



V. LESLIE,
Theological
Bookseller,
57 St. John Str.
Lincoln, Lincolnshire
LONDON

5.29.23.

LIBRARY OF THE THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY
PRINCETON, N. J.

PRESENTED BY

The Estate of Rev. Geo. G. Smith.

SCC

Division.....

1725

Section.....

June 30th 1846. H. Forrester.

LAY-BAPTISM INVALID

Norman AND Mrs. Lott
ESSAY

To Prove, That

Such BAPTISM
Is NULL and VOID,

When Administer'd in Opposition to

The Divine Right
OF THE

Apostolical Succession.

Occasion'd chiefly by the *Anti-Episcopal* Usurpations of our *English* Dissenting Teachers.

The Fourth EDITION, more Correct than the former. In which some Notice is taken of an Ecclesiastical Declaration propos'd to be Establish'd, about ten Years since, in favour of such Usurpations.

With an APPENDIX: Wherein the Boasted Unanswerable *Objection* of Dr. BURNET, late Bishop of Sarum, and other *New Objections*, are Answer'd.

By R. LAURENCE, M. A.

To which is prefix'd a Letter to the Author, by the Reverend GEO. HICKES, D. D.

St. John xx. 21, 23. *As my Father hath sent me, even so send I you. — Whose soever sins ye remit, they are remitted unto them.*

Heb. v. 4. *No Man taketh this Honour to himself, but he that is called of God, as was Aaron.*

L O N D O N :

Printed for RICHARD KING, at the *Prince's Arms* in *St. Paul's Church-Yard*. MDCCXXIII.

1-11-11

1-11-11

1-11-11

1-11-11

1-11-11

1-11-11

1-11-11

1-11-11

1-11-11

1-11-11

1-11-11

1-11-11

1-11-11

1-11-11

1-11-11



THE
AUTHOR
TO THE
READER.



THE Occasion of Writing this Essay is sufficiently declared in the Title-Page; and the Design thereof is to contribute something towards the Recovery of those, who are almost drowned in the fatal Error, of thinking that they receive Christian Sacraments, when in Truth and Reality they receive none at all. I don't doubt but I shall procure to my self many Enemies by this Attempt; but no matter for that, if this my poor Endeavour, can but prove effectual to stir up the Clergy (whose Office it is) to Preach and Write frequently, to disabuse Mankind in so weighty an Affair.

I am well aware, how diligent the Adversaries will be to find what Faults they can; and I am not so vain, as to think my self to have escaped altogether free from some in this Essay. And therefore, that I might take away all Occasion of unnecessary Dispute, and save my self the Trouble of future Answers to what may be cavill'd at by some; I once for all declar'd, in the Second Edition of this Book, what I thought necessary for the more clear Explanation of my Design and Meaning in some Passages, which otherwise I fear'd might have given Offence.

In this Fourth Edition, all those Places are more correct in the Body of the Book it self, and therefore not necessary here to be particularly explain'd, except in the Appendix,

Page 128. and forward, where, in Answer to the 10th Objection, I have attempted to prove the Validity of Holy Orders conferr'd on Unbaptiz'd Persons: What I have propos'd in order thereto, I desire the Judicious Lovers of Truth to interpret only as an Essay. I am not so fond of any thing I have said about it, as to strive with those who may happen to differ from me: Nay more; if after due Consideration, it should be generally condemn'd by Orthodox Learned Men; I shall acquiesce, acknowledging, That a Man ought to be a Member, before he should be admitted to be a Minister of Christ in his Church.

What I have said in the following, and other Parts of this Book, in General Terms, relating to Lay-Baptism, I think necessary by way of Precaution here to explain; by telling my Reader, that I design thereby to mean such Baptism, as is performed by Persons who never receiv'd any Real Authority from their Bishops; or else by such as were
never

never really Authoriz'd, and yet act in Opposition to Episcopacy. "Whether Bishops, the Spiritual Governors of the Church, who have Power from Christ to give a Man a Standing Commission to be a Priest, cannot give him a Commission *pro hac vice*, in Cases of extreme Necessity, to do a Sacerdotal Act," I will not presume to determine. Neither do I think it necessary to dispute against those, who affirm that they can; provided the Layman be in Communion with, and an actual Member of that particular National, or Provincial Church, over which the Bishops preside who give such an Occasional Commission; provided also that they give him this Commission in SUCH A MANNER, and with such LIMITATIONS and RESTRICTIONS, as that there may be no more Reason to suspect the Truth of the Divine Authority residing in him, for the Executing of that Sacerdotal Act *pro hic & nunc*, in a Case of extreme Necessity, than there is to question the Validity of the STANDING COMMISSION of the Ordinary Priesthood. For then, in such Case, the Man acts not of himself, or as a mere Laick: He is suppos'd not to Administer by Virtue of any Canon of Foreign Councils; but as empower'd by the Authority of those Particular Bishops he is subject to. And I think it necessary to make these Proviso's; because, on the other Hand, it is well known, how apt Men have been, and still are, to pervert and abuse this Power and Authority, and misapply it to wrong and ill Purposes, by unsound and false Inferences; (as I myself have found by Experience, in my Conversation relating to my own particular Case) so far as at last to make the Christian Priesthood be esteem'd by the Heedless Multitude, as a thing of

no necessary Use and Value at all: And for this Reason 'tis that I have endeavoured so much (in this Essay, pag. 85. and Appendix, pag. 149, and 150.) to shew the Ill Uses which Men are apt to make of the Church's Power.

After all; whether a Church has, or has not the Power of Authorizing her own Laicks (as above specified) to Baptize in Cases of Extremity, I think I need make no Scruple to say,

1st, *That the Practice of one National or Provincial Church in this Case, cannot Authorize the Laicks of Another such Church, which gives them no such Authority.—— (As here with Us.)*

2dly, *That no Church can have any Power to allow Laicks of Opposite Communions to her, to Administer Baptism in that Case, much less when there is no Necessity at all: (As certainly there is none in our Dissenters Baptisms.)*

3dly, *That no Church has, or can have Power to Confirm Baptism so administer'd; because Confirmation supposes the Person to have been validly baptiz'd before, and his Baptism to be consummated and finished thereby.*

The Author of a Pamphlet entitled, New Dangers to the Christian Priesthood; who with great Rudeness, inconsistent with his Priestly Character has, by PARTIAL Quotations from my Two Books of Sacerdotal Powers, and Dissenters Baptism Null and Void, endeavour'd to persuade the World, that I Separate the Divine Commission from the Christian Ministry, and that I hold and affirm, that Bishops have Power to Authorize Laymen to Baptize, would have done but Common Justice to have consider'd, and let the World see what I have said here in Answer to a Question put to me concerning such a Power in Bishops. He knew in his

his Conscience, or might know, that this was in the Second Edition of Lay-Baptism Invalid, for he refers to that Edition in his abusive Pamphlet. He cannot deny, that in the same Edition, P. 155. I use these very Words, viz. "WHEN IT CAN BE PROVED, That Christ has vested his Church with such a Power, it will necessarily follow, &c." He might have known, that this was in Answer to an Objection which affirm'd, that the "Validity of Lay-Baptism stands on the Authority of the Church's Power to GRANT SUCH LICENCE to Lay-men in Extremities." He cannot chuse but be conscious to himself, if he read the Book, that I in the same Edition, P. 155, 156. shew'd the Danger of the Church's making use of such a supposed Power; these Passages are in p. 148, 149, and 150. of this present Edition. His Conscience must also tell him, that in p. 83. of Sacerdotal Powers, (which he pretends to quote, tho' he does it very unfairly) I say concerning Baptisms Administer'd by virtue of the Canon of the Council of Eliberis, these Words, "IF ANY THING CAN BE SAID for the Validity of those Lay-Baptisms." And p. 85. concerning Midwife-Baptism, allow'd by the Church of Rome, I say thus, "So that upon Supposition, which I DARE NOT GRANT, that those Midwife-Baptisms could be defended as Valid, upon the Account of their Bishops having first granted them such Power, &c." — Lastly, to let the World see a little more of the Integrity of this Writer, he cannot be ignorant that he is very unjust in his Quotation, from p. 6, and 7. of Dissenter's Baptism Null and Void; for in p. 7. before the Period is finish'd, I say, concerning the Church's Power to Authorize her Laymen to

Baptize, thus, "Which, whether RIGHT OR " NO, is no ways applicable to our Laymen and " Dissenters, who are utterly destitute of any " such Plea, &c." By all which Passages the Impartial Reader may easily see, that I do not affirm, that Bishops have Power so to Authorize Laymen; but that, if Bishops could be suppos'd, or prov'd to have such a Power, yet even then our Dissenters Baptisms are Null and Void notwithstanding. The whole Argument runs upon [if they had Power] [whether Right or no, &c.] But these necessary Connections he purposely omitted, because he knew that if he had inserted them 'twould have discovered the Falseness of his Charge, and have spoil'd his Design, of endeavouring to render a Person odious, when he was not able to confute that Truth which he had asserted. How awkwardly soever I may have defended it, that must be left to more impartial Judges than this Gentleman has shew'd himself to be; however, thus much He and his Friends have discovered by their Attempts hitherto, that they dare venture no farther than to nibble at such little things, as are wholly foreign to the MAIN MATTER disputed; and this they do without any Argument at all, while the Merits of the Cause lie neglected by them, as being in their Opinion, either not worth their Regard, or else, because the Invalidity of Lay-Baptism is too great a Truth for them expressly and directly to endeavour to overthrow. — This Writer calls upon me to answer him positively, whether I will hold and maintain, that " Bishops can Authorize Laymen to " Baptize." I hereby assure him, that I will give him no positive Answer to this Question. I will not Declare my self absolutely, either for or against

gainst that Power for Cases of Extremity, but leave it as I found it, and will keep my own Private Opinion about it, to my self; which I am sure I have a Right to do, without any Obligation to publish it for the Sake of such unreasonable and ill-grounded Challenges, as this angry Gentleman has made me; and this shall be all the publick Notice that I will take of his unhandsome Performances; (and which indeed is more than due to them) after I have told him, that some Great Men hold, that Bishops, by their Apostolic Authority, can Authorize Laymen to Baptize in Cases of Extremity, i. e. in want of a Priest: that it is with these Gentlemen I have treated in my Three Books (giving them Argumentum ad hominem) upon their own Principles. That there are others who affirm, that Bishops have not such Power; and that 'tis my Assertion, that whether they have or have not this Power, my Principles stand firm, that Persons not Commission'd, not Authoriz'd, i. e. not really Authoriz'd, (for 'tis not Authority, if 'tis not real) do not Minister Valid Baptism; And this is the Case of our Dissenters Baptisms, let what will become of that other Question. For, if Bishops have not such a Power, then 'tis plain, that the Ministrations of Baptism is an Incommunicable Function of the Standing Priesthood; and so, no Lay-Ministration whatsoever can be Valid, by being allow'd, tolerated, licens'd, approv'd of, or authoriz'd by Bishops. This effectually ruins the Cause of Necessity, which our Author would plead: Because, if Bishops cannot Authorize Laymen, validly to Baptize in Want of a Priest; it must be, because Lay-Christians (as such) have not a CAPACITY to Receive the Divine Commission for such an Exigence: And if they have not this Capacity,

Capacity, *then the Exigence it self cannot empower or authorize them; except a Negative has more of Potentiality than the Positive Power of the Bishops; which is absurd. And therefore our Dissenters (upon this Supposition) are utterly excluded from Ministring Valid Baptism; as they would also, if Necessity could empower Laymen: For they are under no Case of Necessity, where Priests are to be had. And again: If Bishops have such a Power to Authorize their own Laymen, as before specified; our Bishops have not so Authoriz'd their Laymen: And if they had, our Dissenting Teachers are not THOSE LAYMEN; but Laymen Anti-Episcopal, in Rebellion against Episcopacy it self; who intrude into other Men's Provinces, and wickedly attempt (Uncall'd and Unsent) to Minister where there is not so much as any Pretence of Necessity for their Intrusion. And therefore, in both Cases, our Dissenters cannot Minister Valid Baptism.*

This, concerning their dear Friends, the Dissenters, the Adversaries know they cannot get over, and therefore it is that they make such a Bustle, to raise a Dust that Men's Eyes may be blinded, and so hinder'd from seeing this great Truth. To obstruct which, they endeavour to persuade the World, that the Priesthood it self is in New Dangers from those very Doctrines, which are the only Support of it; while they themselves are such Enemies to the Priesthood, that they are endeavouring effectually to destroy it by their pernicious Principles, opposing the Churches Spiritual Independency, the Christian Altar, and Sacrifice, Absolution, and the Ministration of Baptism, as Christ himself appointed it. And this puts me in mind of a late very dangerous Step, that was going to be
made,

made, and which if it had taken Effect, might, without an extraordinary preventing Providence, in a little time have destroy'd the whole Sacerdotal Power and Authority with us; and this was an Attempt to establish a strange, and before to us unheard-of Declaration, that (as those who indited it say) "In Conformity with the Judgment " and Practice of the Catholick Church, and of " the Church of England, in particular. — " Such Persons as have already been Baptiz'd, " in or with Water, in the Name of the Father, " Son, and Holy Ghost, (Altho' their Baptism " was IRREGULAR FOR WANT OF A PROPER " ADMINISTRATOR) ought not to be Baptiz'd a- " gain.

The plain English of which is, that such Persons as have already been, contrary to the Law of Christ, Wash'd or Sprinkled with Water, by any One whatsoever, whether Un-authorized Man, Woman, or Child, Christian, Jew, or Heathen, nay, whether they wash'd themselves, or let one of those others do it, provided it was but done with these Words, [In the Name of the Father, &c.] ought not to be Baptiz'd by a Proper Administrator whom Christ has appointed. For in all these Cases, the Washing is Irregular for want of a proper Administrator, and therefore not, what deserves the Name of CHRISTIAN BAPTISM; tho' the Declaration begs the Question that it is so, by saying [such Persons as have already been Baptiz'd, &c.] For this Irregularity is an Essential Irregularity, because contrary to the Positive Institution of Christian Baptism; and 'tis Irregular for no other Reason, but its being without, or contrary to that Rule; as this Book is design'd to prove. An Endeavour to make the World believe, that

that such Washings as are Irregular for want of a PROPER Administrator, are Valid Baptisms, and this without any Limitations, either for Cases of Necessity, or for the excluding of Women, Heathens, or Stage-Players, &c. is such a Latitude, that it does not fall short of even the worst Corruptions of the Church of Rome. Nay, the Decrees of some of their Popes, &c. concerning Midwife-Baptism, and that given by Pagans, limit them to Cases of Necessity; but this design'd Declaration makes not even this Provision, to secure the Authority of the Christian Priesthood for the Administration of Baptism, but opens a Door for all Intruders, even where there is no Pretence of Necessity. It advises indeed, that "Men take heed that they usurp not an Office whereunto they be not call'd, for God will call them to account for so Doing:" But alas, what Effect can this Advice have, when the Declaration before pronounces their Ministrations Valid; Valid without any Exception of Time, Person, Place, or Circumstance. Will God call Men to account for their Valid Ministrations? For their effecting that which he has appointed to be effected? For their doing of that, which he concurs with, and from the Valid Performance whereof, he has by no Law excluded them? For, if he has by any of his Laws excluded them from the Valid Ministration of Christian Baptism, then their Attempt to Minister it, is an Invalid Act. If he has by no Law excluded them from the Valid Ministration thereof, then their Attempt to Minister it, is no Breach of any Law of his; for, where there is no Law, there is no Transgression, and consequently they will not be call'd to account for it; which plainly shews the great Inconsistency of such a Declaration.

tion. Besides, this Declaration was design'd, it says, "To teach a Truth, to take a Yoke of "Doubtfulness from Men's Consciences, and "to resist an Error NOT MUCH differing from "DONATISM and ANABAPTISM.

The supposed Truth it would teach, has been seen already. Its Latitude, its Contrariety to the Scripture, to the Judgment of the Universal Church, and of the Church of England in particular, which never made a Law or Canon of so universal and unlimited a Nature, are evident to all serious and knowing Enquirers into this Matter. Tertullian Himself, who by degrees fell into this singular Latitude of allowing Laymen to be Priests, in Cases of Necessity, contrary to the Doctrine and Practice of the Catholick Church; expressly and absolutely Excludes Women's Power to Baptize. De Baptismo Cap. 17.—The Constitutions of the Apostles, Book III. Chap. 6, 9, & 10. repudiate all Lay-Ministrations, and particularly Lay-Baptism, and Baptism by Women.—So does St. Epiphanius against the Collyridians utterly disallow of Baptism by Women. See his Works, Book III. Tom. 2. Which Testimonies I thought proper to add here (to those of my Preliminary Discourse) upon this Occasion, that Men may see what a pretended Truth some would Establish, and how Conformable it is to the Judgment and Practice of the Catholick Church.—

The "Yoke of Doubtfulness," &c. would be laid heavier on, rather than taken from, Men's Consciences by such a Declaration; which says, That "God will call Men to account for usurping an Office [of Baptizing] whereunto they "be NOT CALL'D." For, will not the scrupulous Person, who was pretendedly Baptiz'd by one

of

of these, and comes to know it, be very apt to say, How can I rest satisfied in a Baptism declar'd to be Irregular, for want of a proper Administrator, [i.e. One call'd of God] When the Uncall'd pretended Administrator, will by God himself be call'd to Account as an Usurper of the Priestly Office, for Baptizing me? Will God judge him for so doing? And shall I escape his Judgment for knowingly concurring with, or acquiescing in, his sinful Act? By what means shall I extricate my self out of this Difficulty? If 'tis Sin in him, 'tis so in me too, by my approving of it; and yet (that this Scruple may cease) approve of it I must. But how can I approve of it, since it was sinful in the very Act? And thus I find no Relief from such a Declaration, which involves me in Sin, and prohibits my being extricated out of it.

The supposed Error it was designed to oppose, is this; That pretended Baptism, Administred without the Divine Authority or Commission; i.e. by One who has not this Commission, is not Christian Baptism, but Null and Void. Is not this much Differing from the Real Error of Donatism, which was, That the Donatists Rebaptiz'd those who came over to them from the Catholick Church, tho' they had been before rightly Baptiz'd in or with Water in the Name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost, and by One in Real, Valid Holy Orders too? What has this to do with the Matter before us?

And as for Anabaptism, its Error is twofold: First, It Nulls Baptism in an Infant, howsoever and by whomsoever Administer'd. Secondly, In Grown Persons, if they were not plung'd all over in Water; in both which they make the AGE of the Person Baptized, and the VERY GREAT

QUANTITY of *Water* sufficient to cover the *Person*, Essential to the *Ministration* of this *Sacrament*; *Errors* so infinitely *Different* from the *Case* before us, that *One* would wonder how *Men* could *Invent* the *Notion*, of their being not much *Different* from what is *Asserted*, and, *I* hope, fairly *proved*, to be a *Great Truth* in this *Essay*.

The *Author* of a *Pamphlet*, call'd, *The Judgment* of the *Church* of *England* in the *Case* of *Lay-Baptism* and *Dissenters Baptism*, has *publish'd* what he calls *The Second Part* of the *Judgment*, &c. 'Tis an *amazing thing* to see *Men* so *expose themselves*: For this *Gentleman* amuses the *World* with a *Repetition* of all that he had said before; and gives his *Reader* the same *Things* over again, but in other *Words*, and in a *Method* something *diversified* from the former; putting *People* to an *Unnecessary Charge*, besides a *Trial* of their *Patience*, to bear with the *Reading* a *second Time* what they had read before; which is still the more *aggravated* by his *Want* of *Argument*; by his not so much as *endeavouring* to *confute* the *Reasons* brought against his *First Part*, in the *Answer* thereto, call'd, *Dissenters Baptism Null and Void*; (for he tells his *Reader*, that he does not design this as a *Reply* to that *Book*;) by his *unbecoming Language*, in giving *Ill Names* to what he knows he cannot *confute*; and lastly, by his *industriously Evading* the *MERITS* OF THE *CAUSE*; when he knows that the *Church* of *England* has concern'd *Her Self* therewith, that her *Articles* of *Religion* are built upon it, and that he is oblig'd in his own *Defence* to enter into it.

This *Author* mightily triumphs in *Bishops* confirming *Children*, pretendedly *Baptiz'd* by *Dissenting Teachers*, as if they therefore acknowledg'd those
Baptisms

xiv To the READER.

Baptisms to be Valid.— But I can tell him, that there are some who say, that those Baptisms are not Valid before Confirmation, but made valid by Confirmation; this (tho' I absolutely deny it) I can prove to be the Foundation upon which Confirmation has been given to Persons so pretendedly Baptiz'd; and our Author would do well to consider, whether those Bishops he speaks of, did not Confirm them upon the same Foundation, before he so positively affirms, that those Bishops allowed their Baptisms to be Valid: For, if 'tis true, that some act upon this false Foundation, others may have done so likewise; and this will spoil our Writer's Supposition, however insufficient to make those Baptisms Valid, as I have endeavour'd to prove in this Essay.

I have in this Fourth Edition added some further Arguments to prove the main Proposition, so much avoided by this Author, and endeavour'd to Answer new Objections for the Satisfaction of some who may be led away by them. I have nothing more to request of my Reader than Christian Justice and Equity in his Censures, and that he would heartily join with me in this Prayer to Almighty God, That it would please Him to bring into the Way of Truth, all such as have Erred, and are Deceived.





T H E
C O N T E N T S.



<i>Letter to the Author,</i>	Pag. i, to lxx
<i>A Preliminary Discourse of the Various Opinions of the Fathers, concerning Rebaptizations, and Invalid Baptisms; with Remarks,</i>	Page 1.
<i>St. Cyprian and his Collegues Opinion of Heretical and Schismatical Baptisms,</i>	ibid.
<i>The Opinion of Stephen Bishop of Rome, and his Party, concerning such Baptisms,</i>	2
<i>The Arguments of the Stephanians for their Validity,</i>	ibid.
<i>The Cyprianists Reasons for their Invalidity,</i>	3
<i>St. Cyprian's Christian Humility and Charity towards his Antagonists,</i>	9
<i>The contrary Temper of Stephen Bishop of Rome,</i>	ibid.
<i>The Apostolick Canons establish St. Cyprian's Opinion,</i>	9, 10
<i>St. Athanasius rejects Heretical Baptism,</i>	10
<i>The Council of Eliberis allows of Lay-Baptism in Case of Necessity, but with a particular Proviso,</i>	11
<i>The Council of Arles determines the famous Dispute about Rebaptizing Hereticks.</i>	12
<i>But nothing concerning Lay-Baptism,</i>	13
<i>The Orthodox after the Council of Nice reject Lay-Baptism,</i>	ibid
	2
	St. Basil

The CONTENTS.

<i>St. Basil does so too,</i>	14
<i>His Opinion of Heretical and Schismatical Baptism,</i>	15
<i>The Councils of Laodicea, Constantinople, Capua, and Carthage,</i>	15, 16.
<i>The Third Council of Carthage disallows Baptism by Women,</i>	16
<i>St. Chrysoſtom againſt the Validity of Lay-Baptiſm,</i>	ibid.
<i>St. Auguſtin's Argument againſt the Donatiſts, not concluſive for the Validity of Lay-Baptiſm,</i>	18
<i>Nor his Arguments againſt the Cyprianiſts,</i>	20, 21
<i>The Author's Caſe, and Diſſatisfaction,</i>	26
<i>His Short Answer to ſome who would perſuade him, that the Baptiſm adminiſter'd to him in Oppoſition to Epiſcopacy, was good, becauſe done in his Infancy,</i>	27
<i>His Thoughts about the Diſpute in St. Cyprian's Time,</i>	ibid.
<i>His Reſolution however not to meddle with it,</i>	31
<i>His Deſign in this Diſcourſe,</i>	32

THE INTRODUCTION.

Of the Nature and Obligation of Divine Poſitive Inſtitutions of Religion.

DEFINITIONS OF

<i>A Divine Poſitive Inſtitution,</i>	33.
<i>The Eſſential Parts of ſuch an Inſtitution,</i>	ibid.
<i>An Invalid Act,</i>	34.
<i>Supernatural Advantages annex'd to ſuch an Inſtitution,</i>	ibid.
<i>The Divine Authority of the Adminiſtrator,</i>	ibid.
<i>A Lay-Adminiſtration,</i>	ibid.
<i>Axioms, or Undeniable Maxims.</i>	35.

The CONTENTS:

PROPOSITIONS.

- I. *Every Essential Part of a Divine Positive Institution, is of Equal Obligation and Necessity,* 36
Corollary. *Hence no Human Authority can determine one Essential Part of such an Institution, to be more Excellent or Necessary than another,* 37
- II. *If an Act (said to be done in Pursuance of a Divine Positive Institution) be wholly Null and Void, for want of one Essential Part of the Institution; 'tis also as much Null and Void, when it wants but any other One Essential Part of the same Institution,* *ibid.*
Corollary. *Hence there's no such Thing as a but Partial Invalidity; 'tis entire, for want of any One Essential Part of a Positive Institution,* 38
- III. *We have no Reason to expect the Supernatural Benefits annexed to a Divine Positive Institution, without endeavouring to conform to every one of its Essential Parts, when we know that we have not yet conform'd to them,* 39

The ESSAY.

Of the Nature and Benefits of Christian Baptism, 40
'Tis no other than a Divine Positive Institution, 41
Consequently, our Obligation to receive it, and from the Persons by whom 'tis order'd to be administer'd, is wholly and only founded upon the Divine Command, *ibid.*

Prop. I. *That the Divine Authority of the Administrator, is an Essential Part of Christian Baptism,* 42
Prov'd,

1st, *From God's making the Divine Authority of the Administrator, to be an Essential Part of his*

The CONTENTS.

- own Positive Institutions under the Mosaic Law,* 44
- 2dly, *By the Example of our Saviour's not taking upon him to Minister in such Holy Things, till he was particularly and externally Commission'd for that Purpose,* 46
- 3dly, *From the Words of Institution of Christian Baptism,* 48
- 4thly, *From the Design and Benefits thereof,* 60
- 5thly, *From the constant Practice of the True, and Pretended Ministers of the Christian Church,* 65
- 6thly, *From the Doctrine and Practice of the Church of England,* 67
- Prop. II. *That the Divine Authority of the Administrator of Baptism, is as much obliging and necessary to us, as the Water and Form of Administring in the Name of the Trinity,* 75
- Corollary. *Hence no Human Authority can dispense with the Omission of the Divine Authority of him who administers,* 76
- Prop. III. *Whosoever affirms Baptism to be wholly Null and Invalid, for want of either Water, or the Form of Administring in the Name of the Trinity; ought (for the same Reason) to acknowledge Baptism as much Null and Invalid, when it wants only the Divine Commission of the Administrator,* 77
- Corollary. *Hence the Invalidity of such Baptisms, as are administer'd by Unauthoriz'd Persons, cannot be Partial, but Entire,* 78
- Therefore,*

The CONTENTS.

- Therefore Imposition of the Bishop's Hands, is not sufficient to make such Baptism Valid,* 79
- The Church of England, in her Office of Confirmation, (appointed only for validly Baptiz'd Persons) gives us not the least Intimation of any such Efficacy in the Imposition of the Bishop's Hands,* 81
- Of the pretended Practice of Antient Churches to this Purpose,* *ibid.*
- The Unavoidable Mischiefs that must follow upon Allowing the Validity of Lay-Baptism,* 84
- 'Twill be then in vain for the True Ministers of Christ, to tell the People of the Damning Nature of Schism,* 85
- Prop. IV. *He who knows himself to have been invalidly baptiz'd by one who never had the Divine Commission, can have no just Grounds to expect the Supernatural Benefits annexed to the One True Christian Baptism, till he has done his utmost for the Obtaining of them, by endeavouring to procure that One Baptism from the Hands of a divinely Authoriz'd Minister,* 87
- The great Danger they incur, who know themselves to have been invalidly-baptiz'd by a Layman, in Opposition to, and Rebellion against those who were truly Authoriz'd to baptize,* 88
- It highly concerns those who are ignorant of this, to undeceive themselves, if possible, that they may be sure of the Validity of their Baptism,* 89

OBJECTIONS Answered.

- I. *Christ, in the Words of Institution, does not, (in express Terms) confine Baptism to the Administration*

The CONTENTS.

ministration of his Apostles and their Successors, so as that none can Administer True Baptism but they, and such only as they shall Authorize, 90

II. *This Doctrine confines the Efficacy of the Sacraments to the Divine Authority of the Administrator; insomuch, that if an Uncommission'd Person Ministers, he Administers no Sacraments at all,* 92

III. *Who has this Divine Authority is in Dispute, and consequently the Foundation of Baptism is very precarious and uncertain,* 96

The Diligent and Industrious, who live in Conscientious Communion with the True Church, need not be in Suspense about this Dispute; and why, ib.
This Divine Right of Administring, is in Episcopacy only, 98

The Authors who have abundantly prov'd this, refer'd to, 100

IV. *'Tis uncharitable to deny the Validity of the Baptism of Foreign Churches, and some among our selves,* ibid.

The Author's Charity for some who are invincibly Ignorant, 102, 103

V. *The Example of Zipporah, Moses's Wife, who Circumcis'd her Son,* 103

VI. *Fieri non debet; factum valet: i. e. It is not Lawful to be done; yet being done, 'tis Valid,* 105

VII. *The Council of Eliberis, Anno 305. and the Church of England at the Beginning of the Reformation,*

The CONTENTS.

formation, allow'd of *Lay-Baptism* in a *Case of Necessity*; as the *Church of Rome* does to this Day, 107

The Church of England saw *Reasons* afterwards not to give *Liberty* for such *Baptisms*; and therefore now in her *Liturgy*, requires *Baptism* (even in *Cases of Necessity*) to be *Administred* by a *Lawful Minister*, 110

St. Cyprian, and *Bishop Taylor's Opinion*, if the *Custom* of such *Lay-Baptism* had continued, *ib.*

VIII. Of the *Censers* that were *Hallowed* by the *Two Hundred and Fifty Princes* sinful *Offering of Incense*, 112

The Subject of this *Essay*, the *Author* believes to be a *First Principle* of *Christianity*, 115

The great Danger of not *Asserting* and *Vindicating* it, *ibid.*

His short Address and *Request* to the *Clergy*, 116

And Caution to those who endeavour to *usurp* the *Sacred Office*, *ibid.*

His Prayer for the *Church* and *Clergy*, 117

APPENDIX.

The Reason for making this *Addition* in *Answer* to

FURTHER OBJECTIONS.

IX. Of *Unchurching* the *Foreign Reform'd Churches*, who are without *Episcopal Ordination*, this the *Objector* says is *contrary* to the *Concessions* of many *Episcopal Divines* of the *Church of England*, 118

The CONTENTS.

- The Author's charitable Thoughts of many Foreigners,* 121
- The Episcopal Divines spoken of, have by their Concessions, contradicted the Doctrine and avowed Practice of the Church of England,* 122
- A Comparison of a True Priest of the Tribe of Aaron, undertaking to defend the Validity of the Priesthood which Jeroboam had set up,* 123
- No Case of Necessity can of it self Authorize us to assume the great Office of mediating between God and Man,* 125
- Episcopacy cannot be utterly extinct,* 126
- But if it were, 'tis safer for us to wait and hope for some new Revelation of God's Will, to appoint Ministers, than take it upon our selves,* 127
- X. *Of the Nullity of their Orders and Ministrations who have not been Baptiz'd, and yet have been Episcopally Ordain'd to the Ministry,* 128
- An Essay towards an Answer to this Objection,* 129
- But with Submission to the better Reasons of the Clergy,* 139
- The Author's final and determinate Answer to the Objection,* *ibid.*
- XI. *Of the Powers of the Hierarchy, to relax Stated Rules in Cases of Necessity, and of Confirming and Ratifying by Chrism or Imposition of Hands, such Heretical, Schismatical, or Mimical Baptisms, as are done without, nay and against the Consent of the Hierarchy,* 140
- Our Hierarchical Powers have provided no Act of Confirmation of such Baptisms,* 142

The CONTENTS.

- The Powers of the Hierarchy are for ever limited (in things fundamental) to the Canon of the Holy Scriptures,* 142
- Their Hazard in dispensing with things fundamental, and our Insecurity in such Dispensations,* 143
- If the external Rite of such Baptisms does not confer Spiritual Graces, &c. as the Objection supposes, then no after Act of the Bishop, can confirm those Baptisms; but the external Rite must be perform'd by a Lawful Minister,* 144
- Why some Churches allow'd of Antient Heretical and Schismatical Baptisms,* 147
- The ill Use that Hereticks and Schismaticks may make of the Church's supposed Power to License Lay-men to Baptize in Cases of Extremity,* 148
- The Benefit of Asserting the Ministration of the Priesthood to be Essential to the Administration of Christian Sacraments,* 151
- XII. *Of the Church of the Jews changing the First Posture of Standing to eat the Paschal Lamb, into that of Leaning or Lying along,— Of David and his Mens eating the Shew-Bread, which was not lawful but for the Priests alone; and of our Saviour's telling the Jews that God will have Mercy and not Sacrifice.* 153
- None of these Scripture Instances at all parallel to the Administration of Christian Baptism prov'd at large.*
- 1st, *The Posture of Eating the Paschal Lamb,* 154
- 2d, *The Shew-bread,* 157
- 3d, *I will have Mercy and not Sacrifice,* 163
- XIII. *The late Bishop of Sarum's boasted unanswerable Objection, concerning the Usurpation* of

The CONTENTS.

of the Jewish High Priesthood and Atonement,
173

XIV. Of our Saviour's commanding not to forbid the Man who cast out Devils, — when the Apostle would have him forbid because he followed not Christ and his Apostles, 193

XV. Of the Scriptures calling All Christians, Priests, &c. 195

The Conclusion, in a Serious and Humble Address to the Most Reverend, the Right Reverend, and the Reverend, The Governors and Ministers of Christ over his Flock in all Parts of the Universal Church, 203



ERRATA.

IN a Letter to the Author, p. xxxii. In the marginal Note instead of *Hereticus* read *Hæreticus*. p. xxxiii. is false paged xxiii. *ibid.* line 10, instead of *hav-* Read *having*. p. xlv. l. 2. dele *æ*. p. lvi. In the marginal Note l. 1, for § 70, r. § 60.



A L E T-



A LETTER to the
AUTHOR.

S I R,



THE deplorable State of Christianity in those Parts of it which have reform'd from Popery in Doctrine, is chiefly to be ascrib'd to the Contempt or Neglect of the Divine Institutions, relating to the Constitution and Oeconomy of the Church. This in particular hath brought all the Disorder and Confusion in Matters of Religion, for which *England* is scandalous above all other Christian Countries; having ever since the Great Rebellion, abounded with Religious Sects and Factions, which owe their Original, more or less, to the direful Change and Overthrow of that Government, which Christ ordain'd for his Church, and his Apostles left in it, and which throughout all Ages was continued without Interruption in the Christian World for 1500 Years, as that very Form of Church-Government, which all Christians thought was ordain'd

to

to continue unto the End of the World. There never was in all that Time any Church founded but in, and with EPISCOPACY; nor did ever any Sect of Men assume the Title of a Church, till they could get a pretended Bishop, from whom they had their Priests, and their Priests their Mission, till the Time of the Reformation; nor did any Christian Priests, or People of an Episcopal Church, ever rise up against their *Bishops as such*, and reject the *whole Order*, but those of *Great Britain*, under the Pretence of farther Reformation; by which they have brought such Confusions, and so expos'd Religion among us, that it is in a great Measure lost, so that we may say (as was long since said of *Justice* in the *Iron Age* of the World) that she hath taken her Flight from Earth to Heaven. Could any Church, or Father of the Catholick Church, in Antient Times, have imagin'd or believ'd without the Gift of Prophecy, that an Age would come, when the Presbyters of a National Church would take upon them to *depose* their *Bishops*, and teach the People that their *Order* was contrary to God's Word, or grievous and unnecessary to the Church! Could they have imagin'd, that in a flourishing Church, pure in Doctrine and Worship, consisting of Two Provinces, an Assembly

of several Presbyters should be held in *Opposition* to their Bishops, and their Lawful Sovereign Lord the External or Civil Bishop of his Church, by the Command of Rebels in actual Arms against their King! Could they ever imagine, that in three famous National Churches reform'd after the Antient Pattern of Churches settled in the Primitive Times, and professing the same Holy Faith, a strong Party of Presbyters and People, should be so wicked, as by *Force* to depose the whole College of Bishops, and as much as they could, extirpate the whole Order as unlawful and needless, nay, as an Antichristian Constitution, and a Yoak which we nor our Fathers were able to bear! Yet, Sir, I am one of those surviving Men who liv'd in those Times and saw all those things done, and the direful Consequences of such Doings; the first of which was the setting up a Government of the Church by Presbyters assuming Episcopal Authority, who with their Sect were called *Presbyterians*.

But these did not long flourish; for as they had taught the People that Episcopal Ordinations or Missions were not necessary, so others soon said the same of their Ordinations by *Presbyters*, asserting, that only Gifts, and the *Call* of Gifted Men by the Congregation was sufficient for the Ministry;

nistry; and so from the Sect of *Presbytery* sprang up that of the *Independents* among us, and from them again, others, who thought Gifts *alone* were a sufficient Call to the Ministry, and in this *Abomination of Desolation*, *Laymen* first invaded the Sacred Office of the Ministry among us.

When I was a Young School-Boy in a little Village near *Helmsley* in *Yorkshire*, I saw a Man in Gray Clothes step up into the Pulpit on the Lord's Day, where after a long Prayer he preach'd to the People, as well as I can guess from what I now remember, after the Manner of the *Fifth Monarchy Anabaptists*. Being afterwards removed to School at *North-Allerton*, I saw an Officer of *Cromwell's* Army go up into the Pulpit, and there after a long Prayer, he made a long Sermon, of which, as I then understood little, so I remember nothing, but that he talk'd much of *Dead Ordinances*, and Gifts of the Spirit, and a *Carnal Ministry*, meaning no doubt the *Ministry of the Church*. By that time *Quakerism*, which began in *Westmorland*, was much increas'd in that Place, where I often saw not only Men, but Women Preach both in the Fields, and in Houses, without any other Call, but their pretended Motions of the Spirit, when (you must, Sir, excuse my Impertinence to tell you, that)

a School-Fellow older than my self by three or four Years, though of a Lower Form in the School, who had been carefully bred up in *Church Principles*, and like another *Timothy* instructed by his Parents from his Childhood in the Scriptures, so baffled their Speakers, by asking them *who sent them to Preach*, and urging the Places of Scripture against them, which speak of God the Father's sending our Saviour, and *His* sending the Apostles, and *They* others; and by requiring of them a *Visible Proof* of their pretended Call by the Spirit, that they came not of a long Time after to that Place, and as I remember, not till that Boy, so *mighty in the Scriptures*, was taken from the School.

Indeed, Sir, the Necessity of an *Immediate*, or *Mediate Call* and *Mission from God* to any *Divine Ministry*, is so plainly taught in the Scriptures as appears by the * *Margin*,

* THE MISSION OF MOSES, ——— *And the Lord said* ———
Come now therefore, and I will SEND thee unto Pharaoh, that thou mayest bring forth my People, &c. out of Egypt. Exod. iii. 10. *Now therefore go, and I will be with thy Mouth, and teach thee what thou shalt say.* Exod. iv. 12. He SENT Moses his *Servant*, Psal. cv. 26.

THE MISSION OF THE JEWISH PRIESTS, *Take thou unto thee Aaron thy Brother, and his Sons with him, FROM AMONG THE CHILDREN OF ISRAEL, that He may Minister UNTO ME in the Priest's Office, even Aaron, Nadab, and Abihu, Eleazer, and Ithamar, Aaron's Sons.* Exod. xxviii. 1. *And the Lord spake unto Aaron, ——— Thou and thy Sons with thee shall keep your*
PRIESTS

gin, that I have often wonder'd how any sort of Christians, pretending to the Knowledge of them, should take upon them the Ministerial Office, without the Ordinary Regular Call from Man as God hath appointed,

PRIESTS OFFICE. — I HAVE GIVEN *your Priests Office unto you as a Service of GIFT, and the STRANGER that cometh nigh (i. e. as a Priest) shall be put to Death, Numb. xviii. 1, 7. Uzziah the King transgressed against the Lord his God, and went into the Temple of the Lord to burn incense upon the Altar of Incense, and Azariah the Priest went in after him, and with him Fourscore Priests of the Lord that were valiant Men: And they WITHSTOOD Uzziah the King, and said unto him, It APPERTAINETH NOT unto thee, Uzziah, to burn Incense unto the Lord, but to the Priests the Sons of Aaron, that are CONSECRATED to burn Incense: GO OUT of the Sanctuary, for thou hast trespassed, &c. 2 Chron. xxvi. 16, 17, 18. For every High Priest taken FROM AMONG MEN, is Ordain'd for Men in things pertaining to God, that he may offer both Gifts and Sacrifices for Sin: And no Man taketh this Honour unto himself but he that is CALLED OF GOD, as was Aaron, Heb. v. 1, 3. Not to spend too much time in enumerating those Texts which prove the Mission of the Prophets, I shall only recite some of those which plainly evince,*

THE MISSION OF ST. JOHN THE BAPTIST, the Last of the Jewish Prophets and immediate Fore-runner of our Saviour. *There was a Man SENT from God, whose Name was John — He was SENT to bear Witness of that Light (i. e. of Christ) — He that SENT me to Baptize, &c. St. John i. 6, 8, 33. Behold! I SEND MY MESSENGER (i. e. John the Baptist) before thy Face, which shall prepare thy Way before thee, St. Mark i. 2. and xi. 10.*

THE MISSION OF CHRIST, The Second Person of the Eternal Trinity. — *St. John the Baptist speaking of Him, says — He it is, who coming after me, is preferred before me, St. John i. 27, 30. And our Lord speaking of Himself, says, He that receiveth me, receiveth him (i. e. God the Father) that SENT me, St. Matth. x. 40. St. John xiii. 20. — And He that despiseth me, despiseth him that SENT me, St. Luke x. 16 — God SENT not his Son into*
the

ed, or an extraordinary Call from God, without one of which, neither Christ, nor the Holy Spirit, neither Angels nor Men, presum'd to act authoritatively in things pertaining to God.

But

the World to condemn the World, but that the World through him might be saved, St. John iii. 17. ——— Jesus saith, ——— My Meat is to do the Will of him that SENT me, St. John iv. 34. ——— He that honoureth not the Son, honoureth not the Father which hath SENT him ——— He that heareth my Word, and believeth on him that SENT me, hath everlasting Life. ——— I seek not mine own Will, but the Will of the Father which hath SENT me. ——— The Father hath SENT me. ——— And the Father himself which hath SENT me, St. John v. 23, 24, 30, 36, 37. ——— The living Father hath SENT me, St. John vi. 57. The Father that SENT me, St. John viii. 16, 18. ——— Say ye of him (i. e. of Christ) whom the Father hath sanctified (i. e. consecrated or set apart for the Office of the Messias) and SENT into the World, &c. St. John x. 36. ——— That they may believe that thou hast SENT me, St. John xi. 42. ——— I have not spoken OF MY SELF, but the Father which SENT me, he GAVE ME A COMMANDMENT what I should say, and what I should speak, St. John xii. 49. ——— And this is Life eternal, that they might know thee, the only true God, and Jesus Christ whom thou HAST SENT. ——— I have finished the Work which thou GAVEST me to do. I came OUT FROM thee. ——— Thou hast SENT me into the World. ——— Thou hast SENT me, St. John xvii. 3, 8, 18, 25. ——— God SENT his only begotten Son into the World, that we might live through him. ——— And SENT his Son to be the Propitiation for our Sins, 1 St. John iv. 9, 10. ——— God SENT FORTH his Son made of a Woman, &c. Galat. iv. 4. ——— Thus we see that Christ GLORIFIED NOT HIMSELF to be made an High Priest, but he that said unto him, Thou art my Son, Heb. v. 5. ——— Wherefore let us ——— Consider the Apostle and High Priest of our Profession Christ Jesus, who was FAITHFUL to him that APPOINTED him, Heb. iii.

But most especially have I wonder'd, and still do wonder, how Clergy-men, I mean, Presbyters who were *regularly sent*, by Episcopal Ordination, according to the Will of our Lord, the Founder of his Church,

THE MISSION OF THE HOLY SPIRIT, the third Person of the eternal Trinity. *The Comforter, which is the Holy Ghost, whom the FATHER WILL SEND in my Name, St. John xiv. 26.* ——— *When the Comforter is come whom I WILL SEND unto you from the Father, even the Spirit of Truth, who proceedeth from the Father, &c. St. John xv. 26.* ——— *If I go not away, the Comforter will not come unto you; but if I depart, I WILL SEND him unto you, St. John xvi. 7.* ——— *He shall not speak OF HIMSELF; but whatsoever he shall hear, that shall he speak, ver. 13.* ——— *He shall glorifie me, for he shall RECEIVE OF MINE, and shall shew it unto you, ver. 14.* ——— Accordingly, the Holy Ghost was sent from Heaven on the Day of Pentecost, as St. Peter testified to the wondring Multitude, telling them, ——— *This Jesus* ——— *being by the right Hand of God exalted, and having received of the Father the Promise of the Holy Ghost, he hath SHED FORTH this, which you now see and hear (i. e. he hath SENT FORTH THE HOLY GHOST, who has caused those astonishing miraculous Wonders which you now see and hear) Acts ii. 32, 33.* ——— And St. Paul tells the Galatians, *God hath SENT FORTH the Spirit of his Son (i. e. the Holy Ghost) into your Hearts, Galat. iv. 6.* ——— And St. Peter reckons the Holy Ghost SENT DOWN from Heaven, among those things which the Angels desire to look into, 1 St. Peter i. 12.

THE MISSION OF ANGELS. ——— They are ALL *Ministring Spirits SENT FORTH to minister, Heb. i. 14.* ——— *The Angel Gabriel WAS SENT from God unto a City, &c. to a Virgin espoused to a Man whose Name was Joseph. ——— St. Luke i. 26.* ——— The same Angel appeared before unto Zacharias, and told him. ——— *I am Gabriel that stand in the Presence of God, and AM SENT to speak unto thee. ——— ver. 19.* Peter said, *Now I know of a Surety that the LORD HATH SENT his Angel, and hath delivered me out of the Hands of Herod, &c. Acts xiii. 11.* ———

Church, and the *unvariable* and *universal* *Apostolical Practice* of it for 1500 Years, I say, I still wonder, how such Presbyters could first preach against the Episcopal Order, and then proceed to pull down their

The Revelation of Jesus Christ, which God gave unto him, &c. HE SENT and signified it by his Angel unto his Servant John, Revelat. i. 1. — *The seven Spirits of God SENT FORTH into all the Earth,* Revelat. v. 6. — *The Lord God SENT his Angel to shew unto his Servants the things which must shortly be done,* Revelat. xxii. 6.

THE MISSION OF THE APOSTLES. After the twelve Apostles are nam'd, 'tis said, These Twelve Jesus SENT FORTH, and commanded them saying — *Preach — freely ye have RECEIVED, freely give,* St. Matth. x. 5, 7, 8. — *As my Father hath sent me, even so SEND I you,* St. John xx. 21. — *All Power is given unto me in Heaven and in Earth: GO YE therefore and teach (or rather Disciple) all Nations, baptizing them — teaching them — and lo I AM WITH YOU ALWAYS, even unto the End of the World. Amen.* St. Matth. xxviii. 18, 19, 20. — And to supply the Place of Judas Iscariot, one of the Twelve, the Apostles prayed and said, *Thou, Lord, which knowest the Hearts of all Men, shew whether of these two (i. e. of Justus or Matthias) thou hast CHOSEN, that he may TAKE part of this Ministry and Apostleship,* Acts i. 24, 25. *And they gave forth their Lots, and the Lot fell upon Matthias, and he was numbered with the eleven Apostles,* Ver. 26. — *God hath SET some in the Church. FIRST, Apostles,* 1 Cor. xii. 28. — Our Lord said to Ananias concerning the Apostle St. Paul, — *He is a CHOSEN Vessel unto me, to bear my Name before the Gentiles, and Kings, and the Children of Israel,* Acts ix. 15. — *As they minister'd to the Lord, and fasted, the Holy Ghost said, SEPARATE me Barnabas and Saul (i. e. Paul) for the Work whereunto I have CALLED THEM. And when they had fasted and prayed, and laid their Hands on them, they sent them away; so they being SENT FORTH by the Holy Ghost, departed, &c.* Acts xiii. 2, 3, 4. Again, the Lord said unto St. Paul,

b 2

Depart,

their own Bishops, by whom they were ordain'd, and then in Opposition to the Holy Apostolical Order and Character, and the Persons lawfully vested with it, Sacrilegiously presume, like *Colluthus*, to take
upon

Depart, for I will SEND thee far hence unto the Gentiles, Acts XXII. 21. — And therefore he styles himself, Paul CALLED to be an Apostle of Jesus Christ, through the Will of God, 1 Cor. i. 1. and says in another Place, — I am ORDAINED a Preacher, and an Apostle, — a Teacher of the Gentiles, 1 Tim. ii. 7. — How shall they preach, except they be SENT? Rom. x. 15. When he (i. e. Christ) ascended up on high, — he GAVE some Apostles, i. e. he gave some the Power and Authority of being his Ambassadors, Ephes. iv. 11. —

THE MISSION OF THE SEVENTY DISCIPLES, and of the DEACONS. *After these things the Lord APPOINTED other Seventy also, and SENT them two and two before his Face, St. Luke x. 1. — The Twelve (i. e. the Apostles) called the Multitude of the Disciples unto them, and said, — Look ye out among you seven Men of honest Report, full of the Holy Ghost and Wisdom, whom WE MAY APPOINT over this Business, (i. e. of taking care for the Poor) — And they chose Stephen, &c. whom they SET BEFORE THE APOSTLES; and when THEY had prayed, THEY LAID THEIR HANDS on them, Acts vi. 3, 5, 6. —*

THE MISSION OF THE APOSTLES SUCCESSORS. — *St. Paul and St. Barnabas ORDAINED them ELDERS in every Church, Acts xiv. 23. — For this Cause left I thee (i. e. Titus) in Crete, that thou shouldest set in Order the things that are wanting, and ORDAIN Elders in every City, as I (i. e. St. Paul) had APPOINTED thee, Tit. i. 5. — Stir up the GIFT of God which is in thee (i. e. Stir up that Episcopal Authority, and the Gifts annexed thereto, wherewith God has endowed thee) BY THE PUTTING ON OF MY (i. e. St. Paul's) HANDS, 2 Tim. i. 6. — The Things that thou hast heard of me, — the same COMMIT thou to faithful Men, who shall be able to teach others also, 2 Tim. ii. 2. — LAY HANDS suddenly on no Man, 1 Tim. v. 22 — The seven Stars are the ANGELS (i. e. the Bishops, or supreme spiritual Governors) of the seven Churches,*

upon them the Episcopal Office and Power in ordaining and sending of other pretended Presbyters into the Church, as they did a little before the *Restoration*, in all or most Parts of the Nation, after the Abolition of Episcopacy, and the Downfall of the National Church with it, in the Times of which I speak. Such Arch-schismatics as these were Mr. *Bowls* of *York*, Mr. *Baxter* of *Kiderminster*, and Mr. *Hughes* of *Plymouth*, not to mention

es, Rev. i. 20. — Of which St. *Polycarp*, Bishop of *Smyrna* was one. Now that these Successors of the Apostles, to whom the Power of ordaining others into the Ministry was committed, were not mere *Presbyters*, is evident from hence, That they had the Oversight of the Church of God, 1 Pet. v. 2. A Power to receive an ACCUSATION against (and therefore were each of them a JUDGE of) an Elder, or Minister of a consequently inferior Order, 1 Tim. v. 19. — It was also their Province to rebuke with ALL AUTHORITY, so as to let no Man despise them, Tit. ii. 15. — to reject, i. e. excommunicate, a Man that is an Heretick, after the first and second Admonition, Tit. iii. 10. — Without PREFERRING one before another, doing nothing by PARTIALITY, 1 Tim. v. 21. — Hence the particular Angel, or Bishop of the Church in *Pergamos*, was justly reprov'd for tolerating them that held the Doctrine of *Balaam*, and the *Nicolaitans* in that Church, Rev. ii. 14, 15, 16. So also was the particular Angel or Bishop of *Thyatira*, for SUFFERING the false Prophetess *Jezabel*, Rev. ii. 20. — And they could never have been thus justly censur'd, if they had not been vested with the Powers and Authority above-mentioned, and these Powers do vastly exceed all that can be duly claim'd by any mere *Presbyter*, or Body of *Presbyters* whatsoever. —

SMECTYMNUUS, * in and about *London*, where I presume pretended Presbyters were also Ordain'd, by mere Presbyters in those sad Times of Confusion.

I was once at one of their pretended Ordinations, which I since found, was much after the *French Form*. Thus, and this, Sir, was the Original of the *Presbyterian Mission in England*, and it is against the Authority of the pretended Ministers of this Mission, *who were never duly authoriz'd*, and therefore cannot Administer *truly Valid Baptism*, that you have written your excellent Book with great Strength and Perspicuity, as well as Modesty, and confirmed your Doctrine with your Practice.

Indeed, you have written it throughout with so much Modesty and Caution, that in some Places, it hath an Air *almost* of Diffidence and Mistrust, altho' you have said nothing as to the Invalidity of their Administrations, but what our best Divines have written before you. I beg Leave to present you with what I find to this Purpose, in the first Volume of the Posthumous Sermons of one of the greatest of them, [*Bishop Beveridge*] Entituled, *The Dignity and Authority, and Office of the*

* Stephen Marshall, Edmund Calamy, Thomas Young, Matthew Newcomb, William Spurstow.

Priesthood. In the third Sermon on this Text, *Therefore, seeing we have this Ministry as we have received Mercy, we faint not,* at the 103. Page you'll find these Words, "*In the next Place we must observe, that although the Priests, if any be present, lay on their Hands also, yet it is expressly ordered, that the Bishop shall say the Words, Receive ye the Holy Ghost, &c. For if a mere Priest should say them, or any one but a Bishop, the Ordination was reckoned NULL AND VOID, with more to that Purpose. So in his Sermon on Acts xiii. 3. And when they had fasted, and prayed, and laid their Hands on them, they sent them away, you have these Words at p. 309. As the right Ordination of those who administer the Means of Grace must needs be acknowledged to be (necessary) for seeing we can have no Grace, nor Power to do good, but what is delivered to us from God thro' our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, in the Use of the Means which he hath established for that Purpose, unless those Means be rightly and duly Administred, they lose their Force and Energy, and so can never attain the End wherefore they were established. Neither is there any thing more necessary to establish the Means of Grace, than that they who ad-*

“ *minister them be rightly Ordained and*
 “ *Authorized to do it according to the In-*
 “ *stitution and Command of him that did*
 “ *establiſh them. For ſeeing they do not*
 “ *work naturally, but only by virtue of the*
 “ *Inſtitution, and Promise annexed to it,*
 “ *unleſs that be duly obſerved, we have no*
 “ *Ground to expect, that the Promise ſhould*
 “ *be performed, nor by Conſequence that they*
 “ *ſhould be effectual to the Purpoſes for*
 “ *which they were uſed. So in his Sermon*
 “ *on this Text. Now then we are Ambaſſa-*
 “ *dors for Chriſt, &c. p. 386. For that can*
 “ *be done only by the Power of God, accom-*
 “ *panying, and aſſiſting his own Inſtitution*
 “ *and Commiſſion. Inſomuch that if I did*
 “ *not think, or rather was not fully aſſured,*
 “ *that I had ſuch a Commiſſion to be an*
 “ *Ambaſſador for Chriſt, and to act in his*
 “ *Name, I ſhould never think it worth the*
 “ *while to preach, or execute my Miniſterial*
 “ *Office. For I am ſure all that I did would*
 “ *be null and void of it ſelf, according to*
 “ *God's ordinary Way of working, and we*
 “ *have no Ground to expect Miracles.” So*
 “ *in another Place of that Sermon ; “Any*
 “ *Man may read a Sermon, or make an Ora-*
 “ *tion to the People ; but it is not that*
 “ *which the Scripture calls preaching the*
 “ *Word of God, unleſs he be SENT by*
 “ *God to do it. For how can they preach,*
 “ *except*

“ except they be sent? *Rom. x. 16. A*
“ *Butcher might kill an Ox, or a Lamb, as*
“ *well as the High-Priest, but it was no Sa-*
“ *crifice to God, unless a Priest did it: And*
“ *no Man taketh this Honour to himself, but*
“ *he that is called of God, as was Aaron,*
“ &c. All these Passages Sir, exactly agree
with the Subject of your Book; and I might
shew you much more to the same Purpose
out of the Writings of the Clergy, besides
those which you have cited. As out of *the*
second Edition of a Letter to a Noncon. Mi-
nister of the Kirk, shewing the Nullity of the
Presbyterian Mission; and Dr. Wells's Theses
against the Validity of Presbyterian Ordina-
tion.

But what I have cited from the Bishop,
which was publish'd since the first Edition
of your Book, is enough to second the De-
sign of it, and give you Courage boldly to
maintain your Doctrine and Practice, and
the Cause not only of the Church of *Eng-*
land, but of the Catholick Church, against
the *British* Sects and Schisms. Indeed you
have done God and his Church good Service
in a Time of Need; as two worthy Citi-
zens, now with God, *Mr. Allen* and *Mr.*
Lamb, did by their Writings about forty
Years ago; who having gone from the
Church to the *Anabaptists*, by God's Grace
saw their Error, and returned both toge-

ther from them to the Church again, to which they made ample Recompence by their Writings, and were great Ornaments to it in every Respect all their Lives long. I knew them both very well, and am glad of this Opportunity, to mention them with that Respect which is due to both their Memories; whereof the Latter told me, that he had the Misfortune to lead Mr. *Allen* out of the Church to the Schism, but that Mr. *Allen* had the blessed Part to lead him out of the Schism to the Church again. It is to me a comfortable Prefage, that God will not forsake the Church of *England*, nor suffer Toleration and the Gates of Hell to prevail against her, because he raises out of her People, Men to defend her, and adorn her with their Writings. I pray God to stir up more such continually, that those, who are misled by unauthorized Ministers, and Teachers, may consider the great Danger they are in, and after your Example, enter in at the right Door into her Fold, and declare, as you have bravely done, *That you sincerely believe the Subject of your Discourse to be a substantial Truth, nay even a first Principle of Christianity, and that without the courageous asserting thereof, the whole Christian Priesthood, and the Divine Authority of it, must be called in Question,— and encourage every bold Intruder to usurp the sacred*

cred Ministry, in Opposition to that Commission, which hath been constantly handed down from Christ and his Apostles to this very Day. In the same Place you say you hope, that *none vested with this Divine Authority will fight against it, &c.* which if any Clergyman should do, in the Manner as you there mention, I could not but suspect, that he was one of those who took Gifts and Presents of the *Dissenters*, to let the Names of their Children, who had no other but *Schismatical Lay-Baptisms*, be Registered among the true Baptisms of the Church. This unwarrantable Practice, which you have observed to be *scandalously practised in some Places*, I can confirm to be true; For I knew some Ministers of this City (now dead) who were guilty of this Practice, and are gone to God to give an Account of it; and I my self, soon after I was presented to the Vicaridge of *Alhallows Barkin*, had several, and some very great Offers, from *Dissenters*, to enter their Childrens Names, as baptiz'd, in the Parish Church Register; and a Parochial Priest of a great City in this Kingdom, who gave me a Visit about a Year since, did assure me, that all the Ministers of that Place, himself only excepted, were guilty of this execrable Practice; execrable I call it, because it is a double Falsification of our *Parochial Dptychs,*

tychs, as they are Registers and Records both of Church and State, and I think both Deprivation, and the Pillory, to be just Punishments for that Minister, who dares do so great and mischievous a Wickedness, or suffer it to be done.

I say, I should be tempted to suspect any Clergyman, that should write in the Manner you mention, against you, to be one of that corrupt Sort, or at least of another, who to court the Favour and Applause of the *Dissenters*, either never preach in Defence of the Church against *them*, or if they do, they do it no otherwise than barely to shew, that the Church of *England* is a *safe Communion*, and that those, who thro' Mistake separated from it, would be in *no Danger of Damnation* if they returned to it. But to shew that Separation from it is *SCHISM*, and by Consequence a *damning Sin*, and that the Separatists of all sorts from it, are, without the extraordinary Mercy of God, in great *and apparent Danger of Damnation*, these Gentlemen love not to touch upon that Point, nor rise to that Heighth, which long before the Revolution occasioned the Distinction between *High* and *Low* Church-men, and the former to be called by ill, or ignorant Men, *High-Flyers, Tantivies*, and other such opprobrious Names. It was, I suppose, a
Re-

Reflection upon these Men, and the Indignation he had against their double Practices, which Provoked a Divine not very many Years since, to utter a Sarcaſm upon them from the Pulpit, in Words to this Purpose, *That ſome (at the Time he ſpoke it) were become Fathers of the Church, who never were her true Sons.*

Sir, I wiſh all Clergymen, who are concerned in either of theſe Remarks, would ſeriously conſider your pious and reaſonable Addreſs to us in the Concluſion of your *Appendix*. We are all concerned, (as you beſeech and conjure us to do,) *to conſider our high and holy Calling to the Prieſthood, and to vindicate our unalienable Rights to adminiſter the Holy Sacraments, and to let the People underſtand, that the Miniſtration of them is ESSENTIAL to our Office, and our Office eſſential to the Miniſtration of them; and that our long and general Silence in not aſſerting, and defending this great Truth, hath, as you obſerve, been the Occaſion of much Ignorance among the People, of the Nature of Schiſm, and the direful Conſequences of it, which ſome of our Order ſtill are, as I am ſure ſome have been, ſo averſe (contrary to their Truſt, and the Duty of it) to ſet before the People. I remember, when ſome of the London Clergy, reſolving to do this, as you now beſeech us,*

and

and for the same Reasons; it was opposed by the *free-thinking* Divines, especially by one of them, whom I will not name, for no other Reason, but that it would be *censured as preaching up our selves*; a Reason, whereof the Weakness and ill Consequences are shewn by an excellent Person, in the Preface to his *Companion for the Festivals and Fasts of the Church of England*; where, to oblige the Clergy to instruct the People in the great Truth of Sacerdotal Mission, and Authority to administer the Sacraments, he wishes the Catechism of the Church might be continued, in a few Questions and Answers, to shew, who only have Power to administer the Holy Sacraments. I need not name this worthy Gentleman, whom God raised up out of the *People* before you, to defend the Rights and Authority of the *Priesthood*, and who thinks it no more Diminution, or Dishonour to him, to be thought one of *the People* with respect to the *Church*, than one of them with respect to the *State*.

In your *Appendix* to your Book, I think you have solidly and satisfactorily answer'd all the Objections that have been made against the useful Subject of it, since the first Edition, taking in your Second Thoughts, and the Explanation of your Design, and Meaning in some Passages of
it

it to prevent Offence. This, Sir, is an Argument of your great Humility, as well as of your Zeal and Prudence; and your humble and truly Christian Temper and Declaration, encourage me to make a few Remarks upon your *Appendix*, of which you have the Liberty to judge as you please. You have well observed, *that our Church hath provided no Office of Confirmation* for those, who receive Baptism from *Lay-Baptizers*. And indeed it would have been strange, that she, which allows of no Baptism but by a * *lawful Minister*, should have provided such an Office to confirm, or ratifie the Baptism of those, who, truly speaking, were *Sprinkled* or *Washed*, but not *baptized*. But I think, you might with Reason enough have farther observed, that she hath provided an Office very *proper* for baptizing of them, I mean, *Sir*, THE MINISTRATION OF BAPTISM TO SUCH AS ARE OF RIPER YEARS. This new Office was made presently after *the Restauration*, and is Part of the *Liturgy* that now is confirmed by Act of Parliament. And the general Title of it is: *The Ministration of Baptism to such as are of riper Years, and able to answer for themselves*; And of which it is said in the *Preface* before the Book of

* *Rubrics in the Ministration of private Baptism.*

Common-Prayer, *Which although not so necessary when the former Book was compiled, yet by the Growth of Anabaptism, through the Licentiousness of the late Times crept in amongst us, is now become necessary, and may be always useful for the baptizing of Natives in our Plantations; and others converted to the Faith.* Here, Sir, the Church declares the Occasion of making this Office, *viz.* the Growth of *Anabaptism*; and then also observes how useful it is for the baptizing of Converts to the Faith. But I must observe, that there were other Occasions for making that Office, as well as the Growth of *Anabaptism*; as the *Growth of Quakerism*, upon which Account it is also necessary: And none of your Adversaries will deny, but in *Parity of Reason* it is as useful, and is accordingly ordinarily used, for the baptizing of Converts from that monstrous Heresy; and for the same *Parity of Reason* it may be said, that the Office was also intended for such. The *Preface* also, tho' it mentions the *Growth of Anabaptism*, doth not say whether it was intended for *Anabaptists* not yet dipped, or *Anabaptists* dipped in Water, in the Name of the Father, &c. Tho' I am of Opinion, it was intended for them, as well as the others; because their Ministration was null and void. There are many other Cases, in which this Office is
 necessary

necessary and useful, and ought to be apply'd; as in the Case of those adult Persons, who had the Misfortune to be baptized, but not *in the Name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost*; or if in their Names, yet not in their Names as a *Real*, but a *Nominal* Trinity; as, I suppose, the *Bedellists*, who were a numerous Sect at the *Restoration* in some Parts of the Nation, did, and the *Socinians* now do. *Sir*, I believe none of your Adversaries will deny, but this Office is as proper for Adult Persons so unhappily baptized, as for *Anabaptists*, or Convert Unbelievers: And if it be a Proper Office for such as were baptized in that Manner, and in Parity of Reason was intended for them; why should it not be thought as proper for those, who were unhappily baptized without a Lawful or Authorized Minister, (which the Church requires) and in Opposition to the Church and her Ministry; as the pretended Ministers among the *Presbyterians*, as well as among the *Independents* and *Anabaptists* do? If it should be said, that People baptized by Unlawful, or Unauthoriz'd Ministers, are not mentioned with *Anabaptists*, and *Converts to the Faith*, in the Preface of the Church; I answer, that neither are the *Quakers*, &c. mention'd in it; nor indeed was it more needful to mention them there,

than the *Quakers* and others I have mention'd: For all which the Office is proper and useful, and, in Parity of Reason, may be apply'd to Persons whose first Baptism, so called, is *Null* and *Void*, as well as to them. The Case of these, as well as those, did not lie before the Convocation; and happening to be *Casus omitti*, the Church and the Clergy must now proceed in them by Parity of Reason; which, I think, puts those Adults, who only have had *Null* and *Invalid* Baptism, in the same Case with those who have *None*; that is, in the Case of *Competent Catechumens*, who ought to be baptized.

I submit these Observations to your Thoughts, and the Consideration of all who shall read it; and if my Opinion as to this Office is wrong, I hope my Error is pardonable, because it is not hurtful to the Church, nor casts the least Dishonour upon her Learned and Pious Bishops and Priests, her Representatives, who made that Office, which before was wanting. What you say a little before, concerning *the Validity of Lay-Baptism*; viz. "That the Learned Author never design'd, that any thing in his Excellent Book should favour *Lay-Baptism*, in Opposition to the Sacerdotal Power, is evidently true; because it is plain from his Words, he means *Lay-Baptism*"

tism Administred by *Lay-Men*, so and so qualified, to dying Persons, by the Authority and Allowance of the Church; as in the 38th Canon of the Council of *Eliberis*, which you cite in your *Preliminary Discourse*. And it is very praise-worthy in you, that upon second Thoughts, you correct your self in your Premonition, where you tell us, “*You do not presume to determine, whether the Church, which hath Power from Christ to give a Man a standing Commission to be a Priest, cannot, in Cases of extreme Necessity, give him a Commission pro HAC VICE, (or pro hic & nunc) to do a Sacerdotal Act.*” This Commission of that Council proceeded * from an Ancient, but a Pious and Innocent Erroneous Opinion, (as I think I may call it) that *Baptism* was ABSOLUTELY necessary to Salvation, as the Communicating of Infants proceeded from another the like Erroneous Belief of the absolute Necessity of Receiving the Holy Eucharist in order to Salvation. This Error of the absolute Necessity of Baptism, descended in the † *Latin* Church to After-Ages, and acquir’d such Firmness of Belief by constant Practice,

* Tertull. *de Baptismo*. Cap. xvii. Vid. Vossium *de Baptismo* Disput. xi. v. vi. vii.

† According to the Canon Law: *In necessitate quilibet potest baptizare; dum modo intendit facere quod Ecclesia intendit.*

that it remained * some Time uncorrected by our Church after the Reformation; but afterwards the Title of the Office for *Private Baptism* was altered thus: “ *Of them that are to be baptized in Time of Necessity* by the Minister of the Parish, or any lawful Minister that can be procured :” And the Rubrick was accordingly altered in this Manner; “ Let the lawful Minister, and them that be present, call upon God for his Grace, and say the Lord’s Prayer, if the Time will suffer; and then the Child being named by some one that is present, the said lawful Minister shall dip it in Water, or pour Water upon it, saying these Words, I baptize thee, &c.” To this Change of the Title and Rubrick of *them that are to be Baptized in Private*, (in K. Edward’s Book) exactly agrees the Rubrick of our present Liturgy, cited before in the Margin; as you will see in the Ministration of Private Baptism

* As appears from this Rubrick of the Office for them that be Baptized in Private Houses in Time of Necessity, in the Book of Common-Prayer, set forth Anno 2, and 3. of Edward the Sixth, 1549. The Words of that Rubrick are these, “ First, let them that be present call upon God for his Grace, and say the Lord’s Prayer, if the Time will suffer, and then one of them shall name the Child, and dip him in the Water, or pour Water upon him, saying, *I Baptize thee in the Name, &c.* vide *Vossium* de Baptismo Disp. x. §. x.

of Children in Houses, Paragraph 3^d of the Rubrick.

“ *First, Let the Minister of the Parish,*
“ *(or in his Absence, any other lawful Mini-*
“ *ster that can be procured) with them that*
“ *are present, call upon God, and say the*
“ *Lord's Prayer, &c.*

“ *If the Minister, &c.*

“ *I certify, &c.*

“ *But if the Child were baptized by any*
“ *other Lawful Minister ; then the Minister*
“ *of the Parish where the Child was born*
“ *or christned, shall examine and try whe-*
“ *ther the Child be lawfully baptized, or no.*
“ *In which Case, if those that bring a-*
“ *ny Child to Church, do answer that the*
“ *same Child is already baptized ; then shall*
“ *the Minister examine them further, say-*
“ *ing,*

“ *By whom was this Child baptized ?*

“ *Who was present when this Child was*
“ *baptized ?*

“ *Because some Things essential to this*
“ *Sacrament may happen to be omitted thro'*
“ *fear or haste, in such Times of Extremity ;*
“ *therefore I demand further of you,*

“ *With what Matter was this Child bap-*
“ *tized ?*

“ *With what Words was this Child bap-*
“ *tized ?*

And if the Minister shall find, &c.

Sir, From these Observations, I think I may conclude, *First*, That the *absolute indispensable* Necessity of Baptism, is not the Doctrine of the Church of *England*. *Secondly*, That she approves of no Baptism, or thinks no Baptism duly and validly Administred, but what is Ministred by duly Authorized and Lawful Ministers; and consequently, that she rejects all *Lay-Baptism*. *Thirdly*, That she cannot count those duly Authorized and Lawful Ministers, who take upon them the Ministry within the Pale of her Jurisdiction, in Contempt of, and Opposition to her Episcopat and Episcopal Mission, or Power of Ordination; and by Consequence, that she must look upon Baptism Administred by such Ministers, as Null and Void, from the Beginning. From these Conclusions, and the Consequences issuing from them, I have further Reason to think, that the Office of *The Ministration of Baptism to such as are of Riper Years*, ought to be applied to Persons *invalidly Baptized by such unlawful Ministers* among us, as were never duly Authorized, as well as to *Anabaptists* and Converts to the Faith, or to the Disciples of such modern *Manichæans*, and *Seleucians* amongst us, as hold it unlawful to be baptized with the Baptism of the Church.

And

And as you have justly observ'd, that the Learned Author of the Passage you cite, could not design that any thing he said in it should favour *Lay-Baptism*; so I dare say for him, that upon Second Thoughts, he will not affirm, that it is in the Power of the Church to confirm *Ludicrous, Histrionical, or other Mimical Baptisms*; or that any Church or Bishop did ever confirm any of them by Chrism and Imposition of Hands. The Opinion of *Ludicrous Baptism* not to be reiterated, was occasioned by a fabulous Story of *Athanasius*; who, when a little Boy, with others, playing at *Ministers*, as our Children call it, by the Water-side, *Athanasius* acted the *Bishop*, other Boys *Priests* and *Deacons*; and in their Play, baptized several Children, who represented *Catechumens* and *Competents* in Form. *Alexander*, Bishop of *Alexandria*, happening to see this, as the Story is told, sent for the Boys; and understanding from their own Relation, that their Ludicrous Baptism was performed by them according to the Rites and Orders of the Church, was of Opinion with other Bishops present with him, that the Children so christned, were not to be Re-baptized; whereupon he confirmed them with Chrism, and Imposition of Hands:

This * *Hear-say* Story is told by *Sozomen* from *Ruffinus*, and from him again at large by *Petrus Damianus*, in his Book Entitled, *Gratissimus*, and mentioned before him by *Watafridus Strabo*, in his Book *de Divinis Officiis*, and reckon'd by *Antonius Muretus* in the 9th Chap. of his 13th Book of *various Lections*, among the Pre-fages of things that have happened, as Boys have acted them in Play. *Lastly*, Such Reception this Story of *Athanasius* hath had in the World, that it is cited as true by Dr. *George Abbot*, in the Lecture which he read in the Divinity-School at *Oxford*, *de Circumcisione & Baptismo*, 1597, which Lecture he made, to excuse the First Practice of our Church after the Reformation, which he saith *Facilitate larga* with *great Latitude* or *Indulgence* for some time tolerated the Baptism of Lay-men and Women in absolute Necessity, for the Ignorance of the People, and Hardness of their Hearts. This Story favoured the loose Doctrine of St. *Augustin*, as to the Ministration of Baptism, and therefore we need not wonder that † He spoke so favourably of *Ludicrous*, and *Jocular*, as well

* Ηεσθήσω γενομένα τὸδε ΦΑΣΙΝ ἐν αὐτῷ συμπόσειοντα.
Sozom. Eccl. Hist. Lib. 2. Ch. 17.

† De Baptismo contra Donatistas, Lib. 7. Versus finem Libri
in Tom. 7.

as well as *Mimical* and *Histrionical* Baptisms. But as current as by Misfortune this Story hath been, and as many as it hath misled into Error, it is now exploded for very good Reasons by Learned Men; as by Dr. *Cave* in his *Historia Literaria*, by *du Pin* in his Notes on *Athanasie* in his *Nouvelle Bibliotheque*, and by the Learned *Benedictins* in his Life, p. 11. printed before his Works, whither I refer you.

As for *Histrionical Baptism* by Heathens, that also is urged by the Patrons of *Lay-Baptism* in favour of their Opinion. * Of this they cite this Story out of the *Cronicon Alexandrinum*; that in Mockery of the Christians, the Heathen-Players Baptized one of their Companions in warm Water, upon the Stage, and then put upon him a White Garment, upon which he immediately cried out that he was made a Christian, and would die as such. The Spectators hearing him declare this, flew upon the Stage, and taking him from thence, stoned him to Death. † *Ado Viennensis* tells another Story in his Martyrology of *August. 25.* of *St. Genesius*, who being Baptized by Heathens to ridicule Christian Baptism, also became a Christian: But

* *Vossius de Baptismo*, Disp. 11. Sect. 29.

† *Ibid.* Disp. 10. Sect. 13.

then supposing the Truth of these Stories, they are as *perfectly miraculous*, as the Conversion of some Pagan Executioners of Martyrs, who declared themselves Christians at the Place of Execution, and there suffered Death with them, and were *Baptized in their own Blood*. And therefore, the *miraculous* Manifestation of God's Grace at Histrionical Baptisms to testify the Truth of the Christian Religion, and confound its Adversaries, are no Argument for Lay-men, and for the worst of Lay-men, and Lay-men falsely pretending to a true Mission, to take upon them to Administer Baptism as the Men you write against presume to do. Nay, Sir, such an unwarrantable Latitude hath the Church of *Rome* given to the Administration of Baptism, † that some of her *Popes* have allowed the Baptism of *Jews*, and Heathens; and * the Pope in the Council of *Florence* doth expressly decree, that in *case of Necessity*, not only a faithful Christian *Lay-man* or *Woman*, but an *Heretick* or *Pagan* may Validly Baptize.

As to the Case of Necessity so called, it is, as I have already observed, founded

† Ibid. *Disp.* 11, 18.

* In Decreto Eugenii Papæ ad Armenos: *Minister hujus Sacramenti est Sacerdos, cui ex officio competit Baptizare. In Causa autem Necessitatis, non solum Sacerdos, vel Diaconus, sed etiam Laicus, vel Mulier, imo etiam Paganus, & Hereticus Baptizare potest, &c.*

in the mistaken Opinion of the absolute Necessity of Baptism to Salvation. Which Opinion is of Two Sorts, one more antient, grounded on the literal Strictness of the Precept, or Institution of Baptism, which was the Error of *Tertullian*, who therefore, in case of Necessity, * allowed Lay-men of the Church, *but † not Women*, to Baptize. The other is more modern, as having its Rise from the *Pelagian* Controversy, and that was the indispensable Necessity of Baptism to wash away Original Sin. This Strictness of Opinion, as to the indispensable Necessity of this Sacrament, to wash off the Guilt of Original Sin, made *St. Augustin*, that *durus Pater Infantium*, so very loose, as to the Minister of it in case of Necessity. And therefore upon the Question, *whether one, who was not a Christian, could give Baptism*, * He delivered his Opinion, uncertainly, saying, *he would not determine it, because it had not been determined in any Council*. And so from this Error of the *absolute* Necessity of Baptism to Salvation, the Church of *Rome* came by degrees to allow the Mi-

* *De Baptismo.* Cap. 17.

† See *Epiphanius Adversus Hæres.* Lib. III, Tom. II. P. 1057. *Tertul. de præscript. advers. Hæres.* Cap. 41. *de veland.* Virg. Cap. 9.

* *Contra Epist. Parmen.* Lib. 2. Cap. 15.

nistration of Baptism by any Hand, when a lawful Minister could not be had, rather than let a Child, as they speak, perish, which without it they formerly thought must be damned, and still think cannot be saved, as suffering *pœnam damni*, tho' not *pœnam sensûs*, i. e. the Loss of Heaven, tho' not the *Flames* of Hell. * Hence they came to place all the Virtue and Efficacy of Baptism in the Invocation of the Holy Trinity, as in the principal Cause, not making any Difference in the Ministerial, or Instrumental Cause, in case of Necessity. But, Sir, you have shewed with great Force and clear Evidence, that the *Lawful Minister* is as *essential* to the Ministration of Baptism, as the Matter and Form is to that Sacrament, and cannot be dispensed with by Men, who are tied to it by the Divine Institution. But though God ties us, yet he himself is not tied to his own Institutions; and therefore the erroneous Opinion of the Absolute Necessity of Baptism by any Minister, either upon the Account of the Letter of the Institution, or of Original Sin, hath been long rejected by Learned Men, for great, and I think, unanswerable Reasons, as you may see in Archbishop

* *Decretum Eugenii P. ad Armenos in Conc. Florent. Conc. Labb. & Cossar. Tom. 13. P. 535.*

Bramhall's Letter to Sir *Henry de Vic*, at the 979 Page of his Works, and in the 7 Disp. of *Vossius's* Book *de Baptismo*.

I am extremely pleased with the modest Reflection you make in your Premonition, upon what you had said to prove the *Validity of Holy Orders conferred on Unbaptized Persons*. For whereas you distinguish Qualifications for the Ministry, into *Personal* and *Authoritative*, give me Leave to tell you, that I think all Qualifications for it are *Personal*, and that of *Personal Qualifications*, the want of *some only* make a Man unworthy of the Ministry, but not incapable of it; but the want of others make him utterly incapable of it, or of being Separated or Ordained to it. The *Personal* Qualifications of the First sort may be called *Moral*, as Purity, Humility, Sobriety, and all other Vertues and Graces that are comprehended in Holiness of Life, the want of which make a Man unworthy, as of Holy Orders after Baptism, so of Baptism it self, but yet do not Null or make Void either of them, when the Person is Baptized or Ordained. The Second sort of Qualifications are either *Natural*, *Acquired*, or *Legal*, which last may be also called *Political*, as relating to the Fundamental or Positive Laws of the Church. Among *acquir'd* Qualifications we may
safely

safely reckon *Literature*; the utter want of which perfectly disables a Man from performing Priestly Offices, and by consequence, makes his Orders Void. Then as for *Natural Qualifications*, they belong either to the *Body* or the *Mind*; to the *Body*, as the Natural Faculties of Speaking, and Hearing, the want of which (without any * Canons or Positive Laws of the Church) in my Judgment, utterly unqualifies a Man for the Priesthood; and therefore Holy Orders conferred on a Deaf and Dumb Man, must be Null and Void, because they render him incapable of performing Ministerial Offices. The like I may say of a Man who hath neither Hands nor Sight, which joint Defects, I think incapacitate such a Person, though never so Morally worthy for the Priestly Office, and that by consequence he cannot effectually be made a Priest. Qualifications which belong to the *Mind* are Understanding and Memory, the want of which in *Idiots*, *Lunaticks*, and *Maniacs*, makes them so utterly incapable of receiving Holy Orders, that upon Supposition any such were Ordained to the Priesthood, his Orders would be Null and Void. Thus much, Sir, with Submission to the Learned, I have said of

* *Can. Apost. 69.*

Personal Qualifications for the Priesthood that are Moral, or Natural. The *Legal* likewise are of Two Sorts. *First*, such as are *fundamental* to the Christian Society, or Constitution of the Church; or *Secondly*, such as are superinduced by the *Positive Laws* of the Church. Of the *First* sort, in my Opinion, *Baptism* certainly is; the want of which therefore, I think, must utterly render a Man incapable of being a *Christian Priest*, because it makes him utterly incapable of *being a Christian* in the strict and proper Sense of the Word, as it signifies a Member of the Church, who as such hath a Right to receive the Holy Eucharist, which to an Unbaptized Person is *δυσία ἄδυνος*, a Sacrifice of no more effect, than if he had not come to it, and partak'd of it. How then can a Man be made capable to Administer that Holy Sacrament to others, who hath no right to receive it; or make others Members of the Church, of which he is not a Member himself? As to the latter sort of Legal Qualifications, the want of which do make a Man incapable of Holy Orders, and his Orders Null after he is Ordained, by the Canons of the Church, I have no occasion to discourse; and therefore in answer to the Objection made against you, give me leave to observe, that I presume

it relates to this case, which is supposed, but never proved to have happened, *viz.* that when a Person *bona fide*, believing himself to have had Valid Priestly Baptism, but indeed had not, yet happens to be Ordained *Bona Fide*, by the Bishop, his Orders notwithstanding are Null and Void. This, I presume, must be the case in which the Objection is put, and not where the Person Ordaining, and the Person Ordained, both *know* that the latter never received any other than *Lay-Baptism*, by one presuming to Baptize in opposition to the Church. These two Cases are so vastly different, that I believe as to the latter, all Divines truly Learned in their Profession, will make no Difficulty to determine, that Orders so conferred are Null and Void. But as to the former case, upon which I take it for granted the Objection proceeds, we must have recourse to *Equity*, which, in such Cases of perfect invincible Ignorance, takes place in Ecclesiastical as well as Civil Cases, in Divine as well as Human Laws. Therefore, Sir, I make no scruple to tell you, that a Priest in this case now before us, is in the Eyes of God a Valid Priest, and that all his Priestly Administrations, by his merciful Allowance are also Valid and Effectual, and as acceptable as those of other Priests, to
him,

him, who can make Allowances where Men cannot, and ratifie what Men, if it came to their Knowledge, could not ratifie, but must pronounce Null. You know the Priesthood was hereditary among the *Jews*, and it is not unreasonable to suppose, that one Priest or other in such a long tract of time might, without any suspicion, have an adulterous Son; upon which supposition, I believe you will not doubt, that when he was at Age to Administer, God would reckon him among the Priests, and accept of all his Administrations at the Altar; or if such an one happened to be High Priest, even in the very *Holy of Holies*, though if his Incapacity had been known, he must have been deposed from the Priesthood.

Sir, in this way of stating the Case, I am far from encouraging any Person so Baptized, to take upon him the Priesthood. For if such an one, knowing himself to have no other Baptism, offers himself to take Holy Orders, I think he commits a Piacular Sin as great as that of *Corah*; nay, if such a one but suspecting himself to have no other Baptism, takes Holy Orders, I think he commits a Sin of Presumption, and is obliged to a strict Enquiry, whether or no he was so Baptized; and if he finds he was, he is bound, as he expects

Forgiveness of God, to cancel his Orders, and abdicate himself from the Priesthood. But to prevent either of these supposable Cases, you, like a good Christian, have inculcated to the Governors of the Church, *how much it is for her Security, and ought to be their Care, to require of all Candidates of the Ministry, Certificates of their Baptism, as well as of their good Conversation*; after which I beg leave to say, according to my Distinction of Personal Qualifications for the Priesthood, that the want of the former makes a Man incapable to receive Holy Orders, but the want of the latter only makes him unworthy to receive them.

You prudently and modestly decline the great Dispute, which exercised the Church of old, about the Manner of Admitting Persons Baptized in *Heresy* and *Schism*. You know there was the like Dispute among the Apostles about Circumcision, and the Observations of the *Mosaick* Law, but, as St. * *Augustin* observes, without any Breach of Charity. And as it pleases God to let the Governors of his Church be sometimes exercised with great Difficulties, so were they in some of the Golden Ages of it exercised with this Question;

* *Contra Geseorum*. Lib. 2.

but, as the same Father * observes, *salva Unitate*, without Dividing the Unity of the Churches. To prove this, he cites the Words of St. Cyprian, which he spoke at the Opening of the Council of *Carthage*, in which he was at the Head of the most rigid Side; to shew his Moderation in this Dispute; of which you may see a short, but clear Account, in the Learned Note upon *Meam Sententiam*, in 243d. P. of Cyprian's Works, printed at Oxford 1682. The Words are these: *Supereſt, ut de hac ipſa re ſinguli, quid ſentiamus, proferamus, neminem judicantes, aut à jure Communionis aliquem, ſi diverſum ſenſerit, amoventes.* So in his Epistle to *Jubaianus*, tho' he strenuously and warmly defends his Opinion, yet he concludes with great Modesty and Meekness; *Hæc tibi breviter pro noſtra mediocritate reſcripſimus, Frater chariſſime, nemini præſcribentes, aut præjudicantes, quominus unusquiſque Episcoporum, quod putat faciat, habens arbitrii ſui liberam poteſtatem. Nos quantum in nobis eſt propter Hæreticos cum Collegis & Co-Episcopis noſtris non contendimus, cum quibus Divinam Concordi-*

* Ibid. *Neque enim parvi momenti, quod inter Episcopos Anterioris Ætatis quam eſſe inciperet Pars Donati, ipſa quaestio fluctuavit, & varia: haberet inter ſe Collegarum, ſalva Unitate, Sententias.*

am, & dominicam Pacem tenemus, maxime cum & Apostolus dicat, si quis autem putaverit contentiosus esse, nos talem consuetudinem non habemus, neque Ecclesie Dei. These Passages plainly shew, that the Peace and Unity of the Church was not to suffer in this Contention; but that the Bishops and Churches of both Sides were to be left to their own Customs, and the Practice of their Fathers; as St.* *Basil* speaks in his First Canonical Letter to *Amphilochius*, Bishop of *Iconium*, about the Baptism of the *Novatians*. Indeed, there was no Reason why the Bishops should divide Communion, and break the Unity of the Episcopal College in this Controversy: Because, *First*, Both Parties agreed in their Sentiments of the direful, sacrilegious, and damnable Nature of *Heresy* and *Schism*, and particularly of the *Schism* made by the *Novatians* and *Donatists*. *Secondly*, They both run back, and unravelled the Successions of their *Anti-Bishops* to Interruptions; *Optatus Milev.* in the one, as well as *Cyprian* in the other *Schism*. *Thirdly*, Both compared them to *Corah*, *Dathan* and *Abiram*, and likewise to Adulterers, and looked upon their Ordainers

* ὅτι δὲ τῶ ἕδει τῶν καθ' ἑαυτὴν Χώρων ἕπεσθαι. Tom. ii. P. 757.

as Traditors. And *lastly*, Both asserted, that in those Schisms none could be saved in the ordinary way, without Returning to the Church. But then, tho' they agreed in the Charge of Schism, they differ'd as to the Manner of Reconciling *Schismaticks*; one Side being for Baptizing those again who were Baptized in Schism; because they thought their Baptism to be * *Null, Extraneous, and Prophane*; and that Schismatical Churches were † only like Churches, but were not real Churches; and by consequence, that their Bishops and Priests could not Validly Baptize, or do any other Priestly Act. Therefore they had one way of Reconciling Penitents, who had been Baptized in the Church, when they returned to it from the Schism, and another of Reconciling those who had been Baptized in the Schism, when they came over to the Church. The former they only look'd upon as

* Cypr. *Epist.* 71, 72, 73. *Edit.* Oxon.

† Cyprianus Jubaiano. *Quando ad nos non omnino pertineat, quid Hostes Ecclesie faciunt, dummodo teneamus ipsi potestatis nostrae honorem, & rationis, ac veritatis firmitatem. Nam Novatianus Simiarum more, quæ cum Homines non sint, Homines tamen imitantur, vult Ecclesie Catholice auctoritatem sibi, & Honorem vindicare, quando ipse in Ecclesia non sit. Imo adhuc insuper contra Ecclesiam Rebellis & Hostis extiterit.*

* *Stray Sheep*; and as such we re-admitted them into the Fold barely by Imposition of Hands. But they look'd upon the latter as *Non Oves*, who did not belong to the Fold, and were not Sheep at all, and therefore determin'd, that they ought to be Baptized in the Holy Catholick Church, that they might become Sheep of her Fold.

The other Side, on the contrary, tho' they look'd upon those Schismatical Churches not to belong to the *Holy Catholick Church*, but to be extraneous to it, and alienated from it; yet they look'd upon them as Parts, tho' as factious, sacrilegious Parts of the Universal Church, which were guilty of the highest Breach of Charity, and compared them to the Vessels of Dishonour in the House of God. I say, they look'd upon them as

* *Quod nos quoque hodie observamus, ut quos constat hic Baptizatos esse, & a nobis ad Hæreticos transfuisse, si postmodum peccato suo cognito, & errore digesto, ad veritatem & Matricem veniat, satis sit in Pœnitentiam Manum imponere; ut quia ovis fuerat, hanc Ovem ac alienatam & errabundam in Ovile suum Pastor recipiat: si autem quis ab Hæreticis venit, Baptizatus in Ecclesia prius non fuit sed alienus in totum, & profanus venit, Baptizandus est, ut ovis fiat, quia una est aqua in Ecclesia sancta, que Oves facit.* Cyprian. Epist. ad Quintum.

Parts of the Universal Church, * in the most extended Sense of the Word, as it comprehends Good and Bad, Sound and Corrupt, Orthodox and Heretical, Pure and Adulterous Churches, Churches under, and Churches free from the Charge of Schism, and as Members of the Universal Church, in the largest Sense, they also look'd upon them as *Real Churches*, and the Ministrations of their Bishops and Priests, and the Sacraments they administered, as *good in themselves*, tho' *unprofitable*, because both Givers and Receivers wanted Charity, as being divided from the Unity of the Church. This *St. Augustin* inculcates again and again of † Schismatical Baptism, where he defends the *Validity of it in it self*. And as Martyrdom out of the Unity is unprofitable to Salvation, so he saith, Baptism is. The Fathers of
the

* August. *Donatistis Epist.* 166. *Perire vos non vult Deus in sacrilega discordia alienatos a Matre vestra Catholica, Contra Donatist. Lib. 1. Qui separationis aperto Sacrilegio manifesti sunt; Eos tamen a Sacrilegio Schismatis revocat.*

† August. in *Evang. Johan. Tract. 6.* & potest fieri, ut aliquis habeat Baptismum præter Columbam: ut profit ei Baptismus, præter columbam non potest ——— docet nos columba, respondet enim de capite Domini, dicens, Baptismum habes, charitatem autem, qua Ego Gemo non habes. Quid est hec, Inquit, Baptismum habeo, charitatem non habeo. Sacramentum habeo, Charitatem non. Noli clamare, ostende mihi quomodo habeat charitatem, qui dividit unitatem. Ego, Inquit, habeo Baptismum: habes, sed sine

the *Latin* Church, particularly the *Africans* in *St. Augustin's* Time, look'd upon *Schism*, and the utter Violation of *Charity* in it, as an impeding Cause, which hinder'd the Descent, and the Reception of the Holy Spirit upon the Baptized in *Schism*, and their Receiving the *Grace of the Sacrament*, which only could make the Sacrament effectual to Salvation. And upon the whole, *Sir*, I cannot but observe, that the Difference between the *Nullity* and *Inutility* of *Schismatical* Baptism is not very great, if it be consider'd, that those Words are so nearly allied to one another, that in the *Civil Law* the latter is often used to signify the former: So *inutilis*
Stipu-

charitate nihil tibi prodest. *Baptisma* quippe aliquid est, & magnum aliquid est propter illum; de quo dictum est, hic est qui *Baptizat*: sed ne putares illud quod magnum est tibi aliquid prodesse posse si non fueris in *Unitate*. — Si *Baptismum* habes esto in *Columba*, ne non tibi profit, quod habes: tunc ergo ad *Columbam* dicimus, non ut incipias habere, quod non habebas, sed ut prodesse tibi incipiat, quod habes. Foris enim habebas *Baptismum* ad perniciem; intus si habueris, incipit prodesse ad salutem. Contra *Epist. Parmeniani*. *Lib. 2.* aliud est prorsus non habere, aliud perniciosè habere, aliud salubriter habere. Quicquid non habetur dandum est, cum opus est dari, quod vero perniciosè habetur per correctionem depulsa pernicie agendum est, ut salubriter habeatur. Contra *Crescon. Gramm. Lib. 2.* Ita vobis & nos dicimus, quem *Baptismum* vos ignorantes observatis, ejus potestatem vobis nos annunciamus, non ut cum ad nos veneritis alterum accipiatis, sed ut cum, qui jam apud vos erat, utiliter accipiatis. Contra *Donatistas, Lib. 1.* Non eis itaque dicimus, nolite dare, sed nolite in *Schismate* dare. Nec eis quos videntur bapti-

Stipulatio signifies a void Bargain, and *inutiliter testari*, to make a *Will* that is void, or *no Will*. And so the *Inanis* of St. *Cyprian*, and *Inutilis* of St. *Augustin*, let them differ as they will, are both so terrible, that either of them methinks should fright *Schismatics* from the sad State they are in, to betake themselves to the Ark and Sanctuary of the Church, and be reconcil'd to her, either by reiterated Baptism, as St. *Cyprian* saith, many Thousands were in his Time; or only by *Imposition of Hands*, which afterwards obtained in the *Latin* Church. Wherefore, Sir, I agree with you, that the Manner of Admitting, and Reconciling such Penitent Schismatics,

baptizaturi, dicimus, nolite accipere, sed nolite Schismate accipere. — Si postea venire ad Catholicam cogitat, quia certus est ibi prodesse Sacramentum, quod alibi accipi quidem potest, prodesse autem non potest. — In Ecclesia Baptismum recte accipi. — Non autem illic (apud Donatistas) recte accipi. Augustin. de Bapt. contra Donatistas, Lib. 4. Ecclesia paradiso comparata indicat nobis, posse quidem ejus Baptismum Homines etiam foris accipere, sed salutem beatitudinis extra eam neminem vel percipere, vel tenere. — Eos (Hæreticos) doccamus, quod ex unitate habent, non valere ad salutem, nisi ad eandem venerint unitatem. — Salus (inquit) extra Ecclesiam non est, quis negat? Et ideo quæcumque ipsius Ecclesiæ habentur extra Ecclesiam non valent ad salutem, sed aliud est non habere, aliud non utiliter habere. De Unit. Eccles. Sacramenta eadem sunt, sed non profunt, quia cum illi recta sint, ipsi perversi sunt. — Accipiat vinculum pacis, quod non habebat, sine quo illi prodesse non potest Baptisma quod habebat. — Baptismus autem in eo, qui justitiam non habet, esse potest; sed non potest prodesse.

as returned from the *Novatians* and *Donatists*, ought not now to be Matter of Dispute, For, the Conversion of such is the main Point; and the Manner of Admitting them, ought to be left to the Custom of Churches.

Here I cannot but observe to you, with what † *Lenity and Gentleness* the Church of *Africa* treated the *Donatists*. * *She allowed their Ordinations as well as Baptisms*; and in a Diocese where there was a Church-Bishop, and a *Donatist-Bishop*, † *She offered a Partition of such a Diocese, in which the Senior of them should divide, and the Junior chuse.* || *She also received the Clergy-men among the Donatists, upon their Conversion, to the same Honour that they enjoyed among the Donatists*; * *and also admitted those who were Baptized in their Infancy by the Donatists, not only into the Church, but also to the Ministry of the Altar, when they were converted, and had received Imposition of Hands.* Without Conversion, and Admission into the Unity, to which the Church-Bishops invited them by these Concessions and Honours, there could be no Re-union, or

† *African Code in the Clergy-man's Vade Mecum, Part 2. Can. 66.* * *Can. 69.* † *Can. 118.* || *Citr. 68.*
* *Can. 47. 57.*

making the Two into one Communion again. But the *Donatist* Bishops having Numbers and Strength on their Side, refused and slighted all the Offers of the Church, and so added Obstinacy and Contempt to their Sin. * *St. Augustin* tells us, they were so proud and uncondescending, that they would not come to any pacifick Conference with them, (*till forc'd* by the *Emperor*) but prided themselves in their Schism. Sir, I have referred you above to the Canons of the *African Code*, as they are abridg'd in the Second Part of the *Vade Mecum*, because I had a mind to notify that excellent and useful Book to the World, for which the Author deserves great Praise and Thanks. But, Sir, nevertheless I desire you, who understand *Latin*, to read them at large in that Language, in *Justel's Bibliotheca Juris Canonici veteris*, Tom. 1. and when you have leisure, the Conferences at *Carthage* between the *Catholicks*, and the *Donatists* in *Optatus Milevitanus's*

* Exhort. ad Concord. Eccles. Epist. 166. Nihil in nos aliquando probare potuistis, vestri Episcopi conventi à nobis, nunquam pacifice cum nobis conferre voluerunt, quasi fugientes cum peccatoribus loqui. Quis ferat istam superbiam, quasi Paulus Apostolus non contulerit cum peccatoribus, & cum valde sacrilegis. Quasi ipse Dominus non cum Judæis à quibus crucifixus est, sermones de lege habuerit. ——— ut intelligatos istos ideo nobiscum nolle conferre, quia causam suam perditam norunt!

1 *A Letter to the Author.*

Works, or rather St. *Augustin's Breviculum* of them in the 7th Vol. of his Works.

I have observed to you in the beginning of my Letter, that as there never was any Church founded, but *in* and *with* Episcopacy, so no Sect ever assum'd the Title of a Church, till they had a pretended rightful Bishop, before the Time of the Reformation. So *essential* did all Christians (till that time) think Bishops to the Church *as a Society*, according to that of St. *Cyprian* in * his 66 Epist. "*Illi sunt Ecclesia*
 "*Plebs Sacerdoti adunata, & Pastori suo*
 "*Grex adhærens. Unde scire debes Episco-*
 "*pum in Ecclesia esse, & Ecclesiam in Epi-*
 "*scopo, & si qui cum Episcopo non sint, in*
 "*Ecclesia non esse. A Church is composed*
 "*of the People united to the Bishop, and*
 "*the Flock adhering to their Pastor; there-*
 "*fore you ought to know, that the Bishop is*
 "*in the Church, and the Church in the Bi-*
 "*shop; so that they who are not with the*
 "*Bishop, are not in the Church.*

This is exactly according to the Apostolical Doctrine of St. *Ignatius*. But, Sir, to shew you, or rather the Reader, that all Sects, who desired to be accounted Churches, were headed by Bishops *as Principles of Unity*; I need but instance in the *Monta-*

* *Edic. Oxon.*

nists, those antient *Camisars*, who being condemned by the whole Catholick Church, formed themselves into a separate Church, over which they pretended to set *Bishops* and *Presbyters*, whom they chose out of the *Prophetical Order*, as in the time of the Apostles, by the *Immediate Call* of God, I mean by the exprefs Designation of the *Holy Ghost*, or a visible Manifestation of the Divine Unction resting upon them. They also set up a *Primate* in the same manner over their New Church, which they declared to be the most perfect that ever had been on the Face of the Earth. This, *Sir*, you may see in the History of *Montanism*, in *One of the Three Discourses* newly Published against *our pretended new Prophets*, to which I refer you; and it is natural to conclude, that they either had no Notion of a Church without *Bishops*, or that they feared to be detected as false Prophets for rejecting the Apostolical Order; and therefore according to the Practice of the Catholick Church unto that time, from which they durst not depart, they founded their New Churches *in* and *with* Episcopacy; of all which they looked upon the Church of *Pepuza*, a City of *Phrygia*, to be the Mother, as *Hierusalem* was of the *Catholick Church*.

My next Instance shall be in *Novatian*, the Founder of the *Novatian* Schism, who got himself to be Ordained by Three unworthy Bishops in such an indirect and scandalous Manner, as you may read in the 43d *Ch.* of the 6th Book of the Ecclesiastical History of *Eusebius*. According to this received Principle of the Necessity of a Bishop to a Church, most of the Troubles in the ancient Churches were not for *pulling down Bishops*, but about *setting of them up*, that every Party might have a Bishop for a pretended Principle of Unity; and so the *Novatians*, though they were divided from the Church for a long time, yet maintained an Episcopal Succession, that they might in all Places have the Form and Fashion, and Appearance of a Church. Thus the Party of the *Donatists* in *Africa*, so called from *Donatus à Casis Nigris*, who began to trouble the Church in the time of *Mensurius*, *Primate of Carthage*, after his Death set up *Majorinus* against *Cecilian*, his next lawful Successor, who had been truly Elected and Consecrated into his Place. They knew the People of that City would not follow them without a Bishop, and having by that means formed a mighty Party there, they were headed by * those

* *Henricus Vates de Schismate Donatistarum. Cap. 2.*

other Bishops, who condemned *Cacilian*, and set up *Majorinus* against him, and thereby formed the most deplorable Schism that ever was in any of the Churches of Old. The People then had no Notion of a Church without a Bishop, (unless in a vacant Church where the Altar continues) much less of a Church set up against *Episcopacy*. For had they thought that a Church could be without a Bishop, and Episcopal Successors, the Misleaders of them at any time into *Heresy* or *Schism*, need not have taken so much Pains, or used so many indirect Arts to be made Bishops, but have set up *Presbyterian Churches*, which was so contrary to *Catholick Practice*, and the *common Principle* of Bishops being the Apostles Successors, and Principle of Unity in their respective Churches, that they either never thought of doing it, or if they did, they thought they could never do it with Success. So in the famous Sub-division from the Church among the *Donatists*, which separated from them, as they had separated from the Church, * *Maximianus*, a factious Deacon, was set up by them, against *Primianus* their Bishop of *Carthage*, as they at first set up *Majorinus* against *Cacilian*: which they

* August. de Gestis cum Emeristo Donatist. Episcop.

need not have done, if a Church without a Bishop would have served their turn. This Sect of the *Maximianists* is mentioned in that memorable Canon of the *African Code*, wherein the Fathers Ordained, that Legates should be sent to preach Peace to the *Donatists*, both Clergy and People, and to shew them, that they departed from the Church as unjustly as the *Maximianists* divided from them, and that they should also be exhorted to receive Converts from the *Maximianists*, as the Church did from them, *viz. allowing their Ordination and Baptism*

But Sir, to shew those who know not the Story, how the Principle of Episcopacy was transmitted to latter Ages, and kept its Ground to the 15th Century, permit me to relate the Opinion and Proceedings of the *Presbyters* of those *Bohemians* and *Moravians*, who in Persecution retiring to a Mountainous Country near *Silesia*, grew very solicitous how the People should have the Ministry continued unto them after they were dead. * In this Deliberation they had some Thoughts, which Necessity

* *Ecclesiae Sclavonica Bohema in Gente potissimum radicatae Historiola.* §. 59, 60, 61. *sed quassabat animos metus, an satis legitima foret Ordinatio, si Presbyter presbyterum crearet; non vero Episcopus? & quomodo talem Ordinationem, si lis moveretur defensuri essent, sive apud alios sive apud suos.*

suggested to them of ordaining other Presbyters to succeed them. But fearing that such Ordinations would not be Legitimate nor defensible, if called in Question; at length in the Year 1467. the most eminent among them that were dispersed through *Bohemia* and *Moravia*, met together to the Number of about seventy, who addressing themselves to God with Prayers and Tears, beseeched him to shew them if their Purpose were agreeable to his Holy Will, and if that were the time for it, and then proceeded in the following Manner to know the Will of God by *Lot*: They chose by Suffrages *Nine Men* from among themselves, whom they thought most worthy to be *Bishops*, and having put into the Hands of a Child *Twelve* little Papers folded up, they directed him to distribute them among the *Nine Persons*: Nine of the Papers were *Blank*, and on the other Three only were written *E S T*, *it is*, to wit, *the Will of God*, which they had begg'd him to discover to them. It might have so happened, that every one of the *Nine Persons* might have got a *Blank Paper*, which would have been a sign to them of the *Negative Will* of God. But it came to pass, that the *Three written Papers* fell into the Hands of Three among them, who were noted for their Piety, Learning, and Prudence.

These * they embraced with Joy, as given unto them from Heaven, and then deliberated about their Consecration. And to that End sent Three of their Ministers to a part of the *Waldenses*, who being banished out of *France*, came to reside in the Confines of *Austria* and *Moravia*. To these they related their sad State, and having asked their Counsellor, *Stephanus*, one of their Bishops, calling to him another Bishop, and some Ministers, he made known to them the Purity of their Doctrine, the grievous Persecutions they had suffered in *France* and *Italy*, and † *the lawful uninterrupted Succession* of their Bishops from the first Plantation of Christianity to that time. To them therefore the *Bohemian* Ministers, Elected by Lot, were sent to be Consecrated Bishops, after which they resolved to unite with the *Waldenses*, who were suddenly scattered by a new Persecution, in which, *Stephen* their Bishop suffered Martyrdom, being inhumanly burnt at *Vienna*. || *Joh. Amos Comenius* was the last Bishop of this *Bohemian* Succession, who

* *Ibid.* §. 70.

† *Cumque dicti Waldenses legitimos se habere Episcopos legitimamque & non interruptam ab Apostolis usque successionem affirmarent, crearunt tres è nostrorum Ministris Episcopos.* &c. In præfat. *Arte Rationem disciplinæ in Unitate Fratrum Bohemorum.*

|| *Joh. Amos Comenii Dedicatorium Alloquium.* p. 8, 9, 10.

lived to see the * utter Ruin of the *Bohemian* and *Moravian* Churches, occasioned by their Impatience † under the *Cross*, in taking up *Arms* against their lawful Sovereign, and setting up another against him.

But having mentioned *Colluthus* above, as an Usurper upon the Episcopal Office in presuming to Ordain *Presbyters*, give me leave to tell the Story, because, as Lawyers speak, it is a *Book-case*, which shews the Invalidity of *Presbyterian Ordination*. This *Colluthus*, a *Presbyter* of *Alexandria*, took upon him, in Opposition to his Bishop, to Ordain certain *Presbyters*, and among the rest one called † *Ischyras*, who accused *Macarius*, a *Presbyter* of *Athanasius*, for breaking the Chalice while he was Administring at the Holy Altar; and this scandalous Story was one of those which the *Arians* invented, and brought against *Athanasius*, and were all examined, and found to be Lies by a great * Council, which met at *Alexandria* in the Year of our Lord, 340.

* Hoc egerunt ut eas exquisitis divexationibus ad impatientiam, & dehinc ad Arma, proritarent.

† Eo res deducta est, ut intra Bohemiam, & Moraviam nullum amplius Evangelicis Templum, nulla Schola; nullum privatum Religiosis Exercitium. &c.

‡ ποτηριον μυστηριον.

* Athanasii. *Apol.* 2.

As to this particular Story, the Council upon Enquiry declared, * *First*, that in the Place where the *Holy Cup* was said to be broken by *Macarius*, there was no Church; *Secondly*, nor Presbyter there to Administer; nor *Thirdly*, was the Day in which the Fact was said, a Day of Communion, nor *Last* of all was *Ischyras* a Priest, † being only Ordained by *Colluthus*, who died a Presbyter, and whose Imposition of Hands was of no Authority, or Validity, and that, all who were Ordained by him, were Laymen, and communicated in the Assemblies as such. To this Testimony of the Church, let me add another of a *Spanish Bishop*; who having fore Eyes at an Ordination of Presbyters, only laid his Hands upon them, suffering a Presbyter to read the Words of Ordination. This coming to be debated in the * *Second Council of Sevil*, was, upon mature Deliberation, thus determin'd. *First*, That the Presbyter, had he been alive, should have been censur'd for his Presumption. And *Secondly*, That the Presbyters and Deacons

* Ἄλλ' ὅτι μηδὲν ἢ ὅλως ἐκεῖ πῶς γὰρ; ὅτι μήτε τύπος χρυσιακῆς μήτε τις ἐκεῖ Ἐκκλησίας ἀλλὰ μήτε ὁ καιρὸς μουσῆζιων ην.

† Ἄλλ' ὅτι ΚΟΛΛΟΥΘΟΣ πρεσβύτερος ἂν ἐτελευτήσῃ, καὶ πᾶσα Χεῖρ αὐτῆς γέγονεν ἔχυρος, &c.

* *Council. Hisp. II. Cap. 5.*

so Ordained, should be deposed from their Sacred Orders, which they had wrongfully receiv'd. This shews, that this Council were of Opinion that *Presbyters* could have no *Essential* Part in Ordination; and therefore that they are liable to Censure merely for Reading the Words of Ordination, which formally constitute a *Presbyter* or *Deacon*, tho' with the Allowance of his Bishop; who is not supposed to have Power to Authorize him to do that, which he only had Authority to do himself.

Upon what you have written, about the *Form of Baptism*, IN THE NAME OF THE FATHER, &c. *Sir*, Give me Leave to recommend to your Perusal what is written by a very Learned Divine, and an Old Sufferer for the Church of *England*; Mr. *Christopher Elderfield*, in his Book of *Regeneration and Baptism*, from *Pag.* 183, to *Pag.* 207.

I cannot but declare my Consent to what you have written; *viz.* That *supposing it were (as it is not) possible, for the Church to be deprived at once of all her Bishops; it would be our Duty, as well as Safety, in that Destitution, to wait and pray, and hope for a new Revelation of the Will of God, rather than to take upon our selves to make Bishops, for which we have no Authority.* And I concur with you also in

your Conclusion, That *no Doctrine whatsoever can be proved false, [or, as I beg leave to add, ought to be rejected] because Numbers of Men may be involved in the sad Consequences that arise from it.* To which let me also add, More especially when they are involved in them, not without their own Knowledge, or by their own wilful Ignorance or Mistake, or, which is still worse, by Worldly Interests and Evil Passions. This, *Sir*, will appear plainly, if we consider the *Received Principles* of Christianity; which are either Speculative, or Practical that is; either Doctrines, or Commands. By the *Speculative Principles*, I mean all the Received Doctrines of Faith, which we are bound to believe in order to Salvation; and by the *Practical*, those which oblige us to some Practical Duty; which are again of Three Sorts, *Moral, Ritual, and Political.* And there are none of these Principles which some Men among us, in this Age of Destructive Latitude, will not give up, or strive to bend and relax, for Fear or Favour; when great Numbers of Men, especially of Men in Power, are concerned in the Consequences of them. To instance in one of the Speculative Principles: You cannot but know that some do not like our Preaching up the Doctrine of *Christ's being God, or God of*

of God, of the same *Essence* or *Substance* with the Father, and the Belief of it as necessary to Salvation; because so many *Arians* and *Socinians*, and other inexcusable Unbelievers, are involved in the dangerous Consequences of that Doctrine: and for their sakes, and, it may be, secretly for their own, they rack their Inventions to find out New, Loose, and Evasive Expositions of that Fundamental Mystery of Christianity, and express them in odd uncertain Terms, unknown to all *Antiquity*, and as different in Sense as in Sound, from the Language of the *Catholick Church*. I have said *Inexcusable* Unbelievers, tho' these Gentlemen of Large Thoughts, and pretended Large Charity, would excuse them; because the Mystery is Incomprehensible, and the Manner of the Thing, as taught by the *Catholick Church*, Inconceivable by Human Understanding; but, let me say, no otherwise inconceivable by us than some *Natural Mysteries* are; which, tho' we cannot conceive, yet we believe. They will tell us in Behalf of these Unbelievers, *That Men's Minds are as different as their Faces; That our Brains, and the Cells in them, are of different Make; and, That all Men cannot believe alike.* But, Sir, to shew the Vanity of such Apologies, let us suppose that some of our Countrymen

were Trading among a People very remote from the Sea; imagine under the Foot of Mount *Caucasus*; and had told them, that the Waters of the River which run through the Capital City of *England*, did twice every Day, and sometimes oftner, run backwards up the same Channel, down which the Stream had run not long before; And that the *King* of that People, as well as the People, wondring at this Relation, should send Letters to the *Queen*, to desire Her Majesty, that if it was true, she would be pleased to confirm the Truth of it by an Answer with her *Royal Seal*; and that, after he received Her Majesty's most Authentick Letter, should nevertheless declare he would not believe *the Thing*, because he could not conceive the Manner of it, nor how it could possibly be done; and thereupon also did brand the First Relators of this Inconceivable Natural Mystery, as *Lyars*, and then banish them out of his Dominions: Supposing all this, Sir; Do you think it were reasonable to make an Apology for such a Prince's obstinate Incredulity; who, upon the Authority of such Testimonies, would not believe the Thing, because it was not only above his Understanding, but that of all the Philosophers in his Kingdom? I say, would it be reasonable for such a Prince, and his Philoso-

Philosophers, to disbelieve, or doubt of that Thing, after such undoubted Human Authority for the Truth of it; or for others to palliate or excuse their obstinate Unbelief, because Men's Minds are not all alike, and their Brains of different Make? *Sir*, I wish the Gentlemen, for whose Sake I have made this Comparison, would consider it, and no longer, under Pretence of *Universal Charity*, and the *different Features of Minds*, write in such Manner of the great Mystery of our Religion, as to confirm our Doubters or Unbelievers in their *Scepticism* or Unbelief, and thereby give them Occasion to reject it as uncertain or false, rather than be involv'd in the Dreadful Consequence of their Unbelief, should it be, as it certainly is, a Divine Truth.

Then, as to the Practical Principles, which I call Precepts, or *Commands*, they are also as necessary to be *observ'd*, as the other are to be *believ'd*; and, if I may so speak, are as dear to God as any Article of Faith; and yet there is none of them, which some Men of *Latitude* among us will not soften, and trim up into another Sense, to please the Transgressors of them to their Eternal Ruin.

Thus, *Sir*, that very Sect, which not only neglects, but despises the Two Sacraments as Temporary Institutions, or Ritual
Ordi-

Ordinances, appointed only for the *Infant State* of the Church, are not only allowed the Title of Christians, but reckon'd in the ordinary State of Salvation, by some Free-Thinkers, in the *Broad Way*, which leadeth to Destruction. And then, as to the *Political Doctrines*, or Principles, relating to the Government of the Church; tho' it was the Consistent Belief of all Christians for Fifteen Hundred Years, that Bishops were the Successors of the Apostles, and as such only have Power to Ordain Ministers in the Church; yet have we Men, and Men of no ordinary Figures in the Church, that not only never Preach this Doctrine themselves, but do not love that others should Preach it, or Instruct the Youth in it; because, say they, *It Unchurches the Foreign Churches*. But, *Sir*, in the Name of God, is it this Receiv'd Principle of the *Catholick Church* that Unchurches Foreign Churches; or do they Unchurch themselves, in continuing wilful Transgressors of it? As, not to speak more of the *Moral Precepts* of Christianity; Is it, for Instance, the Doctrine of Sobriety, or Justice, or Temperance, or Purity, or Humility, that damns so many Millions of Christians; or do they damn themselves by their wilful Violation of them? The Positive Laws of God are all Sacrosanct, *especially those he*
hath

both Ordain'd for Government; and he will in no wise excuse the wilful Neglect, Contempt, or Transgression of them; but every such Transgression and Disobedience against the Polity of the Christian Theocracy, let the Number of Offenders be never so great, shall receive a just Recompence of Reward. And therefore judge, *Sir*, who act most like Primitive Christians, and the Faithful Servants of Christ; *those*, who in all Meekness and Charity, set this Receiv'd Principle concerning the *Oecumenical Theocracy* of the Mystical *Israel*, the Necessity of Conformity and Obedience, and the Consequences of Disobedience to it, before the *other* Churches; or those, who sooth and flatter them in their Error, because they are *whole Nations*; tho' most of them have abandon'd the Divine Order of Bishops, purely for Human Reasons of State; and particularly, because they have alienated the Revenues, by which they were maintained. Yet, *Sir*, the same Persons, who had rather this *Principle* were suppress'd, than that those Nations should, as they speak, be *Unchurch-ed* by it, would (at least many of them) make no Difficulties to *Unchurch* Lesser Bodies of Christians by it; and let the Consequences which arise from it, have their full Force upon a few, tho' the Transgressi-

on of *the Principle*, and the Consequences of the Transgression, equally affect a great as well as a small Number, and condemn whole Nations of Christians as much, and as effectually, as single Men. But these Gentlemen should consider, that they are the Multitudes, and great Numbers, that will be condemned at the Day of Judgment. Furthermore, *Sir*, you know, what indispenfible Obligations lie upon all Christians, and Christian Nations, to *profess the Faith once delivered to the Saints, and to contend earnestly for it*; and accordingly, how carefully it was guarded, and how zealously contended for against all Hereticks, who (from the Beginning) oppos'd it, or any Part of it. And therefore, if we must believe, and contend for *Divine Revelations*, which have always been oppos'd; why should we not as zealously observe, and contend for that *Divine Institution*, which was never oppos'd for 1500 Years? I mean, that Form of Government which all Christianity receiv'd and practis'd for so many Ages, as that only Ecclesiastical Polity, which was appointed by Christ to continue unto the End of the World.

Sir, I have taken Occasion from your Assertion to say thus much in Behalf of *Episcopacy*, as a *Receiv'd Principle of Christianity*; and from thence to shew, how it
concerns

concerns all our Divines, especially of the Episcopal Order, to set the Dangerous Consequences of Rejecting it, before the *Foreign Churches*; and thereupon to invite, encourage and exhort, nay, to conjure them in the Name of Christ, to join the Apostolical Government to the Apostolical Faith of the Church; that thereby they may become wholly Pure and Primitive, and not only in Part, but in Whole, as we are, and all Christian Nations ought to be. This, surely, would better become the Men of Higher Stations and Characters in the Church; than, in sinful Complaisance to Foreign Churches, to condemn Books of most Excellent Instruction for the Younger Sort *at School*; because they teach them, that *Bishops were Successors to the Apostles in the Church; and only have Power to Ordain, and send forth Labourers into God's Vineyard.* These Gentlemen surely forget, That as the Nature of the Church, as a *Seet*, consists in Doctrines; so, as she is a *Society*, it consists in that Frame of Polity which God hath Ordained for the Government thereof. Wherefore, instead of Condemning, they should rather Recommend all such Books, as instruct the *Laity* (Young or Old) in Primitive Christianity; and encourage them to read all such Tracts and Discourses, in their own or any other
Tongue,

Tongue, as will give them true Views of the State of the Primitive Church in the Best and Purest Ages; and of the Manners of the Primitive Christians in them. And were this diligently done by the Clergy; the Church would soon find great Benefit, and God receive much Glory by it; and the *Stray-Sheep* of our Countries, after your Example, would return in Flocks to her Folds.

Your *Enquiring Genius*, and the Providence of God, led you to read such Books; and his Blessing upon Reading of them, made you see, and correct your Error. And tho' you have an Advantage above most others of the *Laity*, in Understanding *Latin*; yet there is already a great deal written in *English*, to let Pious and Inquisitive Persons into the Knowledge of the Primitive Church, and Primitive Christianity: Such as Dr *Cave's Primitive Christianity*; and his Learned and Elaborate *Lives of the Fathers*; *Fleury, Of the Manners and Behaviour of the Primitive Christians*, turn'd into *English*; *The Ecclesiastical Historians*, in a Noble New Edition, illustrated with Maps by the Learned Dr. *Wells*; *The Genuine Epistles of the Apostolical Fathers*, by the Learned Bishop *Wake*; which is come forth in a Second Edition: The Learned Mr. *Bingham's Origines Ecclesiasticæ*,

clesiastica, or *Antiquities of the Christian Church*; worthy to be read by all Men; The Second Part of the *Clergyman's Vade Mecum*, commended above: Mr. *Reeves's Apologies of the Ancient Christians*; for which he well deserves the Thanks and Praise of all Lovers of Primitive Christianity; who cannot but delight to hear them speak in our Language the same Things, with the same United Force of Wit and Reason, and with the same Charms of Eloquence that they did in their own. To these let me add the Sermons and other Tracts of the late Bishop *Beveridge*, wherein much of Primitive Christian Antiquity may be learned; as also the Sermons of the late Bishop *Bull*, (which will e're long see the Light) and in which likewise many Primitive Christian Doctrines are taught. There are other Excellent Pens at Work in Books of the like Nature with these; and I cannot but hope, that God hath excited the Spirit of Cultivating the more Early *Ecclesiastical Antiquities*, in Mercy to his Church. I could name * several other *English* Tracts upon several Subjects, full of Primitive Christian Divinity, were such a *Bibliothèque* fit for this Place. And besides those which are written in *English*, there are many Excellent Pieces of the

* As the Principles of the *Cyprianick* Age, and the Defence of it, worthy to be read by all Learned Men.

same Kinds written in *French*: As *Du Pin's Nouvelle Bibliotheque des Auteurs Ecclesiastiques*, translated into *English*: *Tillemont's Memoires, Pour servir à l' Histoire Ecclesiastique*, which also deserves to be translated: The Works of *St. Cyprian*, in *French*; which I cannot but wish that all *Englishmen*, who are not versed in *Latin*, but understand that Language, would carefully read. Were our People exercised in such Writings as these, and their Minds season'd with the Antient Doctrines and Principles which are in them, we should soon see the Spirit of Primitive Christianity begin to revive among them, in the Soundness and Orthodoxy of their Faith, in the Piety of their Practice, in their Zeal for the Divine Institutions, in their Love and Reverence of the Clergy, and in their Prayers and Endeavours, for supplying whatever is wanting to make the Church of *England* (in the Sanctity of her Clergy and People, and in the Strictness of her Discipline, and every other thing) as Pure, and Perfect, and Venerable, as the Primitive Church.

Sir, Your Book, had I Time to write them, would furnish me with Matter for more Useful Reflections and Observations; but these are sufficient to shew you, with how much Diligence and Delight it hath been read over by

Your Friend, and Servant,

GEO. HICKES.

A

Preliminary Discourse

O F T H E

Various Opinions of the Fathers
concerning Re - baptismation,
and Invalid Baptisms: with
R E M A R K S.

IN *St. Cyprian's* Days, about the middle of the third Century, arose a great Debate in the Church concerning the Validity of Baptism, administer'd by such as were then either Hereticks or Schismaticks: *St. Cyprian*, with the rest of the Bishops of the *African* Churches, together with many of the *Eastern* Bishops, maintain'd, " That Catholick Bi-
" shops were obliged to condemn all such
" Baptisms, and to hold them void and null,
" and by consequence not strait to *confirm*,
" but first to baptize all such, as having re-
" ceived no other than those False Baptisms,
" in those False and Antichristian Communi-
" ons, left them, and came over to the One,
" True, Catholick, and only Salutary Com-
" munion.

" *Stephen* Bishop of *Rome*, and his Party,
" maintain'd, That by the Evangelical Law

B

" Catholick

2 *A Preliminary Discourse of the*

“ Catholick Bishops were bound to ratify
“ Heretical and Schismatical Baptisms, and
“ to hold them Good and Valid, and to ad-
“ mit such as having been baptized by He-
“ reticks or Schismaticks, deserted them, and
“ came over to the True Catholick Commu-
“ nion, without giving them Catholick Bap-
“ tism, or using any other Rite at their Re-
“ ception, than that of Imposing the Hand
“ for the Collation of the Holy Ghost.

“ The *Stephanians* muster'd up a great ma-
“ ny Arguments for the Validity of such Bap-
“ tisms; they pleaded that Hereticks them-
“ selves were not so nice, as to baptize those
“ who came over from other Heresies to their
“ Communion: That all *Catechumeni*, who
“ died unbaptized, were not therefore damn-
“ ed; much less those who had received Bap-
“ tism, tho' from Hereticks or Schismaticks:
“ That to refuse those who were willing to
“ forsake Heresy or Schism, unless they would
“ consent to be re-baptiz'd, was to obstruct
“ their coming over: That those who had
“ been baptized by *Philip* in *Samaria*, were
“ not re-baptized by the Apostles when they
“ came among them (*Acts* 8.) and that they
“ received Imposition of Hands only, for the
“ Collation of the Holy Ghost: That tho'
“ some in *St. Paul's* Time preach'd Christ out
“ of Envy and Strife, *i. e.* from a Contentious
“ and Schismatical Humour, yet he was plea-
“ sed that Christ was preached (*Phil.* 1. 15.)

“ That

“ That some Schismaticks, particularly the
“ *Novatians*, observed the due Form, and
“ proposed the due Interrogatories in Bap-
“ tism: That the Efficacy of the Sacraments
“ did not depend on the Orthodoxy or the
“ Charity of the Administrators; and that if
“ Persons were baptiz’d in the Name of Christ
“ any manner of way, it was no matter who
“ baptized them: But the main Argument
“ (as *St. Austin* afterwards reckon’d it) was,
“ that *Stephen* Bishop of *Rome* had had it
“ handed down to him by constant Tradition
“ from *St. Peter* and *St. Paul*, Founders
“ of the Church of *Rome*; that those who
“ came over from Heretical or Schismatical
“ Communion, to the Communion of the
“ True Catholick Church, should not be re-
“ baptized; and that all his Predecessors, Bi-
“ shops of *Rome*, since the Days of those Apo-
“ stles, had always conform’d their Practice
“ to such unquestionable Tradition; they
“ had always Ratified, never Repudiated He-
“ retical or Schismatical Baptism.

“ The Arguments of the *Cyprianists* against
“ the Validity of such Baptisms were briefly
“ these. *St. Cyprian* rejects the Baptisms of
“ *Novatianus* upon this very Score, that he
“ was not a Bishop; *Cornelius* was the only
“ True Bishop of *Rome*; no Valid Baptisms
“ could be performed in that Church but by
“ him, or in dependance on him: *Novatia-*
“ *nus* disowned all Dependance on him, sepa-

4 *A Preliminary Discourse of the*

“ rated from him, and pretended to be Bi-
“ shop of *Rome* in Opposition to him; his
“ Baptisms therefore could not be Valid, they
“ could not be True Christian Sacraments,
“ *St. Cyprian's* 69 Epist. And in the same
“ Epistle these Three [to set up an Episcopal
“ Chair] [to assume a Primacy] [and to pre-
“ tend to a Sovereign or Independent Power
“ of Baptizing and Offering, *i. e.* Consecra-
“ ting the Holy Eucharist] he plainly makes
“ Equivalent Phrases, and by them expresses
“ the one Crime of *Novatianus* in standing up
“ as an Anti-bishop to *Cornelius*: That all his
“ Ministrations were of the same Kidney with
“ those of *Corah, Dathan* and *Abiram*, which
“ were wicked, damnable and naught, because
“ perform'd in Opposition to the High-Priest
“ *Aaron*: That it was unaccountable in BI-
“ SHOPS to Ratify Heretical or Schismatical
“ Baptisms; it was a Prostitution of the Ho-
“ nour both of the Catholick Church and the
“ EPISCOPAL COLLEGE; it tended to
“ hinder People from coming over from He-
“ resy or Schism; it encourag'd them to think
“ themselves safe and secure enough in either;
“ for if there they had true Baptism, why not
“ likewise a true Church and true Remission
“ of Sins? To weaken the Authority of a pre-
“ tended Custom to the contrary, he lays it
“ down for an undoubted Truth, That we
“ are not to be determined by any CUS-
“ TOMS of that nature, but to examine
“ whether

“ whether they will bear the Test of Reason.
“ He assembled at *Carthage* a Council of 71
“ Bishops, who confirmed all that had been
“ determined a little before in another Synod
“ held in the same City, concerning the Bap-
“ tism of Hereticks, *viz.* that it was null and
“ void; and about the same time, immedi-
“ ately after this Council, he writ a long Let-
“ ter to *Jubaianus*, a Bishop who had consult-
“ ed him about this Question, wherein he
“ urges abundance of Reasons and Texts of
“ Scripture to support his own Opinion, and
“ answered the Objections that were brought
“ against it. In another Letter to *Pompey* Bi-
“ shop of *Sabra*, he opposes the TRUTH of
“ the Gospel, and the FIRST TRADITI-
“ ONS of the Apostles, both to the Custom
“ and Tradition which *Stephen* had alledg’d
“ for himself. *Firmilian* Bishop of *Cesarea* in
“ *Cappadocia*, in his Letter to *St. Cyprian*, o-
“ penly condemns the Procedure of *Stephen*
“ Bishop of *Rome* [who had answered *St. Cy-*
“ *prian* very roughly] extols *St. Cyprian’s* Con-
“ duct, declares himself entirely in favour of
“ his Opinion, proves it by several Reasons,
“ and assures him it was the ancient Custom
“ of the *Asiatick* Churches, and that it had
“ been regulated many Years before in two
“ Numerous Synods held at *Synnada* and *Ico-*
“ *nium*. The same *Firmilian* answers *Stephen’s*
“ Plea of the constant Tradition he had hand-
“ ed down to him from *St. Peter* and *St. Paul*,

6 *A Preliminary Discourse of the*

“ as before mentioned; that his, *viz.* *Stephen's*
 “ Allegation was utterly false, he could have
 “ no such Tradition from those Apostles (*i. e.*
 “ *St. Peter* and *St. Paul*) from whom he pre-
 “ tended to have it, and that for this very good
 “ reason, that in their Days there were no He-
 “ retical Communion, by consequence no
 “ Heretical Baptisms, no Baptisms out of the
 “ true Communion of the Church Catholick,
 “ and that therefore he slander'd them by fa-
 “ thering such a Tradition on them, seeing it
 “ was certain that they taught the quite con-
 “ trary in their Epistles; that *St. Paul* (*Acts*
 “ 19) re-baptized those who had been bapti-
 “ zed by *John the Baptist*, ought not we then
 “ (says he) to baptize those who come from
 “ Heresy to the Church? Will any Man say
 “ that the Bishops now a-days are greater
 “ than *St. Paul* was? which they must needs
 “ be, if they are able to do that which he could
 “ not, if they by Imposition of Hands only, can
 “ give the Holy Ghost to Hereticks when they
 “ come to them.” *St. Cyprian* in his Letter to
Jubaianus reasons to this purpose against the
 Validity of such Baptisms. “ 'Tis evident
 “ where and by whom the REMISSION OF
 “ SINS (which is given in Baptism) can be
 “ given; for our Lord gave first to *Peter*, &c.
 “ that Power, that *whatsoever he should loose*
 “ *on Earth, should be loosed in Heaven*; then,
 “ after his Resurrection, he gave it to all the
 “ Apostles, when he said (*John* 20. 21, 22,
 “ 23.)

“ 23.) *As my Father hath sent me, &c.* Whence
“ we learn, that none have Authority to
“ BAPTIZE and REMIT SINS but the
“ BISHOPS, and those who are founded in
“ the Evangelical Law, and our Lord’s Insti-
“ tution, and that nothing can be bound or
“ loosed *out of the Church*, seeing there is none
“ *there* who has the Power of Binding and
“ Loosing. Jesus Christ (says *Fortunatus* in the
“ Venerable Council of *Carthage, Anno 256*)
“ our Lord and God, the Son of God the Fa-
“ ther and Creator, built his Church upon a
“ Rock, and not upon Heresy, and he gave
“ the Power of Baptizing to BISHOPS, and
“ not to Hereticks. Those therefore who are
“ *out of the Church*, and stand against Christ,
“ and scatter his Flock, cannot baptize, being
“ *out of the Church.*”

It would be endless to mention all the Testimonies and Arguments brought in that Age against the Validity of such Baptisms, I shall therefore name but one more, which seems to be of great moment for the Discovery of what was meant by Hereticks and Schismaticks in those Days; and that is *Firmilian*, who in one of his Letters says, “ That
“ he, and all the Bishops who met with him
“ in the Synod of *Iconium*, decreed that all
“ those should be holden as Unbaptized, who
“ were Baptized by such as had once been
“ Bishops in the Catholick Church, if they
“ were Baptized by them after they had SE-

8 *A Preliminary Discourse of the*

“ PARATED from the Church.” By which, and the other Monuments of that Age, it is evident, they held, that even Bishops, and all other lawful Ministers, lost their VERY AUTHORITY to do any thing more in the Ministerial Functions, when they either Schismatically or Heretically separated^d themselves from the Church of Christ. Hence doubtless it came to pass that *St. Cyprian* and his Collegues esteemed all their Ministerial Acts, done while in Schism or Heresy, to be Null and Void, and consequently that the supposed Sacraments administered by them, and those whom they ordained, were no true Christian Sacraments, and therefore Invalid and Ineffectual. This, I say, appears to me to be the true Foundation of that great Dispute concerning the Validity of Heretical and Schismatical Baptisms, and which “ *St. Cyprian* managed with so much Christian Humility and Charity, that tho’ *Stephen* Bishop of Rome was so far from agreeing to the Reasons of the *Africans* (whether because he imagin’d they had a Design to condemn the *Roman* Church, or because he thought this Question was of too great consequence) that he was enrag’d against *St. Cyprian* and his Collegues, and used their Deputies ill; nay, he prohibited all Christians belonging to his Church to receive or lodge them, depriving them not only of Ecclesiastical Communion, but also refusing them the
“ common

“ common Civilities of Hospitality ; yet he
 “ [*i. e.* *St. Cyprian*] could not think of break-
 “ ing Peace with them, of giving up Com-
 “ munion with them, of Abstaining or Ex-
 “ communicating them ; notwithstanding *Ste-*
 “ *phen* had taken upon him to excommunicate
 “ those who oppos’d the Ratification of Here-
 “ tical and Schismatical Baptisms. Upon the
 “ whole, the Persecution of the Church by
 “ *Valerian*, Anno 257. put an end to this
 “ Controversy. *St. Cyprian* NEVER alter’d
 “ his Opinion ; the *Greek Churches* were, for
 “ a long time after him, divided upon this
 “ Question : The Council of *Arles* first de-
 “ cided it in the *West* ; *St. Austin* followed its
 “ Decision ; the *Western Church* has embrac’d
 “ this Opinion ; *viz.* That Baptism by Here-
 “ ticks, in the Name of the Trinity, is Valid :
 “ And tho’ the *Eastern Churches* have not a-
 “ greed with her absolutely in this Point, yet
 “ they always made a Distinction between
 “ Hereticks, and differently receiv’d them.

In the Canons that are call’d Apostolical, we have these Remarkable Canons, according to the Division of *Cotelerius*.

Canon 38. “ We order, that a Bishop,
 “ Priest or Deacon, who has receiv’d Bap-
 “ tism, &c. from an Heretick, be depo-
 “ sed ; — or, as the Learned Author of the
 “ *Clergy-man’s Vade-Mecum* observes, “ *The Bi-*
 “ *shop, Priest or Deacon, who allows the Bap-*
 “ *tism, &c. of Hereticks.*

10 *A Preliminary Discourse of the*

Canon 39. “ If a Bishop or Priest do again
“ Baptize *one* who HAS REALLY receiv’d
“ Baptism before ; or if he do not Baptize one
“ that has been polluted by Wicked Men ;
“ (*i. e.* Baptized by Hereticks, *See Canon 38.*)
“ Let him be depos’d, as one that makes NO
“ DISTINCTION betwixt PRIESTS and
“ PRETENDERS.

“ In the 4th Century, St. *Athanasius* re-
“ jects the Baptism of Hereticks. *Pacianus*
“ says, That Baptism purifies from Sins, and
“ Unction brings down the Holy Spirit ; and
“ *both the One and the Other are apply’d by the*
“ *Hand and the Mouth of the Bishop.* *Optatus,*
“ That the *Donatists* (who, by the way, were
“ Schismaticks) “ committed a great Crime
“ in Reiterating Baptism : (*Where ’tis to be*
noted, That they Re-baptized the very Catholicks
who came over to them.) “ That ’tis not he
“ who gives this Sacrament of Baptism, that
“ confers the Graces ; but the Faith of him
“ that receives it, and the Virtue of the Tri-
“ nity. We ask (says he) if it be Lawful to
“ repeat Baptism given in the Name of the
“ Trinity ? Ye maintain that it is Lawful ;
“ We say that it is forbidden : The People
“ are in Suspence. *Let us therefore search after*
“ *the Will of our Father, in the Gospel ;* which
“ will inform us, That he who hath been
“ once washed, needs not to be washed a-
“ gain ; Wherefore (adds he) We do not
“ Re-baptize those who have been Baptized,
“ when

“ when they return again to us. He proves against the *Donatists*, “ That the Holiness “ of the Minister does not contribute to the “ Validity of the Sacrament of Baptism; and “ that, because the Effect of the Sacrament “ is owing to God only; and in short, be- “ cause the Sacraments are Holy, and do “ Sanctify by themselves. Yet he seems to think, “ That we ought to Re-baptize those “ who were Baptized by Hereticks; but does not make the same Determination concerning those who were Baptized by Schismatics.

“ The Council of *Eliberis*, *Anno* 305, Ca- “ non 38, declares, That a Christian who is “ neither Penitent, (*i. e.* not under Pe- nance,) nor a *Bigamist*, may Baptize in a “ Case of NECESSITY, those who are on a “ Journey, being at a great distance from a “ Church, upon Condition that he present “ him to the Bishop, if he survive, to be “ PERFECTED by Imposition of Hands.

Here it ought to be observ'd, that this Ancient Council was not a General one; and so its Canon could not thus authorize all Lay-Christians; it extended no farther than to the Subjects of *those Bishops* there assembled. And therefore our Lay-Baptizers cannot act by virtue of this Canon; especially considering further, that this Canon was not made as *Declarative* of any Proper Inherent Right or Authority that Lay-Christians, AS SUCH, had

to Baptize: It only appointed Some to do this, who had not Authority to do it before of themselves. Besides, it is plainly restrain'd to such as were *in Communion* with, and Subjection to their Bishops; they were not to be under PENANCE, &c. And therefore if this had been a General Council, as it certainly was not, our Lay-Baptizers who act in Opposition to Episcopacy, could have receiv'd no Authority from this Canon.

“ The Council of *Arles*, call'd by the Emperor *Anno 314*, consisting of Thirty three Western Bishops, *Canon 8.* determines the famous QUESTION about the Re-baptization of Hereticks, and ordains concerning the *Africans*, who had ALWAYS Re-baptiz'd them, That if any one leave a Heresy, and return to the Church, he shall be ask'd concerning the Creed; and if it be known that he was Baptiz'd *in the Name of the Father, of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost*, Imposition of Hands only, shall be given him, that he may receive the Holy Spirit: But if he does not acknowledge the Trinity,” I suppose 'tis meant, if while a Heretick he did not acknowledge the Trinity, or if the Heretick who Baptiz'd him did not acknowledge the Trinity, (the latter is the most likely) “ he shall be Re-baptiz'd.

By the way, in this Canon there is not one Word about LAY-BAPTISM: And as for the Hereticks who then Baptiz'd, they had always,

ways, or at least most commonly, received Ordination from the Hands of some CATHOLICK BISHOP or other; nay, generally the HERETICAL BISHOPS were Consecrated before they fell into Heresy, by CATHOLICK BISHOPS, or else afterwards by some Trick or other, got private Consecration from them, that so their Heresies might go down the better with the People: And the same we find concerning Schismaticks in those Days.

I desire that this may be more particularly taken notice of; because it effectually silences all Objections brought from this Council's allowing of the Validity of Heretical and Schismatical Baptisms. For such their Allowance is no ways favourable to the Baptisms we are now disputing against; for they are not only *Lay*, but *Anti-Episcopal Baptisms*; which were not the Subject of this Council.

The Council of *Nice*, Anno 325, consisting of about 300 Bishops, *Canon 19*, ordains, "That the *Paulianists* (who, by the way, did not Baptize in the Name of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost) " shall be Re-baptiz'd who " return to the Church.

After the Council of *Nice*; It was a Pre-
vailing Principle, " That those whom a Laick
" Baptizeth are to be Re-baptized; for it was
" the undoubted Principle whereby the Orthodox
" confuted the Luciferians, who began their
" Schism, upon occasion of the Council of
" *Alexandria's* allowing the Ordination of the
" *Arian*

14 *A Preliminary Discourse of the*

“*Arian* Bishops:” For thus the Orthodox argued against those Schismatics: Those whom a Laick Baptizeth are to be Re-baptiz’d; but those whom an *Arian* Priest Baptizeth, are not to be Re-baptiz’d; therefore an *Arian* Priest is not a Laick. And even *Lucifer* himself, the Author of that Schism, granted the Major Proposition to be true.

In the Council of *Carthage*, Anno 348, before they proceeded to make Canons, the President advis’d thus: “We must have such regard to this time of Peace, that we neither
 “weaken the Obligation of the Laws, nor
 “yet prejudice the present Unity by TOO
 “MUCH SEVERITY. Then the first Head
 “propos’d was about Re-baptization; he
 “ask’d whether that Man ought to be Re-
 “baptiz’d who at his Baptism made Professi-
 “on of believing the Trinity. The BISHOPS
 “answered, God forbid; We declare that
 “this Re-baptization is unlawful, contrary
 “to the Orthodox Faith, and the Ecclesiasti-
 “cal Discipline.

St. *Basil* Bishop of *Cæsarea* Anno 369, says,
 “Those whom a Laick Baptizeth are to be Re-
 “baptiz’d; he also maintains, that the Anci-
 “ents were persuaded that the Baptism of
 “Hereticks was ABSOLUTELY void: As
 “for Schismatics, he likes well enough St.
 “*Cyprian* and *Firmilian*’s subjecting them to
 “the SAME LAW; because being SEPA-
 “RATE from the Church, they had not the
 “Holy

“ holy Spirit, and so could not give it; but
“ says, he would not hinder the allowing of
“ the Baptisms of Schismatics, since the Bi-
“ shops of *Asia* had thought it convenient to
“ admit them: But tho’ the *Encratites* were
“ Schismatics, he declares that their Bap-
“ tism ought not to be approved, and that
“ those ought to be re-baptized to whom
“ they had given Baptism, because they gave
“ it with Precipitation, on purpose to HIN-
“ DER the receiving of it from the Church;
“ nevertheless, if the contrary Custom [*of al-
“ lowing the Baptism of Hereticks and Schisma-
“ ticks*] were established, he confesses it ought
“ to be followed.”

The Council of *Laodicea*, between *Anno* 360 and 370, *Canon* 8. says, “ That they must be
“ wholly Baptized anew who come from the
“ Sect of the *Montanists*.”

The third Council of *Constantinople*, *Anno* 383, in the last Canon, concerning the Man-
ner of receiving Hereticks, who offer them-
selves to return into the Bosom of the Church,
it is ordained, “ That the *Arians, Macedonians,
“ Sabbatians, Novatians, Quartodecimani, Te-
“ tratites and Apollinarists*, shall be received
“ after they have made Profession of their
“ Faith, and anathematiz’d their Errors, by
“ the Unction of the holy Spirit, and the
“ Chrism wherewith they shall be anointed
“ on the Forehead, the Eyes, the Hands, the
“ Mouth, the Ears, at the pronouncing of
“ these

16 *A Preliminary Discourse of the*

“ these Words, *This is the Seal of the holy Spirit.* As to the *Eunomians*, the *Montanists*,
“ the *Sabellians*, and all the other Hereticks,
“ the Council ordains that they shall be re-
“ ceived like Pagans, &c. and at last they
“ shall be Baptized.”

“ The Council of *Capua*, *Anno 390*, decla-
“ red, That it was not lawful to use Re-bap-
“ tization, RE-ORDINATION, and the
“ TRANSLATION of BISHOPS.

The second Council of *Carthage*, *Anno 390*,
in the 8th Canon declares, “ That if a Priest
“ Excommunicated by his own Bishop, un-
“ dertake to offer up the Sacrifices in private,
“ and to set up ALTAR against ALTAR,
“ thereby making a SCHISM, he ought to
“ be anathematiz’d, because there is but
“ ONE CHURCH, ONE FAITH, and
“ ONE BAPTISM.” My Remark upon this
Canon is, That this ONE BAPTISM cannot
be suppos’d to be out of this ONE CHURCH,
and therefore is only in it.

The third Council of *Carthage*, *Anno 398*,
Canon 100, says, “ That a Woman ought
“ not to take upon her to baptize.”

“ *St. Chrysoftom* Archbishop of *Constantinople*,
“ *Anno 398*, is express for the Invalidity of
“ Lay-Baptism, and that it can be no more
“ admittred by a Laick than the Eucharist.
“ (says he) ——— But all these are Things which
“ can be admistred BY NO OTHER MAN
“ LIVING but by those SACRED HANDS
“ ALONE,

“ ALONE, the Hands I say of the PRIEST.
Chryf. Lib. III. de Sacerd. C. 5.

“ In the 5th Century flourish'd St. *Augustin*,
“ Bishop of *Hipo* in *Africa*; he argued vigor-
“ ously against the *Donatists*, who began their
“ SCHISM by a Separation of some *African*
“ Bishops, and proceeded so far as to reckon
“ all other Churches as unclean, and indeed
“ to be no Churches at all; and consequently
“ when any *Catholick* came over to their Par-
“ ty, they would not admit him without Re-
“ baptism, making use of St. *Cyprian* and
“ his Collegues Authority, who taught, That
“ Baptism administred by Hereticks and
“ Schismaticks could not be valid, because
“ they were out of the Church; and the
“ *Donatists* esteemed the *Catholicks* to be no
“ better than such.”

St. *Augustin*, in Opposition to them, under-
takes to prove, “ That tho' his Party were
“ not the Church, yet the *Donatists* were not
“ to baptize them a second time; he confes-
“ ses, that Baptism performed without nam-
“ ing the TRINITY, is Null; but affirms,
“ That if it be administred in the Name of
“ the TRINITY, it is Valid, WHOSOEVER
“ he be that administers it, and ought not to
“ be repeated: That neither the Minister's
“ FAITH as to Religion, nor his Sanctity,
“ avail any thing to the Validity of Baptism:
“ That it is God, and not the Minister, who

18 *A Preliminary Discourse of the*

“ gives the holy Spirit, and worketh the Re-
“ mission of Sins.”

But here, before I proceed further, I must observe, that it does not hence follow, that because the Faith or Sanctity of the Minister avails nothing to the Validity of Baptism, therefore his AUTHORITY by which he acts, avails nothing thereto: For AUTHORITY may very well be, and often is DISTINCT and SEPARATE from both those excellent Qualities. And again; Every one will grant, that it is *God*, and not the *Minister*, who gives the Holy Spirit, &c. What then? Does it thence follow that any Person may stand in God's stead, as appointed by him to Administer? Can it be reasonably expected that God should concur with the USURPATIONS of those who act therein without HIS COMMISSION, nay, and in OPPOSITION thereto [as is the Case with us?] Certainly no; it cannot: For, however he may dispense with the WANT of a Sacrament, yet he has no where promised to give EFFICACY to those Administrations, which are in any Respect contrary to the Essentials of his own Institutions; and to me it seems a mere Fool-hardiness and Presumption to expect it.

But to proceed:

St. *Augustin*, in the 7th Book of Baptism, Cap. 53. says thus: “ It is asked whether that
“ Baptism is to be approved which is admi-
“ nistred

“ nistred by an Unbaptized Person, who out
“ of Curiosity has learned the Way of bapti-
“ zing among Christians? It is asked further,
“ Whether it be necessary for the Validity of
“ Baptism, that he who either administres or
“ receives it, be sincere? And if they should
“ be only in Jest, whether their Baptism
“ ought to be administred again in the
“ Church? Whether Baptism conferr’d in
“ Derision, as that would be, which should
“ be administred by a Comedian, might be
“ accounted Valid? Whether Baptism admi-
“ nistred by an Actor may become Valid;
“ when he that receives it is well dispos’d?”

He answers to these, and such like Questions, “ That the securest way is to return
“ no Answer to Questions that never were
“ decided in any Council, General or Nation-
“ al. But he adds; Should any Man, meet-
“ ing with me at such Council, ask my Ad-
“ vice about these Questions, and that it were
“ my Turn to declare my Opinion, having
“ not heard other Mens Opinions, which I
“ might prefer before my own, &c. I should
“ without difficulty acknowledge, that they
“ all receive Baptism truly, in any Place
“ whatsoever, and by WHOMSOEVER ad-
“ ministred, if on their Part they receive it
“ with Faith and Sincerity. I am apt also
“ to believe, that such as receive Baptism in
“ the Church, or in what is supposed to be
“ the Church, are truly baptized, as to the

20 *A Preliminary Discourse of the*

“ Sacramental Part of the Action, whatso-
 “ ever be their Intention: But as for Baptism
 “ administred and received *out of the Church,*
 “ in Raillery, Contempt, and to make Sport,
 “ I could not approve the same without a
 “ Revelation.”

He endeavours to overthrow the Reasons and Testimonies of the *Cyprianists* against the Validity of Heretical and Schismatical Baptisms by the Comparison of *concealed Hereticks* and *evil Ministers,* with *known Hereticks* and *Schismaticks.* “ For (says he) if the Baptism administred by the FORMER is Valid, and not
 “ to be renewed, why should not the same
 “ thing be said of the LATTER, since all the
 “ Reasons that are alleg’d for the Nullity of
 “ the Baptism of Hereticks, may also belong
 “ to *evil Ministers?* It is said, for Example,
 “ *That to give the Holy Ghost, one must have it:*
 “ *That Hereticks have it not; and consequently*
 “ *that they cannot give it.* Why may we not
 “ reason after the same manner concerning
 “ Baptism conferr’d by conceal’d Hereticks,
 “ or by wicked Priests? Have they the Holy
 “ Ghost to give?” Thus *St. Augustin.*

I cannot but take Notice here, that this Great Man does not appear (to me) to have made the Comparison according to the Design of *St. Cyprian* and his Collegues: for, by the manner of handling this Dispute in those Days, ’tis plain to me that the Hereticks and Schismaticks were supposed to be (by their separating

rating themselves from the Communion of the Church) AS EXCOMMUNICATE, and consequently to have lost all Valid Power and Authority for the Administration of Christian Sacraments, being themselves *out of the Church*: Whereas the *Conceal'd Heretick and Evil Minister*, not having separated themselves from, nor been excluded out of the Church, cannot, during this their Secresy, lose that VISIBLE AUTHORITY wherewith they were at first invested; and we have no OTHER Authority to trust to, except we had the Gift of discerning Spirits. So that the Reasons against the Validity of Baptism administered by KNOWN Self-Excommunicate Hereticks and Schismaticks, will not equally hold good against the Validity of Baptism conferr'd by UNKNOWN Hereticks and Evil Priests, who still continue in *external Communion* with the CHURCH, because the former were by the *Cyprianists* supposed to have not, but the latter have that VISIBLE AUTHORITY and COMMISSION, which Christ gave them to administer his Sacraments, as is plain from the Example of *Judas Iscariot*, whom our Saviour vested with the divine Commission, notwithstanding his great Wickedness.

Leo Bishop of *Rome* in his 18th Answer to several Questions put to him by *Rusticus* Bishop of *Norbonne*, Anno 442, says, "That it is sufficient to lay Hands upon, and call upon the Holy Spirit, over those that do remem-

22 *A Preliminary Discourse of the*

“ber that they have been Baptized, but
“know not in what Sect.”

Gennadius, a Priest of *Marseille*, affirms,
“That there is **BUT ONE BAPTISM**, and
“that we must not baptize them again who
“have been baptized by Hereticks, with the
“Invocation of the Name of the Trinity;
“but they who have not been baptized in
“the Name of the Trinity, ought to be re-
“baptized, because such a Baptism is not
“true.”

The second Council of *Arles*, Canon 17,
says, “The *Bonofiaci*, who baptize as well as
“the *Arians*, in the Name of the Trinity; it
“is sufficient to admit them into the Church
“by Chrism, and Imposition of Hands.”

St. Gregory, about the latter End of the 6th
Century, speaking about the Return of several
Sorts of Hereticks into the Church, says,
“That they are Baptized when they RE-
“ENTER into the Church; the Baptism
“which they have received, not being true,
“since it was not given in the Name of the
“Trinity. When it is **UNCERTAIN** whe-
“ther a Person has been Baptized or Con-
“firmed, we must Baptize or Confirm them,
“rather than suffer them to perish in this
“Doubt.

Gregory II. a little after, *Anno 700*, in his
Decretal Epistle, answering several Questions
put to him by *Boniface*, Article 8. “forbids to
“Re-baptize those who have been once Bap-
“tized

“ tized in the Name of the Trinity, altho’ it
“ were by a *wicked Priest*.

“ *Gregory III.* Orders that they shall be
“ Baptized again in the Name of the Trinity,
“ who have been Baptized by Heathens. And
“ also that those shall be Re-baptized, who
“ have been Baptized by a Priest that hath
“ Sacrificed to *Jupiter*, or eaten Meat offer’d
“ to Idols. Thus far I think may suffice to
have Collected what has been said about Re-
baptization.

And I should not have given my self, or
the Reader, the Trouble of this Account of
Men’s various Judgments and Opinions in this
Case ; were it not that I expected to hear from
some, that I had wholly neglected to search
into Antiquity, concerning the Sense of the
Primitive Fathers about it. To Obviate which
Objection, and because I have been told, that
“ it becomes me to rest satisfied in the *Deter-*
“ *minations* of the Christian Church about
“ this matter, I thought it not amiss to en-
quire into them thus far ; to the intent, that
I might see whether I could procure any
WELL-GROUNDED Satisfaction from their
Authority ; and indeed I must acknowledge,
that if this had been a Thing *Indifferent* in its
own Nature, and not DETERMINED by
the *Word of God*, but left to the Wisdom and
Prudence of the Church to Decree as she
should think convenient and necessary, I ought
to have acquiesc’d with *her Determinations* ;

If she had in General Council made any about *Unauthoriz'd* and *Anti-Episcopal Baptisms*, which in Truth she has not; nor any Provincial Council neither, as it plain by the foregoing Collection.

The Church of *Rome* has indeed assum'd to herself a pretended Power of declaring *all Baptisms in or with Water in the Name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost*, by whomsoever administer'd, whether by a Woman or Layman, *Heretick* or *Orthodox*, Communicant or Schismatick, of what sort soever, to be Good and Valid: But this Her Determination ought to be brought to the Test, and weigh'd in the Ballance of the Sanctuary.

Baptism, and all things Essential thereto, are *Fundamentals* of Christianity; 'tis (in the Apostles Stile) *a Principle of the Doctrine of Christ*; 'tis a *Positive Institution* made by God Himself; and the Holy Scriptures as interpreted by the Doctrine and Practice of the Primitive Catholick Church, are CLEAR ENOUGH for the Determination of all the Necessaries thereof, as well as of all other Fundamental Points of our Religion; and therefore the Decrees of some Particular Fathers and Councils have no more weight with me in this matter (of Lay-Baptism) than what they receive from their Conformity to those Divine Oracles, which are the only Original Rule of our Faith and Practice in Fundamentals, as all *sound Protestants* have affirm'd.

If any shall ask me, who must be Judge between you and the Councils? I answer, The same that must be Judge between the *Contradictious* Canons of Different Councils; the same that must be Judge between me, and a Council that Commands me to Worship Saints and Angels, &c. Now who this is upon Earth, I cannot tell; a Living Infallible Judge we have none; and therefore I must look for a Rule or Guide, *i. e.* the Holy Scripture; and if the Councils and I Differ about this Rule, I must have recourse to the BEST and PUREST Ages of Christianity, and see what the Apostolick Fathers, and the Councils next after them, understood by that Rule. After all, I must be allow'd a *Judgment of Discretion* for my self; in Conjunction with these, and a JUST DEFERENCE to the Canons of that particular Church whereof I am, or ought to be a Member; and by all these Methods, I am brought to conclude for my self, that Lay-Baptism, BY ONE IN OPPOSITION to the Church, can never be Good and Valid.

'Tis by this Rule that I reckon the Councils of *Carthage*, *Iconium* and *Synnada*, together with the Customs of the *Asiatick* and *African* Churches, confirming *St. Cyprian's* Doctrine, have as much (if not more) Authority to sway my Judgement in the Matter of Heretical and Schismatical Baptisms; as the Council of *Arles*, and the After-Determinations of other Councils

cils and Fathers ; for, *these latter* can pretend to no more Divine Authority than the former ; and it may be, upon a Just Examination, will be found to have much less ; tho' I have no need to dwell upon this, because my Province is only confin'd to Lay-*i. e.* unauthoriz'd Baptism—such as is perform'd by Persons who *never were authoriz'd* for that purpose ; who act in direct Opposition to that Order of Men who are empower'd by Christ to authorize others to Baptize ; against Such Baptizers, I have produc'd Several Testimonies from the Purest Times ; and the Adversary can bring forth, in their behalf, *not One Council*, either General or Provincial, till the Corrupt Ones of the Church of *Rome*.

I am very well satisfied that there is but **ONE TRUE CHRISTIAN BAPTISM**, which ought not to be repeated upon those who have receiv'd it : I find my self under an Impossibility to believe, that this **ONE BAPTISM** is any other, than what Christ himself Instituted Just before his Ascension into Heaven ; I reckon an Essential Part of this Institution (and I humbly hope in the Sequel of this Discourse to prove it) to be the **DIVINE AUTHORITY** of the **ADMINISTRATOR** as well as the Water, and the Form of Administration.

I cannot be satisfied, that the Person who is said to have Baptiz'd me, ever had this Authority ; nay, I am fully convinc'd of the contrary ;

trary ; and also, that he was actually in *opposition* to it ; and tho' his meaning were never so good, yet I cannot think God concurr'd with such an Usurpation, when it was done without *Any Necessity at all, in a Christian Country, where truly Authoriz'd Ministers might have been had with as much, if not greater ease and speed than he :* For which Reasons I find no solid Foundation for believing, that I have received this ONE BAPTISM, especially since I my self should with great Reason have refus'd his Administration, as it would have been *my Duty*, if I had been put to my own free Choice ; which, it's certain, I could not then, being but an Infant. I doubt not but some will say, " *That I need not concern my self so much about that which I had no hand in, and wherein I was wholly Passive ; if there was any Fault in such my Baptism, 'twas none of mine, but theirs who had the Care of me :* To whom I return this short Answer, That the Parent's, or Godfather's and Godmother's Act and Deed is *interpretatively* the Child's, and he must make it *really* his own when he comes to Years, by taking it upon himself ; so that if THEN he owns their Sinful Act (knowing it to be such) he makes himself PARTAKER with them in the Sin.

But to return once more to the Dispute in *St. Cyprian's* time, and the Decrees then and since made about it ; I cannot Dissemble my Thoughts, that the Arguments and Determinations

minations against his Doctrine and Practice, having nothing of that Reason and Solidity, which an Inquisitive Person might justly expect in them: And that on the contrary, St. *Cyprian* and his Colleagues defend their Assertion [*that the Baptisms of Hereticks and Schismatics are Invalid*] with so much Judgment and Cogency of Argument, (*founded upon the Topick of such Hereticks and Schismatics, being destitute of Holy Orders while they were out of the Church of Christ*) that I wonder how it could possibly have come to pass, that their Doctrine should be afterwards exploded; especially when I consider, that what they taught and practis'd herein, was confirmed by NUMEROUS COUNCILS in those *earlier Days*, wherein Truth was more prevalent than afterwards; and *Tertullian* long before affirm'd the same thing, " *That Baptism is reserv'd to the Bishop*: Hereticks are not able to give it, because they have it not; and therefore it is that we have a R U L E to Re-baptize them.

Here *Tertullian* talks of a *Rule* to Baptize such Persons; which plainly shews, that he is not speaking so much of his own *Private Opinion* as of the Law and Practice of the Church. This is his relation of Matter of Fact; and as such, to be receiv'd for a Testimony of the Church's Opinion concerning the Baptism of Hereticks, in his Days. But his strange odd Notions (in his Exhortation to Chastity,

Chastity, and his Book of Baptism) “ *That Laicks are Priests*, because it is written, “*Christ hath made us Kings and Priests unto God* and his Father: That when Three are gather’d together *altho’ they be Laicks they make a Church*; and that *Laymen* may Baptize in Case “ of Necessity and Absence of a Priest ”; these appear to be only his own particular Sentiments, and he cannot be call’d a Witness of the Churches *Custom* and *Allowance* in these things; for he talks of *no Rule, no Law* of the Church relating to them, as he does when he speaks of the Baptism of *Hereticks*, by saying we *have a Rule* to re-baptize them. And ’tis certain, that no Church, till the 4th Century, can be produc’d to have *any Rule* for the allowance of *Lay Baptism*, and then, none but the Council of *Eliberis*, which I have before observ’d and remark’d on *Pag. 11*. On the contrary, against *Lay Baptism* we have the Testimonies of *St. Basil*, *St. Chrysostome*, and the *Catholicks* disputing with the *Luciferians* in the same Century, which is more than a Ballance against *Tertullian’s private Opinion* concerning such Baptism, &c. But to go still further backward to the Days wherein some of the Apostles might be still living; *St. Ignatius*, a Glorious Martyr, and Bishop of *Antioch*, *Anno Dom. 71*. in his Epistle to the *Smyrneans*, says, “ Let that SACRAMENT be “ judg’d *effectual and firm*, which is dispens’d “ by the BISHOP or him to whom the Bishop “ has

30 *A Preliminary Discourse of the*

“ has committed it. It is not **LAWFUL**
 “ without the Bishop, either to Baptize or
 “ Celebrate the Offices; but what he approves
 “ of, according to the good pleasure of God,
 “ that is **FIRM AND SAFE**, and so we do
 “ every thing **SECURELY**.

This is so exactly agreeable to *St. Cyprian's* Doctrine, that 'tis no wonder he adher'd to it all the Days of his Life; and it seems to me, that nothing could have given *Credit and Reputation* to the contrary Opinion, but the *monstrous* increase of **HERESY** and **SCHISM** afterwards, which, together with many other Causes concurring, brought into the Church of *Rome*, and the rest of the *Western Churches*, whom she had subjected to her Vassalage, abundance of Damnable Doctrines and Practices, insomuch, that at last there was but little of Solid and Substantial Religion to be found in the Churches of Her Communion. And 'tis very observable, that even among some of us who have reform'd from Her Errors, there is too much of Her Leaven still remaining; for one of Her very *Great and Peculiar Corruptions*, in the Matter of Lay Baptism and Midwives Baptism, is still espous'd by too many who ought to oppose it; and not only so, but rather than part with it, they will swallow another of Her Errors too, and assert *the absolute Necessity of Baptism to all*; and what is worse than Popery it self, affirm, that the want of it *Peoples Hell with many Millions*, as
 the

the Author of a Book fallſly Intituled, *The Judgment of the Church of England, in the Caſe of Lay Baptiſm, and of Diſſenters Baptiſm* has done. And what is the moſt aſtoniſhing of all is, that they who oppoſe the *Popiſh* Doctrin before ſpoken of, are call'd Promoters of **POPERY**, particularly by Dr. *Burnet* the late Biſhop of *Sarum*; juſt as the Church's beſt Friends are called her greateſt Enemies: But 'tis eaſie from hence to diſcover, who they are, that would *introduce and eſtabliſh* **POPERY** among us.

And now, after all that has been ſaid, I declare, that it is not my Deſign to meddle with the *Cyprianick* Diſpute in this Diſcourſe; my buſineſs is not to enquire whether thoſe who were *once duly Authoriz'd*, and afterwards fall into **HERESY** or **SCHISM**, and thereby ſeparate themſelves, or are excluded from the Church, can Adminiſter Valid Sacraments and Ordinations during this their Separation: No, I ſhall not ſo much as touch upon this at all, becauſe I don't think my Caſe affected by it; all that I need concern my ſelf about, is, whether thoſe who act in *oppoſition* to the acknowledg'd and *duly Authoriz'd* Miniſters of Chriſt; and who themſelves were **NEVER** duly Authoriz'd, can Adminiſter *truly Valid Baptiſm*, and whether the Receivers of *theſe Baptiſms* can ſafely reſt ſatiſfied with them, eſpecially when they know of this want of Power and Authority in the Adminiſtrator. This is my Caſe, and this is all that I concern my ſelf about.

And

32 *A Preliminary Discourse of the*

And therefore I wrote the following *ESSAY* in a *Mathematical Method of Definition, Axiom, and Proposition*, for the Information of my own Judgment, in this great *Affair*: It was not at first design'd for *Publick View*, but finding others have been, and it may be still do *Labour* under the same *Circumstances* with my self, I thought it might not be unacceptable to them; and if they shall reap any benefit thereby, or if some abler Pen will undertake to mend my *Faults*, by letting the *World* see something *more Correct and Exact* for that purpose, (the *only Motive* of my *Writing*) I shall obtain my end, which *God* be praised is not mixt with any *Alloy* of *Worldly Gain*, or desire of *Human Applause* for this *Undertaking*.

As for *Caviling* and *Disputing* 'tis not my design to concern my self (and lose my precious time) in such *endless Impertinencies*. If any one will *candidly* shew me my *Errors*, I shall heartily thank him for so doing; but I declare before-hand, that no less than such *Demonstration* as the *Nature* of the *Thing* will bear, can ever go down with me for *Conviction*; I am not to be put off with the *Authority* of any great *Names*, *Separate* from *Scripture*, and the *Consentient Doctrines and Practice* of the *Primitive Church*, for, this has caused too much *Error* in the *World* already, and 'tis high time now to reform from it.

London, 22d of *October*, 1722.

Lay-

Lay-Baptism Invalid.

THE INTRODUCTION.

Of the Nature and Obligation
of Divine Positive Institutions
of Religion.

Definitions.

I. **A** *Divine Positive Institution* of Religion is, that which God himself requires and commands to be done, and which (*having no intrinsic or moral Excellency in it self*) without his Command and Appointment, we could never have been bound to the Observance of; nor ever have convey'd to us by the Observation thereof, any SUPERNATURAL Benefit or Advantage whatsoever.

II. The *Essential Parts* of a Divine Positive Institution, are those which we are oblig'd constantly to observe, as long as the *utmost duration*

D ration;

ration, of the Force and Obligation of the Institution it self.

III. I call an Act *Invalid* for the purposes of such an Institution, when we have *no just Reason* or Motive from Divine Revelation to expect, that God should so far concur with that Act, as to convey by MEANS THERE-OF, those *Supernatural Advantages* he has annex'd to the Institution.

IV. By the *Supernatural Advantages* Annex'd to an Institution, I mean all those *Spiritual Privileges* and *Benefits* which by Nature we cannot have, and which God has promis'd to bestow, upon *Condition* of our *duly* Performing that Institution, which he has made to be the *Ordinary means* of Conveying those Benefits to us.

V. By the *Divine Authority* of the Administrator, I mean *that Commission* which God at first gave to Men, and which they have ever since handed down to others, by his Order and Appointment, to Administer in his Holy Ordinances.

VI. By a Lay Administration I mean, That which is perform'd by *One who never was commission'd* or Impower'd for that Act, by those whom God has appointed to be the Conveyers of his Authority and Commission to Men, for that purpose.

A X I O M S

O R,

Undeniable Maxims.

I. The *Essential Parts* of any thing, are of the same Nature as the *whole*.

II. God himself may *dispense with* any of his own Positive Institutions, either in whole or in Part ; and bestow the Benefits annex'd to them, when, to whom, and how he pleases.

III. *No Ecclesiastical or Civil Authority* can Dispense with any Divine Positive Institution, either in whole, or in any Essential Part, so long as it is binding and obliging to us.

IV. The *only way* to determine whether an Act is Valid or Invalid, for the Purposes of a Divine Positive Institution, is, to know whether that Act be *Lawful or Unlawful*, Agreeable, or Contrary to the Will of God ; which is to be found *no where*, but either in the Institution it self, or in some other Part or Parts of his Written Word, relating to the *same Institution*.

V. No Power or Authority on Earth, can by any after-Act (*not appointed by God for that purpose*)

purpose) make that which before was Invalid, to become as Valid as Conforming to the Divine Institution it self would have made it.

VI. He that *knows* to do good, and does it not, to *him* it is *Sin*; and a *Continuance* in Sin, can bring *no Supernatural Benefit* or Advantage.

PROPOSITION I.

Every Essential Part of a Divine Positive Institution of Religion, is of Equal Obligation and Necessity to us.

DEMONSTRATION. This is evident,

First, from the very Nature of such an Institution, which (by *Definition 1.*) has no *intrinsic excellency*, or moral Virtue to oblige us to observe it, till the Divine Command lays that necessity upon us; so that now we are oblig'd *only* by virtue of the *Authority Commanding*; which being but *One*, (*i. e.* That of God) must necessarily reach to *every Essential Part* of the Institution, and thereby make them all of equal Authority and equally necessary and obliging to us; because *they are every one* of the same Nature as the Institution it self (by *Axiom 1.*) And

Secondly,

Secondly, This is further evident (from *Definition 2.*) since we are *constantly* bound to observe every such *Essential Part* as long as the Institution it self shall have any Force or Virtue. Therefore, since every one of these Parts have but *one Authority*, without any *Inherent Virtue* separate there-from; and are also binding as long as the Institution shall last; it must needs be certain, that they are *all of equal Obligation and Necessity* to us. But this is so very plain at the first Proposal, to all Intelligent Persons, that it hardly deserves the Name of a Proposition to be Demonstrated; and therefore I shall not lose more time about it.

C O R O L L A R Y.

H E N C E it follows, that as no Human Authority can dispense with any Divine Positive Institution (*Axiom 3.*) so neither can they give any *Superiority* of Excellency, or Necessity to one Essential Part thereof more than to another, because, they are all equally necessary and obliging; and have their whole Force and Energy merely from the Divine Command.

P R O P O S I T I O N II.

Whosoever justly esteems an Act (*said to be done in pursuance of a Divine Positive Institution*) to be wholly Null and Invalid for

want of one Essential Part of that Institution, ought also to *acknowledge*, that such an Act is as *much* Null and Void, when it wants *but any other One Essential Part* of the same Institution.

DEMON. For he can *reasonably* judge that Act to be Invalid, only because it is unlawful, or contrary to the Institution; (*Axiom 4.*) So that, the *want* of that Essential Part being unlawful, he thence concludes the Invalidity of the Act: Now, forasmuch as all the Essential Parts of the Institution are of *equal* Authority and Necessity to us (*by the foregoing Proposition,*) it must necessarily follow, that the *Omission* of any one of them will be *equally Unlawful* or Invalid; and consequently such a Deficient Act, as wants any one of those Essential Parts, being by him justly esteem'd Invalid, ought also for the *same Reason* to be esteem'd as much Invalid, when he knows it to want *but any other One Essential Part* of the same Institution: Which was the thing to be prov'd.

COROLLARY.

HENCE it unavoidably follows, that there can be *no such Thing* as a *Partial Invalidity*, thro' the Omission of any Essential Part of a Divine Positive Institution: For, if the Act be *wholly Null* for want of one such Part, it must be also *entirely Void* for the want of any
other

other, by reason of the *Equal Authority and Necessity* of every Essential Part.

PROPOSITION III.

He who knows himself bound to conform to a Divine Positive Institution *in all its Essential Parts*, and is convinc'd that he has not so far conform'd; can have no just Grounds to expect the *Supernatural Benefits* annex'd to that Institution, till he has done his utmost for the Obtaining of them, by endeavouring an *Entire Conformity* to every Essential Part of the said Institution.

Demon. This wants but little Proof: For thus entirely to obey the Institution, is certainly good; and he who knows this, and does it not, to him it is Sin; (*Axiom 6.*) which if he continues in, no Supernatural Advantage can accrue to him thereby, (*by the same Axiom*) much less those Benefits annex'd to the Observance of the Institution: And consequently, he ought to do his utmost for the Obtaining of them, by endeavouring, &c. as was to be demonstrated.

L A Y - B A P T I S M

Invalid.

An E S S A Y, &c.

CHRISTIAN *Baptism*, is a Divine Positive Institution of our most Holy Religion; whereby 'tis appointed, that the APOSTLES, and their SUCCESSORS, to the *End of the World*, should [*by Virtue of a Particular Commission which Christ gave them for this Purpose*] either themselves in Person, or by THEIR SUBSTITUTES, enter into Discipleship, or into the Church of Christ, All Nations, Baptizing them *in the Name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost, &c.* The *Supernatural Privileges and Benefits* annex'd to this Institution, are, The Pardon of Sins, the Gift of the Holy Ghost, and Eternal Life after Death: Or, as the Church of England words it, "*Being by Nature born in Sin, and the Children of Wrath, we are hereby made the Children of Grace, Members of Christ, Children of God, and Inheritors (or Heirs) of the Kingdom of Heaven:* Which Vast and Unspeakable Advantages none can ordinarily have any Right

or

X or Title to, but those who are *duly* admitted to them by this *One True Christian Baptism*.

That it is a *Positive Institution*, is certain from hence; Because, before the Divine Command enjoin'd it, we were never bound to observe it, either in whole, or in part. Washing us *then* with *Water*, had no intrinsic or moral Virtue, to give us any *Spiritual Advantages*: Nor would it have had any thing more of *Efficacy* for that Purpose, if we had been wash'd with Water, and at the same time used the Words, *In the Name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost*; for these Words being pronounc'd, could *then* have had no more Virtue than others. Neither would it have signified any thing to us, whether we had been wash'd either by our *selves alone*, or by some *other Person*; or whether that other Person were a Common Man, or one *set apart* by Consent of the *People* for that End. None of these Things could, by any Excellency in their own Nature, have convey'd to us any *Spiritual Benefits* whatsoever; nor could we have been oblig'd, in a Religious Sense, to observe *any one* of them; because the Divine Command had not enjoin'd them. This, I suppose, all will acknowledge; and consequently, that our Obligation to receive *Christian Baptism*, and *from them* by whom it is order'd to be administer'd, is *wholly* founded upon the *Divine Command*, on which *alone* depends the whole Force and Energy

nergy of a Divine Positive Institution of Religion ; (according to *Definition 1.*) and that therefore the Administration of *Christian Baptism in all its Parts*, is no other than a *mere Positive Institution*, exactly agreeable to the said *Definition*. This being premis'd, I proceed now to demonstrate what are the Essential Parts of this Great Institution of Christianity, *on the Part of the Administration thereof*.

PROPOSITION I.

That *on the Part of the Administration*, The Divine Authority of the *Administrator*, The Matter [*Water*,] and the Form of Administering, [*In the Name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost*,] are every one of them *Essential Parts* of the Divine Positive Institution of Christian Baptism.

DEMON. That the *Water*, and the *Form* of Administration in the *Name* of the *Trinity*, are Essential Parts of this Institution, was never disputed by any but Hereticks; and even these (*except such as the Quakers*) never oppos'd against the *Water's* being so, but only against the Form of Administration in the Name of the Trinity. I shall not make it my business to endeavour their Conviction, who oppose the plain and express Words of the Institution, and from whence *All Sound and Orthodox* Christians have unanimously agreed,

greed, to pronounce *Baptism* Null and Void, when Administer'd without expressing the Names of all the *three Sacred Persons*; because such Baptisms are directly against the Institution it self.

Taking it therefore for granted by all, who have any value for this Holy Ordinance, that the *Water* and the *Form* of Administration in the Name of the Trinity, are Essential Parts thereof; I shall spend no time about the Proof of it; but proceed to Demonstrate, that the *Divine Authority* of the *Administrator*, is also an Essential Part of the same Institution; or (which is the same thing) that the *Divine Authority of the Administrator*, is to be constantly observ'd by us, as long as the *utmost Duration* of the Force and Obligation of the Divine Positive Institution of *Christian Baptism*; And, that it is so, will be evident,

1. From the General Consideration of God's making the *Divine Authority of the Administrator*, to be an *Essential Part* of his own Positive Institutions under the *Mosaic Law*.

2. By the *Example* of our Saviour's not taking upon him to Minister in such Holy Things, till he was *particularly* and *externally Commission'd* for that purpose.

3. From the Words of Institution of *Christian Baptism*.

4. From the Design and Benefits thereof.

5. From

5. From the constant Practice of those who *truly are*, and of others who pretend to be the *Lawful Ministers* of the Christian Church.

6. From the *Doctrine and Practice* of the *Church of England* in particular.

First, I say the General Consideration of God's making the Divine Authority of the Administrator, to be an Essential Part of his own Positive Institutions under the *Mosaic Law*, will go a great way towards proving the like under the Gospel-Dispensation; because, the Things that were then written, were not written for their sakes *only*, but also for our Example (as the Apostle has told us) and as he has most excellently argued, almost throughout his whole Epistle to the *Hebrews*, wherein he makes the Comparison between the *Mosaic Law*, and the *Gospel*, and gives a vast preference to the *latter* before the former. 'Tis therefore worthy our Consideration, that in the Law, *none* could approach the Divine Presence in the *Administration* of his Positive Institutes, but those who were first *Authoriz'd* by *him* for that purpose: And therefore we find that when *Corah, Dathan, and Abiram*, exceeded their own Bounds no farther, than the Offering of Incense, there was no less than a Miracle wrought, the very Earth was made to open its Mouth and swallow them, their Wives and their Children, and all that they had; and a Fire from the Lord consum'd

Two

Two hundred and fifty Princes, Accomplices with 'em in the same Crime; to make them a standing *Example* to future Ages, that none might Usurp the Authority of Administring in his Positive Institutions without a *Commission* first receiv'd from him. Nay, so Jealous was God of *this Honour*, that he suddenly struck *Uzza* dead, only for putting forth his Hand to save the Ark (as he thought) from falling when it was shook; *his Zeal* was no defence for him, God would not pardon, but punish him for it, because 'twas none of his *Business* to meddle in such Holy Things. So King *Saul*, notwithstanding his Plea of *Necessity for want of a Priest*, and the Danger of falling into the Hands of his Enemies before he had made *his Peace* with God, had his Kingdom rent from him, for presuming *only* to offer a Sacrifice himself, it being none but the Priest's Office so to do. More Examples of this kind might be brougth, but these I think are sufficient to shew, that God set such a mighty Value upon the *Commission* he gave to *some Orders of Men*, that he would not accept of, even his own Appointments, when they were *prophan'd* by UNHALLOWED, UNCOMMISSIONED Hands: And what is this, but to make the *Divine Commission* to be an *Essential* Part of such Positive Institutions? Inasmuch, that if any should have *knowingly* concurr'd with those who *usurped* it, they would have made themselves PARTA-

KERS

KERS in the Sin, as well as the Punishment of the Usurpers; as we see was exemplify'd in the Case of *Corah* and his Company, for no less than *Fourteen thousand seven hundred* of them were destroy'd by a Plague, besides the great Number of those who were before swallow'd alive into the Earth, and burnt with Fire from the Lord: and if so, may we not justly infer that God is still as Jealous of *This Honour* under the Gospel, the Ministers whereof being of so much greater Dignity, by how much the Gospel is more excellent than the Law of *Moses*? It is certain that even now, in the *Christian Dispensation*, No Man can take *this Honour to himself*, but he that is called of God, as was *Aaron*; and *Aaron's* Call was not by his great Gifts, and the inward Dictates of the Spirit, but by an **EXTERNAL COMMISSION** first given by God himself to *Moses*, and then by *Moses*, at the Command of God, to *Aaron*. But,

Secondly, The Example of our Saviour's not taking upon him to Minister in Holy Things between God and Man, till he was particularly and *externally Commission'd* by God for that purpose; is a further Advance towards proving, that the Divine Authority of the Administrator of Baptism, is an Essential Part of this Institution. For, notwithstanding he was full of the Holy Ghost, which was not given by Measure, but entirely to him; notwithstanding his Manhood was inseparably united

to the Second Person of the most Glorious Trinity, whereby he was more than sufficiently, nay, infinitely *gifted* for such a purpose; and notwithstanding the great Necessities, and consequent Miseries of all Mankind, which were continually wanting his Undertaking to Administer for them in Things pertaining to God; yet he kept himself in his *private Station* for about 30 Years together, and never would take upon himself so *High an Office*, till he receiv'd his Commission and Inauguration thereinto, from the Hands of a Prophet [*John the Baptist*] who Baptiz'd him, to fulfil this Part of *Righteousness* and *Justice*, viz. of not taking upon himself to be a Minister of the New Covenant, without a special Warrant from *God* by the Mediation of one, who was *by him* appointed to convey this Power and Authority to him: And then we find, that God himself, by the Descent of the Holy Ghost upon him in a *visible Glory*, and by an *audible Voice* from Heaven, saying, *This is my Beloved Son in whom I am well pleas'd*, confirm'd his great Commission, and that from thence-forward (*and not before*) he proceeded in the Execution of it: From that time he preach'd and taught, gave his Apostles order to Baptize and Preach; wrought Miracles himself, and gave others Power to do so likewise, for the Confirmation of his Doctrine, &c. Now what should be the Reason of our Saviour's thus long *desisting* from the performance

of such beneficial Offices? Was he not sufficiently *gifted*? Yes certainly he was. Did not the *Extream Miseries* of Man's Spirituat Bondage call loudly for relief? beyond all doubt they did. Why then did not even *Compassion* it self, the Blessed Jesus, then personally among them, undertake their speedy Rescue? Was it because his Hour was not yet come? Doubtless it was not come; but why? because he had not yet receiv'd his **COMMISSION** from his Father, So that, if our Lord's Example may be allow'd in this Case to be Conclusive, it is plain, that not all the *Gifts* imaginable, nor all the *pressing Necessities* that may be pleaded, can ever of themselves give sufficient Warrant to Minister *Authoritatively*, for Men, in things pretaining to God, when those things are of such a Nature, as that a *Commission* from him must be first obtain'd by the Person who undertakes to Administer: And that therefore such a Person ought to be *duly Commission'd* for such Administrations. Now that Christian Baptism is such an Institution as *necessarily* requires, and *constantly supposes* the Divine Authority of the Administrator, I shall endeavour to Demonstrate,

Thirdly, From the Words of Institution: And in order thereto, 'twill be very well worth while to observe, that our Saviour, a little before his Ascension into Heaven, appointed the **ELEVEN APOSTLES**, and **THEM ONLY** (notwithstanding the vast
Numbers

Numbers of other Disciples which he had at the same time,) to go to a particular Mountain in Galilee, which he had told them of, (St. Matth: 28. 16.) Where, when they were assembl'd, he came to them, and first asserted *his own Power and Authority* wherewith he was Invested, to Authorize and Commission them for the *Great Office* he was then going to confer on them, saying, *All Power is given unto me in Heaven and in Earth*, ver. 18. Whereby he sufficiently assur'd them; that they might rest secure and satisfy'd, that *The Commission* he was going to give them was of full Force and Virtue, and sufficiently Valid to empower them to act for the future according to the *Contents* thereof. And indeed the great things he was about to Authorize them to do, were of so uncommon a Nature, and of such vast Consequence to Mankind, that they might very well have doubted even of the *sufficiency* of their Commission, if our Lord had not thus fix'd their Faith in *his Power and Authority* to give it them: When therefore he had thus prepar'd their Minds, he then proceeds to give them *This Commission* as the *Consequent* of that *Power* which was given him over all things; saying, GO YE THEREFORE and Teach (or rather) DISCIPLE ALL NATIONS, 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 ; AND LO I AM WITH YOU ALWAYS, EVEN UNTO THE END OF THE WORLD. These are the Words of Institution of Baptism, wherein 'tis clear at first sight, that the *Eleven Apostles* were the *peculiar Persons* to whom the *Authority* of Baptizing was committed [*Go ye*] and not only they, but also all those who should succeed them, to the end of the World ; [*Lo I am with you always, even unto the end of the World*] ; for our Saviour's Promise to be with them *so long*, cannot possibly be meant of their *particular Persons* which were not to live to the end of the World, and therefore it must signify the *Apostles* in another Sense, *viz.* those whom **THEY** and **THEIR SUCCESSORS** should Appoint throughout all Ages.

So that, by the Words of Institution above-recited, it plainly appears, that as long as the World shall last, *The Apostles and their Successors* are the Persons *Commission'd* to Disciple the Nations, *Baptizing* them ; and hereby 'tis necessarily imply'd, that *as often* as this *One Baptism* is perform'd, *so often* 'tis done by *One* who has *this Commission* given to him ; otherwise the Promise of being with such *Commission'd Persons* to the end of the World, would have been *in vain* and of no necessity : And if it were not *design'd* by the Institution, that *Baptizing* should be perform'd to the end of the World by a *Successor* of the *Apostles* or his *Substitute* ; it might for the *very same Reason* be
said,

said, that *teaching* was not design'd to be by such a *Successor* to the end of the World, and so the *whole Commission* would be but *Temporary*, and consequently the **MINISTERS** of Christ, and **BAPTIZING** and **TEACHING** would be but *Temporary*; and Christ's Promise of being with his Apostles in these their Ministrations to the end of the World, would have been made without any design of fulfilling it, which is a *Blasphemous Contradiction* to the Infallible Veracity of our Blessed Lord; and therefore *as long* as the World shall last, there must be *Baptizing*, and as long as there shall be *Baptizing*, there must be *such a One* to perform it, as Christ has promis'd to be with, *viz. a Successor to the Apostles or his Substitute*, to the utmost bounds of that Duration.

For 'tis very remarkable, that Christ does not here say, *Lo I am with Baptizing*, *Lo I am with Teaching* alway, &c. But, *GO YE, Baptizing, Teaching*, and **LO I AM WITH YOU**. The Promise (of his Presence and Concurrence) is, to be with **THEM**, not with the *Acts separate* from them, but with **THEM** performing and doing those Acts; and because 'tis to be with *Them* *Baptizing alway even to the End of the World*, and because their particular Persons were not to continue here so long, therefore **THEY** are necessarily **T O B E** in some other respect *always*, &c. And this can be no otherwise than by *Succession*; and then the *Succession* must be such, as that it may be

justly called *Them*, otherwise *Those* to whom the *Promise* was made will in all respects cease to be, and consequently the Promise it self will be of no effect, which is absurd. This Succession then must be such, as that the Apostles must remain to the End of the World; and that can be by no other way than One of these Two, either *First*, by God himself miraculously interposing always to appoint their Successors, which he has no where promis'd to do, and therefore this is not to be expected; or *Secondly*, By the Apostles continuing *themselves* in a Succession by some Act of their own, *viz.* by a Spiritual Generation of such as may in one respect or other be *themselves*; that is, by their Ordaining, such as they were, and Vesting them, some with the *whole ordinary Apostolick Authority*, and others with part thereof; to the intent, that all who act in the Sacred Function of Baptizing, whether in a Higher or Lower Degree, may be justly Entitled to have this Promise verify'd and made good with respect to their Act, *Lo I am with you* [Baptizing] *alway*: For if he who Baptizes be not *One* of the [*You*] an Apostle or Sent of Christ, in a Higher or Lower Degree, to whom the Promise was made, his Act can claim no Right to the Promise, and therefore will be a *Contradiction* to this Sacred Institution. So that it must necessarily follow, that this Institution requires Baptism always to be Administred by One Vested with Apostolick Authority,

Authority, either in whole or in part, to the End of the World.

THIS will further appear from the Nature of a *Commission*, which is *exclusive* of all others, but those to whom it is given; for 'tis well known, that when a Prince gives a *Commission* to any of his Subjects for the executing of some *great Office*, it is with design to *appropriate* that Office to that particular Subject, that *none* may act in it but he, and those whom he shall Authorize: So here, *The Commission* of Baptizing, &c. given by our Saviour to his *Apostles and their Successors, &c.* to the End of the World, is *exclusive* of all others, and consequently none can act therein to the Purposes for which the Commission was given, but they and such as they shall Authorize for that purpose; and therefore it necessarily follows, that the *Administrator* of Baptism must have the *Divine Commission* or Authority, before he presume to Act in this so *Appropriate* an Office and Ministration.

Once more: The Words of Institution are a *Peremptory Command* of our Blessed Lord, requiring His Apostles and their Successors, and such as are or shall be Ordain'd by them, expressly to Disciple all Nations, *Baptizing them*. His Command is Express and Positive, *Go ye, Baptizing*. They are constantly bound therefore to Disciple, by Baptizing *all* who are capable, and have not yet been Baptized by THEM; I say, they are oblig'd by this

Command, when 'tis in their power, to Baptize all such Persons, because the Command is laid upon them, and no other; so that if at any time a capable Person offers himself, or is offer'd, to any of them to be receiv'd into the Church by his Baptizing of him; (supposing that Person never to have been before *so received by One of them* into the Church) the proper Minister of Christ refusing so to receive him, will by such refusal necessarily give us to understand, either that he disregards the Express Command of our Saviour which is a Sin against this Institution; or else, that the Institution does not command him, or any other Minister of Christ to perform this Office to all capable Persons, who have not been so initiated by some one or other of them, which is a Contradiction to this express Command; because it will always hold true concerning a Person so refus'd; That the Ministers of Christ were commanded to Disciple him, Baptizing him, and yet not one of them has ever so Discipled him. They were commanded to do this, and not one of them has done it, which, if such Refusal be right, is making the Command to be of none effect, and so destroys the *Obligation* of the Institution it self, because, none else are commanded thereby to perform this Sacred Office, and consequently none else have any Duty incumbent upon them (but the direct contrary as we shall see by and by) for that purpose; and therefore by reason of
our

our Saviour's Command, the Divine Authority of the Administrator is an Essential Part of the Institution of Baptism.

But the Form of Administring Baptism (*in the Name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost*) being Essential, for *even the Validity* thereof, is an invincible Argument for the *Divine Authority* of the Administrator, that it should be also an *Essential Part* of this Institution, because, as often as any one Administers Baptism *truly* and *really* in the Name of the Trinity, so often he *expressly* affirms, and that *truly too*, that he does it by Virtue of that Power and Authority which he receiv'd from the Trinity for so doing. This will be evident beyond Contradiction, when we impartially enquire into the *just* Meaning and common Acceptation of the Expression [*In the Name of*] when us'd by one who Acts for another; which we shall constantly find signifies, that he who comes, and does any thing in another's Name, does it by his Power and Authority who sent him. " Thus Blessed be he that cometh in the Name of the Lord, (*Psal. 118. 26.*) is the same, as Blessed be he whom the Lord hath Sent, or who comes with the *Authority and Commission* which the Lord hath given him. So *When David's young Men came, they spake to Nabal according to all those words, in the Name of David* (*1 Sam. 25. 9.*) 'tis no more than if it had been said, they spake to *Nabal* according to all those Words,

and made use of *David's* Name to let *Nabal* know that he *Sent* them. Thus again, “ *Haggai the Prophet, &c. Prophefied unto the Jews, in the Name of the God of Israel, (Ezra. 5. 11)* What is this but to say that *Haggai* prophesied what God had *Sent*, and *Order'd* him to Prophefy to 'em? When our Saviour says, “ *I am come in my Father's Name (John 15. 43.)* He plainly declares that he was *Sent* by his Father, or came by his particular Appointment. Again, when our Blessed Lord affirms, “ *The Works that I do in my Father's Name they bear Witness of me, (John 10. 25.)* he in plain Terms asserts, that he did those Works by Virtue of that *Power* and *Authority* which he had receiv'd from his Father. And *Lastly*, (to name no more Texts to this purpose) When *St. Paul* says, “ *I—have judged already,—IN THE NAME of our Lord Jesus Christ,—to deliver such a one (i. e. the Incestuous Corinthian) unto Satan, &c. 1 Cor. V. 3, 4, 5.* He plainly asserts, that it is by *Authority* received from our Lord Jesus Christ, that he adjudg'd and determin'd that Sinner to be excommunicated. So when a Magistrate declares that he acts *in the Name* of his Prince, every one immediately understands thereby that he acts by the *Authority* which he receiv'd from him; but this is too plain to want more Examples; and therefore we may justly conclude, that every time the Minister says, *I Baptize thee in the Name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy*

Holy Ghost, it is the same as to say, I Baptize thee by Virtue of that *Authority* and *Commission* which I have receiv'd from the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost; and therefore when he Baptizes a Person, and pronounces the Words, *In the Name of the Father*, &c. if he be one who is not *vested* with the Divine Authority, he cannot be truly said to Baptize in the Name of the Trinity; for 'tis a perfect *Contradiction* to say such a thing is truly done in the *Name of another*, when really it is not done *in his Name*, or by his *Authority* and *Commission*, which is the only intelligible way of doing something in another's Name.

Thus we see how our Lord has inseparably United the *Divine Authority* of the *Administrator*, with the truth and reality of the *Form of Administration*; insomuch, that the Form it self is no further true, as to the Design thereof, than as it is attended with the Truth and Reality of the *Divine Commission* given to him who Administers; so that, whensoever this Form is truly us'd according to the Intent of this Institution, the Divine Authority and Commission of him who Administers, is *necessarily* and *constantly* imply'd and suppos'd.

And really if we examine into all the *Divine Positive Institutions* that ever were made, we shall find none of them so indispensibly require the *Divine Authority* of the Administrator, and attended with such a *Solemn Form* of Asserting and Declaring his Authority *every time* of Administration.

ministration, as we find in the Divine Positive Institution of Christian Baptism, which enjoins this Form in the Name [or by the Authority of the Trinity] to be constantly observ'd and us'd to the *End of the World*; and consequently, the Divine Authority of the Administrator of Baptism, is an *Essential Part* of that Great Institution.

But here I expect some will tell me, That I lay too much Stress upon the Form of Administring Baptism *in the Name* of the Trinity; because in the *Greek* it is said, *Go ye, &c.* Baptizing them *into the Name* (instead of *in the Name*) of the Father, &c. And tho' *in the Name* signifies *by the Authority and Commission* of the Trinity, yet *into the Name* does not signify so, but rather, into the Belief and Service of the Trinity; which does not imply so necessarily the Divine Authority of the Administrator, as I plead for.

To whom I answer, That tho' the *Greek* does signify *Into the Name*, yet it does not therefore follow that this is the *Only* Sense of the Word in the Original Language wherein St. *Matthew* wrote his Gospel, which the best Criticks affirm was *Hebrew*, or *Syro-Chaldaick*, the Language of the *Jews*, in our Saviour's Time, whereof the *Greek* is but a Translation. 'Tis certain, that the Universal Church of Christ has in all Ages retained; and constantly practis'd the Form *in the Name of the Trinity*; and all Ancient and Modern Translations
from

from the *Greek* it self, have inserted in the Text of the Institution *In the Name*, rather than *Into the Name*: Which plainly intimates, that the former is the most Genuine Sense of *St. Matthew's* Original Word; and therefore, sufficiently authorizes me to lay so great a Stress upon the Usual Form of Administring Baptism *in the Name* of the Trinity. Which necessarily supposes the Administrator thereof to be vested with the Divine Power and Commission; wherein I am the more confirm'd by the 26th Article of the Church of *England*, which expressly affirms, That the Administrator does Minister by "*Christ's Commission and Authority.*"

Dr. Hammond indeed, in his *Practical Catechism*, *Lib. 6. §. 2.* mentions the *Greek* [*into the Name*]; but then, he applies it only to the Part of the Person Baptized, and says, that it signifies, "*That he devotes and delivers himself up to be ruled, as an Obedient Servant, by the Directions of this Great Master, a willing Disciple of this Blessed Trinity.*" But this is nothing to our present Purpose; which is only to enquire, what the Form of Administration signifies on the Minister's Part: And this the same Author tells us in the forecited place; *viz.* "*That the Words* [*I Baptize thee in the Name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost*] *being prescrib'd by Christ to his Disciples (i. e. Apostles) must indispensibly be us'd by all in the Administration; and the Meaning of them on the Minister's*

"*Part*

“ Part is, That what he does, he does not of
 “ himself, but IN THE NAME or Power of,
 “ or by Commission from the Blessed Trinity.

Nay, tho’ the Minister in Baptizing should say, I Baptize thee *into the Name* of the Father, &c. (which would be contrary to the Universal Form) yet even then he would thereby assert the Divine Commission by which he acted: Because, on his Part, Baptizing the Person *into the Name*, must signify, that by that Action he admits him *into the Service* of the Blessed Trinity: Which being a Service of Infinite Benefit, and attended with Inestimable *Supernatural* Rewards to the Person admitted, must necessarily suppose the Person admitting, to be vested with a particular Power, and Supernatural Authority for so great a Purpose; because, *no Natural Power or Authority* is sufficient to confer any the least *Supernatural* Benefit or Advantage. But this Truth will be further confirm’d, by the Arguments that may be drawn,

Fourthly, From the *Design* and *Benefits* of Christian Baptism. For, by the Words of Institution ’tis plain, that the Design thereof is to *Disciple* all Nations; (St. *Matth.* 28.) or, which is the same thing, to *enter* them into the Church of Christ; which in several Places of Sacred Scripture, is called the *Kingdom* of God, and the *Kingdom* of Heaven. Now ’tis evident to whom our Saviour gave the *Keys* of the Kingdom of Heaven; *viz.* to his
 Apostles

Apostles expressly, and in *them* to their *Successors*; and consequently, that he gave to them, and those only whom they should authorize, the Supernatural Power of Admitting Persons into the Church by Baptism, which is the only Rite of Initiation into this Sacred Society.

One of the great Privileges of True Christian Baptism, is, That it is for the *Forgiveness of Sins*: This is a Supernatural Benefit; and therefore it may be justly ask'd, Who can forgive Sins, but *God only*: And if none can, then certainly no Man can assume to himself the Power of *Conveying* this Forgiveness of Sins to others by the *Means* of Baptism, except he be endow'd for that Purpose with Power from *on high*, even from *God* himself: And if any should, without the Divine Commission, suppose himself to have this Power, 'tis plain, that his Ministrations must be ineffectual for so great a Purpose, because he is destitute of the Divine Character: He does not truly personate God, the Bestower of this great Privilege, but runs without being sent; and God has not any where, either by Promise or Covenant, oblig'd himself to Ratify and Confirm the Precipitate Acts, and Usurp'd Administrations of such Rash and Presumptuous Undertakers. But we know to whom our Lord gave this Authority; *viz.* to his Apostles, (and therefore will confirm their Acts) when he said, *Whose soever Sins ye*
“ remit,

“ *remit; they are remitted unto them; and therefore they only, and such as they appoint, can Mediatly remit Sins by Christian Baptism.*

Another great Privilege of Christian Baptism is, That they who receive it, are thereby intitl'd to all the unspeakable Advantages of Free Denizens of Heaven, tho' they were before but Aliens and Strangers, and therefore had no Claim, nor any Right or Title to this Freedom. Now, let any Man but seriously reflect, how unreasonable 'twould be for a Stranger and Foreigner in any State or Kingdom, to imagine, that every, even *Natural Subject* there, cou'd have Authority to grant him a *Valid Naturalization*, and thereby endow him with all the *Rights and Immunities* which the Free-born Subjects of that State or Kingdom do enjoy; would it not be Ridiculous for him to accept (knowingly) of such a pretended Naturalization? And if he should; can it be thought reasonable, that he should enjoy all the Advantages annex'd to a True and Lawful Naturalization, to be receiv'd from the Hands of those only who are Authoriz'd for that purpose? Certainly No; a well Regulated State or Kingdom that has Laws for Naturalizing Strangers, would never allow it; and shall it then be once thought, that every *Subject*, of how mean a Station soever he be in this Spiritual Kingdom of God, can have Authority to Intitle *Strangers* to all the

the *Supernatural* Advantages which are consequent to a *Legal and Valid Naturalization*?

And indeed all the Benefits and Privileges of True Christian Baptism are *so great and many*, that it would be endless to recount them; let it suffice to say, that it is a Sign, a Seal, a Means of Conveyance, and a *Pledge* to assure us of these Supernatural Advantages, *viz.* of being Incorporated into the *Household*, and thereby made *Members*, of Christ, *Children* of God, and *Heirs* of the Kingdom of Heaven, and of all the unspeakable Happineses thereof, which Eye hath not seen, nor Ear heard neither have enter'd into the Heart of Man to Conceive.

NOW, if any reasonable unprejudic'd Man will but duly reflect on these so inconceivable and inestimable Privileges, so infinitely above all the Powers of Nature, either to Obtain or Bestow, without some supernatural Donation, 'twill be very difficult, nay, I may say, *impossible* for him to believe, that God, who is the God of Order, and not of *Confusion*, will bestow them by the *Mediation* of those to whom he has given no Authority for that Purpose: Especially, when he remembers, that God has set apart a *Peculiar Order* of Men, to be *the Stewards* of these his *Mysteries*, and to whom he has giv'n the Power of the *Keys*, whereby to admit into, and exclude out of his Spiritual Kingdom, as the Sacred Scripture do's sufficiently inform us: These Men he
has

has dignify'd with *extraordinary Marks* and signal Character of *Honour*, and *separated* them from the rest of *Mankind*; that they might *represent his Sacred Presence* among us, and that we might have a *strong Confidence* and well-grounded Assurance of their *Divine Mission*, and of our own Happiness in being admitted through Baptism into the Number and Privileges of his Children, by their *Authoriz'd Ministration*.

For the Baptism wherewith they initiate us into Christ's Spiritual Kingdom, is not *Theirs*, but *HIS*, 'tis He that Baptizes us by their Ministry. His Father sent him to be the *One Mediator between God and Man*; as such, He sent His Apostles and their Successors, to be *His Representatives*, to perform Acts of Mediation between God and Man in his *Stead*, and by his Authority, that so they might be *HIS OWN ACTS*, and become *therefore* acceptable to His Father for our Spiritual Benefit and Advantage: For, says he to these same Apostles whom he authoriz'd to Baptize; *As my Father hath sent me, even so send I you: Lo, I AM with you alway*; thereby making them to personate himself, that he, tho' in Heaven, might visibly here on Earth, mediate for us himself by their Ministry, which is *HIMSELF*, because they act by his Authority, being sent by him: without him no Ministrations in our behalf can be acceptable to his Father: For, says he, *no Man cometh to the*
Father

Father BUT BY ME, Joh: xiv. 6. *And without me ye can do nothing*; Joh. xv. 5. Hence we find why the Scripture says that *Jesus made and Baptiz'd Disciples*, Joh. iii. 22. iv. 1. because *He did it* by those whom *he had sent* for that purpose: For, verse 2. *Jesus himself* [*i. e.* in his own Person] Baptized not, but his Disciples: He Baptized, but 'twas by them, vested with his Authority; and thereby it became his own Act; even so; that Baptism might always be justly interpreted to be done by him (who is the only proper Mediator, and whose Mediatorial Acts alone, are, as such, acceptable to his Father, in our behalf.) He vested his Apostles and their Successors, and such as are Ordain'd by them, with HIS OWN AUTHORITY to Baptize to the End of the World, that they might *personate* him in *this Act of Mediation*, and that consequently HE might continue to *make and Baptize Disciples* by their Ministry; which he cannot be said to do, by the Act of one whom he never sent: For which Reason, added to those others I have brought under this 4th Head, we may truly say, That the Divine Authority of him who Administers Baptism is an Essential Part of that Holy Institution. But this is confirm'd also,

Fifthly, By the constant Practice of those who *truly* are, and of others who *pretend* to be, the Lawful Ministers of Christ in his Church.

THE *Lawful Ministers* in all Ages have claim'd the Authority of Baptizing, even from the time of our Saviour's first giving the Commission to his Eleven Apostles, unto this Day; and for this *very Reason*, because they *Deriv'd* their Ministerial Power and Authority from Christ: But if the Divine Authority of the Administrator of Baptism were not an Essential Part of that Institution, their Claim would have been unjust when founded upon their *Divine Right*, and so every Man would have had as much Authority to Baptize as they: But forasmuch as they were never accus'd of Injustice for making this Claim, (except by such Wretches as the Author of *the Rights*, &c. who would confound all Order in the Christian Church;) and since all Sober Christians, who *know* their Duty, never laid Claim to this Authority; it necessarily follows, that the Lawful Minister's Claim is good, and consequently that the Divine Authority of him who Administers is an Essential Part of Baptism.

AS for those who *pretend* to be, but are not, the Lawful Ministers of Christ; 'tis well known, that they plead for the Authority of Baptizing upon this very score, that they *esteem* their Ministerial Commission to be of *Divine Right*; and therefore will never suffer their *Common People* to Administer Baptism: From whence it follows, that they also *in practice* confirm this Assertion of the Divine Authority of the Administrator of Baptism: otherwise

wife their claiming the Power of Baptizing, by Virtue of the *suppos'd Divine Right* of their Mission, would be a meer foolery, and indeed a Contradiction.

SO that, the Lawful Minister's claiming the Authority of Baptizing, because his Mission is *truly* of Divine Right; and the unlawful Minister's claiming the same Authority, because he *esteems* his Mission also to be of Divine Right, do both conspire by their Practice to Confirm this Truth, That the Divine Authority of the Administrator of Baptism is an Essential Part of that Holy Institution; and this is not a little Corroborated,

Sixthly and Lastly, From the Doctrine and Practice of the Church of *England*.

For in her 23d Article of Religion, she affirms, That "*it is not Lawful for any Man to take upon him the Office of Ministering the Sacraments, &c. before he be Lawfully call'd and sent to execute the same.*" Now what can this Article mean by [*it is not Lawful?*] Certainly nothing else but that *it is Sinful*, or Contrary to the Divine Law in the Holy Scripture, for she is not treating of *Civil*, but *Spiritual Things*. But against what Law in the Sacred Scriptures is this a Sin? Surely against *that Law* which treats of *these Sacraments*, and this Law is principally in the Institution of them; so that the plain meaning of this Article must be, that it is *contrary* to the very Institution of the *Sacraments* for *any Man* to take

upon him “ the Office of Adminiftring them;
 “ before he be *Lawfully call'd and ſent to exe-*
 “ *cute the ſame.*

A N D in her 26th Article ſhe teaches,
 “ that the Adminiftrators of the Sacraments
 “ do not Miniſter in their own Name, but in
 “ Chriſt's, and by his *Commiſſion and Authority.*

A N D leſt every One who has acquir'd
 (tho' not juſtly) the Reputation of being ſuch
 a Lawful Miniſter, ſhould fancy himſelf to
 have *Chriſt's Commiſſion*, becauſe the People
 made choice of him, and ſome others of
 higher Rank among them, took upon them
 to Ordain him, Separate from, and Independ-
 ent of the Biſhop ;

In the Preface to her Form and Manner of
 Making, Ordaining, and Conſecrating of Bi-
 ſhops, Prieſts, and Deacons, ſhe tells us thus ;
 “ It is evident unto all Men *diligently* reading
 “ *Holy Scripture*, and Ancient Authors, that
 “ *from the Apoſtles time* there have been theſe
 “ Orders of Miniſters in Chriſt's Church,
 “ *Biſhops, Prieſts and Deacons* ; which Offices
 “ were evermore had in ſuch Reverend Eſti-
 “ mation, that *no Man* might preſume to exe-
 “ cute *any* of them, except he — by Pub-
 “ lick Prayer, with Impoſition of Hands, were
 “ approv'd, and admitted thereunto by *Law-*
 “ *ful Authority.* [And what ſhe means by
 this *Lawful Authority*, is plain by the Words
 immediately following.] “ And therefore, &c.
 “ *No Man* ſhall be accounted, or taken to be
 “ a Law-

“ a Lawful Bishop, Priest or Deacon, in the
 “ Church of *England*, or suffer'd to execute
 “ any of the said Functions, except he be call'd,
 “ &c. thereunto, according to the Form here-
 “ after following, OR HATH HAD FOR-
 “ MERLY EPISCOPAL CONSECRATI-
 “ ON, OR ORDINATION; whereby the
 confines the lawful Authority, so evidently to
 Episcopacy; that a Man must be wilfully
 blind who dares to deny it.

ALL which put together, sufficiently prove
 that by the Doctrine of this Church, the Di-
 vine Authority of the Administrator of Chri-
 stian Sacraments, is an Essential Part of their
 Institution; and consequently, that the Di-
 vine Authority of the Administrator of Bap-
 tism (which is one of those Sacraments) must
 be also an Essential Part of that Holy In-
 stitution.

SO likewise by her Practice she confirms
 this Truth; for in her Office of Ordering of
 Priests, the Bishop says to the Priest: “ Re-
 “ ceive the Holy Ghost for the Office and
 “ Work of a Priest in the Church of God now
 “ committed unto thee by the Imposition of our
 “ Hands. Whose Sins thou dost forgive,
 “ they are forgiven; and whose Sins thou
 “ dost retain, they are retained. And be
 “ thou a faithful Dispenser of the Word of
 “ God, and of his Holy Sacraments, in the
 “ Name of the Father, and of the Son, and
 “ of the Holy Ghost, Amen. And delivering

to the Priest kneeling, the Bible into his Hand, the Bishop adds, "*Take thou AUTHORITY to preach the Word of God, and to Minister the Holy Sacraments.* By all which 'tis plain, that she reckons the Administration of the Sacraments to be *Essential* to the Office of the Priest, and that he must have *Commission* even from the Holy Trinity, by the Mediation of the Bishop, convey'd to him, to qualify and authorize him to administer the same. And in Conformity to this her Rule of Practice, when any Person, tho' formerly a *Teacher*, and one who has assum'd to himself before, the Power of *baptizing* and administering the *Lord's Supper*, notwithstanding his having continu'd even in the *tolerated* Practice of these Usurpations for many Years together, nay, tho' chosen thereto by the Consent of *the People*, who submitted to, and acknowledg'd all such his Ministrations to be *Valid and Good*, when such a Man, I say, forsakes his *Heresies* or *Schisms*, and returns, or desires to be united, to her Communion, and to be reckon'd in the Number, and to have License to act as one of *her lawful Ministers*, she will not allow him such a *License*, he must be receiv'd only to *Lay Communion*, if he was never before *divinely authoriz'd* by *Imposition of Episcopal Hands*, and now refuses to accept such *Catholic Ordination*: She thereby declares that he wants the *Divine Commission* to act in such Holy Ministrations, and that she will not acquiesce

efce with his former Usurpations; he must *dis-*
claim and *renounce* them now, if in her Com-
 munion he would be allow'd to Officiate in the
 Word and Sacraments, as the rest of her Mi-
 nisters do. But why all this, if his Power
 and Authority had been *sufficient* before, for
 the Purposes of the Holy Sacraments? If his
 Commission was good then, 'tis so now, and
 'tis needless to *Re-ordain* him; but if it was
Invalid, she acts consistent with her self in re-
 fusing to admit him among her Ministers, TO
 WHOM ALONE she gives Authority for
 these great Purposes. And really it ought not
 to be dissembl'd, that if such a Man's Admi-
 nistrations of the Sacraments were before *agree-*
able to, and not *Breaches* of their Institution,
 his Ministry before was also *valid*; and there-
 fore 'twould be even *unjust* to require him to
 take up a *new Commission*, and from ANO-
 THER SORT of Authority than what he had
 receiv'd it from at first; because the Design
 of handing down Christ's Commission to Mi-
 nisters, in all Ages, is, that there may be con-
 stantly such *Persons* to administer the Holy
 Sacraments, as he in the first Institution of
 those Sacraments did authorize and require:
 But forasmuch as the Church of *England* re-
 quires such Persons, as above-mentioned, to
 receive the *Divine Authority*, which she reckons
 they wanted before, to qualify them for the
 Administration of Sacraments, 'tis plain that
 this her Practice discourages us to hope, that

without the Divine Authority they are qualify'd for such Ministrations; and consequently confirms us in this, that the *Divine Commission* of the Administrator is an Essential Part of the Institution of a Sacrament. Nay, so very Cautious is she, not to allow the *contrary*, that she makes not so much as any Exception for Cases of *absolute Necessity*; no, not tho' an unbaptiz'd Person were giving up the Ghost, she has not declar'd that any one may baptize him but the *Minister of the Parish*, or in his Absence any other *lawful Minister* that can be procur'd; as in her Office for *private Baptism*, which is the only Office she has provided for Cases of Necessity: And what she means in the Rubrick thereof, by *lawful Minister*, is easily determin'd by her 26th Article of Religion, *viz.*

“ *One who ministers in Christ's Name, and by his*
 “ *Commission and Authority.*

But of this I have treated more largely in my Book of *Dissenters Baptisms* null and void by the *Articles, Canons, and Rubricks* of the Church of England: To which give me leave to add here, that in her Offices for *Publick Baptism*, she requires the PRIEST to address to God in behalf of the baptized thus. “ *Grant*
 “ *that whosoever is here* (as in the Office for Infants); Or, “ *That they being here* (as in the Office for those of Riper Years) “ *DEDICATED to thee by OUR OFFICE AND MI-*
 “ *NISTRY, may also be endued with heavenly*
 “ *Virtues,*” &c. This *Dedication* of Persons to
 God

God by Baptism, is plainly asserted here by the Church, to be, by the *Office*, of those who (in her 26th Article she says) “*Minister in Christ’s Name, and by his Commission and Authority*”; plainly Connecting the Divine Authority of the Administrator of Baptism, with the Baptism it self, and so closely too, that she no where in any of her Publick Acts, gives us the least encouragement to think that *this Dedication* can be by any other; and therefore, what God and his Church have *so joyn’d together, let no Man put asunder.*

A N D now to sum up all that has been said under these Six Heads.

FORASMUCH as God under the *Mosaic Dispensation*, which was but the *fore-runner* of the *Christian*, made the *Divine Authority* of the Administrator an Essential Part of his then Positive Institutions, insomuch as not to accept of the Performance of the *latter* without the *former*: Forasmuch, as Christ himself, notwithstanding his own *Personal Excellencies* and *Perfections*, and the pressing *Necessities* of the whole World, which stood in need of his Ministrations, would not leave his *private Station* to take upon him so great an Office till duly Authoriz’d by the *Divine External Commission*: Forasmuch, as in the Words of the Institution of Baptism, our Lord Commission’d *no other* than his Eleven Apostles and their Successors and Substitutes to Baptize to the End of the World: Forasmuch as their
Com-

Commission (as all others are) is *Exclusive* of all, but those to whom 'twas given; and the very Form of Administration of Baptism, *in the Name*, or by *the Authority* of the Trinity requires, and necessarily supposes and implies the *Divine Authority* of him who Administers: Forasmuch, as the Words of Institution are an express Command to the Apostles and their Successors and Substitutes, to Baptize all capable Persons who have not been Baptized by them. Forasmuch, as the Benefits of Baptism are so great and SUPERNATURAL, that none can give or convey them by Baptism, but such as God has appointed; forasmuch, as Christ himself Baptizes us by the Ministry of those whom he has sent for that purpose; and we cannot be said to be Baptized by him, when 'tis done by one whom he never sent: Forasmuch, as all who call themselves the Divinely Authoriz'd Ministers of Christ, have in all Ages claim'd the Power of Baptizing upon the Account of their *Divine Commission*: And Lastly; Forasmuch, as the Church of *England* by her *Doctrine* and *Practice*, gives sufficient ground to believe, that none can Administer Sacraments but those who are *Divinely Authoriz'd* for that purpose, and that to pretend to do so, is contrary even to the very Institution of the Christian Sacraments. Seeing all these Premises are true, and not to be deny'd, without running into unavoidable Inconsistencies and Contradictions, it must
 necessa-

necessarily be granted, that the *Divine Authority* of the Administrator of Baptism is an *Essential Part* of that Holy Institution, to be observ'd as *often* and *as long* as Baptism shall be necessary to be Administer'd, *even* to the End of the World.

PROPOSITION II.

THAT every Essential Part of Christian Baptism; (*viz.* The *Divine Authority* of the Administrator, *The Water*, and *the Form of Administration* in the Name of the Trinity) is of equal Obligation and Necessity to us.

DEMON. This will follow from the first Proposition of the Introduction; which I shall apply to this Divine Positive Institution; For the very Nature of this Institution is such, that it had no *Intrinsic Excellency*, or Moral Virtue, either in the *Person Baptizing*, or in *the Water*, or in the *Form of Words* wherewith Baptism is given, to bind or oblige us to observe the same, till the Divine Command laid that Necessity upon us, as indeed we find it did; so that now we are oblig'd to observe this Institution, purely and only by Virtue of this *Divine Command*; which, forasmuch as it extends it self to *every one* of the said *Essential Parts* thereof (as has been prov'd in the preceding Proposition, wherein 'twas Demonstrated, *That the Divine Authority of the Administrator*

ministration of Baptism is an Essential Part thereof as well as the Water and the Form) will make them all of equal Authority, and consequently of equal Necessity and Obligation to us; because, the Divine Authority of the Administrator, the Water, and the Form of Administration, are every one of them distinctly of the same Nature (*i. e.* but meer Positive Institutes) as the whole Institution it self. And again, being all Essential Parts [or such as are constantly to be observ'd as long as the Ordinance of Baptism shall be obliging] 'tis evident, that for the same Reason as one part may be omitted, another may be so likewise, and consequently, that every one of them is upon all accounts whatsoever, of equal Obligation and Necessity to us.

Q. E. D.

COROLLARY.

HENCE it follows, that as no Humane Authority can *Dispense* with the whole Institution of Baptism, where 'tis binding and obliging (*Axiom 3.*) so neither can they *Dispense* with the Omission of either Water, or the Form of Administration, in the Name of the Trinity, or the *Divine Mission* of him who Administers. Nor can any such Authority determine, that one of these Essential Parts of the Administration of Baptism, is more excellent than another, because they have every one distinctly, the same Authority Commanding,
from

from which *alone* they receive their whole Force and Efficacy, and are *only* by Virtue of *that one Authority*, made equally necessary and binding to us.

PROPOSITION III.

WHOSOEVER affirms Baptism to be *wholly Null and Invalid*, by reason of the *Omission* either of *Water*, or of the *Form* of Administring in the Name of the Trinity, ought also for the *same Reason* to acknowledge, that Baptism is *as much Null and Invalid* when it wants *only the Divine Authority or Commission* of the Administrator.

DEMON. This will follow from the Second Proposition of the Introduction.

FOR the *only Reason* why the *Omission* of either Water, or the Form, makes such a Baptism Void, must be, because such Omission is *Unlawful*, or *Contrary* to the Institution of Baptism (*Axiom 4.*) So that he must affirm such Baptism Null, because 'tis Administer'd either with such Matter or Form as the Institution has not appointed; or, because 'tis not Administer'd with such Matter or Form as the Institution requires. Now, forasmuch as Christ, who appointed the Water and the Form, appointed also the Person who should Administer both the one and the other: And since the Divine Authority of this Administrator is an Essential Part, and as much obliging
and

and necessary as Water and the Form, those Two other Essential Parts of the Institution; (by the 1st and 2^d Propositions;) it must necessarily follow, that the want of Divine Authority in him who Administers, is *equally* a Breach of, or *contrary* to, the said Institution; and therefore, if the *want* of Water, or the Form, makes any Baptism to be *wholly Null and Void*, because contrary to the Institution; the want also of *only* the Divine Commission in the Administrator, must for the *same Reason* make that Baptism so Minister'd to be *wholly Invalid; and of no Effect*, being *equally* contrary to the same Institution. And consequently, whosoever affirms Baptism to be *wholly Null and Invalid*, by reason of the *Omission* either of Water or the Form, ought also for the *same Reason* to acknowledge, that Baptism is *as much Null and Invalid* when it wants *only* the Divine Authority or Commission of the Administrator. Q. E. D.

C O R O L L A R Y.

FROM this Proposition it undoubtedly follows, that the Invalidity of such Baptisms as are administer'd by Unauthoriz'd Persons, cannot be *partial*, but *entire*: For, if Baptism be wholly void for want of *Water*, or the *Form* of Administring in the Name of the Trinity, as the whole Church of Christ have constantly and with great Reason affirm'd; it must

must be also (by this last Proposition) as *entirely* (and consequently *not partially*) Invalid, for want of *only* the Divine Mission of the Administrator; and all this, by reason of the *Equal Authority and Necessity* of every one of these Essential Parts.

I mention this, [that there cannot be any *Partial Invalidity*, but it must be *whole and entire*] because I have heard from some, that the want of the Divine Mission of the Administrator of Baptism, makes such a Baptism *but partially Invalid*; and that, provided the Person is Baptized by such a one with Water, and Pronouncing of [*In the Name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost,*] Imposition of the Bishop's Hand is sufficient to supply the other Defect, and consequently to make such Baptism as Valid, as it would have been if administer'd by one *divinely authoriz'd*, that is, *wholly and entirely Valid*. But that this cannot be, is evident by the above-mention'd Corollary; wherein 'tis plainly demonstrated, that if in this Case there be any Invalidity at all, it cannot be *Partial* but *Entire*. And as for the Virtue of such Imposition of Hands, 'tis utterly contrary to *Axiom* the 5th, which is a **FIRST PRINCIPLE**; *viz. That no Power or Authority on Earth, can by any After-Act (not appointed by God for that purpose) make that which before was Invalid, to become as Valid, as Conforming to the Divine Institution it self would have made it.* So that, if by *Im-*
position

*posi*tion of Hands; they would make such Im-
 perfect or Invalid Baptisms, to be as Valid
 as the Perfect ones perform'd according to
 the Institution; it lies upon them to demon-
 strate, that such Imposition of Hands was
 appointed by *God himself*, either in some Law,
 or by the Practice of the Holy Apostles, for
 such a Purpose: But this I despair of ever
 seeing them do; because the *Sacred Oracles*
 gives us not the least Encouragement, either
 in plain Words, or by good Inferences; (to
 be drawn from such as are not so plain) to
 believe that this *Rite* of the Imposition of
 Hands, with respect to Baptiz'd Persons, was
 ever Ordain'd, but to be perform'd on those
only, who were before *truly* and *validly* *Bap-*
tiz'd. There is not one Example of the Apo-
 stles using this Ceremony to make up *such* *De-*
fects of Baptism, nor any thing like it: And
 if in After-Ages *some* us'd this Ordinance for
 that Purpose, (as 'tis asserted, tho' upon what
 good Evidence I know not, that they did)
 they seem thereby to have dispens'd with a
 Divine Positive Institution, at the same time
 that it was *binding* and *obliging*; which was
 taking to themselves an Authority that did
 not at all belong to them (by *Axiom* 3.);
 I say, They dispens'd with a Divine Positive
 Institution, when 'twas binding and obliging;
 because they allow'd of the *Omission* of the
Divine Authority of the Administrator of Bap-
 tism, which might have been had (and was
therefore

therefore binding and obliging,) at the *same time* as they gave Imposition of Hands to such invalidly Baptized Persons, who might *instead thereof*, have been *then* Baptiz'd by themselves or their Substitutes, who were vested with the Divine Authority for that Purpose.

AS for the Church of *England*, she gives us not the least Intimation of any Efficacy in the Imposition of the Bishop's Hand; to give Validity to such Baptisms as are suppos'd to be *partly* Invalid before: For, her Office of Confirmation is made *only* for Persons *validly* Baptized; and if they are not so, the Use of that Office upon their Account, will be a perfect Contradiction: Because the Prayer of the Bishop, before he blesses by Imposition of his Hands, asserts, "*That God has Regenerated the Person by Water and the Holy Ghost; and has given unto him Forgiveness of all his Sins*"; which takes in the whole Benefit of Valid Baptism, and therefore cannot be said, with any Sense, over a Person whose Baptism is suppos'd to be but *partly* Valid, and consequently, to convey but Part of the Benefits of True Baptism. So little has she provided for any Method of giving Validity to partly Invalid Baptisms.

WE have some among us, who say, "*That the Ancient Churches, when they found that Persons had been baptiz'd in or with Water, in the Name of the Father, and of*

“ the Son, and of the Holy Ghost, tho’ by Lay-
 “ Persons, or Hereticks, or Schismaticks; they
 “ refus’d to give such Persons *Catholick Bap-*
 “ *tism*, at the Hands of those who were du-
 “ ly authoriz’d by the *Divine Commission*: Be-
 “ cause they reckon’d *any Baptism* with Water
 “ in the Name of the Trinity, by *whomsoe-*
 “ *ver* administer’d, to be that *One Baptism*
 “ which ought not to be repeated; — But
 “ yet, at the *same time*, they esteem’d such
 “ a Baptism in some Measure *Invalid*, till it
 “ was perfected, or rather mended, by Impo-
 “ sition of the Bishop’s Hands. And for this
 they bring the Council of *Eliberis*, *Anno 305.*
 Can. 38. (See *Prelim. Disc.* pag. 11.) “ And
 “ because that Council requir’d the Lay-Bap-
 “ tiz’d Person to be presented to the Bishop,
 “ to be P E R F E C T E D by Imposition of
 “ Hands; thence they conclude, that there
 “ was a *Partial Invalidity* in the Baptism be-
 “ fore; but that it was made *wholly Valid* by
 “ Imposition of Hands. —

But this is only *Gratis Dictum*: For the Pri-
 mitive Church when she refus’d to give a *Se-*
cond Washing, refus’d it upon this Account,
 That she esteem’d the Baptism before to be
the One Valid Baptism; and the Imposition of
 Hands enjoin’d by Her, was *no other* than that
 which was used, either at the Confirmation of
 all other *validly Baptized Persons*, or else at the
 restoring of Returning Penitents, and to the
 same Ends and Purposes; not with any De-
 sign

sign to give an *Essential and Total Validity* to that Act of Baptism which had an *Essential Invalidity* before: And this is what is meant by PERFECTED in the Council of *Eliberis*, viz: That the Baptiz'd Person should be *Confirm'd* by the Bishop, as all other Baptiz'd Christians us'd to be; because, all Valid Baptisms were reckon'd by the Church, to be *consummated* and finish'd by *Confirmation*, or Imposition of the Bishop's Hands, which in those Days was immediately perform'd after Baptism, or as soon after as possibly could be.

For these Gentlemen to say, that the Ancients reckon'd *any Baptism* with Water in the Name of the Trinity, by *whomsoever* administer'd, to be *that One Baptism which ought not to be repeated*, is a great Mistake; for the *Cyprianists* and the *Eastern Churches* affirm'd and practis'd otherwise; and particularly in the Baptism of the *Montanists*, who, tho' they were Wash'd in or with Water, in the Name of the Trinity, were not admitted into the Church without a Second Baptism —. And *St. Basil*, *St. Chrysostome*, and the *Catholicks* after the *Nicene Council*, condemn the Baptism of Laymen as Null and Void, tho' they were done with Water in the Name of the Trinity; and so do the *Apostolic Canons*, the Baptism of Hereticks, as is plain by the Instances in my *Preliminary Discourse* —. But to tell us, that the *Primitives* call'd such Heretical and Schismatical Baptisms as were not repeated, and such

such Lay-Baptisms as they had by Canon allow'd, *partly Invalid*; and that they made them *totally Valid* by Imposition of the Bishop's Hands, is to impose upon us very great Inconsistencies. For, if (as we all agree) there be *but one Baptism*, it must certainly be that which has *no Invalidity*, being Administer'd exactly according to the Essentials of the Institution; and therefore those *other Baptisms* which are not so Administer'd, and are therefore confessedly *imperfect* and *partly Invalid*, must be of *another kind* distinct from that *One True Baptism*, and this will introduce *Two Sorts* of Baptisms in the Christian Church; which is utterly contrary to their own Assertion, as well as that of the Holy Scripture, which acknowledges no more than *One Baptism for the Remission of Sins*; and consequently these imperfect Baptisms are no Baptisms at all, and so are entirely void, and of no effect. And indeed, to allow the Contrary, is in effect to destroy the *whole Ministry* of the *Christian Priesthood*; and to open a Door of *Licentiousness* to all Intrudors into that Sacred Office, and thereby put every Man upon a Level, inso-much that at last all may set up for themselves, and refuse to give any regard or attention, any deference or respect to our blessed Lord and Master, in the Person of his Authoriz'd Ambassadors and Ministers; for where will the Confusion end, if every Man may be suppos'd capable of giving *Valid Baptism*? Will they

they not argue ; What need we attend upon others for these Ministrations, when we have as much *Valid Power* therein as themselves? If our Baptisms are Valid, so may our Administrations of the Lord's Supper, and much more our Preaching to, and Teaching such People, as we can gather to our selves. If Validity may be allow'd *to all these*, by whomsoever Administer'd, then farewell all Rule and Order in the Church ; and Christ's setting some therein ; First, *Apostles* ; Secondly, *Prophets*, &c. for the perfecting of the Saints, for the Work of the Ministry ; and his promising to be with them to the End of the World, was to no purpose. And it will not serve, to say, that such Men will be guilty of Sin in those Usurpations, except we say also, that *their Authoritative Acts of Ministering* in what they call the Holy Sacraments are Sins too, and consequently, contrary to the Institution of the Real Sacraments, and therefore of *no effect* to convey the *Supernatural Graces* and Benefits annex'd to them : For, if ever Men can be once perswaded, that *any unauthoriz'd Person* can by means of the mere *Opus Operatum*, of what they call Sacraments, convey those unspeakable Advantages which are annex'd to Real Sacraments, it will be in vain FOR YOU TRUE MINISTERS to tell them of the *Sin* of Usurping the Sacred Office, when *you* in effect assure them, that every Christian can *Validly* Exercise it ; and as fruit-

less will it be, to preach to them the Danger of *Schism*, or causeless Separation from the Church, when you, by allowing the *Validity* of their *Uncommissioned Teachers* Ministrations of suppos'd Sacraments, give them an Argument to confound all that you shall say for their Conviction, by your affirming that their pretended Sacraments are *as true*, and *effectual* as your authoriz'd Administrations; and that, (since they thereby receive as much Spiritual Benefit as others do by yours, *because God as much concurs with such their Sacraments, as with those Minister'd by you*) your charging them with *Schism* in adhering to *Ministers* who have no *Divine Mission* is ridiculous and nonsensical; because, they have *ALL as valid a Commission* as your own, which you your selves must needs grant, by allowing the *Validity* of their suppos'd Sacraments. Nay further, if it be allow'd that such *their Sacraments* are Valid, then, *any Excommunicated Person* (tho' never Authoriz'd by a Divine Commission) if he can but gather a Congregation to himself, may set up for a *Valid Minister*, and even they who *know this*, may receive *Valid Sacraments* at his Hands, *if the want of a Divine Mission in the Administrator does not Invalidate the Sacraments*: Which is a Consequence *so horrid*, and attended with such *infinite Confusions*, that it should make sober Christians even tremble to think of it: And this brings me to my last Proposition, *viz.*

PROPOSITION IV.

THAT he who knows himself to have been *invalidly Baptiz'd*, by one who never had the DIVINE COMMISSION, can have *no just Grounds* to expect the *Supernatural Graces* and Benefits annex'd to the *One True Christian Baptism*, till he has done *his utmost* for the Obtaining of them, by endeavouring to procure *That One Baptism* from the Hands of a *divinely Authorized Minister*.

DEMON. For, however God may dispense with the WANT of this Sacrament, (*Axiom 2.*) to those who know nothing of it; such as Infants, or others who think they have receiv'd it, tho' they have not, and would receive it, if they could be perswaded that they had not; Or lastly, those who know that they never receiv'd it, and are heartily desirous of it, but cannot possibly attain it; yet, as *he who knows to do good, and does it not, to him it is Sin* (*Axiom 6.*). So he who KNOWS that he ought to be Baptiz'd by a Minister vested with the DIVINE AUTHORITY for that Purpose, and NEGLECTS to be so Baptiz'd, incurs the Guilt of Sin; and consequently, while he *continues* in that Guilt, can (by *Axiom 6.*) expect none of the *Supernatural Benefits* annex'd to the due Performance of his *Neglected Duty*, of Receiving

ceiving such *Valid Baptism*. This is so clear and evident that there is no need to enlarge upon it: Only I would further add, That if he knows himself to be invalidly Baptiz'd by one who never had the Divine Commission, and who notwithstanding presum'd to Baptize him, *in Opposition to, and Rebellion against,* those who were truly Authoriz'd for that purpose; his acquiescing with such a Baptism, will be an Addition to his Sin; because he thereby makes himself a PARTNER in the other's REBELLION, and strengthens him and his Adherents in their Wickedness of *Opposing* Christ's Lawful Ministers; concerning whom our Blessed Lord has positively affirm'd, *That he who despises them, despises him; and he that despises him, despises him that sent him.* And what greater Contempt can be offer'd to them, than to take part with such as *oppose* them in all the Ministrations of that Sacred Office, to which our Saviour has appointed them? This should make us exceeding careful, not to *concur* with such Men in their *Usurpation*; especially considering, that by this our Concurrency, we involve our selves in the Guilt of *Rebellion*, even against God himself; The Consequence of which must needs fall *infinitely* short of any the least Advantage, and, on the contrary, bring upon us the severest of his Wrath, instead of those *Supernatural Graces* and Benefits which he has promis'd to those who duly obey his Holy Institutes.

AS for those who do not, but yet *may know*, whether the Baptism they have receiv'd be according to Christ's Institution, or no, and consequently, *Valid* or *not Valid*; it highly concerns them to make use of those Faculties wherewith God has blessed them, that they may not be deceiv'd in *so great an Affair* as this is. For, *wilful Ignorance*, and *Carelessness* in Spiritual Things, will never excuse them at the Day of Judgment. Nor will it then serve their Turns to plead, that they follow'd the Instructions and Examples of their Teachers; for our Lord, who is Truth it self, has faithfully assur'd us, that *if the Blind lead the Blind, both shall fall into the Ditch*: And the *Unprofitable* Servant, who improv'd not his Lord's Talent, but hid it in a Napkin, was for his *Sloth* and *Idleness* branded with the dreadful Name of *Wicked*, and cast into outer Darkness, to teach us *Diligence* in the most Important Things of another Life. And what can be of greater Importance to us, than to know, whether we are truly *initiated* into the Christian Church, and thereby entitled to all *those infinite Benefits and Privileges*, those inestimable Graces and Blessings which every Member of the Church has a *Right and Title* to? Certainly, it highly concerns us to know the Truth of *our Claim* to such vast Benefits, since our Saviour has told us, That *except a Man be born of Water, &c.* he cannot enter into the Kingdom of God; he cannot be a

Mem-

Member of that Kingdom here in the *Church Militant*; the only known Ark of Salvation from the Wrath to come; nor in Heaven hereafter, in the *Church Triumphant*; if thro' his Carelessness and Negligence he has not been really *initiated* or *enter'd* thereinto, by that *One Baptism* which Christ has instituted, and *Commission'd* his *Apostles*, and *them only*, with their *Successors* and their *Substitutes*, to *Administer* for that Purpose to the *End of the World*.

A N D now, having gone thro' all that I design'd to say about *Invalid Baptism*, I shall conclude with my *Answers* to some few *Objections*, that may probably be started against this *Essay*.

O B J E C T I O N S.

Obj. I. **S**OME may Object, That tho' Christ bid his *Eleven Apostles* disciple the Nations, *Baptizing them*, &c. yet he did not therefore confine Baptism to them and their *Successors* *Ministration*, so as that *none* can *Administer True Baptism* but they, and such *only* as they shall authorize: For if he had, he would in exprefs Words have told us, that no others should have Authority to Baptize but they.

Answer. 'Tis universally granted, that our Lord confin'd the *Matter* of Baptism to *Water*, and the *Form* to *In the Name of the Trinity*,
merely

merely by his saying these Words, *Baptizing them in the Name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost.* So that no other *Matter* or *Form* can be introduc'd for the Administration of *Valid Baptism*, tho' Christ has not in *express Words* forbidden us to introduce them. Even so, tho' he has no where said in *express Words*, *That none but his Apostles, and their Successors, and such as they should appoint, might have this Authority*; yet I affirm, that he has confin'd true Christian Baptism to their *Ministration only*; because, he has done as much as if he had said so in *express and positive Words*; for, he gave *that Commission PARTICULARLY to them, and to no others*, and promis'd *constantly to concur with, and support them* in the Exercise thereof, *to the End of the World*; and he has made no such Promise to Lay Baptizers; and this is as full and *express*, as his appointing no other *Matter* than [*Water,*] and no other *Form* than [*In the Name of the Trinity,*] as is very evident to all, who give themselves leave to think justly, and adequately on the Words of *Institution*. Besides, this Commission is of such great Moment, that the Apostles themselves could never have *lawfully* undertaken to Minister in it, if Christ himself had not *particularly authoriz'd them so to do*, because, Baptism is, by Virtue *only* of Christ's Institution, made a Means of conveying **SUPER-NATURAL BENEFITS**; which they had no **NATURAL RIGHT** to confer on
any

any Man by *means thereof*, and they could acquire no SUPERNATURAL ONE to do so, till Christ gave them that *Power* by a *particular Designation*; as we find he did, in the very Words of Institution; and therefore, since the Apostles themselves could never have presum'd to act in this great Ministration, without a *Particular Divine Commission*; it being impossible for even them to administer Baptism valid, for *supernatural Ends and Purposes*, without it; it must needs follow, that no others can do so, but by *Virtue of this, or some other new Commission*; and if they have no *new one*, they must do it by *Virtue of the Old*; and consequently he who administers Baptism, valid for *Supernatural Purposes* (AND 'TIS NOT CHRISTIAN BAPTISM IF IT BE NOT THUS VALID) must necessarily be vested with the *Divine Commission*, given at first to the Eleven Apostles, and by their Successors convey'd down to him: And if so, then all others are excluded from any *Valid Ministration* hereof, because they are *Destitute* of this *Divine Commission*, which *was never once given to them* for such a purpose.

Obj. II. Others may probably object, That at this Rate I confine *the Efficacy* of the Sacraments, and particularly of Baptism, *wholly* to the *Divine Authority* of the Administrator; and so, if the Person who Ministers, has not been *Commission'd* by Christ, he administers *no real Sacraments* at all.

Ans.

Ans. When the outward Elements of the Christian Sacraments are *rightly* administer'd according to all the *Essential Parts of their Institution*, then, *and then only*, they become *efficacious* to the worthy Receiver of them; and this their Efficacy proceeds *only* from God's Concurrence with his Promise, made to such due Administration of them: So that, in Christian Baptism, the Efficacy depends *no more* upon the Divine *Commission* of him who Administers, than upon the *Water*, and the *Form* of Administration; but upon God's performing his Promise, to bestow the *Supernatural Graces* thereof, by the *Mediation of his own Minister's* applying the *Water in the Name of the Trinity*: And therefore, as the Church has constantly affirm'd, that God does not give Efficacy to *Water* administer'd *even by his own Minister*, without the use of these Words [*In the Name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost*] because an *Essential Part* of the Institution is omitted; So, we have *no Reason* from Divine Revelation (which is our **ONLY GUIDE** in this Case) to believe, that he will give Efficacy to *Water* administer'd with the pronouncing of the said *Form* of Words, when 'tis done by *one who has not the Divine Commission* for so doing, because, *this* is also an *Omission of another equally Essential Part* of the same Institution, as I humbly hope I have sufficiently prov'd.

AS to the latter Part of this Objection; *viz.* That if the Person who Ministers has not been Commission'd by Christ, he administers *no real Sacraments* at all; I readily acknowledge that my Discourse does imply so much; and that the contrary ought *upon no Account whatsoever* to be affirm'd or believ'd; because, the outward Elements are not *Sacraments* by themselves, nor made any ways Efficacious for *Supernatural Purposes*, till administer'd as God has appointed in their Institution; and when they are *so administer'd*, then they become *Sacraments*, and are thereby made *Means of conveying*, and also *Pledges* to assure us of the *Supernatural Graces* which God has annex'd to such their Administration. Now, who does not see at first Sight, that *none* can make any thing to be the *Means* of conveying *Supernatural Benefits and Advantages*, who have not the Power and Authority of a *Supernatural Commission*? That, no Person can make that, which before had no such excellent Quality, to become a *Pledge* or an *Earnest* of Assurance, that God will grant us such inestimable Graces and Privileges (as Nature could never have entitul'd us to) except he be first *sent*, and thereby *authoriz'd* for that Purpose, by him who is to acknowledge the *Pledge* as his own, and for the sake thereof, is to perform all that was promis'd, and imply'd by the giving and receiving of it?

As for Instance,

IN Christian Baptism, *Water*, the outward Element, is no Christian Sacrament till apply'd as the Institution of Baptism requires, and then, *and then only*, 'tis a Means of conveying, and a Pledge to assure us of, the *Mystical Washing away of Sin*; and how shall we rest satisfy'd and assur'd, that it is such a Means and Pledge, if it is not apply'd and given to us by **G O D HIMSELF** *in the Person of his Representative*, Commission'd by him to give us this Assurance? 'tis certain, that if *Water* be apply'd never so seriously, it cannot be the *Christian Sacrament* of Baptism, if it wants the true Form, [*In the Name of the Trinity*,] appointed in the Institution; this every one will acknowledge; and why then should any plead for its being a Sacrament, when the very Truth of the Form it self is destroy'd, by the Administration of a Non-Commission'd Person, who cannot *really and truly, and without a Lye*, say, I Baptize thee in the Name [*or by the Authority and Commission*] of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost; this his Usurpation is as contrary to the Institution, as a truly Commission'd Person's leaving out the *Form* wou'd be; as I think I have prov'd; and therefore, if the one hinders the *Water* from being a True Christian Sacrament, the other must do so too, because the *Person Commission'd to Administer* is as much appointed, as
the

the Matter and Form of Administration: And this Person is AS MUCH the Representative of God the giver, as the matter is the Representation of the Graces given; insomuch, that we have at least as much reason to omit the Symbolical Element, as we have to leave out the Divine Authority or Commission, which represents no less than God himself; and therefore those Administrations of the former, which are destitute of the latter, are no Christian Sacraments or (which is the same) Means and Pledges of Supernatural Graces.

Obj. III. But if this be so, (others will say) you have brought us to a fine Pass, For'tis well known, that this Divine Authority is very much controverted, and where to fix it, is not yet determin'd: So that, while we are in this Suspense, we must be always doubting concerning the Validity of our Baptism; and thereby you put this Divine Institution upon a very *Precarius* and *Uncertain* Foundation.

Ans. That the Divine Right of who shall Minister in things pertaining to God, has been, and still is very much Disputed by some *Ignorant* and *Foolish* Men, and also by others of *corrupt Principles* and *wicked Designs*, we find to be too true, by woful Experience; but what then, do's that argue that it is *not to be determin'd* who has this Divine Right? certainly no; for, tho' through *Heresy* and *Schism* the Minds of many Men are so dreadfully blinded

blinded that they do not discover this great Truth; yet, God be prais'd, they who continue in the Communion of the *Truly Catholick* and *Apostolick Church*, and are *Diligent* and *Inquisitive* to know God's Will, and to live according to that knowledge, need never be put to so great a plunge, as to be in doubt and suspense concerning this Dispute, or the Validity of their Baptism, which they have receiv'd from the Lawfully Ordain'd Ministers of Christ; because, such Ministers must be *visible* and *known*, as long as there is or shall be, any truly *Organiz'd Church* of Christ in the World; and that there shall be *always* such a Church is plain by our Saviour's Promise, That *the Gates of Hades shall not prevail against it*; and as for the Valid Ministers thereof, that they shall also continue, is as certain, by his promising thus to his Apostles, *Lo I am with you alway, even unto the End of the World*; and this is further confirm'd by the Apostle St. Paul's assuring us, that when Christ Ascended up on High, he gave some Apostles, and some Prophets, and some Evangelists, and some Pastors, and Teachers, for the PERFECTING of the Saints, &c. — 'till we all come into the UNITY of the Faith, &c. — unto a PERFECT MAN. Now 'tis certain, that this Perfection and entire Unity will not be compleated till the End of the World, and therefore these Valid Officers appointed to bring about such excellent Purposes, must continue

so long and be *visible* among us : And that the Continuance of such Valid Ministers who have Commission for the effecting of these Noble ends in the Church, is to be *so plain* and *perspicuous*, as that it shall be easie to discover and distinguish them from Non-Commission'd *new Upstarts*, is evident by another Design, for which our Lord appointed them, *viz.* That we henceforth should be no more Children toss'd to and fro, and carried about with every Wind of Doctrine by the slight of Men, and cunning Craftiness whereby they lie in wait to deceive, (Eph. 4. 14.) For how can Valid Ministers of Christ defend us against every Wind of Doctrine, and the Cunning Craftiness of Deceivers, if they are not to be visible and known to us? So that as sure as God is true, so sure we are, that his Validly Commission'd Ministers, *i. e.* Apostles and Prophets, &c. shall continue, and be known in the Church to the Consummation of all things ; and therefore we shall never want such as have Capacity to Administer his Holy Sacraments, and consequently need never be in Suspense about the *Validity* of our Baptism Administer'd by their Hands ; so that my affirming Baptism to be *Invalid* for want of such Divine Authority or Commission in the Administrator, do's not put this Divine Institution upon an uncertain, but a *sure* and *lasting* Foundation.

BUT here I expect that it will be ask'd, In whom do I suppose this *Divine Authority* to
be

be fix'd? I answer, that I do *not only suppose*, but firmly and undoubtedly *Believe*, after a strict and impartial Enquiry which I have deliberately made into this Matter; that 'twas ordain'd by Christ himself at first, and *continually convey'd* down to this Day, in EPISCOPACY ONLY; and of this I am *as certain*, as that our first Day of the Week was appointed by Christ and his Apostles, to be the *Christian Sabbath*: Nay, tho' I am very well satisfy'd that this our Christian Sabbath is of Divine Appointment; yet I can safely affirm, that the Arguments by which it is to be prov'd, are not so *numerous* as those for the Divine Right of Episcopacy; as may easily be demonstrated whensoever it shall be put to the Trial. As for those who are of another Opinion, I wish they had either more Knowledge, or more Humility; it is none of my Business here, to endeavour their Conviction: But if they would use their utmost Diligence to do the Will of God in all other Instances of their Duty, and seek to him for that Wisdom which is from above, enquiring without Prejudice, by attentively reading the Sacred Oracles; and comparing therewith what has been said by many excellent Authors upon this Subject; I hope they would then *know of this Doctrine whether it be of God*; which that they may, I heartily recommend these few Modern Books to their serious Perusal, *viz.*

A Modest Proof of the Order and Government settled by Christ and his Apostles in the Church. Printed for John Wyat, at the Rose in St. Paul's Church-Yard, 1705.

A Discourse shewing who they are that are now qualify'd to Administer Baptism and the Lord's Supper. Printed for C. Brome, at the Gun at the West-End of St. Paul's, 1698.

Dr. Potter of Church Government. Printed for Tim. Child, at the White-Hart in St. Paul's Church-Yard, 1707,

Dr. Hickeys's Two Treatises, one of the Christian Priesthood, the other of the Dignity of the Episcopal Order. Printed for Richard Sare, at Grays-Inn-Gate in Holborn, 1707.

And a little Book call'd, *The Plain Man's Guide to the True Church.* Printed for R. Clavel, at the Peacock in St. Paul's Church-Yard, 1708.

IV. But some it's likely will charge me with Uncharitableness, in denying the Validity of the Baptisms of Foreign Churches, where there is no Episcopal Ordination; and of many Good and Pious Men who are without such Ordination among our selves.

Ans. The

Ans. The Main Drift of my Essay is against the Validity of that Baptism which Men know themselves to have received from Persons who were never Divinely Commissioned, and yet presume to usurp this Authority in *Opposition* to the Divine Right of Episcopacy; which being duly consider'd, frees me from Answering to this Charge, with respect to such Foreigners, some of which have told you that they do not Act in *Opposition* to Episcopacy; and have pleaded, that they lie under a Necessity not to have Bishops among them; but that they *highly* value and reverence that Order in our *English* Church. Whether this Plea of Necessity be good; or whether it affects them *so far*, as to hinder their Receiving Episcopal Ordination from other Protestant Churches, tho' they cannot have Bishops residing among themselves, is not my Business (here) to enquire: But this I'm sure of, That there is not the least Reason, (nay, 'tis impious) to compliment away the Great Truths of God, to please any, tho' never so great a Party of Men.

THE Divine Right of Episcopacy is plain from Scripture, and was never call'd in Question by any considerable Number of Men, till within these last Two Hundred Years; and must we now lay it aside, for fear of Opposing new upstart Notions and Opinions? God forbid! Must our holding fast the sound Doctrine of Christ and his Apostles, be call'd

uncharitable and unkind, because it does not suit with the Temper and Disposition of other People? Cannot we still keep our Charity to them, by Believing that God may dispense with the very want of the Christian Sacraments, and bestow even the Supernatural Graces of them, to those who labour either *under an Invincible Ignorance*, or else *an Impossibility of Receiving those Sacraments*, when they do all that lies in their Power to fulfil his Blessed Will? Certainly we may; for God can dispense with his own Institutes, and give the Spiritual Graces annex'd to them, to whom he pleases (by *Axiom 2.*)

BUT as for some among our selves, I fear their Case is very dangerous; because, Abundance of them seem to want so fair an Excuse, living under that Episcopal Government which they refuse to acknowledge and submit to: But God only knows their several Circumstances of Knowledge and Capacity, and the Strength of those Prejudices which some of them may have contracted by their Education. He is Infinite Goodness it self, and will never punish any for what they *never could help*. But as for the Slothful and Negligent, the Obstinate and Perverse, we have no Authority from Divine Revelation to hope any thing for their Advantage. But to sum up my whole Answer to this Objection, in the Words of an Excellent Modern Author.

“THOSE

“ THOSE who have been Baptiz’d by Per-
 “ sons not lawfully Ordain’d, and consequently
 “ they have receiv’d no Baptism, having receiv’d
 “ it from those who had no Commission to admi-
 “ nister it, but who were guilty of the highest
 “ Sacrilege in Usurping such a Sacred Commission,
 “ not lawfully deriv’d to them by a Successive
 “ Ordination from the Apostles: [as is the Case
 with us.] But yet, thro’ a General Corrup-
 “ tion of the Times, such Baptisms are suffer’d
 “ to pass, whereby the Persons so baptiz’d swim-
 “ ming down the Stream, do think their Bap-
 “ tism to be Valid, and therefore seek not for
 “ a Re-baptization”, [I had rather say True
 Baptism] “ from those who are empower’d to
 “ Administer it. I say, where no such Re-bap-
 “ tization” [or rather True Baptism] “ is
 “ taught, and thereby the People know nothing of
 “ it; in such Case, their Ignorance is in a man-
 “ ner invincible, and their Sincerity and Devoti-
 “ on in Receiving no Sacraments, yet thinking
 “ them True Sacraments, may be accepted by God,
 “ and the Inward Grace conferr’d. But this
 Case does not reach those who do, or may
 know and act better; and is the whole of my
 Charity in this Matter, and, I think, a suffi-
 cient Answer to the Objection.

V. Another Objection in Defence of the
 Validity of Baptisms administer’d by such as
 have not the Divine Commission, is the Ex-
 ample of *Zipporah*, *Moses’s* Wife, who circum-

cis'd her Son, and thereby saved her Husband's Life; for God sought to kill *Moses*; and when she had circumcis'd her Son, he let him go; and therefore approv'd of her Act in so doing, tho' she had no Right to do so by the Institution.

Ans. Whosoever will but look into the first Institution of Circumcision, will find, That God did not set apart a Particular Order of Men for this Purpose; but only requir'd, *Gen. 17. 10. Every Man-Child among you shall be circumcis'd, &c.* to the 15th Verse; *Every Male must be circumcis'd*: But the Persons who should continually administer this Circumcision, are not nam'd in the Institution.

Nay, tho' it should be granted, that Circumcision was to be perform'd by the Master, as he was the Priest of his Family; yet it does not follow, that *Zipporah* did any thing more than what she had a Right to do; because her *Husband's Authority* was devolv'd upon her in his Sickness, when he was unable to do it himself: Especially, considering that this Sickness was inflicted upon him, because his Son had not been circumcis'd; and that he might therefore order his Wife to do it in his stead; and consequently, 'twas interpretatively done by himself, because by his Authority: As we find in the Issue, by God's sparing his Life when the Circumcision was perform'd; and by *Zipporah's* Words to *Moses*, when she had cut off the Fore-Skin of her
Son,

Son, and cast it at *his Feet*, saying, *A bloody Husband thou art, because of the Circumcision, Exod. 5. 25, 26.* which plainly implies, that she did it for his Sake, and by his Order. But what does all this avail to those, who knowingly receive, or acquiesce in Baptism receiv'd, from such as have no *Divine Commission*; when they may be Baptiz'd by Christ's own Ministers, whom he has particularly appointed, *exclusive* of all others, to Baptize? This is Acting even contrary to the Example here objected; because, by all that can be seen in the Text, she acted by a *Divine Commission*, even by Virtue of an Immediate Revelation to *Moses*, her Husband, whom God doubtless acquainted with the Cause of his Displeasure, and the Means of appeasing his Anger by *this Circumcision* of his Son: Which was an *Extraordinary* and *Unusual Case*, and not at all parallel to the Unauthoriz'd Ministrations of those who act *in Opposition* to that *Divine Commission*, which has been successively handed down from Christ and his Apostles, in all Ages.

VI. Another Objection is a Maxim, which some would persuade us will hold good in Christian Baptism; and that is, *Fieri non debet; Factum valet: i. e. It is not lawful to be done; yet being done, 'tis Valid.*

Ansiv. Tho' this Maxim may hold good in Circumstantials of some Secular Cases, yet it does

does not therefore follow that it will so in all, or indeed in any of the *Essentials* of *Worldly Matters*, For Example: 'Tis not Lawful for me to make a Man Free of the *City of London*; and tho' I should be never so serious and formal in pretending, or should really suppose my self to have sufficient Authority to give such a Freedom; yet 'tis certain, that such a Freedom given by me would never be Valid: The Man must receive a Legal Freedom, notwithstanding the Counterfeit one he had of me. The like may be justly affirm'd of the Naturalization of Foreigners, and many other great Concerns of this World; And if this Maxim will not hold good in these, and Abundance of other *Worldly Things*, how much less in those of an infinitely higher Nature, in the *Divine Positive Institutions* which God has made to be the Means and Pledges of *Supernatural Benefits*, to be conferr'd on us by the Ministration of *his own particularly Commission'd and Authoriz'd Ambassadors*? Especially when we remember, that this Maxim was never appointed by him to be our Rule and Guide in any of our Affairs, much less in those of a Religious and Spiritual Nature; as without all doubt Christian Baptism is. Besides, The Objection acknowledges that it is *not Lawful*, therefore 'tis Sinful: 'Tis a Sin against an *Essential* of the Institution; and how SUCH A SINFUL Act should be VALID for SUPERNATURAL PURPOSES,

POSES, is utterly inconceivable; nay, 'tis abominable to affirm it.

VII. Another Objection which I have heard of, is, That the Council of *Eliberis*, Anno 305. allow'd of *Lay-Baptism* in a Case of Necessity; That the Church of *Rome* does so to this Day; And that the Church of *England* did so in the Reign of King *Edward* the VIth, of Queen *Elizabeth*, and in the Beginning of King *James* the Ist.; as is plain, by the several Common-Prayer Books in those Days, particularly King *Edward's*, Anno 1552, and King *James's*, 1621. to be seen at *Sion-College* Library in *London*.

Answ. I grant the Truth of these Matters of Fact; and yet affirm, That those Allowances, be they of what Consequence they will, are not of any Validity for our Unauthorized and Anti-Episcopal Baptisms.

As for the Council of *Eliberis*, I have cited it Pag. 11 and 12 of my *Preliminary Discourse*; and made such Remarks thereon, as will utterly frustrate the Design of this Objection; and therefore I refer the Reader back to it, for his Satisfaction.

Next for the Church of *Rome*, her Allowances in this Case are no Rule to us Protestants, who have separated from her, for her many gross Errors, both in Doctrine and Practice: She began to quarrel with *St. Cyprian*, and other Primitive Bishops, and carried it very unchristianly against them, for not allowing any

any Validity in Heretical and Schismatical Baptisms, which they look'd upon as bad as Lay Baptisms; and she has ever since persisted in this ill Humour, so far as at last to condemn those who do not believe the Validity of Baptism Administer'd by Women, whose Authoritative Acts in the Church of God, are both contrary to the Law of Nature, and also forbidden by the Holy Ghost himself. Nay so far have her Bishops proceeded, as to pronounce Baptism Valid tho' administer'd by an Unbaptiz'd Heathen. " St. Basil in his
 " 10th Epistle, complains of the *Western Bi-*
 " *shops, and particularly the Roman, Quod*
 " *Veritatem neque Norunt, neque discere susti-*
 " *nent.*— *Cum iis qui veritatem ipsis annuncii-*
 " *ant contendentes, hæresin autem per se ipsos*
 " *stabilientes: That they neither know the Truth,*
 " *nor care to learn it; but they contend with them*
 " *who tell them the Truth, and by themselves*
 " *establisth Heresy: For which Reason their*
 Authority ought not to be objected in this Matter by a Protestant; especially considering that such an Objector will not submit to their Decisions, even in things of a much more inferior Nature.

The Practice of the Church of *England* in this Case, would have been look'd upon as a formidable Objection, if She her self had not answer'd it already by purging her Liturgy of so Inconsistent a Rubrick: I call it Inconsistent, because, especially in King *James* the First's
 Reign,

Reign, She had declar'd in her Articles of Religion, that it is *unlawful*, i. e. *sinful* for any Man to Administer Sacraments until he be *Lawfully call'd and sent*; and at the same time allow'd by her Rubrick to Private Baptism, that *any one there present* might Baptize the Infant (*in a Case of Necessity*.) This can be reconcil'd to her Articles of Religion by no other way, but by supposing that She, by her Rubrick, authoriz'd and empower'd *Lay-men* for such Cases, as much, as if She had Ordain'd them by Imposition of Hands. If any will assert this, which will be odd enough if they do, yet still it will not favour the Baptism now disputed against; for *they* are utterly destitute of any such *supposed Impowering and Authorizing Rubrick*, as that was esteemed to have been; Tho' yet, even in that Common-Prayer-Book, upon the Priest's Examination afterwards into the Lawfulness of the Child's Baptism, it was requir'd, that this Question should be put to the Persons who brought the Child to Church; *viz.* " *Whether they think the Child be Lawfully*
and perfectly Baptiz'd; which (considering the preceding Questions, " *Whether 'twas*
Bap-
tiz'd with Water, and in the Name of the
Trinity, &c.) seems to be needless, and to no purpose, except by asking their Thoughts about the Lawfulness and Perfection of such a Baptism, they meant to make it *lawful* or *unlawful*, as the Persons they put such a Question to, should think it: Which is a very strange,
and

and indeed a precarious and uncertain Foundation for us to build the Validity of our Baptism upon, in such a Case of Necessity. And therefore 'tis no wonder that the Church of *England*, afterwards expung'd this Question out of the Rubrick; and also, for very weighty Reasons took away the Liberty of *Lay-Baptizing*, in her present Liturgy, by requiring, even in Cases of Necessity, that Baptism should be Administer'd by "*The Minister of the Parish,*" "*or any other Lawful Minister that can be procur'd*"; which is a substantial Answer to all Objections that may be rais'd from her former Practice. But if such a Custom had been still continu'd, *St. Cyprian* long since laid it down for an *Undoubted Truth*, "*That we are not to be determin'd by any Customs of that Nature,*" "*but to examine whether they will bear the Test*" "*of Reason.*" And *Bishop Taylor* says, (speaking of Baptism by Midwives) "*This Custom*" "*came in at a wrong Door, it lean'd upon a false*" "*and Superstitious Opinion; and they thought*" "*it better to Invade the Priest's Office, than to*" "*trust God with the Souls which he made with*" "*his own Hands, and Redeemed with his Son's*" "*Blood; but this Custom was not to be follow'd,*" "*if it had still continu'd; for even then they*" "*confess'd it was Sin, Factum valet, fieri non*" "*debit; and Evil ought not to be done for a*" "*good end, &c. This Custom therefore is of the*" "*Nature of those which are to be laid aside,*" "*No Man Baptizes but he that is in Holy Or-*" "*ders,*"

“ ders, said Simeon of Thessalonica; and I
 “ think he said truly. But above all things,
 “ Opinions are not to be taken up by Custom, and
 “ reduc'd to Practice: Not only because Custom
 “ is no good warrant for Opinions, &c. But
 “ besides this, when an Opinion is offer'd only by
 “ the hand of Custom, it is commonly a Sign of
 “ a Bad Cause, and that there is nothing else
 “ to be said for it. Ductor Dubitantium,
 “ Fourth Edition, Page 638, 639.

A N D in the same Book, Page 198, “ In
 “ all Moral Actions, there must be a Substantial
 “ Potestative Principle that must have propor-
 “ tion'd Power to the Effect; a thing cannot be
 “ done without a Cause and Principle in Mo-
 “ rality, any more than in Nature. If a Wo-
 “ man goes about to Consecrate the Holy Sacra-
 “ ment, it is an ineffective Hand, she Sins for
 “ attempting it; and cannot do it afterwards;
 “ and it were wiser and truer, if Men will think
 “ the same thing of their giving Baptism, unless
 “ they will confess that to Baptize Children is a
 “ mere Natural and Secular Action, to which
 “ Natural Powers are sufficient; or that Women
 “ have receiv'd Spiritual Powers to do it, and
 “ that whether a Priest or a Woman do's it, is no
 “ difference, but matter of Order only. If an
 “ Effect be Spiritual, the Agent must be so too;
 Thus far that Great Bishop: And if his Rea-
 sons are good against Womens Baptizing, as
 I think they are, they will be as good to all
 Intents and Purposes against a Man's presu-
 ming

ming to do the like without the *Divine Commission*; because, he is equally destitute of a Spiritual Power, and *in fact* is as little in Holy Orders as she.

VIII. The last Objection that I shall mention is, what some Great Men have made use of, to Establish the Validity of *Lay-Baptism*; and that is, That tho' it was a Sin for the Two Hundred and Fifty Princes to offer Incense; yet by even that Sinful Offering, the Censers, wherewith they offer'd, *were hallow'd*; and God himself declared them to be so, *Numb. 16*. In like manner, tho' it be a Sin for *Lay-men* to Baptize, yet the Person so Baptiz'd is thereby Hallow'd and Sanctify'd; and consequently such a Baptism is Valid.

Ansiv. This Objection has no manner of Force for the purpose design'd, because 'tis not in the least parallel to Christian Baptism; for the Censers (mere senseless things) were capable of no *Supernatural Spiritual Graces and Privileges* to be *enjoyed* by them, by virtue of that Offering; but the Objects of Baptism, Sensible, Rational, and Immortal Souls, are to be possess'd of, and to be made happy by, such unspeakable Benefits and Advantages as are annex'd to Baptism. The Censers were wholly Passive; but the Baptiz'd Person is not so, for even in Infancy he is Active by his Sponsors; and when he comes to Years, must be so in his own Person. The Censers, tho' they were hallow'd, yet they were not hal-
low'd

low'd to the same purpose, as the Censers wherewith *Aaron* offer'd Incense; for God did not order those Two Hundred and Fifty Censers to be continu'd, for the *same use* to which those Sinners put them, but requir'd them *to be made broad Plates for a Covering of the Altar: To be a Memorial unto the Children of Israel, that no Stranger which is not of the Seed of Aaron come near to offer Incense before the Lord,* (Numb. 16. 39, 40.) So that, if these Censers are a Parallel Instance for Persons Baptiz'd by *uncommission'd* Pretenders, then, the use that God order'd them to be put to, should teach us to make a like use of such Sinfully-Baptiz'd Persons, *viz.* To make them Memorials to all Christians, that none who are *not Commission'd* by Christ, should dare to come near to Baptize in the Christian Church: But how shall such Sinfully-baptiz'd Persons become such Memorials so effectually, as by renouncing their false, and receiving true Christian Baptism from Christ's Authoriz'd Ministers, and thereby frustrate as much as they can, the presumptuous *Usurpations* of those who have no Divine Mission for so great a Ministration? This is the most proper Inference that can be drawn from these Censers, with respect to such as are unlawfully Baptiz'd: Tho' after all, they have nothing in them that can with any Coherence, be justly adapted to the Institution of Christian Baptism, or any one Essential Part thereof: The

Two Hundred and Fifty Princes, indeed, if compar'd to the Unauthoriz'd Administrators of Baptism, may be something to the purpose; and so may the Incense, if compar'd to the Water in Baptism: Because, as this, when rightly Administrer'd, is the means of Spiritual Benefits; so Incense, when rightly offer'd, *i. e.* by a Divinely Commission'd Person, was a means likewise of procuring the Favour of God, by making an Atonement, for the Sins of the People. But as for the Censers, they were *only* the Vessels wherein this Incense, the Outward Means of the Atonement, was contain'd; so that they have not the least reference, either to the Person Administring, or the Water of Baptism, or to the Person Baptized; and therefore, if the Objector will have them to be Parallel to any thing at all in this matter, they must be so to the Vessel, which contains the Baptism-Water: And he may make as much use as he pleases of that Parallelism, which is nothing at all to our present purpose.

UPON the Whole; the Grand Design of these Princes was (in opposition to the Establish'd Priesthood) to offer Incense before the Lord, *contrary to a Divine Positive Institution, which confin'd that Action to Aaron and his Sons only.* This Offering being thus unlawful, for want of the Divine Authority of the Persons Administring, was so far from being accepted, that it was a crying Abomination; and instead
of

of procuring a Blessing, either for themselves or their Abettors, drew down upon them swift Destruction; the Princes being immediately consum'd by a Fire from the Lord, and Fourteen Thousand Seven Hundred of their Partizans destroy'd by a Plague. Even so, if any thing about Baptism may be hence inferr'd, we may justly fear, that the Administration of suppos'd Baptism by Non-commission'd Persons, in Opposition to the Divinely establish'd Priesthood of the Christian Church, instead of being a Means of conveying Spiritual Graces and Benefits, to those who *knowingly* receive, or acquiesce in it, will rather exclude both such Giver and Receiver, (tho' they escape God's Judgments here) from the infinite Privileges of his Children hereafter, without a sincere and speedy Repentance.

Some other Objections I have endeavour'd to obviate in the Progress of this Essay, and therefore shall only further declare, that I sincerely believe the Subject of this Discourse to be a Substantial Truth; nay, even a first Principle of Christianity, and that without the couragious Asserting and Vindication thereof, the whole Christian Priesthood and the Divine Authority of it, must be call'd in question (as we see it has lately been in Publick Print) and consequently in time so far deny'd, as to encourage every bold intruder to usurp that Sacred Office and Ministry, even in opposition to that Divine Commission,

which has been constantly handed down from Christ and his Apostles, to this very Day.

I hope therefore that *None who are vested with this Divine Authority*, will fight against it by appearing publicly in opposition to the Subject of this Essay: As for my manner of arguing to defend it, there may be some *undesig'n'd Faults* therein, which I humbly submit to their just Correction, and prudent Censure; hoping they will execute *both*, with so much Wisdom and Conduct, as (to make me see my own Errors, and at the same time) not to prejudice, but add Strength and Cogency to the Cause I have pleaded, which ought by no means to suffer for my *Weakness* in its Defence.

AS for the mere Pretenders to this Divine Authority, I have nothing to say to them or their Followers, but only to desire 'em to take care not to deceive themselves, but seriously to enquire whether there is any Legality in that pretended Commission, by which they Act; which till they can *solidly* prove, I shall always esteem to be utterly Invalid for the Administration of Christian Sacraments. I shall not trouble my self to enter the Lists with them, tho' they quarrel never so much with what I have said; they have Work enough already cut out to their Hands, in those excellent Books which I have mention'd in my Answer to the Third Objection; and to *their Arguments* I refer them for the DIVINE RIGHT OF EPISCOPACY, that they

they may save themselves the trouble of demanding them from me.

IF they shall oppose my Assertion of the Necessity of a Divine Commission to Administer Baptism, they will thereby *Confound* themselves when they affirm that they Baptize by Virtue of such a Commission: And then I shall not think them worth my Answering.

I conclude all with my hearty Prayers to Almighty God, that this my weak Endeavour may be for his Glory, and *that he would keep us from all FALSE DOCTRINE, HERESY AND SCHISM; that all who profess and call themselves Christians may be led into the WAY OF TRUTH, and hold the Faith in Unity of Spirit, in the Bond of Peace, and in Righteousness of Life; and that he would be pleas'd to Illuminate ALL BISHOPS, PRIESTS AND DEACONS, with true Knowledge and Understanding of his Word, that both by their Preaching and Living they may set it forth and shew it accordingly; and rightly and duly Administer HIS HOLY SACRAMENTS, that so JEROBOAM'S PRIESTS may not PROPHANE HIS SERVICE, but that THE SEED OF AARON may still MINISTER before him; to whom, with his Eternal Son, and Holy Spirit, Three Persons, but One God, be ascrib'd, as is most due, All Honour, Praise, and Glory, Might, Majesty and Dominion, by every Creature that is in Heaven and Earth, and under the Earth, For ever and ever Amen.*

APPENDIX.

SINCE the Publication of the First Edition of this Book, I am inform'd, that some Gentlemen of no mean Character, have made further Objections against the Subject thereof, which (because they look very plausible at first sight, and may therefore prejudice too many against what I have propos'd) I shall endeavour here to answer, as briefly and plainly as I can.

Obj. IX. **A**ND First 'tis said, that if Lay Baptism be Invalid, and the Divine Commission to Baptize be convey'd from the Apostles in Episcopacy only, then all those Foreign Reform'd Churches which have no Episcopal Ordination are effectually Unchurch'd, as being (by the Principles asserted by me) destitute of a Christian Ministry, and consequently of Christian Baptism; which is a consequence so dreadful, and even contrary to the Concessions of many Episcopal Divines of the Church of *England*, that none ought to admit of that Doctrine, from which (if granted) so great a mischief must necessarily arise.

Answer. That Lay-Baptism is Null and Void, I humbly conceive, I have prov'd; if not, let the Authors of this Objection shew, either the Insufficiency, or Fallacy of the Arguments I have produc'd for that purpose; otherwise

I shall take it for granted, that they acknowledge such Baptisms to be Invalid; or else, that at best they can give no solid Reasons for their Validity. And therefore, till I hear further from them upon this single Topick, I shall give my self no more trouble about it, but proceed to the conveyance of the Divine Commission to Baptize, and this (supposing Lay-Baptism to be Invalid) can be convey'd from the Apostles in the Christian Ministry only; so that all our Business here, is to know how the Christian Ministry was handed down, and successively continued from the Apostles to our Days, and this will determine who can Administer Valid Baptism.

T H A T the Christian Ministry was conveyed from the Apostles in Episcopacy only, we have a Cloud of Witnesses; First, The Institution of our Saviour himself; Secondly, The Practice of the Apostles, both recorded in the Sacred Oracles of infallible Truth, the Holy Scriptures; Thirdly, all Ecclesiastical History; and Fourthly, the constant and uninterrupted Practice of the Universal Church of Christ in all Ages and Places, for One Thousand Five Hundred Years together from the Apostles Days. These all bear testimony to this great Truth, as has been sufficiently demonstrated by a vast number of the best Christian Writers, particularly some of our own Nation, and that very lately, (*vid. Those I have mention'd in Answer to the Third Obje-*

tion, and another Entitled, The Divine Right of Episcopacy, Printed for Richard Sare, at Grays-Inn-Gate in Holborn, 1708,) who have obviated and answer'd the Objections of all Enemies so excellently well, that it would be no less than Presumption in me, to attempt to say any thing more upon that Subject, after such Learned Authors; to whom therefore I refer the Reader for his satisfaction in this Point, and pass on to consider the Objection it self.

IF then the Premises above-mention'd be true; If Lay-Baptism be Invalid, &c. then (says the Objector) “ *All those Foreign Reform'd Churches, &c. are effectually Unchurch'd, being destitute of a Christian Ministry, and consequently of Christian Baptism.* Why truly, if those Foreign Reform'd are Unchurch'd, upon the truth of those Premises, I cannot help that, 'tis the Objector himself that tells me they are so; and I know of no way for him to help them out of that Difficulty at present, but either to prove the Premises false; or else to perswade them to receive Episcopal Ordination. But 'tis said, “ *this is a dreadful consequence.* It may be so, and very dreadful too, if they are so far Unchurch'd as to be reduc'd to a state of absolute Infidels, which I hope the Objector does not mean when he says they are Unchurched; if he does, I must tell him, that (tho' I am no Latitudinarian) I have more charitable Thoughts

Thoughts concerning Thousands of them than he has, upon the Supposition of their being destitute of Christian Baptism: For I believe Abundance of them may be included in the Number of those whom I have spoke of in the Words of a most Excellent Modern Author; (*towards the End of my Answer to the Fourth Objection*) and that therefore they may very fairly be esteem'd AS MUCH IN THE CHURCH as the *Catechumeni*, or Candidates for Christian Baptism, were us'd to be in the Primitive Times. This, I think, abates much of the Dreadfulness of the Consequence to the Honest and Sincere; but it cannot be hence inferr'd, that their Ministry and Ministrations are Good and Valid; or that they who know their Defects, should concur and communicate with 'em in such their Deviations from the Divine Institutes.

BUT (to proceed) this, says the Objector, is "*even contrary to the Concessions of many Episcopal Divines of the Church of England.*" I suppose he means some of the Writers since the Reformation, who have endeavour'd to make Excuses and Salvo's for the Presbyterian and Lay-Ordinations Abroad: In reference to whom, I must needs say, that 'tis justly to be fear'd they have done more Hurt by such their Concessions, than at the Time of their Writing them they were aware of: For 'tis not to be doubted, that many put a great Value upon the Judgment of such

Learn-

Learned and Good Men, and thereby have been induc'd to believe that such Ordinations are Good and Valid; and consequently, that there's no need for those Foreign Reformed to seek for Episcopal Ordination; whereby too many of the Foreign Teachers themselves are, instead of being cur'd of, confirm'd in their Errors, and (it may be) hinder'd from so much as but Enquiring whether they are in the Right or no. With Submission to better Judgments, such large Concessions of those *many Episcopal Divines* have been not only prejudicial and hurtful to the Reform'd Abroad, but even contrary to the Doctrine and avow'd Practice of the Church of *England*, which they were oblig'd in Conscience, by their Subscription, to support and maintain. For, does she not teach in her 23d Article, That “ *It is not lawful* (therefore 'tis sinful, and contrary to their Institution) *for any Man to take upon him the Office of Ministering the Sacraments, before he be lawfully Call'd and Sent?* And does she not confine this **LAWFUL CALLING AND SENDING**, to **EPISCOPAL ORDINATION**, in the Preface to her Form and Manner of Making, Ordaining, and Consecrating of Bishops, Priests and Deacons? Does she not call this **EPISCOPAL ORDINATION CHRIST'S COMMISSION AND AUTHORITY**; when in her 26th Article she teaches, That the Minister, when he Administers the Sacraments, does it “ *in*
Christ's

“ *Christ’s Name, and by his Commission and Authority?* Is she not so exactly consistent to all this, that she will not admit any of these Foreign Teachers into the Number of her Priests, no nor of her Deacons neither, without Episcopal Ordination? Is not all this so true, that none can deny it? And does she not thereby, as much as may be, prevent all such Concessions, and reprove those who make them, contrary to her Doctrine and Practice? I think she does; and consequently, that her Articles, relating to this matter, are not of so loose and variable a Contexture as some (who ought to know better) have represented them to be, (like a Nose of Wax) that may be wrested to serve any Turn, and defend almost all Contradictious Doctrines and Practices whatsoever; without considering that her Articles, Rubricks and Canons, &c. Concerning the Divine Right of Episcopal Ordination, when duly compar’d with one another, do make the most perfect Harmony and Agreement; and have nothing in them, that is either contradictory or inconsistent to themselves, or disagreeable to the Holy Scriptures, and Practice of the Primitive Church.

IF in the Days of *Jeroboam*, the Son of *Nebat*, who made *Israel* to sin, a Priest of the Tribe of *Aaron* should have undertaken to defend the Validity of the Priesthood which *Jeroboam* had set up; would he not have been justly censurable? Would he not have acted
contrary

contrary to the Principles of the True Church of the *Jews* at *Jerusalem*? Certainly he would; notwithstanding the vastly Superior Numbers in the Ten Tribes who forsook the True Priests, and the Smallness of the Numbers in the Two other Tribes, who would not *follow that Multitude to do this Evil*. And the Reason why he would have been justly blameable, is evident; Because *Jeroboam made Priests of the Lowest of the People, which were not of the Sons of Levi*, 1 Kings 12. 31. For that this (as well as their Idolatry) was his and the Ten Tribes Sin, is evident by *Abijah's* Speech to them, (2 Chron. 13. 9, 10.) *Have ye not cast out the Priests of the Lord, the Sons of Aaron, and the Levites, and have made you Priests after the manner of the Nations of other Lands? &c. But as for us, (i. e. the Members of the True Church of God, the other Two Tribes of Israel) the Lord is our God, &c. And the Priest's which minister unto the Lord, are the Sons of Aaron, and the Levites wait upon their Business.* Here you see that *Abijah* triumphs and glories in the True Priesthood with them, because 'twas that which God himself appointed; and he upbraids the Ten Tribes, for their having set up other Priests, without any Regard to the Divine Institution of the Priesthood. Their mighty Numbers, and the seeming Necessity of their being forc'd thereto by the Secular Power, was no Argument for him to allow of their Priesthood. How much less ought those

those Writers among us to have studied so industriously, as some of them have done, to prove the Validity of their Ministry, who are not One Tenth of the Present Universal Church, and who differ from them and the whole Church throughout all Ages, in not Requiring their Ministers to be Vested with the Divine Authority by Episcopal Ordination.

I A M well aware of what is pleaded by those *Episcopal Divines*; viz. That those Foreign Reform'd were under a Case of Necessity, and some of them say, they are so still. But I am not yet satisfied what they mean by this Case of Necessity: The Church of *England*, whereof those Episcopal Divines are Members, has not declar'd it: The Scripture is wholly silent about it, and (on the contrary) has recorded the Dreadful Punishments inflicted upon some, who (to all Appearance) had a great deal of Reason to plead, that they were under great Circumstances of Necessity, to assume to themselves those Offices, wherein they ministred contrary to the Divine Institutions: As in the Cases of *Saul*, 1 *Sam.* 13. from *Ver.* 8. to *Ver.* 14. and *Uzzah*, 2 *Sam.* 6. 6, 7. So that I am utterly at a Loss to know, how those Writers could discover any Case of Necessity, that *of it self* was sufficient to authorize Men to take upon them the Great Office of Mediating between God and Man. There is not one Instance (that I know of) in all the Sacred Oracles, of any one's being in-

stituted

stated into such an Office, even in the greatest Cases of Necessity, without an explicit Revelation of God's Will, that the Man should act therein, when the ordinary appointed Means of giving him his Commission was wanting. And if the Excusers of those Foreign Ordinations can shew me such an Instance, I shall be very much oblig'd to them if they will be pleas'd to do it.

NAY further; Supposing^d that 'twere possible to determine a Case of Necessity, that might be sufficient to empower Men to administer Valid Sacraments, without Receiving a Commission for so doing, by God's appointed Means of Episcopal Ordination; yet I don't find, that any of the abovesaid Writers have prov'd by good Arguments, that the said Foreigners were ever under such a Case of Necessity, *much less that they are so now*: And till this is prov'd, I see no Reason to be at all concluded by the Writings of even the best of Men, when they make such Proviso's as God has not made, and who can give us no Proof of their being guided in their Dictates by the infallible Spirit of Truth, as the Blessed Apostles and Prophets were.

I KNOW that some do beg the Question, by supposing, " What if the Episcopal
 " Order were utterly Extinct, and no Bishops
 " could be found to confer Holy Orders;
 " must there be no Ministers therefore in the
 " Christian Church? And must the Visible
 " Church

“ Church of Christ cease to have a Being as such in the World? This, at first Proposing, looks to be a very weighty Question; but when we justly reflect on the Divine Veracity, which has infallibly assur’d us, *That Christ will be with his Apostles, (i. e. them and their Successors, the Bishops) always even unto THE END OF THE WORLD;* and that *the Gates of Hades shall never prevail against the Church;* then the Impertinence and Folly of this [*What if*] does immediately discover it self: Because it supposes what in Fact never was, nor ever will be; and therefore needs no Answering because not to be granted. But alas! Supposing that it were (as it is not) possible, for the Church to be universally depriv’d of her Valid Spiritual Fathers, the Bishops; ’tis our Duty, as well as Safety, rather to wait and hope for some New Revelation of his Will, for another Institution of Men to succeed in the Christian Priesthood, than to take it upon our selves by such Ways and Means as he has not hitherto appointed, and which will *therefore* prove ineffectual for the *supernatural* Purposes of his own Divine Institution; (because MAN by his own Authority only, can never make a Human equal to a Divine Institution;) but this Case has never happen’d yet; and therefore, no Society of Men, either past or present, can be at all excus’d upon this suppos’d Foundation.

A-N-D now to conclude all that I have to say to this Objection; no Doctrine whatsoever
can

can be prov'd to be false, by the Mischiefs of those Consequences which necessarily arise from it, when those Consequences themselves are not contradictory to some *previous Truths*; and when Men by either their wilful Sins, or supine Neglects, are *the only Causes* of the Mischiefs of those Consequences, for which Truth and its Assertors are no ways answerable. This I believe is a Maxim that will stand the Test of a strict Examination, and hold good in the Case before us: And I pray God to touch the Hearts of those who are concern'd in it, with a due sense of their Deviations from his Holy Institutes, that they may compleat a *thorough Reformation*; that the Christian Priesthood may recover its Ancient Spiritual Glory; and that we may be all bless'd with the Happiness of a Universal Communion of Saints here in the Church Militant, so as to be intitled to an entire and eternal Union and Communion with the Church-Triumphant in the Kingdom of Heaven.

Obj. X. 'Tis further objected; That if Lay-Baptism be Invalid, then all those who never receiv'd any other Baptism are incapable of Holy Orders, having never been Baptiz'd; and therefore the Orders of several Episcopally Ordain'd Persons among us are Null and Void, and consequently so are all their Ministerial Acts too, because they never receiv'd any other than Lay-Baptism. This will involve the Church into the utmost Confusion; and therefore

fore the Invalidity of Lay-Baptism ought not to be allow'd by any, who value the Order and Peace of the Church.

Answ. THIS Objection raises a Consequence from an uncertain, and it may be a false Foundation; for it takes for granted, that the Unworthiness of a Person to receive Holy Orders, or his being not duly qualified for them, by reason of his being Unbaptiz'd, renders Holy Orders, if conferr'd on him, Null and Void; or, in short, that *want of Baptism Nulls Holy Orders in any Person Ordain'd to the Ministry.* This Assertion does not yet appear easy, if at all to be prov'd, for these following Reasons.

1st. Because there is a vast difference between a Personal Capacity or Qualification, and an Authoritative One. For, a *Personal Qualification* for the Ministry, is, what a Man is bound to be endow'd with, IN COMMON with all other Christians, whether he be Ordain'd to the Ministry or no; and therefore Baptism and Holiness of Life being equally incumbent on all Christians, Ministers as well as Lay-men, may justly be distinguish'd by the Name of *Personal Qualifications.*

BUT an *Authoritative Qualification* for the Ministry is that only, whereby a Man is *separated* and *distinguish'd* from the rest of Mankind, and thereby empower'd to *Personate* and *Represent* the Divine Presence, for the conveyance of Spiritual and Supernatural Benefits to

us. This is what we call the Divine Commission, convey'd from the Apostles in Episcopacy, and given to the Ordain'd Person by Imposition of the Bishop's Hands.

2dly, A *PERSONAL Qualification* may be, and in fact often is *wanting*, when an *Authoritative One* remains Good and Valid; and there's abundance of Reason that it should be so, because, the *Personal Qualification* chiefly respects, the Man himself, who is, or ought to be, possess'd of it, since he only will reap the benefit of having, or find the misery of being destitute of it. But the *Authoritative Qualification*, as such, relates only to God, and the People; to God, as the Minister is to be his *Proxy* and *Representative*; and to the People, as they are to receive from God the Supernatural Benefits of his *Proxy's* Ministrations. The People receive no more advantage from the *Personal Qualification* of God's Representative, than they do mischief from his *Personal Immoralities*; that is, none at all, (except but by their own Learning or Imitation of them,) because they are neither answerable for the one or the other, any farther than as they are Encouragers or Abettors of them: If he be destitute of any such Qualifications, let him look to that, 'tis none of their business with respect to the *Validity of his Ministrations*: All that they are bound to take care of, upon that single account, is, that he be TRULY SENT; and if they are but once secure of that, then

in all his Ministrations they are not to suppose him, but Christ himself (*whom he Personates*) to be Administring to them; for, all Sacraments, *on the Part of the Administration*, are Good and Valid, only upon this ONE FOUNDATION; without this, of Christ the Great High Priest's Administring; either himself in Person, or by his Proxy, all Christian Sacraments must fall to the Ground, and be of no use or advantage to Mankind: And therefore if we can but solidly, *i. e.* upon good Foundation, believe, that *he* does thus Administer to us, we need never concern our selves with the *Personal Qualifications* of his Representative, for the Validity of those Administrations, which receive their whole Efficacy from the *Authoritative Qualifications* of Christ himself, who has promis'd to make good, and confirm them, when perform'd by *one whom he has sent*.

TO Exemplify all this in the Case before us: Holiness of Life is requir'd as a Personal Qualification, previous to Holy Orders: This is evident from St. Paul's Epistles to *Timothy* and *Titus*; and yet 'tis well known, that our Lord himself chose *Judas Iscariot*, a covetous Thief, and one whom he himself branded with the Name of *a Devil*; I say, 'tis well known, that he chose this wicked Wretch to be no less than *an Apostle*, and sent *him* to Preach and Baptize, to cast out Devils, and to heal the Sick, as well as the rest of the Apostles; for which Reason, all his Ministerial Acts were

Good and Valid, notwithstanding his being destitute of the *Personal Qualification of Holiness of Life*; and 'tis universally acknowledg'd, that the same is true of all other wicked Bishops, Priests, and Deacons whatsoever, otherwise we could never be satisfied with the Validity of Ordinations in any Age of Christianity. And therefore, tho' Holiness of Life is a *necessary Personal Qualification* for the Ministry, because of great Edification to the People, &c. Yet if a truly Ordained Minister should be a wicked Man, the People ought not to suspect the Validity of his Ministrations by reason of the Wickedness of his Life, because, 'tis Christ that Administers by him as *his Proxy only*, and Christ's Ministrations are certainly Good and Valid; let his visible Representative be never so wicked, he himself (and not the People, except they concur with, and encourage him in his Wickedness,) must answer for that. This is exactly agreeable to the 26th Article of the Church of *England*; and therefore there is no need longer to insist upon it, but to proceed to Baptism, another *Personal Qualification* for Holy Orders.

IT is certainly the indispensable Duty of *Every Minister* to be Baptiz'd, as well as to be personally Holy, because 'tis a Divine Law to which all ought to pay Obedience. For which Reason I cannot omit commending the laudable Custom of the Church of *Rome*, who (tho' Corrupt and scandalously Wicked in other Matters,

Matters, yet) requires her Candidates for Holy Orders to prove their Baptism, before they can be admitted into the Ministry: And I should heartily rejoice to see the Governors of the Church of *England* require the same of her Candidates for the Ministerial Function, who, 'tis to be fear'd, ever since the Reformation, have never been enjoyn'd to bring Certificates of their Baptism, as well as of their Good Behaviour and Christian Conversation. This Omission, I charitably believe, proceeded only from an Opinion, *that none would presume to enter into Holy Orders before they were Baptiz'd, and that therefore 'twas needless to require a Proof of their Baptism*: But however, if this Custom had been preserv'd, 'tis reasonable to believe, that the *English* Clergy would (some of them) have been more strict in keeping their *Parish-Registers* of Persons Baptiz'd by Lawfully Ordain'd Ministers, and not have suffer'd Schismatical *Lay-Baptisms* to have been Register'd among the *True Baptisms*, as 'tis now scandalously practic'd in some Places, to the great Grief of many, and I hope almost all *English* Clergymen, who have constantly oppos'd this *unwarrantable Practice*, and will (to their Praise be it spoken) never suffer such *Registers* to be made in their Parish Books. I say, if this good Custom of requiring Certificates of their Baptism had been continu'd, 'tis very likely, that no Lay-Baptiz'd Person would have got such a Certificate from the

Minister of any Parish ; because a Minister's giving such a Certificate, would have been a publishing of his own fault, in making a Register that is contrary to the Laws and Customs of the Church ; for he must have mention'd the Lay-man's Name, who was said to have Baptiz'd the Person, and thereby have declar'd, that he himself took part with *Schismaticks*, and consequently must have incurr'd the Penalties of the 10th and 57th *Canons of the Church of England* : And this might have been an effectual means of preserving the Registers entire, and consequently of keeping out of the Ministry, those who receiv'd Baptism from Lay-Preachers ; no other Lay-men being at least now so presumptuous, as once to pretend to Baptize. But this only by way of Digression.

AND now to return ; Christian Baptism is certainly a *Personal Qualification* for Holy Orders ; and that it is no more than a *Personal One*, I infer from hence, because all Christians are EQUALLY bound to be Baptiz'd, Ministers as well as People ; and it cannot be prov'd, that it is more the Duty of the one than of the other to be Baptiz'd : If it be said, Yes it is, because there must of necessity be a Christian Minister, before there can be a Baptiz'd Lay-man ; this is not deny'd : It is certainly true there must be so ; but it does not therefore follow that he is not a Christian Minister if he is Unbaptiz'd ; for 'tis not his Baptism, but

but the Commission that makes him a Christian Minister, *or one set apart to Minister in the Divine Offices of the Christian Religion.* His being Baptiz'd is not *his Commission*; for, if it is, then all Baptiz'd Persons are, as such, *Commission'd Officers* of the Church; and so there is no need of any other *Ordination*, which is absurd, and contrary to the Principles upon which this Objection is rais'd. Again, His being Baptiz'd, is no Instituted *Essential Part of his Commission*; for, if it be, then all Baptiz'd Persons, as such, have One Instituted *Essential Part of a Commission*, tho' *not a whole Commission*; which is also absurd, because a Commission is but ONE THING, and the *Essential Parts* thereof cannot be separated without Violence and Destruction to the whole; and therefore all Baptiz'd Persons, if they have *One Essential Part of a Commission*, must have the whole; which brings us back to the first Absurdity, and consequently Baptism it self, being no Constituent *Essential Part of his Commission, or Ordination*, He who is Destitute of Baptism, is not by reason of that WANT ALONE, Destitute of Holy Orders. If it be objected, that while he is Unbaptiz'd, he is out of the Church: And how can he, who is not of the Church, admit another by Baptism into the Church? I Answer, Tho' he is out of the Church with respect to any Benefits himself, yet not with respect to the Spiritual Benefits, he has Authority and Commission *mediately* to

convey to others: For, a Man may be a *True Messenger* to carry that Good to another, which he himself neither does, nor ever will enjoy. A Master of a Family may send a Neighbour, or a *Stranger, who is not of his Family*, and give him full Power and Authority to adopt and enter into his Family, some Poor, Destitute, Orphan Children, whom he Commiserates. And tho' that *Stranger* be not of the Family himself, yet his Adopting those poor Children into that Family, stands good; because the Master of the Family *sent and impower'd* him to do it. And this I take to be very parallel to the Case in hand: And therefore he who is not of the Church, because Unbaptiz'd, may *as truly* admit a Person into the Church by Baptism, as he who (tho' Baptiz'd) thro' his Wickedness, is destitute of the Holy Ghost, can convey the Gift of the Holy Ghost by his Ministration of Sacraments to others: For, as 'tis not the *Personal Holiness* of the Administrator, that conveys Holiness to me in the Ministration of any Sacrament; so neither does his having *receiv'd* that Sacrament, signify any thing to me for the Validity thereof, when he Administers it to me *by virtue of a Divine Commission explicitly given to him*. This **COMMISSION ALONE**, is that which makes the Ministration not his, but God's own Act, and as such (*without any other Appendant Cause*) 'tis Good and Valid. Hence our Blessed Lord call'd both Unbaptiz'd and Unholy Men, *viz.*

his

his Apostles, who cannot be prov'd to *have been Baptiz'd in the Name of the Trinity* before his Resurrection ; and one of them, *Judas Iscariot*, a Thief, a Devil in his Disposition, to the Administration of Holy Things, as if he would thereby teach us, to look with Faith on HIS AUTHORITY ONLY, without confiding in any of the best Accomplishments of those on whom he has conferr'd it. And if we do but look back to the Condition of the *Jewish Church*, during their forty Years sojourning in the Wilderness, we shall find that none of them were Circumcis'd in all that space of time ; and tho' the Uncircumcis'd was by God's own Appointment *to be cut off from among his People* ; yet the Ministry of those Priests and Levites, who were born in the term of those Forty Years, was not Null'd and made Void for their want of Circumcision ; which doubtless was as much necessary to qualify them for Holy Orders, as Baptism is now to qualify our Christian Priests.

UPON the Whole ; As neither the *Baptism*, nor *Personal Holiness* of the Minister, can mediate *Baptize* or make us *Holy*, but THE DIVINE AUTHORITY residing in him ; so neither can the *Baptism* or *Personal Holiness* of the Bishop confer Holy Orders, but THE DIVINE AUTHORITY from Christ and his Apostles, visibly convey'd to and residing in him : 'Tis by virtue of THIS ALONE that Holy Orders are given ; and if either the Bi-
shop

shop or Ordain'd Person, or both, have any *Personal Incapacity, viz.* of Wickedness, or want of Baptism, the Fault is their own, and they must answer for it: But as for the Ordination, that must remain Good and Valid, by reason of the External Divine Commission *de facto* given to the Bishop. For, if every *Personal Defect* of what is requir'd, either in the Administrator or Recipient, could Invalidate the Administration, either of Baptism or Holy Orders, we should never have an End of Re-baptizations and Reordinations: Nay, we could never have any Certainty, either of Valid Baptisms or Ordinations, because we should always find but too many Occasions, to call in question the Sufficiency of the Preparations, and Personal Qualifications of both Ministers and People, who are all equally expos'd to the same Human Frailties, and liable to be try'd with the same innumerable Temptations.

A N D therefore I humbly conceive, our best way is (I don't say ONLY but) CHIEFLY to regard, and insist on the Visible Divine Authority and Commission, handed down from Christ and his Apostles, by that ORDER of Men, who have *always* had power to convey it to others; this, with the *Right Matter* and *Form* of Administration, are what we ought to esteem to be the *only Essentials* of Baptism and Ordination, on the Part of the Administration of them; and as for the rest, every one in particular must do his part to the utmost

most of his Power, to secure those Personal Qualifications, which God has requir'd of both Minister and People, under no less Penalty than that of Eternal Damnation, upon the wilful neglect of them.

THUS far I have presum'd to declare my Thoughts, concerning the Uncertainty and (as far as I can see) the Falseness of the Foundation, upon which this whole Objection is rais'd, humbly submitting all I have said in opposition to it, to the better Reasons and Arguments of my Superiors, the truly Ordain'd Ministers of Jesus Christ, whether Bishops, Priests, or Deacons; sincerely declaring, that if any thing has drop'd from me, that is contrary to the Truth of Christianity, I do hereby Recant it, and will do so in a more particular manner, as soon as I can discover my Error.

AND now, whether what I have said against Ordinations, and Holy Ministrations being Null'd for want of Baptism, be true or no; if the Invalidity of Lay-Baptism be a Truth, let every one take care to keep himself from, or extricate himself out of, the mischievous Consequences of it. And if the Nulling of Holy Orders and Ministrations, be a *real Consequence* of this Truth, then there's no other Remedy, but that they who are involv'd in it, should extricate themselves out of it, by *Episcopal Baptism* and *Reordination*. It is not enough to say, that "*This will involve*
" the

“ *the Church into the utmost Confusion*; for, want of Baptism and a Valid Ministry is the most pernicious Confusion, and infinitely greater than what can proceed from such Persons receiving Valid Baptism and Holy Orders; and therefor, if the Premises are true, the Risk must be run; for Truths of so great Importance must not be stifled, and made to give way to suppos'd Confusions; because, whatsoever mischief may arise, can never be the Result of Divine Truth (which is always Good and Beneficial) but of Mens Sins and Impieties, in usurping those Sacred Offices, which they never receiv'd any Commission to Act in. So that, they who value the Order and Peace of the Church, ought not to disallow of the Invalidity of Lay-Baptism, upon the Account of this Consequence, but rather to enquire seriously, whether Divine Revelation gives us any Foundation to believe, that such Baptisms are Good and Valid; and if they are not, whether the Nulling of Holy Orders be a real Consequence thereof; and if it be, they should assert and maintain it to the utmost of their power, nay even to Martyrdom it self, if the defending such a Truth did expose them to it, rather than suffer themselves to be destitute both of a *Christian Priesthood* and *Christian Baptism*.

Obj. XI. BUT others say, that to avoid the fatal Consequences of adhering too rigorously to this Doctrine of Lay-Baptisms being
Invalid,

Invalid, the Authority of the “ Powers Hierar-
 “ chical are very Divine, and the same which
 “ Christ had, not to the violation of his Laws, but
 “ to DISPENSE with them to EDIFICATI-
 “ ON, for which they may be impower’d to Relax
 “ stated Rules in cases that appear necessary or
 “ expedient. And that therefore, tho’ Hereti-
 “ cal, Schismatical, and Mimical Baptisms are
 “ done without, nay, and against the consent of the
 “ Hierarchy, and therefore are not entire, or valid
 “ in themselves, yet they are made so on the Post-
 “ Fact, by the Spiritual Powers, so far, as that
 “ the External Rite shall not be Reiterated; but
 “ as to any Spiritual Graces they are not to be had
 “ thereby, till those defective and Irregular Acts
 “ are supply’d, Righted and Confirmed, by the
 “ Chrism of the Bishop, or Imposition of his Hands,
 “ or such Right by which he shall fix the Person
 “ Baptiz’d into a State of Canonical Union with
 “ the Church. So also, the Validity of Lay-
 “ Baptism, as well to its Internal, as External
 “ Privileges, stands on the Authority of the
 “ Church’s Power to grant such License to Lay-
 “ men in Extremities. All which being con-
 sider’d, Lay-Baptisms ought now to be ac-
 knowledg’d Valid, especially to such as have
 been confirm’d by the Bishop.

W. Answ. THIS Objection is for the most part
 in the very Words of a Learned and Reverend
 Opposer, of One of the most Poysonous Books,
 that, it may be, was ever suffer’d to be Pub-
 lish’d in the Christian World, *falsly Intitul’d,*
 the

the RIGHTS OF THE CHRISTIAN CHURCH ASSERTED. The worthy Author, who has done the Church good Service, in answering that pernicious Book, I dare say, never designed, that any thing in his most Excellent Book should be constru'd to favour our Lay-Baptisms, which are evidently *in Opposition* to the Divine Right of Episcopacy, and for which the Hierarchical Powers of the Church of *England* have provided NO ACT OF CONFIRMATION. So that, in these Nations, our Lay-Baptizers, and their Profelytes, can reap no Benefit by any thing asserted in this Objection.

I HAVE already, under the Corollary of the Third Proposition, declar'd my Reasons against the Dispensing Power pleaded in this Objection; to which I shall further add, That I acknowledge *the Divine Powers of the Hierarchy*; but with this Restriction; That since the Settling of the Canon of the Holy Scriptures, they are for ever limited IN THINGS FUNDAMENTAL to that Rule, from which they have no Authority to deviate, and consequently not to *dispense* with any of the Essentials of Baptism, which (without all doubt) is a Fundamental of Christianity: Such a *Dispensation* must be a *Violation* of Christ's Law; and how that should be to *Edification*, is inconceivable; since Christ, our Great Lawgiver, has provided Fundamentals sufficient for the Edification of his Church, in all Circumstances whatsoever;

ever; and Obedience to his Laws about Fundamentals, is most certainly the best Edification: Otherwise, He who is Omniscient Wisdom it self, would never have made such Laws. And therefore, with Submission, there seems to be no Necessity for Empowering the Governors of the Church “*to relax his Stated Rules, no not in Cases that appear necessary or expedient.*” Besides, if Christ has made Stated Rules for the Essentials of Christian Sacraments, without providing for such pretended Cases of Necessity; the Hierarchical Powers must certainly run a great Hazard of Sin, in attempting to dispense with Things for which he has made no Provision; and the Persons dispens’d with can have *no just Satisfaction* in such Dispensations; especially when the seeming Cause of them is remov’d, as it certainly is in the Case of Persons baptiz’d by Unauthoriz’d Lay-men, contrary to the Stated Rule, who may afterwards obtain Episcopal Baptism agreeable to the Law of Christ, *if the Hierarchical Powers will but give them Leave.*

THIS I say in Opposition to those who affirm, that the Hierarchical Powers ARE “**ACTUALLY ENDOWED** *with Authority to dispense with Christ’s Laws, and to relax Stated Rules, in Cases that appear necessary and expedient*”; which the Learned Author, whose Words they use, does not say. All that he intimates, is only, that they MAY BE empower’d to do so: Which plainly shews, that

that he would not venture to affirm that they *really* are; and 'tis reasonable to believe, that upon Second Thoughts, he will not allow so much, as that they *may be* so empower'd: Because what *may be*, *may not be*, as far as we know. Nay, 'tis more agreeable to Reveal'd Religion, to say, that they *are not* so empower'd; because a Thing of so great Moment would never have been left out of the Divine Oracles, to be handed down to us thro' all Ages, by the UNCERTAIN METHOD of Oral Tradition only. And therefore, 'tis very unsafe for us to truit in such [*may be's*], when the Receiving, or not Receiving, of *Spiritual Supernatural Privileges and Benefits*, depends upon the Truth or Falsity of such a Dispensing Power, as it certainly does in the Administration of Christian Sacraments. "Heretical, Schismatical and Mimical Baptisms, are in this Objection acknowledg'd to be " *not Entire or Valid in themselves*; therefore in themselves they are utterly and entirely Invalid; (*by the Corollary of the Third Proposition.*) It is also said, That " *as to any Spiritual Graces, they are not to be had thereby, till, &c.* Which is a plain Indication, that of THEMSELVES they are of *no Efficacy* to the Purposes of Christian Baptism; the Administration whereof is certainly efficacious for the Conveyance of Spiritual Graces. Again: They are call'd here " *Defective and Irregular Acts*. But why are they *Defective*; except but for their being
uncapable

incapable of producing the proper Effects of true Baptism? And why should they be term'd *Irregular Acts*; except only but for being contrary to the Stated Rule, (or, which is the same) the First Institution of Christian Baptism?

SO that the *External Rite* perform'd by these *Heretical, Schismatical and Mimical Baptizers*, being thus acknowledg'd to be contrary to the *Institution* of Baptism, and utterly incapable in it self of being the Means to convey any *Spiritual Graces*; what has it to do with Christian Baptism? Certainly it must be a mere Nullity, and all one as if it had never been perform'd: Because, if it had no Virtue to confer *Spiritual Graces*, it had no Virtue to confer any *Benefit* at all; for even the outward *Privileges* are no *Privileges*, when separate from the *Spiritual Graces*. Thus, all Persons on whom the said *External Rite* was perform'd, can receive by means thereof none of the *Benefits* of Christian Baptism; which are all *Spiritual and Supernatural*; and consequently, must remain in the State of the *Unbaptiz'd*, till they receive *True Christian Baptism*; which, how they can receive, without repeating the *External Rite* by a *Proper Administrator*, is utterly inconceivable. It is said indeed, That “ *those Defective and Irregular Acts* (*i. e.* the *External Rites* of those *Heretical, Schismatical and Mimical Baptisms*) are *Supply'd, Righted, and Confirm'd*

“ by the Chrism of the Bishop, or Imposition of his
 “ Hands, &c. For Answer to which, I refer
 the Reader to *the Corollary of the Third Propo-
 sition*; and further add, That this is only said,
 and not prov’d; and I believe never will, till
 it can be demonstrated, that, that which be-
 fore was *no Baptism at all* in the Christian Sense
 of the Word, is now made True Christian
 Baptism, (without the Act of Baptization)
 merely by the Bishop’s Chrism, or Imposi-
 tion of his Hands. Either the first External
 Rite was the ONE BAPTISM the Scripture
 speaks of, or it was not; if it was, then it was
 Entire and Valid Baptism, and consequently
 wants no such Act of the Bishop to *supply and
 right it*; but if it was not that ONE BAP-
 TISM, then nothing can make it so, but the
 very Act of Baptization by a Christian Mini-
 ster: For it may with *as much reason* be af-
 firm’d, that Baptism is Administer’d really and
 truly by such Act of the Bishop, to *all other
 Unbaptiz’d Persons* as well as to those; and so
 at last, Baptism it self will be render’d need-
 less, when the want of it can be *so easily supply’d*:
 But no less than a Divine Revelation will suf-
 fice to convince us, that this is true; and till
 that is produc’d, we must continue to believe,
 that not all the Acts of the Highest Created
 Powers on Earth, are sufficient to make that
 which before was no Baptism, to become Chri-
 stian Baptism, without the Act of Baptization
 by a proper Minister, as Christ has appointed

in the Institution: And that consequently, they who never receiv'd any other than Lay-Baptism, are still unbaptiz'd, notwithstanding their being suppos'd to have been confirm'd by the Bishop.

Thus far, upon Supposition that the Ancient Heretical and Schismatical Baptisms were of the same Nature with those of Unauthoriz'd Lay-men's Baptisms; which this Objection seems to represent them to have been; because it says, that they were *not Valid in themselves* — That no Spiritual Graces were to be had thereby, &c. Tho' in truth those Heretical and Schismatical Baptisms were not of the same Nature with Unauthoriz'd Lay-Baptisms; for they were perform'd by Persons who had receiv'd Episcopal Ordination, and so were authorized to Baptize. So that, whatsoever was the Fault of those Baptisms, the Churches who allow'd them, reckon'd that they were *Valid in themselves* (as wanting no *Essential* Part of the Institution) tho' accidentally Criminal, by reason of the Uncharitableness of the Separation of those Hereticks and Schismaticks, who administer'd and receiv'd those Baptisms: And during this Uncharitableness, they reckon'd, that the Baptiz'd receiv'd no Benefit by their Baptism, till they came into the *Unity* of the Church; when, upon their Repentance of, and Absolution from, the Guilt of their Uncharitable Separation, by Imposition of the Bishop's Hands,

the Obstacle was thought to be taken away, which before hinder'd the Benefit of the Sacrament, and so the Graces due to their *Baptism*, if it had been done in Charity, and which were impeded and hinder'd, by reason of their Uncharitableness and Sinful Separation from the Church; upon their Coming into her Unity, took place, and became effectual to their Spiritual Advantage. This was the Opinion of those Churches, who allow'd those Baptisms *to be Valid in themselves*: And how true this their Opinion was, I am not concern'd; because the Baptisms I am disputing, are not such *Heretical* and *Schismatical* Baptisms, but plainly *Unauthoriz'd*; not only *without* any Commission at all, but also *in Opposition* to Episcopacy it self; which those Ancient Churches *never experienc'd*, nor enter'd into any Consultation about.

As for the *Validity* of Lay-Baptism, That it “stands on the Authority of the Church's Power, to grant such License to Lay-men in Extremities;” when it can be prov'd, that Christ has Vested his Church with such a Power, it will necessarily follow, that such Authoriz'd Lay-Baptism, *in Cases of Extremity*, must be Valid upon that Foundation: But even then *our Ordinary Lay-Baptisms* must be Null and Void, because they are destitute of the Plea of *Necessity*, and also of any such Authority given them by the Church, in a Country where Christian Priests are to be had. And therefore,

fore, 'tis in vain to claim any Benefit from the suppos'd Power of the Church; because she her self is suppos'd not to have Authority to exercise this Power, except in EXTREMITIES, which (God be prais'd) we do not yet labour under. But, after all, 'tis dangerous for the Church to give any such Liberty to Lay-Persons for Cases of Necessity, *as some People call 'em*: Because, this would be an Occasion of Destroying the very Unity of the Church, and expose her to the Endless Divisions and Separations, which Hereticks and Schismaticks would make from her. For, if by Virtue of this suppos'd Power, she should once make a Canon to License Lay-men to Administer Valid Baptism in Cases of Extremity, then, such Dividing Hereticks and Schismaticks, calling their pretended *Scruples* and *Tendernesses of Conscience*, by the Name of CASES OF EXTREMITY, would establish the Validity of their Lay-Administrations, upon the Authority of the Church from whom they separate, and vindicate their Oppositions to her, by the Power which she (in such case) would be constru'd by Implication to give unto them. And so every Private Person, after having blinded his Understanding by hearkning to False Teachers, might plead, That he was under a NECESSITY to separate from the Church, by reason that he cannot overcome *his Scruples* about her Doctrine and Worship; and therefore might join himself to

any Congregation he should like best, without the least Fear of Dividing from the Church: Because, *where True Sacraments, with all the Essentials relating thereto, and the Word of God, are, there must be a True Church*; and he could find Proper Sacraments administer'd in these New Congregations even by Lay-Administrators, who would be presum'd to act by *the Authority of the Church her self*. This would be to build the Church and its Unity upon so *precarious* a Foundation, that we should not know what Schism and Causeless Separation mean, tho' the Scripture tells us *there are, and will be such Sins*: And the Apostle's Pronouncing Damnation upon those who are guilty of such Sins, (*Gal. 5. 20, 21.*) would have no Force and Efficacy upon Men's Consciences, if they should once perswade themselves (as they too often do) that they separate *for Necessity*, and can (*upon that very Account*) receive Valid Sacraments from Lay-Hands: And then 'twill be in vain to say, that such Lay-Administrations must be confirm'd by the Bishop, before they can be Valid Sacraments: For it will be demanded, by what Authority the Bishop requires such Administrations to be confirm'd by him? And if good Testimonials from Holy Scripture are not produc'd for this Purpose, the Bishop's *Supplying* and *Righting* such Irregular Acts, will be made a Jest of, and the *Separatists* will conclude themselves as much in the Church as the Bishop himself, while

while they Administer and Receive as good Sacraments as he ; since he cannot prove their Lay-Administrations *necessary* to be *Confirm'd, Righted* and *Supply'd*, by imposition of his Hands, &c. On the contrary, if it had but been constantly asserted and defended, *That the Sacraments of the Christian Church are, by Institution, of such a Nature, that the Christian Priesthood is one Inseparable and Essential Relation to them, or, that the Divine Authority of the Administrator, is AS MUCH and as durable a part of their Institution, as the very Matter, or outward Elements of them.* If Men had been always taught, *that in the Sacraments, the Priest is AS MUCH the Representative of God the Giver, as the outward Elements are of the Graces given, and that consequently, these latter are no Christian Sacraments when separate from God's Authorized Representative the Priest : And that the Church her self cannot by any Authority given to her, alter the nature of these things.* If these Topicks had been constantly insisted on, without *Trimming* to please any Party of *Hereticks* or *Schismaticks* whatsoever ; 'Tis more than probable, that Men would have been much more tender of the Unity of the Church, and more cautious of separating from her, than now we find they are ; since how far soever their vain Curiosity might have prompted them to have follow'd *New fangled Lay-Teachers* to please their itching Ears, yet the Consideration of their being *destitute* of CHRI-

STIAN SACRAMENTS, might have terrify'd them from *withdrawing* from the Communion of the Christian Priesthood, and thereby have prevented, at least, many of those *final Separations* from *the only Salutary Communion*, which abundance of poor Wretches have fallen into, meerly thro' the false notion of better Edification, and a vain belief of being sure to find true Christian Sacraments in Communion with *their New set up Lay-Teachers*. And 'tis justly to be fear'd, that the continual separations from the Church in all Ages, and particularly in ours, have chiefly sprung from this wretched Opinion of the meer *Opus Operatum* of Sacraments being real Sacraments, whether Administer'd by a Priest or a Lay-Man; as if Christ's appointing the Order of Priesthood in the Christian Church, signify'd nothing at all, notwithstanding 'twas the result of the most consummate Wisdom of our Great Lawgiver.

BUT, because 'tis pleaded from Scripture Instances, that Cases of Necessity and Extremity, have taken place of Divine Institutions, and that therefore Baptism, in Cases of extream Necessity, may be Validly Administer'd by a Lay-man, notwithstanding the Institution requires it to be Administer'd by a Priest: And forasmuch, as many Lay-baptiz'd Persons encourage themselves by supposing theirs to be a Case of Necessity, and consequently that they have receiv'd true Christian

ftian Baptifm, I fhall therefore, in Answer to the next Objection fhew, that thofe Inftances produc'd from Scripture are not parallel to Chriftian Baptifm, and that there is nothing in them that can favour Lay-Baptifm, even in Cafes of the greateft Extremity.

Obj. XII. IN the Inftitution of the Paffover, it was appointed that the Jews fhould eat the Pafchal Lamb “ *with their Loins gird-
“ ed, their Shoes on their Feet, and their Staff
“ in their Hand,* Exod. 12. 11. which fignifies a ftanding Pofture: The Church of the Jews afterwards chang'd this Pofture into that of Leaning or Lying along; and our Saviour finding this Cuftom prevail'd in his Days, comply'd with it when he celebrated the Paffover, (*Mat. 26. 20.*) Which plainly fhews, that we may many times comply with the Churches changing even a Divine Inftitution for a Human one; and why not therefore with the Churches allowing of Lay-Baptifm in Cafes of Neceffity? Again, our Saviour reproving the Jews for their over Rigid Niceneff in obferving the Divine Inftitution of the Sabbath, tells them, “ *That David when he had need did
“ take and Eat the Shew-Bread, and gave to them
“ that were with him; which was not lawful for
“ him to eat, neither for them that were with him,
“ but for the Priests alone* (*St. Mat. 12. 4. St. Mark 2. 25, 26.*) making David's Neceffity a fufficient Reason, for difpenfing at that time with God's own Positive Inftituti-

on about the Shew-Bread. And further, our Blessed Lord upon the same occasion reproving the *Jews*, says, that *God will have Mercy and not Sacrifice*, (St. *Mat.* 12. 7.) Which is sufficient to instruct us, that in Cases of Necessity, the Positive Institutions of God himself must be sometimes dispens'd with, for the supply of our Wants, and consequently that Baptism in Cases of Necessity, where a Priest cannot be had, may be Validly Administer'd by a Layman, to supply the Spiritual Wants of those who are Unbaptiz'd.

Ans. THIS Objection consists of so many Particulars, that 'twill be necessary for me to consider it, in the same order wherein it lyes. And,

1st. THE Posture of standing to Eat the Paschal Lamb, was no more than a *Temporary Institution*, peculiar to the Celebration of the First Passover in *Egypt*, the very Night the *Jews* were to depart out of that Country. This is plain, from the Reason of God's appointing them to Eat in such a Posture of Travellers, *in haste, viz.* because he would "*pass through the Land of Egypt that Night,*" and *Smite all the First-born in Egypt both of* "*Man and Beast,*" (ver. 12.) which would have such an Effect upon the *Egyptians*, that they would be very pressing and Urgent upon the Children of *Israel* to depart out of their Country to be rid of their Company, for whose sake they had suffered so many, and great

great Plagues, and were now depriv'd of their First-born, throughout all their Houses and Families: See *Exod.* 12. from *ver.* 29. to *ver.* 34. And, if the Children of *Israel* had not been that Night in such a Travelling Posture, they would not have been prepar'd for so sudden and hasty a Departure, as the distracted and terrify'd *Egyptians* oblig'd them to, whereby they might have been expos'd to abundance of Inconveniencies, both from the Fury of the *Egyptians*, and their own Unpreparedness for a Midnight Journey: And therefore that they might not be thus incommoded, God requir'd them to eat the Paschal Lamb "IN HASTE, "with their Loins girded, and their Shoes on their "Feet, and their Staff in their Hand, to be ready for their Journey at any Warning that should be given them that Night; but after their Departure, the Reason of this Appointment ceas'd, and therefore so did the Appointment it self, and consequently was no longer binding and obliging; and we never find this Travelling Posture repeated in any of the after Celebrations of the Passover: but that it was only a *Temporary Institution*, peculiar to that first Celebration, I appeal to the Learned *Jews* both Ancient and Modern, and also to our best Commentators upon the Place, (see *Bishop Patrick, Grotius, Diodati, Pool's Synopsis, &c.*) to whom I refer the Reader, that I may not be more prolix upon this Subject.

THE Posture of Standing then, being not enjoyn'd to be constantly us'd, *was no Essential Part* of the Institution of the Passover, and therefore 'twas afterwards *indifferent* what Posture the *Jews* should Eat the Paschal Lamb in; for which Reason, their Church certainly had Power to appoint any *innocent Posture* she should think fit; and since *Leaning or Lying along* was determin'd by her, and prevail'd in our Saviour's Days, and he was pleas'd to conform to it, we ought to follow his Example in complying with such Institutions of the Church as are not *contrary* to the Law of God. But this Instance do's not allow us to comply with the Church's CHANGING a Divine Institution for a Human one; because, the Church of the *Jews* did not herein CHANGE a *Divine* into a *Human Institution*; for the Posture of Standing was then *no Divine Appointment because not Essential to the Passover*, and therefore the Church of the *Jews* did not CHANGE this into another Ceremony, but APPOINT the *indifferent Ceremony* of Lying or Leaning, when there was *no Divine Institution* at that time, obliging them to any other Posture.

AND therefore, we ought not, *from the Authority of this Instance*, to comply with the Church's allowing of Lay-Baptism in Cases of Necessity, because, Baptism by a PRIEST is Essential to Christian Baptism, and as much obliging as the Institution of WATER it self, during the utmost term of the Christian Dispensation,

spensation, as I have prov'd under the First and Second Propositions. And a Lay-man's Baptizing to confer supernatural Benefits, is **NO INDIFFERENT CIRCUMSTANCE** in the Power of Man to determine and appoint; as was the Posture of Lying or Leaning along, when the Church of the *Jews* appointed it; and therefore, from that Church's Example, and our Saviour's conformity thereto, no Argument can be drawn to support the Validity of Lay-Baptism, even in Cases of greatest Necessity, because the Quality of the Person who is Authoriz'd to Baptize for Supernatural Purposes, is determin'd by no other than a mere Positive Divine Institution. And no Cases of Necessity whatsoever can determine any other Means for the Conveyance of *Supernatural Benefits*, than what are already reveal'd to us, except God shall be pleas'd to make some New Revelation of his Will for such a Purpose.

2. AS for the Instance of *David*, and his Men's Eating the Shew-Bread; lest Men should from hence encourage themselves to break through all the Divine Laws to supply their Necessities, 'tis necessary to consider, what Circumstances of Necessity will excuse our breaking a mere positive Institution of Religion.

First, T H E N, considering that all God's positive Institutions are appointed for our Obedience, nothing can excuse us from the Breach of any of one them, but some other

MORE INCUMBENT Duty, which at the same time stands in Competition with the positive Duty.

Secondly, THE means of supplying our Necessities, must either be such as are of a *natural Efficiency*, or else efficacious by Virtue of a *Divine Institution*, Administr'd just as God himself has appointed.

BOTH these Circumstances concurr'd in *David* and his Men's eating the Shew-Bread, and not one of them is to be found in Lay-Baptism. For,

1st: THO' by the positive Law 'twas not lawful for any but the Priests to eat it, yet by the Law of Nature, and Reveal'd Religion too, it was necessary to feed the necessitous Hungry; and *David* and his Men wanting Bread, and there being at that time no other to supply their Necessity, (1 *Sam.* 21. 6.) the Priest gave him the Hallow'd Bread, that so the Law of Charity to the Lives of Men, enforc'd by a double Obligation, *viz.* by the Law of Nature and of Reveal'd Religion, might take Place of the *mere positive Law* about the Shew-Bread, which had no other Obligation than from the positive Institution only, with which the said Law of Charity stood at that time in competition: and this is exactly agreeable to what the Learned Dr. *Hammond* says, in his Paraphrase upon St. *Matth.* 12. 3, 4. which, because so very apposite to this purpose, I shall here transcribe for the Reader's Information:

His

His Words are these, “ Remember the Story of
 “ David, 1 Sam. 21. 6. and by that you will
 “ discern that the Case of Hunger was excepted,
 “ and reserv’d in the Law concerning Holy-
 “ Days or Things: For there David and his
 “ Company being press’d with Hunger, were by
 “ the Priest allow’d to Eat the Shew-Bread;
 “ which being Consecrated, did particularly belong
 “ to the Priest, Levit. 24. 9. Yet might, it seems,
 “ (by the Intention of the Law-giver) be by him
 “ employ’d in any Charitable Use, for the Relief
 “ of others, as long as there were more ready Con-
 “ secrated for the sacred Uses, 1 Sam. 21. 5.
 “ and accordingly, tho’ the Priest pretended not
 “ to dispense with any (so much as Ritual) Part
 “ of God’s Law (as appears by the Exception in-
 “ terpos’d by him, Ver. 4. If the Young Men
 “ have kept themselves from Women) yet he
 “ doubts not to give them freely of the Consecrat-
 “ ed Bread; thereby assuring us, that it was as
 “ Lawful for the Priest to give some Part of the
 “ Consecrated Bread to relieve the Hungry, as to
 “ Eat it himself; and so that in the Law of Holy
 “ Things, not being touch’d by any but the Priests,
 “ the Case of Hunger or Distress was reserv’d,
 “ in which it might by the Priest be lawfully given
 “ to others. Thus far that Learned Author.
 But nothing of all this occurs in Lay-Bap-
 tism: for the positive Law requires that Bap-
 tism should be administred by a Priest of
 God’s Appointment; and there is no Law of
 but equal, much less of greater Obligation,
 that

that requires a Lay-Man to Baptize at all: Natural Religion does not oblige him to Baptize; because Baptism is no Part of Natural Religion: And as for Reveal'd Religion, That has not requir'd him to Baptize; and therefore, in Cases of greatest Necessity, if he does Baptize, he acts *without any Duty incumbent on him*, contrary to a positive Institution, which is no ways consistent with this Instance of *David* and his Men.

2dly, THE Means of supplying the Necessity of *David* and his Men was Bread, which has a Natural Physical Efficiency to satisfy Hunger, and consequently to preserve Human Life; but Baptism has no Natural Physical Power to convey to us the *Forgiveness of Sins*, and *the Gift of the Holy Ghost*: Its Efficacy for such Supernatural Purposes depends only on a positive Institution, and therefore, *is not at all parallel* to the Instance of the Shew-Bread; and consequently, under this Second Rule, nothing can be inferr'd from *David* and his Men's Eating that Bread, to a Lay-man's Administring Valid Baptism: because they are things of quite different Natures and Effects, and no ways applicable to one another. So that to bring Lay-Baptism to this Second Rule, it must be prov'd Efficacious *by Virtue of a Divine Institution, Administred just as God himself has appointed*: But this can never be done, because there is *no Divine Institution of Lay-Baptism*.

IN short, to sum up all that I have said, or need to say, about this Instance of the Shew-Bread: Bread, before 'twas set apart for Sacred Uses, was common for all Men to Eat for the satisfying of their Hunger; but the Administration of Baptism for *Supernatural Purposes* was never thus common: The Priests giving the Shew-Bread, when *no other was to be had*, was then an Act of Charity, to which he was oblig'd by the very Law of Nature, enforc'd by the Reveald Will of God: But Lay-Baptism is no Duty incumbent on us, either by the Law of Nature, or Reveald Religion; the Law of Nature dictates nothing to us about Baptism for Supernatural Purposes, and Reveald Religion is wholly silent about *Lay-Baptism* for such Ends: The Shew-Bread had a Physical Natural Efficiency to satisfy Hunger, and preserve Life; and therefore the Priest had encouragement to give it, because he had no reason to doubt of its good Effect; but Baptism has no Natural Physical Efficiency for Supernatural and Spiritual Graces; its Effects are purely owing to a Positive Institution only; and therefore we have no encouragement to hope for its Effects, when the Institution is not observ'd in all its Essential Parts, as it certainly is not, when a Layman Administers. Further, in the Eating of the Shew-Bread there was *no Contradiction*; the Priest did not give it to be Eaten contrary to the Positive Institution, with a design by

fo doing to obferve the fame Positive Inftitution; but in Lay-Baptifm there's a perfect Contradiction: The Positive Inftitution of Baptifm is broken, that by fo doing, the fame Positive Inftitution may be obferv'd and kept whole. From all which 'tis very clear and evident, that the Eating of the Shew-Bread, and the Adminiftration of Valid Baptifm (in Cafes of Neceffity) by a Lay-hand, are things infinitely different in their Nature, and confequently not at all applicable the one to the other. To which I beg leave to add, that the Eating of the Shew-Bread was NO AUTHORITYATIVE ADMINISTRATION *for the conveyance of Supernatural Graces*, as Valid Baptifm moft certainly is: And therefore 'tis no wonder, that God put a good Conftitution upon *David* and his Men's Eating that Bread to fatisfie their hunger, when no other was to be had; and yet upon all occafions, feverely punifh'd the *Sacrilegious Ufurpations* of every one that attempted to officiate in fuch Authorityative Adminiftrations, as he had appointed for the conveyance of Spiritual Benefits; the *great Neceffities* that urg'd them thus to officiate, were never admitted or allowed of, fo much as but to mitigate their Crime, much lefs to make their Adminiftrations Valid: This is apparently evident in the *Case of Saul's* taking upon him to offer a *Sacrifice* in his great Diftrefs, when his Enemies were coming upon him, when he might have been flain before he

could

could make his peace with God, when the Priest *Samuel* was not present; when he had waited and strove so long, that he at last forc'd himself to offer a Sacrifice to procure the Divine Favour. We see, that all this **NECESSITY** and the **ABSENCE OF THE PRIEST**; this eager desire to obtain a Blessing; was no excuse for his assuming the Priest's Office; God would and did punish him for it, by rending the Kingdom from him, and giving it to another, as you may see in *1 Sam. 13*. This is a standing Example, upon which we should always fix our Eyes, and thereby learn, that however God may excuse in some cases of Necessity, he will never do it in such great Instances, as the taking upon our selves to Administer, or willingly concurring with those who do Minister in the Priest's Office, without being *called of God, as was Aaron*.

3. A S for that other Text, where 'tis said *I will have Mercy and not Sacrifice*, it will as little serve for the Validity of Lay-Baptism as the rest. For the occasion of our Saviour's using those Words, and the place of Scripture from whence he quoted them, do evidently prove, that the Design of this Text is only to convince us, *that such Positive Institutions as are here call'd by the Name of SACRIFICE, were never appointed to frustrate and make void our Obligation to the Genuine Moral Duties of Natural Religion, particularly those of Justice and Equity, and of compassion and charity to the*

Necessities and Wants of our Fellow-Creatures; but that on the contrary, our Want of such Excellent Moral Virtues, and our being of an unjust, uncharitable and cruel temper, will make those Positive Duties when perform'd by us, both loathsome and abominable in the sight of God.

THIS I say is evident, First, from the occasion of our Saviour's referring the Jews to that Text, "*I will have Mercy and not Sacrifice*"; for the Disciples being hungry plucked the Ears of Corn on the Sabbath-Day, which the *Pharisees* observing, affirmed, that it was a Breach of the Sabbath, and therefore unlawful for them to do at that time; but our Saviour (who very well knew the barbarous Cruelty of their temper) bid them remember the Case of *David* and his Men's Eating the Shew-Bread, &c. and then tells them, "*If ye had known what this meaneth, I will have Mercy and not Sacrifice, ye would not have condemn'd the GUILTLESS*, St. Mat. 12. 7. Whereby he prov'd the Innocence of his Disciples, that they had not at all broken the Sabbath, by thus plucking the Ears of Corn to assuage their hunger; and that consequently, the *Moral Duties* of Mercy, and Works of absolute Necessity, were never intended by the Positive Institution of the Sabbath, to be reckon'd as Breaches of the Duty of Rest, which God requir'd on that Holy Day.

2dly. THE Place of Scripture from whence our Lord quoted those Words is *Hosea* 6. 6. *I desired*

desired Mercy and not Sacrifice. This does not mean that God did not require Sacrifice; for 'tis plain that he did require it, and all other Positive Duties signified by that general Word; and the *Jews* at that very time were bound to observe and obey all the Positive Institutions of the Mosaic Law, under no less penalty than that of "*Cursed be he that confirmeth not all the Words of this Law to do them*" Deut. 27. 26. So that the *not Sacrifice* here must mean [NOT ONLY SACRIFICE] or [NOT SACRIFICE ALONE] and therefore, the plain Paraphrase of this Text is, "*I desir'd or Requir'd*" "NOT ONLY SACRIFICE, *not only your*" "*Obedience to my mere Positive Institutions, but*" "*also your Obedervance of my Moral Law of Mercy*" "*and Kindness.*" 'Twas the want of this and other Moral Virtues, together with their being guilty of cruel Murders, Robberies, and other Immoralities, that God complain'd of, almost throughout this whole Chapter, and for which he abhor'd their very Sacrifices, tho' they were of his own Appointment, and they were then bound and oblig'd to offer them to him: This is also confirm'd by *Micah*. 6. and *Isa.* 1. 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, &c. All which being duly consider'd, sufficiently declares the sense and meaning of [*I will have Mercy and not Sacrifice,*] that the design thereof is not to make void our Obligation to obey the Divine Positive Institutions; but to convince us, that the *Moral Duties of Natural Religion,* rein-

forc'd by Divine Revelation, are so far from being inconsistent with, that they must constantly accompany and attend our Obedience to, such Positive Institutions, and that our Approaches to God in his Positive Institutions, without such Moral Virtues, are so far from being accepted that they are hated and abhorr'd by him.

AND therefore, all that (at most) can be inferr'd from those Words of our Saviour is, that *when a mere Positive Institution stands in necessary Competition with a Moral Duty of natural Religion, reinforc'd by Divine Revelation, then the mere Positive Institution must give way to the Moral Duty for that time and circumstance.*

NOW then, to try to apply this to the Case before us. There's a Divine Positive Institution, requiring Baptism to be Administer'd by One who has Christ's Commission for so doing. This Baptism is appointed to be a Means of conferring such merciful Graces and Benefits, as our miserable Nature could never have made any claim or title to, and which all the powers of Nature could never have bestow'd on us. It happens, that a Person wanting these inestimable Benefits most earnestly desires to obtain them by Baptism; but a Minister with Christ's Commission, is neither now, nor likely hereafter to be had: What then must be done in this extream Necessity? Why, says the Objector, *God will have Mercy and not Sacrifice*: And therefore, since

since Sacrifice now stands in competition with Mercy, the Sacrifice must give way to Mercy; the Divine Authority of the Administrator must not now be insisted on; but the Mercies and Favours must be bestowed on the Person by a Lay-man's Administring Baptism to him. This seems to be well said; but upon examination 'twill be found, that no such thing can be justly inferr'd from this Text, because, the *Mercy* there spoken of, is a *Moral Duty* of Natural Religion, and to be extended to the Indigent and Necessitous by *Natural Means*; but the *Mercies* to be receiv'd by Christian Baptism are infinitely above all *Natural Religion*, and consequently not to be convey'd by any *Natural Means*. The reason why we are oblig'd to perform those Natural Acts of Mercy, even when they seem to run counter to some mere Positive Institution, is because *Natural Conscience* dictates this Duty, and *Divine Revelation* has reinforc'd its Obligation; whereas we are bound to observe a *Positive Institution* merely upon the account of a Divine Law promulg'd to us, without which we could never have been oblig'd to the Observation of it. But this Reason is wholly wanting in Lay-Baptism; for *Natural Conscience* dictates nothing to us about bestowing of *Supernatural Mercies* by means of any kind of Baptism whatsoever; and as for Reveal'd Religion, that is wholly silent about a Lay-man's being ever capable of conveying such Mercies to us by Means

of Baptism ; so that the Lay-man has this Duty incumbent on him neither by the Law of Nature, nor of Divine Revelation ; and therefore, if he baptizes for Spiritual Purposes, *that he may shew mercy*, he ventures to do otherwise than the Positive Institution of Baptism requires, and at the same time is destitute of any the least Encouragement from the Text objected ; because there is no Law (either Natural or Reveal'd) that obliges him so to do.

BUT further : When God will *have mercy, and not sacrifice*, it is not intended that one or more Essential Parts of a mere Positive Institution, should be more necessary and obliging to us than the other Essential Parts thereof : No ; all that God then requires of us is, to prefer a Moral before a mere Positive Duty ; as is evident from what I have already said on this Subject. But our Assertors of the Validity of Lay-Baptism in Cases of Necessity, do unavoidably run themselves into this Inconsistency, of making one or more Essential Parts of a mere Positive Institution, to be of greater *Necessity* and Obligation, than another Essential Part of the same Institution : For, they make *Water* and *the Form of Baptism* to be more necessary and obliging, than the *Divine Authority* of the *Administrator*. But this Notion I have already endeavour'd to confute in the *Second Proposition*, to which I refer the Reader ; and desire him here to observe,

serve, how very disagreeable this is with God's requiring *Mercy*, a Moral Duty, and *not Sacrifice*, a mere Positive one. For 'tis in effect to make God say, [instead of, *I will have Mercy, and not Sacrifice,*] *I will have Sacrifice, and not Sacrifice*; since there is not one of those Essential Parts of Baptism, but what is merely of Positive Institution. This, of making one Essential Part of such an Institution to give way to the other Essential Parts thereof, in Cases of Necessity, without a particular Revelation of God's Will for so doing, is so strange, so Unscriptural a Practice, that there is not One Example of it in all the Sacred Writings of the Old and New Testament, from the first Chapter of *Genesis* to the last of the *Revelations*: But on the contrary, we have a flagrant Instance of God's Punishing this Practice in the Person of *Saul*, who in his NECESSITY, that he might obtain MERCY, made one Essential Part of a Positive Institution to give way to another of its Essential Parts. For the Priest, one Essential Part of the Positive Institution of Burnt-Offerings, being absent, he reckon'd the Burnt-Offering to be more Essential than the Administration of the Priest, and therefore offer'd a Burnt-Offering himself; for which rash Action, *Samuel* said to him, *Thou hast done foolishly, (i. e. wickedly) thou hast not kept (but hast broken) the Commandment of the Lord thy God, &c. — Thy Kingdom shall not continue, &c.*

1 Sam. 13. 11, 12, 13, 14. Here his Endeavour to obtain Mercy, by means of *but Part of a mere Positive Duty*, is, notwithstanding the Urgency of his Necessitous Circumstances, branded with the Name of a foolish wicked Action: And because 'twas not attended with the other Essential Part, *viz. the Ministration of the Priest*, was so far from being esteem'd a Valid Offering to God, that it prov'd (instead of a Means of Mercy) a Judgment and a Curse to the Offerer and his Posterity.

THUS we see, that tho' God will have us sometimes extend our *Mercy* rather than offer *Sacrifice*; yet when MERCY is to be obtain'd FROM HIM *by means of Sacrifice*; i. e. such mere Positive Duties as he has requir'd, he will not grant us the Mercy we sue for, by means of *but Part of such Sacrifice*. No; we must either beg it of him by our Observance of the *whole Institution*; or else, when we CANNOT have the whole, sit down contented till we can, since he has declar'd his Abhorrence of such *Partial Sacrifices*, and thereby taught us that they are *no Sacrifices at all*. 'Tis worth while to observe here, what *Samuel* tells *Saul*, (after he had reprov'd him for Breaking God's Commandment about Burnt Offerings;) *For now (says he) would the Lord have established thy Kingdom upon Israel for ever*, 1 Sam. 13. 13. — As much as if he had said, “ *If thou haast not attempted*

“ to gain the Divine Favour by so unwarrantable
 “ an Action; if thou hadst been patient in thy
 “ Necessity, and not endeavour’d to render God
 “ propitious to thee by such an unlawful Method;
 “ He is a God of Mercy, and would not have
 “ imputed Sin to thee for want of a Burnt-Of-
 “ fering, when it could not be had according to
 “ his Institution; but on the contrary, would
 “ have esteem’d thy not Medling therein, to be
 “ an Act of Obedience to his Command, and con-
 “ sequently (tho’ there had been no Burnt-Offering
 “ made to him) would have been gracious and
 “ merciful to thee and thy Children after thee;
 “ and as a Reward of thy Faith and Obedience,
 “ would have establish’d the Kingdom to thee and
 “ thy Sons for ever.” This, I say, is plainly
 the Scope and Meaning of *Samuel’s* Words to
Saul: Whereby we are also encourag’d not to
 distrust the Divine Goodness, but constantly
 and patiently to wait and pray for it, without
 presuming to endeavour to obtain it by *partial*
Sacrifice, when we are under such sad Circum-
 stances, as not to be able to seek for it by
whole Burnt-Offerings; when we cannot have
 ENTIRE BAPTISM, according to the In-
 stitution; when there is no Priest to Admini-
 ster it to us; then ’tis a greater Act of Faith
 and Obedience to refuse, than to accept of
 supposed Baptism from a Lay-Hand Nay,
 for one who knows the Nature and Extent of
 the Institution of Christian Baptism, to ac-
 cept of, or acquiesce in Lay-Baptism in Cases
 of

of suppos'd Necessity, 'tis a great Presumption: Because, 'tis expecting God's Mercy to be convey'd by such Hands, as *he has not appointed for that Purpose*, and to whose Ministration he never requir'd our Obedience: 'Tis the Superstition of making that absolutely necessary to Salvation, which God has not made so. As if when we WANT those Means which he has appointed, he could not extend his Favours and Graces without them: As if there were a *greater Degree* of Holiness in Water and a Form of Words, than in the Institution of the Christian Priesthood: As if none could be saved without the former, but every body without the latter: As if Water could be a Means of Graces *given*, without the Mediation of one who does truly *personate* God the *Grver*. In short, 'tis Superstition, nay, and Presumption too, to expect Mercy by means of but P A R T of a Sacrifice, when God appointed that the W H O L E should be the Means of obtaining that Mercy. And 'tis so exactly parallel to *Soul's Case*, and so infinitely different from the Design of the Text objected, that we may very fairly conclude, that Lay-Baptism cannot be Valid, even in Cases of Necessity. It cannot be sufficient, "*to supply the Spiritual Wants of those who are Un-*" *baptiz'd*; because there's no Comparison between the *Natural Means* of Administring to the ordinary Wants of the Necessitous and Indigent, and the *Supernatural Appointed Means*

of

of supplying the *Spiritual Wants* of the Unbaptiz'd: For these latter are of so extraordinary a Nature, than no less than Mercies Supernatural are sufficient for so great a Purpose; and therefore no other Method must be used to obtain such Mercies, than what he who is to bestow them has appointed. *Obedience* (in this Case) is better than *Sacrifice*, especially than such a false Burnt-Offering as *Saul* (in the Instance above-mention'd) presum'd to offer to God. And may we all take warning by his Punishment, not to confine God to our Will-Worship; not to meddle in his Positive Institutes, and expect that he should concur with our foolish and presumptuous Interposing, in such Ministrations as he has confin'd to the Authority and Administration of his and his Christ's Appointed Priests and Ministers only.

Obj. XIII. The Exposition of the 39 Articles of the Church, which goes under the Name of *Gilbert Bishop of Sarum*, has this Remarkable Passage upon the 23d Article; Page 259, and 260. *Viz.* “ It is to be consider'd,
 “ that the High-Priest among the Jews, was the
 “ Chief Person in that Dispensation; not only
 “ the Chief in Rule, but he that was by the Di-
 “ vine Appointment to Officiate in the Chief Act
 “ of their Religion, the yearly Expiation for the
 “ Sins of the whole Nation, by which Atonement
 “ was made for the Sins of that People.—
 “ HERE IT MAY BE VERY REASO-
 “ NABLY

“ NABLY SUGGESTED, *That since none*
 “ *besides the High-Priest might make this Atonement*;
 “ *then no Atonement was made, if any*
 “ *other besides the High-Priest should so Officiate.*
 “ *To this it is to be added, That God had by an*
 “ **EXPRESS LAW** *fixed the High-Priesthood*
 “ *in the ELDEST of Aaron’s Family; and that*
 “ *therefore, tho’ that being a Theocracy, any*
 “ *Prophet empower’d of God might have transferr’d*
 “ *this Office from one Person or Branch of*
 “ *that Family to another; yet without such an*
 “ *Authority, no other Person might make any*
 “ *such Change. But after all this, (not to mention*
 “ *the MACCABEES, and all their Successors of the*
 “ *Asmonean Family) as Herod had begun to change*
 “ *the High-Priest at Pleasure, so the Romans not only*
 “ *continued to do this, but in a most mercenary manner,*
 “ *they set this Sacred Function to Sale. Here were as*
 “ *great Nullities in the High-Priests that were*
 “ *in our Saviour’s Time, as can be well imagin’d to be.*
 “ *For the Jews keeping their Genealogies so exactly as*
 “ *they did, it could not but be well known in whom the*
 “ *Right to this Office rested; and they all knew that he*
 “ *who had it, purchas’d it; yet these were in fact*
 “ *High-Priests: And since the People could have*
 “ **NO OTHER,** *the Atonement was still perform’d*
 “ *by their Ministry. Our Saviour owned Cajaphas, the*
 “ *Sacrilegious and Usurping High-Priest, (Joh. xviii.*
 “ *22, 23.) and as such he prophesied (Joh. xi.*
 “ *31.): This shews, That where the Necessity*
 “ was

“ was Real and Unavoidable, the Jews were
 “ bound to think that God did, in Consideration
 “ of that, dispense with his own Precept. This
 “ may be a Just Inducement for us to believe,
 “ That whensoever God (by his Providence)
 “ brings Christians under a Visible Necessity, of
 “ being either without all Order and Joint Wor-
 “ ship, or of Joining in an Unlawful and Defiled
 “ Worship, or Finally, of breaking thro’ Rules and
 “ Methods, in order to the being united in Wor-
 “ ship and Government; That of these Three,
 “ of which one must be chosen, the last is the
 “ least Evil, and has the fewest Inconveniencies
 “ hanging upon it, and that therefore it may be
 “ chosen.” — Thus far the Expositor. After
 whom comes another Writer, and applies all
 this to the *Positive Ministrations* of the Chri-
 stian Priesthood; and from hence would
 conclude, That the Baptisms of our Anti-
 Episcopical Dissenters, and of some Foreigners
 who are destitute of Episcopical Ordination,
 ought to be esteem’d good and valid: And so
 great a Stress does he lay upon our Expositor’s
 Judgment in this Matter, that he gives us
 this great Encomium upon the abovesaid Pas-
 sage in these Words: “ This is an Argument
 “ urg’d by the Good Bishop of Sarum, in his
 “ Articles, in this very Case I am arguing upon;
 “ and ’tis SO FULL to the Purpose, that I do
 “ not think it CAPABLE of an Answer.

Answer. Because this Objection is Authoriz’d
 by so great a Name; and boasted to be so
 very

very full to the purpose, I shall endeavour to refute it in a Double Respect. *First*, Upon Supposition, (tho' not granting) that all things asserted by the Expositor, concerning the *Jewish* High Priesthood and Atonement, were exactly as He in his Articles has represented them. And *Secondly*, Upon account of the real Truth of those Matters of Fact related by the Expositor, concerning the Institution and Change of the High-Priesthood.

1st. Tho' all things concerning the *Jewish* High-Priesthood and Atonement, were exactly as the Expositor has represented them, yet it will not follow from thence, that *Unauthorized* Baptisms, such as those mention'd in the Objection, are Good and Valid. Because the Christian Church never was yet reduced to the supposed miserable State of the *Jewish* Church, and *indeed never will be*; for the supposed Ufurpation affected the whole Church of the *Jews*; because, the Atonement by the *Jewish* High-Priest could only be made in that *One Place* called the *Holy of Holies*, which was in the Temple at *Jerusalem*: Even a True High-Priest could not do it in any other part of the World; so that, when a Ufurper had got possession of the Temple, and was by force of the Civil Power maintain'd therein; The *Jews*, if they had adher'd to the True High-Priest could have had no benefit by *his* *Ministration* of an Atonement, because he could have made no Atonement for them, being

ing forcibly kept out of the *Holy of Holies*: But the Ministrations of the Christian Priesthood are not so confin'd to *Place*, they are equally Valid over the face of the whole Earth; so that if wicked Civil Powers in one Country, should even Destroy Christian High Priests, the Bishops: Yet still God's Promise of being with his Apostles, his High-Priests *to the End of the World*, and that *the Gates of Hades shall not prevail against his Church*, secures us thus much, that this Destruction, of Christian High Priests, shall not be Universal; some shall be found on Earth with Powers to give Valid Ordination: if they are *Destroyed* in one Dominion, they will be found in another; and the Ministrations of Baptism by those who are Ordain'd by them, will be Valid in every place. Which is a very different Case from that of the *Jewish* Priesthood.

But further, the Objection does not come up to the point, in the Matter before us; it is not sufficient to justify the Anti-Episcopal Usurpations of Protestants who dare not communicate with the Church of *Rome*, by reason of her intolerable Corruptions in Doctrine and Worship; for, even in the worst times of Popery, they that reform'd without Bishops to head them, might, if they would, have procur'd *Ministers* to be Ordain'd by REFORMED Bishops in *England*, if their own Corrupt Bishops *refus'd* to Ordain them. And 'tis not sufficient to object, that the Labour

and Travel, &c. thus to obtain Valid Ordination, is excessive great, and in many Circumstances, next to impossible; for Men can easily remove these Obstacles; these mighty imaginary Mountains of Trouble and Danger, are no hindrance to them, when they are eagerly bent after Health, Pleasure, or Worldly Riches; then the *remotest Indies* are not too far for them to travel; the dreadful dangerous Wonders of the Deep do not terrify them; the fear of Robbers and Pirates, nay of merciless Murderers too, does not hinder their eager pursuit after perishing Treasures, and many times foolish Trifles: And is not a Valid Ministry vastly preferable to these? Are not the Divine Institutions unspeakably more advantageous, nay, Infinitely Richer, as they convey and Insure to us inestimable Treasures of Eternal Extent and Duration? Certainly they are; and therefore no Pains, no Industry, how great soever, can be too much, since 'tis *no less than our Duty* by all possible means, to procure and obtain them. So that, whatsoever Validity may be supposed to have been in the Ministration of the *Jewish* Usurping High Priest, the Church of the *Jews*, being by the Hypothesis, absolutely depriv'd of any Recourse to, or Dependance on the *True One*, can by no means be apply'd to Usurping Laymen's Ministrations in the Christian Church; because, the Church, where such Laymen pretend to Minister is not universally deprived

of any recourse to, or dependance on true Christian High Priests; they may procure Ordination from some or other of them; they may have, consequently, Instituted Ministrations if they will take pains to obtain them; which upon the *present Supposition*, the *Jews* could not obtain with all their power, because the Atonement could be made *only at the One Altar*, in the *Sanctum Sanctorum* at *Jerusalem*, from which the *Instituted High Priest* was (by supposition) forcibly kept by the Secular Power of the *Romans*——. And therefore the Baptisms here pleaded for, being not parallel to the supposed Case of the Atonement; because Baptism can be had as it was Instituted, (which the Atonement ('tis supposed) could not) must not be allow'd to be Valid, as the Atonement is suppos'd to have been. And much less can it from this Instance be inferr'd, that Baptism by *our Anti-Episcopal Dissenters* is Valid; for, they *Unauthoriz'd attempt this*, even where Christian *High Priests* are in the actual Execution of their Office; and they aim at the Priesthood it self, in *opposition* to, and *rebellion* against the *Vicarious Power* of Christ, in those Christian Bishops to whom they owe Subjection; and from whose Hands they ought, and yet refuse to receive Authority for such Ministrations; which is so monstrous an Attempt of Usurpation; and the persisting in, concurring with, and encouraging of it, so perversly Impious, that the

Church was never, till within these Last Two Hundred Years, exercis'd with the like Flagitious Wickedness: And therefore, our Expositor's own Condition, of God's acceptance of such Uninstituted Ministrations, will not here take place, — for his Proviso is this; *That the People could have no other, and That the Necessity was real and unavoidable among the Jews*; but it is not SO among Christians: It never was, nor ever will be so, for the Reasons I have mention'd. And his supposing “Christians to be brought by God's Providence *under a visible Necessity of — Breaking through Rules and Methods, in order to the being United in Worship and Government,* is not sufficient to make Valid the Uninstituted Ministrations of any Number of Men, from this suppos'd Instance of the Jewish Church; till the imagined Necessity of those Men can be prov'd to be *as Real and Unavoidable, and as Universal too,* as that of the Jewish Church is here represented to have been. — Tho' after all, the Case was otherwise in that Church; for notwithstanding the wickedness of Herod and the Roman Governors, and of the Jews too, in disposing of the High Priesthood, the *Essential Institution* of that High Priesthood was *not Vacated*. For,

2dly, Tho' our Expositor says, that “God had by AN EXPRESS LAW fixed the High Priesthood in THE ELDEST of Aaron's Family”; I must crave leave to say, that

that this *Express Law* is not to be discover'd in the Canon of Holy Scripture. There we find the Institution of the *Jewish High Priesthood* to have been *expressly* in Aaron and his Sons. For thus says God to Moses, "Take
 " thou unto thee Aaron thy Brother, and his
 " Sons with him, from among the Children of
 " Israel, that he may Minister unto me in the
 " Priest's Office. — — And thou shalt make
 " Holy Garments for Aaron thy Brother, for
 " Glory, and for Beauty, Exod. xxviii. 1, 2. The Description of those Glorious Garments is in the following part of that Chapter; and they were appointed to be wore by him when he went into the *Holy Place*, *i. e.* within the Vail: Then at the 40th *verse* the Coats, Girdles, and Bonnets, for Aaron's Sons, are appointed; and *verse* 41. God says to Moses concerning Aaron's Garment, and his Sons Coats, &c. "Thou shalt put them upon Aaron
 " thy Brother and his Sons with him, and shalt
 " Anoint them, and Consecrate them, and Sanctify them, that they may Minister unto me in
 " the Priest's Office. And (*verse* 42. and 43.)
 " thou shalt make them Linen Breeches, to cover
 " their Nakedness, &c. And they shall be upon
 " Aaron and upon his Sons, when they come in
 " unto the Tabernacle of the Congregation, or
 " when THEY come near unto the Altar to
 " Minister in THE HOLY PLACE; —
 " It shall be a Statute for ever unto him, and
 " his SEED after him. Again, Exod. xl.

13, 14, 15. God commands *Moses* to put upon *Aaron* the Holy Garments and Anoint him, &c. "And to bring his Sons and Cloath them, — and Anoint them, — that they may Minister in the Priests Office: for their Anointing shall surely be an everlasting Priesthood, throughout their Generations. In the xvi. ch. of *Leviticus* we have an exact Description of the Atonement, and of the High Priest's Ministration thereof in the Holy Place once a Year, and not one Word of *Aaron's ELDEST SON*, but indefinitely in *verse 32.* 'tis said, "And the Priest whom he shall Anoint, and whom he shall Consecrate to Minister in the Priest's Office in his FATHERS STEAD shall make the ATONEMENT. — and *verse 34.* "This shall be an Everlasting Statute unto you to make an Atonement, &c. Further, *Lev. xxi. 10.* God speaks of the High Priest without any particular designation of the Eldest to that Office; "He that is the High Priest among his Brethren, &c. So *Numbers iii. 10.* Thou shall appoint *Aaron AND HIS SONS*, and they shall wait on their Priests Office, and the Stranger that cometh nigh shall be put to Death. Likewise, *Numb. xviii. 1.* The Lord spake unto *Aaron*, thou and thy Sons with thee shall bear the Iniquity of your Priesthood. And *ver. 7.* Thou and thy Sons with thee shall keep your Priests Office for every thing of the Altar, AND WITHIN THE VAIL, and YE shall serv. I have given your Priests Office unto

“ unto you, as a Service of Gift, and the
 “ STRANGER that cometh nigh shall be put
 “ to Death. Thus we see, that the High
 Priesthood was (by Express Law) in *Aaron*
 and his Sons ; and no Mention made, that it
 should be and remain in the Line of the Eldest
 Son only.

I know ’twill be answer’d, That God him-
 self commanded *Moses* to Consecrate *Eleazar*,
 the Eldest Son of *Aaron*, to be High Priest in
 the Stead of his Father, *Numb. xx. 25, 26, 27.*
 and that therefore the Law confin’d the High
 Priesthood to the Eldest Son’s Line.

In Return to this ; No one will deny so
 plain a Matter of Fact, as that of *Eleazar*’s
 Succession to the High Priesthood, and that it
 was by the Express Command of God ; but
 the Consequence which the *Objector* draws
 from this particular Instance, is not to be al-
 low’d : Because, the Standing Law about the
 High Priesthood, is, That it shall be in *Aaron*
 and his Sons. And there is another Law
 concerning the same Office, that excludes the
Eldest, as well as any other of *Aaron*’s Sons,
 from that Great Dignity, if he should chance
 to have any Impediment mention’d in that
 Law : For, says God unto *Moses*, *Lev. xxi.*
17, to the 23d. “ Speak unto *Aaron*, saying ;
 “ WHOSOEVER he be of thy Seed in their
 “ Generations that hath any Blemish, let him not
 “ approach to offer the Bread of his God : For
 “ WHATSOEVER MAN he be that hath a
 “ Blemish

“ Blemish, he shall not approach; a Blind Man,
 “ or a Lame, or he that hath a flat Nose, or
 “ any thing superfluous, or a Man that is broken-
 “ footed, or broken-handed, or crook-back’d, or
 “ a Dwarf, or that hath a Blemish in his Eye,
 “ or be scurvy or scabbed, &c. NO MAN that
 “ hath a Blemish of the Seed of Aaron the Priest,
 “ shall come nigh to offer the Offerings of the
 “ Lord made by fire: He hath a Blemish, &c.
 “ he shall not go in unto the VAIL, nor come nigh
 “ unto the Altar, because he hath a Blemish.

This is positive and express: And it cannot
 be fairly affirm’d, That God would secure all
 the *Eldest Sons* from every one of these Blemishes,
 that they might Minister before him within the Vail.
 This is not to be suppos’d, that God would *always*
 interpose in Behalf of *Them only*, and give them
 no Promise of such his more than Ordinary (no less
 than Miraculous) Providence over their particular
 Persons. So far is he from giving ’em this Security,
 that he says, *Whosoever, whatsoever Man*
 “ he be of thy Seed in their Generations, that
 “ hath a Blemish, he shall not go in unto the
 “ Vail. As much as if he had said; Even the
 otherwise most Esteem’d Person of the Seed of
Aaron, whether for being the First-born, or the
 Chief for Wisdom, Knowledge, &c. if he hath a
 Blemish, he shall not be High Priest, nor make an
 Atonement before me. One of these Blemishes
 might have happen’d to the Eldest, as well as to
 another;

and

and therefore, God's Appointing *Eleazar* (the Eldest Son of *Aaron*) to succeed his Father in the High-Priest's Office, is no Argument that it was a Standing Law of God, that this Office was always to remain confin'd to the Eldest of *Aaron's* Sons. And since any of those Sons might happen to have a Blemish, therefore God made *no express Law* (as our Expositor says he did) to FIX the High-Priesthood in the ELDEST of *Aaron's* Family: For the Law expressly fix'd it in *Aaron* and his Sons, that if one of them had any Blemish, or indeed any other Impediment, another Son might validly enter into the Holy Place. For, the Atonement was expressly commanded to be made Once a Year; and it must not have been omitted to be made, even tho' the High Priest in Possession had chanced to have a Blemish, as long as another Son of *Aaron* was to be had, and a Vail (or Holy Place) was in being, until the Coming of the Great High Priest, Christ Jesus: For, says the Law, "This shall be AN EVERLASTING Statute unto you, (i. e. Everlasting till the Coming of Christ) to make an Atonement for the Children of Israel, for all their Sins, ONCE A YEAR, Lev. xvi. 34." Which could not have been obey'd, if none but the Eldest of *Aaron's* Family must (by the Law) have enter'd within the Vail; and if he had been at the same time so blemish'd, as that he might not enter therein. For the Atonement must

(in

(in such Case) have ceas'd to be perform'd during the Life of such a High-Priest; which is contrary to the *Express Law*, that required it to be constantly made Once a Year; and therefore the High-Priesthood was not by *Express Law* fix'd in the Eldest of *Aaron's* Family. This we find in Fact to have been true; for the Scripture records several High-Priests who were not of the Line of *Eleazar* the Eldest, but of *Ithamar*, the Younger Son of *Aaron*. For Example: *Eli*, in the Time of the Judges, 1 *Sam.* ii. 27, 30. *Abiah*, i. e. *Abimelech*, in the Reign of King *Saul*, 1 *Sam.* xiv. 3. xxi. 1. and xxii. 15. called also *Abiathar* the High-Priest, *St. Mark* ii. 26. whom King *Saul* slew. So likewise another *Abimelech*, in the Reign of King *David*, 2 *Sam.* viii. 18. and in the Reign of King *Solomon*, *Abiathar*. These, 'tis plain, were not in the Line of *Eleazar*; for *his* Sons are mention'd particularly by Name, 1 *Chron.* vi. and not one of these High-Priests is reckon'd among them: Yet they executed the Office, and no Mark of Infamy is set upon them for so doing, because they were not the *Strangers*, who by the Law of *Moses* were to dye for coming within the Vail; for they were of the Sons of *Aaron*. And certainly, if they had been Invaders of the High-Priesthood, God would have given us some Notice of his Dispensing with his own supposed Law, or else some Mark of his Displeasure at their Usurpation; to have warn'd others

from

from the like Sin for the future: As he did upon King *Saul*, for but Offering a Burnt-Offering, when he had no Authority to do so, being no Priest.

This Argument might be prosecuted much further; but I think enough has been said, to prove, That God did *not* by *an Express Law*, fix the High-Priesthood in the Eldest of *Aaron's* Family: And therefore, when any other of *Aaron's* Sons got into the High-Priesthood, the *Essential Law* of God concerning the High Priesthood (which requir'd that it should be *in Aaron and his Sons*) was not vacated. And this was the Case of the *Maccabees*, and all their Successors of the *Asmonean Family*; they were of the Sons of *Aaron*, and therefore Valid High-Priests; because the Institution requir'd, that a Priest of the Sons of *Aaron* should be Anointed and Consecrated *High-Priest*, and that no other should be so.

To come now to the High-Priests in *Herod's* and the *Romans* Time, they were also of the *Sons of Aaron*: For, notwithstanding the Wickedness of setting that Office to *Sale*, &c. *Josephus* assures us, that it was done with this particular Regard, that those who obtain'd it were in *Holy Orders*. His Words are these:
 “ Herod having now receiv'd the Kingdom from
 “ the Romans, made no longer any Scruple of
 “ Chusing the High-Priests out of the *Asmonean*
 “ Race; but conferr'd the Honour indifferently
 “ upon Persons, tho' never so obscure, provided
 “ they were but in **HOLY ORDERS.**” *Josephus's*

phus's Jewish Antiquities, Book XX. Cap. 8. pag. 1206. 8vo. This shews, that *Herod* and the *Romans*, as wicked as they were, had so much regard to the *Jewish* Laws, as not to prostitute the High-Priest-hood to any who were not of the Seed of *Aaron*: And therefore it is reasonable to conclude, that the High-Priests in our Saviour's time were Valid High-Priests, because of their *Descent from Aaron*, whereby God's Institution of the High-Priest-hood was preserv'd, tho' wickedly Circumstantiated by the buying and selling of so Sacred an Office.

Thirdly, and Lastly, The Expositor's Assertion, "That the Atonement was still perform'd by their (i. e. what He calls the Usurping High-Priests) Ministry, is begging the Question; 'tis affirming what he ought to have prov'd, and has not once attempted to do any thing towards it: And till he do's make it good, I shall take the liberty to deny, that his suppos'd Usurping High-Priests perform'd any Atonement at all: And the Reason why I do deny it, is, Because if they were not instituted High-Priests, their pretended Sacerdotal Acts, attempting to propitiate the Divine Nature, were as Null to that Purpose, as King *Saul's* was before them; that is, wholly Null and Void; and for the same Reason as his was. But further, even tho' those High-Priests were, as I have endeavour'd to prove them, High-Priests

Priest according to the exprefs Law or Institution of the High Priesthood : Yet it does not appear that any Atonement for the Sins of the *Jews* was made by their Ministration in our Saviour's time : For with what Sense can it be said, that Atonement was made for them, who were then appointed to Wrath and Vengeance? For that People, over whom our Saviour wept, because through the Hardness of their Hearts they were Spiritually blinded ; *The things that belong'd to their Peace were hid from their Eyes ;* They were then in actual Bondage to the *Romans* for their Sins ; They were at that time filling up the Measure of their Iniquities ; and for their Impieties, the *Wrath was coming upon them to the utmost ;* infomuch that the dreadful Days werẽ speedily coming, wherein their Glorious City and Temple should inevitably be destroy'd, themselves in vast Multitudes be slain with the Sword, and the remainder of them be led Captive into all Nations Was any Offering made then by the most Regular *Jewish* High-Priest, of any Efficacy to atone for such Sinners : If it was, let the Expositor inform us how we may know it ; and when he has done this, then let him try how he can prove, that the Offerings of his suppos'd *Uninstituted* High-Priests were of the same Validity : If he does not prove this, his whole Objection is lost ; for till the Atonement he talks of, is *prov'd* to have been Valid ; Unauthoriz'd

Baptisms

Baptisms will not be prov'd Valid by his pretended Atonement.

He says, That, “ *where the Necessity was real and unavoidable, the Jews WERE BOUND to think, that God did, in Consideration of that, Dispense with his own Precept.* ” This must be acknowledg'd in one Sense, and absolutely deny'd in another. It must be acknowledg'd that God in such *real and unavoidable Necessities*, Dispenses with his own Precept ; that is, does not expect Us to Obey it, when 'tis out of our Power to Obey it : He then Dispenses with our *Non-ability* to perform it ; and so imputes not to us the *Omission* of it. But then 'tis absolutely to be deny'd, that in such real and unavoidable Necessity, where we cannot have *his Positive Institutions*, He Dispenses with them by allowing us to COMMUTE, and put instead thereof a *Humane Institution*, to serve for the *same Purposes* as the Divine One : This, I say, is absolutely to be denyed, because it infers, that God equalizes a Humane Institution, with His own Divine One ; which is absurd, besides contrary to the *Faith and Practice* of the *Jews*, who always (when they thought and practis'd as the *Mosaic Law* directed them) reckon'd that God would not, in Cases of greatest Necessity, allow them to Substitute their own Inventions, in the room of his Positive Institutions. For thus when they were in Captivity in *Babylon* 70 Years, they did not dare to Sacrifice, because they were Destitute
of

of the Temple and Altar where God had placed his Name, and where the Institution requir'd their Sacrifices to be offer'd. The same we find in that People to this Day; for ask but any of the Knowing Persons among them, why they do not now offer material Sacrifices to God as *formerly*? and they'll tell you, they dare not, because they have not the APPOINTED Temple and *Altar*: If you tell them they may build Altars, and offer thereon; they'll answer you, That God will not so DISPENSE with his Precept, and that such Sacrifices will be an Abomination to him, and therefore of no Benefit, but rather of dangerous Consequence to them; and that it is safer for them to believe, that God under their present Circumstances, expects no material Sacrifice at all, than in our Expositor's Sense to think, that God, *in Consideration of their real and unavoidable Necessity* [of an Altar and Temple] will *dispense* with their Building any *Uninstituted Ones*, and making Sacrifices and Burnt-offerings in and upon them. The same we should have found, if in the time our Expositor refers to, that People had been destitute of *Instituted* High-Priests and Priests; they knew that a STRANGER *was not to come nigh*, they had Experience enough of God's Judgments *on such*, notwithstanding their Pleas of *Necessity*; and therefore they were *Bound to think* the direct Contrary to what our Expositor is pleas'd to affirm; and consequently so are Christians too, if any Arguments

guments, with respect to them, may be drawn from the *Jews* Faith and Practice about such Positive Institutions. The Expositor and his Friend endeavour to make such Arguments in the Objection; and therefore 'tis very just to deal with them in their own way, and consequently to conclude against them from the *Duty* of the *Jews*, to that of *Christians*; That when we cannot have, or obtain *God's Positive Institutions*, we must not *set up our Own* instead thereof; but are BOUND to believe, that in these Respects, God dispenses with our *Want* of them; that we must wait his Leisure till he shall bless us with them; and in the mean time not dare to *Break thro'* such his Rules and Methods prescrib'd to us; and consequently, not to Baptize without an Administrator, who is Vested with his Commission: Since such a Baptism is no Instituted Baptism, and its Ministration for all the Purposes of the *Instituted One*, is equalizing a Humane to a Divine Institution; which is not only an Absurdity, but an Abomination too. And, I think, this is enough in Answer to the late Bishop of *Sarum's* Boasted Unanswerable Objection.

The following Objections are brought by one who stiles himself a Clergy-man of the Church of *England*, in his printed Letter to Dr. Brett, concerning his excellent Sermon against *Lay-Baptism*; and he tells us just before he brings them, *Pag. 17.* That "to shew
" that

“ that every Christian, as Christian, has a natural Right to Baptize; tho’ he grants, “ that he that does it, not Ordain’d, as he ought to be, and not in Cases of absolute Necessity, acts presumptuously, and is very Audacious. *He will use an Argument or two drawn from the Scriptures.*

Obj. XIV. His first pretended Argument is taken from St. Mark ix. 38, 39, 40. or St. Luke xi. 49, 50. “ *John answer’d, saying, Master; we saw one casting out Devils in thy Name; and he follow’d not us; and we forbid him, because he follow’d not us. But Jesus said, Forbid him not, for there is no Man who shall do a Miracle in my Name that can lightly speak evil of me: For He that is not against us, IS ON OUR PART.* The Sense of which Words the Objector says, is this: “ He that pursues the same End that we do; that strives to Beat down the Kingdom of Satan as we do, is not to be forbidden, he is on our side: And does not every one that Baptizes a Child, or Person adult, bring his *helping-hand* to subvert the Kingdom of Satan? and shall we presume to forbid him, &c.?

Answ. He that does his **LAWFUL** Endeavour to Beat down the Kingdom of Satan, ought not to be forbidden; but he that uses **UNLAWFUL** Endeavours to that End, ought to be prohibited; because (to use the Apostle’s Words) he does *Evil* [he acts con-

trary to God's Law] *that Good may come of it.* St. Paul says, that the *Damnation* of those who affirm and practice this, is just: And therefore, he who uses his Endeavours *unlawfully*, i. e. contrary to the Law of God, tho' he may *design* to Beat down, yet, in *reality*, he promotes the Kingdom of Satan, which is advanc'd by nothing more than by Disobedience and Rebellion against God's Laws. And this is the Case of the Lay-Baptizer with us. The Laws of God, and of this Church, have excluded him from the Ministration of Baptism; therefore when he attempts to Minister, he is *Disobedient* and *Rebellious* against these Laws; and so *adds strength* to the Kingdom of Satan, instead of *beating it down*. Besides, the Man objected, did miraculously *Cast out Devils in Christ's Name*; this effectually beat down Satan's Kingdom: For, *how can Satan cast out Satan*, says our Lord? And when our Advocates for *Lay-Baptism* can prove, that *such Baptism* has a *Miraculous Efficiency* for the Destruction of Satan's Kingdom; (for to say this without proof, is only begging the Question) or when our Lay-Baptizers themselves shall work as *uncontroverted* a Miracle as that was, for the Confirmation of their Practice, then 'twill be time enough to believe the Validity of those Baptisms; but till that time comes, we must conclude the Objector at best to be mistaken, if not worse, a Perverter

Perverter of the Sacred Text he adduces, for the *Validity* of such Unauthoriz'd Baptisms.

Obj. XV His Second Imaginary Argument to this purpose, is taken from 1 St. Pet. ii. 5, 9. “ *Ye also—— are built up a Spiritual House, an Holy Priesthood, to offer up Spiritual Sacrifices, acceptable to God through Christ Jesus. —— But Ye are a chosen Generation, a Royal Priesthood.* St. John. Rev. i. 6. tells us, *that Christ has made us Kings and Priests unto God and his Father ——.* And he gives us the same Appellation, Chap. v. 10. — “ *This is apply'd to all Christians, therefore all Christians are Priests, consequently may Baptize——.* That this is no Novelty he brings *Tertullian's* Authority to prove; “ *Nonne & Laici Sacerdotes sumus? Scriptum est enim, Regnum quoque nos & Sacerdotes Deo & Patri suo fecit. Differentiam inter Ordinem & Plebem constituit Ecclesia, & Honor per Ordinis concessum Sanctificatus: adeo ubi Ecclesiastici Ordinis non est Concessus, & Offers & Tinguis, & Sacerdos es tibi solus.* And presently after, “ *Igitur si habes jus Sacerdotis in temetipso, ubi necesse est, habeas oportet etiam Disciplinam Sacerdotis, ubi necesse sit habere jus Sacerdotis.* Exhor. Castit. The least that these Words imply, is certainly, that in *Tertullian's* Judgment, the Laity have a Right to the Priesthood, and *where 'tis a Case of Necessity may exercise that Right.* And hence 'tis evident, that only Order

“ and Regularity makes some Act, and re-
 “ strains others from acting in that Capacity.
 To which add, what he calls his Third
 Argument, that in *Gal. iii. 28.* 'tis said, “ *In*
 “ *Christ Jesus there is neither Jew nor Greek,*
 “ *neither Servant nor Free, neither Male nor*
 “ *Female, for ye are all one in Christ Jesus.*
 “ Therefore 'tis not absolutely necessary in it
 “ self that Baptism should be perform'd by
 “ an Episcopal Hand, because in Christ there
 “ is no distinction of Persons.

Answer. This Gentleman should have taken
 into his Account the Promise of God to the
 Jews, “ *Ye shall be unto me a Kingdom OF*
 “ *PRIESTS, and an Holy Nation, Exod. xix.*
 6. Upon a right consideration of which, he
 would have preserv'd himself from the mis-
 chief, of so *unsafe* an Interpretation of the
 Parallel Texts of the New Testament, and his
 Readers too, from the *Infection* which some
 of them may draw in, from his Publication
 of it. That Text in *Exodus* never exalted the
Common-People of the Jews, to be Proper Lite-
 ral *Priests*, nor gave them any Right to the
 Positive Instituted Functions of the Priest-
 hood; so far from that, that those among
 them, who thought they might perform those
 Priestly Functions, upon their Attempt to do
 so, found to their Sorrow, that they were
not such Priests: (King *Saul* is a standing Proof
 of this.) And the Judgments inflicted on
 them are recorded in the Sacred Oracles, to
 warn

warn us all to avoid such False and Presumptuous Notions, and the Dangerous Practices consequent thereupon.

The Common *Jews* then were only Priests in a *Figurative* Sense of the Word, *i. e.* As God Selected and Consecrated his Proper Priests, and took them *from among Men*, publicly to offer such Gifts and Sacrifices to him as he had *appointed* them: So, he took and separated to himself from among other Nations, the People of the *Jews*, that they might acceptably offer to him such Services, particularly Publick Ones, as he should appoint them also. Even God's *Proper Priests* were limited by him, what Publick Services they should perform to him, insomuch, as that none of them could *Validly* Minister in the *peculiar* Office of the High Priest who was their Head, and they were all dependant on him. So the Common *Jews*, the *Figurative* Priests were limited in their Publick Services; they were none of them to Minister, except *jure Prophetico* in the *Peculiar Offices* of the *Proper Priests*, who were also their Heads and Governors, in the Publick Divine Services, It was a *great Privilege* for the Common *Jews* to be admitted by God, to offer him the Publick Services, or *Figurative* Sacrifices of Prayers and Praises, together with those of themselves, Souls and Bodies, to his reasonable Service; and to be accepted by him when they did this as he had appointed them, in

subordination to, and dependance on his Positive Instituted Priests; and this was their Figurative Priesthood. They are called Priests, only in this *remote* improper Sense of the Word *viz.* because, they were *separate* from other Nations, and *juch* their Services were accepted of by God, as the *Proper Priests* were taken from among Men, and their *Positive Instituted Offerings and Services* were acceptable to him, upon the account of his thus *Separating* and *Consecrating* of them.

This *Separation*, and Consecration of his Instituted Proper Priests by God himself, was not (as the Objector would have it) only for *Order and Regularity*, but also that they might be *Shadows and Types of Christ*, the *Great High Priest* which was to come, in whom alone we can be accepted. They, and the Bloody Offerings and Sacrifices made by them for the People, were appointed to resemble *H I M*, and the Sacrifice he was to make for the Sins of the whole World, as *St. Paul* in his Epistle to the *Hebrews* has abundantly prov'd. And this had infinitely more in it than bare *Order and Regularity*, 'twas an Instituted Method, of interceding with God by the Mediation of Jesus Christ, in behalf of fallen Man; 'twas an appointed way of executing Christ's Mediatorial Office, by visible Representatives of him, and Types of his Ministrations, to reconcile *us* to God, and God to *us*.

'Tis the same now in our Christian Dispensation: The Apostles and their Successors are appointed not only for *Order* and *Regularity*, but also, and more especially, to *Represent* our *Saviour*, to be His Vicegerents and AMBASSADORS, to bear *his Character* and *Authority*; for says He, *As my Father hath sent me, even so send I you. Lo I AM with you! He that Hears you, Hears ME.* This continues visible to us, *His Mediatorial Office*, and makes their Instituted Ministerial Acts to be *His*, and for that Reason acceptable to God for our Spiritual Benefit and Advantage. Hence we discover, that *Tertullian's* Notion concerning the Priesthood of Private Christians was a Montanistical Error; for their Priesthood spoken of in the several Texts objected, amounts to no more than that *Figurative Priesthood* which belong'd to the Common *Jews*, as God's *Segullah* or peculiar People, for the Reasons I have given before concerning them. To which add, that the Text in *St. Peter* confirms this, by naming the Sacrifices they are to offer, for he says their Priesthood is "*to offer up Spiritual Sacrifices, i. e.* those of Prayers and Praises, &c. As for the other Positive Sacrifices, appointed by Christ to be made by his Instituted proper Priests, *viz.* the Dedication of Persons to God by Baptism; the offering of the Commemorative Sacrifice of Christ's Body and Blood in the Eucharist; and presiding in all other Publick Divine Service to

mediate between God and the People in Christ's stead, these are Sacrifices peculiar to the Order of the Clergy, and this Text never design'd them to be perform'd by Lay-Christians. For says St. Paul " *Are all Apostles?* 'Tis His strong Negation, as much as if he had said, ALL Christians are NOT APOSTLES. The *Apostles* and their *Successors* are Christian Priests, because their Ministerial Office is to Mediate with God, as Christ's Representatives, in our behalf: this the Scripture abundantly proves, and the Universal Church constantly testifies. Common Christians are not *such Priests*, they have not this Office of being Christ's Representatives, committed to them, for who can take *this Honour to himself*, but he that is call'd of God as was Aaron? The Text adduced will as much prove them *Literal Kings*, as *such Priests*; for 'tis said, Christ *has made us KINGS and Priests*. If People once perswade themselves, that this Great Office belongs to them, because they are Christians; God's Authority in His Kings will be trampled under Foot, and despised among Men. It behoves Princes, and all other inferior Orders, to take care of such dangerous Interpreters of Scripture as these would be. Christians *as such* are highly exalted, by their Redemption from the Slavery and Bondage of Sin and Satan; from the vile Servitude to their own Lusts; and from the Burden of the *Mosaic Law* of Costly Ceremonies, &c.

In this they are *Kings*, being brought into the Glorious Liberty of the Sons of God, and having through the Aids and Assistances of the Holy Ghost, a Capacity of overcoming all the Powers of Darkness. But they'll lose this their Spiritual Dignity, if they assume to themselves the Title and Office of Kings in the proper Literal Sense of the Word: and so they will their Priesthood too, if they presume, like *Saul*, to attempt to Minister in the *Positive Instituted* Functions of Christ's Appointed Priests.

Thus we see that Christians, as such, are no otherwise Priests than the Common *Jews* were; only thus much they are higher advanc'd than the *Jews*, that they are *Kings* too, by that Spiritual Freedom, Liberty, and Power, which I have mention'd, and which the *Jews*, under their Dispensation, could not boast of, as we may.

There is another Sense wherein Christians, *as such*, Collectively taken, may be term'd Kings and Priests; and that is, as they are the Members of that BODY, whose Head *Christ Jesus* is King and Priest in the highest Sense of those Words: It is no Novelty to call the Body by the Name given to the Head: For the Scripture it self calls the *Church*, which is the Body of Christ, by the Name CHRIST.

1 Cor. xii. 12. *For as the Body is One, and hath many Members, and all the Members of that One Body, being many, are One Body: so also is*
CHRIST

nu

CHRIST, or the Body of Christ, which is His Church. And since the Scripture calls the Church, *Christ*, 'tis no Wonder to find the same Divine Writings call Christians, i. e. *all the Church of Christ, Kings and Priests*; for those Texts speak of the Universal Body, the Church collectively taken: "*A Spiritual House; a Holy Priesthood; a Royal Priesthood.*" This is the meaning of that other Text, "*Kings and Priests*; i. e. in One Body ye are *Kings and Priests*, because ye are the Body of Christ, who is KING AND PRIEST. And as any single Member (*as such*) of that Body, is not *Christ* in the proper Sense of the word; so neither is any Member thereof, *as such*, a King or Priest in the proper Sense of those Words. They are only so in a Figurative Sense, as they are related to, and are in Union with their Head: And so they are likewise as they are Members of the Respective particular Churches, whose visible Spiritual Heads, the Bishops, are Spiritual Kings and Priests by Christ's Institution; to whom the Members are united, and consequently in subjection: And therefore, tho' Christ respects *no particular Person*, more or less, for being of a *Jewish* or *Gentile* Offspring; for being *Born* or *Free*, *Male* or *Female*, but regards the Obedience, &c. of all alike; yet he makes a distinction of *Offices*, and requires the several Members of his Body the Church, to
 keep

keep their proper Stations, (as *St. Paul* most excellently argues throughout his 12th Chapter of the 1st Epistle to the *Corinthians*) to perform their several respective Functions; and to be in Subordination, the Inferior to the Superior, that his *Authority* may be preserv'd visible in his Church, and all the Members thereof may refer to him, the Spiritual Benefits they receive through his Instituted Ministrations, by attending on, and receiving them, at the Hands of those, whom he has made *his Representatives* for that purpose: And therefore, 'tis absolutely necessary by Christ's Institution, that when we are Baptiz'd, we should receive Baptism from an Episcopal Hand, which is Christ's *Officer*, and so far *himself*, notwithstanding that, in Christ Jesus there is no Distinction, or Respect of *Persons*.

I CONCLUDE this Appendix, earnestly intreating the most Reverend, the Right Reverend, and Reverend GOVERNORS and MINISTERS of Christ over his Flock, in all Parts of the UNIVERSAL Church, the PRIESTS of the most High God! who are duly Authoriz'd to represent and make visible to us, the once Visible, but now Invisible PRIESTHOOD of the Great High Priest of our Profession Christ Jesus! who have not taken this Honour unto themselves without being call'd of God, as was Aaron! who are therefore the Delegated AMBASSADORS for Christ, and appointed STEWARDS of the Mysteries of God,

to whom he has given the KEYS, and committed the Custody of the TWO GREAT SEALS of the Kingdom of Heaven; so that whatsoever they shall bind on Earth, shall be bound in Heaven; and whatsoever they shall loose on Earth, shall be loosed in Heaven. I humbly beseech them, in the Bowels of Jesus Christ, to consider the great Dignity of their High and Holy Calling, and their UNALIENABLE Right to Administer those SACRAMENTS, which the Infinite Wildom of our great Lawgiver has appropriated to their Sacred Function. For, if the Ministration of the Sacraments is not ESSENTIAL to their Office, and THEIR OFFICE ESSENTIAL to the Ministration of Valid Sacraments, what signifies the Institution of the Priesthood, and to what purpose did our Blessed Lord promise to be with his Priests, and concur with their Ministrations *to the End of the World*? If the presumptuous Ministrations of Lay-men acting of themselves, or in opposition to the Church and her Priests, is not inconsistent with the Nature and Property of True Sacraments: Or if they can be *True and Valid* Sacraments when given by their Hands, how, and by what means shall we be convinc'd of the Necessity of the Christian Priesthood to the Church, by Divine Institution, and its Perpetuity, till the Consummation of all things? How shall we be perswaded to value the Ministrations of a Priest more than those

of

of a Lay-man, and what Arguments can be produc'd for the Preservation of the *Unity* of the Church, and to keep us from Eternal Schisms and Separations from Her? Your *long Silence* in not asserting and defending the *Dignity of your Office*, and the *unalienable Nature* of those Sacraments which Christ has inseparably annex'd thereto, tho' it may have proceeded from a Notion of Humility and Modesty, *that you might not be thought to preach up your selves, but Christ Jesus the Lord*; yet (with submission be it spoken) seems to have been the occasion of *much Ignorance* among the Laity, of the Nature of Schism, and their Duty to you, and consequently of encouraging the Enemies of the Clergy and of their great Master in Heaven, to blaspheme him, and trample the Authority you have from him, under their Feet. Atheism, Deism, Prophaneness, Blasphemy, and Sacrilege, are now grown Impudent and Bare-fac'd, Bold and Rampant; they scorn any longer to dwell in Obscurity and Darknes, when they are become the fashionable Accomplishments of *our pretended great Wits, and Men of distinguished Sense and Judgment*. They have a grand Design in hand, (and their Emisfaries have prosecuted it but with too much success) to represent your Office every-where, and to all sorts of Men, as Tyranny, Imposture, and Usurpation; to wrest the Sacraments out of your Hands, that you may become usefess and insignificant; to make the giddy Multitude believe, that all you do is nothing but

Priest-

Priestcraft, to bring and keep them under a worse than *Egyptian* Bondage; to expose you to the Rage and Fury of an *ungovernable Mob*, and so at last to hiss you, and all *Reveal'd Religion*, off of the Stage of this World. What else mean their several execrable Books and Pamphlets that are now indultoriously publish'd, of set Purpose to decry your Office, and ridicule your Ministrations? How shall the Ignorant be defended from their Infection, but by the Antidote, which some of you, both by Books and Sermons, have already begun to apply, couragiously following the Example of the great *St. Paul*, who *magnified his Office*, and thereby the Authority of *Jesus Christ* who sent him? God be praised for these happy Beginnings, these first noble Performances in maintaining your Office, and in defence of the *True Rights of the Christian Church*, deposited in your Hands by the great Author of our most Holy Religion: And may he, by the blessed Influences of his Spirit, stir up many MORE OF YOU to Cry aloud and spare not, to lift up your Voices like a Trumpet, to shew the People their Transgression, and those who strive with the Priest their Sin, *Isa. lviii. 1. Hos. iv. 4. and Rom. ii. 8.* That they may learn to KNOW and submit to, those who are over them, (in the Lord) and who watch for their Souls, *Heb. xiii. 17.* That they may esteem them VERY HIGHLY in love for their WORKS sake, *1 Thess. v. 13.* Because they are the Ministers of Christ, and

Stewards

Stewards of the MYSTERIES of God, 1 Cor. iv. 1. That so the People may effectually be enabled to mark and avoid those, who tho' they come to us in Sheeps-Cloathing, and transform themselves into the Appearance of Apostles of Christ, and Ministers of Righteousness, are yet inwardly but ravening Wolves, false Apostles, deceitful Workers, and Ministers of Satan, in St. Paul's Language; for they cause Divisions and Offences contrary to the Doctrines which we have learn'd; nay, contrary to the very Principles, or Foundations of the Doctrine of Christ, of Baptisms, and of Laying on of Hands; and therefore should be avoided, that we may keep the Unity of the Spirit in the Bond of Peace: Which that we may all learn to do, and by your consentient CONSTANT WARNINGS be preserv'd from the dreadful Sin of hating sound Doctrine, and heaping to our selves Teachers destitute of the Divine Commission, who serve not our Lord Jesus Christ, but their own Bellies: May God of his Infinite Mercy grant, through Jesus Christ; to whom be Glory for ever and ever. Amen.

F I N I S.

BOOKS lately Printed for RICHARD KING at the Princes-Arms in St. Paul's Church-Yard.

A Defence of the Doctrine and Discipline of the Church of *England* in two Parts. Containing the Objections of Dissenters, fairly represented from their own celebrated Writers; And fully answer'd from Scripture, the Primitive Fathers, and our own Pious and Learned Reformers. With an Introduction, giving a succinct History of the separation thro' the several Reigns of our Kings and Queens. Being a compleat System of the whole Controversie. By *William Nichols*, D. D. Author of the Commentary on the Book of Common-Prayer.

A Collection of the Principal Liturgies, used by the Christian Church in the Celebration of the Holy Eucharist: Particularly the Ancient, *v.z.* the Clementine, as it stands in the Book call'd the Apostolical Constitutions; the Liturgies of St. *James*, St. *Mark*, St. *Chrysostom*, St. *Basil*, &c. Translated into *English* by several Hands. With a Dissertation upon them, shewing their Usefulness and Authority, and Pointing out their several Corruptions and Interpolations. By *Thomas Brett*, L. L. D. Price 6 s.

A Discourse concerning the Necessity of discerning the Lords Body in the Holy Communion. With a Preface, giving an Account of the Erroneous Opinions of the *Papists*, *Lutherans*, and *Calvinists*, upon this Subject by *Thomas Brett*, L. L. D. Price 1 s.

A further Proof of the Necessity of Tradition to explain and interpret the Holy Scriptures; Price 2 s.

T H E
Second Part
O F
LAY-BAPTISM Invalid:
Shewing, That
The Ancient Catholick Church
Never Had Any
ECCLESIASTICAL LAW,
TRADITION, OR CUSTOM,
FOR THE
Validity of Baptisms

Perform'd by Persons who Never were Com-
mission'd by Bishops to Baptize.

All Prov'd from the Reverend Mr. *Bingham's*
Scholastical History of Lay-Baptism, and from
other Evidences not produc'd by that Historian.

R. Laurence.

By the Author of *Lay-Baptism Invalid.*

Other Foundation can no Man lay, than that is laid. — Ye are built upon the Foundation of the APOSTLES, — Jesus Christ himself being the Chief Corner-Stone. 1 Cor. iij. 11. Ephes. ij. 20.

Quam Periculosum sit autem in Divinis Rebus ut quis cedat jure suo & potestate, Scriptura Sancta declarat, cum in Genesi Esau *Primatus* suos inde perdiderit, nec recipere id postmodum potuerit quod *semel cessit.* Cypr. Epif. ad Jubaian. 73. p. 151. Paris 1548.

London: Printed for H. CLEMENTS, at the Half-Moon in St. Paul's Church-Yard. MDCCXIII.



THE P R E F A C E.

§. I. **A**S I have hitherto avoided all unnecessary Cavillings and Disputes, about Words and Things that have no Relation to the Merits of the Cause, in this Controversy; and as I have all along Consulted the Just Honour and Reputation of the Clergy, and upon a Principle of Great Reverence and Esteem for their Sacred Character, have been exceeding Scrupulous and Fearful, of Saying and Publishing any thing that might reasonably be interpreted to be disrespectful or uncivil to any of them, how much soever they have (some of them) Differ'd from me; So I resolve (by God's Grace) still to preserve the same Temper and Disposition; and in the following Remarks to Avoid the great Impertinence of Troubling my Self and the Reader, with Strife and Wrangling about mean, little, pedantick Things, which serve only to Cloud and Obscure That Truth, which we profess to Plead for, and Discover to Others.

§. II. If any of my Opponents have been thus Troublesome to their Readers in this Dispute, their Performances of that kind will meet with the Deserved Censure of the Discerning and Judicious; and if to make their Assertions go off the Better, they have thought fit to treat me with Incivility; I pass it by, with only pitying their
A 2
Temper,

Tempers, and advising them to fix their Eye more steddily upon the Great Matter it self which is now in Debate; and then they'll see that 'tis too Noble a Subject to be mix'd with such an Alloy; and that it will sooner be determin'd by separating from our Reasonings about it, all ungenteel Reflections upon Persons, and all Partialities in favour of some, who are Deeply concern'd in its Consequences.

But tho' I resolve to be as Civil to my Opponents as the Merits of the Cause will allow, yet they must not Expect that I will Compliment any of their Errors, or that I will be so soft and kind to their Dangerous Notions, as to skreen and hide them from that just Reproach which is due to them. If my Learned Adversaries make false Arguments to defend Error, I shall not Esteem such their Methods to be only Mistakes, but something worse, considering the Greatness of their Knowledge; and if my Endeavours to Expose their false Reasonings be unpleasant to them, I care not; since Important Truths of a Spiritual Concern are infinitely more valuable to me, than the Pleasure and Satisfaction of even the Greatest of Men, who stand in publick Opposition to them.

The Author of Lay-Baptism Invalid, whatever his Name is, has abundant Reason not yet to publish it in Print; and therefore in this Discourse will not answer Mr. Bingham by the Name of Lawrence, tho' that Reverend Historian has been pleas'd unciwilly to print that Name at large in his Title-Page, &c. without the Leave or Consent of the Person, whom he supposes and asserts to be the Author he aims at. But not to detain the Reader any longer from the Matter in Hand, I will here, once for all, shew him, First, What it is that the Author of Lay-Baptism Invalid do's insist upon; And, Secondly, What those Things are, which were never design'd to be insisted upon in his several Treatises. And,

§. III. *First, he insists upon it, that the Pretended Baptism which is administer'd by Persons who never were Commissioned to Baptize, or who never were impower'd, never authoriz'd to Baptize, is Null and Void, and no Christian Baptism: This is the Subject of his * Treatises of Lay-Baptism already published; this their Design to prove; and this Baptism, the Author calls Lay-Baptism; Baptism destitute of a Commission; unauthoriz'd Baptism, because done by such as were never authoriz'd: And in several Places of those Treatises he calls this false Baptism, by the Name of Invalid Baptism, upon Supposition that he has prov'd it to be so. So that throughout those his several Books, the Terms of "Lay-Baptism, Unauthoriz'd Baptism, and Invalid Baptism," do all mean this one and the same Thing, Baptism by those who never were Commission'd, Authoriz'd, or impower'd to Baptize. This he thought he had sufficiently declared before; especially by adding a new Definition in his 3d Edition of Lay-Baptism Invalid: But that no one may henceforward mistake his Meaning, he thinks it very pertinent to declare it once more, in Answer to the Vth Page of Mr. Bingham's Preface, where he says, and reckons it a great Error, that I frequently "Confound the Terms of Lay-Baptism, Unauthoriz'd Baptism, and Invalid Baptism, together, &c. For, any Man that does but look into the Treatises before mention'd, may easily see, that all which has been there said upon this Subject, is confin'd to Baptism by Persons never Commission'd at all to Baptize: Are not these Lay-Baptisms? Sure if such Persons are not Laicks, then there are no Laicks at all in the Church.*

* Lay-Baptism Invalid. Sacerdotal Powers. Dissenters Baptism Null and Void. The Bishop of Oxford's Charge Consider'd.

Are not such Baptisms Unauthoriz'd, i. e. never Authoriz'd? Certainly they are. And when they have been prov'd to be Invalid, is it any wrong confounding of Terms to call them Lay, Unauthoriz'd, and Invalid Baptisms? What is it then that Mr. Bingham requires? What Name would he have us give to Baptisms perform'd by Persons who were never Commission'd, if we must not call them Lay-Baptisms? This cavilling at Words discovers an Inclination in him to make Things look like Errors, when they are so far from being so, that they are exactly right and just; and let him prove the contrary if he can.

S. IV. Secondly, Those Things which were never design'd to be determin'd Negatively or Affirmatively in the several Treatises written by the Author of Lay-Baptism Invalid, are these, 1st. A supposed Power of Bishops [which some say they have] to Commission Laymen to Baptize in Cases of Extremity. Whether Bishops can or cannot so commission Lay-Men, the Author (whatever his private Opinion is about it,) had no Mind publickly to determine, because his Business was only with those, who were without all Dispute never commission'd by Bishops, in any Respect whatsoever, to Baptize; and so is utterly foreign to the other Question, How far Bishops have Authority to impower or commission Men for Sacred Ministrations. I have in several Places indeed, shew'd the Danger of their endeavouring to vest Lay Men with Power to Baptize, in Case of suppos'd Necessity; I have also oppos'd some pretended Arguments, which have been advanced to prove, that Bishops have such a Power to authorize Lay-Men; and even in this Book I have shew'd, that the Catholick Church has determin'd nothing in Favour of such a Power: But yet in all this I will not concern my self so far, as publickly to determine whether Bishops have or have not such a suppos'd extensive Power for Cases of Extremity; and let Men take which Side of

the

the Question they please; the Truth I am concern'd about will stand good, that pretended Baptism by Persons never commission'd by Bishops to Baptize, [who are therefore certainly Lay-Men] is utterly Null and Void. If Bishops can really vest their own Lay-Men with Power to Baptize, in want of the Clergy, then 'twill follow, that such Lay-Men so Baptizing, are not Laicks in that Act of Ministration, because vested with a Priestly Power for that Purpose, by the Hypothesis: But this Proposition wants to be prov'd; and I care not whether it can be prov'd or no, for it no ways affects the present Controversy; since there must be always Bishops in the Church to vest Men with Commission to baptize, how Contracted or Extensive soever the Power of Bishops is for this Purpose; and since there can be no valid Ministration of Baptism without an Episcopal Commission really given to the Baptizer: Which is the great Proposition I am concern'd for.

2dly, The Validity or Invalidity of some ancient heretical and schismatical Baptisms, were not design'd to be insisted upon by that Author; because they were also different from the Case before us; their Baptisms were perform'd by Persons who had been commission'd by Bishops to Baptize; and so whatever the Nature of their Baptisms was, it had no Comparison with that sort of Baptism which is evidently and professedly perform'd, not only by those who were never Episcopally Commission'd, but also in Opposition to the Divine Right of Episcopacy, or the Apostolical Order it self. A new Usurpation this, of so monstrous a Nature, that whatsoever may be fairly pleaded in behalf of the Ancient, Heretical, and Schismatical Baptisms, cannot be said in Defence of these, as will be seen in due Time.

§. V. In the Historical Account of those Heretical and Schismatical Baptisms, I have indeed express'd a great Value and Esteem for St. Cyprian and his Colleagues

Ecclesiastical Laws or Canons against them. Laws so strict, as that they Condemn'd all such Baptisms to be Null and Void. And why should not the Spiritual Supreme Governors of the Church, have Power to make such Laws, as shall so far limit and restrain the Commission they give to Ordin'd Persons, that when they presume to do any thing by Virtue thereof in Heresy or Schism, their Acts shall be wholly Null and Void by Virtue of such Laws? St. Cyprian and his Colleagues did make Ecclesiastical Laws to this purpose (as we shall see hereafter) and in so doing I reckon that they acted like themselves, and took the most effectual way to beat down Heresy and Schism: If the rest of the Churches, who in their Discipline differ'd from St. Cyprian and his Colleagues, had made such Laws as they did, those Laws being in such case Universal, might in all likelihoood, have preserv'd the Unity of the Church, and prevented the many Dreadful Heresies and Schisms which afterwards ensu'd: But these Churches would not concur so far with That Blessed Martyr; They would not agree with him, to make frustrate and void, during their Heresy and Schism, the Commissions, once receiv'd by their Heretical and Schismatical Subjects; and because they were not so Null'd by such wish'd-for Laws, therefore their Ministrations were by those Churches esteem'd to be Good and Valid in themselves, tho' the Persons concern'd in them, both Administrators and Receivers, were tainted with the Sinful Circumstances of Heresy and Schism; Insomuch, that tho' these Churches did not declare those Baptisms to be Null and Void in the Administrations, for want of Commission in the Administrator, yet they reckon'd, that the Spiritual Graces were impeded, or hinder'd from Descending on the Baptized, by reason of the Sins of Heresy and Schism, till the Baptized return'd to the Unity of the Church, and as Penitents, receiv'd Absolution by Imposition of the Bishop's Hands, and then the Spiritual Graces of Baptism were reckon'd to take effect. Thus those Churches held such

Baptisms

Baptisms to be valid in themselves as to their Ministration, and so do I too, because there was no want of Commission; and tho' I submit to this not so strict Discipline as that of the Cyprianick Churches; yet I should value and esteem St. Cyprian's Discipline, rather than this, if it were establish'd in the Church: But this my preferring one before the other, is no Argument that I therefore esteem to be null and void, what I think not so perfect in its Circumstance as the other.

s. VI. *Mr. Bingham says that the Author of Lay-Baptism Invalid's "Notions concerning the Invalidity of Heretical and Schismatical Baptism, do, in their direct and immediate Consequence --- unchurch and unbaptize the whole Church of England, unless it can be shew'd that we had our Baptism from some other Church originally, than from the Heretical and Schismatical Church of Rome,"* Preface p. V. *This indeed is a momentous Consideration, and of so mighty Importance, that it would have been but just in Mr. Bingham to have nam'd that Author's black Notions in his own Words, and at the same time too as he brings in so heavy a Charge against him; and prosecutes it to the utmost for almost two Pages together, without so much as naming One of those dismal Notions and Arguments he talks of. But to accuse heavily and positively a long while before we come to a Trial of Men's supposed Crimes, has something in it of Policy and Cunning to win upon the Faith of the credulous. But by what I have already said in this Preface, and shall further say in the Prosecution of this Discourse, the Reader may easily see, that I have no such Notions as tend to the unchurching and unbaptizing of our Church of England, or indeed of any other Episcopal Church in the World, that retains the **Essentials** of Christ's Holy Institutions, as our Church most certainly does: And if Mr. Bingham, or any other, can prove that I have*

any

any such unchurching Principles, I will publicly repent of and retract them ; but if he cannot prove this, he is in common Justice bound to acknowledge his Mistake (to make the best of it) and publicly to take off that Reproach, which he has so openly laid on one, who hopes he has been very far from deserving it, from his or any other Clergyman's Hands.

§. VII. “ Our Superiours legally assembled in Convocation, before they acquiesce in this Gentleman's Proposal, “ Whether it might not be proper to have a peculiar Form of Confirmation or Imposition of Hands, for such as were baptized by Hereticks and Schismaticks, upon their Return to the Unity of the Church, — &c. without (what he calls) Rebaptization, ” Preface Pag. VII. ’tis humbly hop’d will in their great Wisdom distinguish the Baptism of such Hereticks and Schismaticks as have been Episcopally, i. e. validly ordain’d, from that of others who never received any Episcopal, i. e. valid Commission at all. All Forms of Imposition of Hands that are yet to be found in primitive Church-History, belong only to Persons baptized by the former Sort of Hereticks and Schismaticks ; and there is not one ancient Precedent of a Form of Confirmation, of such as were pretendedly Baptiz’d by the latter Sort. So that the Peculiar Form propos’d with respect to these, will be Peculiar indeed ! and wholly new, without any Example or Precedent in the Ancient Church of Christ. I mention this, only with Submission to that Reverend and Learned Body of the Clergy, especially because I find, that our Historian makes no Proviso whatsoever for this necessary Distinction ; tho’ there is plainly abundance of Reason for it ; because otherwise, a Commission once received, and not vacated, will be reduc’d to an Equality with a no Commission ever received at all ; while the Ministrations of those who have a Commission, will be Equivalent to the
Mi-

Ministrations of those who never had one, and thereby the Word of God himself will be made of no Effect.

§. VIII. Besides, 'tis very observable, that the Form of Confirmation which Mr. Bingham subjoins to give some Light into this Matter, pag. VIII. is not more ancient than the Ninth Century, and by Consequence wants the true and noble Character of what is Catholick, i. e. has Antiquity, Universality, and Consent; and he might with as much Reason have given an Instance of Image-Worship and Invocation of Saints, from the Second General Council of Nice, about the Year 787. who pretended more Authorities from Fathers and Scripture too, for the establishing of those Errors, than our Reverend Historian can produce, for the Confirmation of Persons pretendly baptized, by such as never were Commission'd to Baptize; for indeed he can produce no Authority at all for that Sort of Confirmation. I say our Reverend Historian might as reasonably have produc'd, the Authority of that Council, for the establishing of those Idolatrous Practices, as this Form of Confirmation for the Exemplar of a Form to be made, to confirm the False Baptisms of those, who have been only washed or sprinkled by our Hereticks and Schismaticks, who were never commission'd to Baptize, if his Exemplary Form had been us'd to confirm such false Baptisms, as indeed it was not; for the Form he produces, does not, throughout the whole Ceremony and Prayers, make the least mention of any Defect in the Baptism it self, before received by the Confirm'd Person; and as for the Prayer of Confirmation's, beseeching God to give the Person "the Seal of the Divine Union, and the Inspiration of the Holy Spirit", it contains no more in Substance, with Reference to the preceding Baptism, than what is as proper to be said over another, who was baptiz'd by an Orthodox Priest in the Unity of the Church; as neither is there in the following Words of another Prayer, which speak of the Confirm'd Person

Person as now “ Perfect and Consummate with the “ true Faith, in God, and with the Seal of His “ Holy Unction.” For Confirmation was always reckon’d by the Church to Perfect and Consummate with the True Faith, and with the Seal of God’s Holy Unction, even all validly baptiz’d Persons in the Church it self. So that here is nothing in all this Form, peculiar to any Imperfection in the Baptism it self, before receiv’d, but only in Reference to the Errors of the Person who was received into the Communion of the Church : And this might have been well put into the Form, even for a Person in all Respects rightly baptiz’d before, if he fell into any dangerous Errors, as all Hereticks most certainly did ; and ’tis notorious they were Episcopal Persons ; and therefore, a Form to be compos’d after the Example, and in Pursuance of the Design and Purpose of that Form, will not be sufficient to confirm Persons supposedly baptiz’d by Hereticks and Schismaticks, who never were vested with a Divine Commission. As is the Case of our Anti-Episcopal Dissenters Baptisms.

§. IX. I know some of my Readers will expect, that I should say something to Mr. Bingham’s Appendix ; but I must tell them, that to speak particularly to every thing that Gentleman has been pleas’d there to insinuate, and which is foreign to the Merits of the Cause, is to spend Time and Paper to no Purpose, and to incur the just Displeasure of the Candid and Judicious, without doing any Service to others who are not so. What is worthy of an Answer, and deserving of the Reader’s Notice, I shall remark upon [as hereunder] only in this Preface, referring to the several Pages of the following Treatise, where my Answers are more fully to be found.

Our Reverend Historian’s Observation [in his 141st Page] upon a Passage in my Discourse of Sacredotal Powers, Chap. V. Pag. 120. is very just and right, that instead of these Words, namely, “ Those whom a

“ Laick Baptizeth are to be Rebaptized ; but those
 “ whom an *Arian* Priest Baptizeth are not to be
 “ rebaptized : Therefore an *Arian* Priest is not a
 “ Laick. This *Argument* so confounded Hilary the
 “ Deacon that he was forc’d to deny the *Major*, which his
 “ Master Lucifer had granted before , viz. That those
 “ whom a Laick Baptizeth are to be Rebaptized. ” It
 should have been thus :

“ This *Argument* so Confounded Hilary the Deacon,
 “ that he was forc’d to Deny the *Assumption* [or *Vinoz*]
 “ which his Master Lucifer had Granted before ; viz.
 “ That Those whom an *Arian* Priest Baptizeth, are
 “ not to be re-baptized.” And so ’tis mended in the *Se-*
cond Edition of *Sacerdotal Powers*, p. 76. and I thank
 Mr. Bingham for the Notice, that I may not let any unde-
 signed Slip [as this was] pass uncorrected by me.

Mr. Bingham’s 141st Page concerning St. Jerom’s
 Notion of the Validity of Lay Baptism, is largely Answer’d
 in Page 120, &c. of this Treatise.

His 142^d Page of St. Chrysoftom’s Assertion concern-
 ing the Invalidity of Lay-Baptism, is Answer’d in Page 114.

His 142, 143, 144 Pages, of St. Basil’s Opinion, is An-
 swer’d in Page 109.

His Demand in Page 145. “ In what Writing of
 “ the Stephanians I find this Maintain’d, That They
 “ who had received Baptism from Hereticks or Schisma-
 “ ticks, were in a State of Salvation? Is nothing but
 Captiousness and Cavilling, for himself and all who
 have look’d into St. Cyprian’s Works do know, that Ste-
 phen Bishop of Rome did hold, that such Baptiz’d Per-
 sons were in a State of Salvation, for they esteem’d
 them to have been Validly Baptiz’d, and therefore re-
 fus’d to give them any other Baptism, and quarrell’d
 with St. Cyprian, &c. for judging otherwise ; and
 sure they who held Men to have been Validly Baptiz’d,
 esteem’d them to have been in a State of Salvation,
 otherwise what signified the Validity of their Baptism?
 But for further Answer to this Captious Question, the

Reader

Reader may find enough in St. Cyprian's Epistles to Ju-
 baianus and Pompeius, and in Firmilian's Epistle to
 St. Cyprian; in all which the Arguments of Pope Ste-
 phen and His Followers, are particularly mention'd,
 and endeavour'd to be Answer'd by St. Cyprian and Fir-
 milian; and tho' Mr. Bingham makes himself Ignorant
 of the Stephanians maintaining, "that they who had
 " received Baptism from Hereticks or Schismaticks
 " were in a State of Salvation." Yet as Learned
 * and Judicious an Author as any Modern Writer what-
 soever, has expressly asserted that they affirm'd, "That
 " all Catechumens who dy'd unbaptiz'd, were not
 " therefore damn'd; much less those who had re-
 " ceiv'd Baptism, tho' from Hereticks or Schismaticks,
 which is the very Argument of the Stephanians, that I
 have mention'd in the Place on which Mr. Bingham
 makes his Remark, and from which alone he Deduces
 his Captious Question.

His next Remark, p. 145. is, That I "would infi-
 "nuate, that Athanasius was of Cyprian's Opinion,
 "and rejected the Baptism of All Hereticks in Ge-
 "neral;" Which he inferrs from my saying, "That
 "Athanasius in the 4th Century rejected the Baptism
 "of Hereticks." The falseness of his Inference discovers
 it self; for, "the Baptism of Hereticks," which are
 my Words, do not mean the "Baptism of all Here-
 ticks in General," as He would represent; and He would
 think it very odd and unbecoming me, if I should thus
 force some Words of his, which are as capable as mine are
 of so Universal a Sense: For Example, he says in his
 34th Page, "The Council of Nice never made any
 "Decree about the Re-baptization of Persons bap-
 "tiz'd by Laymen, but only by Heretical Priests."

* See Vindication of a Discourse of the Principles of the
 Cyprianic Age, Page 304.

Now should I from hence infer, that Mr. Bingham "would insinuate," that the Council made a Decree "about the Re-baptization of Persons baptiz'd by all Hereticks in General," would not Mr. Bingham have just Reason to complain of the Incivility of such a forc'd Inference? And would not the judicious Reader also have reason to find fault with the Impertinence of thus imposing upon his Time and Patience? But this is trifling, and I beg the Reader's Pardon for concerning my self thus much with only a Dispute about Words. Mr. Bingham is pleas'd in this place to say that Athanasius "rejects the Arian Baptism as Invalid; — and that he allow'd the Baptism of all others;" and for this he refers you back to his Chap. I. Sect. 20. as if he had there prov'd it; when behold in that very Chapter and Section he says expressly that Athanasius "concludes the same of the Manichees and Montanists, and Samosataniens," viz. that "their Baptism was of no Effect." And let the Reader judge whether this is "allowing the Baptism of all others but the Arians." This Inconsistency with himself, is not the only One that Mr. Bingham has committed; as will be seen in the following Treatise.

His 145th Page, where he Remarks on a Passage I cite out of Pacianus, is Answer'd in Page 98.

His 146th Page, concerning Optatus, is already Answer'd by what I said just now on his Remark concerning St. Athanasius.

He acknowledges, Page 146, that my Reflections on the Council of Eliberis are just enough: But

In his 147th Page he says, I am not so just and accurate in my Reflections on the First Council of Arles; Because, 1st, I "Diminish the Authority of this Council by following the faulty Subscriptions [says he] which make but 33 Bishops to have been at it; Whereas it was [says Mr. Bingham] a Plenary Council of the Whole Western Church, as St. Austin calls it, consisting of 200 Bishops, &c.

But

But in Answer to this, the Learned Du * Pin affirms, that “ This Council was compos’d of 33 *Western* Bishops, with some Priests and some Deacons.” And he gives good Reasons for this, against Baronius, and a Mistaken Text of St. Austin, in these Words : “ Baronius thought, that this Council consisted of 200 Bishops, which he Grounded upon a Passage of St. Austin, in his Book against the Epistle of Parmenianus, Ch. V. but he misunderstood that Passage ; for there he do’s not speak of the Council of *Arles*, but of the Council of *Rome*, which consisted only of 19 Bishops, and not of 200, as they are reckon’d in the Text of St. Austin, according to the Common Editions ; but this Place has been restor’d in the Last Edition, by a Manuscript in the *Vatican* Library ; and instead of reading it as it was, “ *Ut DUCENTOS JUDICES, apud quos victi sunt, victis litigatoribus credant esse postponendos,* It is now thus restor’d,” “ *Ut CONTRA JUDICES, apud quos victi sunt, victis litigatoribus credant,* &c. There are but 33 Names at the Head of the Council’s Letter ; but of these 33, there are 4 Priests and 1 Deacon, and 6 Exorcists. They endeavour to prove, that there was a greater Number of Bishops at this Council, because *Constantine* in his Letter to *Chrestus*, and the Second Council of *Arles* testify, that there were Bishops in it from all Parts of the World. But these 19 Bishops are found to be from all Parts of the *West*, and so it is not necessary to admit a greater Number of them, to verify what is said by *Constantine*, and the Fathers of the Second Council of *Arles*. *Aldo* says that

* *Du Pin’s Eccles. Hist.* 4 Cent. p. 247. & Council of *Arles*.
Note b,

“ 600 Bishops were present at this Council, but
 “ this is in no wise probable.” *Thus far Du Pin.*

*And now I would ask our Reverend Historian, what
 if 1000 Bishops were there present, do's Their Determi-
 nation concerning the Baptism of Hereticks in the Name
 of the Trinity, that they should not be re-baptiz'd, amount
 to any thing in our present Dispute, about Baptism by Persons
 who never had an Episcopal Commission to Baptize? Were
 those Hereticks, such Baptizers, or no? Were they meer
 Laymen, or were they in Episcopal Orders?*

2dly, *He says in the same Page that I am mistaken,
 when I say, “ That the Ancient Hereticks and Schif-
 “ matics, whose Baptisms that Council allow'd,
 “ had commonly receiv'd Ordination from the
 “ Hands of some Catholick Bishop or other —
 “ and that therefore those Baptisms were not Anti-
 “ Episcopal.” And the Reason he gives why these are
 Mistakes, stands thus: “ For [says he] many of the
 “ Heresies and Schisms of those Times had a Long Suc-
 “ cession of False Bishops of their Own, who were
 “ not Ordain'd by Catholick Bishops, as the
 “ Novatians, &c. who certainly did not act by any Au-
 “ thority of the Catholick Church, whilst they were
 “ out of the Holy Catholick Church, and in Manifest
 “ Opposition to it.” — They were Anti-Episcopal pro-
 “ perly speaking, — Anti-Episcopal Baptisms were
 “ in some Sense, the Subject of that Council, &c.*

*In Answer to all which, Mr. Bingham doubtless knows
 that the Novatians and other Hereticks and Schismaticks
 began their Heresies and Schisms in Episcopacy; he can-
 not fairly deny that they had their first Bishops ordained and
 consecrated by Catholick Bishops; That these first here-
 tical and schismatical Bishops so ordained, had not their
 Orders null'd and voided by those Churches who allowed
 their Baptisms; That the Ordinations perform'd by these
 Heretical and Schismatical Bishops were therefore Episco-*

pal; and consequently the long Succession was truly **Episcopal**, having been begun by **Catholick Bishops**, and handed down successfully by an unrepeal'd, not vacated Episcopal Commission; hence [the Commission being still but the same that was at first given by Catholick Bishops, namely, **Episcopal**.] The Baptizers who were ordained by Virtue of this one and the same Episcopal Authority, are truly said to have "received Ordination from the Hands [viz. Convey'd to them by their Ordainers from the Hands] of **Catholick Bishops**", who vested their Ordainers with the same Power to ordain, which the Catholick Bishops themselves were vested with. Mr. Bingham says, "This was a long Succession of **False Bishops**". If by **False Bishops** he means Bishops who were false to the Trust repos'd in 'em, [as all Hereticks and Schismaticks most certainly are] then there will be no need to dispute about this Term; but if by "**False Bishops**" he means Counterfeit or no Bishops, who had no real Episcopal Authority conferr'd on them; The Churches who esteem'd their Ordinations to have been Valid, and therefore did not pronounce them Null, are contrary to him; witness the Great Council of Nice, &c. And therefore in the Sense of those Churches they were not "**Anti-Episcopal**, properly speaking," as Mr. Bingham would have it; neither were their Baptisms **Anti-Episcopal Baptisms**. But I must refer the Reader to what I have said more upon this Subject in Page v, vj. of this Preface, and in Page 193, &c. of the following Treatise, which is all that I think needful to say to him, in Answer to every thing he has advanc'd about Heretical and Schismatical Baptisms, in his Scholastical History, and the Appendix thereto.

In his 149th Page he is pleas'd again to Cavil at the Term **unauthoriz'd** so often made use of by me: In answer to which I tell him once more, that by **unauthoriz'd** and **uncommisston'd**," I constantly design what all Englishmen

men usually mean by such Words ; namely, not authoriz'd, or never authoriz'd ; not commission'd, or never commission'd : And Mr. Bingham might have sav'd himself and his Reader too a great deal of Time and Trouble, if he had but rightly consider'd my VItb Definition in Page 34, of the 3d Edition of *Lay-Baptism Invalid* : which is this ; “ By a Lay-Administration, “ I mean, that which is perform'd by one, who “ never was Commission'd or Impower'd for that Act, “ by those whom God has appointed to be the “ Conveyers of his Authority and Commission to “ Men for that purpose.” For certainly Baptism by such Persons as these, is *Lay-Baptism* ; and because never Commission'd, therefore *Unauthoriz'd Baptism*. Indeed, if there can be any such thing as the giving of a *Real Authority* to Laymen to Baptize, then, when Authoriz'd, they'll cease in that Respect to be Laymen, having [if they can have] a *Sacerdotal Power* to Baptize in Want of the Clergy ; which will make such their Baptism to be *Sacerdotal, Authoriz'd Baptism*, and so not properly *Lay-Baptism*. But that Laymen can have this Power conferr'd on them, it wants still to be prov'd.

He Demands at the Bottom of his 149th Page, “ How can it be said with Truth, that no Council can be produced for the Validity of *Lay-Baptism*, or *Unauthoriz'd Baptism*, when He himself, [that is, the Author of *Lay-Baptism Invalid*] “ owns that the Council of *Eliberis* Authorized “ the One, and so many Councils confirm'd the “ Validity of the Other.” He takes Occasion to put this Question, and thus to misrepresent me from my Words, in Page 26 of my *Preliminary Discourse to Lay-Baptism Invalid*, Edit. 2d. where speaking of *Heretical and Schismatical Baptisms*, and the Determinations of some Councils, &c. about them, I conclude the Paragraph

graph in these Words ; namely, “ I have no need to dwell upon this, because my Province is only confin’d to Lay, i. e. [that is] Unauthoriz’d Baptism, such as is perform’d by Persons, who never were authoriz’d for that purpose ; who act in Direct Opposition to that Order of Men, who are impower’d by Christ to authorize others to Baptize — And the Adversary can bring forth in their behalf not one Council, either General or Provincial, till the Corrupt Ones of the Church of Rome.” And all this I do still insist upon, and affirm in answer to his Question, that the Council of Eliberis is not for “ Lay, that is, Unauthoriz’d Baptism, such as is perform’d by Persons who never were authoriz’d for that purpose, who act in Direct Opposition to that Order of Men, [i. e. Bishops] who are impower’d by Christ to Authorize others to Baptize.

This is the Connection of my Words ; and I will not depart from them, but challenge Mr. Bingham and all his Friends to prove, that the Council of Eliberis’s Canon, made with Design to Authorize and Impower some of their own Laicks to Baptize, was a giving Countenance to the Baptisms above-mention’d, which I am disputing against. But of this see more in Page 58, &c. of the following Treatise, that I may not be further Guilty of Repetition ; whereby the Reader will easily see, that our Lay-Baptisms are not favour’d by that Council ; and in Page 193, &c. that the Ancient Churches who allow’d of the Validity of some Heretical and Schismatical Baptisms, did not esteem those Baptisms to have been destitute of Commission, or Unauthoriz’d, that is, never Authoriz’d ; for they esteem’d the Clerical Orders of the Baptizers to have been Valid.

Mr. Bingham’s 150th Page about Tertullian is answer’d in Page 39, &c. of this Treatise, to which I add,
that

that 'tis very strange, he should charge me with a Mistake for saying, That Tertullian refers us to "the Law and Practice" of the Church, by his saying "concerning Hereticks, we have a Rule to Rebaptize them", when Mr. Bingham himself cannot deny but acknowledges, pag. 150, 151. that Tertullian makes the then Rebaptization of Hereticks to have been the Practice of the Church in Tertullian's Days, and that this was founded upon a Rule: For says our Historian, "I own he speaks of the Practice of Rebaptizing Hereticks as Heathens: But the Rule by which he justifies this Practice is not the Rule of the Church, but the Rule of Christ," pag. 150. And he calls this, of Rebaptization, "The Practice of the Church," in Page 151. Mr. Bingham would insinuate to his Reader, that I make what Tertullian calls a Rule for this Practice to be "the Law and Rule of the Church, distinct from the Law of Christ". But our Reverend Historian should have produc'd something, if he was able, from my own Words, to have proved this, which he cannot do; and therefore herein he acts very much beneath himself: I speak of "the Law and Practice of the Church", without concerning my self whether she made "a Law and Rule distinct from the Law of Christ" or no, and without once specifying what sort of Rule it was whereon she founded her Practice: If she founded it upon the Law of Christ and the Apostles, as Mr. Bingham words it, p. 150. why then she took this Law for her Rule, and so 'twas her Law too; so that even according to Mr. Bingham himself, it was the Law and Practice of the Church: It was "her Law", because she made it the Rule of her Practice; and it was "her Law and Practice", because she bound those who would be admitted to her Communion, to be subject to it. And Mr. Bingham cavils at my calling it "her Law

“ and Practice”, as related by Tertullian, when his own Account of Tertullian’s Words makes it to be so too.

His Note concerning St. Ignatius, pag. 152. is sufficiently answer’d in the following Page 35. —

And all that follows of Heretical and Schismatical Baptisms in Page 193, of this Book.

And as for the Conclusion of his Appendix, with a Latin Sentence, that he may see I have translated it, and made the Application as he [it seems] desires me to do; I hereby assure him, that if the Person who Baptiz’d me was Episcopally ordain’d [as he certainly was] and if he had been a Heretick, and publickly censur’d as such [which he never was] nay though he had never given publick Notice to the World, that he had repented of and forsaken his Heresy, and so I might have been tempted to believe, that he was therefore a Heretick, at the very Time that he gave me Baptism; [All which, God be praised, I am fully satisfied is no ways applicable to that Reverend Priest who baptiz’d me; yet,] If all this had been justly chargable on him, I should not in the least [considering the Now Laws of the Catholick Church, and of the Church of England in particular] have suspected the Validity of Baptism, given me by such a one, with Water in the Name of the Trinity; but should have reckon’d my self an Incorporated Member of Christ’s Church, &c.

But to conclude my long Preface, I leave this with our Reverend Historian, [as he is a Clergyman] and do affirm, that ’tis a Proposition very easy to be proved against any Man whatsoever, That if Baptism perform’d by Persons who were Never really and truly Commission’d by Bishops to Baptize, and who act herein, Rebellionously against, and in Opposition to, the Divine Right of Episcopacy, be Good and Valid Baptism; Then, Authoritative Preaching, Administring the other Sa-

crament, the Power of Excommunicating, of Binding and Loosing, of Retaining and Absolving Men's Sins, *and all the Spiritual Functions of the Clergy, are also Good and Valid, when attempted by Unauthoriz'd, never Commission'd Lay-Persons : The Consequence of which, is, the utter Dissolution and taking away of the Necessity of the Christian Priesthood, therefore of Christ's Authority here on Earth, and so of all Reveal'd Religion too; which is a Dreadfull Consideration; and much more so, if any who ought to be the Guardians of these Sacred Things, should endeavour by their Writings and Preaching, to establish the dangerous Premisses, from whence such prophane Consequences do naturally flow.*

London, May 29th,
1713.



T H E C O N T E N T S.

C H A P. I.

T H E Occasion and Nature of the present Dispute, Page
I

C H A P. II.

MR. *Bingham's* Account of the Apostolick Commission to Baptize, of the Conveyance and constant Necessity thereof to the End of the World, 5

He makes the Commission to Baptize, Essential to the Ministration of Baptism, 5

The Pseudo-St. *Ambrose's* Opinion, that the Apostles at first commission'd all Christians both to Teach and Baptize, refuted, 7

Mr. *Bingham*, from this Author, infers, that *no one can* have a Power of Baptizing, but he that receives some way or other a Commission from the Apostles, 8

And that the Original Power of Baptizing was lodg'd *solely and entirely* in Bishops, and derivatively convey'd from them to others; inferr'd by him from the Ancient Writers, II

His Notion of Bishops Ratifying Irregular Baptisms, by adding what was wanting in the Circumstances of Baptism, by an *after Confirmation*, consider'd and set to Rights, ibid.
His

The CONTENTS.

- His Distinction between *Irregularity* and *Invalidity*, consider'd, 13
 His Notion of Baptism minister'd *without a Commission*, that it was esteem'd *Valid*, notwithstanding the *Sinfulness* of the ACT OF MINISTRATION, refuted, 13, 14, &c.
 His Attempt to prove, that the Ancients did not suppose Baptism to be wholly founded upon *Sacerdotal Powers*, prov'd to be contrary to, and inconsistent with his own Assertions, 16, to 18
 His Fancy, that Baptism by an *Irregular Priest*, if allow'd to be Valid upon the Account of his Priestly Character, must be *Authoriz'd* and *Unauthoriz'd*, *Regular* and *Irregular*, *Lawful* and *Unlawful* at the same time, and in the very same Act and Respect, and therefore a Contradiction; prov'd to be very fallacious, 19
 His ill-grounded Guesse, at the Reasons why the Ancients allow'd of the *Validity* of Baptism by an *Irregular Priest*, 22
 His odd Notion of *Deacons* not being *Priests*, and consequently that Baptism perform'd by them in Absence of the *Priests*, is not Baptism by a *Sacerdotal* or *Priestly* Power; refuted, 16, 25

C H A P. III.

- TESTIMONIES for and against Lay-Baptism Examined, 30
 Mr. *Bingham* owns that *Lay-Men* were *always* debarr'd from the Ministration of Baptism in ALL ORDINARY CASES, *ibid.*
 This prov'd to be a Nulling of all *Lay-Baptisms* perform'd in Ordinary Cases; consequently that our Dissenters Baptisms are Null and Void, *ibid.*
 Mr. *Bingham* states the *grand Question* wrong, concerning *Lay-Baptism in Extraordinary Cases*, if he would bring it to our Case about which we are disputing, 32
 The Grand Question of our Lay-Baptisms truly stated, *ibid.*
 No Testimonies for Lay-Baptism in the first 200 Years of Christianity, 33
 Therefore no ancient Catholick Tradition, no general Sense and Practice of the Church, can be found whereon to establish the Practice of Lay-Baptism, *ibid.*
 Mr. *Bingham* owns that Particular Churches, are Exceptions against his pretended general Practice of the Church in this Matter, 32, 33
 Mr. *Bingham's* whole Evidence amounts to *no Catholick Tradition* for Lay-Baptism, 34
 St. *Ignatius*, Anno 71, makes Baptism to be Null and Void, when perform'd by one who was never commission'd by the Bishop, 35

The CONTENTS.

St. <i>Hermas</i> mentions none but Episcopally or Divinely Authoriz'd Baptizers, for Cases of Extremity,	38
<i>Tertullian's</i> private Notion, about the Year 200, of Lay-Men's Right to baptize in Absence of the Clergy; no Evidence of any Law, Tradition or Custom of the Catholick Church, for their pretended Right,	39, &c.
His false Reason upon which he founds their pretended Right, refuted,	43
His other particular Fancies, may with as much Reason be call'd the Church's General Sense and Practice, as his Notion of Lay-Baptism may,	44
He gives us not one Instance of any such Baptism, allow'd of by the Church in his Days,	47
His Words are full and direct against our ordinary Lay-Baptisms, and by Consequence prove their Nullity,	ibid.
St. <i>Cyprian</i> and <i>Firmilian</i> about the Year 256. reckon'd Lay-Baptisms to be Null and Void, as St. <i>Basil</i> witnesses,	48
St. <i>Cyprian's</i> own Works plainly shew, that he esteem'd all Baptisms to be void, that were perform'd by such as were reckon'd to be destitute of Priestly Power and Authority,	51
<i>Firmilian's</i> Letter to St. <i>Cyprian</i> proves, that <i>Firmilian</i> and the Council of <i>Iconium</i> held the same,	54, 55
Several of St. <i>Cyprian's</i> Collegues in the Council of <i>Carthage</i> , the same,	55, 56
The 47th Canon call'd Apostolical, the same,	57
The Council of <i>Eliberus</i> in <i>Spain</i> held by 19 Bishops <i>Anno</i> 305, does not favour Baptism by Persons, who never were commission'd by Bishops to baptize,	58, III
This Council is against <i>Tertullian's</i> private Opinion, of Lay-Men's Right in themselves to baptize in Absence of the Clergy,	59
And 'tis also against Mr. <i>Bingham's</i> Guess that <i>the Ancients might esteem Baptism by whomsoever Christian perform'd to be good and valid,</i>	59, 60
The Council of <i>Eliberis's</i> Canon, is no Argument for the Practice of the Catholick Church,	61
The Fable of <i>Athanasius</i> , when as Boy, baptizing his Play-fellows in Sport; and of <i>Alexander</i> the Bishop's determining the Baptism to be Valid, expos'd,	62
<i>Rufinus</i> , the first Author of it, a very credulous and careless Historian,	65
<i>Sozomen's</i> Account of it taken only from <i>Rufinus</i> ,	67
He was no very judicious Writer,	68
<i>Socrates Scholasticus</i> , the most Judicious and Diligent of the three Historians,	69
This latter, though quoted by Mr. <i>Bingham</i> to vouch for the Truth of that Fable, does not speak one Word, either of the Boy	69
<i>Atha-</i>	

The CONTENTS.

<i>Athanasius's</i> Baptizing the other Boys ; or of <i>Alexander's</i> suppos'd Determination about it,	69, 70
He says he Copy'd from <i>Rufinus</i> , such Passages, in the relation whereof <i>Rufinus</i> did not forsake the Truth,	71
And therefore his omitting this Fable, is an Argument that he did not believe <i>Rufinus's</i> Relation of it,	ibid.
Another of Mr. <i>Bingham's</i> Authors for the Truth of this Fable, founds it upon a new Supposition of his own, that spoils the Design of Mr. <i>Bingham's</i> relating it,	72
<i>Johannes Moschus</i> , another of Mr. <i>Bingham's</i> Vouchers, a Ridiculous Visionary Monk of the 7th Century ; who writes this Fable, among other idle Legendary Stories of Miracles, Dreams, &c. not to be credited ; some Particulars whereof are instanc'd,	73
<i>Nicephorus Calistus</i> , another of his Vouchers, a Fabulous Writer of the 14th Century, tho' Mr. <i>Bingham</i> says he relates this Story, yet in truth he do's not relate it,	75
And if he had, would have been but a sorry Evidence,	ibid.
A just Reflection on Mr. <i>Bingham's</i> producing such Fabulous Writers, to vouch for the Truth of this Fable, so pernicious in its Consequences, if believ'd to be true, just and right,	ibid.
The little or no Credit this Story has among Learned Men,	76
Even Papists themselves reject it,	77
This a Reproach to some Protestants who believe it,	78
But Protestants too have given their Testimony against it,	79
The Circumstances of the Story it self spoil its Credit,	ibid.
The Authors who believ'd this Story, are no Evidences that it was agreeable to the General Sense and Practice of the Church,	84
Mr. <i>Bingham</i> owns, there was Neither <i>Canon</i> nor Precedent PERHAPS to Warrant the suppos'd Fact of <i>Athanasius</i> ; and that it would be STRANGE, if any such Canon should be made in the Church,	90
His believing that " 'tis no easy Matter to produce an Ancient Canon " DIRECTLY TO CONFRONT <i>Alexander's</i> suppos'd Determination, is nothing to the purpose,	91
Because the Institution of Baptism and Laws of the Church, do confine Baptism to a Commission, and consequently forbid such a Determination in favour of its Validity when without a Commission,	ibid.
Mr. <i>Bingham</i> supposes, but do's not prove, and therefore is call'd upon to prove it, that an Uninstituted Ministration of Baptism, may be made Valid by a Post-fact Confirmation of the Bishop,	93

The CONTENTS.

If the Fable of <i>Athanasius</i> had been true, yet nothing to the Purpose could have been inferr'd from it,	95
Nor any thing have been safely concluded from it,	ibid.
The Dreadful Consequences of admitting Bishop <i>Alexander's</i> supposed Opinion, to have been JUST and RIGHT,	ibid.
Which Proves the whole Story to be Foolish and Ridiculous; and therefore contrary to the <i>General Sense and Practice</i> of the Catholick Church,	97
<i>Hilary</i> , Deacon of <i>Rome</i> , about <i>Anno</i> 350, affirms, that in his time Laymen did not Baptize,	ibid.
<i>Pacianus</i> , Bishop of <i>Barcelona</i> , Nulls Baptism by Persons not having a Priestly Power,	98
<i>Optatus</i> , Bishop of <i>Milevis's</i> SUPPOS'D NOTION of the Validity of Baptism by any Person whatsoever, prov'd to be Singular and Popish, and not Countenanc'd by the Catholick Church,	104
His Words more Justly and Candidly interpreted, infer no such <i>Latitudinarian</i> Principle,	106
<i>St. Basil</i> , Bishop of <i>Cesarea</i> , <i>Anno</i> 369, Nulls Lay-Baptism,	109
<i>St. Chrysostom</i> , Archbishop of <i>Constantinople</i> , <i>Anno</i> 398, do's the same,	114
A Passage quoted by Mr. <i>Bingham</i> out of the Apostolick Constitutions, do's so likewise,	117
<i>St. Jerom</i> in the Latter end of the IVth Century, his Notion of Laymen's Power to Baptize in Case of Necessity, founded on No Law of God, or of the Ancient Catholick Church,	120
But on a False Principle of his own, much the same with that of <i>Tertullian</i> ,	122
He Contradicts this Notion by his Dialogue against the <i>Luciferians</i> Schismatics, wherein he Confutes the <i>Luciferians</i> by this Principle, That if the <i>Arian</i> Clergy were but Laicks, the Baptism administer'd by them ought to be reject'd,	123, to 138
The Inconsistency of <i>St. Jerom's</i> first Notion, with the Scope of this Dialogue,	131, 139
He Nulls Lay-Baptism by saying, "That without Priests there is no Church,	139
Mr. <i>Bingham's</i> Cavil at Dr. <i>Forbes's</i> and Mr. <i>Reeves's</i> Words, upon this Dialogue, consider'd,	140
<i>St. Augustin</i> , as quoted by Mr. <i>Bingham</i> from <i>Gratian</i> , misrepresented by him to the <i>English</i> Reader, in favour of Lay-Baptism,	143
His Words prove No Matter of Fact, of Laymen's Baptizing,	ibid.
Another Passage of that Father, as quoted by Mr. <i>Bingham</i> from <i>Gratian</i> , makes the <i>Apostolick Commission</i> to be a Necessary Condition of Baptism,	145
	Ano-

The CONTENTS.

Another Passage <i>Gratian</i> attributes to St. <i>Augustin</i> , which by Necessary Consequence Nulls our Lay-Baptisms,	146
A Story <i>Gratian</i> relates as from St. <i>Augustin</i> in favour of Lay-Baptism,	ibid.
St. <i>Augustin</i> , if he did relate it, owns that 'twas only a Report, and the <i>Author unknown</i> ,	147
St. <i>Augustin</i> 's suppos'd Opinion, That such a Case, as a Layman's Baptizing a Person in Danger of Death, where no other was present, might happen ; and that a Person so in Danger ought not to be left unbaptiz'd, fairly consider'd,	147, 148
St. <i>Augustin</i> 's Genuin Works, prove Nothing of any Law, Tradition, or Custom of the Catholick Church for Lay-Baptism,	150, to 162
He Hesitates, and is not positive, that Lay-Baptism in Case of Necessity is Valid ; this proves, that he did not know of any Catholick Tradition for the pretended Validity thereof,	150, 151
Which is further Confirm'd, by his not being able to Clear such pretended Baptisms from the Guilt of Sin,	153
His Notion of Usurped Lay-Baptism in Ordinary Cases, being Unlawful, and to be repented of by both Giver and Receiver, and that 'tis yet <i>Valid</i> ; refuted at large,	154, to 160
He acknowledges this not to have been the Determination of any General Council, but his own Private Opinion,	155, 156
He was not wholly free from introducing Novelcies in Religion,	161
<i>Gelasius</i> , Bishop of <i>Rome</i> , <i>Anno</i> 492. His Saying of Laymen's having Power granted them to Baptize in Cases of Extreme Necessity, is no Proof that this was the General Sense and Practice of the Church,	162, 163
Mr. <i>Bingham</i> 's false Inference from <i>Gelasius</i> 's Words, That LAYMEN had <i>as much Power</i> to Baptize in Absence of Deacons, as DEACONS HAD in Absence of the Presbyters and Bishop, expos'd,	162
<i>Gelasius</i> is no Evidence for the Validity of Baptism by Persons who were never Commission'd by Bishops to Baptize,	164
<i>Isidore</i> , Bishop of <i>Sevil</i> , <i>Anno</i> 595, founds the Power of Baptizing upon the Commission Christ gave to his Apostles,	165, 166
His saying of Laymen's being permitted or impower'd to Baptize, is still confining the Power of Baptizing to a Commission to be first receiv'd by the Baptizer,	167
The Unaccountable Lengths some Men ran into, concerning the Minister of Baptism, after St. <i>Augustin</i> 's Days,	ibid.

The CONTENTS.

The Summ of Mr. *Bingham's* whole Evidence, in his own Words, is, That the General Sense and Practice of the Church for the first 600 Years, was grounded upon the Apostolick Commission, given to all Baptizers in *Cases Ordinary* and *Extraordinary*

169

From whence it follows, that the General Sense and Practice of the Ancient Catholick Church, do's not Countenance the pretended Validity of Baptisms, perform'd by Persons, who never were Commission'd by Bishops,

170

Mr. *Bingham's* whole Evidence is not so much as a Proof, that the Ancient Catholick Church for the first 600 Years, did ever Authorize or Commission Laymen to Baptize, in want of the Clergy,

ibid.

C H A P. IV.

Mr. *Bingham's* Objections against the Testimonies of St. *Cyprian*, St. *Basil*, and St. *Chrysoptom*, answer'd,

174

C H A P. V.

HIS Acknowledgments, concerning the Great Question now in Dispute, viz. "*Whether the Usurped and Unauthoriz'd Baptism of Luymen, was allow'd* [by the Ancient Catholick Church] "*to be Valid?*" Wherein he establishes our Assertion,

189

C H A P. VI.

THE Ancient Churches, who allow'd of Heretical and Schismatical Baptisms, did not reckon those Baptisms to have been *Unauthoriz'd, Uncommission'd, Anti Episcopall Lay-Baptisms*, tho' Mr. *Bingham* endeavours to make them look as such,

193

Of the Rite of Imposition of Hands, whereby repenting Hereticks and Schismaticks were receiv'd into the Church,

208

C H A P. VII.

Mr. *Bingham's* Account of the supposed Practice of Lay-Baptism by the Modern *Greeks, Moscovites*, and Foreign Reform'd, examin'd,

102

Of

The CONTENTS.

Of the Modern Greeks,	ibid.
Of the Moscovites,	240
Of the Foreign Reform'd,	246

CHAP. VIII.

THE whole Evidence of Antiquity summ'd up; proving;
That the Far Greater Majority of Ancient Testimony, is a-
gainst all Pretended Baptisms perform'd by Persons, who ne-
ver were Authoriz'd by Bishops to Baptize; and consequently,
that such Baptisms are not Valid by any Ecclesiastical Law,
Tradition, or Custom of the Ancient Catholick Church,
259, to 269

The Conclusion, containing a True State of the Question about
Supposed Cases of Necessity, where Episcopally Authoriz'd Bap-
tizers are not to be had, 269

E R R A T A.


- P**Age 3. Line 29. *for* Baptism, *read* Christian Sacraments.
P. 36. l. the last, *for*, by Virtue any, *read*, by Virtue of any.
P. 59. l. 15. *read* *Scholastical History*
P. 117. l. 19. *for*, this of the Invalidity, *read*, this Applicable to
the Invalidity.
P. 126. In the Note l. 4. *read*, est enim.
P. 127. l. 2. *read*, do not act. L. 13. *read*, whom you do not.
L. 15, 16, 22. blot out " the Double Comma's.
P. 144. l. 22. *read* Fallacy.
P. 224. l. 21. *read* *His Collection*.
P. 269. l. 5. *read*, I have said.
P. 272. l. 10. *read*, and Deacons.



THE
SECOND PART
OF
Lay-Baptism Invalid.

CHAP. I.

*The Occasion and Nature of the
present Dispute.*

§ I.  HAT there may be no Mistake in the Nature and Design of this Controversy, the Reader is desir'd to bear this always in mind, and to keep his Eye continually upon it; That the Occasion thereof is a most Novel, and formerly unheard of, Unchristian Usurpation, attempted at the *Reformation*, and since that time to this day, by Men who *never receiv'd* any Divine Commillion; and who yet, in Opposition to, and Rebellion against, their Spiritual Sovereigns, refusing to receive any such

B Com-

Commission from them, endeavour to advance themselves into the High-Priests and Priests Office, and to minister in such Holy Things, as God has appropriated to that *Sacred Commission*, which he gives to Men for that Purpose: And this they do, not upon the pretence of *Necessity*, arising, as some suppose, from the want of such as are Commission'd, but in an *obstinate perverse Resistance* against Christ's *Spiritual Vicegerents*, undervaluing and trampling upon *that Authority* wherewith He has invested them.

§ II. It is also to be remembred, That God always us'd (if we may believe the Divine Oracles) to set a Mark of his severest Displeasure, *not only* upon such *Usurping Administrators* themselves, but also upon those who adher'd to and encourag'd them in their *Usurpations*; as I have formerly observ'd and instanc'd upon this Occasion; and He has made such *Usurpers* and their *Adherents* sensible of his *Wrath and Fury*, not only when they have attempted *Sacred Ministrations*, without any plea of *Necessity*, as did *Corah* and his Company, and King *Uzziah*; but also, when, to all appearance, they had a fair plea of *Necessity* to excuse their *Usurpations*, if *That* could be an Excuse, as we see that it was not in the Cases of *Saul* and *Uzza*.

§ III. Hence it behoves such *Usurpers*, and those who concur with, abett, and encourage their *Usurpations*, seriously to consider what they are doing; and upon what foundation they can venture to affirm any *Validity* to be in such *pretended Ministrations*; when God himself has branded *others like theirs*, with indelible Marks of *Infamy* and

and Reproach, by the Everlasting Sacred History of his Just Indignation and most Righteous Vengeance against such Usurpers, and their Encouragers and Abettors.

§ IV. It was this Consideration, that at first set the Author of *Lay-Baptism Invalid*, upon enquiring, whether God has a kinder Regard for such Usurpations now, than He had formerly; and whether He will now admit of and receive as good and valid, the *pretended* Ministration of Christian Sacraments, from such Usurpers Hands, as He *never did* so much as once Authorize, Commission, or Impower for Sacred Ministrations, since He has Ordain'd and Set apart a particular Order of Men, whom He Vested with his own Authority for such Purposes? Upon a serious Enquiry into this Matter, and a deliberate Search into the *Divine Institution* of the Christian Priesthood and Sacraments, and the Nature thereof, He could not chuse but think thus much; That the *Commission* of him who ministers Christian Sacraments, *is as much, as durable*, and as constantly *an obliging Positive Divine Institution*, as either the *Matter* or *Form* of the Sacraments is; and that consequently, a *Ministration destitute* of either of these latter, which is so displeasing to God, as to be therefore wholly *Null and Void*; is, but *an Equal Offence* against the *Institution of Baptism*, with another false *Ministration*, which is destitute only of the *Divine Commission*; and that therefore this *latter*, where there is *no Commission*, is *as much Offensive* to the Divine Majesty, and consequently *Null and Void*, as the other, upon the very same Reason and Foundation: And this, with respect to *Baptism*, he has endeavour'd to prove, from the *Institution it self of Baptism*, keep-

ing close to the Rule which our Saviour set his Church herein. And the Opposers of this, must produce no less than *Vincentius Lirinensis's* Golden Rule, viz. *Traditio, semper, ubique, & ab omnibus credita*, to prove that it was a Catholick Tradition, always, in every Place, and by all taught, believ'd, and practis'd, at least by the generality of the Ancient Church, viz. That the Institution of *Baptism* does not hinder, but that Persons who *were never Commission'd at all to Baptize*, may administer *Legally Valid* Baptism; I say, *Legally Valid*, with respect to the *Divine Law*; for if it wants of that Legal Validity, what signifies any other pretended Validities of Mens Invention? If they do not produce such an Universal Tradition as this, for the Interpretation of the Institution of Baptism, in favour of Ministrations perform'd by such as were *never Commission'd*; their pompous Show of *Quotations* from some few *Latin Fathers*, will amount to no more than a bare Discovery of some of their private Opinions; which, in Matters of such vast Moment as this is, will fall *infinitely* short of Deciding the *Merits* of the Cause.

§ V. Let us then see what Mr. *Bingham* has done towards the Discovery of this Universal *Tradition*; and whether his Scholastical History does not rather prove, that the Universality of the Church's Tradition, is, That the Institution of Baptism requires the *Divine Commission* of the Minister of Baptism constantly to accompany the Ministration thereof; and because *constantly*, therefore, that the Commission is *Essential* to the *Valid Ministration* thereof; *Essential*, by reason of its Equal Obligation and Necessity with the *Matter* and the *Form* by the Institution.

C H A P. II.

Our Historian's Account of the Apostolick Commission to Baptize ; of the Conveyance, and constant Necessity thereof to the End of the World.

§ I. **H**E first very rightly begins with the Commission given to the *Apostles*, p. 2. where he says, “ *It is certain, the Commission to Baptize, was Originally given by our Saviour to the Eleven Apostles ; for so it is expressly said, Mat. xxviii. 16, &c.* Then he adds ; That “ *By the Tenor of this Commission, it is certain they were invested with Authority, not only to Baptize themselves, but to communicate this Power to others : For the Commission and Power of Baptizing, was not to Die with them, but to Continue to the End of the World,* p. 3. Upon which 'tis very remarkable, that He makes the **Commission** to Baptize of constant *Duration* and *Obligation*, in and to the Church ; for he says, 'twas to *Continue to the End of the World* : And the very great and pressing Necessity of this, he urges thus ; “ *But then two Questions arise from hence : Whom they actually Authoriz'd to Baptize ? And to whom they gave Commission to Authorize others to Baptize ? For (says he) both these things were Necessary, to Preserve the Church, according to the Order of Christ, at least in Future Ages,* p. 3. Pray observe this, for 'tis a granting of the Thing disputed for,

viz. That the Church cannot be preserv'd, Christian Baptism cannot be had, *without the Commission to Baptize*; for, if it can, then, *whom the Apostles actually Authoriz'd, and to whom they gave Commission to Authorize others, to Baptize*, were not Necessary to preserve the Church: For where lies the Necessity, if it can be preserv'd without the Commission to Baptize? But this Historian says they were Necessary; *i. e.* the Commission, who should Baptize, was Necessary to preserve the Church, according to the Order of Christ, in future Ages. And this amounts to no less, than that the Commission to Baptize was Necessary to Preserve Baptism; because if Baptism is not Preserv'd, the Church it self is not preserv'd, since Baptism is the Incorporation of all its Members; and therefore, where there is *No Commission*, there is *no Baptism, no Church*, according to the Order of Christ; if we may believe Mr. Bingham himself. This is a fair setting out for him at the Beginning of his Work, and is destructive of the main Design of his History, and shews that *the Divine has the better of the Historian.*

§ II. He next proceeds to Answer the Two Questions he just now propos'd, and proves, first, That the Apostles gave Commission to Bishops, Presbyters and Deacons to Baptize; — and then says, *“ but still it remains a Question, whether they extend-
“ ed this Commission to any others, either in Ordinary or Extraordinary Cases, p. 3.* He says, *“ The Ancient Author, under the Name of St. Ambrose, was of Opinion, That the Apostles first found
“ it necessary, for the Augmentation and Encrease
“ of the Church, to Grant a General Commission to
“ all Christians, both to Teach and Baptize; but
“ as*

“ as soon as that Necessity was over, as soon as
 “ the World was generally Converted, and Churches
 “ erected, Governors and other Officers were appointed
 “ in all Churches, and then this General Commission
 “ was withdrawn ; so that none, even among the
 “ Clergy, was to presume to meddle with any Office
 “ to which he was not Appointed. Mr. Bingham
 goes on with his Quotation, thus ; “ Hence it came
 “ to pass, that neither Deacons were allow’d to
 “ Preach, nor the Inferior Clergy nor Lay-men to
 “ Baptize, p. 3 & 4. But the Latin, as himself
 quotes it in the Margin, p. 3. is, “ *Hinc ergo est,*
 “ *unde nunc neque Diaconi in populo Prædicant, neque*
 “ *Clerici vel Laici Baptizant.* † All in the Pre-
 sent Tense ; which is a Proof that the supposititious
 St. Ambrose said, concerning the Time that he lived
 in, *Hence it comes to pass, that Now neither Dea-*
cons are allowed to Preach, nor the Inferior Clergy
nor Lay-men to Baptize : plainly excluding all Lay-
 men of his time and knowledge, without exception,
 from that Power ; and whoever was the Author,
 whether Hilary the Deacon of Rome, or Remigius of
 Lyons, he cannot be suppos’d to have written ear-
 lier than the middle of the Fourth Century.

But now, Is the Opinion of this spurious St. Am-
 brose, That the Apostles did at first “ Grant a
 “ General Commission to all Christians both
 “ to Teach and Baptize,” true or no ? If it were
 true, would all the Greek and Latin Writers, for
 350 Years together, have been silent about this
 Matter ? And if they had said any thing to con-
 firm it, would our Reverend Historian have omitted
 their more primitive Evidence, and instead of it,

† *Ambros. Com. in Ephes. iv. p. 948.*

have given us only one Quotation from a doubted Author, whose *Ability* and *Veracity* both are very justly suspicious, upon the account of his *Obscurity*, his *great Distance* from the Days of the Apostles, and his *Singularity* of Opinion about this Matter, for which he vouches no former Author? If it were true, would the Apostle St. Paul have given us reason to believe the contrary, by affirming, in his Days, when the World was not *Generally Converted*, An. Chr. 59. That God — set some in his Church, first Apostles, secondarily Prophets, thirdly **Teachers**; upon which he makes this Interrogation — *Are all Teachers?* 1 Cor. xii. 28, 29. which is a strong Affirmation, that all Christians were not then *Teachers*; contrary to the Opinion of the spurious St. Ambrose, that the Apostles did at first grant a general Commission to all Christians to Teach; and since he is wrong in this, 'tis reasonable to believe he is so in the other, viz. the *general Commission to all Christians to Baptize*, which he connects to that of their *Teaching*: And therefore our Historian has prov'd nothing of Lay-Christians being at first Authoriz'd to Baptize, from this Quotation: since his Author's pretended Evidence is contrary to Scripture, in one Instance; and not establish'd thereby, but wholly singular with respect to all Antiquity before him, in the other.

§ III. After this Quotation; Mr. Bingham says, concerning the Power of Baptizing receiv'd from the Apostles, by way of Paraphrase upon his Author's Words, "That his Author seems to have been of Opinion, that — as no one can have a Power of Baptizing, but He that receives, some way or other, a Commission from them, [i. e. the

the Apostles;] *So, &c. p. 4.* This is our Historian's own Comment; and I desire it may be taken the more notice of, because I shall make some further Use of it hereafter; in the mean time, it plainly intimates, in conjunction with this Quotation, That the Commission to Baptize **can only be executed** by the Apostles and their Successors, and such as are *Appointed, Authoriz'd, Impower'd* or *Commission'd* by them, be they who they will, whether Men in standing Holy Orders, or, in want of such, others who are not so, *if they can be at all Commission'd*: And whether they can or no, I trouble not my self; but leave that to be disputed between Mr. *Bingham* and his Antagonist the Doctor at *Greenwich*, Author of a little Pamphlet, Intituled, *New Dangers to the Christian Priesthood*, (who reckons the standing Priesthood to be in very great Danger, upon this Principle, of Bishops having Power to Authorize Lay-men to Baptize) which has been Answer'd in the *Preface* to the Third Edition of *Lay-Baptism Invalid*.

§ IV. Mr. *Bingham* proceeds with his Author's Opinion; "*When the Necessities of the Church requir'd it, they [i. e. the Apostles] had Power to Authorize others, besides the standing Ministers, to Baptize; which Power they both might and did recall again, as soon as those Necessities of the Church were over: And upon this Principle it was, chiefly, that the Ancient Bishops of the Church allow'd Deacons and sometimes Lay-men to Baptize, &c. p. 4.* But our Historian's Author has not prov'd the Truth of his Opinion. He has given no Ancient Testimony of the "*Apostle's Commissioning others besides the standing Ministers to Baptize*": This pretended Matter of Fact is so far from being well

well attested, that it is not attested at all; we have nothing but his bare *ipse dixit* for it, at 300 Years Distance from the Apostles, and have reason to believe it to be false: See § II. And therefore to found the Principle of Bishops Power to Authorize Lay-men to Baptize, upon this not prov'd but pretended Matter of Fact only, is very weak and precarious. Besides, why are *Deacons* here rank'd with Lay-men, among those who are not *standing Ministers to Baptize*? Did not *Mr. Bingham* reckon 'em before as *standing Ministers*? p. 3. How shall we account for these things? But further, If it could be prov'd, as it has not yet been, that Bishops have Power, and by *virtue thereof* have sometimes allow'd or authoriz'd Lay-men to Baptize, "when the Necessities of the Church requir'd it;" Is it not a jest to talk at this rate, if Lay-men can in such Cases "have a Power of Baptizing" without the *Bishop's Commission*? Either such Exigencies alone gave them a Power, or they did not. If they did, then they stood in no need of being *Authoriz'd by Bishops*; and so Bishops taking upon them so to *Authorize them*, was a pretence of Power which signify'd nothing: If such Exigencies alone did not Impower them to Baptize, then, if they had pretended to Baptize, having never receiv'd the *Bishop's Commission*, they would have exerted *no Power* of Baptizing, and so their Act would have been *No Baptism*: It remains then, that the whole Power of *Legally Valid Baptism* must be resolv'd into the *Commission* of the Baptizer, in conjunction with the Matter and the Form. Otherwise the Power of *Giving and Withdrawing a Commission* to Baptize will be but a Banter. And *without this Principle*, [of the Necessity of the Apostolick Commission to Baptize]

Baptize] *it will be impossible to account for the Practise of all the Bishops of the Catholick Church, who appropriate to themselves alone the Power of giving others Commission to Baptize.*

§ V. Mr. Bingham tells us next, That many Passages of the Ancient Writers “*speak of the Original Power of administering Baptism, as lodg’d solely and entirely in the hands of Bishops, as the Apostles immediate Successors, [This is acknowledged] He proceeds, “and derivatively convey’d from them to others,”* — whom they “*Authoriz’d to be either the standing and Ordinary Ministers of Baptism, or else only the Occasional and Extraordinary Ministers of it, in Times of absolute Necessity, and great Exigences of the Church,* — p. 5. This of “*only the Occasional and Extraordinary Ministers of Baptism, besides Bishops, Priests and Deacons, who are the “standing and Ordinary Ministers”* thereof, he has not yet brought Evidence for. Then he goes on, That the Antients “*thought Baptism chiefly to be the Bishop’s Office; and when it was done by others, it was still done by his Authority, and reputed as his Act; which he also Ratified as Occasion required, by adding what was wanting in the Circumstances of the Solemnity, in a subsequent Confirmation,* p. 8. This is very Right, they did think so, and the Bishop did so Ratifie and Confirm what was wanting in the **Circumstances** of the Solemnity, but never what was wanting of the *Essentials* relating to the Sacrament, “*in a subsequent Confirmation.*” Let our Historian produce any ancient Instances of these latter sort of pretended Confirmations, if he is able; which he has not yet done. And the Commission to
Baptize,

Baptize, is not a Circumstantial, but an *Essential* relation to Baptism.

§ VI. He says, That this Point was clear among
 “ them *beyond all Dispute, That Presbyters had only*
 “ *a Derivative and Subordinate Power to Baptize as*
 “ *well as others, and so long as they kept to this*
 “ *Rule, their Baptisms were Regular and Lawful, as*
 “ *done in Conformity to the Establish’d Rules and*
 “ *Orders of the Church : But if they set themselves*
 “ *in Opposition to their Bishop, and either acted with-*
 “ *out or against his Consent, as Absolute and In-*
 “ **dependent** *of him, then their Baptisms and all*
 “ *their other Offices were Irregular and Unlawful,*
 “ *because done in a Schismatical Way, and in a pro-*
 “ *fess’d Contempt of Authority, and all the standing*
 “ *Rules and Laws of the Church,* p. 9, 10.

This of Presbyters Derivative and Subordinate Power to Baptize, is not to be deny’d : But then it is to be enquir’d, What Presbyters among the Antients did ever offer to Baptize, as **Absolute and Independent of Bishops** ? Mr. *Bingham* has not produced any ancient Instance of such modern Rebels ; no, the Schismaticks of old adher’d to, and depended upon some Bishop or other. And if it be proper to call their Baptisms Irregular and Unlawful, yet their Irregularity and Unlawfulness had a reference only to the *Circumstantial Rules and Laws of the Church* ; as a Baptism administer’d by a Priest, with us, in a *Private House*, where there is no Necessity for such Private Baptism, may be call’d *Irregular and Unlawful*, because contrary to the Church’s Rubrick ; it may be fairly aggravated to such a pitch, as to be affirm’d to be “ *in Opposition to the Bishop, and without or against his Consent.*” And yet all this is but a *Circumstantial Irregularity*, which

which is certainly a great Sin, but yet not such a one as that which is an *Essential Irregularity, or breach of the Essential Law or Institution of Baptism.*

This answers what our Author says, “*That a plain Distinction must needs have been made always, between the Irregularity and the Invalidity of any Baptism; since the want of a Lawful Commission and Authority would render the Act of Administration Sinful and Irregular, but not absolutely Invalid,* p. 10. For here he begs the Question, as if want of Commission for some Circumstance relating to Baptism, were exactly the same as **want of Commission to Baptize**; or as if an Officer Commission’d to Baptize, but restrain’d from Executing his Commission by some Ecclesiastical Law respecting some particular Circumstances, were *but equal* in Authority and Power to Baptize, with One who never receiv’d any Commission or Authority to administer that Sacrament at all: Just as if a Man should say, that the Irregularity of a Lay-Person’s Washing, who never was at all in any respect whatsoever Commission’d to Baptize, is but of the *same Nature* with that Irregularity which a Priest Commission’d to Baptize commits, when he executes his Commission with some sinful Circumstance, contrary to the Injunction or particular Licence of his Bishop for that particular Occasion; thus confounding *Circumstantial* with *Essential* Irregularities: And without making this Necessary Distinction,

§ VII. He next tries, “*How it came to pass, that Baptism ministred by a Presbyter Illegally and without Commission, [as he calls it] was nevertheless esteem’d Valid, notwithstanding the Sinfulness of the Act of Administration?*”

But

But in his stating of this Question, he is very uncorrect, nay, unintelligible; he speaks of a **Presbyter without Commission**. Who can understand this? If he is a *Presbyter*, then he *has a Commission*; for 'tis only his having a Commission that makes him a *Presbyter*; and when he has *no Commission*, or is *without a Commission*, which I take to be all one, he is no *Presbyter* at all: So that here Mr. *Bingham* makes an Enquiry concerning a Person who is a *Presbyter* and *no Presbyter*, who is in Commission, and yet "*without a Commission*"; "*and this is enquiring about nothing at all*. But however, to find his Meaning, if I can: By Baptism, ministred by a *Presbyter, illegally, and without Commission*, he may mean, such a Baptism as is ministred by a *Presbyter* who is Commission'd by his Bishop to Baptize; but he does it in such a *Circumstance* for which Circumstance he receiv'd *no Commission*; nay, he does it, probably, in such a Circumstance as is prohibited both by the Laws of God and his Church; and it may be our Historian would enquire, how it came to pass that such Baptisms were nevertheless esteem'd Valid?

There is another thing which wants to be clear'd in his Wording the Question, and that is this; What he means by **the Sinfulness of the Act of Ministration**? For a *Presbyter* or Priest's Act of Baptism, as such, *is not a Sinful Act*, when it has all the Essentials relating to Baptism. The *Act of Ministration* is good in *it self*; all the Sin is only in the *Circumstance* that attends the Act: So that by "*the Sinfulness of the Act of Ministration*," I believe our Author here means, the *Sinfulness of that Circumstance* which accompanies the Act of Ministration. With Submission, I think, these things ought to have been more clearly express'd, because
very

very much depends upon that Enquiry which is to be made about them; and I am sorry this learned Gentleman puts me to the Trouble of thus endeavouring to set in a clear Light a Question of so great Importance, which he has *so darkly* propos'd to resolve.

§ VIII. We come now to see how he resolves this Question; and first, he disapproves of doing it, by supposing *an indelible* Character and Power in the Priesthood, which is said by the School-men to be “*given to a Presbyter at his Ordination, by which they think all his ministerial Acts stand good, tho’ done in an irregular Manner against the Laws and Canons of the Church; and that a Priest cannot be divested of this Power after he is once legally Ordained to it.*” Now as to this indelible Character which our Historian argues against, I find no necessity to take either Side of the Question; Whether there is an *absolutely indelible Character and Power* conferr’d on Priests in a valid Ordination, or whether there is not? This will not touch the Truth I am concern’d for, whether they have it, or have it not; only I must make some Observations upon Mr. Bingham’s supposed Reasons, against the Antients allowing the Baptism perform’d by such disorderly Priests to be good and valid upon the Account of their *indelible* Character.

And first he says, That the Antients “*did not suppose Baptism founded wholly upon Sacerdotal Powers, nor tied so absolutely to the Office of a Priest, but that it might in ordinary Cases also be administer’d by Deacons, if they had the Bishop’s Commission; and by Lay-men in extraordinary Cases of pressing Necessity, if they had the Bishop’s License and Authority to do it, as we shall see here-*

“ *hereafter, says our Author,*” p. 10. In giving this his suppos’d Reason, he has committed several Mistakes; for first, his Assertion, that the Antients did not suppose Baptism to be *founded wholly upon Sacerdotal Powers*, is inconsistent with what he had said before, *viz.* That “ *the Commission and Power [given the Apostles] to Baptize, was to continue to the End of the World;*” That “ *whom they authoriz’d to Baptize, and to whom they gave Commission to authorize others to Baptize,*” were both “ *of them necessary to preserve the Church according to the Order of Christ in future Ages,*” p. 2. “ *That no one can have a Power of Baptizing, but he that receives some way or other a Commission from them,*” i. e. the Apostles, p. 4. “ *That the Original Power of administering Baptism,*” — is — “ *lodg’d solely and entirely in the Hands of Bishops,*” p. 5. — That “ *when it was done by others, it was still done by his, the Bishop’s, Authority, and reputed as his Act,*” p. 8. All which was plainly founding Baptism wholly upon *Sacerdotal Powers*, if the Apostolick Commission, Episcopal Authority, and the Bishop’s *Act*, can be called *Sacerdotal*, and if *no one* can have a *Power of Baptizing without it*. But now, indeed, ’tis otherwise with our Historian, because he likes not the *indelible Character* of the Priesthood. “ *The Antients did not suppose Baptism wholly founded upon Sacerdotal Powers,*” they did, and they did not; I am sorry for the Occasion of this Remark. 2dly, His here reckoning **Deacons** among such as have not *Sacerdotal Powers*, by making their *Baptizing* an instance that Baptism was not by the Antients wholly founded upon *Sacerdotal Powers*, is another Inconsistence with himself; for in his *Origines*, Vol. I. p. 250, 251. he shews, That “ *Op-*
tatus

“ *tatus* gives all the Three Orders of *Bishops, Presbyters and Deacons, the Title of Priesthood:*—That, “ *according to him, every Order had its Share tho’ in different Degrees in the Christian Priesthood:*” That “ *Bishops, Presbyters and Deacons had each their respective Share in the Priesthood:*” That it was one Act of the *Priest’s Office* to offer up the *Sacrifices of the Peoples Prayers,*” &c. And that “ *another Act of the Office [i.e. the Priest’s Office] was in God’s Name to bless the People, particularly by admitting them to the Benefit of Remission of Sins, by Spiritual Regeneration or Baptism:*” That “ *thus far Deacons were anciently allowed to minister in Holy Things, as Mediators between God and the People.*”— And Lastly, in his 2d Vol. Chap. 1. where he is shewing, how the inferior Orders of the Clergy, in the Primitive Church, “ *differ’d from the superior Orders of Bishops, Presbyters and Deacons.*” He says of these superior Orders, p. 9, 10. That they are by the Antients call’d “ *Holy and Sacred, the Hierarchy:*”— That “ *they were always ordain’d at the Altar,*”— with the Solemn Rite of “ *Imposition of Hands,*”— “ *to minister before God as Priests,*” in which respects, “ *Deacons are said by Optatus and others, to have their Share and Degree in the Christian Priesthood:*” And Mr. Bingham quotes the Reverend and Learned Dr. Hicks’s Opinion to the same Purpose, without gain-saying it, Vol. I. p. 251. But notwithstanding all this, our Historian so far forgets his *Origines*, as now, to make Deacons Baptizing, an Instance of Persons Baptizing, without *Sacerdotal Powers:* Nay, Thirdly, even his introducing Baptism by “ *Lay-men in extraordinary Cases, if they had the Bishop’s Authority;*” as another

Instance of Persons Baptizing without *Sacerdotal Powers*, is another Contradiction to what he had said before, *7. 8. viz.* "That when [Baptism] was done by others, it was still done by the Bishop's Authority, and reputed his Act." Now the Bishop's Act, I hope, is a *Sacerdotal Power*; and if a Lay-man can be so far authoriz'd by his Bishop, as that the Lay-man's Act of Baptism shall be reputed to be the Bishop's Act, Is not this supposed Baptism founded upon a *Sacerdotal Power*, when the Baptism by such a Lay-man (if there can be such a one) is the Bishop's Act? Again, the Reverend Historian in his *Origines*, Vol. I. p. 42. has been so kind to Lay-ministrations, as to tell us, without endeavouring to refute the Notion, that *Tertullian* grants no other Priesthood to Lay-men, save "that they may Baptize in Case of absolute Necessity, &c." These are our Historian's own Words, "No other Priesthood, save that, they may Baptize;" which is plainly to make the Power of Baptizing, a Power of Priesthood. Let *Tertullian's* Opinion about Lay-men be true or false for the present; Mr. *Bingham* here makes Baptism to be one Part of Priesthood, by saying, "No other Priesthood, save that they may Baptize:" And therefore, if Lay-men "may Baptize," they therein have one Power of Priesthood at least, according to our Author in his *Origines*; but, on the contrary, in his *Scholastical History*, their Baptizing even with the Bishop's Authority, is an Instance of Baptism not founded on a *Sacerdotal Power*: These things do not hang well together. However, I charitably hope, they are but meer Slips, the Effects of Human Frailty, and not purposely design'd by our Reverend Historian.

§ IX. His second suppos'd Reason against the Antients allowing the Validity of Baptisms, perform'd
by

by *irregular Priests*, to be founded on their *indelible Character*, is this, p. 10, 11. “ *The indelible Character of a Priest, do’s not authorize or qualifie him to act contrary to the Commission of his Bishop: For then his Baptizing would be authorized and unauthorized, regular and irregular, lawful and unlawful, at the same Time, and in the very same Act and Respect, which is a manifest Contradiction.*”

In this there is a great deal of Art, but no good Reasoning; for an *irregular Priest’s Act of Baptizing* simply consider’d, is *not contrary to the Commission of his Bishop*, but ’tis doing exactly that which his Bishop commission’d him to do, when he Baptizes with Water, in the Name of *the Trinity*, and when his Commission was not before made Null and Void by that Power which vested him with it: He commits some Irregularity indeed against the Laws of the Church; but his Power to Baptize, if ’tis *not null’d*, still remains, and therefore *in Baptizing*, he acts nothing without, or contrary to the *Bishop’s Commission* to Baptize, wherewith he still remains invested: He rebels against his Bishop by Baptizing in some prohibited Circumstance, by exercising his Function illegally; and in so doing opposes the Laws of the Church, as a Priest of the Church of *England* do’s, when he unnecessarily Baptizes in private Houses, or when he Baptizes Children without God-fathers and God-mothers, or when he uses the Publick instead of the Private Form in Houses: But his Sin is not against his Bishop’s Commission it self to Baptize, but against some Circumstantial Law relating to the Execution of the Commission. So that his Act of Baptizing is not, as Mr. *Bingham* says, both authoriz’d and unauthoriz’d, for ’tis authoriz’d; but the Circumstance that attends it, is *unauthoriz’d*. The Bap-

tism it self is *regular*, because done by virtue of a Commission still remaining; but the Circumstance is irregular, because against a Circumstantial Rule. And the Baptism it self is *lawful*, because no other than commission'd Baptism; but the Circumstance *unlawful*, because contrary to a Circumstantial Law, as is plain by the above-mention'd Instance of an irregular Priest of the Church of *England's* illegally executing his Commission to Baptize. So that the manifest Contradiction Mr. *Bingham* talks of, as arising from a Supposition of the indelible Character of an irregular Priest, and the Validity of his Baptism founded thereon, do's not appear; for Baptism, by such a Priest, is not "*both authoriz'd and unauthoriz'd, regular and irregular, lawful and unlawful, at the same Time, and in the very same Act and Respect:*" For the **very same Act** is even at that same time *authoriz'd, regular, and lawful* in it self, because commission'd; but the Circumstance only, is *unauthoriz'd, irregular and unlawful*. The Irregularity is not *ad idem, secundum idem, & eodem respectu*, and therefore no Contradiction; that is, the *Act it self being commission'd*, is right; but the Circumstance which accompanies the Act is wrong: And therefore the Act it self stands good and valid, tho' the Circumstance attending it ought sincerely to be repented of, by all that are any ways concern'd in it, which implies no Contradiction at all.

Our Historian, if he would have done any thing here to the Purpose, should have produc'd Authorities from those Antients, who allow'd of the Validity of Baptism in the Name of the Trinity, administred by heretical, schismatical, and other irregular Priests; I say, he should have given us a History of such Antients, nulling and making void the Commission of those

those Priests during their Heresy, Schism, or other Irregularity; or he should have given us Instances from such Antients, that they judg'd such Priests Commissions to be made null and void by their Heresy, Schism, or Irregularity it self; without one of these he does nothing: As yet he has given us no such Instance, and indeed he never will. For 'tis notorious, that those ancient Churches which allow'd of the *Validity* of those Baptisms, did also acknowledge the *Holy Orders of the Baptizers*, and esteem'd their Episcopal Ordination to be good and valid—Witness the Council of *Nice*, Anno 325. which decreed concerning the *Novatian* Schismaticks, who came over to the Catholick and Apostolick Church, thus; “**They who are ordain'd shall continue in the Clergy.**” * Or, as Mr. *Bingham* himself words it, *Scholastical History*, p. 92. “*The Great Council of Nice decreed, That upon their return to the Church, they should continue in the same Station and Clerical Degrees they were in before, only receiving a reconciliatory Imposition of Hands, by way of Absolution.*” “These Puritans were not only Orthodox as to their Faith, but they retained *Episcopal Ordination*; therefore Orders receiv'd among them, were not look'd upon as *Null or Invalid.*” And “the Church of *Africa* † allow'd the Ordinations, as well as Baptisms” of the *Donatist* Schismaticks, who also retain'd Episcopacy to be valid. All which plainly shews, that those ancient Churches, who esteem'd the Baptisms we speak of to be valid, did also

* Canon 8. according to *Balsamon*, and *Zonaras*, and *Bishop Beveridge*; *vid.* *Clergyman's Vade-Mecum*, Part. 2. p. 48.

† *African Code*, in the *Clergyman's Vade-Mecum*, Canon 68, 69, & 118.

reckon the Priestly Character of those Schismatical Clergy-men, who perform'd them, to be at least so far *Indeleted*, as that they did not lose that Sacred Character, even in their Schism; That the Schism it self did not blot it out, but that it still remain'd upon them; otherwise they could not have admitted them to *Continue* or Remain among the Clergy, upon their Conversion, as they certainly did, **without Re-Ordination.**

For these Reasons, 'tis plain, that those Antients reckon'd the Character of the Priesthood to be *Indeleted*, so long as it was not actually Blotted out or Taken away by that very Authority, *i. e.* the Episcopal Power which at first gave it: And therefore all Mr. Bingham's Arguings, against those Antients founding the Validity of Baptisms (perform'd by such Irregular Priests) upon their *Indelible* Character, amount to nothing; because, tho' Priests should be prov'd, not to have an **absolutely Indelible Character**, yet so long as their Sacerdotal Character is not *Deleted* by the Authority which gave it, it must remain *Indeleted*, as it did in the Case before us, except our Historian can find some other way, whereby they may be depriv'd of it, and which those Antients acknowledg'd did actually so deprive them. — But this he has not yet done.

§ X. However, as if he had made it good, That the Character of the Priesthood of those Irregular Priests was lost; he tells us, “*That the Irregular Baptisms of such Priests, being esteem'd Valid, so as not to be repeated, tho' Irregularly and Unlawfully given, could not be thought Valid, upon the Notion of their being once Ordain'd Priests, and having an Indelible Character*”
“ of

“ of the Priesthood upon them; but upon some
 “ other Notion and Foundation, which equally ex-
 “ tended to Deacons as well as Priests; and
 “ made the Baptism of a Deacon, tho’ Irregularly and
 “ Unlawfully perform’d, as Valid as that of a Priest,
 “ in the same Circumstances: And that must be
 “ (says he) upon one of these two Grounds, either,
 “ That Baptism, by whomsoever Christian per-
 “ form’d, was Valid, and not to be repeated, pro-
 “ vided it was done with due Matter and Form: Or
 “ else, That the Bishops of the Church, as Chief Mi-
 “ nisters of Baptism, had Power to Receive and Con-
 “ firm those Baptisms, which were otherwise Irre-
 “ gularly, and in Opposition to their Authority and
 “ Commission, perform’d in the Church, p. 11, 12.

Here we see again confirm’d, what I observ’d be-
 fore, That our Historian separates Deacons, from
 such as have the Character of Priesthood; and
 thereby contradicts himself: See p. 17. before. But
 the Design of this is plain, by his Two propos’d
 Gueses, which are evidently made to promote the
 Belief of One of these Two Things; 1st, That
 those Antients reckon’d Baptism perform’d with
 Water, in the Name of the Trinity, by any *Chri-*
stian, tho’ never Commission’d to Baptize, was Good
 and Valid, (not excepting Apostate or Excommu-
 nicate Christians) nay, even tho’ it were done
 by such *Uncommission’d* Persons, in Opposition to
 the Divine Right of the Apostolick Order, *i. e.* Epi-
 scopacy; for, he says, “ by whomsoever *Chri-*
stian perform’d: Which is a Latitude of that vast
 Extent, that it sufficiently justifies the Severity of
 my Observation.

But then, if this should fail, and such Bap-
 tisms be prov’d Null and Void, then he reckons,
 2^{dly}, That Bishops might Confirm and thereby

make such Baptisms to become Valid. If One of these Two be not his Design, then he designs nothing at all; and so might have spar'd us the trouble of concerning our selves with such his Guesses; and if he do's design to induce us to believe either of those Notions, he must bring better Evidence for the Truth thereof, than has yet been produc'd, or than what his *Scholastical History* can furnish us withal: He seems to be something sensible of this, in his following Words; for, not trusting wholly to either of those Two supposititious Principles, he concludes his Paragraph, thus; "But **however it was**, (says he) *this is certain, That the Validity of an Irregular Priest's Baptism, was not owing to his Indelible Character; since the Baptism of Deacons, and Lay-men who had not the Character of Priests, was sometimes authoriz'd and allow'd as Valid; which is evident from plain Matters of Fact, which I now proceed to give a further Account of,* (says our Historian, p. 12.—) Upon which 'tis very remarkable, that hitherto he *hesitates* concerning the *Certainty* of his Two foregoing Suppositions, — by saying, "*However it was;*" tho' he had said just before, that it "**must be upon one of those two Grounds**; first, lifting us up with the Expectation of a *Certainty*, by his [**must be;**] and then letting us fall into our former Doubtfulness, by his [**however it was:**] But at last, after these various Fluctuations, he endeavours to fix our Minds, upon what, he says "**is certain**, viz. *That the Validity of an Irregular Priest's Baptism was not owing to his Indelible Character:*" And this is answer'd, by saying, that his Character was *Indeleted*, it remain'd good, because not blotted out by the same Powers who impress'd it. Those Powers did not pretend to take
 away

away his Character, as we have before observ'd ; therefore the Baptisms perform'd by him were Sacerdotal, and so founded upon a *Sacerdotal Commission*, and consequently Valid ; and his following pretended Reason to the contrary, *viz.* That “ *the Validity of the Baptism was not owing to his* “ **Indelible Character**, since the Baptism of “ **Deacons and Lay-men**, who had not the Cha- “ *racter of Priests, was sometimes authoriz'd and* “ *allow'd as Valid,*” is an evident Falacy ; because built upon a false Foundation, That *Deacons* had not the Character of Priests, when himself acknowledges, in other Places before noted in *p. 17.* That **Deacons** have their Share in the *Christian Priesthood* ; nay, and he has given the Name or Character of *Priesthood*, even to Lay-men Baptizing in Case of Necessity, as I have prov'd before in *p. 17, 18.*

§ XI. He next proceeds to give us an Historical Account of *Deacons* Baptizing ; and tells us, That they, “ *by some ancient Canons, are invested with* “ *the Power of Baptizing in Ordinary Cases, as* “ *well as Priests,* *p. 12.* That “ *some other An-* “ *cient Rules seem absolutely to forbid Deacons to* “ *minister Baptism in Ordinary Cases, confining the* “ *Office only to Bishops and Presbyters,* *p. 14,* for which he produces the Canons call'd Apostolical, and the Constitutions under the Names of the Apostles : That “ *yet notwithstanding this, —* “ *a Deacon may Baptize, if he has a Commission and* “ *Authority from his Bishop to do it,* *p. 16.* — for which he quotes the same Constitutions : That, “ *In Case of Necessity, [St. Chysoptom] not only* “ *permits, but positively enjoins Deacons to Baptize,* *p. 18 :* And proceeding upon the same Subjects to

p. 22. he at last concludes thus; “ *So Necessary, we see, was this Distinction between Ordinary and Extraordinary Cases, to adjust Matters, in the Practice of the Primitive Church; whilst, on the one hand, the Honour and Dignity of the Priesthood was to be preserv’d; and yet Deacons allow’d on the other hand, to minister Baptism in some Cases, tho’ they were not Priests in the strict sense, in the Opinion of those who allow’d them to do it.*”

This of Deacons not being *Priests in the strict sense*, amounts to no more than saying, they are **not Bishops**; for Bishops alone have the *whole Power* of the Christian Priesthood in themselves; but others derive the Priesthood from them, as Presbyters do in the next subordinate Degree; and Deacons under them, in the third and lowest Order; as Mr. Bingham himself has observ’d. And as for the Necessity of a *Distinction between Ordinary and Extraordinary Cases, to adjust Matters in the Practice of the Primitive Church*; this is certain, from all that he has said to this part of his History; That as the *Apostolick Commission* was always insisted upon, to Impower Men to Baptize in *Ordinary*, so it was likewise requir’d to Impower them to Baptize in **Extraordinary Cases**; to the intent that this **Commission** might “ *Continue to the End of the World* ;” because it was “ *Necessary to Preserve the Church, according to the Order of Christ, — in future Ages* ;” as our Historian has excellently observ’d, in his p. 3. and upon which I have remark’d, p. 5, 6. For this, the Three Orders of *Bishops, Priests, and Deacons*, were Instituted, that they might, the Inferior in subordination to the Superior, minister Baptism by the same **Commission**, in **Ordinary**
and

and **Extraordinary Cases** too, and that in the Absence of one, the other might still be enabled to supply the Wants of the Church, by one and the same **commission'd Baptism**. The Restraining of Presbyters and Deacons, sometimes from the Exercise of this Power, during the Presence of the Bishop, was to preserve the Dignity of the Superior Order, and to keep the Inferior in that just Subordination which 'twas their Duty to observe (as in our Church the Priest is not to give the Blessing in Presence of the Bishop, nor the Deacon to Baptize in Presence of the Presbyter;) but this *occasional* Restraining the Exercise of their Function for some Times and Circumstances, was not a taking away their Commission to Baptize in those Circumstances, but only a making them give way to their Superiors: For which Reason, Deacons, who were Priests of the Third Order, and in their Ordination were vested with a Commission to Baptize, were also restrain'd from the Exercise of that Function during the Presence of a **Priest** of the Second Order, to preserve the Dignity of the Second Order. But this Restraining was no more a Nulling or making Void the Deacon's Commission which he had receiv'd to Baptize, than it was of the Priests; for we do not find by any thing which our Historian has yet produc'd, that Clergy-men, of any Order, transgressing these Circumstantial Rules of the Church, were actually divested of their *Commission* by *those ancient Churches* who esteem'd their Ministrations valid: On the contrary we see, by the *Nicene Council*, and the *African Code*, before refer'd to, that the Commissions of irregular Clergy-men, whether Bishops, Priests or Deacons (who had acted in Schism which they ought not to have done) remain'd still good and valid; for those Churches did not require them to be

be re-consecrated or re-ordain'd. Our Historian then, if he would make the irregular Practices of Deacons Baptizing in Circumstances prohibited by the Church, to be equivalent to the attempted Usurpations of Persons, who *never were at all commission'd to Baptize*, and who yet presume to endeavour to do it, even in opposition to the Divine Right of the Apostolick Order, must, *1st*, produce Instances of such Non-episcopal, or Anti-episcopal Deacons, who never receiv'd a Commission at all to Baptize, and yet presum'd to attempt that Holy Ministration. *2^{dly}*, He must prove, that the Antients held such their pretended Baptisms, if ever there were any, to be good and valid. *3^{dly}*, He must make it clear, that the ancient Catholick Church, as well as some particular Men, thought so too: Or, *4^{thly}*, in Case he fails of these (as I am confident he will) then he must prove, that the ancient Catholick Church held Deacons Commissions to Baptize, to be null'd and made void by their Baptizing irregularly; but that, at the same time, those very Baptisms were good and valid, if done with Water in the Name of the Trinity: Either he must prove this Fourth, or the other Three Propositions, else it will stand good, that the Irregularities of ancient Deacons Baptizing contrary to some Circumstantial Rules of the Church, have no Comparison with those *Essential Irregularities* which our Modern, *never commission'd Usurpers*, commit, who act in Opposition to that very *Apostolick Commission* which Mr. Bingham himself acknowledges, in effect, to have an *essential* relation to Baptism, by saying, That it was "**to continue** "**to the End of the World;**" and that it was "**necessary to preserve the Church, &c.**" For he can say *no more* than this concerning the *Water*,
and

and the *Form* in the Name of the Trinity; and therefore makes the Apostolick Commission, *as much* an Essential of the Institution, as they are.

§ XII. Our Historian's "*next Question, is concerning Sub-deacons, and the rest of the Inferior Orders, who went by the Name of the Minor Clergy in the Primitive Church;— Whether in any Cases they had Power to Baptize?*" p. 22, 23. And upon this he concludes, That "*they had no Power in ordinary Cases:*" Whether they had in any extraordinary ones, he says, "*There are few among the Antients that have in direct Terms decided, p. 23.*" At last he concludes that this Question may be decided thus: "*If the Antients (says he) granted Liberty to meer Monks and Lay-men to Baptize in extraordinary Cases, it will readily follow, that they would never scruple to grant the same Power to the Inferior Clergy, who were at least one Degree above Monks and Lay-men. We cannot therefore better determine this Question, than by proceeding to that other concerning the Power granted to Lay-men, in reference to the Administration of Baptism; which is the grand Question in this whole Affair, p. 24.*"

C H A P. III.

Testimonies for and against Lay-Baptisms; and all Mr. Bingham's Evidences examin'd and prov'd to make nothing for the pretended Validity of Baptisms, perform'd by Persons who never were Commission'd by Bishops to Baptize.

§ I. **O**UR Author first acknowledges, that "it is certain that Lay-men were always debarr'd from meddling with the Administration of Baptism in all ordinary Cases. Here then comes in a very apt Question, By what Law or Rule shall Baptism by Lay-men in ordinary Cases be pronounc'd good and valid? How shall that Baptism, which is given by Persons who never were at all commission'd to Baptize, and who attempt to do it ordinarily, be determin'd to be valid? Is not this a Law Case, a Question to be answer'd only by the Rule of our Christian Law, and the Enforcement thereof by the Laws of the Catholick Church? The Christian Law, viz. the Institution of Baptism, excludes such never commission'd Persons; and the Laws of the Church "always debarr'd them," by our Reverend Historian's own Confession; Where then shall we seek for, and find the Validity of their pretended Ministrations? Is it to be determin'd without a Law or Rule? By what then shall they be guided, who endeavour to perswade us of their Validity? Is arbitrary Will and Pleasure alone sufficient to convince the Judgment? Or, is there such a Charm in the Formality of seriously imitating *an opus operatum alone*, as that a Thing shall

shall be Good and Valid, when done; tho' done without, and contrary to, something else, which the Law makes **Essential** to the very Doing thereof? This will be New, indeed; for "*it is certain, that Lay-men were always debarr'd from meddling with the Administration of Baptism in all Ordinary Cases;*" To which I add, They were *always* so debarr'd, both by the Law of God, and of his Church; and therefore, our *Dissenters* Baptisms are destitute of *any Law* for their Validity, because perform'd by *Lay-men* in *Ordinary Cases*; and consequently, they who pronounce them Valid, esteem them to be Valid without Law: And how safe this is, in a Matter of such vast Moment; how satisfying to those who want to be secur'd of a Valid Baptism; I leave the Defenders of such a *Nove!* Opinion to Answer.

§ II. But, it may be, some will say, That these Baptisms may be pronounced Valid, upon the same account as Baptisms perform'd by Irregular Deacons were. To which I Answer; If that be true, then these Lay-men must be prov'd to be equal in Power and Authority with such Irregular Deacons. But our Reverend Historian will not allow this; for he immediately subjoins, "*All the former Allegations, which make it the proper Office of Bishops and Presbyters, even to the exclusion of Deacons, are certainly of much greater Force against the Usurpations of Lay-men,* p. 22. Which plainly makes the Case of such Lay-Usurpations to be very different from that of Irregular Deacons; and therefore, whatsoever Arguments will hold for the Validity of such Deacons Baptisms, will be no-ways competent for the Validity of those Lay-Baptisms.

§ III. “ *But (says Mr. Bingham) still the Grand Question remains, Whether ever they [i.e. Laymen] were allow’d to do it in Extraordinary Cases of extreme Necessity, when no Publick Minister could be procur’d to do it? And this (says he) must be resolv’d in the Affirmative, as to the general Practice of the Church, tho’ there are some Exceptions of particular Churches to the contrary,* p. 25. But, with submission, tho’ the Question propos’d, and endeavour’d to be resolv’d, by the Reverend Historian, in the Affirmative, be worth enquiring into; yet it is not the **grand Question** which now exercises the Church: For, that about which we are now concern’d, is, *Whether Persons never once commission’d at all to Baptize, can administer Valid Baptism, especially, when they attempt to Baptize, even in Opposition to the Divine Right of the Apostolick Commission, to be receiv’d only from Bishops, the Successors of the Apostles? And, Whether the Ancient Catholick Church has given her Testimony for the Validity of these pretended Baptisms? This is the Great Thing that ought to be enquir’d into, and fairly determin’d either in the Negative, or the Affirmative, according to the just Merits of the Cause. And this, our Reverend Author’s Scholastical History cannot resolve in the Affirmative; even tho’ he could prove, (as he cannot) That Lay-men “ were allow’d to Baptize in Extraordinary Cases, when no Publick Minister could be procur’d to do it, and that they were so in the General Practice of the Church: His Testimonies for which, I come now to examine; and shall, as I go along, see of what Use they are to the Great Question now before us, Of Baptism by Persons never Commission’d to Baptize.*

§ IV. And, *First*, 'Tis very remarkable, That our Reverend Historian can produce no Testimonies from the Apostles, or their Cotemporaries; Nor from the Apostolick Fathers who next succeeded them; Nor, lastly, from any of the Antients who liv'd before *Tertullian*: So that, for about the first Two hundred Years of Christianity, we hear nothing of Lay-Baptisms being administer'd, nor of any thing in favour of them, either directly or indirectly. A strange and long Silence this, in a Matter which is pretended to be the "**general Practice of the Church.**" What would the Adversaries against Episcopacy say, if Antiquity had been so long silent about the Power and Authority of Bishops? And then, by what Rule should we have been determin'd of the *Jus Divinum* of Episcopacy, if *Scripture*, and the Writings of the Antients for about the first Two hundred Years of Christianity, had been so absolutely silent about it, as they are about the Validity of Lay-Baptism?

§ V. But, *Secondly*, In a Matter of such Importance as this is, if it had been the **general practice** of the Church, and so safely to be rely'd on, as some represent it to be; would there have been any *considerable Exceptions* against so **general a practice**, insomuch, as that whole Churches have refus'd to come in to it; or, to use the Reverend Historian's Words, Would there have been "*some Exceptions of particular Churches to the contrary?*" Do's not this spoil the Practice's being **Catholick**, while **particular Churches**, Cotemporary with those other Churches who are suppos'd to have practis'd it, refus'd to suffer or
D
allow

allow of any such Practice. In this supposed Difference of the Churches, some will say, That one Side was wrong, for *allowing*, what the other Side *refus'd to allow*; and others, 'tis likely, will say, That these latter were in the wrong, and those others in the right: What must we then do, when we find such a Difference? Certainly, we must have **some Rule** or other, whereby to discover which of them was in the wrong, and which in the right; otherwise, the Fundamentals of Religion must be determin'd only by Number of *Votes*; (which God forbid:) This Rule must be the Holy Scripture, and therein, the Divine Positive Institution of Baptism, and the Laws of God about such Positive Institutions as that is; all which do *as much* exclude Persons who *never were Commission'd*, as they do any *Matter and Form* which were *never Appointed*: And 'tis by this Rule of the Holy Scripture, that the *different Practices* of Churches must be tried; and by which, sometimes, the fewest have been found to be in the right, whilst the greater Number have been in the wrong: But here there is no fear of any such Matter, with respect to those Ancient Churches who allow'd, and the other Ancient Churches who did not allow of, the Validity of Lay-Baptism: For all the suppos'd Evidence that is brought for Defence of it, will not amount to a *Catholick Tradition*; being destitute of any Proof from Scripture, and the first Two hundred Years of Christianity, as 'tis also of the Authority of any *one ancient General Council* that ever was Held in the Church of Christ, and consists only of a false Notion of *Tertullian's*, about the Year 200; a particular Provincial Council of *Spanish Bishops*, Held, some think, *Anno 305*; a fabulous Story of a Baptism by Boys in Play, about

about the same time ; a Notion of *St. Jerom's*, founded upon *Tertullian's* false Principle, and inconsistent with himself ; *Optatus's* Dangerous Position, if it can be interpreted as some Men would have it ; *St. Augustin's* ill-grounded Opinion ; These in the Fourth Century : A Saying of *Gelasius* Bishop of *Rome*, Anno 492 ; and another of *Isidore* Bishop of *Sevil*, Anno 595. These are all that can be found in the first Six hundred Years of Christianity ; — and the strength of their Evidence is now to be enquired into, and other opposite Evidences to be brought against them —

§ VI. But before I concern my self with *Mr. Bingham's* Evidences, I shall take what offers it self against these Baptisms, from the Days of the Apostles. —

St. Ignatius, about the Year of Christ 71, affirms, That * “ It is not lawful, without the Bishop, to Baptize. That, “ Without Bishops, Priests, “ and Deacons, there is no Church of the Elect: And, That “ He is without, who do's any thing “ without the Bishops, and Presbyters, and Deacons. These are that Apostolick Father's positive Assertions, relating to those Sacred Ministrations, which were deposited in the Hands of *Bishops, Priests, and Deacons*. It is not *Lawful*, (says he) *without the Bishop*, to Baptize. In these Words there are Two Things to be enquired into: 1st, What he means by *Without the Bishop*? It is not to be suppos'd that *St. Ignatius* meant, that the Bishop must always be present in Person at every Baptism; for we find, that *Philip* the Deacon Baptiz'd, in the

* Epist. to the *Smyreans*, N. 8. Epist. to the *Trallians*, N. 2, 3: 7.

the Absence of the Apostles ; and Presbyters and Deacons were Instituted to Officiate, in those Sacred Functions to which they were Ordain'd, in the Absence as well as in the Presence of the Bishop ; and this, by reason 'twas impossible for the Bishop always to be Personally present : And therefore, *without the Bishop*, must signifie, without Commission or Authority receiv'd from the Bishop ; Presbyters and Deacons then being Men Authoriz'd and Commission'd by the Bishop to Baptize, are not here spoken of ; but Persons who never were so Commission'd, and are therefore call'd *Laicks*. 2dly, What Law do's this blessed Saint and Martyr refer us to, when he says, *It is not Lawful ?* It must be either to the Law of God, or to the Law of the Church, or to both of these together : If to the Law of God ; then, 'tis plain, that Baptisin by a Person who never had a Commission from the Bishop, if any such had then been attempted, would have been contrary to the Law of God, and therefore there was no Law of God by which to pronounce it Valid ; consequently, no Valid Law of the Church for that Purpose ; because, the Church can have no Law sufficient to make that Valid before God, which is not Valid by any of his Laws. If *St. Ignatius* refers us to any Laws of the Church, and means, that, in respect of those Laws, "*it is not Lawful ;*" then, 'tis plain, that the Church had at that time no Law of hers, whereby such a suppos'd Baptisin could have been pronounc'd Valid, *in the sense of the Church* ; In such Case, its pretended Validity must have been judg'd of by some *previous Law* of God : But that Law is not to be found ; and therefore, such a suppos'd Baptisin could not have been pronounc'd Valid, by virtue of any the then Laws

of the Church. *Lastly*, If *St. Ignatius* has an eye to both the Laws of God, and his Church; then, such a suppos'd Baptism must not have been Valid, by virtue of any Law whatsoever; and therefore Invalid, for want of all Law whatsoever to give it Validity. And this is the more confirm'd, by his asserting, That *without Bishops, Priests, and Deacons*, there is *no Church of the Elect*; and, that He is "**Without,**" *i. e.* Out of the Church, "*who do's any thing,* [*i. e.* any Sacred Positive Function, that belongs peculiarly to the Office of the Clergy,] "*without the Bishops, and Presbyters, and Deacons.*" For in those Days, if Laicks had attempted such Ministrations, they, and their Dependants, being and having "*no Bishops, Priests, and Deacons,*" but acting without them, would have been **no Church**; and if *no Church*, then their pretended Ministrations would have been **no Christian Sacraments**; because, where there is "**no Church,** there are *no Sacraments*; and therefore *no Baptism*."

The only Question that remains, is, Whether *St. Ignatius's* Words are not to be restrain'd to Ordinary Cases only; and, whether Extraordinary Cases, where *Bishops, Priests, and Deacons* cannot be had, are not to be excepted? In Answer to which, 'tis plain that *St. Ignatius* makes no Exceptions; his Words are general, and he refers to no Rule or Custom then in the Church, for any Exception whatsoever; so that, if Men will make Exceptions, they must have *reason* to do so; otherwise their Exceptions will be arbitrary, and without foundation. If there be any reason for an Exception, it must be founded either on the Law of Nature, or else the Positive Revealed Law of God: The Law of Nature has no Rule for such an Exception, because Baptism is a thing

about which that Law is no-ways concern'd; and the Reveal'd Positive Law of God has no such Rule for such an Exception; if it has, Where is it? It has not yet been produc'd; so that Men have nothing whereon to ground such an Exception. Some, it may be, will suppose, that the Church had then a Law or Rule that excepted such Extraordinary Cases: But Supposing, without Proving, will not do; and they cannot shew us any such early Primitive Law; and consequently, St. Ignatius's Words cannot be fairly interpreted to be restrain'd to Ordinary Cases only, and therefore they must include Extraordinary Cases also.

§ VII. St. *Hermas*, who was Cotemporary with St. *Paul*, tho' he had so strict an Opinion of the * Necessity of Baptism, that he reckon'd the *Righteous Men* and *Prophets*, who Dy'd before the Coming of Christ, stood in need of Christian Baptism, even in their Separate State; yet, to supply this their Necessity, none are mention'd by him to have gone to them to give 'em Baptism, but " † *The Apostles and Doctors of the Preaching of the Son of God.*" *The Apostles and Teachers, who preach'd the Name of the Son of God;*" Men who had Christ's and the Apostles Commission to minister in Holy Things; not the least Hint of any who never were Commission'd to Baptize, that went to supply their want of Baptism. But if our modern Notion, That *Laicks, in want of the Clergy, may Baptize*, had then been held by the Church; considering, that the Laity were always vastly more Numerous than the Clergy, it

* *Vif. iii. N. 2. Simil. xix. N. 15, 16.*

† *Simil. xix. N. 15.*

would have been but natural enough to suppose, that some of those Prophets, &c. were baptiz'd by common Christians also; but in this our *St. Hermas* is absolutely silent, and mentions no other Baptizers, for this suppos'd Case of Necessity, than the Apostles and Teachers, who preach'd the Name of the Son of God: And how could they Preach except they were sent or commission'd? according to the Great Apostle of the *Gentiles*. But to come now to *Mr. Bingham's* Evidences:

§ VIII. This Reverend Historian gives us first of all, *Tertullian's* Opinion upon the Matter, about the Year of Christ 200, translated from his Book *de Baptismo*, c. 17. Thus “ the chief Priest, who is
 “ the Bishop, has Power to give Baptism; and after
 “ him Presbyters and Deacons; yet not without the
 “ Authority of the Bishop, for the Honour of the
 “ Church, in the Preservation of which Peace is
 “ preserv'd. In another Respect, Lay-men have
 “ also a Right to give it; for what is received in com-
 “ mon, may be given in common. Baptism is God's
 “ peculiar, and may be conferr'd by all. But Lay-
 “ men are in a much greater Degree obliged by the
 “ Rules of Modesty in the Use of their Power, since
 “ they, who are Superior to them, are obliged not
 “ to assume to themselves the Office which belongs to
 “ the Bishop only: Emulation is the Mother of Strife;
 “ all things are Lawful says the Apostle, but all things
 “ are not Expedient. Therefore it ought to suffice
 “ them to use this Power in Necessities, when the
 “ Condition of the Place, or Time, or Person
 “ requires it: For then their charitable Assistance is
 “ accepted, when the Circumstance of one in Danger
 “ presses them to it. And in this Case he would be
 “ guilty of a Man's Destruction, that omitted to do

“*what he lawfully might,*” p. 25, 26. Thus far *Tertullian’s* Opinion. But by what Rule shall we discover that it was then a Catholick Tradition of the Church, and not *Tertullian’s* private Opinion only? Our Reverend Historian would have it, That ’twas then “*the common Practice of the Church:*” 1st, Because “*no learned Man before*” Mr. Dodwell, and some others, “*ever thought*” that it was “*only*” “*Tertullian’s own private Opinion, and not the com-*” “*mon Practice of the Church:*” 2dly, Because of “*the Coherence of Tertullian’s Discourse.*” “*In*” “*the former Part of it* (says Mr. Bingham) *he is*” “*certainly speaking of the Practice of the Church,*” “*when he says, Presbyters and Deacons act by the*” “*Bishop’s Authority, when they administer Baptism*” “*in ordinary Cases. It would be strange then, if he*” “*should invert his Discourse immediately in the next*” “*Words, and not mean the Practice of the Church,*” “*when he comes to speak of Lay-men,*” p. 27. These are Mr. Bingham’s Two suppos’d Reasons: The First amounts to nothing; because our Reverend Historian cannot prove, that all Learned Men, before Mr. Dodwell, &c. esteemed this Passage of *Tertullian’s*, to be an Evidence of the General Practice of the Church. What *no Learned Man ever thought* before Mr. Dodwell, and others, is a meer Negative, and hard to be discover’d, except by some positive Declaration; so that till Mr. Bingham produces the Declaration of those Learned Men, shewing, that this Passage of *Tertullian* is an Evidence for the General Practice of the Church, his saying that “*no Learned Man before* [Mr. Dodwell] “*ever thought,*” as Mr. Dodwell, and some others thought, is giving no Reason at all: As neither would his producing their Testimony only, if it were not also back’d with such Arguments for the

Truth

Truth of their Evidence, as will stand a fair Examination. And then, as to the Second, *viz.* “*The* “ [*suppos’d*] *Coherence of Tertullian’s Discourse,*” &c. Upon a just Observation of his own Words, it will be found, that his Notion was not the Practice of the Church; for as Mr. *Bingham* himself acknowledges, *Tertullian’s* Words do plainly respect the Church’s Practice in the former Part of his Discourse, where he speaks of the *Power of the Bishops, Priests, and Deacons*, to Baptize; and mentions only Priests, and Deacons, as acting in Subordination to, and by *Authority* of the Bishop, “*for* “ *the Honour of the Church.*” But what is this *Honour of the Church*, except our submitting to her Rules and Orders? How can her Honour be preserv’d, but by our obeying her just Laws, and following her well-grounded Traditions and Customs? Therefore her Laws and Customs, concerning Baptism, are here referr’d to by *Tertullian*, when he speaks of *her Honour*, in the Power of the Bishop, and under him, of Presbyters and Deacons, to Baptize. His saying immediately after this, *Alioquin*, otherwise, or “*in another respect,*” is a plain Transition from his former Subject of what had a reference to the Church’s Law or Custom; and evidently shews, that he is going to say something that is separate and distinct therefrom: For, says he, “*in another respect,*” *i. e.* in respect of something else foreign to the Church’s Law or Custom before referr’d to, “*Lay-men have also a Right to give it:*” As much as if he had said, by the Law or Custom of the Church, “*The Chief Priest, who is the Bishop,* “ *has Power to give Baptism, and after him Presby-* “ *ters and Deacons, yet not without the Authority* “ *of the Bishop; for the Honour of the Church:*” in the Preservation of *which* Honour, by our ob-

serving

serving this her Law, "*Peace is preserv'd*:" Otherwise, or "*in another respect*" distinct and separate from the Consideration of this Law or Custom, "*Lay-men have also a Right to give it*;" which is the same as saying, that Lay-men *have a Right* in themselves to Baptize, separate and distinct from the Consideration of the Church's Law or Custom: So that *Tertullian's* Notion of Lay-men's *Right* to Baptize, is not founded upon any **Law** or Custom of the Church at that time giving them such a *Right*, or on any Act of the Bishop pretending to vest them with *his* Authority: So far from these, that he speaks of *Lay-mens Right* by way of *Antithesis* to 'em, by introducing it with an *Alioquin, otherwise*, making it to have "*another respect*" than that of the Church's Law, and *the Bishop's Authority*. Consequently their *Right* to Baptize, here spoken of by *Tertullian*, being neither founded on any Law of the Church, nor on any Authority receiv'd from the Bishop, must be a pretended *Right* which the Church never gave them, and therefore is not the Church's Tradition; because 'tis inconceivable how the Church should have a Tradition for **Lay-mens Right** to Baptize, without any Authority receiv'd from the Bishop, when at the same time the Tradition was universal, that all Power to Baptize was originally in the Apostles, and their Successors the Bishops; and that *nene could have any Right* to Baptize, but those who were in some respect or other *commission'd* by them: As *Mr. Bingham* has very well observ'd in his 4th and 5th Pages. This shews that *Tertullian's Right of Laymen* to Baptize, was his own particular Notion only.

And this is not a little corroborated by his manner of speaking, when he refers to the Laws and Practice of the Church; for then he gives us

such

such plain Tokens of his speaking about *them*, that we cannot well miss of understanding him. Thus in the Place before us, his speaking of the *Honour of the Church* being preserv'd by the Power of the Bishop to Baptize, and of Priests and Deacons in subordination to, and by his Authority, is an evident Token of his referring to the Church's Law and Practice. So again; When he speaks of Persons who had receiv'd Heretical Baptism, he says, "*We have * a Rule among us to Re-baptize them;*" plainly thereby referring to the Law and Practice of the Church where he liv'd. But nothing like these has he to guide us to the *general Practice* of the Church giving Lay-men a **R**ight to Baptize; but the direct contrary, by his *Alioquin*, &c. as has been prov'd before. And therefore, 'tis no other than his own private Opinion, and *no general Practice* of the Church.

§ IX. Which is further confirm'd by the imaginary Reason upon which he endeavours to found their *pretended Right*, and 'tis this: "*For what is received in common, may be given in common;*" as Mr. *Bingham* Words it. A Principle so false, that multitudes of Instances may be brought to demonstrate its contrariety to Truth and Reason: And even *Tertullian* himself contradicts this Notion a little after in the Case of Baptism by Women, whom he will not allow to have any *Right* at all to Baptize; which certainly they must have, if "*what is received in common, may be given in common.*" For Women as well as Men receive Baptism, and may therefore give it, if this Principle be true, as

* Tertul. de Pudicitia, c. 19. Edit. Rigal. Lutet. 1634.

it most certainly is not, in Cases that relate to a Commission; for 'tis plain, that all the Citizens, properly so call'd, of the City of *London*, receive the Freedom of the City in common, and yet that Freedom may not be given in common by every such Citizen; it must be done by those Officers of the City, who are in Commission to give Freedoms; otherwise, the pretended Freedom will prove a Nullity in all respects whatsoever. So in Cases of Naturalization of Foreigners, and abundance of other Instances that might be brought to shew the Fallacy of *Tertullian's* false Maxim, the very proposing of which betrays the Weakness of it, and the consequent Danger of that Practice, which is built upon no better Foundation.

§ X. Thus *Tertullian* gives us nothing but his own Word for it, and a false Reason to support it, that "*Lay-men also have a Right to give Baptism.*" And now I would fain know, whether *this alone is sufficient* to convince any reasonable Man, that Lay-men then had such a Right? Is the bare Word of such an ancient Writer, his single Opinion, without the necessary Adjunct of the *Church's Rule* to support it, a powerful Reason to persuade us, that it was in his Days the *general Practice of the Church*? If this be enough, then we must swallow *Tertullian's* other *Nostrums*, as Doctrines and Practices of the Church too; for he is as positive in some of them, as he is in this. Thus he makes *Lay-men to be Priests*, * purely upon a wrong Interpretation of a Text in the First Chapter of the *Revelations*, which makes all Christians to be as *much* and as

* Nonne & Laici Sacerdotes sumus? Scriptum est Regnum quoque nos & Sacerdotes, Deo & Patri suo fecit. Tertul. de Exhor. Castit. cap. 7.

proper Kings, as it makes them proper Priests, *i. e.* not at all. How Christians, as such, are Kings and Priests in a figurative Sense, I have already shew'd in * another Place. He reckons *the difference † between Clergy and Laity to be founded on the Church's Authority*, when, in truth, it is founded on *God's Law*, and the Institution of *Christ himself*: In Consequence of this he teaches, that *in the Absence of the Clergy, || Lay-men are Priests for themselves*, and have Power not only to Baptize, but also to Offer and Minister the Memorial of the Sacrifice of Christ's Body and Blood, [*¶ Offers ¶ Tinguis*, says he;] nay, further, he affirms, That *where Three are gather'd together, tho' they be but Laicks, they are a Church*: The Consequence of which, is, that they must also have those Spiritual Powers which belong to the Church: Hence they may not only Baptize and Administer the other Sacrament, but also *Ordain, Excommunicate, and Absolve, and Retain Sins*, otherwise they cannot constitute a Church; which plainly shews the Falseness of the Principle from whence such Consequences flow. And all these are Errors so very notorious, and so contrary to Scripture-Rule, that who can dare to say, they were Traditions of the Catholick, Primitive Church? And yet they must be so, if *Tertulian's* Notions must be receiv'd for the Church's Doctrines and Practices.

* *Lay-Baptism Invalid, 3d Edit. p. 156, &c.*

† Differentiam inter ordinem & plebem constituit Ecclesie Auctoritas & Honor per ordinis concessum sanctificatus. || Adeo ubi Ecclesiastici ordinis non est concessus, & offers, & tinguis, & sacerdos, es tibi solus. ** Sed ubi tres Ecclesia est licet Laici.—*Tertul. de Exhort. Castitatis, cap. 7. Edit. Rigal. Lutet. Par. 1634.*

§ XI. I might also instance several of his other Errors and Paradoxes, as his false Notion, *Of the Soul of the first Man's being made out of the Substance of God; His Error concerning the Sex of Souls; That the Soul is corporeal, and not properly a Spirit; That the Soul can suffer nothing without the Body; That God himself is corporeal, because nothing is incorporeal. That Christ, the Son of God, was always seen by Men in true and real Flesh, before he was Born of the Holy Virgin; and, That Second Marriages are as Wicked as Whoredom:* These Errors of this ancient Writer, are, with * others mention'd in the Margin, collected together in *Paradoxa Tertulliani cum Antidoto Jacobi Pamelii*, in the 2d Vol. of his Works, Printed at Paris, 1635. — And does his holding them, shew, that the Church held them too?

-
- * 1 De Angelis defertoribus qui duxerunt filias Hominum.
 2 De Angelorum apparitionibus in vera humana carne.
 3 De Anima primi Homini ex materia Dei.
 4 De Animabus posterorum Adæ ex traduce.
 5 De Animæ Sexu.
 6 Animam peccatricem potius quam carnem.
 7 De Anima corporea, quòd proinde propriè spiritus non sit
 8 Animam nihil pati posse sine corpore.
 11 Animas Hominum pessimas post mortem in Dæmonas verti.
 15 De Deo corporeo, eo quod nihil incorporale sit.
 18 De Ecclasi *sive* Amentia, *sive* spiritu Prophetico Montani, & Insanarum Vatum Priscillæ & Maximillæ, & Similium.
 19 Filium Dei Christum, semper visum ab hominibus in vera, etsi non nata carne.
 25 De Nuptiis secundis damnaticis tanquam stupris.
 26 De Paraceto Montano.
 28 Psychicis, quo nomine Catholicis calumniam fecit.

No such Matter; and therefore, his asserting, *Laymen to have a Right to Baptize*, in Cases of suppos'd *Necessity*, without appealing to the Church's Law or Rule for such a *Right*, is no Argument, that the Church in general held any such Notion; but only proves, that it was his own private Opinion; and consequently, it must stand or fall, by the Goodness or Badness of the Argument which he brings to support it. His Argument has been already prov'd to be false, in the IXth Section of this Chapter: — And therefore, upon the whole, we may fairly conclude, that *Tertullian* is no Evidence of *any general Practice of the Church* countenancing the pretended Right of Lay-men to Baptize, in Case of Necessity. Nay, he has not given so much as one Instance of any such Baptism by a Lay-man, allow'd of by the Church; no Historical Account of any such Matter, but only his singular private Opinion, what he thought a Lay-man might do, in want of the Clergy; and this founded upon a false Principle.

But then, as to the Case before us, of Baptism by Laicks, Persons never Commission'd by Bishops, attempting to do this where the Clergy are to be had; *Tertullian* is full and direct against them, and refers us to the Law and Practice of the Church, when he asserts, That “*The Chief Priest, who is the Bishop, has the Power to give Baptism; and after him, Presbyters and Deacons; yet not without the Authority of the Bishop, for the Honour of the Church.*” This was the standing Rule and Law of the Church, pursuant to the Law of God: So that, if Lay-men had then pretended (as they do now) to have usurp'd the Power of Baptizing, where Bishops, Priests, and Deacons, were to be had; it would have been against the Honour of the Church, a
Breach

Breach of her Law and Custom, as well as of the Law of God; and consequently, destitute of any Law either of God, or his Church, whereby to judge and pronounce their Usurped Ministration Good and Valid.

And thus our Reverend Historian has produc'd nothing of the **Church's Practice** in favour of Lay-Baptism, in any Case whatsoever, for the space of the first (Three) hundred Years, the purest Ages of the Christian Church: So that, if I should proceed no farther, but Conclude here, I might venture to say, That the Validity of pretended Baptisms, perform'd by Persons who never were Commission'd by Bishops to Baptize, never was a Tradition of the Catholick Church, because not attested by her in the purest Ages, the first Three hundred Years of Christianity: But, on the contrary, Baptism by Persons suppos'd to have no Power or Authority from Bishops, was exclaim'd against, in that very Period, by no less Men than the blessed St. *Ignatius* Bishop of *Antioch*, as I have prov'd before, pag. 35; by St. *Cyprian* Bishop of *Carthage*; and by *Firmilian* Bishop of *Cæsarea*, and their Colleagues. For,

§ XII. About the Year of Christ 256, St. *Cyprian* and *Firmilian* held the Baptism of Hereticks and Schismaticks to be *Null and Void*, upon this score, that, Because they were Broken off from the Church, and become *Lay-men*, therefore they had no Power to Baptize: Their being become Lay-men, made them to have no Power to Baptize; and their want of Power, made their Baptisms Null and Void, in the Opinion of these two Bishops. That this was their Opinion, St. *Basil*, who sat in the Chair of *Cæsarea*, about an Hundred and thirteen
Years

Years after *Firmilian*, testifies: And that his Testimony may not be question'd, it shall stand here in *Mr. Bingham's* own Translation, and he introduces it thus: " *St. Basil* brings in *Cyprian*, and *Firmilian* his Predecessor in the See of *Cæsarea*, arguing after this manner;" then follows *St. Cyprian* and *Firmilian's* Argument, thus translated; * " *Hereticks and Schismaticks are broken off from the Church, and become Lay-men, and therefore have no Power to Baptize, or to Ordain; being no longer able to give the Gift of the Holy-Ghost, which they have lost themselves; therefore, such as are Baptized by them, are to be Re-baptized with the True Baptism of the Church, as being only Baptized by Lay-men.*

The whole Stress of this Argument, we see, is founded upon **Lay-mens** having no power to Baptize, and the consequent Necessity of giving **True Baptism** to such as were **only Baptiz'd by Lay-men**. Whether *St. Cyprian* and *Firmilian's* pronouncing Hereticks and Schismaticks to be no more than *Lay-men*, was right or no; or, whether they esteem'd them to be redu'd to *Lay-men*, by their Heresy or Schism only; or rather, by virtue of the Laws of those Churches to whom they ow'd Subjection; 'tis no matter at present to enquire: Be that how it will, this is certain, That they made the want of a Commission, *i. e.* Lay-mens want of Power to Baptize, the Standard by which they judg'd of the Invalidity of Baptism by Hereticks and Schismaticks: Baptism by Lay-men was Null and Void, in their Opinion; and they, consequently, pronounc'd Baptism by Hereticks and Schismaticks to be so too, because they esteem'd

* *Basil. Epist. 1. ad Amphilechium, cap. 1.*

them to be but *Lay-men*. This Evidence is very destructive of what some say, That *Tertullian's* Notion about Lay-Baptism, was the *general Practice of the Church* in his Days: For, is it at all likely, that Two such Bishops as these were, should, so soon as about 56 Years after *Tertullian's* Writing his Book *de Baptismo*, make use of such an Argument as this? If *Tertullian's* Notion of the *Validity of Lay-Baptism* had been founded upon the *general Practice* of the Church at that Time, these two Bishops must, at that rate, have been greater Strangers to, and more ignorant of, the Church's *general Practice*, than *Tertullian*, a private Priest; or else the *general Practice* must have ceas'd, by that time *St. Cyprian* and *Firmilian* came to dispute against Heretical and Schismatical Baptisms: Suppositions so ill grounded, that no reasonable Man can believe them; and 'till there shall be produc'd good Reasons to the contrary, we must conclude, that *St. Cyprian* and *Firmilian's* Opinion, of the Invalidity of Lay-Baptism, was then a standing Principle, in their Churches at least: Because 'tis unreasonable to believe, that in so Publick a Dispute as that was, about Heretical and Schismatical Baptism, two such celebrated Bishops as *St. Cyprian* and *Firmilian*, should use an Argument founded on the Invalidity of Lay-Baptism, if the Validity of Lay-Baptism had at the same time been a received Principle in those Churches. This Testimony of those two great Bishops, upon so Publick an Occasion, That *Lay-Baptism was then esteem'd to be Null and Void*, is of so great Consequence, that our Reverend Historian is something particular in his Endeavours to weaken the Credit of it: But his several Objections shall be Answer'd in the following Chapter.

§ XIII. And tho' their Evidence is transmitted to us by *St. Basil*, and therefore sufficiently establish'd by his Authority; yet even in *St. Cyprian's* Works themselves, we find good Proofs, that *St. Cyprian*, *Firmilian*, and others their Colleagues, held pretended Baptisms to be Null and Void, when perform'd by Persons who were suppos'd by them to have had no Commission to Baptize. Thus *St. Cyprian*, in his Epistle to *Januarius* *, says, "It is necessary that Water should be first Cleans'd and Sanctified by the Priest; that by his Baptism, the Sins of the Baptiz'd Person may be wash'd away." In his Epistle to *Stephen* Bishop of *Rome*, he acquaints him, † That he and his Colleagues, in Council Decreed, "by Common Consent and Authority, That if any Presbyters or Deacons, who were first Ordained in the Catholick Church, and afterwards rebelled and stood out against Her; or, If any who were, among Hereticks, Ordain'd by the profane Ordination of False Bishops, &c. — If any of these return'd to the Church, they should be receiv'd to Communion only as Lay-men." In his Epistle to *Jubaianus*, he affirms, That

* Oportet ergo mundari & Sanctificari Aquam prius à Sacerdote, ut possit Baptismo suo peccata Homini qui Baptizatur, abluere. *Epist.* 70. *Paris*, 1548. Pag 137.

† Addimus plane & Adjungimus Frater charissime *Concensu & Auctoritate Communi*, ut etiam si qui Presbyteri, aut Diaconi, qui vel in Ecclesia Catholica prius Ordinati fuerint, & postmodum perfidi ac rebelles contra Ecclesiam steterint, vel apud Hæreticos à pseudo-Episcopis & antichristis contra Christi dispositionem, profana Ordinatione promoti sint & contra Altare unum arque Divinum Sacrificia foris falsa ac sacrilega offerre conati sunt, eos quoque hac conditione suscipi cum revertuntur, ut *Communicent Laici*, &c. — nec debere eos revertentes ea apud nos Ordinationis & Honoris Arma retinere, quibus contra nos rebellaverint. *Epist.* 72 p. 141, 142.

“ **None have Authority to Baptize, or give Remif-
 “ sion of Sins, but the Bishops, and those who are
 “ founded in the Evangelical Law, and our Lord’s
 “ Appoinment; and, That nothing can be Bound
 “ or Loosed out of the Church, seeing there is None
 “ there who has the Power of Binding and Loosing.
 “ — That this is founded upon the Authority of
 “ the Holy Scriptures. — That No One can
 “ usurp to himself, in Opposition to the Bishops and
 “ Priests, what he has no Right and Power
 “ to perform; and instances the Examples of Corah,
 “ Dathan, and Abiram’s endeavouring to usurp to
 “ themselves the Power of Sacrificing, in Opposition
 “ to Moses, and Aaron the Priest. So again, in
 his Epistle to Magnus, speaking of the Baptism
 given by Hereticks and Schismaticks, he calls it,
 * a Profane Washing; and gives this for a Reason,
 why those who come over from them to the Church,
 ought to be Baptiz’d in the Church: † “ We say,
 “ (says he) That all Hereticks and Schismaticks are
 “ utterly destitute of all Power and Right:” In
 Consequence of this, he calls their Altars, || False
 Altars; their Priesthood, Unlawful; and their Sa-

** Intelligimus, non nisi in Ecclesia Præpositis, & in Evangelica
 Lege, ac Dominica Ordinatio, ne fundatis licere Baptizare, re-
 missam peccatorum dare, foris autem nec ligari aliquid posse
 nec solvi, ubi non sit qui aut ligare possit aliquid, aut solvere.
 Nec hoc frater charissime sine Scripturæ divinæ auctoritate pro-
 ponimus, ut dicamus certa Lege, — cuncta esse disposita; nec
 posse quenquam contra Episcopos & Sacerdotes usurpare sibi
 aliquid, quod non sit sui Juris & potestatis. Nam & Chore, Da-
 tham, & Abyron, &c. Epist. 73. p. 145.

* Prophanum Lavacrum.

† Dicimus omnes omnino Hæreticos & Schismaticos nihil ha-
 bere Potestatis ac Juris.

|| Falsa Altaria, & illicita Sacerdotia, & Sacrificia Sacrilega,
 & nomina adulterata fingentes.

crifices,

crifices, *Sacrilegious*. He affirms, That * *they vainly Contend, [who say, That] "any one can be Baptiz'd and Sanctified with Saving Baptism, where 'tis manifest that the Baptizer has not Authority or Commission to Baptize."* And he asks, † *"How can they Justifie and Sanctifie the Baptiz'd, who are the Priest's Enemies, and endeavour to usurp to themselves things unfit and unlawful for them, and which were never granted them by any Law or Authority whatsoever?"*

These, among many other Instances that might be brought from St. *Cyprian's* own Works, do plainly shew, That he esteem'd it necessary that the *Baptifinal Water* should be Sanctified by the *Priest*; That *Hereticks* and *Schismaticks* were, in his Opinion, but as *Lay-men*; That they had no *Power, Authority* or *Right* to Baptize; and that, because they had not this *Right* or *Authority*, therefore their *Baptifms* were *Null* and *Void*. Whether those *Hereticks* and *Schismaticks* were rightly judg'd by him to be but *Lay-men*, is another Question; but this is certain, that St. *Cyprian* esteem'd their *Baptifms* to be *Invalid*, for want of *Commission* and *Authority* to Baptize; and thereby plainly shew'd, that he esteem'd the *Commission* to be *Essential* to the *Ministration* of *Baptifm*; and consequently, that a *supposititious Baptifm*, by a *Person* who never had a *Commission* to Baptize, [which is the very Case of our *Lay-*

* Frustra Contendunt *Baptizari* & *Sanctificari* illic aliquem salutari *Baptifmo* posse, ubi constat *Baptizantem* *Baptizandi* *Licentiam* non habere. —

† Quomodo tales *justificare* & *sanctificare* *Baptizatos* possunt; qui *Hofes* *Sacerdotum*, *aliena* & *illicita* & *nullo* *sibi* *Fure* *concessa* *usurpare* conantur? — *Epist.* 76. p. 167, 170, 171.

Baptisms] must be Null and Void, whatever became of Baptisms by Hereticks and Schismaticks who in those Days used to be Ordain'd by Bishops.

§ XIV. *Firmilian* was also of the same mind ; for, in his Epistle to St. *Cyprian*, he affirms of Hereticks who have cut themselves off from the Church ; That * “ *They can have nothing of Grace, or Power, [or Authority ;] since all Grace and Authority is establish'd in the Church, where the Bishops preside, who have the Power or Authority of Baptizing, of Laying on of Hands, and of Ordination. For as an Heretick has not the Authority of Ordaining, or of Laying on of Hands, so neither has he the Power or Authority of Baptizing. — He says, † “ That this was long before Establish'd and Confirm'd in a Council at Iconium, held by him and the Bishops of Galatia and Cilicia, and the rest of the neighbouring Regions, firmly to be held and maintain'd against Hereticks, when any Doubt should arise about this Matter. — They Decreed, || “ That all those should be holden*

* Hæretici si se ab Ecclesia Dei Sciderint, nihil habere Potestatis aut Gratia possunt, quando omnis Potestas & Gratia in Ecclesia Constituta sit ; ubi præsident majores natu qui & Baptizandi & manum imponendi, & ordinandi possident potestatem. Hæretico enim sicut Ordinare non licet, nec Manum imponere, ita nec Baptizare. — *Firmiliani Epist. inter Epist. Cyr. LXXV. p. 159.*

† Quod totum nos jampridem in *Iconio*, collecti in unum convenientibus ex *Galatia* & *Cilicia*, & cæteris proximis Regionibus confirmavimus, tenendum, contra Hæreticos firmiter & vindicandum, cum à quibusdam de ista re dubitaretur. p. 160.

|| Nos etiam illos quos hi qui prius in Ecclesia Catholica Episcopi fuerant, & postmodum sibi potestatem Clericæ Ordinationis assumentes Baptizaverant, pro non Baptizatis habendos judicavimus, &c. p. 165.

“ as not Baptiz’d, who were Baptiz’d by such as
 “ had once been Bishops in the Catholick Church, if
 “ they were Baptiz’d by them after they had sepa-
 “ rated from the Church, and assum’d to themselves
 “ the Power of the Priestly Order.”

All which Passages of Firmilian’s Letter to St. Cyprian do abundantly prove, that he and his Colleagues, Assembled in the Council of Iconium, were entirely of St. Cyprian’s Opinion, That there was no Baptism, where there was *no Priestly Power* to Baptize; and consequently, that Baptism by Lay-men, Persons not having this Priestly Power, is Null and Void; whatever becomes of that other Question, Whether the then Hereticks and Schismaticks were or were not, in reality, reduc’d to the State and Condition of meer Lay-men.

§XV. So again, several of St. Cyprian’s Colleagues in the Council of Carthage, consisting of 87 Bishops, expressly affirm’d the same thing: Thus *Novatus à Thamugade* says, That * “ According to the Decree of their Colleagues, Men of most sacred Memory, all Hereticks and Schismaticks ——— who seem to have been Ordain’d, should, upon their Conversion to the Church, be receiv’d among Laicks.

Confessor *Pomponius à Dionysiana* says, † “ ’Tis manifest, that Hereticks cannot Baptize, and

* Secundum Decretum Collegarum nostrorum sanctissimæ memoriæ virorum, omnes Schismaticos & Hæreticos qui ad Ecclesiam conversi sunt, — & qui Ordinati videbantur inter Laicos recipi. *Concil Carthag. inter S. Cyp. Oper. p. 354.*

† Manifestam est Hæreticos non posse Baptizare, & Remissionem Peccatorum dare, qui potestatem non habent, ut aut solvere aut ligare aliquid in terris possint. *P. 360.*

“ give Remission of Sins, who have not the Power
 “ of Binding or Loosing any thing on the Earth.

Confessor *Clarus à Mascula* affirms, That
 * “ Hereticks, who have no Power out of the
 “ Church, — cannot Baptize any one with their
 “ Baptism.”

In Consequence of this Supposition, That Hereticks were destitute of Power and Authority to Baptize, [as Lay-men, Persons who were never Commission'd, most certainly are,] these Fathers determin'd, That those who were Baptiz'd only by such Hereticks, should, upon their Conversion, be Baptiz'd in the Church: It matters not, whether those Hereticks were utterly destitute of all Power to Baptize, or no: We plainly see, that *St. Cyprian, Firmilian*, and their Colleagues, grounded the Invalidity of their Baptisms, upon their supposed want of Power and Authority; which is an undeniable Proof, that 'twas their Opinion, That if there was in reality *no Commission*, there certainly could be *no Baptism*; which is the very Case about which we are now Disputing: For our Lay-Baptisms are notoriously such, as are perform'd by Persons who never receiv'd, and therefore have not any Commission, Power, or Authority to Baptize; and consequently, according to *St. Cyprian, Firmilian*, and their Colleague Bishops, Assembled in the Councils of *Iconium* and *Carthage*, these Baptisms being without Commission, Power, or Authority, are wholly Null and Void.

* Hæretici qui nec potestatem foris, nec Ecclesiam Christi habent, neminem Baptizare Baptismo ejus possunt. P. 363.

§ XVI. The Canons call'd Apostolical are very ancient; and Three of them, wherein the Baptism of Hereticks is rejected, are suppos'd * by the Learned *Du Pin*, to be the very Canons of the Synods of *Iconium* & *Synnada*, and therefore at least as early as the Year of Christ 255, or 256. — One of these Three, which is the 47th of the Apostolick Canons, is this: “ † *If a Bishop or Presbyter do again Baptize one, who has really receiv'd Baptism before;*” or, “ *if he do not Baptize one that has been polluted by Wicked Men, let him be depos'd as one who contemns the Cross and Death of Christ, and makes no Distinction between Priests, and counterfeit Priests.*”

The Fathers who made this Canon, reckon'd that a Man *was polluted*, when he was pretendedly Baptiz'd by the *Wicked Men* here spoken of; who those *Wicked Men* were, the Conclusion of the Canon determines, namely, *counterfeit or false Priests*; Persons whom that Council reckon'd to be *no Priests*, at the time of their suppos'd pretended Ministration; for they are spoken of, by way of Opposition to *Priests* simply consider'd: So that by this Canon, if a Person had been only Baptiz'd by one, who was but a *counterfeit Priest*, a Bishop, or Presbyter, was to be depos'd, if he did not Baptize that Person; and the Reason why he was to be depos'd, was this, because he made *no*

* *Du Pins Eccles. Hist. Cent. 1. p. 14. Lond.*

† *Episcopus vel Presbyter eum qui vere habet Baptisma si de integro Baptizaverit, vel si eum qui ab impiis pollutus est, non Baptizaverit, deponatur, ut qui irrideat Crucem Domini, & Mortem, & non Desernat Sacerdotes, à falsis Sacerdotibus. Can. SS. Apof. XLVII.*

Distinction between Priests and Pretenders; between those who were really vested with Priestly Power, and others, who in those Days, and by those Fathers, were accounted to have no such Power, and therefore only to have before polluted, and not Baptiz'd the Person; which comes fully up to our present Case. Our Lay-Baptizers, namely, our Dissenting Teachers, being but Pretenders only, false and counterfeit Priests, having no more actual Power of Priesthood than the meanest Mechanick Laick in the World has.

§ XVII. Mr. *Bingham's* Second Instance of Laymen's being allow'd to Baptize in Cases of Necessity, is about one hundred Years after his First; and he takes it from the *Spanish Council of Eliberis*, held by 19 Bishops, said to have been assembled about the Year of Christ 305. Canon 38. "They there appointed (says he, pag. 27.) that when Men were upon a Voyage at Sea, or in any Place where no Church was at hand, if a Catechumen happen'd to be extremely Sick, and at the Point of Death, that then any Christian, who had his own Baptism entire, and was no Bigamist, might Baptize him." Upon which our Reverend Historian Remarks, That "This Authority was not given to all Christians in all Cases, but with several Limitations and Restrictions. 1st, It must be a Case of absolute Necessity when Baptism could not otherwise be had. 2dly, The Person Baptizing must have his own Baptism entire. 3dly, He must be no Bigamist."— And upon the whole, Mr. *Bingham* affirms, That "in the main, the Matter is indisputable, that they [*i. e.* the *Spanish* Bishops of that Council] plainly intended in some extraordinary Cases to give Laymen a License and Authority to administer Baptism,

“ *tism, which could not then be said to be unautho-*
 “ *rized in Spain, since it had the best Authority the*
 “ *Church could give it; which is the Determination*
 “ *and Authority of a Council,*” pag. 27, 28. In all
 which there are several Things worth Obser-
 vation.

1st, That Mr. *Bingham* reckons this Council gave
Authority to some Lay-men to Baptize in extraor-
 dinary Cases: How the Doctor at *Greenwich* will like
 this, who affirms, that such a Supposition exposes
 the Christian Priesthood to new Dangers, I know
 not; but it may be, he will have a more favourable
 Opinion of this Notion, now 'tis espous'd by our
 Reverend Historian, for whose *Historical History* I
 am inform'd he has a mighty Value and Esteem:—
 But if the Council of *Eliberis* intended to give a
Real Authority to some, and not to all Lay-men to
 Baptize, then 'twill follow,

2^{dly}, That this Canon is not **Declarative** of
 any Right in Lay-Christians *as such*, to give Bap-
 tism in Cases of Extremity, but rather the con-
 trary, that they have no such Right in themselves,
 because the Bishops gave *them Authority*, according
 to our Historian; which those *Spanish* Bishops could
 not be said to have done, if Lay-men had *such*
Authority before: And this also is therefore de-
 structive of *Tertullian's* Notion of Lay-men's having
 a Right in themselves to Baptize in the Absence of
 the Clergy. For the Councils intending to Author-
 ize **some Lay-men** (according to Mr. *Bingham*)
 and **not others**, to Baptize in such Cases, is an
 Evidence, that those Bishops did not Esteem *all*
Lay-Christians as such, to have that *Power and Au-*
thority. Hence it follows,

3^{dly}, That this Canon is a good Argument
 against Mr. *Bingham's* Supposition, in pag. 11, 12.—
 where

where he guesses that the Antients might Esteem some irregular Baptisms to be *valid*, upon this Principle, “*That Baptism, by whomsoever Christian perform’d, was valid, and not to be repeated*: For, if the Bishops of this Council had known of any such Principle, what need had they to make a Canon to *give Authority* to some Sort of Lay-Christians to Baptize, *if all Christians*, as such, had that Authority in themselves; and Baptism, by *whomsoever Christian* administred, was then good and valid, in the Opinion of the Catholick Church?

There was another Condition impos’d on those Baptizers, by the *Spanish* Bishops of that Council, which Mr. *Bingham* has not taken notice of, and ’twas this; “*That * if the Baptized survived, he who Baptiz’d him, was obliged to present him to the Bishop to be Confirm’d by Imposition of Hands*:” Which taken in Conjunction with Mr. *Bingham’s* other Observation, that the Baptizer *was to have his own Baptism entire*; (which, by many Learned Men, is suppos’d to signifie, that he was to be one who had not forfeited the Benefits of his Baptism by lapsing, or falling into such Sins as had brought him under Penance for them, as *Du Pin* upon this Canon has observ’d; and Mr. *Bingham* himself, *pag. 28. from Albaspinny*;) plainly shews, that the Baptizer was to be one in Communion with his Bishop: He was to be *no Separatist* from the Church; no Schismatical member of her Sacred Body; no Rebel against Episcopacy it self; but one in actual Communion with the Church; one who own’d and acknowledg’d the Spiritual Power of Bishops; and that so far, as to bring the Bap-

* Ita ut si supervixerit, ad Episcopum eum perducatur, ut per manus impositionem perfici possit, Concil. Eliber. Can. XXXVIII.

tiz'd to be Confirm'd by Imposition of the Bishop's Hands. But our Lay-Baptizers are not so; and therefore nothing in Favour of their pretended Baptisms can be pleaded from this Canon, if it were of any Obligation in our Church, as it most certainly is not.

Mr. *Bingham* is pleas'd to tell us, That " *It will not here be material for any One to Object, That this was but the Determination of a Private National Council; for (says he) we are not now enquiring what Obligation any other Church is under to follow this Rule, but only what was Matter of Fact, and the Practice of the Ancient Church,*" pag. 29. But, with Submission, this Objection is *very material*, and for this Reason, because, we are enquiring, not into the Practice of *a particular Church or two*, but of the ancient Catholick Church, that we may be able to distinguish *singular unwarranted Notions*, from *truly ancient and well-grounded Catholick Traditions and Practices*. This Council was but Provincial; it says nothing about any former Catholick Tradition or Practice; it speaks of *no general Custom* then in Use about this Matter, at the time of 'its Session; it was never receiv'd into the Code of the Catholick Church, as consonant to the Sense of the Catholick Church; and therefore has nothing in it of sufficient weight to convince us, that this Canon is a Testimony of the General Practice of the Church in those Days. We must have more than one single Provincial Council to shew us the General Practice of the Ancient Church: And after all, even if this had been a General Council, it would not have determin'd, that all Lay-Christians, as such, have in themselves a Right to Baptize, in Cases of Extremity; nay, it would not have so
much

much as *Authoriz'd* or *Impower'd* all *Baptiz'd Laymen* for that Purpose, because it do's not Authorize Bigamists; much less would it have Authoriz'd Schismaticks, who separate from their Bishop's Communion: And therefore, the pretended Baptism, given by Persons who never were at all Commission'd to Baptize, and who attempt to give Baptism *Ordinarily*, without the least appearance of Necessity, and this even in Opposition to, not only some particular Bishops, but the Divine Right of Episcopacy it self; I say, such pretended Baptisms would not have had the least Countenance from this Council, if it had been a *GeneralOne*; and therefore, certainly, since 'twas but a *Provincial one*, those spurious Baptisms, can upon no account whatsoever, be favour'd by the Canon of that *Spanish Council*, even if Bishops could, by a Canon in Council, Authorize or Impower their own Lay-Communicants to Baptize, which, it has not yet been prov'd that Bishops can do; and I do not trouble my self to enquire whether they can or cannot; it being foreign to the present Controversy, which relates to those who were never at all suppos'd to have been Authoriz'd by Bishops.

§ XVIII. The Reverend Historian's Third Instance, is taken from the Story of Boys Baptizing in Play at the Sea-side, in the days of *Alexander* Bishop of *Alexandria*; and he introduces it thus: " *Whilst this Matter* [of the *Spanish Bishops* in the Council of *Eliberis*, their making a Canon to Authorize some of their Lay-men to Baptize, &c.] " *was thus determin'd in the West, there happen'd* " *another famous Transaction in the East, which* " *drew on a like Determination in the Church* " *of Alexandria, if we may give credit to any of the* " *ancient*

“ ancient Historians, Socrates, Sozomen, and Rufin,
 “ who all Relate it: Rufin (says he) had the
 “ Story from the Mouth of those who liv'd and con-
 “ vers'd with Athanasius; and the Account of it,
 “ according to his Relation, is this: Alexander, Bi-
 “ shop of Alexandria, on a certain Day, being the
 “ Festival of Peter the Martyr, after the Solemn Ser-
 “ vice of the Church was over, was entertaining
 “ himself with a Prospect toward the Sea, whilst he
 “ expected his Clergy to come and dine with him. In
 “ his Prospect, at some distance upon the Sea-shore,
 “ he beheld a Number of Youths at Play, acting the
 “ Part of a Bishop, and doing all things which were
 “ used to be done in the Church: And viewing them
 “ intently for some time, he at last saw them come
 “ to the Secret and Mystical Rites of Religion,
 “ upon which, being somewhat perplex'd, he sent
 “ immediately for his Clergy, and shew'd them what he
 “ himself had seen, ordering them withal to go, and
 “ bring the Boys before him. Who being ask'd, What
 “ Play they were at, and what they had done, and
 “ after what manner? They at first deny'd all the whole
 “ Matter, as Children us'd to do through fear; but
 “ afterward, they told every thing in order as it was
 “ done, confessing, that they had Baptiz'd certain
 “ Catechumens, by the Hands of Athanasius, who
 “ acted the Part of the Bishop in the Play. Then ex-
 “ amining farther of those who were said to be Bap-
 “ tiz'd, What Questions they were ask'd, and what
 “ Answers they made? And being likewise inform'd
 “ by him who had been the chief Actor; when he found
 “ that all things had been done according to the Rites
 “ of our Religion, after he had conferr'd with a
 “ Council of his Clergy, he is said to have deter-
 “ min'd, [Statuisse traditur, says Rufin,] That
 “ the Baptism of those, on whom Water had been
 “ pour'd,

“ pour’d, with the proper Interrogatories and Re-
 “ sponses, ought not to be repeated, but only have
 “ those things added, which the Priests were used to
 “ perform. * Socrates, and † Sozomen, have the
 “ same Story; and the Author of the Life of Atha-
 “ nadius in Photius, with Johannes Moschus, and
 “ many others,” says Mr. Bingham, pag. 29, 30, 31.
 Then he Names “ Archbishop Whitgift, Abbot, Co-
 “ tolerius, Pagi, and, he says, many others that
 “ might be nam’d, Men of Character in their Age,
 “ have appear’d in its Behalf, and defended it as a
 “ genuine Piece of History. And it is some Confir-
 “ mation, that Rufin says he had it from the Mouth
 “ of those who convers’d with Athanasius. And Ni-
 “ cephorus Calistus, who also relates the Story, ||
 “ gives a parallel Instance of another Fact much like
 “ this, which happened in his own time at Constanti-
 “ nople,” pag. 31. Thus far Mr. Bingham. It is a
 wonderful Thing to see with what Air of Gravity,
 and Solemnity of Expression, this Reverend Historian
 introduces the Story of this ludicrous, sportive
 Washing: He says of it, “ There happen’d ano-
 “ ther famous Transaction in the East.” This,
 before one comes to read the Story it self, looks as
 if it was some mighty important Affair which was
 of a very Publick Nature, and undoubtedly attested
 to by the Bishops of the Eastern Church; for, he
 says, it “ drew on a like Determination in the
 “ Church of Alexandria,” i. e. a like Determina-
 tion to that of the Council of *Eliberis*, he was
 just before speaking of. Now who is there, that at
 first reading of this, would not naturally expect

* Hist Lib. 1. cap. 15.

† Lib. 2. cap. 17.

|| Niceph. Hist. Lib. 3. c. 37.

to find, that a *Provincial Council* of Bishops was assembled at *Alexandria*, upon the Account of this pretended "*famous Transaction*," and that they had made some new Canon, as the Council of *Eliberis* did, about Lay-Baptism? For, he says, it "*drew on a like Determination*;" when, behold, *parturiunt montes, &c.* a Mountain has brought forth a Mouse. This *famous Transaction* was nothing but Boys Play, in the East, *i. e.* at the Water-side near *Alexandria*; and the *Determination* it is said to have drew on, was no more than this, That the Bishop of *Alexandria*, (having taken Council with the Priests that were about him, whom he was before expecting to Dine with him) is said to have determin'd, that the Boys Baptiz'd in Play, should not be Baptiz'd again: A *famous Transaction this!* and as important a Determination too! If it had been true in fact, which we have no reason to believe it was, if we consider, 1st, The Ecclesiastical Writers whom Mr. Bingham appeals to for the Truth thereof. 2^{dly}, Its little or no Credit among Learned Men. And 3^{dly}, The Circumstances of the Story itself. For,

First, The known Person, from whom we originally have this Story, is no other than *Rufinus*; and from him *Sozomen* alone, among the *ancient Ecclesiastical Historians*. The First, a Man remarkably credulous, and besides so very careless in his Ecclesiastical History, that *Socrates Scholasticus* complains of it, * and says, That he "*has err'd concerning the Notation of the Times*:" And gives one Instance thereof in the Troubles of *St. Athanasius*; That "*he was also ignorant of*

* *Socrates Eccles. Hist. Book ii. cap. i.*

“ St. Athanasius’s Banishment into the Gallias, and
 “ of several other things.” That Socrates “ ha-
 “ ving at first followed Rufinus, [as his Author]
 “ wrote the First and Second Book of his [i. e. So-
 “ crates’s] History according to his [i. e. Rufinus’s]
 “ Authority”—— “ But [says Socrates] when we
 “ had afterwards procur’d Athanasius’s Books, where-
 “ in he laments his own calamitous Sufferings, &c.—
 “ we thought it more expedient to Credit him (which
 “ had suffer’d these Hardships) and those who had
 “ been present at the transacting of these Matters,
 “ rather than such as have followed Conjectures
 “ in their Relations thereof, and for that Reason have
 “ been mistaken.” Besides, “ having got several
 “ Letters of Persons at that time, very Eminent,
 “ to our utmost Ability, we have diligently traced
 “ out the Truth. Upon which Account, we have
 “ been necessitated entirely to dictate again the First
 “ and Second Book of this Work [i. e. Socrates’s
 “ Ecclesiastical History] making use nevertheless of
 “ those Passages, in the Relation whereof Rufinus
 “ hath not forsaken the Truth.” By all which
 ’tis plain, that the Credulity of Rufinus, his Care-
 lessness, his following Conjectures, and his deviating
 from, and forsaking of Truth, in some Matters of
 his Ecclesiastical History, were the Reasons which
 induc’d Socrates to write over a-new, the First and
 Second Books of his History, which he at first took
 from Rufinus; whose Authority he afterwards
 found was not to be depended upon in many
 Cases, when he had consulted more Authentick
 Records: And why we should depend upon Rufinus’s
 History, concerning this ludicrous Baptism, when
 the Judicious Socrates Scholasticus found Rufinus to
 be so apt to follow Conjectures, and to depart from
 Truth, that he refus’d to Copy this Story from him,

as I shall by and by prove ; I say, why we should believe *Rufinus*, when an ancient *competent* Judge of such Matters, who knew his Errors in History better than we, did not believe him in this Matter, is hard to understand ; especially, when we find, that even the Moderns have discover'd *Rufinus* to have been so careless and negligent in Writing, as that “ *he* * *seems to have compos'd his Two Books of* “ *Ecclesiastical History, without looking into any Re-* “ *ords. He translated Eusebius's † Ecclesiastical* “ *History with great Liberty ; he added thereto a Re-* “ *lation of St. Gregory Thaumaturgus his Miracles,* “ *and an Harangue of Lucian the Martyr, which* “ *are not in Eusebius.— There are several Faults in* “ *his Translation : He makes Zacharias, spoken of in* “ *St. Luke, to have been a Martyr at Lyons ; he* “ *confounds St. Biblias with Blandina, &c.”* Thus he deals with another Man's Works. And as for his own, “ *There are many Historical Faults in his* “ *History. These are some ; He supposes that Atha-* “ *nasius hid himself for six Years after he was con-* “ *demn'd by the Council of Tyre : He perverts the* “ *Order of Time in the History of St. Athanasius.—* “ *He says, that St. Hilary was Excommunicated,* “ *which is false : And he confounds the Time,* “ *when he says, that St. Hilary was Banish'd after* “ *the Council of Milan, &c.”* And thus we see what a correct and careful Historian *Rufinus* was!

As for *Sozomen's* Account of this Story, he took it from *Rufinus* ; and therefore is no additional Evi-

* *Valesius concerning the Life and Writings of Socrates and Sozomen, prefix'd to their Ecclesiastical History.*

† *Du Pin's Eccles. Hist. Cent. V. p. 108. Notes (h) and (l) Lond.*

dence for the Truth of it, so that it still stands on'y upon the first Foundation which *Rufinus* laid; and what that is, will be something more discover'd, by what I have farther to say concerning *Socrates Scholaasticus*: In the mean time, we have no more reason to regard this Story, for *Sozomen's* having transcrib'd it from *Rufinus*, than we have to esteem other *Trivial* and *Childish* Passages which are found to occur in several Places of *Sozomen's Ecclesiastical History*, and which he might probably have taken from other Writers who follow'd *Conjectures*, in their Relations, and for that reason were often mistaken; of this sort, of Trifling and Childishness, is, * “his Digression, in his 1st Book, concerning the Building of the City Hemona; and concerning the Argonauts Carrying the Ship Argo on their Shoulders some Furlongs; also his Description of Daphne without the Walls of the City Antioch, which occurs at Chap. 19th of his 6th Book; and that Observation of his, concerning the Beauty of the Body, where he treats of that Virgin with whom the blessed Athanasius Absconded a long while.” All which, betray what Judgment he had, as an Historian, and make him to be less valuable, in that respect, than *Socrates Scholaasticus* was.

For this latter, in collecting his *Ecclesiastical History*, has † “made use of a singular **Judiciousness and Diligence**: His **Judiciousness** is manifested, by his **Remarks and Sentiments** interwoven every-where throughout his Books. — He judges incomparably well, both of Men, and and also of **Ecclesiastical Business and Affairs**. There is nothing in him but what is **Grave and**

* Valefius, of the Life and Writings of *Socrates* and *Sozomen*.

† *Ibid*.

“ **Serious** ; nothing that you can expunge, as
 “ *Superfluous* ; but, on the contrary, some Passages
 “ occur in *Sozomen*, that are *Trivial and Childish*.
 “ *Socrates’s Diligence is declar’d by many* — In-
 “ stances ; chiefly by this, in regard he frequently
 “ annexes a *Note of the Times*, that is, the *Consu-*
 “ *lates and Olympiads*, especially where he mentions
 “ such Matters as are more momentous. Nor has
 “ he *Carelessly or Negligently* written his *History*, as
 “ *Rufinus did*, who (as has been observ’d before)
 “ seems — to have compos’d his *Two Books of Ec-*
 “ *clesiastical History* — without looking into any
 “ Records. Our *Socrates did far otherwise* ; for
 “ having from all Places got together the *Best Manu-*
 “ *ments*, that is, the *Epistles of Prelates*, the *Acts*
 “ of *Synods*, and the *Books of Ecclesiastical Writers*,
 “ agreeable to their Authority, he compos’d his
 “ *History*. This Diligent and Judicious Eccle-
 “ siastical Historian is brought in by *Mr. Bingham*,
 “ to vouch for the *Truth of Rufinus’s Story*, of
 “ *Mr. Bingham’s Famous Transaction*, of *Baptism*
 “ by *Boys at Play at the Water-side* ; *Mr. Bingham*
 “ names *Socrates* no less than twice, as an ancient
 “ Historian who may challenge our *Belief of this*
 “ *Story* ; for he says, before the beginning of it,
 “ That “ *There happen’d a Famous, &c. which drew*
 “ *on a Determination, &c.* — if we may give
 “ credit to any of the *Ancient Historians*, *So-*
 “ *crates, &c. who all Relate it,*” pag. 29 : And
 “ then, after the Conclusion of this *Story*, he says,
 “ *Socrates, &c. have the same Story,*” pag. 31. and
 “ is so particular, as to refer us to *Socrates’s Eccle-*
 “ *siastical History*, *Book 1. Chap. 15.* For my part,
 “ I am confounded at *Mr. Bingham’s Positiveness* in
 “ this Assertion, and wonder at the *Greatness of his*
 “ *Mistake* in so plain a Matter, (if it be indeed a

Mistake in a Man so much conversant in Ecclesiastical Writers as Mr. *Bingham* is.) However, I will not aggravate this Slip, lest I should thereby make my self guilty of too severe a Censure : But this I am certain of, that

Socrates Scholasticus says not one word of the Boy *Athanasius's* Baptizing other Boys, nor of *Alexander* the Bishop's determining, that those suppos'd Baptiz'd Children ought not to be Baptiz'd again. I say, *Socrates* has not one word of this in all his History : And that the Reader may see that I do not wrong Mr. *Bingham*, I will here transcribe from the 15th Chapter of the 1st Book of *Socrates's Ecclesiastical History*, all that he relates concerning *Athanasius's* Play at the Water-side, and of the Notice which Bishop *Alexander* took of it ; and 'tis this : “ Upon the Death of *Alexander* Bishop of Alexandria, *Athanasius* was promoted to the Presidency over that Church. *Rufinus* relates, That this Person, when he was very young, did, together with those that were his equals in Age, play at a kind of an Holy Sport ; this Play was an Imitation of the Sacerdotal Function, and of those Persons Order that were Clergy-men ; in this Sport, therefore, *Athanasius* was elected Bishop, and every one of the rest of the Children acted either a Presbyter or a Deacon. This Sport the Children play'd at, on that Day whereon was celebrated the Memory of *Peter the Martyr and Bishop*. *Alexander* Bishop of Alexandria accidentally passing by at that time, saw all their Play ; and having afterwards sent for the Children, he enquired of them, what Place had been allotted to every one of them in the Play, supposing, that from what had been done, something might be portended [concerning each of them ;] and he gave Order, that

“ that the Children should be educated in the Church,
 “ and instructed in Learning, but most especially
 “ Athanasius. Afterwards, when he was come to
 “ a maturity of Age, he Ordain'd him Deacon, and
 “ took him along with him to Nice, that he might
 “ assist him in the Disputations there, at such time
 “ as that Synod was Convened. These Things Ru-
 “ finus has related concerning Athanasius, in his
 “ Books [of Ecclesiastical History;] nor is it at all
 “ unlikely that these things happen'd, for many such-
 “ like Acts are frequently found to have been done.
 “ Thus much we have hitherto said concerning
 “ Athanasius.

Thus far *Socrates*, and he has nothing more relating to this Matter : So that we may plainly see what part of *Rufinus's* Story he had reason to believe, and hand down to Posterity, and what part he reckon'd not to be agreeable to Truth ; he says, in his * *History*, That he “ makes use of these
 “ Passages, in the Relation whereof *Rufinus* hath
 “ not forsaken the Truth ;” plainly intimating, that *Rufinus*, in some Passages of his *Ecclesiastical History*, had forsaken the Truth, and that he would not make use of any such his false Passages ; and therefore, in his Transcripts from *Rufinus*, what *Socrates* omits in his *History*, which *Rufinus* relates in his, may be look'd upon as false, or at least not well attested, in the Opinion of our judicious *Socrates* ; and since *Socrates* has wholly omitted the Story of *Athanasius's* Baptizing the Boys in Play, and also of *Alexander's* determining, that they ought not to have their Baptism repeated, 'tis a sign that he reckon'd this part of the Story to be

* Book 2. Chap. 1.

one Instance of *Rufinus's* forsaking the Truth, and consequently, that he did not believe it, and so would not stuff his History with such an odd improbable Relation.

The Author of the Life of *St. Athanasius*, (another of *Mr. Bingham's* Historians) in *Photius*, is an unknown Writer. *Photius* does not so much as guess who he was; and therefore, tho' he has the same Story, yet being an unknown Author, his Evidence is of no weight in this Matter, especially if we consider, that he is so singular in one part of this Story, as to reckon, that what the Children did in their Play, was done by **Divine * Instinct or Inspiration**. A very extraordinary Addition this to *Rufinus's* first Story, and which betrays the *Credulity* of this unknown Author, whoever he was: Besides, if what he says be true, it will follow, that this Baptism was Authoriz'd and Commission'd by God himself, being done by a *Divine Instinct*, and so spoils *Mr. Bingham's* Design in quoting this Story. But this, of a *Divine Instinct* in the Boys, none but those who give credit to idle Fables, will ever believe.

Another of *Mr. Bingham's* supposed Vouchers for the Truth of this Story, is *Johannes Moschus*, pag. 31. But sure our Reverend Historian is hard put to it for good Evidence, when he stoops so low, as to make use of such ridiculous Authors as this Monk, who, in that very Book which *Mr. Bingham* quotes, [viz. *Moschus Pratum Spir.*] "relates
" many strange Stories and Miracles that deserve little
" credit, (as *Du Pin* tells us;) for Instance, in his

* Alexander ad se vocat, auditque non illos sacra irrifisse, sed ut ex eventu colligas fecisse Divino quodam Instinctu, &c. Photii Biblioth. Cod. 253. pag. 1430.

45th Chapter, he says, "A Recluse promised the Devil, he would adore the Virgin's Image no more, to be delivered from his Temptation, and that he was reprov'd by his Elder for doing so. In the 47th, he relates, "That the Virgin having Appear'd twice to a Fester uttering impious Speeches against her, and having warn'd him to do so more, but to no purpose, she Appear'd to him the third time, and that having sign'd his Hands and Feet with the Sign of the Cross, he found himself, when he awoke, without Hands and Feet. In the 79th, "That a Catholick, being Servant to a Severian, having left with his Master the Key of his Chest, where he had laid up the Eucharist in a Lincloth, the Master having design'd to Burn it, because his Servant did not come back, found that the Particles of the Eucharist had brought forth Ears of Corn. In the 196th Chapter, he relates, "That some Children of the Province of Apamea would needs represent the Celebration of the Holy Mysteries, and that having chosen one of themselves to perform the Office of a Priest, and two others of Deacons, they set some Bread upon a Stone, and that he that acted the Priest did pronounce the Words of Oblation, which he had gotten by heart. ——— That having thus performed all the Ceremonies, before they brake the Bread, to give the Communion, Fire came down from Heaven, which consumed the Oblation, and the whole Stone whereon it was laid. That the Bishop of the Place, hearing of it, built a Monastery in that Place, and made all these Children Monks. To this Example, he adds that reported by Rufinus, of the Baptism by St. Athanasius, who was then but a Child, to some other Children. ——— And in the 207th, "There is mention made of Two
" Angels

“ Angels who stood Sureties for a Girl which had a
 “ mind to be Baptiz’d.

The same Book is full of an infinite number of Relations and miraculous strange Stories of Apparitions, Revelations, Visions, and Miracles said to be wrought by Hermits, by Fore-telling Things to come, Discovering Mens Thoughts, Commanding Lions and Wild Beasts; when Dead, speaking to the Living from their Graves; and such-like fabulous Trumpery: Among those Whims, *Rufinus’s* Story is also related. And let the Judicious determine, whether this *Johannes Mosculus*, a Monk of the 7th Century, so foolishly Credulous even to Superstition, can give any Reputation to the Story before us. If this must be our Way to get at the *General Practice* of the Primitive Church, and we resolve to trust to such Legendary Writers as *Johannes Moschus*, we shall soon return again to all the Corruptions of Popery: For, where shall we stop, when we follow such Dreaming, Visionary Guides, as he was?

Mr. *Bingham* tells us, That *Nicephorus Calistus* relates the same Story: Upon this, one would have thought, that *Nicephorus* gives us a particular Account of it; but when we look into his History, there we find, that after he has told a Story of a Jew, Baptized with Sand instead of Water, in a Desert Place where no Water was to be had, and of his being afterwards commanded to be Baptized with Water; he then adds only this, * “ *Histories say, that something like this happen’d also in the time of the Great Athanasius.* ” This is all that *Nicephorus* says.

* *Niceph. Calist. Eccles. Hist. lib. 3. cap. 37. Paris 1630.*
 Simile quiddam accidisse etiam sub Athanasio magno Historiæ tradunt.

And how can it be affirm'd, that "*Nicephorus Calistus* relates the same Story, when he only says those few Words? And what he says, amounts to no Relation of the Story at all; since nothing of the Boy *Athanasius's* Baptizing his Play-fellows, or of *Alexander's* Determining the Validity of this suppos'd Ludicrous Baptism, can be gather'd from *Nicephorus's* Words, consider'd as they stand in his History, *separate from any other* that was written before him. Indeed, he does immediately add another Story of a Jew Boy, Baptiz'd in Play, by Christian Children, at the Sea-side near *Constantinople*, in his own Days: But then, if we consider that this Writer *Nicephorus Calistus*, a Monk of *Constantinople*, * liv'd and wrote in the 14th Century, that he has mix'd his History with a great many **Fables**, and has fall'n into many **Mistakes**, (as the learned *Du Pin* informs us) 'tis easie to account for *Nicephorus's* relating such Stories as this; and the *easie Credulity* of a *Fabulous Writer* in the 14th Century, is but a *sorry Evidence* for, nay, a *Dis-reputation* to, the Truth of any Tales of this nature. Mr. *Bingham's* referring us to **such Authors**, for the Confirmation of *Rufin's* Story, is no-ways answerable to the Character he has acquir'd among Learned Men; and, *for a Reverend Priest of the Church of England* to refer us to the Authority of such *Fabulous Writers*, as *Johannes Moschus*, and *Nicephorus Calistus*, in the *Dark Ages* of the Church, to convince us of the Truth of an odd whimsical Story, which in its natural Consequences tends to the utter Abolition of the whole Priestly Character, if the Matter thereof be allow'd

* *Du Pin's Eccles. Hist. Cent. xiv. pag. 87. Lond.*

to be true, just, and right, is a very *astonishing* thing, and the Principle from whence it proceeds hard, if at all, to be accounted for, especially in a Man who doubtless, has given his Assent to the 21st and 22d *Articles of the Church of England*, which warn us against trusting to Mens Mistakes, and ill-grounded fabulous Inventions in *Matters of Religion*.

The Reader, I hope, will charitably censure the Zeal of this Reflection, since it proceeds from nothing else but a necessary Indignation, which all good Christians ought to have, against such *fabulous Stories*, as strike at the very Root of our Saviour's Holy Institutions. But 'tis time to proceed.

Secondly, We have no reason to believe that there is any Truth in this part of the Story, since it has so little or no Credit among Learned Men: The Industrious and Judicious Ecclesiastical Historian *Socrates*, a very good Judge, and Competent by reason of his Abilities, the best Monuments he procured from all Places, and the early Days he liv'd in, this Writer, so well qualified, as I have before observed, tho' in his Two first Books he follows *Rufinus* in many things, yet, in his 1st Book, and 15th Chapter, where he Copies one part of the Story from *Rufinus*, he absolutely passes over in silence the other part of it, about the Ludicrous Baptism, and the pretended Determination relating thereto, as not worthy the Notice of himself, or his Reader; which certainly he would not have done, if he had believ'd that it was so *Famous a Transaction* as Mr. *Bingham* calls it, and if he had found any such Determination of the Bishop and his Clergy about it, as our Reverend Historian talks of; for *Socrates* says of himself, That he makes "use of such Passages, in the Relation whereof
" *Rufinus*

“*Rufinus hath not forsaken the Truth.*” But a Man of *Socrates's* Judgment and Knowledge was not to be impos'd upon by the single Authority of only one such Writer as *Rufinus*, and therefore, finding no better Authority than his, he does not follow him in this part of his Story, but wholly leaves him, and thereby gives us to understand that he had no reason to believe it, and consequently, that it deserves not the Regard and Esteem of Future Posterity. And we find none of the following Ancient Fathers, or Councils, no, not even *St. Augustin* himself, appeal to this Story, for the Validity of Lay-Baptism; this latter especially, who pleaded for the Validity of Baptism, by *whomsoever* administer'd, In the Name of the Trinity, would doubtless have made use of the Authority of this pretended “*famous Transaction,*” if he had known of it, and believ'd it. If he did not know of it, the Cause must be its *great Obscurity*, and the little, or rather *no notice* which the Church took of it; this argues its *Worthlessness*: If he knew of it, and did not believe it, and so would not appeal to it, 'tis an argument that it had then no established Credit, and might therefore justly be neglected by him.

There is another sort of Men who reject this Story as a Fable, and who cannot be suspected to have any other Motive for so doing, than an impartial love to Truth, and they are some Learned Men of the Communion of the Church of *Rome*, whose love to Truth, makes 'em, in some Instances, forget their Partiality for the Corruptions of that Church, and even Despise some Fables, the Belief of which would conduce very much to the seeming Reputation of their Erroneous Practices. This very Story of *Athanasius*, if it were true, would add
 very

very much (in some Mens Opinion) to the Reputation of Baptism by Lay-men and Women, taught in that Church: And yet the best Judges, even among them, are not hereby tempted to own this Fable for a Truth, but, on the contrary, they esteem it to be but a Fiction, because they find no Marks of Truth upon it. Mr. *Bingham* is not so kind to his Reader, as to discover any of these Opposers of that Story; 'twould have spoil'd its Credit if he had, and therefore I shall here produce some of their Testimonies against it. The Learned *Du Pin*, Doctor of the *Sorbon*, calls it, * “*A Story — very Improbable,*” and that “*it passes among Learned Men, rather for a Fable than a Truth,*” and gives good Reasons for the Improbability of the Truth of it, which I will shew by and by. The Learned Monks of the *Benedictin* Order tell us also, † That “*it labours under very great Suspicion among Learned Men;*” and these Monks likewise shew Reason why this Story do's not deserve any Credit. And shall the Judiciousness and Impartiality of *Papists*, stand in Competition with the Judgment and Integrity of *Protestants*? Will the *Reform'd* defend a Story, which [if true] favours *Popery*, when *Papists* themselves shew the Improbability of the same Story? God forbid! 'Tis well we have also had the Evidence of those who have Reform'd from *Popery*, such

* *Du Pin's History of Ecclesiastical Writers*, Century IV. p. 28. Lond. 1696.

† Verum hæc Rufini Historia grandi apud eruditos laborat suspicione. *Vita S. Athan. Opera & Studio Monachorum Ordinis S. Benedicti*, pag. 5.

as *Spanheim*, our Learned Dr. *Cave*, * as in the Margin, and Others, against it; otherwise, the *Papists* (as Things go at this time of day) might have reproach'd us, for being as great Favourers of *Idle Fables* and *Stories* to support our own Fancies, as we charge them to be, in the Defence of their Corruptions. But,

Thirdly, The Circumstances of the Story it self are such, as that it deserves not to be credited; for the Time and Place, in which this sportive Baptism, and the Ratification thereof, is said to have happened; *viz.* in the Time of the Episcopat of *Alexander*, and in the Church of *Alexandria*, betray the unlikelihood of it: For as the Learned *Du † Pin* has observ'd, “ *1st, This Story of Children Baptiz'd*
 “ *by Athanasius [in his Childhood] do's not at all*
 “ *agree with the Discipline of the Church of Alexan-*
 “ *dria upon the Subject of Re-baptization, and 'tis a*
 “ *thing unheard of that it should be approv'd of, or*
 “ *that any could approve a Baptism of this Nature,*

* Mitto quæ de eo adhuc puero Episcopi personam induente Baptismumque per sacrum quendam Ludum celebrante, vulgo narrant. Fabulam certè esse, & nunc, & olim suspicatus sum. Primus hanc Historiam extulit Rufinus, scriptor nimis credulus, quique hæc ex solo auditu refert, ipse à re gestâ integro penè sæculo remotus: Nec leve præjudicium videri debet, rem adeò memorabilem omnes hujus ævi scriptores latuisse, neminemq; ante Rufinum de eo vel verbum inaudivisse, neque alia desunt, quæ idem suadeant argumenta, modo his immorari vellem. *Hist. Literaria Autore Guil. Cave S. S. Theol. Profes. Vol. 1. p. 141, 142.*

The whole Evidence is founded upon the single Authority of Rufinus, who 'tis plain was the first Reporter of the Story, a Man infinitely careless in his Accounts of Things, and who took up this, only as a popular Tradition, at near an hundred Years distance from the Thing it self. Cave's Lives of the Primitive Fathers, Vol. 2. p. 72.

† *Du Pin's History of Ecclesiastical Writers, Century IV. p. 28. Note (d.)*

“ as Alexander of Alexandria is suppos’d to have
 “ done. 2dly, It do’s not agree with the Age of
 “ St. Athanasius: For Alexander was not ordain’d
 “ Bishop of Alexandria, according to the Testimony
 “ of St. Jerome, until the Year 321. and St. Athana-
 “ sius, being ordain’d Bishop in 326, was not, in
 “ this Interval, of an Age to play such little Pranks.
 “ And tho’ it were suppos’d, against the Authority
 “ of St. Jerome, that Alexander was ordain’d in 315.
 “ this would not remove the Difficulty; for it cannot
 “ be said, that St. Athanasius play’d at this Sport,
 “ when he was **above** 10 or 12 Years old; from
 “ whence it would follow, that he was ordain’d Bishop
 “ at the 25th or 27th Year of his Age; which is not
 “ very probable.” Baronius places Alexander in
 that See, either in 310 or 311. and Athanasius in
 the Year 326, 15 or at most 16 Years after; and
 cites Theodoret, l. I. c. 26. and Athanasius himself,
Apol. 2. According to which Account, if the Story
 were true, he must have been a very young Bishop,
 not above 25 or 26 Years old at most, which does
 not agree with the Church’s Discipline in those
 Days: Nor could he possibly have made such a
 Figure in the Council of Nice, convened A. D. 327.
 as he plainly did. *Socrat.* l. I. c. 8. and *Theodoret.*
l. I. c. 25. See also *G. Naz. Orat.* 21. p. 380, 381.
 Nay, by the Calculation of the Learned *Benedictines*,
 † in their Account of St. Athanasius’s Life, when he
 is said to have play’d at this Sport, he could hardly
 be less than Eighteen Years of Age; and how a
 Youth of those Years, and so solid as Athanasius

† Et si enim per Athanasii aetatem minime repugnaret ejus-
 modi Lusus, quod haud facile tamen concedatur de adolescente,
 cui ex memoratis superius, vix minus *duodeviginti annorum tum*
adscriptimus.

was, could be guilty of such childliffness, let any one in his Senfes judge. Add to this, that *Alexander* the Bishop (as thofe Learned || Monks have observ'd) “ was not fuch a Man as would have “ esteem'd Childrens Sport to be good and valid in “ fo weighty and ferious a Matter as this is. 3dly, The very Words of *Rufinus's* Story fhew, that he himfelf could not rely upon it; for notwithstanding, that by way of Preface, he fays, he'll relate fome few things of St. *Athanasius* as he receiv'd them “ from *thofe wholiv'd and convers'd with him:*” Yet, when he comes to *Alexander's* fuppos'd Determination of not re-baptizing the Children, he feems either not to have receiv'd it from thofe who were fo converfant with *Athanasius*, or elfe to doubt of the Truth of it; for he do's not fay, that *Alexander* determined: No, he does not venture to be fo pofitive; but thus, “ **He is faid to have determined,** “ *that the Baptifm* ought not to be repeated.*” The very Language of a Man who tells a Story, the Truth of which he is not fure of, and the Vouchers for which he dare not wholly rely on: And yet, notwithstanding this Uncertainty of *Rufinus* himfelf, about the great Thing we are fearching into, viz. Bishop *Alexander's* Determination, Mr. *Bingham* endeavours to make it pafs for a “ *genuine* “ *Piece of History,*” pag. 31. And indeed, if the Determination it felf be not genuine, all the reft of the Story is of no Consideration in this Debate; for what does the Play of Children fignifie, be it of what fort foever, fo long as the Governours of

|| *Non is erat Alexander qui tam feria in re, Ludum puerorum ratum haberet.* Vita S. Athan p. 3.

* *Statuiffe traditur, illis, &c. iterari Baptifmum non debere.* Rufin. Ecclef. Hift. ut fupra.

the Church make no grave and serious Determinations about it? Our *Rufinus*, the first Author who publish'd the Story of *Athanasius's* Play, do's not venture to relate *Alexander's* suppos'd Determination as a thing certain; he seems to have some Fears, that such an odd unprecedented Determination, was not very likely to be made by so grave a Bishop; he would not risk his own Reputation so far as to vouch for the Truth of it, but refers us to others for that [and they also are unknown] "*traditur statuisse:*" "*He is said to have determin'd*" a sorry Proof for "*an authentick Piece of History,*" when the original Historian himself hands it to us in such uncertain, doubtful Terms.

Mr. *Bingham* says, "*It is some Confirmation, that Rufin says, he had it from the Mouth of those who convers'd with Athanasius,*" pag. 31. But Mr. *Bingham* must prove that *Rufin* says, He had *Alexander's* Determination of not Re-baptizing, from the Mouth of those who convers'd with *Athanasius*. This do's not at all appear; for *Rufin* do's not conclude his whole Story with telling us, that he had all the preceding things from the Mouth of those who convers'd with *Athanasius*: He says nothing like this at the End of his Relation. Before the Beginning thereof indeed, he makes a short Preface to inform his Reader, after he had shew'd that St. *Athanasius* was made Bishop of *Alexandria* upon the Decease of *Alexander*, that he did not think it improper † to repeat some few things concerning the Rise of

† Verum non mihi absque ordine viderur, pauca de hujus viri [Sc. Athanasii] origine supra repetere, & cujus à puero institutionis fuerit, sicuti ab his qui cum ipso vitam duxerant accepimus memorare. *Rufini Hist. Eccles. Lib. 1. c. 14.*

St. *Athanasius*, and to mention what sort of Education he had from a Child, as he had receiv'd 'em from those who liv'd and convers'd with him.

Here we see, that what *Rufinus* himself says he receiv'd from them, was no more than a few things concerning St. *Athanasius*'s Rise and Education from a Child: So that Bishop *Alexander*'s suppos'd Determination, of not Baptizing the other Children, having nothing to do with St. *Athanasius*'s Rise and Education, cannot be fairly said to have been receiv'd by *Rufinus*, from those Persons who liv'd and convers'd with him. Mr. *Bingham* should have let his Readers see *Rufinus*'s Preface to the Story, and also his Words towards the Conclusion thereof, that they might have been enabled to pass a right Judgment, what Parts of the Story *Rufinus* refers to, when he says he had them from those who liv'd and convers'd with St. *Athanasius*; for the Conclusion of the Story plainly discovers those few things which he says he had from them, and they are in short these, * “ That Alexander order'd Athanasius, &c. to be brought up for the Service of the Church; That in a short time after, Athanasius having been sufficiently instructed,—was restor'd by his Parents to the Bishop; That from that time he was like Samuel, brought up in the Temple of

* Athanasium vero, atque eos quos ludus ille vel Presbyteros habere visus fuerat vel ministros, convocatis parentibus, sub Dei obsecratione tradit Ecclesiæ suæ nutriendos. Parvo autem tempore cum à Notario integrè, & à Grammatico sufficienter Athanasius fuisset instructus, continuó tanquam fidele Domini commendatum, à parentibus restituitur Sacerdoti, ac velut Samuel quidam in templo Domini nutritur, & ab eo pergente ad Patres in senectute bona, ad portandum post se Ephod Sacerdotale deligitur. *Rufin. Hist. Eccl. Lib. 1. c. 14.*

“ the Lord; and that finally upon the Death of Alexander, he was ordained Bishop in his stead.” These are the few things relating to St. *Athanasius*’s Rise and Education, which *Rufinus* says he had from those who were conversant with St. *Athanasius*. And if *Alexander*’s supposititious Determination about not Baptizing the other Boys, can be prov’d to have any necessary dependance on St. *Athanasius*’s Rise and Education, then, it may be allow’d, that *Rufin* says, he receiv’d that also from those who were conversant with St. *Athanasius*: This does not yet appear, but the contrary, by *Rufinus*’s saying of that Determination; only “ *traditur statuisse,*” it is said, That he determin’d; using a more doubtful way of speaking here, than he does, when he speaks of the Rise and Education of St. *Athanasius*: Add to this, that *Socrates*, who had St. *Athanasius*’s Books, together with the Assistance of those who also were conversant with him, wholly omits this Passage, tho’ he had *Rufinus*’s History before him, when he transcrib’d some other Parts of the Story from it. This confirms the Remark I made before, that *Rufinus* did not receive that Passage from those who convers’d with St. *Athanasius*; for if he did, why should so judicious an Historian as *Socrates*, discredit it so far as to refuse to Copy it from him?

Mr. Bingham says, “ Admit it were a fabulous Report, yet we must charitably believe of the ancient Historians, both Greek and Latin, that they believ’d themselves, at least, what they reported, that such a Fact had happened at Alexandria; and if it had been contrary to the general Sense and Practice of the Church in their times, they would hardly have related it so plausibly without passing some Censure and Reflection on it:— Which, the ancient

“ *ancient Historians having not done, it may reasonably be concluded, that, at least, they thought the Determination of Alexander and his Council, to be agreeable to the general Sense and Practice of the Church,*” pag. 31, 32.

But in Answer to this, do's not Mr. *Bingham* know, that it is a common thing for Historians to transcribe from those who wrote before them, such Transactions as they relate to have happened; and that Writers do often thus follow one another, not because they believe every thing they transcribe, but because they would not have their own Writings to be accus'd, of omitting such Relations, as others took notice of before them in their Histories of the same Time? It is often enough seen, that this is the only Design of *some Historians*, and that they leave their Readers to judge for themselves, whether some of their Relations be true or false, without passing any Censure themselves upon the Things which they relate. But what if ancient Historians did themselves believe, the fabulous Reports they hand down to us? Do's it therefore follow that they thought those Fables to be agreeable to the *general Sense and Practice* of the Church? Where lies the reasonableness of this Consequence; are Historians Thoughts always intent upon, and declaratory of, the Church's Belief and Practice? No such Matter. But it is pleaded, if the Fable “ *had been contrary to the general Sense and Practice of the Church, they would hardly have related it so plausibly, without passing some Censure and Reflection on it.*” This makes nothing for the Matter; because, what they would *hardly* have done is no Argument, since we find many Writers have overcome this *imaginary Difficulty*: For, the same Superstition, easie Credulity, or Heedlessness, that

makes Men to believe a *Fable*, which is *contrary to Truth*; causes them also to relate without any Censure, such Stories as are even contrary to the *general Sense and Practice of the Church*; and doubtless, 'tis from this corrupt Fountain, that several Churches have, in process of time, been overflow'd with Error and Superstition, by first not censuring new Fables that were started contrary to the general Doctrine and Practice of the Church; then suffering them to be handed down to Posterity, by Persons of Note and Character, till at last the Infection has spread so far, as that Lyes themselves have been firmly believ'd to be substantial Truths in those Churches.—

Mr. *Bingham* should not handle this Matter in such *dubious Terms*, as to say, “**They would hardly have related it, &c.**” 'Tis a Thing of too great Importance for us to be put off with such inconclusive ways of arguing. Historians have many times been so *careless*, as to relate, without Censure and Reflection on them, several things which were even contrary to the general Sense and Practice of the Church; and this, whether they do it easily or **hardly**, is no Matter, so long as they do it; 'tis a Proof against Mr. *Bingham's* way of arguing. I know 'twill be expected that I should give some Instances of this; and therefore I will do so, even out of two of the Historians which Mr. *Bingham* has produc'd for the Truth of this Fable. *Johannes Moschus's* Fable related by him without any Censure, concerning Children's celebrating the Holy Eucharist, by the Hands of a Child, whom they chose to do the Office of a Priest, &c. [See p. 73.] is no Proof, that *Johannes Moschus* reckon'd this to be agreeable to the general Sense and Practice of the Church: So

So *Nicephorus Calistus* his Story *, which he relates without any Censure, concerning a *Jew's* being miraculously heal'd of a dangerous Distemper, by being Baptiz'd with Sand for want of Water in a desert Place, is no Argument, that he believ'd Baptizing with Sand, or healing Distempers thereby, was agreeable to the general Sense of the Church: And if *Johannes Moschus*, and *Nicephorus Calistus*, had been so vain as to believe these Fancies, to have been agreeable to the Church's general Sense and Practice, yet such fabulous Writers Belief alone, without other concurring authentick Evidence, do's not prove that the Church's general Sense and Practice was of the same Nature with their ill-grounded Fables; for if this were a way of discovering the Church's general Sense and Practice, then all the idle Stories which have been handed down to us by fabulous Writers, if they believ'd them to have been agreeable to the Sense and Practice of the Church, must be receiv'd as such; and so the senseless Dreams of Purgatory, of Adoration of Saints and Angels, and of the Worshipping of Images, together with the rest of the vain Trumpery of the Church of *Rome*, as related by some visionary, fabulous Writers, must be acknowledg'd to be, according to the general Sense

* *Judæus*—quidam in *Locis Desertis*, & *inaquosis*—nobiscum iter faciebat. Quum vero *Morbo Repentino* ita affligeretur, ut crederetur moriturus—comitibus suis obsecrando institit—ut *Divini Lavacri* participem facerent—*Illi* itaque detrahitis homini vestibus, arena quæ ibi erat pro aqua usi, in *Nomine Patris*, &c. tertium arena in eum coniecta Baptizarunt. Per hanc tam insolitam, & admirandam sacrorum mysteriorum initiationem, imbecillitate omni tanquam vinculo quodam is solutus, longe melius quam illi validus jam prorsus iter fecit. *Niceph. Calist. Eccles. Hist. Lib. iii. c. 37. Paris 1630.*

and Practice of the Church, which will bring us to a fine Pass indeed, if this be a good way of arguing.

But further; Mr. *Bingham* cannot prove, that even *Rufinus* himself, the first Relater of *Alexander's* suppos'd Determination, did really believe, that he made any such Determination at all: His speaking of it in *such dubious Terms* as *traditur statuisse*, "it is said that he determin'd," plainly implies his Diffidence about this Part of the Story; that *Socrates Scholaasticus* utterly disbeliev'd it, is plain by his refusing to Copy it from *Rufinus*, as I have largely observ'd before. Add to this, that another of Mr. *Bingham's* Historians, *viz.* the Author of the Life of St. *Athanasius* in *Photius*, did not believe, that *Alexander's* Determination was made upon Mr. *Bingham's* Foundation; for that Author, whoever he was, * suppos'd, that the story'd Baptism by the Boy *Athanasius*, was done by some certain Divine Inspiration; and he judg'd so by the suppos'd Event, *viz.* *Alexander's* ordering the Children not to be Re-baptiz'd; as if he thought, that *Alexander* had known of the Divine Inspiration, and that he consequently esteem'd the Baptism to have been by God's Appointment, and therefore not to be repeated. What is this but a Supposition, that the Baptism was by Divine Commission and Authority? Nay, his judging so by the suppos'd Event of *Alexander's* Determination, signifies his Opinion to have been, that *Alexander* would not, or should not, have made such a Determination, if he had thought that the Baptism had been done without the Divine Commission and Authority:

* *Alexander ad se vocat, auditque non illos sacra irrifisse, sed ut ex eventu Colligas fecisse Divino quodam instinctu.*

Photii. Biblioth. Cod. 258. p. 1430.

For why should he say, “ *That we may collect the Baptism to have been by Divine Inspiration, from Alexander’s Determination about it;*” If he had believ’d that *Alexander* had Authority to make such a Determination concerning Baptism perform’d by Persons who never had any Divine Commission?

Thus we see, That there is no Ground to believe the Story of *Alexander’s* Determination, [Not to Baptize the Children who were before suppos’d to have been Baptiz’d by the Boy *Athanasius* in Play, without any Divine Commission.] I say, There is no Ground to Believe this Story to have been agreeable, but rather contrary to the General Sense and Practice of the Church; since *Rufinus*, the first Publisher of it, relates the Determination *as doubtful*; not venturing to be positive about it. *Socrates*, the more Judicious and Competent Historian, utterly discredits it, by not giving it any room in, but wholly leaving it out of his History, that part of it which he transcrib’d from *Rufinus*. And the unknown Author of the Life of *St. Athanasius*, tho’ he believes the Story of the Determination of *Alexander*, yet does it upon the foundation, of the Baptisms having been before done by Divine Inspiration; which, when *true and certain*, is the same as the Divine Commission, and so do’s not favour Baptisms done without any Commission at all. All these, thus discountenancing the Notion of *Alexander’s* Determining Baptism to be Good and Valid, when done without a Divine Commission, are *so many Evidences against* this Notion’s being the *General Sense and Practice* of the Church; and, together with all that has been said before, do abundantly betray the Story of *Alexander’s* suppos’d Determination to be no better than a meer Fable.

Mr. Bingham tells us, He believes “*There is no Canon that does antecedently Authorize one Youth, without Necessity to Baptize another,* pag. 32. But this Reverend Gentleman would have done us more Justice, if he had also added, That there is no Canon at all for *Boys* to Baptize, even in Cases of *greatest Necessity*; for his Words stand so loose, as to leave room for his Reader to believe, that there may be a Canon for Youths to Baptize in times of Necessity.

He says again, “*As to the Fact of Athanasius, any One will readily own, that there was neither Canon nor Precedent, Perhaps, to warrant the Doing it; and it would be strange, if any such Canon should be made in the Church,*” pag. 32. But why must we have this *Perhaps* clapp’d in? It is more fair, to let the Reader know *Certainly*, that there never was any such Canon or Precedent at all: These *Perhaps*’s are no sure Guides to Enquiring Persons, especially in Cases which require more positive Determinations. The following Words, indeed, are something more home, “*It would be strange, if any such Canon should be made in the Church.*” This is very right; it would so: But why? What is the reason that it would be so strange? The Answer is very easie; Because it *never was the General Sense and Practice of the Church*; She never had any *Precedent* for it: This is the reason why such a Canon would be a strange thing. And now, is it not a fair Question to ask, Was it not *as strange* a thing, for a Bishop to Ratifie, what it would have been *strange* for the Church antecedently to Authorize? Was it not wholly new and strange, for *Alexander* to Determine that to be *Valid*, for which he had *no Precedent or Canon*: For if there was no Precedent or
Canon

Canon for the Boy *Athanasius's* Baptizing, (and it would be *strange*, if any such Canon should be made.) Upon what foundation could *Alexander* Determine the Validity of *Athanasius's* Baptizing, when there was no Precedent of, or Canon for, such a Baptism before ; and certainly, there was no Example of, or Canon for, any such Determination ? So that, if *Alexander* had made the pretended Determination, it would have been a Novelty of his own ; and consequently, no-ways Agreeable to, or Declaratory of, the General Sense and Practice of the Church.

Mr. *Bingham's* believing, that 'tis no easie matter
 “ to produce an ancient Canon, directly to Con-
 “ front the suppos'd Determination of *Alexander*,
 “ by Declaring, That such Irregular Baptisms are
 “ utterly Null and Void, tho' they have the Postnate
 “ Allowance of the Church where they are done,
 “ which (he says) was the peculiar Circumstance
 “ of the present Case, pag. 32, 33. is nothing at
 all to the purpose : Because, the Institution of Baptism, and the Laws of the Church, by requiring Baptism constantly to be administer'd by One vested with the *Divine Commission*, without making any Exceptions in favour of Baptism by such as never had that Commission ; do leave these pretended Baptisms in the same state, as the Institution of Baptism found them at first, *viz.* in the State of Uninstituted Administrations, *i. e.* wholly Null and Void for the Purposes of the *Instituted Ministration* ; because, no Ministration whatsoever of Baptism, could ever have been Valid for Christian Purposes, but by virtue of a Divine Institution ; and the Ministration we are speaking of, was utterly destitute of any such Institution, except Mr. *Bingham* can prove it to have been by Divine Inspiration,

tion, as one of his Authors, we see, fancied it to have been; and 'twas also without any Precedent or Canon to Authorize it, and so had neither Divine or Human Law, whereby to determine its Validity. And, certainly, when neither God nor his Church, had by any Law, given Validity to such Acts; The first Determiner of their Validity must have run a great risk of Presumption, in pronouncing *that* Valid, which neither God nor his Church had ever before declar'd to be so: This would have been a Determination without any Rule; And if such Determinations are fit to be made, and good and valid when done, then we shall have no Security for the Continuance of Divine Institutions; since Man's arbitrary Will and Pleasure, without any Law, may substitute something else instead of them. It is not therefore enough for Mr. *Bingham* to say, that we can produce "*no Ancient Canon*" directly to Confront such Determination, by Declaring such Baptisms to be utterly **Null and Void**, tho' they have the *Postnate Allowance of the Church*. For if the Canon of Holy Scripture, and also the Canons of the Ancient Church, do constantly restrain the Ministration of Baptism, to those who have a Divine Commission, as they most certainly do; this restraining of the Ministration to the Commission, is a Consequent Nulling of pretended Ministrations, which are done by those who never had that Commission; (as I have largely endeavour'd to prove * elsewhere:) And therefore, 'till there shall be produced some Law of God, or some Canon of the Catholick Church, agreeable thereto, for the making Valid such *Uninstituted*

* *Dissenters Baptism Null and Void, &c.*

Ministrations; it will stand good, that they are Null and Void in themselves: And how, or by what Law, either of God or the Church, any *Post-nate* Allowance of the Bishop do's make them to be good and Valid, let our Reverend Historian inform us, if he can, for as yet he has not.

He says, indeed, "*There seem to be Two Ways of allowing any Act, either by an antecedent Authority given to a Man to perform it; or, by a subsequent Confirmation of the Thing, when done irregularly and without Authority, which is, ex post facto, an Allowance of it. And thus (says he) it is plain, the Baptisms given by Athanasius, were Allow'd and Confirm'd by Alexander in the Church,*" pag. 33. But here Mr. Bingham is not Certain; he says, "*There seem to be Two Ways of Allowing,*" &c. This is not coming close to the Point; either there are *certainly* Two such Ways of Allowing Baptism, or *there are not*: We must have no *Medium* in this Case; there is no contenting with *May-be Baptisms*, those who would be *sure* of True Baptism. If there *are really* Two such Ways in the Church, of Allowing, &c. as Mr. Bingham speaks of, let him prove them; let him give good Reasons why One of them, *viz.* the Allowing of an Uninstituted Ministration of Baptism, by a Post-Fact, is *Valid*; as, we are sure, Baptism perform'd by virtue of an *Antecedent Commission*, is; and then we shall have an end of the Dispute about the Constant and Unalterable Necessity of a Previous Commission. But, 'till our Reverend Historian, or some other, shall produce good Proof for this, we shall acknowledge but One Valid Way in the Church of Allowing Baptism, *viz.* by an *Antecedent Authority* given by the Bishop, to a Man to Baptize.

The

The Other Way which Mr. *Bingham* proposes, of allowing Baptism, perform'd without a Commission, "by a subsequent Confirmation of it, which (he says) is, ex post facto, an Allowance of it," is a Power which *none can claim* but Christ the Supreme Head and Sovereign of the Church, and those who have receiv'd that Power from him. Let Mr. *Bingham* prove, That Bishops have receiv'd that Power from Christ; and then also this Point shall be given up to him. 'Till then, it is evident, that Bishops are only Christ's Deputies, and as such, are bound up to the Obedience of his Laws, and can validly act (in this Case) no farther than he has Commission'd them: And since the Commission for them to allow such Baptisms, by an After-Act, do's not appear, we must conclude, that it is not in being, and consequently, that they cannot Validly allow of such Baptisms as are perform'd by Persons who never were Commission'd to Baptize. "And thus, 'tis plain," *Alexander* had no Authority to Confirm the Baptisms said to be given by the Boy *Athanasius* in Play. And in Fact, by what has been largely said before upon this Story, he never did confirm this Supposititious Ludicrous Baptism; nor was it ever consonant to the General Sense and Practice of the Church, that he should confirm such a Baptism.

It is now high time for me to beg the Reader's pardon, for detaining him so long upon the Refutation of this Fable. Mr. *Bingham* is so very zealous for it's Credit and Reputation, as "a genuine Piece of History," and his Name and Character are so advantageous for the Recommendation of it, that I thought it well worth while to be thus copious, in discovering the Weakness and Insufficiency, of the Foundation upon which 'tis built, that Men
may

may avoid the Danger of trusting and relying on it. I shall conclude my Observations upon this Fable, by remarking ; That if it had been a real Truth, If *Athanasius* the Boy had sportively Baptiz'd his Play-fellows, and If *Alexander* the Bishop had, by the Advice of his Clergy, appointed that those Children should have no other Baptism ; yet, nothing to the Purpose could be justly and safely inferr'd from it. For, *1st*, We are seeking for the General Sense and Practice of the Church ; and this Act of **one Bishop**, never once taken notice of by the Ancient Catholick Church in Council, by way of approving it, or any thing like it, could not justly have been said to be the General Sense and Practice of the Church, and therefore it would have been nothing to the purpose of our Enquiry. *2dly*, Neither could any thing have been safely concluded from it ; for the natural Inference would have been only this, That *Alexander* reckon'd the sportive Baptism perform'd by the Boy, in the Name of the Trinity, to be Good and Valid, even tho' done without any Necessity, where Priests were to be had. Now, if Men will venture to affirm, that *Alexander's* suppos'd Opinion was just and right, and that therefore all such sportive Baptisms, are equally good and valid ; and this they must affirm, if they will maintain the other ; then it will unavoidably follow, That the **sacred and tremendous Institutions of the Deity**, and the most profound Reverence and Respect which we owe to the *Mediatorial Authority* of our Lord Jesus Christ, in the appointed Ministration of them, by those who bear *his Commission*, will be of no greater *Value* and *Esteem*, than Childrens Play ; because, as the present Lord Bishop of *Oxford* has excellently well observ'd,

serv'd, " *There is no * Majis and Minus, in the Validity or Invalidity of Sacraments, which cannot be partly Valid, and partly Invalid.*" And therefore Childrens Sport and Play, in Imitation of Christian Sacraments, is advanc'd to *an equal Dignity* with the instituted Ministration of them; and what is this, but taking off *our Obligation* which we owe to the Divine Institutes, and making God's own Appointments to be but of a trifling Nature, since all the World agrees in this, That the Play of Children, is no better; and that we are under no Obligation to their Sports and Pastimes. This is an unavoidable Consequence of the *suppos'd Truth*, and imaginary Right and Justice, of the stor'd Determination of *Alexander*: And how safe and secure it is, let all good Christians judge, when it cuts the very Sinews of all Divine Institutions, and carries on the accur'd Design of Atheists and Deists, to represent *all revealed Religion*, as needless, ridiculous, and childish, and consequently to be despis'd and trampled on by the *heedless, unthinking, and deceiv'd Multitude*. For my part, I would not (to gain the whole World) be concern'd in propagating or defending Premisses so *dreadfully dangerous*, in their Consequences: And I sincerely pray to God, that none of his *Ambassadors*, who are by him *intrusted* with the sacred *Depositum* of his Divine Sacraments, may ever prostitute these inestimable Jewels, nor cast these invaluable *Pearls before Swine*, by debasing the Ministration of them *so low*, as to make the giving of them, to amount to no more in Worth and Value, than the *inconsiderate Play* of silly Children. — But

* *Bishop of Oxford's Charge, 1712. pag. 14.*

not to be farther prolix upon this Matter, the Story before us deserves to be valued but as a Fiction; and if it had been true in Fact, would have been *foolish* and *ridiculous*; and as such, highly unworthy of being esteem'd, to have any the least Consonancy with the General Sense and Practice of the Church. Thus Mr. *Bingham* is hitherto got no farther than the Council of *Eliberis*, and *that* also has nothing in it, that can declare the Ancient Catholick Church's Sense, in favour of any Validity in pretended Baptisms, by Persons who *never were Commission'd* to Baptize; (as I have before noted.)

§ XIX. About Fifty Years after this Council, we find its Canon to Authorize some sort of Lay-Christians to Baptize, in want of a Priest, was so little known or taken notice of, by those who were *not of the Church of Spain*, that *Hilary* the Deacon of *Rome*, who is most reasonably suppos'd, to be the Author of the Comments on the Epistles of *St. Paul*, bearing the Name of *St. Ambrose*, says, concerning the Churches of his Time and Knowledge, thus; * “ *Now*, ——— *neither the Inferior*
“ *Clergy nor Lay-men are allow'd to Baptize.* The Inferior Clergy were but Lay-men, being inferior to Deacons, and having no Spiritual Power conferr'd on them; neither these, nor any other Lay-men, we see, were allow'd to Baptize in those Days, in the Churches that were within his knowledge: He had a particular fancy, That at first
“ *the Apostles Impower'd all Christians to Preach and*

* Nunc ——— neque Clerici vel Laici Baptizant. *Ambros. Com. in Ephes. iv. p. 948.*

“*Baptize.*” This has been Answer’d in *pag.* 7, 8. Now, tho’ his Evidence for what he supposes the Apostles to have done, above Three hundred Years before his Time, be not good, for the Reasons I have there given; yet he may reasonably be admitted, for a Witness of the Sense and Practice of the Churches of his own Time and Place, and he is positive as to these, that “*Lay-men were not allowed to Baptize.*” This is an Argument, that the Canon of the *Spanish Council of Eliberis*, made to Authorize some sort of their own Lay-men to Baptize, in Cases of Extremity, when a Priest was not to be had, was *not the General Sense and Practice* of the Church in *Hilary’s Days*; for if it was, the Church of *Rome* may reasonably be suppos’d to have had the same Practice, and *Hilary* the Deacon of *Rome* may as reasonably be thought to have known of it, and so could not have justly said, That in his Time Lay-men were not allow’d to Baptize: He makes *no Exceptions for Cases of Necessity*, as if they were allow’d to do it in those Cases; and therefore we may conclude, That in the Churches of his Time and Knowledge there was no such Practice as the allowing of Lay-men to Baptize, even in Cases of Necessity, nor any Canon to Impower them to do so.

§ XX. The next in order, who instructs us in this Matter, but whose Evidence is wholly omitted by Mr. *Bingham*, is “*Pacianus Bishop of Barcelona, no less famous for the Holiness of his Life, than the Eloquence of his Discourse,*” says *St. Jerom.* This holy Bishop, in his *Sermon of Baptism* address’d to the *Catechumens*, sets forth the Misery of Man by the Fall of our First Parents, and proves, That we are all by Nature born in Sin; then

then he proceeds to shew the great Necessity of our Regeneration, and New Birth by Jesus Christ: Says he, * “ *Are not we begotten by Christ, that we may be sav'd thro' Him?* — He shews how this New Birth was brought about, *viz.* in short, By our Saviour's taking upon him, and uniting unto Himself, our whole Human Nature; By his *Mystical Marriage therein* to his Spouse the Church; By the Descent of his Holy Spirit, the Celestial Seed, upon our Souls, whereby we grow in the Bowels of our Mother the Church; and being born of her sacred Womb, are quicken'd and enliven'd in Christ. “ *Thus † (says he) Christ [per suos Sacerdotes] by his Priests, begets Children in his Church; and the Spirit of God brings them forth, at the Font, [i.e. in Baptism,] Manibus Sacerdotis, by the Hands of the Priest.* — Then

* Nunquid nos à Christo geniti sumus, ut propter ipsum salvi esse possimus? — Novissimis temporibus animam utique cum carne accepit Christus ex Maria, hanc venit salvam facere, hanc apud inferos non reliquit, hanc Spiritui suo conjunxit, & suam fecit. Et hæ sunt nuptiæ Domini, uni carni conjunctæ, ut secundum *illud magnum Sacramentum* fierent duo in carne una Christus & Ecclesia. Ex his Nuptiis Christianæ plebs nascitur, veniente de super Spiritu Domini: nostrarumque animarum substantiæ, superfuso & admixto protinus Semente Cœlesti, visceribus matris inolescimus, alvoque ejus effusi vivificamur in Christo. — † Sic generat Christus in Ecclesia per suos Sacerdotes. — Atque ita Christi Semen, id est, Dei Spiritus, novum Hominem alvo matris agitatum, & partu fontis exceptum, *manibus Sacerdotis* effundit, fide tamen pronuba. — Hæc autem Compleri aliàs nequeunt, nisi Lavacri & Chrismatis & Antistitis Sacramento. Lavacro. n. peccata purgantur, Chrismate Sanctus Spiritus superfunditur, utraque vero ista, manu & ore Antistitis impetramus: atque ita totus Homo renascitur & innovatur in Christo. *S. Paciani Barcelonensis Episcopi Sermo ad Fideles Catechumenos de Baptismo. Biblioth. Patrum, Tom. 4. Colon. p. 247.*

summing up the whole Matter, he expressly affirms, That “ *These Things* [i. e. our Regeneration, and New Birth] **cannot** be accomplish’d, “ *any otherwise than by the Sacrament of Baptism* “ *and Chrism, and* [the Ministry] *of the Bishop.* “ *By Baptism, Sins are purged away; by Chrism,* “ [i. e. Confirmation] *the Holy-Ghost is poured out* “ *upon us; and both these we obtain by the Hand* “ *and Mouth of the Bishop: And so the whole Man* “ *is Born again and Renew’d in Christ.*” From which Words of this holy Bishop, nothing less can be collected than this, That he reckon’d, *That the Regeneration and New Birth of Christians, according to Divine Revelation, on which he founds his whole Discourse) cannot be accomplish’d by any other Baptism than that which is administer’d by One having a Priestly Power to Baptize: I say, no less than this can be inferr’d from his Words; 1st, Because he makes it necessary for us to be Regenerated by Christ himself. 2dly, Because he says, Christ do’s this by his Priests, i. e. such as have his Authority and Commission to minister in this part of his Priestly Office. 3dly, Because he affirms, It cannot be accomplish’d otherwise than by the Sacrament of Baptism and Chrism, and* [the Ministry] **of the Bishop**, which plainly implies, that they must both, in some sense or other, be ministr’d to us by the **Bishop**; because he says, in the Words immediately following, that we obtain the **Benefits** of both [Baptism and Chrism] “ *By the Hand* “ *and Mouth of the Bishop.*” So that, according to *Pacianus*, the Baptism must either be ministr’d by the Bishop himself in Person; or else [that it may be still by his Ministry] it must be by One, who is *really Commission’d, Authoriz’d, or Impower’d by him*; which makes it to be the **Bishop’s Act**, and

and consequently, to be *Christ's*, whose more *immediate Representative* he is. Thus this holy Father, without any Regard to (what some call) Cases of Necessity, teaches us, That the New Birth **cannot** be *effected* but by *Episcopal Baptism*; he knew of no other Way to accomplish it, he affirms that there **cannot** be any other Way; and this he teaches his Candidates for Baptism, without giving them any hopes of ever attaining to this New Birth, (in the greatest Extremity) without it.

If in his Days the Church had any right sense of Regeneration, and a New Birth, to be effected by such Washings as are now perform'd by Persons who never were at all Commission'd by the Bishop to Baptize, and whose Acts, consequently, cannot upon any account whatsoever, be truly said to be the Bishop's Ministration, and therefore they are not *Christ's*: I say, If the Church had then held such Washings to be Good and Valid Baptisms, and had believ'd this upon good grounds; would so holy a Bishop as *Pacianus*, have been so bold as to have limited the Outward Means of our Spiritual Regeneration and New Birth, to *Episcopal Baptism, &c.* only? If he had known of our *modern Latitude*, and the *Goodness* and *Validity* thereof; would he not, at least, have encourag'd his Catechumens so far, as to have let them know, that in *absence of a Priest*, they might be brought to this Second Birth by the Hands of *any Lay-Christian whatsoever*, tho' he was never Commission'd to Baptize? Sure, if this had been the then *General Sense and Practice of the Church*, was *Pacianus* Bishop of *Barcelona* ignorant of it? Or, if he knew it, would he have hidden so useful a Piece of Knowledge from his Catechumens, and

led them into a contrary, and (what some of our Moderns call) an *Uncharitable Notion*, That only *Episcopal Baptism*, and no other, can be a Means of our Second Birth? No, certainly, so holy a Bishop would never, in his Instructing of the Ignorant, have instill'd an *Uncharitable, False Doctrine* into them, contrary to the *Lawful, General Sense and Practice* of the Church, if Baptism, by **whomsoever Christian** perform'd, was then justly esteem'd to be Valid, by the Church's General Sense and Practice. Is it not rather evident, that *Episcopal Baptism alone*, was, in the *General Sense and Practice of the Church* in his Days, the only Means of our Regeneration? Do's it not plainly appear to have been so, by his Instructing such as were, before their Baptism, to be taught the more *necessary Truths* of Christianity, That this *only* was the Means of their Second Birth? If any Baptism with Water, and pronouncing the Form, *In the Name of the Trinity*, had been Valid, as some now say it is, What need was there of keeping Catechumens under *so long a Discipline* and Instruction as was then practis'd, and telling them, That their Regeneration and New Birth could not be accomplish'd "*any otherwise than by the Sacrament of Baptism and Chrism, and the Ministry of the Bishop*;" and that we obtain the Benefits of "**Both these** by the Hands and Mouth of the Bishop?"

If our Modern Notions had been true, Catechumens might have been Regenerated in Baptism by a *Shorter Way*; for the great *Zeal* they had, to procure as soon as possible this Spiritual Benefit, would have made 'em run to any other than an *Episcopal Hand* for Baptism, if they had been taught, that such Baptism *was as good as the Bishops*: They might have sav'd them-

themselves the *Penance of Long Delays*, &c. impos'd on them before they were admitted to *Episcopal Baptism*; and might have obtain'd the *Long'd-for End* of all their *Toil and Labour*, by another Baptism in a *much shorter Time*, and with *less Pains*, without *submitting* to such appointed Preparations, and *confining* themselves to the *Will and Pleasure of the Bishop*, for the Time of their Initiation into the Church of Christ, upon our *Modern Schemes of Liberty and Latitude*. But *Pacianus* and his Catechumens were not such *Free-thinkers*; they were *limited* in their Opinions by *Divine Laws*, and *Ecclesiastical Constitutions agreeable thereto*; and in Conformity to *these*, that holy Bishop taught, and his Catechumens believ'd, (as those of other Churches, doubtless did, if we may judge of their *Belief* by their *pious Practice*, of submitting to these appointed Delays, and waiting patiently for Baptism by the Bishop's Authority) "*That the Regeneration and New Birth of Christians, cannot be accomplish'd any otherwise, than by Episcopal Baptism,*" &c. and that consequently, those *Washings* which are *not Episcopal*, are *Ineffective Acts*, and not Means of Accomplishing our *Spiritual Regeneration*; and therefore *Null and Void* for the Purposes of *Episcopal Baptism*: For if they are good and valid, then our *Regeneration and New Birth can be accomplish'd* without the Bishop's Baptism and Chrism; which is contrary to *Pacianus's Assertion*, who says, That "*they cannot be accomplish'd without 'em.*"

§ XXI. In the same Century liv'd *Optatus* Bishop of *Milevis*, a City of *Numidia* in *Africa*, whose Opinion Mr. *Bingham* gives us in his 44th Page, thus; "*Optatus (says our Historian) —*

“ thought that Christ gave a Commission to his Apostles
 “ to Baptize, but yet not such an one, as perempto-
 “ rily annull’d and evacuated all Baptisms that were
 “ performed by any other. Our Saviour (says
 “ Optatus) gave Commandment in whose Name
 “ the Nations should be Baptized: But he did not
 “ Determine, without Exception, by whom they should
 “ be Baptiz’d. He said not to his Disciples, This
 “ shall ye do, and no other shall do it. For*, **whoever**
 “ Baptizes In the Name of the Father, Son, and
 “ Holy-Ghost, fulfils the Work of the Apostles. —
 Optatus concludes, “ That it was the Name of the
 “ Trinity, and not the Work of the Agent, that
 “ sanctifies the Mystery; and that the Ministers of
 “ Baptism were only Labourers, and not Lords of
 “ the Action.” This Quotation Mr. Bingham pro-
 “ duces, to shew that Optatus held, “ All those to
 “ have Baptism, **wheresoever** or by **whomsoever**
 “ Baptiz’d, that had receiv’d it in Faith, and with-
 “ out Dissimulation, in that Form of Words which is
 “ prescrib’d by the Gospel,” &c. for Mr. Bingham
 adds, a little after those Words, thus; “ Optatus
 “ was plainly of the same Opinion, p. 45. Now,
 upon the reading of Optatus’s Words, if they must
 be taken in the full Sense of his [*Quisquis*] **Who-**
ever; ’tis plain, That he utter’d only his own
 private Opinion, and not the General Sense and
 Practice of the Church.

For, 1st, The word [*Quisquis*] **Whoever**, is
 of both Genders, and includes Women as well as
 Men; and so if we take Optatus’s Opinion in the
 full Extent of his own Words, we shall make him

* *Quisquis* in Nomine Patris Filii & Spiritus Sancti Eaptiza-
 verit, Apostolorum Opus implevit. *Optat. contra Parmen.*, lib. 5.
 pag. 50.

to have held, That Baptism ordinarily perform'd by any Person, whether *Utoman* as well as Man, if done with the Use of the Form, in the Name of the Trinity, was Good and Valid; for no less than this is included in the full Sense of *Optatus's Quisquis* [Whoever, &c.] This Latitude, is contrary to what *Mr. Bingham* acknowledges, *viz.* That "As to ordinary Cases, it is agreed on all hands, That Women were absolutely forbidden to meddle with any Ecclesiastical Office, and Baptism in particular." And *Mr. Bingham* as fairly agrees also, "That the Ancient Church did not allow them to Baptize in Extraordinary Cases of extreme Necessity," p. 46. And, finally, he does not venture to Determine, that Baptism by Women is good and valid, but leaves it "to the Judgment of others, and farther Enquiry," pag. 49. And yet this Passage of *Optatus*, [Whoever Baptizes, &c.] allows of the Validity of Baptism by Women, tho' the General Sense and Practice of the Ancient Church gives not the least Countenance to the suppos'd Validity thereof by *Mr. Bingham's* own Confession.

And, 2dly, *Optatus's* [*Quisquis*] *Whoever, &c.* is of so great a Latitude, That it admits of Baptism to be Valid, tho' perform'd by Unbaptiz'd *Infidels, Jews, or Pagans*, whether Men, Women, or even Children, who were never Commission'd for this Sacred Function; a Latitude so very unaccountable, that *Mr. Bingham* confesses, 'tis "One of the Novelties of Popery,— p. 98. utterly without Precedent in the Primitive Church," pag. 100. And therefore, upon *Mr. Bingham's* own Principles, *Optatus's Quisquis* [Whoever Baptizes, &c.] allowing of the Validity of Baptism by Women, and also by Unbaptiz'd *Infidels, Jews, or Pagans,*
whether

whether Men, Women, or Children ; was no-ways consonant to the *General Sense and Practice* of the Church, but a *Novel, Singular* Opinion of his own, and therefore of no value in our present Enquiry after the *Ancient Church's Catholick Tradition* : And so *Optatus's* Opinion is a perfect Blank in this Dispute ; *because his* [Quisquis,] *his Whoever Baptizes, &c.* is of so *unlimited* an *Extent and Latitude*, as that it can no ways be accounted for in the *Church's General Sense and Practice* —

§ XXII. But I am not so uncharitable as to believe that *Optatus* was so great a *Latitudinarian* as some of our *Moderns* represent him ; I don't think that He would have stood by this singular Notion which *Mr. Bingham* fathers on him, *viz.* That “ *Baptism, wheresoever or by whomsoever administered, is Good and Valid*, in his *pag. 45.* For tho' *Optatus* does uncautiously say, *Quisquis* — *Baptizaverit, &c. Whoever Baptizes* — “ *fulfils the Work of the Apostles* ; which if taken in an unlimited Sense, makes all Baptism by Persons never Communion'd, in Ordinary and Extraordinary Cases, whether by Men, Women, or Children, Christians in or out of Communion with their Bishop, Excommunicates, or Apostates, Infidels, Jews, Turks, or Pagans, &c. if done with the Form, In the Name of the Trinity, to be Good and Valid : Which Latitude of Baptism by Women, Infidels, Jews, Turks, or Pagans, *Mr. Bingham* acknowledges, has no Precedent in the General Sense and Practice of the Church, and the latter of Baptism by Infidels, he calls “ *One of the Novelties of Popery,* ” &c. (as before observed :) Yet, I say, to do something towards taking off the Reproach, which, by such a *Latitudinarian Notion*, is cast on
this

this Bishop, I should charitably consider the Occasion of his Words, and from thence judge of his Meaning by them: He was engag'd in Dispute with the *Donatists*, a *Puritanical, Schismatical* Sect, who (tho' they retain'd Episcopacy) separated from the Church, because they reckon'd the Catholicks to be *defil'd*, and *polluted*, and *abominable*, not to be Communicated withal, by reason of their Communion with some whom the *Donatists* charg'd to have been *Traditors*, to have yielded in time of Persecution, and to have deliver'd up the Holy Books into the Hands of the Heathen: Upon this account, they reckon'd the Catholicks to be the *Schismaticks*, and that they were so *impure*, that all their Ordinations, and other Ministrations, were Null and Void; and the *Donatists*, in consequence of this false Charge, Re-baptiz'd all who came over to their Party, tho' they had been before Baptiz'd in the Church, by Catholick Bishops, Priests, or Deacons.

Optatus, in the Book quoted by our Reverend Historian, endeavours to convince the *Donatists*, that if the *Catholicks* had been Schismaticks, yet their Baptism would be Valid notwithstanding, and therefore ought not to be repeated: In his *First Book*, he wonders that *Parmenian* the *Donatist* should say, (of the suppos'd Schismaticks, after this manner,) † “ *How can a Man that is defil'd,*
“ *cleanse another by a false Baptism? How can an*
“ *impure Man purifie? How can One that makes*
“ *others fall, lift up those that are fallen down?*
“ *How can One that is Guilty, grant Pardon? or*
“ *One that is Condemn'd, Absolve? Optatus* de-
“ nies, that this can be said of those that are only

† *Du Pin's Eccles. Hist. Cent. iv. p. 83, 89. Lond.*

“ Schismaticks, who, as he thinks, may Lawfully
 “ administer the Sacraments. He tells *Parmenian* “ * *Schism, which breaks the Bond of Peace, is*
 “ *begotten by Discord, nourish'd by Envy, and con-*
 “ *firm'd by Disputes; thus impious Children forsake*
 “ *the Catholick Church their Mother, withdraw and*
 “ *separate themselves—being cut off from the Church,*
 “ *and become Rebels and Enemies: But they inno-*
 “ *vate nothing in Doctrine, still retaining what they*
 “ *had learned from their Mother.*” And he con-
 cludes, That “ Schismaticks have preserv'd the
 “ True Sacraments of the Church, tho' they are
 “ separated from its Body.” In his 5th Book, the
 very Book from whence *Mr. Bingham* takes his
 Quotation, *Optatus* proves, that in the Sacrament
 of Baptism, it is not absolutely necessary, “ † that
 “ the Minister should be Faithful and Just; be-
 “ cause the Ministers are chang'd every Day, and
 “ it is Jesus Christ who Baptizes—— And the Ho-
 “ linefs of the Minister, do's not contribute” to
 the Holiness of the Sacrament; just as the Church
 of *England* teaches concerning “ ‖ *the Unworthiness*
 “ *of the Minister, which hinders not the Effect of the*
 “ *Sacraments:*” All which being duly weigh'd and
 consider'd, by a Man of a candid Temper, will in-
 cline him to believe, that *Optatus's* “ *Quisquis,*
 “ **whoever** *Baptizes—fulfills the Work of the Apo-*
 “ *stles;*” was design'd by him only to mean the Bap-
 tizers he was then disputing for, *viz.* the then Mi-
 nisters of Baptism, whom the *Donatists* reckon'd to
 be Schismaticks, and so polluted, that (even tho'
 they were ordain'd Bishops, Priests, or Deacons)
 their Ministrations were defiled by them, and upon

* *Du Pin's Eccles. Hist. Cent. iv. p. 83, 89.*

† *Ibid. p. 93. Lond.*

‖ *As in her 26th Article.*

that Account wholly Null and Void; *Optatus*, in Opposition to this, shews, that if the Ministers of Baptism were such Sinners, yet their Sins did not hinder the Efficacy of the Sacraments administer'd by their Hands: And says, "*Whoever Baptizes*" [i. e. candidly interpreting his Words] whoever Minister, whether Catholick or Schismatick, Baptizes "*In the Name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost, fulfils the Work of the Apostles.*" And we know, that in those Days, the allow'd Ministers of Baptism, whether Catholicks or Schismaticks, were only such as were **Commission'd by Bishops**: And this will make nothing for the Validity of pretended Baptisms, perform'd by Persons who never were *Episcopally Commission'd* to Baptize. So that, whether we take *Optatus's* Words in this more candid Sense of them, with regard to the Subject of his Dispute, or in the full Extent and Meaning of them, as they stand by themselves; this Father is no Evidence, that the general Sense and Practice of the ancient Church, gives Countenance to any Validity in pretended Baptisms, perform'd by such as never were Commission'd to Baptize.

§ XXIII. The next ancient Writer I shall consider, is *St. Basil*, Bishop of *Cæsarea* in *Cappadocia*, Ordain'd about the Year 369, whom our Reverend Historian takes notice of in his 39th Page thus: "As to *St. Basil*, it will be readily own'd, that he had somewhat of a singular Opinion in this Matter; for he was for Re-baptizing all Persons that were **only Baptiz'd by Lay-men**, as he was also for Re-baptizing all that were Baptiz'd by Heretical and Schismatical Priests; for he brings in *Cyprian*, and *Firmilian* his Predecessor,"

" in

“ in the See of *Casarea*, arguing after this manner:
 “ * *Hereticks and Schismaticks are broken off from*
 “ *the Church, and become Lay-men, and there-*
 “ *fore have no Power to Baptize*——— *Therefore*
 “ *such as are Baptiz'd by them, when they return to*
 “ *the Church, are to be Re-baptiz'd with the true*
 “ *Baptism of the Church, as being only Baptiz'd*
 “ *by Lay-men.*” This is a very full Evidence
 against the Validity of Lay-Baptism; for whether
 St. *Basil's* Opinion, that Heretical and Schismatical
 Baptisms were the same as Lay-Baptisms, was true
 or false, this is certain, that he makes the Invali-
 dity of Lay-Baptism, to be the *Standard*, the in-
 contested Principle, whereby he Judges of the In-
 validity of Baptism by Heretical and Schismatical
 Priests. There were before, and in his Days, *no*
publick Disputes of any Churches against the Inva-
 lidity of Baptism by Lay-men, *i. e.* Men who had
no Power or Commission to Baptize; for St. *Basil* cer-
 tainly means such Persons, when he speaks of Lay-
 men; because he reckons Heretical and Schismatical
 Priests to be but *as Lay-men*, and therefore to have
no Power to Baptize, i. e. as if he had said, Lay-men
 are such Persons as are destitute of Power to Bap-
 tize; Hereticks and Schismaticks are become Lay-
 men, and therefore Hereticks and Schismaticks have
 no Power to Baptize: I say, the Churches before,
 and in the Days of St. *Basil*, had no Disputes against
 the Invalidity of Baptisms by St. *Basil's* Lay-men;
 If they had, where are the publick Records of this
 Dispute? Mr. *Bingham* neither has, nor can ever
 produce, any such Records; and therefore we shall
 conclude, that the Invalidity of Baptisms perform'd

* *Basil Epist. 1. ad Amphil. cap. 1.*

by St. *Basil's* Lay-men, *i. e.* by Persons *destitute of Power* to Baptize, was an allowed Principle in the Churches of his Days.

Nay, the Practice of the Ancient Church of *Spain*, [the Bishops whereof, in the Council of *Eliberis*, made a Canon to empower some, and not others, of their own Lay-men, who were in Communion with their Bishops, to Baptize in extreme Cases, where Priests could not be had,] confirms the general Principle of the Invalidity of Baptism perform'd by Persons not authoriz'd, *i. e.* by St. *Basil's* Lay-men; because, if Baptism by Persons not Commission'd, had been then valid in the general Sense and Practice of the Church, those *Spanish* Bishops would have had no need of making a new Canon, to Authorize some Lay-men to do *that*, which the Catholick Church in Doctrine and Practice esteem'd to be good and valid, when done by any Lay-christian, *without such a suppos'd Authority.*

But *Divine Revelation*, and the *general Sense and Practice* of the Church, had excluded such *Lay-men* from that Ministration, this Exclusion of them render'd their Attempts, if they should have endeavour'd to Baptize, Null and Void, for want of the Commission requir'd by the Institution, which as *much*, and as *constantly* requires the Commission, as it does the Water and the Form: The Council of *Eliberis*, doubtless found things in this State; The Bishops thereof, 'tis reasonable to believe, saw Lay-men conscientiously refrain from usurping the Ministration of Baptism, upon the Account of their having no Power to Baptize; Lay-men doubtless abstain'd from it, as we do now, upon a common Principle of their *Inability* to minister the Means of our Regeneration and new Birth, to be administered

nister'd by Christ's commission'd Representatives: Some *Catechumens*, at a great Distance from a Church, it's very likely dy'd without Baptism for want of such a Commission'd Minister: The *Spanish* Bishops, hearing of such sort of Accidents, consider'd, how such *Catechumens*, in such Extremities, might receive *valid Baptism*; and supposing themselves to have sufficient Power so to do, made a new Canon to authorize some of their own Lay-Communicants, to Baptize such *Catechumens* in those Extremities, that so, such Lay-men might take Courage, and Act by a *suppos'd Commission* in that Ministration, which they before had reason to think could be of no Value if they attempted it without a Commission; and that *Catechumens* might not die in such Extremities without *suppos'd Baptism*; and also that those *Spanish* Bishops might not incur a *suppos'd Guilt*, of letting Men die without a *suppos'd Commission'd Baptism*. The Canon evidently supposes, that Lay-men in *Spain*, had no Power in themselves to Baptize; and no Churches oppos'd St. *Basil's* Assertion of the Invalidity of Baptism by Lay-men, Persons not empowered by Bishops to Baptize; he only found, that some Churches did not agree with him, that Heretical and Schismatical Priests, were the Same as Lay-men: And therefore, tho' his Opinion of Heretical and Schismatical Baptisms being Null and Void, was not the *general Sense and Practice of the Church* in his Days, because many Churches differ'd from him therein; yet his Opinion of the Invalidity of Lay-Baptism, *i. e.* Baptism by Persons *never Commission'd*, was agreeable to the *general Sense and Practice of the Church*; because, no Church in Council did then or before, publicly oppose that Principle, but, on the contrary, all Canons confirm'd and establish'd it, by *wholly*

Confining the Ministration of Baptism to *Bishops, and those on'y who are Commission'd*, or suppos'd to be Commission'd by them, and making no Exceptions by any Publick Ecclesiastical Declaration whatsoever, in favour of the Validity of Baptism by Persons who *never were so Commission'd*.

In short, *St. Basil's* Argument from *St. Cyprian* and *Firmilian*, reduc'd into Form, stands thus: Baptism by Lay-men, Persons not Impower'd or Commission'd to Baptize, is Null and Void—Heretical and Schismatical Priests, are become Lay-men; therefore Baptism, by Heretical and Schismatical Priests, is Null and Void. The Major Proposition, *viz.* Baptism by Laymen, Persons not Impower'd to Baptize, is Null and Void, was not publickly oppos'd by any Churches; but the Minor, *viz.* that Heretical and Schismatical Priests were become Lay-men, was Deny'd by several Churches; and therefore in Compliance with those Churches, he would not wholly insist upon his Conclusion, That *Baptism, by Heretical and Schismatical Priests, was Null and Void*; for He acquiesc'd in the Customs of some Churches, who reckon'd the Baptisms of some Schismaticks to be Good and Valid. But this was no ways a Departing from the Incontested Principle, That *Baptism by Lay-men, Persons not Commission'd or Impower'd to Baptize, was Null and Void*; because, his allowing some Schismaticks not to be reduc'd to Lay-men, was only an Abatement from the Rigour of his Assertion, which He made before, concerning Hereticks and Schismaticks without Distinction, when other Churches did not allow, that all Schismaticks whatsoever were become Lay men. Those Churches did not Dispute against His other Principle, of the Invalidity of Baptism by Persons Not Commission'd; and therefore

fore it stood good, notwithstanding His Compliance, and their Practice, with respect to the other by Schismatical Priests.

§ XXIV. *St. Chrysoſtom*, Arch-Biſhop of *Conſtantinople*, Anno 398. whom *Mr. Bingham* takes Notice of in his 17th, 18th, and 38th Pages, is full againſt the Validity of Baptiſm perform'd by Perſons who never were Commiſſion'd to Baptize. His Words, as *Mr. Bingham* has noted 'em, are theſe; “ * 'Tis plain Madneſs to deſpiſe ſo Great a Power, [*viz.* that of the Prieſt] “ without which we cannot obtain Salvation, or the good Things that are promiſed us. For if **No One** can enter into the Kingdom of Heaven, **except** he be born of Water and the Holy Ghoſt; and he that eats not the Fleſh of the Lord, and drinketh not his Blood, is **Deprived** of Eternal Life; and all theſe things are perform'd, **By No Other**, but Thoſe Sacred Hands, I mean the Hands of the Prieſt: “ How can any one, without theſe either eſcape the Fire of Hell, or Obtain the Crown that is laid up in Heaven.——† “ If there be a Neceſſity, and a Child be found Unbaptiz'd, and ready to Die, it is Lawful for a Deacon to Baptize it.” Theſe two Paſſages from *St. Chryſoſtom*, do eſta-bliſh what I obſerv'd before from *Pacianus* Biſhop of *Barcelona*, That *No One* can Adminiſter Baptiſm, as the Means of our Regeneration and New Birth, but ſuch as either in a higher or lower Senſe have a *Prieſtly Power*. *St. Chryſoſtom* is Expres and Poſitive, that this Means of Regeneration is per-

* *Chryſof. de Sacerdot. lib. iii. c. 5.*

† *St. Chryſoſt. Hom. 61. Tom. 7. Edit. Savil, p. 423.*

form'd “ **By No Other but Those Sacred Hands:** This is absolutely an Excluding of all others whatsoever, nay, even in Cases of Necessity, for, *in articulo mortis*, when an Unbaptiz'd Child is ready to Die, *St. Chrysoſtom* points out no other than a *Priestly Hand* to Baptize it, *viz.* a Deacon, ~~who~~ who is so far a *Priest*, as he has receiv'd the *Priestly Power* to Administer this Sacrament in the Absence of the Bishop, who has the whole Priesthood, and of the Presbyter, who has the Next Degree of Sacerdotal Power. *Mr. Bingham* knows and acknowledges, that Deacons have so far a share of the *Priestly Power*, as they are authoriz'd to Baptize, &c. He knows also, that when *Presbyters and Deacons* (Persons Ordain'd by the Bishop to Baptize) do Administer this Holy Sacrament, their Act is, in the Language of the Ancients, *The Bishop's Act*, because they receiv'd their Commission from him: These Things consider'd, whoever of these, whether *Presbyter* or *Deacon* Baptizes, 'tis done by a *Priestly Power*. And *St. Chrysoſtom* is clear, that without *this Power* “ **we cannot obtain Salvation, or the good Things that are promis'd us.**” One of the Means of Salvation which he speaks of, is, the Sacrament of Baptism; and he says positively, that it is “ *perform'd by no other but the Sacred Hands of the Priest.*” If then, a Person never Commission'd to Baptize, and who is therefore *Destitute of Priestly Power*, attempts to Baptize, we “ **cannot obtain Salvation by his Hand,**” because there is *no Priestly Power*: He do's not minister the Means of Salvation; He gives us no Baptism of Regeneration, because such Baptism is perform'd by **no other** than “ *the Sacred Hands of the Priest;*” and the Hands of this Usurper are **not** those Sacred Hands, consequently he performs

nothing, and we obtain nothing by his Means. If such Sacrilegious Hands do minister *real Baptism*, Baptism whereby we may be born again, then there are other Hands besides the Priests, that perform this; tho' St. *Chrysoftom* says there are *no other*: And if the pretended Baptisms, by Persons who have *no Priestly Power*, are Means of Salvation, then 'tis plain, we can obtain Salvation *without* the *Priestly Power*, tho' St. *Chrysoftom* affirms expressly, that without this Power "**we cannot obtain Salvation:**" But I will sooner take this Saint's Word, in this important Matter, than trust to the dangerous Positions of some, who came after him; because, his Assertions are *clearly* founded on the Divine Oracles, the Holy Scriptures of the Word of God, that Sacred Standard of Truth, and only Safe Rule of our Faith and Practice: There, as we discover Christian Baptism, whereby we are born again, to be with no other Matter than *Water*, and in no other Form than that in the Name of the Trinity, whether Ordinarily or Extraordinarily; so, we *as certainly* find no other *Administrator* thereof, than one who is vested with *Apostolick*, i. e. *Priestly Power* or Authority, whether in Ordinary Cases, or in Times of Greatest Necessity; and our St. *Chrysoftom*, keeping his Eye upon this *Sure Rule*, affirms, that we *cannot be saved* without this *Priestly Power*; and that there is *no other* than the Hand of one who is vested with this Power to minister to us Christian-Baptism, the Means of our Salvation: In no Case whatsoever can it be done by another, for even in Absence of the Bishop and Presbyter, none but a Deacon vested also with *Priestly Power to Baptize*, had Authority to do it: So far was he from the unaccountable Latitude of our Days, that he knew of no other

other Minister of Baptism, in Times of greatest Extremity, than an Episcopal Deacon, who was so far a Priest as he was impower'd by the Bishop to Baptize: And thus by St. *Chrysoſtom's* Rule, agreeable to that of the Holy Scripture, we cannot obtain Salvation; receive Baptism, the Means thereof, Ordinarily, or in Times of Extremity, "*without the Priestly Power.*"

§ XXV. About the latter end of the Fourth, or beginning of the Fifth Century, appear'd the Constitutions call'd Apostolical, as the Right Reverend Bishop *Pearson*, and after him the Reverend and Learned Doctor **Grabe* inform us. These Constitutions, tho' in Matters relating to the Doctrine of the Trinity, they have been interpolated by Anti-Trinitarian Hereticks; yet in Matters of Ancient Discipline, they inform us of several Things highly worthy of our Observation; among which, this of the Invalidity of pretended Baptism, perform'd by Persons who were never Commission'd to Baptize, is very remarkable, which I shall give the Reader in Mr. *Bingham's* own Translation, pag. 41, 42.—Thus, "*It is an horrible thing for a Man to thrust himself into the Priest's Dignity, or Office, as the Corahites, and Saul, and Uzzias did; as it was not Lawful for a Stranger, that was not of the Tribe of Levi, to offer any thing, or approach the Altar without a Priest; so do ye nothing without the Bishop. For if any Man do's any thing without the Bishop, he do's it in Vain: it shall not be reputed to him as any Service. As Saul, when he had offer'd Sacrifice without Sa-*

* *Spicileg. Patrum, Tom. 1. p. 284.*

“ muel, was told that he had done **Vainly**; so
 “ whatever **Lay-man** do's any thing without a
 “ Priest, he **Labours in Vain**. And as King
 “ Uzzias, when he had invaded the Priest's Office,
 “ was smitten with Leprosy for his Transgression;
 “ so every **Lay-man** shall bear his Punishment that
 “ contemns God, and insults his Priests, and takes
 “ Honour to himself, not imitating Christ, who glo-
 “ rify'd not himself, but staid till his Father said,
 “ Thou art a Priest for ever, after the Order of
 “ Melchizedeck.” Now 'tis evident, that this
 whole Discourse is founded upon Scripture, and
 the Sense of it when apply'd to Baptisin, is no
 less than this :

First, That whoever Lay-man, what Person so-
 ever, that was never Commission'd to Baptize, at-
 tempts this *Priestly Function*, which upon no ac-
 count whatsoever belongs to him, is a very great
 Transgressor in the sight of God, and his pretend-
 ed Service is “ *Vain as to what concerns himself*;
 “ *for it shall never be accounted to him as accepta-*
 “ *ble Service, worthy of a Reward, but rather in-*
 “ *evitably make him liable to Wrath and Punish-*
 “ *ment.*” So far Mr. Bingham acknowledges,
 pag. 42.

And, Secondly, I add, That from this Discourse
 'tis plain, that such a pretended Baptizer acts also
 in *Vain*, with respect to those whom he attempts to
 Baptize; he do's them **No Service** at all, if we
 will but be so just as fairly to consider the Scrip-
 ture-Instances here referr'd to, and to which our
 Usurper is compar'd: He is compar'd to the *Corahites*;
 now every Body that knows the History of
Corah's Rebellion, knows also that *Corah* offer'd In-
 cense in *Vain*, with respect to himself and to the
 rest of his rebellious *Accomplices* of the Congrega-
 tion,

tion, for whom he *pretended to offer*; for the Punishment fell on him, and that part of the Congregation also who did not offer, but *approved of his Offering*; So *Saul's* pretended Burnt-Offering *was Vain*, with respect to himself and others, for who was there that receiv'd *any Benefit* by it? The Punishment extended not only to him, but also to others, for himself and *his Children* too were for ever *Depriv'd* of the Kingdom for *this Usurpation*. Also *Uzziah's* attempting to offer Incense, if he had proceeded so far as to gain a Party to concur with him in the Usurpation, would doubtless have brought upon himself and his Accomplices, for defending his Sacrilege, a dreadful Punishment from God: But the *Priests* timely and courageously interpos'd, stop'd his Progress, and *thrust him away from the Altar of the Lord*, and so he had no Party in his Defence, that concurr'd with his *Sacrilegious Usurpation*. The **Stranger** also that was not of the Tribe of *Levi*, if he had attempted to offer any thing, or approach'd the Altar without a Priest, his Attempt would have *been Vain*; and he would have done No Acceptable Service, either for himself, or others concurring with and abetting his Usurpation; for, the same reason which would have made his pretended Service *Vain*, as to himself, would have made it also *Vain* as to others who should have concurred with him; because, they being concern'd with him in the Sin, cannot be suppos'd to receive any Benefit from that Sin of his, which they *concur with and encourage*. The Passage of the Constitutions, now before us, says, by way of Inference from the before-mention'd Instances, "So whatever **Lay-man** do's any thing without a Priest, he Labours in Vain," *i. e.* he Labours in Vain as *Saul*, &c. Labour'd in Vain; that is,

as they in their Usurpations Labour'd *in Vain*, and brought No Benefit to *themselves or others*; so our Lay-man, in his Usurpation, *Labours in Vain*, and to no Purpose in his pretended Ministrations; he brings no Benefit, but rather *Wrath and Punishment* to himself and others for whom he pretends to minister, who concur with and approve of his usurped Acts. Our Reverend Historian is so sensible of this, that he acknowledges, Page 41. That this Passage "**Seems** to pronounce severely of usurp'd and unauthoriz'd Actions, as utterly Null and Void;" but by what has been said, 'tis plain this Passage do's more than **Seem** to pronounce so, it do's really say they are done **in Vain**: "*Whatever Lay-man do's any thing without a Priest he Labours in Vain,*" and therefore his Act is utterly Null and Void.

§ XXVI. Mr. Bingham, Page 33. produces St. *Ferom* in the latter end of the Fourth Century, as an Evidence for Lay-Baptism: His Words are these, "*St. Jerom—Derives the Power of Presbyters and Deacons to Baptize, from the Original Power of the Bishop; yet in Cases of Necessity, he, (i. e. St. Ferom*) says "it was also allow'd frequently to Lay-men: For in such Cases, he that had receiv'd Baptism, might give it to others."* Thus Mr. Bingham gives us St. *Ferom's* Words. St. *Ferom* in this Place says, that it is **Lawful** for Laicks to baptize, "*when Necessity Compels,*" [*Licere Laicis, says he*]

* Sine Chrismate & Jussione Episcopi, neque Presbyter neque Diaconus jus habent Baptizandi. Quod frequentur (si tamen Necessitas cogit) Scimus etiam licere Laicis. Ut enim accipit quis, ita & dare potest. *Hieronimi Dialog. cum Luciferian,* p. 4.

But now the Question is to *What Law* do's he refer us for the Lawfulness of this? *First*, Is it to the Law of God? *Secondly*, Is it to the Law of the Ancient Catholick Church? Or, *Thirdly*, Is it to some private Maxim, which with him stands instead of a Law, as a self-evident Principle, that wants no other Law to enforce it? One of these he must refer us to, when he talks of a **Lawful Act**; otherwise his saying 'tis Lawful has no Signification at all.

First, Then, I say that he refers us to *No Law of God* for the *Lawfulness* of Laicks Baptizing in Cases of Necessity; because there is no such Law extant in his written Word, if there is, let it be produced, that Men may not remain in Ignorance about it.

Secondly, St. *Jerom* can refer us to *No Law* of the Ancient Catholick Church; for she never made any such Law. If she did, when and where did she make it? In which of her *General Councils* was it enacted? Certainly not in any One of them; and no less than this, can make it a *Law of the Catholick Church*; and whatsoever falls *short* of this, is insufficient to shew the *general Sense and Practice of the Ancient Church*. Shall it be then suppos'd that St. *Jerom* has an Eye to the *Spanish Council of Eliberis's* Canon, made to impower some sort of Lay-men to Baptize *Catechumens*, in danger of Death, when a Priest could not be had? Why even this will not do neither; for that Council being but a particular Provincial One, and so *very Singular* in this Matter, that we have no other Instance of the like in the whole Christian World in those Days, its Canon was *no Law* to the Churches where St. *Jerom* liv'd, and so the *Lawfulness* of Lay-mens Baptizing could have no reference to that

that Canon, except it could be prov'd that he is speaking only of the Lay-Subjects of the *Spanish* Bishops of that Council, that it was *Lawful* for *them* to Baptize in Cases of Extremity; yet even this would not serve for our Lay-Baptisms, which are notoriously without any Necessity, by Persons who are not so much as suppos'd to Act by virtue of any Canon, and who attempt to Baptize, not only without having been ever Commission'd at all, but also in *direct* profess'd *Opposition* to that Apostolick, *i. e.* Episcopal Authority, from whence alone all Commissions to Baptize must flow. St. *Ferom* never once spoke of such *pretended Baptisms* as these; for the Church in his Days had *no Experience* of them. But to return to the Lay-Baptisms he speaks of: Do's St. *Ferom* then refer us to the Will and Pleasure of the particular Bishops of those Laicks, and say, that 'twas Lawful for them to Baptize, because their respective Bishops *authoriz'd* them to do so, in Absence of the Clergy? But how shall we know this, where do's it appear? And if it were so, this would not determine it to be *Lawful* by the *general Sense and Practice* of the Church, for the Will and Pleasure only of some particular Bishops, is no Law of the *Catholick Church*; and besides even this also, if it were allow'd that particular Bishops could and did authorize their own Lay-men, will not prove the Lawfulness or Validity of our Lay-Baptisms, which are evidently such as are done by Persons never authoriz'd at all by their respective Bishops. So that it must follow therefore that,

Thirdly, St. *Ferom*, as a suppos'd Evidence of the general Sense and Practice of the Church, refers us to *no other Law*, whereby to determine the Lawfulness of Laicks Baptizing in Cases of Necessity,

sity, than that false Maxim, which, with 'a little Variation, he plainly appears to have borrow'd from *Tertullian*, when he says, *That what a Man has receiv'd, he can also give to others*; as if this were an undoubted Principle, and in the General Sense and Practice of the Church, of equal force with a Law; and that therefore, *St. Jerom* knew that 'twas *Lawful* for Laicks to Baptize in Cases of Extremity: But the Weakness of this Position I have already expos'd, *Page 43.* to which I further add here, that if this false Principle was the *General Sense and Practice* of the Church, then it will follow, that if Lay-mens Baptisms are Lawful upon that Foundation, then, a meer Presbyter having receiv'd a Power to Baptize, to Administer the other Sacrament, to Preach, and to Absolve, &c. can Lawfully give this Power also to others; and even a Deacon too may give Power to Baptize, if *what is receiv'd can be given to others by the Receiver*; Consequences so false in Fact, (tho' necessarily arising from such a suppos'd Maxim) that the Principle from whence they flow was certainly at no Time the "*General Sense and Practice of the Ancient Church*"; and therefore this Principle being the Measure of the Lawfulness of Lay-Baptism in *St. Jerom's* Opinion, is no Argument for the Lawfulness thereof in the General Sense and Practice of the Church, about which we are still Inquiring.

§ XXVII. Let us then see whether *St. Jerom* do's not on the other side, make Lay-Baptism to be Invalid, upon Catholick Principles: And in order thereto, 'tis to be observ'd, that after the Great Council of *Nice*, *Lucifer* Bishop of *Calaris* in the Island of *Sardinia*, resolv'd to have no Conversation or Correspondence with any of the Bishops, who

who had receiv'd into their Communion, those that had formerly sign'd the *Arian* Creeds. He withdrew himself therefore into his own Island, and separated from the Communion of almost all the Bishops in the World; he dy'd in this Resolution, and left some Followers, call'd *Luciferians*, who spread themselves over all the World. These *Luciferian* Separatists insisted upon it, that the Orders of the *Arian* Bishops and Clergy were Null and Void, because they were Hereticks; and that upon their Repentance and Union to the Catholick Church, they ought not to be receiv'd into the Number of the Clergy, when the same *Luciferians* receiv'd *Lay-Arians* to Communion, only by Imposition of Hands, tho' they had been Baptiz'd by the *Arian* Clergy. St. *Jerom*, in his Dialogue against those Schismaticks, introduces an Orthodox Christian disputing with a *Luciferian*, in Defence of the Practice of the Catholicks, who receiv'd not only *Lay-repenting Arians* to Communion, but also receiv'd *Arian* Bishops, Priests, and Deacons, upon their Repentance, in the same Rank and Degree of Clergy-men, as they held while they were Hereticks: And the Argument which *Orthodox* uses in Defence of this Practice of the Church, is in short thus; You acknowledge by your Practice that the Baptism administer'd by the *Arian* Clergy is good and valid, because you receive their Laicks Baptiz'd by them without repeating their Baptism; You ought therefore to acknowledge the Orders of their Clergy, otherwise you must reject the Baptism administer'd by them, whom you do not own to be Priests. The *Luciferian* was not able to get over this, he had no Reply (in our Modern Stile) that Baptism, by Persons who have no Priestly Power, is good and valid: He might have

confounded *Orthodox's* Reasoning with this Answer, if it had then been agreeable to the *General Sense and Practice of the Church*; but he yielded to the force of the Argument, and was convinc'd by this Principle, that Baptism by One Not having a Priestly Power to Baptize, ought to be rejected; and therefore we may conclude that this was a receiv'd Maxim in the Church in those Days.

But to give the Reader a little farther Insight into this *Dialogue*, that he may see the Truth of what I say, I shall here set down the Sense of some of it, out of *St. Jerom*, according to the *Benedictine Monk's* Edition, thus :

(1) *Orthodox.* “ Shew me, why you receive
“ a Laick, who comes over from the *Arians*, when
“ you receive not an [*Arian*] Bishop ?

(2) *Luciferian.* “ I receive an *Arian* Laick,
“ who Confesses that he has been in an Error ;
“ and the Lord would rather have the Repen-
“ tance, than the Death of a Sinner.

(3) *Orthod.* “ Receive therefore the Bishop
“ also, who likewise Confesses that he has been in
“ an Error ; and the Lord would rather have the
“ Repentance, than the Death of a Sinner.

(4) *Lucif.* “ If the *Arian* Bishop Confesses
“ that he has Err'd ; Why do's he continue a Bi-

(1) *Orthod.* Expone mihi quare Laicum venientem ab Arianis recipias, Episcopum non recipias?

(2) *Lucif.* Recipio Laicum qui errasse se confitetur, & Dominus mavult pœnitentiam peccatoris quàm mortem.

(3) *Orthod.* Recipe ergo & Episcopum, qui & errasse se confitetur, & Dominus mavult penitentiam peccatoris quam mortem.

(4) *Lucif.* Si errare se confitetur. Cur Episcopus perseverat? Deponat Sacerdotium, concedo veniam pœnitenti.

shop?

“ **B**ishop? Let him give over his Priesthood, and
 “ I grant Pardon to the Penitent.

(5) *Orthod.* “ And I will Answer you in your
 “ own Language. If an [*Arian* Baptiz’d] Laick
 “ Confesses that he has Err’d; How do’s he con-
 “ tinue (in the State of) a [Baptiz’d] Laick? Let
 “ him lay aside his Laical Priesthood, that is, the
 “ Baptism [which he receiv’d,] and I also grant
 “ Pardon to the Penitent, &c. ———— What-
 “ soever is Unlawful for a Christian, is as much
 “ Unlawful for a Laick as for a Bishop. He
 “ that repents, condemns his former Crimes. If
 “ it is not Lawful for a Penitent [*Arian*] Bishop
 “ to continue [a Bishop] as he was before; then
 “ also, it is not Lawful for a Penitent [*Arian*]
 “ Laick to remain in the State [of Baptism which
 “ he receiv’d in *Arianism*,] for which he now re-
 “ pents.

(6) *Lucif.* “ We receive [Penitent *Arian*]
 “ Laicks, because none of them would be Conver-
 “ ted, if they knew that they were to be Re-bap-
 “ tiz’d; and so we should be the Cause of their
 “ Perdition, if we should not allow of the Bap-
 “ tism they receiv’d of the *Arian* Clergy.

(5) *Orthod.* Respondebo tibi & Ego sermonibus tuis, si Lai-
 cus errasse se confitetur, quomodo Laicus perseverat? Deponat
 Sacerdotium Laici, *i. e.* Baptisma, & ego do veniam pœnitenti.
 Scriptum este nim regnum quoque, nos & Sacerdotes Deo Patri suo
 fecit. (*Apoç. 1. 6.*) omne quod non licet Christiano, Communé
 est tam Episcopo quám Laico. Qui pœnitentiam agit, priora
 condemnat. Si non licet Episcopo pœnitenti perieverare quod
 fuerat, non licet & Laico pœnitenti permanere in eo, propter
 quod pœnitentiam confitetur.

(6) *Lucif.* Recipimus Laicos, quoniam nemo convertetur, si
 se scierit Re-baptizandum, & ita fiet ut nos simus causa perditio-
 nis eorum si repudientur.

(7) *Orthod.*

(7) *Orthod.* “ — [As for us,] we do not all
 “ *inconsistently with our selves ; for we either re-*
 “ *ceive the Bishop, with the People whom he Baptiz'd ;*
 “ *or if we do not receive the Bishop [as such,] we*
 “ *know, that his People also must be rejected, [i. e.*
 “ *not receiv'd as Baptiz'd Laicks.]* — “ There-
 “ fore, I pray you, That you either allow him to
 “ sacrifice, (*i. e.* to be a Priest, having Power to
 “ administer the Sacrifice of the Eucharist) “ whose
 “ Baptism [administred by him] you allow of ;
 “ or else reject that Baptism which was admi-
 “ nistred by him, whō you do not esteem to be a
 “ Priest.

(8) *Lucif.* “ [Tho' I allow of the Baptism he
 “ administred,] yet the Laick he baptiz'd, I re-
 “ ceive (upon his Repentance) by Imposition of
 “ Hands, and Invocation of the Holy-Ghost ; be-
 “ cause I know, that the Gift of the Holy-Ghost
 “ cannot be conferr'd by Hereticks.

(9) *Orthod.* “ When a Man is baptiz'd [*as he*
 “ *is among the Arians]* into or in the Name of the
 “ Father, Son, and Holy-Ghost ; he is then made
 “ the Temple of the Lord, a new Temple of the
 “ Holy Trinity. How can you say, that among
 “ the

(7) *Orthod.*— Nos nobis adversa non facimus: Aut Episcopum cum populo recipimus quem facit Christianum, aut si Episcopum non recipimus, scimus etiam nobis populum rejiciendum— Quamobrem oro te, ut aut sacrificandi ei licentiam tribuas cujus Baptisma probas: *Aut reprobes ejus Baptisma quem non existimas Sacerdotem.* —

(8) *Lucif.* Sed ego recipio Laicum pœnitentem, per manus impositionem & invocationem Spiritus Sancti, Sciens ab Hœreticis Spiritum Sanctum non posse conferri.

(9) *Orthod.*—Quum in Patre, & Filio & Spiritu Sancto Baptizatus homo Templum Domini fiat, quum veteri ade destructa novum Trinitatis delubrum ædificetur, quomodo dicis sine ad-
 ventu

“ the *Arians*, Sins may be remitted, without the
 “ Descent of the Holy-Ghost? ——— [for Bapt-
 “ tism is for the Remission of Sins.] ——— “ It is
 “ evident, that there is no True Baptism without
 “ the Holy-Ghost. ——— If an *Arian* cannot
 “ give the Holy-Ghost, he cannot truly Baptize;
 “ because, without the Holy-Ghost, there is no
 “ True Baptism of the Church: Therefore, when
 “ you receive a Person baptiz’d by an *Arian*, and
 “ call on the Holy-Ghost to descend on him; either
 “ you ought to baptize him, because he could not
 “ be baptiz’d before without the Holy-Ghost; or,
 “ if he was at first baptiz’d in the Spirit, then
 “ forbear to call on the Spirit to descend on him,
 “ since he receiv’d the Holy-Ghost when he was
 “ baptiz’d.

(10) *Lucif.* “ But pray, have you not read in
 “ the Acts of the Apostles, That they who had
 “ been before baptiz’d by *John* the Baptist, when
 “ they answer’d to the Apostle’s Question, that they
 “ had not so much as heard whether there was any
 “ Holy-Ghost, did afterwards obtain the Gift of

ventu Spiritus Sancti apud Arianos peccata posse dimitti?—
 Apparet Baptisma non esse sine Spiritu Sancto.—

Si Arianus Spiritum Sanctum non potest Dare, ne Baptizare qui-
 dem potest, quia Ecclesiæ Baptisma sine Spiritu Sancto nullum
 est. Tu vero quum Baptizatum ab eo recipias, & postea
 invoces Spiritum Sanctum, aut Baptizare eum debes quia sine
 Spiritu Sancto non potuit Baptizari; aut si est Baptizatus in
 Spiritu, desine ei invocare Spiritum, quem tunc quum Baptiza-
 retur accepit.

(10) *Lucif.* Obsecro te, nonne legisti in actibus Apostolorum,
 eos qui jam à Johanne Baptizati fuerant, quum ad interroga-
 tionem Apostoli respondissent, se nec auditu quidem comparisse,
 quid esset Spiritus Sanctus, postea fuisse Spiritum Sanctum conse-
 quutos? Unde manifestum est, posse aliquem Baptizari, & tamen
 non habere Spiritum Sanctum.

“ the

“ the Holy-Ghost? Whence it is manifest, that a
 “ Person may be baptiz’d, and yet not have the
 “ Holy-Ghost.

(11) *Orthod.* ——— But Paul said to those
 same Persons, “ *John indeed Baptiz’d the People*
 “ *with the Baptism of Repentance, saying, that they*
 “ *should believe on him who was to come after him,*
 “ *that is, on Jesus, for the Remission of Sins. And*
 “ *when they had heard these things they were bap-*
 “ *tiz’d in the Name of our Lord Jesus Christ; and*
 “ *when Paul had laid his hands upon them, the Holy-*
 “ *Ghost immediately fell on them, Acts xix. 1, &c.*
 “ If they therefore were baptiz’d with the True
 “ and Lawful Baptisin of the Church, and so did
 “ afterwards obtain the Holy-Ghost; do you also
 “ follow the Rule of the Apostles, baptize those
 “ who have not Christ’s Baptisin, [*i. e.* the Laicks
 baptiz’d by *Arians*, who you say are not Priests]
 “ and then [when you have given them Christ’s
 Baptisin] “ you may call on the Holy-Ghost to
 “ descend on them.

(12) *Lucif.*—“ But do you not know, that this
 “ is the Custom of the Churches, *viz.* that the Bi-

(11) *Orthod.*— *Dixit autem Paulus: Johannes quidem Baptizavit*
Baptismo Pœnitentiæ Plebem, dicens in advenientem post eum ut cre-
derent, hoc est in Jesum, in remissionem peccatorum. His auditis Bap-
tizati sunt in Nomine Domini Nostri Jesu Christi. Et quum imposuisset
illis manus Paulus, continuo cecidit Spiritus Sanctus super eos.
 Si ergo Baptizati sunt, vero & legitimo Ecclesiæ Baptizate,
 & ita postea Spiritum Sanctum consequuti sunt; & tu Aposto-
 lorum sequere auctoritatem, & Baptiza eos, qui Christi non
 habent Baptisma, & poteris invocare Spiritum Sanctum.

(12) *Lucif.*— An nescis etiam Ecclesiarum hunc esse morem;
 ut Baptizatis postea manus imponantur, & ita invocetur Spiritus
 Sanctus? Exigis ubi Scriptum sit? In actibus Apostolorum.

“shop should lay his Hands on those who have
 “been already baptiz’d, and call on the Holy-
 “Ghost to descend on them? Do you demand
 “where this is written? ’Tis in the Acts of the
 “Apostles.

(13) *Orthod.* “Truly I do not deny that this
 “is the Custom of the Churches, that, when Per-
 “sons have been baptiz’d by Presbyters and Dea-
 “cons, at a great Distance, in small Cities [where
 Bishops do not reside] “the Bishop should come
 “and lay his Hands on them, with Invocation of
 “the Holy-Ghost.—But if you now enquire,
 “why a Person baptiz’d in the Church may not
 “receive the Holy-Ghost, but by Imposition of the
 “Hands of the Bishop, when we assert that the
 “Holy-Ghost is also given in True Baptism: You
 “are to understand, that this Custom descends to

(13) *Orthod.* Non quidem abnuo hanc esse Ecclesiarum con-
 suetudinem, ut ad eos qui longe in minoribus urbibus per Presby-
 teros & Diaconos baptizati sunt, Episcopus ad invocationem Sancti
 Spiritus manum impositurus excurrat.— Quod si hoc loco
 quaris; Quare in Ecclesia Baptizatus, nisi per manus Episcopi,
 non accipiat Spiritum Sanctum, quem nos asserimus in vero
 Baptizate tribui: Disce, hanc observationem, ex ea auctoritate
 descendere, quod post ascensum Domini, Spiritus Sanctus ad apo-
 stolos descendit. Et multis in locis idem factitatum reperimus, ad
 honorem potius Sacerdotii quam ad legem necessitatis. Alioqui
 si ad Episcopi tantum imprecationem Spiritus Sanctus defluit, lu-
 gendi sunt qui in lectulis, &c. per Presbyteros & Diaconos bap-
 tizati, ante dormierunt quam ab Episcopis inviserentur. Ecclesie
 salus in summi Sacerdotis dignitate pendet: Cui si non exors quæ-
 dam, & ab omnibus eminens detur potestas, tot in Ecclesiis
 efficientur Schismata quot Sacerdotes. Inde venit, ut sine Chris-
 mate & Episcopi jussione, neque Presbyter, neque Diaconus jus
 habeant baptizandi. Quod frequenter, si tamen recessitas cogit,
 scimus etiam licere Laicis. Ut enim accipit quis, ita & dare
 potest, &c.

“ us from this Authority, that after our Lord’s
 “ Ascension, the Holy-Ghost came down on the
 “ Apostles. And in many Places we find the
 “ same Custom [*viz.* of Conferring the Holy-
 Ghost on baptiz’d Persons by Imposition of the
 Bishop’s Hands] “ to be observ’d rather for the
 “ Honour of the [Bishop’s] Priesthood, than for
 “ any Law of Necessity. Otherwise, if the Holy-
 “ Ghost descends by reason of the Bishop’s Prayer
 “ only; then they are to be bewail’d who were
 “ baptiz’d in their Beds, &c. by Presbyters and
 “ Deacons, and dy’d before they could be visited
 “ by the Bishops. The Safety of the Church de-
 “ pends on the Dignity of the High-Priest, [*i. e.*
 the Bishop] “ to whom, if there were not given
 “ some certain Power and Authority, not to be
 “ shared in by others, but Eminent above all,
 “ there would be as many Schisms and Divisions in
 “ the Churches as Priests. Hence it comes to pass,
 “ that without the Chrism and Consent of the Bi-
 “ shop, neither Presbyter nor Deacon have Autho-
 “ rity to Baptize: Which for all that, if Necessi-
 “ ty compels, we know is frequently Lawful for
 “ Laicks. For even as a Man receives, so he
 “ can give to others the Thing he receiv’d.

Note here, ’Tis very remarkable, that in this
 last Answer of the Catholick, Saint *Jerom*
 strangely brings in the Notion of the Lawful-
 ness of Baptism by Laicks in Cases of Extre-
 mity, without any Connection or Reference
 to his former or following Discourse, but in-
 deed inconsistently with his Argument against
 the *Luciferian*; I say inconsistently, because
 the *Luciferian*, upon this Principle, might
 have overthrown *Orthodox’s* whole Argument;

for 'twould have been very natural for the *Luciferian* to have answer'd, " You say that I
 " must reject a Baptism administer'd by One
 " whom I do not esteem to be a Priest. [See *Orthodox*, p. 127.] I say that I am not oblig'd
 " to reject such a Baptism; because, upon your
 " own Principle, and also that of the *Catholick*
 " Church, [if this Principle was Hers] Laicks
 " may Lawfully baptize in Case of Extremity,
 " where Priests are not to be had; the *Arian*
 " Priest, whom I esteem to be No Priest, baptiz'd the *Arian* Laick; the *Arian* Laick
 " could get no other Baptism under his Circumstances, therefore the Baptism he receiv'd was
 " a Baptism in Necessity perform'd by a Layman, according to my Opinion, and good by
 " your Principle; consequently tho' I allow of
 " the Baptism, I am not oblig'd to acknowledge
 " him for a Priest, viz. the *Arian* Priest who
 " administer'd it." This would have been a very natural Retort upon *St. Jerom*, if his singular Notion of the Lawfulness of Laicks baptizing in Cases of Necessity, had been then the *General Sense and Practice of the Church*; but the *Luciferian's* next Subsequent Answer shews that he had no Knowledge of any such Notion; that he took no notice at all of *St. Jerom's* advancing it, and therefore 'tis unaccountable how *St. Jerom* brought it into his Discourse, when it had no dependance at all upon his Argument; but is inconsistent with it, and even destructive of that *Catholick* Principle, upon which he was endeavouring to Confute the Practice of the *Luciferians*. But to proceed; the *Luciferian*, without taking any notice of *St. Jerom's* Saying about
 Laicks

Laicks baptizing; as if it was a singular Notion that would do him no Service in his Dispute with *Orthodox*, answers thus:

(14) *Lucif.* “ Be it so, *viz.* that among the
 “ *Arians* there is indeed no Baptism, and that
 “ therefore the Holy Spirit cannot be given by
 “ them, because they have not yet receiv'd Remis-
 “ sion of Sins; all this helps much towards my
 “ gaining the Victory.——An *Arian* is not
 “ baptiz'd, how then can he be a Priest? Among
 “ them there is not a baptiz'd Lay-man, how then
 “ can there be a Bishop? &c.

(15) *Orthod.* “ I do not at present so much re-
 “ proach, or defend the *Arians*, as I endeavour to con-
 “ vince you. For the same reason that you receive a

(14) *Lucif.*—Esto quippe apud Arianos ne Baptisma quidem esse, & ideo Spiritum Sanctum ab eis non posse dari quia necdum remissionem peccatorum acceperint, totum hoc victoriae meae proficit, & argumentorum tuorum palestra mihi palmam victoriae sudat. Arianus Baptisma non habet & quomodo Sacerdotium habet? Laicus apud eos non est & quomodo Episcopus esse potest? Mihi recipere mendicum non licet, tu recipis regem? Vos hosti castra traditis, & à nobis perfuga rejiciendus est?

(15) *Orthod.* Ego—non tam in presenti Arianos vel improbo, vel defendo, quam illam cursus mei metam circumeo, eadem ratione à nobis Episcopum recipi, qua Laicus à vobis recipitur. Si erranti concedis veniam; & ego ignosco poenitenti. Si in fide sua baptizato baptizans nocere non potuit, & in fide sua Sacerdotem constitutum constituens non inquinavit. Subtilis est Hæresis, & ideo simplices animæ facile decipiuntur. Deceptio tam Laici quam Episcopi Communis est: — Igitur parvulorum inter se certantium ritu, quidquid dixeris dicam: Affirmabis, affirmabo; negabis, negabo. Arianus Baptizat; Ergo Episcopus est: Non Baptizat; tu refuta Laicum, & ego non recipio Sacerdotem. Sequar te quoquamque ieris, aut pariter in luto hæsitabimus, aut pariter expediemur.

“ Penitent [*Arian* Laick] we receive a Penitent
 “ [*Arian* Bishop.] If you grant Pardon to the
 “ Laick who Err’d; I also Forgive the Penitent
 “ Bishop. If the *Baptizer* could not hurt him
 “ whom he baptiz’d, in his *false* Faith, then he
 “ who ordain’d, did not defile the Priest whom he
 “ ordain’d, in his *false* Faith. Heresy is a subtil
 “ thing, and therefore simple Souls are easily de-
 “ ceiv’d. Bishops, as well as Laicks, are Lyable
 “ to be Deceiv’d.—Therefore, as Children use
 “ to do when striving with one another, whatso-
 “ ever you shall say, I will say; what you shall
 “ affirm, I will affirm; what you shall deny, I will
 “ deny. [If you say that] an *Arian* Bishop bap-
 “ tizes, [and this you must say, if you receive Lay-
 “ repenting *Arians* without Re-baptizing them] “ I
 “ say he is therefore a Bishop. [If you say] he do’s
 “ not baptize, then I say, do you Convince the
 “ Laick [that he receiv’d no Baptism from the
 “ *Arian* Bishop] “ and I disapprove of the Priest-
 “ hood of him who baptized. I will follow you
 “ whithersoever you shall go; either we will both
 “ together stick in the Mud, or we will equally
 “ get clear out of it.

(16) *Lucif.* “ But a Laick ought therefore to
 “ be pardon’d, because in his Simplicity, thinking
 “ the *Arians* to be the Church of God, he ap-
 “ ply’d to them; and believing, was, according
 “ to his own Faith, baptiz’d.

(16) *Lucif.* Sed Laico ideo ignoscendum est, quia Ecclesiam
 Dei putans simpliciter accessit, & juxta fidem suam credens bap-
 tizatus est.

(17) *Orthod.* “ You assert a new Thing, that
 “ any One may be made a Christian, by him who
 “ is no Christian himself. Into what Faith is he
 “ baptiz'd, that goes over to the *Arians*? Certain-
 “ ly into the Faith of the *Arians*.

(18) *Lucif.* ——— “ A Laick baptiz'd in
 “ Faith, even out of the Church, is receiv'd to
 “ Communion upon his Repentance. But a Bishop
 “ either does not do Penance because he is a Priest,
 “ or if he does Penance he ceases to be a Bishop;
 “ wherefore we rightly receive a Penitent *Arian*
 “ Laick, and we reject an *Arian* Bishop if he will
 “ continue in his Priesthood.

(19) *Orthod.* “ Our Question now, is not, Whe-
 “ ther a Bishop can undergo Penance, as a Laick
 “ may; but, Whether the Lay-Heretick has re-
 “ ceiv'd Baptism, who, if (as 'tis plain) he has
 “ not Baptism, how can he be a Penitent before he
 “ is a Christian? Prove to me, that a Laick com-
 “ ing from the *Arians*, is baptiz'd, and I will not
 “ deny him Penance; but if he is not a Christian,
 “ if

(17) *Orthod.* Novam rem asseris, ut Christianus quisquam factus sit ab eo qui non fuit Christianus. Accedens ad Arianos, in qua fide baptizatus est? Nempe in ea quam habebant Ariani.

(18) *Lucif.*— Laicus etiam extra Ecclesiam fide baptizatus pœnitens recipitur. Episcopus vero, aut pœnitentiam non agit, & sacerdos est, aut si pœnitentiam egerit esse Episcopus desinit. Quomobrem recte nos laicum & suscipimus pœnitentem, & Episcopum si in Sacerdotio perseverare vult, repudiamus.

(19) *Orthod.* ——— Neque enim hoc modo queritur: An Episcopus Pœnitens esse non possit, & laicus possit? Sed an Hæreticus baptismum habeat? qui si ut constat baptismum non habet, quomodo potest esse pœnitens antequam Christianus? Proba mihi ab arianis venientem Laicum habere Baptismum, & tunc ei pœnitentiam non negabo. Si vero Christianus non est, si non

“ if he had not a Priest who could make him a
 “ Christian, [as 'tis plain he had not, if we deny
 the Orders of the *Arian* Clergy] “ how shall a
 “ Man be admitted to do Penance, who is not yet
 “ a Christian ?

(20) *Lucif.* “ Do's it then seem reasonable to
 “ you, that an *Arian* should be a Bishop ?

(21) *Orthod.* “ You your self allow him to be
 “ a Bishop, by your receiving an *Arian* Laick
 “ baptiz'd by him, [and thereby you acknowledge
 the Validity of his Orders, because you do not
 reject, but allow of the Baptism which the Laick
 receiv'd from him] “ and in this you are to be
 “ reprov'd. Why you do separate from our Com-
 “ munion, when you not only agree with us in
 “ Faith, but in receiving of Hereticks also ?—
 “ For I receive [*as a Bishop*] an *Arian* Bishop,
 “ coming over from the *Arians* to the Church; up-
 “ on the very same Principle that you receive [*as*
 a Lay-Christian] “ an *Arian*-Laick baptiz'd by
 “ him.—We agree in the Faith, we agree in
 “ receiving Hereticks, let us also agree in One
 “ and the Same Communion.

habuerit Sacerdotem, qui eum faceret Christianum, quomodo
 aget pœnitentiam Homo qui necdum credit ?

(20) *Lucif.* ——— Æquumne tibi videtur, ut Arianus
 Episcopus sit ?

(21) *Orthod.* “ Tu eum Episcopum probas, qui ab eo recipis
 Baptizatum ; & in hoc reprehendendus es. Quare a nobis parietibus
 separaris, quum in fide & in Arianorum nobiscum receptione
 consentias ? ——— Eadem enim ratione Episcopum ab arianis
 recipio, qua tu recipis Baptizatum. ——— Consentimus in
 fide, Consentimus in Hæreticis recipiendis, Consentimus etiam
 ab Conventu.

(22) *Lucif.* “ — Behold, I give way, I submit, and acknowledge that you have Conquer'd me *.

Thus much may suffice to shew the Catholick Principle insisted on by St. *Jerom* in this Dialogue; I have not always confin'd my self to the very Letter of the Words, but expatiated sometimes by way of Paraphrase, that the Sense and Meaning of the Dispute against the *Luciferians*, might be the more Evident to the *English* Reader; and that he might be thereby the more enabled to see the Truth of what I have before asserted, and here repeat again, *viz.* That the Great Argument, by which the *Luciferian* was Convinc'd, was, That If the *Luciferians* rejected the Orders of the *Arian* Clergy, they ought also to reject the Baptisms administer'd by them; but the *Luciferians* in their Practice, allow'd of those Baptisms, because they admitted *Arian* Repentant-Laicks to Communion, without re-baptizing them; and therefore the *Luciferians* were bound to acknowledge the Priestly Power of the *Arian* Clergy, who baptiz'd those Laicks: This is so plain, in the Dialogue before us, that he who runs may read it; and the whole Argument turns upon this, That where there is not a Priestly Power, there is No True Baptism administer'd; for, says *Orthodox*,

(22) *Lucif.* En tollo manus, cedo, vicisti. —

* *S. Hieronymus adversus Luciferianos*, p. 290. &c.
Opera, Tom. IV. Paris 1706.

N^o 7. “ If we do not receive the [Arian] Bishop [as a Bishop] “ we know that the People [baptiz’d by him] “ must also be rejected,” [not receiv’d as baptiz’d Laicks.]

——“ Reject that Baptism which was administer’d by him, whom you do not esteem to be a Priest.

N^o 15. “ An Arian Bishop baptizes, therefore he is a Bishop. If he does not, i. e. cannot baptize, I disapprove of his Priesthood.

N^o 19. “ If an Arian Laick, had not a Priest, who could make him a Christian; how should he [be admitted to] do Penance, viz. the Arian Laick, who is not yet a Christian.

N^o 21. “ You your self approve an Arian to be a Bishop, by your receiving an Arian Laick baptiz’d by him, &c.

By such Arguments as these, *Orthodox* asserts against the *Luciferian*, that the *Arian* Clergy were not Lay-men, but had Priestly Power: He concludes the Validity of their Priesthood from the Validity of the Baptism they administer’d: He asserts, that if they had no Priesthood, the Baptism administer’d by them ought to be rejected. And to this, as to an Invincible Argument, the *Luciferian* submitted, and was overcome by the force thereof; and consequently *St. Jerom* here confuted the *Luciferian*, by insisting upon a then known Principle of the Invalidity of Baptism perform’d by Persons destitute of a Priestly Power; and so is an Evidence of the Church’s Sense in those Days, against the Validity of our pretended Baptisms, perform’d by those who certainly were never vested

vested with any such Power and Authority, as our Dissenters 'tis evident never were.

And for a further Confirmation of this, let it be observ'd, that St. *Ferom* in the same Dialogue, do's afterwards, towards the Conclusion, expressly affirm, That; * *Without Priests there is no Church*; which would be a Notorious Falsity, if in his Days, it was a *Just and Sound* Principle of the Catholick Church, that Persons who never were Priests in any respect whatsoever, could minister Valid Baptism, for where there is Valid Baptism there is most certainly a Church; because, Baptism is Our Admission *into the Church*: And so, without Priests, there would be a Church, which is contrary to this Father. St. *Ferom* do's here therefore Null all pretended Baptism by Persons that are *Not Priests*, because [according to him] where there is No Priest there is No Church; and certainly if there is No Church (*i. e.* where there is No Priest) there is No Baptism: And if no Baptism, then the pretended Baptisms of such **No Priests**, are Null and Void, if this Father may be suppos'd to be Consistent with himself in this and the rest of his Assertions against the *Luciferian* Schismatick.

We have seen, in the Course of this *Dialogue*, that St. *Ferom* made a Slip, when he said, That in Cases of Necessity 'twas lawful for Laicks to Baptize; we have observ'd how inconsistent this is with the whole Scope of his Argument against the Schismaticks, whom he was endeavouring to convert upon Catholick Principles; that it is very odly, and without any Connection, brought into a

* *Ecclesia autem non est, quæ non habet Sacerdotes. S. Hieron. Oper. Tom. IV. adver. Lucif. 302. Paris 1706.*

Discourse of another Nature, and which was made on a quite contrary Principle and Foundation. It is also plain, from what has been largely said before, Page 121, &c. that this of the Lawfulness of Laicks baptizing, was not the then general Sense and Practice of the Church; and that let it be taken in what tolerable Sense it will, our Lay-Baptisms receive no Countenance from it: And lastly, That the very Foundation, upon which St. *Jerom* supposes Laicks Baptism to be Lawful, is false in Fact, and dangerous to other Sacred Institutions, as well as to that of Baptism; and therefore upon the whole we may venture to say, That if our Reverend Historian had but thoroughly read over, and duly consider'd St. *Jerom's* Dialogue, he might have been convinced that he had no reason to censure [as he do's] Two such Excellent and Learned Men as Dr. *Forbes*, and Mr. *Reeves*, and in so publick a Manner too, [in his 33d and 34th Pages] as guilty of Error and Mistake, for affirming, That "*after the Council of Nice, this Proposition, that those, whom a Laick Baptizeth, are to be re-baptiz'd, was look'd upon to be so true, that it was the undoubted Principle whereby the Orthodox confuted the Luciferians.*" For by the Dialogue we plainly see that it was so; and it is to be wonder'd how it comes to pass, that one so well vers'd "*in Greek and Latin Fathers*" as our Reverend Historian is, do's not see it too.

Mr. *Bingham* says, pag. 34. "*Who that reads these Words [viz. after the Council of Nice, &c.] in these Learned Writers [i. e. Dr. Forbes, and Mr. Reeves] would not at first sight be tempted to think, that the Council of Nice had somewhere made an Order, that Persons baptiz'd by Lay-men should be re-baptiz'd; and that the Catholicks gene-*"
 rally

“ rally made use of this, as an undoubted Principle,
 “ to confute the Luciferians? ” What a strange In-
 finuation is this, against the Ingenuity and Integri-
 ty of those Two Learned Gentlemen! Would Mr.
Bingham take it kindly to be serv'd thus him-
 self? I appeal to his own Conscience, whether he
 himself believes, that those *Excellent* Persons had
 any such design in their Words, as to make the
 World believe, that the Council of *Nice* made such
 an Order. Who but the Careless, &c. would, in
 reading those Learned Mens Words, “ be at first sight
 “ tempted to think ” any such thing? If Men,
 “ at first sight, ” are apt to be heedless, let 'em look
 again, and then they'll find that, as second Thoughts
 are often best, so is a second Inspection. Mr. *Bing-*
ham knows, that before his Scholastical History
 came forth, there were Men, who pleaded the Au-
 thority of “ *Ancient Catholick Tradition* ” for the
 Validity of Lay-Baptism, particularly the corrupt
 Church of *Rome*, and others, tho' not of her Com-
 munion, yet *so far* however agreeing with her in
Popery: He knows that the Plea of Antiquity is
 a very powerful Motive, to cause some Men to be-
 lieve Doctrines and Practices; Dr. *Forbes* and
 Mr. *Reeves*, no doubt, had an eye to this, in the
 Question of Lay-Baptism; and they have prov'd
 to the World, that the pretended Validity of Bap-
 tism by Lay-men, was not so old a Doctrine as
 some Men represent it: The particular Instance here
 produc'd by them, shews, that even after the first
 300 Years of Christianity, it was not known
 in the general Sense and Practice of the Church,
 but that the very contrary was held by the Catho-
 licks in the Fourth Century; because, when the
Luciferian Schismatics separated themselves from
 the Communion of the Church, which they did
 “ after

“ after the Council of Nice ” [held A. C. 325.] The Orthodox confuted those *Luciferians* by this “ *undoubted Principle, that those, whom a Laick Baptizeth, are to be re-baptiz’d.* ” This *St. Jerom* asserted so late, as, in the Year 384, long after the Council of Nice. This the *Luciferian* Schismatick could not gainsay, but submitted to it, as is evident from the before-mentioned *Dialogue*— And this being “ after the Council of Nice, ” ’twas highly reasonable for those Learned Men to say, That ’twas so ; because thereby we may discover, not only the Novelty of the Notion of Lay-Baptisms being Valid, but also, that [notwithstanding the * Council of *Nice* had decreed, that the Orders of the *Novatian* Schismaticks were good and valid yet] the Orthodox did not believe any thing done that Council could favour the Validity of Lay-Baptisms, tho’ some of the Favourers of those false Baptisms might, from this Council’s Act about the *Novatian* Schismaticks, falsly infer the Validity of such Baptisms, since ’tis notorious that some reckon (as *Mr. Bingham* very well knows) Lay-Baptism, and the Ancient Schismatical Baptism, to be much of the same Nature ; but of this more hereafter. And these may be the Reasons why those Excellent Writers say, and that very truly too, That “ † after the Council of Nice, this Proposition, “ that those, whom a Laick Baptizeth, are to be re-baptized ; was look’d upon to be so true, that it “ was the undoubted Principle, whereby the Orthodox “ confuted the *Luciferians.* ” But for a further

* Canon 8.

† *Forbes’s Instruct. Histor. Lib. 10. Cap. 14. N. 5.*
Reeves’s Note on Vincentius Lirin. p. 263.

Vindication of those Two Learned and Judicious Writers, I refer the Reader to the Reverend and Learned Dr. *Bret*, who has abundantly prov'd Mr. *Bingham*, and not those Excellent Persons, to be mistaken in this Matter, as may be seen in that Learned Doctor's "*Enquiry into the Judgment and Practice of the Primitive Church, in relation to Persons being Baptiz'd by Lay-men,*" from pag. 30, to 40.

§ XXVIII. *St. Augustin* comes next under our Consideration. Mr. *Bingham* says of him thus, in pag. 34. He "was Co-temporary with *St. Jerom*,
" and of the same Opinion with him in this Mat-
" ter. In his Epistle to *Fortunatus*, which is pre-
" serv'd in **Gratian*, he says, *In time of Necessity,*
" *when a Bishop or Presbyter, or other Minister,*
" *could not be found, and a Man desir'd Baptism,*
" *who was in danger of Death, in that case Lay-*
" **men were used to give him that Sacrament**
" *which they had receiv'd, rather than he should end*
" *his Life without it.*"

But in Answer to this, it is to be observ'd, That Mr. *Bingham*, in translating this Passage, is more positive, and thereby induces his *English* Reader to believe, much more than the *Latin* will allow; for according to this Translation, it looks as if *St. Augustin* assur'd us, That 'twas Matter of Fact, that in such a "*Case, Lay-men were used to Give that Sacrament,*" &c. whereas, in truth, it was to *St. Augustin* himself a *Hear-say* only: He do's not tell this, as if himself were an Evidence of the Truth of it, but that it was *reported* so; his

* Ap. Gratian de Consecrat. Dist. 4. Cap. 21.

Words are these, as Mr. *Bingham* has 'em in his Margin : “ *In Necessitate, cum ——— urget periculum ejus qui petit, ne sine isto Sacramento hanc vitam fineat, etiam Laicos solere dare Sacramentum quod acceperunt, Solemus Audire. We use to Hear, that, In time of Necessity, &c. Laymen are used to give that Sacrament,*” &c. St. *Augustin*, [if those are his Words] do's not say, (as Mr. *Bingham* represents it) That Lay-men were us'd to give that Sacrament ; but only gives us to understand, that there us'd to be such Reports. Now what does this signifie, towards clearing the Matter we are enquiring after ? If such Reports were spread Abroad, and came to St. *Augustin*'s Ear ; do's it therefore follow, that the Thing reported was true, and that it was also the *General Sense and Practice* of the Church ? Must we have no better Proofs for her *General Sense and Practice*, than such Hear-say Stories ? If Mr. *Bingham* do's not give us better Evidence than this, the World will easily see through the Falacy : And 'tis very unaccountable, for a Man of that Gentleman's Character and Function, to make his *English* Reader believe, that St. *Augustin* himself says (in this Place) that Lay-men did Baptize ; when in truth he only says, “ *We use to Hear*” so.

But our Reverend Historian goes on, and tells us from *Gratian*, That “ This Custom St. *Augustin* **found**s upon Authority, descended by Bishops from the Apostles ; for in the same * Epistle he

* Ap. *Gratian de Consecrat. Dist. 4. Cap. 36. Sanctum est Eaptisma per se ipsum, quod datum est in Nomine Patris, & Filii, & Spiritus Sancti: Ita ut in eodem Sacramento sit etiam auctoritas Traditionis per Dominum nostrum ad Apostolos, per illos autem ad Episcopos, & alios sacerdotes, vel etiam Laicos Christianos ab eadem Origine & Stirpe venientes.*

[i. e. *St. Augustin*] says, “*Baptism is Holy in it self,*
 “*if it be given In the Name of the Father, Son, and*
 “*Holy-Ghost : And there is in this Sacrament the*
 “*Authority of the Commission, which our Saviour*
 “*gave to the Apostles, and by them to Bishops, and*
 “*other Priests, and even to Lay-men descending from*
 “*the same Stock and Original.*” This Translation
 do's not give the full, plain Sense of the Words, as
Gratian has transcrib'd them; they ought rather
 to be translated thus, that the *English* Reader may
 see the true Meaning of them: “*Baptism is Holy*
 “*in it self, if it be given In the Name of the Father,*
 “*Son, and Holy Ghost ; [Ita ut in eodem Sacra-*
 “*mento sit etiam Auctoritas, &c.] So that there*
 “*be also in this Sacrament, the Authority of the*
 “*Commission which our Saviour gave to the Apostles,*
 “*and by them to Bishops and other Priests, and even*
 “*to Christian Lay-men descending from the same Stock*
 “*and Original.*” This Passage shews, that the
 Baptism which is *Holy in it self*, must not only be
 given in the Name of the Trinity, but must also
 have the **Authority of Christ's Commission.**
 Now if this Commission was really given to *Chri-*
stian Lay-men by the Apostles, as *Gratian* here
 makes *St. Augustin* suppose it was, (tho' *St. Au-*
gustin never did prove any such thing, nor indeed
 any other Writer whatsoever, either before or after
 him;) I say, supposing Lay-men could really have
 this Commission; yet still 'tis notorious, that Our
 Lay-men about whom we Dispute, never had any
 such Commission at all; and therefore, whatsoever
 may be pleaded from this Passage, for Baptisms
 by such *supposedly-Commission'd Lay-men*, can no-
 ways be apply'd to the pretended Baptisms per-
 form'd by our *Laicks, who have not the least ap-*
 L pearance

pearance of any such *supposed* Commission ever given to them.

To this may be added another Passage which *Gratian* attributes to *St. Augustin*; * “*Baptism is not such as he is who ministers it, but such as He is [i.e. Christ] by whose Power and Authority it is given,*” &c. From hence it follows, that the pretended Baptism given by our Laicks is no *Christian Baptism*, because it is not perform’d by *Christ’s Power and Authority*: He by whose Authority they give it, is nothing but a common *unconsecrated Person*: Such as he is, such is the pretended Baptism they give; therefore ’tis Nothing but a common Washing, because he is Nothing but a common Person: For our Laicks pretended Power and Authority, is receiv’d by them from No One whatsoever, that is consecrated to give them a valid Power; and consequently their Washings perform’d by Authority of an unconsecrated common Person, are Not Christian Baptism, but common Washings only. But to proceed,

Mr. Bingham, in his 35th and 36th Pages, next tells us out of *Gratian*, that *St. Augustin* “*relates a Story of a certain Catechumen, who being at Sea, and in danger of being cast away in a Storm, was baptiz’d by a Penitent, because there was no other Christian in the Ship with them;*” and that *St. Augustin* concludes upon it, “*That tho’ such a Fact had not happen’d, yet it was a Case that every*

* Baptismus talis est, qualis ille est in cuius potestate datur, non qualis est ille per cuius ministerium datur. Augustin super Joannem in parte prima, *Tract. 5. ad Cap. 1.* apud Gratian de Consecrat. *Dist. 4. Cap. xxvi.*

“ one must own might happen; and then No One
 “ could say, that in such a Case a Man who desired
 “ Baptism in imminent danger of Death, was to be
 “ deserted, and left unbaptiz'd.

But to do justice to this Passage, and to the Reader too, I will give him a little further insight into the Credit of this *supposed Fact*, than our Reverend Historian has thought fit to do: It is then very true, that *Gratian* makes *St. Augustin* relate such a Story; but 'tis also as true, that the same *Gratian* makes *St. Augustin* say of this Story thus,
 “ * If any one refuses to believe what I have related,
 “ (for it is not founded on Authority of the Holy
 “ Scriptures, but reported by an unknown doubt-
 “ ful Author) I will not thwart him.” This plainly discovers that *St. Augustin* himself, [if he did relate such a Story] had no Foundation whereon to rely for the Truth of it; 'twas by his own Confession *only a Report*, and the Author of it **Not Known**, therefore not to be depended on: He did not think it to be of such Importance as to be insisted on; no, he would not Oppose any One that refus'd to believe it: So that, here we are amus'd with a Story of *No Moment*, a Thing only in the Air, of no weight, but a *very Trifle*, not worth our Notice. *St. Augustin* is made, however, to say, that this “ was a Case that every one

* Quod si forte hoc quod narravi, &c. — Non vult aliquis credere (non enim hoc Scripturarum Divinarum auctoritas, sed incerto auctore fama commendat) non repugnabo: sed interrogabo, si tale aliquid contingat, quid futurum est? Non enim potest quisquam dicere relinquendum esse illum qui morte imminente baptizari desiderat. Quem Baptizatum à pœnitente quisquis non credit Contigisse oportet ut Credat posse contrahere. Apud *Gratian de Con'ecrat. Dist. 4. Cap. 26.*

“*must own might happen;*” and what then? What signifies the Possibility of such a Case? Our Inquiry is after *Matters of Fact*, attested to by the Ancient Catholick Church. A Thousand ridiculous Cases are possible to happen; nay, some, (as we find by Experience) which are Superstitious even to a degree of Madness and Distraction, have happen'd; and some Popish Writers, &c. are full of Relations of such Accidents. But the Consequences and Inferences which are rais'd from 'em are not always *just* and good, but frequently *false*, and *repugnant* to the Laws both of God and Man.

Our suppos'd St. *Augustin* says, “*If any thing like this should happen, No One can say, that in such a Case, a Man who desires Baptism in imminent danger of Death, is to be deserted and left unbaptiz'd.*” This is very true, he ought not to be deserted, by those who have the *Power of Giving him Baptism*; but if there are none present, and no other to be procured, but Lay-hands, such as *never receiv'd the Power of Giving Baptism*, then 'tis Nonsense to say, that he is deserted by them who have it not in their Power to give him what he wants; [and to say that *Necessity* gives them this Power, is begging the Question] so that, if he dies unbaptiz'd, he is not *Deserted* and *Left unbaptiz'd*, but he is **taken away** unbaptiz'd. If in a desert Place I see a miserable Object, a Man dangerously wounded by Robbers, and wallowing in his Blood, ready to Expire; I search his Wound, and find it so large, as that 'tis out of my Power to close it up, or stop the Blood from issuing out of it; I can only Sympathize with the poor Man in his miserable desperate Case, and send up my Prayers to God for his departing Soul: He in this
Case

Case is not *forsaken* by me, tho' he dies without that Relief which he wanted, and which I had not at all in my Power to administer to him. Or, suppose, which is a just Parallel to the Case before us; A Christian, who never receiv'd the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper, upon the near Approach of Death, fears that he shall not be saved without it, and therefore with vehement Cries and Tears begs of me to procure him the Reception of it. We are very remote from any Place where Priests are to be had, and after all Diligence us'd, none can be procured to give it him; he is assur'd of this, but yet continues unsatisfied, and earnestly desires me to give it him, believing that in this Case it will be the same thing; I tell him 'tis utterly out of my Power, mine is an ineffective Hand, I never was vested with Christ's Authority, and therefore he would receive Nothing from me but Common, *Not Sacramental* Bread and Wine; however, I assist him with my charitable Prayers, &c. and he dies without receiving what I had no Power to give: 'Tis certain, the Man is not *Deserted* and *Left*, without the Sacrament, by me; God took him away from it, and to his most wise Disposal he must be left, as must all such unbaptiz'd Persons we are now speaking of; and if our suppos'd *St. Augustin* reckon'd, that, rather than leave them thus to God, any Christian present, had better minister Water to them, with the Form, In the Name of the Trinity; It is certain, that he only spoke dogmatically, giving but his own private Opinion in such a Case; for he refers us to no Law, no Canon, nor Custom of the Catholick Church for such a Practice.

Thus far may suffice in Answer to the Passages Mr. *Bingham* has produced out of *Gratian*, "a

“ Monk, who frequently quotes spurious * Books, as the genuine Writings of the Fathers:” And whose Authority, with relation to these Passages, is therefore so little to be rely’d on, that even our Reverend Historian himself intimates, that they may be question’d; and therefore, as not relying on them, he gives us a Quotation out of St. *Augustin’s* genuine Works, and says, pag. 36. “ But “ if any one thinks these Passages doubtful, because “ they are only related by *Gratian*, he may read “ the same in St. *Augustin’s* undoubted Works. In “ his Books against *Parmenian* the *Donatist*, he uses “ this Argument to prove, that the Baptism of “ Hereticks ought not to be repeated, viz. † *Be- “ cause, tho’ it be but a Lay-man that gives Baptism “ to a Man in extream Necessity, when he is ready “ to Perish; he cannot think any one can piously “ say, that it ought to be repeated. If it be done “ without Necessity, it is indeed an Usurpation “ of another Man’s Office; but if he be compell’d by “ Necessity, it is either no Fault at all, or but a very “ light one.*” This is Mr. *Bingham’s* Translation of St. *Augustin’s* Words; wherein ’tis very remarkable, that our Reverend Historian says of that Father, “ **He cannot think any one can piously say,** “ &c.” whereas in Truth, St. *Augustin’s* Words are, [“ **Nescio an pie quisquam dixerit esse repe- “ tendum**] **I know not whether any One can pi- “ ously say that it ought to be repeated.**” The

* Dr. *Bett’s* Enquiry into the Judgment and Practice of the Primitive Church, in relation to Persons baptiz’d by Lay-men, p. 42.

† *Augustin. Contra Epistol. Parmen. lib. 2. C. 13. Et si Laicus aliquis pereunti dederit, necessitate Compulsus, quod cum ipse acciperet dandum esse addidit, nescio an pie quisquam dixerit esse repetendam, &c.*

whole Passage then [to come as near as I can to Mr. Bingham's Translation, without doing any Violence to the Sense of St. *Augustin's* Words] is this, "If a Lay-man, Compell'd by Necessity, should give Baptism to a Man that is ready to Perish, &c. I know not whether any one can piously say, that it ought to be repeated. If it be done without Necessity, it is indeed an Usurpation of another Man's Office; but if he be compell'd by Necessity, it is either no Fault at all, or but a very Light One." Now in this Passage, thus set to rights, 'tis worthy our Observation.

First, That St. *Augustin* here speaks Dogmatically, giving his own private Opinion only, and not the Lawful Sense and Practice of the Church: He only puts a Case, that if a Lay-man should so baptize; he do's not relate any *Matter of Fact* of a Lay-man's having done so, and of its being agreeable to the Sense and Practice of the Church, but, like a Casuist, supposes if such a thing should happen; and then he resolves upon it with a great deal of Hesitancy, as one not sufficiently inform'd what should be done in such a Case; "I know not [says he] whether any one can piously say, that [such a Baptism] ought to be repeated." I know not, is strange Language, about an Undoubted Lawful Determination of the Church: If she had determin'd the Unlawfulness of Repeating such a Baptism, sure St. *Augustin* would have known of this; and if such a Determination had been Pious, then sure St. *Augustin* must have call'd it Impious, to have said, "That such a Baptism ought to be repeated." But instead of any thing like this, for him to say [*Nescio an pie quisquam dixerit*] I know not whether any one can piously say so; plainly shews that he did not know, that it was

contrary to Piety to say, “*They ought to be repeated* ;” for he that does not know, **Whether** I can *piouſly* ſay a thing, do’s not know that ’tis impious for me to ſay it, becauſe [the Latin word *An*] **Whether**, has always a Reference to two things, and when one of them only is nam’d in a Propoſition, the contrary thereto is always to be underſtood ; as when a Man ſays, **I know not whether** you are an *honest Man*, he plainly means thereby, **I know not** whether you are, or are not an *honest Man* ; thereby ſhewing that he does not know what to determine on either ſide, tho’ ſtill his Partiality to one ſide rather than the other, is evident enough ; and he ſhews that he queſtions the *Honeſty* of the Man, tho’ he is not able to *prove him diſhoneſt*. So here, *St. Auguſtin’s*, “**I know not whether** any one can *piouſly* ſay, that the [ſuppoſed] Baptiſm ought to be repeated ;” muſt mean, that he did not know, whether, on the one Hand, ’twas *Pious*, or on the other Hand, *contrary to Piety* to ſay ſo : His Partiality, ’tis true, is plain enough, that he queſtions the *Piety* of ſaying that ſuch a Baptiſm ought to be repeated ; but then he plainly ſhews [by his *I know not whether*, &c.] that he was not able to prove it a Contradiſtion to *Piety*, to ſay that it ought to be repeated : From whence ’tis evident that *St. Auguſtine* did not know, that it was at that Time the *Pious* Lawful Senſe and Practice of the Church, to call ſuch pretended Baptiſms, the *One Chriſtian Baptiſm*, which ought not to be Repeated ; for if he had known ſo, inſtead of ſaying, *I know not whether* any One can *piouſly* ſay they ought to be repeated, he might have confidently affirm’d, “*I know that* ’tis not **Pious** to ſay ſo.” But we ſee, that this Fa-
ther

ther did not venture to be thus Positive, but Hesi-
tates, and speaks of it in doubtful Terms, which
he does not use to do when he speaks of the *Gene-
ral Sense and Practice of the Catholick Church*; for
then he is Clear, Express, and Positive enough;
thus for Example, The then **Catholick Practice*, of
allowing the Validity of Heretical and Schisma-
tical Baptisms in the Name of the Trinity, per-
form'd in Separation from the Church, is Plain-
ly, and Fully, and Positively affirm'd by him, to
have been *Search'd and Inquir'd into, Consider'd,*
*Perfected, Confirm'd and Establish'd, with the Con-
sent and Agreement of the whole [Christian] World.*
But nothing like this, has he, or could he have
said in all his Works in behalf of *usurped Lay-
Baptisms*; and therefore we may conclude, that he
knew of *No Pious, Lawful Sense and Practice of the
Catholick Church*, in favour of the Validity of such
pretended Baptisms, which is further Confirm'd
by the other Observation upon this Passage of his,
viz.

Secondly, That he plainly shews, he cannot clear
such Usurpations from the Guilt of Sin: He says,
of a Lay-man's being supposedly *Compell'd by Ne-
cessity*, to baptize, "*that it is either no Fault at
all, or but a very light one.*" Now if it had
been agreeable to the then *General Pious Sense and
Practice* of the Church, 'tis reasonable to believe
that he would have known it to be so; and then

* De iis verò qui ab Ecclesiæ unitate separati sunt, nulla jam
quæstio est, quin & habeant & dare Possunt, & quin perniciose
habeant, pernicioseque tradant extra vinculum pacis. Hoc
enim jam in ipsa totius orbis unitate discussum, consideratum,
perfectum atque firmatum est. S. August. Contra Epist. Parmen.
Lib. 2. C. xiii. Sess. 30. Tom. 9. p. 45. Paris 1694.

without any Hesitancy, he might have said, it is not only *no Fau't at all*, but a *commendable Pious Action*, arising from a well inform'd Judgment, and due Sense of Duty; but *St. Augustin*, as knowing of no such *General Sense and Practice of the Church*, tells us, that *either 'tis no Fault at all*, or else but a *Light One*. Who can believe that this Saint would have allow'd the *Pious General Sense and Practice of the Church*, to be any Sin at all, of how small a sort soever? No, this is not the Language of an Evidence of the Church's *General Pious Sense and Practice*; and is therefore no more than his own private Opinion, which has nothing to do with our present Enquiry.

Mr. *Bingham*, in his 43d Page, produces another Passage from *St. Augustin*, in favour of Lay-Baptisms, even in ordinary Cases, thus; *St. Augustin's Words are these*, “ * *Though it be usurped without Necessity, and given by any Man to another, that which is given cannot be said not to be given, tho' it may be truly said to be unlawfully given. Therefore the Unlawful Usurpation is to be corrected by a sincere and affectionate Repentance. And if it be not Corrected, that which is given will remain to the Punishment of the Usurper, as well of him who gave it unlawfully, as of him who receiv'd it unlawfully. But yet it cannot be accounted as not given. No devout Soldier ever violates the Royal Stamp, tho' it be usurp'd by private Men: For tho' some by Stealth, and in a Clandestine way, set the Royal Stamp, not to the publick Money, but their own; yet the Money so stamp'd, when they are either*

* *August. Contra Epist. Parmen. Lib. 2. C. xiii.*

“ *punish'd, or pardon'd for their Offence, having the*
 “ *Royal Standard upon it, is not defac'd, but brought*
 “ *into the King's Treasury.*” “ Whence (says
 “ *Mr. Bingham, pag. 44.) 'tis plain, He [St. Au-*
 “ *gustin] thought, that Baptism given by Lay-*
 “ *men in Ordinary Cases, which was an Usurpa-*
 “ *tion of the Priest's Office, was not to be repeated.*
 “ And this he asserts in another Place against the
 “ *Donatists; Yet not as the Determination*
 “ *of any General Council, but as his own*
 “ *Opinion;**” “ For “ *he says, If he were a Mem-*
 “ *ber of such a Synod wherein this Question was de-*
 “ *bated, he should not scruple to assert all those to*
 “ *have Baptism, * wheresoever or by whomsoever*
 “ *Baptiz'd, that had receiv'd it in Faith, and without*
 “ *Dissimulation, in that Form of Words which is pre-*
 “ *scrib'd by the Gospel; tho' if they wanted Charity,*
 “ *and were out of the Catholick Church, it would not*
 “ *profit them to Salvation, or any other Spiritual*
 “ *Concerns.*”

Thus we see how far *St. Augustin* was carry'd in the Heat of Dispute against the *Donatists*; for, because they *Re-baptiz'd even the Catholicks*, who had been before validly *Baptiz'd* In the Name of the Trinity, by *Catholick Priests*, [and this they did, upon pretence of their former *Baptisms* being a Pollution, as being defil'd by the *Ministration* of those, whom they call'd *Wicked and Profane*, and for that reason not *Ministers of Jesus Christ*] — Therefore *St. Augustin*, in his Dispute against this Practice of the *Donatists*, ran into the other Extreme, and asserted (as we see in these Passages) That *Baptism* perform'd “ *by any Man whomsoever,*

* *August. de Baptismo, lib. vii. chap. 53.*

“or *wheresoever*,” if done with the Form of Words, In the Name of the Trinity, was good and valid, and not to be repeated : A Latitude so extremely singular, that it allows of Baptism, not only by Christian Lay-men, but even by Apostates, Jews, Turks, Pagans, and all other sorts of Infidels, not only in Cases of Extremity, when Priests are not to be had ; but also in Ordinary Cases, where *they are* or may be present. Such a Liberty is this, that nothing Sacred, no Divine Institution whatsoever can be of any Force upon Mens Consciences, if it should be *universally allow'd of* : And so unwarrantable is the Notion, that Mr. *Bingham* (as I have before observ'd, *pag. 105.*) acknowledges, That Baptism by Jews and Pagans, “*is one of the Novelties of Popery,*” *wholly New,* “and utterly without Precedent in the Primitive Church.” Nay, even in this Place our Reverend Historian confesses, That this of *such Usurped Baptism*, was asserted by St. *Augustin*, “Not as the Determination of any General Council, “But as his own Opinion.” So that it was nothing but St. *Augustin*'s private Opinion, not the *General Sense and Practice of the Church* ; which is the Great Thing we are enquiring after, and which hitherto we cannot discover, by all that Mr. *Bingham*'s *Scholastical History* has yet related.

As for St. *Augustin*, his Reasons for pretended Baptisms, (tho' usurp'd and perform'd by any Man, without Necessity) are none at all ; for he says, “*That which is given, cannot be said not to be given, tho' it may be truly said to be unlawfully given.*” This is plainly a begging of the Question ; for 'tis the thing deny'd : We say, in such Case, Christian Baptism **is not given** at all, and therefore not so much as *unlawfully given* ; let those
who

who are Friends to St. *Augustin's* odd Opinion in this Matter, prove, (what he has not prov'd) That Christian Baptism is really, tho' *unlawfully given*, and we will have done. When Laws are Enacted for making *Conveyances* of Estates, or Privileges to Men; if those Laws require that the Conveyance should be made by the *Sign Manual, and Seal and Delivery*, of the *Principal Owner*, or his *Lawful Attorney*; 'tis false, to say, That the Conveyance is *really and validly* made by a *Cheating Usurper* who is not so *authorized*; no Law will allow this to be a *Valid Conveyance*, no, tho' it was done with all the *other necessary Requisites* of the Law; 'tis an absolute Nullity, and is very parallel to the Case before us. St. *Augustin* brands such pretended Baptisms with the odious Name of **unlawful Usurpations**; and so they justly deserve to be term'd, for they are Usurpations against all the Laws of God, and his Church; and if so, then there is **no Law** whereby to determine them Valid; and they cannot have a Legal Validity, without some Law or other whereby to try their Validity.

He says, "*The unlawful Usurpation is to be corrected, by a sincere and affectionate Repentance.*" This is undoubtedly necessary. But wherein do's this Repentance consist? Repentance must be differently express'd; and its Fruits must be *according to the Nature* of the Sin committed. Confession, Sorrow, Prayer for Pardon, Resolution to do so no more, and Constancy in keeping this Resolution, are not sufficient to constitute "*a sincere and affectionate Repentance*" for some sort of Sins: The Proper and Genuine Work of True Repentance, is, to *undo* (as much as lies in our Power) the Wickedness we have committed. Hence Restitution is necessary, in Cases of *Injustice, Robbery,*

Robbery, and Defamation; and such Usurpations as are made by Persons, who, by all the Laws of God and his Church, are utterly excluded from *sacred Ministrations*, cannot properly be said to be *truly repented of*, without *undoing and making void*, in Fact, as much as we can, the thing which was *endeavoured to be usurped*. Thus, if a Presbyter should wickedly presume *to attempt to Ordain Men* to minister in Holy Things, his Repentance would be but false and spurious, if he did not, to the utmost of his Power, cause those *false Ordinations* to be undone, either by discovering the Persons he had so *pretendedly Ordain'd*, that they might be known not to be in Holy Orders; or else, by endeavouring to cause them to be *validly Ordain'd* by the Bishop, if they are *duly qualified* for Holy Orders. And in this Case, it would not be just, to say *they receiv'd Holy Orders* before, *tho' unlawfully*; for in truth, *they receiv'd them not at all*: This I desire our Episcopal Friends to consider. And as for those who are not entirely Episcopal, but think the Presbyterian Scheme to be as good as that of Episcopacy, [tho' they will never be able to prove it, to be any other, than a very wicked and sacrilegious Usurpation] I ask them, Whether if a Man, whom they esteem to be but a *meer Layman*, should presume to attempt to give Holy Orders; I say, Would such a Man's Repentance for this Sin be sufficient, without discovering (to his power) the Persons he so pretendedly Ordain'd, and endeavouring, either to have them known as Persons *not Ordain'd*, or else to procure them to receive what the Presbyterians call *Valid Orders*? Sure, our Friends to the Presbyterian Scheme will not call this *true Repentance*: And if not, then there is no reason to say, That the wicked Usurpations

tions of Persons pretending to Baptize, who never were Commission'd, are duly repented of, without their endeavouring to procure Baptism by a *Valid Commission*, to be given to those whom they, in their wicked Usurpations, did but *pretendedly baptize* before; for the same reason that holds for one, will hold for this other also.

St. *Augustin* says farther, concerning such a Usurpation, "If it be not corrected [i. e. by Repentance,]" "that which is given will remain to the Punishment of the Usurper, as well of him who gave it unlawfully, as of him who receiv'd it unlawfully; but yet it cannot be accounted as not given." Still begging the Question, that Baptism is given in these Cases: And it may as justly be said, that Holy Orders are given in the other Case I put above. The *Usurper's* Repentance I have already spoken of; and if he does not truly repent of and correct his Usurpation, his usurped Act will remain to his Punishment, (says St. *Augustin*.)

I am now to see what must be the Repentance of the *supposed Receiver*; and that is already discovered, by the Repentance of the *pretended Giver*: For as this latter, in the Case of a False Ordination, was bound to endeavour the Discovery of the Falsly-Ordain'd Persons, that they might be known as not Ordain'd, and so receive *Valid Ordination*; So, the Receiver of those False Orders, must repent of, and correct what was *pretendedly received* by him; he must not claim the *Privileges and Prerogatives* due to *Valid Holy Orders*; and if he would enjoy them, he must disclaim all pretended Right to them as due by *virtue of the Counterfeit Ordination*, and must receive Valid Orders from such as have Power to give them. Even so
the

the Receivers of these *pretended Baptisms*, if they *must repent* of their Part in the Usurpation, must necessarily acknowledge, that they have acquir'd *no Right* to the Privileges of a *Valid Baptism*, by virtue of the *Usurped Act*: The Usurped Act was Unlawful, with respect to *all the Laws* of God and his Church; therefore his Repentance must be such, as to express his *actual Obedience to those Laws*: He do's not shew *such Obedience to*, but even actual Rebellion against those Laws, while *he claims* (by virtue of a Usurper's Act, in Opposition to all those Laws) the same Privileges as are Conferr'd by others whom those Laws do *authorize* to Conferr them; this is making the *Usurpation* to be only a *Circumstantial Fault*, when in truth 'tis also an *Essential one*, by reason of its *Contrariety* to the Essential Law of the Institution; as I humbly hope I have prov'd * in another Place; and therefore, Repentance for it, as a Fault against a *Circumstantial Law only*, when 'tis in truth, a Rebellion against *all Law whatsoever*, as well *Essential* as *Circumstantial*, is a continuing the Usurpation in a very great degree; and the Demanding of Privileges by *virtue thereof*, is in some sort an Equalizing its *pretended Legality*, with the Lawfulness of the *Commission'd Acts*, and so a False and Counterfeit Repentance. The Penitent then, must wave his *pretended Right* to the Privileges of a Commission'd Baptism; and seek for them, by endeavouring to procure Baptism from those who are *Commission'd* to give it him; and this his *Endeavour*, shews his sincere Repentance for *his part in the Usurpation*; and then, what was pretendedly given to him before, being now forsaken by him,

* *Lay-Baptism Invalid.*

will not “remain to his Punishment,” as *St. Augustin* says it will, if the *Utiurpation* “be not corrected by a sincere and affectionate Repentance.”

As for *St. Augustin's* Simile about unlawful Coining of Money, I have answer'd it long since in * another Book to which the Reader is refer'd: And I have insisted thus long on *St. Augustin's* Notions, which he advanc'd in Defence of *Lay-Utiurpations*; because (as I have proved) they were only his own private Opinions, and not the Sense of the *Ancient Catholick Church*: And because I find some † Men of Character among our selves, have copy'd these Notions from him, without so much as producing any Argument to support them, whose Great Names are notwithstanding (in the Opinion of some Men) sufficient to recommend them to be receiv'd as good and wholesome Doctrines, I shall therefore, from the Learned *Du Pin*, conclude all that I have to say of the Great *St. Augustin*, by shewing the Reader, that He was not wholly free from introducing Novelty in Religion; and that the *Latin Fathers* after him, copy'd his Principles, and follow'd him, as their great Leader and Guide, in Matters of Divinity. — *Du Pin's* Words are these: || “He [*i. e.* *St. Augustin*] “starts several Questions never thought of before, and resolves many of them by the meer strength of his Wit. He often left the Notions of his Predecessors, to follow a Path wholly New, whether in Expounding the Scripture, or in Opinions of Divinity. That

* *Dissenters and other Unauthoriz'd Baptisms Null and Void, &c.*

† *Appendix to the Bishop of Oxford's Charge, Anno 1712.*

|| *Du Pin's Eccles. Hist. Cent. V. pag. 206, 207. Lond.*

“ may be said of him as to Divinity, which Cicero
 “ said of himself as to Philosophy, That he was
 “ **Magnus Opinator,**” — [A great Opini-
 niator.] — “ He framed (if we may so say)
 “ the Body of Divinity for all the Latin Fathers that
 “ came after him. They have not only taken out of
 “ his Books the Principles they make use of, but
 “ often they have only copied them.” So that it will
 be no wonder, to find some of the Latin Writers
 after him, asserting the same as he did, in behalf
 of Lay-Baptisms: But all that he has said, a-
 mounts to no Evidence, that Baptism by Persons
 never Commission’d, was Good and Valid, in the
General Sense and Practice of the Ancient Church.
 And as for his own Opinions in this Matter, they
 stand upon such weak Foundations, (as has been
 already prov’d) that they are of no Importance
 to our present Enquiry.

§ XXIX. *Gelasius* Bishop of Rome, Anno 492.
 is Mr. Bingham’s next supposed Evidence: Our
 Reverend Historian tells us, pag. 36. That this
 Bishop, in his Epistle to the Bishops of *Lucania,*
Brutia, and *Sicily,* * “ *Restrains the Office of Bap-*
 “ *tizing in Ordinary Cases to Bishops and Presbyters*
 “ *only; excluding Deacons from it, except in Cases*
 “ *of Extreme Necessity, when the Superior Ministers*
 “ *were absent: In which Cases, it was often al-*
 “ *low’d to Lay-Christians to perform it.*” And
 the Inference that Mr. Bingham draws from hence,
 is this; “ So that Lay-men had as much Autho-
 “ rity to perform it in the Absence of Deacons,
 “ as Deacons had to do it in the Absence of
 “ the Presbyters and Bishop.”

* *Gelas. Epist. 9. ad Episcop. Lucan. cap. 9.*

But in Answer to this, 1st, Mr. *Bingham* has not prov'd, neither can he prove, That the Apostles ever Authoriz'd Lay-men to Baptize at all; and he cannot deny, but acknowledges that they did Authorize Deacons: So that, by Apostolick Institution, Deacons had Authority to Baptize in Absence of the *Superior Orders*; which Authority, in Absence of the Deacons, appears never to have been given by the Apostles to *Lay-men*. 2^{dly}, He has not prov'd, That the **Ancient Catholick Church** gave Authority to Lay-men to Baptize in absence of the Deacons; and 'tis notorious, that it was the Office of the Deacons to do this in absence of the Bishops and Presbyters. From which Considerations 'tis evident, that Mr. *Bingham's* Inference from *Gelasius* is a Mistake, when he says, That "*Lay-men had as much Authority to [Bap- tize] in the absence of Deacons, as Deacons had to do it in the absence of the Presbyters and Bishops*"; for Lay-men never were so Authoriz'd by the Apostles, or by the Ancient Catholick Church, as Deacons were. And now let us enquire into the Force of what *Gelasius* himself says about Lay-mens Baptizing.

We are seeking for the *General Sense and Practice of the Ancient Catholick Church*, 1st, In respect to Lay-mens Baptizing, by virtue of a suppos'd Authority given to them; and 2^{dly}, In relation to Baptism by Persons, who never were at all Commission'd for that Purpose.

As for the First, *Gelasius's* Words point out nothing whereby we can discover any such *general Sense and Practice of the Church*; he refers us to *no general Council*, no Catholick constant Tradition from the Apostles Days, whereon to found the *Authority of Lay-men*:—He says only of Baptizing

when extreme Necessity compels [by reason of the Absence of the Clergy] that [*“Laicis Christianis facere plerumque conceditur :”*] It is often [or sometimes] **granted to Lay-men to perform it.** This do's not determine **who** they were that **granted** this, nay more, it shews, that even then it was **not always** granted; and it is therefore impossible from hence to conclude, that it was the *ancient Catholick Church's Grant*; and if it was not hers, 'tis no matter whose it was else. It may be *Gelasius* himself, or some of his *late Predecessors*, Bishops of *Rome*, made this *Grant* to impower some of their *own Lay-men* for such Cases, as the *Spanish Bishops* in the Council of *Eliberis* had done before them; or else it may be, that *Gelasius* only points at what those *Spanish Bishops* had done: But whether it be one, or the other, or both of these, it amounts to nothing but the Practice of *some particular Bishops*, not of the *ancient Catholick Church*: Nay further, if this had been (as it certainly was not) the *ancient Church's general Sense and Practice*, yet this Passage of *Gelasius* would not have been an Evidence, that pretended Baptism, by Persons *never commission'd* to Baptize, was the *general Sense and Practice of the Church*. For,

Secondly, His saying, *“It is granted to Lay-Christians ;”* plainly shews, that they had not the Authority and Power in themselves as Lay-Christians: For the Thing **granted** was not in their Power before 'twas **granted**; if it was, then it was **no Grant**, and it would have been a meer Jest to talk of **granting a Power** to Lay-Christians, if they had it in themselves without such a **Grant**: Lay-Christians, as such therefore, had no such Power, because *Gelasius* says it was *granted* to them. Consequently, *if they could have such a*
Power

Power conferr'd on them, this would not prove any thing in Behalf of those, who evidently *have it not*, and *indeed never had it*; which is the Case of *our Laicks*, against whose pretended Baptisms we are now disputing. And therefore *Gelasius* is no Evidence for any Validity in such *spurious Baptisms*.

§ XXX. *Isidore*, Bishop of *Sevil* in *Spain*, about one hundred Years after *Gelasius*, viz. *Anno 595*. is *Mr. Bingham's* next suppos'd Evidence, *pag. 37*. And our Reverend Historian gives us that Bishop's Words thus: * “ *It is unlawful either for private Men, or the inferior Clergy, [Clericis sine Gradu] (who were Lay-men,) to Baptize; for the Office belongs only to Priests. We read in the Gospel that it was given by Commission to no other but the Apostles; Jesus after his Resurrection, saying unto them, as my Father hath sent me, so send I you; And when he had said this he breathed on them, saying, Receive ye the Holy Ghost. Whosoever Sins ye remit, they are remitted unto them; and whosoever Sins ye retain, they are retain'd. And in another Place, Go Teach all Nations, Baptizing them In the Name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost. Whence it is manifest, that the Ministry of Baptism was committed only to Priests; nor is it lawful for Deacons themselves to perform the Mystery without a Bishop or a Presbyter: Except in their Absence, the extreme Necessity of Sicknes compels them to do it. In which Case also Lay-Christians are often permitted to do it; lest any one should be called*

* *Isidor. de Offic. Ecclesiast. Lib. 2. c. 24.*

“*out of the World without the Remedy or Means of Salvation.*” This is Mr. Bingham’s last Evidence in this Matter. And now we will examine to what purpose ’tis in our present Dispute.

And first, *Isidore* founds the Power of Baptizing upon the Commission given to the Apostles: So far we are agreed. Secondly, He hence infers, That “*the Ministry of Baptism was committed only to Priests.*” Now if by Priests he means only *Bishops* and *Presbyters*, *Isidore* himself was mistaken; for that Ministry was given also by the Apostles to *Deacons*, as Mr. Bingham himself has very justly observ’d; see *p. 3.* of his *Scholastical History*. Consequently, by the Divine Law, ’twas Lawful for *Deacons* to Baptize. But, Thirdly, *Isidore* says, It is not “*Lawful for Deacons themselves to perform the Mystery* [*Mysterium—explere absque Episcopis vel Presbyteris*] or rather to perfect the Mystery, “*without the Bishops or Presbyters: Except, in their Absence, the extreme Necessity of Sickness compel them to do it.*” This was a Matter of Order only, as it is now in our Church, that *Deacons* should give way to *Bishops* and *Presbyters*, their Superiors, and not presume to take place of them, but only Baptize in their Absence: Therefore, when *Isidore* says, ’tis not Lawful for them to Baptize, &c. He cannot be suppos’d to reckon them but equal to *Laicks*; for ’tis plain, that the Apostles gave them Power to Baptize, *which they did not give to Laicks*. And therefore their Exercise of that Power, in an irregular Circumstance, when *Bishops* and *Presbyters* were present, or might be had, tho’ it was unlawful, yet it was not so with respect to the Essence of the Commission, as if they never had receiv’d any Commission at all; but ’twas only unlawful with respect to the Circumstance of Order: It being
a stand-

a standing Law of the Church, that Deacons should act in Subordination to Bishops and Presbyters, and give way to them in Sacred Ministrations. *Fourthly*, His telling us of the Power of Baptizing in want of the Clergy [*Quod & Laicis fidelibus plerumque permittitur, &c.*] That “it is often [or sometimes] “permitted [allow’d or granted] to Lay-Christians to Baptize, lest any one should be call’d out of the World without the Remedy or Means of Salvation;” is still confining the Power of Baptizing to a suppos’d Commission to be first receiv’d, and abundantly shews, that Lay-Christians have not that Power in themselves as Christians, but it must be acquir’d by an *explicit Permission or Grant*; so that, if such a Commission *could be given* to Lay-Christians, yet even then, this Passage would not favour the Washings perform’d by our Laicks, *who never had any Commission at all*. And further, here is no Evidence that Lay-men were in *the general Sense and Praëctice of the Church* impower’d to Baptize in Absence of the Clergy. *Isidore* appeals to *no general Council, or uninterrupted ancient Catholick Tradition or Praëctice*: And being a *Spanish Bishop*, ’tis just and reasonable to believe, that he only has an eye to the Praëctice of the *Spanish Church*, in Consequence of their Council of *Eliberis*, which was *no general Council*, and determin’d nothing relating to Washings by Persons who *never were commission’d to Baptize*.

As for some Mens particular Opinions about the Minister of Baptism, ’tis no wonder that [especially after *St. Augustin’s Days*] they ran such unaccountable Lengths, as at last to reckon, that ’twas no matter who perform’d it, so that ’twas done with Water and Invocation of the Holy Trinity; for they follow’d the Opinion of that Father, That Water,

and the Name of the Trinity, were *absolutely necessary* to the Salvation of all Men. *St. Augustin* did not allow, that even Infants could be sav'd without Water; and hence he was for having Water apply'd by any one, with the Use of the Form, in the Name of the Trinity, as we have seen before; and to such a Latitude did Men run at last, that they in express Terms affirm'd Baptism to be valid, tho' perform'd by a Pagan. Thus *Gratian* reckons *Isidore* * to have affirm'd; which if true, shews how valuable his Authority is in the Case of Baptism perform'd by *supposedly authoriz'd Lay-Christians*. So the same *Gratian* quotes a † *Pope of Rome* asserting the Validity of Baptism by a Pagan; and in || another Place, that it is all one whether perform'd by a Christian or Pagan, so that it was done in the Name of the Trinity: Nay, if it was done only in the Name of Christ, by a Pagan, the Persons so baptiz'd ought not to receive any other Baptism. So extravagant have Men been in their Notions of the meer Imitation of an *opus operatum* in this matter. But *Mr. Bingham* confesses this to be a *Popish Novelty*, and so indeed he ought in reason to acknowledge, that Baptism by Persons *never commif-*

* *Isidor Non iteratur Baptisma quod à Pagano Ministratur. Apud Gratian de Consecrat. Dist. 4. cap. xxii. pag. 1983. Edit. Taur. 1620.*

† *Romanus Pontifex, non hominem judicat qui Baptizat: sed spiritum Dei subministrare gratiam Baptismi licet Paganus sit qui Baptizat. Ibid. cap. xxiii.*

|| *A quodam Judeo nescitis utrum Christiano an Pagano, multos in patria vestra baptizatos asseritis, & quid de iis sit agendum consulitis. Hi profectò si in Nomine Sanctæ Trinitatis, vel tantum in Christi Nomine, sicut in actibus Apostolorum legimus, baptizari sunt (unum quippè idèmq; est, ut sanctus exponit Ambrosius [Lib. i. de Spiritu Sancto, cap. 3.] constat eos non esse denuò baptizandos. Ibid. cap. xxiv.*

tion'd at all to Baptize, is as much a Novelty of corrupt Popery, since the *ancient Catholick Church* never determin'd any thing in favour of these, any more than she did in favour of *Pagan Baptism*; and a Pagan has as much *Power and Authority* to Baptize, as our Laicks who *never were commission'd* any more than he.

XXXI. Our Reverend Historian is so sensible, that what he has produc'd from the Antients is nothing to the Purpose of pretended Baptisms by Persons never commission'd; that he sums up his whole Evidence in a very remarkable Manner, in these Words, pag. 38. "Thus we have seen [says he] for six hundred Years, the general Sense and Practice of the antient Church, grounded, as they suppose, upon the Commission given to the Apostles, whereby Bishops, as the apostles Successors, are qualified first to give Baptism themselves, and then to grant a Commission to others to Baptize, and that either to Presbyters or Deacons, or to Presbyters alone in ordinary Cases, and in Cases extraordinary and of extreme Necessity to Deacons and Lay-men." Thus Mr. Bingham acknowledges, that all his Evidences conspire in this, that the general Sense and Practice of the ancient Church was, that Baptism, whether in ordinary or extraordinary Cases, was administred by the Bishop, or else by such as had [or at least were suppos'd to have had] an Episcopal Commission to Baptize; from whence it necessarily follows, that even this suppos'd general Sense and Practice of the Church, as stated by Mr. Bingham, does not give Countenance to the Validity of pretended Baptisms perform'd ordinarily as well as extraordinarily, by Persons who never had an Episcopal Commission, and who yet presume

presume to attempt to Baptize, in Opposition to the Divine Right of Episcopacy : So far from this was the supposed General Sense and Practice of the Ancient Church, that even in Cases of *Extreme Necessity*, we see Baptism was suppos'd to be perform'd, by none but such as were reckon'd to be *Impower'd by the Bishop* : Infomuch, that our Laicks pretended Baptisms, tho' done in Extremity, where none of the Clergy can be had, can claim nothing of Benefit from the *General Sense and Practice of the Ancient Church* for the first 600 Years of Christianity, by Mr. Bingham's own Account of the Matter, whereby he makes Baptism, even in Cases of *Extreme Necessity*, to be founded upon a *Commission given by Bishops to Deacons and Lay-men to Baptize*.

§ XXXII. But not to leave this Matter here ; I affirm, That all Mr. Bingham's Evidence summ'd up together, do's not amount to so much as a Proof, That the *Ancient Catholick Church's* Sense and Practice for the first 600 Years, was, to *Commission or Authorize Lay-men to Baptize*, in want of the Clergy.

For, The first 300 Years have not so much as One Evidence of any One Lay-man *so Authorized*.

Tertullian's Opinion was singular, That Lay-Christians, as such, had that Power in themselves : He did not suppose any such *Authority given to them* by the Bishops ; nay, he suppos'd them also to have Power to minister the other Sacrament of the *Eucharist*, in absence of the Clergy. But *St. Cyprian, Firmilian*, and their Colleagues, are plain Evidences against this his singular Notion of Lay-mens Power to Baptize, and the Founda-
tion

tion upon which he grounds their pretended Power, has been already overthrown.

The Council of *Eliberis*, which made a Canon to *Authorize* some particular sort of their own Laymen, who were in Communion with their Bishop, to Baptize a Catechumen in Danger of Death, when the Clergy could not do it ; has been largely prov'd to be a Contradiction to *Tertullian's* Notion ; and that it was but a Provincial Council of *Spanish* Bishops, not a General Council, and therefore not Declaratory of the General Sense and Practice of the Ancient Catholick Church ; since, in the whole space of the first 600 Years, this Council stands singular by it self ; no other Council whatsoever, whether General or Provincial, during that Period, made any such Canon.

The Story of the Boy *Athanasius's* Baptizing his Play-fellows in Sport, and of *Alexander's* determining, that the Children should have no other Baptism ; besides its being Fabulous, is no Instance of a Laicks Baptizing by the Bishop's Commission and Authority : If it had been true, it would not have been an Instance of the General Sense and Practice of the Ancient Catholick Church ; being, upon that Supposition, but the Private Act of one single Bishop only : Nay farther, the supposing the whole Story to be true, and the Determination thereupon to be just and good, would naturally tend to the Exposing of all Divine Institutions, to be Ridicul'd and Despis'd, as insignificant and Childish things, and so make way for the Extirpation of all Reveal'd Religion out of the World.

St. *Ferom's* Saying, Of the Lawfulness of Laicks Baptizing in Case of Necessity, has been prov'd to be built on *Tertullian's* false Foundation ; to be no Instance of the *General Sense and Practice of the*
Ancient

Ancient Catholick Church ; but to be an Inconsistency with himself, and a Contradiction to that Catholick Principle, whereby he confuted the *Luciferian* Schismatick, who reckon'd the *Arian* Clergy to be but Lay-men, and whose Baptism, *St. Jerom* affirm'd, ought therefore to be rejected, if the *Luciferians* Opinion were true.

St. Augustin's Opinions have been examin'd ; he proves nothing, but supposes the Validity of an Imitated *Opus Operatum*, without any Argument ; he speaks things upon Hear-say only ; he hesitates, and cannot determine, as to *his Knowledge*, about Usurped Lay-Baptisms being Valid ; he gives us no Proof of any General Council, nor of any Tradition shewing the *General Sense and Practice* of the Ancient Catholick Church, for Laymens being Authoriz'd to Baptize. And,

Lastly, *Gelasius* and *Isidore*, tho' they say that Lay-men were often Authoriz'd to Baptize, in Case of Necessity, yet neither of them points at the *General Sense and Practice of the Church* ; No General Council, No Catholick Tradition, No Universal Practice of the Bishops of the Catholick Church ; they leave us in the dark, as to these ; and therefore 'tis just and reasonable to infer, that they speak only, either of their own or some other particular Mens Practices, and therefore are of *No Authority* to us in this Matter.

Upon the Whole, The profound Silence of the Days of the Apostles and Apostolick Fathers, and of the Three first Centuries of Christianity, concerning Lay-mens being at all *Commission'd* to Baptize, is a full Proof, that the Bishop's Authorizing of them to Baptize, can *never be founded* on any **Catholick Tradition** of the *Primitive Church of Christ* : And more, If there had in truth been such

such a **Catholick Tradition**, even from the Times of the Apostles to this Day, [as there never was,] yet still this would be of no Advantage to the pretended Baptisms of our Laicks, [*i. e.* our *Dissenters*,] who were never Commission'd by Bishops, [and indeed, who cannot be Commission'd, for they have **no Bishops**] to Baptize.

This is the Result of all Mr. *Bingham's* Evidences: But at the End of this Book, I shall sum up the whole Evidence *for* and *against* Baptism by Persons who *never were Commission'd*, or who were suppos'd to have *no Commission*, to Baptize; which it is not so proper to do here, before I have *Answer'd* Mr. *Bingham's* *Objections*, against several of the Testimonies of the Ancient Fathers against Unauthoriz'd Baptisms, and also his *Objections* relating to the Antient *Heretical* and *Schismatical* Baptisms allow'd of by the Church, which Mr. *Bingham* endeavors to make look like our *Unauthoriz'd Lay-Baptisms*.

C H A P.

C H A P. IV.

ANSWERS to Mr. Bingham's OBJECTIONS, against the Testimonies of St. Cyprian, St. Basil, and St. Chrysoftom, who reckon'd pretended Baptisms by Persons never Commission'd, to be Null and Void.

OBJECT. **T**HE Evidence of those Three Fathers I have already shewn, Chap. III. § XII, XIII, XXIII, XXIV. And our Reverend Historian, in his 38th Page, says, That if their Evidence were entirely on our Side, "*It would not weigh very much; because it would be only their Private Sense, and not the Practice of the Church, which is the Subject of our present Enquiry.*"

ANSW. Now our Side, *i. e.* the Proposition we insist upon, is this, That pretended Baptisms, by Persons *never Commission'd to Baptize*, is Null and Void. These Three Fathers, (besides others which I have produc'd) are entirely with us in this Point, as I have already prov'd. Mr. *Bingham* has brought *no Evidence* of any One Church upon Earth, for the first Six hundred Years of Christianity, determining the contrary; the Story of the Boy *Athanasius* Baptizing his Play-fellows, and of the Church of *Alexandria's* allowing it to be Valid, having been prov'd to be but a meer Fiction: So that all Mr. *Bingham's* Evidence for this Side of the Question, is from no other than the *Private Opinion's* of *Tertullian* and *St. Jerom*, Two Presbyters; and

and *Optatus* and *St. Augustin*, Two Bishops; the Two first upon false Principles, and the other Two meerly upon their own private Opinion, without giving any good Reason for it: And one of them, *St. Augustin*, at the same time hesitating and doubting about it, as I think I have largely prov'd.

As for any other Evidence *Mr. Bingham* has brought, *viz.* from the *Spanish Council of Eliberis*, *St. Augustin*, *Gelasius* and *Isidore*, they wholly relate only to Baptism *suppos'd to have been authoriz'd by Bishops*; which is foreign to our present Enquiry, tho' even *they* are no Proofs of the *general Sense and Practice of the Church*, but only show how far some Bishops thought themselves to have been empower'd to *authorize others to Baptize*, namely, their own Lay-men in want of the Clergy. And whether they thought and practis'd rightly or no, this is certain, that their particular Practice has not been prov'd to be the *Sense and Practice of the ancient Catholick Church*. And further; nothing in favour of pretended Baptisms, by Laicks *never authoriz'd* by their Bishops, and acting in opposition to them, can be at all inferr'd therefrom. And therefore the Testimonies of *St. Cyprian*, *St. Basil*, and *St. Chrysostom*, against the Validity of spurious Baptisms perform'd by Persons who never were Episcopally Commission'd, and therefore have *no Priestly Power* to Baptize, are of very great Weight and Importance; *1st*, Because their Evidence is founded on the Divine Positive Institution of Baptism; *2dly*, Because it is corroborated by other concurring Evidence; And *3dly*, Because it never was gainsay'd or oppos'd by any Law or Tradition of the ancient Catholick Church, nor so much as by any authentick Law or Tradition of but one Particular, Ancient, Orthodox Church of Christ.

But

But Mr. Bingham has particular Objections against the Evidence of those Fathers respectively, which I now come to Answer.

OBJECT. II. He says, “*When Chrysoftom confines the Office of Baptism to the Hands of a Priest, he only means in ordinary Cases, otherwise Deacons, who are no Priests, would be absolutely excluded from it in all Cases whatsoever, as well as Lay-men; and yet Chrysoftom allows Deacons to Baptize in Cases of Necessity, which makes it evident, that his Discourse only relates to the Ministration of Baptism in ordinary Cases.*”

ANSW. All this is very fallacious; for Mr. Bingham cannot fairly deny, that *Deacons are so far Priests* as they are impower’d to Baptize: See what I have said, p. 16, & 17. Himself says, That Baptism perform’d by the Bishop’s Authority, was reputed as *his Act*: See his 8th Page. He therefore must acknowledge, that when Deacons Baptize by virtue of *that Commission* they receiv’d from the Bishop, ’tis Baptism by a *Priestly Power and Authority*, and done by the Hands of a *Priest*, a Deacon being so far a Priest; and moreover *his Act* being the *Bishop’s Act*, who is the *High Priest*. And therefore Mr. Bingham’s Objection is lost; for ’tis plain, that *St. Chrysoftom’s* confining the Office of Baptism to the Hands of a *Priest*, relates both to *ordinary* and *extraordinary* Cases too, because, even for Cases of Extremity, he points out no other than the Hands of a Priest of the lowest Order, *viz.* a Deacon to Baptize; and therefore *St. Chrysoftom absolutely excludes* all such, as can upon no account whatsoever be said to be vested with *Priestly Authority*, *viz.* all who
never

never were authoriz'd by Bishops to Baptize. The Reader may also see Mr. *Bingham's* whole Objection provided against in p. 114. and therefore this may suffice here in Answer thereto.—

OBJ. III. His next Objection is against *St. Basil's* Evidence thus, in his 39, 40, and 41 Pages, "*As to St. Basil—*" *he had somewhat of a singular Opinion* "*in this matter; for he was for re-baptizing all Persons* "*that were only baptized by Lay-men.—But he was* "*not so stiff—as to unchristian those that were* "*baptiz'd by Schismatics, or break the Communion* "*of the Church upon it: For he gives his Advice—* "*That Men should quietly comply with the Rules and* "*Practice of their own Church where they liv'd.* "*But forasmuch (says he) as some of the Asiatick* "*Churches think otherwise, that the Baptism of* "*such, by way of Dispensation for the sake of* "*great Multitudes, ought to be receiv'd, let it be* "*receiv'd. "Whence I think (says Mr. Bingham)* "*it may be inferr'd, that tho' St. Basil, in his own* "*Opinion, did not approve of the Baptism either of* "*Schismatics or Lay-men, yet he thought it might* "*stand good, if the Church thought fit to receive and* "*confirm it; and this he seems to assert upon the* "*common Principle of the Antients, that a Latitude* "*of Power was left with the Rulers and Governours* "*of the Church to ratifie such Baptisms, when they* "*found it necessary for the Benefit and Edification of* "*the Church. But if otherwise, St. Basil's Opi-* "*nion cannot Prejudice the contrary Doctrine, or be* "*thrown into the Ballance against the common* "*Consent and Practice of the Church. And yet it* "*may be observ'd, that St. Basil speaks perhaps,* "*not of Lay-Baptism in Cases of Necessity, but of* "*usurping the Office, as Hereticks did in ordinary*

N

"Cases:

“ **Cases** : Which makes a wide Difference in the
 “ Case, and belongs to a more difficult Question,
 “ that is, Whether unauthoriz’d Baptisms, were
 “ ever ratified and made good by the subsequent
 “ Confirmation and Reception of the Church ?

A N S W. The Reader, by considering what I have said already, Page 109, &c. upon St. Basil’s Evidence against Lay-Baptism, may observe, that St. Basil speaks of Lay-men as Persons *not having Authority* to baptize ; that he makes their want of Power and Authority to be the Reason of the Invalidity of their Baptizing ; that he reckon’d the Schismaticks here spoken of, to have been by their Separation from the Church reduc’d to Lay-men, and that consequently they had **no Power** to minister in holy Things, and that *therefore* because they were as Lay-men, Persons without Commission, their Baptisms were *Null and Void* : And ’tis notorious against the first part of Mr. Bingham’s Objection, that he was *not Singular* in this Principle ; for St. Cyprian and Firmilian are quoted by him, as having been of the same Principle ; and I have also prov’d from St. Cyprian’s Works, that they and others of their Colleagues were really so ; and consequently Mr. Bingham’s Charge of Singularity against St. Basil is very unfair, especially if it be also consider’d that his Epistle to *Amphilochius* Bishop of *Iconium*, out of which his Evidence is taken, is a *Canonical Epistle*, and reckon’d as Canon Law in the Code of the *Greek Church*. Thus much for Mr. Bingham’s Charge of Singularity against St. Basil.

Now for the Consequence Mr. Bingham draws from that Father’s acquiescing in the Practice of some *Asiatick Churches*, who receiv’d the Baptisms
 of

of Schismatics. — “ *Whence I think* (says Mr. Bingham) “ *it may be inferr'd, that tho' St. Basil,* “ *in his own Opinion, did not approve of the Bap-* “ *tism, either of Schismatics or Lay-men, yet* “ *he thought it might stand good, if the Church* “ *thought fit to receive and confirm it.*” Here Mr. Bingham blends and confounds together **Schismatical** and **Lay-Baptism**, and infers, that *St. Basil* thought they might **both stand good**; when 'tis notorious by *St. Basil's* First Canon of that Epistle, and the Connection of his Words, that he speaks of nothing else, that *may stand good*, but the **Schismatical Baptisms** receiv'd and allow'd of by the *Asiatick Churches*; and Mr. Bingham might have seen this, even in *St. Basil's* Words as himself has translated them, which are these; “ *But forasmuch as some of the Asiatick Churches* “ *think otherwise, that the Baptism of such,* [viz. of the Puritans, Encratites, Hydroparastats, and Apotactites, the Schismatics he was just before speaking of] “ *by way of Dispensation for the* “ *sake of Great Multitudes, ought to be re-* “ *ceiv'd; let it be receiv'd.*” I say, from these very Words, 'tis plain, that *St. Basil* speaks of none but the **Schismatical Baptisms**, the Baptisms receiv'd by “ **Great Multitudes**,” for we know that those Schismatics were *Numerous*, and that consequently so were their Baptisms, yet we know also that they had *Episcopal Orders*; and whether their Orders were *Null and Void*, by reason only of their *Schism*, is another Question. *St. Basil* thought they were, and consequently that they were as *Lay-men*. Some *Asiaticks* did not *Null their Orders*; *St. Basil* therefore, for the sake of **Multitudes** concern'd in this, and because of the Practice of those *Asiatick Churches* which did

not Null the Orders of those Schismaticks, said, "Let their Baptism be receiv'd." This does not signify, that he meant, Let Lay-Baptisms, Baptisms by *Persons never Commission'd*, be receiv'd: He only abated of his Rigour of Condemning the Schismaticks to be but meer Laicks; he would have lik'd it, if they had by those Churches been reduc'd to *that State*, as they were by the *Cypriatick Churches*; but since those *Astiatck Churches* did not so far condemn them, he acquiesc'd in the Discipline of those Churches, and reckon'd that their **Orders* and *Baptisms* might be receiv'd: But 'twas never heard of, that in those Churches, *Lay-men*, really and *incontestably* such, assum'd to themselves any Power at all to baptize, without, or in opposition to their Bishop's Commission; and therefore the **Great Multitudes** here spoken of by *St. Basil*, must signify only the great Multitudes of Persons that were concern'd, in the Episcopal Orders and Baptisms given and receiv'd, by the Schismaticks before spoken of by that Father. This, together with what I have before said in *Page 109*, &c. I think to be a sufficient Answer to this part of *Mr. Bingham's* Objection against *St. Basil's* Evidence.

There is another remarkable Thing in *Mr. Bingham's* Objection, which must not be pass'd over, and 'tis this, That he doubts of his own Inference, which he makes from *St. Basil's* Words; for first he introduces it with an "I think it may be inferr'd, that tho' *St. Basil*———did not approve of the Baptism of *Lay-men*, yet he thought it might stand good, &c." This shews that he

* *Clergy-man's Vade mecum*, Part II. p. 201.

cannot be Positive in his Inference; for if he could, his "*I think it may be, &c.*" is a needless Modesty; and not only so, but prejudicial to his Reader, as it leaves him undetermin'd in this Matter: But I doubt not, Mr. *Bingham* easily foresaw, that it would be objected against his *may be Inference* about **Lay-Baptism**, that *St. Basil* was only speaking of the *Asiatics* admitting of *Schismatical Baptisms*, and that *St. Basil* do's not say, that *Lay-Baptisms* might stand good; and Mr. *Bingham* having blended and confounded *Lay-Baptisms* with *Schismatical Baptisms*, concludes his Inference with a mis-giving Air of Suspicion, that it would not do: He hesitates about it, and says, "But if otherwise, [*i. e.* if *St. Basil* did not think that **Lay-Baptisms**, as well as *Schismatical Baptisms*, might stand good]" *St. Basil's Opinion* (says Mr. *Bingham*) "*cannot prejudice the contrary Doctrine, or be thrown into the Ballance against the common Consent and Practice of the Church.*" Thus we see that himself cannot assure us of the Truth of his own Inference about *Saint Basil's* supposed Thoughts of allowing *Lay-Baptism*; and therefore we may conclude, that *St. Basil* do's not appear to have thought, that *Lay-Baptism, i. e.* Baptism by Persons *having no Power*, being never authoriz'd to Baptize, could stand good and valid; but the contrary: And Mr. *Bingham's* saying, that *St. Basil's* Opinion, "*cannot be thrown into the Ballance against the common Consent and Practice of the Church;*" is taking for granted what he has not prov'd, that the *common Consent and Practice* of the Ancient Church, was, to allow as valid, pretended Baptisms perform'd by Persons never Commission'd to Baptize.

Mr. Bingham says further, that “*it may be Observed that St. Basil speaks perhaps, not of Lay-Baptism in Cases of Necessity, but of Usurping the Office, as Hereticks did in ordinary Cases.*” But these **P**erhaps’s will not serve our Turn, they are *No Arguments*; nay, they are *Fallacious* upon the Judgments of some sort of Readers, who are too apt to be carried away with such *ungrounded Suppositions*: What has *St. Basil* said in all his Writings, that can give the least Colour for such a **P**erhaps? There is nothing in all his Works, that looks towards *Lay-Baptism in Cases of Necessity*; and when he speaks of *Lay-Baptisms*, he do’s it in such Terms, as include all Cases whatsoever, and *No Exception* made for *Extraordinary Cases*, nor *Limitation* to *Ordinary Ones*. At this rate, a Man may *Limit* and *Restrain* the most *Universal Propositions*; thus, for Example, “*Go ye Disciple all Nations, Baptizing them In the Name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy-Ghost.*” By Mr. Bingham’s way of **P**erhapsing, may not be design’d to restrain the *Form* of Baptizing “*In the Name of the Trinity,*” to That *Form* alone, for all Cases whatsoever; there may be suppos’d *Cases of Necessity*! when Men cannot procure Baptism in *this Form*; their Baptizers, tho’ *Episcopally Ordain’d*, may have *false Notions concerning the Deity*; and in Consequence thereof, may *Mutilate* and *Change the Form*, and refuse to give Baptism in the *prescrib’d Form*: Some reckon, however, that *Water* is *absolutely Necessary* to Salvation, therefore, in their *Imagination*, this would be a *Case of Necessity*, and so the *New, tho’ Uninstituted Form*, will do, because, *Water* must be apply’d; and therefore, the *Instituted Form* **P**erhaps

haps was not appointed for *Cases of Necessity!* especially considering that *Even a Pope of Rome* has said, that Baptism is good and valid, if done *In the Name of Jesus only!* But who is there, that do's not see the Folly of this way of **Perhapsing?**

As for Mr. *Bingham's* Supposition, "*That a Latitude of Power was left with the Rulers and Governours of the Church to Ratify such Baptisms [i. e. Baptisms by Lay-men, Persons destitute of Power, never authoriz'd to Baptize] when they found it necessary, &c.*" 'Tis a Proposition that *has not been proved*; and I have said so much upon it * elsewhere, that I see no Necessity to trouble my Reader with any thing more upon it, till Mr. *Bingham*, or Somebody else, shall offer their **Arguments** for such a Ratifying Power; and therefore I proceed to our Reverend Historian's next Objection, which is this.

OBJECT. IV. Against *St. Cyprian's* Evidence, he objects thus in his 39th Page, "*If it were not for St. Basil's Testimony (says he) I should doubt whether Cyprian had ever made use of such an Argument as this,*" [viz. That Hereticks and Schismaticks, broken off from the Church, were become *Lay-men*, and that therefore the Baptisms of Hereticks and Schismaticks were Null and Void, because they were *become Lay-men.*]

ANSW. But here, either Mr. *Bingham* believes *St. Basil's* Testimony concerning *St. Cyprian*, or Mr. *Bingham* do's not believe it. If he believes it,

* *Lay-Baptism Invalid.*

then there's an end of his Doubt about St. *Cyprian's* Argument—and so his following imaginary Reasons against St. *Cyprian's* ever having us'd such an Argument fall at once. But if he do's not believe St. *Basil*, then he might have plainly told us so, and not have amus'd us with an “*If it were not for St. Basil's Testimony.*” This looks, however, as if he could not charge St. *Basil* with being a false Evidence; tho' still he endeavours to take off from the Worth of his Testimony, by his following Three Observations.

First, “*Because (says Mr. Bingham) no such Argument [about Lay-men] that I know of is to be found in his [i. e. St. Cyprian's] Works.*”

But if Mr. *Bingham* do's not know of any such Argument in St. *Cyprian's* Works, others do know of it; and 'tis plain enough there to be found, that St. *Cyprian* and his Colleagues, reduc'd Hereticks and Schismaticks, though ordain'd before in the Church, to the State of *Lay-men*; that they receiv'd them only to *Lay-Communion* upon their Repentance; that they reckon'd them *Not as Priests*, but Destitute of **Priestly Power and Authority**, and that they charg'd their Ministrations to be Null and Void, for want of such *Priestly Power*, as I have prov'd before, Page 51, &c.

Secondly, His next Observation against St. *Cyprian's* having ever made use of such an Argument is, “*Because Tertullian, whom Cyprian commonly call'd his Master, made a great Distinction between the Baptism of Hereticks and the Baptism of Catholick Lay-men, at least in Cases of Necessity—*”
 “*for he was against Re-baptizing, those that were*
 “*so Baptized by Lay-men, tho' he was as much*
 “*for*”

“ for Re-baptizing those that were Baptiz'd * by Hereticks, as Cyprian himself.

Here I must not let pass a remarkable Fallacy, and 'tis this; Mr. Bingham says, *Tertullian* “ was against Re-baptizing those that were so Baptiz'd by Lay-men.” An uncautious Reader will be apt to believe from hence, that *Tertullian* has related it to be *Matter of Fact*, that Persons were Baptiz'd by Lay-men in his Days; when 'tis certain that he relates *No such Matter of Fact*, but is only speaking of Lay-men, as if they might Baptize, not as if they had Baptiz'd in Cases of the Clergy's Absence.—His Words are plain enough, as Mr. Bingham has 'em in his 26th Page, [† “ *Etiam Laicis jus est;* ”] Lay-men (says *Tertullian*) have also a Right to give it [*i. e.* Baptism.] This shews that 'twas *Tertullian's* Opinion, that they had a Right; but it do's not prove it *Matter of Fact*, that any of them Acted according to this Pretended Right. Mr. Bingham therefore should have said, that *Tertullian* would have been “ against Re-baptizing Persons, if they had been so Baptiz'd by Lay men,” which would have prevented his Reader from mistaking a pretended *Matter of Fact* instead of a suppos'd *Matter of Right*: This being clear'd, there is no doubt but *Tertullian* would have been against what Mr. Bingham calls Re-baptizing such Persons.—But what then, do's it therefore follow, that St. Cyprian was of *Tertullian's* Principle in this Matter, because he call'd *Tertullian* his Master? This is admirable! I esteem, and may call *Cicero* my Master, therefore

* Tertul. De Baptismo, Cap. 15.

† Tertul. De Baptismo, Cap. 17.

I must be a Heathen because *Cicero* was so; I and a great many other Members of our Church have been mightily pleas'd with Mr. *Bingham's* Antiquities of the Christian Church; therefore whatsoever Mr. *Bingham* says and believes, I and they must believe it too, whether it be right or wrong! But our Reverend Historian will find himself very much mistaken if he thinks so; for we may *Highly Value* a Man, and even call him *Our Master* too, for *some of his Excellencies*, when at the same time we may see his Faults, and Mistakes, &c. and dissent from, nay, and abhor them too; tho' it may be we do not always *make publick Proclamation* of them. And this, no doubt, was the Case with the blessed *St. Cyprian*; he valued *Tertullian* for his great Accomplishments of *Wit*, &c. he call'd him his Master; but 'tis no ways reasonable to suppose, that he *therefore* believed his many Errors. Is it rational to believe, that he follow'd him in *Montanism*, and in those Errors I have mention'd in *Page 46.* of which I have there given a particular Catalogue in the Margin, for a Memorandum to the Learned Reader? No, certainly that Pious Father was not so blind, as to be led into his *supposed Master's* Errors and Mistakes, and particularly in the Matter now before us, which I humbly hope I have proved to have been One of *Tertullian's* Singularities; and in *Page 48.* that *St. Cyprian* did not follow him in it, but asserted the contrary Doctrine of the Invalidity of Lay-Baptism, *i. e.* pretended Baptism perform'd by Persons destitute of a Commission to Baptize.

Thirdly, Mr. *Bingham's* last Observation against *Saint Cyprian's* ever having made use of such
an

an Argument, as that of the Invalidity of Lay-Baptism, is this, *viz.* “ Cyprian *always paid a far greater Deference to Catholick Lay-men than he did to Heretical Priests; as esteeming the One Members of the Church, and the Other quite cut off from it: He admitted the One into his Councils, and did nothing without their Consent in many Ecclesiastical Causes; but the Other he abandon'd and abhor'd, as Men that had abandon'd the Faith, and renounc'd their Christianity by their Heretical Doctrine.*” And what is to be infer'd from all this? Did St. Cyprian therefore approve of Baptism by Catholick Lay-men, this is meer Amusement; as if, because St. Cyprian lov'd and valu'd Catholick Lay-men, and voluntarily took their Consent in many Ecclesiastical Cases; therefore he would not have been offended, he would not have esteem'd their Attempts Null and Void, if they had endeavour'd to do any thing in the *Sacerdotal Ministration* of Holy Sacraments! This is just as good Sense, as if I should say, that Mr. Bingham loves and esteems a pious, judicious, and orthodox Lay-man of the Church of *England*, better than he do's a Schismatical or Heretical Priest, who separates, or is excluded, from her Communion; and that he would follow the Advice of the *Former* in Church Matters, and not admit of the other so much as into his Company, much less to be his Adviser and Counsellor in Ecclesiastical Affairs; and from thence conclude, that if the Church-Lay-man should, thro' a *false Zeal*, &c. attempt to ordain Men into the Ministry, Mr. Bingham's Love and Esteem for him, would oblige him to acknowledge the Validity of such a *supposed Ordination*, tho' at the same time he would not have allow'd the like of the Heretical

cal or Schismatical Priest had attempted to Ordain. Who is there that do's not see the Weakness of such a Supposition? And upon what Foundation can Mr. *Bingham* guess that St. *Cyprian* was of so Partial a Temper, as to esteem pretended Baptism by Church-Lay-men, Persons having no Authority to Baptize, to be good and Valid, when 'twas at the same time his Principle, that Heretical and Schismatical Baptisms were Null and Void, because perform'd by Persons who were suppos'd to be destitute of Priestly Power and Authority to minister in Holy Things?——But enough upon Mr. *Bingham's* Observations about this Matter; for himself, do's but say of 'em, “*These are* **probable Arguments** *to incline a Man to think,* “*that Cyprian was of the same Mind with his* “*Master Tertullian, as to the Point of Lay-Bap-* “*tism, had not St. Basil's Authority been against* “*them, Page 40.*”——We have seen, that St. *Basil's* Testimony is good: That there is not so much as any Probability in Mr. *Bingham's* supposed Arguments: And that St. *Cyprian* did not follow his Master's Errors, particularly in the *Pretended Priesthood* of Lay-men, but taught the contrary Doctrine, as is plain by the Testimony of St. *Basil*, and by Inferences that may be, and have been drawn from several Passages in St. *Cyprian's* own Works. And thus all our Reverend Historian's Objections against the Evidence of St. *Cyprian*, St. *Basil*, and St. *Chrysoptom*, are of no Weight or Importance.

C H A P. V.

Mr. Bingham's Acknowledgments concerning the great Question now in Dispute, viz. Whether the Usurped and Unauthoriz'd Baptism of Lay-men, was allowed to be Valid?

§ I. **O**UR Reverend Historian handles this Question in his 41st Page; and here one would naturally have expected to have found abundance of uncontested Evidence and Testimony from the Ancient Catholick Church, that such pretended Baptisms were, by Her, held to be Good and Valid; if it had ever been, the *General Sense and Practice of the Ancient Catholick Church*, to esteem them as such. But instead of producing any Evidence for their Pretended Validity; (and consequently for the Validity of our Dissenters supposititious Baptisms, which are evidently *Usurped and Unauthoriz'd Baptisms by Lay-men*) Mr. Bingham very fairly and ingenuously confesses, that this of “*Unauthoriz'd Usurped Lay-Baptism makes a wide Difference in the Case, Page 41. and is a more Difficult Question,*” [*viz. than that of Lay-Baptism [suppos'd to be] Authoriz'd by Bishops, in Cases of Extremity, about which he had been Treating before.*] He says this Question of “*Usurped and Unauthoriz'd Baptism of Lay-men has much more difficulty than the Former.*” And he gives this particular Reason why 'tis so “*much more Difficult, because (says he) a great many*”
“ of

“ of the Authors who have justified the Lawfulness of
 “ Lay Baptism, in Cases of Necessity, are wholly
 “ silent upon this Point.” “ For [continues he]
 “ neither Tertullian, nor the Council of Eliberis,
 “ nor St. Jerom, nor Gelasius, nor Isidore, have
 “ said any thing upon it; they Only consider the
 “ Case of Necessity, and no other.”

§ II. And to this I must add some other Reasons, why this of Usurped Unauthoriz'd Lay-Baptism is so very Difficult a Question; and they are these from Mr. Bingham himself.

First, Because “ The Apostolick Commission to Baptize, was to continue to the end of the World,” according to Mr. Bingham, in his 3d Page.

Secondly, Because the Conveyance of this Commission to others, “ was necessary to preserve the Church, according to the Order of Christ, in future Ages,” as in his 3d Page.

Thirdly, Because “ No One can have a Power of Baptizing, but he that receives, some way or other, a Commission from the Apostles.” See his 4th Page.

Fourthly, Because “ The Original Power of Administring Baptism is lodg'd solely and entirely in the Hands of Bishops, as the Apostles immediate Successors, and derivately Convey'd from them to others,” in Cases Ordinary and Extraordinary also, as in his 5th Page.

Fifthly, Because “ When Baptism was done by others, [i. e. not by the Bishop] the Antients thought “ it was still done by his Authority, and reputed as his Act.” See his 8th Page.

Sixthly, and Lastly, Because Mr. Bingham, in summing up his whole Evidence, in his 38th Page, says, “ Thus we have seen for Six hundred Years,
 “ the

“ *the General Sense and Practice of the Ancient*
 “ *Church, grounded, as they suppose, upon the*
 “ *Commission given to the Apostles; whereby Bi-*
 “ *shops, as the Apostles Successors, are qualified first*
 “ *to give Baptism themselves, and then to Grant a*
 “ *Commission to others to Baptize;——in Or-*
 “ *inary Cases, and in Cases Extraordinary and of*
 “ *Extream Necessity, &c.*

These are Reasons which make the present Question of Unauthoriz'd Usurp'd Lay-Baptisms so very Difficult, that there is “ a wide Differ-
 “ ence ” between these pretended Baptisms, and the others, suppos'd to have been minister'd by Episcopal Authority; so that we see even from Mr. *Bingham's* own Account of the Matter, that the general Sense and Practice of the Ancient Church has nothing in favour of *Usurp'd Unauthoriz'd Lay-Baptisms*.

§ III. It is therefore evident, that the *general Sense and Practice of the Ancient Church*, cannot be call'd in as an Evidence, for the pretended Validity of such *false Baptisms*; No! No! they stand by themselves, *utterly Destitute* of that Catholick Testimony, and have *Nothing* to support them but the weak, fallacious, and imaginary Reasonings of a *private Spirit* only.

For, *First*, The Apostolick Commission to Baptize, is here *discontinued* and *broken off*.

Secondly, The Conveyance of that Commission is here wanting, and so, that which is “ *Necessa-*
 “ *ry to Preserve the Church, according to the Or-*
 “ *der of Christ*——is absent.

Thirdly, Here is a Destitution of *Power* to Baptize, because here is *No One* that has receiv'd any manner

manner of way whatsoever, *A Commission from the Apostles.* Because,

Fourthly, The Original Power of administering Baptism, “*Lodg’d solely and entirely in the Hands of Bishops—the Apostles immediate Successors, is not here Derivately Convey’d from them to the Usurping Unauthoriz’d Lay-Pretender.*”

Fifthly, Here being *No Baptism* done by the *Bishop’s Authority*, the pretended Baptism cannot be reputed as the *Bishop’s Act.*

Sixthly, and Lastly, In this Act there is nothing to be seen of the *general Sense and Practice of the Ancient Church*, for the first Six hundred Years, which was confessedly “*grounded upon the Commission granted in Cases Ordinary and Extraordinary too;*” for here is *No Grant of any Commission* at all—and so, these pretended Baptisms are destitute of any *Law, Rule, or Ancient Catholick Tradition*, whereon to ground their pretended Validity.

§ IV. And yet notwithstanding all this, our Reverend Historian, in his 43d; 44th, and 45th Pages, Instances the Fiction of the suppos’d Sportive-Baptism, said to have been given by the Boy *Athanasius*, to his Play-fellows—and the private Opinions of *St. Augustin* and *Optatus*, in favour of those Pretended Baptisms, perform’d by Lay-Persons, who *never were Commission’d to Baptize*; but I have already consider’d these in their proper Places, and therefore have no need here to repeat the Arguments brought against them; since ’tis plain, by all that has been hitherto said, that these Pretended Baptisms are *utterly Destitute* of the *general Sense and Practice of the Ancient Church*, whereon to found their Pretended Validity.

C H A P. VI.

That the Ancient Churches, who allow'd of Heretical and Schismatical Baptisms, did not reckon those Baptisms to have been Unauthoriz'd, Uncommission'd Anti-Episcopal Lay-Baptisms.

§ I. **I** Am oblig'd thus far to Concern my self with the Ancient Heretical and Schismatical Baptisms, because our Reverend Historian endeavours to represent them, as of the *same Nature* with *Unauthoriz'd Lay-Baptisms*: The Terms he makes use of, and his Assertions about them being such, as will *easily* induce *some* sort of Readers, who have not been Conversant in these Matters, to believe, that when the Ancient Churches allow'd of the Validity of *Heretical* and *Schismatical* Baptisms, they did it upon the *same Principle* which some now hold, for the *pretended Validity* of false Baptisms, perform'd by Persons who *never were Episcopally Commission'd to Baptize*: Thus, for Example, Mr. Bingham says of the Ancient Heretical and Schismatical Baptisms, That they were “**Unauthoriz'd**,” That “**Hereticks and Schismaticks, and Degraded Clergy-men, had not any Legal Authority from the Church to Baptize**,”—That “**They acted not only without Her Authority, but against Her Authority, in all their Ministrations**, Page 51. *although their Baptisms were receiv'd as Valid, under such an Irregular, and Unlawful Administration,*” pag. 52.—“**What they**”
 “**did**”

“ *did was done (properly speaking) by an Unautho-*
 “ *riz’d, Criminal, Anti-Episcopal Usurpation,*
 “ *&c.*” pag. 54. Such Terms as these naturally
 lead an *uncautious Reader* into this Notion, that
 those Ancient Heretical, and Schismatical Bap-
 tisms, were of the same Nature with our *Anti-*
Episcopal, Unauthoiz’d Lay-Baptisms; for by
 such Colours as these, they have an *appearance* [yet
 ’tis but an appearance] of being *utterly destitute* of
 any Commission at all, *as much* as our Lay-Bap-
 tisms are, that are perform’d by Persons who never
 were at all *Authoiz’d* or *Commission’d* for that
 Purpose.

§ II To give the Reader therefore a fair In-
 sight into this Matter, it is to be observ’d, that
 there were two Sorts of Discipline in the ancient
 Churches about *Heretical* and *Schismatical* Bap-
 tisms.

First, That of the *Cyprianick Churches*, who made
Ecclesiastical-Laws, that if the Clergy fell into He-
 resy or Schism, their *Ordinations*, and other *Mini-*
strations, should be null and void; and that con-
 sequently the Baptisms given by them, during their
Heresy or Schism, should be look’d upon as *no Chri-*
stian Baptism: And therefore Persons so baptiz’d by
 them, should, upon their Repentance and Recon-
 ciliation to the Church, be receiv’d by Baptism as
Heathens were.

Agrippinus *, Bishop of *Carthage*, in a Synod of
 the Provinces of *Africa* and *Numidia*, establish’d
 this Discipline.

* *Cypr. Epist. ad Quintum. 71.—p. 149. Paris.*

So did also the Councils * of *Carthage*, under *St. Cyprian*, make *Ecclesiastical Laws*, whereby they reduc'd to *Lay-men*, those *Heretical* and *Schismatical* Clergy-men, who either separated from the Church after their Ordination, or were ordain'd among *Hereticks* and *Schismaticks*; and they null'd all their *Baptisms*, as being destitute of *Authority* and *Commission*.

St. Cyprian's Colleague likewise, *Firmilian* † Bishop of *Cæsarea*, appeals to the Council of *Iconium*, held long before, for the Obligation and Necessity of this.

Dionysius, Bishop of *Alexandria*, “alleges the Decrees of the Councils of *Iconium* and *Synada* for Confirmation” of this Custom; as *Mr. Bingham* informs us, pag. 56. And the same *Dionysius* speaks of these Councils || as held long before his Days, and calls 'em the *Bishops populous* (or numerous) *Assemblies*.

Thus we see that the Invalidity of *Heretical* and *Schismatical Ordinations* and *Baptisms*, held by the *Cyprianick Churches*, was not matter of private *Opinion* only; but *Ecclesiastical Canon Law*, and *Determination of Synods*, whereby the Bishops of those Churches bound their Subjects *so strictly* to the Union of the Church, as that *their Clergy* should not break her Union by *Heresy* or *Schism*, under any less *Penalty*, than that of losing their *Holy Orders*: The *Commission* they receiv'd before in the Church, was made null and void by those *Laws* of the Church to which they ow'd *Subjection*; and if any of them were ordain'd by *Heretical* and *Schismatical Bishops*, those *Ecclesiastical Laws* condemn'd such *Ordina-*

* *Epist.* 72. ad *Stephanum* de *Concilio*, p. 141. *Paris.*
Concil. Carthag. de *Baptiz.* *Hæret.* p. 352. *Paris.*

† *Inter Cypr.* *Epist.* 74. p. 159, 160. *Paris.*

|| *Dionys.* *Epist.* apud *Euseb.* *Lib.* vii. c. 7.

tions to be invalid, and so all their Ministrations, by the same Laws, were made to be of no *legal Force* or *Validity* in those Churches. And as for the **L**aity of those *Cyprianick* Churches, these Laws were of great Influence to keep them also in the *Unity* of the Church; because, by the Terror of those Sanctions, they plainly saw, that (tho' their Bishops did not pretend to *null and void* Baptism once receiv'd in the Church) yet they *invalidated* all *Ordinations* and *Ministrations* done out of the Church, as well as the Orders of their separating Clergy: And so the Lay-members of those Churches had no hopes, either of their Childrens receiving *Valid Baptism* in Heretical and Schismatical Congregations, or of receiving themselves any *Valid Sacrament* of the Lord's Supper: And therefore, during the Obligation of this strict Discipline, they had no great Temptation to leave the *Unity* of the Church, to joyn themselves to such *dangerous Societies*, as lay under this severe Censure of their *Spiritual Sovereigns* the Bishops, who, by their Power of *Binding* given them by Christ, had bound them by such *Disciplinary Laws*, decreed and enacted in **numerous Synods and Councils**. So that in Consideration of these *Synodical Decrees*, the Baptisms of the *Heretical and Schismatical Subjects* of those Churches were term'd **Unauthoriz'd, Uncommission'd, and Anti-Episcopal**: And why may not the *Bishops* of Christ's Church make such *wholsome Laws*, if they see it fit, for the Government of their own Churches, when they do not impose them (as *St. Cyprian* * did not) upon other Churches,

* Neque enim quisquam nostrum Episcopum se esse Episcoporum constituit, aut tyrannico terrore ad obsequendi necessitatem

Churches, whose *Spiritual Governours* think it not fit to be *so severe* in the Discipline of their Churches; as 'tis plain the Churches did not, who acted otherwise than the *Cyprianick Churches* in this matter. For,

§ III. *Secondly*, The other sort of Discipline which was practis'd by the Churches who would not come up to the *Cyprianick Severity*, was, That they did not *null and make void* the Commissions of either. 1st, Those *Heretical and Schismatical Clergy-men*, who had been ordain'd in the Church: Or, 2^{dly}, of those who had been ordain'd only by *Heretical and Schismatical Bishops*: They receiv'd their Orders as *good and valid*, and their Baptisms in the Name of the Trinity, and other Ministrations, to be so too: So that, when they or any baptiz'd by them return'd to the Unity of the Church, they were receiv'd [as all other Penitents us'd to be] by Imposition of Hands; the Clergy, as Clergymen, and the Laicks, as Lay-Christians already baptiz'd, without requiring any other *Ordination or Baptism*, than what they had receiv'd before.

Mr. *Eingham* is so well appriz'd of the Truth of this, that he himself acknowledges, pag. 88. upon the Question, Whether *Hereticks and Schismaticks* be *Clergy-men or Lay-men, Priests or not Priests, Bishops or not Bishops?* and says, “ *When in the Discipline of the Church, it was thought proper to deprive them of the Power and Honour of their Places, yet even in that Case, the Church did*

fi aтем Collegas suos adigit, quando habeat omnis Episcopus pro licentia & libertatis & Potestatis suæ arbitrium proprium, tamque judicari ab alio non possit, quam nec ipse potest judicare, &c. *Concil. Carthag. de Baptizandis Hæreticis*, p 353. *Paris.*

^c not intend to deny the **Validity** of their **Ordination**.— He says also, in his *pag. 89.* That
^c *Hereticks and Schismatics, and degraded*
^c **Priests, were allow'd to be Priests still.**—
 And *pag. 90.* “*The Church indeed did not pretend*
 “ *wholly to cancel or annul their Ordination,*
 “ *or give them a new Ordination.*” But further,
 whether *Mr. Bingham* had acknowledg'd this or no,
 [as we see he has] yet 'tis plain, that the Churches,
 who in their Practice differ'd from the Discipline
 of the *Cyprianick Churches*, made *no Laws* or *Eccle-*
siaſtical Canons for the Nulling of the Orders of *He-*
retical and Schismatical Clergy-men: So far from
 that, that the Great Council of *Nice*, in the 8th
 Canon, allows of the Ordinations of the *Novatian*
Schismatics: And in the *African Code*, Canons 68,
 69, and 118, the Ordinations of the *Donatist* *Sch-*
ismatics, are receiv'd for good and valid, as I have
 before noted, *pag. 21.* from all which 'tis notorious,
 that in the Discipline of those Churches, who al-
 lowed Heretical and Schismatical Baptisms, in the
 Name of the Trinity, to be good and valid; the
Baptizers who were *Heretical and Schismatical* *Bi-*
shops, Priests and Deacons, had a *valid Commission*
to Baptize; their Orders were *not null and void*;
 there were **no Laws** of those Churches to make
 them so; but, on the contrary, their *Ecclesiaſtical*
Laws or Canons decreed them to be *indeleted*, that
 they remain'd valid, and so they were **not Lay-**
men, Persons **destitute of Commission**, but
 still *Bishops, Priests and Deacons*, with an *indeleted,*
unrepeal'd Commission to Baptize. Consequently Per-
 sons baptiz'd by them, in Heresy and Schism, had
 in the *sense of those Churches* all the *external Requi-*
sites of the Administration appointed by the *Insti-*
tution of Baptism, (and therefore insisted on by us)

viz. *Water*, the *Form* in the Name of the Trinity, and the *Commission* of the Baptizer; *these Three* were in all those Baptisms: And therefore, whatsoever Discipline those Churches us'd at the receiving of those Penitents, it had no reference to the *Nullity* of the *Commission* of the Baptizer, any more than it had to the *Nullity* of the *Water*, or of the *Form* of Baptizing.

§ IV. Hence it comes to pass, that all Mr. Bingham's Terms us'd by him, when he calls those Baptisms **Unauthoriz'd**, **Anti-Episcopal Usurpations**, &c. as before observ'd, must be understood in such a *qualified Sense* of those Words, as Men mean, when they speak of a Thing done by a Person in a *prohibited Circumstance*, yet in pursuance and by virtue of a Commission receiv'd by him, to do *that very thing*. Thus a Priest executing his *Commission* to baptize, in the prohibited Circumstances of *Opposition* to some lawful Command of his particular Bishop; of Disobedience to the Canons and Rubricks of the Church whereof he is a Member; or lastly, in the sinful Circumstance of *Heresy* or *Schism*; If that Church has no Ecclesiastical Laws or Canons to *null* and make *void* his Commission, during those sinful Circumstances; If that Church has not decreed his Commission, to be *ipso facto*, null and void in those prohibited Circumstances, then, the Baptism administer'd by him, in the Name of the Trinity, cannot **properly** be said to be **Unauthoriz'd**; for 'tis plain, he *had a Commission* when he baptiz'd, and therefore the Baptism it self was **Authoriz'd**: As neither can that Baptism, in strict Propriety of Speech, be call'd **Anti-Episcopal**, which was administer'd by a *Priest* or *Deacon*, who had at the Time of Baptizing, an

Episcopal Commission, and who did not set up a **Pretended Altar** Against **Episcopacy** it self; or Disown the **Divine Right** of the Apostolick, *i. e.* *Episcopal Order*; but acknowledg'd, submitted to, and depended on it, and receiv'd all Power, Commission, and Authority from **Bishops**, and **from them only**, to minister in Holy Things, how much soever they transgressed the Laws of God, and his Church, in other Instances, which was plainly the Case of the *Heretical* and *Schismatical Baptizers* we are now speaking of, who were no other than *Bishops*, *Priests*, and *Deacons*, Consecrated and Ordain'd by Bishops; and tho' *Heretics* and *Schismatics*, yet vested with *Episcopal Power and Authority*, so long as those Churches did not *Vacate*, *Null*, and *make void* the **Commissions** of them, or of the Bishops who were their **Ordainers**: So that, in the Direct and Proper Sense of the Words, the Baptisms they administer'd In the Name of the Trinity, cannot in the Sense of *those Churches* be call'd **Unauthoriz'd** and **Anti-Episcopal** Baptisms; for they were as much *Authoriz'd* and *Episcopal* then, as any Baptisms now given by *wicked Priests* *Episcopally Ordain'd*, and receiv'd by the Baptiz'd, in *Sinful Circumstances*. The *Circumstance* indeed, whether of *Heresy*, *Schism*, or other *Transgression* of the *Rules and Orders* of the Church, is doubtless *very Sinful*, and therefore *Unauthoriz'd*; and by reason of the Disobedience, may [in a remote Sense of the Word] be call'd *Anti-Episcopal* too, as it has a *Tendency* in its Consequences, to destroy the *just Authority and Power* of Bishops; but still this Circumstance, wherein the Baptism is administer'd, is not the *Ministration* it self; the *Ministration* is one thing, the *Circumstance* wherein 'tis given

given, is another; and that which can justly be charg'd on the Circumstance, cannot fairly be apply'd to the *Commission'd Ministrations*; because, tho' the Circumstance of Heresy, Schism, &c. is certainly wicked and *unauthoriz'd*; yet the Ministrations of Baptism with Water, In the Name of the Trinity, by a Person Vested with an *Episcopal Commission*, not Vacated, Null'd, or made Void by the Heresy or Schism, or by any Law of the Church, is, in *it self*, no other than that Commission'd Baptism, which the Church her self Administers; and it proceeds from Mr. *Bingham's* not duly attending to this *Distinction* between the *Authoriz'd Baptism*, and the *Circumstance* wherein 'tis administer'd, that he affirms "All the Baptisms of Hereticks, Schismaticks, and Degraded Priests, are Unauthoriz'd;" and that "It was agreed on all Hands, that Hereticks and Schismaticks, and Degraded Clergy-men had not any Legal Authority to Baptize, Page 51." when 'tis plain they had the Church's **Legal Authority**; since they were *Episcopally Ordain'd*, and the Church did not Null their Orders, by any of her Laws, but the contrary, as we have seen before; and since Mr. *Bingham* himself says of them, That "the Church did not intend to deny the **Validity** of their Ordination," Page 88. Thus, running into Inconsistencies and Contradictions, for want of a due Regard that ought to be had, to the Difference between a **Thing** and its **Circumstance** only.

§ V. It is from hence that our Reverend Historian thus concludes his Account of Heretical and Schismatical Baptisms in his 91st Page, "Upon the whole (says he) the Result of our Enquiry concerning

“cerning Hereticks and Schismaticks, and Degraded
“Clergy-men, is this;

“First, They all *aſt* in Opposition to the Church’s
“Lawful Authority, and therefore have not her
“Lawful Authority to Baptize.” In Answer to
which, ’tis evident by all that has been ſaid upon
this Subject, that the *Cyprianick Churches*, did, by
Eccleſiaſtical Laws, enacted in numerous Synods
of their Biſhops, make Null and Void the Com-
miſſions of their Heretical and Schiſmatical Cler-
gy; ſo that, by Virtue of thoſe Laws, they were, by
thoſe Churches, reckon’d to be *deſtitute* of Authority
and Power for Sacred Miniſtrations, during their
Schiſm or *Heresy*: But the other Churches, who
would not come up to the *Cyprianick Discipline* in
this Matter, made no ſuch *Nullifying Laws*, but
the contrary; and therefore, their *Heretical* and
Schiſmatical Subjects of the Clergy had not their
Commiſſions, which they at firſt receiv’d of the
Church, made *Null and Void*, but they remain’d
ſtill *Indeleted*, *not Vacated*, by the Church; and
therefore they had ſtill her *Lawful Authority*; for
if they had it not, then ’tis plain they had not
her Authority at all, for her Authority is no other
than a **Lawful One**; if they had not her Autho-
rity, then they had not *her Commiſſion*; if they
had not her Commiſſion, then they had no *Episcopal*
Commiſſion, for her Commiſſion is only *Episcopal*;
if they had no *Episcopal Commiſſion*, then they
were but *Laicks*; if they were but *Laicks*, then
they were *No Priests*, and their Ordination was
Null and Void; when yet Mr. Bingham ſays, “The
“Church did not intend to Deny the **Validity** of
“their Ordination, Page 88. and that “They
“were allow’d to be **Priests** ſtill, Page 89. He
goes on and ſays,

“Secondly,

“ Secondly, *Notwithstanding this* [*i. e.* notwithstanding their not having the Church’s *Lawful Authority to Baptize*] “ *their Baptisms, if done in due Form, are Valid, and not to be repeated.*” But the Discipline of the *Cyprianick Churches* did not allow this; for as *they* vacated their Commissions, so in consequence thereof they null’d their Baptisms too; but the other Churches, as they did *not null* their Commission and Authority, so neither did they make *void their Baptisms*; and since they were Commission’d Baptisms, no wonder they stood good and valid in those Churches. Mr. Bingham proceeds,

“ Yet, Thirdly, *Those Baptisms have great Deficiencies, particularly, that they do not minister Remission of Sins, and other invisible Graces of the Holy Spirit*——which Deficiencies are to be **supply’d** by *Imposition of Hands, and Invocation of the Holy Spirit, upon their* [*i. e.* the Baptized’s] “ *Repentance, and return to the Catholick Church: And this, whether Hereticks acting in that Capacity be consider’d,*

“ Fourthly, *Either as Clergy-men or Lay-men, or in a middle State betwixt both, &c.*” But our Reverend Historian do’s not here distinguish: For the *Great Deficiencies* he speaks of, are not in *those Baptisms* themselves, properly speaking; for he may remember, what himself says of Baptisms wickedly circumstantiated, even in the Church it self, *viz.* that “ *the same Deficiency was many times in the Baptism of those who were baptiz’d in the Church, because they were baptized in Enmity and Hatred of their Brethren, and in that State could not have Forgiveness of Sins.* See his 81st Page. Mr. Bingham sure do’s not mean that these

these Baptisms *in the Church*, have in themselves, this great Deficiency; no, they have certainly no Deficiency at all, the Fault is only in the Circumstance, *not in the Baptism*; the Persons baptiz'd, as himself acknowledges, “*are hereby made Partakers of all such Privileges, as the receiving the outward and visible Sacrament of Baptism can give to such as debar themselves (by some Obstacle of their own) from the Invisible and Spiritual Grace of it,* Page 77. The Invisible and Spiritual Grace of it, is the Invisible and Spiritual Grace of the Baptism it self, that which is inseparably annex'd to it. “*But this Grace is not receiv'd.*” That is very true; but the reason why 'tis not receiv'd, is not from any Deficiency in the Baptism, for 'tis [according to Mr. Bingham] the Sinner's “*Own Obstacle,*” and by this he “*Debars*” himself from the Invisible and Spiritual Grace of the Baptism. This *Circumstance* of Wickedness in the Sinner is the *Causa impediens*, the Obstacle or *Impediment* which Obstructs the Divine Influence of the *Spiritual Grace*, and therefore hinders the Baptized from receiving it; the Baptism it self is Efficient, and has no Defect; but the *Recipient* is not at present capable, by reason of his Sin, to receive the *Spiritual Benefits annex'd thereto*; take away this Obstacle, by a *sincere and hearty Repentance*, and the inward Spiritual Grace will be received by *Virtue of the former Baptism*. This is the Case of some wicked Persons who are baptiz'd even in the Church it self; and Mr. Bingham cannot deny, but in the Sense of those Churches, this also was much the same, with respect to the Heretical and Schismatical Baptisms we are speaking of; for he, from St. Augustin's Authority, “*supposes such as are*
Baptized

“Baptized by Hereticks and Schismaticks to be
 “much in the same State as bad Men in the
 “Church” — Nay, more he says, “They need—
 “only Repentance and Absolution to return
 “to the Church again; the Seal and Character of
 “their Baptism remaining in this respect for ever
 “Indelible upon them, so as to qualify them to
 “be admitted ever after to Pardon and Forgiveness
 “upon a true Repentance. These are Privileges
 “that a wicked Man has by Virtue of his having
 “receiv’d the outward Form of Baptism, or the vi-
 “sible Sacrament in the Church, tho’ all the Time,
 “by his own Fault, he be destitute of Pardon of
 “Sins, and all the invisible Graces and Operations
 “of the Holy Spirit. As the Baptism of Simon Ma-
 “gus was a true Baptism, tho’ he was an Unworthy,
 “and therefore an Unprofitable Receiver of it;
 “and as the Sacrament of the Eucharist is a true
 “Sacrament, tho’ many Men eat it, not to their
 “Soul’s Health, but to their own Damnation, be-
 “cause they are unworthy Receivers of it. Now
 “as the Case was with wicked Men, who thus re-
 “ceiv’d Baptism in the Church. — So the
 “Ancients supposed the Case of those to be who
 “were baptized — by Hereticks or Schis-
 “maticks, &c. Their Baptism, if done in due
 “Form — was the visible Sacrament of
 “Baptism — and qualified them for some, if
 “not all of the forementioned Privileges, so that
 “upon their Repentance and return to the Church
 “ — the Church by Imposition of Hands and In-
 “vocation of the Holy Spirit, might obtain for them
 “those Blessings and Graces, which might have been
 “had in Baptism, if they themselves had not been
 “the Obstacle, and put in a Bar against them. This
 “Mr. Bingham takes to be the true State of this
 “Matter;

“ *Matter, as generally deliver’d by such of the Ancients, as defended the Validity of Heretical Baptism.*” See his 77th, 78th, and 79th Pages. And to this also we do agree, in consideration, that those Ancients did likewise acknowledge the *Validity of the Episcopal Orders* of the Baptizers, consequently that their Baptism was *Episcopally Authoriz’d Baptism*; therefore that it had *no Deficiency in it self*, all the Fault being only in the *Circumstance* of the *Heresy*, or *Schism*, wherein their *Ministrations* were perform’d; so that this sinful *Circumstance*, this *Obstacle*, which (to use Mr. Bingham’s own Words) “ **Put a Bar against**” the *Spiritual Graces* of those Baptisms, and hinder’d the receiving of them, being remov’d and taken away by the *Repentance* of the Baptized and *their return to the Church*; by *Imposition of Hands*, and *Invocation of the Holy Ghost*, those *Spiritual Graces* then took place, and were receiv’d by the Baptized, without a *Second Baptism*, because the *First* had *no Deficiency in its Ministration*, but was *whole and entire*, being *Commission’d Baptism with Water*, In the *Name of the Trinity*: And when our Advocates, for the Baptisms we are disputing against, Baptisms by Persons *never Commission’d* at all to Baptize, can prove, that these false Baptisms given by our *Lay-Dissenting-Teachers*, are such *Episcopally Commission’d Baptisms*, as those *Ancient Heretical and Schismatical Baptisms* were, **then we shall have done with this Dispute**; but till then, it must be acknowledg’d, that whatsoever can be fairly said for the *Validity* of those *Heretical and Schismatical Baptisms*, which were *Episcopal*, is no ways applicable to these, which are not only *without an Episcopal Commission*, but are also in the most *direct and proper Sense* of the word

word *Anti-Episcopal*, in opposition to the very Order of Bishops; a Usurpation, this of so unheard of a Nature till of late, that the Ancient Catholick Church had *no Experience* of it; and consequently, could never have any *Tradition* or *Custom* in favour of its *pretended Validity*.

§ VI. By all that has been said, 'tis plain that *our Church of England* always had *Valid Baptisms*, because she *always had an Episcopal Commission* to baptize. Even when she was [as Mr. Bingham calls her] an Heretical and Schismatical Church, while under the Slavery of the *Romish Yoke*, her Episcopal Commission *was* good and valid, because there were no *Ecclesiastical Laws* or *Canons* of the Catholick Church, or of any Church to whom she may be suppos'd to have ow'd Subjection, that made her *Episcopal Commission* null and void upon the Account of her [suppos'd] Heresy or Schism; therefore all her Baptisms were *even then* good and Valid in *themselves*, being *Commission'd Baptisms* In the Name of the Trinity: They had **no Defect**, as they were the Sacrament of Baptism; whatsoever Deficiencies of Spiritual Graces she is suppos'd to have then labour'd under, were not owing to the Imperfection of the Sacrament, but to the Sinfulness and Uucharitableness of the suppos'd Heresy or Schism she is said to have been in: 'Twas only by this *Obstacle*, that those Spiritual Benefits can be suppos'd to have been *obstructed*, which *Obstacle* being remov'd by her *Repentance* and *Reformation*, those Spiritual Graces take effect; but her *Commission* it self is *no more* than it was before, the *Validity* thereof is just the same, only the *Obstacle* is now remov'd, which before [is suppos'd to have] hinder'd the receiving
of

of those Inward and Spiritual Graces, which are *constantly annex'd to the Commission it self*, whether the Commission'd Baptizer be **Wicked** or no; as our Church has taught us in her **Twenty-Sixth Article**.

§ VII. Before I conclude this Chapter, I must observe, that the *Rite of Imposition of Hands*, whereby Men who had formerly been Baptiz'd by *Heretical and Schismatical Priests*, were receiv'd into the Church, was not appointed to supply any *suppos'd Defect* in the Baptism it self which they had receiv'd, for it was the *Rite* whereby Penitents, *even those that had been baptiz'd in the Church it self*, were us'd to be receiv'd; it was the Ceremony of *Reconciliation*, and Absolution, and not us'd to give any *pretended Validity* to a Baptism, or Ordination, which was [*before such Imposition of Hands*] suppos'd to have been **Invalid**. And this was the Case of the Schismatical *Novatian Clergy*, whose Orders the great Council of *Nice*, which was a *General Council*, did not pretend to **make Valid** by Imposition of Hands; for Mr. *Bingham* himself observes in his 92d Page, That
 “ * the great Council of Nice decreed in the Case of
 “ the Novatians, that upon their Return to the
 “ Church, they should Continue in the same Sta-
 “ tion and Clerical Degrees they were in before,
 “ only receiving a **Reconciliatory Imposition of**
 “ **Hands by way of Absolution,**” which was plainly allowing the *Validity* of their Orders; and the Imposition of Hands was *Reconciliatory*, and by way of **Absolution**, according to Mr. *Bingham*; and the Canon has nothing in it, that supposes any

* *Con. Nic. Can. 8.*

Defect in the *Ordination it self* of the *Novatian Schismatics* to be supply'd by *Imposition of Hands*. And when the *Case* of our *Dissenters* shall be prov'd to be *the same* with those *Novatians*; when their having **no Episcopal Commission** shall be prov'd to be the same with the *Novatians*, who plainly **had one**; then, and not till then, can a "**Reconciliatory Imposition of Hands**, by "*way of Absolution*," be sufficient, for the receiving of our *Dissenters* as *validly Baptiz'd Persons*, in the *Sense* of the *Catholick Church*; for there are *no Instances*, that can be brought, to prove, that the *Ancient Catholick Church* ever receiv'd, by *Imposition of Hands*, *without Baptism*, such *Persons* as were only wash'd before, by those who were known (or suppos'd) to have been **never Episcopally Commission'd** to Baptize.

C H A P. VII.

Mr. Bingham's Account of the suppos'd Practice of Lay-Baptism by the Modern Greeks, Muscovites, and Foreign Reform'd, Examin'd; and prov'd to be no Evidence of the General Sense and Practice of the Church.

§ I. **O**UR Reverend Historian begins his Account of the Modern Greeks, with telling us in his 101st Page, That “ *in the Greek Church there has been some Dispute about this Matter, [i. e. of Lay-Baptism] and some seeming Variation in the Decrees of their Councils, tho' they have more generally agreed with the Latins so far, as to allow the Baptism of Lay-men in Cases of Extreme Necessity.*”

His first Instance is from the Time of the Patriarch Nicephorus, in the beginning of the Ninth Century, whose two Canons allow of Baptism by a Christian Lay-man, “ *where there is no Priest.*” Mr. Bingham reckons, “ *this was the declared Sense of the Greek Church, Authentically deliver'd in those two Canons made in a Patriarchal Council, where 270 Bishops were present, if the Council of Constantinople, Anno 814. was the Council in which these Canons were made, Page 105.*—In his 102d Page he produces Georgius Hamartolus, about the Year 840. making “ *a bitter Invective against the Lawfulness of this, as either not knowing the Decrees of Nicephorus, or else as Contemning and insulting them, Page 103.*—
That

That in the Twelfth Century “*there were some*
 “ *who made Opposition to them; for Michael*
 “ *Glycas, about the Year 1120. takes occasion to*
 “ *urge several Arguments against the Validity of*
 “ *Lay-Baptism in any Cases of Necessity what-*
 “ *soever, Page 104.*—That “*about 100 Years*
 “ *after, one Theodorus Scutariota, maintain'd the*
 “ *Invalidity of Lay-Baptism, Page 105.*—That,
 “ *that which seems—to bear down the foresaid*
 “ *Authority [of Nicephorus's two Canons] is ano-*
 “ *ther Decree made in the Council of Constantinople,*
 “ *under Lucas Chrysoberges the Patriach, An. 1166.*
 Mr. Bingham acknowledges, That “*this Council*
 “ *cannot be deny'd to speak plainly against the Va-*
 “ *lidity of Lay-Baptism, and in favour of [what he*
 “ *calls] “ Re-baptization, in the Case that was then*
 “ *laid before them, which was the Ordinary Mi-*
 “ *nister of Baptism by such as counterfeited Or-*
 “ *ders, and pretended to be Priests, when they*
 “ *were not so, Page 106.*—That “*the Best Greek*
 “ *Writers of late Days, in speaking of the Mi-*
 “ *nister of Baptism and the Practice of their*
 “ *Church, always except the Case of Extreme Ne-*
 “ *cessity, in which they allow a Lay-man, or Wo-*
 “ *man to Baptize, rather than suffer a Child to die*
 “ *without Baptism.”* He produces “*Jeremy, the*
 “ *late Patriarch of Constantinople,*” as allowing
 of this; also another “*Evidence from what Suice-*
 “ *rus has observ'd out of Metrophanes Critopu-*
 “ *lus, a late Writer of that Communion; Arcu-*
 “ *dus's Remark out of Gabriel Severus, Arch Bi-*
 “ *shop of Philadelphia;*” and lastly, our Learned
 Dr. Smith, who gives this Account from one of
 their Publick Confessions of Faith, Printed 1662.
 “*That it is not Lawful and Proper for any One to*
 “ *Baptize, but a Lawful Priest, Except in a*
 “ *Time*

“ *Time of Necessity, and then a Secular Person,*
 “ *whether Man or Woman, may do it,* Page 107,
 108.

These are Mr. *Bingham's* Evidences for the Practice of the *Greeks*; and now let us see the Force of their Testimony, as to the Matter we are enquiring about, which is, whether the *Ancient Catholick Church* has any Law, Tradition, or Custom, for the Validity of *pretended Baptism*, by Persons never Commission'd to baptize; for if we don't keep our Eye upon this, we shall be *very apt* to wander from the *great Point* now in Debate.

§ II. It is then to be observ'd, that in Mr. *Bingham's* whole *Scholastical History*, there is not so much as **One Instance** of the *Greek Church's* having ever attempted to Authorize *their Lay-men* to baptize in Case of Necessity, for the *first Eight Hundred Years* of Christianity, nor any Proof that the *Greek Church* ever had in that Period *any pretended Baptisms* by Persons never Commission'd to baptize.—So that, for the *first Eight Hundred Years*, that Church has *no Rule, Ecclesiastical Law, or Custom*, whereby to determine the pretended Validity of any Lay-Baptisms whatsoever; and this Negative is a good Argument, that the Validity of Baptism by *Laicks*, never was the *General Sense and Practice of the Ancient Catholick Church*; for, if the Ancient Catholick Church had esteem'd it so, it is a most unaccountable thing, to find *nothing of this* attested to by the *Greek Church* for Eight Hundred Years together, when we consider the **Great Extent** of that Church, that it was *so Significant* a Part of the Catholick Church, as that the most celebrated and most receiv'd Councils
 were

were held in it; and when we consider also the *Great Number* of *Greek* Authors, whose Writings make so remarkable a Figure as they do, among the Works of the *Primitive Fathers*; and who, both *Councils* and *Greek Fathers*, are thus silent for Eight Hundred Years together, in so *Important a Matter*, as this of the pretended general Sense and Practice of the Church, in favour of Baptism by Laicks, must needs have been, if it had ever been a *Catholick Tradition, Ecclesiastical Law, or Custom.*

§ III. Add to this, that tho' there was such a *profound Silence* in the *Greek Church*, concerning any *Validity* in such Baptisms, for the first Eight Hundred Years; yet, there was **no such Silence** about their **Invalidity**; for, we have already seen, that St. *Chrysoptom* and St. *Basil*, in the Fourth Century, pronounc'd them to be **Null and Void**. St. *Basil's* Epistle, wherein he affirm'd this, was a *Canonical Epistle*, and receiv'd into the Code of the *Greek Church*, as part of their *Canon Law*; so that this was the Sense of the *Ancient Greek Church*, and was never oppos'd by any *Greek Council*, or the contrary taught by any of the *Greek Fathers*, till the Time of the *Corrupt Ages* of the Church; when other **Superstitions** very dangerous to *Christianity*, crept into the *Greek*, as well as into the *Latin Church*.

§ IV. Mr. *Bingham* begins his Account of the suppos'd Practice of the *Greek Church* (as to Lay-Baptism) in the Ninth Century, one of the most corrupt and superstitious Ages of the Church; wherein the Practice of the **Worshipping of Images** was carried on, both in the *East* and *West*

with a high Hand; and **Nicephorus* Patriarch of *Constantinople*, [our Reverend Historian's Author] was a very zealous Promoter of *this Superstition*, insonmuch as to *Suffer* and *Die* in Banishment for it, as if it had been the *Cause of God*; which is no *great Reputation*, to his *supposed two Canons*, produced by our Reverend Historian in favour of *Lay-Baptism*; and his *Authority* is of no *more Value* in this Case, than it is in the other, of the *Use of Images* in *Divine Worship*.

§ V. 'Tis true, Mr. *Bingham* glories in this as *the Declared Sense of the Greek Church authentically deliver'd in these two Canons, made in a Patriarchal Council, where 270 Bishops were present, If the Council of Constantinople, Anno 814. was the Council in which these Canons were made,* [says he] Page 105." But the Reader may easily see, that Mr. *Bingham* dare not say, **This was the Council**; he puts it only upon the weak Foundation of an, *If the Council of Constantinople, &c.—was the Council, in which they were made.*" Our Reverend Historian do's not so much as *attempt to prove*, that those *two Canons* were made in *that Council*; and therefore we may fairly conclude, that *it is not to be prov'd*; this Gentleman however shews his Inclination to have it so, but it is no ways becoming a *faithful Historian*, to prejudice his Readers with **It's, May-be's, and Perhaps's**, so frequently as our Author do's; because, abundance of People do not so much mind every single word, [**If, Perhaps, &c.**] but that they may be carried

* *Du Pin's Ecclesiastical History*, Cent. IX. p. 1, 5.

away with a Belief of what is annex'd to such "If's and **May-be's**," especially, when the rest of the words are *big* and *ostentatious*: As here, we have the glaring shew, of "*The declar'd Sense of the Greek Church Authentically Deliver'd, and a Patriarchal Council of 270 Bishops;*" these are *great Things*, apt enough to fill up the whole Imagination of *many careless Readers*, who may neglect the **If** to which they are join'd: But let us a little enquire, what reason *Mr. Bingham* has *thus partially* to Name **this**, any more than the *other Councils*, said to have been held by *Nicephorus*? Nay, upon what good Foundation he could suppose those two Canons, to have been made in any *Authentick Council* at all?

Nicephorus was made Patriarch of *Constantinople*, Anno 806; in that same Year a * Council was held at *Constantinople* about the Restoration of *Joseph* the Steward of that Church to his Office, out of which he had been turn'd by *Nicephorus's* Predecessor *Tarasius* the Patriarch; and there are *no Records* of any such Canons made in that Council.

In the Year 809. *Nicephorus* held another † Council, "*In which Joseph was not only Confirm'd in his Place, but the second, Adulterous, Marriage of Constantine Copronymus the Emperor, who after he had divorc'd his Wife, married another nam'd Theodota, was declar'd Lawful, by Dispensation, and every one that should maintain the contrary was Anathematiz'd.*" Neither did this Council make those Canons; and if

* *Du Pin's Chron. IX. Cent.*

† *Du Pin's Eccles. Hist. Cent. IX. p. 5.*

they had, 'twould have been but very little to their *Reputation*, to have been decreed by those who could **Confirm** even **Adultery** it self.

In the Year 813. *Leo Armenus* possess'd himself of the Empire, and was Crown'd by *Nicephorus* the 11th of (a) *July*. This *Leo* declar'd against **Image Worship** in favour of the *Iconoclasts*, who were (b) *Nicephorus's Enemies*, upon the account of his great *Zeal* for that *Superstition*. "The Emperor resolving to root out that *Corruption*, consulted with *Antonius* Metropolitan of *Silea*, to assist him in this (c) *Design*, promising to make him Patriarch of *Constantinople* instead of *Nicephorus*, which *Antonius* promis'd the Emperor he would." *Du Pin*, in his *Chronicle* of the Ninth Century, says, "that this Year, 813. was held the Council of *Constantinople*, against *Antonius* of *Silea*." *Labbe* says 'twas in the (d) Year 814. and that it consisted of 270 Bishops; so that this must be the Council *Mr. Bingham* speaks of. Now 'tis plain, that there appears to have been no other *Business* transacted at that Council, but the *Anathematizing* of *Antonius*, for endeavouring to put down *Image Worship*. There are no such **Canons** of that Council Extant; and therefore *Mr. Bingham* has no more reason to suppose *Nicephorus's* two **Canons** to have been made in this Council, than he has to affix them to either of the other two Councils held by that Patriarch.

(a) *Du Pin's Chron.* IX. Century.

(b) *Du Pin's Eccles. Hist.* Cent. IX. p. 1.

(c) *Concil. Iabbei*, Tom. 7 p. 129.

(d) *Ib d.* 1290.

There was another Council at *Constantinople*, Anno 814. but it was held by the *Iconoclasts* [Opposers of Image Worship] after *Nicephorus's* Banishment for his superstitious Zeal to promote and uphold that great Corruption, when *Theodosius* the *Iconoclast* was made Patriarch in his stead, who presided in that Council; so that *Nicephorus*, to be sure, neither would, nor could sit in that Council, and consequently his *two Canons* were not made there; in short, they cannot be prov'd to have been made by him *in any Council* at all; and therefore our Reverend Historian can hardly clear himself from the Imputation of Partiality, when he pitches upon *the Council* against *Antonius*, rather than any other, and all because of the great show that it makes of 270 Bishops; who, if they had made these *two Canons*, would have no more shew'd the Sense of the Ancient *Catholick Church* in this Matter, than they did in the other of *Image Worship*, when they Anathematiz'd a Bishop for opposing that great Superstition.

§ VI. It is true, that immediately after this Council, Anno 814. *Labbe* places Seventeen Canons of *Nicephorus*, among which are the two Canons we are speaking of; but then 'tis as true, that *Labbe* do's not reckon them as *Acts* of that Council, but acknowledges that * he took them from the same Author as our Reverend Historian receiv'd them, *vis.* from *Leunclavius*; and that he

* *Concil. Labb. Tom. 7. p. 1200.* Eidem quoque subjiciemus Leges Synodicas ab eodem Nicephoro sanctitas ex *Libro III. Tom. 1. Juris Græco Romani à Joanne Leunclavio Concinnati: neque enim Indagare ullatenus potuimus ad quem potissimum Annum sint revocandæ.*

could not at all affix them to any particular Year wherein they were made, and therefore by consequence to no *particular Council*.

Labbe indeed calls 'em *Synodical Laws*, but *Leunclavius* from whom he took 'em, gives 'em no other Name than only *the *Canons of Nicephorus the Confessor*, and says nothing of their having been made in any *Synod* at all. But some are apt to think they were decreed in a *Synod of Bishops*, because they are found in *Leunclavius's* Third Book, which bears this Title, [Lib. III. *Qui continet Sententias Synodales, & Sanctiones Pontificias Archiepiscoporum & Patriarcharum Constantinopolis.*]
 “ The Third Book, containing the *Synodical Judgments*, and Pontifical Decrees of Arch-Bishops, and Patriarchs of *Constantinople* : ” In which 'tis to be observ'd, that *Leunclavius* gives his Reader to understand, that in his Third Book he had collected two sorts of Decrees; *First*, Those which were made in Councils at *Constantinople*. *Secondly*, Others that were made by particular Arch-Bishops and Patriarchs of that *See*. When they are Canons or Decrees of Councils, he expressly calls them so; when they are Constitutions of *Particular Patriarchs*, or *Arch-Bishops*, he entitles them as such, and does not give Notice of any Council whatsoever as having appointed them: Thus for Example, in his Third Book, Page 186. he gives us a Constitution of *St. John Chryssostom*, Arch-Bishop of *Constantinople*, and do's not call it *Synodical*. In Page 187. he has a *Synodical* One, made by *Gennadius*, Patriarch of *Constantinople*, in a *Council assembled there with him*, and so *Leuncla-*

* *Leunclav. Jus Græco. Rom. Vol. I. Lib. III. p. 196.*

vius expresse it; but when he gives us *Nicephorus's* Canons, he only calls 'em "*Canons of Nicephorus the Confessor,*" as I have before observ'd, without saying that they were ever made *in any Council*, and he is remarkably particular in this Distinction; so that, since there is no Council to which these two Canons can be *appropriated*, we may conclude, that they were made by no other than *Nicephorus* himself; and every Body who has look'd into Ecclesiastical History, knows that particular Popes, Patriarchs, Arch-Bishops, Bishops, and Abbots, &c. have made many Canons by their own Authority, without any Councils assembled, and concurring with them in those Canons.

§ VII. Add to this, that these two Canons are not to be found in the Collection of *Nicephorus's* Thirty Seven Canons, nor in that of his Nine Canons, both publish'd by **Cotelerius*; only *Leunclavius* (from *Harmenopolus*) in his Collection of the *Greek and Roman Laws*, has publish'd Seventeen Canons, attributed to *Nicephorus*, all which are in *Cotelerius's* Collections, except the 2d, 3d, 9th, 12th, 13th, and 16th of the Seventeen: These Six Canons look very suspiciously, being mix'd with Eleven others, which Eleven are found in the former Collections, *when the Six are not be found in them*; among these Six are the Two Canons for Lay-Baptism, about which we are disputing, *viz.* the 13th and 16th of the Seventeen; so that their being *Nicephorus's*, is founded only upon the single Testimony of *Harmenopolus*, who

* *Inter Monumenta, Eccles. Græc. Tom. 3. p. 445.*

wrote his Epitome of the *Greek Canons* about the Year 1150. from whom *Leunclavius* says he took them; which Evidence, supposing it to be as good as can be desir'd, is no Argument that they were of any *Publick Authority*, as the Authentick Sense of the *Greek Church*, but only that they were the *Decrees of One Patriarch*. And we have seen that he was not so very exactly found in *Principle and Practice*, but that he could be carried away with a false Zeal for the Promoting of Superstition, and did not scruple to ratify and confirm even *Adultery* it self.

§ VIII. But further, these Canons appear to have been but of very little, if of any Authority at all in the *Greek Church*; for if they had been the *declar'd Authentick Sense of that Church*: How should some of the *Greek Writers* [*who never were accus'd of Contumacious opposing the standing Rules and Orders of their Church*] write so zealously as they have done, against the *Lawfulness* of Lay-Baptism, even in Cases of *pretended Necessity*? As *Georgius Hamartolus*, about the Year 840. *Glycas*, Anno. 1120. and *Theodorus Scutariota*, Anno 1220. Sure these knew the *general Sense and Practice of the Greek Church*; and why should we believe they would have written so boldly against it, if this had been the *approv'd Lawful Sense and Practice* thereof? They plainly pass over and neglect these Two Canons, as if they never had been; or if they had any Knowledge of them, they look'd upon 'em only as the Opinion of one Man, to be only of Private, if of any Authority, and not the declar'd Authentick Sense of the *Greek Church*, which we may reasonably believe they would have been more tender of Opposing, if it had been

" truly

“ *truly Catholick and agreeable to the Word of God.*” Since Mr. *Bingham* do’s not give us any Instance of their Contradicting the standing Rules and Orders of their Church in any other respect whatsoever.

§ IX. And great reason had those Writers so strenuously to oppose Lay-Baptism in any Case whatsoever; for the Institution it self gives not the least encouragement to such a Practice, but the contrary: *St. Basil*, in his Canonical Epistle to *Amphilochius*, part of the Canon Law of the *Greek Church*, pronounced such Baptism Null and Void; *St. Chrysostom*, Arch-Bishop of *Constantinople*, did the same; these both in the Fourth Century: The Constitutions, call’d Apostolical, very much esteem’d by that Church, absolutely prohibit Laicks from meddling in such Holy Things; and the *Greek Church*, for the first Eight Hundred Years of Christianity, had nothing that favour’d such a Practice as that of Lay-Baptism; so that even if *Nicephorus*, Anno 814. had endeavour’d by his Patriarchal Authority to introduce such a Novelty, and those Writers had known of this his Design, yet they had good Foundation whereon to build their Arguments against it; especially, if we also consider that it was a Novelty of some of the *Latins*, and that the Emisseries of the Bishops of *Rome* were very early in their Attempts upon other Churches, particularly the *Greek Church*, to make them submit to their *Erroneous Doctrines and Practices*; for even *St. Basil*, in his Tenth Epistle, complains of the *Western Bishops* in his Days, particularly the *Roman*, [“ *Quod veritatem neque Norunt, neque discere sustinent—*
“ *Cum iis qui veritatem ipsis annunciant Contenden-*
“ *tes,*

“ *tes; herasın autem per se ipsos stabilientes.*”]
 “ That they neither know the Truth, nor care to
 “ learn it; but they contend with them who tell
 “ ’em the Truth, and by themselves establish He-
 “ refy.” Our *Nicephorus*’s familiar Correspondence
 with the then Bishop of Rome, Pope Leo III. whereof
 we have an Instance in * a Letter *Nicephorus*
 wrote to him, Anno 811. in which he acknowledges
 the Invocation of Saints, and Worship of Images—
 and excuses himself to the Pope that he did not
 write to him sooner; and says, that the Cause
 was, that he was made to believe that the Church
 of Rome was at Enmity with that of Constantinople;
 but now the Cause of the Division being remov’d,
 he doubted not but there would be a *perfect Agreement*
 between the two Churches. I say, this and such
 like familiar Correspondence of *Nicephorus*, and
 other *Greeks*, with the Bishops of Rome then and
 afterwards, together with the restless Endeavours
 of the Bishops of that Church, to make other
 Churches submit to their Erroneous Doctrines
 and Practices, without which the Church of Rome,
 in her corrupt Ages, would have no *perfect Agreement*
 with any other Church; gave but too just
 occasion to others of the *Greek Church* who were
 jealous for the Truths of Christianity, to give
 that Church timely Warning of Dangerous
Romish Novelties creeping in among them; of
 which Number *Georgius Hamartolus*, *Glycas*, and
Theodorus Scutariota, appear to have been, in
vigorously opposing the pretended Lawfulness
 of *Lay-Baptism*, which was first started only
 in the *Latin Church*; and in Defence of which,
 we have no In-

* Du Pin IX. Cent.

stance in the Primitive *Greek Church*: And *Nicephorus's* suppos'd Two Canons, in the Ninth Century, were but of his private Authority, and not at all regarded, but neglected and contemn'd, if they were so much as known by those Writers from the Year 840. to 1220.

§ X. But our Reverend Historian will have it that *Nicephorus's* Two Canons “*continued in force among the Greeks for some Ages after* [the Year 840.] Page 103. Of this he is *very Positive*; and now let us see what is his Reason for it? Why truly no more than this, *viz.* “*For Harmenopolus, who lived in the middle of the Twelfth Century, and wrote his Epitome of the Greek Canons about the Year 1150. has inserted them both into his Collection; and they are the only Canons that are mention'd upon this Subject, which seems to argue, that they were then the standing Rule of the Greek Church,*” Page 104. This is his whole Argument; in which there are several things worth our Notice: *First*, That he asserts the Two Canons continu'd in force for some Ages, because they were inserted by a Writer, in his Collection of Canons, above Three Hundred Years after *Nicephorus*: This is just as good an Argument, as if I should say, that a Modern *English* Writer's collecting *Ancient English Canons*, made Three Hundred Years ago, whether by Men in the right or the wrong for making them, is a good Proof that such Old *English* Canons continued in force in the Church of *England* all that while, to *the time of his Collecting them*; the Weakness of which betrays it self. *Secondly*, He says they are the **Only Canons** that are mention'd upon this Subject: This confirms what I observ'd before, that there

there were none such in the *Greek Church* for the first Eight Hundred Years; and now they stand Singular by themselves for Three Hundred and Fifty Years after, during which Time we have not yet had so much *as one Argument*, that they were of any *standing Authority*, or Force in the *Greek Church*; the Practice countenanc'd by them was oppos'd very early after they are suppos'd to have been made, *viz.* by *Georgius Hamartolus* within Twenty Six Years after, and by *Glycas* not above Thirty Years before *Harmenopulus* collected them; so that in these Three Hundred and Fifty Years they made no Figure in the *Greek Church*, as *Lawful Constitutions* thereof, since they were either not known, or *contemn'd and despis'd*, by two Writers who are not accus'd of being either *Hereticks* or *Schismaticks*, and who very well knew, and did not quarrel with, the *Lawful and Genuine Rules of their Church*.—But, *Thirdly*, *Harmenopulus's* inserting them in this Collection, and they being “*the Only Canons mention'd upon this Subject, seems to argue, that they were then the standing Rule of the Greek Church.*” First, Our Reverend Historian was **positive** that they *continued in Force for some Ages*; and for this Positiveness one would have thought he was going to introduce as Positive a Reason, when he begins it with a **For**, but at last he finishes with only, it **Seems**; so that all he has said to prove their continuing in Force for some Ages, amounts to no more, than that *Harmenopulus's* Collecting them do's but “*seem to argue,*” it is no convincing Argument that they were then the standing Rule of that Church, it only seems so; But Mr. *Bingham* must give us more than **Seeming Arguments** for the *Greek Church's Standing Rules, Ecclesiastical Laws* and

and *Canons* about this matter; (all is not Gold that glitters) 'till our Reverend Historian proves them to be the *Authentick Constitutions* of that Church, we shall esteem those Two *Canons* not to have been the *Greek Church's standing Rule*, but a singular Innovation of no Publick Authority or Obligation.

§ XI. And now let us see what can be made of these Two *Canons*; why truly no more than this: That *if Bishops have Power* by Canon to authorize their own Lay-men to Baptize, in want of a Priest, (*which has not yet been prov'd that they have*) then *Nicephorus*, by these Two *Canons*, authoriz'd his *Greek Lay-men* for that purpose. And what would this be to us if it were so? Nothing at all certainly; for *his Canons*, even in that case, have *no Obligation* upon us: Our Lay-men can receive *no Authority* at all from them, and therefore they are of no Use in our present Controversie, which is, about the Validity of that *pretended Baptism* which is given by Persons, who, upon *no account whatsoever*, can be said to have been at all commission'd or authoriz'd by Bishops to Baptize, if Bishops could so authorize their own Lay-Communicants.

§ XII. Before I proceed any farther I must take notice, that Mr. *Bingham* rejects all *Glycas's* Arguments against Lay-Baptism, and says of 'em from *Cotelerius*, That "*his Arguments are grounded upon several Mistakes in matters of Fact, which makes them weak and inconclusive,*" pag. 104. But because *Glycas* was mistaken in some Facts, nay some but **pretended Facts**; Do's it therefore follow that he has no good Argument against this Practice? Let us try one of that *Greek Writer's* Ar-

guments, and see how our Reverend Historian can disprove it. "*Glycas alledges the Authority of the Apostolical Canons prohibiting Lay-men to meddle with the Priest's Office, whatever Cases of Necessity may seem to require it.*" Mr. Bingham finds fault with this, and says, "*The Case of Necessity is never so much as once mentioned in all the Apostolical Canons or Constitutions; only Lay-men are severely prohibited in general from thrusting themselves into the Offices of the Ecclesiastical Function,*" pag. 104. Now who is there that do's not see, that Mr. Bingham, by this Observation, confirms *Glycas's* Allegation? "*The Case of Necessity is not once mentioned in all the Apostolical Canons or Constitutions,*" says Mr. Bingham; and I in return do say, that for this very reason, *Glycas* had good Authority to affirm, That "*Lay-men were prohibited to meddle with the Priest's Office, whatsoever Cases of Necessity may seem to require it.*" For, since the Apostolical Canons or Constitutions do not once mention, they consequently make no Provision for, any Case of Necessity whatsoever. And since *Lay-men are severely prohibited in general*, by Mr. Bingham's own Confession, therefore, this Prohibition is *absolute and unlimited*, it includes all Cases, and consequently the pretended Case of *Necessity*, because it *excepts none*; and all this because it relates to a Thing, which was never valid before 'twas *commission'd*, and owes its Validity to the Observation of the first Institution, which *annex'd it to a Commission*, and made no *Proviso* for its Validity *without a Commission* in any Case whatsoever: Therefore the **general Prohibition** of the Apostolical Canons, against Persons who have *no Commission*, includes even the suppos'd Case of *Necessity*, and excludes such Persons (as *Glycas* very well infers)

from

from meddling in the Priest's Office, whatsoever Cases of Necessity may seem to require it. For there is no Case of Necessity that can **really** require it, because the Institution points at no such Case, nor makes any Provision for it; the worst Case may in some Mens Opinion *seem to require it*, yet it do's but *seem* to do so: For if we put them upon the Proof that the Case **certainly** requires it, they are at a *great stand*, and have no Arguments to produce for it; nay, so far from that, that some of 'em say, 'Tis *sinful* for an *uncommission'd Person* to meddle in it, when at the same time they *call it necessary*, and run themselves into the Contradiction of asserting the Necessity of a Sin, or that the Case is a Case of Necessity, and that some-body must supply it, tho' by sinning against the Law of God himself, as we have seen by some late Attempts about this matter, set forward by those, from whom we should least have expected them.

§ XIII. But to return to the *Greek Church*: It is plain, that hitherto we have found *no authentick Act of hers* giving Countenance to the suppos'd Validity of Lay-Baptism; and as for the Testimony of particular Writers of that Church, 'tis evident from what has been said, that the *Majority* is against the Validity thereof, so far as to the Year 1220, when *Theodorus Scutariota* maintain'd the Invalidity of such Baptism. Let us now see what the *Greek Church* assembled in Council has done, and her *Authentick Sense* against such Baptisms as those are, against which we are now disputing, *viz.* Baptisms perform'd by Persons who never were Episcopally ordain'd, and who yet presume to reckon themselves as Ministers of Christ, and to Baptize as if they were **really** such.

In the Year 1166. there was a great Council at Constantinople *, where were present Three Patriarchs, Lucas Chrysoberges of Constantinople, Athanasius of Antioch, and Nicephorus of Jerusalem, with Fifty seven Metropolitans, besides other Bishops.— Mr. Bingham owns, that in this Synod, a “ Question was put by Manuel Arch-Bishop of Heraclea, ” “ Whether a Man ought to be received as a Christian, who was baptiz’d by one who pretended to be a Priest, but was not so? For such a Case had lately happened in his Diocese. In answer to this the Synod decreed, That such ought to be re-baptiz’d; because the Administration of Baptism is only committed to Bishops and Priests, according to the 46th and 47th Canons of the Apostles, ” pag. 106. Our Reverend Historian acknowledges also, That “ this Council cannot be deny’d to speak plainly against the Validity of Lay-Baptism, and in favour of [what he calls] “ Re-baptization in the Case that was then laid before them, which was the ordinary Administration of Baptism by such as counterfeited Orders, and pretended to be Priests when they were not so. ” And this is most evidently our present Case; for our Lay-Baptisms are by Persons pretending to be in Orders who are not so, and they give their false Baptisms ordinarily, claiming the ordinary Ministration of Baptism: And therefore the declared, authentick Sense of the Greek Church, in a Synod of Three Patriarchs, Fifty seven Metropolitans, and other Bishops, is full and direct against the Validity, and positive for the Invalidity of their false Baptisms; and Mr. Bingham cannot produce any

* Cave Hist. Lit. Vol. 1. p. 676. Vol. 2. p. 418, 419.

one Council that was ever held, either in the *Eastern* or *Western Church* for the first Twelve hundred Years of Christianity, that he can prove would have decreed any otherwise than this Council did in this matter.

§ XIV. Our Reverend Historian seems not willing to believe, that the Decree of this Council was so *extensive*, as some of the Enemies of Lay-Baptism may be apt to believe; for he says thus, “*But whether they [i. e. the Members of that Council] intended by this, wholly to invalidate the Baptism of Deacons and Lay-men, in extraordinary Cases of absolute Necessity, when neither a Bishop nor Presbyter can be had; as they have not express’d themselves particularly upon this point; so it is more than I can pretend positively to determine,*” pag. 106. Here again Mr. Bingham repeats his *artful* but very *unfair way* of joyning **Deacons** with *Lay-men*, as if Deacons were *no more* Partakers of the Priestly Power, than *Lay-men*: But the Fallacy of this I have already sufficiently expos’d, and therefore shall here only speak of *Lay-men*, *Persons never commission’d* by Bishops to baptize; and I do affirm, that Baptism by such Persons, tho’ done when none of the Priesthood can be had, is by this *Synodical Act* declared *Null and Void*.

First, Because the Baptism by the *Pretender to Holy Orders*, who *deceiv’d* the baptiz’d, was to the Receiver, equivalent to a *Lay-Baptism* in want of a Priest, and esteem’d *Null and Void* by those Bishops; for, this pretended Baptism was as much a Case of Necessity to the baptiz’d, as if no Priest could have been had, because the *Deceiver* appear’d *as a Priest*; as such he was receiv’d by the baptiz’d, and he had, at the time of his Baptism, no

Medium by which to discover the *Fallacy*, and therefore 'twas to him equivalent to a Case of Necessity, because (by reason of the *Delusion*) he had no free Choice to be baptiz'd by a *Priest*; and therefore, since that Council would not admit this *pretendedly baptiz'd Person as a Christian* without *Sacerdotal Baptism*, and all because the Pretender had *no Priestly Character*, and for this *only reason too*; it must needs be, that they null'd a *pretended Baptism* receiv'd from a Lay-man, by one in a Case of Necessity, when he could (in his Circumstances) have no Priest to baptize him. And,

Secondly, The Reason given by that Council proves this Assertion; for they affirm'd expressly, That "*such ought to be re-baptiz'd, because the Administration of Baptism is only committed to Bishops and Priests, according to the 46th and 47th Canons of the Apostles.*" The Power of Baptizing being committed *only* to those who are vested with a *Priestly Power*, is made the *Reason* why *Priestly Baptism* was decreed to be given to him, who before was *falsly baptiz'd*, by one who had no *such Sacerdotal Power*; and this without distinguishing, that it might be otherwise in any Case whatsoever: 'Tis *absolute* and *unlimited* without any Exception, and therefore includes all Cases ordinary and extraordinary: 'Tis apply'd by the Council, particularly to the Case before us, which was an *extraordinary Case* to the pretendedly baptiz'd, by reason of the *Delusion* and *Cheat* put upon him; they did not decree in his favour, because he was thus deluded, and under that Circumstance could have no other Baptism, which made his a Case of Necessity; that therefore, because his was such a Case, his *false Baptism* was good and valid; no, they determin'd *only upon this Principle*, that there was really

no Priestly Power, therefore no Baptism; and for this reason, and this only, they decreed that he should be baptiz'd: It is not recorded, whether the counterfeit Priest pretended to minister *Ordinarily*, where true Priests were to be had, or *Extraordinarily* where they were Absent; and let the Adversary chuse which of them he will, the Case was still the same to the pretendedly Baptized; for, the false Baptizer made him believe, that he was such a One as could give True Baptism; and the Baptized being deceiv'd, took him for such. If true Priests were to be had, he esteem'd the counterfeit One, under his Delusion, as true, and therefore as eligible, as any of them, and so saw no Necessity of Addressing to One of them for Baptism, rather than to him; which put him under a *Necessity* of being supposedly baptiz'd by him: And if true Priests could not be had, it would but have been the *same Case of Necessity*; but notwithstanding, upon sifting the Matter, 'twas only the *want of Commission*, that was the reason of the Invalidity of the Baptism, in the Sense of that Council; and the Case is but just the same, when a Laick, a Person *never Commission'd* to baptize, attempts to give Baptism in an Extraordinary Case, where Priests are not to be found; for, the Laick's *Open and Known Usurpation*, of what was never Committed to him, do's *no more vest him with a Commission*, than the covert and sly Pretences of the counterfeit Priest, [who is no Priest at all] do's Authorize him; they are both *equally without any Commission*; and the Absence of true Priests, do's not give any Advantage to the Lay-Usurper's Case; for, *this Negative* can confer *no Positive Power or Authority* to baptize; the Laick never had it before, for such a Case, either by the *Laws of Na-*

ture, for *that* has nothing to do in the Matter; or by the Law of God, for *that* never vested him with it; or lastly, by any suppos'd *Donation* of the Catholick Church, or of the Bishops, to whom he owes Subjection, [if either the *Catholick Church*, or those Bishops, could make such a *Donation*, or Gift of Power, to Laicks;] consequently this Laick, in Absence of the Priests, is *as much without a Commission*, as the counterfeit Priest was; and since this Council decreed, the pretended Baptism administer'd by the counterfeit Priest, to be Null and Void, "*because the Administration of Baptism was never Committed to him,*" and he had therefore **No Priestly Character**; it necessarily follows, that the same Decree censures pretended Baptism to be Null and Void, when given by a Laick, one *never Commission'd to Baptize*, tho' done in *Destitution* and want of *Priests*, because the Laick, even in this Case, has *no more a Commission* than the *Counterfeit Priest*: The Ministration of Baptism was no more Committed to this Laick, than it was to that Impostor; they are both *equally Laicks*, both exactly alike, *Non-Commission'd*.

And if any favourable Construction may be made for *pretended Baptism* by one, rather than by the other, to the Advantage of the supposedly Baptized; it is more equitable to allow of that which was perform'd by the **Counterfeit Priest**, than to acquiesce in that, which was done by the known *presumptuous Lay-man*; because, the supposedly Baptized has a better colour of Excuse, by reason of the *Cunning* of the Impostor, and the *great Difficulty*, if not *Impossibility* (under his Circumstances) of discovering the Cheat, when he had *no Suspicion* of it, nor any Grounds given why he should

should suspect the *Administrator's Commission*; when on the other hand, the presumptuous to Lay-man, who puts on no Disguise, is easy to be discover'd; for the People are us'd to receive Baptism from the Hands of the Priests, they know 'tis their Office to give it, so that when a *known Laick* presumes to do it in any Case whatsoever, there's something shocking in it; and the meanest unprejudic'd understanding of those Men, who are us'd (as all ought) to study their Bibles, may easily see, that *No Appearance of Necessity* can vest Men with that Sacred Office which God has appropriated to others, to minister in Holy Things; and therefore, they are in such Case, *less excusable* for submitting to such *open unwarranted Usurpations*. But this Council of *Constantinople* used no *such false Judgment*, they decreed the false Baptism, given by the *Cunning Impostor*, to be Null and Void, notwithstanding all the pleadable Difficulty of suspecting or discovering the Cheat; and consequently the same Determination stands good, against the Validity of pretended Baptism, given (tho' in Absence of the Clergy) by known Lay-men, Persons never Commission'd to baptize; because there is *less colour* for Excuse, in favour of those who receive these false Baptisms, than there is in behalf of such as are almost *unavoidably deluded*, by the *other Cunning and Subtile Pretenders*. But without favouring one more than the other, they are *both equally without Commission*; and therefore by this *Greek Council* their *Ministrations* are both *Null and Void*.

§ XV. Our Reverend Historian says, Page 106. “ If it was so [*viz.* if this Council design’d to Invalidate such Lay-Baptisms] “ then I can say, “ it was plainly contrary to the Decrees of the “ Former Council under Nicephorus, which “ prevail’d in Practice both before and since this “ Council, and still do’s in the Greek Church to this “ Day.” And then he charges some Learned Persons with Error for thinking otherwise. But Mr. Bingham has not yet produc’d the Council which he talks of, he has given us nothing but an *If* for his supposed Council under *Nicephorus*; nay, he cannot prove that this Patriarch’s Two Canons were ever made by any Synod at all, but yet he calls ’em the Decrees of the *Former Council*, very emphatically, as if he had given Proof of some particular Synod wherein they were made, which he has not at all done; so that Mr. Bingham is here very positive upon an *Uncertainty*, (to make the best of it) even in *direct Opposition* to what is *Evident* and *Certain*; for he insists upon a *supposititious Council’s Decrees*, against an *undoubted Decree* of an *Incontested, Indisputable Authentick Council*; and would make us believe that the former (*tho’ not prov’d*) were of most force, in that “ they prevail’d in Practice, both before and since this *Certain and Undisputed Council*; How they prevail’d in Practice before, we have seen already; Mr. Bingham has hitherto produc’d no Evidence for this their supposed *Prevalency*; and if he had, it still wants to be prov’d that this Practice was founded upon the *general Sense of the Greek Church*, and not rather upon the *false Principles*, introduc’d among some *Latinizing Greeks*, by the Craft and Cunning

Cunning of Popish Emiffaries, who have been continually endeavouring to corrupt that poor, oppressed, and afflicted Church: But this Council of *Constantinople*, held by Three Patriarchs, Fifty Seven Metropolitans, and other Bishops besides, is a *Glaring Evidence*, that this Corruption of Popery had not yet in the Year 1166. prevail'd in the *Greek Church*; for if it had, 'tis *inconceivable* how such a *Numerous Synod*, as that was, should make a Decree so directly contrary to the Popish Notion of Lay-Baptism.

§ XVI. But our Author goes on with his Endeavours to prove, that this Piece of Popery "*prevail'd in the Greek Church, since this Council, and still do's to this Day*; For (says he) *the Best Greek Writers of late Days, in speaking of the Minister of Baptism, and the Practice of their Church, always except the Case of Extreme Necessity, in which they allow a Layman, or Woman, to baptize, rather than suffer a Child to die without Baptism.*" And he instances *Jeremy* Patriarch of *Constantinople*, in the Sixteenth Century; *Suicerus's* Observation out of *Metrophanes Critopulus*; *Arcudius's* Remark out of *Gabriel Severus*, Arch-Bishop of *Philadelphia*, and our *Dr. Smith's* present State of the *Greek Church*.

§ XVII. In Answer to all which 'tis evident, that our Reverend Historian's *Best Greek Writers*, as he calls 'em, have betray'd themselves to be *Uncatholick* in their Principles; and the Practice they speak of, to be also *Uncatholick and Popish*; for they espouse the Cause of *Baptism by Women*, whom *Mr. Bingham* acknowledges never to have been allow'd by the *Ancient Church* to Baptize:

tize: This shews of what Party those *Greeks* are, who allow of this, and that they learn'd and took it from the corrupt Church of *Rome*, the known *Promoter* and *Abettor* of this *Erroneous* and *Uncatholick* Practice; but the Authors mention'd by our Historian, are no more than *particular Men*, and their *Authority* of no Importance against that of the Council of *Constantinople*, Anno 1166. And 'tis very Notorious, that in these latter Ages the *Greeks* are, by the Craft and Subtilty of the *Romish* Emissaries, divided into two Parties; one that adheres to the Principles and Practices of their *Ancestors*, the *Ancient Greeks*; and the other that embraces the Novelties and Superstitions of the Church of *Rome*.

Dr. *Smith*, in the Preface to his Account of the *Greek* Church, shews us how *Cyrellus Lucaris* Patriarch of *Constantinople*, 1621. by opposing the Designs of the *Jesuits*, got to himself the *Hatred* and *Ill-will* of the *Latinizing Greeks*; and from Page 239. and forward of that Book, how by the Intigation of the *Jesuits*, and *Conspiracy* of some *Greek Bishops*, he was *Prosecuted*, *Dethron'd*, *Banish'd*, and at last *Barbarously Murder'd*, An. 1638. In Page 249. we see how the *Romish Emissaries* and *Latinizing Greeks* bribe the *Turks* to get their *own Party-Men* advanc'd to the Patriarchate; there we find how the Church of *Rome* sends *Titular Bishops* among them, and how the *Romish Ambassadors*, as well as *Romish Priests*, disturb and rend that poor *distressed Church*, by Corrupting the *Greek Bishops*.

Sir *Paul Ricaut*, late Consul at *Smyrna*, in his Present State of the *Greek* and *Armenian* Churches, Anno 1678. tells us in his Preface, Page 15. that a Confession of Faith, suppos'd to have been writ-

ten by *Cyrillus* Patriarch of *Constantinople* in the Year 1629. was believ'd in a great measure to have been *father'd on him by the Jesuits*, to render him odious both to *Greeks* and *Latins*.—In the 28th Page of his Book he assures us, that “*The Roman Priests frequent all Places where the Greeks Inhabit, endeavouring to draw them unto their side, both by Preaching and Writings, of which one being written in the Vulgar Greek by Francis Richard a Jesuit, and Printed at Paris, call'd, Τάγμα τῆς Ρωμαϊκῆς Ἐκκλησίας, was dispers'd in all Parts where that Language was Current. That, [Page 29.] Whereas now the Ancient Structures and Colleges of Athens are become ruinous——and all Greece Poor and Illiterate, such Spirits and Wits among them, who aspire unto Sciences and Knowledge, are forc'd to seek it in Italy; where sucking from the same Fountain, and eating Bread made with the same Leaven of the Latins, it is natural that they should conform to the same Principles and Doctrine. So that it will not be strange, if in Exposition of those Points wherein the Church of God for some Ages hath been silent, and but now controverted in these latter Days, the Greek Priests should with little Variety follow the Sense of the Latin, which they take up at adventure, not being of themselves capable either to prove or try the meaning of the Scriptures, or examine the Ancient Tenets of their own Church.*” And in Page 333. “*Italy is the sole Gymnasion and Library of their Knowledge and Learning; for in most Points of Controversy, where the Patriarchal Authority is not concern'd, they exactly concur with the Sense of the Roman Schools.*” And the Friars of the Church of Rome are so industri-

ous to make the World believe that the *Oriental Churches* are like their own, that the same Writer in his 447th Page assures us, that “*some*” Friars of the *Roman Church* perswaded the *Armenian Patriarch* and Bishops at *Constantinople* to subscribe a Confession agreeable to the Tenets of the *Roman Faith*—a Copy of which Sir *Paul Ricaut* saw and read, as it was deliver’d to him from the *Mertabet*, or *Armenian Bishop*.

Dr. *Smith*, in the 6th Page of his above-mention’d Preface, says, “*It is manifest to all who understand Antiquity, how much the present Greeks have in several Points of Doctrine varied from the Belief of their Ancestors, and have corrupted the Simplicity and Purity of Religion by odd Opinions and Fancies.*” So that ’tis now no wonder if we find some of their late particular Bishops Latinize so far, as to run into the Popery of Baptism by *Lay-men* and *Women*.

What Regard then is due to *Jeremias* the Patriarch’s Opinion in this Matter, when he * was displeas’d with the *Lutherans* for believing “*In-vocation of Saints to be vain and frivolous,*” and for despising that Adoration which is paid to their *Images and Holy Relicks*, as they are called? Mr. *Bingham* might with as good a Grace have produc’d that Patriarch’s Testimony for these Popish Corruptions, as for the other; and the rest of his Instances are of so modern a Date, that we have reason to believe they are no better than the meer Effects, of some *Greeks* being too much infected with the Superstitions of the Church of *Rome*.

* *Du Pin’s XVI. Cent. Tom. 2. p. 441. Lond.*

§ XVIII. Dr. *Smith* tells us, in the 109th Page of his Account of the *Greek Church*, “ *They believe such an absolute Necessity of this Sacrament— as that they entertain hard and cruel Thoughts of the State of Infants, which by some Misfortune and Casualty are depriv’d of it, to prevent which Mischiefs, and secure their Fears, where there is a real and certain Danger of imminent Death in the Absence of a Priest, who is at all other times the only Lawful Minister of this Sacred Rite, it is allowed to Lay-Persons of either Sex, as it is expressly laid down in their Publick Confession of Faith, Written in the Vulgar Greek, and Printed in the Year 1662.*” “ *It is not lawful and proper for any one to baptize but a lawful Priest, except in time of Necessity ; and then a Secular Person, whether Man or Woman, may do it.*” By this we see, that the Reason of this Practice of some of the *Greeks*, is the *uncharitable and cruel Opinion* which some of the *Romanists* hold of Infants dying without Baptism, and which those *Greeks* have learn’d from them: That the Practice founded upon that Opinion, is no other than *Popish*, since it allows *Women* as well as Lay-men to baptize; which is a peculiar Practice of the corrupt Church of *Rome*. And ’tis no sufficient Answer to say, That this is the Sense of the *genuine Greek Church*; because ’tis “ *expressly laid down in their Publick Confession of Faith, Anno 1662.*” For it cannot be prov’d that the *true Greek Church*, without any Mixture of *Romish Priests and Fryars*, or *Latinizing Greeks*, made that Confession of Faith; nay, it is most likely, that *Popish Emissaries* had a great Hand in making it: For Dr. *Smith*, in the 6th Page of his Preface, to the above-cited Book, makes *the*

bold

bold Determinations of this very Confession of Faith, Anno 1662. and of the Bethleemetick Synod, said to have been Held in 1671. to be such Instances “*as will incline any sober and considering Man to believe, that the Greeks have of late, more than ever, been wrought upon by the sly Artifices and underhand Dealing of the subtle Emissaries of Rome, who watch continually over the poor Greeks, and take Advantage of their Poverty and Distress, to bring them to a farther Compliance, and in time to a downright Subjection.*” So that upon a serious Consideration of the whole Matter, Mr. Bingham’s producing these *Modern Instances* of some particular *Greeks* allowing of Baptism by Lay-men, and even by *Women*, amounts to no more, than if he had given us the like Instances from the *Church of Rome*; for ’tis well known, that, that Church has infected *some of the Greeks* with her false Doctrines and unwarrantable Practices, insomuch as that some of their late Synodical Determinations, and Confessions of Faith, have been made by the Instigation of Popish Priests, and founded upon *Romish Principles*, especially in some Doctrines and Practices which were never held or us’d in the *Ancient Greek Church*, as this of Baptism by *Lay-men* and *Women* never was, before some of their *Bishops* and *Clergy* were too easily wrought upon by the cunning Craftiness of Popish Emissaries in the *declining Ages of the Church*.

§ XIX. As for the *Moscovites*, Mr. Bingham says, pag. 109. “*Their Rules and Canons give particular Orders about this matter;*” and for Proof of this he says, pag. 110. That “*the first Canon of John their Metropolitan, who is commonly call’d their Prophet, gives this Direction, That Children,*”
“ in

“ *in Case of Necessity, should be baptiz’d without a Priest.*” And this is all he produces for the Practice of the *Moscovite Churches*; one *single Man’s Authority*; no *Synod or Council* mention’d wherein this Canon was made, and yet this must stand for the *authentick Sense and Practtice of those Churches.* Strange arguing this! as if the Opinion of *One Bishop* was the Opinion of *all those Churches*: But the contrary to this is very evident from *Mr. Bingham’s* own Observation, in the Words immediately following, which are these; “ *The People indeed do not always observe this Rule, for some Authors tells us, many of them think a Priest so absolutely requisite to perform this Office, that, whatever Case of Necessity happen, they will not permit it to be done by any other but a Priest:*” From whence ’tis plain, the *Moscovites* do not think their *Metropolitan* to be in the right, tho’ he do’s say, That “ *Children may be baptiz’d*” in Case of Necessity “ *without a Priest.*”

§ XX. But *Mr. Bingham* replies to this, That “ *we are to judge of the Sense and Practtice of a Church from the Rules and Canons made by its Governours, and not by the Practtice of the Vulgar, who often trangress their Rules, either through Ignorance, Neglect or Contempt; in which Case it would be injurious to any Church, to judge of her Doctrines by the contrary Practtice of the common People.*” In return to this I must tell our Reverend Historian, that there are some *first Principles in Christianity*, which when the common People have been thoroughly inform’d of, and *accustom’d to*, they cannot be easily drawn from them, but will persist in them, in *Opposition* to the contrary *Novel Innovations* of some of their mi-

Itaken Governours: It is easie to conceive upon what Principle some in high Stations may have been tempted to enact that which they ought not; and which the Vulgar, upon the *common Principles* of Christianity, are bound not to submit to: As for Instance;

“ * *Several Bishops of Lithuania, and Russia-Nigra, who had hitherto continued in the Communion of the Greek Church, wrought upon by several Temporal Advantages and Honours, which they propos'd to gain in the Diet and Government of Poland, sent Two of their Number to Rome, in the Year 1595, in order to their being reconcil'd to that Church.— But their going thither, and doing this in the Name of all the Ruthenick Churches was protested against, and a publick Act made of it by Constantine, Duke of Ostorovia, and several others who dislik'd this intended Union.*”

Now 'tis easy to see how and upon what Motives those Bishops, if they had not been publickly oppos'd, might have caball'd together, and made *Rules and Canons* in favour of many of the *Corruptions* of the Church of Rome, which the *Moscovites* were never us'd to Practice; and 'tis as easie to see into the Reason, why the People, in such case, would for a long time have *persisted, in the Practice* of what their *Bishops and Priests* had all along before taught them, contrary to those *Innovations*: So that the *Peoples* not observing some singular Rule, made by one or *some few* of their Governours, is not *always* an Instance of their *Ignorance, Neglect* or *Contempt* of the *wholsome Laws* of their Church, but sometimes is a *Proof* of the *Novelty* and *Corruption*

* *Dr. Smith's Account of the Greek Church, p. 242, 243.*

of the *Imposition*; and that the People have been accustom'd to be taught *better things*, and will therefore persist in their *ancient Customs and Practices*.

What Mr. *Bingham* observes, 'That "we are to Judge of the Sense and Practice of a Church from the Rules and Canons made by its Governours, and not by the Practice of the Vulgar," is very true in some Cases, but not in all. 'Tis true, when Rules and Canons are made by Synods of the Bishops and other Clergy of a Church *fully and freely* assembled, then those Rules are the *Sense* of the governing Part of that Church; and when they are reduc'd to Practice, by the Members both Clergy and Laity, then they are the Sense and Practice of that Church: But of such *Rules and Canons* of the *Governours and Clergy* of the *Moscovite Churches*, Mr. *Bingham* has not given us one Instance. On the other hand, 'tis false to suppose when only *one Governour* of the Church makes, or some few cabal together to make, a *new Rule* or Canon to which that Church was not *before accustom'd*, that such a Rule or Canon is the Sense and Practice of that Church, 'tis no better than a *novel Imposition* of *one or some* of its particular Governours; and the Multitude of Peoples not taking any notice of, but acting contrary to it, *upon a religious Principle*, is an Argument that their Minds are prejudic'd against it, either by former *long Practice and Custom*, or else by the Instructions and Teachings of the greater Part of their Clergy, or both of these together; and in such case the Practice of the People, and not the Novel Canon made by a particular Bishop, shews the Sense of that Church; and this is the Case before us. *John the Metropolitan* of the *Moscovites*, has a particular Canon which affirms,

that Baptism in Time of Necessity may be given *without a Priest*: This Canon do's not appear to have been made by any Synod or Council of that Church, but by his singular Authority; the People, "*whatever Case of Necessity happens, will not permit it to be done by any other but a Priest*": They regard not their Metropolitan's Canon; and why? Not thro' Ignorance or Neglect, as Mr. Bingham Insinuates, but from a Religious Principle; because they think *No Man* sufficient for this Holy Function, in any Case of Necessity whatsoever, *but a Priest*; as is plain by the * Author quoted by Mr. Bingham, in his 111th Page; and the same is also attested to by † Gerhard, another of this Reverend Gentleman's Authors.—And even Arcudius, a Romish Priest, another of our Historian's Authors, who wrote a Book, Printed in the Year 1626. to make the World believe that the *Oriental Churches* agreed with the *Roman*, is free enough to Acknowledge, || That "*for the most part all Grecia,*

* *Joh. Fabri. de Relig. Moscovit. p. 176* Huic muneri fungendo quæcunque Necessitas inciderit, *Nemo hominum* sufficere putatur nisi *Sacerdos* extiterit.

† *Gerhard Loc. Com. Tom. 4. De Baptismo, n. 37. p. 242.* In Moscovitas aliqui perhibent baptizandi muneri quæcunque necessitas inciderit, *neminem hominum* sufficere, nisi *Sacerdos* extiterit. *In opere de variis rerum Moscovitic. Autorib. p. 136.*

|| Postquam de materia & forma Baptismi Egimus, superest ut de ministro aliquid dicamus: Quod eo alacrius aggredior, quo totam ferme Græciam, Russiam, Moscoviam, & alias Provincias quæ in fide Christi ritu Græco perseverant, ex imperitia in eo versari errore, scrupulo & religione animadverto; ut absente Presbytero malint permittere, ut Infantes sine Baptismo à vita decedant, quàm eos saluari lavacro abluere; quod existiment sibi laicis ne in necessitate quidem licere hoc munere fungi. *Arcud. de Concord. Eccles. Orient. & Occid. Lib. 1. c. xi. p. 24. Paris 1626.*

“ Russia,

“ Russia, Moscovia, and other Provinces, who, after the manner of the Greek Church, continue in the Faith of Christ, when a Priest is Absent, had rather suffer their Infants to Die without [what he calls] “ Baptism, than suffer them to be baptiz’d [as he terms it] “ by any other, because they think that it is not Lawful, even in Necessity, for Laicks to Execute this Office.” He is pleas’d indeed to call this, their *Error*, and to say that it proceeds from their *Ignorance*, and want of Knowledge; but that is usual enough with *Romish Priests*; ’tis their Custom to call every Body that differs from the false Tenets of their Church, *Ignorant* and *Erroneous*; but that is no Proof, that they are so. Here are confessedly vast Multitudes of Christians, inhabiting far *Extended Kingdoms*, and Provinces, who hold, that *Laicks cannot Baptize*, even in want of *Priests*; ’tis a part of their Religion to think so; and in consequence of this, *no false Notions of Charity* and Natural Affection to their Tender Infants, can prevail with them to suffer *Laicks to meddle* in this Sacred Function, even in Times when no other can be had; no, they venture the Souls of their Children, and leave them to the Mercy of God, without attempting to secure their Salvation by *uninstituted, uncommanded*, and in their Opinion, *prohibited Ministrations*; they don’t think, they must *do Evil*, or what they think to be Evil, *that Good may come of it*; and whence should it come to pass, that Christians should, in such *prodigious Numbers*, run unanimously into this Opinion and Practice, of esteeming it better, and therefore suffering their Children *rather to Die without Lay-Baptism*, when Priests are not to be had, than let them be *profanely Wash’d by Laicks*? Do’s it not at least proceed

ceed from hence, that they have been us'd to be taught no other than *Priestly Baptism*? And that they have been accustom'd to no other? And who have been their Teachers, but the Bishops, Priests, and Deacons of those Churches? They have not been us'd to the Impudent Usurpations of Unordain'd Lay-Teachers, as we are; so that this Opinion and Practice of theirs, being so Universal, must proceed originally from their own Clergy of the *Greek* and *Moscovite* Churches; and their persevering in them, in Opposition to some few singular Novel *Romish* Attempts to the contrary, must be attributed to this, that the *Romish* Priests and *Latinizing Greeks*, have not yet been so powerful in their Attempts, but that still the *Greeks* and *Moscovites* for **the most part** dissent from them in this Matter: We have no less than the Evidence of [*Arcudius*] a Modern *Romish* Priest for this, who wrote his Book on purpose to shew the Agreement of the *Eastern* Churches with the *Latin*; and who yet, when he comes to the Article of Baptism, is forc'd to acknowledge, that for the *most part* all Greece, Russia, Moscovy, and other Provinces in Communion with the *Greek Church*, dissent so very much from the *Roman Church* about the *Minister of Baptism*, as that they suffer their Children rather to Die without Lay-Baptism, when a Priest cannot be had, than let any Laick pretend to Baptize them; and purely upon this Principle, "That it is not Lawful, even in Times of Necessity, for Laicks to Execute the Office of Baptizing."

§ XXI. Having been thus long upon the Sense and Practice of the *Greeks* and *Muscovites*, I shall be the more brief upon that of the *Foreign Reform'd*; because, they can be no Evidence of the
general

general Sense and Practice of the Ancient Catholick Church, except they produce her Ecclesiastical Laws, Traditions, or Customs, [for the Validity of Baptisms perform'd by Persons who were never Commission'd by Bishops to baptize] which I am sure they cannot do.

And first for the Lutherans; Mr. Bingham in his 111th Page, &c. introduces *some of them* asserting that “*any Person who is a Christian, Man, or Woman, may be the Extraordinary Minister of Baptism——when there is imminent Danger of Death, and a Minister of the Word cannot be had.*” And here we may easily see, that *these Lutherans* are so far **Popish**, in that they allow of Baptism by **Women**, which by Mr. Bingham's own Confession, *never was allow'd by the Ancient Catholick Church*; so that, in this of Baptism by *Women*, the Lutherans Mr. Bingham speaks of, are *Uncatholick*; and as for the other, of Baptism by *Lay-men*, we have abundantly seen already, that they have **No Catholick Principle** whereon to found that Practice, since the *Ancient Catholick Church* never had any Ecclesiastical Law, Tradition, or Custom for it. The supposed Reasons they give [as in his 112th and 113th Pages] for the Baptism of *Lay men* and *Women*, are very weak, insignificant, and false, and have been already obviated and answer'd in several * Treatises published long since. Mr. Bingham himself do's not care to be concern'd “*what weight and force there is in their [pretended] Arguments,*” and

* *Lay-Baptism Invalid. Sacerdotal Powers. Dissenters Baptism Null and Void.*

therefore I will not trouble the Reader with them.

§ XXII. Mr. *Bingham's* next Instance is of the *Helvetic* Body, the Followers of *Zuinglius*, wherein he tells us [in his 114th and 115th Pages] that *Zuinglius* was of Opinion, "that Baptism (in Case of Necessity) might be given by **Any Man**, [*Quivis Hominum*] yea by a **Woman** also;" which is plainly the *Popish Novelty* in its full Extent, and therefore needs no further Confutation. "His Followers disapprov'd of *this Latitude* of Baptism by **Women**, and therefore after his Death *prohibited it*," says Mr. *Bingham*: So far they did well. But says our Reverend Historian, "No Prohibition was [by them] laid up on **Men**, in Cases of Necessity, nor any Order made for Re-baptizing those who were irregularly baptiz'd by others." And what do's this signify more, than that they have laid aside one Piece of **Popery**, and not provided against another; that is, *Baptism by Women is forbidden*; but still [*Quivis Hominum*] **Any Man**, [as *Zuinglius* words it] may baptize: His Followers have not forbidden *this*; that is, they have not forbidden *Turks, Jews, or Pagans to Baptize*, so they be but **Men**, [for all this is included in *Zuinglius's Quivis Hominum, Any Man*] a very hopeful Reformation indeed! as Mr. *Bingham* has describ'd it; so that, we need not wonder why they made no Order for what he calls *Re-baptizing*. Thus far may suffice, for what Mr. *Bingham* has told us, of the **Popery** of some of the *Lutherans* and *Zuinglians*.

§ XXIII. And now for the *Calvinists*. Our Reverend Historian owns in his 115th Page, that “*Calvin freely declares his mind against the Lawfulness of Lay-Baptism in Any Case whatsoever. That he thinks there can be No Necessity sufficient to Authorize private Men or Women, to do the Office of a Publick Minister.*” Mr. *Bingham* tells his *English Reader*, that “*Calvin owns indeed, that the Contrary Practice had generally prevail'd, not only several Ages before his own Time, but, in a manner, from the first beginning of the Church, Lay-men always baptized in danger of Death, If a Minister could not be had in due Time.*” But that He, [*i. e. Calvin*] thinks the Grounds they went upon were “*not justifiable.*” By Mr. *Bingham's* thus representing the Sense of *Calvin*, the Reader may be induc'd to think, that *Calvin* could not but own, that Lay-Baptism had generally prevail'd, that is, had been the General Practice of the Catholick Church, and that Lay-men had always baptiz'd, &c. whereas in Truth, *Calvin's* Words, as Mr. *Bingham* has 'em in his Margin, contain nothing that shews he own'd this to have generally prevail'd; not one Word that acknowledges “*Lay-men always Baptiz'd, &c.*” For the whole of what he says is only, * That “*Many Ages before,*” his Time, “*and so far, as almost from the first be-*

* *Calvin Instit. Lib. 4. cap. 15. N. 20.* Quod autem multis ab hinc sæculis, adeoque ab ipsa fere Ecclesiæ exordio, usu receptum fuit, ut in periculo mortis Laici Baptizarent, si minister in tempore non adesset, non video quam firma ratione defendi queat.

“ginning of the Church, it was a Receiv’d Custom [he do’s not say it generally prevail’d] “that Lay-men should Baptize” [he do’s not say Lay-men always baptiz’d] “in danger of Death, if a Minister could not be had in due Time; and that He [i. e. Calvin] did not see how or by what substantial Reason this” Custom “could be defended.” So that this Custom which Calvin thought was so early taken up, do’s not appear from his Words, to have been own’d by him as a Practice that Generally Prevail’d; for a suppos’d Custom of some few singular Persons, may be call’d a Custom, and an early one too, without being the Custom or Practice of the Church it self: Some of the Members of the Church may have suppos’d Practices of their own, which never were own’d by the Church as her Customs and Traditions; so that, if Calvin reckon’d, that there was a receiv’d Custom very early for Lay-men to baptize in danger of Death, when Clergy-men could not be had; this do’s not prove that he thought it was a Custom receiv’d by great Multitudes, much less that it Generally Prevail’d, as Mr. Bingham expresses it; and whoever they were, that by Calvin’s Supposition took up this Custom [which by all that has been said before, was not by any one so early receiv’d as he [i. e. Calvin] fancy’d it, yet Calvin contemns their Authority, and plainly shews, that he thought their Practice could not be defended.

But notwithstanding all this, Mr. Bingham says in his 116th Page, that Calvin “do’s not peremptorily pronounce such Baptisms, absolutely Null and Void, but the contrary.” And for this he quotes

quotes Arch-Bishop * *Whitgift's* Words, because they have these Expressions, *viz.* " *It is sufficient for us to know the Hand and Seal of the Lord in his Sacraments, by whomsoever they be deliver'd——we shall be sufficiently defended [i. e. against the Anabaptists, who deny'd Baptism to be right, because given by Idolatrous Persons in the Church of Rome] " if we think that we were Baptiz'd, not in the Name of any Man, but in the Name of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, and therefore Baptism not to be of Man, but of God, by whomsoever it be minister'd.* And because of this [*whomsoever*] Mr. *Bingham* concludes, that *Calvin* do's not absolutely *Null and Void* Baptism by Lay-men. But, in answer to this, if the word *whomsoever*, as Arch-Bishop *Whitgift* has it, must be taken in its full Extent and Meaning; then *Calvin* will be made to have esteem'd as *Good and Valid*, all the pretended Baptisms of *Lay-men* and *Women, Jews, Turks, Infidels, and Pagans*, which is plainly a Novelty of **Corrupt Popery**. And not only so, but the Validity of Baptism by Private Persons, if it be included in this word *whomsoever*, will be an *Inconsistency* and *Contradiction* to what Mr. *Bingham* said before, *viz.* that " *Calvin declares his Mind against the Lawfulness of Lay-Baptism in any Case whatsoever;*" and that " *he thinks there can be no Necessity sufficient to Authorize private Men or Women to do the Office of a publick Minister;*" so that, *Calvin* will be made to speak inconsistently with himself, and to contradict his own Principle. For, if Baptism by

* *Whitgift's Defence of the Answer to the Admonit. Tract. 9. p. 518. ex Calvin Instit. Cap. 17. Sect. 16.*

Lay-men, or Women, be not **Lawful** in any Case whatsoever; and there can be no Necessity sufficient to Authorize it [according to Calvin:] Then 'tis plain, that in Calvin's Opinion; such pretended Baptisms, have **No Law, Rule, or Authority**; for if they have, then they are *Lawful* and *Authoriz'd*, which Calvin says they are not; since then they have no **Law or Rule**, and are Destitute of any **Authority** in Calvin's Sense, it necessarily follows, that "*the Hand and Seal of the Lord cannot be in such false Ministrations, and therefore they are Invalid*;" for if the *Hand and Seal* of the Lord is in them, then they have *His Authority*, and are therefore **Lawful**, because the *Hand and Seal* of a *Principal*, really set to any Instrument, is either by himself, or his *Authoriz'd Attorney or Representative*, and so is *His*, and therefore *His Authority*; and consequently **Lawful**, and therefore *Valid*, because **His Hand and Seal**: But Calvin says on the contrary, that they are *not Lawful in any Case whatsoever*, no Necessity can be sufficient to *Authorize them*; therefore the *Hand and Seal* of the Lord cannot be in them, and consequently they cannot be *Valid*, by **whomsoever** perform'd, if we take *whomsoever*, in the full extensive Meaning of the Word, to include *Private Men and Women*, Persons never *Authoriz'd or Commission'd* to Baptize; that is, Calvin reckons such Baptisms *Valid*, by saying the *Lord's Hand and Seal is in them*; tho' by what he said before, they are *Invalid*, because utterly *Unlawful*, and void of *Authority*; except it can be prov'd, that, in this Case, *there is Validity* where there is **no Law, no Rule, no Hand and Seal of the Lord**, and Nothing of **His Authority**.

Thus

Thus we see *Calvin's* Inconsistency, if his **whomsoever** must be taken in the full Latitude of the Word, to include Lay, *i. e.* Uncommission'd Baptizers; and therefore they who would make him *Consistent* with himself, must understand by his **whomsoever**, only whomsoever "*Publick Minister,*" whether Reform'd Protestant, or *Idolatrous Papist*, since Arch-Bishop *Whitgift's* Words, taken from *Calvin*, were levell'd against the then *Anabaptists*, who deny'd Baptism to be *Right*, because given by *Idolatrous Baptizers* in the Church of *Rome*. For, 'tis plain, that *Calvin* not only declares his Mind against the Lawfulness of Lay-Baptism in **any Case whatsoever**, as *Mr. Bingham* has rightly observ'd; but that the same *Calvin* did in a Publick and Authentick manner Sign to it *, that such Baptism is utterly Null and Void in exprefs Terms, Witness his Hand to the **Publick Act of the Ministers and Doctors in the Church of Geneva**, [as they are call'd] who were at the National Synod of *Lyons*, Anno 1563. wherein, Article the First, it is expressly affirm'd that such Baptism "*is of No Force, Power, Validity, or Effect,*" and to which *John Calvin* sign'd his Name in full Length.

Mr. Bingham acknowledges that *Beza*, *Calvin's* Successor, "*declares positively against the Validity of Baptism administer'd by private Persons,* p. 116. And that it is certain the *French Reform'd* do all join with him "*in the Doctrine of the Invalidity and Nullity of Lay-Baptism,* p. 117. And it is

* As may be seen in *Quick's Synodicon*, Vol. 1. Chap. XXI. p. 50. Or more easily in a little Book, call'd, *The Judgment of the Reform'd in France, &c. Concerning the Invalidity of Lay-Baptism*, Page 16. Printed for H. Clements, Anno 1712.

notorious that this was asserted by them in no less than Six National Synods, namely, the First held at *Paris*, Anno 1559. the Second at *Poitiers* 1560. another at *Lyons* 1563. where the Deputies of *Geneva* were also present agreeing thereto; another at *Rochel* 1571. where *Beza* of *Geneva* was Moderator; the National Synod of *Gap*, Anno 1603. and that at *Rochel*, Anno 1607. to which Mr. *Bingham* adds another Synod of *Alençon* 1637. in his 118th Page, and justly concludes, that the Doctrine of the Invalidity of Lay-Baptism “*is indisputably the Practice of the French Church,*” to which he should have added that of *Geneva* too, as is plain by two at least of those Seven Synods. These were full National Synods, and very solemnly held; and Mr. *Bingham* cannot produce such full flagrant Evidence among the *Lutherans*, for the other side of the Question.

Besides, he thinks that the *Dutch* also join with the *French* in this particular Page 119th, as he judges by the *General Current* of the *Dutch* Writers; so that here are no less than the *French* and the *Genevans*, in National Synods; and the *Dutch* also for us against the *Validity of Lay-Baptism*.

Mr. *Bingham* comes next to the *Palatines*, and says, Page 120. “*The Churches of the Palatinate, Commonly follow the Doctrine of the Calvinists;*” So that here our Reverend Historian acknowledges, that the *Palatine* Protestants are commonly against the *Validity of Lay-Baptism*—very well. But says he, “*In One Case some of their Divines make an Exception, as in a Time of great Persecution, or Dispersion of the Ministry in some grand Dissipation of the Church.* And for this he produces but One of their Divines, Dr. *Alt- ing*, who says, “*Baptism administer’d by private Men*

“Men, in a grand Dispersion of the Church, is not to be reiterated.” But what signifies the Saying of one Man only, among the *Palatines*, when [according to Mr. *Bingham*] the Churches of the *Palatinate* commonly follow the *Contrary Doctrine*; especially, when 'tis also consider'd, that this very Dr. *Alting*, says of this *same Baptism* thus, “We do not say it is *Legitimate*, or *Lawful*,” and thereby is *inconsistent* with himself, and so we may leave him as a Doctor of no Moment in this *Affair*; for, he brings false Arguments against repeating the *Baptism*, which he acknowledges to be *Unlawful* and *Illegitimate*, and therefore *False* and *Invalid*. He endeavours to prove, that they should not be repeated, “because the *Jewish* Circumcisions and *Papish* Baptisms were not repeated, tho' they were perform'd and attended with many *Superstitions* in the corrupt State of the *Jewish* and *Romish* Church.” As if *Corruptions* of *Superstition*, &c. attending a *True Commission*, were just the same as *no Commission at all*; the *Fallacy* of which betrays it self.

Thus we have seen the *Thoughts* of the *Foreign Reform'd* in this *Matter*; we have observ'd from Mr. *Bingham*, that some of the *Lutherans* and *Zuinglians* are *very Papish* about it. And it has been prov'd, that the *French Protestants*, the *Genevans*, the *Dutch*, and the *Palatines*, do not submit to this *Corruption of Popery*; but have very justly reform'd from it in *Principle* and *Doctrine*.

But says Mr. *Bingham*, “The *Dutch* and *French Churches* are [by some] reckon'd of no Account but *Unchurch'd*, because they want *Episcopacy*, and consequently *True Ordinations*, and *Christian Sacraments*, in their *Opinion*; and then
“ what

“ what signifies their Testimony, in such a Case, if
 “ as soon as they have deliver’d their Evidence
 “ about Christian Baptism, they shall be Cashier’d,
 “ and positively declar’d to be no Christians? See
 his 119th Page. This of Unchurching has been
 long since answer’d in * another Place; and if
 some do hold that there are “ no True Ordinations
 “ and Christian Sacraments,” where there is no
 Episcopacy, they are very much in the right of it;
 and if Mr. Bingham do’s not approve of this,
 [which he emphatically calls] **Their Opinion**,
 [as if it were separate, and of another Nature,
 from what he Holds himself] then let him give
 us a *Scholastical History*, of the *Sense and Practice of*
the Church, in Defence of the *Contrary Principle*,
 if he is able; that so we may see from Authentick
 Testimonies, that there were anciently *True Or-*
dinations and Christian Churches and Sacraments
 without **Episcopacy**. But this I am sure he will
 never be able to prove from any of the *Antiqui-*
ties of the Christian Church; for the direct contra-
 ry is notorious Matter of Fact, as is Evident both
 from Scripture and Ecclesiastical History, That
 there never was any *Christian Church, True Ordi-*
nations, or Christian Sacraments, without Episcopa-
cy, no one Instance whatsoever can be produc’d in
 Proof that there was; and therefore we must still
 Hold [what he calls] our Opinion, which is more
 than barely so, for ’tis an *Ancient Catholick*, and
 therefore a *Substantial Truth*.

And tho’ the *trench and Dutch* are so deeply
 concern’d [as our Reverend Historian says some
 reckon them to be] in this Truth; yet still **Their**

* *Lay-Baptism Invalid.*

Evidence against Lay-Baptism is very *Significant*, and of great *Importance* both to themselves and us.
For,

First, It shews *them* the great Necessity of securing to *themselves* a Real, and therefore Valid *Mission*; since, by their *own Confession*, they have no *Christian Baptism*, if their Baptizers are not in *Valid Holy Orders*. And,

Secondly, Their Evidence is a Benefit to us, because it shews the prevailing Power of Truth; which Men [seriously considering the Nature of Things] are obliged to submit to, even tho' themselves are involved in the Consequences of it. It is no small Motive of Credibility, when a Truth is attested to, not only by those who are its avowed *Friends*, and Practice according to it, but also by those very Men, who, in the Opinion of unprejudic'd Standers by, are oblig'd, considering their Circumstances, either to oppose and gainsay it, or else to reform their own Practice, that they may be truly consistent therewith. It is a pleasant and delightful thing, to see Men in love with **Truth in the Abstract**: It is no Abatement of the Truth how much soever they are concern'd in the *Consequences* which they *themselves* have made; those Consequences may indeed [and ought to] be **reform'd**, but the Truth they are Witnesses for, is *unchangeable*, and is not in the least alter'd by their contrary, irregular *Circumstances* and *Practices*. *Nathan's* Parable to King *David* contain'd an excellent Truth, of the great Deformity, and heinous Demerit of Mens acting contrary to the Rules of *Justice* and *Equity*. *David* assented to this *Truth*; and in the Case that *Nathan* put to him was so *very zealous*, that he, like a Just and Righteous Judge, resolv'd, that the Man who was guilty of

the Injustice *Nathan* complain'd of, *should surely die*. The King did not reckon, that the *Application* was to be made to himself; no matter for that, the Truth was still the same: And when *Nathan* said unto him, "**Thou art the Man;**" he still acknowledg'd the *Truth* he had assented to before, he submitted to the Justice of the Sentence himself had pronounc'd, and sincerely repented of, without endeavouring to excuse or extenuate, **the Occasion** which himself had given for *Nathan's* Parable; and God grant that the *French*, and the *Dutch*, and other Reform'd abroad, &c. may go and do likewise, so as really to put in *Practice* what is agreeable to, and *consistent* with their own avowed *Principles*, in the matter before us!

As for what *Mr. Bingham* says of the Church of *England*, and Sense of her Members, from his 122d, to his 137th Page, it is needless to repeat in Answer thereto what has been already said in * *Treatises* already published, and in which our Reverend Historian's Remarks are *obviated* and *answer'd*: And therefore the Reader is referr'd to them, that I may now proceed to sum up the whole Evidence of the Antients in the next Chapter, and so conclude.

* *Dissenters and other unauthoriz'd Baptisms Null and Void by the Articles, Canons and Rubricks of the Church of England. The Bishop of Oxford's Charge Consider'd.*

C H A P. VIII.

The whole Evidence of Antiquity sum'd up; proving, That the far greater Majority of Ancient Testimony, is against all pretended Baptisms perform'd by Persons, who never were authoriz'd by Bishops to baptize, and consequently that such Baptisms are not valid by any Ecclesiastical Law, Tradition or Custom of the ancient Catholick Church: The Conclusion containing a true State of the Question about suppos'd Cases of Necessity, where Episcopally Authoriz'd Baptizers are not to be had.

WE have already seen in *Chap. 3.* That the ancient Catholick Church never attempted to *Authorize* or *Commission* Lay-men to baptize, in any Case whatsoever; and that all the *Endeavours* of this sort have been made only by *some few particular Persons*, who can upon no account whatsoever be said to make up, **The ancient Catholick Church**; and whose Attempts, if they were right, are also of no Importance to favour the Practice of those who have not even so much as any Pretence to this *suppos'd Authority*, and Commission, from Bishops to baptize, as certainly our Laicks [the Dissenting Teachers] have not.

It remains now that I sum up the whole Evidence relating to Baptisms perform'd by a *real* [or *suppos'd*] *Episcopal Commission*, and concerning other pretended Baptisms by Persons who never had such a Commission at all, that the Reader may,

in a narrow Compass, see the whole Evidence of the Antients for and against these *never-Commission'd* Baptisms, and pass Judgment accordingly: And that he may do it the more easily, I note the Whole in the following Table, in which the Antients, &c. who are thought to have been for *Baptisms* by Persons *never Commission'd* by Bishops, are noted on the Left-side; and those, whose Evidence is for Baptisms perform'd by Episcopal Authority only, are on the Right, with the Pages in this Book, where their several Testimonies, and the Arguments thereupon, are to be found, thus:

The Antients, &c. whose Testimonies are thought to make for the Validity of Baptism by Persons never Commission'd by Bishops.

The Antients, &c. whose Testimonies make for Baptism perform'd by Episcopal Authority only, and who Null Unauthoriz'd Baptisms.

Jesus Christ, in his Institution of Baptism, gave his Commission only to his Apostles, the first Bishops, and to such as they and their Successors should Authorize, Page 5. This Commission to continue to the End of the World, and *necessary* to preserve the Church according to the

the **Order** of **Christ**,
as *Mr. Bingham* owns,

p. 5.

The Truth of this Nulls
Uncommision'd Bap-
tisms, *p. 6, 28.*

None baptiz'd at first
but by Authority re-
ceiv'd from the Apo-
stles, according to one
of *Mr. Bingham's* Au-
thors, *p. 7.*

No one *can have a Power*
of Baptizing, but he
who receives some
way or other, a *Com-
mission* from them, ac-
cording to *Mr. Bing-
ham's* said Author, *p. 8.*

The Original Power of
Baptizing lodg'd *sole-
ly* and *entirely* in Bi-
shops, and *derivative-
ly* convey'd from them
to others, ordinarily
and extraordinarily,
according to *Mr. Bing-
ham*, *p. 11.*

Baptism by such Persons
was reputed as the **Bi-
shop's Act**, *ibid.*

Lay-men *always* debarr'd
from Baptizing in all
ordinary Cases, ac-
cording to *Mr. Bing-
ham*, *p. 30.*

He owns that **particular Churches** would not allow *Lay-men* to baptize in want of the Clergy, p. 32.

I. and II. Centuries.

I. and II. Centuries.

St. Ignatius says, "Without Bishops, Priests, and Deacons," there is no Church, p. 35.

And without the Bishop it is not *Lawful* to baptize, p. 35.

St. *Hermas* names no other than *Authoriz'd* Baptizers for greatest Extremities, p. 38.

III. Century.

Tertullian, about Anno 200, thinks *Lay-men* have a *Right* in themselves to baptize in absence of the Clergy, p. 39.

But founds it upon a false Principle, which allows Women to baptize, p. 45.

III. Century.

Tertullian refers us to the Practice of the Church whereby the Bishop had the Power of Baptism, and after him Presbyters and Deacons, yet **not** without the **Authority** of the **Bishop**, p. 39, 41.

He will not allow Women to baptize, p. 47.

St. *Cyprian* makes Baptism without a Priestly Power, *i. e.* Episcopal Commission, to be Null and Void, p. 48.

Firmilian does the same, p. 54.

Novatus

Novatus à *Ibamugade*,
 the same, p. 55.
 Confessor *Pomponius* à
Dionysiana, do's so like-
 wife, p. 55.
 Confessor *Clarus* à *Mas-*
cula the same, p. 56.
 The XLVII Canon call'd
 Apostolical, nulls Bap-
 tism for the same Rea-
 son, p. 57.

IV. *Century.*IV. *Century.*

Nineteen Bishops in the
Spanish Council of Eli-
beris, made a Canon,
 which [according to
Mr. Bingham] vested
some of their own Lay-
men, but not all, with
Authority to baptize in
 want of the Clergy;
 but this with parti-
 cular Limitations and
 Restrictions, p. 58.

So this Council is of no
 Benefit for *unautho-*
riz'd Baptisms, but the
 direct *contrary*. p. 59.

The Author of the *Life*
 of *Athanasius* in *Pho-*
tius, supposes that the
 Boy *Athanasius* bap-
 tiz'd his Play-fellows
 by a **Divine In-**
stinct, p. 72.

About this time comes
 in the *Fable* of the
 Boy *Athanasius* bapti-
 zing his Play-fellows
 in Sport, and the pre-
 tended Determination
 of Bishop *Alexander*,
 that the Baptism was
 Valid, refuted at large,
 p. 62.

And this he judg'd from
Alexander's suppos'd
Determination about
it, *p. 88.*

Therefore [in his Opini-
on] *Alexander* took
it for a divinely Au-
thoriz'd Baptism, *ibid.*

Mr. *Bingham* says, It
would be strange! if
any Canon should be
made in the Church
for such ludicrous Bap-
tisms, *p. 90.*

Fifty Years after the
Council of *Eliberis*;
Hilary, the Deacon of
Rome Witnesses, that
Lay-men did not then
baptize, *p. 97.*

Pacian, Bishop of *Bar-
celona*, teaches, that
the New Birth cannot
be effected but by Epif-
copal Baptism, *p. 99.*

Optatus, Bishop of *Mile-
vis*, [if his Words are
taken in their full La-
titude] allows of Bap-
tism not only by *Chri-
stian Lay-men*, but also
by *Women*, nay by un-
baptiz'd *Infidels*, *Jews*,
or *Pagans*, even in or-
dinary Cases, *p. 103.*

Optatus's Words candid-
ly interpreted, speak
only of Baptism ad-
minister'd by the then
ordinary Ministers of
Baptism, whether Ca-
tholicks or Schisma-
ticks; and they were
Episcopally Commif-
sion'd, *p. 106.*

But Mr. *Bingham* acknowledges this Latitude was never allow'd by the Church; and that 'tis a *Novelty of Popery*, p. 105.

St. Basil, Bishop of *Cæsarea*, Nulls Lay-Baptism, p. 109.

St. Chrysostom, Arch-Bishop of *Constantinople*, do's the same, p. 114.

The Constitutions call'd Apostolical do so likewise, p. 117.

St. Jerom, derives the Power of Presbyters and Deacons to baptize, from the Original Power of the Bishop, p. 120.

St. Jerom reckons it frequently *Lawful* for Lay-men to baptize; but this when Necessity compels, p. 120.

He refers to no Law of God, or the *Catholick Church* for this, p. 121.

His false Maxim whereon he founds this Power of Lay-men, p. 122.

This Assertion of his, inconsistent with his Dialogue against the *Luciferians*, p. 131.

If *St. Jerom* on the other side, means that some *Bishops* authoriz'd Lay-men to baptize in Case of Necessity, then 'tis plain his Evidence is only for what he thought were *Episcopally Authoriz'd Baptisms*, p. 122.

He Nulls Lay-Baptism in his *Dialogue* against the *Luciferians*, in which he confutes their Assertion, that *Arian Priests* were *Laicks*, by this Principle, "That if they were
" *Laicks*, the Baptisms administer'd
" by them ought to be
" rejected, p. 123, &c.

He

St. *Augustin* allows of the Validity of Baptism in ordinary as well as extraordinary Cases, tho' perform'd by any Man; which includes *Jews* and *Pagans* as well as *Christians*,
p. 143, 154, &c.

He finds uncommis- sion'd Baptisms upon hear-say Stories, *p. 143, 147.*

And false, or rather no Arguments, *p. 148, 151, 156.*

In expounding Scripture he follow'd a Path wholly new, *p. 161.*

He says, That without *Priests* there is no *Church*; therefore say **I, no Baptism**, *p. 139.*

St. *Augustin*, as quoted by *Gratian*, speaking of Lay-mens baptizing in Case of Necessity, founds it upon Authority of Commission descend- ed by *Bishops* from the Apostles, *p. 144.*

Another Passage of his as quoted by *Gratian*, which Nulls Baptisms by our Laicks, *p. 146.*

St. *Augustin* hesitates about the Validity of *usurped Lay-Baptism* in time of supposed Necessity, *p. 151.*

He is not *positive*, but such a *Usurpation* is a **Sin**. *p. 153.*

Therefore 'twas not the general Sense and Practice of the Church, *p. 153, 154.*

He acknowledges that the Validity of Lay-Baptism in ordinary Cases [tho' his own Opinion] was not the Determination of any **general Council**, con- sequently

sequently 'twas not the general Sense of the ancient Catholick Church, *p. 155.*
 He calls such Baptisms **unlawful Usurpations**; and says, That the unlawful Usurpation must be *corrected* by a sincere and affectionate *Repentance*, else the *Baptism* will remain to the **Punishment** of the *Giver* and *Receiver*, *p. 154.*
 This is in effect a Nulling of such Baptisms, *p. 157.*

V. *Century.*V. *Century.*

Gelasius, Bishop of *Rome*, restrains the Office of Baptizing in *ordinary* and *extraordinary Cases* to Persons *authoriz'd* by Bishops, *p. 162, 164.*

VI. *Century.*VI. *Century.*

Gratian makes *Isidore* say, That Baptism by a *Pagan* is Valid.

Isidore, Bishop of *Sevil*, in *Spain*, do's the like, *p. 165.*

Mr. Bingham makes the Sum of his whole Evidence to be, that for the first Six hundred Years of Christianity, the

the *general Sense and Practice of the Church* was this; That Baptism, whether in *Ordinary* or *extraordinary* Cases, was administer'd either by the Bishop himself, or else by such as had, [or were suppos'd to have had] *Apostolick, i. e. Episcopal Authority or Commission* to baptize, *p. 169.*

And that the Question of usurp'd and unauthoriz'd Baptism by Lay-men, is a *more difficult Question*; and he cannot resolve, that their Validity has any *Catholick Tradition* of the Church, whereon to suppose it ground- ed, *p. 189.*

Mr. Bingham endeavours to represent as *Unauthoriz'd, Uncommission'd, and Anti-Episcopal*, the *Heretical and Schismatical Baptisms* which were allow'd to be Valid by some ancient Churches.

The *Ancient Heretical and Schismatical Baptisms*, allowed of by some Churches, were not *Unauthoriz'd, Uncommission'd, and Anti-Episcopal Lay-Baptisms*; this prov'd from the *general Council of Nice, the African Code,* and *Mr. Bingham's own Account of 'em, p. 193.*

So that upon a just Consideration of this Table, and all that has been said before, 'tis evident, that the Sum Total of all that our Reverend Historian and I have have said upon this Subject, is, That the ancient Catholick Church never had any Ecclesiastical Law, Tradition, or Custom, in Favour of the Validity of Baptisms perform'd by those, who are notoriously known to have been never Commission'd by Bishops to baptize. If Men will then venture to pronounce them Valid, 'tis plain that they have no Law of God, or of *his ancient Catholick Church*, whereon to found such a *Determination*. And therefore it must be done upon some private Principle of their own: But from such fatal Practices, I pray God to deliver and preserve his Church for ever.

I shall without any the *least Pedantry* conclude with these following Observations about suppos'd *Cases of Necessity*, concerning which some [without any Necessity at all] do make so great a Bustle.

1st, Supposing a Person duly qualified for Baptism, but not Baptiz'd, should be in such Circumstances, as that he could not possibly obtain Baptism, tho' from a duly Ordained Priest there present, but with an *Uninstituted Form*, not in the Name of the Trinity; the Priest, for Supposition's sake, being an *Anti-Trinitarian*: If this Person should desire Baptism in the Name of the Trinity, and yet accept of this *False Baptism*, reckoning it to be Right, because he can have no Other; 'Tis plain, he is *not actually Baptiz'd*, notwithstanding the suppos'd Necessity, and therefore is not in *Actual* Covenant with God; and consequently, if he Dies without True Baptism, he must be left to God's Uncovenanted Mercy; but with this Disadvantage, That he acquiesces in a Sin, though ignorantly, to make the best of it. ———

2dly, Supposing this Person to have a right sense of his Duty, and to Die with the Refusal of this False Baptism, because 'tis contrary to the Institution; 'tis plain, he Dies *Unbaptiz'd*, and so is not in *Actual* Covenant with God, and therefore must be referr'd to the same *Uncovenanted* Mercy; but with this great Advantage on his side, That he would do his Duty, but cannot: He knows 'tis sinful to Break the Institution; and consequently, through a pious, just fear of Transgressing, will not admit of an *Uninstituted* Form, and consequently, of False Baptism instead of the True: He trusts to *Uncovenanted* Mercy, with the Advantage of not breaking God's Law to obtain it: And let any one in his Senses judge, which of the Two is the *safest* to be chosen. So,

3dly, A Baptism *with the Form in the Name of the Trinity*, perform'd by a **Person never Commission'd** to Baptize, tho' done *when no Commission'd Person can be had*, is as much a Breach of the *Institution* as the other, and therefore we must have recourse to *Uncovenanted* Mercy for its Acceptance: For by *what Covenant* has God obliged himself to accept of it? But then our Confidence in this Mercy is abated, nay, is liable to be confounded, by our Sin and Presumption, in doing and acquiescing in a *sinful Ministration*, which is a Breach of the *Essential Law of God* about this Matter. Whereas,

4thly and *Lastly*, By refusing the *Never-commission'd Pretender*, when we can have *No Commission'd* Baptism, we express our *Pious* Regard to the Divine Institution; we show, That we must not do or acquiesce in *Evil*, with a design that *Good may come of it*: But we refer ourselves to the Divine Mercy, without venturing to break his Law; and

so we escape the Imputation of Presumption, and are the more capable Objects of his Pity and Compassion, tho' we have no Claim to it by virtue of an *Explicit Baptismal Covenant*, when we Die in this Case without the *Instituted Ministration* of Baptism by a Commission.

In short, Upon the present Supposition, Persons pretendedly Baptiz'd by Non-commission'd Usurpers, and so Dying, must be referr'd to an *Uncovenanted Mercy* for Acceptance, [because they were not receiv'd into Covenant by the *Instituted Ministration*;] as must also others, who [refuse those False Baptisms, and] Die without True Baptism, because they cannot procure *Commission'd Baptism*. But the difference to the *Disadvantage* of the *first* is very great, for their Case is attended with Sin, even in the Baptized himself, when he consents to, acquiesces in, defends, and never endeavours to amend the Usurpation, [as is the Case of *too many* with us, who are come to Years of Discretion, &c.] Whereas *these latter*, who so Die without *Commission'd Baptism*, are so far from having any Sin to answer for, upon the account of *refusing an Uncommission'd Usurper's Act*, that their *very Refusal* of it, was an Act of *Piety and Religion*; and therefore their and *our Confidence* in God's Mercy, is *much better founded*, while 'tis thus free from the *base alloy of Presumption*.

And it were to be wish'd, that they who talk so much of *pretended Cases of Necessity*, [especially among us, where there are *really* none] would seriously consider, which of these Two is the *safest Way*; and the *very great Danger* of *Encouraging People* to sit down contented with that, which themselves acknowledge to be a *Sin*, when 'tis so easie among us to *correct and amend* it

it, by a *Validly Commission'd Baptism*; every-where to be obtain'd, if those who have Power will but administer it, and they who want it will but qualifie themselves to receive and seek for it.

But I Conclude; Humbly and Earnestly Praying to Almighty God, *“Who gathers his Flock out of all Nations into the Saving Fold of One Catholic Church; Who has also appointed divers Orders [Bishops, Priests, Deacons] in his Church,”* [in their several Degrees and Stations, to represent the Great Mediator between God and Man, Christ Jesus, for this Sacred Purpose;] *“That He would be pleas'd to Inspire All Bishops and their Clergy, with Courage and Skill, and Fatherly Care, to Edifie and Guard their several Charges;”* to keep that which is committed to their Trust, and in Christ's stead, here on Earth, to Open the Kingdom of Heaven to all Believers: That he would Bless all the Laity *“with a filial Love, and due Obedience to their Spiritual Superiors;”* That the *Clearness of Truth, and Beauty of Holiness, daily increasing in his Church, through every one's devout Pursuance of their Duties, all Hereticks and Schismaticks* may be converted, and *“all Jews and Pagans be happily won into her Sacred Bosom the sole Ark of Salvation;”* through the Power and Merits of the *Eternal Son of God, Jesus Christ our Lord, To whom with his Eternal Father, and the Holy Ghost, eternally proceeding from the Father and the Son; Three Persons, but One Incomprehensible God!* be all Honour, Praise, and Glory, Might, Power, Majesty and Dominion, for Ever and Ever, *Amen.*



