

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

(H. Knollys sc)

LONDON,

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

ReformedontheWeb

www.reformedontheWeb.com/home/html



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 Rejoinder to Mr. Wills his Vindiciæ; 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.*

S I R,

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-

A 2

vate

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 immineat*; calling it, p. 7. of your *Vind. A frivolous Charge*; excusing yourself 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 1. 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 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 *רחץ* whereas you say the *Dr.* tells us, *λύω* signifies the *washing the whole Body*, and answers to *רחץ* &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, denied 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 [*nostrū* *Wiclivistz* *Baptismum* *Ecclesiasticum*]

cum

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 ancient 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 Cœlorum erit aliquis medius, aut ullus alicubi locus, ubi beate vivant parvuli, qui sine Baptismo ex hac vitâ migrarunt sine quo in regno Cœlorum quod est vita æterna 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 *fathring upon Authors that which they say not*, you charge him with abusing *Basil. Appeal p. 181.* in fathring 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. *πιστεύου γὰρ δὲ προτέρῳ εἶτα τῷ βαπτισματι προσερχομεθα*, 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 publickly 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 *inhanuce* 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. | } | Jo. Gosnold. |
| Will. Kyffen. | | Hen. Forty. |
| Dan. Dyke. | | Tho. De Laune. |