



THE
Baptists Answer,
TO
Mr. *OBED. WILLS*,
HIS
APPEAL
Against
Mr. *H. DANVERS*.

LONDON,

Printed for *Francis Smith*, at the
Elephant and Castle in *Cornhill*,
near the *Royal-Exchange*, 1675.





An Advertisement from the Bookseller.

THe Impartial Reader desiring Information into the Principle of Baptizing Believers, may be furnish'd with the following Treatises, bound together, or severally.

A Treatise of Baptism; wherein that of Believers, and that of Infants is Examined by the Scriptures, with the History of both out of Antiquity.

A Reply to Mr. Wills, in Defence of the said Treatise.

A Second Reply to Mr. Baxter, in Defence of the same.

A Rejoynder to Mr. Wills his Vindicia; with an Answer to his Appeal; all by Mr. Henry Danvers.

A Treatise concerning the Covenant and Baptism; wherein is shewed, that Believers only are the Spiritual Seed of Abraham; with a Reply to Mr. Whistons Answer to Mr. Danvers, by Mr. Edward Hutchinson: With a Letter [of Reproof] to Mr. Obed. Wills by T. B.



*The Baptists Answer to
Mr. Obed. Wills, his
Appeal against Mr. H.
Danvers.*

SIR,

WE have seriously con-
sidered your *Appeal*
against Mr. *Danvers*,
and have also heard, and careful-
ly weighed the *Defence* he makes
thereto ; and in order to give an
Impartial Judgment, as you call
us to, have desired some of our
Number diligently to examine the
Authors cited by you both ; and
though it appears to us, that Mr.
Danvers, has earnestly endeavou-
red an *accomodation*, in a more pri-

vate and friendly manner, betwixt you and him, so to rectifie mistakes on any hand, which (had it been accepted of) might have saved this *trouble* ; and that the Method you have used in this *Appeal* be unusual , and unlike the *Pattern* you seem to take ; an *Appeal* in these Cases being then only *proper*, when the Party appealed against, appears to be so *contumacious*, and *stubborn*, as to *reject*, and stand out against just *conviction* and *admonition* ; which we find not to be justly chargeable upon Mr. *Danvers*, and whether it be not rather your own oversight, we hope you will in time be sensible of ; yet we say, we shall not insist upon that *Consideration* ; and to give you, and the World that *satisfaction expected* from us,

some

some of us whose names are subscribed, have examined the Particulars you charge him with, and find some mistakes and escapes on Mr. *Danvers* side, which he ingeniously acknowledges; and we hope may be to your full satisfaction as it cannot (in justice) but be to ours, since (as you seem to hint) a publick owning, is what you expect.

Some of the Particulars in your Appeal, we find to be so trivial, and insignificant, that they deserve not to be mentioned, and deem his Answers returned to them respectively, sufficient to satisfy the Reader.

Others of your Charges he traverses, and joyns issue with you at the Bar you have brought it to, and the most material of these we now remark to you; so that what

he acknowledges, and what's *inconsiderable*, and what's here further examined, comprehends your whole Appeal.

And we must observe to you, that you lie *obnoxious* to the Return you made to Mr. *Danvers*, when he charged you with leaving out part of the Sentence of *Nazianzen*, viz. *Si aliquid periculi imminet*, calling it, p. 7. of your *Vind. A frivolous Charge*; excusing your self after such a manner as you will not be satisfied with from others; therefore if we say many of your Charges are *frivolous*, your Reason in your own behalf will *Justifie* us, you being Judge.

I. And therefore I. we desire you to consider, whether the *stopping your Translation out of Calvin*, where you did, P. 162. Appeal, be
not

not unfair, and a misleading an
English Reader.

II. You charge Coll' Danvers
Appeal, p. 166. to adde the words,
[for it cannot be, that the Body
should receive the Sacrament of Bap-
tism till the Soul hath before received
the truth of Faith] and say they are
not Jeroms Words, but of Mr.
Danvers Adding: But upon Exa-
mination of that place [Mat. 28.
Tom. 9 Edit. Paris. An. 1546.]
we find them to be Jeroms Words
Verbatim, as Mr. Danvers Cites
them. And we observe in your
Quotation of Mr. Danvers, in that
place you add, [Magd. Cent. 4.
c. 6. 418.] as if Mr. Danvers
had particularly Quoted the Magd.
there, which indeed he doth not;
but only Jerom upon Mathew,
which Double Injury we conceive

deserves

deserves your Double Consideration, in order to a Candid acknowledgment.

III. You charge him, p. 169. With abusing Calvin, fathering Estius's Words upon him, though he hath owned it a mistake in his Reply, But we observe also, That he Quotes Estius Annot. Gen. 17. 7. at the end, which you leave out, though you took all his words to that, and yet reprove him so often for the same, which seems neither ingenious nor fair.

IV. You charge him with abusing Dr. Hamond, p. 107. in affirming, That βαπτισμος signifies an Immersion, or Washing the whole Body, answering the Hebrew טבילה whereas you say the Dr. tells us, λύσεις signifies the washing the whole Body, and answers to טבילה &c. We have examined

mined the Doctor's Book, Printed for R. Royston, Anno 1653. and find Mr. *Danvers* quoted his words truly, and the mistake to be yours, which we hope will convince you of the untrue and unjust reproach you subjoyn, *That he understands not English Authors, &c.*

V. You charge Mr. *Danvers* for affirming from *Walden*, That the *Wickleivians*, in agreement to the Doctrine of *Pelagius* and others, denyed Infant Baptism, he acknowledges it to be his mistake to alledge, That it was agreeable to *Pelagius* and others, (said to be for Infant Baptism) but if *Walden* be to be believed, it appears, That the *Wickliffists* judged Ecclesiastical Baptism unprofitable to little ones, in these words [*nostræ Wiclivistæ Baptismum Ecclesiasticum*

cum inutile judicant parvulis contra omnes predictos] against all the aforesaid, *viz. Pelagius, Vincentius Victor, and those that Baptized Children, as born of Believing Parents.* And we must remark to you, that in your Quotation, p. 172. Appeal, you leave out [*parvulis*] the principal word there, and with what design or end we leave you to consider.

VI. You charge him, p. 179, 180. for adding the Words [*it is our Will, That all that affirm, That Young Children receive Everlasting Life, albeit they be not by the Sacrament of Grace or Baptism renewed*] to the *Milevitan Decree.* We have examined that 4th. *Tom. in Collect. Reg.* and find the *Canon* quoted by Mr. *Danvers* in p. 559. of it, taken out of a very antient Copy, immediately

ately following the Words you Cite, thus, *Item placuit, ut si quis dicit ideo dixisse dominum; In domo patris mei mansiones multe sunt, ut intelligatur, quia in regno Coelorum erit aliquis medius, aut nullus alicubi locus, ubi beate vivant parvuli, qui sine Baptismo ex hac vita migrarunt sine quo in regno Coelorum quod est vita aeterna intrare non possunt, Anathema sit, An. Christi* 424. Now for you to affirm, that the said Clause was of Mr. Danvers's own adding; whereas, as he says, *Here is an express Anathema against those that affirmed Children might be saved without Baptism, is an Instance (to give the most favourable conjecture of it) that you have made but a lame search: So that it is very just for us to acquit Mr. Danvers of this Charge. We presume you know, that the Magde-*
burgs

burgs give an account when they speak of that *Milevitan Synod*, of some that affirm'd Infants Salvation without Baptism, as by the Instances *Mr. Danvers* gives from them, undeniably appears; And in opposition to them was that *Anathema* enacted, and every Circumstance concurs to evidence it as genuine as the other *Canons*: And therefore upon a review of the place we question not but you will be satisfied here is no *forgery* or *prevarication* in *Mr. Danvers* in this Particular.

VII. Under the Head of his *fathering* upon *Authors* that which they say not, you charge him with abusing *Basil. Appeal p. 181.* in *fathering* those Words upon him, [*must the faithful be sealed with Baptism? Faith must precede, and*

go before] whereas you say, *there is no such Speech in what the Magd. repeat of Basil, contra Eunom.* which we conceive to be a very weak ground for your Charge. For must it follow, that the Words are not *Basils*, because you find it not in the *Magdeburgs*? we have search'd *Basil*, and find his VVords to be *lib. 3. p. 84. contra Eunom.* to the sence he is Cited by *Mr. Danvers*, viz. *πιστεύουσα γὰρ ὡς προτερόν ἔτα τῶ βαπτισμαῶ ἐπισφραγισθῆναι, i. e. It is necessary first to believe, and afterwards to be signed with Baptism.* So that this is also your own error and oversight.

VIII. You charge him with a notorious untruth, *p. 185.* for affirming from the *Magd.* That *Gulielmus added the Virgin Mary to the form of Baptism.* VVe have examined the *Magd. Cen. 13. p. 419 Cap. 4.*
Edit.

Edit. Basil Anno 1574. and find the words, *Male Gulielmus ad formam Baptismi addidit Mariam Baptizo te in nomine patris omnipotentis, & filii & spiritus sancti, & Beate Marie Virginis,* as Cited by Mr. Danvers; and therefore for you to affirm the contrary is a gross mistake.

And thus, Sir, we have given a true and impartial representation of the Particulars as we find them, being, as we conceive, the principal matters under our Cognizance, omitting the less material, & do recommend them to your *Christian consideration*, hoping that your serious review of them, will discover them to be your errors. And as Mr. Danvers has publicly owned what of mistake he is convinced of in his *Answer* to your *Appeal*: So it is justly expected, you will also, according to your promise

mise in the Preface to your Appeal, do the same in these Particulars.

And since your Charges do not appear to be true to the satisfaction of all impartial persons; but on the contrary great mistakes on your side, you will not, we hope, think it unjust if we acquit him, & reflect the blame of the Charge upon your self, as you desire, in case you be found in the error.

The Particulars Mr. Danvers owns in his said Answer to your Appeal, we bring not under our discussion or censure, concluding it to be enough that he acknowledges them,

And such petty Charges as he sufficiently answers, and are indeed of little weight, save to inhaunce the number of your Particulars, as also things controverted, and only collateral to the grand Proposition in dispute, (as are those things you call
strange

strange Doctrins, &c.) we think do not so properly offer themselves to our Considerations. And therefore we conclude we may be excused if we wave them.

And lastly, we propose, That if the Return we give to your *Appeal* should be deemed *insufficient* by you, or *short in any thing*, (which we are not conscious of) and that thereupon you take your self concerned to appear any further in *this Controversie*, you would be perswaded, that things may be transacted in an *amicable and friendly way*; which we hope may tend to our *mutual satisfaction* in the clearing up of Truth, and to Cherish that love, that all that fear the Lord should bear each other, though differing in some things, which is our very earnest desire; and to promote which, we shall endeavour to contribute the utmost we can.

London the 13th. of the 5th. Month 1675.

Hans. Knollys.

Will. Kyffen.

Dan. Dyke.

} Jo. Gosnold.

} Hen. Forty.

} Tho. De Lanne.

A POSTSCRIPT by H. D.

FOR the Readers better and more full satisfaction (after the great cry against me for Forgery and Prevarication by my Antagonists) I have here gathered you together, this brief account of all the mistakes of moment that I have met with from any hand. And which the Reader is desired to correct in the Treatise as he meets with them; which are as followeth, viz.

1. Of my own or Friends discovery, p. 55. 56. for Eastern r. Western, p. 139. for Erosnius r. Beza, p. 124. dele what is produced from Lanfrank about Beringarius, and p. 68. and 115. and Index, dele the Canon of the Council of Constant, as spurious.
2. Of Mr. Baxter's finding out, p. 223. for 3 & 4 book against the Donatists, r. 4 book, p. 286. 294. for Cochleus r. Walden.
3. Of Mr. Wills's, p. 75. for Aquinas, r. Albertus, p. 116. dele Deodans, and for Hincmarus r. Sericius, p. 117. r. Magdeburgs for Zonaras, p. 155. for work no such cause, r. be no such cause, p. 287. dele Pelagius and Vincenius Victor.

These being all the errors of any weight I have yet met with from any. The judicious Reader will be more able to discern;

A Postscript by H. D.

* To lead from the main question to things not to the purpose, and make a heavy stir about them, is the right Method of Cavillers, and which my Opposites take with me in this controversy.

1. Whether here be any Forgery or Prevarication, or any wilful abuse, or misleading the Reader, (as with so much virulence suggested) or any other oversight or mistakes, then such as usually attend other writings; and therefore whether all the clamour and out-cry of my Antagonists, discovers not more of malice than matter, and is the result rather of prejudice and passion, than a zeal for the candid investigation of truth. *

2. Whether since the Exceptions appear to be so insignificant and immaterial to the great point contended about, and no weighty objections made good after so severe a scrutiny, and troubling the World with the dust and pudder made about them, the Question in debate be not fully given up, viz. That it is now clearly manifest, that there is no Primitive Antiquity for Infants Baptism, nor no Record to make it appear that it was practiced as Christs Ordinance for the first 300 years; The truth whereof having not only been evinced by unanswered Arguments and Demonstration; but from their own Pens, being constrained at last to acknowledge, That except in case of danger of Death, there is no Record in the History of the Church for the necessity thereof in those first times.

Therefore the Reader is desired to take notice what ground we get herein, and how far this consideration tends to justify our practice, viz.

1. That the Baptizing of Believers, after profession of Faith, is not only evidenced by express precept and example from the Scripture; (the true and only way whereby Christs Ordinances are established to Protestants) but by the universal consent of all Ages; our very Enemies being Judges.

2. That

A Postscript by H. D.

2. That the Baptizing of Infants is neither to be made good by any express precept or practice from Scripture; nor as an Apostolical Tradition for these first and purest times; as our Adversaries also acknowledge; though they would insinuate as if they could consequentially deduce it; whereas no natural nor unforc'd consequence can be infer'd in its favour from Scripture or primitive Antiquity, but absurd and illogical non-sequiturs, proving nothing so much as the weakness of the cause they endeavour to support.

So that it necessarily and undeniably follows, That though Papists and some Protestants may plead Antiquity since the 5th. Century, and no higher (the Milevitan Synod that first imposed it, being in the year 416.) for the necessity of Baptizing of Children to take away Original sin, regenerate and save their Souls, with the Concomitants of Chrism, Exorcism, Gossips, &c. Yet the Protestants with whom we have to do (owning this to be a poysonous Antichristian Doctrine) cannot pretend higher for their Christ-^{*which ne-}ning Children upon the account of foederal ^{vel argu-}*right ment of foederal right is excellently refuted by Mr. Ep. Hut-

then the 15th. or 16th. Century. And that therefore (they rejecting the grounds of the Ancients) their Infants Baptism upon this new Medium is a very novelty. So that I hope we shall hear no more of Antiquity for Infants Baptism of any sort.

And 3ly. that it yet undeniably appears, that a famous Witness has been born for Believers and against Infants Baptism in the successive Ages since Christ.

And as a further ratification of the truth of these things pleaded for betwixt us in this contest, it may not be unnecessary to mind the Reader the sense that

A Postscript by H. D. A

that some standers have given by their suffrages, both as to the manner and matter pleaded for, which you have exemplified in the learned and judicious disquisitions of Mr. Hutchinson in his late Reflections and Animadversions upon Mr. Baxter, Mr. Wills, and Whiston's Writings. The Letter of Mr. T. B. to Mr. Wills, the Epistle of Mr. Tho. DeLaune before Mr. Hutchinson's; all of them so great strangers to me, that I neither ever saw any of their Faces, or so much as heard of their names that I know of, before their said works.

And to which I may presume to add a Letter sent to me upon this occasion, by a person of Quality, a searcher into this Controversie, and one of known worth, ability, and moderation; which you may take as followeth.

S I R,

As to Mr. Baxters Piece (which so soon as I heard of, I forthwith sent for) I have cursorily run over, especially that part thereof, which more immediately concerns your self, and am sorry to see so much Rancor and Malice in the Writings of one who hath had so great a Name for Religion and Piety: But whither will not Pride, Passion, and an Over-weaning Opinion of a mans self carry those who are overcome by them?

When I first read your Treatise of Baptism, I hoped it would have occasioned a serious and full disquisition of that point; but whether through the unhappy temper of your Opponents, or what else I know not, I have been hitherto disappointed in my expectation, meeting in their writings with

A Postscript by H. D.

with more of *heat, passion, and personal reflections*, than of *Reason* or a *sober Inquisition* after Truth.

I am not so well vers'd in *Antiquity*, as to say when *Infant Baptism* first came in use amongst *Christians*; but admire a matter of *fact* onely, as that is, should be so difficult to be determined: But if it were not in all, or at least the *first and purest Ages* of *Christianity*, (as some learned *Pædobaptists* seem to grant it was not) it cannot be said to be of *Apostolical Tradition*; the best plea, if true, I have yet heard for it; and therefore I could wish that point had been *soberly* and *calmly* debated. I must confess, I know not of any *difference* amongst *Professors*, of more *unhappy* and *pernicious* consequence then this of *Baptism*, in regard of that *separation* and *division* it causes amongst learned, sincere, and truly pious *Christians*; for such I no ways doubt but there are of both persuasions. But 'tis matter of greatest trouble and sorrow to me, to see with what *uncharitable* and *unchristian Spirits* some men manage this controversy, even to the reproach and scandal of *Religion*, and this too in a day, when our common sufferings ought in prudence, if not for *Piety*-sake to unite us, at least in *Brotherly love*, and a *Christian* walking together so far as we have *attained*, and in other things to a patient waiting for the *Revelation* of the mind of *God*, to them that differ; who in his good time will, I doubt not, *Unite* our *Affections*, *Heal* our *Breaches*, and make us all but *one Sheep-fold*, under the great Shepherd of the *Sheep Christ Jesus*, to whose guidance and protection I most heartily recommend you, and for the present remain, &c.

And

A Postscript by H. D.

And lastly, I hope the Baptists answer to Mr. Wills his Appeal against me, will have no small tendency to issue this Controversie, whose diligent search (by those learned Men they appointed there-to.) into the Authors quoted by me, and excepted against by him, will be a sufficient vindication (I doubt not) of my integrity in my Quotations, as well as the truth asserted thereby; and a due Reproof to Mr. Wills for his great Temerity, being himself so eminently found guilty by them in so many things he so injuriously charges upon me, insomuch that they (as he desires, in case my innocency appears to them) as you see, have thought just to acquit me, and reflect the blame of the Charge upon himself: All which is again submitted to his Conscience, the Impartial Readers, and the blessing of the Almighty. By

H. D.

