

**THE HISTORY OF
INFANT BAPTISM:
IN TWO PARTS**

Published @ 2017 Trieste Publishing Pty Ltd

ISBN 9780649719655

The History of Infant Baptism: In Two Parts by W. Wall

Except for use in any review, the reproduction or utilisation of this work in whole or in part in any form by any electronic, mechanical or other means, now known or hereafter invented, including xerography, photocopying and recording, or in any information storage or retrieval system, is forbidden without the permission of the publisher, Trieste Publishing Pty Ltd, PO Box 1576 Collingwood, Victoria 3066 Australia.

All rights reserved.

Edited by Trieste Publishing Pty Ltd.
Cover @ 2017

This book is sold subject to the condition that it shall not, by way of trade or otherwise, be lent, re-sold, hired out, or otherwise circulated without the publisher's prior consent in any form or binding or cover other than that in which it is published and without a similar condition including this condition being imposed on the subsequent purchaser.

www.triestepublishing.com

W. WALL

**THE HISTORY OF
INFANT BAPTISM:
IN TWO PARTS**

THE HISTORY
OF
INFANT BAPTISM

In Two Parts

THE FIRST,
BEING AN IMPARTIAL COLLECTION OF ALL SUCH PASSAGES IN
THE WRITERS OF THE FOUR FIRST CENTURIES
AS DO MAKE FOR, OR AGAINST IT.

THE SECOND,
CONTAINING SEVERAL THINGS THAT DO HELP TO
ILLUSTRATE THE SAID HISTORY

By W. WALL, VICAR OF SHOREHAM, IN KENT



LONDON
GRIFFITH, FARRAN, OKEDEN & WELSH
(SUCCESSORS TO NEWBERRY AND HARRIS)
AND SYDNEY

THE HISTORY OF INFANT BAPTISM,

CONTAINING

SEVERAL THINGS THAT DO HELP TO ILLUSTRATE THE
SAID HISTORY.

PART II.

infant baptism to have been either not from the beginning, or not universal, have been brought to this concession by the instances of several ancients, who are pretended to have been born of Christian parents, and yet not baptised in infancy, p. 24.

CHAPTER III.

OF THOSE WHO ARE SAID TO HAVE BEEN BORN OF CHRISTIAN PARENTS,
AND YET NOT BAPTISED TILL OF MAN'S AGE, p. 25.

Sect. 1, p. 25.

An account of the persons, and state of their case.

Sect. 2. Of Constantine, and Constantius, his son, p. 27.

That were not born of baptised parents.

§ 1. Constantine was not baptised till just before his death, p. 27. § 2. His father was not a Christian, p. 28. Nor his mother, when he was born, p. 30. § 3. Constantius's parents were not baptised Christians when he was born, nor a long time after, p. 30.

Sect. 3. Of Gratian and Valentinian the Second, p. 32.

There is no proof that their father was a baptised Christian when they were born.

§ 1. The history of their father, p. 32. § 2. The time of the birth and death of each of them, p. 33. § 3. Valentinian desired baptism before his death, but missed of it, p. 35. § 4. Gratian probably was baptised, but not in infancy, p. 36. § 5. Their father does not appear to have been baptised himself till a little before his death, when the youngest of them was eight years old, p. 37.

Sect. 4. Of Theodosius the First, p. 37.

§ 1. He was not baptised till after he was Emperor, p. 37. § 2. His father was not a baptised Christian till he (the son) was twenty-five years old, p. 38.

Sect. 5. Of St Basil, p. 39.

There is no proof to the contrary but that he was baptised in infancy.

§ 1. The quotations brought by Mr Danvers for his baptism at his adult age are some of them forged, others unfairly recited, p. 39. § 2. Amphilocheus's *Life of St Basil*, from whence this story is fetched, is a forged piece, p. 39. § 3. Nazianzen, Nyssen, and Ephraim Syrus, writing the passages of his life, have no such thing, p. 40. § 4. The same man that baptised him, did afterwards give him ordination, p. 40.

Sect. 6. Of St Gregory Nazianzen, p. 41.

He was not baptised in infancy, though probably born of baptised parents.

§ 1. An account of when he was baptised, p. 41. § 2. His father was not a Christian till the year 325, p. 41. § 3. The old account is, that the son was born anno 300, which is contradicted by Baronius, p. 42. § 4. Papebrochius resettles the old account, and answers Baronius, p. 42. § 5. A quotation out of Gregory himself, that he was born after that his father was in orders, p. 44. § 6. Some other reasons on each side examined, p. 45. § 7. An inquiry when his sister Gorgonia and brother Cæsarius were baptised, p. 46.

Sect. 7. Of Nectarius, p. 48.

§ 1. He was elected Bishop before he was baptised, p. 48. § 2. There is not the least pretence that his parents were Christians, p. 48.

Sect. 8. Of St Chrysostom, p. 49.

His parents were probably heathens at the time of his birth.

§ 1. Ancient historians do say they were, p. 49. § 2. Grotius, without giving any reason, affirms the contrary, p. 49. § 3. Proof out of Sozomen, that Chrysostom himself was for some time a heathen, p. 51. § 4. M. du Pin's quotations on this subject examined, p. 51.

Sect. 9. Of St Ambrose, p. 52.

There is no account of his parents being Christians at the time of his birth.

§ 1. He was chosen for Bishop before he was baptised, p. 52. § 2. There is no proof that his parents were Christians at the time of his birth, p. 52. § 3. There is very probable proof from his own words of the contrary. p. 53.

Sect. 10, p. 54.

There is no proof to the contrary, but that St Hierom was baptised in infancy.

§ 1. Erasmus thought he was baptised at Rome, because he says he there took on him "the garment of Christ," p. 54. § 2. St Hierom by that phrase means the *monk's habit*, p. 55. § 3. Baronius's reason to the contrary considered, p. 56. § 4. The objection from his ordination answered, p. 58. § 5. The state of the monastic life at that time, p. 60. § 6. St Hierom's excessive value for it, p. 61.

Sect. 11. Of St Austin, p. 61.

His father was a heathen when he was born, and a long time after.

§ 1. He was thirty-three years old when he was baptised, p. 61. § 2. His father did not turn Christian till he [St Austin] was seventeen years old, p. 62. § 3. St Austin was a Manichee, and then a Deist, before he was a Christian, p. 64.

Sect. 12. Of Monica, Adeodatus, Alipius, and some others, p. 65.

They do none of them make instances to this purpose.

§ 1. It is not known whether Monica were born of Christian parents, and baptised in infancy, or of heathens, and baptised at years of discretion, p. 65. § 2. St Austin was no Christian when his son Adeodatus was born: as soon as he was baptised himself, he got his son baptised, p. 65. § 3. Alipius was a heathen first, and then a Christian, p. 65. § 4. A reflection on Mr Delaun's quotations against infant baptism, taken out of *Danvers*, p. 86, p. 66.

CHAPTER IV.

OF THE CHURCH OF THE ANCIENT BRITONS; AND OF THE SECTS OF THE NOVATIANS AND DONATISTS, WHICH ARE BY SOME THOUGHT TO HAVE BEEN ANTIPÆDOBAPTISTS. AND OF THE ARIANS, p. 67.

§ 1. *Danvers's* Proof from *Fabian's Chronicle*, that the ancient Britons were against infant baptism, is grounded on the misprinting of two or three words in one edition of that book; the contrary proved, p. 67. § 2. The pretence that the Novatians and Donatists denied infants' baptism, has no proof; there is proof to the contrary, p. 69. § 3. The Arians called Anabaptists: not that they disliked infant baptism, but because they rebaptised all that had been baptised by the Catholics, p. 71.

CHAPTER V.

OF SOME HERETICS THAT DENIED ALL WATER-BAPTISM: AND OF OTHERS THAT GAVE BAPTISM SEVERAL TIMES TO THE SAME PERSON. THE DISPUTE IN THE CATHOLIC CHURCH ABOUT REBAPTISING. OF THE PAULIANISTS, WHOM THE NICENE FATHERS ORDERED TO BE BAPTISED ANEW, IF THEY WOULD COME INTO THE CHURCH. THE REVENGE WHICH THE MODERN PAULIANISTS TAKE ON THOSE FATHERS, BY ACCUSING THEM OF TRITHEISM. THE FALSENESS OF THAT ACCUSATION, p. 72.

§ 1. The Valentinians, some of them, renounced all external baptism; others profaned it by their alterations of the form, &c. Their several tenets concerning it out of *Irenæus*, p. 72. § 2. *Quintilla* preached at Carthage in

the second century, that water-baptism is needless ; faith alone is enough, p. 73. § 3. The Manichees held that baptism in water does nobody any good, p. 73. § 4. The Messalians held the same, being a distracted sort of people. And so did the Ascodyti, Archontici, and Seleucians or Hermians, p. 74. § 5. The Marcionites of old, and the Muscovites of late, the only persons in the world that ever owned formal anabaptism, or rebaptisation of the same person several times, p. 75. § 6. The dispute among the Catholics, whether baptism given by heretics be valid, or must be reiterated. Baptism given in the right form of words, though by heretics, adjudged valid, p. 76. § 7. The Paulianists excepted by the Council of Nice from the number of heretics that were to have this privilege, p. 77. § 8. The modern Paulianists, do, in revenge, accuse the Nicene and other Fathers of Tritheism : and that they held not a numerical, but only a specific, unity of the Divine essence, p. 77. § 9. They persist in affirming this as proved by Curcellæus, after that all the instances produced by Curcellæus had been by Bishop Stillingfleet shown to be mistakes. The open affront given by M. le Clerc to all the Churches that own the Nicene Creed, p. 79. § 10. The new instances they bring from Tertullian, answered, p. 80. § 11. And those they bring from Gregory Nazianzen, p. 82. § 12. The heresies of Praxeas, Noetus, and Sabellius on one side, and Philoponus on the other, and the way the churchmen take to refute them, do plainly show that the Church held the numerical unity, p. 85. § 13. St Austin, St Hierom, St Ambrose, &c., do express fully the numerical unity of the essence : but these are blackened on other accounts, p. 89. § 14. The mischief brought on the credit of Christian religion, by vilifying the ancient professors of it, because their sayings cannot be brought to serve a turn, p. 90. *P.S.*—St Austin also in a late piece is made a tritheist. § 15. St Hilary vindicated from the same imputation, p. 92.

CHAPTER VI.

THE OPINIONS OF THE ANCIENTS CONCERNING THE FUTURE STATE OF INFANTS, AND OTHER PERSONS THAT HAPPENED TO DIE UNBAPTISED, p. 95.

§ 1. They do all understand that rule of our Saviour (John iii. 5), "Except one be born again," &c., of water-baptism. Calvin's new interpretation of that text, and the advantage which the antipædobaptists do take of it, p. 95. Also they do all by *the Kingdom of God* in that text, understand the kingdom of glory. The inconsistency of some later interpretations with the words of the text, p. 95. § 2. Their opinion of the case of martyrs dying unbaptised, that they went to heaven, p. 100. § 3. The case of converts believing, but being unbaptised. Those that had contemned or neglected baptism, con-

demned. Those that had fully resolved to take it, but missed of it, went, as some thought, to a middle state; as others thought to heaven, p. 101. § 4. Of infants dying unbaptised. All agree that they miss of the Kingdom of Heaven. They go, as the Greek Fathers think, into a middle state; as others, into some degree of punishment, p. 105. § 5. Of the degree of their punishment. St Austin thinks it to be a very moderate one; a state better than no being at all. The books in which the more rigid opinion is held, are Fulgentius's, and not his, p. 107. § 6. The opinions of the following ages. Fulgentius, anno 500; Pope Gregory, 600; Anselm, 1000; do speak of their being tormented. The schoolmen, anno 1200, go over to the opinion of the Greek Church, that they shall be in a middle state. The Council of Trent were about to determine the opinion of their being tormented to be a heresy, p. 110. § 7. Some in the Middle Age have conceived hopes of some unbaptised infants going to heaven. Hincmarus Rhemensis, Wickliff, the Lollards, Hussites, &c. (and the schoolmen for infants dying in the womb), and in the latter times Cajetan and Cassander, p. 112. § 8. The opinions of the Protestants, Lutherans, Calvinists, Church of England, English Presbyterians, antipædobaptists, concerning the possibility of salvation of unbaptised infants, p. 117. § 9. That all baptised infants dying such are saved; the generality of the Christian world has agreed. The ancient Prædestinarians and Semipelagians consented in this. Of the modern Prædestinarians some few have doubted or denied it, p. 119. § 10. The ancients never refused to baptise a child on account of the parents' wickedness, as some Calvinists now do, p. 122.

CHAPTER VII.

AN ACCOUNT OF THE STATE OF THIS PRACTICE FROM THE YEAR 400 TILL THE RISE OF THE GERMAN ANTIPÆDOBAPTISTS. OF THE WALDENSES, AND THEIR CHIEF ACCUSERS, ST BERNARD, PETRUS CLUNIACENSIS, REYNERIUS, PILICHDORF, ETC., THE CONFESSIONS OF THE WALDENSES THEMSELVES, p. 122

§ 1. There are no pretences of anyone in this period before the time of the Waldenses being against infant baptism, but what are proved to be mistakes. The instance of Hincmarus, Bishop of Laudun, shown to be such, p. 122. § 2. Of Bruno, Bishop of Angiers, and of Berengarius, Archdeacon of the same Church, there are reports that they held doctrines that do overthrow infant baptism; but they never owned any such, p. 125. § 3. A general account of the Waldenses, A.D. 1150. What the Popish historians do say of their tenets. What the present remainders of them do say of their ancestors. Some of their old confessions. The present debate, whether they were anciently pædobaptists or antipædobaptists, p. 126.