

BAP
0345
copy 1

Liturgy of the Theological Seminary,

PRINCETON, N. J.

Presented by Mr. Samuel Agnew of Philadelphia, Pa.

Agnew Coll. on Baptism, No.

SCB
10228
c. 1













A N O U T L I N E

OF THE

ARGUMENT AGAINST

THE

VALIDITY OF LAY-BAPTISM.

BY

REV. JOHN D. OGILBY, A. M.

(St. Mark's Church in the Bowery)—Professor of Ecclesiastical History in the General
Theological Seminary of the Protestant Episcopal Church.

"ONE LORD, ONE FAITH, ONE BAPTISM."

NEW-YORK :

D. APPLETON AND CO., 200 BROADWAY.

MDCCCXLII.

ENTERED according to Act of Congress, in the year 1841, by
JOHN D. OGILBY,
in the Clerk's Office of the District Court of the Southern
District of New-York.

University Press :
JOHN F. TROW, PRINTER,
114 Nassau-street,
New-York.

TO
THE RIGHT REVEREND FATHERS,
THE
BISHOPS OF THE CHURCH IN AMERICA,
CHIEF PASTORS OF THE FLOCK OF CHRIST AND
STEWARDS OF THE MYSTERIES OF GOD,
THIS HUMBLE EFFORT
TO ILLUSTRATE AN IMPORTANT POINT OF DOCTRINE
AND DISCIPLINE,
IS MOST RESPECTFULLY INSCRIBED BY
THEIR SERVANT IN CHRIST,
THE AUTHOR.

“In this discourse, I have no aim to displease any, nor any hope to please all. If I can help on to truth in the Church and the peace of the Church together, I shall be glad, be it in any measure. Nor shall I spare to speak necessary truth, out of too much love of peace, nor thrust on unnecessary truth to the breach of that peace, which once broken is not so easily soldered again. And if for necessary truth’s sake only, any man will be offended, nay take, nay snatch at, that offence which is not given, I know no fence for that. It is truth, and I must tell it; it is the gospel, and I must preach it. And far safer it is in this case to bear anger from men, than a wo from God.”

LAUD’S CONFERENCE WITH FISHER.



CONTENTS.

	Page
PREFACE,	7
CHAPTER I.	
State of the Case. Importance of the Subject, .	13
CHAPTER II.	
The Argument furnished by the very terms of our blessed Saviour's Commission to his Apostles,	19
CHAPTER III.	
The Argument derived from the Nature of the Holy Sacrament itself,	23
CHAPTER IV.	
The <i>onus probandi</i> rests upon the Advocates of Lay-Baptism. The sort of proof which they must bring to break the force of the foregoing Argument. The position of the leading An- glican writers in favor of Lay-Baptism defined. The position of its American advocates widely different,	30
CHAPTER V.	
The evidence, derived from Primitive Antiquity, in favor of Lay-Baptism, examined. Its insuffi- ciency shown,	38
CHAPTER VI.	
The Catholic doctrine and usage of the Primitive Church positively confirm the Arguments of Chapters II. and III.,	72

CHAPTER VII.

	Page
An examination of sundry pleas, by help of which the Advocates of Lay-Baptism attempt to evade the Arguments of Chapters II. and III. 1. Alleged instances of Lay-Baptism in the New Testament. 2. Attempted parallel between Preaching and Baptizing. 3. Comparison of Circumcision and Baptism. 4. Asserted authority of bishops to ratify <i>ex post facto</i> any Baptisms whatsoever,	94

CHAPTER VIII.

An examination of the Argument in favor of Lay-Baptism, derived from the alleged consequences of the contrary doctrine,	111
---	-----

CHAPTER IX.

The Argument derived from Consequences against Lay-Baptism. Sundry Arguments for it briefly discussed,	133
--	-----

CHAPTER X.


The Erroneous Notions of certain Fathers shown to be the Source of Lay-Baptism. It progressed <i>pari passu</i> with Error and Corruption, until it was established by Papal Sanction,	144
--	-----

CHAPTER XI.

The early Anglican Reformers retained the Papal Doctrine, both as to the absolute necessity of Baptism, and the validity of Lay-Baptism. The Anglican Church gradually returned to the Primitive Doctrine in both respects, and conformed thereto her authorized Standards and Formularies,	158
---	-----

CHAPTER XII.

The American Liturgy. The alleged Practice of the American Church. Conclusion,	179
NOTES,	187



P R E F A C E.

THE Author of this "Outline" is aware that some apology may be thought necessary for bringing forth, into the open arena of public discussion, a subject, which has been suffered to repose in unbroken silence during the whole period that has elapsed since the independent organization of the Church in America. It is true that the subject has not been wholly unheeded; that the principles advocated in these pages have been secretly and quietly gaining ground; and that they have been practically carried out in many instances within the last few years; but still noiselessly and almost invisibly. Nor would the present writer have taken upon himself the responsibility of disturbing the even tenor of their way, had he not been constrained so to do by the instinctive impulse of self-defence, as well as by a sense of official responsibility.

It is already known, most probably, to all the readers of this publication, that a recent Baptism by him of two persons who had previously received Lay-Baptism, has excited no small degree of attention, and has raised against him no little outcry. Some have objected to that Baptism on account of the *mode* adopted. He has deemed it best not to divert attention from the main question by treating of this matter on the present occasion. It may be presumed that most objectors find fault with him

for *re-baptizing* those who had already received (as they allege) a *valid* Baptism.

As has been already hinted, the administration of Baptism under such circumstances is no new thing. But as the Baptism in question was by immersion in the river, and in the presence of a goodly number of witnesses, this particular ministration became publicly known: and since it was the first *open* transgression of the kind, the sins of all who had preceded him in such ministrations, were visited upon this single offender, at least by some. Neither seeking secrecy on the one hand, nor courting notoriety on the other, he has been dragged before the bar of private judgment, and condemned or acquitted, without the form of trial, according to the prepossessions of his several self-constituted judges. He has therefore seen fit to appeal to the Church at large, and to set forth, in the following "Outline of the Argument against the Validity of Lay-Baptism," the principles and reasons which have governed his practice. Experience and observation have convinced him, that involuntary ignorance and hereditary prejudice combined, have for the most part sustained the practice of allowing Lay-Baptism, which has obtained too generally in the Church. The design therefore of this "Outline" is to put it in the power of all, who are willing to be at a little pains, to form a correct judgment in regard to the merits of the controversy; or, at the least, to prepare them for entering upon a more thorough investigation of the subject.

It is not pretended that the argument is exhausted here. Those who wish to follow it further may consult, *in favor* of Lay-Baptism, HOOKER'S "Ecclesiastical Polity" (5th Book);—BINGHAM'S "Scholastical History of Lay-Baptism,—and KELSALL'S "Answer to Dr. Waterland's First Letter" (contained in the 10th vol. of Dr. W.'s

Works). On the other side, it will be sufficient to study WATERLAND'S* "Letters" on the subject, in the 10th vol. of his Works; and LAWRENCE'S "Lay-Baptism Invalid." The latter work the writer has never seen; he relies for its character upon the report of others. His "Sacerdotal Powers" is well worthy of perusal; as also Bennett's "Rights of the Clergy." Indeed, any one, who agrees with the Author in regard to the principles laid down in the first three chapters of this "Outline," might safely stop after reading the authorities referred to *in favor* of Lay-Baptism. With the profoundest reverence for "the judicious HOOKER," the Author has never read that particular portion of his great Work, without being reminded of Horace's words, "*bonus dormitat HOMERUS.*" Where Hooker fails to make out his case, Bingham and Kelsall may not hope for success.

The modern opponent of Lay-Baptism is under great disadvantage in being obliged to run counter to the private opinions of some of the most distinguished names in the Anglican Church since the Reformation. It may look, at first sight, like presumption in one unknown to fame, to reject the verdict of theologians, at whose feet he might sit as a learner (on most subjects) with credit and advantage to himself. And it would indeed be the height of presumption, were it not that he is privileged to appeal to a higher tribunal than even that which is graced by the Hookers, the Bingham, and the Potters of our venerable Mother Church, and by the Patriarchal White of our own,—even the au-

* Dowling ("Introduction to the Critical Study of Ecclesiastical History," p. 195) speaks of Waterland as "the last of our great patristical scholars." The Author's great obligations to him are repeatedly acknowledged in the course of the following "Outline."

gust tribunal of the Primitive Fathers, the only competent Witnesses to Apostolic and Catholic Practice ; the highest Court of Appeal, where holy Scripture is silent, or its true sense and scope the subject matter of dispute.

The Author trusts that he has learned more thoroughly than he had before, from the investigation of this subject, a two-fold lesson, which every Catholic ought to learn by heart, as fundamental to true Churchmanship,—*to be humble* in mind, whenever and wherever *mere private judgment* is concerned, in view of the errors of men wiser and better than himself,—*to be thankful* in heart, that God's grace has not left his Church without a competent Witness and Umpire in doubtful and difficult questions of Doctrine and Discipline,* viz. the Fathers of the first four centuries, in whose writings are embodied, for our benefit, the Doctrine and Discipline of the Primitive Catholic and Apostolic Church.

It is hardly necessary to remark in this place, what is obvious from the course of reasoning pursued, that this little work is designed mainly for those, who are professedly *Churchmen*. All the denominations in the country, who hold to a Ministry *by succession* (i. e. all but the various modifications of *Congregationalism*), are in general consistent in this matter, and make the *validity* of the Sacraments to depend upon the *legality* and *regularity* of

* It is hardly necessary to remark that the Author, with the Church, defers to the Fathers, not as infallible doctors, but as competent *witnesses to facts*, whether of doctrine or discipline. Their individual opinions are to be taken for what they are worth ; their concurrent testimony is to be received as historical truth, whether it relate to the practice or the teaching of the inspired Apostles.

the *Ministration*. Between them and us there is no controversy on this subject of Lay-Baptism considered by itself: our difference is as to what constitutes a *legal* and *regular* MINISTRY. This point is here assumed, as the Church has defined it.


The only consistent advocates of Lay-Baptism (as we think are the *Congregationalists*, or those who deny a Ministry perpetuated by *successive ordinations*; and who virtually hold Tertullian's conceit of the *inherent Priesthood of every Christian*. According to which theory of course every man *may* and *can* administer the Sacraments; although for the sake of decency and order, no man *ought* so to do, until he has received some sort of authority from the expressed consent of those whom it may concern.

Many, no doubt, who are shut out of the Ministry, or of the visible fold of Christ, by the definition of *lawful* Ministration all along implied in these pages, will charge the Church and the present writer with "want of charity," "illiberality," "bigotry," &c. To such he would briefly say, that when *they* relinquish every principle, which inferentially condemns others, they may with more decency make the demand of him and of the Church. Let not the Calvinist, who condemns all, but his select few, to absolute and inevitable perdition—nor the non-Episcopal Trinitarian, of whatever name, who virtually un-Christianizes the Socinian and Arian—presume to charge with "bigotry" the Churchman, who, holding Episcopal ordination essential to legal or valid ministration in holy things, does consistently therewith class all not thus ordained as Laymen, and their Baptisms as Lay-Baptisms. Theirs is the very quintessence of bigotry, who charge the breach of charity on him who, in the exercise of that "liberty of conscience" (of which some *talk* so much), dares to hold and follow out

any principle, that their infallibility has not first approved and sanctioned.

In conclusion, the Author respectfully requests of those, who hold that grave questions in Doctrine and Discipline should be decided by *reasoning*, and not by *railing*, to grant him a patient hearing; regarding the *matter*, rather than the *manner* and *style*, of his "Outline." Unavoidable haste in its execution must apologize for defects in the latter respect: if other duties had not interfered, he would gladly have devoted more weeks, than he has been able to give days, to its preparation. Desirous that truth may be ascertained and prevail, he asks for the matter nothing more than fair and Christian treatment.

GENERAL THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY,
October 6th, 1841.



CHAPTER I.

State of the Case. Importance of the Subject.

FROM the period of the Anglican Reformation down to the present time, there has existed, both in the Anglican and in the American branches of the Church Catholic much diversity of opinion in respect to the *validity of Lay-Baptism*, i. e. Baptism (or the *form* thereof) administered by such as have not received a *regular commission* to act as Christ's Ministers, from the Successors of the Apostles, the Bishops of the Church of God. None admit the *regularity* or *legality* of *Lay-Baptism*, who maintain that Episcopal Ordination is necessary to constitute a man an Ambassador of God. With those who deny that Episcopal Ordination is essential to a *regular, legal, and valid* Ministry, we have no common ground. For we regard as *Laymen* all, who have not a commission *Episcopally* conveyed. Our argument is with those, who, while they maintain (according to the Primitive and Catholic rule, *nulla Ecclesia sine Episcopo*, "no Church without the Bishop,") that a Commission, derived from

Christ through His Apostles and their Episcopal Successors, is essential to *regular* and *legal* ministration in things divine, hold, notwithstanding, that the *irregular* and *illegal* ministration of the Holy Sacrament of *Baptism* (in particular), whether by laymen *in* or *out* of the Church, *is truly a Sacrament* and *valid* to the receiver; so that the *regular* and *legal* ministration of that Sacrament, by a lawful Minister, to one thus *irregularly* and *illegally* baptized (as they term it), is nothing less than an infringement of the Scriptural and Catholic rule of "one Baptism for the remission of sins," a deliberate attempt to do a *second* time what Christ requires to be done *once for all*.

Now it is obviously clear and certain, that the issue here presented is one of the greatest moment, whichever of the two opposite views be in accordance with truth. For, if Lay-Baptism be indeed *valid*, then are certain among us guilty of great and grievous presumption, in attempting to give a better and more perfect Baptism than that which CHRIST and his *Church* allow. And, furthermore, the relation of the motley and multitudinous assemblages around us to the Church itself, is very different from what *they* hold it to be, who deny both their Orders *and* their *Baptism*. For, if they possess and confer a *valid* Baptism, then are the individuals, who compose them, members of Christ's Body, the Church, and in the most anomalous and

contradictory position imaginable, viz., that of being, at one and the same time, *in* and *out* of the Church; or (as it may be translated), “of being in two places at once.”

Nor will it answer to evade or explain away this difficulty, by alleging as parallel the case of the ancient Schismatics and Heretics, who were readmitted to the communion of the Church (except by the Africans and Asiatics for a time), after confession and penance, *without re-baptization*, provided always their Baptism had been conferred agreeably to Christ’s institution. For, be it observed, these had a legal ministry, and had received the “one Baptism” committed to the ministry of Apostolic succession;* and their case was that of those in our day, who, having become members of the Church by *legal* and *regular* Baptism, are afterwards excommunicated for evil living or teaching, and again restored to communion after due satisfaction for their fault. The ancient Heretics were really (suspended) members of the Church. The modern sectaries are in no sense such, unless they have made themselves such by baptizing themselves.

If, on the other hand, *Lay-Baptism* be *invalid* (as well as *illegal* and *irregular*), then are the con-

* See Chapter VI., under the head of St. Cyprian’s testimony, for a full exposition of this subject,

sequences most serious to all such as have received no other Baptism. For they are in no proper sense "members of Christ" and of His Church. That is, they have no *covenant right* to claim that high and gracious privilege. We presume not to say, that they cannot and will not "see God;" that for them "Christ has died in vain." We forget not, that "judgment belongeth unto God," and that He "will have mercy, and not sacrifice." But we do say (what is a necessary logical consequence, if Baptism be the *Seal* of the Covenant of Grace, and a *means* of Grace) that they are not Members of the visible Church of God; and that they must lose the blessings, which God *ordinarily* conveys through the medium of the Church and of its Divine Ministrations; unless God miraculously or extraordinarily supply them in some other way. This He may do, if He will; but this He has not promised to do: nor may we expect or claim it of Him, without grievous folly and presumption.

Above all does this inquiry concern that important and increasing class of the adherents to the Church, who have come over from the Sects around us. It surely is their solemn duty to ascertain, if possible, whether they are *really* of the Church, as well as *apparently within* it. The mere fact, that several of our Bishops, and many of our Clergy and theologians, regard their Baptism as *invalid* (*null* and *void*), should move them to pros-

ecute the inquiry with alacrity and diligence. Nor let them imagine, that, allowing their Baptism to be *invalid*, this defect has been supplied by their having received the Apostolic rite of Confirmation; or by their having long partaken of the Holy Communion of the Body and Blood of our Saviour Christ. For neither Confirmation, nor the Holy Communion *includes* Baptism,—the former being at most only supplemental to Baptism, and the latter the right and privilege of those only who have received it. Moreover Baptism, Confirmation, and the Communion of our Lord's Body and Blood, are to be severally received, *each by and for itself*, in their proper order, by every one who would approve himself an obedient disciple of Christ. The receiving of one is not the receiving of the other; to receive two, and to omit the third, is to break God's holy ordinance; here, as elsewhere, to "offend in one point" is to be "guilty of all."

In the ancient Church, it is true, Confirmation was allowed to supply whatever of spiritual grace was wanting in the Baptism conferred by heretical or schismatical Ministers. But then it was held, that these had power, by virtue of their legal ordination, to administer the Sacraments truly and validly; albeit their disaffection to the Church, and alienation or excommunication from it, made the act one of disobedience and contumacy on their

part, and deprived those who knowingly and wilfully partook of their heresy or schism of the spiritual benefits, in whole or in part, which Baptism duly received, as well as duly administered, is the means of conveying. These latter, however, did receive a *valid* Baptism, and were thereby grafted into Christ's Body the Church; so that when they repented of their sin, and made atonement therefor, they were absolved from the penalties of disobedience, and the spiritual defects of their Baptism were supplied by the laying on of the Bishop's hands in Confirmation.* This case is in nowise parallel to that of such as have only received *Lay-Baptism*, i. e. (as we contend), who have received no Baptism at all. Confirmation cannot supply the defects of such Baptism; for *a non-entity can have no supplement*.

In either view of the case, then, it is one of most thrilling interest; affecting the Ministerial conduct of Christ's Ambassadors; involving the spiritual condition and welfare of thousands now existing, and of millions yet unborn; and imposing an awful weight of obligation and responsibility on the CHURCH of GOD, the "Pillar and Ground of the Truth," and the Steward of His Holy Mysteries.—Well may we, wisely will we, address ourselves, humbly and diligently, to this high argument.

* See Note (A) at the end of the volume.

CHAPTER II.

The Argument furnished by the very Terms of our blessed Saviour's Commission to his Apostles.

“ And Jesus came, and spake unto them, saying, All power is given unto me in heaven and in earth. Go ye, therefore, and teach 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. Amen.” *St. Matthew's Gospel*, xxviii. 18—20.

IN the foregoing quotation from the Word of God we have that final and solemn sentence of our Lord, whereby, when he had finished His own ministry on earth, He transferred the duty of carrying it on in His stead to the Apostles, whom He had chosen. He had before committed to them the keys of the “ Kingdom of Heaven,” with the promise and pledge, that what they bound on Earth should be bound in Heaven. He now repeats both the commission and the promise. After asserting His own delegated omnipotence as the Head of the Church in virtue of His obedience, He sends them, 1, to prepare men for admission to His Kingdom by preaching the Gospel,—“ Go ye, therefore, and teach all nations ;” 2, to admit them, when thus pre-

pared, within the Church's fold,—“baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost;” 3, to guide and govern them, after their admission, agreeably to His ordinances and precepts,—“teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you;” and, 4, He gives them the promise of His presence and protection, and extends that promise, as well as His commission, to all of the Apostolic Line to the end of time,—“And lo, I am with you always, even unto the end of the world. Amen.”

We are chiefly concerned at present with the second head, relating to the admission of men to the Church. Now, be it observed, that our Saviour here expressly commits and confines to His Apostles alone the power of admitting men to His Church, and puts the key that opens the door thereof, viz. Holy Baptism, into their keeping. He gives this prerogative of Baptizing as exclusively to them, as He does the prerogatives of Teaching, Ordering, and Governing the Church. By the terms of our Saviour's Commission, then, no one may presume to baptize; or, if he presume so to do, claim validity for his ministration, who cannot show that the Apostles have delegated to him their authority, and thereby given him a share of their Commission.—Had not the Apostles themselves communicated to others, not of their own order, one or more of the powers conveyed to them by the Commission of

their ascending Lord; then each and all of those powers must, to the end of time, have been vested exclusively in those, who derive their spiritual authority directly from the Apostles themselves, and are their proper lineal successors, viz. the Bishops of the Church. For the assumption of any one, even the least important, of those powers, without the warrant and direction of the Apostles, by one not of their Order, would have been an open and flagrant violation of the very letter of the Divine Commission, and an insult to His authority, from whose grace it emanated.

Accordingly we find as an historical fact, that a portion of the power, which was given *in solidum* to each and all of the Apostolic College, was by the Apostles themselves imparted *by Commission* to others (besides their Apostolic or Episcopal successors), in different degrees, viz. to the Presbyters and Deacons, whom they thereby constituted respectively the second and third grades of the Holy Ministry; and whose competency to minister in holy things, in their several proportions and in due subordination to the Apostolic Order, has ever since been acknowledged by the several branches of the Catholic Church.

The fact, that this communication of their ministerial powers and prerogatives, to the orders just named, was made by the divinely inspired Apostles, warrants us in taking it for granted that they acted

in this matter agreeably to the will of their Lord, in the exercise of the power conveyed to them under the third head of their Commission. Had not the Apostles, under the guidance of the Holy Ghost, brought the Presbyters and Deacons within the scope of their Commission, any attempt, on the part of these, to act in Christ's name and stead, would be a gross usurpation, which the Church must have disowned and annulled. By the same rule the Church is bound to disown and annul the ministerial acts of *laymen*, whether within or without her fold; unless indeed they can bring some competent voucher for their asserted right other than Christ's Commission.

It belongs to another chapter to examine the pretensions of those, who, having no part in our Lord's Commission, would fain persuade us that they too hold the key of His Kingdom, and that they can and do open it to whom they list, in spite of his prohibition.

CHAPTER III.

The Argument derived from the Nature of the Holy Sacrament itself.

“ Baptism is not only a sign of profession, and mark of difference, whereby Christian men are discerned from others that be not christened ; but it is also a sign of regeneration, or new birth, whereby, as by an instrument, they that receive Baptism rightly are grafted into the Church ; *the promises of the forgiveness of sin, and of our adoption to be the sons of God by the HOLY GHOST, are visibly signed and sealed.*”—*Art. xxvii.*

TAKING the italicised portion of the foregoing quotation from the 27th Article of our Church as a just exhibition of the Holy Sacrament of Baptism, in the aspect which now concerns us, we maintain that the argument, derived from the *Nature* of the Holy Sacrament itself, strengthens the position, already made good in the preceding chapter, viz., that none can *validly* administer Baptism, who have not received a regular *Commission* to serve at His altar from the Author of the Sacrament himself ; or, in other words, that Lay-Baptism is *invalid*, as well as *illegal* and *irregular*.

The words of the Article referred to most clearly and truly set forth Baptism, not only as a “ sign”

and "instrument" of Regeneration, but also as the SIGN *and* SEAL of the NEW, or *Evangelic*, COVENANT. To this Covenant there are two parties, GOD and *Man*. That the Covenant between the contracting parties may be duly ratified and mutually binding, it must be signed and sealed by both of them, acting *immediately* for themselves, or *mediately* through the agency of one or more, whom they have formally empowered and commissioned to act in their stead. *Man* signs and seals the Covenant, partly in person or by his sponsors, partly by the officiating Minister. GOD acts wholly by His representative or proxy, whom He designates and authorizes. "And no man taketh this honor unto himself, but he that is called of God, as was Aaron."* "*No man taketh ;*" i. e. no man *can* take: for to say that no man *does* take, were false. Witness, under the Aaronic Priesthood, Korah, Dathan, and Abiram; and, under the Christian, the countless usurpers of this sacred office. Men may now, as of old, "gather themselves together against" the duly commissioned Ministers of God, and say "unto them, Ye take too much upon you, seeing all the congregation are holy, every one of them, and the Lord is among them: wherefore, then, lift ye up yourselves above the congregation of the Lord?" They may "take every man his censer, and put

* Hebrews 5: 4.

fire in them, and lay incense thereon, and stand in the door of the tabernacle of the congregation with Moses and Aaron." But God will not "respect their offering," nor make good their acts; for "the man whom the Lord doth choose, he shall be holy;" "even him whom He hath chosen, will He cause to come near unto Him."* He may not vindicate their exclusive right to act for Him in holy things, as He did that of Moses and Aaron, by a miraculous attestation of His displeasure; nor need He, for "the things that were written aforetime, were written for our learning." But sooner or later "the fire shall try every man's work, of what sort it is."†

No man *may*, no man *can*, no man *does* act in God's place, unless God hath called, chosen, and commissioned him. Let him then, who would set God's *seal* to the New, or Evangelic Covenant, by Holy Baptism, *show his Commission*; let him prove that "he is called, as was Aaron;" or else let him not cry out against those who refuse to acknowledge his counterfeit signature and seal. "Ye take too much upon you, ye sons of Levi."

There is another view of the *Sacrament of Baptism* which confirms the foregoing argument. The administration of it involves a *Priestly* agency, in *consecrating*, both the *water* to the use of Baptism,

* Numbers 16 : 3, ss.

† 1 Cor. 3 : 13.

without which it is not the "laver of regeneration," and the *person* baptized to the service of God. This may be illustrated by the other Sacrament of the Holy Eucharist. There too there is a *Consecration* of the Elements of Bread and Wine, without which they are not sacramentally "the Body and Blood of Christ;" and an *oblation* of the communicants to God. Furthermore Baptism was anciently reckoned the grand *Absolution*, since it is by our Saviour's appointment *the* means of conveying "remission of sins." Now to give Absolution has ever been accounted a Priestly act.* The necessity of lawful ministration in the one Sacrament is acknowledged on the very ground here asserted. Why should it not be allowed for the same reason in the other likewise? No reason can be assigned unless it be this, that the appropriation of the title "Priest" to the second grade of the Ministry has given rise to the groundless notion that the Deacons do not belong to the *Priesthood*; and consequently that Baptism, to which they are competent, is not a Priestly act. This mode of reasoning, however, proves too much; for in the same way it were easy to exclude Bishops likewise from the *Priesthood*. Now it is plain that *consecration* of Water

* Vide Waterland, VII. p. 239, ss. VIII. p. 222, 257—260. Bingham, Book xix. c. 1.

in Holy Baptism, so that it shall represent mystically the renewing and life-giving energy of the Holy Ghost, is as much a *Priestly* act as to *consecrate* Bread and Wine in the Holy Eucharist, so that they become spiritually the Body and Blood of Christ. And to set apart a human being *for the first time and forever* to the service of God is not less a Priestly act than to repeat that consecration afterwards. It is true that there is, beyond this limit, a distinction and a difference between the ministration of the two Sacraments severally ; and that Deacons are not competent to administer one of them. This does not prove, however, that they are destitute of the Priestly *character*, but rather that they have not so much Priestly *power* as the Presbyters ; even as these have less than the Bishops.* Now can any one usurp the Priestly character, or exercise (without a commission) Priestly power, unless he can make himself indeed and in truth a Priest ? Assuredly not ; “ no man taketh (*can* take) this honor to himself : and what he has no right to take, we have no right to allow. “ The Scriptures teach us, that the Holy Ghost has instituted an Order of Clergy : we say, a Priesthood, so authorized, can no more be changed by us, than we can change the Scriptures, or make new Sacraments ; because they

* For authority confirming the position here maintained, see Note (B).

are all founded on the same authority, without any power of a dispensation delegated to us in one case more than in another." And "as a true Priest cannot benefit us by administering a false Sacrament; so a true Sacrament is nothing, when it is administered by a false uncommissioned Minister."*

It may be as well in this place to expose a sophism, which is frequently made to pass current as an argument in behalf of Lay-Baptism. "Granting," say its advocates, "that Lay-Baptism is both *illegal* and *irregular*, still it must be allowed to be *valid*, on the received maxim, *quod non debuit fieri, factum valet*, i. e., "What ought not to have been done is nevertheless *valid when done*." Certainly what *is* done, is *done*, and must needs stand, or be *valid*. But who, that is willing to see, does not see, that the maxim is wholly impertinent to the case in hand; that its application here is a *petitio principii*, a mere begging of the question? It amounts just to this, "Lay-Baptism is truly Baptism, *because it is*." Most admirable logic! In this way it were easy to prove any thing. I repeat, then, for the sake of distinctness, that the very question at issue is, *whether the application of water, in the name of the Holy Trinity, by an uncommissioned agent, or a layman, is valid Baptism*. How absurd to say that because one man has *washed*

* Law's Second Letter to Bishop Hoadley.

another with water, in the name of the Trinity, he has therefore *baptized* him ; when the *lis sub judice*, the point to be settled, is whether such washing can be called Baptism. It might seem trifling to dwell upon so flimsy a sophism, had it not, strange to say, been much insisted on by our opponents in this controversy.

In a word, then, no one can sign and seal a Covenant but the parties contracting, or those whom they empower to act in their name and behalf. And if any one pretend to covenant for another, without his express direction and commission, such act is neither *legal, regular, nor valid*, however nearly the usurping party may copy the hand and seal of him whom he pretends to represent. For the instrument which he executes, though it have the *form* and *semblance* of a Covenant, wants that which is *essential* thereto, viz., the *express consent* of both the contracting parties ; and is therefore *no Covenant*.* According to which rule "Lay-Baptism," or washing in the name of the Holy Trinity, administered by one not authorized to act for God, *is no Baptism*, pretences and appearances to the contrary notwithstanding.

* Note (C).

CHAPTER IV.

The ONUS PROBANDI rests upon the advocates of Lay-Baptism. The sort of Proof which they must bring to break the force of the foregoing Argument. The position of the leading Anglican writers in favor of Lay-Baptism defined. The position of its AMERICAN ADVOCATES widely different.

WE trust that it has been sufficiently shown in the foregoing chapters, that by the very terms of our Blessed Saviour's Commission to His Apostles, and by the nature of the Sacrament itself, the *right* and *power* to administer Holy Baptism are confined to those who can produce a regular Commission to act in Christ's behalf in holy things; and that consequently Lay-Baptism is *invalid*; unless the contrary can be proven by evidence or arguments derived from some other source. Now since the whole evidence, both express and implied, which is furnished by the Commission and Institution of our Lord, makes in favor of our position and against Lay-Baptism, it remains for its advocates to show, why judgment should not be entered against them. They will not pretend to deny, we presume, that *as a general rule*, the *power*, as well as *right*, to baptize is vested only in Christ's lawfully commissioned or ordained Ministers. But

they claim that *the rule has its exceptions*. Now it is their duty to *prove* the particular exception or exceptions, and to show that they have the same warrant and authority as the rule itself. For no law can be set aside or suspended save by the law-giver, or by one deputed to act in his stead. This principle, which is true in regard to ordinary laws, applies with manifold force to *Constitutional* enactments. And such is the nature of our Saviour's injunctions respecting the Ministry and the Sacraments of His Church. Both the one and the other are of its essence ; destroy them and you destroy it. All enactments therefore respecting them are *Constitutional* principles, which man cannot, if he would, bend or break.

These remarks indicate the sort of proof too, which the advocates of Lay-Baptism must adduce to make good their alleged exception or exceptions in its favor. Since no Constitutional principle can be modified, except by the party that ordained it ; and since the *general rule* respecting Holy Baptism was enacted and established by the precept of Christ himself and the practice of His Apostles ; it follows of course that the *exception* or *exceptions* must be similarly authorized and confirmed. And since we have already granted, that the testimony and practice of the inspired Apostles are a sufficient exposition of their Lord's Commission and Institution ; it is only required that the claim of

laymen to give valid Baptism shall be sustained by the sanction of the Apostles. Nothing short of this can meet the case, or make good the position we assail. And inasmuch as it is plainly impossible to prove the Apostolic practice in this matter with absolute certainty, out of the New Testament alone, we shall cheerfully accept the *Catholic* usage of the Primitive Church for the first four centuries, as a sufficient and satisfactory voucher for the practice of the Apostles themselves. This is both reasonable in itself, and binding upon us as Churchmen. Be it noted, however, that we will not accept as evidence the mere *opinions* of this or that Father, however illustrious he may be. His *testimony* to the *fact* of Apostolic and Catholic practice must be allowed; with individual opinions and notions we have at present nothing to do; nor will the decision of a local Synod, binding for a time only upon a part of the Church, serve any better purpose; it is the *consent* of antiquity that is alone decisive in such a question.

And here in justice to the leading Anglican writers in favor of the validity of Lay-Baptism, it is our duty to state what they concede to us in the outset, and what they profess themselves able and willing to prove. *Mr. Kelsall* in his "Answer to *Dr. Waterland's* First Letter," says, "The question among us is not whether lay-persons may lawfully baptize, much less exercise other parts of the sa-

cerdotal office. So far am I from affirming any such thing, that I believe, whatever pretence they may have, so much as to baptize even in cases of utmost necessity, depends altogether upon the will of their Ecclesiastical Superiors" (i. e. the Bishops of the Church), "who may allow or disallow it, as they see cause, being a matter wherein the discipline, rather than the doctrine, of the Church is concerned, as I said before. But to presume to do it in ordinary cases, in defiance of the Christian Priesthood, as our schismatical lay-preachers do, is what we all readily agree, there is no more ground for in Scripture, than there is for *lay-ordination, lay-absolution,*" &c.*

Did Mr. Kelsall not depart from the line of argument here traced, which he is sometimes tempted to do, it is plain that the advocates of Lay-Baptism, as it flourishes in this Paradise of Sects, would find him a broken reed to lean upon. For here *all* the Lay-Baptisms celebrated are "*in ordinary cases,*" and "*in defiance of the Christian Priesthood,*" and "*as our [their] schismatical lay-preachers do ;*" even by such as acknowledge no "Ecclesiastical Superiors," whose "will" might make *valid*, what else (*Kelsall* *judice*) is *invalid*. An odd, if not awful, doctrine, by the way, that a Bishop's nod is of the *essence* of the sacrament ; can

* Waterland's Works, X. p. 33.

make it, or annihilate it! Rather worse this than the making *lawful ministration* essential to its validity. Thus do extremes meet.

Let us next see what stand *Bingham* takes: "Now here first of all it is certain, that laymen were always debarred from meddling with the administration of baptism in all ordinary cases. 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 laymen. Besides they are sometimes prohibited in particular by name; as in the Apostolic Constitutions three times at least. The author, under the name of St. Ambrose, says therefore, 'that from the time of the Apostles, the inferior clergy' (i. e. the *sub-deacons*, *exorcists*, &c., who had no *sacerdotal* character) 'and laymen were prohibited to baptize.' Which at least must be understood of a prohibition to usurp the office, and do it in ordinary cases. But still the grand question remains,—Whether ever they were

* This "exclusion of Deacons" from the office of Baptizing was not a Catholic usage. They were always held to be *competent* to baptize, by virtue of their *sacerdotal* character, though not always allowed to do it in *ordinary* cases, i. e., where a Priest of higher grade could be had. So the Church now regards them as *competent* to preach; and yet, as a matter of discipline, forbids them to do it, unless specially licensed by the Bishop. See *Bingham*, II. 20, 9.

allowed to do it in *extraordinary cases of extreme necessity, when no public minister could be procured to do it.*”*

To the same effect is *Archbishop Potter's* statement of the case. “It remains to be considered, whether *laymen* may baptize; which must not be understood, as if it was inquired, whether laymen may lawfully baptize where ordained ministers can be procured; for it has been already shown, that Baptism is annexed to the cure of souls, and consequently can ordinarily be administered by none, but the Bishop and other Ministers whom he appoints. But the question is, *Whether laymen may baptize in cases of necessity, where no Minister can be procured, and men are in danger of dying unbaptized.*”†

These two extracts from *Bingham* and *Potter* narrow the question exceedingly, and leave the advocates of Lay-Baptism *in the lump* not an inch of ground as a foot-hold. For not one case in ten thousand of the many myriads of Lay-Baptisms taking place each year around us, are of the character described, viz., “*extraordinary cases of extreme necessity,*” “*where no Minister can be procured, and men are in danger of dying unbaptized.*” Alas!

* *Bingham*, Schol. Hist. c. I. § 7, 8.

† Discourse on Church Government, *Philadelphia ed.* p. 230. For the Italics in these two passages we are responsible.

men in general, in these days of sublimated rationalism, ascribe too little virtue to sacramental ministrations to be much alarmed by "the danger of dying unbaptized!" And those are very rare and "extraordinary cases," where, even in "extreme necessity," "no Minister can be procured." Were the whole *genus* of Lay-Baptisms reduced to this particular *species*, it would be a hard matter to lay your finger on them. To ratify such Lay-Baptisms only were to sanction a *rare exception*; whereas our opponents in this country seek to make the exception so exceeding broad, that it shall be applied many times more frequently than the rule itself. Were it not better to face right about, or to look the way you leap; and, with plain, downright honesty, at once to make the rule the exception, and the exception the rule; seeing that (according to Mr. Kelsall) it is a matter of "discipline," rather than of "doctrine"?

We might in fairness, under these circumstances, claim a judgment in our favor by default, seeing that the witnesses relied on against us refuse to appear in favor of the defendant's case. But since complaint might be made that we are disposed to take undue advantage, we are willing to examine the witnesses in reference to the other case already stated. We think it can be shown that there is no sufficient evidence that the Primitive Church Catholic, for the first four centuries, al-

lowed the *validity* of Baptisms performed by laymen, even "in extraordinary cases of extreme necessity." If not in such cases, then *a fortiori* not in those with which alone we are conversant.

CHAPTER V.

The evidence, derived from Primitive Antiquity, in favor of Lay-Baptism examined. Its insufficiency shown.

BEARING in mind the sort of proof (viz., the Catholic usage of the Primitive Church during the first four centuries) required to make good the alleged exception in favor of Lay-Baptism; and also the position of the Anglican writers in relation to the subject, as defined in the latter part of the preceding chapter; let us proceed to examine, as briefly as we may, and in chronological order, the witnesses summoned by our adversaries.

The first witness in order of time, alleged in favor of Lay-Baptism, is

TERTULLIAN, A. D. 192.

There are only two passages in this author that have any bearing upon the case in hand. The first is from his treatise *De Baptismo*, written before he became a Montanist: "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 honor of the Church, in the preservation of which peace is preserved. In another respect laymen have also a right to give it, for what is received in common,

may be given in common. Baptism is God's peculiar, and may be conferred by all. But laymen 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 Holy 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."*

Now I think it is evident that *Tertullian* in the former part of this extract *gives testimony* in favor of the Catholic usage of the Church, which confined ministration in holy things to holy men, always and everywhere; and that in the latter part he does but advance *his own private opinion* or conceit. For (as *Dr. Waterland* justly observes) "here is not the least intimation that the Church in his time either believed or practised thus," i. e., so as to acknowledge that Lay-Baptism is valid.

* Consult Note (D) for the Latin original, and for Bishop Kaye's comments thereon.

“He appeals to no rule, order, or custom for the right of the laity, as he does for that of the Clergy; but, for want of it, sets himself to invent reasons, and goes on in arguing and debating the point for a good while together; which had been needless had Lay-Baptism been the current doctrine or practice of the Church.”* And as Mr. Lawrence (quoted by *Dr. W.*) argues, “the word *alioquin*, ‘otherwise,’ is a plain transition from his former subject of what had reference to the Church’s law or custom; and evidently shows that he is going to say something that is separate and distinct therefrom. As much as if he had said, By the law and custom of the Church the Bishop has power to give Baptism, and after him Presbyters and Deacons, yet not without the authority of the Bishop, for the honor of the Church. *Otherwise*, distinct and separate from the consideration of this law or custom, *laymen* also have a right to give it.”†

Is it not perfectly obvious that if Tertullian had intended to *bear witness to a fact*, and to state the *usage* of the Church, he would have expressed himself to this effect: “In certain cases even laymen have a right to give it; for, in cases of necessity, their ministrations are allowed by the Church, and their acts are ratified by the Bishop?” He, however, nowhere asserts any such thing, but gives for this

* Works, X. p. 109.

† Ibid.

alleged right of laymen to baptize, reasons of his own devising, and those sufficiently far-fetched. This will appear still more clearly from the other passages relating to this controversy, which we give in Bishop Kaye's language. "Do not suppose that what is forbidden to the Clergy is allowed to the Laity. All Christians are Priests, agreeably to the words of St. John in the book of Revelation—"Christ has made us a kingdom and a priesthood to God and his Father." The authority of the Church and its honor, which derives sanctity from the assembled Clergy, has established a distinction between the Clergy and Laity. In places where there are no Clergy, any single Christian may exercise the functions of the Priesthood, may celebrate the Eucharist, and baptize. But where three, though laymen, are gathered together, there is a Church. Every one *lives by his own faith, nor is there respect of persons with God; since not the hearers, but the doers of the law are justified by God*, according to the Apostle. If, therefore, you possess within yourself the right of the Priesthood to be exercised in cases of necessity, you ought also to conform yourself to the rule of life prescribed to those who engage in the Priesthood; the rights of which you may be called to exercise. Do you, after contracting a second marriage, venture to baptize or to celebrate the Eucharist? How much more heinous is it in a layman who has contracted

a second marriage, to exercise the functions of the Priesthood, when a second marriage is deemed a sufficient ground for degrading a Priest from his order? But you will plead the necessity of the case as an apology for the act. The plea is invalid, because you were not placed under the necessity of marrying a second time. Do not marry again, and you will not run the hazard of being obliged to do that which a Digamist is not allowed to do. It is the will of God that we should at all times be in a fit state to administer His Sacraments, if an occasion should arise.' We are very far from meaning to defend the soundness of Tertullian's argument in this passage. We quote it because it is one of the passages which have been brought forward to prove that he did not recognize the distinction between the Clergy and Laity, whereas a directly opposite inference ought to be drawn."*

Tertullian, be it observed, is arguing against a *layman's* marrying a second time. The Montanists, to whom he now belonged, were strenuous in their opposition to second marriages under any and all circumstances; and at that period of the Church such marriages were very generally forbidden to the Clergy.† Tertullian putting together

* *Bp. Kaye's Tertullian*, p. 225. For the original see Note (E).

† This prohibition was based upon St. Paul's injunction

this fact, and his own notion of the inherent Priesthood of every baptized person, frames an argument of his own, by which he seeks to extend the prohibition to the laity. It amounts to this: "The Church forbids all *Priests* to marry a second time; but Christ has made *all Christians Priests* (as well as *Kings*): therefore, you (laymen), in virtue of your inherent Priesthood, are bound to refrain from a second marriage." He says not a syllable about the Church's recognizing the right of laymen to baptize; but rather makes that right antecedent to, and independent of, the Church's action in the matter. "Christ has given," says he, "the sacerdotal character to all his disciples; the Church, it is true, has restrained the ordinary exercise of this right to the Ministry; but the Church has not taken, and cannot take, this right away; you have the character and the right of a Priest, and you should therefore submit to the discipline of a Priest, lest you unfit yourself for sacerdotal ministrations in cases of necessity." There is but *one historical fact* alleged that has any bearing on our subject, viz., that "the difference between the order (of the Ministry) and the people has been established by the authority of the Church;" and this is not truly stated, for that "difference" was established by the that Bishops, &c., should be "husbands of one wife," which in Tertullian's day was held to mean that they should never marry a second time.

Divine Head of the Church, and is therefore not to be done away—no, not even by the Church itself.

If any claim that Tertullian refers to the practice of the Church when he speaks of a layman's *baptizing* where there is no Priest; we reply, then does he in the same breath assert the usage of the Church, when he speaks of a layman's *administering the Holy Communion*. In *both* cases it is plain that he either testifies to fact, or states his private opinion. The dilemma is an awkward one for our opponents, and perhaps the repulsive prominence of its horns may account for the fact that this passage is generally passed by, and the one before examined relied upon alone by the advocates of Lay-Baptism. For surely they cannot decline it because he was a Montanist when he wrote it; for however much this fact may impeach his judgment, it cannot impair his honesty, nor his credit as a historian.

In a word, if this passage proves that the usage of the Church sanctioned *Lay-Baptism* in case of necessity, it equally proves that it likewise sanctioned *Lay-Consecration of the Eucharist*. Tertullian in truth is fearfully consistent in carrying out to its results his notion of the inherent Priesthood: "*You both administer the Holy Communion,* and bap-*

* I do not deem it necessary to dwell on Mr. Kelsall's explanation of the word "offerre" (answering to *προσφερεν*.)

tize, and are your sole Priest." If he is here referring *historically* to allowed Catholic and Primitive usage in cases of necessity, then is his statement very sweeping and comprehensive. Let no one pretend to claim a part of it, who is not willing to take the whole.

We have dwelt at some length on Tertullian's evidence, because he is the first in point of time, and perhaps for that very reason the most material, of the witnesses adduced by our opponents. We shall pass on to the next in order, after stating briefly the conclusions to which the foregoing examination has led us.

1. That Tertullian does sanction Lay-Baptism, but that he grounds the right of laymen to baptize on a false and private interpretation of an isolated passage of Scripture, and on certain conceits and notions of his own; but not on the alleged fact of Catholic usage.

2. He restricts the exercise of this right to *cases of necessity*; "acknowledges that in all ordinary cases the administration of baptism is appro-

which is rendered above in its ordinary patristical sense. He interprets it (as a Sophomoric philologist might) of the "carrying," as a mere messenger, "the consecrated elements," e. g. to a sick person. Dr. W. discusses the matter, Vol. X. p. 112. It is plain at a glance, that Tertullian designates by this term a strictly sacerdotal act.

priate to the Clergy, and condemns all Lay-Baptism in such cases, as irregular and sinful.”—*Waterland*.

3. That Tertullian cannot be cited as a witness to prove that the Apostolic and Primitive Church Catholic sanctioned Lay-Baptism *even in case of necessity*: but that he is a competent witness to show that *it did not authorize such Baptisms in ordinary cases*; i. e., *that it condemns such Lay-Baptisms as are so prevalent around us*.

The next witness in order of time, and after the lapse of a century, is

The SYNOD of ELIBERIS or *Elvira*, in *Spain*, A.D. 305.

This was a *local* Synod, composed of *nineteen* Bishops. I quote *Bingham's* account of its proceedings in regard to Lay-Baptism. “The Spanish Bishops assembled in the council of Eliberis, made a public decree about this matter: they there appointed, ‘that when men were upon a voyage at sea, or in any place where no Church was near at hand, if a Catechumen happened 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. [Provided that, if he survive, he bring him to the Bishop, that his baptism may be perfected by the laying on of

hands.]*' This authority was not given to all Christians in all cases, but with several limitations and restrictions. 1. It must be a case of absolute necessity, when baptism could not otherwise be had. 2. The person baptizing must have his own baptism entire ; which Albaspinny understands of not lapsing after baptism. Vossius, with better reason, supposes it to be opposed to *Clinic* baptism, which was a less solemn and imperfect baptism, which made a man incapable of holy orders ever after, as I have shown elsewhere from the ancient laws of the Church. And it was very often attended with another defect, which was the want of Confirmation and of the gift of the Holy Ghost by imposition of the hands of the Bishop, which was not ordinarily sought for by *Clinics*, who were baptized in haste upon a death-bed. For this reason these Spanish Bishops denied such the privilege of baptizing in any case, whilst they allowed it to others. 3. They require also, that the man must be no bigamist, because that also unqualified a person for sacred orders. And it was their intent, when a Priest could not be had to administer baptism, only to authorize such laymen to do it as had those proper qualifications that were requisite to obtain orders, and so bring them as near Priests

* The words in brackets are left out by Bingham. For the original see Note (F).

as they could. This is the most probable account I can give at present of these limitations; however, in the main the matter is indisputable, that they plainly intended, in some extraordinary cases, to give laymen a license and authority to administer baptism, which could not then be said to be unauthorized in Spain, since it had the best authority the Church could give it, which is the determination and authority of a Council.”*

We remark upon this statement: 1st. That although, so long as this Canon remained in force, Lay-Baptism in certain cases was not “unauthorized *in Spain*,” the action of the Synod throws no light upon the subject we are examining, viz., *the Catholic usage of the Primitive Church*. For no appeal is made in it to the alleged historical fact, that Lay-Baptism was accounted *valid*, in case of necessity, *from the beginning*. Indeed had it been so, the Canon was wholly uncalled for and unmeaning; unless, as Mr. Kelsall thinks, its object was “to restrain the use of that liberty” (of baptizing in case of necessity) “to such alone of the laity as had not unqualified themselves for holy orders.” But as Dr. *Waterland* conclusively replies, “this is very wonderful, that men upon a voyage and under great necessities, which might entitle them to the most favor and indulgence of any, should have a

* Scholastical Hist. c. I. sec. 9.

Canon made on purpose to abridge them of a liberty that any man might take at home. But waving the unreasonableness of such a supposition, * * the Canon * * upon Mr. K.'s scheme should have had quite a different turn in the form of a *prohibition*, as thus: 'Though it has been a custom for laymen to baptize in cases of necessity, yet in this particular case upon a voyage we strictly forbid it, unless with these provisos, &c.,' and so it should have been worded *negatively*, '*Non posse quemquam, qui sit bigamus, &c.*' which would, in my humble opinion, have suited much better with the wisdom and accuracy of the *Spanish Fathers*.'"*

Is it not plain that by this Canon these Spanish Bishops gave to laymen under their jurisdiction permission to do what before they were not allowed to do, *even in Spain*; and that therefore, so far from giving direct testimony in favor of the *validity* of Lay-Baptism in case of necessity as a *Catholic rule* of the Primitive Church, it rather bears witness indirectly to the contrary fact, and helps to make good our position? For, we repeat, if the universal practice of the Church sanctioned *all* Baptisms administered by laymen in case of necessity, how absurd to enact a Canon authorizing a very small portion of this selfsame class of Lay-Baptisms!

* Works, Vol. X. p. 126.

2. "When we quote this Canon, it is no more than the private opinion of one National Church; and yet, to make the best of it, it comes not up to the matter in debate, but is wide of the question, since it allows no baptism by laymen, but what is *authorized by Bishops, done in extreme necessity, done by one in communion with the Church, and qualified for orders.* Here are no less than four qualifying circumstances; none of which are applicable to the pretended baptisms of our dissenters, about which we are disputing, and therefore little use can be made of this Canon in the present controversy."*

OPTATUS OF MILEVIS, A. D. 368.

"It is plain" that this writer, as Mr. Kelsall alleges, "never thought the Minister was of the essence of Baptism." But it is equally plain that he neither speaks, nor pretends to speak, the language of the Church. He seems to have gone quite beyond Tertullian, as so many of the moderns have done, and not to have regarded Baptism as a *Sacerdotal* ministration at all. Speaking of our Lord's Commission, he says: "Non dixit Apostolis, vos facite, alii non faciant. *Quisquis* in nomine Patris et Filii et Spiritus Sancti baptizaverit, Apostolorum opus implevit." "He said not to the Apostles,

* Waterland, X. p. 127,

Do you administer ; let not others do it. *Whosoever* shall have baptized in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost, has fulfilled the work of the Apostles." This is going all lengths, even to Rome itself ; for as Dr. Waterland observes, "Optatus's reasoning would necessarily imply, not only that Lay-Baptism, even by women, by Jews, Turks and Pagans, *in the name of the Trinity*, is *valid*, but that it is *lawful* too ; since he supposes that by the Institution of Baptism any man has an equal right to administer it, as being not excluded by Christ from doing it."* No Churchman pretends that the Primitive Church held any such doctrine. Every Churchman, therefore, will allow that he spoke herein his private opinion. And with mere private opinions we have nothing to do.

ST. JEROME, A. D. 384.

"Great dispute has been about the sense and meaning of St. Jerome in relation to the present controversy ; both sides contending that he is expressly for them, and both having something very plausible to urge for their respective opinions. I have considered this matter very carefully, and shall state it very fairly and impartially, as far as I am able to judge of it, and perhaps in conclusion

* Waterland, X. p. 136.

Mr. K. himself will have no reason to complain of me. His dialogue against the Luciferians is what we are to examine. The Luciferians, as is well known, so called from Lucifer, Bishop of Caralis (now *Cagliari* in Sardinia), the head of the schism, separated from the Catholic Church, because they (the Catholics) had received the Arian Bishops; yet they scrupled not to receive the Arian *laymen* to communion. St. Jerome undertakes to confute them upon their own principles, by showing them how inconsistent they were in rejecting the Bishops, and yet receiving the laics, and how they must upon their own principles either be obliged to receive or reject both. The Luciferians pretended that the Arian Bishops were by their heresy and crimes utterly disabled from acting *in sacris* to any purpose; that their ministrations were ineffectual, their light extinguished, their powers deleted; in a word, they unbishoped them. St. Jerome confutes their pretences by this single argument; that since they allowed their Baptisms, they must of consequence admit of their other sacerdotal ministrations as effectual and valid, and therefore own their character not to be extinct, nor their sacerdotal powers deleted. The most remarkable words of the Dialogue to this purpose are the following :*

* Waterland X. p. 143.

“Wherefore, I pray you, either grant the liberty of ministering in sacred things to him, whose Baptism you approve ; or condemn his Baptism, whom you do not regard as a Priest.”

“If the Arian baptizes, then he is a Bishop : if he does not baptize, then do you reject the laic, and I will not receive the Priest.”

“You acknowledge him to be a Bishop, because you receive one who has been baptized by him. He (the laic) is no Christian, if he had no Priest to make him a Christian.”*

Here St. Jerome alleges that the acknowledgment of the *validity* of any given Baptism, implies of necessity the *validity* of his ordination who conferred it ; which would be absurd, if Lay-Baptism were *valid*. In other words, he holds that Baptism is strictly and truly a *sacerdotal* ministration ; if “no Priest,” then, as a necessary consequence, “no Christian.” Accordingly, says Dr. W., “from these words, and from the whole scope and drift of St. Jerome’s argument, Dr. Forbes and Mr. Reeves, and after them Dr. Brett and Mr. Lawrence, thought it reasonable to assert, that the *invalidity* of Lay-Baptism was the undoubted principle upon which the *orthodox* confuted the Luciferians in St. Jerome’s times. * * * St. Jerome seems plainly to suppose a reciprocal connection between the va-

* For the original, see Note (G).

lidity of Baptism, and the validity of the Orders of the Baptizer.”*

Had St. Jerome always written in perfect keeping with the passages above quoted, he would be a decisive witness against the validity of Lay-Baptism under any and all circumstances. But there is a passage in this very Dialogue, which must be taken as a limitation of the foregoing extracts. “Without the unction and order of the Bishop, neither Presbyter nor Deacon has the right of baptizing. Which we know is also allowed to laymen, provided always necessity constrain them. *For as one receives it, so he can also give it.*”† On which Dr. W. remarks: “A very wise reason! I hope the Church had a better, if that were her practice.” And then with that ingenuousness (always natural to an honest man) which the consciousness of a good cause makes doubly easy, he proceeds thus: “However, I will not say, with Dr. Brett and Mr. Lawrence, that this was a slip of his pen, and inconsistent with the rest of the Dialogue. I will suppose that the practice of Lay-Baptism in cases of necessity had got some footing in the *Latin* Church about his time. But then I say it was by the permission of the Bishops, whenever it was, and was not *unauthorized* Lay-Baptism, nor was any such permitted in ordinary cases, nor allowed

* Works, X. p. 144.

† See Note (H).

to be valid. And so to make St. Jerome coherent and consistent, he might perhaps think Lay-Baptism unauthorized, and in ordinary cases invalid; and yet allow of the validity of authorized Lay-Baptism in cases extraordinary. Or else, he might think that the *sacerdotium laici*, which he speaks of, might take place in such circumstances, and consistently enough allow laymen, when necessity makes them Priests, as he seems to imagine, to execute the Priestly function.”*

In concluding this case of St. Jerome, be it observed :

1. That in the first passages cited, he holds Catholic language, and unintentionally bears witness to the Catholic rule of the *invalidity* of Lay-Baptism *under any and all circumstances* ; inasmuch as he *inseparably* connects *true* and *valid* BAPTISM with a *true* and *valid* ORDINATION.

2. That in the second passage he states an un-Catholic and novel doctrine (authorizing Lay-Baptism in certain cases), which in the latter part of the fourth century was gradually extending itself in the *Western Church*. We shall elsewhere endeavor to point out its source, and to trace its further development, until it attained its full growth under Papal auspices.

3. That he, after all, reprobates all such Lay-Baptisms as we have to do with.

* Works, X. p. 145.

ST. AUSTIN, A. D. 400.

This Father goes beyond St. Jerome in justifying Lay-Baptism. He was engaged in a long and fierce controversy with the schismatical Donatists, who had separated themselves from the Church in Africa, and had organized themselves into a separate communion; because the Bishops of the African Province had in the first place consecrated as Bishop of Carthage Caecilianus, whose consecration they (the Donatists) held to be null and void by reason of the *personal* unworthiness, both of himself and of his Consecrator; and because, in the second place, they had kept up communion with him, notwithstanding the formal protest of the malcontent Bishops, who were chiefly from Numidia. Africa thus contained two numerous bodies of Christians, both regularly organized under lawfully ordained Bishops; each charging the other with schism (and finally with heresy too), and claiming for itself alone the rightful title of the Church of God. There was, however, this difference between them: the Catholics readmitted penitent and returning Donatists to communion, after penance only, without re-baptization; in obedience to the Catholic rule (sanctioned by the First General Council at Nice), that neither heresies nor schism nulled Orders, and that therefore Baptisms conferred by heretical or schismatical

clergy were *valid* and not to be repeated. The Donatists, on the other hand, *re-baptized* all proselytes whom they gained over from the Catholic communion; because they perversely held that the Orders of the Catholic Bishops and Clergy were null and void, and consequently that their Baptisms were necessarily null and void. Their premises were wrong; their conclusion was logical and just, albeit un-Catholic and untrue.

St. Austin, assailing them on this point, first attacks their premises and demonstrates their falsity, and their departure from Catholic usage and doctrine. This he does by showing that "the Catholic Church always thought that Orders once truly given could never be deleted by any heresy or schism, or indeed by any thing. And here he observes, that if any of the heretical or schismatical Clergy upon their return to the Church were allowed to officiate again as Clergy, they were admitted without any new ordination; a plain argument that heresy or schism had not deleted their Orders. Nay, he observes further, that though they were often not allowed to officiate, but only admitted to lay-communion, yet even then they were not looked upon as laymen, and therefore did not submit to penance and receive imposition of hands, which was the usual discipline for returning laics. * * To this answer, though full, plain and unexceptionable, and agreeable to the

known rules and practice of the Catholic Church, he subjoins *another of his own*, with great diffidence and modesty."

"He denies the consequence, that Baptism must necessarily be null upon supposition that heresy or schism did vacate Orders; and he brings it in by the by, and *ex abundantia*." "Although, even if a layman, constrained by necessity, have given Baptism to one perishing, seeing that he learned how it ought to be given, when he received it himself, I am inclined to think no one can piously say, that it ought to be repeated. For, if it be done without any necessity, it is an usurpation of another's office; but if necessity compel, it is either no fault, or a venial one."*

"Does this look" (continues *Dr. Waterland*) "as if Lay-Baptism, even in cases of necessity, was a customary practice in the Church of his time? Would he have spoke with such diffidence, "*nescio an pie?*" Would not he rather have urged the authority and custom of the Church, as in the case before mentioned, and have said, instead of "*nescio an pie,*" *certe impie* or *temere*? But he is here offering his own private conjecture in a case that had not been expressly determined by any Council, though the reason of the thing, and the custom of the Church, were sufficiently against him. He has neither rule nor instance to plead in

* Note (I).

his behalf, and therefore endeavors to supply that want by his own private reason ; and so he goes on to give his opinion, that Lay-Baptism may be valid even in ordinary cases, though irregular and sinful upon this principle, *quod datum fuerit, non potest dici non datum* (“ what has been given, cannot be said not to have been given”); which is either begging the question, or arguing thus : A person is *washed* in the name of the Trinity ; therefore he is *baptized*. After he had wandered a while in the dark about this question, indulging too far his own private conjectures, he returns at length to his first answer, as being more just and solid, and abides by it ; insisting again upon it, that heretical or schismatical Clergy had not lost their Orders ; and he appeals to the decision of the whole Christian world in proof of his assertion ; and so goes on triumphantly on that point to the end of the chapter.” * * *

“ It may be observed of St. Austin, that though at first in his disputes with the Donatists he was very modest and diffident in proposing any of his own private conjectures, keeping close for the most part to the known rules and principles of the Church ; yet afterwards, in the progress of the dispute, as men are apt (especially when flushed with victory) to grow both warmer and bolder, he ventured to proceed further, and to lay it down for a maxim, that any Baptism was good, by whomso-

ever administered in the form of words, in the name of Father, Son, and Holy Ghost. This was a short and easy solution for any difficulty; and were it as solid too, would justify all the lengths of Popery in the matter of Baptism; would not only prove that heretics or schismatics, whether of the Clergy or Laity, may validly baptize; but that women and children, and even Jews, Turks and Pagans, either seriously or in sport and mockery, may administer true Baptism.”*

The foregoing part of the argument, which is based upon St. Austin’s own writings, seemed to merit a full discussion, especially as this Father has the honor, whatever it be (as I shall attempt to show in a subsequent chapter), of giving Lay-Baptism such firm root in the Western Church, that it has grown and spread until it has quite overshadowed that *Sacerdotal* Baptism, for which alone we claim validity, as well as legality. There are two passages, quoted by Bingham† from Gratian, as St. Austin’s, which must be briefly noticed, as that learned writer lays much stress upon them in favor of Lay-Baptism.

“In case of necessity, when neither Bishops nor Presbyters, nor any of the (lawful) Ministers (of Baptism) can be found, and the danger of the can-

* Waterland’s Works, X. p. 147, ss.

† Schol. Hist. c. I. sect. 1.

didate is pressing, lest he should depart this life without that Sacrament (Baptism), we are used to hear that even laics are wont to give the Sacrament, which they have received.”* Nothing can be more obvious than that St. Austin is here speaking, not of the custom of the Church Catholic, but of an *unauthorized* practice, which was winked at by those in authority, and was thereby gaining ground. For had he spoken of an *allowed* and *Catholic* usage, he would surely not have spoken of it as a matter of *hearsay* (“we are used to hear”), but of *certain knowledge*, on his part.

Once more : “That Baptism is valid of itself, which has been given in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost : Provided that there be also in the same Sacrament the authority of the Commission conveyed through our Lord to the Apostles ; but through them to the Bishops and the other Priests ; or even to Christian laics, who come from the same stock and origin.”† In this passage there is not a word about the usage of the Church ; it is St. Austin’s *ipse dixit*. It is, besides, positively adverse to the Lay-Baptisms, which we are chiefly concerned with, since it limits the power of baptizing to those laymen who are *in the Communion of the Church* (“Christian laics who come from the same stock

* Note (K),

† Note (L).

and origin") and whose acts are *authorized by the Bishops* : in other words, it brings *such* acts within the scope of the Commission.

In regard to this witness we claim :

1. That in his controversy with the Donatists, his main argument recognizes and confirms our position, that the *validity of Baptism* is inseparably connected with, and absolutely dependent upon, the *validity of the Administrator's Orders*.

2. That he nowhere says, directly or indirectly, that Lay-Baptism, in any case whatsoever, had received the sanction of the Catholic Church.

3. That the principles, upon which he bases his private opinion in favor of Lay-Baptism, if carried out to their legitimate and necessary results, prove so much, that they utterly subvert other indisputable Catholic principles and verities, everywhere recognized by St. Austin himself ; and would endanger the Ministry, the Sacraments, and the Church of God itself, by "dissolving all rule and order in the Church ;" "frustrating Christ's commission to his Apostles, and melting down all distinction between Clergy and Laity." Consequently that the doctrine of the validity of Lay-Baptism, which he builds on such a foundation, was an *erroneous private opinion*, although countenanced by the *private judgment* of other *individual* Doctors, e. g., Tertullian, Optatus, and Jerome.

All the principal witnesses summoned in favor of Lay-Baptism from the Primitive Church, down to the beginning of the fifth century, have now been examined. And here this chapter would be brought to a close, were it not that our opponents might charge us either with ignorance of their claim to other additional evidence, or with inability to set it aside. We shall therefore very briefly examine it, though we deem this wholly a work of supererogation.

First in order then comes NOVATIAN'S BAPTISM, of which Archbishop Potter (*clarum et venerabile nomen*) thus writes: "One remarkable instance (of Lay-Baptism) we find in the Church of Rome, where Novatian, being in danger of death, was baptized in his bed by the *exorcists*, who were an order of Ministers below Deacons, and consequently had no greater share of spiritual authority than mere laymen. Which Baptism was so fully approved of by the Bishop and Church of Rome, that Novatian was afterwards ordained Presbyter. Indeed there was then a Canon, whereby men, who had been baptized in their sick beds, were denied admission into orders; but this had no relation to the persons by whom Baptism was administered on such occasions, but only to the backwardness or negligence of the person who deferred his Baptism to the last extremity (*Eusebius Eccl. Hist. L. VI. C. 43*). So that this Bap-

tism of Novatian is a full evidence of the practice and opinion of the Church of this age.”*

I think that any one who will attentively examine the original text of Eusebius in the passage above referred to will agree with me, that the *Exorcists*, whom the Archbishop regards as the *administrators* of the Baptism, were merely *instrumental in procuring* Novatian’s Baptism, either by persuading and preparing him to receive it, or by securing the agency of a lawful Minister, or both. *Clinic* Baptism (such as Novatian received) was, by the Canon, a disqualification for orders, even when administered by a Priest. If Novatian’s Baptism, then, besides being *irregular* and *defective* in this respect, had labored under the *additional* irregularity and defect of having been *administered by a layman*, it can hardly be possible that his Bishop, however lenient, would have ordained him.—Or, admitting that he had, it is certain that his enemies would have reproached him with the *latter* defect in his Baptism, as they are known to have cast the *former* in his teeth. I doubt not that Novatian’s Baptism was *regular* as respects the *administration*. *The contrary, at least, can never be proved*; and assuredly that ought to be a *very clear* case, which claims to be allowed as “a *full evidence* of

* Discourse on Church Government, Philad. ed. p. 232.

the practice and opinion of the Church of this age.”*

Next in order we have what Bingham calls “the determination in the CHURCH of ALEXANDRIA.”

Were not even the trifling of great men a serious matter, it would be hard to treat this case gravely, as Bingham does. To make a long story short, *it is said* that ATHANASIUS, when a boy, baptized some of his playmates *in sport*, using however the prescribed *element* and *formula*; and that Alexander, then Bishop of Alexandria, having witnessed the transaction at a distance, ascertained the facts of the case, and “after he had conferred with a council of his clergy, he is said to have determined, that the Baptism of those on whom water had been poured, with the proper interrogatories and responses, ought not to be repeated, but only have those things added which the Priests were used to perform.”† Now if this is Baptism, it behooves us all to be on our guard, lest we be *Ana-Baptists* without knowing it! I would let the story pass for what it is worth, so far as our argument is concerned; but I would say a word to vindicate the fair fame of the good Bishop of Alexandria. Note then the *rise* of the story. Ruffinus, its first relater,

* See note (M) for the passage of Eusebius both in Greek and English; and for Mr. Bennett’s judgment on the case.

† Scholast. Hist., c. I. sect. 10.

says (I quote Bingham), that "he had the story from the mouth of those who lived and conversed with Athanasius:" i. e. *Ruffinus says, that somebody said to him, &c.* Most notable attestation, truly, of a most marvellous case! To make its *credibility* unquestionable, take the character of Ruffinus as an historian from Dr. Cave, who pronounces him "very credulous," "too ready to listen to fables, and to the vague rumors of the rabble, which he was wont to pick up in the streets and barbers' shops, and commit hap-hazard to writing."*

Here no doubt we have the real parentage of the veracious "fable" or "rumor," which is made to counterfeit the voice of the Church. No doubt "those who lived and conversed with Athanasius," and from whose "mouth" Ruffinus had this story, belonged to that "rabble," with whom he conversed "in the streets and barbers' shops" to gather materials for history! 'Tis a lame cause surely that seeks such a prop.

The next remaining witness is the PSEUDO-AMBROSE, probably HILARY the Roman Deacon, about A. D. 355.

"He (says Mr. Kelsall), contrary to the sense of Calvin and other moderns, supposes the offices of baptizing and preaching *separable*, though they are both joined together in the Commission. And

* For the original, see Note (N).

he quotes in proof, “Non omnis qui baptizat idoneus est et evangelizare;” i. e. “every man who baptizes is not fit to preach;” or, in other words, “a man may be a lawful Priest, and yet a bad preacher:” which is as undeniably true in fact, as it is irrelevant to the question.

He quotes another passage from the same author,* and remarks upon it as follows. “He tells us that at first, for the swifter propagation of the Gospel, leave was given to *all promiscuously* to teach, baptize, and explain the Scriptures.” * * * “He does indeed, a little after, say, that this large Commission was withdrawn, when the circumstances of the Church made it no longer necessary: ‘Hinc ergo est, unde nunc neque diaconi in populo praedicant, neque clerici vel laici baptizant;’ i. e. ‘hence it comes to pass, that neither do the deacons preach in public, nor do the inferior clergy. (viz. sub-deacons, &c.) or the laymen administer Baptism.’”—Now, in the first place, this writer puts *lay-preaching* and *lay-baptizing* both on the same original footing under the Commission, and makes both equally *lawful* and *regular* as well as *valid*; and ascribes their *irregularity* and *illegality* in his own day wholly to a *Canonical* restriction of our Lord’s Commission.

2. “Though this author is something mistaken

* See the whole passage in Note (O).

in his chronology (not fixing the distinction of clergy and laity early enough), yet he reasons very right ; that after proper officers were once appointed, none should dare usurp upon the sacred inclosure. And it is worth observing what he adds ;—“ *Neque clerici vel laici baptizant,*” “ nor do the inferior clergy nor laymen baptize.” He may be a good witness of what was done in his own time, though a bad reasoner about the practice of the Apostles.”*

GREGORY NAZIANZEN, A. D. 370.

Mr. Kelsall, by detaching a sentence of this Father from the context, makes him advise his Catechumens not to be too particular what sort of a *layman* they received Baptism from, supposing them driven to the necessity of submitting to Lay-Baptism. Dr. Waterland, by quoting the passage in its just connection, makes Mr. K.’s perversion palpable. St. Gregory was in fact advising his Catechumens not to be “fanciful or curious” about the *dignity* or *personal* merit of the *Priest*, who should baptize them. For a full exhibition of the case, see *Waterland, Vol. X. p. 149, ss.*

EPIPHANIUS.

“As for Epiphanius” (says Hooker), † “he

* Waterland, X. p. 133.

† Ecclesiastical Polity, vol. V. c. 61, § 3.

strikerh on the very selfsame anvil with Tertullian." If so, let him hammer away to his heart's content, for he will forge, at best, a mere *brutum fulmen*; and will make nothing more than noise, to confound either us or our readers.

We have now examined all the evidence from the first four centuries, whether derived from the testimony of Fathers or Councils, which has been adduced by the leading advocates of Lay-Baptism in its favor. In summing up the evidence, we claim to have shown in the course of the examination,

1. That the demand made upon our opponents in this controversy, in the latter part of the preceding chapter, *has not been met by them*, their professions and promises to the contrary notwithstanding. For *not even one of their witnesses testifies that the CATHOLIC USAGE of the PRIMITIVE CHURCH sanctions Lay-Baptism in any case whatsoever*. On the contrary, all who defend the practice, ground it wholly either on some private and erroneous conceit, not known by the Church (*e. g.* Tertullian on the *inherent Priesthood* of every man); or else they beg the question, maintaining, for example, that *washing*, in the name of the Trinity, by whomsoever done, and under whatever circumstances, is BAPTISM.

2. That the *sole* instance of Canonical authority in favor of Lay-Baptism, is that of a local Synod at

Eliberis, whose action, so far from representing that of the Church at large, does plainly imply that the previous and general usage of the Church was directly contrary to it.

3. That nothing like *usage* favorable to Lay-Baptism is to be found until the *latter part* of the *fourth* century ; and that then it was only gaining ground by force of individual practice or allowance, without any *formal Ecclesiastical sanction* ; and was wholly confined to the Western Church, where it grew out of local errors (as shall be more fully shown hereafter).

4. That whatever sanction either individual authority or local usage may have given to Lay-Baptisms, under certain circumstances (when administered *in case of extreme necessity*, or by laymen *having the qualifications requisite for Orders, &c.*), no countenance is given by antiquity to such Lay-Baptisms, as some among us would fain *ratify ex post facto*, if not *legalize a priori*.

And here we might safely and fairly rest our case, having shown affirmatively that our Saviour and his Apostles confined, as a general rule, the right of administering Holy Baptism to *lawfully* ordained Ministers, having *sacerdotal* character and power ; and that the Nature of the Sacrament itself presumes and requires such ministration : and having also further demonstrated (as we trust) negatively, that the *exception* which our opponents allege

to that rule, has not, on their own showing, the evidence in its favor, which can alone entitle it to our recognition and adoption. But we are willing to go farther, for the full satisfaction of the scrupulous ; and shall therefore attempt to prove in the next chapter that the testimony of Primitive Antiquity, both directly and indirectly, confirms our position against the validity of Lay-Baptism.

CHAPTER VI.

The Catholic Doctrine and Usage of the Primitive Church positively confirm the Arguments of Chapters II. and III.

WE undertake in this chapter to prove that *the Catholic doctrine and usage of the Primitive Church positively confirm the Argument of Chapters II. and III.*; or, in other words, make against the *validity*, as well as *legality*, of Lay-Baptism. We do not mean by this that the practice of Lay-Baptism is expressly condemned in formal enactments of Synods and Councils, or in the solemn protests of the Fathers in general. It were equally absurd to require or offer such proof against it. For we have already seen that *no such thing was even thought of until Tertullian's time*, or for the space of *two whole centuries*; and that he does not speak of or justify the *practice*, but merely *theorizes* about the *abstract right* or *power* of the laity in the matter. *Nor is a single well authenticated instance, either of the practice of Lay-Baptism, or of its allowance, adduced prior to the beginning of the fourth century.* Had the early Fathers then attacked Lay-Baptism, they would have deserved commendation for Quixotic chivalry, rather than for sober and well-directed courage. They would in fact have set up a man

of straw to do battle with. And even towards the close of the fourth century the use of Lay-Baptism was only *occasional*, as well as *local*; so that it caused little notice, until it had become prevalent under the sanction of St. Austin, whose dictatorial authority in the Western Church at length fastened this error, as well as others, upon his servile followers, for many generations.

But although it is plainly as impossible to show, that the ancients condemned Lay-Baptism *in terms*, as it is to prove that they expressly forbad the blocking up the track of a railroad, and for the selfsame reason; still it is easy to demonstrate that they do what is equivalent, viz., condemn it "implicitly, virtually, and consequentially;" "as negative prohibitions are implied in positive precepts; as drunkenness is forbid by commanding sobriety, and irregularity condemned by a precept to observe order. The ancients would be of little use to us in modern controversy, if we suppose them to condemn nothing, but what they specify in terms. At this rate we might despair of confuting late inventions and modern corruptions from Fathers or Councils; for it is evident they could not so *in terms* condemn what they never thought of. But notwithstanding their very silence in some cases is a sufficient condemnation; and very often the general reason they went upon, in cases disputed in their times, may be applicable to others af-

terwards ; and so what they do by consequence or parity of reason condemn, they do as certainly condemn, though not so directly.”*

Bearing in mind this obviously just rule, let us proceed to the evidence. And here we are met upon the threshold by a difficulty, the very opposite of that which annoys our adversaries. They can hardly find any evidence on their side, that even they themselves deem pertinent. We are so surrounded by witnesses, whose unequivocal testimony is full and overflowing, that the task of selection is extremely perplexing. For all those passages in the ancient Fathers, which restrict ministration in holy things to the three Orders of the Ministry, and make no exception in favor of the Laity, tend directly to the point, at which we aim, the *invalidating* Lay-Baptism. The *validity* of Lay-Baptism (as Dr. Waterland justly observes) must have some *principle* to rest upon, if it is to stand at all. We have seen already, in examining the evidence for it, that no universally acknowledged principle or principles have been adduced from Antiquity to sustain it. Now it is our part to show that principles universally recognized by the Primitive Church make directly against it, or, in other words, *invalidate* it.

For instance : 1. All those passages in the

* Waterland, X. p. 104.

Fathers which represent the BISHOP as the *Centre of Unity* in the Church, and forbid that any thing shall be done without him, go to invalidate Baptisms performed by those, who neither derive their authority from him, nor hold it in subordination to him. Thus St. Ignatius writing to the Church at Smyrna, says, "*Let no one perform any ecclesiastical office without the BISHOP,*" which (says Bingham) "he explains, both there and elsewhere, to mean, *without his authority and permission.*" And again, in the same epistle, "*It is not lawful either to Baptize, or celebrate the Eucharist, without the BISHOP; but that which he allows is well-pleasing to God.*" It were useless to transcribe more of the numberless passages, which enforce the same rule, and recognize the same principle. Now we maintain that this principle is fatal to all Baptisms (or other sacerdotal acts) which are performed by *un-commissioned* agents or laymen. For what does this principle mean, when unfolded? It means nothing less nor more than this; that a Baptism, or other sacerdotal act, which the Bishop has not *authorized by ordaining an agent to perform it*, is destitute of Divine sanction, is not GOD'S act. I know some will reply that the Bishop may authorize a *layman* to baptize in case of necessity, or (as the advocates of Lay-Baptism among us are forced to contend) may even ratify and *give validity ex post facto* to Baptisms administered by any body and under any

circumstances. But I reply, show me this power in his commission, or make it palpable that the Apostles, and their successors, one and all, always, and everywhere, acted upon or avowed this principle ; and *then* I'll stretch my faith so far as to believe it. In the mean time, I take it upon me to deny that even the successors of the Apostles are *lords* over the Sacraments, ordained by *their* LORD, and of which they are only the *stewards*. Their authority is, indeed, I allow and contend, *essential* to the ministration, and very being, of the Sacraments : that authority, however, is not to be conveyed in whatever way they choose, but in the way which Christ taught his Apostles, and which they taught their immediate successors, and which, in spite of irregularities, has been handed down to our times, viz., *by setting men apart to God's service in Ordination*, and thus empowering them to act in Christ's stead, and to administer His holy Sacraments.

That Bishops had not an *arbitrary* authority in conferring power to administer the Sacraments, may be inferred from the fact, that when they had once duly authorized a man to act in holy things as Christ's representative, *they could not take back that power, nor invalidate* his after acts, if they were done according to our Lord's institution. It is true that they might restrain the *exercise* of the right or power to baptize, &c., and in case of dis-

obedience suspend or excommunicate the offender. But even after that, his acts were *valid*, because they were performed by one, upon whom ordination had indelibly and forever impressed the sacerdotal character. I grant that the Africans under Cyprian, and many Asiatics, denied this, and *annulled*, or treated as *invalid*, the Baptisms of schismatical ministers, on the ground that their schism had deprived them of the *sacerdotal* character, and had thereby disqualified them for conveying sacramentally spiritual blessings. But the contrary principle was recognized as Catholic, from the time of the first Nicene Council; and the authority, which Episcopal ordination had once imparted, to minister in holy things, was allowed to be perpetual and irrevocable. It is plain, then, we think, that the Bishop could only in one way *authorize* (in the strict sense of the term) any sacerdotal ministration, Baptism included.

This conclusion is justified by another consideration. In the second passage quoted from St. Ignatius it is said, that "it is not lawful, either to baptize, or to celebrate the *Eucharist*, without the Bishop; but that which he allows is well-pleasing to God." Now, if this is to be so interpreted as respects "*baptizing*," that the Bishop may ratify the ministration of a layman therein, and give validity to his acts; it must be interpreted in the same way in regard to "*celebrating the Eucharist*," and

lay-consecration thereof must be held *valid*, if the Bishop "allow" it. And so on to the end of the chapter. Such a mode of interpretation proves quite too much in favor of Episcopal prerogative for our churchmanship to digest; and furnishes a new example, to show that the advocates of the largest liberty are often the most efficient promoters of despotism.

We claim, then, that all the countless passages in the Apostolic Fathers and other ancient authors, which make the authority of the Bishop necessary to ministration in holy things, and to the validity of sacerdotal acts, do in effect utterly exclude laymen from all interference therein, and render their usurpations utterly *void* and their acts *invalid*; inasmuch as the Bishop himself cannot authorize a layman to act in holy things, except by ordaining him; i. e. by causing him to cease being a layman; after which his acts are truly *sacerdotal*.

2. Again, all those passages in the writings of the Primitive age, which either recognize the *sacerdotal* character of the Ministry, as exclusively authorized to act "as God's peculiar Priests, proxies or representatives" or which set forth Baptism as the *sign* and *seal* of a covenant between God and man; do virtually suppose or imply the *invalidity* of Lay-Baptism. For a *proxy* is such only by virtue of his commission; and a *covenant* can only be made *valid* by the sign and seal of the contracting

parties, or of their *legal* representatives. No array of quotations is here necessary; we are content with the acknowledgments of our opponents on this head. Mr. Kelsall, for example, “denies not but it is easy to collect many passages out of St. Ignatius and others of the *ancientest* writers, wherein the right of administering in religious matters is asserted to the *Priesthood*, as proper *only* to them, and the people forbidden to meddle or do any thing in holy things without the concurrence and approbation of the Bishop;”—(which, we have shown, he can only give by *ordination*.) “To the same effect St. Chrysostom *(who flourished in the beginning of the fifth century), discoursing of the dignity of the Christian Priesthood, and thereupon mentioning the two Sacraments of the Church, the power of the Keys, &c., says, “all these things are administered by no other, but only by those sacred hands, those, I say, of the Priest.”† Both the principles here laid down are so universally held by ancient writers, and so generally allowed by our opponents (except when they make against this particular case of Lay-Baptism), that we may pass on to another topic.

3. We claim, then, that *all the testimony from the Fathers* (and indeed from all other sources), *which*

* Chrysos. de Sacerdot. 1, III. c. 5.

† “Answer,” &c. p. 45.

invalidates Lay-Ordination, or Lay-Consecration of the Eucharist, &c., does, by parity of reasoning, necessarily invalidate Lay-Baptism. And here we have in our favor the *consent* of all Antiquity. This no churchman will presume to deny; if our premise hold good, that *what invalidates one must invalidate all.* But some imagine a difference in the cases, which excepts Lay-Baptism from the operation of the general principle.

One says, 'true *Lay-Baptism* is unlawful, irregular and criminal; but nevertheless, when a layman has washed another with water in the name of the Trinity, he has *baptized* him; *Quod factum factum.*' I rejoin: *Lay-Ordination* is unlawful, irregular and criminal; but nevertheless when a layman has laid his hands upon another, and uttered the usual form of words, he has *ordained* him. Or, *Lay-Consecration of the Eucharist* is unlawful, irregular and criminal; but, nevertheless, when a layman has broken bread, and taken the cup, and blessed them, he has *consecrated* them. *Quod factum factum.*

Another argues that every Christian is a Priest; and although for the sake of order none should minister in holy things, but they who have authority given them in the congregation; still, since every layman is *competent* to act in God's stead by virtue of his inherent Priesthood, if such a one baptize, his act is *valid*, and ought not to be repeated. *Mutatis mutandis*, I affirm the same, on

the same plea, and with the same reason, of *Lay-Ordination*, &c. And in like manner it will be found that *every pretence offered in favor of making Lay-Baptism an exception to the rule, that the acts of un-commissioned agents in holy things are invalid—will apply with equal force and fairness to each and every function of the Priestly office.* If so, surely the *argumentum ad absurdum* is conclusive against the validity of Lay-Baptism.

We shall close this chapter with some ancient testimony, that goes to establish our position.

The first witness is

ST. CYPRIAN, A. D. 248.

Although St. Cyprian does not so much as mention Lay-Baptism expressly, he is notwithstanding a competent witness against it. For in his controversy respecting the validity of the Baptisms of schismatical clergy, he invalidates such Baptisms mainly on the ground, that *the administrators by schism had forfeited their commission*; that their orders were null, and therefore their Baptisms *invalid*: in other words, that being mere *laymen* they could not confer *valid* Baptism.

It is true that he does not state it precisely in these terms; for “it was not necessary for him to say that *Lay-Baptism* is allowed to be *invalid*; therefore so is the Baptism of schismatics; because

this would have been begging the question, and proving *idem per idem*. The point was only *whether schismatics had forfeited their orders or not*; and how impertinent would it have been for St. Cyprian to observe that laymen could not baptize, unless his adversaries had allowed the schismatical clergy to be no more than laymen; which they never did allow, but still contended they were Priests. * * * He set himself to prove *that they were not Priests*, that they had lost their commissions, that they had no sacerdotal power or character left; and that *therefore their Baptisms were invalid.*" * * *

"St. Basil, therefore, was much in the right in saying, that Cyprian and Firmilian, with their adherents, rejected the Baptisms of schismatics upon this principle, that being cut off from the church and *become laics*, *λαϊκοὶ γερόμενοι*, they had lost the power of baptizing." * * * "What I have here asserted is abundantly confirmed from St. Austin's management of this controversy with the Donatists afterwards. The main point which he undertakes to prove, and in which he prevails and triumphs over his adversaries at every turn, is *that heresy and schism did not null or vacate orders*. For when the Donatists objected to him, that *schism deprived them of the right of baptizing*, he *denies it utterly*, and pleads strongly for the *indelible character*. And he proves it unanswerably upon a prin-

ciple which both sides acknowledged, viz., that *heresy or schism did not vacate Baptism before received in the Church.*”

“St. Austin argues upon this principle, *if Baptism once validly given is always valid, then orders once validly given are always valid; therefore can never be deleted by any heresy, schism, or apostacy; therefore schismatical clergymen still retain their sacerdotal character; therefore their ministrations, and particularly Baptism, are still valid, inasmuch as they could not lose their right of baptizing given in their ordination.* This is so clear all the way in Austin’s dispute with the Donatists, that he that runs may read it. It is plain, then, that he thought the strength of Cyprian’s cause consisted in this one mistaken principle, that *schism and heresy null-ed orders*; and that if St. Cyprian had been convinced of that mistake, he would have changed his *opinion.* What is this but asserting, or at least insinuating, the very same thing with St. Basil; that Cyprian *rejected the Baptism of schismatics because he rejected their orders,* and looked upon them, as to any sacerdotal power or right, as being no more than *laymen?*” * * *

“I have mentioned St. Austin only as a witness of St. Cyprian’s sense and meaning, whom he thoroughly studied, and as thoroughly confuted, with respect to that point on which Cyprian grounded his opinion, viz., that *heresy or schism nulled orders*;

which being removed there was nothing considerable left to support the doctrine of the *invalidity of heretical or schismatical Baptisms*, if administered in due form with water and in the name of the Blessed Trinity.”

I have quoted the foregoing passages from Dr. Waterland’s* very clear exposition of the turning point in the Cyprianic controversy, because it greatly confirms our position ; and because Bingham has laid great stress upon this controversy ; and has perverted it in favor of Lay-Baptism, by denying the Catholic principle of the *indelible character*, and by assuming that the heretics and schismatics, whose Baptisms the Church allowed in opposition to Cyprian, were mere *laymen* ; and consequently that the Church allowed the *validity* of Lay-Baptism, although administered by heretics or schismatics. His premise, that heretical and schismatical clergymen had *ipso facto* forfeited their Orders is sufficiently disproved by a *single unquestionable fact*, viz., that such clergymen, if restored to the Communion of the Church, and allowed to minister in holy things, *were never re-ordained*. Wherefore, “I cannot but wonder (with Dr. W.) at Mr. Bingham’s strange attempt, strange in a man of his learning and sagacity, to overthrow this so well-grounded notion of the indelible char-

* Works, X. p. 116, ss.

acter of Orders ; by which, whatever he pretends, he runs cross to all Antiquity, except the African Church in the time of St. Cyprian, and a few years before and after."

Bingham, after all, by a happy inconsistency, admits all we ask, though in the main he strives to prove heretical, schismatical, and apostate Priests, mere laymen. He was too honest, however, to be a good special pleader in a bad cause ; and accordingly he allows that the ordination of such a Priest "remains so far indelible and inviolable, as that if the Church thinks fit, after all his crimes and suspensions, to admit him, upon his repentance, to officiate in that station again, he shall not need a new ordination to qualify him for it ; in this sense there are none among the Ancients but will allow heretics and schismatics to be Bishops or Priests, according to their respective Orders."* This is all we ask ; on this ground we affirm that the *indelible character* was a Catholic Doctrine ; for if the sacerdotal character had been *deleted* by heresy, &c., it could only be *re-impressed* by a *new ordination*.

It is evident, I think, that both the contending parties in the Cyprianic controversy assumed or allowed the invalidity of Lay-Baptism ; and that the issue between them was *whether schismatical*

* Schol. Hist. I. 22.

and heretical clergymen lost ipso facto their sacerdotal character, and with it the power of conferring valid Baptism. The Cyprianists maintained the *affirmative*, and therefore rejected their Baptisms as *invalid*: the Church decided in the *negative*, and accordingly recognized their Baptisms as *valid*.*

After the foregoing account of the Cyprianic controversy had been written, I met with a passage in Bingham, much to my surprise, in which that learned writer strangely contradicts his own special pleading in regard to this subject, by the seemingly *unconscious* statement of an historical fact. Speaking of "Cyprian and all his associates" he says,—“they thought no Baptism could be valid, unless both the administrator was an authorized person, and his Baptism could also exhibit all those spiritual graces, which are ordinarily the effects of Catholic Baptism; but both these things were wanting in the Baptism of heretics, viz., both authority and spiritual graces; and therefore they concluded their Baptism to be invalid.”†

Here he represents Cyprian and his associates as resting the charge of *invalidity* against heretical Baptisms, 1, *on want of authority in the administrator*; and, 2, *on the deficiency of such Baptisms in spiritual graces*. It is plain, then, from his own confession, that one party in the controversy sought

* See Note (P).

† Scholast. Hist. I. 19.

to invalidate *heretical* Baptisms by proving them *Lay-Baptisms*, i. e. Baptisms of which “the administrator was an unauthorized person;” or, in other words, *assumed the invalidity of Lay-Baptism as the basis of the argument*. And if the one party assumed it, *the other allowed it by not objecting to it*. For surely had they deemed the foundation, on which Cyprian built, unsound, they would have pulled it down or have taken it from under him; which they did not even attempt. Besides, is it not clear that his opponents must have denied one or both of the two fundamental principles, on which his argument rested? Now it is certain that they did not question the second principle, that *heretical baptisms were deficient in spiritual graces*; for the whole Church sanctioned this principle by word and deed, as Bingham fully shows. They must therefore have objected to the first principle, that the *heretical Clergy were unauthorized Administrators of Baptism*; in other words, they must have alleged that they were *authorized Administrators*, and that *therefore their acts were valid*. And by *authorized Administrators* they must have meant *ordained Priests*, still retaining the Commission of Christ, and the power of the keys; for they could not have meant it in the loose sense of *countenanced by the Bishop*, since this was not the case.

It is plain, I repeat, from Bingham’s own statement of fact, that when Cyprian called heretical

Ministers *unauthorized* Administrators of Baptism, he called them *laymen*; and that when his opponents called them *authorized* Administrators, they called them *Priests*. For I will not trifle with my readers' patience by exposing the monstrosity of that mongrel species, the abortive progeny of a perplexed brain, a nameless and homeless *tertium quid*, neither clergy, nor laity; for which Bingham strives to find "a local habitation" (but not "a name"), by placing them vaguely enough, "*as it were, in a sort of middle state betwixt both,*" viz., the clergy and the laity! So much for theorizing and special pleading!*

In a word, it is clear (Bingham himself being witness), that both parties in the Cyprianic controversy, assuming the *invalidity* of Lay-Baptism as a conceded Catholic principle, sought, the one to prove heretical Ministers to be mere *laymen*, and their Baptisms *therefore invalid*, the other to prove them to be still *Priests*, and their Baptisms *therefore valid*.

ST. BASIL, A. D. 370.

"As to St. Basil," says Bingham, "it will be readily owned, that he had somewhat of a singular opinion in this matter; for he was for rebaptizing all persons, that were only baptized by laymen;

* Scholast. Hist. I. 22.

as he was also for rebaptizing all that were baptized by heretical and schismatical Priests; for he brings in Cyprian, and Firmilian, his predecessor in the see of Cæsarea, arguing after this manner,* “Heretics and schismatics are broken off from the Church and *become laymen*; and *therefore* have *no power to baptize*, or to ordain, being no longer able to give the gift of the Holy Ghost to others, which they have lost themselves. Therefore, such as are baptized by them, when they return to the Church, are to be rebaptized with the true Baptism of the Church, as being only baptized by laymen.”†

Is it not palpable that St. Basil here tacitly assumes the invalidity of Lay-Baptism, as an unquestioned *fact*; and thence infers the invalidity of Baptism administered by heretical or schismatical Priests, on the ground that such Priests had lost their orders, and therefore had “no power to *baptize*, or to ordain?” By the way, it is worth observing that he rests the “power to *baptize*,” and the “power to *ordain*” on the same foundation (viz. of Divine Commission), and makes them stand or fall together. Pity it is that “what God has joined together” men will “put asunder.”

* Basil, Ep. I. ad Amphiloch. c. 5. For the original Greek, see Note (Q).

† Scholast. Hist. c. I. sect. 15.

APOSTOLICAL CONSTITUTIONS.

Although the precise date of the several parts of this collection cannot be ascertained, it is nevertheless allowed that the compilation was completed before the close of the fourth century, and that it therefore affords satisfactory evidence of the prevalent practice of the Church for some time prior to that period. Bingham, who makes frequent use of these "Constitutions," thus refers to them in connection with the subject of "usurped and unauthorized Baptism by laymen." "The author of the Apostolical Constitutions seems to pronounce severely of usurped and unauthorized actions, as *utterly null and void*. He has a whole chapter with this title, 'That it is a horrible thing for a man to thrust himself into the Priest's dignity or office, as the Corahites, and Saul, and Uzzias did : ' and he thus expresses himself upon it : ' 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 does any thing without the Bishop, he does it in vain : it shall not be reputed to him as any service. As Saul, when he had offered sacrifice without Samuel, was told that he had done vainly ; so whatever layman does any thing without a Priest, he labors in vain. And

as King Uzzias, when he had invaded the Priest's office, was smitten with leprosy for his transgression, so every layman shall bear his punishment that contemns God, and insults his Priests, and takes honor to himself, not imitating Christ, who glorified not himself, but stayed till his Father said, 'Thou art a Priest for ever after the order of Melchizedek.' ”*

Bingham endeavors to break the force of the foregoing unqualified denunciation by a paraphrase suited to his case ; the acts of such a usurper are “*vain as to what concerns himself.*” How does this agree with his former admission, “The author seems to pronounce” them “*utterly null and void?*” We accept the latter as the natural, true, and Catholic interpretation.

We now claim to have made good our assertion that “*the Catholic doctrine and usage of the Primitive Church positively confirm the Arguments of Chapters II. and III.,*” because,

1. We have proved, both by passages of the Fathers and by the admissions of our opponents themselves, that the whole current of ancient testimony sets in favor of that Argument, which was derived from the terms of our blessed Saviour's Commission, and from the Nature of the Sacraments themselves. For *all the authorities*, from the

* Schol. Hist. c. I. sect. 16.

writings and documents of the first four centuries, that bear upon this subject, *invariably and universally* recognize and confirm certain *fundamental principles, which from their very nature admit of no exception, and which utterly annihilate the figment or notion of the validity of Lay-Baptism.* Such are the following, viz., that *the Bishop is the centre and symbol of the unity of the Church*;—that *no Ministration in holy things has God's sanction, or is valid, unless authorized by the Bishop*;—that *the Bishop cannot authorize a man to act for God, otherwise than by ordaining him*;—that *all the sacerdotal powers stand on the same foundation, viz., of CHRIST'S Commission, and that any pretence which removes one of them from that Rock, will remove each and all of them from it, or, in other words, underminethem all*;—that *in Baptism the New Covenant between God and Man is signed and sealed, which can be done only by the contracting parties, or their legally authorized representatives*;—that *none are legally authorized to act for God, but those whom the Bishop has ordained, and thereby made Priests in God's House, etc.*

2. We have shown that throughout the long protracted and widely diffused controversy about the Baptism of heretics and schismatics, *the invalidity of Lay-Baptism was tacitly assumed by all parties as an acknowledged principle*;—for they did not take for granted (as some suppose) that the heretics and schismatics were *ipso facto* laymen, and

then go on to prove that Lay-Baptism was valid or invalid;—but they took it for granted that Lay-Baptism was invalid, and then set about to prove that the schismatical and heretical Clergy were or were not in fact Laymen; whence it would follow of course that their Baptisms were accordingly either invalid or valid. And this incidental and undesigned testimony, afforded by the tacit and general agreement of contending parties, is neither to be denied nor impeached.

CHAPTER VII.

An Examination of sundry Pleas, by help of which the advocates of Lay-Baptism attempt to evade the Arguments of Chapters II. and III.

WE proceed, next in order, to examine briefly certain exceptions which our opponents offer to the arguments in our second and third chapters, based upon the Commission of our Lord, and the nature of the Sacrament.

1. Some think that they find instances of Lay-Baptism in the New Testament itself. It is alleged that the Apostles must have been aided by disciples, who were *laymen*, in baptizing three thousand souls in one day: "*Then they that gladly received the word, were baptized; and the same day there were added unto them about three thousand souls.*"* But is it not clear that this conclusion is founded on the double and gratuitous *assumption*, that the Apostles could not have baptized so many themselves, and that they did not ordain any for the purpose?

Again the Baptism of St. Paul is cited as a case in point.† Ananias, it is asserted, was a *layman* only, and yet baptized him. Now, first, it does not

* Acts 2: 41.

† Ibid. 9: 18.

clearly appear that *Ananias* was the baptizer; nor that he was a layman. But admitting both points, it is certain that Ananias was *sent by God*. We will cheerfully allow the claim of any man to baptize, who will furnish us with *as good proof* that he too has been thus *sent*, even though he may not have received Episcopal ordination.

The case of Cornelius and his household is not at all more favorable to Lay-Baptism; for when St. Peter "commanded them to be baptized in the name of the Lord,"* it is fair to presume that he gave the command to those who were competent and authorized to minister in holy things. At all events the contrary cannot be made out, except by a groundless assumption, which can never set aside a well established principle.

These, it is believed, are all the particular cases in the New Testament, that our opponents deem favorable to their hypothesis. It needs no comment to show their entire inadequacy to prove, or to make plausible, the alleged exception to the rule of *sacerdotal* ministrations.

2. There is another mode, by which it is sought to establish the validity of Lay-Baptism, by running a parallel between Preaching and Baptizing. Both are by the Commission intrusted wholly and solely to the Apostles and their successors; and to such

* Acts 10: 48.

as hold *from* and *under* them lawful authority to minister in holy things. But still, it is argued, God's *word* takes effect upon the hearer, or is *valid*, notwithstanding the want of a commission on the part of him who preaches it: why then should not the Sacrament of Baptism likewise take effect, or be *valid*, notwithstanding the same defect is in him who administers it? Or, to state it with most advantage, in Hooker's words;—"he which teacheth and is not sent, loseth the reward, but yet retaineth the name of a teacher; his usurped actions have in him the same nature which they have in others, although they yield him not the same comfort.—And if these two cases be peers, the case of doctrine and the case of baptism both alike, sith no defect in their vocation that teach the truth is able to take away the benefit thereof from him which heareth; wherefore should the want of a lawful calling in them that baptize make Baptism to me vain?"*

This argument looks plausible, because both powers are delegated by the same Commission to the same parties. But is there not a difference between the Word and Sacraments considered by and in themselves, which reconciles our claim of exclusive validity for the Sacrament *lawfully administered* with our admission of the validity of the

* Ecclesiastical Polity, V. 62, 13.

Word, although *unlawfully preached*? The *Sacrament* (or its outward form), we contend, is *no Sacrament* unless *sacerdotally* dispensed; just as a *Covenant* (or its outward form) is no *Covenant*, which is not *lawfully* signed and sealed. But the Word is God's Word, preach or publish it who may.—And although we venture not with Hooker to regard it as a matter of indifference (so far as the efficiency of the Word is concerned) by whom it is proclaimed, whether by hallowed or unhallowed lips; we admit, notwithstanding, that man cannot make utterly void or *invalid* God's revealed truth. We deny therefore the justness of the parallel between the Word and the Sacrament, as above exhibited; and suggest the following as a better illustration of the case. 'A man need not go to church, and hear a minister of Christ read and preach God's Word; for it is no more God's Word when preached or read by an ordained Priest, than when preached or read by any body else. He may as well therefore read and preach for himself at home. And since the Word and the Sacrament stand upon the same footing, what is true of one must be true of the other. A man therefore need not go to church, and receive Baptism from a minister of Christ, for it is no more God's Sacrament when administered by an ordained Priest, than when administered by any body else. He may as well stay at home and baptize himself.'—Let those

who like the conclusion, accept the premises, and deny all difference between *preaching the Word and administering the Sacraments*. Those are not true parallels, which, when carried out, cross one another. It is obvious that things may accord in many particulars, and differ in others. Preaching and Baptizing agree, in that they are committed by Christ to the same keeping, and can both be *legally* exercised only by *commissioned* agents; but they differ in that their *validity* is not equally dependent upon their *legality*. *Preaching by a layman*, though unlawful, is yet *valid* to him that heareth with faith, because what he hears is nevertheless the *Word of God*. *Washing by a layman* in the name of the Trinity, unlawful like the former, is unlike it *invalid* to the receiver, because what he receives is not the *Sacrament of CHRIST*.*

3. The next plea urged in defence of Lay-Baptism is made to rest upon a comparison of the Christian Sacrament of Baptism with the Jewish Rite of Circumcision. It is alleged that the latter as well as the former was the *seal* of the Covenant between GOD and Man; and that therefore, if a *formally* authorized agent is essential to the validity of the Covenant sealed by Baptism, such an agent must have been equally essential to the validity of

* See Note (R), where the foregoing argument is confirmed.

the Covenant sealed by Circumcision. To all this we cordially assent and subscribe.

Well, then, argues the advocate of Lay-Baptism, you will not deny that the silence of the Old Testament in regard to the necessity of Priestly ministration in Circumcision, taken in connexion with the modern practice of the Jews (who deem Priestly administration *un-essential* to its validity), affords strong and sufficient, though only presumptive, evidence of the ordinary allowance of lay-ministration in that Sacrament. And if laymen were competent to circumcise even in ordinary cases, surely they must be equally competent to baptize in cases of necessity.

Now we attach no more importance to modern Jewish practice as evidence of ancient usage under the Mosaic economy, than we do to modern Christian practice as evidence of Catholic usage in the days of Primitive Christianity. Nevertheless we are willing to admit (what is after all not *certain*, for *silence* is not always equivalent to *assent*), that the *laity* were *allowed*, even in *ordinary cases*, to administer Circumcision. But we deny the justness of the conclusion thence drawn in favor of Lay-Baptism; for it proceeds upon the tacitly assumed and most erroneous premise, that God was not competent, when he introduced by Christ the "better Covenant," to make a change in the *agent*, as well as in the *form* of sealing it. The following

we deem the true mode of reconciling the difference between the Jewish and Christian seal of the Covenant in respect to the administrator. Moses, by God's direction, *allowed* laymen *ordinarily* to circumcise; they were therefore God's *authorized* agents for this particular purpose. For surely no one will have the boldness to pretend that they *ordinarily usurped* authority in holy things; this would be to make the whole people a race of Korahites. And if they were, as we doubt not, God's *authorized* agents, then their action was both *lawful* and *valid*, or *valid because lawful*. Nor let it be supposed that this is an ingenious theory (like Tertullian's inherent Priesthood), got up to meet an emergency. On the contrary, it has, we think, sure warrant in Holy Scripture. For was not *Abraham*, the first minister of circumcision, an agent of the Lord, *authorized* to represent God in this and other holy ministrations? Had not the *Patriarch*, prior to the Mosaic economy, lawful *authority* to act in holy things from and for God?

It seems indeed palpable that Moses retained certain features of the Patriarchal economy, when he instituted a Priesthood wholly separated from secular life, to administer the more complex economy, which superseded the former. And one of these remains of the Patriarchal system, which survived the change, was the authorizing laymen (or, as we are disposed to think, the *head* of the house-

hold, the *Patriarch*) to administer the rite of circumcision. This solution has in its favor the presumptive evidence already adduced from the Patriarchal economy (*under which, be it noted, circumcision was first instituted*); and it is besides the only solution known to us, that meets satisfactorily all the difficulties of the case. For it shows that the rite of circumcision was not committed (as some seem to think) to the keeping and administration of *any* body or *no-body*; but was by God himself put in charge of the Patriarch, or head of each family, who was thereby constituted for this purpose a *lawful* minister of God.* And, on the other hand, this solution is in no respect at variance with the ordinance of Christ; or with the Catholic doctrine, that under the New Covenant, none are God's proxies or priests, or competent to perform any *sacerdotal* act, but such as have been authorized by those whom Christ set apart as His sole representatives on earth, viz. the Apostles and their successors. For this solution recognizes an *authorized* and *legal*, and therefore *valid*, sealing of both Covenants (the old and the new), by Circumcision and Baptism respectively; and it refers the

* None, it is presumed will object that the Patriarch was not a lawful minister of circumcision, because not ordained by laying on of hands. For none surely can suppose that God is tied to any particular mode of designating his agent, though he may tie our hands, if he will.

change in the *administrator* as well as in the *mode of his designation*, to the good pleasure of Him, “who worketh all things after the counsel of His own will.”

But if the advocate of Lay-Baptism declines this explanation, which we nevertheless deem sufficient; the parallel attempted to be run between Baptism and Circumcision will serve his cause no better than that between Baptism and Preaching. For, be it carefully noted, that under the Mosaic economy lay-administration of the initiatory Rite was *lawful* and *regular* as well as *valid*. If then “these two cases be peers,” we are entitled to carry out the parallel, and to conclude that under the Christian dispensation lay-administration of Baptism is likewise *lawful* and *regular*, as well as *valid*. Is not this a plain *reductio ad absurdum*?

There is however another hook on which they strive to hang an argument in favor of Lay-Baptism, but on which Lay-Baptism itself were more fitly hung, viz., the case of Zipporah’s circumcising her son.*

We are not disposed to lay much stress upon the plea sometimes urged, that, in her husband’s inability, Zipporah had a natural right to act in his stead; for we acknowledge no *natural* right in regard to a *positive* institution of God. It follows,

* Exodus 4: 24—26.

therefore, either that *women* were *authorized* to administer circumcision in *ordinary* cases; or, that Zipporah's circumcision was a mere usurpation; or that the case was an *extraordinary* one, and that she received from God a special commission for that single occasion. The first hypothesis is utterly baseless, if we except this single case, and cannot be entertained for a moment. The second we deem equally untenable, for (as Hooker argues) "the sequel thereof, take it which way you will, is a plain argument, that God was satisfied with what she did, as may appear by his own testimony declaring how there followed in the person of Moses present release of his grievous punishment, upon her speedy discharge of that duty, which by him neglected had offended God, even as after execution of justice by the hands of Phinehas the plague was immediately taken away, which former impunity of sin had caused."* We have therefore little doubt (for, when Scripture is silent, we may but conjecture, and that with diffidence) that the third hypothesis accords with the facts of the case, and that Zipporah did receive authority from God to do for her husband, what he was through his own fault then incompetent to do. God may have seen fit to teach his chosen Prophet, now entering upon his long career of trial, the necessity of unhesitating

* Ecclesiastical Polity, V. 62, 21.

obedience to each and all of His commands, by subjecting him to peril of life for his disobedience in this particular. And yet, in judgment remembering mercy, He may have seen fit to allow him the benefit of another's obedience in his stead; and therefore to have sanctioned in this *extraordinary* case a deviation from the usual, regular and lawful mode of ministration. If so, Zipporah's ministration was *authorized and lawful, and therefore valid*. Any other explanation of this singular case, is attended with insuperable difficulty. And no exposition of it favorable to Lay-Baptism can be suggested, which would not bring us back to Rome in this matter, and sanction the *validity* if not the *legality* of Baptism by *women*, at least in cases of necessity.

4. We would not again refer to the alleged right of Bishops, as the chief stewards of God's mysteries, to authorize laymen to baptize in extraordinary cases, and even to sanction *ex post facto* any and all pretended Baptisms, by whomsoever and under whatsoever circumstances administered; were it not that such great stress has been laid on this erroneous and dangerous assumption, and did it not find an auxiliary in that respect and reverence for the chief Pastors of the Church, which it is so desirable to cherish and so imprudent and improper to abuse.

In this matter Bingham has run to most absurd

and dangerous lengths. He saw that if *un-authorized* Lay-Baptisms were countenanced, all order in the Church would soon be at an end ; that it would be, like a house without door or keeper, “ trodden under foot of men.” It was necessary, therefore, to devise a remedy for this sad evil, and to subject Lay-Baptism to some disability or disadvantage, and also to the cognizance of some tribunal competent to try its merits and to remedy its alleged defects. The Primitive Church had never *expressly* legislated upon the subject, because there was no occasion. What then was to be done in order to press antiquity to support this doubtful case ? It was remembered that in the ancient Church there was a Catholic rule, that the Bishop’s authority is essential to legalize ministration in holy things ; and that in the case of schismatical and heretical Baptisms their acknowledged deficiencies were supplied by the Bishop’s laying his hands upon the reconciled penitent. Here was a foothold for Lay-Baptism ; one step more and it would stand on firm ground. Accordingly, schismatical and heretical clergymen were voted laymen (with Cyprian and his associates), the Catholic church and Bingham’s own slips to the contrary notwithstanding ; and their Baptisms of course Lay-Baptisms. And on this fictitious precedent was based the Catholicity of the rule that Lay-Baptisms were *valid*, though defective ; and that their deficiencies were

to be supplied by the laying on of the Bishop's hands in Confirmation: from which it follows necessarily that *Bishops possess the power of ratifying and completing any Baptisms whatsoever*, if the prescribed element and form of words have been used. Here is a principle broad enough to cover any and every imaginable case of illegal and irregular Baptism.

We have already held up to view this novel claim *for* (not *by*) the Bishops of arbitrary control over Christ's Sacrament in more than one light, and now refer to it mainly to expose yet more fully Bingham's extravagance and inconsistency in the matter, occasioned, as we believe, by the badness of his cause. His perplexity, arising from the fact that heretical and schismatical clergymen were not *re-ordained*, if restored to their former privileges, has been already noticed; as well as his vain attempt to untie the knot by putting them "as it were in a sort of middle state between" the clergy and the laity, that the reconciling Bishops might not have so far to raise them without the lever of Ordination.—According to which notion, by the way, he ought to have put their Baptisms "as it were, in a sort of middle state between" Baptism and washing, or between a verity and a nullity.—There is another strange inconsistency into which he has betrayed himself, that merits passing notice, because it helps to expose the falsity and absurdity of his hy-

pothesis. It relates to the predicament of the Anglican Church at the time of the Reformation. Let him state the case himself.

“ If it be inquired now how the reformed Church of England comes to have full and ample authority to baptize, which before was an heretical and schismatical Church, under the slavery of the Romish yoke? I answer, by shaking off that yoke and reforming her errors, and returning to the unity of the Catholic Church; which was the ancient method for schismatical and heretical Bishops and other clergy, to gain that lawful authority that empowered them to officiate legally, which they had not and could not have, whilst they continued in their errors and out of the Holy Catholic Church. Thus 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 station and clerical degrees they were in before, only receiving a reconciliatory imposition of hands, by way of absolution.* And by virtue of this they had now the full power and license of the Church to authorize them to officiate, which they certainly had not before. And this was the case of the Donatists in the time of St. Austin, as appears from the writings of that father, and several canons in the African code, of which I have given a particu-

* Con. Nic. Can. 8.

lar account in another place. The same rule and method then, which was used and allowed in the Primitive Church, was that which authorized the English Bishops and Priests to officiate legally upon their reforming from their heretical and schismatical errors and corruptions, and returning to the strict and perfect unity of the Holy Catholic Church. And so those persons, who could only give valid Baptism before, as heretics and schismatics may do by a kind of usurpation, were now qualified authoritatively to give it every way, legal, perfect and authentic.”*

Now, be it remembered, that, according to Bingham’s assumption, heretics and schismatics are laymen, and their Baptisms therefore Lay-Baptisms; and that, by his admission, the Anglican Church, on the eve of the Reformation, was “an heretical and schismatical Church,” her clergy of course heretics and schismatics, and therefore *laymen*, and their Baptisms Lay-Baptisms. And furthermore, be it observed, that (according to Mr. B.) such Lay-Baptisms must be ratified and completed by imposition of the hands of a *lawful* Bishop; and that such heretical and schismatical (*quondam*) ministers can be transferred from their lapsed or *lay* condition only by the “reconciliatory imposition of hands, by way of absolution,” given by a *lawful* Bishop of the Catholic Church.

* Schol. Hist. I. 23.

Now where were these lawful Bishops who thus restored the *nominal Bishops* but *actual laymen* (Bingham *judice*) of the Anglican Church, to the possession of their forfeited privileges, as the Catholic Bishops of the Nicene council did the Novatian clergy, by imposition of hands and absolution? If anywhere, they must have been among those "noble professors" the "Waldenses, or the Albigenses, and the Fratres Bohemi," who "opposed the corruptions of the Romish Church, and kept themselves free from her heretical stains and pollutions," the "seven thousand who never bowed the knee to Baal?" But had the English heretics and schismatics the grace to seek this needed cleansing from the stains of heresy, this *panacea* for all the ills the Church is heir to, through man's fault and folly? Alas! no;—so that, on Bingham's showing, the Church of England, and by consequence our own likewise, has neither *lawful Baptism nor any Ministry at all!* Surely, if this be so, we ought to make diligent search after some Bishop, if haply we may find such, whose powers have descended through a channel undefiled by heresy or schism, or any thing that defileth and maketh unclean, to the end that our Bishops and clergy may be translated from that "middle state," to which their predecessors' sin has else unchangeably condemned them. Are not the premises from which

such conclusions are logically derived, at once absurd and false ?

How much more consistent with reason and antiquity to hold, that neither heresy nor schism, nor any other *personal* defect, can null orders ; that heretical and schismatical clergymen are (though unworthy) ministers of Christ, and their ministrations *valid*, though defective ; that all a lawful Bishop can do to such ministrations, is to recognize them in the name of Christ and of his Church, and to confer by other ordinances needed spiritual grace to the returning penitent ; and consequently that a Bishop cannot make that Baptism either *valid* or *complete*, which is not performed by a lawful (though unworthy) Priest, nor authorize what neither Christ nor the Church has authorized.

CHAPTER VIII.

An Examination of the Argument in favor of Lay-Baptism, derived from the alleged consequences of the contrary doctrine.

THE upholders of Lay-Baptism have dwelt largely and mournfully upon the "black and tragical" consequences, which, as they think, necessarily attend the practical recognition of its utter invalidity. It behoves us, therefore, to notice this argument so prevalent and conclusive with many minds, although in truth we have little respect or affection for such a mode of reasoning. For consequences can only be ascertained with certainty after the event (which, as regards this and other questions affecting the Church, is the end of the world); and our prophetic conjectures respecting them are apt to take their color from our wishes or our prejudices. The only safe and certain way then, in all questions of moral and religious import, is to go to the law and the testimony, and to follow out faithfully and fearlessly their dictates and directions. This we have sought to do in the foregoing part of our argument; and we deem the conclusions arrived at so firm and sure, that no array of probable *consequences* could deter us from adhering to them. But we think it can be shown

satisfactorily that the "black and tragical" consequences, foreseen by some in this case, are mere phantoms of a disordered imagination or creations of an unbridled fancy.

1. The first consequence we notice is, that *this doctrine of the utter invalidity of Lay-Baptisms* (including all those of non-Episcopal ministers) *shuts out of the Covenant of mercy, and thereby consigns to perdition, the millions who have hitherto died, or shall hereafter die, without any other Baptism, their faith and obedience* (in other respects) to the contrary notwithstanding. We admit that this doctrine does really and truly imply such exclusion from all *formal* claim to the privileges of that Covenant, of which Baptism is the seal; and we hold with the Church, that the Sacraments are "generally necessary to salvation;" but we deny that it necessarily follows from this, that those who have received a false Baptism are thereby consigned to perdition, or are even in the same predicament with the unbaptized and unevangelized heathen. For as Mr. Lawrence justly reasons on this point: "As for the dismal consequences of unauthorized Lay-Baptism's being null, viz. that persons so falsely baptized *are not Christians, are shut out of Christ's Covenant, and are no better than heathens*; these are but accidental, and owing to men's sins and impieties, affecting only those who are guiltily involved in them. But as for others, who believe the

articles of the Christian faith, who cannot be accused of any criminal neglect, and who are unwillingly, unaffectedly, and yet invincibly ignorant of the necessity of (and therefore never received) Episcopal, which is the only instituted Baptism, 'tis reasonable to believe, that their case is no worse than that of the Primitive Catechumens, or candidates for Baptism, who happened to die before they could be admitted to that Sacrament, and yet were not reckoned as *shut out of Christ's Covenant, and no better than heathens* : for though we are bound to every particular institution of God, yet He is not, and therefore can give the inward spiritual graces where the outward part of a Sacrament cannot be obtained ; which leaves room enough for our charitable sentiments of the case of many thousands who never received the external Baptism of the Church of Christ, having only been washed by lay persons, without, or contrary to, the authority of the Bishops."*

Our blessed Lord has said, " he that believeth and is baptized shall be saved." It is therefore our bounden duty to inculcate the great importance and the general necessity of a true and valid Baptism, as well as of a genuine and living faith, whatever consequences may in man's judgment seem to follow. Not even the Judge of quick and dead

* Sacerdotal Powers, p. 77.

Himself (we speak with reverence) can dispense with genuine faith as a condition of salvation ; for it is the living root from which all other graces derive their health and vigor, and “without faith,” and “holiness” its fruit, no man can “please God,” “no man shall see the Lord.” But Christ, who ordained Baptism as one of the means of grace, may by some other means convey that grace to faithful souls, of which the want of valid Baptism would else deprive them. He who does often assuredly give some degree of grace (even the grace of faith itself, which in the adult is a prerequisite for holy Baptism,) to those yet unbaptized, may give yet more and more, even the grace of life eternal, to such as cannot show his written pledge and promise to grant to them that gracious boon, because their copy of His Covenant bears not His genuine seal and signature ; while others, in whose charter no flaw or informality can be detected by the strictest scrutiny, shall hear the withering sentence, “I never knew you, depart from me, ye workers of iniquity.” Let us not, however, undervalue the importance, nay necessity, of true and valid Baptism “where it may be had :” * we *know* and *affirm* that “he that *believeth and is baptized* shall be saved ;” we do not know and dare not affirm the same with equal certainty of him who *believeth and is not baptized*.

* See the “Exhortation” in the Office for the “Baptism of those of riper years.”

Before leaving this topic, it may not be amiss to observe that the foregoing argument from consequences is quite as applicable to the case of lay-administration of the Eucharist as to that of Lay-Baptism, and makes as much for the one as for the other. The injunction of our Saviour, the consent of antiquity, and the express testimony of our own standards, represent both Sacraments as equally necessary to salvation, at least to adults. "It cannot be denied," says Hooker, "but sundry the same effects and benefits which grow unto men by the one Sacrament may rightly be attributed unto the other. Yet then doth Baptism challenge to itself but the inchoation of those graces, the consummation whereof dependeth on mysteries ensuing. We receive Christ Jesus in Baptism once as the first beginner, in the Eucharist often as being by continual degrees the finisher of our life. By Baptism therefore we receive Christ Jesus, and from him that saving grace which is proper unto Baptism. By the other Sacrament we receive Him also, imparting therein himself and that grace which the Eucharist properly bestoweth."*—Surely that Sacrament, on which dependeth the "*consummation* of those graces," of which Baptism doth "challenge to itself but the *inchoation*," is not less necessary to salvation than the latter Sacrament; without question, it is as needful that we should

* Eccles. Polity, v. 57. 6.

“receive Christ Jesus in the Eucharist often as being by continual degrees the *finisher* of our life,” as that we should receive Him “in Baptism once as the first *beginner*” of it ; unless indeed *to live* is of less account than *to be born*. If then the denial of the validity of Lay-Baptism involves the denial of spiritual *birth* to all who have received no other Baptism ; so does the denial of the validity of Lay-Consecration of the Eucharist involve likewise the denial of spiritual *life* to all those who receive it only from lay hands. And if the consequences of the former denial are so grievous as utterly to contradict it and to prove it false, the same is true of the second ; if on this ground Lay-Baptism must be allowed to be valid, so must Lay-Consecration of the Eucharist.

By the way, the latter part of the foregoing quotation from Hooker, confirms a position assumed in a former chapter, that the participation of one Sacrament cannot atone for the neglect of the other, seeing that each has its proper grace, which it is the appointed means of conveying. This truth is more distinctly set forth in the sentence that completes the paragraph : “So that each Sacrament having both that which is general or common, and that also which is peculiar unto itself, we may hereby gather that the participation of Christ, which properly belongeth to any one Sacrament, is not otherwise to be obtained but by the Sacrament where-

unto it is proper." Whenever, therefore, any one, who has received only washing with water, in the name of the Holy Trinity, from an uncommissioned agent or layman, is satisfied of the invalidity of such Baptism, we hold it to be his solemn duty to seek legal and valid Baptism from a lawful minister of Christ, even as it is the duty of the converted Jew or heathen to be "baptized for the remission of sins."

2. Another objection to the doctrine that Lay-Baptism is utterly null and void, derived from supposed consequences, is that *many must in that case die wholly unbaptized, whenever in extreme necessity a lawful minister cannot be had*, as for example, newly born infants who die presently after birth; in which case it is alleged the hardship is greater, as these cannot have either faith in Christ or the intention of receiving Baptism; and, since "necessity has no law," it is better that a layman should run the risk of doing what he has no authority to do, than that the salvation of such innocent and helpless beings should be put in jeopardy; or, at all events, however it may fare with the lay usurper of the priestly office, that such Baptisms do nevertheless stand firmly on this ground of necessity, or in other words are *valid*.

To this we reply in general, that these cases do not constitute one in a thousand of the Lay-Baptisms with which we have to do, and that therefore

this objection hardly touches our main argument. Besides, in the case of infants, why should not the faith and intention of their parents avail them with a merciful God when they necessarily lose Baptism, even as the faith and profession of their sponsors avail them when they actually receive it? Surely in the case supposed a parent has a better right to hope that God, who "will have mercy and not sacrifice," will accept his righteous intention of Baptism for his child coupled with reverent obedience to the institution of Christ, rather than his irregular administration of it, by a presumptuous usurpation of priestly power, in contempt of God's holy ordinance; for "*to obey is better than sacrifice.*" And as respects the lay-administrator himself, where in the whole compass of God's word can he find warrant for perilling his own soul by disobedience, that he may save thereby the soul of another? Let him rather take warning from Uzza's fate, and not presume to overstep the appointed limits of his office, even though he vainly hope, or weakly strive, to stay thereby the tottering Ark of God. Are God's commands so unreasonable and contradictory, that obedience to one does or can in any case involve disobedience to another? Surely this can never be; the action that proceeds on this hypothesis is impious.

Again, we repeat that the plea of the *absolute* necessity of Baptism, as the ground of justifying the

lay-administration of it, is unscriptural, unreasonable and vain. To illustrate this further in Hooker's words,—“the law of Christ, which in these considerations maketh Baptism necessary, must be construed and understood according to rules of natural equity. * * * And, because equity so teacheth, it is on all parts gladly confessed, that *there may be in divers cases* life by virtue of inward Baptism, even where outward is not found. So that if any question be made, it is but about the bounds and limits of this possibility. * * * It hath been therefore constantly held, as well touching other believers as martyrs, that Baptism taken away by necessity, is supplied by desire of Baptism, because with equity this opinion doth best stand.”

“Touching infants which die unbaptized, sith they neither have the Sacrament itself, nor any sense or conceit thereof, the judgment of many hath gone hard against them. But yet seeing grace is not absolutely tied unto Sacraments, and besides such is the lenity of God that unto things altogether impossible he bindeth no man, but where we cannot do what is enjoined us accepteth our will to do instead of the deed itself; again, forasmuch as there is in their Christian parents and in the Church of God a presumed desire that the Sacrament of Baptism might be given them, yea a purpose also that it shall be given; remorse of equity hath moved divers of the school divines

in these considerations ingenuously to grant, that God, all merciful to such as are not in themselves able to desire Baptism, imputeth the secret desire that others have in their behalf, and accepteth the same as theirs, rather than casteth away their souls for that which no man is able to help.”*

Bingham substantially agrees with the foregoing argument, when he states “what opinion the Ancients had of the necessity of Baptism.” * * “In case there was no contempt, but only an unavoidable and unforeseen necessity hindered their Baptism, whilst they were diligently preparing for it; in that case they were treated a little more favorably by the Ancients, who did not generally think the mere want of Baptism, in such circumstances, to be such a piacular crime, as to exclude men absolutely from the benefit of Church communion, or the hopes of eternal salvation. Some few of them indeed are pretty severe upon infants dying without Baptism, and some others seem also in general terms to deny eternal life to adult persons dying without it; but yet, when they interpret themselves, and speak more distinctly, they make some allowance and except several cases, in which the want of Baptism may be supplied by other means, when the want of it proceeded not from contempt, but from some great necessity and disa-

* Ecclesiastical Polity, v. 60. 5, 6.

bility to receive it. They generally ground the necessity of Baptism upon those two sayings of our Saviour, "He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved," and, "Except a man be born of water and of the Spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God ;" but then, in their exposition of these texts, they limit the sense to the ordinary method of salvation and such cases wherein Baptism may be had; and as for extraordinary cases, wherein Baptism could not be had, though men were desirous of it, they made several exceptions in behalf of other things, which, in such circumstances, were thought sufficient to supply the want of it."*

3. The third objection derived from consequences, against the principle of the invalidity of Lay-Baptism, is a most serious and appalling one, if it be well founded. It is alleged that *if Baptism given by a layman is invalid, then the Apostolic succession has been either wholly broken, or else involved in such confusion and uncertainty that it must prove impossible to trace any one continuous line of Bishops in the Church.* For as the whole Western Church for centuries prior to the Reformation, and the Anglican Church until the time of James I., allowed Lay-Baptism in cases of necessity, it follows that the Baptisms of all the Bishops, Priests and Deacons, who were ordained within that period are

* Antiquities, X. 2. 19.

liable to suspicion; they may be, or may not be valid; and very many of them certainly are invalid. Besides which many of the Bishops and clergy of the Church of England since the time of James I., as well as many in the American Church, have been converts from the various dissenting communities, and have been admitted to the communion of the Church, perhaps in most instances, without Baptism. But it is argued, "if the Baptism of such clergymen as we now speak of was (is) invalid, so was (is) their ordination too; they were (are) laymen still, and of the lowest class, laymen unbaptized. They could (can) not have the keys of the Church delivered to them before they were (are) members of it. Such men, acting as Priests, could (can) not baptize; acting as Bishops could (can) not ordain. And yet they did (do) pretend to do both, as apprehending no cause to doubt the competency of their own authority.—The effect whereof must be an endless propagation of nullities in respect both of Baptism and Ordination. * * * Upon this hypothesis we can have no assurance without a revelation from heaven, that we ourselves are in the Church, and consequently in a state of salvation; or that there is a Bishop, a Sacrament, or a Christian in the whole Christian world."* If this be indeed so, Mr. Kelsall might

* Kelsall's answer to Dr. Waterland's first letter.

well add, "you see the consequences drawn from this principle (viz. the utter invalidity of Lay-Baptism) are altogether as *black and tragical* as can be *imagined*."

This whole argument rests upon the assumption that *Baptism is an essential qualification for orders*, or, in general terms, that *no one can be an officer in a society, or perform valid official acts therein, who has not been legally and formally made a member thereof*. We submit that this assumption is false, and that therefore the objection itself, being without foundation, must fall to the ground. It is certainly *fitting and right* that none should be received as candidates for the ministry, or admitted to holy orders, who have not received true and valid Baptism; just as it is fitting and right that none should be so received or admitted who do not possess personal holiness. These, as well as other *personal* qualifications should be demanded as prerequisites to ordination. But if through an error of judgment or want of due care, on the part of those who have lawful control in this matter, an individual is ordained who wants either of the personal qualifications named, does this mistake or neglect *vitate his lawful Commission*, and render the acts regularly and duly performed by virtue of it illegal and invalid?

Take, in the way of illustration, a parallel case. The constitution of the United States requires that

every candidate for the Presidency shall be a citizen of the country by right of birth. Suppose, notwithstanding, that a man has been duly elected and formally inaugurated, or *commissioned*; and that it is afterwards discovered that he is neither a native nor a citizen of the country; are all his acts thereby rendered null and void? Are they even *voidable*? We do not pretend to legal knowledge, and yet it is not presumption (we think) to affirm that every lawyer in the land would treat the hypothesis as ridiculous; and would justify his verdict by referring to the obvious distinction between *personal qualifications*, which constitute *fitness* for an office, and *official prerogative* or *powers*, on which alone depend the legality and validity of official acts performed according to law.

Or, to take a still more analogous case; the judge of a court of record is competent by law to naturalize aliens, or, in other words, to admit them formally as members of this community of fellow-citizens. It is fitting and right, according to law and reason, that such judge should have the previous qualification of citizenship, before being eligible to the said office. But if nevertheless an individual not having that qualification should be duly elected, through the ignorance or negligence of the electors, and should be formally inducted into office, the regularity and legality of his commission would give legality and validity to all his

official acts notwithstanding his previous ineligibility. Surely no one would venture to say that his personal disqualification, arising from want of citizenship, would render all his acts of naturalization null and void, so that all the individuals naturalized by him would not only forfeit thereby the character and rights of citizens, but would in their turn labor under the same inability, if elected to office, of performing legal and valid acts; "the effect whereof must needs be an endless propagation of nullities in respect both of" naturalization and all other public official acts; so that in process of time it might well become a matter of doubt whether there was a lawful judge, a valid instrument of naturalization, or a true citizen in the whole country (on the supposition that all citizens were required to be naturalized, as all Christians are commanded to be baptized).

We quote a single passage from Dr. Waterland, which is much to the purpose:—"That there is no contradiction or absurdity in the supposition" (that an unbaptized Priest can confer Baptism), "appears further from hence, that it is not a man's Baptism, but his Commission, that empowers him to act as God's Minister. They are things of a very distinct nature, and given for different ends; and it cannot be shown that they are essential parts, or at all parts of each other. A personal qualification may be often wanting, where the authoritative one stands

good. A man may be a heretic, a deist, an apostate, an atheist, and yet be a Christian Priest; and it will be hard to prove that the validity of his Baptism depends any more upon his Baptism, than it does upon his faith or manners. A man may be an instrument of conveying that to another, which he does not enjoy himself; and nothing is more usual than for proxies and representatives to confer rights, privileges, and powers to others, which they have not of their own. A person need not be married to be capable of marrying others, nor be free himself to enable him to make others so: provided he has but a commission (ordinary or extraordinary it matters not) to empower him to do it. And why may not the case be the same with regard to Baptism, that any person commissioned to baptize may do it, whether he himself be baptized or no?''*

Not to dwell too long upon this theme, we cannot refrain from expressing our regret (with due respect at the same time for those who disagree with us) that so many Churchmen suffer themselves to be led away from a principle, which we deem fundamental to the Church's Polity, and sanctioned by the consent of Primitive Antiquity, viz., that the Bishop, as the immediate representative on earth of our Divine High Priest, is the centre

* Works, X. p. 175.

and symbol of the Church's Unity; and that the criterion of *visible unity* is the perpetuity of the Apostolic succession, and not the integrity of Baptism, nor *undeviating* adherence *in all respects* to the "one faith," whether taken separately or conjointly. Some, with the Cyprianists, make every thing turn on the unity of the faith, and regard Orders, Baptisms, and all, as rendered null and void by heretical error.

We have seen already how inconsistently Bingham (for the sake of making the case of ancient heretical and schismatical Baptisms parallel to that of modern Lay-Baptisms) applied this principle to the Anglican Church, because of its temporary participation of the heretical errors of Papal Rome, and virtually annulled the Baptisms, Orders, and Succession in that Church and our own.* Others, with Mr. Kelsall, seem to make the unity of Baptism the criterion of the Church's visible unity, and thus set up a standard which modern laxity and irregularity have made it impossible to fix. The Primitive Church, on the other hand, presents the Bishop as the representative of the "one Lord," as the guardian of the "one faith," as the steward of the "one Baptism;" and thereby makes all other unities dependent on that unit, and holds up the uninterrupted continuity of the Apostolic succes-

* See p. 107.

sion as the criterion and pledge of the Church's unbroken unity.

This is a safe criterion and a sure pledge: this, from the nature of the case, never can be, as it never has been, interrupted. The promise to the Fathers of that sacred line,—“Lo, I am with you always, even unto the end of the world,” is unfailing and infallible. Here only in the system of the Church do we find a visible centre of unity, which is invariable amid all the revolutions and disturbances to which other parts of the system are ever liable; and here only do we find a safe remedy for all irregularities and disorders. Does heresy invade the Church, and tempt men from their “one Lord,” and endanger the “one faith;” that Lord has His representatives to vindicate His authority, that faith its keepers to maintain its purity; Cranmer, and Latimer, and Ridley, and Laud, and others not unknown to fame, all of the Apostolic line, stand forth to purify without consuming, to reform without destroying. And now that the unity of Baptism is in peril, by reason of long continued and almost prescriptive laxity of discipline (if not of doctrine), our help under God is still to be found in the same Holy Brotherhood. Were all the Baptisms in the land null and void, the Bishops of the Apostolic succession have all their transmitted powers unimpaired, and can confer on others both lawful Baptism and the power to give it in their

turn. Nay more, they can prevent by their godly counsel, or (if need be) by wholesome discipline, all future violations of Baptismal unity, and once more require that they, who seek to enter the Fold of Christ, shall come in by that one door which Christ himself has opened.

Could we be persuaded that Baptism is indeed an *essential* qualification for Orders, we would be doubly urgent on prudential grounds that the Church should confine its administration to the clergy of the Church, and refuse to allow of any other Baptisms (even supposing Lay-Baptism valid, if otherwise regular), at least in the case of those who seek to become candidates for Orders. For what guarantee have we, that those who come from the denominations around us have received any Baptism at all; or that the prescribed element and form have been used? The American editor of Wheatley, though he maintains the validity of Lay-Baptism in opposition to that distinguished author, at the same time makes the following admission: "In this country, where the tendency is so strong to undervalue and neglect Baptism, more caution perhaps ought to be used in ascertaining whether water has been used, and whether the words of the Baptismal formulary have been observed. The sect of the Universalists have a practice of dedicating their infants without Baptism, which uninformed persons have mistaken for the Sacrament of ad-

mission into the Christian Church, and it is one of the unhappy effects of the prevalence of the Unitarian or Socinian heresy, that some of its teachers, there is reason to believe, have omitted the form of Baptism prescribed by our Saviour."

This is but a specimen of the beauties of Lay-Baptism! What "caution" can avail against such devices? There is one way of keeping down these countless shoots of heresy and schism; pluck up the root from which they spring; suppress that irregularity which is the parent of all others, the irregularity of the administration; confine all sacerdotal ministrations to sacerdotal men; reject all others as utterly null and void; and then your "caution" in guarding against the wiles of Satan may give place to care in doing your own duty.

4. But it is urged, the immediate consequences of rejecting all Lay-Baptisms as utterly null and void, must prove fatal to the peace and growth of the Church. For, if carried out, it must involve the excommunication of very many, who have long been regarded as members of the Church, including not a few in her ministry. Now, in the first place, this objection would be equally valid against any and every reformation of inveterate abuses whether in Church or State. It utterly condemns Cranmer and all his associates in the Anglican Reformation; and might then have been urged (as indeed it was) by the advocates of the Papal supremacy against

their opponents, with as much propriety as it is now urged in favor of Lay-Baptism, supposing this to be an abuse.

But furthermore, it does not necessarily follow that the reformation of this abuse must prove fatal to the peace and growth of the Church. It is not for us, but for the Bishops of the Church, to determine how this evil shall be abated or removed.— They may see fit to follow the example of the English Bishops in 1575, and discountenance Lay-Baptism by every possible means short of penal prohibitory enactments. And we doubt not that the authority of their judgment against it, duly seconded by the instructions of the parochial clergy, would induce very many who have received Lay-Baptism only, to seek lawful Baptism from its appointed ministers; so that in process of time custom would become law, and it would be deemed just as proper and necessary for lay converts from non-Episcopal communities to receive Baptism on entering the Church, as it now is for ministers who come over from them to receive a true and legal ordination.

Since we deny the *absolute* necessity of Baptism to salvation, and to legal and valid ordination likewise, we are not bound to be hasty or rash in the work of reform. Our anxiety is that the Sacraments should be administered as Christ ordained; and that they who seek them should have the ben-

efit of *true* and *valid* Sacraments ; that the Church should invite her children to enjoy all their privileges as well as to fulfil all their duties ; and not, while permitted to eat “the children’s bread,” to rest content with “the crumbs that fall from their Master’s table.”

CHAPTER IX.

The Argument derived from Consequences against Lay-Baptism. Sundry other Arguments briefly discussed.

IN the foregoing Chapter it was attempted to set aside certain objections grounded upon the consequences, which some suppose must needs attend the rejection of Lay-Baptisms as null and void. As we lay little stress upon such arguments either way, two or three objections of similar kind, which make against Lay-Baptism, shall be very briefly noticed.

1. *The principle that Lay-Baptism is valid, tends to dissolve the unity of the Church*; and that too, whether such Lay-Baptism be wholly unauthorized, or authorized by the Bishop *ex post facto*. We have already seen, that the Bishop is the centre of unity, and that the continuity of the Apostolic succession is the pledge and criterion of visible unity; so that where there is no Bishop, nor Apostolic succession, there can be no visible unity, or principle of visible unity. But if Lay-Baptism be valid, then there is (not *the* principle, but) *a* principle of such unity where there is no Bishop; for then are all those, who have been laically baptized, members of the Church, since they need not Baptism to enter it (unless there be some other door of entrance, *e. g.*, Confirmation,

or Communion) ; then are all the non-Episcopal congregations around us congregations of the Church, members of the one Body, of which Christ is the Head, although they have severed all connection between themselves and the sole visible Representatives of Christ on earth, and have thereby practically denied and openly violated *the* principle of visible unity, viz., communion and connection with the one appointed symbol and unchangeable centre of all visible unity.

Take a parallel case: Lay-administration of circumcision we allow was valid. Now suppose a company of heathens had obtained a copy or copies of the Law of Moses, and had organized themselves into a Church, and administered circumcision at the appointed time, and so on ; but still had no communion or connection with the High Priest, who was to the Jews what the Bishop is to Christians,* the Representative of Christ, and the symbol of visible unity ; would such circumcised men have been recognized as members of the Church of God ? Assuredly not. Or to make the case more favorable to our opponents ; had a portion of the Jews forsaken the communion of the High Priest, and the Altar at Jerusalem, and organized themselves

* For proof of this position, and for a clear exhibition of the principle of visible unity in the Church, see Dodwell's "Discourse concerning the One Altar, and the One Priesthood," *passim*.

separately, with (so called) Priests of their own, and maintained circumcision together with other Jewish rites, would those whom they circumcised have been looked upon as Members of the Church of God, by virtue of such circumcision? If so, then were the Samaritans members of the Church, which no one will dare to pretend. Such circumcision would have been merely a cutting of the flesh, and not the valid ministration of an appointed rite, just as Lay-Baptism is merely a washing of the body. Nor can this argument be turned against us by saying that, since such proselytes, if they sought access to the Communion of the High Priest, could not be circumcised again, their previous *illegal* circumcision would have been received as *valid*; *because this is plainly contradicted by fact.* “When the Jews admitted a proselyte of another nation, if he had received Circumcision (*Concision*) they were satisfied with drawing some drops of blood from the part usually circumcised, which blood was called ‘the blood of the Covenant.’”^{*} Seeing that the previous “concision” had made an exact compliance with the outward form impossible, they obeyed at least the spirit of the law, and *sealed* “the Covenant” with “blood,” which by this very act, and by the name (“blood of the covenant”) which they gave to the blood extracted, they declared had

* Calmet, *Art.* “Circumcision.”

not been done before, the outward form to the contrary notwithstanding.

This objection to the doctrine of the *validity* of Lay-Baptism derived from its tendency to dissolve the unity of the Church, cannot be met by the assertion that such Baptisms, although in themselves no Baptisms, become such when authorized *ex post facto* by the Bishop, and that the validity of (authorized) Lay-Baptism is thus made to consist with the principle of visible unity; for, as we have already shown, the Bishop can only in one way authorize any Baptism, viz., by ordaining men to administer it sacerdotally and lawfully.*

2. Our second objection, drawn from consequences, to the doctrine of the validity of Lay-Baptism, is that *the principles which support it tend to subvert the Priesthood*, and would therefore, if carried out universally, prove fatal not only to the unity, but to the very being, of the Church. We have already shown that the principles and reasons alleged in favor of Lay-Baptism, are equally conclusive in favor of Lay-ordination, Lay-consecration of the Eucharist, Lay-absolution, &c.† Now if all these are to be sanctioned, whenever there exists a supposed necessity for lay-administration of them, it is plain that the spirit of Korah, which is rife enough in these days of innate *rights*

* See p. 76.

† See p. 80.

(if not *ideas*), would soon overbear all order, and supplant wholly the lawful Priesthood of Christ's institution. That this would be fatal not only to the unity, but to the very being of the Church, is certain on St. Jerome's rule (the rule of Scripture and antiquity)—“that is no Church, which has no Priests.”*

And even where this tendency is held in check and prevented from working its natural results, these lax principles do nevertheless exercise a malign influence upon the just authority and the usefulness of the Clergy; and retard the spiritual growth of the Laity, by lowering in their estimation the value of the Sacraments as means of grace, and thereby hindering them from the reception of them with that unquestioning faith and cheerful obedience, which are the conditions of God's promised blessing. And indeed all the ordinances of Christ are deprived of due reverence by this same cause, and are rendered comparatively inefficacious by reason of their unworthy treatment.

3. Our third objection, derived from consequences, to the principle that Lay-Baptism is valid, is that *it encourages and perpetuates dissent*. For if we allow the Baptisms of Dissenters to be valid, although they will not like our rejection of their Or-

* “Nulla est Ecclesia, quae non habet sacerdotes.”—*Hieron. adv. Lucif.*

ders, they will notwithstanding feel satisfied that (ourselves being the judges), they are not so ill off, as we would fain persuade them, while they remain estranged from the Communion of the Church. For they have logic enough to apply the principles on which some rest the validity of their Baptisms, to their Orders, &c. ; and will naturally enough conclude that our denial of validity to these is sheer inconsistency, arising out of prejudice or bigotry. And if we undertake to tell them that the validity of their Baptisms turns upon this, whether they are *ex post facto* ratified by the Bishop, we shall only confirm them (and in this particular with reason) in their otherwise unreasonable prejudice against that sacred Order, as being arbitrary despots, lording it over the very Sacraments of Christ. Satisfied by our admission on this point, that all their ordinances are at the least valid, that they are formally members of the Church on earth, in the enjoyment of valid preaching, sacraments, and ordinances, they will care less to examine whether they might not be in some respects better off elsewhere ; mere *vis inertiae* will keep them where they are.

If, on the other hand, with candor and kindness too, we carry out our principles to their just conclusions, and tell them that we cannot regard their Baptisms as valid, or themselves as formally members of the Church of God, we present to them a

motive strong enough to induce them to examine the foundations on which they have built. And even if our well meant warning or entreaty go unheard or unheeded, having spoken the whole truth we have done our duty.

4. A fourth objection, that *the allowance of Lay-Baptism makes it impossible in very many cases to ascertain the fact of Baptism*, has been sufficiently set forth in the preceding Chapter.

There are sundry miscellaneous arguments urged in favor of the validity of Lay-Baptism, which are perhaps entitled to notice in passing.

1. The maxim, *quod non debuit fieri, factum valet*, "what ought not to have been done, is valid when done,"—is very often applied to justify Lay-Baptism. We have already attempted to show that it is wholly inapplicable, since it begins by taking for granted what it ought to prove.*

2. The second argument proceeds upon an arbitrary distinction between the "*substance*" of a Sacrament, and its *circumstantial appendages*, the former being insisted on as essential to its very *being*, the latter being regarded as affecting its *well being* only. Hooker says: "In writing and speaking of the blessed Sacraments we use for the most part under the name of their substance not only to comprise that whereof they outwardly and sensibly

* See Chapter III. p. 28.

consist, but also the secret grace which they signify and exhibit. * * To complete the outward substance of a Sacrament, there is required an outward form, which form Sacramental elements receive from Sacramental words. Hereupon it groweth, that many times there are three things said to make up the substance of a Sacrament, namely, the grace which is thereby offered, the element which shadoweth or signifieth grace, and the word which expresseth what is done by the element. So that whether we consider the outward by itself alone, or both the outward and inward substance of any Sacrament; there are in the one respect but two essential parts, and in the other but three that concur to give Sacraments their full being.”*

Now with all due respect for the illustrious author just quoted, we cannot but think that there is a false assumption in this definition of the “substance” or “essential” parts, of a Sacrament, by which he seeks to class the *Minister* among *circumstantials*, or *non-essentials*. Granting that the “outward form” of a Sacrament consists of “but two essential parts,” viz., “Sacramental elements” and “Sacramental words;” it is surely not impertinent to inquire, what constitutes Water in Baptism, or Bread and Wine in the Eucharist, “*Sacramental elements?*” Are they such by nature? Is all

* Ecclesiastical Polity, V. 58.

bread, all wine, all water, "*Sacramental*?" If not, what makes any given portion of the one or the other "*Sacramental*?" Is it the intention of the receiver? If so, a man may make his daily bread "*Sacramental*." Or is it the "blessing" of Christ's authorized representative, and the invocation of the Holy Ghost by one, who is the proxy on earth of Him, from whom with the Father that Blessed Spirit doth proceed? If so, then a lawful Minister, if not of "the outward substance" of the Sacrament, is at the least an *essential* instrument in bringing that "outward substance" into being, since no "*Sacramental* element" can exist without his mediation. We might proceed to show that the other "essential part" of the "outward substance" is equally dependent for its "*Sacramental*" character upon *Sacerdotal* agency; but we deem it unnecessary.

We close this topic with another view of it in the words of Mr. Lawrence: "The Baptism, which He" (Christ) "appointed, is certainly to be known only by the law which He has made concerning it, and this law is in His Commission to His Apostles, where it is plain, that Christ's Baptism has three essential parts in its ministration; the *authorized Baptizer* in the Apostolic succession; the matter, *water*; and the *form in the name of the Trinity*. These essentials are all merely positive, nothing moral: they were all instituted by one authority,

and all together at the same time ; not one or two of them separate from another ; and they are all of equal duration, and consequently of the same necessity and obligation ; so that if one of them be wanting, the remainder cannot be the instituted Baptism, because it was not appointed separate from that other part which is wanting. For example ; a Priest baptizing only with water, without the form, does not administer Christ's instituted Baptism, because Christ did not appoint Baptism without, but with the form. Again ; a Priest baptizing with water, and another form of words, instead of the instituted form, does not administer Christ's Baptism, because Christ never instituted Baptism with such a form. And lastly, Baptism, with pronouncing the form of words in the name of the Trinity, when done by a person who is not one of those whom Christ promised to be with *Baptizing*, is none of Christ's instituted Baptism ; for He never appointed any Baptism in the name of the Trinity, to be done by one whom He did not promise to concur with ; that is, he never instituted unauthorized Lay-Baptism. And therefore His instituted Baptism, which is the supernatural means of supernatural graces and benefits, is only that which must be administered in the name of the Trinity by one bearing the Apostolic Commission."*

* Sacerdotal Powers, c. V. p. 108.

3. Some have argued that the custom in the Primitive Church of sending the Eucharistic elements home to the sick by any convenient messenger, justifies lay-administration of Baptism. It is enough to say that the *consecration* of the Elements, not the *delivery* of them, requires and involves Priestly agency. In Baptism, on the other hand, the *application* of the consecrated Element is also a Priestly act, inasmuch as the recipient is thereby consecrated to God, and the Covenant visibly sealed.

4. It has been held at divers times by many, and is still held by some, that of all the requisite qualifications for lawful ministration in holy things, *personal holiness* is the most essential; and that any true Christian may therefore *validly* administer Baptism, seeing that his character sanctifies the act. As the Church has definitively ruled this point, we shall not discuss it here; but refer our readers to the 26th Article, whose title runs thus, —“*Of the unworthiness of the Ministers, which hinders not the effect of the Sacraments.*”

CHAPTER X.

The Erroneous Notions of certain Fathers shown to be the Source of Lay-Baptism. It progressed PARI PASSU with Error and Corruption, until it was established by Papal Sanction.

WE have seen already that the earliest of the Fathers, who notices or recognizes Lay-Baptism in any way whatever, is Tertullian; and that he holds it forth, not practically as a *fact*, or existing custom of the Church, but theoretically, as a logical consequence of his own private conceit of the inherent Priesthood of every Christian. And this vain notion of an honest but wild enthusiast, if not fanatic, is historically the *original source* of Lay-Baptism, and of all the evils and irregularities connected with it.

I do not mean to assert that either Tertullian alone, or the notion referred to alone, can be regarded as the sole cause and ground of the ultimate recognition and allowance of the validity of Lay-Baptism in cases of necessity. Other agents and other principles had doubtless a much larger share of influence in compassing this end. For Tertullian's acknowledged singularity and want of judgment would have prevented the adoption of a practice upon his mere opinion or authority, not-

withstanding his ability, learning, and popularity as a writer. And the absurdity of the principle on which he rested that opinion, or at least its want of Scriptural and Apostolic sanction, would have hindered its growth, until it had at length perished through oblivion.

It is true that this selfsame principle of the inherent Priesthood was afterwards recognized by other Fathers, whose judgment was in general more sound than Tertullian's. Thus St. Jerome speaks of a *sacerdotium laici*, or lay Priesthood; by which however he may have meant no more than is meant in holy Scripture, where all Christians are called relatively to unbelievers, "a holy Priesthood, to offer up spiritual sacrifices, acceptable to God by Jesus Christ;" and again, "a chosen generation, a royal Priesthood, a holy nation, a peculiar people."* But Tertullian's principle certainly did reappear in another shape, when Lay-Baptism was afterwards justified on the ground (taken both by Optatus and St. Jerome) *ut accipit quis, ita et dare potest*, "what a man has received, that he can give." For this amounts to saying that Baptism gives a man the power of Baptizing, i. e., makes him so far a Priest.

This principle, however, carried with it little weight, and probably never would have procured

* 1 Peter 2: 5, 9.

general toleration, much less formal sanction, for Lay-Baptism, even in case of extreme necessity, at any period of the Church's history. Another principle, far more plausibly supported both by Scripture and Antiquity, and (wherever and whenever received) sure to exercise a controlling influence, was the chief instrument in giving to this doctrine an onward motion, which has carried it forward to the present time by force of that early impetus, long after the moving power was itself withdrawn. The principle, to which I refer, is *the absolute necessity of Baptism to salvation.*

That this was not Primitive Catholic doctrine we have elsewhere shown.* That it is not the doctrine of the Anglican and American Churches is sufficiently shown by their determination that the Sacraments are "*generally*" (not *absolutely* and *always*) "necessary to salvation."†

On the other hand we have abundant proof that the dogma of the *absolute* necessity of Baptism to salvation and that of the validity of Lay-Baptism are intimately and historically connected, so that we are warranted in regarding their relation as that of cause and effect. The admission of the learned Dr. Cave, himself an advocate of the validity of Lay-Baptism, is directly to the point. Speaking of the validity of Lay-Baptism, in connection with

* See Chapter VIII. p. 118.

† See the Catechism.

Tertullian and its later advocates, he says : “ This (Lay-Baptism), without question, arose from an opinion they had of the absolute indispensable *necessity* of Baptism, without which they scarce thought a man’s future condition could be safe ; and that therefore it was better it should be had from any, than to depart this life without it ; for, excepting the case of *Martyrs* (whom they thought sufficiently qualified for heaven, by being *baptized* in their own *blood*—insisting upon a two-fold Baptism, one of *Water* in time of peace, another of *Blood* in time of persecution, answerable to the *Water* and *Blood* that flowed out of our Saviour’s side—excepting these), they reckoned no man could be saved without being baptized, and cared not much in cases of necessity, so they had it, how they came by it.”*

It may be worth observing that this doctrine of Baptism in their own blood, being in the case of martyrs an equivalent substitute for regular Baptism in water, is traced by Bingham† to Tertullian and his contemporary Origen, both equally rich in singular conceits. From them it was borrowed by subsequent Fathers, who sought to reconcile the salvation of such catechumens as had been deprived by necessity of desired Baptism, and had proved

* Primitive Christianity, p. 191, 7th ed. London.

† See “ Antiquities,” X. 11, 20.

their faith by martyrdom, with the extreme dogma of the *absolute necessity* of Baptism to future happiness. That doctrine, however, was never recognized by the Church. The Primitive and Catholic doctrine may be fairly stated in Bingham's words (applied by him to the judgment of a particular Father), that "*faith and repentance, joined with a desire of Baptism, were sufficient to save a man in the article of necessity, when there was otherwise no opportunity to receive it.*"*

Had St. Austin, "that hard Father," whose better nature prompted at times admissions like the foregoing, always taught consistently therewith, Lay-Baptism would probably never have been formally sanctioned in the Western Church. In the earlier part of his career he was disposed to greater leniency in judging of the condition of those, who lost Baptism through invincible necessity. But in the progress of his controversy with the Pelagians, as he matured his system, he locked the door of heaven against all the unbaptized of every class and condition, except "the believer among the worshippers of the true God before the time of Christ, and likewise the unbaptized martyrs."†

* Antiquities, X. 11, 21.

† Wiggers' "Historical Presentation of Augustinism and Pelagianism," translated by Prof. Emerson; c. 5, wherein "the Pelagian doctrine on Baptism," and "Augustine's doctrine" on the same are contrasted.

Bingham, after stating that some of the later Greek Fathers, who “spoke the most favorably of” the case of infants dying unbaptized, “would only venture to assign them a middle state, neither in heaven nor hell,” further states that “this opinion of a middle state never found any acceptance among the Latins. For they make but two places to receive men after the day of judgment, heaven and hell, and concluded, that since children, for want of washing away original sin, could not be admitted into heaven, they must of necessity be in hell, there being no third place between them. St. Austin frequently insists upon this against the Pelagians, who distinguish between the kingdom of God and eternal life, asserting, ‘that children dying unbaptized, might be admitted to eternal life and salvation, though not to the kingdom of God;’ whom he opposes after this manner in his books about the Merits and Remission of Sin; ‘though,’ he says, ‘the condemnation of those shall be greater, who to original sin add actual sins of their own, and every man’s condemnation so much the greater, by how much greater sin he commits; yet original sin does not only separate from the kingdom of God, whither children, dying without the grace of Christ, cannot enter, as the Pelagians themselves confess; but also it excludes them from eternal life and salvation, which can be no other than the king-

dom of God, into which our communion with Christ alone can introduce us,'” &c.*

It deserves to be noted that Tertullian, the Father of Lay-Baptism, in one of the two passages in which he sanctions it distinctly recognizes the *absolute* necessity of Baptism to salvation, and connects this recognition with the allowance of lay-baptizing in case of necessity in such a way as to show that they were inseparably associated in his own mind. After saying that “it ought to suffice them (laymen) to use this power (of baptizing) in necessities,” he declares that “in this case (of necessity) he would be guilty of a man’s destruction, that omitted to do what he lawfully might.”† Here it is more than implied that loss of Baptism involves “destruction” or final perdition; and it is obvious that this consideration is urged as justifying the practice of Lay-Baptism in cases of necessity. And in like manner we think it could be shown, did our limits allow, that all the advocates of Lay-Baptism proceeded upon the same hypothesis, until at last St. Austin, Aristotle’s more than rival in the Empire of Mind, riveted firmly upon the Western Church both the doctrine of the absolute necessity of Baptism to salvation, and the validity of Lay-Baptism, where no other Baptism could be had.

* Antiquities, X. 2, 24.

† See the whole passage on p. 38.

And indeed, when we consider the awful and unbending rigor of St. Austin's doctrine, especially as regards infants, who must often lose Baptism, if Lay-Baptism had been wholly forbidden; we cannot wonder that even his lion heart quailed before the frightful consequences of his unsparing principles, and that he chose to sanction a deviation from the doctrine and discipline of the Church Catholic, or even from Christ's own law and institution, rather than to consign to irremediable and inevitable wo so many innocent and helpless victims. And if, when called upon to choose between the consigning unbaptized infants and believers to eternal death only for their want of the "washing of regeneration," and the relaxing the rule in regard to the lawful administrator, St. Austin deemed the latter the less and preferable evil; it is no wonder that minds less deeply imbued with the love of order, and more prone by nature to tenderness and pity, gladly ratified his choice and followed his authority.

I do not mean to affirm that the absolute necessity of Baptism was the only principle, besides that of Tertullian already noticed, which contributed to the more general allowance and finally to the authoritative sanction of Lay-Baptism in the Western Church. Other principles had some share in bringing about this issue. It is plain, for instance, that the Council of Eliberis was partly influenced by the

notion (which prevailed more or less throughout the West from the time of the Cyprianic controversy) that merely personal qualifications in the Minister affect the validity of his ministrations ; so that the want of personal fitness, on the one hand, vitiates a lawful commission, while, on the other hand, the possession of personal fitness is no bad substitute for such commission.* It is obvious too that St. Austin himself was tempted, in his controversy with the Donatists, to assert the validity of Lay-Baptism, in order to prove that, even admitting the charges of the Donatists against the Orders of the Catholics, their Baptisms need not be repeated.† Still, these considerations were all, I think, subordinate to the one before insisted upon, viz., the absolute necessity of Baptism to salvation.

We have already ascribed to St. Austin, the double honor of establishing in the West the two-fold error of the absolute necessity of Baptism, and of the consequent validity of Lay-Baptism, where no better can be had. None, who are tolerably versed in the history of the Church, will think that we have exaggerated his influence, or ascribed too much to his agency, in this matter. Be this, however, as it may, it is historically certain that from his time onward, both the dogmas in question became more and more prevalent in the West ; until,

* See for evidence of this, p. 46, ss.

† See p. 59.

at length, Baptism administered by women “was expressly confirmed by a decree of Pope Urban the Second, in the latter end of the eleventh century;”^{*} and finally this rubric or direction was introduced by the Church of Rome into her Ritual of Baptism; “that though the ordinary Minister of Baptism be only a Priest or a Deacon, yet, in case of necessity, it may be done not only by a layman or woman, that is a Catholic, but by a Jew, a Pagan, or an infidel.”[†]

This Bingham styles “one of the novelties of Popery.” Surely not more “one of the novelties of Popery,” than Baptism by Catholic laymen is “one of the novelties” of Tertullian, Jerome, and Augustine. To give the Pope his due, I would rather call it one of the *consistencies* of Popery; for it might be shown with little difficulty that it is the logical result of the principles upon which Lay-Baptism is for the most part founded. But at all events, one fact is demonstrably certain; that *Papal Rome* matured, legalized, and established the principle and practice of Lay-Baptism; and that if any sort of Catholicity can be claimed for it, it is that sort only which may be fairly claimed for Purgatory, Transubstantiation, Indulgences, &c., viz., *Papal* or *Roman* Catholicity, which is no Catholicity at all.

* Potter on Church Government, p. 235.

† Bingham, Schol. Hist. c. I. § 24. See Note (S) for proof that the Church of Rome holds the absolute necessity of Baptism in connection with the validity of Lay-Baptism.

And if to Rome belongs the honor of developing and maturing the germ of Lay-Baptism, received from the hands of St. Augustine; to Rome likewise must we ascribe the merit of propagating it, and particularly of giving it root in English soil, whence it has been transplanted to this Western land. At the period of the Anglican Reformation, so wide was its prevalence and so sturdy its growth (thanks to the fostering care of Papal patronage and the congenial nourishment of ecclesiastical corruption), that not even when Primitive order had been in some measure restored and Primitive purity in a good degree revived, did the Anglican Bishops deem it wise to venture further towards its extinction, than to withdraw from it the legal sanction, by help of which it thrived. So that it survived, nay, still survives the other Papal corruptions with which it had grown up, and which were long ago plucked up by the roots and cast out to wither and die.

We are thus express and explicit in declaring, what is surely manifest, that Lay-Baptism is a remnant of Popery, not to insinuate that its advocates among us are Papists in disguise, but to anticipate and bar the charge if attempted to be made against ourselves. It is now (as it seems to have been when Lawrence wrote) the fashion with certain theologues to brand every doctrine, that suits them not, as *Popish*; and when argument fails them, and

they have reached after a short stage their wit's end, to drown their adversary's voice, and silence his reasoning, by raising against him the clamorous cry of "*Papist.*" Lest any should seek to try this sort of tactics in the present case, we quote the following passage from Mr. Lawrence's conclusive reply to the charge, that in opposing Lay-Baptism he had made a step towards Rome.

"This is strange even to a wonder and an astonishment; every body that can tell what corrupt Popery is, knows that the notion of Lay-Baptism's being valid, is one of the particular tenets of the Church of Rome. And how the denying of any validity in such Baptisms, is making a step towards (when it is directly contrary to) Popery, is inconceivable. But some people may find a way to make this Popery, by a new maxim, which our forefathers were ignorant of, and that is this; *every thing that is destructive of Heresy, Schism, Fanaticism, Libertinism, Deism and Atheism, is Popery.* This is some of the new light that is hung out to us in these days of darkness! By this we are enabled to discover secrets which before lay hid; and to free ourselves from that dismal slavery and bondage, wherein the Priests held us, while we were destitute of this all-discovering light! By this, Socinians determine the doctrine of the Trinity to be Popery; Schismatics, that the necessity of constant communion with the Church is Popery; Fa-

natics, that all decency and order, and proper ceremonies in divine worship, are Popery ; Libertines, that all restraining of our fleshly lusts, all obedience and submission to spiritual superiors, are Popery ; Deists, that all revealed religion is an invention of Popery ; and Atheists, that the being of a God, and his providence, are Popery. Every one of these calls what he dislikes, Popery ; and by this means, works so far upon the imaginations of simple people as to make them dislike and hate it too, because it is Popery ! For you must know, that Popery was once so dreadfully mischievous to us, that ever since, if the name of Popery be but given to the best of things, 'tis an effectual way to make some who know nothing of the matter, abhor and loathe, what 'tis their duty to love, reverence and esteem."*

So much for the cry of "Popery." There is, however, a newly imported substitute for that antiquated makeshift of nonplussed reasoners, which is likely to supersede its forerunner in frequency of use, if not in efficacy : I mean the charge of "Oxfordism," which is applied with as little discrimination, and with far greater absurdity, than the old and stale imputation of "Popery." Substitute "Oxfordism" in the above passage for "Popery," and it now holds good : indeed the terms are by some held to be synonymous.

* "Sacerdotal Powers," c. 5, p. 125.

Now in brief we utterly disown Oxford-*ism*, and every other *ism* (except *Catholicism*) ; that is, every thing in the doctrine and discipline of any and every party, which is *peculiar to it alone*. While, on the other hand, we refuse to abate one jot or tittle of fixed and eternal truths, because, forsooth, certain fallible individuals or parties hold (if so it be) those Catholic truths in combination with private errors ; or because (a more frequent case perhaps) they are falsely represented as holding them in such connexion by prejudiced or incompetent witnesses. Our principles are as old again as even ancient and venerable Oxford herself ; and, if Oxford have, in any particular of doctrine or discipline, swerved (as some allege) from “the old paths” (a question foreign to our inquiry), it is our right and privilege, as catholic churchmen, to appeal from her (as in the present case we do from some among ourselves) to that common tribunal, recognized by the Anglican Church no less than by our own, the Word of God, interpreted by Apostolic and Catholic Antiquity.

CHAPTER XI.

The early Anglican Reformers retained the Papal Doctrine, both as to the absolute necessity of Baptism, and the validity of Lay-Baptism. The Anglican Church gradually returned to the Primitive Doctrine in both respects, and conformed thereto her authorized Standards and Formularies.

WE have seen that the Church of Rome, under Papal auspices, attempted by her absolute and infallible authority to convert into Catholic doctrines the private opinions of St. Augustine, and certain other Fathers, respecting the absolute necessity of Baptism to salvation and the validity of Lay-Baptism. It was not to be expected that Cranmer and his associates, however faithful in the study of the Holy Scripture by the light of Primitive Antiquity, should presently rid themselves of each and all of the many errors and corruptions, which ages of submissive ignorance on the one hand, and of active and intriguing despotism on the other, had sanctioned and sanctified. It is rather a miracle that they did so nearly purge and cleanse the channel of truth from all its accumulated impurities, and permit the pure stream to flow down from the fountain almost wholly free from pollution by the admixture of foreign and incongruous elements.

When we allow then that the early Anglican Reformers in this one matter of Lay-Baptism still retained a portion of Papal error, we do but acknowledge that they were neither Popes, nor Angels, but fallible men, albeit in most things "heaven-directed" for the Church's good.

Nothing can be more certain than that the two dogmas of the absolute necessity of Baptism and of the validity of Lay-Baptism, which were contemporary in their origin, progress an destablishment, continued after the Reformation to exist together by the allowance of the first Reformers, until they gradually declined and finally died together. "In the formularies of faith put forth during the reign of Henry VIII., the Church of England retained the same belief as the Church of Rome respecting the absolute necessity of Baptism to salvation, though in somewhat modified terms, in the 'Necessary Doctrine and Erudition for any Christian Man.'—Nor did she *positively* express her dissent from it, until the Hampton Court Conference in 1604. The practice of Lay-Baptism, which seems to have arisen out of this belief, was also, till then, sanctioned by the rubric prefixed to the service for administering private Baptism. But at the revision of the book of Common Prayer which then took place, this rubric was altered, and from that period the custom of Lay-Baptism has been disallowed by the Church of England. Coeval with this change in

the rubric was the addition to the Church Catechism of that part relating to the Sacraments, in which the Church of England, for the first time, asserts that Baptism is only *generally*, not absolutely, *necessary to salvation*; or, as she expresses it in the Baptismal service for those of riper years, which was added to the Prayer-book after the Conference in 1661, 'Ye perceive the great necessity of this Sacrament, *where it may be had.*'"* For documentary evidence that Cranmer and his associates held with Rome that Baptism is *absolutely* necessary, the reader is referred to the publication from which the foregoing extract is made. Our limits require that we confine ourselves to an historical examination of the several changes in the Baptismal services respecting the administrator of Baptism.

The Baptismal Formularies, which we have to examine, are those of the First and Second Service-books of Edward VI., the Common Prayer-book of 1604, and that of 1661. The First Service-book of Edward VI. was adopted by Convocation, sanctioned by Parliament, and published A. D. 1549. Toward the close of A. D. 1550, Cranmer and the Bishops undertook a revision of this book, which

* "The order of Baptism, both public and private, according to the use of the United Church of England and Ireland, illustrated, &c.," by the Rev. T. M. Fallow, A. M. (Introd. p. 30.) London, 1838.

resulted in the adoption and publication of the Second Service-book, A. D. 1552.* No change was made under Elizabeth in regard to the provisions respecting the administrator of Baptism.

On the accession of James I., the Puritans sought and obtained from him a conference between several leading dignitaries of the Church, and a committee of their own theologians, the King himself acting as umpire, for the adjustment of sundry differences. This conference was held at Hampton Court Palace, A. D. 1604, and resulted in several alterations of the Liturgy, one of which (as shall presently appear) concerns our inquiry.†

After the Restoration, Charles II., in the hope of satisfying the Presbyterians, appointed a commission of Divines, selected equally from the two contending parties, to revise the book of Common Prayer. This is known, from its place of meeting, as the Savoy Conference, and was held A. D. 1661. Although nothing was done by the Conference itself, the Convocation, which was sitting at the time, reported to Parliament various proposed alterations in the Liturgy (the Baptismal Service in-

* See "The Two Books of Common Prayer, set forth by authority of Parliament in the reign of King Edward VI., compared with each other, and edited by Edward Cardwell, D. D." (Preface.)

† See Dr. Cardwell's "History of Conferenees," c. 3, and Fallow's "Order of Baptism," p. 162.

cluded), which were formally sanctioned and published.* The attempt to revise the Liturgy in the reign of William and Mary, proved abortive, so that it has remained unchanged since the revision of 1661.

All the various editions and revisions of the Liturgy agree in confining *public* ministration of Baptism to the Priest or lawful Minister. In regard to "*them that be baptized in private houses in time of necessity,*" both the Prayer-books of Edward VI. appoint as follows :

"The pastors and curates shall oft admonish the people, that they defer not the Baptism of infants any longer than the Sunday, or other holy day next after the child be born, unless upon a great and reasonable cause declared to the Curate and by him approved."

"And also, they shall warn them that without great cause and necessity, they baptize not children at home in their houses. And when great need shall compel them so to do, that then they minister it on this fashion. 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 these words,—N, I baptize thee," &c.

* Consult "History of Conferences," c. 6., and Fallow, p. 177.

“And let them not doubt, but the child so baptized is lawfully and sufficiently baptized, and ought not to be baptized again in the Church. But yet, nevertheless, if the child which is after this sort baptized, do afterwards live, it is expedient that he be brought into the Church, to the intent the Priest may examine and try whether the child be lawfully baptized or no.”*

Then follow the questions which the Priest was in such case to put to the child, and which relate to the *element* and *form* only. It is plain therefore that both the liturgies of King Edward legalized Lay-Baptism in case of necessity, following herein the Roman custom. And this state of things continued until the reign of James I.

In the first day's conference at Hampton Court, to which the Puritan divines were not admitted, the King “required satisfaction” of the Bishops about several points of doctrine and discipline.—Under the head of the Book of Common Prayer, the third point (according to Barlow) was “private Baptism; if private for place, his majesty thought it agreed with the use of the Primitive Church; if for persons, that any but a lawful minister might baptize anywhere, he utterly disliked; and in that point his highness grew somewhat earnest against the baptizing by women and laics.”

* See Fallow, p. 224, and Cardwell, “The two Books of Common Prayer,” &c. p. 337.

After replying to certain other difficulties and doubts suggested by the King, the "Archbishop proceeded to speak of private Baptism, showing his majesty that the administration of Baptism by women and lay-persons was not allowed in the practice of the Church, but inquired of by Bishops in their visitation and censured ; neither do the words in the book infer any such meaning. Whereunto the King excepted, urging and pressing the words of the book, that they could not but intend a permission, and suffering of women and private persons to baptize. Here the Bishop of Worcester said that the words were doubtful, and might be pressed to that meaning, but yet it seemed by the contrary practice of our Church (censuring women in this case) that the compilers of the book did not so intend them, and yet propounded them ambiguously, because otherwise, perhaps, the book would not then have passed in the Parliament (and for this conjecture, as I remember, he cited the testimony of my Lord Archbishop of York) : whereunto the Bishop of London replied, that those learned and reverend men, who framed the book of Common Prayer, intended not by ambiguous terms to deceive any, but did, indeed, by those words intend a permission of private persons to baptize in case of necessity, whereof their letters were witnesses." * * *

"The issue was a consultation, whether into the

rubric of private Baptism, which leaves it indifferently to all laics or clergy, the words, Curate or lawful Minister, might not be inserted, which was not so much stuck at by the Bishops.”*

Accordingly, the rubric of King Edward’s book for Private Baptism, was so modified, as to read thus: “And also they shall warn them that, without great cause and necessity, they *procure not their children to be baptized* at home in their houses. And when great need shall compel them so to do, that then *Baptism shall be administered* on this fashion; first let *the lawful minister and* them that be present call upon God for his grace and say the Lord’s prayer, if 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,*” &c.†

We think it fair to conclude from the foregoing account of the Liturgies of Edward VI. and James I.,

1. That the earliest reformers retained the Romish doctrine respecting the absolute necessity of Baptism, and the validity of Lay-Baptism in case of necessity, which they accordingly allowed.

* See “The Sum and Substance of the Conference, &c. at Hampton Court,” by Dr. Barlow, in Cardwell’s “History of Conferences,” p. 167, ss.

† Fallow’s “Order of Baptism,” &c. p. 225. The Italics above denote the additions to the rubric of Edward, which may be seen on p. 162.

2. That gradually, as the notion of the absolute necessity of Baptism gave way, an aversion to Lay-Baptism arose, so that prior to the Hampton Court Conference, the Bishops discountenanced and prohibited it as far as in them lay, without resorting to forcible measures.

3. That at the said Conference a diversity of opinion existed touching the question, whether Lay-Baptism was allowed even by Edward's rubric; and that the Bishops (without deciding upon the validity of Lay-Baptism if done without sanction) acquiesced in the king's determination, that the Minister, "though he be not of the essence of the Sacrament, yet is he of the essence of the right and lawful ministry of the Sacrament," and accordingly formally disallowed Lay-Baptism altogether.

The rubric respecting private Baptism in the Liturgy of 1661, differs from that of 1604 chiefly in this particular; instead of saying, "let the lawful Minister and them that be present call upon God," &c., it enjoins, "let *the Minister of the parish, or, in his absence, any other lawful Minister that can be procured,* with them that are present, call upon God," &c. It substantially agrees with the former; but is still more explicit, restricting Baptism, even in case of necessity, to the "Minister of the parish," and in case of his absence, prescribing as the *only* substitute, "any other *lawful* Minister:" by which all pretence of the allowance or tolerance of Lay-

Baptism is effectually barred, since it is plain from the Preface to the Ordinal, that no man is regarded as a "lawful Minister" by the Church, unless he has received Episcopal Ordination.

It is sometimes objected to the foregoing interpretation of the rubrics respecting Private Baptism in the Liturgies of 1604 and 1661, that the portion of them which provides for *conditional* Baptism, in case the Minister of the parish have doubts respecting the regularity and completeness of any Baptism, is adverse to our view of the exclusive allowance of *legal* Baptism under them.

After providing for and sanctioning private Baptism by a lawful Minister in case of necessity, the rubric proceeds: "If the child which is baptized after this sort do afterward live, it is expedient that it be brought into the church, to the intent that, if the Minister of the same parish did himself baptize that child, the congregation may be certified of the true form of Baptism by him privately before used."

* * * "But if the child were baptized by *any other lawful Minister*, the Minister of the parish where the child was born or christened shall examine and try whether the child be lawfully baptized or no."

* * * "And if the Minister shall find by the answers of such as bring the child, that all things were done as they ought to be ; then shall not he christen the child again, but shall receive him as one of the flock of true Christian people, saying," &c. * * *

“But if they which bring the infant to the church do make such uncertain answers to the Priest’s questions, as that it cannot appear that the child was baptized with water, in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost (which are essential parts of Baptism), then let the Priest baptize it in the form before appointed for Public Baptism of Infants; saving that at the dipping of the child in the font, he shall use this form of words,—If thou art not already baptized, I baptize thee,” &c.*

Now the words upon which great stress is laid, as though they implied the sufficiency of Lay-Baptism, are those in the last paragraph which follow the mention of the element and form, viz., “*which are essential parts of Baptism* ;” as though the rubric, in declaring the element and form “essential,” did pronounce the Minister *un*-essential. This is about as fair logic as the following; a *body* and a *soul* are “essential parts” of man; therefore a *spirit* is not an essential part of man.

Is it not plain that, to make good our opponents’ plea, the definite article is needed before “essential?” Had the rubric declared the element and form *the* “essential parts of Baptism,” it would be a fair inference, that the Minister is not “essential.” On the other hand we claim that the absence

* See Fallow, p. 229, ss.

of the definite article does necessarily imply that there is some other "essential part" besides the form and element. What can this be but the *lawful Minister*?

We think then that it has been clearly shown that, at the final revision of the Liturgy in 1661 (by which time the decision of the Hampton Court Conference that the Sacraments are "*generally* necessary to salvation" had quite superseded the Augustinian and Papal dogma of their *absolute* necessity), a final blow was levelled at Lay-Baptism, which has ever since been utterly destitute of any other foundation than that afforded by lingering prejudice, or by the tolerance of individual Bishops of the Church. We are aware that English *laymen*, acting as Judges of Ecclesiastical Courts, have otherwise determined. But with this we have nothing to do. It is one of the blessings of our exemption from all formal connection with, or dependence on the state, that we are free from the anomaly of subjecting "those who sit in Moses' seat" to the (usurped) dictation in *spiritual* things, of such as ought herein to be learners, not teachers, doers of the law, not judges of the law. Were we in England, it would be incumbent on us to submit to such decisions, although we could not but deem them in opposition to the law and the testimony. Here we are privileged and bound to follow the recorded directions of the Church herself, wherever

they are plain; and where they are doubtful, to have recourse to the arbitration (not of laymen, but) of the Bishops of the Church, the spiritual judges, as well as rulers, in the courts of the Lord.

In respect to this question of Lay-Baptism, as decided by the rubrics of the Anglican Church, there does not appear, we repeat, any ground for it to rest upon. Lest we should be thought singular in our opinion, we quote the recorded judgment of Anglican writers of no mean rank.

Mr. Lawrence thus writes upon this subject:—
“Our Church is not so supine and negligent about Lay-Baptisms, as some may reckon her; for, though (as Dr. Geo. Abbot, *in the lecture which he read in the divinity school at Oxford, De Circumcisione et Baptismo, 1597*, says) ‘*our Church after the Reformation, facilitate larga, with great latitude and 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,*’ yet it is most certain, that upon a review of her Liturgy, she has erased and blotted out that rubric which tolerated such Baptisms; and not only so, but instead thereof, has appointed that even in cases of necessity, Baptism shall be administered by the *Minister of the parish, or in his absence any other lawful Minister that can be procured*; and we all know what she means by *lawful Minister*, i. e., one Episcopally ordained; for she allows of no

other ordination, but obliges all, howsoever and by whomsoever otherwise ordained, to submit to be ordained by a Bishop before she can acknowledge them to have any lawful call, or power to minister the holy Sacraments. This shows her non-approval and rejection of midwife and other Lay-Baptisms; which is a plain proof that she does not allow of their validity; and by this act she calls louder for what our author terms Re-baptization, than her supposed silence does for an acquiescence in such false, or rather no Baptisms: and therefore, 'tis necessary to administer Catholic Baptism to those who never received it, and who only have been washed by unauthorized and Anti-Episcopal lay-baptizers, which is worse than if they had been so by laymen, allowed of by their Bishops; the authority of which latter Baptism, if any at all, is now also taken away, and made void in the Church of England."*

Bishop Mant (than whom the Church of England has no truer son, nor an abler advocate of Evangelic truth and Apostolic order) thus forcibly and unequivocally interprets the doctrine of the Church on this subject:—

“No authority to administer Baptism having been given to any others than Christ’s ministers, it should seem that Baptism, as well as the preaching

* *Sacerdotal Powers*, c. 5. p. 88, ss.

of the Gospel and the ministration of the other Sacraments, cannot lawfully and with assurance of its efficacy, be celebrated by any others. And this is agreeable to the rules of the Church. For although there may have been aforesaid some, who have pleaded for the ministration of Baptism in cases of great necessity by another person than a lawful minister, where a lawful minister could not be had; and although the Church of Rome, acting under the persuasion of the absolute necessity of Baptism to salvation, has allowed persons, not having the ministerial commission to baptize in such cases; and although in the earliest age of our Reformed Church, under the influence of the like persuasion, inherited from the Romish Church, allowance was likewise given for such a practice; yet subsequently, following the judgment and example of the early Church, she discerned her error, and retraced her steps; and by three successive corrections of her decision, first, by a restrictive explanation of her former law in Queen Elizabeth's time, and then in King James the First's, and again in King Charles the Second's, by a new and positive provision, she determined, that even private Baptism, in cases of great necessity, should be ministered only by a lawful minister. And the ground of her determination must be judged to be, that however excellent be the Sacrament of Baptism by reason of its spiritual grace, that grace is not prom-

ised except to its due administration; and that it were better to omit the rite altogether, and to leave the child to the uncovenanted mercy of God, than to make pretence of ministering it unlawfully, and thus attempt to bring the child into covenant with God by an instrument not of his appointment."

"You see, then, that it is a 'lawful minister,' from whom the members of the Church are to seek the Baptism of their children; and, of course, 'the minister of the Parish' in all ordinary cases; though 'in cases of great cause and necessity,' where 'need compels' them to seek for private Baptism, they may 'in the absence' of the minister of the parish, have recourse to 'any other lawful minister that can be procured.' Even in such cases of 'need,' however, the Church does not permit the Baptismal Sacrament to be administered, (as it was intimated that she did in the years first following the Reformation,) 'by any one of them that be present,' that is, by any lay-person; but she limits the ministration to 'a lawful minister,' to one authorized by Christ's commission to minister it, and therefore qualified to minister it with effect.'*

We conclude this citation of witnesses with the following lucid passage from Wheatley, who is ac-

* "The Church and her Ministrations: in a series of Discourses," by Richard Mant, D. D., Bishop of Down and Connor; p. 244, ss. London, 1838.

knowledged to be one of the most competent judges in all Liturgical questions:—

“ When necessity requires that Baptism be privately administered, *the Minister of the parish, or (in his absence) some other lawful Minister is to be procured.* This is an order which was not made till after the conference at Hampton Court, upon the accession of King James I. to the throne. In both Common Prayer Books of King Edward, and in that of Queen Elizabeth, the rubric was only this: *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 these words, N, I baptize, &c.* Now this, it is plain from the writings and letters of our first Reformers, was originally designed to commission Lay-Persons to baptize in cases of necessity ; being founded upon an error, which our Reformers had imbibed in the Romish Church, concerning the impossibility of salvation without the Sacrament of Baptism: which therefore being in their opinion so absolutely necessary, they chose should be administered by any body that was present, in cases of extremity, rather than any should die without it.”

“ But afterwards, when they came to have clearer notions of the Sacraments, and perceived how absurd it was to confine the mercies of God to out-

ward means; and especially to consider that the salvation of the child might be as safe in God's mercy, without any Baptism, as with one performed by persons not duly commissioned to administer it; when the governors of the Church, I say, came to be convinced of this, they thought it proper to explain the rubric above mentioned, in such a manner as should exclude any private person from administering of Baptism. Accordingly, when some articles were passed by both houses of Convocation, in the year 1575, the Archbishop and Bishops (who had power and authority in their several dioceses *to resolve all doubts concerning the manner how to understand, do, and execute the things contained in the Book of Common Prayer*) unanimously resolved, that even *private Baptism, in case of necessity*, was only to be administered by a lawful Minister or Deacon, and that all other persons should be inhibited to intermeddle with the ministering of Baptism privately, as being no part of their vocation." * * *

“Upon the accession of King James I. to the throne, the matter was again debated in the Hampton Court Conference; the result of which was, that instead of those words, *let them that be present call upon God, &c.*, the rubric should be, *let the lawful Minister,*” &c.

“And thus the rubric stood till the review at

the Restoration, when it only underwent some small variation." * * *

"The Church only provides that none but a *Minister*, or one *duly ordained*, presume to intermeddle in it ; well knowing that the persons, by whom Baptism is to be administered, are plainly as positive a part of the institution, as any thing else relating to that ordinance ; and consequently that the power of administering it must belong to those only whom Christ hath authorized by the institution." * * *

"If it be asked, whether Baptism, when performed by an unordained person, be, in the sense of our Church, *valid* and *effectual* ? I answer, that, according to the best judgment we can form from her public acts and offices, it is not. For she not only supposes, that a child will die unbaptized, if the regular Minister does not come time enough to baptize it ; but in the abovesaid determination of the Bishops and Convocation, she expressly declares, that even in *cases of necessity*, Baptism is only to be administered by a *lawful* Minister or Deacon, and directly inhibits all other persons from intermeddling with it, though ever so *privately, as being no part of their vocation* ; a plain intimation that no Baptism, but what is administered by persons duly ordained, is valid or effectual.—For if Baptism, administered by persons not duly ordained, be valid and sufficient to convey the ben-

efits of it, why should such persons be prohibited to administer it in case of real necessity, when a regular Minister cannot be procured? It would surely be better for the child to have it from any hand, if any hand could give it, than that it should die without the advantage of it. Our Church therefore, by prohibiting all from intermeddling in Baptism but a *lawful* Minister, plainly hints, that when Baptism is administered by any others, it conveys no benefit or advantage to the child, but only brings upon those, who pretend to administer it, the guilt of usurping a sacred office; and consequently that persons so pretendedly baptized (if they live to be sensible of their state and condition) are to apply to their lawful Minister or Bishop for that Holy Sacrament, of which they only received a profanation before.”*

The authorities just cited sustain, we think, fully the positions we have taken in this chapter. We repeat, then, that it is evident,

1. That the doctrine of the absolute necessity of Baptism to salvation, which was itself an error of certain Fathers, was the source of Lay-Baptism.

2. That these two doctrines progressed *pari passu*, and were established in the Western Church by Papal influence and authority.

* “A Rational Illustration of the Book of Common Prayer of the Church of England,” p. 391. ss. Boston ed. 1837.

3. That they both survived the Reformation in England, and were not deprived of all authoritative sanction until the Hampton Court Conference in 1604; since which time, in the Anglican Church, the validity of Lay-Baptism has nothing to stand upon but mere private opinion.

CHAPTER XII.

The American Liturgy. The alleged Practice of the American Church. Conclusion.

ALL the arguments of the preceding Chapter against Lay-Baptism, based upon the rubrics in the formulary of the Anglican Liturgy for the ministration of Private Baptism in case of necessity, have the same firm foundation in the American Liturgy; which has retained the service of 1661 entire and unchanged. So that those who seek formal ecclesiastical authority in favor of Lay-Baptism, must go to the Pope for it, seeing that the Anglican Church finally renounced it in 1661, and that the American Church has from the beginning adopted that renunciation.

If therefore any individual who has received Lay-Baptism becomes satisfied of its invalidity, he is entitled to ask and have true and legal Baptism from a lawful Minister of the Church. Or, if any individual so baptized, or the lawful Minister whom he may consult, should entertain doubts upon the subject; we see not why he may not be conditionally baptized; although with our view of the subject, there is no more objection to the unconditional Baptism of a lay convert to the Church, than to the unconditional ordination of a clerical

convert. In fact they both stand upon the same footing; without Episcopal ordination there is no lawful ministry; and without lawful ministration there is no valid Baptism. Hence the remedy is, in the former case, lawful ordination by a Bishop; in the latter, lawful Baptism by a Priest. In other words—no Bishop, no Priest; no Priest, no Baptism.

Our position,—that the standards of the Church reprobate Lay-Baptism, and warrant, if they do not prescribe, the subsequent Baptism by a lawful Minister of those who have been washed by a layman, in the name of the Trinity,—is met by another objection. Common usage, it is said, is common law; and since the validity of Lay-Baptism has been long allowed in the case of converts from the denominations around us, it follows that this point is thereby ruled in favor of Lay-Baptism, notwithstanding the contrary conclusions derived from the standards of the Church.

Now, whatever force the maxim, about common usage being common law, may have in secular things, we utterly deny its applicability to things divine. What man originates, man may change in his own way; what God originates, man may not change in any way. And what God's Church ordains, as the interpreter and the keeper of His word, agreeably to His will, no custom nor law of man can possibly affect or set aside. Otherwise it were

easy to sanction and perpetuate the grossest abuses. This maxim would sustain and justify each and all of the corruptions of Popery, not excepting the Papal supremacy itself. In this consists the indefectibility (not infallibility) of the Church, that, no matter what errors or corruptions shall from time to time arise and bear sway for a season in any branch of the Church, there is always a remedy at hand, in the keeping even of the corrupt branch itself, viz., the Word of God, and the recorded testimony and practice of Apostolic men, to whom inspired Apostles taught "the truth as it is in Jesus." And it is even then, when common usage has almost sanctified error or corruption, that the divine witness gives testimony against and sets aside such false intruders, notwithstanding their alleged prescriptive right to permanent possession.

So is it in the case before us. Lay-Baptism, begotten of error in the Church of God, was at last domesticated among its rightful occupants by unjust and unfaithful stewards; and when a returning sense of duty moved more faithful rulers to its ejection, it still lingered in the outer courts, hiding its diminished head, or skulked in corners of the sacred house; and now, when dragged from its hiding place, and required to obey the lawful sentence long ago pronounced and long artfully evaded, it offers prescriptive right of occupation as its plea for undisturbed possession. But no—cast it out;

for it bears not the seal and impress of the sanctuary.

I beg leave, in conclusion, to adopt as my own the following pertinent questions of Mr. Lawrence, and respectfully propose them to the asserters of the validity of Lay-Baptism, as well deserving their most serious consideration.

“ 1st. Whether Christ’s institution of Baptism does not as much determine, that it must constantly and unalterably be administered by those only, who are the Apostles’ Successors, and others appointed by them; as it does fix the *matter* to be no other than *water*, and the *form* to be no other than that *in the name of the Trinity*? And if it does, then,

“ 2dly. Whether the Administrator of Christ’s Baptism is not appointed to be the Representative of God the giver, as much as the matter water is, to be the outward sign of the inward and spiritual graces given and conveyed by Baptism? And if it is,

“ 3dly. Whether there can be such a thing as an instituted outward sign of inward and spiritual graces given, without the instituted Representative of God, the Giver of those graces?

“ 4thly. Whether an unauthorized Layman can be justly said to be God’s Representative; and how he can, even in times of greatest necessity, give us the sign and seal as God’s Attorney, with-

out a Commission, either immediately from God, or mediately from those whom God has authorized to give such Commission ?

“5thly. Whether Christ’s Commission to His Apostles and their Successors, and those appointed by them to the end of the world, in these words, “Go YE, *disciple—baptizing*,” is not a POSITIVE COMMAND to them, actually to baptize such as were never baptized by them? If it is not, how are clergymen obliged to baptize at all? And what divine law is there, that has made it their incumbent duty to give Baptism? But if the command is a peremptory command, and they are bound to obey it, and consequently to baptize actually all capable subjects who were never baptized by them, then,

“6thly. How can they be fairly said to have obeyed this command of Christ, when they refuse Baptism to those, who never received it from any of them, and earnestly sue to them for it ?

“7thly. Whether instead of this act of obedience there is any instituted commutative act, to be performed by the clergy over those who never were baptized by them; and which is appointed to answer all the ends and designs of sacerdotal Baptism in some extraordinary cases, when the giving or requiring of such Baptism may cause disturbances in the Church of Christ, from the wickedness of some and ignorance of others ?

“8thly. If there is any such instituted commutative act, to supply the want of sacerdotal Baptism, when and by whom was it appointed ?

“9thly. But if there is no such commutative act appointed, then why should men rest satisfied with such uninstituted washings as are performed by unauthorized Laymen ? And especially, what reason can be given why many among us should be esteemed to have received Christ’s Baptism, when in truth they have only been washed by unauthorized Laymen, in opposition to the divine authority of the Apostles’ Successors, the Bishops of the Christian Church ?

“10thly. If the Institution of Baptism does not necessarily require that the administration thereof should be authorized and commissioned by the Apostles’ Successors ; then by what divine law can it be proved, that unbaptized persons of riper years are obliged to seek for Baptism at the hands of any other administrator ? Why cannot such persons baptize themselves as well as receive Baptism from another, since they have as much authority to come into the Church by their own act of baptizing themselves, as others have to admit them into it by their unauthorized act of baptismation ?”

To these I add the following questions :

11thly. If the plea of necessity does overrule and set aside the provision of Christ and of His Church in regard to the administration of Bap-

tism; why should not the same plea overrule and set aside the ordinance of Christ and His Church respecting ordination, and make the laying on of hands by a Presbyter, or Deacon, or even Layman, valid ordination?*

12thly. If the restriction of the divine Commission is not so firm and immovable, but that it may be relaxed in favor of Lay-Baptism in certain cases; why may it not be relaxed in similar cases in favor of Lay-consecration of the Eucharist, Lay-absolution, Lay-preaching; and so on of all holy ministrations? And if it may be thus relaxed, what ground has the Christian Ministry to stand upon, but that of higher expediency, or popular allowance?

If this be so, then are the Ministers of Christ of all men most miserable; for they must fight, in the vanguard of the host, against the world, the flesh, and the devil, shorn of spiritual authority, and stripped of spiritual armor. If this be so (that their authority depends on popular allowance), the temptation were sore to adopt the lying motto, *Vox populi vox Dei*; and instead of reproof, rebuking, exhorting, to prophesy smooth things.

* It is worth noticing a fact, which speaks volumes, that almost every writer, who advocates Lay-Baptism in ease of necessity, allows likewise the validity, under the like circumstances, of non-Episcopal ordination, and consequently of lay-ministration of every sacerdotal office.

But thank God it is not so ; our Lord's commission has neither exception nor flaw. It is the fiat of Him, who has said, " Heaven and earth shall pass away, but my word shall not pass away." And by it He has committed *all spiritual power* for the good of His Church to those alone, to whom He said, " ALL POWER IS GIVEN UNTO ME IN HEAVEN AND IN EARTH. GO YE, THEREFORE, AND TEACH 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 ALWAY, EVEN UNTO THE END OF THE WORLD. AMEN."

N O T E S .

NOTE (A), page 18.

“BUT now, though the Baptism of heretics and schismatics, and degraded or excommunicated clerks was reputed valid, so as it needed not to be repeated, yet it was not esteemed so perfect to all intents and purposes as the regular and authorized Baptism of the Church, because both on the part of the receiver, and on the part of the giver, there were some deficiencies in it.” * * *

“St. Austin, who has considered this matter most exactly, often inculcates a known distinction between the external or visible Sacrament, and the invisible or spiritual grace, the former of which is common both to good and bad men in the Church ; but the latter is peculiar only to those that are good. Now he supposes such as are baptized by heretics and schismatics, to be much in the same state as bad men in the Church.” * * * ,

“Nor was this the singular opinion of St. Austin about the deficiency of heretical Baptism, but the general sense of the Church ; for which reason they appointed that imposition of hands should be

given to such as returned to the Church, in order to obtain the grace of the Holy Ghost for them by prayer, which they wanted before, as having received Baptism from those, who had no power to give the Holy Ghost."—*Bingham, Schol. Hist.* I. 21.

It may be well to observe that the argument in the text loses nothing of its force, if the "imposition of hands" given to repentant heretics and schismatics be distinguished from the "laying on of hands" in the Apostolic rite of Confirmation.

NOTE (B), p. 27.

I cannot forbear inserting here the following passage from Mr. Bingham (*Antiquities*, Book II. c. 19, § 15), as illustrating and confirming my position in regard to the Priestly character of Deacons. "If it here be inquired, as it is very natural to ask the question, why Optatus gives all the three orders of Bishops, Presbyters and Deacons, the title of Priesthood, the answer is plain and obvious. Because, according to him, every order had its share, though in different degrees, in the Christian Priesthood; which is not, as some imagine, a power to offer Christ's body and blood really upon the altar, as a propitiatory sacrifice for quick and dead (which is such a notion of the Christian Priesthood as no ancient author or ritual ever mentions): but it consists in a power and authority to minister publicly, according to God's appointment, in holy

things, or things pertaining to God. And there are several parts of this power, according to the different participation of which, in the opinion of Optatus, Bishops, Presbyters and Deacons, had each their respective share in the Priesthood.— Thus it was one act of the Priest's office to offer up the sacrifice of the people's prayers, praises and thanksgivings to God, as their mouth and orator, and to make intercession to God for them. Another part of the office was in God's name to bless the people, *particularly by admitting them to the benefit and privilege of remission of sins by spiritual regeneration or baptism.* And thus far Deacons were anciently allowed to minister in holy things, as mediators between God and the people; upon which account a late learned writer (*Dr. Hick's Discourse of the Christian Priesthood*, c. II. § 5) joins entirely with Optatus, in declaring Deacons to be sharers in this lowest degree of the Christian Priesthood.—He then proceeds to show how the Presbyters possessed a higher degree of Priestly power than the Deacons, and Bishops still higher than these, and in the concluding sentence of the section he adopts the foregoing view as his own, in these words: "This may serve at once to caution the reader against that subtle distinction of the Romanists (respecting the Prelatical and Sacerdotal office in a Bishop), *and give him a short account both of the nature and different degrees of the Christian*

Priesthood." This admission is worthy of notice, because (in his Scholastical History of Lay-Baptism, c. I. § 15), when it serves his turn, he contradicts himself, and crosses Antiquity, by saying that Deacons "are no Priests!"

NOTE (C), p. 29.

The argument against Lay-Baptism derived from its *federal* character, is so conclusive that we deem it worth while to support by some show of proof, what it might be supposed no one would deny, had not at least one illustrious Churchman questioned it. "The celebrated Dr. Sherlock," says Waterland, "thought the argument drawn from the nature of a covenant to be so strong and forcible against the validity of Lay-Baptism, that he could find no surer way of evading it, than by denying Baptism to be a formal covenant, in which I presume that great man was pretty singular, and only showed that he was hard pressed." Waterland (vol. X. p. 317) says, "That Baptism is a *federal* rite, a formal stipulation between God and the party baptized, might be probably argued many ways. But for brevity sake, I shall confine myself to the consideration of one express text; which I render thus: 'The like figure whereunto Baptism doth now save us; not the putting away the filth of the flesh, but the *stipulation* [ἐπεσώτημα] of a good conscience to Godward, by the resurrection of

Christ.’* Here we have the very doctrine which I am pleading for, that Baptism is a *federal* rite, a *stipulation* with God. So Beza and Grotius, and other critics of best note, interpret the place, and give very substantial reasons for it, which I need not here recite. I shall only add, that the ancients† constantly taught, that Baptism was a *covenanting* rite, a solemn form of *stipulating* with God, the *seal* of the Lord, and that it succeeded in the room of circumcision, being therefore called the *Christian* circumcision, ‘made without hands,’ or the *spiritual* circumcision, as a figure and instrument of it.”—It were easy to multiply authorities indefinitely to the same effect.

NOTE (D), p. 39.

“Dandi quidem jus habet summus Sacerdos, qui est Episcopus; dehinc Presbyteri et Diaconi, non tamen sine Episcopi auctoritate, propter Ecclesiæ honorem, quo salvo pax est. Alioquin etiam laicis jus est; quod enim ex æquo accipitur, ex æquo dari potest; nisi Episcopi jam aut Presbyteri aut Diaconi vocantur, dicentes, Domini sermo non debet abscondi ab ullo. Proinde et baptismus æque Dei census ab omnibus exerceri potest; sed quanto magis laicis disciplina verecundiæ et modestiæ in-

* 1 Peter 3: 21.

† See Dr. W.’s references; and compare Bingham, XI. 1, 6.

cumbit, cum ea majoribus competat, ne sibi assumant dicatum Episcopis officium Episcopatus? Æmulatio schismatum mater est. ‘Omnia licere,’ dixit sanctissimus Apostolus, ‘sed non omnia expedire.’ Sufficiat scilicet, in necessitatibus ut utaris; sicubi aut loci, aut temporis, aut personæ conditio compellit. Tunc enim constantia succurrentis excipitur, cum urget circumstantia periclitantis. Quoniam reus erit perditioni hominis, si supersederit præstare quod libere potest.”—*Tertull. de Bapt. c. 17.*

I have given in the text Bingham’s version of this passage, as not likely to be partial to Lay-Baptism, inasmuch as some difference of opinion exists in regard to two or three phrases. This difference does not, however, affect its general scope. Bingham passes over in silence the only obscure passage in it, “nisi Episcopi jam——abscondi ab ullo.” Bishop Kaye (“Ecclesiastical History of the 2d and 3d centuries illustrated out of Tertullian,” p. 447), adopts the reading “vocantur Discentes” (putting a *period* after *Discentes*), and thus interprets the latter part of the passage and comments upon the whole: “Otherwise the Laity possess the right: for that which all equally receive, all may equally confer: unless Bishops, or Priests, or Deacons, were alone designated by the word *Discentes*, i. e. Disciples. The word of God ought not to be concealed by any; Baptism, therefore, which

equally (with the word) proceeds from God, may be administered by all.' Our author then goes on to say that, although the Laity possess the right, yet as modesty and humility are peculiarly becoming in them, they ought only to exercise it in cases of necessity, when the eternal salvation of a fellow-creature is at stake. He does not, however, extend the right to women; on the contrary he stigmatizes the attempt on their part to baptize, as a most flagrant act of presumption. In the passage just cited, Tertullian rests the right of the Laity to administer Baptism on the assumption, that a man has the power of conferring upon another whatever he has himself received, and on the comprehensive meaning of the word *Disciples* in John iv. 2. On other occasions, as we have seen, he rests it on the ground that all Christians are in fact Priests. It is not easy to determine which of the three arguments is the least conclusive."

NOTE (E), p. 42.

We give the original with Bishop Kaye's comment on a phrase of doubtful meaning. "Vani erimus, si putaverimus, quod Sacerdotibus non liceat, Laicis licere. Nonne et Laici Sacerdotes sumus? Scriptum est, *Regnum quoque et Sacerdotes Deo et Patri suo fecit*. Differentiam inter Ordinem et Plebem Constituit Ecclesiæ autoritas, et honor per Ordinis consessum sanctificatus.—(There is an am-

biguity in the latter clause of this sentence, which must be differently translated, according as *honor* is referred to *Ecclesiæ*, or to *Differentiam inter Ordinem et Plebem*. I have adopted the former sense, though by no means certain of its correctness. I conceive the allusion to be to the higher seats of the Clergy, apart from the Laity, in the places of religious assembly. In the tract de Fuga in Persecutione, c. 11, Tertullian makes a distinction between Christians *majoris et minoris loci*; apparently meaning the Clergy by the former, and the Laity by the latter. So in the tract de Baptismo, c. 17, Sed quanto magis Laicis disciplina verecundiæ et modestiæ incumbit, quum ea *majoribus* competat.) —Adeo ubi Ecclesiastici Ordinis non est consessus, et offers, et tinguis, et Sacerdos es tibi solus. Sed ubi tres, Ecclesia est, licet laici; unusquisque enim *sua fide* vivit, nec est personarum acceptio apud Deum. Quoniam non *auditores legis* justificabuntur a Deo, sed *factores*, secundum quod et Apostolus dicit. Igitur si habes jus Sacerdotis in temetipso, ubi necesse est, oportet etiam disciplinam Sacerdotis, ubi necesse sit habere jus Sacerdotis. Digamus tinguis? Digamus offers? Quanto magis Laico digamo capitale est agere pro Sacerdote, quum ipsi Sacerdoti digamo facto auferatur agere Sacerdotem? Sed necessitati, inquis, indulgetur. Nulla necessitas excusatur, quæ potest non esse. Noli denique digamus deprehendi, et non committis in

necessitatem administrandi quod non licet digamo. Omnes nos Deus ita vult dispositos esse, ut ubique Sacramentis ejus obeundis apti simus.”—*De Exhort. ad Cast. c. 7.*

NOTE (F), p. 47.

“Peregre navigantes, aut si Ecclesia in proximo non fuerit, posse fidelem (qui lavacrum suum integrum habet, nec sit bigamus), baptizare in necessitate infirmitatis positum catechumenum, ita ut, si supervixerit, ad Episcopum eum perducatur, ut per manus impositionem perfici posset.”—*Concil. Illiberit. can. xxxviii.*

NOTE (G), p. 53.

Quamobrem, oro te, aut Sacrificandi ei licentiam tribuas, cujus Baptisma probas, aut reprobas ejus Baptisma, quem non existimas Sacerdotem.”—*Dial. adv. Lucifer. I. c. 2.*

“Arianus baptizat, ergo Episcopus est: non baptizat; tu refuta laicum, et ego non recipio Sacerdotem.”—*Ibid. c. 5.*

“Tu eum Episcopum probas, quia ab eo recipis baptizatum—Christianus non est, si non habuerit Sacerdotem, qui eum faceret Christianum.”—*Ibid.*

NOTE (H), p. 54.

“Sine Chrismate et jussione Episcopi neque Presbyter, neque Diaconus, jus habent baptizandi.

Quod frequenter (si tamen necessitas cogit), sci-
mus etiam licere laicis. *Ut enim accipit quis, ita et
dara potest.*—*Ibid.* c. 4.

NOTE (I), p. 58.

“Quamquam etsi laicus aliquis pereunti dederit
(Baptisma), necessitate compulsus; quod, cum ipse
acciperet, quomodo dandum esset, addidit; nes-
cio an pie quisquam dixerit esse repetendum.
Nulla enim necessitate si fiat, alieni muneris usur-
patio est: si autem necessitas urgeat, aut nullum,
aut veniale delictum est.”—*Aug. Cont. Epis. Par-
men.* L. II. c. 13.

NOTE (K), p. 61.

“In necessitate, cum Episcopi, aut Presbyteri,
aut quilibet ministrorum non inveniuntur, et urget
periculum ejus qui petit, ne sine isto Sacramento
hanc vitam finiat, etiam laicos solere dare Sacra-
mentum, quod acceperunt, solemus audire.”—*Aug.
ap. Gratian. de Consecrat. Dist.* IV. c. 21.

NOTE (L), p. 61.

“Sanctum est Baptisma per seipsum, quod da-
tum est in nomine Patris, et Filii, et Spiritus Sancti:
ita ut in eodem sacramento sit etiam auctoritas tra-
ditionis per Dominum nostrum ad Apostolos; per
illos autem ad Episcopos, et alios Sacerdotes, vel
etiam laicos Christianos ab eadem origine et stirpe
venientes.”—*Ibid.* c. 36.

NOTE (M), p. 65.

The following are the original words of Eusebius, according to Heinichen's edition. Ἦν γε ἀφορμὴ τοῦ πιστεῦσαι γέγονεν ὁ σατανᾶς, φοιτήσας εἰς αὐτὸν καὶ οἰκήσας ἐν αὐτῷ χρόνον ἰκανόν. Ὅς βοηθούμενος ὑπὸ τῶν ἐπορημιστῶν, νόσῳ περιπεσὼν χαλεπῇ, καὶ ἀποθανεῖσθαι ὅσον οὐδεπῶ νομιζόμενος, ἐν αὐτῇ τῇ κλίνῃ ἦ ἔκειτο, περιχυθεὶς, ἔλαβεν (scil. τὸ βάπτισμα).

“And indeed Satan was the author of his faith” (i. e. Satan caused him to *profess himself* a Christian), “having entered into him, and dwelt in him a long time. Who, being aided by the exorcists, when he had fallen into a grievous illness, and was thought to be at the point of death, received Baptism in the very bed on which he lay, having water poured upon him.”

The writer here seems to connect the ministry of the exorcists in this case, agreeably to the nature of their office (vid. Bingham's Antiquities, B. III. c. 4), with Novatian's dæmoniacal possession, rather than with the Baptism. And such appears to be Mr. Bennett's interpretation, in the following passage, which met my eye after my own judgment of the case had been formed and put on record. “'Tis said that Novatian was baptized by an Exorcist, who was but a layman. To which I reply, that the Exorcists, as such, were indeed only laymen. For though they are sometimes called clergy in a large sense of the word, yet they were not Ec-

clesiastical officers instituted by God's order, and for that reason I have already shown and allowed them to be laymen. Nor shall I inquire whether Presbyters and Deacons were not sometimes Exorcists also. Though what Eusebius reports of Romanus, who suffered martyrdom under Diocletian, fairly proves it as to the order of Deacons; and I think myself obliged to observe, that if this were the case in the beginning of the second century, then this history can do our adversaries no service. Because, though Novatian were never so certainly baptized by an Exorcist, yet that Exorcist might very probably be a clergyman. But what I insist upon is this, viz. that the history is manifestly mistaken. For Cornelius (in that Epistle, part of which is preserved by Eusebius) does not say that he was baptized by the Exorcist, but that when he had been cured by the Exorcists, he fell into a grievous distemper which threatened him with death; and that then he was baptized in his bed. So that some time might pass between his cure wrought by the Exorcist, and his falling into that dangerous sickness. However, a clergyman might baptize him, and in my opinion he was certainly baptized by a clergyman. For 'twas no case of necessity, and Cornelius, who observes such minute particulars in that very Epistle, could not but have objected his Lay-Baptism, which was notoriously a violation of the then discipline, if there had been any ground

for such an objection.”—*Rights of the Clergy*, c. 24, p. 319.

NOTE (N), p. 66.

“In historia isthac concinnanda temporisque ratione digerenda credulum admodum fuisse Ruffinum constat, in fabulas et incertos plebeculae rumores nimis propensum, quos e triviis et tons-trina petitos literis mandare temere solebat.”—*Hist. Litter.* vol. I. p. 218 (quoted by Waterland).

NOTE (O), p. 67.

Neque Petrus Diaconos habuit aut diem quaesivit, quando Cornelium cum omni domo ejus baptizavit; nec ipse, sed jussit fratribus, qui cum illo ierant ad Cornelium ab Joppe. Adhuc enim praeter septem Diaconos nullus fuerat ordinatus. Ut ergo cresceret plebs et multiplicaretur, omnibus inter initia concessum est et evangelizare, et baptizare, et Scripturas in Ecclesia explanare. At ubi autem omnia loca circumplexa est Ecclesia, Conventicula Constituta sunt, et rectores et caetera officia in ecclesiis sunt ordinata, ut nullus de clero auderet, qui ordinatus non esset, praesumere officium, quod sciret non sibi creditum vel concessum, et coepit alio ordine et providentia gubernari Ecclesia, quia si omnes eadem possent, irrationabile esset, et vulgaris res vilissima videretur. Hinc est unde nunc neque Diaconi in populo praedicant, neque clerici vel laici baptizant.”—*Pseud. Ambros. in Gal. IV.*

It is obvious that this writer first *assumes* that, at the time of St. Peter's visit to Joppa, none had been ordained but "the seven Deacons," and that the companions of the Apostle were *lay* "brethren;" and that he then *infers* from the foregoing gratuitous assumption his loose notion of the promiscuous right of all Christians *in the beginning* to minister in holy things. He seems to have transferred the crude conceit of certain "philosophers," about a "state of nature," from that society, which *they* claim to be man's handiwork, to that Divine Economy, which God incarnate has ordained, on principles akin to those which rule in heaven, where the "*first law*" is "*order.*"

NOTE (P), p. 86.

Mr. Lawrence enters into the question of heretical and schismatical Baptisms. After stating his opponent's case, who treated Lay-Baptisms as all one with the former class of Baptisms, he thus proceeds—"He blends and jumbles together the notion of the nullity of unauthorized Lay-Baptisms with that of the invalidity of heretical Baptisms, which are things vastly different from one another; the first having no pretence to any commission at all given by the Bishops, and was never discussed in any General Council, because the Church was not pestered with such unaccountable lay-usurpers as we are now, till within these last 200 years; and

the other, viz. heretical Baptisms, being such as were administered by heretics, who had by one means or other been *Episcopally ordained* to minister in holy things. It was the dispute about the validity of these Baptisms that exercised the Primitive Church about the middle of the third century, when St. *Cyprian*, Bishop of Carthage, and his colleagues, after the example of their predecessors, and in conformity to the ancient customs of the *Asiatic Churches*, and the determinations in the two numerous Synods at *Synnada* and *Iconium*, held many years before, and the council of *Carthage* then, pronounced such heretical Baptisms to be null and void, as being destitute of any valid authority, being performed in heresy and out of the Church. For they determined at *Iconium* in the council under *Firmilian*, ‘*That all those should be held as unbaptized who were baptized by such as HAD ONCE BEEN BISHOPS in the Catholic Church, if they were baptized by them after they had separated from the Church.*’”—*Sacerdotal Powers*, p. 78.

NOTE (Q, p. 89.

‘Οι δε ἀποπόρραγέντες, λαϊκοὶ γενόμενοι, οὔτε τοῦ βαπτίζεω, οὔτε τοῦ χειροτονεῖν εἶχον ἐξουσίαν, οὐκέτι δυνάμενοι χάριν Πνεύματος Ἁγίου ἐτέροις παρέχειν, ἧς αὐτοὶ ἐκπεπωκασι. Διο ὡς παρὰ λαϊκῶν βαπτιζομένους τους παρ’ αὐτῶν ἐκέλευσαν ἐρχομένους ἐπὶ τὴν ἐκκλησίαν τῷ ἀληθινῷ βαπτίσματι, τῷ τῆς ἐκκλησίας, ἀνακαθαιρῆσθαι. *Basil. Ep. I. ad Amphiloeh. Cap. I.*

I subjoin Mr. Lawrence's comments on this passage: "St. Basil thus argues: '*Those whom a Laick baptizeth, are to be re-baptized; but those whom a Heretick or Schismatick baptizeth, a Laick baptizeth; therefore such are to be re-baptized.*' This argument he made use of, to prove that heretical and schismatical Baptisms were null and void; and he reckoned them so, because he thought them of the same nature as Lay-Baptisms in those days. His major proposition, that '*Those whom a Laick baptizeth, are to be re-baptized,*' was not denied; he had no opposers to defend such Baptisms. All the opposition he met with was, that they denied his Minor, '*That those whom a Heretick or Schismatick baptizeth a Laick baptizeth:*' they would not allow that the Hereticks and Schismaticks in those days, were mere Laicks; for in fact, they had been admitted into the Ministry by Episcopal Ordination; and the Nicene Council had condemned the notion of such Hereticks and Schismaticks being mere laymen: and therefore, though they did not deny, but Lay-Baptism was null and void, yet they affirmed heretical and schismatical Baptisms in the name of the Trinity to be good, because they were not Lay-Baptisms; and to this St. Basil consented."—*Sacerdotal Powers*, p. 119.

NOTE (R), p. 98.

"But further, what our Author drives at by asking, '*has not every Christian, in cases of necessity, a*

right to teach, &c., and consequently to baptize ?' is not to be granted; for, whatever right the layman has to teach, he did not come to that right by virtue of this Commission, because this Commission was never given him; and for his not having received it, he is distinguished from the Clergy by this term of a *layman*. Besides, what our Author calls a case of necessity, gives the layman no *more right or authority* to teach or preach than he had before. * * * He cannot, in cases of necessity, in the absence and destitution of God's authorized preachers, set himself up as one of them, and affirm with any truth, that he is an *Ambassador for Christ, a Steward of the mysteries of God*, for he was never vested with any such powers; he cannot tell his auditors (but with a lie) *that if they despise him, they despise Christ,—that God has given to him (this layman) the Ministry of reconciliation.* * * * And if he cannot preach these for truths respecting his office, because he has no spiritual office at all; then 'tis plain, that his charitable instructing of his ignorant neighbors is not by virtue of the Commission, which Christ gave his Apostles and their successors; and consequently so neither can his Baptizing be by virtue of this Commission; and therefore his Baptism is no instituted Baptism; because not that Baptism which Christ has promised to concur with."—*Sacerdotal Powers*, p. 94.

NOTE (S) p. 153.

The following authoritative statement of the Church of Rome sets forth the absolute necessity of Baptism in the most express and fearful terms: "Sed cum cæterarum rerum cognitio quæ hactenus expositæ sunt, fidelibus utilissima habenda sit: tunc vero nihil magis necessarium videri potest, quam ut doceantur, omnibus hominibus Baptismi legem a Domino præscriptam esse, *ita ut, nisi per Baptismi gratiam Deo renascuntur, in sempiternam miseriam et interitum a parentibus, sive illi fideles sive infideles sint, procreantur.*"—"But as the knowledge of the other things, which have been thus far set forth, ought to be accounted most useful to the faithful; so indeed nothing can appear more necessary than that they be taught, that the law of Baptism has been enjoined by our Lord upon all men in such wise, that *children are begotten* by their parents, whether believers or unbelievers, *to eternal misery and perdition, unless they are born again to God by the grace of Baptism.*"—Catechism of the Council of Trent. (See Fallow's "Baptismal Offices Illustrated," Introd. p. 31, where the doctrine of the Catechism of Trent is contrasted with that of the Anglican Catechism subsequent to the Savoy Conference.)

THE END.

NEW WORKS & NEW EDITIONS.

The undersigned have the pleasure of presenting to you a copy of their Catalogue of important Publications in the several departments of Literature. They would particularly direct your attention to that admirable series of devotional works by BISHOP PATRICK, DOCTOR SUTTON and others, which have received the unqualified commendation of the Church. In a letter received from BISHOP WHITTINGHAM, he says, "I had forgotten to express my *very great satisfaction* at your commencement of a series of devotional works, lately re-published in Oxford and London." Again, BISHOP DOANE says of this, "I write to express my thanks to you for reprints of the Oxford books; first, for reprinting such books, and secondly, in such a style. I sincerely hope you may be encouraged to go on, and give them all to us. You will dignify the art of printing, and you will do great service to the best interests of the country." The undersigned also beg to refer to their beautiful edition of the Poetical Works of SOUTHEY, also to that excellent series of "Tales for the People and their Children," by MARY HOWITT and others, and to that extensive series of popular works for general reading, uniting an interesting style with soundness of Christian principle, such as the works of ARCHBISHOP MAGEE, GUIZOT, JOHN ANGELL JAMES, MISS SINCLAIR, REV. ROBERT PHILIP, REV. AUGUSTUS WM. HARE, JNO. PYE SMITH, FREDERICK AUGUSTUS SCHLEGEL, ISAAC TAYLOR, DR. W. C. TAYLOR, REV. DR. SPRAGUE, &c. &c. They also publish those very popular Voyages and Travels by REV. H. SOUTHGATE, of the Episcopal Mission, and FITCH W. TAYLOR, together with the Memoirs of GENERAL ALEXANDER HAMILTON by his son; and will continue to publish standard and popular works, and trust to merit a continuance of public favour.

D. APPLETON & Co.

Emporium for Standard Literature,
200 BROADWAY, New-YORK.

§ D. A. & Co.'s Catalogue of English Books (methodically arranged) and Select Catalogue of American Publications, will shortly be ready for delivery.

SCHLEGEL'S PHILOSOPHY OF HISTORY,

The Philosophy of History, in a course of Lectures delivered at Vienna, by **FREDERICK VON SCHLEGEL**, translated from the German, with a Memoir of the author, by **J. B. ROBERTSON**. Handsomely printed on fine paper. 2 vols. 12mo.

"A masterly production—written in that flowing, elegant style so characteristic of the German school. In fact, diligent investigation, accurate discernment, sound judgment and elegant taste, will be found employed in every page. Our readers may rely upon our word that a perusal of these pages will yield them an ample harvest of pleasure and advantage."—*Quarterly Review*.

THE NATURAL HISTORY OF SOCIETY,

IN THE BARBAROUS AND CIVILISED STATE,

An Essay towards discovering the Origin and Course of Human Improvement. By **W COOKE TAYLOR, LL.D., &c.**, of Trinity College, Dublin. Handsomely printed on fine paper. 2 vols. 12 mo.

"A most able work, the design of which is to determine from an examination of the various forms in which society has been formed, what was the origin of civilization, and under what circumstances those attributes of humanity, which in one country become the foundation of social happiness, and in another perverted to the production of general misery. For this purpose the author has separately examined the principal elements by which society, under all its aspects, is held together, and traced each to its source in human nature. He has then directed attention to the development of these principles, and pointed out the circumstances by which they were perfected on the one hand, or corrupted on the other."

"We perceive by the preface that the work has had throughout, the superintendence of the very learned Archbishop Whately."—*Literary Gazette*.

PALMER'S TREATISE on the CHURCH.

A TREATISE ON THE CHURCH OF CHRIST,

Designed chiefly for the use of Students in Theology. By the **REV. WILLIAM PALMER, M.A.**, of Worcester College, Oxford. Edited, with Notes, by the **Right Rev. W. R. WHITTINGHAM, D.D.**, Bishop of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the diocese of Maryland. 2 vols. 8vo. Handsomely printed on fine paper.

MEDITATIONS ON THE SACRAMENT.

Godly Meditations upon the most Holy Sacrament of the Lord's Supper. By CHRISTOPHER SUTTON, D.D., late Prebend of Westminster. 1 vol. royal 16mo., elegantly ornamented.

SACRA PRIVATA :

THE

Private Meditations, Devotions and Prayers

Of the Right Rev T. Wilson, D.D., Lord Bishop of Soder and Man. First complete edition. 1 vol. royal 16mo., elegantly ornamented.

A Discourse Concerning Prayer

And the Frequenting Daily Public Prayers. By SIMON PATRICK, D.D., sometime Lord Bishop of Ely. Edited by FRANCIS E. PAGET, M.A., Chaplain to the Lord Bishop of Oxford. 1 vol. royal 16mo., elegantly ornamented.

THOUGHTS IN PAST YEARS :

A beautiful collection of Poetry, chiefly Devotional. By the Author of the Cathedral. 1 vol. royal 16mo. elegantly printed.

HEART'S EASE :

Or a Remedy against all Troubles.

WITH A

Consolatory Discourse,

Particularly addressed to those who have lost their friends and dear relations. By SIMON PATRICK, D.D., sometime Lord Bishop of Ely. 1 vol. royal 16mo., elegantly ornamented.

THE FLAG SHIP :

Or, a Voyage Round the World, in the United States Frigate *Columbia*, attended by her consort, the Sloop of War *John Adams*, and bearing the broad pennant of Commodore George C. Read. By Fitch W. Taylor, Chaplain to the Squadron. 2 vols. 12mo. plates.

TOUR THROUGH TURKEY and PERSIA.

Narrative of a Tour through Armenia, Kurdistan, Persia, and Mesopotamia, with an Introduction and Occasional Observations upon the Condition of Mohammedanism and Christianity in those countries. By the Rev. HORATIO SOUTHGATE, Missionary of the American Episcopal Church. 2 vols. 12mo. plates.

MAGEE on Atonement and Sacrifice.

Discourses and Dissertations on the Scriptural Doctrines of Atonement and Sacrifice, and on the Principal Arguments advanced, and the Mode of Reasoning employed, by the Opponents of those Doctrines, as held by the Established Church. By the late Most Rev. WILLIAM MAGEE, D. D., Archbishop of Dublin. 2 vols. royal 8vo., beautifully printed.

SCRIPTURE and GEOLOGY.

On the Relation between the Holy Scriptures and some parts of Geological Science. By JOHN PYE SMITH, D. D., author of the *Scripture Testimony of the Messiah, &c. &c.* 1 vol. 12mo.

SOUTHEY'S POETICAL WORKS.

The complete collected edition of the Poetical Works of ROBERT SOUTHEY, Esq., LL.D. edited by himself. Printed verbatim from the ten volume London edition. Illustrated with a fine portrait and vignette. 1 vol. royal 8vo.

"This edition of the works of Southey is a credit to the press of our country."
—*N. A. Review.*

GUIZOT'S HISTORY of CIVILIZATION.

General History of Civilization in Europe, from the Fall of the Roman Empire to the French Revolution. Translated from the French of M. GUIZOT, Professor of History to la Faculté des Lettres of Paris, and Minister of Public Instruction. 2d American, from the last London edition. 1 vol. 12mo.

THE LIFE OF ALEXANDER HAMILTON.

Edited by his son, JOHN C. HAMILTON. 2 vols. royal 8vo.

"We cordially recommend the perusal and diligent study of these volumes, exhibiting, as they do, much valuable matter relative to the Revolution, the establishment of the Federal Constitution, and other important events in the annals of our country."—*New-York Review*.

BICKERSTETH'S COMPLETE WORKS.

The Works of the REV. EDWARD BICKERSTETH, Rector of Manton, Hertfordshire, containing Scripture, Help, Treatise on Prayer, the Christian Hearer, the Chief concerns of Man for Time and Eternity, Treatise on the Lord's Supper, and the Christian Student. 1 vol. 8vo.

SCOTLAND and the SCOTCH;

OR, THE WESTERN CIRCUIT.

By CATHERINE SINCLAIR, author of *Modern Accomplishments*, *Modern Society*, &c. &c. 1 vol. 12mo.

SHETLAND and the SHETLANDERS;

OR, THE NORTHERN CIRCUIT.

By CATHERINE SINCLAIR, author of *Scotland and the Scotch*, *Holiday House*, &c. &c. 1 vol. 12mo.

THE METROPOLITAN PULPIT;

Or Sketches of the most Popular Preachers in London. By the author of *Random Recollections, The Great Metropolis, &c. &c.* 1 vol. 12mo.

HARE'S PAROCHIAL SERMONS.

Sermons to a Country Congregation. By **AUGUSTUS WILLIAM HARE, A.M.**, late Fellow of New College and Rector of Alton Barnes. 1 vol. royal 8vo.

"Any one who can be pleased with delicacy of thought expressed in the most simple language—any one who can feel the charm of finding practical duties elucidated and enforced by apt and varied illustrations—will be delighted with this volume, which presents us with the workings of a pious and highly gifted mind."—*Quarterly Review*.

Williams's Missionary Enterprises.

A Narrative of Missionary Enterprises and Triumphs in the South Seas, with Remarks upon the Natural History of the Islands, Origin, Language, Tradition and Usages of the Inhabitants. By the **REV. JOHN WILLIAMS**, of the London Missionary Society. Numerous plates. 1 vol. large 12mo.

Missionary's Farewell.

By the **REV. JOHN WILLIAMS**, author of *Missionary Enterprises, &c.* 1 vol. 18mo.

SACRED CHOIR.

A Collection of Church Music. Edited by **GEORGE KINGSLEY**, author of *Social Choir, &c.*

"This collection is pronounced by the most eminent professors to be superior to any published in the country."

Physical Theory of Another Life.

By ISAAC TAYLOR, author of *Natural History of Enthusiasm*.
Third edition. 1 vol. 12mo.

HOME EDUCATION.

By ISAAC TAYLOR, author of *Natural History of Enthusiasm, &c.*
&c. Second Edition. 1 vol. 12mo.

Limitations of Human Responsibility.

By FRANCIS WAYLAND, D.D. Second edition. 1 vol. 18mo.

The Principles of Diagnosis.

By MARSHALL HALL, M.D. F.R.S., &c. Second edition, with many
improvements, by DR. JOHN A. SWETT. 1 vol. 8vo.

A GIFT FROM FAIRY-LAND.

By J. K. PAULDING, Esq. Illustrated with one hundred unique
original plates by Chapman. Elegantly bound. 1 vol. 12mo.

WORKS BY THE REV. ROBERT PHILIP.

**THE LIFE AND OPINIONS OF DR. MILNE,
MISSIONARY TO CHINA.**

Illustrated by *Biographical Annals of Asiatic Missions from Primitive to Protestant Times*, intended as a Guide to Missionary Spirit.
By ROBERT MILNE. 1 vol. 12mo.

THE LIFE AND TIMES OF JOHN BUNYAN,
Author of the *Pilgrim's Progress*. By ROBERT PHILIP. With a fine
port ait. 1 vol. 12mo.

THE LIFE AND TIMES OF WHITEFIELD,

The eminent Preacher. By ROBERT PHILIP. With a fine portrait.
1 vol. 12mo. •

LADY'S CLOSET LIBRARY,

AS FOLLOWS:

THE MARYS;

Or Beauty of Female Holiness. By ROBERT PHILIP. 1 vol. 18mo.

THE MARTHAS;

Or Varieties of Female Piety. By ROBERT PHILIP. 1 vol. 18mo.

THE LYDIAS;

Or Development of Female Character. By ROBERT PHILIP. 1
vol. 18mo.

DEVOTIONAL AND EXPERIMENTAL GUIDES.

By ROBERT PHILIP. With an Introductory Essay by REV. ALBERT
BARNES. 2 vols. 12mo. Containing

Guide to the Perplexed.

Do do Devotional.

Do do Thoughtful.

Do do Doubting.

Do do Conscientious.

Do do Redemption.

YOUNG MAN'S CLOSET LIBRARY.

By ROBERT PHILIP. With an Introductory Essay by REV. ALBERT
BARNES. 1 vol. 12mo.

LOVE OF THE SPIRIT,

Traced in his Work: a Companion to the Experimental Guides.

By ROBERT PHILIP. 1 vol. 18mo.

THE MARTYRED MISSIONARIES.

Memoirs of the REV. SAMUEL MUNSON and the REV. HENRY LY-
MAN, late Missionaries to the Indian Archipelago, with the Jour-
nal of their Exploring Tour. By the REV. WM. THOMPSON.
1 vol. 12mo.

WORKS BY THE REV. JOHN A. JAMES.

Pastoral Addresses:

By REV. JOHN ANGELL JAMES. With an Introduction by the
REV. WM. ADAMS. 1 vol. 18mo.

THE YOUNG MAN FROM HOME.

In a series of Letters, especially directed for the Moral Advancement
of Youth. By the REV. JOHN ANGELL JAMES. Fifth edition.
1 vol. 18mo.

The Anxious Enquirer after Salvation

Directed and Encouraged. By REV. JOHN ANGELL JAMES. 1 vol.
18mo.

The Christian Professor.

Addressed in a series of Counsels and Cautions to the Members of
Christian Churches. By REV. JOHN ANGELL JAMES. 1 vol.
18mo.

WORKS BY THE REV. DR. SPRAGUE.

True and False Religion.

Lectures illustrating the Contrast between True Christianity and
various other systems. By WILLIAM B SPRAGUE, D.D. 1 vol.
12mo.

Lectures on Revivals

In Religion. By W. B. SPRAGUE, D.D. With an Introductory
Essay by LEONARD WOODS, D.D. 1 vol. 12mo.

Letters to a Daughter,

On Practical Subjects. By W. B. SPRAGUE, D.D. Fourth edi-
tion, revised and enlarged. 1 vol. 12mo.

Lectures to Young People.

By W. B. SPRAGUE, D.D. With an Introductory Address by SAM-
UEL MILLER, D.D. Fourth edition. 1 vol. 12mo.

MY SON'S MANUAL.

Comprising a Summary View of the Studies, Accomplishments, and Principles of Conduct, best suited for Promoting Respectability and Success in Life. Elegantly engraved frontispiece. 1 vol. 18mo.

MY DAUGHTER'S MANUAL.

Comprising a Summary View of Female Studies, Accomplishments and Principles of Conduct. Beautiful frontispiece. 1 vol. 18mo.

Letters to the Young.

Chiefly of a Devotional character. By MARIA JANE JEWsbURY. 1 vol. 12mo.

Thoughts in Affliction.

By the REV. A. S. THELWALL A.M. To which is added *Bereaved Parents Consoled*, by JOHN THORNTON, with *Sacred Poetry*. 1 vol. 32mo.

**APPLETON'S TALES FOR THE PEOPLE
And their Children.**

Under the above title are now being issued a series of moral and highly interesting Tales by MARY HOWITT and others. The following have already appeared.

WHO SHALL BE GREATEST ?

A Tale. By MARY HOWITT. 1 vol. 18mo. plates.

SOWING AND REAPING :

Or What will come of it ? By MARY HOWITT. 1 vol. 18mo. plates.

STRIVE AND THRIVE.

A Tale. By MARY HOWITT. 1 vol. 18mo. plates.

HOPE ON, HOPE EVER,

Or the Boyhood of Felix Law. By MARY HOWITT. 1 vol. 18mo. plates.

GRIFFIN'S REMAINS.

Remains of the Rev. Edmund D. Griffin. Compiled by FRANCIS GRIFFIN. With a Memoir by REV. DR. McVICAR. 2 vols. 8vo.

Lafever's Modern Architecture.

Beauties of Modern Architecture; consisting of Forty-eight Plates of Original Designs, with Plans, Elevations and Sections, also a Dictionary of Technical Terms, the whole forming a complete Manual for the Practical Business Man. By M. LAFEVER, Architect. 1 vol. large 8vo. half bound.

Lafever's Stair-Case and Hand-Rail Construction.

The Modern Practice of Stair-Case and Hand-Rail Construction, practically explained in a series of Designs. By M. LAFEVER, Architect. With Plans and Elevations for Ornamental Villas. Fifteen plates. 1 vol large 8vo.

HODGE ON THE STEAM-ENGINE.

The Steam Engine, its Origin and Gradual Improvement from the time of Hero to the present day, as adapted to Manufactures, Locomotion and Navigation. Illustrated with forty-eight plates in full detail, numerous wood cuts, &c. By PAUL R. HODGE, C. E. 1 vol. folio of plates and letter-press in 8vo.

"In this work the best Western and Eastern machinery, as applied to navigation, together with the most approved locomotive engines in this country and Europe, are given in detail, forming the most valuable work for the practical man ever published."

Keightly's Mythology for Schools.

The Mythology of Ancient Greece and Italy, designed for the use of Schools. By THOMAS KEIGHTLY. Numerous wood cut illustrations. 1 vol. 18mo. half bound.

HAZEN'S SYMBOLICAL SPELLING-BOOK.

The Symbolical Spelling Book, in two parts. By EDWARD HAZEN. Containing 288 engravings, printed on good paper.

"This work is already introduced into upwards of one thousand different schools, and pronounced to be one of the best works published."

CRUDEN'S CONCORDANCE.

Containing all the words to be found in his large work relating to the New Testament. 1 vol. 18mo.

THE POLYMICRIAN NEW TESTAMENT,

Numerous References, Maps, &c. 1 vol. 18mo.

MILLER ON RULING ELDERS.

An Essay on the Warrant, Nature and Duties of the Office of the Ruling Elders in the Presbyterian Church. By SAMUEL MILLER, D.D. 1 vol. 12mo.

ESTHER;

A SCRIPTURE NARRATIVE.

By a Lady. With an Original Poem by Miss H. F. GOULD. 1 vol. 18mo.


ELLA V——;

Or the July Tour. By one of the Party. 1 vol. 12mo.

“He can form a moral on a glass of champagne.”—Le Roy.

DISCOURSES ON THE NERVOUS SYSTEM.

Select Discourses on the Functions of the Nervous System, in opposition to Phrenology, Materialism and Atheism; to which is prefixed a Lecture on the Diversities of the Human Character, arising from Physiological Peculiarities. By JOHN AUGUSTINE SMITH, M.D. 1 vol. 12mo.

 *Preparing for Publication.*

THE PARABLE OF THE PILGRIM.

By SIMON PATRICK, D.D., sometime Bishop of Ely. With an Introduction and some account of the Author, by the REV. THOMAS CHAMBERLAINE, M.A., of Christ Church, Oxford. 1 vol. royal 16mo. elegantly printed, uniform with Heart's Ease, Discourse on Prayer, &c.

LEARN TO LIVE.

Disce Vivere, Learn to Live; wherein is shown that the Life of Christ is, and ought to be, an express Pattern for imitation unto the life of a Christian. By CHRISTOPHER SUTTON, D.D., sometime Prebend of Westminster. 1 vol. 16mo. elegantly printed.

LEARN TO DIE.

Disce Mori, Learn to Die, a Religious Discourse, moving every Christian man to enter into a serious remembrance of his end. By CHRISTOPHER SUTTON, D D., sometime Prebend of Westminster. 1 vol. 16mo, elegantly printed.

LYRI APOSTOLICI.

From the last London edition. 1 vol. 16mo. elegantly printed.

The LOOKING-GLASS for the MIND,

Or Intellectual Mirror; being an elegant Collection of the most delightful Little Stories and Interesting Tales, with numerous illustrations. From the twentieth London edition. 1 vol. 18mo.

Happiness, its Nature and Sources.

By REV. JOHN ANGELL JAMES.

THE WIDOW DIRECTED

To the Widow's God. By REV. JOHN ANGELL JAMES.

THE PHILOSOPHICAL HISTORY OF MANKIND.

From the German of HERDER.

RANKE'S REFORMATION IN GERMANY,

The History of the Reformation in Germany. By LEOPOLD VON RANKE, author of the History of the Popes. Translated by SARAH AUSTEN.

Recently Published.

The Sacred Choir:

A COLLECTION OF CHURCH MUSIC.

Consisting of Selections from the most distinguished authors, among whom are the names of HAYDN, MOZART, BEETHOVEN, PERGOLESSI, &c. &c.; with several pieces of Music by the author; also a Progressive Elementary System of Instruction for Pupils. By GEORGE KINGSLEY, author of the Social Choir, &c. &c. Fourth edition.

The following are among the many favourable opinions expressed of this work.

From L. Meignen, Professor of Music, Philadelphia.

"G. Kingsley,

"Sir,—I have carefully perused the copy of your new work, and it is with the greatest pleasure that I now tell you that I have been highly gratified with the reading of many of its pieces. The harmony throughout is full, effective and correct; the melodies are well selected and well adapted; and I have no doubt, that when known and appreciated, this work will be found in the library of every choir whose director feels, as many do, the want of a complete reformation in that department of music. Believe me, dear sir,

"Yours respectfully,

"L. Meignen."

From Mr. B. Denman, President of the David Sacred Music Society, Philadelphia, to George Kingsley.

"Dear sir,—Having examined your 'Sacred Choir,' I feel much pleasure in recommending it as the very best collection of Church Music I have ever seen. It combines the beauties of other books of the kind, with some decided improvements in selection, arrangement and composition, and commends itself to the choir, the parlour and social circle. Wishing you the success your valuable and well-arranged work merits, I am, sir,

"Yours respectfully."

From the Committee of the Choir of Yale College.

"Sir,—We have been using for some time past your new publication in the choir with which we are connected. We take pleasure in stating to you our entire satisfaction with the manner in which it has been compiled and harmonized, and would willingly recommend it to any of the associations desiring a collection of Sacred Music of a sterling character and original matter. The melodies are quite varied and of an unusually pleasing character; and uniting, as they do, the devotional with the pleasing, we have no hesitation in giving them our preference to any other collection of a similar character at present in use among the churches."

From Three Leaders of Choirs.

"Mr. George Kingsley.

"Sir,—We have examined the 'Sacred Choir' enough to lead us to appreciate the work as the best publication of Sacred Music extant. It is beautifully printed and substantially bound, conferring credit on the publishers. We bespeak for the 'Sacred Music Choir' an extensive circulation.

Sincerely yours,

"O. S. Bowdoin.

"E. O. Goodwin.

"D. Ingraham."

EMPORIUM FOR STANDARD LITERATURE,
English and American.

D. APPLETON & Co.

Beg leave to invite the attention of their Friends and the Public generally, to their Choice and Unique Assortment of the most important Works that emanate from the English and American Press.

Their Establishment is distinguished by its large collection of Standard Works in the various departments of THEOLOGY, CIVIL AND ECCLESIASTICAL HISTORY, POETRY, NATURAL AND MORAL PHILOSOPHY, ARCHITECTURE AND ENGINEERING, GENERAL BIOGRAPHY, VOYAGES AND TRAVELS, FINE ARTS, CLASSICAL and GENERAL LITERATURE.

Among their recent importations will be found new and beautiful editions of the Works of Bacon, Clarendon, Burnet, Jeremy Taylor, Milton, Barrow, Hooker, Ben Jonson, Massinger and Ford, Beaumont and Fletcher, Shakspeare, Froissart, Monstrelet, Doddridge, Baxter, Owen, Strype, Bloomfield, Cranmer, Butler, Cave, Berkeley, Adams, Greenhill, Doune South, Hume and Smollett, Gibbon, Robertson, Locke, Lardner, Leslie, Hurd, Porteus, John Scott, Skelton, Sherlocke, Warburton, Chillingworth, Leighton, Simeon, Tillotson, Hall, Shirley, Davy, Henry, Clarke, Wraxhall, Alison, Mitford, Byron, Stackhouse, Bentley, Shaaron, Turner, Spencer, Warton, Fuller, Lamb, Hazlitt, Coleridge, Shelley, Bingham, Graves, Beveridge, Wycherley, Congreve, Vaubrough, Farquhar, and others, too numerous to mention, always for sale on favourable terms.

AMERICAN BOOKS.

Their Assortment of "Modern American Publications" is now very complete, comprising the most Valuable and Approved
**WORKS IN THEOLOGICAL AND MISCELLANEOUS
LITERATURE,**

TO WHICH ADDITIONS ARE CONSTANTLY BEING ADDED.

School Books in every variety.

**Country Merchants supplied on the most
favourable terms.**

IMPORTATION OF EUROPEAN BOOKS.

D. APPLETON & Co.

Beget to inform Literary and Scientific Gentlemen, and the Public generally, that they have recently made extensive arrangements for the increase of their business, through the senior partner of their firm, (now resident in England,) connected with the establishment of a permanent London Agency for the purchase and supply of European Books, to be conducted by one of their house, who will devote his personal attention to the execution of all orders transmitted them, with the utmost promptitude and despatch.

They are induced to take this step from a conviction of its important utility to the literary interests of this country, derived from their long experience in business; and they flatter themselves that this arrangement will place them in the most favourable position for making purchases in the British and Continental Book Markets; while by restricting their business simply to an Agency for the purchase of Books, they will enjoy all the advantages accorded by the custom of the London Trade when books are bought for exportation to a foreign country, but which are rigorously withheld from any establishment engaged in the sale of books on the spot.

It will be their aim to merit the patronage of the public by furnishing books at the lowest possible price, and the constant attention of a member of their Firm, personally acquainted with the British and Foreign Book Trade, will secure the speedy execution of all orders entrusted to their care.

TERMS.—Colleges, Theological Seminaries, and Incorporated Institutions generally, may have their orders executed, to any amount, free of duty, on a charge of Ten per cent. Commission—the Goods to be paid for on their arrival at New-York—without any advance of cash required.

From Gentlemen, and Private Individuals, (when they are not known to D. A. & Co.) an advance of one half the probable cost of the order will be required; the balance to be settled on the arrival of the Books at New-York. A Commission of Ten per cent. being charged.





