and gravely replied, that they were baptized
naked, after the same fashion as in Germany; but bow
this peculiar custom had crept into Hamburgh he was ig-
norant. At length they did agree, that the judgment of
Luther, and the divines of Wittemberg should be de-
manded about the point; which being done, Luther did
write back to Hamburgh, that this sprinkling was an
abuse which they ought to remove. Thus plunging of in-
fants was restored at Hamburgh.

J. L. in answer to this, says ibus: * * The story told
of the learned John Bugenhagius Pomeronus, I don't
see any foundation for. Your correspondent's late author
does not give us so much as the title of the German book
to which he refers.

The reply I made to this, was in a letter to Mr. Urban
as follows, viz.

Mr. Urban,

In the controversy between your ingenious correspondents,
about the mode of Baptism, I find, that what is cited from
me by the one, respecting the testimony of Bugenhagius; the
other can see no foundation for; because the title of the Ger-
man book referred to, is not mentioned. And to corroborate
his dimishedness, adds, † * Nor do Adams or Secken-
dorf, so far as he could see, say any thing of it, though
one wrote his life, and the other says a great many things
of him.' Poor reasoning! Who ever wrote the life of a
man, that contained even every material act thereof. And
what difficulty could attend the search after a book, when the
year in which it was published, is mentioned, though the title
is not? It cannot be supposed that the author wrote many
books in the same year.

This

To the Reader.

This late author, says Mr. Lewis, (I should have said I.L. but since it is out, let it go, at most, it can be deemed but a mistake) "seems quite mistaken in saying Bugenhagius succeed Luther in the ministry at Wittemberg." Adams says, "sufficet us eft in locum Simonis Benkii, alias Henfii. It's not at all probable, that Bugenhagius should neither have beard or seen, a minister sprinkle or pour water on the head or face of an infant wrapped in swaddling clothes. Nor does this late author's ingenious supposition, that he meant among protestants, mend the matter, as if the protestants of that time did no sucb thing. All that this proves is, the misfortune of our imagining, we are wiser or more knowing than any body else. This I think is enough to shew that it is a novel and groundless opinion, that dipping is of the essence of christian baptism.

Thus the Rev. Mr. John Lewis of Margate, in his history of the English Anabaptists, as he titles them, after the recital of the mad rebellion of a frantic people in Germany, says, "This is sufficient to shew, that infant baptism had been the custom and practice of all the christian churches from the very beginning." And I.L. has found enough to shew, That it is a novel and groundless opinion, that dipping is of the essence of christian baptism. Great discoveries! But to justify my own citation. I am not convinced of any mistake at all by I.L.'s, I had almost said Mr. Lewis's reasoning, they are so much alike. For according to Adams, if Bugenhagius did succeed Henfiius in Denmark, that is not a proof that he did not succeed Luther at Wittemberg, with whom he was a fellow in the ministry, as appears by the article Hofman, in Mr. Bayle's Crit. and Hist. Dict. And the learned Dr. Duveil expressly affirms, that he was both a fellow and successor in the ministry of Luther at Wittemberg.

Sup-

To the Reader.

Supposing then, not granting a mistake, how does the fact related appear not at all probable? They are according to Duveil, Bugenhagius's own words, and both Thuanus and Zanchy witnesses, that he was a very moderate, learned, and pious man, and consequently as much, if not more to be credited than J. L. who, though he has said nothing to the purpose, yet tells us, he has said enough to shew, that dipp[ing, as an essence of christian baptism, is a novel and groundless opinion; which gives him a fair title to the sole property of the misfortune he mentions; inasmuch as I appealed to those who were wiser and more knowing than myself, telling them in my preface to the reader, vol. I. That I should hold myself obliged to them, who should be pleased to represent my mistakes, promising to amend them.

It does not belong to my province to enter the lists with gentlemen, who are pleased to controvert the mode or subject of baptism. I shall in the preface to my next volume, [i.e. the present vol.] shew, that both the principles and practice of the English Baptists are justified, even by the most learned of the pedobaptists themselves, and but just observe here, That both Scapula and Stephens, two as great masters of the Greek tongue as most we have, do tell us in their Lexicons, that Bap{th}o from Baeplo, signifies mergo, immergo, &c. And Mr. Leigh, in his Critica Sacra, says, the native and proper signification of the word, is to dip into the water, &c. And also says, some would have it signify washing; which sense Erasmus opposed, affirming, that it was not otherwise so, than by consequence, for the proper signification was such a dipping or plunging as dyers use for dying of cloth. The learned and pious Mr. Joseph Mede affirms, There was no such thing as sprinkling or rantiim used in baptism, in the apostles days, nor many ages after. He had spoken more properly, if he had said, there was no rantiim used in the apostle's days, but baptism; since he well knew, they are two distinct different acts.
To the Reader.

As. It cannot be baptism at all, if it be only rantism immersion or dipping being the very thing, not an accident, but an essential, so absolutely necessary, that it cannot be the act or ordinance without it. Therefore dipping is essential to baptism.

Your humble servant,

THO. CROSBY.
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HO' many of the English Baptists, men of great learning, prudence, and piety, have wrote so fully in vindication of Believers baptism, in opposition to that of Infants, and sufficiently justified, both from scripture and antiquity, their principles and practice; yet many, whom they cannot but acknowledge, and must esteem to be men of piety, and true christians, retain an aversion, not only to their practice, but also to their persons, and are too ready to ridicule both. But as the Rev. Mr. David Rees, very justly observes, 'The wider any people remove from papal errors, or any other inno-

vations crept into the christian church, and the nearer they approach to the standard of naked truth; by so much the more they expose themselves, to the
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'venious cenfures of their neighbours;
'specially, whilst those neighbours un-
happily continue fettered with the long
received custom of their ancestors. The
state of the protestant diffenters in gene-
ral, says he, may exemplify the truth
of this. And hence it comes to pafs in
particularly, that tho' we, who aflert a-
dult baptism, differ in nothing else ma-
terial, from our protestant brethren, of
other communities in this nation, ex-
cepting in the point of baptism; yet for
our attempting, conscientiously to re-
store this single ordinance to its original
purity; we have been, and it seems
must continue to be, as a felt everywhere
spoken againft. This treatment, is some-
what the more remarkable because
it is so well known, that the principle
whereupon we differ from others, is so
evidently supported by scripture, that
our very adverfaries often confess it, and
themselves are not able to produce any
thing like the shape of a fair argument
against it.'

I shall therefore here give the reader a
view of the several concellions, that have
been made by the clergy of the church
of England, and other Pædobaptifts, to
those who deny the rite of infant-baptism,
and administer that ordinance only by
immersion.

How far the church of England agrees
with us in this point, will be manifest
from the Question thereupon, and the
answer thereto, in her Catechism.

Q. What
The **P R E F A C E.**

Q. What is required of persons to be baptized?

A. Repentance, whereby they forsake sin, and faith, whereby they steadfastly believe the promises of God made to them in that sacrament.

But before I come to particulars, permit me to observe; That there is nothing more readily, and more universally allowed by protestants, than that the holy scriptures are a perfect rule of the christian's faith and practice. By this weapon, they have often vanquished their popish adversaries, and therefore have greatly triumphed in it. But in disputes among themselves they have been either ashamed, or afraid to produce it; or else, have so unskilfully managed it, as to wound the very cause they designed to defend by it. If any weight may be given to the dignity of the persons who have affixed this truth; not only reverend prelates, and eminent professors and pastors of the reformed churches, but Kings and noblemen also, have declared themselves to be of this judgment.

That excellent determination of king James I. says Dr. Whitby, is worthy to be still. His Majesty thinketh, that for concord there is no nearer way, than diligently to separate things necessary from the unnecessary, and to bestow all our labour that we may agree in the things necessary, and that in things unnecessary, there may be christian liberty allowed. Now his Majesty
The PREFACE.

' Majestye calls those things simply necessary, which the Word of God expressly commandeth, to be believed or done. N. B. Or which the ancient church did gather from the word of God, by necessary consequence: but those things which by the constitution of men, without the word of God, tho' piously, and prudently introduced, his Majestye conceives, they may be changed, mollified, antiquated.'

K. Charles I. his Testimony.

More plain and full to the purpose was King Charles I. who in his conference with the popish Marquis of Worcester, in Ragland castle anno 1646, says, ' That the scripture is the rule, by which all differences may be composed. It is the light, wherein we must walk; the food of our souls; an antidote that expelleth any infection; the only sword that kills the enemy; the only plaiter that can cure our wounds; the only documents to attain to eternal life.'

Cotamens Religionum, p. 119.

Ibid. p. 116.

Again, ' That the evidences which are in scripture cannot be manifested, but out of the same scripture.'


The learned and judicious Lord Faulkland, in his reply to White's answer to his discourse of infallibility, speaks thus, ' I am confident, that all who receive the scripture for the only rule, and believe what is there plain to be only necessary, would (if they truly believed what they professed, and were not led aside, either by prejudice, or following the authority of some persons, either alive or dead, by
The PREFACE.

'by them much esteemed) soon agree in
'as much as is necessary, and in concluding
'no necessity of agreeing in more, there
'being no doubt, but it would soon ap-
'pear plainly what is plain.'

The most reverend and learned Bishop Taylor's
Taylor says, 'Christ only is our Law-giver,
'and what he said, was to last for ever.
'In all things which he said not, the apostles
'could not be lawgivers. They had no such authority: and therefore whatso-
'er they ordered, by their own wis-
'did abide, but still with the same liberty
'with which they appointed it; for of
'all men in the world, they would least
'put a snare upon the disciples, or tye
'oh, that in this case, says Dr. Whitty, in
'that this case, says Dr. Whitty, P. 214.
'their successors would be pleased to imi-
tate them.

The reverend and learned Dr. Stillingfleet, in his preface to his Frenicium, among Stilling-
many arguments, to exhort Christians, to pursue the things that make for peace,
useth this: 'The grand commission, the Prot. Recon.
apostles were sent out with, was only to F. 237.
teach what Christ had commanded them:
not the least intimation of any power
given them to impose, or require any
thing, beyond what he himself had
spoken to them, or they were directed
to, by the immediate guidance of the
spirit of God.'
The PREFACE.

To the same purpose could I proceed, in citing a multitude from the reverend clergy; so likewise from the most eminent of the dissenting ministers. But I shall only add a few testimonies of some of our modern dissenting ministers, and begin with them, taken from their sermons, preached at Salters-baill, in the Year 1735, against popery.

Dr. Harris: Dr. Harris in a few words, but very full to the purpose, declares thus, 'We acknowledge nothing as an authoritative rule of faith, but the scriptures, the great charter of the christian church.'

Dr. Wright: Dr. Wright says, 'A church built upon unscriptural traditions, yea, upon anti-scriptural traditions is a building of men, raised by the help and instigation of the god of this world; a kingdom set up to overthrow the great design of the gospel, and in direct opposition to our favour's declaration, that his kingdom is not of this world.' And again, 'For if it be our duty to stand fast to the things delivered by the apostles, and to hold to their epistles; then it is our duty to reject things that are evidently contrary to their epistles, and to doctrines, and precepts let down in their writings.'

Mr. Barker: Mr. Barker expresseth himself thus; Christianity is plain and simple, and no impure mixtures are to be made or allowed with it; no Jewish observances, no human inventions, no old or new traditions. To this singly, without
The Preface.

addition or alteration, should christians
stick and adhere, keeping to the truth
as it is in Jesus, and preserving the
simplicity of the gospel; not mingling
it with any thing, that is false and for-
reign to it; not concealing any part of
it, or mixing any falsehood with it, or
wresting or perverting the true sense or
meaning of it, to serve our own ends,
the lusts of others, or any worldly pur-
pofes whatsoever.

Mr. Chandler says; 'We have no full Mr. Chand-
and certain account of the doctrines ler's Testimony.
taught by Christ, and his apostles, but P. 13.
from the records of the new testament;
and as these contain the whole revelati-
on of the gospel, all that we are to be-
lieve and practice as christians, 'tis an
undeniable consequence, that we can no
otherwise demonstrate, our subjection
and fidelity to Christ, as lord, and law-
giver in his church, than by our care
in acquainting ourselves with the sacred
records of truth, and religiously adhe-
ring to them, as the only rule and stan-
dard of our faith and worship.'

Dr. Hughes very justly observes; 'That Dr. Hughes's
in all our disquisitions about religion. Testimony.
we are to consider the blessed God, as P. 11.
the restor of the world, who has an un-
questionable right to prescribe laws to
his rational creatures. These laws suf-
ficiently notified we are bound to obey
accordingly. God has revealed his
mind to man in the sacred scriptures,
those standing oracles of our holy reli-
a 4 gion.
The PREFACE.

'gion. Whatever institutions we meet
' with there, as appointed by God, we
' are religiously to comply with; what-
' ever else is appointed by others, if it
' have no foundation in the word of God,
' we are so far from being obliged to the
' practice of it, that in honour to God,
' we ought to protest against it, as a bold
' usurpation of the divine authority.'

Mr. Neal's
Testimony.

I cannot omit the testimony of the
reverend Mr. Neale; tho' he has shewn
himself no friend to the English Baptists,
by his injudicious representation of them,
in his late History of the Puritans. Yet
when he speaks truth it ought not to be
buried in oblivion; and therefore I shall
join him with his brethren, as a witness
in this behalf. For he says, 'By the
'sufficiency of the holy scriptures, we
'mean, that they contain all things ne-
' cessary to be believed and practised. The
' law of Moses was so compleat a direc-
'tion of the faith and obedience of the
' Jews, that the addition of the scribes
' and Pharisees, were both useless and
' vain; and are condemned as such by
' our favour. In like manner, the writings
' of the new testament, are a perfect flaw-
' dard to us christians; for all things, that
' our blessed Lord heard of his father,
' he made known to his apostles, and the
' apostles made them known to the
' churches. I take you to record, that I
' have not been told to declare to you the
' whole counsel of God; which counsel re-
'mains for our service, in the books of
' the
The Preface.

the new testament. And without all doubt, the curses denounced against those, who add to, or take from the prophecy of the book of the revelations, were designed as an awful guard upon all the inspired writings. If any man shall add to these things, God shall add to him the plagues that are written in this book: And if any man shall take away from the words of this prophecy, God shall take away his part out of the book of life, and out of the holy city, and from the things that are written in this book. Methinks, says he, such a solemn threatening should strike terror into the hearts of those, who pretend to supply the defects of revelation, by their unwritten traditions.' Again, in the practical remarks upon his discourse, he says, 'Hence we may learn, that the regiment of a christian should be his bible; because it contains the whole revealed will of God, and is a perfect rule of faith and practice.' Tis also, says he, a more sure word of prophecy, or a more infallible guide, than the unwritten traditions of men. Again, in judging of controversies among christians, says he, let us not be carried away by the authority of great names, or the numbers of them, that are on one side; but keep close to the scriptures. If our first reformers, had acquiesced in the authority of the church, we had been in popish darkness unto this day: but they searched the scriptures, and compared the
The PREFACE.

...the received doctrines of the church with the word of God. Let us follow their example — Councils, and fathers, and synods, may be mistaken in their decrees, but the word of God is infallible; here we are safe, and no where else.

The reverend Dr. Watts in his Miscellaneous Thoughts, thus expresses himself; if I were an idolater, and would build a temple for the sun, I should make the whole fabric to consist of glass; the walls and roof of it should be all over transparent, and it should need no other windows. Thus I might every where behold the glory of the God that I worship, and feel his heat, and rejoice in his light, and partake of the vital influences of that illustrious star, in every part of his temple. But may not this happiness be obtained without forsaking the true GOD, or falling off to idolatry?

Surely, says he, the blessed ordinances of christianity, are thus contrived and designed. Such are Baptism, and the Lord's-Supper, preaching, praying, and psalmody. These institutions of worship are chosen and appointed with such divine wisdom, that they represent to us, the glory of the several perfections of our GOD in his works of nature and grace; and transmit the beams of his power and love, to enliven and to comfort our dark and drooping spirits.
The PREFACE.

spirits — But to carry the similitude yet further:
‘Suppose, says he, when I had finish-
ed this heathen temple, and basked there with pleasure, under the rays of my bright idol, some fanciful and in-
genious painter, should attempt to cover the building all round with his own or-
naments: —— how would this seclude the sun’s best influences, and shut this idol deity out of his own temple? Nay, tho’ the image of the sun should be drawn there ten thousand times over, in lines of gold, with a pretence to repre-
sent him in all his wond’rous effects; yet every line will forbid the entrance of a sun-beam, and the worshipper within, must dwell in twilight, or per-
haps adore in darkness —— Such, says he, are the rites and ceremonies of hu-
man wisdom, when they are contrived as ornaments to divine worship. A sacred institution, mingled with the de-
vices of men, is in truth nothing else, but glass darkened with the colours of a painter, laid thick upon it. —— So far, as ornaments prevail above the simple ordinance, they prevent all the kind influences of his power and grace; for he vouchsafes to transmit thefe, no other way, but thro’ his own institu-
tions.

O excellent instructors! We will hear them, tho’ we dare not do after their works, in the point of baptism; and cleave
The PREFACE.

cleave to the holy scriptures only, as our rule, both of faith and practice.

Now in a strict and proper sense, a rule is a measure, whereby we try material things; in order to judge of some qualities, which are to be determined, to belong to those things, or to be wanting, according as they agree or disagree to their rule.

And so in a figurative sense, the scripture is a rule, or measure, whereby we are to try, or judge, of all those things, concerning which, God has revealed his mind and will to us: And we are bound to believe things true or false, worthy to be received, or to be rejected, just as they agree or disagree with the scriptures.

The scripture then, as a Rule, must be plain and intelligible; and indeed, it can be a rule no farther, than it is so. What is not to be understood can't be proposed as a rule, by a good and merciful God, who never requires impossible things.

And it must also be certain and decisive: for it is given us by God, who cannot lye, and whose words are all true in the utmost exactness. Therefore the scripture in its primitive simplicity, and in the condition wherein it was delivered by God, and in its present condition contains as much certainty, as is requisite to make it a perfect rule, being sufficient to determine all our doubts, and to decide all disputes.

The
The PREFAECE.

The famous Dr. Tillotson, archbishop of Canterbury, says, "A rule of faith is the measure, according to which we judge, what matters we are to assent to, as revealed to us by God, and what not. And more particularly; the rule of christian faith, is the measure, according to which we are to judge, what we ought to assent to, as the doctrine revealed by Christ to the world, and what not."

Now, that Christ has not revealed to us the practice of Infant Baptism; I shall begin with the testimony of bishop Burnet, who in his exposition of the 27th article of the church of England, says, "There is no express precept, or rule, given in the New Testament, for the baptism of infants."

Again, Dr. Barlow, bishop of Lincoln, also by Dr. Barlow, in his letter to Mr. Tombs, says, "I believe and know, that there is neither precept nor example in scripture for Pædo-baptism."

Dr. Jeremy Taylor, Bishop of Down and Bishop Taylor, Connor goes farther, and says, "It is against Liberty of Pædo-trine to baptize infants. For besides, that Christ never gave any precept to baptize infants, nor ever himself, nor his apostles, that appears, did baptize any of them: all that either he or his apostles said concerning it, requires such previous dispositions to baptism, of which infants are not capable; and these are faith and repentance."

Dr.
The Preface.

Dr. Wall begins the preface of his elaborate history of Infant Baptism, with this conception.

'Forasmuch as the commission given by our favour to his disciples, in the time of his mortal life, to baptize, is set down in such brief words, that there is no particular direction given, what they were to do in reference to the children of those that received the faith; and among all the persons that are recorded, as baptized by the apostles, there is no express mention of any infant.'

Mr. Fuller says; 'We do freely confess, that there is neither express precept, nor precedent, in the New Testament, for the baptizing of Infants.'

To these testimonies, let me add one more, from that great champion for Pædobaptism, Mr. Richard Baxter. For he does not only acknowledge, the silence of the scripture in this matter, but forms it into an argument, thus; 'If there can be no example given in scripture, of any one that was baptized, without the profession of a saving faith, nor any precept for so doing; then must not we baptize any without it. But the antecedent is true: therefore so is the consequent.'

Then he proceeds to prove this, by reviewing the scripture examples of Baptism: After which he thus concludes the argument.

'In a word, I know of no one word in scripture, that giveth us the least intimation, that ever man was baptized, without
The PREFACE.

'without the profession of a saving faith, 'or that giveth the least encouragement, 'to baptize any upon another's faith.'

It must be allowed, that notwithstanding the concessions of the aforementioned authors, yet they continued in the practice of infants baptism, and endeavoured to justify the same.

For Mr. Fuller observes; 'That St. By Mr. Fuller.

John faith, Chap. xxi. 25. And there 'are also many other things, which Jesus 'did, which are not written; amongst I. I. Andor. 'which, for ought appears to the con-

'tary, the baptizing of these infants, 'viz. that Christ took in his arms and 'blessed] might be one of them.'

A pretty argument for popish superstition and idolatry! For what may not be thrust into the practice of the christian church, upon such a way of arguing?

To the like purpose Mr. Walker says, By Mr. Walk-

'It doth not follow that our favour gave 'precept, for the baptizing of infants, Mod. Plut. p. 268. 'because no such precept is, particularly ' (as our adversaries suppose) expressed 'in the scripture. For our favour spake 'many things to his disciples, concerning 'the kingdom of God, both before his 'passion, and also after his resurrection, 'which are not written in the scriptures. 'And who can say, but that, among 'those many unwritten sayings of his, 'there might be an express precept for 'infants baptism?'

Seeing
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By Tradition. Seeing scripture will not do, the next refuge for the justification of infants baptism is tradition. Therefore to this I shall subjoin the words of the afore-cited Dr. Jeremy Taylor.

'But tradition, says he, by all means, must supply the place of scripture. And there is pretended a tradition apostolical, that infants were baptized. But at this we are not much moved. For we who rely upon the written word of God, as sufficient to establish all true religion, do not value the allegation of tradition. And however the world goes, none of the reformed churches can pretend this argument against this opinion; because they who reject tradition when it is against them, must not pretend it at all for them. But if we should allow the topick to be good, yet how will it be verified? For so far as it can appear, it relies wholly upon the testimony of Origen: for from him Austin had it. Now a tradition apostolical, if it be not confounded with a fuller testimony than of one person, whom all after-ages have condemned of many errors, will obtain so little reputation amongst those, who know that things have upon greater authority, pretended to derive from the apostles, and yet falsely; that it will be a great argument, that he is credulous and weak, that shall be determined by so weak probation, in matters of so great concernment. And the truth of
The PREFACE.

' the business is, as there was no com-
mand of scripture to oblige children to
the suspicion of it; so the necessity of
Paedo-baptism, was not determined in the
church, 'till in the eighth age after
Christ. But in the year 418, in the
Milevitan council, a provincial of Africa,
there was a canon made for Paedo-baptism:
never till then! I grant it was practiced
in Africa before that time: and they,
or some of them, thought well of it.
And tho' that be no argument for us to
think so; yet none of them did ever
before pretend it to be necessary; none
to have been a precept of the gospel.
St. Austin was the first, that ever
preached it to be absolutely necessary:
and it was in his heat and anger against
Pelagius; who had warm'd and chafe'd
him so in that question, that it made
him innovate in other doctrines, possi-
bly of more concernment than this.
And that altho' this was practiced anci-
ently in Africa, yet, that it was with-
out an opinion of necessity, and not often
there, nor at all in other places; we
have the testimony of a learned Paedo-
baptist, Ludovius Vives, who in his
annotations upon St. Austin, De civit.
Dei, l. i. c. 27. affirms, Neminem nisi
adulturn, antiquitus solere baptizari.
' But besides, says the Doctor, that the
tradition cannot be proved apostolical;
we have very good evidence from anti-
quity; that it was the opinion of the
primitive
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...primitive church, that infants ought not to be baptized.

To confirm what the Doctor so fully affirms; the testimony of two eminent Pædobaptists, as I find them quoted by the ingenious Mr. Stennet, may not be amiss in this place.

The first is Suicurus; who tells us in plain terms, 'That in the two first ages, no person was baptized till he was instructed in the faith, and tinctured with the doctrine of Christ, and could testify his own faith; because of those words [of Christ] He that believeth and is baptized. Therefore, believing was first: and hence the order of the catechumens in the church: and it was a custom then constantly observed, to give the catechumens the Eucharist immediately after baptism: and therefore because the Eucharist was before given to the adult catechumens, as soon as they were washed with holy baptism, it was thought fit in like manner to give it to infants, after the introduction of infant-baptism.'

The like ingenious confession is made by Curcellus; his words are these: 'Pædobaptism was not known in the world, the two first ages after Christ. In the third and fourth it was approved by a few. At length, in the fifth and following ages, it began to obtain in diverse places. And therefore we observe this rite indeed as an ancient custom, but not as an apostolical tradition.'

And
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And in another place he tells us,
' That the custom of baptizing infants,
' did not begin before the third age after
' Christ; and that there appears not the
' least footstep of it, in the two first cen-
' turies.'

Much more to the same purpose might
be produced both from the antients and
the moderns of the Paedobaptists. But as
my chief design is to shew the unreason-
ableness of the many calumnies and re-
proaches, which have been, and still are
cast upon the Baptists; and also of the
sufferings they have endured from govern-
ments, instigated by the malice and envy
of wicked zealots, for no other reason,
but because they deny infant-baptism, and
only differ from their brethren in that one
thing, which no wise nor worthy men
make absolutely necessary to salvation; so
I shall from the whole only infer;

I. If infant-baptism was never insti-
tuted, commanded, nor appointed of God;
and if there be no precedent, as there is
no precept in the scripture, that any infant
was baptized; then infants ought not to
be baptized.

II. If all that is necessary to faith and
practice, is left upon record in the holy
scriptures, that being a compleat and perfect
rule; then infant-baptism being acknowled-
ged, not to be contained or found
therein, is not of God.

But as some of the adversaries of the
Baptists have vainly boasted, that they
have scripture precepts, precedents, and

good
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good consequences, on which they found their practice; I shall briefly consider some of their principal texts brought for this purpose; and shew, even from the *Pedobaptists* of the most eminent rank, that those scriptures are misapplied, and no way answer the end for which they are cited: and so consequentely the less material ones must fall before them.

The first then I begin with, is *Matth.* xxviii. 19. Go ye therefore and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost. Which Mr. John Turner says, "being given in general, and unlimited terms, and ordain'd by Almighty God, as one of the ordinary means of salvation, ought to be extended to all persons whatsoever, that are capable of admission into the covenant: *Infants* are capable of being admitted into the covenant: and then *infants* are also included in this precept or command."

In answer to this let me cite Dr. Whitby, who in his annotations upon this text, says, *Teach all nations, is here to preach the gospel to all nations, and engage them to believe it, in order to their profession of that faith by baptism; as seems apparent,

1. From the parallel commission, *Mar.* xvi. 15. *Go preach the gospel to every creature, he that believeth and is baptized shall be saved.*

2. From the scripture notion of a disciple; that being still the same as a believer;
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'liever; as in that question to the blind 'Man, Wilt thou also be his disciple? That 'is, will you believe he is a prophet sent 'from God? And in the answer of the 'Pharisees, We are the disciples of Moses. 'If here it should be said, says the Doc-'tor, that I yield too much to the Anti-'pedobaptists, by saying, that to be made 'disciples here, is to be taught to believe in 'Christ; I desire any one to tell me, how 'the apostles could make a disciple, of an heathen, or an unbelieving 'Jew, without being teachers of them: whether they were not sent 'to preach to those that could hear, and 'to teach them to whom they preached, 'that Jesus was the Christ; and only to 'baptize them when they did believe this.

Dr. Burnet, bishop of Sarum, upon this head says, 'That by the first teach the 39 Arr.'ing, or making disciples, that must go P. 300. 'before baptism; is to be meant the con-vincing of the world, that Jesus is the 'Christ, the true Messiah anointed of God, 'with a fulness of grace, and of the spi-rit without measure, and sent to be the 'saviour and redeemer of the World; 'and when they were brought to ac-knowledge this, then they were to bap-tize them, to initiate them to this reli-gion, by obliging them to renounce all 'idolatry and ungodliness, as well as all 'secular and carnal lust.

Mr. Burkit acknowledges the same; for Mr. Burkit on the form of this commission, as recorded by baptism, p. 18. St. Mark, doth also prove this to be the b 3 sense
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The sense of it; He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved. A profession of actual faith, says Mr. Burkit, is necessarily required before baptism in all adult persons, that is, persons grown to riper years: who are the persons whom our Saviour meant, when he said, He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved; as most evidently appears by the following words: He that believeth not shall be damned. What, says he, must all that die in their infancy go to hell for an impossibility? The text only intends such, as by hearing the gospel preach’d, are capable of actual faith; such as enjoy the means of faith, and yet live and die in the neglect of faith, and contempt of baptism, shall certainly be damned. Says the apostle, If any man will not work, let him not eat; that is, such as are capable of working must work. But must children be starved because they cannot labour? Thus here: Children lye under a natural incapacity of professing actual faith; therefore the first text does not concern them any more than the latter.

And this interpretation of Christ’s commission for baptizing, confirms the argument formed upon it by Dr. Jeremy Taylor, in favour of the Baptists. Not to instance, faith he, in those innumerable places, that require faith before this sacrament; there needs no more but this one saying of our blessed Saviour, He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved, but he that believeth not shall be damned.

Plainly
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Plainly thus: faith and baptism in conjunction will bring a man to heaven, but if he have not faith, baptism shall do him no good. So that, if baptism be necessary, then faith is faith, and much more: for want of faith damning absolutely; it is not said so of the want of baptism.

Now if this decretary sentence be to understood of persons of age; and if children by such an answer (which indeed is reasonable enough) be excused from the necessity of faith, the want of which regularly does damn: then it is faith to say, the same incapacity of reason and faith shall not excuse them from the actual susceptibility of baptism, which is less necessary, and to which faith and many other acts are necessary predispositions, when it is reasonably and humanly received. The conclusion is, that baptism is also to be deferred till the time of faith; and whether infants have faith or no, is a question to be disputed by persons that care not how much they say, nor how little they prove.

Again: That infants baptism is founded on God's word, some endeavour to prove: from Acts ii. 38. Peter said unto them repent and be baptized every one of you, in the name of Jesus Christ, for the remission of sins, and ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Ghost; for the promise is to you, and your children, and to all that are afar off, even as many as the Lord our God shall call.

In which words, says Mr. Turner, children. Bann. p. 16.
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dren are fairly intimated, at least, to be intituled, both to the promises of the covenant, and to the sacrament that confirms it.

To this, we have an answer drawn up for us by the aforesaid Dr. Jeremy Taylor, which whether it were his own opinion or not, yet any one may easily discern the strength of his reasoning in it. It is considerable, says he, that the discourse of St. Peter, which is pretended for the intituling infants to the promise of the Holy Ghost, and by consequence to baptism, which is supposed to be its instrument and conveyance, is wholly a fancy, and hath in it nothing of certainty, or demonstration, and not much probability. For besides, that the thing itself is unreasonable, and the Holy Ghost works by the heightening and improving our natural faculties, and therefore is a promise that so concerns them, as they are reasonable creatures, and may have a title to it, in proportion to their nature, but no possession or reception of it, till their faculties come into act: besides this, I say, the words mention'd in St. Peter's sermon, which are the only record of the promise, are interpreted upon a weak mistake: the promise belongs to you, and to your children; therefore infants are actually receptive of it in that capacity. That's the argument. But the reason of it is not yet discover'd, nor ever will: For, [to you and your children] is to you and your posterity,
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'\textit{Rit}'y, to you and your \textit{children}, when
'\textit{they} are of the same capacity in which
'\textit{you} are, effectually receptive of the
'promise. But he, that whenever the
'word [\textit{children}] is used in scripture,
'shall by [\textit{children}] understand \textit{infants},
'must needs believe, that in all \textit{Israel},
'there were no men, but all were \textit{infants}:
'and if that had been true, it had been
'the greater wonder they should over-
'come the \textit{Anakims}, and beat the king
'of \textit{Moab}, and march so far, and di-
'course so well; for they were all called
'the \textit{children of Israel}.

The learned Dr. \textit{Hammond} falls before Dr. Ham-
this reasoning, and declares, he cannot mon.
defend those that attempt to bring argu-
ments in defence of \textit{Pardobaptism} from
Peter's words, \textit{The promise is to you and}
your \textit{children}. 'If any, says he, have \textit{Revol. to 6}
made use of that very \textit{inconcluent} argu-
'ment, I have nothing to say in defence
'of them; I think that the word
'\textit{children} there is really the \textit{posterity of}
'the \textit{Jews}, and not peculiarly their \textit{in-
'fant children}.

Dr. \textit{Whitby} puts a sense upon these \textit{Dr. Whitby}.
words, which carry them still farther from
proving \textit{infant baptism}. 'These words, \textit{Annot. in}
says he, will not prove a right of \textit{infants}
to receive \textit{baptism}; the promise men-
tioned here, being that only of the Holy
\textit{Ghost}, and to those persons, who by
\textit{age} were made capable of those extra-
\textit{ordinary gifts}.

\textbf{Again:}
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Again: For the support of infant baptism, some have recourse to those texts, Matth. xix. 13, 14, Mark x. 13, 14, Luke xviii. 15, 16, all which places give us an account, that little children were brought to our Saviour, &c.


Thus Mr. Fowler Walker, to prove infant baptism, says, 'We are told that Christ, during his incarnation, welcomed children to his arms, blessed them, and declared them subjects of his kingdom: which, I think, says he, is a sufficient indication of his mind, that they should be received into his church by baptism.

Dr. Whitby's answer.

But Dr. Whitby, in his annotations on this text, grants, that Christ neither baptized these children himself, nor commanded his apostles to do it. For which concession he gives these two reasons, 1. 'That Christian baptism was not yet instituted. 2. That the baptism then used by John and Christ's disciples, was only the baptism of repentance and faith in the Messiah, which was to come: of both which infants were incapable.

Acts xix. 4.

Now as these are very good reasons to induce any one to believe, that those infants were not baptized; so I think they are sufficient to overthrow any argument that can be drawn for the baptizing of infants, from this passage. For, 1. As the Christian baptism was not yet instituted, then certainly our Saviour, in his words and action upon this occasion, had no reference to baptism; nor could they be designed to teach the disciples concerning a rite,
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a rite, which was not yet instituted: so that all arguments drawn from thence for *baptizing infants*, extend the words and action of our Saviour beyond the first intention of them. And what can be more absurd, than to take direction about a *positive rite*, from any word or action that happen'd before the institution was in the world?

2. To say they were not admitted to the *baptism* then in use, because they were incapable of it, *repentance and faith* in the *Messiah* which was to come, faith the doctor, being required to the *baptism* used by *John*, and the disciples of our Saviour: This, I say, grants that no *children* were *baptized* in the time of our Saviour's life; and that they are as incapable of Christ's *baptism* as they were of *John's*. For *children* are as incapable of *repentance*, and believing that the *Messiah* is come as they were of believing he was to come; and yet both these are required of persons, in order to their receiving Christ's *baptism*.

And to say that these *children* were not *baptized* because they had already enter'd *into covenant with God by circumcision*, is to say no more of them than what might be said of all men, who had hitherto been *baptized* either by *John* or the disciples of our Saviour.

Very justly therefore does the learned Dr. Ham.

Dr Hammond say, 'If the inference [from *Mond's Relo*, *to 6 Queries*, this text] were, that all *infants* are, *that is, ought to be baptized*, upon this (and
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' (and no other) ground, because Christ blessed them, I should acknowledge, the conclusion to be weakly built.' And he grants, 'That little children may, and must be permitted to be brought by others to Christ, and being to brought, yet are said to come unto him. 2. His blessing them, by imposition of hands; and, 3. His affirming, that the kingdom of God, the church here, and heaven hereafter, are a conjunction of particulars, which come not home distinctly to baptism of infants; because, it is not affirmed he did baptize them.'

So that this gentleman confirms the argument given by the reverend Dr. Jeremy Taylor; who says, 'From the action of Christ's blessing infants, to infer that they are to be baptized, proves nothing so much, as that there is great want of better arguments. The conclusion would be with more probability derived thus; Christ blessed children and so dismissed them, but baptized them not; therefore infants are not to be baptized. But let this be as weak as its enemy; yet that Christ did not baptize them, is an argument sufficient, that Christ hath other ways, of bringing them to heaven, than by baptism. He pasted his act of grace upon them, by benediction and imposition of hands.

The continuers of Pool's annotations say, 'That a doubt may from this text arise in the reader's mind, for what purpose the parents or nurses did bring these
The \textit{Preface.}

these young children to \textit{Christ}; it was not for \textit{baptism}, for he baptized none himself.

Again, 'That we must take heed, we do not find \textit{infant-baptism}, upon the example of \textit{Christ} in this text; for it is certain, that he did not \textit{baptize these children}.'

Permit me then to observe, and it is \textit{remarkable}, plain, that the \textit{coming} unto \textit{Christ}, spoken of in the text, intends a \textit{personal} approach, not a \textit{spiritual} coming, so as to love him, fear him, believe in him, and become his followers.

Now from childrens being brought into his presence, and from what is laid, of the lawfulness of such a coming to him, to infer, their capacity of coming to him \textit{spiritually}, and their right to \textit{baptism} is a very weak conclusion. Many that were permitted to come into \textit{Christ}'s presence in the days of his flesh, were far enough from being his disciples, or having any right to the ordinances of the gospel church. Many who believed not in him were brought to him to be healed. Many of the Scribes and Pharisees came to him to mock him, and catch at his sayings; therefore from a \textit{bodily} coming to him, to argue a \textit{right} or capacity of a \textit{spiritual} coming, is most ridiculous.

Nor does it appear, from the relation given of this matter by either of the \textit{evangelists}, that these children were brought to \textit{Christ}, upon any other account than what many grown persons were,
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viz. that they might be healed of some bodily distempers. Nay, the words of St. Luke plainly intimate, it was for this end. For, says he, they brought to him also, infants, that he would touch them; where the term also intimates, that they were either brought with others, or upon the same account that others were; viz. to be healed.

For it is, as if he had said; As they brought men and women, afflicted with various distempers unto Christ to be cured; so they brought children also. And this interpretation is further signified, in that it is said, they brought them to him, that he would touch them. Now it was well known, that Christ's method of healing distempers, was by his touching the person, or their touching of him. Nor do we read that ever he convey'd spiritual benefits to persons by a touch; therefore it is evident, that it was not any spiritual privilege, but a bodily cure, for which they brought these children to him. Nor do the words of St. Matthew overthrow this interpretation, when he says, they were brought that he should put his hands on them, and pray; for he frequently took that method, in the performing of his miracles. When Jairus besought Christ to come and heal his daughter, he says, I pray thee come and lay thine hands on her, that she may be healed.

Sometimes we read of this work, joined with his imposition of hands; as in the cure of the Leper, and at the raising of the
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the widow of Nain's son; and it is said, Luke vii. 14.,
that Christ lift up his eyes and prayed, John xi. 41.,
when he raised Lazarus from the dead.
This being Christ's custom; it is very
easy to understand their design, in bring-
ing these children unto him, that he would
lay his hands on them and pray; viz. that
they might thereby receive the blessing of
a miraculous cure:

That objection, That if these children
were brought to Christ to be healed of
any bodily distempers, then the disciples
would not have hindered them, is of no
force. For we find they were sometimes
guilty of the same error, when adult per-Matt. xx. 31;
furthers sought to him for a cure. It is said,
those that followed Christ, which chiefly
were his disciples, rebuked the two blind
men, because they should hold their peace.
It is expressly said of the disciples, that
they besought Christ to send the woman
of Samaria away, when repeated appli-
cation was made to him. Christ was some-
times so thronged with the multitude of
men and women that came to him, that
he with his disciples had not leisure to
take their necessary refreshment, so that
they might conclude, their master would
be much pressed indeed, if they were al-
lowed to bring their sick and weak children
also. And the reason which our favour
gives, why he would have them suffer'd
to come unto him, viz. for of such is the
kingdom of heaven, does not in the least
overthrow this interpretation, but rather
justifies it. For by the kingdom of
heaven,
heaven, it is agreed on all hands, our favour either intends the state of glory, or the christian church.

Now since children for their innocence and humility resemble the blessed in heaven, who are free from all infirmities, or the saints who are interested in the kingdom of grace. Our favour may well be understood, as if he had said, there is no reason to think them below my notice, or so deprive them of receiving from me a cure of their infirmities: they have not brought their sicknesses and diseases upon themselves by their actual transgressions, as indeed many of the adult whom I have cured have done; and therefore they have a better title to my compasion to enjoy the blessing of a miraculous cure.

And that our favour does not intend by these words that little children should be members of the gospel church, but only such who resemble little children in innocence and humility, and a freedom from all prejudices, appears both by the word το εξήγησα here used, that is, such like, or those that resemble them; and also, by what the evangelist reports our favour to have added at the same time, as explicative of this saying, Verily I say unto you, whatsoever shall not receive the kingdom of God, as a little child, shall in no wise enter therein. But if we wave all these advantages against the argument drawn from hence; there is another observation that will sufficiently overthrow it, viz.

That
The *P R E F A C E.*

That tho' it be plainly expressed here, that little children were brought to Christ, that he declared such might come unto him, and that he laid his hands upon them, and blessed them; yet there is not the least intimation, in any of the evangelists, that they were baptized. So particularly the learned Dr. Whitby upon this text grants, that Christ neither baptized these children himself, nor commanded his disciples to do it; and for this conception he gave those two very good reasons aforementioned.

When bloody Bonner, in his dispute with Robert Smith the martyr, brought this text to prove the necessity of baptizing infants; the martyr smartly returned this answer; Our favour says, suffer little children to come unto me, and not unto Mon. p. 1256. water.

Having thus considered the subjects of the Mode of baptism, I shall proceed to the mode of Baptism considered.

Mr. Baxter charges the practice of dipping in Baptism, as a breach of the sixth commandment; and forms his argument upon it thus: 'That which is a plain breach of the sixth commandment, 'Thou shalt not kill,' is no ordinance of God, but a most heinous sin: But the ordinary practice of baptizing by dipping over head in cold water, as necessary, is
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'a plain breach of the sixth commandment: Therefore it is no ordinance of God, but an heinous sin. And as Mr. Gradock, in his book of Gospel Liberty, shews; the magistrate ought to refrain it, to save the lives of his subjects; even according to their principles, that will yet allow the magistrate no power directly in matter of worship. That this is flat murder, and no better, being ordinarily and generally used, is undeniable to any understanding man. For that which directly tendeth to overthrow mens lives, being wilfully used, is plain murder.' And farther he adds, 'I know not what trick a covetous landlord can find out, to get his tenants to die apace, that he may have new fines and herriots, likelier than to encourage such practices, that he may get them all to turn Anabaptists. I wish, says he, that this device be not it that countenancest these men. And covetous physicians, methinks, should not be much against them. Catarrhhs and obstructions, which are the two great fountains of most mortal diseases in man's body, could scarce have a more notable means to produce them where they are not, or to increaseth where they are. Apoplexies, lethargies, palsy, and all comatous diseases, would be promoted by it. So would cephalalgies, hemicranies, phthises, debility of the stomach, crudities, and almost all fevers, dysenteries, diarrhæas, cholicks, iack paffions, convulsions,
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convulsions, spasms, tremors, &c. All hepatic, splenetic, pulmonary perils, and hypochondriacks, would soon have enough of it.'

Strange quackisin! as if hard words, impudence, and nonsense, delivered with a magisterial air, would carry every thing before them. He might have added, Thus, Gentlemen, you may easily by my bill perceive, that I infinitely surpass those empty pretending quacks, who confine their narrow talent to one distemper, whereas all diseases are alike to me, and I have a hundred several ways to extirpate them. But he concluded thus: 'In a word, says he, it is good for nothing, but to dispatch men out of the world, that are burdensome, and to ranken church-yards.'

No wonder, Mr. Baxter was so unwilling to be dipt. I have been informed that Mr. Baxter was for having all the Baptists hanged, and therefore shall add one passage more, and leave the reader to judge, what he would have done to the Baptists, had it been in his power. They are his own words: 'If, says he, Murder Prog. p. 156. be a sin, then dipping ordinarily in cold water over head in England, is a sin. And if those that would make it Mens religion to murder themselves, and urge it on their consciences as their duty, are not to be suffered in a common-wealth, any more than highway murderers; then judge how these Anabaptists, that teach the necessity of such dipping, are to be suffered.'
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His next argument is to prove dipping a breach of the seventh commandment. Thou shalt not commit adultery. For thus he expresseth himself; 'My seventh argument, is also against another wickedness, in their manner of baptizing; which is their dipping persons naked, as is very usual with many of them, or next to naked, as is usual with the most respectful, that I have heard of.'

Mr. Baxter indeed acknowledges, that in his youth he was addicted to lying, and it plainly appears he had not left it when he wrote this chapter. The whole of which, besides lies, is so full of obscenity and immodesty, that it rather discovers the naughtiness of his own heart, than a confutation of what is intended thereby; and therefore I forbear to recite it.

But whether the water of baptism ought to be applied by immersion, or by that of aspersion, or effusion, is, says the learned Dr. Tavorson, 'a more material question, than it is commonly deemed by us, who have been accustomed to baptize by a bare effusion, or sprinkling of water upon the party. For in things which depend for their force, upon the meer will and pleasure of him who instituted them, there ought no doubt, great regard to be had to the commands of him, who did so; as without which there is no reason to presume, we shall receive the benefit of that ceremony to which he hath been pleased to annex it. Now, what
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what the command of Christ was in this
particular cannot well be doubted of,
by those who shall consider the first
words of Christ concerning it, and the
practice of those times; whether in the
baptism of John, or of our favour. For
the words of Christ are, that they should
baptize or dip those whom they made
disciples to him; for so no doubt
the word baptism, properly signifies.
And which is more, and not without
its weight, that they should baptize
them into the name of the father, and
of the son, and of the holy ghost;
thereby intimating such a washing, as
should receive the party baptized, with-
in the very body of that water, which
they were to baptize him with. And
further, says he,

'If there could be any doubt, con-
cerning the signification of the words
in themselves [in Christ's commission]
yet would that doubt be removed, by
considering the practice of those times,
whether in the baptism of John, or of
our favour. For such as was the prac-
tice of those times in baptizing, such in
reason are we to think, our favour's
command to have been concerning it,
especially when the words themselves
incline that way; there being not other-
wise, any means, either for those, or
future times, to discover his intention
concerning it. Now what the practice
of those times was, as to this particular,
will need no other proof, than their

refert
reforting to rivers, and other such like receptacles of water for the performance of that ceremony, as that too, because there was much water there; for so the scripture doth not only affirm concerning the baptism of John, but both intimate concerning that, which our favour administered in Judea. Because, making John's baptism, and his, to be so far forth of the same sort, and expressly affirm concerning the baptism of the Eunuch, which is the only christian baptism, the scripture is any thing particular in the description of. The words of St. Luke being, that both Philip and the Eunuch went down into a certain water, which they met with in their journey, in order to the baptizing of the latter. For what need would there have been, either of the Baptists reforting to great confluxes of water, or of Philip and the Eunuch's going down into this; were it not, that the baptism, both of the one or the other, was to be performed by an immersion? A very little water, as we know it doth with us, sufficing for an effusion or sprinkling.

Dr. Tillotson, archbishop of Canterbury, says thus, 'Antiently those who were baptized, put off their garments, which signified the putting off the body of sin, and were immersed, and buried in the water, to represent their death to sin; and then did rise up again out of the water, to signify their entrance upon a new life. And to these customs the apostle
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"apostle alludes, when he says; How shall we that are dead to sin live any longer therein? Know ye not, that so many of us, as were baptized into Jesus Christ, were baptized into his death? Therefore we are buried with him by baptism."

Dr. Cave tells us, 'That the party to Dr. Cave, be baptized was wholly immersed, or 7 Edit. p.264. Prim. Christ. constant and universal custom of those times, whereby they did more notably, and significantly express the three great ends, and effects of baptism. For, as in immersion, there are in a manner three several acts; the putting the person into the water, his abiding there for a little time, and his rising up again; so by these were represented Christ's death, burial, and resurrection; and in conformity thereunto, our dying unto sin, the destruction of its power, and our resurrection to a new course of life.'

Dr. Sharp, archbishop of York, in his sermon before Queen Mary, has these words: 'Whenever a person in ancient times was baptized, he was not only to profess his faith in Christ's death and resurrection, but he was also to look upon himself as obliged, in correspondence therewith to mortify his former carnal affections, and so enter upon a new state of life; and the very form of baptism, did lively represent this obligation to them. For what did their being plunged under water signify but their undertaking, in imitation of Christ's death
The P R E F A C E.

and burial, to forfake all their former evil courses, as their ascending out of the water, did their engagement to lead a holy spiritual life.

Dr. Whitby observes, 'That it is said of our favour himself, that being baptized he came up straightway out of the water. The observation of the Greek church is this; that he who ascended out of the water, must first descend down into it: Baptism therefore, is to be performed not by sprinkling, but by washing the body; and, indeed, it can be only from ignorance of the Jewish rites in baptism, that this is questioned. For they, to the due performance of this rite, so superstitiously required the immersion of the whole body in the water, that if any dirt, hindered the water from coming to any part of it, the baptism was not right; and if one held the baptized by the arm, when he was let down into the water, another must after dip him, holding him by the other arm that was washed before, because his hand would not suffer the water to come to his whole body.'

Bishop Burnet says thus; 'How well for ever the Jews might have been accustomed to this rite, and how proper a preparation for ever, it might be to the manifestation of the Messiah; yet the justification of baptism, as it is a federal act of the Christian religion, must be taken from the commission, that our favour gave to his disciples; to go
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preach and make disciples to him in all nations, for that is the strict signification of the word; baptizing them in the name of the father, and of the son, and of the holy ghost; teaching them to observe all things, whatsoever I have commanded you. By the first teaching or making of disciples, that must go before baptism, says the bishop, is to be meant the convincing of the world, that Jesus is the Christ, &c. as cited page 9. And then they led them into the water, and with no other garments, but what might cover nature; they at first laid them down in the water, as a man is laid in a grave, and then they said these words, I baptize, or wash thee, in the name of the father, son, and holy ghost: then they raised them up again, and clean garments were put on them, from whence came the phrases, of being baptized into Christ's death; of being buried with him by baptism into death; of our being risen with Christ, and of our putting on the Lord Jesus Christ; of putting off the old man, and putting on the new. After baptism was thus performed, the baptized person was to be further instructed in all the specialties of the christian religion, and in all the rules of life, that Christ had prescribed.

I must beg leave once more to cite Dr. Dr. Whitby. Whitby on this head, because he speaks so full to the purpose: and do hope it will not be deemed superfluous. He says, Prot. Recom.

That baptism in the apostles' time, was Ed. p. 264. administered
administered by dipping, not by sprinkling the baptized person: and therefore that dipping was the institution of our Lord, or his apostles, is extremely evident. For thus this sacrament was administered to our blessed Saviour, of whom it is said, "That straightway Jesus went up out of the water. He came up; therefore he went down; behold an immersion, not an aspersion, faith Jeremias Patriarch of Constantinople: and this immersion, was used to express the great mystery of baptism, viz. our being buried with Christ, as to the old man, and our resurrection with him to newness of life. So St. Paul plainly intimateth, saying, "How shall we that are dead to sin live any longer therein? Now that baptized christians are dead to sin, he proveth from their being buried with Christ in baptism. Whence it is clear, that baptism then was so performed as to be an image of the burial and resurrection of our Lord, and therefore was administered by putting the baptized person under water, and causing him to rise up out of it.

Dr. Wall. Dr. Wall, in his Defence of Infant-baptism, grants, that the baptisms of John, and the apostles was performed by immersion. His words are these: "As to the manner of baptism then generally used, the texts produced by our author *, and by every one that speaks of these matters, are undeniable proofs, that the baptized person went ordinarily into the water,
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water, and sometimes the Baptist too. We should not know by these accounts whether the whole body of the baptized was put under water, head and all; were it not for two later proofs, which seem to me to put it out of question. One, that St. Paul does twice, in an allusive way of speaking, call baptism a burial: which allusion is not so proper, if we conceive them to have gone into the water only up to the arm-pits, &c. as it is, if their whole body was immersed. The other, the custom of the Christians in the near succeeding times, which being more largely and particularly delivered in books, is known to have been generally, or ordinarily, a total immersion of the naked body, and that (as this author observes, and I had shewn) thrice repeated.

In another place, the Doctor, to shew his zeal for the practice of immersion in baptism, offers very submissively some few things to the consideration of those of his brethren, who thought the coldness of our climate a good reason to change the antient practice of dipping into that of sprinkling. For thus he affirms, 'That Def. of Inf. our climate is no colder than it was, for those thirteen or fourteen hundred years, from the beginning of Christianity here, to Queen Elizabeth's time; and not near so cold as Muscovy and some other countries, where they do still dip their children in baptism, and find no inconvenience in it. That the apparent reason
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Reason that alter'd the custom, was not the coldness of the climate, but the imitation of Calvin, and the church of Geneva, and some others thereabouts.

That our reformers and compilers of the liturgy (even of the last edition of it) were of another mind; as appears both by the express orders of the rubrick itself, and by the prayer used just before baptism, sanctify this water, &c. and grant that this child now to be baptized therein, &c. (if they had meant, that pouring should have always, or most ordinarily have been used, they would have said therewith. And by the definition given in the catechism of the outward visible sign in baptism; water wherein the person is baptized. I know, that in one edition it was said is dipped or sprinkled with it. I know not the history of that edition; but as it is a late one, so it was not thought fit to be continued. The old edition had the prayer before said in these words, baptized in this water.

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

If the coldness of the water; there is no reason, from the nature of the thing, nor order or command of God, or man, that it should be used cold: but
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but as the waters in which our favour and the primitive christians in those hot countries, which the scripture mentions, were naturally warm by reason of the climate; so if ours be made warm, they will be liker to them. As the inward and main part of baptism, is God's washing and sanctifying the soul; so the outward symbol is the washing the body, which is as naturally done by warm water as cold; it may I suppose be used in such degree of warmth as the parents desire.

The Doctor goes on to shew the difficulties that lye in the way of restoring this lost primitive practice of dipping in baptism: and thinks Calvin was the first who made a breach therein, by prescribing pouring water on the infant; but lays the total profanation of it (by bringing it to sprinkling) at the door of the Presbyterians here in England, when their reign began about the year 1644. This, he says, 'scandalized many people; and in Def. of Inf. deed it was, and is really scandalous.' And Bapt. p. 149. in another place, he calls them, 'the most disorderly baptizers of all.' And that we ib. p. 97. might not be mistaken of the persons he thus brands, he adds, 'Those, I mean, who affecting to use as little water as possible, do purposely throw no more than a sprinkle or drop of water on the face of a child. The scripture, says he, will never justify these, nor the ancient church, nor the rubric of the church of England.

I must
I must observe here, that this learned Gentleman, when about to compliment the people called Quakers, with a short catalogue of their ancient friends, seems to be off his guard. For I mistake him much if he does not there fairly prove, that the Valentinians*, which he thinks deserved a worse name than that of Heretics, were the first that changed the practice of dipping into pouring; so that pouring in baptism, which he seems to be so fond of, sprung from a very bad origin.

After that flourished about the year 140.

Vol. II, p. 94. nal. For after he has given a very strange account, from Irenæus, of the practice of some of them in their ways of baptism, he tells us, 'That some of them say, 'that it is needless to bring the person to the water at all. But making a mixture of oil and water, they pour it on his head, using certain prophane words much like them before-mentioned: and they say that this is redemption [or baptism.]

Many more testimonies to this purpose might be produced, both foreign and domestic. But least some, who delight in numbers, should think these not sufficient, I shall, for their sakes, add the testimony of an whole assembly of Divines, who in their annotations on those words of the apostle, buried with him by baptism, deliver their opinion in these terms.

'In this phrase, say they, the apostle seemeth to allude to the ancient manner of baptism, which was to dip the parties baptized, and as it were to bury them under
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under the water for a while, and then to
draw them out of it, and lift them up,
to represent the burial of our old man,
and our resurrection to newness of life.

I shall now conclude with the words of a Mr. Joseph reverend and learned gentleman, who, after he had been contemplating on these things, says, 'He cannot chule but la-
ment, that so many pious and learned men should find themselves so fettered by the tyranny of custom and tradition, that they cannot but aspire after the liberty of practicing the ordinances of Christ, according to the primitive pattern, and now and then let go some thoughts and wishes, to express the sense of their minds on this head, yet they seem to want that degree of resolution, and firmness of mind, which is necessary to attempt such a reformation.

Too many are afraid of the consequences of altering old traditions, and seem rather disposed to tolerate abuses, than to redress them: not enough considering, that it is every man's duty to reform his own practice, and to en-deavour to reform that of others, to far as he is capable in his station; that there can be no good excuse framed to palliate the violation of plain institutions; that the long or general practice of a custom that wants a foundation in the word of God, makes the reasons that are urged for a reformation so much the stronger; and that whatsoever names of reproach may be given to those, who have
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have the courage to stem the tide of vulgar errors and abusés, they act an honourable part, in espousing the cause of truth, which is the cause of God. For those who honour him, he will honour.'

Notwithstanding so much which has been said, and much more which might have been said in favour of the English Baptists; yet there is hardly any party, or denomination of Christians, that have been so basely misrepresented, and unkindly treated in the world as they. Wherever there has been any persecution, they, if any in those countries, have been sure to feel the hottest part of it. The books written against them, are not only very numerous, but commonly fill'd with foolish and scandalous stories, to render them odious: and the histories of this people, that are yet extant, are, for the most part, such as have been published by their greatest adversaries.

The foreign Baptists indeed have published some account of themselves, and their martyrology is a large book in folio; but the English have done nothing of this nature. It were much to be wished, that some abler hand had undertaken it; for, I believe, that none who have gone under this name in the world have behaved themselves better, or can have more said to their reputation, and to recommend them to the love and esteem of their fellow Christians, than those who have lived in England. And further, I will venture to say, that none of the reformed churches in
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in \textit{England}, or elsewhere, have behaved themselves with more prudence, piety, and charity, than the \textit{Englisb Baptists}; and, to their immortal honour be it spoken, they have never been persecutors of others for conscience sake, though they themselves have been persecuted by every sect.

Before the reformation was established, all \textit{Protestants} were, by \textit{Roman Catholicks}, branded with the name of \textit{Anabaptists}; as appears by King \textit{Henry VIII’s} speech to his parliament, \textit{Dec. 24, 1545}, and several of them in their examinations, and at their executions took care to clear themselves. `Behold, says he, what love \textit{Fox}, vol. III.

`and charity is among you, when the one P. 57.`

`. calleth the other \textit{Heretick}, and \textit{Anabaptist}, and he calleth him again \textit{Papist}, \textit{Hypocrite}, and \textit{Pharisee}.'

After the reformation, all that differed from the established church, had the same title bestowed upon them; and not one of the several sects, as I can find, escaped it.

Thus the \textit{Brownists} complain, in their third petition to King \textit{James I.} \textit{We Apology,}

`. have been, say they, all manner of ways P. 80, 112.

`. traduced, and divulged to be Donatists, \textit{Anabaptists, &c.}.

The male-contents, that is, those who continued in the church, but disliked several things in it, and endeavoured to \textit{Strype, c. have them reformed, complain of being xxviii. p. 293. reproached with this name by their brethren; as appears by their petition at the
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the beginning of Queen Elizabeth's reign.

The Family of Love were represented
by King James himself, to be a vile sect
among the Anabaptists; as they shew in
their petition to that prince, and of
which they endeavour to clear themselves.

'Whereas, say they, there is published
a book, written by your highness, as an
instruction to your most noble son, of a
people that are of a vile sect among the
Anabaptists, called the Family of Love,
who do hold and maintain many proud,
uncharitable, unchristian, and most ab-
surd opinions. — They, with humble
hearts, do beseech your majesty to un-
derstand, that the people of the Family
of Love, or of God, do utterly declaim
and detest all the said absurd, and self-
conceited opinions, and disobedient and
erroneous sorts of the Anabaptists, and
all other proud minded sects and here-
ies whatsoever.'

And further, To render the name of
Anabaptist yet more odious, they have en-
deavoured to represent the greatest Here-
ticks, and men who have been executed for
the sort of crimes, to be of the sect of the
Anabaptists.

Sir John Yelverton, lieutenant of the tower,
who was executed on Tower-hill for poision-
ing Sir Thomas Overbury was represented to
be an Anabaptist, as appears by his speech
on the scaffold. In which, says he, 'The
Lord Chief Justice, upon the closing up
of my speeches, at my arraignment, said
' I was an Anabaptist. I would to
' God I was as clear from all other sins,
' as
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as from that; for I always detested that condition.

How much weak minds have been wrought upon by such representations, appears still among the Paedobaptists, who never gave themselves the trouble of enquiring into the truth of facts. And the more ignorant of them, are even frighted at the name, and will hardly esteem their neighbours, thus denominated, christians. And that time might not blot out such representations, Mr. Neal was pleased to stamp a mark of his favour thereon: but what credit he has gained, even among his Paedobaptist friends thereby, let the world judge.

But I shall cite the Paedobaptists themselves, to take off the edge of such mischiefous, unchristian, and ill-natured representations; believing, that a word or two from them will go much farther with such bigoted persons, than all we can say, tho' never so full to the purpose, for our selves.

The first I shall mention is Mr. William Walker: who in the preface to his Plea for Infant-baptism, says thus; 'Of all dissenters from the church of England, none seem to lye under stronger prejudices, than the Anti-paedobaptists, as having so seemingly fair pleas to make, both for themselves, and against their opponents; and that both from scripture text, and ecclesiastical practice, as few of their fellow-dissenters can parallel. With
With the more favour and kindness, in my thoughts, are their persons, precisely considered as such, to be treated: and with the more fairness and clearness ought those endeavours, which are undertaken for the removal of their prejudices to be managed.

Obed Wills, M. A. in the preface to his Infant-baptism asserted, says, 'There are some very worthy persons, and eminent christians of that way [Antipædobaptists] whom I exceedingly honour for their gifts and graces, moderation and sweetness of spirit, and liberality towards all christians.'

Again; 'Tho' I contend with what I conceive is an error in them, yet I cannot but love their persons; for I know there are some of that persuasion, who for their eminency in grace, ought to be had in estimation by us.' And further adds, 'Tis hard in disputes, both not to be provoked, and not to provoke; nevertheless, I hope the godly, sober, and ingenious amongst them, will put the best construction upon all.'

Mr. John Rogers of St. Thomas Apostles in London, in his treatise of Church-discipline, having spoken of a small number of Anabaptists in Ireland, as he calls them, who discovered a malicious spirit, and refuted communion with other christians that differed from them; yet speaking of those in England, says, 'They excel all others of that practice, that I ever met with.'
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with. Many of that judgment here in
London, and other places, may be set
for eminent examples, both to them at
Dublin, and us here, of sweetness, pa-
tience, humility, obedience, self-denial,
and love even to all saints; and, indeed,
such in whom my soul much rejoices,
and hath been much refreshed.'

And as to their practice of dipping, he
says, 'Indeed I dare not deny my judg-
ment, to teach thus far for dipping,
above the other forms of sprinkling, or
pouring; that were it as orderly in our
church, and used, and no offence to
weak souls, I would sooner be induced
to dip one, that was never before
baptized, than to sprinkle one; for to
me, it would be more significant, and
full, and pregnant with former prac-
tices.'

Mr. Mark Needham, in his View of
England's Interest, published in 1659,
speaking of the Anabaptists in England,
as so itiled, and the injustice of charging
them with the crimes of those called so
in Germany, says, 'It is known, that many
learned men, and others, have been,
and are of the same judgment; who,
touching other particulars, are as or-
thodox as any.' Besides, Mr. Cawdry
faith, 'the scriptures are not clear, that
infant-baptism was an apostolical prac-
tice.'

Bishop
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Lib. 3. c. 13. Bishop Moreton, in his Appeal acknowledgeth, that there was an antient practice, for admitting infants to the sacrament of the Lord's-lupper, as well as to baptism; and that it held six hundred years in the church, yet in later times, it was thought fit to be laid aside. 'Shall any presume then, says he, to fasten an odium upon a whole party, which abounds with pious men, truly protestant in other points, merely because some others think, as they do concerning Pædobaptism, do fly out into other notions? By this rule of proceeding, I will easily condemn, not popery itself, and praelacy only, but other professions of men, whom to avoid offence I will not now name; because there is no one party of them, but have their transcendentials. But this shall not therefore, be an argument against the whole parties themselves; among whom the most are men of sobriety and gravity, and such we must allow to be the constitution of the baptized party.'

Mr. Richard Baxter, with whose testimony I shall conclude this head, in his works, says; 'I confess to you, of the two evils, I think the church is more corrupted, for want of a solemn renewing of the baptismal covenant at age, and by turning confirmations into a ceremony, than by those Anabaptists, who call people to be rebaptized, as the Averick council did those, that had been baptized by hereticks. Infants-baptism
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is no such easy controversy, or article of faith, as that no one should be tolerated, that receiveth it not. The antient church, which we most reverence, left all men to their liberty, to be baptized only when they pleased; and compelled none, for themselves, or their children. Tertullian was for the delay till they understood. Nazianzen was for the staying some years. Augustin and others of the Fathers were baptized at age.' And in his Life and Times he says; p. 140. And for the Anabaptists themselves; tho' I have written and said so much against them; as I found, that most of them were people of zeal in religion; so many of them were sober and godly people, and differed from others, but in the point of Infant-baptism, or at most in the point of predestination, and free-will, and perseverance, &c.

Again, in his book upon confirmation he says; 'Upon the review of my arguments, viz. with Mr. Tonges, upon the controversy about Infant-baptism, I find that I have used too many provoking words, for which I am heartily sorry, and desire pardon of God and him.' And further, in his Letter to Mr. Lamb's wife; 'If, says he, Mr. Lamb look into my book for Infant-baptism, let him know, that I much repent of the harsh language in it, but not of the main matter.

Thus
Thus this good old gentleman, and disciple of Christ, lived to see his fault in speaking injuriously of the Baptists; and repented, and did not scruple to make a public acknowledgment; an example worthy of imitation, and, therefore, I recommend it to the reverend Mr. Neal.
“A History of the Baptists should be understood in its objects and aims; and cleared, in the beginning, of misapprehension and perversion. It is not the history of a nationality, a race, an organization, but of people, traced by their vital principles and gospel practices. The unity to be exhibited and demonstrated was not brought about by force, by coercion of pains and penalties, by repressive and punitive Acts of Conformity; but by the recognition and adoption of a common authoritative and completely divine standard... the Word of God.”

Dr. J. L. M. Curry (1825-1903)
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