

27
Lawrence

32
15
160
32
\$480


Library of the Theological Seminary,
PRINCETON, N. J.

Presented by Mr. Samuel Agnew of Philadelphia, Pa.

Agnew Coll. on Baptism, No.

BAP
12795
50921

SCB
10144
c. 1



W. G. Hayes

T H E
Second Part
 O F
LAY-BAPTISM Invalid:
 Shewing, That
The Ancient Catholick Church
 Had
ECCLESIASTICAL LAW,
TRADITION, OR CUSTOM,
 F O R T H E
Validity of Baptisms

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

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

Robert Laurence

By the Author of *Lay-Baptism Invalid.*

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

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

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

THE
STORY
OF
LAW-BAPTISM INVALID:
Showing, That
The Ancient Catholick Church
Has
RECEIVED AS A LAW,
TRADITION, OR CUSTOM,
FOR THE
Validity of Baptisms

Performed by Persons who never were Com-
munion'd by Bishops or Bishops.
All Provd from the Reverend Mr. E. Brown,
Sole-priviledg'd Attorney of Law-Baptism, and from
other Evidence not produc'd by this Historian.

By the Author of Law-Baptism Invalid.


Printed and Sold by J. B. B. at the Sign of the Anchor, in St. Pauls Church-Yard, near the North-Door, in the Strand, in the City of London.

Printed and Sold by J. B. B. at the Sign of the Anchor, in St. Pauls Church-Yard, near the North-Door, in the Strand, in the City of London.

Printed for H. C. at the Sign of the Anchor, in St. Pauls Church-Yard, near the North-Door, in the Strand, in the City of London.

R B Hayes

PROPERTY OF
F B IN O E T O N
REC. APR 1881
H E D O T O N



THE P R E F A C E.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Baptisms

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

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

any

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

* See Vindication of a Discourse of the Principles of the Cyprianic Age, Page 324.

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

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

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

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

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

But

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

men usually mean by such Words ; namely, not authoriz'd, or never authoriz'd ; not commission'd, or never commission'd : And Mr. Bingham might have sav'd himself and his Reader too a great deal of Time and Trouble, if he had but rightly consider'd my VIth Definition in Page 34, of the 2d Edition of *Lay-Baptism Invalid* : which is this ; “ By a Lay-Administration, “ I mean, that which is perform'd by one, who “ never was Commission'd or Impower'd for that Act, “ by those whom God has appointed to be the “ Conveyers of his Authority and Commission to “ Men for that purpose.” For certainly *Baptism by such Persons as these, is Lay-Baptism ; and because never Commission'd, therefore Unauthoriz'd Baptism.* Indeed, if there can be any such thing as the giving of a *Real Authority to Laymen to Baptize, then, when Authoriz'd, they'll cease in that Respect to be Laymen, having [if they can have] a Sacerdotal Power to Baptize in Want of the Clergy ; which will make such their Baptism to be Sacerdotal, Authoriz'd Baptism, and so not properly Lay-Baptism. But that Laymen can have this Power conferr'd on them, it wants still to be prov'd.*

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

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

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

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

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

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

His Note concerning St. Ignatius, pag. 152. is sufficiently answer’d in the following Page 25. —

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

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

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

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

London, May 29th,
1713.

Faint, illegible text at the top of the page, possibly bleed-through from the reverse side.





W. B. Bayne

THE CONTENTS.

CHAP. I.

THE Occasion and Nature of the present Dispute, Page
I

CHAP. II.

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

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

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

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

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

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

Bapt: in private houses p. 19

The CONTENTS.

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

C H A P. III.

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

The CONTENTS.

St. <i>Hermas</i> mentions none but Episcopally or Divinely Authoriz'd Baptizers, for Cases of Extremity,	38
<i>Tertullian's</i> private Notion, about the Year 200, of Lay-Men's Right to baptize in Absence of the Clergy ; no Evidence of any Law, Tradition or Custom of the Catholick Church, for their pretended Right,	39, &c.
His false Reason upon which he founds their pretended Right, refused,	43
His other particular Fancies, may with as much Reason be call'd the Church's General Sense and Practice, as his Notion of Lay-Baptism may,	44
He gives us not one Instance of any such Baptism, allow'd of by the Church in his Days,	47
His Words are full and direct against our ordinary Lay-Baptisms, and by Consequence prove their Nullity,	ibid.
St. <i>Cyprian</i> and <i>Firmilian</i> about the Year 256. reckon'd Lay-Baptisms to be Null and Void, as St. <i>Basil</i> witnesses,	48
St. <i>Cyprian's</i> own Works plainly shew, that he esteem'd all Baptisms to be void, that were perform'd by such as were reckon'd to be destitute of Priestly Power and Authority,	51
<i>Firmilian's</i> Letter to St. <i>Cyprian</i> proves, that <i>Firmilian</i> and the Council of <i>Iconium</i> held the same,	54, 55
Several of St. <i>Cyprian's</i> Collegues in the Council of <i>Carthage</i> , the same,	55, 56
The 47th Canon call'd Apostolical, the same,	57
The Council of <i>Eliberis</i> in <i>Spain</i> held by 19 Bishops <i>Anno</i> 305, does not favour Baptism by Persons, who never were commision'd by Bishops to baptize,	58, III
This Council is against <i>Tertullian's</i> private Opinion, of Lay-Men's Right in themselves to baptize in Absence of the Clergy,	59
And 'tis also against Mr. <i>Bingham's</i> Guess that <i>the Ancients might esteem Baptism by whomsoever Christian perform'd</i> to be good and valid,	59, 60
The Council of <i>Eliberis's</i> Canon, is no Argument for the Practice of the Catholick Church,	61
The Fable of <i>Athanasius</i> , when as Boy, baptizing his Play-fellows in Sport ; and of <i>Alexander</i> the Bishop's determining the Baptism to be Valid, expos'd,	62
<i>Rufinus</i> , the first Author of it, a very credulous and careless Historian,	63
<i>Sozomen's</i> Account of it taken only from <i>Rufinus</i> ,	67
He was no very judicious Writer,	68
<i>Socrates Scholasticus</i> , the most Judicious and Diligent of the three Historians,	69
This latter, though quoted by Mr. <i>Bingham</i> to vouch for the Truth of that Fable, does not speak <u>one Word</u> , either of the Boy	Athas

The CONTENTS.

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

The CONTENTS.

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

The CONTENTS.

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

The CONTENTS.

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

169

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

170

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

ibid.

CHAP. IV.

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

174

CHAP. V.

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

189

CHAP. VI.

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

193

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

208

CHAP. VII.

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

102

Of

The CONTENTS.

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

C H A P. VIII.

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

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

E R R A T A.

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

P. M. Hayes



THE
SECOND PART
OF
Lay-Baptism Invalid.



CHAP. I.

The Occasion and Nature of the present Dispute.

§ I.



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

B

Com.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

C H A P. II.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

But

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Here we see again confirm’d, what I observ’d be-
 fore, That our Historian separates *Deacons*, from
 such as have the Character of *Priesthood*; and
 thereby contradicts himself: See p. 17. before. But
 the Design of this is plain, by his Two proposed
 Guesses, which are evidently made to promote the
 Belief of One of these Two Things; 1st, That
 those Antients reckon’d Baptism perform’d with
 Water, in the Name of the Trinity, by *any Christian*, tho’ never Commission’d to Baptize, was Good
 and Valid, (not excepting Apostate or Excommu-
 nicate Christians) nay, even tho’ it were done
 by such *Uncommission’d* Persons, in Opposition to
 the Divine Right of the Apostolick Order, *i. e.* Epi-
 scopacy; for, he says, “ **by whomsoever Chri-**
stian perform’d: Which is a Latitude of that vast
 Extent, that it sufficiently justifies the Severity of
 my Observation.

But then, if this should fail, and such Bap-
 tisms be prov’d Null and Void, then he reckons,
 2^{dly}, That Bishops might Confirm and **thereby**

make such Baptifims to become Valid. If One of these Two be not his Design, then he designs nothing at all; and so might have spar'd us the trouble of concerning our selves with such his Guesses; and if he do's design to induce us to believe either of those Notions, he must bring better Evidence for the Truth thereof, than has yet been produc'd, or than what his *Scholastical History* can furnish us withal: He seems to be something sensible of this, in his following Words; for, not trusting wholly to either of those Two supposititious Principles, he concludes his Paragraph, thus;

“ **But however it was,** (says he) *this is certain,*
 “ *That the Validity of an Irregular Priest's Baptism,*
 “ *was not owing to his Indelible Character; since the*
 “ *Baptism of Deacons, and Lay-men who had not*
 “ *the Character of Priests, was sometimes authoriz'd*
 “ *and allow'd as Valid; which is evident from plain*
 “ *Matters of Fact, which I now proceed to give a*
 “ *further Account of,* (says our Historian, p. 12.—)

Upon which 'tis very remarkable, that hitherto he *hesitates* concerning the *Certainty* of his Two foregoing Suppositions, — by saying, “ *However*
 “ *it was;*” tho' he had said just before, that it
 “ **must be upon one of those two Grounds;** first, lifting us up with the Expectation of a *Certainty*, by his [**must be;**] and then letting us fall into our former Doubtfulness, by his [**however it was:**]

But at last, after these various Fluctuations, he endeavours to fix our Minds, upon what, he says
 “ **is certain,** viz. *That the Validity of an Irregular*
 “ *Priest's Baptism was not owing to his Indelible Cha-*
 “ *acter:*” And this is answer'd, by saying, that his Character was *Indeleted*, it remain'd good, because not blotted out by the same Powers who impress'd it. Those Powers did not pretend to take
 away

away his Character, as we have before observ'd ; therefore the Baptisms perform'd by him were Sacerdotal, and so founded upon a *Sacerdotal Commission*, and consequently Valid ; and his following pretended Reason to the contrary, *viz.* That “ *the Validity of the Baptism was not owing to his* “ **Indelible Character**, *since the Baptism of* “ **Deacons and Lay-men**, *who had not the Cha-* “ *racter of Priests, was sometimes authoriz'd and* “ *allow'd as Valid,*” is an evident Falacy ; because built upon a false Foundation, That *Deacons* had not the Character of Priests, when himself acknowledges, in other Places before noted in *p. 17.* That **Deacons** have their Share in the *Christian Priesthood* ; nay, and he has given the Name or Character of *Priesthood*, even to Lay-men Baptizing in Case of Necessity, as I have prov'd before in *p. 17, 18.*

§ XI. He next proceeds to give us an Historical Account of *Deacons* Baptizing ; and tells us, That they, “ *by some ancient Canons, are invested with* “ *the Power of Baptizing in Ordinary Cases, as* “ *well as Priests,* *p. 12.* That “ *some other An-* “ *cient Rules seem absolutely to forbid Deacons to* “ *minister Baptism in Ordinary Cases, confining the* “ *Office only to Bishops and Presbyters,* *p. 14,* for which he produces the Canons call'd Apostolical, and the Constitutions under the Names of the Apostles : That “ *yet notwithstanding this, —* “ *a Deacon may Baptize, if he has a Commission and* “ *Authority from his Bishop to do it,* *p. 16. —* for which he quotes the same Constitutions : That, “ *In Case of Necessity, [St. Chysoftom] not only* “ *permits, but positively enjoins Deacons to Baptize,* *p. 18 :* And proceeding upon the same Subjects to

p. 22.

p. 22. he at last concludes thus; “ *So Necessary, we see, was this Distinction between Ordinary and Extraordinary Cases, to adjust Matters, in the Practice of the Primitive Church; whilst, on the one hand, the Honour and Dignity of the Priesthood was to be preserv’d; and yet Deacons allow’d on the other hand, to minister Baptism in some Cases, tho’ they were not Priests in the strict sense, in the Opinion of those who allow’d them to do it.*”

This of Deacons not being Priests in the strict sense, amounts to no more than saying, they are not Bishops; for Bishops alone have the whole Power of the Christian Priesthood in themselves; but others derive the Priesthood from them, as Presbyters do in the next subordinate Degree; and Deacons under them, in the third and lowest Order; as Mr. Bingham himself has observ’d. And as for the Necessity of a Distinction between Ordinary and Extraordinary Cases, to adjust Matters in the Practice of the Primitive Church; this is certain, from all that he has said to this part of his History; That as the *Apostolick Commission* was always insisted upon, to Impower Men to Baptize in Ordinary, so it was likewise requir’d to Impower them to Baptize in Extraordinary Cases; to the intent that this *Commission* might “ *Continue to the End of the World;*” because it was “ *Necessary to Preserve the Church, according to the Order of Christ, — in future Ages;*” as our Historian has excellently observ’d, in his p. 3. and upon which I have remark’d, p. 5, 6. For this, the Three Orders of Bishops; Priests, and Deacons, were Instituted, that they might, the Inferior in subordination to the Superior, minister Baptism by the same *Commission*, in Ordinary
and

and **Extraordinary Cases** too, and that in the Absence of one, the other might still be enabled to supply the Wants of the Church, by one and the same **commission'd Baptism**. The Restraining of Presbyters and Deacons, sometimes from the Exercise of this Power, during the Presence of the Bishop, was to preserve the Dignity of the Superior Order, and to keep the Inferior in that just Subordination which 'twas their Duty to observe (as in our Church the Priest is not to give the Blessing in Presence of the Bishop, nor the Deacon to Baptize in Presence of the Presbyter;) but this *occasional* Restraining the Exercise of their Function for some Times and Circumstances, was not a taking away their Commission to Baptize in those Circumstances, but only a making them give way to their Superiors: For which Reason, Deacons, who were Priests of the Third Order, and in their Ordination were vested with a Commission to Baptize, were also restrain'd from the Exercise of that Function during the Presence of a **Priest** of the Second Order, to preserve the Dignity of the Second Order. But this Restraining was no more a Nulling or making Void the Deacon's Commission which he had receiv'd to Baptize, than it was of the Priests; for we do not find by any thing which our Historian has yet produc'd, that Clergy-men, of any Order, transgressing these Circumstantial Rules of the Church, were actually divested of their *Commission* by *those ancient Churches* who esteem'd their Ministrations valid: On the contrary we see, by the *Nicene Council*, and the *African Code*, before refer'd to, that the Commissions of irregular Clergy-men, whether Bishops, Priests or Deacons (who had acted in Schism which they ought not to have done) remain'd still good and valid; for those Churches did not require them to

be re-consecrated or re-ordain'd. Our Historian then, if he would make the irregular Practices of Deacons Baptizing in Circumstances prohibited by the Church, to be equivalent to the attempted Usurpations of Persons, who *never were at all commission'd to Baptize*, and who yet presume to endeavour to do it, even in opposition to the Divine Right of the Apostolick Order, must, *1st*, produce Instances of such Non-episcopal, or Anti-episcopal Deacons, who never receiv'd a Commission at all to Baptize, and yet presum'd to attempt that Holy Ministrations. *2^d*, He must prove, that the Antients held such their pretended Baptisms, if ever there were any, to be good and valid. *3^d*, He must make it clear, that the ancient Catholick Church, as well as some particular Men, thought so too: Or, *4th*, in Case he fails of these (as I am confident he will) then he must prove, that the ancient Catholick Church held Deacons Commissions to Baptize, to be null'd and made void by their Baptizing irregularly; but that, at the same time, those very Baptisms were good and valid, if done with Water in the Name of the Trinity: Either he must prove this Fourth, or the other Three Propositions, else it will stand good, that the Irregularities of ancient Deacons Baptizing contrary to some Circumstantial Rules of the Church, have no Comparison with those *Essential Irregularities* which our Modern, *never commission'd Usurpers*, commit, who act in Opposition to that very *Apostolick Commission* which Mr. Bingham himself acknowledges, in effect, to have an *essential* relation to Baptism, by saying, That it was "**to continue**" "**to the End of the World;**" and that it was "**necessary to preserve the Church, &c.**" For he can say *no more* than this concerning the *Water*,
and

and the Form in the Name of the Trinity; and therefore makes the Apostolick Commission, *as much* an Essential of the Institution, as they are.

§ XII. Our Historian's "next Question, is concerning Sub-deacons, and the rest of the Inferior Orders, who went by the Name of the Minor Clergy in the Primitive Church;— Whether in any Cases they had Power to Baptize?" p. 22, 23. And upon this he concludes, That "they had no Power in ordinary Cases:" Whether they had in any extraordinary ones, he says, "There are few among the Antients that have in direct Terms decided, p. 23." At last he concludes that this Question may be decided thus: "If the Antients (says he) granted Liberty to meer Monks and Lay-men to Baptize in extraordinary Cases, it will readily follow, that they would never scruple to grant the same Power to the Inferior Clergy, who were at least one Degree above Monks and Lay-men. We cannot therefore better determine this Question, than by proceeding to that other concerning the Power granted to Lay-men, in reference to the Administration of Baptism; which is the grand Question in this whole Affair, p. 24.

C H A P. III.

Testimonies for and against Lay-Baptisms; and all Mr. Bingham's Evidences examin'd and prov'd to make nothing for the pretended Validity of Baptisms, perform'd by Persons who never were Commission'd by Bishops to Baptize.

§ I. **O**UR Author first acknowledges, that " *it is certain that Lay-men were always debarr'd from meddling with the Administration of Baptism in all ordinary Cases.* Here then comes in a very apt Question, By what Law or Rule shall Baptism by Lay-men in **ordinary Cases** be pronounc'd good and valid? How shall that Baptism, which is given by Persons who *never were at all commission'd to Baptize*, and who attempt to do **it ordinarily**, be determin'd to be **valid**? Is not this a Law Case, a Question to be answer'd only by the Rule of our Christian Law, and the Enforcement thereof by the Laws of the Catholick Church? The Christian Law, *viz.* the Institution of Baptism, excludes such *never commission'd* Persons; and the Laws of the Church " *always debarr'd them,* " by our Reverend Historian's own Confession; Where then shall we seek for, and find the Validity of their pretended Ministrations? Is it to be determin'd without a Law or Rule? By what then shall they be guided, who endeavour to perswade us of their Validity? Is arbitrary Will and Pleasure alone sufficient to convince the Judgment? Or, is there such a Charm in the Formality of seriously imitating *an opus operatum alone*, as that a Thing shall

shall be Good and Valid, when done; tho' done without, and contrary to, something else, which the Law makes **Essential** to the very Doing thereof? This will be New, indeed; for "*it is certain, that Lay-men were always debarr'd from medling with the Administration of Baptism in all Ordinary Cases:*" To which I add, They were *always* so debarr'd, both by the Law of God, and of his Church; and therefore, our *Dissenters* Baptisms are destitute of *any* Law for their Validity, because perform'd by *Lay-men* in *Ordinary Cases*; and consequently, they who pronounce them Valid, esteem them to be Valid without Law: And how safe this is, in a Matter of such vast Moment; how satisfying to those who want to be secur'd of a Valid Baptism; I leave the Defenders of such a *Novel* Opinion to Answer.

§ II. But, it may be, some will say, That these Baptisms may be pronounced Valid, upon the same account as Baptisms perform'd by Irregular Deacons were. To which I Answer; If that be true, then these Lay-men must be prov'd to be equal in Power and Authority with such Irregular Deacons. But our Reverend Historian will not allow this; for he immediately subjoins, "*All the former Allegations, which make it the proper Office of Bishops and Presbyters, even to the exclusion of Deacons, are certainly of much greater Force against the Usurpations of Lay-men,* p. 22. Which plainly makes the Case of such Lay-Usurpations to be very different from that of Irregular Deacons; and therefore, whatsoever Arguments will hold for the Validity of such Deacons Baptisms, will be no-ways competent for the Validity of those Lay-Baptisms.

§ III. “ But (says Mr. Bingham) still the Grand
 “ Question remains, Whether ever they [i.e. Lay-
 “ men] were allow’d to do it in Extraordinary Cases
 “ of extreme Necessity, when no Publick Minister
 “ could be procur’d to do it? And this (says he)
 “ must be resolv’d in the Affirmative, as to the gene-
 “ ral Practice of the Church, tho’ there are
 “ some Exceptions of particular Churches to
 “ the contrary, p. 25. But, with submission, tho’
 the Question propos’d, and endeavour’d to be re-
 solv’d, by the Reverend Historian, in the Affirma-
 tive, be worth enquiring into; yet it is not the
grand Question which now exercises the Church:
 For, that about which we are now concern’d, is,
*Whether Persons never once commission’d at all
 to Baptize, can administer Valid Baptism,* especially,
 when they attempt to Baptize, even in Opposition
 to the Divine Right of the Apostolick Commis-
 sion, to be receiv’d only from Bishops, the Suc-
 cessors of the Apostles? And, Whether the An-
 cient Catholick Church has given her Testimony
 for the Validity of these pretended Baptisms?
 This is the Great Thing that ought to be enquir’d
 into, and fairly determin’d either in the Negative,
 or the Affirmative, according to the just Merits
 of the Cause. And this, our Reverend Author’s
 Scholastical History cannot resolve in the Affirma-
 tive; even tho’ he could prove, (as he cannot)
 That Lay-men “ were allow’d to Baptize in Ex-
 “ traordinary Cases, when no Publick Minister could
 “ be procur’d to do it, and that they were so in the
General Practice of the Church: His Testimonies
 for which, I come now to examine; and shall, as
 I go along, see of what Use they are to the Great
 Question now before us, Of Baptism by Persons
never Commission’d to Baptize.

§ IV. And, *First*, 'Tis very remarkable, That our Reverend Historian can produce no Testimonies from the Apostles, or their Cotemporaries; Nor from the Apostolick Fathers who next succeeded them; Nor, lastly, from any of the Antients who liv'd before *Tertullian*: So that, for about the first Two hundred Years of Christianity, we hear nothing of Lay-Baptisms being administer'd, nor of any thing in favour of them, either directly or indirectly. A strange and long Silence this, in a Matter which is pretended to be the "**general Practice of the Church.**" What would the Adversaries against Episcopacy say, if Antiquity had been so long silent about the Power and Authority of Bishops? And then, by what Rule should we have been determin'd of the *Fus Divinum* of Episcopacy, if *Scripture*, and the Writings of the Antients for about the first Two hundred Years of Christianity, had been so absolutely silent about it, as they are about the Validity of Lay-Baptism?

§ V. But, *Secondly*, In a Matter of such Importance as this is, if it had been the **general practice** of the Church, and so safely to be rely'd on, as some represent it to be; would there have been any *considerable Exceptions* against so **general a practice**, insomuch, as that whole Churches have refus'd to come in to it; or, to use the Reverend Historian's Words, Would there have been "*some Exceptions of particular Churches to the contrary?*" Do's not this spoil the Practice's being **Catholick**, while **particular Churches**, Cotemporary with those other Churches who are suppos'd to have practis'd it, refus'd to suffer or

D

allow

allow of any such Practice. In this supposed Difference of the Churches, some will say, That one Side was wrong, for *allowing*, what the other Side *refus'd* to allow; and others, 'tis likely, will say, That these latter were in the wrong, and those others in the right: What must we then do, when we find such a Difference? Certainly, we must have **some Rule** or other, whereby to discover which of them was in the wrong, and which in the right; otherwise, the Fundamentals of Religion must be determin'd only by Number of *Votes*; (which God forbid:) This Rule must be the Holy Scripture, and therein, the Divine Positive Institution of Baptism, and the Laws of God about such Positive Institutions as that is; all which do *as much* exclude Persons who *never were Commission'd*, as they do any *Matter* and *Form* which were *never Appointed*: And 'tis by this Rule of the Holy Scripture, that the *different Practices* of Churches must be tried; and by which, sometimes, the fewest have been found to be in the right, whilst the greater Number have been in the wrong: But here there is no fear of any such Matter, with respect to those Ancient Churches who allow'd, and the other Ancient Churches who did not allow of, the Validity of Lay-Baptism: For all the suppos'd Evidence that is brought for Defence of it, will not amount to a *Catholick Tradition*; being destitute of any Proof from Scripture, and the first Two hundred Years of Christianity, as 'tis also of the Authority of any *one ancient General Council* that ever was Held in the Church of Christ, and consists only of a false Notion of *Tertullian's*, about the Year 200; a particular Provincial Council of *Spanish Bishops*, Held, some think, *Anno 205*; a fabulous Story of a Baptism by Boys in Play, about

about the same time; a Notion of *St. Jerom's*, founded upon *Tertullian's* false Principle, and inconsistent with himself; *Optatus's* Dangerous Position, if it can be interpreted as some Men would have it; *St. Augustin's* ill-grounded Opinion; These in the Fourth Century: A Saying of *Gelasius* Bishop of *Rome*, Anno 492; and another of *Isidore* Bishop of *Sevil*, Anno 595. These are all that can be found in the first Six hundred Years of Christianity; — and the strength of their Evidence is now to be enquired into, and other opposite Evidences to be brought against them——

§ VI. But before I concern my self with *Mr. Bingham's* Evidences, I shall take what offers it self against these Baptisms, from the Days of the Apostles. ———

St. Ignatius, about the Year of Christ 71, affirms, That * “It is not lawful, without the Bishop, to Baptize. That, “Without Bishops, Priests, and Deacons, there is no Church of the Elect: And, That “He is without, who do's any thing “without the Bishops, and Presbyters, and Deacons. These are that Apostolick Father's positive Assertions, relating to those Sacred Ministrations, which were deposited in the Hands of *Bishops, Priests, and Deacons*. It is not *Lawful*, (says he) *without the Bishop*, to Baptize. In these Words there are Two Things to be enquired into: 1st, What he means by *Without the Bishop*? It is not to be suppos'd that *St. Ignatius* meant, that the Bishop must always be present in Person at every Baptism; for we find, that *Philip* the Deacon Baptiz'd, in the

* Epist. to the *Smyrneans*, N. 8. Epist. to the *Trallians*, N. 2, 3, 7.

the Absence of the Apostles ; and Presbyters and Deacons were Instituted to Officiate, in those Sacred Functions to which they were Ordain'd, in the Absence as well as in the Presence of the Bishop ; and this, by reason 'twas impossible for the Bishop always to be Personally present : And therefore, *without the Bishop*, must signifie, without Commission or Authority receiv'd from the Bishop ; Presbyters and Deacons then being Men Authoriz'd and Commission'd by the Bishop to Baptize, are not here spoken of ; but Persons who never were so Commission'd, and are therefore call'd *Laicks*. 2dly, What Law do's this blessed Saint and Martyr refer us to, when he says, *It is not Lawful* ? It must be either to the Law of God, or to the Law of the Church, or to both of these together : If to the Law of God ; then, 'tis plain, that Baptisin by a Person who never had a Commission from the Bishop, if any such had then been attempted, would have been contrary to the Law of God, and therefore there was no Law of God by which to pronounce it Valid ; consequently, no Valid Law of the Church for that Purpose ; because, the Church can have no Law sufficient to make that Valid before God, which is not Valid by any of his Laws. If *St. Ignatius* refers us to any Laws of the Church, and means, that, in respect of those Laws, "*it is not Lawful* ;" then, 'tis plain, that the Church had at that time no Law of hers, whereby such a suppos'd Baptisin could have been pronounc'd Valid, *in the sense of the Church* ; In such Case, its pretended Validity must have been judg'd of by some *previous Law* of God : But that Law is not to be found ; and therefore, such a suppos'd Baptisin could not have been pronounc'd Valid, by virtue of any the then Laws of

of the Church. *Lastly*, If *St. Ignatius* has an eye to both the *Laws of God*, and his *Church*; then, such a suppos'd *Baptism* must not have been *Valid*, by virtue of any *Law* whatsoever; and therefore *Invalid*, for want of all *Law* whatsoever to give it *Validity*. And this is the more confirm'd, by his asserting, That *without Bishops, Priests, and Deacons*, there is *no Church of the Elect*; and, that *He is "Without," i. e.* Out of the *Church*, "*who do's any thing*, [*i. e.* any *Sacred Positive Function*, that belongs peculiarly to the *Office of the Clergy*,] "*without the Bishops, and Presbyters, and Deacons.*" For in those *Days*, if *Laicks* had attempted such *Ministrations*, they, and their *Dependants*, being and having "*no Bishops, Priests, and Deacons*," but acting without them, would have been *no Church*; and if *no Church*, then their pretended *Ministrations* would have been *no Christian Sacraments*; because, where there is "*no Church*, there are *no Sacraments*; and therefore *no Baptism*."

The only *Question* that remains, is, Whether *St. Ignatius's* *Words* are not to be restrain'd to *Ordinary Cases* only; and, whether *Extraordinary Cases*, where *Bishops, Priests, and Deacons* cannot be had, are not to be excepted? In *Answer* to which, 'tis plain that *St. Ignatius* makes no *Exceptions*; his *Words* are general, and he refers to no *Rule* or *Custom* then in the *Church*, for any *Exception* whatsoever; so that, if *Men* will make *Exceptions*, they must have *reason* to do so; otherwise their *Exceptions* will be *arbitrary*, and without *foundation*. If there be any *reason* for an *Exception*, it must be founded either on the *Law of Nature*, or else the *Positive Revealed Law of God*: The *Law of Nature* has no *Rule* for such an *Exception*, because *Baptism* is a thing

about which that Law is no-ways concern'd; and the Reveal'd Positive Law of God has no such Rule for such an Exception; if it has, Where is it? It has not yet been produc'd; so that Men have nothing whereon to ground such an Exception. Some, it may be, will suppose, that the Church had then a Law or Rule that excepted such Extraordinary Cases: But Supposing, without Proving, will not do; and they cannot shew us any such early Primitive Law; and consequently, St. Ignatius's Words cannot be fairly interpreted to be restrain'd to Ordinary Cases only, and therefore they must include Extraordinary Cases also.

§ VII. St. *Hermas*, who was Cotemporary with St. *Paul*, tho' he had so strict an Opinion of the * Necessity of Baptism, that he reckon'd the *Righteous Men and Prophets*, who Dy'd before the Coming of Christ, stood in need of Christian Baptism, even in their Separate State; yet, to supply this their Necessity, none are mention'd by him to have gone to them to give 'em Baptism, but "† *The Apostles and Doctors of the Preaching of the Son of God.*" *The Apostles and Teachers*, who "preach'd the Name of the Son of God;" Men who had Christ's and the Apostles Commission to minister in Holy Things; not the least Hint of any who never were Commission'd to Baptize, that went to supply their want of Baptism. But if our modern Notion, That *Laicks, in want of the Clergy, may Baptize*, had then been held by the Church; considering, that the Laity were always vastly more Numerous than the Clergy, it

* *Vif. iii. N. 3. Simil. xix. N. 15, 16.*

† *Simil. xix. N. 15.*

would have been but natural enough to suppose, that some of those Prophets, &c. were baptiz'd by common Christians also; but in this our *St. Hermas* is absolutely silent, and mentions no other Baptizers, for this suppos'd Case of Necessity, than the Apostles and Teachers, who preach'd the Name of the Son of God: And how could they Preach except they were sent or commission'd? according to the Great Apostle of the *Gentiles*. But to come now to Mr. *Bingham's* Evidences:

§ VIII. This Reverend Historian gives us first of all, *Tertullian's* Opinion upon the Matter, about the Year of Christ 200, translated from his Book *de Baptismo*, c. 17. Thus “ the chief Priest, who is
 “ the Bishop, has Power to give Baptism; and after
 “ him Presbyters and Deacons; yet not without the
 “ Authority of the Bishop, for the Honour of the
 “ Church, in the Preservation of which Peace is
 “ preserv'd. In another Respect, Lay-men have
 “ also a Right to give it; for what is received in com-
 “ mon, may be given in common. Baptism is God's
 “ peculiar, and may be conferr'd by all. But Lay-
 “ men are in a much greater Degree obliged by the
 “ Rules of Modesty in the Use of their Power, since
 “ they, who are Superior to them, are obliged not
 “ to assume to themselves the Office which belongs to
 “ the Bishop only: Emulation is the Mother of Strife;
 “ all things are Lawful says the Apostle, but all things
 “ are not Expedient. Therefore it ought to suffice
 “ them to use this Power in Necessities, when the
 “ Condition of the Place, or Time, or Person
 “ requires it: For then their charitable Assistance is
 “ accepted, when the Circumstance of one in Danger
 “ presses them to it. And in this Case he would be
 “ guilty of a Man's Destruction, that omitted to do

“ *what he lawfully might,*” p. 25, 26. Thus far Tertullian’s Opinion. But by what Rule shall we discover that it was then a Catholick Tradition of the Church, and not Tertullian’s private Opinion only? Our Reverend Historian would have it, That ’twas then “ *the common Practice of the Church:*” 1st, Because “ *no learned Man before*” Mr. Dodwell, and some others, “ *ever thought*” that it was “ *only Tertullian’s own private Opinion, and not the common Practice of the Church:*” 2dly, Because of “ *the Coherence of Tertullian’s Discourse.*” “ *In the former Part of it (says Mr. Bingham) he is certainly speaking of the Practice of the Church, when he says, Presbyters and Deacons act by the Bishop’s Authority, when they administer Baptism in ordinary Cases. It would be strange then, if he should invert his Discourse immediately in the next Words, and not mean the Practice of the Church, when he comes to speak of Lay-men,*” p. 27. These are Mr. Bingham’s Two suppos’d Reasons: The First amounts to nothing; because our Reverend Historian cannot prove, that all Learned Men, before Mr. Dodwell, &c. esteemed this Passage of Tertullian’s, to be an Evidence of the General Practice of the Church. What *no Learned Man ever thought* before Mr. Dodwell, and others, is a meer Negative, and hard to be discover’d, except by some positive Declaration; so that till Mr. Bingham produces the Declaration of those Learned Men, shewing, that this Passage of Tertullian is an Evidence for the General Practice of the Church, his saying that “ *no Learned Man before* [Mr. Dodwell] “ *ever thought,*” as Mr. Dodwell, and some others thought, is giving no Reason at all: As neither would his producing their Testimony only, if it were not also back’d with such Arguments for the Truth

Truth of their Evidence, as will stand a fair Examination. And then, as to the Second, *viz.* “*The*” [suppos’d] *Coherence of Tertullian’s Discourse,*” &c. Upon a just Observation of his own Words, it will be found, that his Notion was not the Practice of the Church; for as Mr. *Bingham* himself acknowledges, *Tertullian’s* Words do plainly respect the Church’s Practice in the former Part of his Discourse, where he speaks of the *Power of the Bishops, Priests, and Deacons*, to Baptize; and mentions only Priests, and Deacons, as acting in Subordination to, and by *Authority* of the Bishop, “*for the Honour of the Church.*” But what is this *Honour of the Church*, except our submitting to her Rules and Orders? How can her Honour be preserv’d, but by our obeying her just Laws, and following her well-grounded Traditions and Customs? Therefore her Laws and Customs, concerning Baptism, are here referr’d to by *Tertullian*, when he speaks of *her Honour*, in the Power of the Bishop, and under him, of Presbyters and Deacons, to Baptize. His saying immediately after this, *Alioquin*, otherwise, or “*in another respect,*” is a plain Transition from his former Subject of what had a reference to the Church’s Law or Custom; and evidently shews, that he is going to say something that is separate and distinct therefrom: For, says he, “*in another respect,*” *i. e.* in respect of something else foreign to the Church’s Law or Custom before referr’d to, “*Lay-men have also a Right to give it:*” As much as if he had said, by the Law or Custom of the Church, “*The Chief Priest, who is the Bishop, has Power to give Baptism, and after him Presbyters and Deacons, yet not without the Authority of the Bishop; for the Honour of the Church:*” in the Preservation of which Honour, by our ob-

serving

serving this her Law, "*Peace is preserv'd:*" "Otherwise, or "*in another respect*" distinct and separate from the Consideration of this Law or Custom, "*Lay-men have also a Right to give it;*" which is the same as saying, that Lay-men *have a Right* in themselves to Baptize, separate and distinct from the Consideration of the Church's Law or Custom: So that *Tertullian's* Notion of Lay-men's Right to Baptize, is not founded upon any **Law** or Custom of the Church at that time giving them such a *Right*, or on any Act of the Bishop pretending to vest them with *his* Authority: So far from these, that he speaks of *Lay-mens Right* by way of *Antithesis* to 'em, by introducing it with an *Alioquin, otherwise*, making it to have "*another respect*" than that of the Church's Law, and *the Bishop's Authority*. Consequently their Right to Baptize, here spoken of by *Tertullian*, being neither founded on any Law of the Church, nor on any Authority receiv'd from the Bishop, must be a pretended Right which the Church never gave them, and therefore is not the Church's Tradition; because 'tis inconceivable how the Church should have a Tradition for **Lay-mens Right** to Baptize, without any Authority receiv'd from the Bishop, when at the same time the Tradition was universal, that all Power to Baptize was originally in the Apostles, and their Successors the Bishops; and that *none could have any Right* to Baptize, but those who were in some respect or other *commission'd* by them: As Mr. *Bingham* has very well observ'd in his 4th and 5th Pages. This shews that *Tertullian's Right of Laymen* to Baptize, was his own particular Notion only.

And this is not a little corroborated by his manner of speaking, when he refers to the Laws and Practice of the Church; for then he gives us

such

such plain Tokens of his speaking about *them*, that we cannot well miss of understanding him. Thus in the Place before us, his speaking of the *Honour of the Church* being preserv'd by the Power of the Bishop to Baptize, and of Priests and Deacons in subordination to, and by his Authority, is an evident Token of his referring to the Church's Law and Practice. So again; When he speaks of Persons who had receiv'd Heretical Baptism, he says, "*We have * a Rule among us to Re-baptize them;*" plainly thereby referring to the Law and Practice of the Church where he liv'd. But nothing like these has he to guide us to the *general Practice* of the Church giving Lay-men a **Right** to Baptize; but the direct contrary, by his *Alioquin*, &c. as has been prov'd before. And therefore, 'tis no other than his own private Opinion, and *no general Practice* of the Church.

§ IX. Which is further confirm'd by the imaginary Reason upon which he endeavours to found their *pretended Right*, and 'tis this: "*For what is received in common, may be given in common;*" as Mr. Bingham Words it. A Principle so false, that multitudes of Instances may be brought to demonstrate its contrariety to Truth and Reason: And even *Tertullian* himself contradicts this Notion a little after in the Case of Baptism by Women, whom he will not allow to have any *Right* at all to Baptize; which certainly they must have, if "*what is received in common, may be given in common.*" For Women as well as Men receive Baptism, and may therefore give it, if this Principle be true, as

* Tertul. de Pudicitia, c. 19. Edit. Rigal. Lutet. 1634.

it most certainly is not, in Cases that relate to a Commission; for 'tis plain, that all the Citizens, properly so call'd, of the City of *London*, receive the Freedom of the City in common, and yet that Freedom may not be given in common by every such Citizen; it must be done by those Officers of the City, who are in Commission to give Freedoms; otherwise, the pretended Freedom will prove a Nullity in all respects whatsoever. So in Cases of Naturalization of Foreigners, and abundance of other Instances that might be brought to shew the Fallacy of *Tertullian's* false Maxim, the very proposing of which betrays the Weakness of it, and the consequent Danger of that Practice, which is built upon no better Foundation.

§ X. Thus *Tertullian* gives us nothing but his own Word for it, and a false Reason to support it, that "*Lay-men also have a Right to give Baptism.*" And now I would fain know, whether *this alone is sufficient* to convince any reasonable Man, that Lay-men then had such a Right? Is the bare Word of such an ancient Writer, his single Opinion, without the necessary Adjunct of the *Church's Rule* to support it, a powerful Reason to perswade us, that it was in his Days the *general Practice of the Church*? If this be enough, then we must swallow *Tertullian's* other *Nostrums*, as Doctrines and Practices of the Church too; for he is as positive in some of them, as he is in this. Thus he makes *Lay-men to be Priests*, * purely upon a wrong Interpretation of a Text in the First Chapter of the *Revelations*, which makes all Christians to be as *much* and as

* Nonne & Laici Sacerdotes sumus? Scriptum est Regnum quoque nos & Sacerdotes, Deo & Patri suo fecit. Tertul. de Exhor. Castit. cap. 7.

proper Kings, as it makes them proper Priests, *i. e.* not at all. How Christians, as such, are Kings and Priests in a figurative Sense, I have already shew'd in * another Place. He reckons *the difference † between Clergy and Laity to be founded on the Church's Authority*, when, in truth, it is founded on *God's Law*, and the Institution of *Christ himself*: In Consequence of this he teaches, that *in the Absence of the Clergy, || Lay-men are Priests for themselves*, and have Power not only to Baptize, but also to Offer and Minister the Memorial of the Sacrifice of Christ's Body and Blood, [*& Offers & Tinguis*, says he;] nay, further, he affirms, That *where Three are gather'd together, tho' they be but Laicks, they are a Church*: The Consequence of which, is, that they must also have those Spiritual Powers which belong to the Church: Hence they may not only Baptize and Administer the other Sacrament, but also *Ordain, Excommunicate, and Absolve, and Retain Sins*, otherwise they cannot constitute a Church; which plainly shews the Falseness of the Principle from whence such Consequences flow. And all these are Errors so very notorious, and so contrary to Scripture-Rule, that who can dare to say, they were Traditions of the Catholick, Primitive Church? And yet they must be so, if *Tertulian's* Notions must be receiv'd for the Church's Doctrines and Practices.

* *Lay-Baptism Invalid, 3d Edit. p. 196, &c.*

† Differentiam inter ordinem & plebem constituit Ecclesie Auctoritas & Honor per ordinis concessum sanctificatus. || Adeo ubi Ecclesiastici ordinis non est concessus, & offers, & tinguis, & sacerdos, es tibi solus. ** Sed ubi tres Ecclesia est licet Laici. — *Tertul. de Exhort. Castitatis, cap. 7. Edit. Rigal. Lutet. Par. 1634.*

§ XI. I might also instance several of his other Errors and Paradoxes, as his false Notion, *Of the Soul of the First Man's being made out of the Substance of God; His Error concerning the Sex of Souls; That the Soul is corporeal, and not properly a Spirit; That the Soul can suffer nothing without the Body; That God himself is corporeal, because nothing is incorporeal. That Christ, the Son of God, was always seen by Men in true and real Flesh, before he was Born of the Holy Virgin; and, That Second Marriages are as Wicked as Whoredom:* These Errors of this ancient Writer, are, with * others mention'd in the Margin, collected together in *Paradoxa Tertulliani cum Antidoto Jacobi Pamellii*, in the 2d Vol. of his Works, Printed at Paris, 1635. — And does his holding them, shew, that the Church held them too?

-
- * 1 De Angelis desertoribus qui duxerunt filias Hominum.
 2 De Angelorum apparitionibus in vera humana carne.
 3 De Anima primi Hominis ex materia Dei.
 4 De Animabus posterorum Adæ ex traduce.
 5 De Animæ Sexu.
 6 Animam peccatricem potius quam carnem.
 7 De Anima corporea, quòd proinde propriè spiritus non fit.
 8 Animam nihil pati posse sine corpore.
 11 Animus Hominum pessimas post mortem in Dæmonas verti.
 15 De Deo corporeo, eo quod nihil incorporale fit.
 18 De Ecstasi sive Amentia, sive spiritu Prophetico Montani, & Insanarum Vatum Priscillæ & Maximillæ, & Similium.
 19 Filium Dei Christum, semper visum ab hominibus in vera, etsi non nata carne.
 25 De Nuptiis secundis damnaticis tanquam stupris.
 26 De Paracleto Montano.
 28 Psychicis, quo nomine Catholicis calumniam fecit.

No such Matter; and therefore, his asserting, *Lay-men to have a Right to Baptize*, in Cases of suppos'd *Necessity*, without appealing to the Church's Law or Rule for such a *Right*, is no Argument, that the Church in general held any such Notion; but only proves, that it was his own private Opinion; and consequently, it must stand or fall, by the Goodness or Badness of the Argument which he brings to support it. His Argument has been already prov'd to be false, in the IXth Section of this Chapter: — And therefore, upon the whole, we may fairly conclude, that *Tertullian* is no Evidence of *any general Practice of the Church* countenancing the pretended Right of Lay-men to Baptize, in Case of Necessity. Nay, he has not given so much as one Instance of any such Baptism by a Lay-man, allow'd of by the Church; no Historical Account of any such Matter, but only his singular private Opinion, what he thought a Lay-man might do, in want of the Clergy; and this founded upon a false Principle.

But then, as to the Case before us, of Baptism by Laicks, Persons never Commission'd by Bishops, attempting to do this where the Clergy are to be had; *Tertullian* is full and direct against them, and refers us to the Law and Practice of the Church, when he asserts, That “*The Chief Priest, who is the Bishop,*
 “*has the Power to give Baptism; and after him,*
 “*Presbyters and Deacons; yet not without the Au-*
 “*thority of the Bishop, for the Honour of the Church.*” This was the standing Rule and Law of the Church, pursuant to the Law of God: So that, if Lay-men had then pretended (as they do now) to have usurp'd the Power of Baptizing, where Bishops, Priests, and Deacons, were to be had; it would have been against the Honour of the Church, a
 Breach

Breach of her Law and Custom, as well as of the Law of God ; and consequently, destitute of any Law either of God, or his Church, whereby to judge and pronounce their Usurped Ministration Good and Valid.

And thus our Reverend Historian has produc'd nothing of the **Church's Practice** in favour of Lay-Baptism, in any Case whatsoever, for the space of the first Three hundred Years, the purest Ages of the Christian Church : So that, if I should proceed no farther, but Conclude here, I might venture to say, That the Validity of pretended Baptisms, perform'd by Persons who never were Commission'd by Bishops to Baptize, never was a Tradition of the Catholick Church, because not attested by her in the purest Ages, the first Three hundred Years of Christianity : But, on the contrary, Baptism by Persons suppos'd to have no Power or Authority from Bishops, was exclaim'd against, in that very Period, by no less Men than the blessed *St. Ignatius* Bishop of *Antioch*, as I have prov'd before, *pag. 35* ; by *St. Cyprian* Bishop of *Carthage* ; and by *Firmilian* Bishop of *Cæsarea*, and their Colleagues. For,

§ XII. About the Year of Christ 256, *St. Cyprian* and *Firmilian* held the Baptism of Hereticks and Schismaticks to be *Null and Void*, upon this score, that, Because they were Broken off from the Church, and become *Lay-men*, therefore they had no Power to Baptize : Their being become *Lay-men*, made them to have no Power to Baptize ; and their want of Power, made their Baptisms Null and Void, in the Opinion of these two Bishops. That this was their Opinion, *St. Basil*, who sat in the Chair of *Cæsarea*, about an Hundred and thirteen Years

Years after *Firmilian*, testifies: And that his Testimony may not be question'd, it shall stand here in Mr. *Bingham's* own Translation, and he introduces it thus: " *St. Basil* brings in *Cyprian*, and *Firmilian* his Predecessor in the See of *Cesarea*, arguing after this manner;" then follows *St. Cyprian* and *Firmilian's* Argument, thus translated; * " *Hereticks and Schismaticks are broken off from the Church, and become Lay-men, and therefore have no Power to Baptize, or to Ordain; being no longer able to give the Gift of the Holy-Ghost, which they have lost themselves; therefore, such as are Baptized by them, are to be Re-baptized with the True Baptism of the Church, as being only Baptized by Lay-men.*"

The whole Stress of this Argument, we see, is founded upon **Lay-mens** having no power to Baptize, and the consequent Necessity of giving **True Baptism** to such as were **only Baptiz'd by Lay-men**. Whether *St. Cyprian* and *Firmilian's* pronouncing Hereticks and Schismaticks to be no more than *Lay-men*, was right or no; or, whether they esteem'd them to be redu'd to *Lay-men*, by their Heresy or Schism only; or rather, by virtue of the Laws of those Churches to whom they ow'd Subjection; 'tis no matter at present to enquire: Be that how it will, this is certain, That they made the *want of a Commission*, *i. e.* *Lay-mens* want of Power to Baptize, the Standard by which they judg'd of the Invalidity of Baptism by Hereticks and Schismaticks: Baptism by Lay-men was Null and Void, in their Opinion; and they, consequently, pronounc'd Baptism by Hereticks and Schismaticks to be so too, because they esteem'd

* *Basil. Epist. 1. ad Amphilochium, cap. 1.*

them to be but **Lay-men**. This Evidence is very destructive of what some say, That *Tertullian's* Notion about Lay-Baptism, was the *general Practice of the Church* in his Days: For, is it at all likely, that Two such Bishops as these were, should, so soon as about 56 Years after *Tertullian's* Writing his Book *de Baptismo*, make use of such an Argument as this? If *Tertullian's* Notion of the *Validity of Lay-Baptism* had been founded upon the *general Practice* of the Church at that Time, these two Bishops must, at that rate, have been greater Strangers to, and more ignorant of, the Church's *general Practice*, than *Tertullian*, a private Priest; or else the *general Practice* must have ceas'd, by that time *St. Cyprian* and *Firmilian* came to dispute against Heretical and Schismatical Baptisms: Suppositions so ill grounded, that no reasonable Man can believe them; and 'till there shall be produc'd good Reasons to the contrary, we must conclude, that *St. Cyprian* and *Firmilian's* Opinion, of the Invalidity of Lay-Baptism, was then a standing Principle, in their Churches at least: Because 'tis unreasonable to believe, that in so Publick a Dispute as that was, about Heretical and Schismatical Baptism, two such celebrated Bishops as *St. Cyprian* and *Firmilian*, should use an Argument founded on the Invalidity of Lay-Baptism, if the Validity of Lay-Baptism had at the same time been a received Principle in those Churches. This Testimony of those two great Bishops, upon so Publick an Occasion, That *Lay-Baptism was then esteem'd to be Null and Void*, is of so great Consequence, that our Reverend Historian is something particular in his Endeavours to weaken the Credit of it: But his several Objections shall be Answer'd in the following Chapter.

§ XIII. And tho' their Evidence is transmitted to us by *St. Basil*, and therefore sufficiently establish'd by his Authority; yet even in *St. Cyprian's* Works themselves, we find good Proofs, that *St. Cyprian*, *Firmilian*, and others their Colleagues, held pretended Baptisms to be Null and Void, when perform'd by Persons who were suppos'd by them to have had no Commission to Baptize. Thus *St. Cyprian*, in his Epistle to *Fanuarus* *, says, "It is necessary that Water should be first Cleans'd and Sanctified by the Priest; that by his Baptism, the Sins of the Baptiz'd Person may be wash'd away." In his Epistle to *Stephen* Bishop of Rome, he acquaints him, † That he and his Colleagues, in Council Decreed, "by Common Consent and Authority, That if any Presbyters or Deacons, who were first Ordained in the Catholick Church, and afterwards rebelled and stood out against Her; or, If any who were, among Hereticks, Ordain'd by the profane Ordination of False Bishops, &c. — If any of these return'd to the Church, they should be receiv'd to Communion only as Lay-men." In his Epistle to *Jubaianus*, he affirms, That

* Oportet ergo mundari & Sanctificari Aquam prius à Sacerdote, ut possit Baptismo suo peccata Hominis qui Baptizatur, abluere. *Epist.* 70. *Paris*, 1548. Pag. 137.

† Addimus plane & Adjungimus Frater charissime Concensu & Auctoritate Communi, ut etiam si qui Presbyteri, aut Diaconi, qui vel in Ecclesia Catholica prius Ordinati fuerint, & postmodum perfidi ac rebelles contra Ecclesiam steterint, vel apud Hæreticos à pseudo-Episcopis & antichristis contra Christi dispositionem, profana Ordinatione promoti sint & contra Altare unum atque Divinum Sacrificia foris falsa ac sacrilega offerre conati sunt, eos quoque hac conditione suscipi cum revertuntur, ut Communicent Laici, &c. — nec debere eos revertentes ea apud nos Ordinationis & Honoris Arma retinere, quibus contra nos rebellaverint. *Epist.* 72. p. 141, 142.

“ **None have Authority to Baptize, or give Remission of Sins, but the Bishops, and those who are founded in the Evangelical Law, and our Lord's Appointment; and, That nothing can be Bound or Loosed out of the Church, seeing there is None there who has the Power of Binding and Loosing. — That this is founded upon the Authority of the Holy Scriptures. — That No One can usurp to himself, in Opposition to the Bishops and Priests, what he has no Right and Power to perform; and instances the Examples of Corah, Dathan, and Abiram's endeavouring to usurp to themselves the Power of Sacrificing, in Opposition to Moses, and Aaron the Priest. So again, in his Epistle to Magnus, speaking of the Baptism given by Hereticks and Schismaticks, he calls it, * a Profane Washing; and gives this for a Reason, why those who come over from them to the Church, ought to be Baptiz'd in the Church: † “We say, (says he) That all Hereticks and Schismaticks are utterly destitute of all Power and Right:” In Consequence of this, he calls their Altars, || False Altars; their Priesthood, Unlawful; and their Sa-

** Intelligimus, non nisi in Ecclesia Præpositis, & in Evangelica Lege, ac Dominica Ordinatio, ne fundatis licere Baptizare, remissam peccatorum dare, foris autem nec ligari aliquid posse nec solvi, ubi non sit qui aut ligare possit aliquid, aut solvere. Nec hoc frater charissime sine Scripturæ divinæ auctoritate proponimus, ut dicamus certa Lege, — cuncta esse disposita; nec posse quenquam contra Episcopos & Sacerdotes usurpare sibi aliquid, quod non sit sui Juris & potestatis. Nam & Chore, Dathan, & Abyron, &c. Epist. 73. p. 145.

* Prophanum Lavacrum.

† Dicimus omnes omnino Hæreticos & Schismaticos nihil habere Potestatis ac Juris.

|| Falsa Altaria, & illicita Sacerdotia, & Sacrificia Sacrilega, & nomina adulterata fingentes.

crifices,

crifices, *Sacrilegious*. He affirms, That * *they vainly Contend, [who say, That] "any one can be Baptiz'd and Sanctified with Saving Baptism, where 'tis manifest that the Baptizer has not Authority or Commission to Baptize."* And he asks, † *"How can they Justifie and Sanctifie the Baptiz'd, who are the Priest's Enemies, and endeavour to usurp to themselves things unfit and unlawful for them, and which were never granted them by any Law or Authority whatsoever?"*

These, among many other Instances that might be brought from *St. Cyprian's* own Works, do plainly show, That he esteem'd it necessary that the *Baptifinal Water* should be Sanctified by the *Priest*; That *Hereticks* and *Schismaticks* were, in his Opinion, but as *Lay-men*; That they had no *Power, Authority* or *Right* to Baptize; and that, because they had not this *Right* or *Authority*, therefore their *Baptifms* were *Null* and *Void*. Whether those *Hereticks* and *Schismaticks* were rightly judg'd by him to be but *Lay-men*, is another Question; but this is certain, that *St. Cyprian* esteem'd their *Baptifms* to be *Invalid*, for want of *Commission* and *Authority* to Baptize; and thereby plainly shew'd, that he esteem'd the *Commission* to be *Essential* to the *Miniftration* of *Baptifm*; and consequently, that a *supposititious Baptifm*, by a *Person* who never had a *Commission* to Baptize, [which is the very Case of our *Lay-*

* *Frustra Contendunt Baptizari & Sanctificari illic aliquem salutari Baptifmo posse, ubi constat Baptizantem Baptizandi Licentiam non habere.* ———

† *Quomodo tales justificare & sanctificare Baptizatos possunt; qui Hostes Sacerdotum, aliena & illicita & nullo sibi Jure concessa usurpare conantur? — Epist. 76. p. 167, 170, 171.*

Baptisms] must be Null and Void, whatever became of Baptisms by Hereticks and Schismatics who in those Days used to be Ordain'd by Bishops.

§ XIV. *Firmilian* was also of the same mind; for, in his Epistle to St. *Cyprian*, he affirms of Hereticks who have cut themselves off from the Church; That * “ *They can have nothing of Grace, or Power, [or Authority;] since all Grace and Authority is establish'd in the Church, where the Bishops preside, who have the Power or Authority of Baptizing, of Laying on of Hands, and of Ordination. For as an Heretick has not the Authority of Ordaining, or of Laying on of Hands, so neither has he the Power or Authority of Baptizing.* — He says, † “ *That this was long before Establish'd and Confirm'd in a Council at Iconium, held by him and the Bishops of Galatia and Cilicia, and the rest of the neighbouring Regions, firmly to be held and maintain'd against Hereticks, when any Doubt should arise about this Matter.* — They Decreed, || “ *That all those should be holden*

* *Hæretici si se ab Ecclesia Dei Sciderint, nihil habere Potestatis aut Gratia possunt, quando omnis Potestas & Gratia in Ecclesia Constituta sit; ubi præsident majores natu qui & Baptizandi & manum imponendi, & ordinandi possident potestatem. Hæretico enim sicut Ordinare non licet, nec Manum imponere, ita nec Baptizare.* — *Firmiliani Epist. inter Epist. Cyr. LXXV. p. 159.*

† *Quod totum nos jampridem in Iconio, collecti in unum convenientibus ex Galatia & Cilicia, & cæteris proximis Regionibus confirmavimus, tenendum, contra Hæreticos firmiter & vindicandum, cum à quibusdam de ista re dubitaretur. p. 160.*

|| *Not: etiam illos quos hi qui prius in Ecclesia Catholica Episcopi fuerant, & postmodum sibi potestatem Clericæ Ordinationis affumentes Baptizaverant, pro non Baptizatis habendos judicavimus, &c. p. 165.*

“ as not Baptiz'd, who were Baptiz'd by such as
 “ had once been Bishops in the Catholick Church, if
 “ they were Baptiz'd by them after they had sepa-
 “ rated from the Church, and assum'd to themselves
 “ the Power of the Priestly Order.”

All which Passages of Firmilian's Letter to St. Cyprian do abundantly prove, that he and his Colleagues, Assembled in the Council of Iconium, were entirely of St. Cyprian's Opinion, That there was no Baptism, where there was no Priestly Power to Baptize; and consequently, that Baptism by Lay-men, Persons not having this Priestly Power, is Null and Void; whatever becomes of that other Question, Whether the then Hereticks and Schismaticks were or were not, in reality, reduc'd to the State and Condition of meer Lay-men.

§XV. So again, several of St. Cyprian's Colleagues in the Council of Carthage, consisting of 87 Bishops, expressly affirm'd the same thing: Thus Novatus à Thamugade says, That * “ According to the De-
 “ cree of their Colleagues, Men of most sacred Me-
 “ mory, all Hereticks and Schismaticks ——— who
 seem to have been Ordain'd, should, upon their Con-
 version to the Church, be receiv'd among Laicks.

Confessor Pomponius à Dionysiana says, † “ 'Tis
 “ manifest, that Hereticks cannot Baptize, and

* Secundum Decretum Collegarum nostrorum sanctissimæ memoriæ vrorum, omnes Schismaticos & Hæreticos qui ad Ecclesiam conversi sunt, — & qui Ordinati videbantur inter Laicos recipi. *Concil Carthag. inter S. Cyp. Oper. p. 354.*

† Manifestum est Hæreticos non posse Baptizare, & Remissionem Peccatorum dare, qui potestatem non habent, ut aut solvere aut ligare aliquid in terris possint. *P. 360.*

“ give Remission of Sins, who have not the Power
 “ of Binding or Loosing any thing on the Earth.

Confessor *Clarus à Mascula* affirms, That
 * “ Hereticks, who have no Power out of the
 “ Church, — cannot Baptize any one with their
 “ Baptism.”

In Consequence of this Supposition, That Hereticks were destitute of Power and Authority to Baptize, [as Lay-men, Persons who were never Commission'd, most certainly are,] these Fathers determin'd, That those who were Baptiz'd only by such Hereticks, should, upon their Conversion, be Baptiz'd in the Church: It matters not, whether those Hereticks were utterly destitute of all Power to Baptize, or no: We plainly see, that *St. Cyprian, Firmilian*, and their Colleagues, grounded the Invalidity of their Baptisms, upon their supposed want of Power and Authority; which is an undeniable Proof, that 'twas their Opinion, That if there was in reality *no Commission*, there certainly could be *no Baptism*; which is the very Case about which we are now Disputing: For our Lay-Baptisms are notoriously such, as are perform'd by Persons who never receiv'd, and therefore have not any Commission, Power, or Authority to Baptize; and consequently, according to *St. Cyprian, Firmilian*, and their Colleague Bishops, Assembled in the Councils of *Iconium* and *Carthage*, these Baptisms being without Commission, Power, or Authority, are wholly Null and Void.

* Hæretici qui nec potestatem foris, nec Ecclesiam Christi habent, neminem Baptizare Baptismo ejus possunt. P. 363.

§ XVI. The Canons call'd Apostolical are very ancient; and Three of them, wherein the Baptism of Hereticks is rejected, are suppos'd * by the Learned *Du Pin*, to be the very Canons of the Synods of *Iconium & Synnada*, and therefore at least as early as the Year of Christ 255, or 256. — One of these Three, which is the 47th of the Apostolick Canons, is this: “ † *If a Bishop or Presbyter do again Baptize one, who has really receiv'd Baptism before;*” or, “ *if he do not Baptize one that has been polluted by Wicked Men, let him be depos'd as one who contemns the Cross and Death of Christ, and makes no Distinction between Priests, and counterfeit Priests.*”

The Fathers who made this Canon, reckon'd that a Man *was polluted*, when he was pretendedly Baptiz'd by the *Wicked Men* here spoken of; who those *Wicked Men* were, the Conclusion of the Canon determines, namely, *counterfeit or false Priests*; Persons whom that Council reckon'd to be *no Priests*, at the time of their suppos'd pretended Ministrations; for they are spoken of, by way of Opposition to *Priests* simply consider'd: So that by this Canon, if a Person had been only Baptiz'd by one, who was but a *counterfeit Priest*, a Bishop, or Presbyter, was to be depos'd, if he did not Baptize that Person; and the Reason why he was to be depos'd, was this, because he made *no*

* *Du Pins Eccles. Hist. Cent. i. p. 14. Lond.*

† *Episcopus vel Presbyter eum qui vere habet Baptisma si de integro Baptizaverit, vel si eum qui ab impiis pollutus est, non Baptizaverit, deponatur, ut qui irrideat Crucem Domini, & Mortem, & non Decernat Sacerdotes, à falsis Sacerdotibus. Can. 55. Apof. XLVII.*

Distinction between Priests and Pretenders; between those who were really vested with Priestly Power, and others, who in those Days, and by those Fathers, were accounted to have no such Power, and therefore only to have before polluted, and not Baptiz'd the Person; which comes fully up to our present Case. Our Lay-Baptizers, namely, our Dissenting Teachers, being but Pretenders only, false and counterfeit Priests, having no more actual Power of Priesthood than the meanest Mechanick Laick in the World has.

§ XVII. Mr. Bingham's Second Instance of Laymen's being allow'd to Baptize in Cases of Necessity, is about one hundred Years after his First; and he takes it from the Spanish Council of *Eliberis*, held by 19 Bishops, said to have been assembled about the Year of Christ 305. Canon 38. "*They there appointed (says he, pag. 27.) that when Men were upon a Voyage at Sea, or in any Place where no Church was at hand, if a Catechumen happen'd to be extremely Sick, and at the Point of Death, that then any Christian, who had his own Baptism entire, and was no Bigamist, might Baptize him.*" Upon which our Reverend Historian Remarks, That "*This Authority was not given to all Christians in all Cases, but with several Limitations and Restrictions: 1st. It must be a Case of absolute Necessity when Baptism could not otherwise be had. 2dly, The Person Baptizing must have his own Baptism entire. 3dly, He must be no Bigamist.*"— And upon the whole, Mr. Bingham affirms, That "*in the main, the Matter is indisputable, that they [i. e. the Spanish Bishops of that Council] plainly intended in some extraordinary Cases to give Laymen a License and Authority to administer Baptism,*"

“*tism, which could not then be said to be unautho-*
 “*rized in Spain, since it had the best Authority the*
 “*Church could give it; which is the Determination*
 “*and Authority of a Council,*” pag. 27, 28. In all
 which there are several Things worth Obser-
 vation.

1st, That Mr. *Bingham* reckons this Council gave
Authority to some Lay-men to Baptize in extraor-
 dinary Cases: How the Doctor at *Greenwich* will like
 this, who affirms, that such a Supposition exposes
 the Christian Priesthood to new Dangers, I know
 not; but it may be, he will have a more favourable
 Opinion of this Notion, now 'tis espous'd by our
 Reverend Historian, for whose *Historical History* I
 am inform'd he has a mighty Value and Esteem:—
 But if the Council of *Eliberis* intended to give a
Real Authority to some, and not to all Lay-men to
 Baptize, then 'twill follow,

2^{dly}, That this Canon is not **Declarative** of
 any Right in Lay-Christians *as such*, to give Bap-
 tism in Cases of Extremity, but rather the con-
 trary, that they have no such Right in themselves,
 because the Bishops gave *them Authority*, according
 to our Historian; which those *Spanish* Bishops could
 not be said to have done, if Lay-men had *such*
Authority before: And this also is therefore de-
 structive of *Tertullian's* Notion of Lay-men's having
 a Right in themselves to Baptize in the Absence of
 the Clergy. For the Councils intending to Author-
 ize **some Lay-men** (according to Mr. *Bingham*)
 and **not others**, to Baptize in such Cases, is an
 Evidence, that those Bishops did not Esteem *all*
Lay-Christians as such, to have that *Power and Au-*
thority. Hence it follows,

3^{dly}, That this Canon is a good Argument
 against Mr. *Bingham's* Supposition, in pag. 11, 12.—
 where

where he guesses that the Antients might Esteem some irregular Baptisms to be *valid*, upon this Principle, “*That Baptism, by whomsoever Christian perform’d, was valid, and not to be repeated*: For, if the Bishops of this Council had known of any such Principle, what need had they to make a Canon to *give Authority* to some Sort of Lay-Christians to Baptize, *if all Christians*, as such, had that Authority in themselves; and Baptism, by *whomsoever Christian* administred, was then good and valid, in the Opinion of the Catholick Church?

There was another Condition impos’d on those Baptizers, by the *Spanish* Bishops of that Council, which Mr. *Bingham* has not taken notice of, and ’twas this; “*That * if the Baptized survived, he who Baptiz’d him, was obliged to present him to the Bishop to be Confirm’d by Imposition of Hands*:” Which taken in Conjunction with Mr. *Bingham’s* other Observation, that the Baptizer *was to have his own Baptism entire*; (which, by many Learned Men, is suppos’d to signifie, that he was to be one who had not forfeited the Benefits of his Baptism by lapsing, or falling into such Sins as had brought him under Penance for them, as *Du Pin* upon this Canon has observ’d; and Mr. *Bingham* himself, *pag. 28. from Albaspiny*;) plainly shews, that the Baptizer was to be one in Communion with his Bishop: He was to be *no Separatist* from the Church; no Schismatical member of her Sacred Body; no Rebel against Episcopacy it self; but one in actual Communion with the Church; one who own’d and acknowledg’d the Spiritual Power of Bishops; and that so far, as to bring the Bap-

* Ita ut si supervixerit, ad Episcopum cum perducatur, ut per manus impositionem perfici possit, Concil. Eliber. *Can. XXXVIII.*

tiz'd to be Confirm'd by Imposition of the Bishop's Hands. But our Lay-Baptizers are not so; and therefore nothing in Favour of their pretended Baptisms can be pleaded from this Canon, if it were of any Obligation in our Church, as it most certainly is not.

Mr. Bingham is pleas'd to tell us, That "It will not here be material for any One to Object, That this was but the Determination of a Private National Council; for (says he) we are not now enquiring what Obligation any other Church is under to follow this Rule, but only what was Matter of Fact, and the Practice of the Ancient Church," pag. 29. But, with Submission, this Objection is *very material*, and for this Reason, because, we are enquiring, not into the Practice of a particular Church or two, but of the ancient Catholick Church, that we may be able to distinguish *singular unwarranted* Notions, from *truly ancient and well-grounded Catholick Traditions and Practices*. This Council was but Provincial; it says nothing about any former Catholick Tradition or Practice; it speaks of *no general Custom* then in Use about this Matter, at the time of 'its Session; it was never receiv'd into the Code of the Catholick Church, as consonant to the Sense of the Catholick Church; and therefore has nothing in it of sufficient weight to convince us, that this Canon is a Testimony of the General Practice of the Church in those Days. We must have more than one single Provincial Council to shew us the General Practice of the Ancient Church: And after all, even if this had been a General Council, it would not have determin'd, that all Lay-Christians, as such, have in themselves a Right to Baptize, in Cases of Extremity; nay, it would not have so much

much as *Authoriz'd* or *Impower'd* all *Baptiz'd Laymen* for that Purpose, because it do's not Authorize Bigamists; much less would it have Authoriz'd Schismatics, who separate from their Bishop's Communion: And therefore, the pretended Baptism, given by Persons who never were at all Commission'd to Baptize, and who attempt to give Baptism *Ordinarily*, without the least appearance of Necessity, and this even in Opposition to, not only some particular Bishops, but the Divine Right of Episcopacy it self; I say, such pretended Baptisms would not have had the least Countenance from this Council, if it had been a *General One*; and therefore, certainly, since 'twas but a *Provincial one*, those spurious Baptisms, can upon no account whatsoever, be favour'd by the Canon of that *Spanish Council*, even if Bishops could, by a Canon in Council, Authorize or Impower their own Lay-Communicants to Baptize, which, it has not yet been prov'd that Bishops can do; and I do not trouble my self to enquire whether they can or cannot; it being foreign to the present Controversy, which relates to those who were never at all suppos'd to have been Authoriz'd by Bishops.

§ XVIII. The Reverend Historian's Third Instance, is taken from the Story of Boys Baptizing in Play at the Sea-side, in the days of *Alexander* Bishop of *Alexandria*; and he introduces it thus: "*Whilst this Matter* [of the *Spanish* Bishops in the Council of *Eliberis*, their making a Canon to Authorize some of their Lay-men to Baptize, &c.] "*was thus determin'd in the West, there happen'd* "*another famous Transaction in the East, which* "*drew on a like Determination in the Church* "*of Alexandria, if we may give credit to any of the* "*ancient*

“ ancient Historians, Socrates, Sozomen, and Rufin,
 “ who all Relate it : Rufin (says he) had the
 “ Story from the Mouth of those who liv'd and con-
 “ vers'd with Athanasius; and the Account of it,
 “ according to his Relation, is this: Alexander, Bi-
 “ shop of Alexandria, on a certain Day, being the
 “ Festival of Peter the Martyr, after the Solemn Ser-
 “ vice of the Church was over, was entertaining
 “ himself with a Prospect toward the Sea, whilst he
 “ expected his Clergy to come and dine with him. In
 “ his Prospect, at some distance upon the Sea-shore,
 “ he beheld a Number of Youths at Play, acting the
 “ Part of a Bishop, and doing all things which were
 “ used to be done in the Church: And viewing them
 “ intently for some time, he at last saw them come
 “ to the Secret and Mystical Rites of Religion,
 “ upon which, being somewhat perplex'd, he sent
 “ immediately for his Clergy, and shew'd them what he
 “ himself had seen, ordering them withal to go, and
 “ bring the Boys before him. Who being ask'd, What
 “ Play they were at, and what they had done, and
 “ after what manner? They at first deny'd all the whole
 “ Matter, as Children us'd to do through fear; but
 “ afterward, they told every thing in order as it was
 “ done, confessing, that they had Baptiz'd certain
 “ Catechumens, by the Hands of Athanasius, who
 “ acted the Part of the Bishop in the Play. Then ex-
 “ amining farther of those who were said to be Bap-
 “ tiz'd, What Questions they were ask'd, and what
 “ Answers they made? And being likewise inform'd
 “ by him who had been the chief Actor; when he found
 “ that all things had been done according to the Rites
 “ of our Religion, after he had conferr'd with a
 “ Council of his Clergy, he is said to have deter-
 “ min'd, [Statuisse traditur, says Rufin,] That
 “ the Baptism of those, on whom Water had been
 “ pour'd,

“ pour’d, with the proper Interrogatories and Re-
 “ sponses, ought not to be repeated, but only have
 “ those things added, which the Priests were used to
 “ perform. * Socrates, and † Sozomen, have the
 “ same Story; and the Author of the Life of Atha-
 “ nadius in Photius, with Johannes Moschus, and
 “ many others,” says Mr. Bingham, pag. 29, 30, 31.
 Then he Names “ Archbishop Whitgift, Abbot, Co-
 “ tolerius, Pagi, and, he says, many others that
 “ might be nam’d, Men of Character in their Age,
 “ have appear’d in its Behalf, and defended it as a
 “ genuine Piece of History. And it is some Confir-
 “ mation, that Rufin says he had it from the Mouth
 “ of those who convers’d with Athanasius. And Ni-
 “ cephorus Calistus, who also relates the Story, ||
 “ gives a parallel Instance of another Fact much like
 “ this, which happened in his own time at Constanti-
 “ nople,” pag. 31. Thus far Mr. Bingham. It is a
 wonderful Thing to see with what Air of Gravity,
 and Solemnity of Expression, this Reverend Histo-
 rian introduces the Story of this ludicrous, sportive
 Washing: He says of it, “ There happen’d ano-
 “ ther famous Transaction in the East.” This,
 before one comes to read the Story it self, looks as
 if it was some mighty important Affair which was
 of a very Publick Nature, and undoubtedly attested
 to by the Bishops of the Eastern Church; for, he
 says, it “ drew on a like Determination in the
 “ Church of Alexandria,” i. e. a like Determina-
 tion to that of the Council of *Eliberis*, he was
 just before speaking of. Now who is there, that at
 first reading of this, would not naturally expect

* Hist. Lib. 1. cap. 15.

† Lib. 2. cap. 17.

|| Niceph. Hist. Lib. 3. c. 37.

to find, that a Provincial Council of Bishops was assembled at *Alexandria*, upon the Account of this pretended "*famous Transaction*," and that they had made some new Canon, as the Council of *Eliberis* did, about Lay-Baptism? For, he says, it "*drew on a like Determination*;" when, behold, *parturiunt montes, &c.* a Mountain has brought forth a Mouse. This *famous Transaction* was nothing but Boys Play, in the *East, i. e.* at the Water-side near *Alexandria*; and the **Determination** it is said to have drew on, was no more than this, That the Bishop of *Alexandria*, (having taken Council with the Priests that were about him, whom he was before expecting to Dine with him) is said to have determin'd, that the Boys Baptiz'd in Play, should not be Baptiz'd again: A *famous Transaction this!* and as important a Determination too! If it had been true in fact, which we have no reason to believe it was, if we consider, 1st, The Ecclesiastical Writers whom Mr. *Bingham* appeals to for the Truth thereof. 2^{dly}, Its little or no Credit among Learned Men. And 3^{dly}, The Circumstances of the Story itself. For,

First, The known Person, from whom we originally have this Story, is no other than *Rufinus*; and from him *Sozomen* alone, among the *ancient Ecclesiastical Historians*. The First, a Man remarkably credulous, and besides so very careless in his Ecclesiastical History, that *Socrates Scholasticus* complains of it, * and says, That he "*has err'd concerning the Notation of the Times*:" And gives one Instance thereof in the Troubles of *St. Athanasius*; That "*he was also ignorant of*

* *Socrates Eccles. Hist. Book ii. cap. i.*

“ *St. Athanasius’s Banishment into the Gallias, and*
 “ *of several other things.*” That *Socrates* “ *ha-*
 “ *ving at first followed Rufinus, [as his Author]*
 “ *wrote the First and Second Book of his [i. e. So-*
 “ *crates’s] History according to his [i. e. Rufinus’s]*
 “ *Authority*” — “ *But [says Socrates] when we*
 “ *had afterwards procur’d Athanasius’s Books, where-*
 “ *in he laments his own calamitous Sufferings, &c.—*
 “ *we thought it more expedient to Credit him (which*
 “ *had suffer’d these Hardships) and those who had*
 “ *been present at the transacting of these Matters,*
 “ *rather than such as have followed Conjectures*
 “ *in their Relations thereof, and for that Reason have*
 “ *been mistaken.*” Besides, “ *having got several*
 “ *Letters of Persons at that time, very Eminent,*
 “ *to our utmost Ability, we have diligently traced*
 “ *out the Truth. Upon which Account, we have*
 “ *been necessitated entirely to dictate again the First*
 “ *and Second Book of this Work [i. e. Socrates’s*
 “ *Ecclesiastical History] making use nevertheless of*
 “ *those Passages, in the Relation whereof Rufinus*
 “ *hath not forsaken the Truth.*” By all which
 ’tis plain, that the Credulity of *Rufinus*, his Care-
 lessness, his following Conjectures, and his deviating
 from, and forsaking of *Truth*, in some Matters of
 his Ecclesiastical History, were the Reasons which
 induc’d *Socrates* to write over a-new, the First and
 Second Books of his History, which he at first took
 from *Rufinus*; whose Authority he afterwards
 found was not to be depended upon in many
 Cases, when he had consulted more Authentick
 Records: And why we should depend upon *Rufinus’s*
 History, concerning this ludicrous Baptism, when
 the Judicious *Socrates Scholasticus* found *Rufinus* to
 be so apt to follow Conjectures, and to depart from
Truth, that he refus’d to Copy this Story from him,
 as

as I shall by and by prove; I say, why we should believe *Rufinus*, when an ancient *competent* Judge of such Matters, who knew his Errors in History better than we, did not believe him in this Matter, is hard to understand; especially, when we find, that even the Moderns have discover'd *Rufinus* to have been so careless and negligent in Writing, as that “*he * seems to have compos'd his Two Books of Ecclesiastical History, without looking into any Records. He translated Eusebius's † Ecclesiastical History with great Liberty; he added thereto a Relation of St. Gregory Thaumaturgus his Miracles, and an Harangue of Lucian the Martyr, which are not in Eusebius.— There are several Faults in his Translation: He makes Zacharias, spoken of in St. Luke, to have been a Martyr at Lyons; he confounds St. Biblias with Blandina, &c.*” Thus he deals with another Man's Works. And as for his own, “*There are many Historical Faults in his History. These are some; He supposes that Athanasius hid himself for six Years after he was condemn'd by the Council of Tyre: He perverts the Order of Time in the History of St. Athanasius.— He says, that St. Hilary was Excommunicated, which is false: And he confounds the Time, when he says, that St. Hilary was Banish'd after the Council of Milan, &c.*” And thus we see what a correct and careful Historian *Rufinus* was!

As for *Sozomen's* Account of this Story, he took it from *Rufinus*; and therefore is no additional Evi-

* *Valesius concerning the Life and Writings of Socrates and Sozomen, prefix'd to their Ecclesiastical History.*

† *Du Pin's Eccles. Hist. Cent. V. p. 108. Notes (b) and (l) Lond.*

dence for the Truth of it, so that it still stands *on'y* upon the first Foundation which *Rufinus* laid; and what that is, will be something more discover'd, by what I have farther to say concerning *Socrates Scholasticus*: In the mean time, we have no more reason to regard this Story, for *Sozomen's* having transcrib'd it from *Rufinus*, than we have to esteem other *Trivial* and *Childish* Passages which are found to occur in several Places of *Sozomen's Ecclesiastical History*, and which he might probably have taken from other Writers who follow'd *Conjectures*, in their Relations, and for that reason were often mistaken; of this sort, of Trifling and Childishness, is, * “his Digression, in his 1st Book, concerning the Building of the City *Hemona*; and concerning the Argonauts Carrying the Ship *Argo* on their Shoulders some Furlongs; also his Description of *Daphne* without the Walls of the City *Antioch*, which occurs at Chap. 19th of his 6th Book; and that Observation of his, concerning the Beauty of the Body, where he treats of that Virgin with whom the blessed *Athanasius* Absconded a long while.” All which, betray what Judgment he had, as an Historian, and make him to be less valuable, in that respect, than *Socrates Scholasticus* was.

For this latter, in collecting his *Ecclesiastical History*, has † “made use of a singular **Judiciousness and Diligence**: His *Judiciousness* is manifested, by his Remarks and Sentiments interwoven every where throughout his Books. — He judges incomparably well, both of Men, and and also of *Ecclesiastical Business* and Affairs. There is nothing in him but what is **Grave and**

* *Valesius*, of the *Life and Writings* of *Socrates* and *Sozomen*.

† *Ibid.*

“ **Serious** ; nothing that you can expunge, as
 “ *Superfluous* ; but, on the contrary, some Passages
 “ occur in Sozomen, that are *Trivial and Childish*.
 “ Socrates’s Diligence is declar’d by many — In-
 “ stances ; chiefly by this, in regard he frequently
 “ annexes a Note of the Times, that is, the Consu-
 “ lates and Olympiads, especially where he mentions
 “ such Matters as are more momentous. Nor has
 “ he Carelessly or Negligently written his History, as
 “ Rufinus did, who (as has been observ’d before)
 “ seems — to have compos’d his Two Books of Ec-
 “ clestial History — without looking into any
 “ Records. Our Socrates did far otherwise ; for
 “ having from all Places got together the Best Monu-
 “ ments, that is, the Epistles of Prelates, the Acts
 “ of Synods, and the Books of Ecclesiastical Writers,
 “ agreeable to their Authority, he compos’d his
 “ History. This Diligent and Judicious Eccle-
 “ siastical Historian is brought in by Mr. Bingham,
 to vouch for the Truth of Rufinus’s Story, of
 Mr. Bingham’s **Famous Transaction**, of Baptism
 by Boys at Play at the Water-side ; Mr. Bingham
 names *Socrates* no less than twice, as an ancient
 Historian who may challenge our Belief of this
 Story ; for he says, before the beginning of it,
 That “ There happen’d a Famous, &c. which drew
 “ on a Determination, &c. — if we may give
 “ credit to any of the Ancient Historians, **Soc-**
 “ **rates**, &c. who all Relate it,” pag. 29 : And
 then, after the Conclusion of this Story, he says,
 “ *Socrates*, &c. have the same Story,” pag. 31. and
 is so particular, as to refer us to *Socrates’s Eccle-*
siastical History, Book I. Chap. 15. For my part,
 I am confounded at Mr. Bingham’s Positiveness in
 this Assertion, and wonder at the Greatness of his
 Mistake in so plain a Matter, (if it be indeed a

Mistake in a Man so much conversant in Ecclesiastical Writers as Mr. *Bingham* is.) However, I will not aggravate this Slip, lest I should thereby make myself guilty of too severe a Censure: But this I am certain of, that

Socrates Scholasticus says not one word of the Boy *Athanasius's* Baptizing other Boys; nor of *Alexander* the Bishop's determining, that those *suppos'd* Baptiz'd Children ought not to be Baptiz'd again. I say, *Socrates* has not one word of this in all his History: And that the Reader may see that I do not wrong Mr. *Bingham*, I will here transcribe from the 15th Chapter of the 1st Book of *Socrates's Ecclesiastical History*, all that he relates concerning *Athanasius's* Play at the Water-side, and of the Notice which Bishop *Alexander* took of it; and 'tis this: "Upon the Death of *Alexander*
 " Bishop of Alexandria, *Athanasius* was promoted to
 " the Presidency over that Church. *Rufinus* relates,
 " That this Person, when he was very young, did,
 " together with those that were his equals in Age,
 " play at a kind of an Holy Sport; this Play was an
 " Imitation of the Sacerdotal Function, and of those
 " Persons Order that were Clergy-men; in this Sport,
 " therefore, *Athanasius* was elected Bishop, and
 " every one of the rest of the Children acted either
 " a Presbyter or a Deacon. This Sport the Children
 " play'd at, on that Day whereon was celebrated
 " the Memory of *Peter the Martyr and Bishop*.
 " *Alexander* Bishop of Alexandria accidentally passing
 " by at that time, saw all their Play; and having
 " afterwards sent for the Children, he enquired of
 " them, what Place had been allotted to every one
 " of them in the Play, supposing, that from what
 " had been done, something might be portended
 " [concerning each of them;] and he gave Order,
 " that

“ that the Children should be educated in the Church,
 “ and instructed in Learning, but most especially
 “ Athanasius. Afterwards, when he was come to
 “ a maturity of Age, he Ordain'd him Deacon, and
 “ took him along with him to Nice, that he might
 “ assist him in the Disputations there, at such time
 “ as that Synod was Convened. These Things Ru-
 “ finus has related concerning Athanasius, in his
 “ Books [of Ecclesiastical History ;] nor is it at all
 “ unlikely that these things happen'd, for many such-
 “ like Acts are frequently found to have been done.
 “ Thus much we have hitherto said concerning
 “ Athanasius.

Thus far *Socrates*, and he has nothing more re-
 lating to this Matter : So that we may plainly see
 what part of *Rufinus's* Story he had reason to be-
 lieve, and hand down to Posterity, and what part
 he reckon'd not to be agreeable to Truth ; he says,
 in his * *History*, That he “ makes use of those
 “ Passages, in the Relation whereof *Rufinus* hath
 “ not forsaken the Truth ;” plainly intimating,
 that *Rufinus*, in some Passages of his *Ecclesiastical*
History, had forsaken the Truth, and that he would
 not make use of any such his false Passages ; and
 therefore, in his Transcripts from *Rufinus*, what
Socrates omits in his *History*, which *Rufinus* relates
 in his, may be look'd upon as false, or at least
 not well attested, in the Opinion of our judicious
Socrates ; and since *Socrates* has wholly omitted the
 Story of *Athanasius's* Baptizing the Boys in Play,
 and also of *Alexander's* determining, that they
 ought not to have their Baptism repeated, 'tis a
 sign that he reckon'd this part of the Story to be

* Book 2. Cap. 1.

one Instance of *Rufinus's* forsaking the Truth, and consequently, that he did not believe it, and so would not stuff his History with such an odd improbable Relation.

The Author of the Life of St. *Athanasius*, (another of Mr. *Bingham's* Historians) in *Photius*, is an unknown Writer. *Photius* does not so much as guess who he was; and therefore, tho' he has the same Story, yet being an unknown Author, his Evidence is of no weight in this Matter, especially if we consider, that he is so singular in one part of this Story, as to reckon, that what the Children did in their Play, was done by **Divine * Instinct or Inspiration.** A very extraordinary Addition this to *Rufinus's* first Story, and which betrays the *Credulity* of this unknown Author, whoever he was: Besides, if what he says be true, it will follow, that this Baptism was Authoriz'd and Commission'd by God himself, being done by a *Divine Instinct*, and so spoils Mr. *Bingham's* Design in quoting this Story. But this, of a *Divine Instinct* in the Boys, none but those who give credit to idle Fables, will ever believe.

Another of Mr. *Bingham's* supposed Vouchers for the Truth of this Story, is *Johannes Moschus*, pag. 31. But sure our Reverend Historian is hard put to it for good Evidence, when he stoops so low, as to make use of such ridiculous Authors as this Monk, who, in that very Book which Mr. *Bingham* quotes, [viz. *Moschus Pratum Spir.*] "relates many strange Stories and Miracles that deserve little credit, (as *Du Pin* tells us;) for Instance, in his

* Alexander ad se vocat, auditque non illos sacra irrississe, sed ut ex eventu colligas fecisse Divino quodam Instincto, &c. Photii Biblioth. Cod. 258. pag. 1430.

45th Chapter, he says, "A Recluse promised the Devil, he would adore the Virgin's Image no more, to be delivered from his Temptation, and that he was reprov'd by his Elder for doing so. In the 47th, he relates, "That the Virgin having Appear'd twice to a Fester uttering impious Speeches against her, and having warn'd him to do so more, but to no purpose, she Appear'd to him the third time, and that having sign'd his Hands and Feet with the Sign of the Cross, he found himself, when he awoke, without Hands and Feet. In the 79th, "That a Catholick, being Servant to a Severian, having left with his Master the Key of his Chest, where he had laid up the Eucharist in a Linnen-Cloth, the Master having design'd to Burn it, because his Servant did not come back, found that the Particles of the Eucharist had brought forth Ears of Corn. In the 196th Chapter, he relates, "That some Children of the Province of Apamea would needs represent the Celebration of the Holy Mysteries, and that having chosen one of themselves to perform the Office of a Priest, and two others of Deacons, they set some Bread upon a Stone, and that he that acted the Priest did pronounce the Words of Oblation, which he had gotten by heart. ——— That having thus performed all the Ceremonies, before they brake the Bread, to give the Communion, Fire came down from Heaven, which consumed the Oblation, and the whole Stone whereon it was laid. That the Bishop of the Place, hearing of it, built a Monastery in that Place, and made all those Children Monks. To this Example, he adds that reported by Rufinus, of the Baptism by St. Athanasius, who was then but a Child, to some other Children. ——— And in the 207th, "There is mention made of Two
 " Angels

“ *Angels who stood Sureties for a Girl which had a
“ mind to be Baptiz’d.*”

The same Book is full of an infinite number of Relations and miraculous strange Stories of Apparitions, Revelations, Visions, and Miracles said to be wrought by Hermits, by Fore-telling Things to come, Discovering Mens Thoughts, Commanding Lions and Wild Beasts; when Dead, speaking to the Living from their Graves; and such-like fabulous Trumpery: Among those Whims, *Rufinus’s* Story is also related. And let the Judicious determine, whether this *Johannes Mosculus*, a Monk of the 7th Century, so foolishly Credulous even to Superstition, can give any Reputation to the Story before us. If this must be our Way to get at the *General Practice* of the Primitive Church, and we resolve to trust to such Legendary Writers as *Johannes Moschus*, we shall soon return again to all the Corruptions of Popery: For, where shall we stop, when we follow such Dreaming, Visionary Guides, as he was?

Mr. *Bingham* tells us, That *Nicephorus Calistus* relates the same Story: Upon this, one would have thought, that *Nicephorus* gives us a particular Account of it; but when we look into his History, there we find, that after he has told a Story of a *Jew*, Baptized with Sand instead of Water, in a Desert Place where no Water was to be had, and of his being afterwards commanded to be Baptized with Water; he then adds only this, * “ *Histories say, that something like this happen’d also in the time of the Great Athanasius.*” This is all that *Nicephorus* says.

* *Niceph. Calist. Eccles. Hist. lib. 3. cap. 37. Paris 1630.*
Simile quiddam accidisse etiam sub Athanasio magno Historiæ tradunt.

And how can it be affirm'd, that "*Nicephorus Calistus* relates the same Story, when he only says those few Words? And what he says, amounts to no Relation of the Story at all; since nothing of the Boy *Athanasius's* Baptizing his Play-fellows, or of *Alexander's* Determining the Validity of this suppos'd Ludicrous Baptism, can be gather'd from *Nicephorus's* Words, consider'd as they stand in his History, *separate from any other* that was written before him. Indeed, he does immediately add another Story of a Jew Boy, Baptiz'd in Play, by Christian Children, at the Sea-side near *Constantinople*, in his own Days: But then, if we consider that this Writer *Nicephorus Calistus*, a Monk of *Constantinople*, * liv'd and wrote in the 14th Century, that he has mix'd his History with a great many **Fables**, and has fall'n into many **Mistakes**, (as the learned *Du Pin* informs us) 'tis easie to account for *Nicephorus's* relating such Stories as this; and the *easie Credulity* of a *Fabulous Writer* in the 14th Century, is but a *sorry Evidence* for, nay, a Dis-reputation to, the Truth of any Tales of this nature. Mr. *Bingham's* referring us to such **Authors**, for the Confirmation of *Rufin's* Story, is no-ways answerable to the Character he has acquir'd among Learned Men; and, for a *Reverend Priest of the Church of England* to referr us to the Authority of such *Fabulous Writers*, as *Johannes Moschus*, and *Nicephorus Calistus*, in the *Dark Ages* of the Church, to convince us of the Truth of an odd whimsical Story, which in its natural Consequences tends to the utter Abolition of the whole Priestly Character, if the Matter thereof be allow'd

* *Du Pin's Eccles. Hist. Cent. xiv. pag. 87. Lond.*

to be true, just, and right, is a very *astonishing* thing, and the Principle from whence it proceeds hard, if at all, to be accounted for, especially in a Man who doubtless, has given his Assent to the 21st and 22d *Articles of the Church of England*, which warn us against trusting to Mens Mistakes, and ill-grounded fabulous Inventions in *Matters of Religion*.

The Reader, I hope, will charitably censure the Zeal of this Reflection, since it proceeds from nothing else but a necessary Indignation, which all good Christians ought to have, against such *fabulous Stories*, as strike at the very Root of our Saviour's Holy Institutions. But 'tis time to proceed.

Secondly, We have no reason to believe that there is any Truth in this part of the Story, since it has so little or no Credit among Learned Men: The Industrious and Judicious Ecclesiastical Historian *Socrates*, a very good Judge, and Competent by reason of his Abilities, the best Monuments he procured from all Places, and the early Days he liv'd in, this Writer, so well qualified, as I have before observed, tho' in his Two first Books he follows *Rufinus* in many things, yet, in his 1st Book, and 15th Chapter, where he Copies one part of the Story from *Rufinus*, he absolutely passes over in silence the other part of it, about the Ludicrous Baptism, and the pretended Determination relating thereto, as not worthy the Notice of himself, or his Reader; which certainly he would not have done, if he had believ'd that it was so *Famous a Transaction* as Mr. *Bingham* calls it, and if he had found any such Determination of the Bishop and his Clergy about it, as our Reverend Historian talks of; for *Socrates* says of himself, That he makes “ *use of such Passages, in the Relation whereof*
“ *Rufinus*

“*Rufinus hath not forsaken the Truth.*” But a Man of *Socrates’s* Judgment and Knowledge was not to be impos’d upon by the single Authority of only one such Writer as *Rufinus*, and therefore, finding no better Authority than his, he does not follow him in this part of his Story, but wholly leaves him, and thereby gives us to understand that he had no reason to believe it, and consequently, that it deserves not the Regard and Esteem of Future Posterity. And we find none of the following Ancient Fathers, or Councils, no, not even *St. Augustin* himself, appeal to this Story, for the Validity of Lay-Baptism; this latter especially, who pleaded for the Validity of Baptism, by *whomsoever* administer’d, In the Name of the Trinity, would doubtless have made use of the Authority of this pretended “*famous Transaction,*” if he had known of it, and believ’d it. If he did not know of it, the Cause must be its *great Obscurity*, and the little, or rather *no notice* which the Church took of it; this argues its *Worthlessness*: If he knew of it, and did not believe it, and so would not appeal to it, ’tis an argument that it had then no established Credit, and might therefore justly be neglected by him.

There is another sort of Men who reject this Story as a Fable, and who cannot be suspected to have any other Motive for so doing, than an impartial love to Truth, and they are some Learned Men of the Communion of the Church of *Rome*, whose love to Truth, makes ’em, in some Instances, forget their Partiality for the Corruptions of that Church, and even Despise some Fables, the Belief of which would conduce very much to the seeming Reputation of their Erroneous Practices. This very Story of *Athanasius*, if it were true, would add
 very

very much (in some Mens Opinion) to the Reputation of Baptism by Lay-men and Women, taught in that Church: And yet the best Judges, even among them, are not hereby tempted to own this Fable for a Truth, but, on the contrary, they esteem it to be but a Fiction, because they find no Marks of Truth upon it. Mr. *Bingham* is not so kind to his Reader, as to discover any of these Opposers of that Story; 'twould have spoil'd its Credit if he had, and therefore I shall here produce some of their Testimonies against it. The Learned *Du Pin*, Doctor of the *Sorbon*, calls it, * "A Story — very *Improbable*," and that "it passes among Learned Men, rather for a Fable than a Truth, and gives good Reasons for the Improbability of the Truth of it, which I will shew by and by. The Learned Monks of the *Benedictin* Order tell us also, † That "it labours under very great Suspicion among Learned Men;" and these Monks likewise shew Reason why this Story do's not deserve any Credit. And shall the Judiciousness and Impartiality of *Papists*, stand in Competition with the Judgment and Integrity of *Protestants*? Will the *Reform'd* defend a Story, which [if true] favours *Popery*, when *Papists* themselves shew the Improbability of the same Story? God forbid! 'Tis well we have also had the Evidence of those who have Reform'd from *Popery*, such

* *Du Pin's History of Ecclesiastical Writers*, Century IV. p. 28. Lond. 1696.

† Verum hæc Rufini Historia grandi apud eruditos laborat suspicione. *Vita S. Athan. Opera & Studio Monachorum Ordinis S. Benedicti*, pag. 3.

as *Spanheim*, our Learned *Dr. Cave*, * as in the Margin, and Others, against it; otherwise, the *Papists* (as Things go at this time of day) might have reproach'd us, for being as great Favourers of *Idle Fables* and *Stories* to support our own Fancies, as we charge them to be, in the Defence of their Corruptions. But,

Thirdly, The Circumstances of the Story it self are such, as that it deserves not to be credited; for the Time and Place, in which this sportive Baptism, and the Ratification thereof, is said to have happened; viz. in the Time of the Episcopat of *Alexander*, and in the Church of *Alexandria*, betray the unlikelihood of it: For as the Learned *Du † Pin* has observ'd, “ *Ist, This Story of Children Baptiz'd*
 “ *by Athanasius [in his Childhood] do's not at all*
 “ *agree with the Discipline of the Church of Alexan-*
 “ *dria upon the Subject of Re-baptization, and 'tis a*
 “ *thing unheard of that it should be approv'd of, or*
 “ *that any could approve a Baptism of this Nature,*

* Mitto quæ de eo adhuc puero Episcopi personam induente Baptismumque per sacrum quendam Ludum celebrante, vulgo narrant. Fabulam certè esse, & nunc, & olim suspicatus sum. Primus hanc Historiam extulit Rufinus, scriptor nimis credulus, quique hæc ex solo auditu refert, ipse à re gestâ integro penè sæculo remotus: Nec leve præjudicium videri debet, rem adeò memorabilem omnes hujus ævi scriptores latuisse, neminemq; ante Rufinum de eo vel verbum inaudivisse, neque alia desunt, quæ idem suadeant argumenta, modo his immorari vellem. *Hist. Literaria Autore Guil. Cave S. S. Theol. Profes. Vol. I. p. 141, 142.*

The whole Evidence is founded upon the single Authority of Rufinus, who 'tis plain was the first Reporter of the Story, a Man infinitely careless in his Accounts of Things, and who took up this, only as a popular Tradition, at near an hundred Years distance from the Thing it self. Cave's Lives of the Primitive Fathers, Vol. 2. p. 71.

† *Du Pin's History of Ecclesiastical Writers, Century IV. p. 28. Note (d)*

“ as Alexander of Alexandria is suppos’d to have
 “ done. 2dly, It do’s not agree with the Age of
 “ St. Athanasius: For Alexander was not ordain’d
 “ Bishop of Alexandria, according to the Testimony
 “ of St. Jerome, until the Year 321. and St. Athana-
 “ sius, being ordain’d Bishop in 326, was not, in
 “ this Interval, of an Age to play such little Pranks.
 “ And tho’ it were suppos’d, against the Authority
 “ of St. Jerome, that Alexander was ordain’d in 315.
 “ this would not remove the Difficulty; for it cannot
 “ be said, that St. Athanasius play’d at this Sport,
 “ when he was above 10 or 12 Years old; from
 “ whence it would follow, that he was ordain’d Bishop
 “ at the 25th or 27th Year of his Age; which is not
 “ very probable.” *Baronius* places Alexander in
 that See, either in 310 or 311. and *Athanasius* in
 the Year 326, 15 or at most 16 Years after; and
 cites *Theodoret*, l. i. c. 26. and *Athanasius* himself,
Apol. 2. According to which Account, if the Story
 were true, he must have been a very young Bishop,
 not above 25 or 26 Years old at most, which does
 not agree with the Church’s Discipline in those
 Days: Nor could he possibly have made such a
 Figure in the Council of Nice, convened A.D. 327.
 as he plainly did. *Socrat.* l. i. c. 8. and *Theodoret.*
 l. i. c. 25. See also *G. Naz. Orat.* 21. p. 380, 381.
 Nay, by the Calculation of the Learned *Benedictines*,
 † in their Account of St. *Athanasius*’s Life, when he
 is said to have play’d at this Sport, he could hardly
 be less than Eighteen Years of Age; and how a
 Youth of those Years, and so solid as *Athanasius*

† Et si enim per Athanasii ætatem minime repugnaret ejus-
 modi Lusus, quod haud facile tamen concedatur de adolescente,
 cui ex memoratis superius, vix minus duodeviginti annorum tum
 adscripsimus.

was, could be guilty of such childishness, let any one in his Senses judge. Add to this, that *Alexander* the Bishop (as those Learned || Monks have observ'd) "was not such a Man as would have "esteem'd Children's Sport to be good and valid in "so weighty and serious a Matter as this is. 3dly, The very Words of *Rufinus's* Story shew, that he himself could not rely upon it; for notwithstanding, that by way of Preface, he says, he'll relate some few things of *St. Athanasius* as he receiv'd them "from those who liv'd and convers'd with him:" Yet, when he comes to *Alexander's* suppos'd Determination of not re-baptizing the Children, he seems either not to have receiv'd it from those who were so conversant with *Athanasius*, or else to doubt of the Truth of it; for he do's not say, that *Alexander* determined: No, he does not venture to be so positive; but thus, "He is said to have determined, "that the Baptism* ought not to be repeated." The very Language of a Man who tells a Story, the Truth of which he is not sure of, and the Vouchers for which he dare not wholly rely on: And yet, notwithstanding this Uncertainty of *Rufinus* himself, about the great Thing we are searching into, viz. Bishop *Alexander's* Determination, Mr. *Bingham* endeavours to make it pass for a "genuine "Piece of History," pag. 31. And indeed, if the Determination it self be not genuine, all the rest of the Story is of no Consideration in this Debate; for what does the Play of Children signifie, be it of what sort soever, so long as the Governours of

|| *Non is erat Alexander qui tam seria in re, Ludum puerorum ratum haberet. Vita S. Athan p. 3.*

* *Statuisse traditur, illis, &c. iterari Baptismum non debere. Rufin. Eccles. Hist. ut supra.*

the Church make no grave and serious Determinations about it? Our *Rufinus*, the first Author who publish'd the Story of *Athanasius's* Play, do's not venture to relate *Alexander's* suppos'd Determination as a thing certain; he seems to have some Fears, that such an odd unprecedented Determination, was not very likely to be made by so grave a Bishop; he would not risk his own Reputation so far as to vouch for the Truth of it, but refers us to others for that [and they also are unknown] "*traditur statuisse:*" "*He is said to have determin'd*" a sorry Proof for "*an authentick Piece of History,*" when the original Historian himself hands it to us in such uncertain, doubtful Terms.

Mr. *Bingham* says, "*It is some Confirmation, that Rufin says, he had it from the Mouth of those who convers'd with Athanasius,*" pag. 31. But Mr. *Bingham* must prove that *Rufin* says, He had *Alexander's* Determination of not Re-baptizing, from the Mouth of those who convers'd with *Athanasius*. This do's not at all appear; for *Rufin* do's not conclude his whole Story with telling us, that he had all the preceding things from the Mouth of those who convers'd with *Athanasius*: He says nothing like this at the End of his Relation. Before the Beginning thereof indeed, he makes a short Preface to inform his Reader, after he had shew'd that St. *Athanasius* was made Bishop of *Alexandria* upon the Decease of *Alexander*, that he did not think it improper † to repeat some few things concerning the Rise of

† Verum non mihi absque ordine viderur, pauca de hujus viri [Sc. Athanasii] origine supra repetere, & cujus à puero institutionis fuerit, sicuti ab his qui cum ipso vitam duxerant accepimus memorare. *Rufini Hist. Eccles. Lib. 1. c. 14.*

St. *Athanasius*, and to mention what sort of Education he had from a Child, as he had receiv'd 'em from those who liv'd and convers'd with him.

Here we see, that what *Rufinus* himself says he receiv'd from them, was no more than a few things concerning St. *Athanasius*'s Rise and Education from a Child: So that Bishop *Alexander*'s suppos'd Determination, of not Baptizing the other Children, having nothing to do with St. *Athanasius*'s Rise and Education, cannot be fairly said to have been receiv'd by *Rufinus*, from those Persons who liv'd and convers'd with him. Mr. *Bingham* should have let his Readers see *Rufinus*'s Preface to the Story, and also his Words towards the Conclusion thereof, that they might have been enabled to pass a right Judgment, what Parts of the Story *Rufinus* refers to, when he says he had them from those who liv'd and convers'd with St. *Athanasius*; for the Conclusion of the Story plainly discovers those few things which he says he had from them, and they are in short these, * “ *That Alexander order'd Athanasius, &c. to be brought up for the Service of the Church; That in a short time after, Athanasius having been sufficiently instructed,—was restor'd by his Parents to the Bishop; That from that time he was like Samuel, brought up in the Temple of*

* Athanasium vero, atque eos quos ludus ille vel Presbyteros habere visus fuerat vel ministros, convocatis parentibus, *sub Dei obrestatione* tradit Ecclesiæ suæ nutriendos. Parvo autem tempore cum à Notario integrè, & à Grammatico sufficienter Athanasius fuisset instructus, continuó tanquam fidele Domini commendatum, à parentibus restituitur Sacerdoti, ac velut Samuel quidam in templo Domini nutritur, & ab eo pergente ad Patres in senectute bona, ad portandum post se Ephod Sacerdotale deligitur. *Rufin. Hist. Eccl. Lib. 1. c. 14.*

“ the Lord; and that finally upon the Death of Alexander, he was ordained Bishop in his stead.” These are the few things relating to St. *Athanasius*’s Rise and Education, which *Rufinus* says he had from those who were conversant with St. *Athanasius*. And if *Alexander*’s supposititious Determination about not Baptizing the other Boys, can be prov’d to have any necessary dependance on St. *Athanasius*’s Rise and Education, then, it may be allow’d, that *Rufin* says, he receiv’d that also from those who were conversant with St. *Athanasius*: This does not yet appear, but the contrary, by *Rufinus*’s saying of that Determination; only “ *traditur statuisse,*” it is said, That he determin’d; using a more doubtful way of speaking here, than he does, when he speaks of the Rise and Education of St. *Athanasius*: Add to this, that *Socrates*, who had St. *Athanasius*’s Books, together with the Assistance of those who also were conversant with him, wholly omits this Passage, tho’ he had *Rufinus*’s History before him, when he transcrib’d some other Parts of the Story from it. This confirms the Remark I made before, that *Rufinus* did not receive that Passage from those who convers’d with St. *Athanasius*; for if he did, why should so judicious an Historian as *Socrates*, discredit it so far as to refuse to Copy it from him?

Mr. *Bingham* says, “ Admit it were a fabulous Report, yet we must charitably believe of the ancient Historians, both Greek and Latin, that they believ’d themselves, at least, what they reported, that such a Fact had happened at Alexandria; and if it had been contrary to the general Sense and Practice of the Church in their times, they would hardly have related it so plausibly without passing some Censure and Reflection on it:— Which, the ancient

“ ancient Historians having not done, it may reasonably be concluded, that, at least, they thought the Determination of Alexander and his Council, to be agreeable to the general Sense and Practice of the Church,” pag. 31, 32.

But in Answer to this, do's not Mr. Bingham know, that it is a common thing for Historians to transcribe from those who wrote before them, such Transactions as they relate to have happened; and that Writers do often thus follow one another, not because they believe every thing they transcribe, but because they would not have their own Writings to be accus'd, of omitting such Relations, as others took notice of before them in their Histories of the same Time? It is often enough seen, that this is the only Design of *some Historians*, and that they leave their Readers to judge for themselves, whether some of their Relations be true or false, without passing any Censure themselves upon the Things which they relate. But what if ancient Historians did themselves believe, the fabulous Reports they hand down to us? Do's it therefore follow that they thought those Fables to be agreeable to the *general Sense and Practice* of the Church? Where lies the reasonableness of this Consequence; are Historians Thoughts always intent upon, and declaratory of, the Church's Belief and Practice? No such Matter. But it is pleaded, if the Fable “ *had been contrary to the general Sense and Practice of the Church, they would hardly have related it so plausibly, without passing some Censure and Reflection on it.* This makes nothing for the Matter; because, what they would *hardly* have done is no Argument, since we find many Writers have overcome this *imaginary Difficulty*: For, the same Superstition, easie Credulity, or Heedlessness, that

makes Men to believe a *Fable*, which is *contrary to Truth*; causes them also to relate without any Censure, such Stories as are even contrary to the *general Sense and Practice of the Church*; and doubtless, 'tis from this corrupt Fountain, that several Churches have, in process of time, been overflow'd with Error and Superstition, by first not censuring new Fables that were started contrary to the general Doctrine and Practice of the Church; then suffering them to be handed down to Posterity, by Persons of Note and Character, till at last the Infection has spread so far, as that Lyes themselves have been firmly believ'd to be substantial Truths in those Churches.—

Mr. *Bingham* should not handle this Matter in such *dubious Terms*, as to say, “*They would hardly have related it, &c.*” 'Tis a Thing of too great Importance for us to be put off with such inconclusive ways of arguing. Historians have many times been so *careless*, as to relate, without Censure and Reflection on them, several things which were even contrary to the general Sense and Practice of the Church; and this, whether they do it easily or *hardly*, is no Matter, so long as they do it; 'tis a Proof against Mr. *Bingham's* way of arguing. I know 'twill be expected that I should give some Instances of this; and therefore I will do so, even out of two of the Historians which Mr. *Bingham* has produc'd for the Truth of this Fable. *Johannes Moschus's* Fable related by him without any Censure, concerning Children's celebrating the Holy Eucharist, by the Hands of a Child, whom they chose to do the Office of a Priest, &c. [See p. 73.] is no Proof, that *Johannes Moschus* reckon'd this to be agreeable to the general Sense and Practice of the Church:

So

So *Nicephorus Calistus* his Story *, which he relates without any Censure, concerning a *Jew's* being miraculously heal'd of a dangerous Distemper, by being Baptiz'd with Sand for want of Water in a desert Place, is no Argument, that he believ'd Baptizing with Sand, or healing Distempers thereby, was agreeable to the general Sense of the Church: And if *Johannes Moschus*, and *Nicephorus Calistus*, had been so vain as to believe these Fancies, to have been agreeable to the Church's general Sense and Practice, yet such fabulous Writers Belief alone, without other concurring authentick Evidence, do's not prove that the Church's general Sense and Practice was of the same Nature with their ill-grounded Fables; for if this were a way of discovering the Church's general Sense and Practice, then all the idle Stories which have been handed down to us by fabulous Writers, if they believ'd them to have been agreeable to the Sense and Practice of the Church, must be receiv'd as such; and so the senseless Dreams of Purgatory, of Adoration of Saints and Angels, and of the Worshipping of Images, together with the rest of the vain Trumpery of the Church of *Rome*, as related by some visionary, fabulous Writers, must be acknowledg'd to be, according to the general Sense

* *Judæus*— quidam in *Locis Desertis*, & *inaquosis*-- nobiscum iter faciebat. Quum vero Morbo Repentino ita affligeretur, ut crederetur moriturus — comitibus suis obsecrando institit — ut Divini Lavacri participem facerent— Illi iraque detractis homini vestibus, arena quæ ibi erat pro aqua usi, in Nomine Patris, &c. tertium arena in eum coniecta Baptizarunt. Per hanc tam insolitam, & admirandam sacrorum mysteriorum initiationem, imbecillitate omni tanquam vinculo quodam is solutus, longe melius quam illi validus jam prorsus iter fecit. *Niceph. Calist. Eccles. Hist. Lib. iii. c. 37. Paris 1630.*

and Practice of the Church, which will bring us to a fine Pass indeed, if this be a good way of arguing.

But further; Mr. *Bingham* cannot prove, that even *Rufinus* himself, the first Relater of *Alexander's* suppos'd Determination, did really believe, that he made any such Determination at all: His speaking of it in *such dubious Terms as traditur statuisse*, "it is said that he determin'd," plainly implies his Diffidence about this Part of the Story; that *Socrates Scholasticus* utterly disbeliev'd it, is plain by his refusing to Copy it from *Rufinus*, as I have largely observ'd before. Add to this, that another of Mr. *Bingham's* Historians, *viz.* the Author of the Life of St. *Athanasius* in *Photius*, did not believe, that *Alexander's* Determination was made upon Mr. *Bingham's* Foundation; for that Author, whoever he was, * suppos'd, that the story'd Baptism by the Boy *Athanasius*, was done by some certain Divine Inspiration; and he judg'd so by the suppos'd Event, *viz.* *Alexander's* ordering the Children not to be Re-baptiz'd; as if he thought, that *Alexander* had known of the Divine Inspiration, and that he consequently esteem'd the Baptism to have been by God's Appointment, and therefore not to be repeated. What is this but a Supposition, that the Baptism was by Divine Commission and Authority? Nay, his judging so by the suppos'd Event of *Alexander's* Determination, signifies his Opinion to have been, that *Alexander* would not, or should not, have made such a Determination, if he had thought that the Baptism had been done without the Divine Commission and Authority:

* *Alexander ad se vocat, auditque non illos sacra irrississe, sed ut ex eventu Colligas fecisse Divino quodam instinctu.*

Photii. Biblioth. Cod. 253. p. 1430.

For why should he say, “ *That we may collect the Baptism to have been by Divine Inspiration, from Alexander’s Determination about it;*” If he had believ’d that *Alexander* had Authority to make such a Determination concerning Baptism perform’d by Persons who never had any Divine Commission?

Thus we see, That there is no Ground to believe the Story of *Alexander’s* Determination, [Not to Baptize the Children who were before suppos’d to have been Baptiz’d by the Boy *Athanasius* in Play, without any Divine Commission.] I say, There is no Ground to Believe this Story to have been agreeable, but rather contrary to the General Sense and Practice of the Church; since *Rufinus*, the first Publisher of it, relates the Determination *as doubtful*; not venturing to be positive about it. *Socrates*, the more Judicious and Competent Historian, utterly discredits it, by not giving it any room in, but wholly leaving it out of his History, that part of it which he transcrib’d from *Rufinus*. And the unknown Author of the Life of St. *Athanasius*, tho’ he believes the Story of the Determination of *Alexander*, yet does it upon the foundation, of the Baptisms having been before done by Divine Inspiration; which, when *true and certain*, is the same as the Divine Commission, and so do’s not favour Baptisms done without any Commission at all. All these, thus discountenancing the Notion of *Alexander’s* Determining Baptism to be Good and Valid, when done without a Divine Commission, are *so many Evidences against* this Notion’s being the *General Sense and Practice* of the Church; and, together with all that has been said before, do abundantly betray the Story of *Alexander’s* suppos’d Determination to be no better than a meer Fable.

Mr. Bingham tells us, He believes "There is no Canon that does antecedently Authorize one Youth, without Necessity to Baptize another, pag. 32. But this Reverend Gentleman would have done us more Justice, if he had also added, That there is no Canon at all for Boys to Baptize, even in Cases of greatest Necessity; for his Words stand so loose, as to leave room for his Reader to believe, that there may be a Canon for Youths to Baptize in times of Necessity.

He says again, "As to the Fact of Athanasius, any One will readily own, that there was neither Canon nor Precedent, Perhaps, to warrant the Doing it; and it would be strange, if any such Canon should be made in the Church," pag. 32. But why must we have this Perhaps clapp'd in? It is more fair, to let the Reader know Certainly, that there never was any such Canon or Precedent at all: These Perhaps's are no sure Guides to Enquiring Persons, especially in Cases which require more positive Determinations. The following Words, indeed, are something more home, "It would be strange, if any such Canon should be made in the Church." This is very right; it would so: But why? What is the reason that it would be so strange? The Answer is very easie; Because it never was the General Sense and Practice of the Church; She never had any Precedent for it: This is the reason why such a Canon would be a strange thing. And now, is it not a fair Question to ask, Was it not as strange a thing, for a Bishop to Ratifie, what it would have been strange for the Church antecedently to Authorize? Was it not wholly new and strange, for Alexander to Determine that to be Valid, for which he had no Precedent or Canon: For if there was no Precedent or Canon

Canon for the Boy *Athanasius's* Baptizing, (and it would be *strange*, if any such Canon should be made.) Upon what foundation could *Alexander* Determine the Validity of *Athanasius's* Baptizing, when there was no Precedent of, or Canon for, such a Baptism before; and certainly, there was no Example of, or Canon for, any such Determination? So that, if *Alexander* had made the pretended Determination, it would have been a Novelty of his own; and consequently, no-ways Agreeable to, or Declaratory of, the General Sense and Practice of the Church.

Mr. *Bingham's* believing, that 'tis no easie matter
 " to produce an ancient Canon, directly to Con-
 " front the suppos'd Determination of *Alexander*,
 " by Declaring, That such Irregular Baptisms are
 " utterly Null and Void, tho' they have the Postnate
 " Allowance of the Church where they are done,
 " which (he says) was the peculiar Circumstance
 " of the present Case, pag. 32, 33. is nothing at
 all to the purpose: Because, the Institution of Baptism, and the Laws of the Church, by requiring Baptism constantly to be administer'd by One vested with the *Divine Commission*, without making any Exceptions in favour of Baptism by such as never had that Commission; do leave these pretended Baptisms in the same state, as the Institution of Baptism found them at first, *viz.* in the State of Uninstituted Administrations, *i. e.* wholly Null and Void for the Purposes of the *Instituted Ministration*; because, no Ministration whatsoever of Baptism, could ever have been Valid for Christian Purposes, but by virtue of a Divine Institution; and the Ministration we are speaking of, was utterly destitute of any such Institution, except Mr. *Bingham* can prove it to have been by Divine Inspiration,

tion, as one of his Authors, we see, fancied it to have been; and 'twas also without any Precedent or Canon to Authorize it, and so had neither Divine or Human Law, whereby to determine its Validity. And, certainly, when neither God nor his Church, had by any Law, given Validity to such Acts; The first Determiner of their Validity must have run a great risk of Presumption, in pronouncing *that* Valid, which neither God nor his Church had ever before declar'd to be so: This would have been a Determination without any Rule; And if such Determinations are fit to be made, and good and valid when done, then we shall have no Security for the Continuance of Divine Institutions; since Man's arbitrary Will and Pleasure, without any Law, may substitute something else instead of them. It is not therefore enough for Mr. *Bingham* to say, that we can produce "*no Ancient Canon*" directly to Confront such Determination, by Declaring such Baptisms to be utterly **Null and Void**, tho' they have the *Postnate Allowance of the Church*. For if the Canon of Holy Scripture, and also the Canons of the Ancient Church, do constantly restrain the Ministration of Baptism, to those who have a Divine Commission, as they most certainly do; this restraining of the Ministration to the Commission, is a Consequent Nulling of pretended Ministrations, which are done by those who never had that Commission; (as I have largely endeavour'd to prove * elsewhere :) And therefore, 'till there shall be produced some Law of God, or some Canon of the Catholick Church, agreeable thereto, for the making Valid such *Uninstituted*

* *Dissenters Baptism Null and Void, &c.*

Ministrations; it will stand good, that they are Null and Void in themselves: And how, or by what Law, either of God or the Church, any *Post-nate* Allowance of the Bishop do's make them to be good and Valid, let our Reverend Historian inform us, if he can, for as yet he has not.

He says, indeed, " *There seem to be Two Ways of allowing any Act, either by an antecedent Authority given to a Man to perform it; or, by a subsequent Confirmation of the Thing, when done irregularly and without Authority, which is, ex post facto, an Allowance of it. And thus (says he) it is plain, the Baptisms given by Athanasius, were Allow'd and Confirm'd by Alexander in the Church,*" pag. 33. But here Mr. Bingham is not Certain; he says, " *There Seem to be Two Ways of Allowing,*" &c. This is not coming close to the Point; either there are *certainly* Two such Ways of Allowing Baptism, or *there are not*: We must have no *Medium* in this Case; there is no contenting with *May-be* Baptisms, those who would be *sure* of True Baptism. If there are *really* Two such Ways in the Church, of Allowing, &c. as Mr. Bingham speaks of, let him prove them; let him give good Reasons why One of them, *viz.* the Allowing of an Uninstituted Ministration of Baptism, by a Post-Fact, is *Valid*; as, we are sure, Baptism perform'd by virtue of an *Antecedent Commission*, is; and then we shall have an end of the Dispute about the Constant and Unalterable Necessity of a Previous Commission. But, 'till our Reverend Historian, or some other, shall produce good Proof for this, we shall acknowledge but One Valid Way in the Church of Allowing Baptism, *viz.* by an *Antecedent Authority* given by the Bishop, to a Man to Baptize.

The

The Other Way which Mr. *Bingham* proposes, of allowing Baptism, perform'd without a Commission, "by a subsequent Confirmation of it, which (he says) is, ex post facto, an Allowance of it," is a Power which *none can claim* but Christ the Supreme Head and Sovereign of the Church, and those who have receiv'd that Power from him. Let Mr. *Bingham* prove, That Bishops have receiv'd that Power from Christ; and then also this Point shall be given up to him. 'Till then, it is evident, that Bishops are only Christ's Deputies, and as such, are bound up to the Obedience of his Laws, and can validly act (in this Case) no farther than he has Commission'd them: And since the Commission for them to allow such Baptisms, by an After-Act, do's not appear, we must conclude, that it is not in being, and consequently, that they cannot Validly allow of such Baptisms as are perform'd by Persons who never were Commission'd to Baptize. "And thus, 'tis plain," *Alexander* had no Authority to Confirm the Baptisms said to be given by the Boy *Athanasius* in Play. And in Fact, by what has been largely said before upon this Story, he never did confirm this Supposititious Ludicrous Baptism; nor was it ever consonant to the General Sense and Practice of the Church, that he should confirm such a Baptism.

It is now high time for me to beg the Reader's pardon, for detaining him so long upon the Refutation of this Fable. Mr. *Bingham* is so very zealous for it's Credit and Reputation, as "a genuine Piece of History," and his Name and Character are so advantageous for the Recommendation of it, that I thought it well worth while to be thus copious, in discovering the Weakness and Insufficiency, of the Foundation upon which 'tis built, that Men
may

may avoid the Danger of trusting and relying on it. I shall conclude my Observations upon this Fable, by remarking ; That if it had been a real Truth, If *Athanasius* the Boy had sportively Baptiz'd his Play-fellows, and If *Alexander* the Bishop had, by the Advice of his Clergy, appointed that those Children should have no other Baptism ; yet, nothing to the Purpose could be justly and safely inferr'd from it. For, 1st, We are seeking for the General Sense and Practice of the Church ; and this Act of **one Bishop**, never once taken notice of by the Ancient Catholick Church in Council, by way of approving it, or any thing like it, could not justly have been said to be the General Sense and Practice of the Church, and therefore it would have been nothing to the purpose of our Enquiry. 2^{dly}, Neither could any thing have been safely concluded from it ; for the natural Inference would have been only this, That *Alexander* reckon'd the sportive Baptism perform'd by the Boy, in the Name of the Trinity, to be Good and Valid, even tho' done without any Necessity, where Priests were to be had. Now, if Men will venture to affirm, that *Alexander's* suppos'd Opinion was just and right, and that therefore all such sportive Baptisms, are equally good and valid ; and this they must affirm, if they will maintain the other ; then it will unavoidably follow, That the **sacred and tremendous Institutions of the Deity**, and the most profound Reverence and Respect which we owe to the *Mediatorial Authority* of our Lord Jesus Christ, in the appointed Ministrations of them, by those who bear *his Commission*, will be of no greater *Value* and *Esteem*, than Childrens Play ; because, as the present Lord Bishop of *Oxford* has excellently well observ'd,

serv'd, " *There is no * Majis and Minus, in the Validity or Invalidity of Sacraments, which cannot be partly Valid, and partly Invalid.*" And therefore Childrens Sport and Play, in Imitation of Christian Sacraments, is advanc'd to *an equal Dignity* with the instituted Ministration of them; and what is this, but taking off *our Obligation* which we owe to the Divine Institutes, and making God's own Appointments to be but of a trifling Nature, since all the World agrees in this, That the Play of Children, is no better; and that we are under no Obligation to their Sports and Pastimes. This is an unavoidable Consequence of the *suppos'd Truth*, and imaginary Right and Justice, of the stor'd Determination of *Alexander*: And how safe and secure it is, let all good Christians judge, when it cuts the very Sinews of all Divine Institutions, and carries on the accur'd Design of Atheists and Deists, to represent *all revealed Religion*, as needless, ridiculous, and childish, and consequently to be despis'd and trampled on by the *heedless, unthinking, and deceiv'd Multitude*. For my part, I would not (to gain the whole World) be concern'd in propagating or defending Premisses so *dreadfully dangerous*, in their Consequences: And I sincerely pray to God, that none of his *Ambassadors*, who are by him *intrusted* with the sacred *Depositum* of his Divine Sacraments, may ever prostitute these inestimable Jewels, nor cast these invaluable *Pearls before Swine*, by debasing the Ministration of them *so low*, as to make the giving of them, to amount to no more in Worth and Value, than the *inconsiderate Play* of silly Children. — But

* *Bishop of Oxford's Charge*, 1712. pag. 14.

not to be farther prolix upon this Matter, the Story before us deserves to be valued but as a Fiction; and if it had been true in Fact, would have been *foolish* and *ridiculous*; and as such, highly unworthy of being esteem'd, to have any the least Consonancy with the General Sense and Practice of the Church. Thus Mr. *Bingham* is hitherto got no farther than the Council of *Eliberis*, and *that* also has nothing in it, that can declare the Ancient Catholick Church's Sense, in favour of any Validity in pretended Baptisms, by Persons who *never were Commission'd* to Baptize; (as I have before noted.)

§ XIX. About Fifty Years after this Council, we find its Canon to Authorize some sort of Lay-Christians to Baptize, in want of a Priest, was so little known or taken notice of, by those who were *not of the Church of Spain*, that *Hilary* the Deacon of *Rome*, who is most reasonably suppos'd, to be the Author of the Comments on the Epistles of *St. Paul*, bearing the Name of *St. Ambrose*, says, concerning the Churches of his Time and Knowledge, thus; * “ *Now, ——— neither the Inferior*
“ *Clergy nor Lay-men are allow'd to Baptize.* The Inferior Clergy were but Lay-men, being inferior to Deacons, and having no Spiritual Power conferr'd on them; neither these, nor any other Lay-men, we see, were allow'd to Baptize in those Days, in the Churches that were within his knowledge: He had a particular fancy, That at first
“ *the Apostles Impower'd all Christians to Preach and*

* Nunc ——— neque Clerici vel Laici Baptizant. *Ambros. Com. in Ephes. iv. p. 948.*

“*Baptize.*” This has been Answer’d in pag. 7, 8. Now, tho’ his Evidence for what he supposes the Apostles to have done, above Three hundred Years before his Time, be not good, for the Reasons I have there given; yet he may reasonably be admitted, for a Witness of the Sense and Practice of the Churches of his own Time and Place, and he is positive as to these, that “*Lay-men were not allowed to Baptize.*” This is an Argument, that the Canon of the *Spanish Council of Eliberis*, made to Authorize some sort of their own Lay-men to Baptize, in Cases of Extremity, when a Priest was not to be had, was *not the General Sense and Practice* of the Church in *Hilary’s Days*; for if it was, the Church of *Rome* may reasonably be suppos’d to have had the same Practice, and *Hilary* the Deacon of *Rome* may as reasonably be thought to have known of it, and so could not have justly said, That in his Time Lay-men were not allow’d to Baptize: He makes *no Exceptions for Cases of Necessity*, as if they were allow’d to do it in those Cases; and therefore we may conclude, That in the Churches of his Time and Knowledge there was no such Practice as the allowing of Lay-men to Baptize, even in Cases of Necessity, nor any Canon to Impower them to do so.

§ XX. The next in order, who instructs us in this Matter, but whose Evidence is wholly omitted by Mr. *Bingham*, is “*Pacianus Bishop of Barcelona, no less famous for the Holiness of his Life, than the Eloquence of his Discourse,*” says *St. Jerom.* This holy Bishop, in his Sermon of *Baptism* address’d to the *Catechumens*, sets forth the Misery of Man by the Fall of our First Parents, and proves, That we are all by Nature born in Sin; then

then he proceeds to shew the great Necessity of our Regeneration, and New Birth by Jesus Christ: Says he, * “ *Are not we begotten by Christ, that we may be sav'd thro' Him?* ——— He shews how this New Birth was brought about, *viz.* in short, By our Saviour's taking upon him, and uniting unto Himself, our whole Human Nature; By his *Mystical Marriage therein* to his Spouse the Church; By the Descent of his Holy Spirit, the Celestial Seed, upon our Souls, whereby we grow in the Bowels of our Mother the Church; and being born of her sacred Womb, are quicken'd and enliven'd in Christ. “ Thus † (says he) *Christ [per suos Sacerdotes] by his Priests, begets Children in his Church; and the Spirit of God brings them forth, at the Font, [i.e. in Baptism,] Manibus Sacerdotis, by the Hands of the Priest.* ——— Then

* Nunquid nos à Christo geniti sumus, ut propter ipsum salvi esse possimus? ——— Novissimis temporibus animam utique cum carne accepit Christus ex Maria, hanc venit salvam facere, hanc apud inferos non reliquit, hanc Spiritui suo conjunxit, & suam fecit. Et hæ sunt nuptiæ Domini, uti carni conjunctæ, ut secundùm *illud magnum Sacramentum* fierent duo in carne una Christus & Ecclesia. Ex his Nuptiis Christiana plebs nascitur, veniente de super Spiritu Domini: nostrarumque animarum substantiæ, superfuso & admixto protinus Semente Cœlesti, visceribus matris inolescimus, alvoque ejus effusi vivificamur in Christo. ——— † Sic generat Christus in Ecclesia per suos Sacerdotes. ——— Atque ita Christi Semen, id est, Dei Spiritus, novum Hominem alvo matris agitatum, & partu fontis exceptum, *manibus Sacerdotis* effundit, fide tamen pronuba. ——— Hæc autem Compleri aliàs nequeunt, nisi Lavacri & Chrismatis & Antistitis Sacramento. Lavacro. n. peccata purgantur, Chrismate Sanctus Spiritus superfunditur, utraque vero ista, manu & ore Antistitis impetramus: atque ita totus Homo renascitur & innovatur in Christo. *S. Paciani Barcilonensis Episcopi Sermo ad Fideles Catechumenos de Baptismo. Biblioth. Patrum, Tom. 4. Colon. p. 247.*

summing up the whole Matter, he expressly affirms, That “ *These Things [i. e. our Regeneration, and New Birth] cannot be accomplish’d, any otherwise than by the Sacrament of Baptism and Chrism, and [the Ministry] of the Bishop. By Baptism, Sins are purged away; by Chrism, [i. e. Confirmation] the Holy-Ghost is poured out upon us; and both these we obtain by the Hand and Mouth of the Bishop: And so the whole Man is Born again and Renew’d in Christ.*” From which Words of this holy Bishop, nothing less can be collected than this, That he reckon’d, *That the Regeneration and New Birth of Christians, according to Divine Revelation, on which he founds his whole Discourse) cannot be accomplish’d by any other Baptism than that which is administer’d by One having a Priestly Power to Baptize: I say, no less than this can be infer’d from his Words; 1st, Because he makes it necessary for us to be Regenerated by Christ himself. 2d’y, Because he says, Christ do’s this by his Priests, i. e. such as have his Authority and Commission to minister in this part of his Priestly Office. 3d’y, Because he affirms, It cannot be accomplish’d otherwise than by the Sacrament of Baptism and Chrism, and [the Ministry] of the Bishop, which plainly implies, that they must both, in some sense or other, be ministr’d to us by the Bishop; because he says, in the Words immediately following, that we obtain the Benefits of both [Baptism and Chrism] “ *By the Hand and Mouth of the Bishop.*” So that, according to Pacianus, the Baptism must either be ministr’d by the Bishop himself in Person; or else [that it may be still by his Ministry] it must be by One, who is really Commission’d, Authoriz’d, or Impower’d by him; which makes it to be the Bishop’s Act,*

and

and consequently, to be *Christ's*, whose more *immediate Representative* he is. Thus this holy Father, without any Regard to (what some call) Cases of Necessity, teaches us, That the New Birth cannot be effected but by *Episcopal Baptism*; he knew of no other Way to accomplish it, he affirms that there cannot be any other Way; and this he teaches his Candidates for Baptism, without giving them any hopes of ever attaining to this New Birth, (in the greatest Extremity) without it.

If in his Days the Church had any right sense of Regeneration, and a New Birth, to be effected by such Washings as are now perform'd by Persons who never were at all Commission'd by the Bishop to Baptize, and whose Acts, consequently, cannot upon any account whatsoever, be truly said to be the Bishop's Ministrations, and therefore they are not *Christ's*: I say, If the Church had then held such Washings to be Good and Valid Baptisms, and had believ'd this upon good grounds; would so holy a Bishop as *Pacianus*, have been so bold as to have limited the Outward Means of our Spiritual Regeneration and New Birth, to *Episcopal Baptism, &c.* only? If he had known of our *modern Latitude*, and the *Goodness and Validity* thereof; would he not, at least, have encourag'd his Catechumens so far, as to have let them know, that in *absence of a Priest*, they might be brought to this Second Birth by the Hands of *any Lay-Christian whatsoever*, tho' he was never Commission'd to Baptize? Sure, if this had been the then *General Sense and Practice of the Church*, was *Pacianus* Bishop of *Barcelona* ignorant of it? Or, if he knew it, would he have hidden so useful a Piece of Knowledge from his Catechumens, and

led them into a contrary, and (what some of our Moderns call) an *Uncharitable Notion*, That only *Episcopal Baptism*, and no other, can be a Means of our Second Birth? No, certainly, so holy a Bishop would never, in his Instructing of the Ignorant, have instill'd an *Uncharitable, False Doctrine* into them, contrary to the *Lawful, General Sense and Practice* of the Church, if Baptism, by **whomsoever Christian** perform'd, was then justly esteem'd to be Valid, by the Church's General Sense and Practice. Is it not rather evident, that *Episcopal Baptism alone*, was, in the *General Sense and Practice of the Church* in his Days, the only Means of our Regeneration? Do's it not plainly appear to have been so, by his Instructing such as were, before their Baptism, to be taught the more *necessary Truths* of Christianity, That this *only* was the Means of their Second Birth? If any Baptism with Water, and pronouncing the Form, *In the Name of the Trinity*, had been Valid, as some now say it is, What need was there of keeping Catechumens under *so long a Discipline* and Instruction as was then practis'd, and telling them, That their Regeneration and New Birth could not be accomplish'd "*any otherwise than by the Sacrament of Baptism and Chrism, and the Ministry of the Bishop;*" and that we obtain the Benefits of "*Both these* by the Hands and Mouth of the "*Bishop?*"

If our Modern Notions had been true, Catechumens might have been Regenerated in Baptism by a *Shorter Way*; for the great Zeal they had, to procure as soon as possible this Spiritual Benefit, would have made 'em run to any other than an *Episcopal Hand* for Baptism, if they had been taught, that such Baptism *was as good as the Bishops*: They might have sav'd them.

themselves the *Penance of Long Delays, &c.* impos'd on them before they were admitted to *Episcopal Baptism*; and might have obtain'd the *Long'd-for End* of all their *Toil and Labour*, by another Baptism in a *much shorter Time*, and with *less Pains*, without *submitting* to such appointed Preparations, and *confining* themselves to the *Will and Pleasure of the Bishop*, for the *Time* of their Initiation into the Church of Christ, upon our *Modern Schemes of Liberty and Latitude*. But *Pacianus* and his Catechumens were not such *Free-thinkers*; they were *limitted* in their Opinions by *Divine Laws*, and *Ecclesiastical Constitutions agreeable thereto*; and in Conformity to *these*, that holy Bishop taught, and his Catechumens believ'd, (as those of other Churches, doubtless did, if we may judge of their *Belief* by their *pious Practice*, of submitting to these appointed Delays, and waiting patiently for Baptism by the Bishop's Authority) "*That the*
 "*Regeneration and New Birth of Christians, cannot*
 "*be accomplish'd any otherwise, than by Episcopal Bap-*
 "*tism,*" &c. and that consequently, those *Washings* which are *not Episcopal*, are *Ineffective Acts*, and not Means of Accomplishing our *Spiritual Regeneration*; and therefore *Null and Void* for the Purposes of *Episcopal Baptism*: For if they are good and valid, then our *Regeneration and New Birth can be accomplish'd* without the Bishop's Baptism and Chrism; which is contrary to *Pacianus's Assertion*, who says, That "*they cannot be accomplish'd*
 "*without 'em.*"

§ XXI. In the same Century liv'd *Optatus* Bishop of *Milevis*, a City of *Numidia* in *Africa*, whose Opinion *Mr. Bingham* gives us in his 44th Page, thus; "*Optatus* (says our Historian) —

“ thought that Christ gave a Commission to his Apostles
 “ to Baptize, but yet not such an one, as perempto-
 “ rily annull’d and evacuated all Baptisms that were
 “ performed by any other. Our Saviour (says
 “ Optatus) gave Commandment in whose Name
 “ the Nations should be Baptized: But he did not
 “ Determine, without Exception, by whom they should
 “ be Baptiz’d. He said not to his Disciples, This
 “ shall ye do, and no other shall do it. For*, **whoever**
 “ Baptizes In the Name of the Father, Son, and
 “ Holy-Ghost, fulfils the Work of the Apostles. —
 Optatus concludes, “ That it was the Name of the
 “ Trinity, and not the Work of the Agent, that
 “ sanctifies the Mystery; and that the Ministers of
 “ Baptism were only Labourers, and not Lords of
 “ the Action.” This Quotation Mr. Bingham pro-
 “ duces, to shew that Optatus held, “ All those to
 “ have Baptism, **wheresoever** or by **whomsoever**
 “ Baptiz’d, that had receiv’d it in Faith, and with-
 “ out Dissimulation, in that Form of Words which is
 “ prescrib’d by the Gospel,” &c. for Mr. Bingham
 adds, a little after those Words, thus; “ Optatus
 “ was plainly of the same Opinion, p. 45. Now,
 upon the reading of Optatus’s Words, if they must
 be taken in the full Sense of his [*Quisquis*] **Who-**
ever; ’tis plain, That he utter’d only his own
 private Opinion, and not the *General Sense and*
Practice of the Church.

For, 1st, The word [*Quisquis*] **Whoever**, is
 of both Genders, and includes *Women* as well as
 Men; and so if we take Optatus’s Opinion in the
 full Extent of his own Words, we shall make him

* *Quisquis* in Nomine Patris Filii & Spiritus Sancti Eaptiza-
 verit, Apostolorum Opus implevit. Optat. contra Parmen, lib. 5.
 pag. 50.

to have held, That Baptism ordinarily perform'd by any Person, whether **Woman** as well as Man, if done with the Use of the Form, in the Name of the Trinity, was Good and Valid; for no less than this is included in the full Sense of *Optatus's Quisquis* [Whoever, &c.] This Latitude, is contrary to what Mr. *Bingham* acknowledges, *viz.* That "As to ordinary Cases, it is agreed on all hands, That Women were absolutely forbidden to meddle with any Ecclesiastical Office, and Baptism in particular." And Mr. *Bingham* as fairly agrees also, "That the Ancient Church did not allow them to Baptize in Extraordinary Cases of extreme Necessity," p. 46. And, finally, he does not venture to Determine, that Baptism by Women is good and valid, but leaves it "to the Judgment of others, and farther Enquiry," pag. 49. And yet this Passage of *Optatus*, [Whoever Baptizes, &c.] allows of the Validity of Baptism by Women, tho' the General Sense and Practice of the Ancient Church gives not the least Countenance to the suppos'd Validity thereof by Mr. *Bingham's* own Confession.

And, 2dly, *Optatus's* [*Quisquis*] *Whoever, &c.* is of so great a Latitude, That it admits of Baptism to be Valid, tho' perform'd by Unbaptiz'd Infidels, Jews, or Pagans, whether Men, Women, or even Children, who were never Commission'd for this Sacred Function; a Latitude so very unaccountable, that Mr. *Bingham* confesses, 'tis "One of the Novelties of Popery,— p. 98. utterly without Precedent in the Primitive Church," pag. 100. And therefore, upon Mr. *Bingham's* own Principles, *Optatus's* *Quisquis* [Whoever Baptizes, &c.] allowing of the Validity of Baptism by Women, and also by Unbaptiz'd Infidels, Jews, or Pagans,
whether

whether Men, Women, or Children ; was no-ways consonant to the *General Sense and Practice* of the Church, but a *Novel, Singular* Opinion of his own, and therefore of no value in our present Enquiry after the *Ancient Church's Catholick Tradition* : And so *Optatus's* Opinion is a perfect Blank in this Dispute ; *because his* [Quisquis,] his *Whoever Baptizes, &c.* is of so *unlimited* an *Extent* and *Latitude*, as that it can no ways be accounted for in the *Church's General Sense and Practice* —

§ XXII. But I am not so uncharitable as to believe that *Optatus* was so great a *Latitudinarian* as some of our *Moderns* represent him ; I don't think that He would have stood by this singular Notion which *Mr. Bingham* fathers on him, *viz.* That “ *Baptism, wheresoever or by whomsoever administered, is Good and Valid,* in his *pag. 45.* For tho' *Optatus* does uncautiously say, *Quisquis — Baptizaverit, &c. Whoever Baptizes —* “ *fulfils the Work of the Apostles* ; which if taken in an unlimited Sense, makes all Baptism by Persons never Commission'd, in Ordinary and Extraordinary Cases, whether by Men, Women, or Children, Christians in or out of Communion with their Bishop, Excommunicates, or Apostates, Infidels, Jews, Turks, or Pagans, &c. if done with the Form, In the Name of the Trinity, to be Good and Valid : Which Latitude of Baptism by Women, Infidels, Jews, Turks, or Pagans, *Mr. Bingham* acknowledges, has no Precedent in the General Sense and Practice of the Church, and the latter of Baptism by Infidels, he calls “ *One of the Novelties of Popery,* ” &c. (as before observed :) Yet, I say, to do something towards taking off the Reproach, which, by such a *Latitudinarian Notion*, is cast on
this

this Bishop, I should charitably consider the Occasion of his Words, and from thence judge of his Meaning by them: He was engag'd in Dispute with the *Donatists*, a *Puritanical, Schismatical* Sect, who (tho' they retain'd Episcopacy) separated from the Church, because they reckon'd the Catholicks to be *defil'd*, and *polluted*, and *abominable*, not to be Communicated withal, by reason of their Communion with some whom the *Donatists* charg'd to have been *Traditors*, to have yielded in time of Persecution, and to have deliver'd up the Holy Books into the Hands of the Heathen: Upon this account, they reckon'd the Catholicks to be the *Schismaticks*, and that they were so *impure*, that all their Ordinations, and other Ministrations, were Null and Void; and the *Donatists*, in consequence of this false Charge, Re-baptiz'd all who came over to their Party, tho' they had been before Baptiz'd in the Church, by Catholick Bishops, Priests, or Deacons.

Optatus, in the Book quoted by our Reverend Historian, endeavours to convince the *Donatists*, that if the *Catholicks* had been *Schismaticks*, yet their Baptism would be Valid notwithstanding, and therefore ought not to be repeated: In his *First Book*, he wonders that *Parmenian* the *Donatist* should say, (of the suppos'd *Schismaticks*, after this manner,) † “ *How can a Man that is defil'd,*
“ *cleansse another by a false Baptism? How can an*
“ *impure Man purifie? How can One that makes*
“ *others fall, lift up those that are fallen down?*
“ *How can One that is Guilty, grant Pardon? or*
“ *One that is Condemn'd, Absolve? Optatus* de-
“ *nies, that this can be said of those that are only*

† *Du Pin's Eccles. Hist. Cent. iv. p. 88, 89. Lond.*

“ Schismatics, who, as he thinks, may Lawfully
 “ administer the Sacraments. He tells *Parmenian*
 “ * *Schism, which breaks the Bond of Peace, is*
 “ *begotten by Discord, nourish’d by Envy, and con-*
 “ *firm’d by Disputes; thus impious Children forsake*
 “ *the Catholick Church their Mother, withdraw and*
 “ *separate themselves— being cut off from the Church,*
 “ *and become Rebels and Enemies: But they inno-*
 “ *vate nothing in Doctrine, still retaining what they*
 “ *had learned from their Mother.*” And he con-
 cludes, That “ Schismatics have preserv’d the
 “ True Sacraments of the Church, tho’ they are
 “ separated from its Body.” In his 5th Book, the
 very Book from whence *Mr. Bingham* takes his
 Quotation, *Optatus* proves, that in the Sacrament
 of Baptism, it is not absolutely necessary, “ † that
 “ the Minister should be Faithful and Just; be-
 “ cause the Ministers are chang’d every Day, and
 “ it is Jesus Christ who Baptizes— And the Ho-
 “ liness of the Minister, do’s not contribute” to
 the Holiness of the Sacrament; just as the Church
 of *England* teaches concerning “ || *the Unworthiness*
 “ *of the Minister, which hinders not the Effect of the*
 “ *Sacraments:*” All which being duly weigh’d and
 consider’d, by a Man of a candid Temper, will in-
 cline him to believe, that *Optatus’s* “ *Quisquis,*
 “ *whoever Baptizes— fulfills the Work of the Apo-*
 “ *stles;*” was design’d by him only to mean the Bap-
 tizers he was then disputing for, *viz.* the then Mi-
 nisters of Baptism, whom the *Donatists* reckon’d to
 be Schismatics, and so polluted, that (even tho’
 they were ordain’d Bishops, Priests, or Deacons)
 their Ministrations were defiled by them, and upon

* *Du Pin’s Eccles. Hist. Cent. iv. p. 88, 89.*

† *Ibid. p. 93. Lond.*

|| *As in bc. 26th Article.*

that

that Account wholly Null and Void; *Optatus*, in Opposition to this, shews, that if the Ministers of Baptism were such Sinners, yet their Sins did not hinder the Efficacy of the Sacraments administer'd by their Hands: And says, "*Whoever Baptizes*" [i. e. candidly interpreting his Words] whoever Minister, whether Catholick or Schismatick, Baptizes "*In the Name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost, fulfils the Work of the Apostles.*" And we know, that in those Days, the allow'd Ministers of Baptism, whether Catholicks or Schismaticks, were only such as were **Commission'd by Bishops**: And this will make nothing for the Validity of pretended Baptisms, perform'd by Persons who never were *Episcopally Commission'd* to Baptize. So that, whether we take *Optatus's* Words in this more candid Sense of them, with regard to the Subject of his Dispute, or in the full Extent and Meaning of them, as they stand by themselves; this Father is no Evidence, that the general Sense and Practice of the ancient Church, gives Countenance to any Validity in pretended Baptisms, perform'd by such as never were Commission'd to Baptize.

§ XXIII. The next ancient Writer I shall consider, is *St. Basil*, Bishop of *Cæsarea in Cappadocia*, Ordain'd about the Year 369, whom our Reverend Historian takes notice of in his 39th Page thus: "As to *St. Basil*, it will be readily own'd, that he had somewhat of a singular Opinion in this Matter; for he was for Re-baptizing all Persons that were **only Baptiz'd by Lay-men**, as he was also for Re-baptizing all that were Baptiz'd by Heretical and Schismatical Priests; for he brings in *Cyprian*, and *Firmilian* his Predecessor,

" in

“ in the See of *Cæsarea*, arguing after this manner:
 “ * *Hereticks and Schismaticks are broken off from*
 “ *the Church, and become Lay-men, and there-*
 “ *fore have no Power to Baptize——— Therefore*
 “ *such as are Baptiz’d by them, when they return to*
 “ *the Church, are to be Re-baptiz’d with the true*
 “ *Baptism of the Church, as being only Baptiz’d*
 “ *by Lay-men.*” This is a very full Evidence
 against the Validity of Lay-Baptism; for whether
 St. *Basil’s* Opinion, that Heretical and Schismatical
 Baptisms were the same as Lay-Baptisms, was true
 or false, this is certain, that he makes the Invali-
 dity of Lay-Baptism, to be the *Standard*, the in-
 contested Principle, whereby he Judges of the In-
 validity of Baptism by Heretical and Schismatical
 Priests. There were before, and in his Days, *no*
publick Disputes of any Churches against the Inva-
 lidity of Baptism by Lay-men, *i. e.* Men who had
no Power or Commission to Baptize; for St. *Basil* cer-
 tainly means such Persons, when he speaks of Lay-
 men; because he reckons Heretical and Schismatical
 Priests to be but *as Lay-men*, and therefore to have
no Power to Baptize, i. e. as if he had said, Lay-men
 are such Persons as are destitute of Power to Bap-
 tize; Hereticks and Schismaticks are become Lay-
 men, and therefore Hereticks and Schismaticks have
 no Power to Baptize: I say, the Churches before,
 and in the Days of St. *Basil*, had no Disputes against
 the Invalidity of Baptisms by St. *Basil’s* Lay-men;
 If they had, where are the publick Records of this
 Dispute? Mr. *Bingham* neither has, nor can ever
 produce, any such Records; and therefore we shall
 conclude, that the Invalidity of Baptisms perform’d

* *Basil Epist. 1. ad Amphil. cap. 1.*

by St. Basil's Lay-men, *i. e.* by Persons *destitute of Power* to Baptize, was an allowed Principle in the Churches of his Days.

Nay, the Practice of the Ancient Church of Spain, [the Bishops whereof, in the Council of *Eliberis*, made a Canon to impower some, and not others, of their own Lay-men, who were in Communion with their Bishops, to Baptize in extreme Cases, where Priests could not be had,] confirms the general Principle of the Invalidity of Baptism perform'd by Persons not authoriz'd, *i. e.* by St. Basil's Lay-men; because, if Baptism by Persons not Commission'd, had been then valid in the general Sense and Practice of the Church, those *Spanish* Bishops would have had no need of making a new Canon, to Authorize some Lay-men to do *that*, which the Catholick Church in Doctrine and Practice esteem'd to be good and valid, when done by any Lay-christian, *without such a suppos'd Authority.*

But *Divine Revelation*, and the *general Sense and Practice* of the Church, had excluded such *Lay-men* from that Ministration, this Exclusion of them render'd their Attempts, if they should have endeavour'd to Baptize, Null and Void, for want of the Commission requir'd by the Institution, which as *much*, and as *constantly* requires the Commission, as it does the Water and the Form: The Council of *Eliberis*, doubtless found things in this State; The Bishops thereof, 'tis reasonable to believe, saw Lay-men conscientiously refrain from usurping the Ministration of Baptism, upon the Account of their having no Power to Baptize; Lay-men doubtless abstain'd from it, as we do now, upon a common Principle of their *Inability* to minister the Means of our Regeneration and new Birth, to be adm-
nister'd

nister'd by Christ's commission'd Representatives: Some *Catechumens*, at a great Distance from a Church, it's very likely dy'd without Baptism for want of such a Commission'd Minister: The *Spanish* Bishops, hearing of such sort of Accidents, consider'd, how such *Catechumens*, in such Extremities, might receive *valid Baptism*; and supposing themselves to have sufficient Power so to do, made a new Canon to authorize some of their own Lay-Communicants, to Baptize such *Catechumens* in those Extremities, that so, such Lay-men might take Courage, and Act by a *suppos'd Commission* in that Ministration, which they before had reason to think could be of no Value if they attempted it without a Commission; and that *Catechumens* might not die in such Extremities without suppos'd Baptism; and also that those *Spanish* Bishops might not incur a suppos'd Guilt, of letting Men die without a *suppos'd Commission'd Baptism*. The Canon evidently supposes, that Lay-men in *Spain*, had no Power in themselves to Baptize; and no Churches oppos'd St. *Basil's* Assertion of the Invalidity of Baptism by Lay-men, Persons not impowered by Bishops to Baptize; he only found, that some Churches did not agree with him, that Heretical and Schismatical Priests, were the Same as Lay-men: And therefore, tho' his Opinion of Heretical and Schismatical Baptisms being Null and Void, was not the *general Sense and Practice of the Church* in his Days, because many Churches differ'd from him therein; yet his Opinion of the Invalidity of Lay-Baptism, *i. e.* Baptism by Persons *never Commission'd*, was agreeable to the *general Sense and Practice* of the Church; because, no Church in Council did then or before, publicly oppose that Principle, but, on the contrary, all Canons confirm'd and establish'd it, by *wholly*

Confining the Ministration of Baptism to Bishops, and those only who are Commission'd, or suppos'd to be Commission'd by them, and making no Exceptions by any Publick Ecclesiastical Declaration whatsoever, in favour of the Validity of Baptism by Persons who never were so Commission'd.

In short, St. Basil's Argument from St. Cyprian and Firmilian, reduc'd into Form, stands thus: Baptism by Lay-men, Persons not Impower'd or Commission'd to Baptize, is Null and Void—Heretical and Schismatical Priests, are become Lay-men; therefore Baptism, by Heretical and Schismatical Priests, is Null and Void. The Major Proposition, *viz.* Baptism by Laymen, Persons not Impower'd to Baptize, is Null and Void, was not publicly oppos'd by any Churches; but the Minor, *viz.* that Heretical and Schismatical Priests were become Lay-men, was Deny'd by several Churches; and therefore in Compliance with those Churches, he would not wholly insist upon his Conclusion, That *Baptism, by Heretical and Schismatical Priests, was Null and Void*; for He acquiesc'd in the Customs of some Churches, who reckon'd the Baptisms of some Schismatics to be Good and Valid. But this was no ways a Departing from the Incontested Principle, That *Baptism by Lay-men, Persons not Commission'd or Impower'd to Baptize, was Null and Void*; because, his allowing some Schismatics not to be reduc'd to Lay-men, was only an Abatement from the Rigour of his Assertion, which He made before, concerning Hereticks and Schismatics without Distinction, when other Churches did not allow, that all Schismatics whatsoever were become Lay-men. Those Churches did not Dispute against His other Principle, of the Invalidity of Baptism by Persons Not Commission'd; and there-

fore it stood good, notwithstanding His Compliance, and their Practice, with respect to the other by Schismatical Priests.

§ XXIV. *St. Chrysoſtom, Arch-Biſhop of Conſtantinople, Anno 398.* whom *Mr. Bingham* takes Notice of in his 17th, 18th, and 38th Pages, is full againſt the Validity of Baptiſm perform'd by Perſons who never were Commiſſion'd to Baptize. His Words, as *Mr. Bingham* has noted 'em, are theſe; “ * 'Tis plain Madneſs to deſpiſe ſo Great a Power, [viz. that of the Prieſt] “ without which we cannot obtain Salvation, or the good Things that are promiſed us. For if No One can enter into the Kingdom of Heaven, except he be born of Water and the Holy Ghoſt; and he that eats not the Fleſh of the Lord, and drinketh not his Blood, is Deprived of Eternal Life; and all theſe things are perform'd, By No Other, but Thoſe Sacred Hands, I mean the Hands of the Prieſt: How can any one, without theſe either eſcape the Fire of Hell, or Obtain the Crown that is laid up in Heaven.—† “ If there be a Neceſſity, and a Child be found Unbaptiz'd, and ready to Die, it is Lawful for a Deacon to Baptize it.” Theſe two Paſſages from *St. Chryſoſtom*, do eſta-bliſh what I obſerv'd before from *Pacianus* Biſhop of *Barcelona*, That No One can Adminiſter Baptiſm, as the Means of our Regeneration and New Birth, but ſuch as either in a higher or lower Senſe have a Prieſtly Power. *St. Chryſoſtom* is Expres and Poſitive, that this Means of Regeneration is per-

* *Chryſoſ. de Sacerdot. lib. iii. c. 5.*

† *St. Chryſoſt. Hom. 61. Tom. 7. Edit. Savil, p. 423.*

form'd " **By No Other but Those Sacred Hands:** This is absolutely an Excluding of all others Whatsoever, nay, even in Cases of Necessity, for, *in articulo mortis*, when an Unbaptiz'd Child is ready to Die, *St. Chrysoftom* points out no other than a *Priestly Hand* to Baptize it, *viz.* a Deacon, who who is so far a Priest, as he has receiv'd the *Priestly Power* to Administer this Sacrament in the Absence of the Bishop, who has the whole Priesthood, and of the Presbyter, who has the Next Degree of Sacerdotal Power. *Mr. Bingham* knows and acknowledges, that Deacons have so far a share of the *Priestly Power*, as they are authoriz'd to Baptize, &c. He knows also, that when *Presbyters and Deacons* (Persons Ordain'd by the Bishop to Baptize) do Administer this Holy Sacrament, their Act is, in the Language of the Ancients, *The Bishop's Act*, because they receiv'd their Commission from him: These Things consider'd, whoever of these, whether *Presbyter* or *Deacon* Baptizes, 'tis done by a *Priestly Power*. And *St. Chrysoftom* is clear, that without *this Power* " **we cannot obtain Salvation, or the good Things that are promis'd us.**" One of the Means of Salvation which he speaks of, is, the Sacrament of Baptism; and he says positively, that it is " *perform'd by no other but the Sacred Hands of the Priest.*" If then, a Person never Commission'd to Baptize, and who is therefore *Destitute of Priestly Power*, attempts to Baptize, we " **cannot obtain Salvation by his Hand,**" because there is *no Priestly Power*: He do's not minister the Means of Salvation; He gives us no Baptism of Regeneration, because such Baptism is perform'd by no other than " *the Sacred Hands of the Priest;*" and the Hands of this Usurper are not those Sacred Hands, consequently he performs

nothing, and we obtain nothing by his Means. If such Sacrilegious Hands do minister *real Baptism*, Baptism whereby we may be born again, then there are other Hands besides the Priests, that perform this; tho' St. *Chrysoptom* says there are *no other*: And if the pretended Baptisms, by Persons who have *no Priestly Power*, are Means of Salvation, then 'tis plain, we can obtain Salvation *without* the *Priestly Power*, tho' St. *Chrysoptom* affirms expressly, that without this Power "**we cannot obtain Salvation:**" But I will sooner take this Saint's Word, in this important Matter, than trust to the dangerous Positions of some, who came after him; because, his Assertions are *clearly* founded on the Divine Oracles, the Holy Scriptures of the Word of God, that Sacred Standard of Truth, and only Safe Rule of our Faith and Practice: There, as we discover Christian Baptism, whereby we are born again, to be with no other Matter than *Water*, and in no other Form than that in the Name of the Trinity, whether Ordinarily or Extraordinarily; so, we *as certainly* find no other *Administrator* thereof, than one who is vested with *Apostolick*, i. e. *Priestly Power* or Authority, whether in Ordinary Cases, or in Times of Greatest Necessity; and our St. *Chrysoptom*, keeping his Eye upon this *Sure Rule*, affirms, that we *cannot be saved* without this *Priestly Power*; and that there is *no other* than the Hand of one who is vested with this Power to minister to us Christian-Baptism, the Means of our Salvation: In no Case whatsoever can it be done by another, for even in Absence of the Bishop and Presbyter, none but a Deacon vested also with *Priestly Power to Baptize*, had Authority to do it: So far was he from the unaccountable Latitude of our Days, that he knew of no other

other Minister of Baptism, in Times of greatest Extremity, than an Episcopal Deacon, who was so far a Priest as he was impower'd by the Bishop to Baptize: And thus by *St. Chrysoftom's* Rule, agreeable to that of the Holy Scripture, we cannot obtain Salvation; receive Baptism, the Means thereof, Ordinarily, or in Times of Extremity, "*without the Priestly Power.*"

§ XXV. About the latter end of the Fourth, or beginning of the Fifth Century, appear'd the Constitutions call'd Apostolical, as the Right Reverend Bishop *Pearson*, and after him the Reverend and Learned Doctor **Grabe* inform us. These Constitutions, tho' in Matters relating to the Doctrine of the Trinity, they have been interpolated by Anti-Trinitarian Hereticks; yet in Matters of Ancient Discipline, they inform us of several Things highly worthy of our Observation; among which, this of the Invalidity of pretended Baptism, perform'd by Persons who were never Commission'd to Baptize, is very remarkable, which I shall give the Reader in *Mr. Bingham's* own Translation, pag. 41, 42.—Thus, "*It is an horrible thing for a Man to thrust himself into the Priest's Dignity, or Office, as the Corahites, and Saul, and Uzzias did; as it was not Lawful for a Stranger, that was not of the Tribe of Levi, to offer any thing, or approach the Altar without a Priest; so do ye nothing without the Bishop. For if any Man do's any thing without the Bishop, he do's it in Vain: it shall not be reputed to him as any Service. As Saul, when he had offer'd Sacrifice without Sa-*

* *Spicileg. Patrum, Tom. 1. p. 284.*

“ muel, was told that he had done **Vainly**; so
 “ whatever **Lay-man** do's any thing without a
 “ Priest, he **Labours in Vain**. And as King
 “ Uzzias, when he had invaded the Priest's Office,
 “ was smitten with Leprosy for his Transgression;
 “ so every **Lay-man** shall bear his Punishment that
 “ contemns God, and insults his Priests, and takes
 “ Honour to himself, not imitating Christ, who glo-
 “ rify'd not himself, but staid till his Father said,
 “ Thou art a Priest for ever, after the Order of
 “ Melchizedeck.” Now 'tis evident, that this
 whole Discourse is founded upon Scripture, and
 the Sense of it when apply'd to Baptism, is no
 less than this :

First, That whoever Lay-man, what Person so-
 ever, that was never Commission'd to Baptize, at-
 tempts this *Priestly Function*, which upon no ac-
 count whatsoever belongs to him, is a very great
 Transgressor in the sight of God, and his pretend-
 ed Service is “ *Vain as to what concerns himself;*
 “ *for it shall never be accounted to him as accepta-*
 “ *ble Service, worthy of a Reward, but rather in-*
 “ *evitably make him liable to Wrath and Punish-*
 “ *ment.*” So far Mr. Bingham acknowledges,
 pag. 42.

And, Secondly, I add, That from this Discourse
 'tis plain, that such a pretended Baptizer acts also
 in *Vain*, with respect to those whom he attempts to
 Baptize; he do's them **No Service** at all, if we
 will but be so just as fairly to consider the Scrip-
 ture-Instances here refer'd to, and to which our
 Usurper is compar'd: He is compar'd to the *Corah-
 bites*; now every Body that knows the History of
 Corah's Rebellion, knows also that Corah offer'd In-
 cense in **Vain**, with respect to himself and to the
 rest of his rebellious *Accomplices* of the Congrega-
 tion,

tion, for whom he *pretended to offer*; for the Punishment fell on him, and that part of the Congregation also who did not offer, but *approv'd of his Offering*: So *Saul's* pretended Burnt-Offering *was Vain*, with respect to himself and others, for who was there that receiv'd *any Benefit* by it? The Punishment extended not only to him, but also to others, for himself and *his Children* too were for ever *Depriv'd* of the Kingdom for *this Usurpation*. Also *Uzziab's* attempting to offer Incense, if he had proceeded so far as to gain a Party to concur with him in the Usurpation, would doubtless have brought upon himself and his Accomplices, for defending his Sacrilege, a dreadful Punishment from God: But the *Priests* timely and courageously interpos'd, stop'd his Progress, and *thrust him away from the Altar of the Lord*, and so he had no Party in his Defence, that concurr'd with his *Sacrilegious Usurpation*. The **Stranger** also that was not of the Tribe of *Levi*, if he had attempted to offer any thing, or approach'd the Altar without a Priest, his Attempt would have *been Vain*; and he would have done No Acceptable Service, either for himself, or others concurring with and abetting his Usurpation; for, the same reason which would have made his pretended Service *Vain*, as to himself, would have made it also *Vain* as to others who should have concurred with him; because, they being concern'd with him in the Sin, cannot be suppos'd to receive any Benefit from that Sin of his, which they *concur with and encourage*. The Passage of the Constitutions, now before us, says, by way of Inference from the before-mention'd Instances, "So whatever *Lay-man* do's any thing without a Priest, he *Labours in Vain*," i. e. he *Labours in Vain* as *Saul*, &c. *Labour'd in Vain*; that is,

as they in their Usurpations Labour'd *in Vain*, and brought No Benefit to *themselves or others*; so our Lay-man, in his Usurpation, *Labours in Vain*, and to no Purpose in his pretended Ministrations; he brings no Benefit, but rather *Wrath and Punishment* to himself and others for whom he pretends to minister, who concur with and approve of his usurped Acts. Our Reverend Historian is so sensible of this, that he acknowledges, Page 41. That this Passage “ **Seems** to pronounce severely of usurp'd and unauthoriz'd Actions, as utterly Null and Void;” but by what has been said, 'tis plain this Passage do's more than **Seem** to pronounce so, it do's really say they are done **in Plain**: “ *Whatever Lay-man do's any thing without a Priest he Labours in Vain,*” and therefore his Act is utterly Null and Void.

§ XXVI. Mr. Bingham, Page 33. produces St. *Ferom* in the latter end of the Fourth Century, as an Evidence for Lay-Baptism: His Words are these, “ St. *Jerom*—Derives the Power of Presbyters and Deacons to Baptize, from the Original Power of the Bishop; yet in Cases of Necessity, he, (*i. e.* St. *Ferom* *) says “ it was also allow'd frequently to Lay-men: For in such Cases, he that had receiv'd Baptism, might give it to others.” Thus Mr. Bingham gives us St. *Ferom*'s Words. St. *Ferom* in this Place says, that it is **Lawful** for Laicks to baptize, “ *when Necessity Compels,*” [*Licere Laicis,* says he]

* Sine Chrismate & Jussione Episcopi, neque Presbyter neque Diaconus jus habent Baptizandi. Quod frequentur (si tamen Necessitas cogit). Scimus etiam licere Laicis. Ut enim accipit quis, ita & dare potest. *Hieronomi Dialog. cum Luciferian,* c. 4.

But now the Question is to *What Law* do's he refer us for the Lawfulness of this? *First*, Is it to the Law of God? *Secondly*, Is it to the Law of the Ancient Catholick Church? Or, *Thirdly*, Is it to some private Maxim, which with him stands instead of a Law, as a self-evident Principle, that wants no other Law to enforce it? One of these he must refer us to, when he talks of a **Lawful Act**; otherwise his saying 'tis Lawful has no Signification at all.

First, Then, I say that he refers us to *No Law of God* for the *Lawfulness* of Laicks Baptizing in Cases of Necessity; because there is no such Law extant in his written Words, if there is, let it be produced, that Men may not remain in Ignorance about it.

Secondly, St. *Ferom* can refer us to *No Law* of the Ancient Catholick Church; for she never made any such Law. If she did, when and where did she make it? In which of her *General Councils* was it enacted? Certainly not in any One of them; and no less than this, can make it a *Law of the Catholick Church*; and whatsoever falls *short* of this, is insufficient to shew the *general Sense and Practice of the Ancient Church*. Shall it be then suppos'd that St. *Ferom* has an Eye to the *Spanish Council of Eliberis's* Canon, made to impower some sort of Lay-men to Baptize *Catechumens*, in danger of Death, when a Priest could not be had? Why even this will not do neither; for that Council being but a particular Provincial One, and so *very Singular* in this Matter, that we have no other Instance of the like in the whole Christian World in those Days, its Canon was *no Law* to the Churches where St. *Ferom* liv'd, and so the *Lawfulness* of Lay-mens Baptizing could have no reference to that

that Canon, except it could be prov'd that he is speaking only of the Lay-Subjects of the *Spanish* Bishops of that Council, that it was *Lawful* for *them* to Baptize in Cases of Extremity; yet even this would not serve for our Lay-Baptisms, which are notoriously without any Necessity, by Persons who are not so much as suppos'd to Act by virtue of any Canon, and who attempt to Baptize, not only without having been ever Commission'd at all, but also in *direct* profess'd *Opposition* to that Apostolick, *i. e.* Episcopal Authority, from whence alone all Commissions to Baptize must flow. St. *Ferom* never once spoke of such *pretended Baptisms* as these; for the Church in his Days had *no Experience* of them. But to return to the Lay-Baptisms he speaks of: Do's St. *Ferom* then refer us to the Will and Pleasure of the particular Bishops of those Laicks, and say, that 'twas Lawful for them to Baptize, because their respective Bishops *authoriz'd* them to do so, in Absence of the Clergy? But how shall we know this, where do's it appear? And if it were so, this would not determine it to be *Lawful* by the *general Sense and Practice* of the Church, for the Will and Pleasure only of some particular Bishops, is no Law of the *Catholick Church*; and besides even this also, if it were allow'd that particular Bishops could and did authorize their own Lay-men, will not prove the Lawfulness or Validity of our Lay-Baptisms, which are evidently such as are done by Persons never authoriz'd at all by their respective Bishops. So that it must follow therefore that,

Thirdly, St. *Ferom*, as a suppos'd Evidence of the general Sense and Practice of the Church, refers us to *no other Law*, whereby to determine the Lawfulness of Laicks Baptizing in Cases of Necessity,

sity, than that false Maxim, which, with 'a little Variation, he plainly appears to have borrow'd from *Tertullian*, when he says, That *what a Man has receiv'd, he can also give to others*; as if this were an undoubted Principle, and in the General Sense and Practice of the Church, of equal force with a Law; and that therefore, *St. Jerom* knew that 'twas *Lawful* for Laicks to Baptize in Cases of Extremity: But the Weakness of this Position I have already expos'd, *Page 43.* to which I further add here, that if this false Principle was the *General Sense and Practice* of the Church, then it will follow, that if Lay-mens Baptisms are Lawful upon that Foundation, then, a meer Presbyter having receiv'd a Power to Baptize, to Administer the other Sacrament, to Preach, and to Absolve, &c. can Lawfully give this Power also to others; and even a Deacon too may give Power to Baptize, if *what is receiv'd can be given to others by the Receiver*; Consequences so false in Fact, (tho' necessarily arising from such a suppos'd Maxim) that the Principle from whence they flow was certainly at no Time the "*General Sense and Practice of the Ancient Church*"; and therefore this Principle being the Measure of the Lawfulness of Lay-Baptism in *St. Jerom's* Opinion, is no Argument for the Lawfulness thereof in the General Sense and Practice of the Church, about which we are still Inquiring.

§ XXVII. Let us then see whether *St. Jerom* do's not on the other side, make Lay-Baptism to be Invalid, upon Catholick Principles: And in order thereto, 'tis to be observ'd, that after the Great Council of *Nice*, *Lucifer* Bishop of *Calaris* in the Island of *Sardinia*, resolv'd to have no Conversation or Correspondence with any of the Bishops, who

who had receiv'd into their Communion, those that had formerly sign'd the *Arian* Creeds. He withdrew himself therefore into his own Island, and separated from the Communion of almost all the Bishops in the World; he dy'd in this Resolution, and left some Followers, call'd *Luciferians*, who spread themselves over all the World. These *Luciferian* Separatists insisted upon it, that the Orders of the *Arian* Bishops and Clergy were Null and Void, because they were Hereticks; and that upon their Repentance and Union to the Catholick Church, they ought not to be receiv'd into the Number of the Clergy, when the same *Luciferians* receiv'd Lay-*Arians* to Communion, only by Imposition of Hands, tho' they had been Baptiz'd by the *Arian* Clergy. St. *Ferom*, in his Dialogue against those Schismaticks, introduces an Orthodox Christian disputing with a *Luciferian*, in Defence of the Practice of the Catholicks, who receiv'd not only Lay-repenting *Arians* to Communion, but also receiv'd *Arian* Bishops, Priests, and Deacons, upon their Repentance, in the same Rank and Degree of Clergy-men, as they held while they were Hereticks: And the Argument which *Orthodox* uses in Defence of this Practice of the Church, is in short thus; You acknowledge by your Practice that the Baptism administer'd by the *Arian* Clergy is good and valid, because you receive their Laicks Baptiz'd by them without repeating their Baptism; You ought therefore to acknowledge the Orders of their Clergy, otherwise you must reject the Baptism administer'd by them, whom you do not own to be Priests. The *Luciferian* was not able to get over this, he had no Reply (in our Modern Stile) that Baptism, by Persons who have no Priestly Power, is good and valid: He might have
con-

confounded *Orthodox's* Reasoning with this Answer, if it had then been agreeable to the *General Sense and Practice of the Church*; but he yielded to the force of the Argument, and was convinc'd by this Principle, that Baptism by One Not having a Priestly Power to Baptize, ought to be rejected; and therefore we may conclude that this was a receiv'd Maxim in the Church in those Days.

But to give the Reader a little farther Insight into this *Dialogue*, that he may see the Truth of what I say, I shall here set down the Sense of some of it, out of *St. Jerom*, according to the *Benedictine Monk's* Edition, thus :

(1) *Orthodox.* “ Shew me, why you receive a Laick, who comes over from the *Arians*, when you receive not an [*Arian*] Bishop ?

(2) *Luciferian.* “ I receive an *Arian* Laick, who Confesses that he has been in an Error; and the Lord would rather have the Repentance, than the Death of a Sinner.

(3) *Orthod.* “ Receive therefore the Bishop also, who likewise Confesses that he has been in an Error; and the Lord would rather have the Repentance, than the Death of a Sinner.

(4) *Lucif.* “ If the *Arian* Bishop Confesses that he has Err'd; Why do's he continue a Bi-

(1) *Orthod.* Expone mihi quare Laicum venientem ab Arianis recipias, Episcopum non recipias?

(2) *Lucif.* Recipio Laicum qui errasse se confitetur, & Dominus mavult poenitentiam peccatoris quam mortem.

(3) *Orthod.* Recipe ergo & Episcopum, qui & errasse se confitetur, & Dominus mavult penitentiam peccatoris quam mortem.

(4) *Lucif.* Si errare se confitetur: Cur Episcopus perseverat? Deponat Sacerdotium, concedo veniam poenitenti.

shop?

“shop? Let him give over his Priesthood, and
 “I grant Pardon to the Penitent.

(5) *Orthod.* “And I will Answer you in your
 “own Language. If an [*Arian* Baptiz’d] Laick
 “Confesses that he has Err’d; How do’s he con-
 “tinue (in the State of) a [Baptiz’d] Laick? Let
 “him lay aside his Laical Priesthood, that is, the
 “Baptism [which he receiv’d,] and I also grant
 “Pardon to the Penitent, &c. ——— What-
 “soever is Unlawful for a Christian, is as much
 “Unlawful for a Laick as for a Bishop. He
 “that repents, condemns his former Crimes. If
 “it is not Lawful for a Penitent [*Arian*] Bishop
 “to continue [a Bishop] as he was before; then
 “also, it is not Lawful for a Penitent [*Arian*]
 “Laick to remain in the State [of Baptism which
 “he receiv’d in *Arianism*,] for which he now re-
 “pents.

(6) *Lucif.* “We receive [Penitent *Arian*]
 “Laicks, because none of them would be Conver-
 “ted, if they knew that they were to be Re-bap-
 “tiz’d; and so we should be the Cause of their
 “Perdition, if we should not allow of the Bap-
 “tism they receiv’d of the *Arian* Clergy.

(5) *Orthod.* Respondebo tibi & Ego sermonibus tuis, si Lai-
 cus errasse se confitetur, quomodo Laicus perseverat? Deponat
 Sacerdotium Laici, i. e. Baptisma, & ego do veniam pœnitenti.
 Scriptum est nim regnum quoque, nos & Sacerdotes Deo Patri suo
 fecit. (*Apoc.* I. 6.) omne quod non licet Christiano, Communé
 est tam Episcopo quám Laico. Qui pœnitentiam agit, priora
 condemnat. Si non licet Episcopo pœnitenti perseverare quod
 fuerat, non licet & Laico pœnitenti permanere in eo, propter
 quod pœnitentiam confitetur.

(6) *Lucif.* Recipimus Laicos, quoniam nemo convertetur, si
 se scierit Re-baptizandum, & ita fiet ut nos simus causa perditio-
 nis eorum si repudientur.

(7) *Orthod.*

(7) *Orthod.* “ — [As for us,] we do no all
 “ *inconsistently with our selves ; for we either re-*
 “ *ceive the Bishop, with the People whom he Baptiz'd ;*
 “ *or if we do not receive the Bishop [as such,] we*
 “ *know, that his People also must be reject'd, [i. e.*
 “ *not receiv'd as Baptiz'd Laicks.] — “ There-*
 “ *fore, I pray you, That you either allow him to*
 “ *sacrifice, (i. e. to be a Priest, having Power to*
 “ *administer the Sacrifice of the Eucharist) “ whose*
 “ *Baptism [administred by him] you allow of ;*
 “ *or else reject that Baptism which was admi-*
 “ *nistred by him, who you do not esteem to be a*
 “ *Priest.*

(8) *Lucif.* “ [Tho' I allow of the Baptism he
 “ administred,] yet the Laick he baptiz'd, I re-
 “ ceive (upon his Repentance) by Imposition of
 “ Hands, and Invocation of the Holy-Ghost ; be-
 “ cause I know, that the Gift of the Holy-Ghost
 “ cannot be conferr'd by Hereticks.

(9) *Orthod.* “ When a Man is baptiz'd [*as he*
 “ *is among the Arians]* into or in the Name of the
 “ Father, Son, and Holy-Ghost ; he is then made
 “ the Temple of the Lord, a new Temple of the
 “ Holy Trinity. How can you say, that among
 “ the

(7) *Orthod.*— Nos nobis adversa non facimus: Aut Episcopum cum populo recipimus quem facit Christianum, aut si Episcopum non recipimus, scimus etiam nobis populum rejiciendum— Quamobrem oro te, ut aut sacrificandi ei licentiam tribuas cujus Baptisma probas: Aut reprobes ejus Baptisma quem non existimas Sacerdotem. —

(8) *Lucif.* Sed ego recipio Laicum pœnitentem, per manus impositionem & invocationem Spiritus Sancti, Sciens ab Hœreticis Spiritum Sanctum non posse conferri.

(9) *Orthod.*—Quum in Patre, & Filio & Spiritu Sancto Baptizatus homo Templum Domini fiat, quum veteri æde destructa novum Trinitatis delubrum ædificetur, quomodo dicis sine ad-
 ventu

“ the *Arians*, Sins may be remitted, without the
 “ Descent of the Holy-Ghost? ——— [for Baptism is for the Remission of Sins.] ——— “ It is
 “ evident, that there is no True Baptism without
 “ the Holy-Ghost. ——— If an *Arian* cannot
 “ give the Holy-Ghost, he cannot truly Baptize;
 “ because, without the Holy-Ghost, there is no
 “ True Baptism of the Church: Therefore, when
 “ you receive a Person baptiz’d by an *Arian*, and
 “ call on the Holy-Ghost to descend on him; either
 “ you ought to baptize him, because he could not
 “ be baptiz’d before without the Holy-Ghost; or,
 “ if he was at first baptiz’d in the Spirit, then
 “ forbear to call on the Spirit to descend on him,
 “ since he receiv’d the Holy-Ghost when he was
 “ baptiz’d.

(10) *Lucif.* “ But pray, have you not read in
 “ the Acts of the Apostles, That they who had
 “ been before baptiz’d by *John* the Baptist, when
 “ they answer’d to the Apostle’s Question, that they
 “ had not so much as heard whether there was any
 “ Holy-Ghost, did afterwards obtain the Gift of

ventu Spiritus Sancti apud Arianos peccata posse dimitti? —
 Apparet Baptisma non esse sine Spiritu Sancto. ———

Si Arianus Spiritum Sanctum non potest Dare, ne Baptizare quidem potest, quia Ecclesie Baptisma sine Spiritu Sancto nullum est. Tu vero quum Baptizatum ab eo recipias, & postea invocas Spiritum Sanctum, aut Baptizare eum debes quia sine Spiritu Sancto non potuit Baptizari; aut si est Baptizatus in Spiritu, desine ei invocare Spiritum, quem tunc quum Baptizaretur accepit.

(10) *Lucif.* Obsecro te, nonne legisti in actibus Apostolorum, eos qui jam à Johanne Baptizati fuerant, quum ad interrogationem Apostoli respondissent, se nec auditu quidem compariisse, quid esset Spiritus Sanctus, postea fuisse Spiritum Sanctum consequutos? Unde manifestum est, posse aliquem Baptizari, & tamen non habere Spiritum Sanctum.

“ the

“ the Holy-Ghost? Whence it is manifest, that a
 “ Person may be baptiz’d, and yet not have the
 “ Holy-Ghost.

(11) *Orthod.* ——— But Paul said to those
 same Persons, “ *John indeed Baptiz’d the People*
 “ *with the Baptism of Repentance, saying, that they*
 “ *should believe on him who was to come after him,*
 “ *that is, on Jesus, for the Remission of Sins. And*
 “ *when they had heard these things they were bap-*
 “ *tiz’d in the Name of our Lord Jesus Christ; and*
 “ *when Paul had laid his hands upon them, the Holy-*
 “ *Ghost immediately fell on them, Acts xix. 1, &c.*
 “ If they therefore were baptiz’d with the True
 “ and Lawful Baptism of the Church, and so did
 “ afterwards obtain the Holy-Ghost; do you also
 “ follow the Rule of the Apostles, baptize those
 “ who have not Christ’s Baptism, [*i. e.* the Laicks
 baptiz’d by *Arians*, who you say are not Priests]
 “ and then [when you have given them Christ’s
 Baptism] “ you may call on the Holy-Ghost to
 “ descend on them.

(12) *Lucif.*—“ But do you not know, that this
 “ is the Custom of the Churches, *viz.* that the Bi-

(11) *Orthod.*— *Dixit autem Paulus: Johannes quidem Baptizavit*
Baptismo Pœnitentiæ Plebem, dicens in advenientem post eum ut cre-
derent, hoc est in Jesum, in remissionem peccatorum. His auditis Bap-
tizati sunt in Nomine Domini Nostri Jesu Christi. Et quum imposuisset
illis manus Paulus, continuo cecidit Spiritus Sanctus super eos.
 Si ergo Baptizati sunt, vero & legitimo Ecclesiæ Baptizmate,
 & ita postea Spiritum Sanctum consequuti sunt; & tu Aposto-
 lorum sequere auctoritatem, & Baptiza eos, qui Christi non
 habent Baptisma, & poteris invocare Spiritum Sanctum.

(12) *Lucif.*— An nescis etiam Ecclesiarum hunc esse morem,
 ut Baptizatis postea manus imponantur, & ira invocetur Spiritus
 Sanctus? Exigis ubi Scriptum sit? In actibus Apostolorum.

“shop should lay his Hands on those who have
 “been already baptiz’d, and call on the Holy-
 “Ghost to descend on them? Do you demand
 “where this is written? ’Tis in the Acts of the
 “Apostles.

(13) *Orthod.* “Truly I do not deny that this
 “is the Custom of the Churches, that, when Per-
 “sons have been baptiz’d by Presbyters and Dea-
 “cons, at a great Distance, in small Cities [where
 Bishops do not reside] “the Bishop should come
 “and lay his Hands on them, with Invocation of
 “the Holy-Ghost.——But if you now enquire,
 “why a Person baptiz’d in the Church may not
 “receive the Holy-Ghost, but by Imposition of the
 “Hands of the Bishop, when we assert that the
 “Holy-Ghost is also given in True Baptism: You
 “are to understand, that this Custom descends to

(13) *Orthod.* Non quidem abnuo hanc esse Ecclesiarum con-
 suetudinem, ut ad eos qui longe in minoribus urbibus per Presby-
 teros & Diaconos baptizati sunt, Episcopus ad invocationem Sancti
 Spiritus manum impositurus excurrat.—— Quod si hoc loco
 quæris; Quare in Ecclesia Baptizatus, nisi per manus Episcopi,
 non accipiat Spiritum Sanctum, quem nos asserimus in vero
 Baptizate tribui: Disce, hanc observationem, ex ea auctoritate
 descendere, quod post ascensum Domini, Spiritus Sanctus ad apo-
 stolos descendit. Et multis in locis idem factitatum reperimus, ad
 honorem potius Sacerdotii quam ad legem necessitatis. Alioqui
 si ad Episcopi tantum imprecationem Spiritus Sanctus defluit, lu-
 gendi sunt qui in lectulis, &c. per Presbyteros & Diaconos bap-
 tizati, ante dormierunt quam ab Episcopis inviserentur. Ecclesie
 salus in summi Sacerdotis dignitate pendet: Cui si non exors quæ-
 dam, & ab omnibus eminens detur potestas, tot in Ecclesiis
 efficientur Schismata quot Sacerdotes. Inde venit, ut sine Chris-
 mate & Episcopi jussione, neque Presbyter, neque Diaconus jus
 habeant baptizandi. Quod frequenter, si tamen necessitas cogit,
 scimus etiam licere Laicis. Ut enim accipit quis, ita & dare
 potest, &c.

“ us from this Authority, that after our Lord’s
 “ Ascension, the Holy-Ghost came down on the
 “ Apostles. And in many Places we find the
 “ same Custom [*viz.* of Conferring the Holy-
 “ Ghost on baptiz’d Persons by Imposition of the
 “ Bishop’s Hands] “ to be observ’d rather for the
 “ Honour of the [Bishop’s] Priesthood, than for
 “ any Law of Necessity. Otherwise, if the Holy-
 “ Ghost descends by reason of the Bishop’s Prayer
 “ only; then they are to be bewail’d who were
 “ baptiz’d in their Beds, &c. by Presbyters and
 “ Deacons, and dy’d before they could be visited
 “ by the Bishops. The Safety of the Church de-
 “ pends on the Dignity of the High-Priest, [*i. e.*
 “ the Bishop] “ to whom, if there were not given
 “ some certain Power and Authority, not to be
 “ shared in by others, but Eminent above all,
 “ there would be as many Schisms and Divisions in
 “ the Churches as Priests. Hence it comes to pass,
 “ that without the Chrism and Consent of the Bi-
 “ shop, neither Presbyter nor Deacon have Autho-
 “ rity to Baptize: Which for all that, if Necessi-
 “ ty compels, we know is frequently Lawful for
 “ Laicks. For even as a Man receives, so he
 “ can give to others the Thing he receiv’d.

Note here, ’Tis very remarkable, that in this
 last Answer of the Catholick, Saint *Jerom*
 strangely brings in the Notion of the Lawful-
 ness of Baptism by Laicks in Cases of Extre-
 mity, without any Connection or Reference
 to his former or following Discourse, but in-
 deed inconsistently with his Argument against
 the *Luciferian*; I say inconsistently, because
 the *Luciferian*, upon this Principle, might
 have overthrown *Orthodox*’s whole Argument;

for 'twould have been very natural for the *Luciferian* to have answer'd, " You say that I
 " must reject a Baptism administer'd by One
 " whom I do not esteem to be a Priest. [See Or-
 " thodox, p. 127.] I say that I am not oblig'd
 " to reject such a Baptism; because, upon your
 " own Principle, and also that of the *Catholick*
 " Church, [if this Principle was Hers] Laicks
 " may Lawfully baptize in Case of Extremity,
 " where Priests are not to be had; the *Arian*
 " Priest, whom I esteem to be No Priest, bap-
 " tiz'd the *Arian* Laick; the *Arian* Laick
 " could get no other Baptism under his Circum-
 " stances, therefore the Baptism he receiv'd was
 " a Baptism in Necessity perform'd by a Lay-
 " man, according to my Opinion, and good by
 " your Principle; consequently tho' I allow of
 " the Baptism, I am not oblig'd to acknowledge
 " him for a Priest, viz. the *Arian* Priest who
 " administer'd it." This would have been a
 very natural Retort upon *St. Jerom*, if his
 singular Notion of the Lawfulness of Laicks
 baptizing in Cases of Necessity, had been then
 the *General Sense and Practice of the Church*;
 but the *Luciferian's* next Subsequent Answer
 shews that he had no Knowledge of any such
 Notion; that he took no notice at all of *St. Je-
 rom's* advancing it, and therefore 'tis unac-
 countable how *St. Jerom* brought it into his
 Discourse, when it had no dependance at all
 upon his Argument; but is inconsistent with
 it, and even destructive of that *Catholick*
 Principle, upon which he was endeavouring
 to Confute the Practice of the *Luciferians*.
 But to proceed; the *Luciferian*, without
 taking any notice of *St. Jerom's* Saying about
 Laicks

Laicks baptizing; as if it was a singular Notion that would do him no Service in his Dispute with *Orthodox*, answers thus:

(14) *Lucif.* “ Be it so, *viz.* that among the
 “ *Arians* there is indeed no Baptism, and that
 “ therefore the Holy Spirit cannot be given by
 “ them, because they have not yet receiv'd Remif-
 “ sion of Sins; all this helps much towards my
 “ gaining the Victory.——An *Arian* is not
 “ baptiz'd, how then can he be a Priest? Among
 “ them there is not a baptiz'd Lay-man, how then
 “ can there be a Bishop? &c.

(15) *Orthod.* “ I do not at present so much re-
 “ proach, or defend the *Arians*, as I endeavour to con-
 “ vince you. For the same reason that you receive a

(14) *Lucif.*—Esto quippe apud Arianos ne Baptisma quidem esse, & ideo Spiritum Sanctum ab eis non posse dari quia necdum remissionem peccatorum acceperint, totum hoc victoriae meae proficit, & argumentorum tuorum palestra mihi palmam victoriae sudat. Arianus Baptisma non habet & quomodo Sacerdotium habet? Laicus apud eos non est & quomodo Episcopus esse potest? Mihi recipere mendicum non licet, tu recipis regem? Vos hosti castra traditis, & à nobis perfuga rejiciendus est?

(15) *Orthod.* Ego—non tam in praesenti Arianos vel improbo, vel defendo, quam illam cursus mei metam circumeo, eadem ratione à nobis Episcopum recipi, qua Laicus à vobis recipitur. Si erranti concedis veniam; & ego ignosco poenitenti. Si in fide sua baptizato baptizans nocere non potuit, & in fide sua Sacerdotem constitutum constituens non inquinavit. Subtilis est Hæresis, & ideo simplices animæ facile decipiuntur. Deceptio tam Laici quam Episcopi Communis est: — Igitur parvulorum inter se certantium ritu, quidquid dixeris dicam: Affirmabis, affirmabo; negabis, negabo. Arianus Baptizat; Ergo Episcopus est; Non Baptizat; tu refuta Laicum, & ego non recipio Sacerdotem. Sequar te quoquamque ieris, aut pariter in luto hæsitabimus, aut pariter expediemur.

“ Penitent [*Arian Laick*] we receive a Penitent
 “ [*Arian Bishop.*] If you grant Pardon to the
 “ *Laick* who Err’d; I also Forgive the Penitent
 “ *Bishop.* If the *Baptizer* could not hurt him
 “ whom he baptiz’d, in his *false* Faith, then he
 “ who ordained, did not defile the Priest whom he
 “ ordain’d, in his *false* Faith. Heresy is a subtil
 “ thing, and therefore simple Souls are easily de-
 “ ceiv’d. Bishops, as well as Laicks, are Lyable
 “ to be Deceiv’d.——Therefore, as Children use
 “ to do when striving with one another, whatso-
 “ ever you shall say, I will say; what you shall
 “ affirm, I will affirm; what you shall deny, I will
 “ deny. [If you say that] an *Arian Bishop* bap-
 “ tizes, [and this you must say, if you receive Lay-
 “ repenting *Arians* without Re-baptizing them] “ I
 “ say he is therefore a Bishop. [If you say] he do’s
 “ not baptize, then I say, do you Convince the
 “ *Laick* [that he receiv’d no Baptism from the
 “ *Arian Bishop*] “ and I disapprove of the Priest-
 “ hood of him who baptized. I will follow you
 “ whithersoever you shall go; either we will both
 “ together stick in the Mud, or we will equally
 “ get clear out of it.

(16) *Lucif.* “ But a *Laick* ought therefore to
 “ be pardon’d, because in his Simplicity, thinking
 “ the *Arians* to be the Church of God, he ap-
 “ ply’d to them; and believing, was, according
 “ to his own Faith, baptiz’d.

(16) *Lucif.* Sed Laico ideo ignoscendum est, quia Ecclesiam
 Dei putans simpliciter accessit, & juxta fidem suam credens bap-
 tizatus est.

(17) *Or-*

(17) *Orthod.* “ You assert a new Thing, that any One may be made a Christian, by him who is no Christian himself. Into what Faith is he baptiz'd, that goes over to the *Arians*? Certainly into the Faith of the *Arians*.

(18) *Lucif.* ——— “ A Laick baptiz'd in Faith, even out of the Church, is receiv'd to Communion upon his Repentance. But a Bishop either does not do Penance because he is a Priest, or if he does Penance he ceases to be a Bishop; wherefore we rightly receive a Penitent *Arian* Laick, and we reject an *Arian* Bishop if he will continue in his Priesthood.

(19) *Orthod.* “ Our Question now, is not, Whether a Bishop can undergo Penance, as a Laick may; but, Whether the Lay-Heretick has receiv'd Baptism, who, if (as 'tis plain) he has not Baptism, how can he be a Penitent before he is a Christian? Prove to me, that a Laick coming from the *Arians*, is baptiz'd, and I will not deny him Penance; but if he is not a Christian,
“ if

(17) *Orthod.* Novam rem asseris, ut Christianus quisquam factus sit ab eo qui non fuit Christianus. Accedens ad Arianos, in qua fide baptizatus est? Nempe in ea quam habebant Aiani.

(18) *Lucif.*— Laicus etiam extra Ecclesiam fide baptizatus pœnitens recipitur. Episcopus vero, aut pœnitentiam non agit, & sacerdos est, aut si pœnitentiam egerit esse Episcopus desinit. Quamobrem recte nos laicum & suscipimus pœnitentem, & Episcopum si in Sacerdotio perseverare vult, repudiamus.

(19) *Orthod.* ——— Neque enim hoc modo quæritur: An Episcopus Pœnitens esse non possit, & laicus possit? Sed an Hæreticus baptismum habeat? qui si ut constat baptismum non habet, quomodo potest esse pœnitens antequam Christianus? Proba mihi ab arianis venientem Laicum habere Baptismum, & tunc ei pœnitentiam non negabo. Si vero Christianus non est, si non

“ if he had not a Priest who could make him a
 “ Christian, [as 'tis plain he had not, if we deny
 the Orders of the *Arian* Clergy] “ how shall a
 “ Man be admitted to do Penance, who is not yet
 “ a Christian ?

(20) *Lucif.* “ Do's it then seem reasonable to
 “ you, that an *Arian* should be a Bishop ?

(21) *Orthod.* “ You your self allow him to be
 “ a Bishop, by your receiving an *Arian* Laick
 “ baptiz'd by him, [and thereby you acknowledge
 the Validity of his Orders, because you do not
 reject, but allow of the Baptism which the Laick
 receiv'd from him] “ and in this you are to be
 “ reprov'd. Why you do separate from our Com-
 “ munion, when you not only agree with us in
 “ Faith, but in receiving of Hereticks also ?—
 “ For I receive [*as a Bishop*] an *Arian* Bishop,
 “ coming over from the *Arians* to the Church; up-
 “ on the very same Principle that you receive [*as*
 a Lay-Christian] “ an *Arian*-Laick baptiz'd by
 “ him.—We agree in the Faith, we agree in
 “ receiving Hereticks, let us also agree in One
 “ and the Same Communion.

habuerit Sacerdotem, qui eum facerit Christianum, quomodo
 aget pœnitentiam Homo qui necdum credit ?

(20) *Lucif.* ——— Æquumne tibi videtur, ut Arianus
 Episcopus sit ?

(21) *Orthod.* Tu eum Episcopum probas, qui ab eo recipis
 Baptizatum ; & in hoc reprehendus es. Quare a nobis parietibus
 separaris, quum in fide & in Arianorum nobiscum receptione
 consentias ? ——— Eadem enim ratione Episcopum ab arianis
 recipio, qua tu recipis Baptizatum. ——— Consentimus in
 fide, Consentimus in Hæreticis recipiendis, Consentiamus etiam
 in Conventu.

(22) *Lucif.*

(22) *Lucif.* “ — Behold, I give way, I submit, and acknowledge that you have Conquer'd me *.

Thus much may suffice to shew the Catholick Principle insisted on by *St. Jerom* in this Dialogue; I have not always confin'd my self to the very Letter of the Words, but expatiated sometimes by way of Paraphrase, that the Sense and Meaning of the Dispute against the *Luciferians*, might be the more Evident to the *English* Reader; and that he might be thereby the more enabled to see the Truth of what I have before asserted, and here repeat again, *viz.* That the Great Argument, by which the *Luciferian* was Convinc'd, was, That If the *Luciferians* rejected the Orders of the *Arian* Clergy, they ought also to reject the Baptisms administer'd by them; but the *Luciferians* in their Practice, allow'd of those Baptisms, because they admitted *Arian* Repentant-Laicks to Communion, without re-baptizing them; and therefore the *Luciferians* were bound to acknowledge the Priestly Power of the *Arian* Clergy, who baptiz'd those Laicks: This is so plain, in the Dialogue before us, that he who runs may read it; and the whole Argument turns upon this, That where there is not a Priestly Power, there is No True Baptism administer'd; for, says *Orthodox*,

(22) *Lucif.* En tollo manus, cedo, vicisti. —

* *S. Hièronymus adversus Luciferianos*, p. 290. &c.
Opera, Tom. IV. Paris 1706.

N^o 7. “ If we do not receive the [Arian] Bishop [as a Bishop] “ we know that the People [baptiz’d by him] “ must also be rejected,” [not receiv’d as baptiz’d Laicks.]

—“ Reject that Baptism which was administer’d by him, whom you do not esteem to be “ a Priest.

N^o 15. “ An Arian Bishop baptizes, therefore he “ is a Bishop. If he does not, i. e. cannot “ baptize, I disapprove of his Priesthood.

N^o 19. “ If an Arian Laick, had not a Priest, “ who could make him a Christian; how should “ he [be admitted to] do Penance, viz. the “ Arian Laick, who is not yet a Christian.

N^o 21. “ You your self approve an Arian to be a “ Bishop, by your receiving an Arian Laick “ baptiz’d by him, &c.

By such Arguments as these, *Orthodox* asserts against the *Luciferian*, that the *Arian* Clergy were not Lay-men, but had Priestly Power: He concludes the Validity of their Priesthood from the Validity of the Baptism they administer’d: He asserts, that if they had no Priesthood, the Baptism administer’d by them ought to be rejected. And to this, as to an Invincible Argument, the *Luciferian* submitted, and was overcome by the force thereof; and consequently St. *Jerom* here confuted the *Luciferian*, by insisting upon a then known Principle of the Invalidity of Baptism perform’d by Persons destitute of a Priestly Power; and so is an Evidence of the Church’s Sense in those Days, against the Validity of our pretended Baptisms, perform’d by those who certainly were never vested

vested with any such Power and Authority, as our Dissenters 'tis evident never were.

And for a further Confirmation of this, let it be observ'd, that St. *Ferom* in the same Dialogue, do's afterwards, towards the Conclusion, expressly affirm, That, * *Without Priests there is no Church*; which would be a Notorious Falsity, if in his Days, it was a *Just and Sound* Principle of the Catholick Church, that Persons who never were Priests in any respect whatsoever, could minister Valid Baptism, for where there is Valid Baptism there is most certainly a Church; because, Baptism is Our Admission *into the Church*: And so, without Priests, there would be a Church, which is contrary to this Father. St. *Ferom* do's here therefore Null all pretended Baptism by Persons that are *Not Priests*, because [according to him] where there is No Priest there is No Church; and certainly if there is No Church (*i. e.* where there is No Priest) there is No Baptism: And if no Baptism, then the pretended Baptisms of such *No Priests*, are Null and Void, if this Father may be suppos'd to be Consistent with himself in this and the rest of his Assertions against the *Luciferian* Schismatick.

We have seen, in the Course of this *Dialogue*, that St. *Ferom* made a Slip, when he said, That in Cases of Necessity 'twas lawful for Laicks to Baptize; we have observ'd how inconsistent this is with the whole Scope of his Argument against the Schismaticks, whom he was endeavouring to convert upon Catholick Principles; that it is very odly, and without any Connection, brought into a

* *Ecclesia autem non est, quæ non habet Sacerdotes. S. Hieron. Oper. Tom. IV. adver. Lucif. 302. Paris 1706.*

Discourse of another Nature, and which was made on a quite contrary Principle and Foundation. It is also plain, from what has been largely said before, Page 121, &c. that this of the Lawfulness of Laicks baptizing, was not the then general Sense and Practice of the Church; and that let it be taken in what tolerable Sense it will, our Lay-Baptisms receive no Countenance from it: And lastly, That the very Foundation, upon which St. *Jerom* supposes Laicks Baptism to be Lawful, is false in Fact, and dangerous to other Sacred Institutions, as well as to that of Baptism; and therefore upon the whole we may venture to say, That if our Reverend Historian had but thoroughly read over, and duly consider'd St. *Jerom's* Dialogue, he might have been convinced that he had no reason to censure [as he do's] Two such Excellent and Learned Men as Dr. *Forbes*, and Mr. *Reeves*, and in so publick a Manner too, [in his 33d and 34th Pages] as guilty of Error and Mistake, for affirming, That "after the Council of Nice, this Proposition, that those, whom a Laick Baptizeth, are to be re-baptiz'd, was look'd upon to be so true, that it was the undoubted Principle whereby the Orthodox confuted the Luciferians." For by the Dialogue we plainly see that it was so; and it is to be wonder'd how it comes to pass, that one so well vers'd "in Greek and Latin Fathers" as our Reverend Historian is, do's not see it too.

Mr. *Bingham* says, pag. 34. "Who that reads these Words [viz. after the Council of Nice, &c.] in these Learned Writers [i. e. Dr. *Forbes*, and Mr. *Reeves*] " would not at first sight be tempted to think, that the Council of Nice had somewhere made an Order, that Persons baptiz'd by Lay-men should be re-baptiz'd; and that the Catholicks gene- rally

“ rally made use of this, as an undoubted Principle,
 “ to confute the Luciferians? ” What a strange In-
 sinuation is this, against the Ingenuity and Integri-
 ty of those Two Learned Gentlemen! Would Mr.
Bingham take it kindly to be serv'd thus him-
 self? I appeal to his own Conscience, whether he
 himself believes, that those *Excellent* Persons had
 any such design in their Words, as to make the
 World believe, that the Council of *Nice* made such
 an Order. Who but the Careless, &c. would, in
 reading those Learned Mens Words, “ be at first sight
 “ tempted to think ” any such thing? If Men,
 “ at first sight, ” are apt to be heedless, let 'em look
 again, and then they'll find that, as second Thoughts
 are often best, so is a second Inspection. Mr. *Bing-*
ham knows, that before his Scholastical History
 came forth, there were Men, who pleaded the Au-
 thority of “ *Ancient Catholick Tradition* ” for the
 Validity of Lay-Baptism, particularly the corrupt
 Church of *Rome*, and others, tho' not of her Com-
 munion, yet *so far* however agreeing with her *in*
Popery: He knows that the Plea of Antiquity is
 a very powerful Motive, to cause some Men to be-
 lieve Doctrines and Practices; Dr. *Forbes* and
 Mr. *Reeves*, no doubt, had an eye to this, in the
 Question of Lay-Baptism; and they have prov'd
 to the World, that the pretended Validity of Bap-
 tism by Lay-men, was not so old a Doctrine as
 some Men represent it: The particular Instance here
 produc'd by them, shews, that even after the first
 300 Years of Christianity, it was not known
 in the general Sense and Practice of the Church,
 but that the very contrary was held by the Catho-
 licks in the Fourth Century; because, when the
Luciferian Schismatics separated themselves from
 the Communion of the Church, which they did
 “ after

“after the Council of Nice” [held A. C. 325.] The Orthodox confuted those *Luciferians* by this “undoubted Principle, that those, whom a Laick Baptizeth, are to be re-baptiz’d.” This St. *Ferom* asserted so late, as, in the Year 384, long after the Council of Nice. This the *Luciferian* Schismatick could not gainsay, but submitted to it, as is evident from the before-mentioned *Dialogue*— And this being “after the Council of Nice,” ’twas highly reasonable for those Learned Men to say, That ’twas so; because thereby we may discover, not only the Novelty of the Notion of Lay-Baptisms being Valid, but also, that [notwithstanding the * Council of Nice had decreed, that the Orders of the *Novatian* Schismaticks were good and valid yet] the Orthodox did not believe any thing done that Council could favour the Validity of Lay-Baptisms, tho’ some of the Favourers of those false Baptisms might, from this Councils Act about the *Novatian* Schismaticks, falsely infer the Validity of such Baptisms, since ’tis notorious that some reckon (as Mr. *Bingham* very well knows) Lay-Baptism, and the Ancient Schismatical Baptism, to be much of the same Nature; but of this more hereafter. And these may be the Reasons why those Excellent Writers say, and that very truly too, That “† after the Council of Nice, this Proposition, “that those, whom a Laick Baptizeth, are to be re-baptized; was look’d upon to be so true, that it “was the undoubted Principle, whereby the Orthodox “confuted the *Luciferians*.” But for a further

* Canon 8.

† *Forbes’s Instruct. Histor. Lib. 10. Cap. 14. N. 5.*
Reeves’s Note on Vincentius Lirin. p. 263.

Vindication of those Two Learned and Judicious Writers, I refer the Reader to the Reverend and Learned Dr. *Bret*, who has abundantly prov'd Mr. *Bingham*, and not those Excellent Persons, to be mistaken in this Matter, as may be seen in that Learned Doctor's "*Enquiry into the Judgment and Practice of the Primitive Church, in relation to Persons being Baptiz'd by Lay-men,*" from pag. 30, to 40.

§ XXVIII. St. *Augustin* comes next under our Consideration. Mr. *Bingham* says of him thus, in pag. 34. He "was Co-temporary with St. *Ferom*, and of the same Opinion with him in this Matter. In his Epistle to *Fortunatus*, which is preserv'd in **Gratian*, he says, *In time of Necessity, when a Bishop or Presbyter, or other Minister, could not be found, and a Man desir'd Baptism, who was in danger of Death, in that case Lay-men were used to give him that Sacrament which they had receiv'd, rather than he should end his Life without it.*"

But in Answer to this, it is to be observ'd, That Mr. *Bingham*, in translating this Passage, is more positive, and thereby induces his *English* Reader to believe, much more than the *Latin* will allow; for according to this Translation, it looks as if St. *Augustin* assur'd us, That 'twas Matter of Fact, that in such a "*Case, Lay-men were used to Give that Sacrament,*" &c. whereas, in truth, it was to St. *Augustin* himself a *Hear-say* only: He do's not tell this, as if himself were an Evidence of the Truth of it, but that it was reported so; his

* Ap. *Gratian* de Consecrat. Dist. 4. Cap. 21.

Words are these, as Mr. *Bingham* has 'em in his Margin: "*In Necessitate, cum ———— urget periculum ejus qui petit, ne sine isto Sacramento hanc vitam sineat, etiam Laicos solere dare Sacramentum quod acceperunt, Solemus Audire. We use to Hear, that, In time of Necessity, &c. Lay-men are used to give that Sacrament,*" &c. St. *Augustin*, [if those are his Words] do's not say, (as Mr. *Bingham* represents it) That Lay-men were us'd to give that Sacrament; but only gives us to understand, that there us'd to be such Reports. Now what does this signifie, towards clearing the Matter we are enquiring after? If such Reports were spread Abroad, and came to St. *Augustin's* Ear; do's it therefore follow, that the Thing reported was true, and that it was also the *General Sense and Practice* of the Church? Must we have no better Proofs for her *General Sense and Practice*, than such Hear-say Stories? If Mr. *Bingham* do's not give us better Evidence than this, the World will easily see through the Falacy: And 'tis very unaccountable, for a Man of that Gentleman's Character and Function, to make his *English* Reader believe, that St. *Augustin* himself says (in this Place) that Lay-men did Baptize; when in truth he only says, "*We use to Hear*" so.

But our Reverend Historian goes on, and tells us from *Gratian*, That "This Custom St. *Augustin* **found upon Authority**, descended by Bishops from the Apostles; for in the same * Epistle he

* Ap. *Gratian* de Consecrat. *Dist.* 4. *Cap.* 36. *Sanctum est Baptisma per se ipsum, quod datum est in Nomine Patris, & Filii, & Spiritus Sancti: Ita ut in eodem Sacramento sit etiam auctoritas Traditionis per Dominum nostrum ad Apostolos, per illos autem ad Episcopos, & alios sacerdotes, vel etiam Laicos Christianos ab eadem Origine & Stirpe venientes.*

[i. e. *St. Augustin*] says, “ *Baptism is Holy in it self, if it be given In the Name of the Father, Son, and Holy-Ghost : And there is in this Sacrament the Authority of the Commission, which our Saviour gave to the Apostles, and by them to Bishops, and other Priests, and even to Lay-men descending from the same Stock and Original.*” This Translation do’s not give the full, plain Sense of the Words, as *Gratian* has transcrib’d them ; they ought rather to be translated thus, that the *English* Reader may see the true Meaning of them : “ *Baptism is Holy in it self, if it be given In the Name of the Father, Son, and Holy-Ghost ; [Ita ut in eodem Sacramento sit etiam Auctoritas, &c.] So that there be also in this Sacrament, the Authority of the Commission which our Saviour gave to the Apostles, and by them to Bishops and other Priests, and even to Christian Lay-men descending from the same Stock and Original.*” This Passage shews, that the Baptism which is *Holy in it self*, must not only be given in the Name of the Trinity, but must also have the **Authority of Christ’s Commission**. Now if this Commission was really given to Christian Lay-men by the Apostles, as *Gratian* here makes *St. Augustin* suppose it was, (tho’ *St. Augustin* never did prove any such thing, nor indeed any other Writer whatsoever, either before or after him ;) I say, supposing Lay-men could really have this Commission ; yet still ’tis notorious, that Our Lay-men about whom we Dispute, never had any such Commission at all ; and therefore, whatsoever may be pleaded from this Passage, for Baptisms by such *supposedly-Commission’d Lay-men*, can no-ways be apply’d to the pretended Baptisms perform’d by our *Laicks, who have not the least appearance*

pearance of any such *supposed* Commission ever given to them.

To this may be added another Passage which *Gratian* attributes to *St. Augustin*; * “*Baptism is not such as he is who ministers it, but such as He is [i.e. Christ] by whose Power and Authority it is given,*” &c. From hence it follows, that the pretended Baptism given by our Laicks is no *Christian Baptism*, because it is not perform’d by *Christ’s Power and Authority*: He by whose Authority they give it, is nothing but a common *unconsecrated Person*: Such as he is, such is the pretended Baptism they give; therefore ’tis Nothing but a common Washing, because he is Nothing but a common Person: For our Laicks pretended Power and Authority, is receiv’d by them from No One whatsoever, that is consecrated to give them a valid Power; and consequently their Washings perform’d by Authority of an unconsecrated common Person, are Not *Christian Baptism*, but common Washings only. But to proceed,

Mr. Bingham, in his 35th and 36th Pages, next tells us out of *Gratian*, that *St. Augustin* “*relates a Story of a certain Catechumen, who being at Sea, and in danger of being cast away in a Storm, was baptiz’d by a Penitent, because there was no other Christian in the Ship with them;*” and that *St. Augustin* concludes upon it, “*That tho’ such a Fact had not happen’d, yet it was a Case that every*

* *Baptismus talis est, qualis ille est in cujus potestate datur, non qualis est ille per cujus ministerium datur.* *Augustin* super *Joannem* in parte prima, *Tract. 5. ad Cap. 1.* apud *Gratian* de *Consecrat. Dist. 4. Cap. xxvi.*

“ one must own might happen; and then No One
 “ could say, that in such a Case a Man who desired
 “ Baptism in imminent danger of Death, was to be
 “ deserted, and left unbaptiz'd.

But to do justice to this Passage, and to the Reader too, I will give him a little further insight into the Credit of this *supposed Fact*, than our Reverend Historian has thought fit to do: It is then very true, that *Gratian* makes *St. Augustin* relate such a Story; but 'tis also as true, that the same *Gratian* makes *St. Augustin* say of this Story thus,
 “ * If any one refuses to believe what I have related,
 “ (for it is not founded on Authority of the Holy
 “ Scriptures, but reported by an unknown Doubt-
 “ ful Author) I will not thwart him.” This plainly discovers that *St. Augustin* himself, [if he did relate such a Story] had no Foundation whereon to rely for the Truth of it; 'twas by his own Confession *only a Report*, and the Author of it **Not Known**, therefore not to be depended on: He did not think it to be of such Importance as to be insisted on; no, he would not Oppose any One that refus'd to believe it: So that, here we are amus'd with a Story of *No Moment*, a Thing only in the Air, of no weight, but a *very Trifle*, not worth our Notice. *St. Augustin* is made, however, to say, that this “ *was a Case that every one*

* Quod si forte hoc quod narraui, &c. — Non vult aliquis credere (non enim hoc Scripturarum Divinarum auctoritas, sed incerto auctore fama commendat) non repugnabo: sed interrogabo, si tale aliquid contingat, quid futurum est? Non enim potest quisquam dicere relinquendum esse illum qui morte imminente baptizari desiderat. Quem Baptizatum à poenitente quisquis non credit Contigisse oportet ut Credat posse contingere. Apud Gratian de Consecrat. Dist. 4. Cap. 36.

“ *must own might happen;*” and what then? What signifies the Possibility of such a Case? Our Inquiry is after *Matters of Fact*, attested to by the Ancient Catholick Church. A Thousand ridiculous Cases are possible to happen; nay, some, (as we find by Experience) which are Superstitious even to a degree of Madness and Distraction, have happen'd; and some Popish Writers, &c. are full of Relations of such Accidents. But the Consequences and Inferences which are rais'd from 'em are not always *just* and good, but frequently *false*, and *repugnant* to the Laws both of God and Man.

Our suppos'd St. *Augustin* says, “ *If any thing like this should happen, No One can say, that in such a Case, a Man who desires Baptism in imminent danger of Death, is to be deserted and left unbaptiz'd.*” This is very true, he ought not to be deserted, by those who have the *Power of Giving him Baptism*; but if there are none present, and no other to be procured, but Lay-hands, such as *never receiv'd the Power of Giving Baptism*, then 'tis Nonsense to say, that he is deserted by them who have it not in their Power to give him what he wants; [and to say that *Necessity* gives them this Power, is begging the Question] so that, if he dies unbaptiz'd, he is not *Deserted* and *Lest* unbaptiz'd, but he is **taken away** unbaptiz'd. If in a desert Place I see a miserable Object, a Man dangerously wounded by Robbers, and wallowing in his Blood, ready to Expire; I search his Wound, and find it so large, as that 'tis out of my Power to close it up, or stop the Blood from issuing out of it; I can only Sympathize with the poor Man in his miserable desperate Case, and send up my Prayers to God for his departing Soul: He in this
Case

Case is not *sorsaken* by me, tho' he dies without that Relief which he wanted, and which I had not at all in my Power to administer to him. Or, suppose, which is a just Parallel to the Case before us; A Christian, who never receiv'd the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper, upon the near Approach of Death, fears that he shall not be saved without it, and therefore with vehement Cries and Tears begs of me to procure him the Reception of it. We are very remote from any Place where Priests are to be had, and after all Diligence us'd, none can be procured to give it him; he is assur'd of this, but yet continues unsatisfied, and earnestly desires me to give it him, believing that in this Case it will be the same thing; I tell him 'tis utterly out of my Power, mine is an ineffective Hand, I never was vested with Christ's Authority, and therefore he would receive Nothing from me but Common, *Not Sacramental* Bread and Wine; however, I assist him with my charitable Prayers, &c. and he dies without receiving what I had no Power to give: 'Tis certain, the Man is not *Deserted* and *Left*, without the Sacrament, by me; God took him away from it, and to his most wise Disposal he must be left, as must all such unbaptiz'd Persons we are now speaking of; and if our suppos'd *St. Augustin* reckon'd, that, rather than leave them thus to God, any Christian present, had better minister Water to them, with the Form, In the Name of the Trinity; It is certain, that he only spoke dogmatically, giving but his own private Opinion in such a Case; for he refers us to no Law, no Canon, nor Custom of the Catholick Church for such a Practice.

Thus far may suffice in Answer to the Passages Mr. *Bingham* has produced out of *Gratian*, "a

“ Monk, who frequently quotes *Spurious * Books,*
 “ *as the genuine Writings of the Fathers:*” And
 whose Authority, with relation to these Passages,
 is therefore so little to be rely'd on, that even our
 Reverend Historian himself intimates, that they
 may be question'd; and therefore, as not relying
 on them, he gives us a Quotation out of *St. Au-*
gustin's genuine Works, and says, *pag. 36.* “ But
 “ if any one thinks these Passages doubtful, because
 “ they are only related by *Gratian,* he may read
 “ the same in *St. Augustin's* undoubted Works. In
 “ his Books against *Parmenian the Donatist,* he uses
 “ this Argument to prove, that the Baptism of
 “ Hereticks ought not to be repeated, *viz. † Be-*
 “ *cause, tho' it be but a Lay-man that gives Baptism*
 “ *to a Man in extream Necessity, when he is ready*
 “ *to Perish; he cannot think any one can piously*
 “ *say, that it ought to be repeated. If it be done*
 “ *without Necessity, it is indeed an Usurpation*
 “ *of another Man's Office; but if he be compell'd by*
 “ *Necessity, it is either no Fault at all, or but a very*
 “ *light one.*” This is Mr. Bingham's Translation
 of *St. Augustin's* Words; wherein 'tis very remark-
 able, that our Reverend Historian says of that Fa-
 ther, “ **He cannot think any one can piously say,**
 “ &c.” whereas in Truth, *St. Augustin's* Words
 are, [“ **Nescio an pie quisquam dixerit esse repe-**
 “ **tendum**] **I know not whether any One can pi-**
 “ **ously say that it ought to be repeated.**” The

* Dr. Brett's Enquiry into the Judgment and Practice of the Pri-
 mitive Church, in relation to Persons baptiz'd by Lay-men, p. 42.

† Augustin. Contra Epistol. Parmen. lib. 2. C. 13. *Et si*
laicus aliquis pereuntis dederit, necessitate Compulsus, quod cum ipse
acciperet dandum esse addidit, nescio an pie quisquam dixerit esse
repetendum, &c.

whole Passage then [to come as near as I can to Mr. Bingham's Translation, without doing any Violence to the Sense of St. *Augustin's* Words] is this, " If a
 " *Lay-man, Compell'd by Necessity, should give Bap-*
 " *tism to a Man that is ready to Perish, &c. I know*
 " *not whether any one can piously say, that it ought*
 " *to be repeated. If it be done without Necessity, it*
 " *is indeed an Usurpation of another Man's Of-*
 " *fice; but if he be compell'd by Necessity, it is*
 " *either no Fault at all, or but a very Light One.*"
 " Now in this Passage, thus set to rights, 'tis wor-
 thy our Observation.

First, That St. *Augustin* here speaks Dogmatically, giving his own private Opinion only, and not the Lawful Sense and Practice of the Church: He only puts a Case, that if a Lay-man should so baptize; he do's not relate any *Matter of Fact* of a Lay-man's having done so, and of its being agreeable to the Sense and Practice of the Church, but, like a Casuist, supposes if such a thing should happen; and then he resolves upon it with a great deal of Hesitancy, as one not sufficiently inform'd what should be done in such a Case; " I know not [says he] " whether any one can piously say, that [such a Baptism] " ought to be repeated." I know not, is strange Language, about an *Undoubted Lawful Determination* of the Church: If she had determin'd the Unlawfulness of Repeating such a Baptism, sure St. *Augustin* would have *Known* of this; and if such a Determination had been *Pious*, then sure St. *Augustin* must have call'd it *Impious*, to have said, " That such a Baptism ought to be re-
 " peated:" But instead of any thing like this, for him to say [*Nescio an pie quisquam dixerit*] I know not whether any one can piously say so; plainly shews that he did not know, that it was

contrary to Piety to say, "They ought to be repeated;" for he that does not know, **Whether** I can *piously* say a thing, do's not know that 'tis impious for me to say it, because [the *Latin* word *An*] **Whether**, has always a Reference to two things, and when one of them only is nam'd in a Proposition, the contrary thereto is always to be understood; as when a Man says, **I know not whether** you are an honest Man, he plainly means thereby, **I know not** whether you are, or are not an honest Man; thereby shewing that he does not know what to determine on either side, tho' still his Partiality to one side rather than the other, is evident enough; and he shews that he questions the Honesty of the Man, tho' he is not able to *prove him dishonest*. So here, *St. Augustin's*, "**I know not whether** any one can *piously* say, that the [supposed] Baptism ought to be repeated;" must mean, that he did not know, whether, on the one Hand, 'twas Pious, or on the other Hand, *contrary to Piety* to say so: His Partiality, 'tis true, is plain enough, that he questions the Piety of saying that such a Baptism ought to be repeated; but then he plainly shews [by his *I know not whether*, &c.] that he was not able to prove it a Contradiction to Piety, to say that it ought to be repeated: From whence 'tis evident that *St. Augustine* did not know, that it was at that Time the Pious Lawful Sense and Practice of the Church, to call such pretended Baptisms, the *One Christian Baptism*, which ought not to be Repeated; for if he had known so, instead of saying, *I know not whether* any One can *piously* say they ought to be repeated, he might have confidently affirm'd, "*I know that 'tis not Pious* to say so." But we see, that this Father

ther did not venture to be thus Positive, but Hesi-
tates, and speaks of it in doubtful Terms, which
he does not use to do when he speaks of the *Gene-
ral Sense and Practice of the Catholick Church*; for
then he is Clear, Express, and Positive enough;
thus for Example, The then * *Catholick Practice*, of
allowing the Validity of Heretical and Schisma-
tical Baptisms in the Name of the Trinity, per-
form'd in Separation from the Church, is Plain-
ly, and Fully, and Positively affirm'd by him, to
have been *Search'd and Inquir'd into, Consider'd,*
*Perfected, Confirm'd and Establish'd, with the Con-
sent and Agreement of the whole [Christian] World.*
But nothing like this, has he, or could he have
said in all his Works in behalf of *usurped Lay-
Baptisms*; and therefore we may conclude, that he
knew of *No Pious, Lawful Sense and Practice of the
Catholick Church*, in favour of the Validity of such
pretended Baptisms, which is further Confirm'd
by the other Observation upon this Passage of his,
viz.

Secondly, That he plainly shews, he cannot clear
such Usurpations from the Guilt of Sin: He says,
of a Lay-man's being supposedly *Compell'd by Ne-
cessity*, to baptize, "*that it is either no Fault at
all, or but a very light one.*" Now if it had
been agreeable to the then *General Pious Sense and
Practice* of the Church, 'tis reasonable to believe
that he would have known it to be so; and then

* De iis verò qui ab Ecclesiæ unitate separati sunt, nulla jam
quæstio est, quin & habeant & dare Possint, & quin perniciose
habeant, pernicioseque tradant extra vinculum pacis. Hoc
enim jam in ipsa totius orbis unitate discussum, consideratum,
perfectum atque firmatum est. S. August. Contra Epist. Parmen.
Lib. 2. C. xiii. Sect. 30. Tom. 9. p. 45. Paris 1694.

without any Hesitancy, he might have said, it is not only *no Fault at all*, but a *commendable Pious Action*, arising from a well inform'd Judgment, and due Sense of Duty; but *St. Augustin*, as knowing of no such *General Sense and Practice of the Church*, tells us, that *either 'tis no Fault at all*, or else but a *Light One*. Who can believe that this Saint would have allow'd the *Pious General Sense and Practice of the Church*, to be any Sin at all, of how small a sort soever? No, this is not the Language of an Evidence of the Church's *General Pious Sense and Practice*; and is therefore no more than his own private Opinion, which has nothing to do with our present Enquiry.

Mr. Bingham, in his 43d Page, produces another Passage from *St. Augustin*, in favour of Lay-Baptisms, even in ordinary Cases, thus; *St. Augustin's Words* are these, “ * *Though it be usurped without Necessity, and given by any Man to another, that which is given cannot be said not to be given, tho' it may be truly said to be unlawfully given. Therefore the Unlawful Usurpation is to be corrected by a sincere and affectionate Repentance. And if it be not Corrected, that which is given will remain to the Punishment of the Usurper, as well of him who gave it unlawfully, as of him who receiv'd it unlawfully: But yet it cannot be accounted as not given. No devout Soldier ever violates the Royal Stamp, tho' it be usurp'd by private Men: For tho' some by Stealth, and in a Clandestine way, set the Royal Stamp, not to the publick Money, but their own; yet the Money so stamp'd, when they are either*

* *August. Contra Epist. Parmen. Lib. 2. C. xiii.*

“ *punish'd, or pardon'd for their Offence, having the*
 “ *Royal Standard upon it, is not defac'd, but brought*
 “ *into the King's Treasury.*” “ Whence (says
 “ *Mr. Bingham, pag. 44.) 'tis plain, He [St. Au-*
 “ *gustin] thought, that Baptism given by Lay-*
 “ *men in Ordinary Cases, which was an Usurpa-*
 “ *tion of the Priest's Office, was not to be repeated.*
 “ And this he asserts in another Place against the
 “ *Donatists; Yet not as the Determination*
 “ *of any General Council, but as his own*
 “ *Opinion:*” “ For “ *he says, If he were a Mem-*
 “ *ber of such a Synod wherein this Question was de-*
 “ *bated, he should not scruple to assert all those to*
 “ *have Baptism, * wheresoever or by whomsoever*
 “ *Baptiz'd, that had receiv'd it in Faith, and without*
 “ *Dissimulation, in that Form of Words which is pre-*
 “ *scrib'd by the Gospel; tho' if they wanted Charity,*
 “ *and were out of the Catholick Church, it would not*
 “ *profit them to Salvation, or any other Spiritual*
 “ *Concerns.*”

Thus we see how far *St. Augustin* was carry'd in the Heat of Dispute against the *Donatists*; for, because they Re-baptiz'd even the *Catholicks*, who had been before validly Baptiz'd In the Name of the Trinity, by *Catholick Priests*, [and this they did, upon pretence of their former Baptisms being a Pollution, as being defil'd by the Ministration of those, whom they call'd Wicked and Profane, and for that reason not Ministers of Jesus Christ] — Therefore *St. Augustin*, in his Dispute against this Practice of the *Donatists*, ran into the other Extreme, and asserted (as we see in these Passages) That Baptism perform'd “ by any Man whomsoever,

† *August. de Baptismo, lib. vii. chap. 53.*

“or *wheresoever*,” if done with the Form of Words, In the Name of the Trinity, was good and valid, and not to be repeated: A Latitude so extremely singular, that it allows of Baptism, not only by Christian Lay-men, but even by Apostates, Jews, Turks, Pagans, and all other sorts of Infidels, not only in Cases of Extremity, when Priests are not to be had; but also in Ordinary Cases, where *they are* or may be present. Such a Liberty is this, that nothing Sacred, no Divine Institution whatsoever can be of any Force upon Mens Consciences, if it should be *universally allow'd of*: And so unwarrantable is the Notion, that Mr. Bingham (as I have before observ'd, pag. 105.) acknowledges, That Baptism by Jews and Pagans, “*is one of the Novelties of Popery,*” *wholly New,* “and *utterly without Precedent in the Primitive Church.*” Nay, even in this Place our Reverend Historian confesses, That this of *such Usurped Baptism*, was asserted by St. Augustin, “*Not as the Determination of any General Council,*” “*But as his own Opinion.*” So that it was nothing but St. Augustin's private Opinion, not the *General Sense and Practice of the Church*; which is the Great Thing we are enquiring after, and which hitherto we cannot discover, by all that Mr. Bingham's *Scholastical History* has yet related.

As for St. Augustin, his Reasons for pretended Baptisms, (tho' usurp'd and perform'd by any Man, without Necessity) are none at all; for he says, “*That which is given, cannot be said not to be given, tho' it may be truly said to be unlawfully given.*” This is plainly a begging of the Question; for 'tis the thing deny'd: We say, in such Case, Christian Baptism *is not given* at all, and therefore not so much as *unlawfully given*; let those who

who are Friends to St. *Augustin's* odd Opinion in this Matter, prove, (what he has not prov'd) That Christian Baptism is really, tho' *unlawfully given*, and we will have done. When Laws are Enacted for making *Conveyances* of Estates, or Privileges to Men; if those Laws require that the Conveyance should be made by the *Sign Manual, and Seal and Delivery*, of the *Principal Owner*, or his *Lawful Attorney*; 'tis false, to say, That the Conveyance is *really and validly* made by a *Cheating Usurper* who is not so *authorized*; no Law will allow this to be a *Valid Conveyance*, no, tho' it was done with all the *other necessary Requisites* of the Law; 'tis an absolute Nullity, and is very parallel to the Case before us. St. *Augustin* brands such pretended Baptisms with the odious Name of **unlawful Usurpations**; and so they justly deserve to be term'd, for they are Usurpations against all the Laws of God, and his Church; and if so, then there is **no Law** whereby to determine them Valid; and they cannot have a Legal Validity, without some Law or other whereby to try their Validity.

He says, "*The unlawful Usurpation is to be corrected, by a sincere and affectionate Repentance.*" This is undoubtedly necessary. But wherein do's this Repentance consist? Repentance must be differently express'd; and its Fruits must be *according to the Nature* of the Sin committed. Confession, Sorrow, Prayer for Pardon, Resolution to do so no more, and Constancy in keeping this Resolution, are not sufficient to constitute "*a sincere and affectionate Repentance*" for some sort of Sins: The Proper and Genuine Work of True Repentance, is, to *undo* (as much as lies in our Power) the Wickedness we have committed. Hence Restitution is necessary, in Cases of *Injustice, Robbery,*

Robbery, and Defamation; and such Usurpations as are made by Persons, who, by all the Laws of God and his Church, are utterly excluded from *sacred Ministrations*, cannot properly be said to be *truly repented of*, without *undoing and making void*, in Fact, as much as we can, the thing which was *endeavoured to be usurped*. Thus, if a Presbyter should wickedly presume *to attempt to Ordain Men* to minister in Holy Things, his Repentance would be but false and spurious, if he did not, to the utmost of his Power, cause those *false Ordinations* to be undone, either by discovering the Persons he had so *pretendedly Ordain'd*, that they might be known not to be in Holy Orders; or else, by endeavouring to cause them to be *validly Ordain'd* by the Bishop, if they are *duly qualified* for Holy Orders. And in this Case, it would not be just, to say *they receiv'd Holy Orders* before, *tho' unlawfully*; for in truth, *they receiv'd them not at all*: This I desire our Episcopal Friends to consider. And as for those who are not entirely Episcopal, but think the Presbyterian Scheme to be as good as that of Episcopacy, [tho' they will never be able to prove it, to be any other, than a very wicked and sacrilegious Usurpation] I ask them, Whether if a Man, whom they esteem to be but a *meer Layman*, should presume to attempt to give Holy Orders; I say, Would such a Man's Repentance for this Sin be sufficient, without discovering (to his power) the Persons he so pretendedly Ordain'd, and endeavouring, either to have them known as Persons *not Ordain'd*, or else to procure them to receive what the Presbyterians call *Valid Orders*? Sure, our Friends to the Presbyterian Scheme will not call this *true Repentance*: And if not, then there is no reason to say, That the wicked Usurpations

tions of Persons pretending to Baptize, who never were Commission'd, are duly repented of, without their endeavouring to procure Baptism by a *Valid Commission*, to be given to those whom they, in their wicked Usurpations, did but *pretendedly baptize* before; for the same reason that holds for one, will hold for this other also.

St. *Augustin* says farther, concerning such a Usurpation, "If it be not corrected [*i. e.* by Repentance,] "that which is given will remain to the Punishment of the Usurper, as well of him who gave it unlawfully, as of him who receiv'd it unlawfully; but yet it cannot be accounted as not given." Still begging the Question, that Baptism is given in these Cases: And it may as justly be said, that Holy Orders are given in the other Case I put above. The *Usurper's* Repentance I have already spoken of; and if he does not truly repent of **and correct** his Usurpation, his usurped Act will remain to *his Punishment*, (says St. *Augustin*).

I am now to see what must be the Repentance of the *supposed Receiver*; and that is already discovered, by the Repentance of the *pretended Giver*: For as this latter, in the Case of a False Ordination, was bound to endeavour the Discovery of the Falsly-Ordain'd Persons, that they might be known as not Ordain'd, and so receive *Valid Ordination*; So, the Receiver of those False Orders, must repent of, and correct what was *pretendedly received* by him; he must not *claim* the *Privileges and Prerogatives* due to *Valid Holy Orders*; and if he would enjoy them, he must disclaim all pretended Right to them as due by *virtue of the Counterfeit Ordination*, and must receive *Valid Orders* from such as have Power to give them. Even so
the

the Receivers of these *pretended Baptisms*, if they *must repent* of their Part in the Usurpation, must necessarily acknowledge, that they have acquir'd *no Right* to the Privileges of a *Valid Baptism*, by virtue of the *Usurped Act*: The Usurped Act was Unlawful, with respect to *all the Laws* of God and his Church; therefore his Repentance must be such, as to express his *actual Obedience to those Laws*: He do's not shew *such Obedience to*, but even actual Rebellion against those Laws, while *he claims* (by virtue of a Usurper's Act, in Opposition to all those Laws) the same Privileges as are Conferr'd by others whom those Laws do *authorize* to Conferr them; this is making the *Usurpation* to be only a *Circumstantial Fault*, when in truth 'tis also an *Essential one*, by reason of its *Contrariety* to the Essential Law of the Institution; as I humbly hope I have prov'd * in another Place; and therefore, Repentance for it, as a Fault against a *Circumstantial Law only*, when 'tis in truth, a Rebellion against *all Law whatsoever*, as well *Essential* as *Circumstantial*, is a continuing the Usurpation in a very great degree; and the Demanding of Privileges by *virtue thereof*, is in some sort an Equalizing its *pretended Legality*, with the Lawfulness of the *Commission'd Acts*, and so a False and Counterfeit Repentance. The Penitent then, must wave his *pretended Right* to the *Privileges* of a *Commission'd Baptism*; and seek for them, by endeavouring to procure Baptism from those who are *Commission'd* to give it him; and this his *Endeavour*, shews his sincere Repentance for *his part in the Usurpation*; and then, what was pretendedly given to him before, being now forsaken by him,

* *Lay-Baptism Invalid.*

will not “remain to his Punishment,” as *St. Augustin* says it will, if the Usurpation “be not corrected by a sincere and affectionate Repentance.”

As for *St. Augustin's* Simile about unlawful Coining of Money, I have answer'd it long since in * another Book to which the Reader is refer'd: And I have insisted thus long on *St. Augustin's* Notions, which he advanc'd in Defence of *Lay-Usurpations*; because (as I have proved) they were only his own private Opinions, and not the Sense of the *Ancient Catholick Church*: And because I find some † Men of Character among our selves, have copy'd these Notions from him, without so much as producing any Argument to support them, whose Great Names are notwithstanding (in the Opinion of some Men) sufficient to recommend them to be receiv'd as good and wholesome Doctrines, I shall therefore, from the Learned *Du Pin*, conclude all that I have to say of the Great *St. Augustin*, by shewing the Reader, that He was not wholly free from introducing Novelties in Religion; and that the *Latin Fathers* after him, copy'd his Principles, and follow'd him, as their great Leader and Guide, in Matters of Divinity. — *Du Pin's* Words are these: || “*He [i. e. St. Augustin] starts several Questions never thought of before, and resolves many of them by the meer strength of his Wit. He often left the Notions of his Predecessors, to follow a Path wholly New, whether in Expounding the Scripture, or in Opinions of Divinity. That*

* *Dissenters and other Unauthoriz'd Baptisms Null and Void, &c.*

† *Appendix to the Bishop of Oxford's Charge, Anno 1712.*

|| *Du Pin's Eccles. Hist. Cent. V. pag. 206, 207. Lond.*

“ may be said of him as to Divinity, which Cicero
 “ said of himself as to Philosophy, That he was
 “ **Magnus Opinatus,**” — [A great Opini-
 niator.] — “ He framed (if we may so say)
 “ the Body of Divinity for all the Latin Fathers that
 “ came after him. They have not only taken out of
 “ his Books the Principles they make use of, but
 “ often they have only copied them.” So that it will
 be no wonder, to find some of the Latin Writers
 after him, asserting the same as he did, in behalf
 of Lay-Baptisms: But all that he has said, a-
 mounts to no Evidence, that Baptism by Persons
 never Commission’d, was Good and Valid, in the
General Sense and Practice of the Ancient Church.
 And as for his own Opinions in this Matter, they
 stand upon such weak Foundations, (as has been
 already prov’d) that they are of no Importance
 to our present Enquiry.

§ XXIX. *Gelasius* Bishop of Rome, Anno 492.
 is Mr. Bingham’s next supposed Evidence: Our
 Reverend Historian tells us, pag. 36. That this
 Bishop, in his Epistle to the Bishops of *Lucania,*
Brutia, and *Sicily,* * “ *Restrains the Office of Bap-*
 “ *tizing in Ordinary Cases to Bishops and Presbyters*
 “ *only; excluding Deacons from it, except in Cases*
 “ *of Extreme Necessity, when the Superior Ministers*
 “ *were absent: In which Cases, it was often al-*
 “ *low’d to Lay-Christians to perform it.*” And
 the Inference that Mr. Bingham draws from hence,
 is this; “ So that Lay-men had as much Autho-
 “ rity to perform it in the Absence of Deacons,
 “ as Deacons had to do it in the Absence of
 “ the Presbyters and Bishop.”

* *Gelas. Epist. 9. ad Episcop. Lucan. cap. 9.*

But in Answer to this, 1st, Mr. *Bingham* has not prov'd, neither can he prove, That the Apostles ever Authoriz'd Lay-men to Baptize at all; and he cannot deny, but acknowledges that they did Authorize Deacons: So that, by Apostolick Institution, Deacons had Authority to Baptize in Absence of the *Superior Orders*; which Authority, in Absence of the Deacons, appears never to have been given by the Apostles to Lay-men. 2dly, He has not prov'd, That the Ancient Catholick Church gave Authority to Lay-men to Baptize in absence of the Deacons; and 'tis notorious, that it was the Office of the Deacons to do this in absence of the Bishops and Presbyters. From which Considerations 'tis evident, that Mr. *Bingham's* Inference from *Gelasius* is a Mistake, when he says, That "*Lay-men had as much Authority to [Baptize] in the absence of Deacons, as Deacons had to do it in the absence of the Presbyters and Bishops*; for Lay-men never were so Authoriz'd by the Apostles, or by the Ancient Catholick Church, as Deacons were. And now let us enquire into the Force of what *Gelasius* himself says about Lay-mens Baptizing.

We are seeking for the *General Sense and Practice of the Ancient Catholick Church*, 1st, In respect to Lay-mens Baptizing, by virtue of a suppos'd Authority given to them; and 2dly, In relation to Baptism by Persons, who never were at all Commission'd for that Purpose.

As for the First, *Gelasius's* Words point out nothing whereby we can discover any such *general Sense and Practice of the Church*; he refers us to no *general Council*, no Catholick constant Tradition from the Apostles Days, whereon to found the *Authority of Lay-men*:—He says only of Baptizing

when extreme Necessity compels [by reason of the Absence of the Clergy] that [*“Laicis Christianis facere plerumque conceditur :”*] It is often [or sometimes] **granted to Lay-men to perform it.** This do's not determine **who** they were that **granted** this, nay more, it shews, that even then it was **not always** granted; and it is therefore impossible from hence to conclude, that it was the *ancient Catholick Church's Grant*; and if it was not hers, 'tis no matter whose it was else. It may be *Gelasius* himself, or some of his *late Predecessors*, Bishops of *Rome*, made this *Grant* to impower some of their *own Lay-men* for such Cases, as the *Spanish Bishops* in the Council of *Eliberis* had done before them; or else it may be, that *Gelasius* only points at what those *Spanish Bishops* had done: But whether it be one, or the other, or both of these, it amounts to nothing but the Practice of *some particular Bishops*, not of the *ancient Catholick Church*: Nay further, if this had been (as it certainly was not) the *ancient Church's general Sense and Practice*, yet this Passage of *Gelasius* would not have been an Evidence, that pretended Baptism, by Persons *never commission'd* to Baptize, was the *general Sense and Practice of the Church*. For,

Secondly, His saying, *“It is granted to Lay-Christians;”* plainly shews, that they had not the Authority and Power in themselves as Lay-Christians: For the Thing **granted** was not in their Power before 'twas **granted**; if it was, then it was **no Grant**, and it would have been a meer Jest to talk of **granting a Power** to Lay-Christians, if they had it in themselves without such a **Grant**: Lay-Christians, as such therefore, had no such Power, because *Gelasius* says it was *granted* to them. Consequently, *if they could have such a Power*

Power conferr'd on them, this would not prove any thing in Behalf of those, who evidently *have it not*, and *indeed never had it*; which is the Case of *our Laicks*, against whose pretended Baptisms we are now disputing. And therefore *Gelasius* is no Evidence for any Validity in such *spurious Baptisms*.

§ XXX. *Isidore*, Bishop of *Sevil* in *Spain*, about one hundred Years after *Gelasius*, viz. Anno 595. is Mr. *Bingham's* next suppos'd Evidence, pag. 37. And our Reverend Historian gives us that Bishop's Words thus: * “ *It is unlawful either for private Men, or the inferior Clergy, [Clericis sine Gradu] (who were Lay-men,) to Baptize; for the Office belongs only to Priests. We read in the Gospel that it was given by Commission to no other but the Apostles; Jesus after his Resurrection, saying unto them, as my Father hath sent me, so send I you; And when he had said this he breathed on them, saying, Receive ye the Holy Ghost. Whosoever Sins ye remit, they are remitted unto them; and whosoever Sins ye retain, they are retain'd. And in another Place, Go Teach all Nations, Baptizing them In the Name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost. Whence it is manifest, that the Ministry of Baptism was committed only to Priests; nor is it lawful for Deacons themselves to perform the Mystery without a Bishop or a Presbyter: Except in their Absence, the extreme Necessity of Sicknes compels them to do it. In which Case also Lay-Christians are often permitted to do it; lest any one should be called*

* *Isidor. de Offic. Ecclesias. Lib. 2. c. 24.*

“ *out of the World without the Remedy or Means of Salvation.*” This is Mr. Bingham’s last Evidence in this Matter. And now we will examine to what purpose ’tis in our present Dispute.

And first, *Isidore* founds the Power of Baptizing upon the Commission given to the Apostles: So far we are agreed. *Secondly*, He hence infers, That “ *the Ministry of Baptism was committed only to Priests.*” Now if by Priests he means only *Bishops* and *Presbyters*, *Isidore* himself was mistaken; for that Ministry was given also by the Apostles to *Deacons*, as Mr. Bingham himself has very justly observ’d; see p. 3. of his *Scholastical History*. Consequently, *by the Divine Law, ’twas Lawful for Deacons to Baptize.* But, *Thirdly*, *Isidore* says, It is not “ *Lawful for Deacons themselves to perform the Mystery* [*Mysterium—explere absque Episcopis vel Presbyteris*] or rather to perfect the Mystery, “ *without the Bishops or Presbyters: Except, in their Absence, the extreme Necessity of Sickness* “ *compel them to do it.* This was a Matter of Order only, as it is now in our Church, that *Deacons* should give way to *Bishops* and *Presbyters*, their Superiors, and not presume to take place of them, but only Baptize in their Absence: Therefore, when *Isidore* says, ’tis not Lawful for them to Baptize, &c. He cannot be suppos’d to reckon them but equal to *Laicks*; for ’tis plain, that the Apostles gave them Power to Baptize, *which they did not give to Laicks.* And therefore their Exercise of that Power, in an irregular Circumstance, when *Bishops* and *Presbyters* were present, or might be had, tho’ it was unlawful, yet it was not so with respect to the Essence of the Commission, as if they never had receiv’d any Commission at all; but ’twas only unlawful with respect to the Circumstance of Order: It being
a stand-

a standing Law of the Church, that Deacons should act in Subordination to Bishops and Presbyters, and give way to them in Sacred Ministrations. *Fourthly*, His telling us of the Power of Baptizing in want of the Clergy [*Quod & Laicis fidelibus plerumque permittitur, &c.*] That “it is often [or sometimes] “permitted [allow’d or granted] to Lay-Christians to Baptize, lest any one should be call’d out of the World without the Remedy or Means of Salvation;” is still confining the Power of Baptizing to a suppos’d Commission to be first receiv’d, and abundantly shews, that Lay-Christians have not that Power in themselves as Christians, but it must be acquir’d by an *explicit Permission or Grant*; so that, if such a Commission *could be given* to Lay-Christians, yet even then, this Passage would not favour the Washings perform’d by our Laicks, *who never had any Commission at all*. And further, here is no Evidence that Lay-men were in the *general Sense and Practice of the Church* empower’d to Baptize in Absence of the Clergy. *Isidore* appeals to *no general Council, or uninterrupted ancient Catholick Tradition or Practice*: And being a *Spanish Bishop*, ’tis just and reasonable to believe, that he only has an eye to the Practice of the *Spanish Church*, in Consequence of their Council of *Eliberis*, which was *no general Council*, and determin’d nothing relating to Washings by Persons who *never were commission’d to Baptize*.

As for some Mens particular Opinions about the Minister of Baptism, ’tis no wonder that [especially after *St. Augustin’s Days*] they ran such unaccountable Lengths, as at last to reckon, that ’twas no matter who perform’d it, so that ’twas done with Water and Invocation of the Holy Trinity; for they follow’d the Opinion of that Father, That Water,

and the Name of the Trinity, were *absolutely necessary* to the Salvation of all Men. *St. Augustin* did not allow, that even Infants could be sav'd without Water; and hence he was for having Water apply'd by any one, with the Use of the Form, in the Name of the Trinity, as we have seen before; and to such a Latitude did Men run at last, that they in express Terms affirm'd Baptism to be valid, tho' perform'd by a Pagan. Thus *Gratian* reckons *Isidore* * to have affirm'd; which if true, shews how valuable his Authority is in the Case of Baptism perform'd by *supposedly authoriz'd Lay-Christians*. So the same *Gratian* quotes a † *Pope of Rome* asserting the Validity of Baptism by a Pagan; and in || another Place, that it is all one whether perform'd by a Christian or Pagan, so that it was done in the Name of the Trinity: Nay, if it was done only in the Name of Christ, by a Pagan, the Persons so baptiz'd ought not to receive any other Baptism. So extravagant have Men been in their Notions of the meer Imitation of an *opus operatum* in this matter. But *Mr. Bingham* confesses this to be a *Popish Novelty*, and so indeed he ought in reason to acknowledge, that Baptism by Persons *never commis-*

* *Isidor. Non iteratur Baptisma quod à Pagano Ministratur. Apud Gratian de Consecrat. Dist. 4. cap. xxii. pag. 1983. Edit. Taur. 1620.*

† *Romanus Pontifex, non hominem judicat qui Baptizat: sed spiritum Dei subministrare gratiam Baptismi licet Paganus sit qui Baptizat. Ibid. cap. xxiii.*

|| *A quodam Judeo nescitis utrum Christiano an Pagano, multos in patria vestra baptizatos asseritis, & quid de iis sit agendum consulitis. Hi profectò si in Nomine Sanctæ Trinitatis, vel tantùm in Christi Nomine, sicut in actibus Apostolorum legimus, baptizati sunt (unum quippè idemque est, ut sanctus exponit Ambrosius [Lib. i. de Spiritu Sancto, cap. 3.] constat eos non esse denuò baptizandos. Ibid. cap. xxiv.*

tion'd at all to Baptize, is as much a Novelty of corrupt Popery, since the *ancient Catholick Church* never determin'd any thing in favour of these, any more than she did in favour of *Pagan Baptism*; and a Pagan has as much *Power and Authority* to Baptize, as our Laicks who *never were commission'd* any more than he.

XXXI. Our Reverend Historian is so sensible, that what he has produc'd from the Antients is nothing to the Purpose of pretended Baptisms by Persons never commission'd; that he sums up his whole Evidence in a very remarkable Manner, in these Words, pag. 38. " Thus we have seen [says he] for six hundred Years, the general Sense and Practice of the antient Church, grounded, as they suppose, upon the Commission given to the Apostles, whereby Bishops, as the Apostles Successors, are qualified first to give Baptism themselves, and then to grant a Commission to others to Baptize, and that either to Presbyters or Deacons, or to Presbyters alone in ordinary Cases, and in Cases extraordinary and of extreme Necessity to Deacons and Lay-men." Thus Mr. Bingham acknowledges, that all his Evidences conspire in this, that the general Sense and Practice of the ancient Church was, that Baptism, whether in ordinary or extraordinary Cases, was administred by the Bishop, or else by such as had [or at least were suppos'd to have had] an Episcopal Commission to Baptize; from whence it necessarily follows, that even this suppos'd general Sense and Practice of the Church, as stated by Mr. Bingham, does not give Countenance to the Validity of pretended Baptisms perform'd ordinarily as well as extraordinarily, by Persons who never had an Episcopal Commission, and who yet presume

presume to attempt to Baptize, in Opposition to the Divine Right of Episcopacy : So far from this was the supposed General Sense and Practice of the Ancient Church, that even in Cases of *Extreme Necessity*, we see Baptism was suppos'd to be perform'd, by none but such as were reckon'd to be *Impower'd by the Bishop* : Insomuch, that our Laicks pretended Baptisms, tho' done in Extremity, where none of the Clergy can be had, can claim nothing of Benefit from the *General Sense and Practice of the Ancient Church* for the first 600 Years of Christianity, by Mr. *Bingham's* own Account of the Matter, whereby he makes Baptism, even in Cases of *Extreme Necessity*, to be founded upon a *Commission given by Bishops to Deacons and Lay-men to Baptize*.

§ XXXII. But not to leave this Matter here ; I affirm, That all Mr. *Bingham's* Evidence summ'd up together, do's not amount to so much as a Proof, That the *Ancient Catholick Church's* Sense and Practice for the first 600 Years, was, to *Commission or Authorize Lay-men* to Baptize, in want of the Clergy.

For, The first 300 Years have not so much as One Evidence of any One Lay-man *so Authorized*.

Tertullian's Opinion was singular, That Lay-Christians, as such, had that Power in themselves : He did not suppose any such *Authority given to them* by the Bishops ; nay, he suppos'd them also to have Power to minister the other Sacrament of the *Eucharist*, in absence of the Clergy. But *St. Cyprian, Firmilian*, and their Colleagues, are plain Evidences against this his singular Notion of Lay-mens Power to Baptize, and the Founda-
tion

tion upon which he grounds their pretended Power, has been already overthrown.

The Council of *Eliberis*, which made a Canon to *Authorize* some particular sort of their own Laymen, who were in Communion with their Bishop, to Baptize a Catechumen in Danger of Death, when the Clergy could not do it; has been largely prov'd to be a Contradiction to *Tertullian's* Notion; and that it was but a Provincial Council of *Spanish* Bishops, not a General Council, and therefore not Declaratory of the General Sense and Practice of the Ancient Catholick Church; since, in the whole space of the first 600 Years, this Council stands singular by it self; no other Council whatsoever, whether General or Provincial, during that Period, made any such Canon.

The Story of the Boy *Athanasius's* Baptizing his Play-fellows in Sport, and of *Alexander's* determining, that the Children should have no other Baptism; besides its being Fabulous, is no Instance of a Laicks Baptizing by the Bishop's Commission and Authority: If it had been true, it would not have been an Instance of the General Sense and Practice of the Ancient Catholick Church; being, upon that Supposition, but the Private Act of one single Bishop only: Nay farther, the supposing the whole Story to be true, and the Determination thereupon to be just and good, would naturally tend to the Exposing of all Divine Institutions, to be Ridicul'd and Despis'd, as insignificant and Childish things, and so make way for the Extirpation of all Reveal'd Religion out of the World.

St. *Ferom's* Saying, Of the Lawfulness of Laicks Baptizing in Case of Necessity, has been prov'd to be built on *Tertullian's* false Foundation; to be no Instance of the *General Sense and Practice of the Ancient*

Ancient Catholick Church ; but to be an Inconsistency with himself, and a Contradiction to that Catholick Principle, whereby he confuted the *Luciferian* Schismatick, who reckon'd the *Arian* Clergy to be but Lay-men, and whose Baptism, *St. Jerom* affirm'd, ought therefore to be rejected, if the *Luciferians* Opinion were true.

St. Augustin's Opinions have been examin'd ; he proves nothing, but supposes the Validity of an Imitated *Opus Operatum*, without any Argument ; he speaks things upon Hear-say only ; he hesitates, and cannot determine, as to *his Knowledge*, about Usurped Lay-Baptisms being Valid ; he gives us no Proof of any General Council, nor of any Tradition shewing the *General Sense and Practice* of the Ancient Catholick Church, for Laymens being Authoriz'd to Baptize. And,

Lastly, *Gelasius* and *Isidore*, tho' they say that Lay-men were often Authoriz'd to Baptize, in Case of Necessity, yet neither of them points at the *General Sense and Practice of the Church* ; No General Council, No Catholick Tradition, No Universal Practice of the Bishops of the Catholick Church ; they leave us in the dark, as to these ; and therefore 'tis just and reasonable to infer, that they speak only, either of their own or some other particular Mens Practices, and therefore are of *No Authority* to us in this Matter.

Upon the Whole, The profound Silence of the Days of the Apostles and Apostolick Fathers, and of the Three first Centuries of Christianity, concerning Lay-mens being at all Commission'd to Baptize, is a full Proof, that the Bishop's Authorizing of them to Baptize, can never be founded on any Catholick Tradition of the *Primitive Church of Christ* : And more, If there had in truth been such

such a **Catholick Tradition**, even from the Times of the Apostles to this Day, [as there never was,] yet still this would be of no Advantage to the pretended Baptisms of our Laicks, [*i. e.* our *Dissenters*,] who were never Commission'd by Bishops, [and indeed, who cannot be Commission'd, for they have **no Bishops**] to Baptize.

This is the Result of all Mr. *Bingham's* Evidences: But at the End of this Book, I shall sum up the whole Evidence *for* and *against* Baptism by Persons who *never were Commission'd*, or who were suppos'd to have *no Commission*, to Baptize; which it is not so proper to do here, before I have *Answer'd* Mr. *Bingham's* *Objections*, against several of the Testimonies of the Ancient Fathers against Unauthoriz'd Baptisms, and also his *Objections* relating to the Antient *Heretical* and *Schismatical* Baptisms allow'd of by the Church, which Mr. *Bingham* endeavors to make look like our *Unauthoriz'd Lay-Baptisms*.

C H A P. IV.

ANSWERS to Mr. Bingham's OBJECTIONS,
*against the Testimonies of St. Cyprian,
 St. Basil, and St. Chrysoftom, who reckon'd
 pretended Baptisms by Persons never Com-
 mission'd, to be Null and Void.*

OBJECT. **T**HE Evidence of those Three
 I. Fathers I have already shewn,
*Chap. III. § XII, XIII, XXIII,
 XXIV.* And our Reverend Historian, in his 38th
 Page, says, That if their Evidence were entirely on
 our Side, "*It would not weigh very much; because*
 "*it would be only their Private Sense, and not the*
 "*Practice of the Church, which is the Subject of our*
 "*present Enquiry.*"

ANSW. Now our Side, *i. e.* the Proposition we
 insist upon, is this, That pretended Baptisms, by
 Persons *never Commission'd to Baptize*, is Null and
 Void. These Three Fathers, (besides others which
 I have produc'd) are entirely with us in this Point,
 as I have already prov'd. Mr. *Bingham* has brought
no Evidence of any One Church upon Earth, for
 the first Six hundred Years of Christianity, de-
 termining the contrary; the Story of the Boy
Athanasius Baptizing his Play-fellows, and of the
 Church of *Alexandria's* allowing it to be Valid,
 having been prov'd to be but a meer Fiction: So
 that all Mr. *Bingham's* Evidence for this Side of the
 Question, is from no other than the *Private Opi-
 nion's* of *Tertullian* and *St. Jerom*, Two Presbyters;
 and

and *Optatus* and *St. Augustin*, Two Bishops; the Two first upon false Principles, and the other Two meerly upon their own private Opinion, without giving any good Reason for it: And one of them, *St. Augustin*, at the same time hesitating and doubting about it, as I think I have largely prov'd.

As for any other Evidence *Mr. Bingham* has brought, *viz.* from the *Spanish Council of Eliberis*, *St. Augustin*, *Gelasius* and *Isidore*, they wholly relate only to Baptism *suppos'd to have been authoriz'd by Bishops*; which is foreign to our present Enquiry, tho' even *they* are no Proofs of the *general Sense and Practice of the Church*, but only show how far some Bishops thought themselves to have been empower'd to *authorize others to Baptize*, namely, their own Lay-men in want of the Clergy. And whether they thought and practis'd rightly or no, this is certain, that their particular Practice has not been prov'd to be the *Sense and Practice of the ancient Catholick Church*. And further; nothing in favour of pretended Baptisms, by Laicks *never authoriz'd* by their Bishops, and acting in opposition to them, can be at all inferr'd therefrom. And therefore the Testimonies of *St. Cyprian*, *St. Basil*, and *St. Chrysostom*, against the Validity of spurious Baptisms perform'd by Persons who never were Episcopally Commission'd, and therefore have *no Priestly Power* to Baptize, are of very great Weight and Importance; *1st*, Because their Evidence is founded on the Divine Positive Institution of Baptism; *2dly*, Because it is corroborated by other concurring Evidence; And *3dly*, Because it never was gainsay'd or oppos'd by any Law or Tradition of the ancient Catholick Church, nor so much as by any authentick Law or Tradition of but one Particular, Ancient, Orthodox Church of Christ.

But

But Mr. *Bingham* has particular Objections against the Evidence of those Fathers respectively, which I now come to Answer.

OBJECT. II. He says, “ When Chrysoſtom confines the Office of Baptiſm to the Hands of a Priest, he only means in ordinary Cases, otherwise Deacons, who are no Priests, would be absolutely excluded from it in all Cases whatsoever, as well as Lay-men; and yet Chrysoſtom allows Deacons to Baptize in Cases of Neceſſity, which makes it evident, that his Discourse only relates to the Miniſtration of Baptiſm in ordinary Cases.

ANSW. All this is very fallacious; for Mr. *Bingham* cannot fairly deny, that Deacons are so far Priests as they are impower'd to Baptize: See what I have said, p. 16, & 17. Himself says, That Baptiſm perform'd by the Bishop's Authority, was reputed as his Act: See his 8th Page. He therefore must acknowledge, that when Deacons Baptize by virtue of that Commission they receiv'd from the Bishop, 'tis Baptiſm by a Priestly Power and Authority, and done by the Hands of a Priest, a Deacon being so far a Priest; and moreover his Act being the Bishop's Act, who is the High Priest. And therefore Mr. *Bingham's* Objection is lost; for 'tis plain, that St. Chrysoſtom's confining the Office of Baptiſm to the Hands of a Priest, relates both to ordinary and extraordinary Cases too, because, even for Cases of Extremity, he points out no other than the Hands of a Priest of the lowest Order, viz. a Deacon to Baptize; and therefore St. Chrysoſtom absolutely excludes all such, as can upon no account whatsoever be said to be vested with Priestly Authority, viz. all who
never

never were authoriz'd by Bishops to Baptize. The Reader may also see Mr. Bingham's whole Objection provided against in p. 114. and therefore this may suffice here in Answer thereto.——

OBJ. III. His next Objection is against St. Basil's Evidence thus, in his 39, 40, and 41 Pages, "As to St. Basil—*he had somewhat of a singular Opinion in this matter; for he was for re-baptizing all Persons that were only baptized by Lay-men.—But he was not so stiff—as to unchristian those that were baptiz'd by Schismaticks, or break the Communion of the Church upon it: For he gives his Advice—That Men should quietly comply with the Rules and Practice of their own Church where they liv'd. But forasmuch (says he) as some of the Asiatick Churches think otherwise, that the Baptism of such, by way of Dispensation for the sake of great Multitudes, ought to be receiv'd, let it be receiv'd. Whence I think (says Mr. Bingham) it may be inferr'd, that tho' St. Basil, in his own Opinion, did not approve of the Baptism either of Schismaticks or Lay-men, yet he thought it might stand good, if the Church thought fit to receive and confirm it; and this he seems to assert upon the common Principle of the Antients, that a Latitude of Power was left with the Rulers and Governours of the Church to ratifie such Baptisms, when they found it necessary for the Benefit and Edification of the Church. But if otherwise, St. Basil's Opinion cannot Prejudice the contrary Doctrine, or be thrown into the Ballance against the common Consent and Practice of the Church. And yet it may be observ'd, that St. Basil speaks perhaps, not of Lay-Baptism in Cases of Necessity, but of usurping the Office, as Hereticks did in ordinary*

“ **Cases** : Which makes a wide Difference in the
 “ Case, and belongs to a more difficult Question,
 “ that is, Whether unauthoriz'd Baptisms, were
 “ ever ratified and made good by the subsequent
 “ Confirmation and Reception of the Church ?

A N S W. The Reader, by considering what I have said already, Page 109, &c. upon St. Basil's Evidence against Lay-Baptism, may observe, that St. Basil speaks of Lay-men as Persons *not having Authority* to baptize; that he makes their want of Power and Authority to be the Reason of the Invalidity of their Baptizing; that he reckon'd the Schismatics here spoken of, to have been by their Separation from the Church reduc'd to Lay-men, and that consequently they had **no Power** to minister in holy Things, and that *therefore* because they were as Lay-men, Persons without Commission, their Baptisms were Null and Void: And 'tis notorious against the first part of Mr. Bingham's Objection, that he was *not Singular* in this Principle; for St. Cyprian and Firmilian are quoted by him, as having been of the same Principle; and I have also prov'd from St. Cyprian's Works, that they and others of their Colleagues were really so; and consequently Mr. Bingham's Charge of Singularity against St. Basil is very unfair, especially if it be also consider'd that his Epistle to *Amphilochius* Bishop of *Iconium*, out of which his Evidence is taken, is a *Canonical Epistle*, and reckon'd as Canon Law in the Code of the *Greek Church*. Thus much for Mr. Bingham's Charge of Singularity against St. Basil.

Now for the Consequence Mr. Bingham draws from that Father's acquiescing in the Practice of some *Asiatick Churches*, who receiv'd the Baptisms
 of

of Schismatics. — “ Whence I think (says Mr. Bingham) “ it may be inferr’d, that tho’ St. Basil, “ in his own Opinion, did not approve of the Bap- “ tism, either of **Schismatics** or **Lay-men**, yet “ he thought it might stand good, if the Church “ thought fit to receive and confirm it.” Here Mr. Bingham blends and confounds together **Schisma- tical** and **Lay-Baptism**, and infers, that St. Ba- sil thought they might **both stand good**; when ’tis notorious by St. Basil’s First Canon of that Epistle, and the Connection of his Words, that he speaks of nothing else, that *may stand good*, but the **Schismatical Baptisms** receiv’d and al- low’d of by the *Asiatick Churches*; and Mr. Bingham might have seen this, even in St. Basil’s Words as himself has translated them, which are these; “ But forasmuch as some of the *Asiatick Churches* “ think otherwise, that the **Baptism of such**, [viz. of the Puritans, Encratites, Hydroparastats, and Apotactites, the Schismatics he was just before speaking of] “ by way of Dispensation for the “ sake of **Great Multitudes**, ought to be re- “ ceiv’d; let it be receiv’d.” I say, from these very Words, ’tis plain, that St. Basil speaks of none but the **Schismatical Baptisms**, the Bap- tisms receiv’d by “ **Great Multitudes**,” for we know that those Schismatics were *Numerous*, and that consequently so were their Baptisms, yet we know also that they had *Episcopal Orders*; and whether their Orders were *Null and Void*, by rea- son only of their *Schism*, is another Question. St. Basil thought they were, and consequently that they were as *Lay-men*. Some *Asiaticks* did not *Null their Orders*; St. Basil therefore, for the sake of **Multitudes** concern’d in this, and because of the Practice of those *Asiatick Churches* which did

not Null the Orders of those Schismatics, said, "Let their Baptism be receiv'd." This does not signify, that he meant, Let Lay-Baptisms, Baptisms by *Persons never Commission'd*, be receiv'd: He only abated of his Rigour of Condemning the Schismatics to be but meer Laicks; he would have lik'd it, if they had by those Churches been reduc'd to *that State*, as they were by the *Cypriatick Churches*; but since those *Asiatick Churches* did not so far condemn them, he acquiesc'd in the Discipline of those Churches, and reckon'd that their * *Orders and Baptisms* might be receiv'd: But 'twas never heard of, that in those Churches, *Lay-men*, really and *incontestably* such, assum'd to themselves any Power at all to baptize, without, or in opposition to their Bishop's Commission; and therefore the **Great Multitudes** here spoken of by *St. Basil*, must signify only the great Multitudes of Persons that were concern'd, in the Episcopal Orders and Baptisms given and receiv'd, by the Schismatics before spoken of by that Father. This, together with what I have before said in *Page 109*, &c. I think to be a sufficient Answer to this part of *Mr. Bingham's* Objection against *St. Basil's* Evidence.

There is another remarkable Thing in *Mr. Bingham's* Objection, which must not be pass'd over, and 'tis this, That he doubts of his own Inference, which he makes from *St. Basil's* Words; for first he introduces it with an "I think it may be *inferred*, that tho' *St. Basil*———*did not approve of the Baptism of Lay-men*, yet he thought it might stand good, &c." This shews that he

* *Clergy-man's Vade mecum*, Part II. p. 201.

cannot be Positive in his Inference; for if he could, his "*I think it may be, &c.*" is a needless Modesty; and not only so, but prejudicial to his Reader, as it leaves him undetermin'd in this Matter: But I doubt not, Mr. *Bingham* easily foresaw, that it would be objected against his *may be Inference* about **Lay-Baptism**, that *St. Basil* was only speaking of the *Afiaticks* admitting of *Schismatical Baptisms*, and that *St. Basil* do's not say, that *Lay-Baptisms* might stand good; and Mr. *Bingham* having blended and confounded *Lay-Baptisms* with *Schismatical Baptisms*, concludes his Inference with a mis-giving Air of Suspicion, that it would not do: He hesitates about it, and says, "But if otherwise, [*i. e.* if *St. Basil* did not think that **Lay-Baptisms**, as well as *Schismatical Baptisms*, might stand good] "*St. Basil's Opinion* (says Mr. *Bingham*) "*cannot prejudice the contrary Doctrine, or be thrown into the Ballance against the common Consent and Practice of the Church.*" Thus we see that himself cannot assure us of the Truth of his own Inference about *Saint Basil's* supposed Thoughts of allowing *Lay-Baptism*; and therefore we may conclude, that *St. Basil* do's not appear to have thought, that *Lay-Baptism, i. e.* Baptism by Persons *having no Power*, being never authoriz'd to Baptize, could stand good and valid; but the contrary: And Mr. *Bingham's* saying, that *St. Basil's* Opinion, "*cannot be thrown into the Ballance against the common Consent and Practice of the Church;*" is taking for granted what he has not prov'd, that the *common Consent and Practice* of the Ancient Church, was, to allow as valid, pretended Baptisms perform'd by Persons never Commission'd to Baptize.

Mr. Bingham says further, that “*it may be Ob-*
“*serv'd that St. Basil speaks perhaps, not of Lay-*
“*Baptism in Cases of Necessity, but of Usurping the*
“*Office, as Hereticks did in ordinary Cases.*” But
these **P**erhaps's will not serve our Turn, they
are *No Arguments*; nay, they are *Fallacious* upon
the Judgments of some sort of Readers, who are
too apt to be carried away with such *ungrounded*
Suppositions: What has *St. Basil* said in all his *Wri-*
tings, that can give the least Colour for such a
Perhaps? There is nothing in all his *Works*,
that looks towards *Lay-Baptism in Cases of Necess-*
sity; and when he speaks of *Lay-Baptisms*, he
do's it in such *Terms*, as include all *Cases* what-
soever, and *No Exception* made for *Extraordinary*
Cases, nor *Limitation* to *Ordinary* Ones. At this
rate, a Man may *Limit* and *Restrain* the most
Universal Propositions; thus, for Example, “*Go*
“*ye Disciple all Nations, Baptizing them In the*
“*Name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the*
“*Holy-Ghost.*” By *Mr. Bingham's* way of **P**er-
hapsing, may not be design'd to restrain the
Form of *Baptizing* “*In the Name of the Trini-*
ty,” to That *Form* alone, for all *Cases* whatso-
ever; there may be suppos'd *Cases of Necess-*
sity! when Men cannot procure *Baptism* in
this Form; their *Baptizers*, tho' *Episcopally* *Or-*
dain'd, may have **f**alse **N**otions concerning
the **D**eity; and in *Consequence* thereof, may
Mutilate and *Change the Form*, and refuse to give
Baptism in the *prescrib'd Form*: Some reckon,
however, that *Water* is *absolutely Necessary* to *Sal-*
vation, therefore, in their *Imagination*, this would
be a *Case of Necessity*, and so the *New*, tho' *Unin-*
stituted Form, will do, because, *Water* must be ap-
ply'd; and therefore, the *Instituted Form* **P**er-
haps

haps was not appointed for *Cases of Necessity!* especially considering that *Even a Pope of Rome* has said, that Baptism is good and valid, if done *In the Name of Jesus only!* But who is there, that do's not see the Folly of this way of **P**erhapsing?

As for Mr. *Bingham's* Supposition, "That a *Latitude of Power was left with the Rulers and Governours of the Church to Ratify such Baptisms [i. e. Baptisms by Lay-men, Persons destitute of Power, never authoriz'd to Baptize] when they found it necessary, &c.*" 'Tis a Proposition that *has not been proved;* and I have said so much upon it * elsewhere, that I see no Necessity to trouble my Reader with any thing more upon it, till Mr. *Bingham,* or Somebody else, shall offer their **A**rguments for such a Ratifying Power; and therefore I proceed to our Reverend Historian's next Objection, which is this.

OBJECT. IV. Against *St. Cyprian's* Evidence, he objects thus in his 39th Page, "If it were not for *St. Basil's* Testimony (says he) I should doubt whether *Cyprian* had ever made use of such an Argument as this," [viz. That Hereticks and Schismaticks, broken off from the Church, were become *Lay-men,* and that therefore the Baptisms of Hereticks and Schismaticks were Null and Void, because they were become *Lay-men.*]

A N S W. But here, either Mr. *Bingham* believes *St. Basil's* Testimony concerning *St. Cyprian,* or Mr. *Bingham* do's not believe it. If he believes it,

* *Lay-Baptism Invalid.*

then there's an end of his Doubt about St. Cyprian's Argument—and so his following imaginary Reasons against St. Cyprian's ever having us'd such an Argument fall at once. But if he do's not believe St. Basil, then he might have plainly told us so, and not have amus'd us with an "If it were not for St. Basil's Testimony." This looks, however, as if he could not charge St. Basil with being a false Evidence; tho' still he endeavours to take off from the Worth of his Testimony, by his following Three Observations.

First, "Because (says Mr. Bingham) no such Argument [about Lay-men] that I know of is to be found in his [i. e. St. Cyprian's] Works.

But if Mr. Bingham do's not know of any such Argument in St. Cyprian's Works, others do know of it; and 'tis plain enough there to be found, that St. Cyprian and his Colleagues, reduc'd Hereticks and Schismatics, though ordain'd before in the Church, to the State of Lay-men; that they receiv'd them only to Lay-Communion upon their Repentance; that they reckon'd them *Not as Priests*, but Destitute of **Priestly Power and Authority**, and that they charg'd their Ministrations to be Null and Void, for want of such Priestly Power, as I have prov'd before, Page 51, &c.

Secondly, His next Observation against St. Cyprian's having ever made use of such an Argument is, "Because Tertullian, whom Cyprian commonly call'd his Master, made a great Distinction between the Baptism of Hereticks and the Baptism of Catholick Lay-men, at least in Cases of Necessity— for he was against Re-baptizing, those that were so Baptized by Lay-men, tho' he was as much
" for

“ for Re-baptizing those that were Baptiz'd * by Hereticks, as Cyprian himself.

Here I must not let pass a remarkable Fallacy, and 'tis this; Mr. Bingham says, Tertullian “ was against Re-baptizing those that were so Baptiz'd by Lay-men.” An uncautious Reader will be apt to believe from hence, that Tertullian has related it to be *Matter of Fact*, that Persons were Baptiz'd by Lay-men in his Days; when 'tis certain that he relates *No such Matter of Fact*, but is only speaking of Lay-men, as if they might Baptize, not as if they had Baptiz'd in Cases of the Clergy's Absence.——His Words are plain enough, as Mr. Bingham has 'em in his 26th Page, [† “ *Etiam Laicis jus est;* ”] Lay-men (says Tertullian) have also a **Right** to give it [*i. e.* Baptism.] This shews that 'twas Tertullian's Opinion, that they had a Right; but it do's not prove it *Matter of Fact*, that any of them Acted according to this Pretended Right. Mr. Bingham therefore should have said, that Tertullian would have been “ against Re-baptizing Persons, if they had been so Baptiz'd by Lay men,” which would have prevented his Reader from mistaking a pretended *Matter of Fact* instead of a suppos'd *Matter of Right*: This being clear'd, there is no doubt but Tertullian would have been against what Mr. Bingham calls Re-baptizing such Persons.——But what then, do's it therefore follow, that St. Cyprian was of Tertullian's Principle in this Matter, because he call'd Tertullian his Master? This is admirable! I esteem, and may call Cicero my Master, therefore

* Tertul. De Baptismo, Cap. 15.

† Tertul. De Baptismo, Cap. 17.

I must be a Heathen because *Cicero* was so; I and a great many other Members of our Church have been mightily pleas'd with Mr. *Bingham's* Antiquities of the Christian Church; therefore whatsoever Mr. *Bingham* says and believes, I and they must believe it too, whether it be right or wrong! But our Reverend Historian will find himself very much mistaken if he thinks so; for we may *Highly Value* a Man, and even call him *Our Master* too, for *some of his Excellencies*, when at the same time we may see his Faults, and Mistakes, &c. and dissent from, nay, and abhor them too; tho' it may be we do not always *make publick Proclamation* of them. And this, no doubt, was the Case with the blessed *St. Cyprian*; he valued *Tertullian* for his great Accomplishments of *Wit*, &c. he call'd him his Master, but 'tis no ways reasonable to suppose, that he *therefore* believed his many Errors. Is it rational to believe, that he follow'd him in *Montanism*, and in those Errors I have mention'd in *Page 46.* of which I have there given a particular Catalogue in the Margin, for a Memorandum to the Learned Reader? No, certainly that Pious Father was not so blind, as to be led into his *supposed Master's* Errors and Mistakes, and particularly in the Matter now before us, which I humbly hope I have proved to have been One of *Tertullian's* Singularities; and in *Page 48.* that *St. Cyprian* did not follow him in it, but asserted the contrary Doctrine of the Invalidity of Lay-Baptism, *i. e.* pretended Baptism perform'd by Persons destitute of a Commission to Baptize.

Thirdly, Mr. *Bingham's* last Observation against *Saint Cyprian's* ever having made use of such an

an Argument; as that of the Invalidity of Lay-Baptism, is this, *viz.* "Cyprian always paid a far greater Deference to Catholick Lay-men than he did to Heretical Priests; as esteeming the One Members of the Church, and the Other quite cut off from it: He admitted the One into his Councils, and did nothing without their Consent in many Ecclesiastical Causes; but the Other he abandon'd and abhor'd, as Men that had abandon'd the Faith, and renounc'd their Christianity by their Heretical Doctrine." And what is to be infer'd from all this? Did St. Cyprian therefore approve of Baptism by Catholick Lay-men, this is meer Amusement; as if, because St. Cyprian lov'd and valu'd Catholick Lay-men, and voluntarily took their Consent in many Ecclesiastical Cases; therefore he would not have been offended, he would not have esteem'd their Attempts Null and Void, if they had endeavour'd to do any thing in the *Sacerdotal Ministrations* of Holy Sacraments! This is just as good Sense, as if I should say, that Mr. Bingham loves and esteems a pious, judicious, and orthodox Lay-man of the Church of England, better than he do's a Schismatical or Heretical Priest, who separates, or is excluded, from her Communion; and that he would follow the Advice of the *Former* in Church Matters, and not admit of the other so much as into his Company, much less to be his Adviser and Counsellor in Ecclesiastical Affairs; and from thence conclude, that if the Church-Lay-man should, thro' a *false Zeal*, &c. attempt to ordain Men into the Ministry, Mr. Bingham's Love and Esteem for him, would oblige him to acknowledge the Validity of such a *supposed Ordination*, tho' at the same time he would not have allow'd the like of the Heretical

cal or Schismatical Priest had attempted to Ordain. Who is there that do's not see the Weakness of such a Supposition? And upon what Foundation can Mr. *Bingham* guess that St. *Cyprian* was of so Partial a Temper, as to esteem pretended Baptism by Church-Lay-men, Persons having no Authority to Baptize, to be good and Valid; when 'twas at the same time his Principle, that Heretical and Schismatical Baptisms were Null and Void, because perform'd by Persons who were suppos'd to be destitute of Priestly Power and Authority to minister in Holy Things?——But enough upon Mr. *Bingham's* Observations about this Matter; for himself, do's but say of 'em, “*These are* **probable Arguments** *to incline a Man to think,* *that Cyprian was of the same Mind with his* **Master Tertullian,** *as to the Point of Lay-Baptism, had not St. Basil's Authority been against* **them,** *Page 40.”*——We have seen, that St. *Basil's* Testimony is good: That there is not so much as any Probability in Mr. *Bingham's* supposed Arguments: And that St. *Cyprian* did not follow his Master's Errors, particularly in the *Pretended Priesthood* of Lay-men, but taught the contrary Doctrine, as is plain by the Testimony of St. *Basil*, and by Inferences that may be, and have been drawn from several Passages in St. *Cyprian's* own Works. And thus all our Reverend Historian's Objections against the Evidence of St. *Cyprian*, St. *Basil*, and St. *Chrysostom*, are of no Weight or Importance.

C H A P. V.

Mr. Bingham's Acknowledgments concerning the great Question now in Dispute, viz. Whether the Usurped and Unauthoriz'd Baptism of Lay-men, was allowed to be Valid?

§ I. **O**UR Reverend Historian handles this Question in his 41st Page; and here one would naturally have expected to have found abundance of uncontested Evidence and Testimony from the Ancient Catholick Church, that such pretended Baptisms were, by Her, held to be Good and Valid; if it had ever been, the *General Sense and Practice of the Ancient Catholick Church*, to esteem them as such. But instead of producing any Evidence for their Pretended Validity; (and consequently for the Validity of our Dissenters supposititious Baptisms, which are evidently *Usurped and Unauthoriz'd Baptisms by Lay-men*) Mr. Bingham very fairly and ingenuously confesses, that this of "*Unauthoriz'd Usurped Lay-Baptism makes a wide Difference in the Case, Page 41. and is a more Difficult Question,*" [*viz. than that of Lay-Baptism [suppos'd to be] Authoriz'd by Bishops, in Cases of Extremity, about which he had been Treating before.*] He says this Question of "*Usurped and Unauthoriz'd Baptism of Lay-men has much more difficulty than the Former.*" And he gives this particular Reason why 'tis so "*much more Difficult, because (says he) a great many*"
 " of

“ of the Authors who have justified the Lawfulness of
 “ Lay Baptism, in Cases of Necessity, are wholly
 “ silent upon this Point.” “ For [continues he]
 “ neither Tertullian, nor the Council of Eliberis,
 “ nor St. Jerom, nor Gelasius, nor Isidore, have
 “ said any thing upon it; they **Only** consider the
 “ Case of Necessity, and no other.”

§ II. And to this I must add some other Reasons, why this of Usurped Unauthoriz'd Lay-Baptism is so very Difficult a Question; and they are these from Mr. Bingham himself.

First, Because “ The Apostolick Commission to Baptize, was to continue to the end of the World,” according to Mr. Bingham, in his 3d Page.

Secondly, Because the Conveyance of this Commission to others, “ was necessary to preserve the Church, according to the Order of Christ, in future Ages,” as in his 3d Page.

Thirdly, Because “ No One can have a Power of Baptizing, but he that receives, some way or other, a Commission from the Apostles.” See his 4th Page.

Fourthly, Because “ The Original Power of Administring Baptism is lodg'd solely and entirely in the Hands of Bishops, as the Apostles immediate Successors, and derivately Convey'd from them to others,” in Cases Ordinary and Extraordinary also, as in his 5th Page.

Fifthly, Because “ When Baptism was done by others, [i. e. not by the Bishop] the Antients thought “ it was still done by his Authority, and reputed as his Act.” See his 8th Page.

Sixthly, and Lastly, Because Mr. Bingham, in summing up his whole Evidence, in his 38th Page, says, “ Thus we have seen for Six hundred Years,
 “ the

“ the General Sense and Practice of the Ancient
 “ Church, grounded, as they suppose, upon the
 “ Commission given to the Apostles; whereby Bi-
 “ shops, as the Apostles Successors, are qualified first
 “ to give Baptism themselves, and then to Grant a
 “ Commission to others to Baptize;——in Or-
 “ dinary Cases, and in Cases Extraordinary and of
 “ Extream Necessity, &c.

These are Reasons which make the present Question of Unauthoriz'd Usurp'd Lay-Baptisms so very Difficult, that there is “ a wide Differ-
 “ ence ” between these pretended Baptisms, and the others, suppos'd to have been minister'd by Episcopal Authority; so that we see even from Mr. Bingham's own Account of the Matter, that the general Sense and Practice of the Ancient Church has nothing in favour of Usurp'd Unauthoriz'd Lay-Baptisms.

§ III. It is therefore evident, that the *general Sense and Practice of the Ancient Church*, cannot be call'd in as an Evidence, for the pretended Validity of such *false Baptisms*; No! No! they stand by themselves, *utterly Destitute* of that Catholick Testimony, and have *Nothing* to support them but the weak, fallacious, and imaginary Reasonings of a *private Spirit* only.

For, *First*, The Apostolick Commission to Baptize, is here *discontinued* and *broken off*.

Secondly, The Conveyance of that Commission is here wanting, and so, that which is “ *Necessa-
 “ ry to Preserve the Church, according to the Or-
 “ der of Christ*——is absent.

Thirdly, Here is a Destitution of Power to Baptize, because here is No One that has receiv'd any manner

manner of way whatsoever, *A Commission from the Apostles.* Because,

Fourthly, The Original Power of administering Baptism, “*Lodg’d solely and entirely in the Hands of Bishops—the Apostles immediate Successors, is not here Derivately Convey’d from them to the Usurping Unauthoriz’d Lay-Pretender.*”

Fifthly, Here being *No Baptism* done by the *Bishop’s Authority*, the pretended Baptism cannot be reputed as the **Bishop’s Act.**

Sixthly, and Lastly, In this Act there is nothing to be seen of the *general Sense and Practice of the Ancient Church*, for the first Six hundred Years, which was confessedly “*grounded upon the Commission granted in Cases Ordinary and Extraordinary too;*” for here is *No Grant of any Commission* at all—and so, these pretended Baptisms are destitute of any **Law, Rule, or Ancient Catholick Tradition**, whereon to ground their pretended Validity.

§ IV. And yet notwithstanding all this, our Reverend Historian, in his 43d, 44th, and 45th Pages, Instances the Fiction of the suppos’d Sportive-Baptism, said to have been given by the Boy *Athanasius*, to his Play-fellows—and the private Opinions of *St. Augustin* and *Optatus*, in favour of those Pretended Baptisms, perform’d by Lay-Persons, who *never were Commission’d to Baptize*; but I have already consider’d these in their proper Places, and therefore have no need here to repeat the Arguments brought against them; since ’tis plain, by all that has been hitherto said, that these Pretended Baptisms are *utterly Destitute of the general Sense and Practice of the Ancient Church*, whereon to found their Pretended Validity.

C H A P. VI.

That the Ancient Churches, who allow'd of Heretical and Schismatical Baptisms, did not reckon those Baptisms to have been Unauthoriz'd, Uncommission'd Anti-Episcopal Lay-Baptisms.

§ I. I Am oblig'd thus far to Concern my self with the Ancient Heretical and Schismatical Baptisms, because our Reverend Historian endeavours to represent them, as of the *same Nature* with *Unauthoriz'd Lay-Baptisms*: The Terms he makes use of, and his Assertions about them being such, as will *easily* induce *some* sort of Readers, who have not been Conversant in these Matters, to believe, that when the Ancient Churches allow'd of the Validity of *Heretical* and *Schismatical* Baptisms, they did it upon the *same Principle* which some now hold, for the *pretended Validity* of false Baptisms, perform'd by Persons who *never were Episcopally Commission'd to Baptize*: Thus, for Example, Mr. Bingham says of the Ancient Heretical and Schismatical Baptisms, That they were “*Unauthoriz'd*,” That “*Hereticks and Schismaticks, and Degraded Clergy-men, had not any Legal Authority from the Church to Baptize*,” — That “*They acted not only without Her Authority, but against Her Authority, in all their Ministrations*, Page 51. *although their Baptisms were receiv'd as Valid, under such an Irregular, and Unlawful Administration*,” pag. 52.—“*What they*”
 O “*did*”

“ did was done (properly speaking) by an Unautho-
 “ rized, Criminal, Anti-Episcopal Usurpation,
 “ &c.” pag. 54. Such Terms as these naturally
 lead an *uncautious Reader* into this Notion, that
 those Ancient Heretical, and Schismatical Bap-
 tisms, were of the same Nature with our Anti-
 Episcopal, Unauthoriz’d Lay-Baptisms; for by
 such Colours as these, they have an *appearance* [yet
 ’tis but an appearance] of being *utterly destitute* of
 any Commission at all, *as much* as our Lay-Bap-
 tisms are, that are perform’d by Persons who never
 were at all Authoriz’d or Commission’d for that
 Purpose.

§ II To give the Reader therefore a fair In-
 sight into this Matter, it is to be observ’d, that
 there were two Sorts of Discipline in the ancient
 Churches about *Heretical* and *Schismatical* Bap-
 tisms.

First, That of the *Cyprianick Churches*, who made
Ecclesiastical Laws, that if the Clergy fell into He-
 resy or Schism, their *Ordinations*, and other *Mini-
 strations*, should be null and void; and that con-
 sequently the Baptisms given by them, during their
Heresy or Schism, should be look’d upon as *no Chri-
 stian Baptism*: And therefore Persons so baptiz’d by
 them, should, upon their Repentance and Recon-
 ciliation to the Church, be receiv’d by Baptism as
Heathens were.

Agrippinus *, Bishop of *Carthage*, in a Synod of
 the Provinces of *Africa* and *Numidia*, establish’d
 this Discipline.

* Cypr. Epist. ad Quintum. 71.—p. 140. *Paris*.

So did also the Councils * of *Carthage*, under *St. Cyprian*, make *Ecclesiastical Laws*, whereby they reduc'd to *Lay-men*, those *Heretical* and *Schismatical* Clergy-men, who either separated from the Church after their Ordination, or were ordain'd among *Hereticks* and *Schismaticks*; and they null'd all their *Baptisms*, as being destitute of *Authority* and *Commission*.

St. Cyprian's Colleague likewise, *Firmilian* † Bishop of *Cæsarea*, appeals to the Council of *Iconium*, held long before, for the *Obligation* and *Necessity* of this.

Dionysius, Bishop of *Alexandria*, “alleges the “*Decrees of the Councils of Iconium and Synada for Confirmation*” of this Custom; as *Mr. Bingham* informs us, pag. 56. And the same *Dionysius* speaks of these Councils || as held long before his Days, and calls 'em the *Bishops populous* (or numerous) *Assemblies*.

Thus we see that the *Invalidity* of *Heretical* and *Schismatical Ordinations* and *Baptisms*, held by the *Cyprianick Churches*, was not matter of private *Opinion* only; but *Ecclesiastical Canon Law*, and *Determination of Synods*, whereby the *Bishops* of those Churches bound their *Subjects* so strictly to the *Union* of the Church, as that *their Clergy* should not break her *Union* by *Heresy* or *Schism*, under any less *Penalty*, than that of losing their *Holy Orders*: The *Commission* they receiv'd before in the Church, was made null and void by those *Laws* of the Church to which they ow'd *Subjection*; and if any of them were ordain'd by *Heretical* and *Schismatical Bishops*, those *Ecclesiastical Laws* condemn'd such *Ordina-*

* *Epist. 72. ad Stephanum de Concilio, p. 141. Paris. Concil. Carthag. de Baptiz. Hæret. p. 352. Paris.*

† *Inter Cypr. Epist. 74. p. 159, 160. Paris.*

|| *Dionys. Epist. apud Euseb. Lib. vii. c. 7.*

tions to be invalid, and so all their Ministrations, by the same Laws, were made to be of no *legal Force* or *Validity* in those Churches. And as for the Laity of those *Cyprianick* Churches, these Laws were of great Influence to keep them also in the *Unity* of the Church; because, by the Terror of those Sanctions, they plainly saw, that (tho' their Bishops did not pretend to *null and void* Baptism once receiv'd in the Church) yet they *invalidated* all *Ordinations* and *Ministrations* done out of the Church, as well as the Orders of their separating Clergy: And so the Lay-members of those Churches had no hopes, either of their Childrens receiving *Valid Baptism* in Heretical and Schismatical Congregations, or of receiving themselves any *Valid Sacrament* of the Lord's Supper: And therefore, during the Obligation of this strict Discipline, they had no great Temptation to leave the *Unity* of the Church, to joyn themselves to such *dangerous Societies*, as lay under this severe Censure of their *Spiritual Sovereigns* the Bishops, who, by their Power of *Binding* given them by Christ, had bound them by such *Disciplinary Laws*, decreed and enacted in **numerous Synods and Councils**. So that in Consideration of these *Synodical Decrees*, the Baptisms of the *Heretical and Schismatical Subjects* of those Churches were term'd **Unauthoriz'd, Uncommission'd, and Anti-Episcopal**: And why may not the *Bishops* of Christ's Church make such *wholsome Laws*, if they see it fit, for the Government of their own Churches, when they do not impose them (as *St. Cyprian* * did not) upon other Churches,

* Neque enim quisquam nostrum Episcopum se esse Episcoporum constituit, aut tyrannico terrore ad obsequendi necessitatem

Churches, whose *Spiritual Governours* think it not fit to be *so severe* in the Discipline of their Churches; as 'tis plain the Churches did not, who acted otherwise than the *Cyprianick Churches* in this matter. For,

§ III. *Secondly*, The other sort of Discipline which was practis'd by the Churches who would not come up to the *Cyprianick Severity*, was, That they did not *null and make void* the Commissions of either. 1st, Those *Heretical and Schismatical Clergy-men*, who had been ordain'd in the Church: Or, 2^{dly}, of those who had been ordain'd only by *Heretical and Schismatical Bishops*: They receiv'd their Orders as *good and valid*, and their Baptisms in the Name of the Trinity, and other Ministrations, to be so too: So that, when they or any baptiz'd by them return'd to the Unity of the Church, they were receiv'd [as all other Penitents us'd to be] by Imposition of Hands; the Clergy, as Clergymen, and the Laicks, as Lay-Christians already baptiz'd, without requiring any other *Ordination or Baptism*, than what they had receiv'd before.

Mr. *Bingham* is so well appriz'd of the Truth of this, that he himself acknowledges, *pag. 88.* upon the Question, Whether *Hereticks and Schismaticks* be *Clergy-men or Lay-men, Priests or not Priests, Bishops or not Bishops?* and says, "When in the Discipline of the Church, it was thought proper to deprive them of the Power and Honour of their Places, yet even in that Case, the Church did

si atem Collegas suos adigit, quando habeat omnis Episcopus pro licentia & libertatis & Potestatis suæ arbitrium proprium, tamque judicari ab alio non possit, quam nec ipse potest judicare, &c. *Concil. Carthag. de Baptizandis Hæreticis*, p 353. *Paris.*

“ not intend to deny the Validity of their Ordination. — He says also, in his pag. 89. That Hereticks and Schismaticks, and degraded Priests, were allow'd to be Priests still. — And pag. 90. “ The Church indeed did not pretend wholly to cancel or annul their Ordination, or give them a new Ordination.” But further, whether Mr. Bingham had acknowledg'd this or no, [as we see he has] yet 'tis plain, that the Churches, who in their Practice differ'd from the Discipline of the Cyprianick Churches, made no Laws or Ecclesiastical Canons for the Nulling of the Orders of Heretical and Schismatical Clergy-men: So far from that, that the Great Council of Nice, in the 8th Canon, allows of the Ordinations of the Novatian Schismaticks: And in the African Code, Canons 68, 69, and 118, the Ordinations of the Donatist Schismaticks, are receiv'd for good and valid, as I have before noted, pag. 21. from all which 'tis notorious, that in the Discipline of those Churches, who allowed Heretical and Schismatical Baptisms, in the Name of the Trinity, to be good and valid; the Baptizers who were Heretical and Schismatical Bishops, Priests and Deacons, had a valid Commission to Baptize; their Orders were not null and void; there were no Laws of those Churches to make them so; but, on the contrary, their Ecclesiastical Laws or Canons decreed them to be *indeleted*, that they remain'd valid, and so they were not Laymen, Persons destitute of Commission, but still Bishops, Priests and Deacons, with an *indeleted, unrepeal'd Commission* to Baptize. Consequently Persons baptiz'd by them, in Heresy and Schism, had in the sense of those Churches all the external Requisites of the Administration appointed by the Institution of Baptism, (and therefore insisted on by us)

viz.

viz. *Water*, the *Form* in the Name of the Trinity, and the *Commission* of the Baptizer; *these Three* were in all those Baptisms: And therefore, whatsoever Discipline those Churches us'd at the receiving of those Penitents, it had no reference to the *Nullity* of the *Commission* of the Baptizer, any more than it had to the *Nullity* of the *Water*, or of the *Form* of Baptizing.

§ IV. Hence it comes to pass, that all Mr. *Bingham's* Terms us'd by him, when he calls those Baptisms **Unauthoriz'd, Anti-Episcopal Usurpations**, &c. as before observ'd, must be understood in such a *qualified Sense* of those Words, as Men mean, when they speak of a Thing done by a Person in a *prohibited Circumstance*, yet in pursuance and by virtue of a *Commission* receiv'd by him, to *do that very thing*. Thus a Priest executing his *Commission* to baptize, in the prohibited Circumstances of *Opposition* to some lawful Command of his particular Bishop; of *Disobedience* to the Canons and Rubricks of the Church whereof he is a Member; or lastly, in the sinful Circumstance of *Heresy* or *Schism*; If that Church has no Ecclesiastical Laws or Canons to *null* and make *void* his *Commission*, during those sinful Circumstances; If that Church has not decreed his *Commission*, to be *ipso facto*, null and void in those prohibited Circumstances, then, the Baptism administer'd by him, in the Name of the Trinity, cannot *properly* be said to be **Unauthoriz'd**; for 'tis plain, he *had a Commission* when he baptiz'd, and therefore the Baptism it self was **Authoriz'd**: As neither can that Baptism, in strict Propriety of Speech, be call'd **Anti-Episcopal**, which was administer'd by a *Priest* or *Deacon*, who had at the Time of Baptizing, an

Episcopal Commission, and who did not set up a **Pretended Altar** Against **Episcopacy** it self; or Disown the **Divine Right** of the Apostolick, *i. e.* **Episcopal Order**; but acknowledg'd, submitted to, and depended on it, and receiv'd all Power, Commission, and Authority from **Bishops**, and **from them only**, to minister in Holy Things, how much soever they transgressed the Laws of God, and his Church, in other Instances, which was plainly the Case of the *Heretical* and *Schismatical Baptizers* we are now speaking of, who were no other than *Bishops, Priests, and Deacons*, Consecrated and Ordain'd by Bishops; and tho' *Hereticks* and *Schismaticks*, yet vested with *Episcopal Power and Authority*, so long as those Churches did not *Vacate, Null, and make void* the **Commissions** of them, or of the Bishops who were their **Ordainers**: So that, in the Direct and Proper Sense of the Words, the Baptisms they administer'd In the Name of the Trinity, cannot in the Sense of *those Churches* be call'd **Unauthoriz'd** and **Anti-Episcopal** Baptisms; for they were as much *Authoriz'd* and *Episcopal* then, as any Baptisms now given by *wicked Priests* *Episcopally Ordain'd*, and receiv'd by the Baptiz'd, in *Sinful Circumstances*. The *Circumstance* indeed, whether of *Heresy, Schism, or other Transgression* of the *Rules and Orders* of the Church, is doubtless *very Sinful*, and therefore *Unauthoriz'd*; and by reason of the Disobedience, may [in a remote Sense of the Word] be call'd *Anti-Episcopal* too, as it has a *Tendency* in its Consequences, to destroy the *just Authority* and *Power* of Bishops; but still this *Circumstance*, wherein the Baptism is administer'd, is not the *Ministration* it self; the *Ministration* is one thing, the *Circumstance* wherein 'tis given

given, is another; and that which can justly be charg'd on the Circumstance, cannot fairly be apply'd to the *Commission'd Ministration*; because, tho' the Circumstance of Heresy, Schism, &c. is certainly wicked and *unauthoriz'd*; yet the Ministration of Baptism with Water, In the Name of the Trinity, by a Person Vested with an *Episcopal Commission*, not Vacated, Null'd, or made Void by the Heresy or Schism, or by any Law of the Church, is, in *it self*, no other than that *Commission'd Baptism*, which the Church her self Administers; and it proceeds from Mr. *Bingham's* not duly attending to this *Distinction* between the *Authoriz'd Baptism*, and the *Circumstance* wherein 'tis administer'd, that he affirms "All the Baptisms of Hereticks, Schismaticks, and Degraded Priests, are Unauthoriz'd;" and that "It was agreed on all Hands, that Hereticks and Schismaticks, and Degraded Clergy-men had not any Legal Authority to Baptize, Page 51." when 'tis plain they had the Church's **Legal Authority**; since they were *Episcopally Ordain'd*, and the Church did not Null their Orders, by any of her Laws, but the contrary, as we have seen before; and since Mr. *Bingham* himself says of them, That "the Church did not intend to deny the Validity of their Ordination," Page 88. Thus, running into Inconsistencies and Contradictions, for want of a due Regard that ought to be had, to the Difference between a **Thing** and its **Circumstance** only.

§ V. It is from hence that our Reverend Historian thus concludes his Account of Heretical and Schismatical Baptisms in his 91st Page, "Upon the whole (says he) the Result of our Enquiry concerning

“cerning Hereticks and Schismaticks, and Degraded
“Clergy-men, is this;

“First, They all act in Opposition to the Church’s
“Lawful Authority, and therefore have not her
“Lawful Authority to Baptize.” In Answer to
which, ’tis evident by all that has been said upon
this Subject, that the *Cyprianick Churches*, did, by
Ecclesiastical Laws, enacted in numerous Synods
of their Bishops, make Null and Void the Com-
missions of their Heretical and Schismatical Cler-
gy; so that, by Virtue of those Laws, they were, by
those Churches, reckon’d to be *destitute of Authority*
and *Power* for Sacred Ministrations, during their
Schism or *Heresy*: But the other Churches, who
would not come up to the *Cyprianick Discipline* in
this Matter, made no such *Nullifying Laws*, but
the contrary; and therefore, their *Heretical* and
Schismatical Subjects of the Clergy had not their
Commissions, which they at first receiv’d of the
Church, made *Null* and *Void*, but they remain’d
still *Indeleted*, *not Vacated*, by the Church; and
therefore they had still her *Lawful Authority*; for
if they had it not, then ’tis plain they had not
her *Authority at all*, for her Authority is no other
than a **Lawful One**; if they had not her Autho-
rity, then they had not her *Commission*; if they
had not her Commission, then they had no *Episcopal*
Commission, for her Commission is only *Episcopal*;
if they had no *Episcopal Commission*, then they
were but *Laicks*; if they were but *Laicks*, then
they were *No Priests*, and their Ordination was
Null and Void; when yet Mr. Bingham says, “The
“Church did not intend to Deny the **Validity** of
“their **Ordination**, Page 88. and that “They
“were allow’d to be **Priests** still, Page 89. He
goes on and says,

“Secondly,

“ Secondly, *Notwithstanding this* [*i. e.* notwithstanding their not having the Church’s *Lawful Authority to Baptize*] “ *their Baptisms, if done in due Form, are Valid, and not to be repeated.*” But the Discipline of the *Cyprianick Churches* did not allow this; for as *they* vacated their Commissions, so in consequence thereof they null’d their Baptisms too; but the other Churches, as they did *not null* their Commission and Authority, so neither did they make *void their Baptisms*; and since they were Commission’d Baptisms, no wonder they stood good and valid in those Churches. Mr. Bingham proceeds,

“ Yet, Thirdly, *Those Baptisms have great Deficiencies, particularly, that they do not minister Remission of Sins, and other invisible Graces of the Holy Spirit*—— *which Deficiencies are to be supply’d by Imposition of Hands, and Invocation of the Holy Spirit, upon their* [*i. e.* the Baptized’s] “ *Repentance, and return to the Catholick Church: And this, whether Hereticks acting in that Capacity be consider’d,*

“ Fourthly, *Either as Clergy-men or Lay-men, or in a middle State betwixt both, &c.*” But our Reverend Historian do’s not here distinguish: For the *Great Deficiencies* he speaks of, are not in *those Baptisms* themselves, properly speaking; for he may remember, what himself says of Baptisms wickedly circumstantiated, even in the Church it self, *viz.* that “ *the same Deficiency was many times in the Baptism of those who were baptiz’d in the Church, because they were baptized in Enmity and Hatred of their Brethren, and in that State could not have Forgiveness of Sins.* See his 81st Page. Mr. Bingham sure do’s not mean that these

these Baptisms *in the Church*, have in themselves, this great Deficiency; no, they have certainly no Deficiency at all, the Fault is only in the Circumstance, *not in the Baptism*; the Persons baptiz'd, as himself acknowledges, “are hereby made Partakers of all such Privileges, as the receiving the outward and visible Sacrament of Baptism can give to such as Debar themselves (by some Obstacle of their own) from the Invisible and Spiritual Grace of it, Page 77. The Invisible and Spiritual Grace of it, is the Invisible and Spiritual Grace of the Baptism it self, that which is inseparably annex'd to it. “But this Grace is not receiv'd.” That is very true; but the reason why 'tis not receiv'd, is not from any Deficiency in the Baptism, for 'tis [according to Mr. Bingham] the Sinner's “Own Obstacle,” and by this he “Debars” himself from the Invisible and Spiritual Grace of the Baptism. This Circumstance of Wickedness in the Sinner is the *Causa impediens*, the Obstacle or *Impediment* which Obstructs the Divine Influence of the *Spiritual Grace*, and therefore hinders the Baptized from receiving it; the Baptism it self is Efficient, and has no Defect; but the *Recipient* is not at present capable, by reason of his Sin, to receive the *Spiritual Benefits annex'd thereto*; take away this Obstacle, by a *sincere* and *heartly Repentance*, and the inward Spiritual Grace will be received by Virtue of the *former Baptism*. This is the Case of some wicked Persons who are baptiz'd even in the Church it self; and Mr. Bingham cannot deny, but in the Sense of those Churches, this also was much the same, with respect to the Heretical and Schismatical Baptisms we are speaking of; for he, from St. Augustin's Authority, “supposes such as are Baptized

“ Baptized by Hereticks and Schismaticks to be
 “ much in the same State as bad Men in the
 “ Church” — Nay, more he says, “ They need—
 “ only Repentance and Absolution to return
 “ to the Church again; the Seal and Character of
 “ their Baptism remaining in this respect for ever
 “ Indelible upon them, so as to qualify them to
 “ be admitted ever after to Pardon and Forgiveness
 “ upon a true Repentance. These are Privileges
 “ that a wicked Man has by Virtue of his having
 “ receiv’d the outward Form of Baptism, or the vi-
 “ sible Sacrament in the Church, tho’ all the Time,
 “ by his own Fault, he be destitute of Pardon of
 “ Sins, and all the invisible Graces and Operations
 “ of the Holy Spirit. As the Baptism of Simon Ma-
 “ gus was a true Baptism, tho’ he was an Unworthy,
 “ and therefore an Unprofitable Receiver of it;
 “ and as the Sacrament of the Eucharist is a true
 “ Sacrament, tho’ many Men eat it, not to their
 “ Soul’s Health, but to their own Damnation, be-
 “ cause they are unworthy Receivers of it. Now
 “ as the Case was with wicked Men, who thus re-
 “ ceiv’d Baptism in the Church. — So the
 “ Ancients supposed the Case of those to be who
 “ were baptized — by Hereticks or Schil-
 “ maticks, &c. Their Baptism, if done in due
 “ Form — was the visible Sacrament of
 “ Baptism — and qualified them for some, if
 “ not all of the forementioned Privileges, so that
 “ upon their Repentance and return to the Church
 “ — the Church by Imposition of Hands and In-
 “ vocation of the Holy Spirit, might obtain for them
 “ those Blessings and Graces, which might have been
 “ had in Baptism, if they themselves had not been
 “ the Obstacle, and put in a Bar against them. This
 “ Mr. Bingham takes to be the true State of this
 “ Matter,

“ *Matter, as generally deliver'd by such of the Ancients, as defended the Validity of Heretical Baptism.*” See his 77th, 78th, and 79th Pages. And to this also we do agree, in consideration, that those Ancients did likewise acknowledge the *Validity of the Episcopal Orders* of the Baptizers, consequently that their Baptism was *Episcopally Authoriz'd Baptism*; therefore that it had *no Deficiency in it self*, all the Fault being only in the *Circumstance* of the *Heresy*, or *Schism*, wherein their *Ministrations* were perform'd; so that this sinful *Circumstance*, this *Obstacle*, which (to use Mr. Bingham's own Words) “ **Put a Bar against**” the *Spiritual Graces* of those Baptisms, and hinder'd the receiving of them, being remov'd and taken away by the *Repentance* of the Baptized and *their return to the Church*; by *Imposition of Hands*, and *Invocation of the Holy Ghost*, those *Spiritual Graces* then took place, and were receiv'd by the Baptized, without a *Second Baptism*, because the First had no *Deficiency in its Ministration*, but was *whole and entire*, being *Commission'd Baptism with Water*, In the Name of the *Trinity*: And when our Advocates, for the Baptisms we are disputing against, Baptisms by Persons *never Commission'd* at all to Baptize, can prove, that these false Baptisms given by our *Lay-Dissenting-Teachers*, are such *Episcopally Commission'd Baptisms*, as those Ancient Heretical and Schismatical Baptisms were, **then we shall have done with this Dispute**; but till then, it must be acknowledg'd, that whatsoever can be fairly said for the *Validity* of those *Heretical and Schismatical Baptisms*, which were *Episcopal*, is no ways applicable to these, which are not only *without an Episcopal Commission*, but are also in the most *direct and proper Sense* of the word

word *Anti-Episcopal*, in opposition to the very Order of Bishops; a Usurpation, this of so unheard of a Nature till of late, that the Ancient Catholick Church had *no Experience* of it; and consequently, could never have any *Tradition* or *Custom* in favour of its *pretended Validity*.

§ VI. By all that has been said, 'tis plain that *our Church of England* always had *Valid Baptisms*, because she *always had an Episcopal Commission* to baptize. Even when she was [as Mr. Bingham calls her] an Heretical and Schismatical Church, while under the Slavery of the *Romish Yoke*, her Episcopal Commission *was* good and valid, because there were no *Ecclesiastical Laws* or *Canons* of the Catholick Church, or of any Church to whom she may be suppos'd to have ow'd Subjection, that made her *Episcopal Commission* null and void upon the Account of her [suppos'd] Heresy or Schism; therefore all her Baptisms were *even then* good and Valid in *themselves*, being *Commission'd Baptisms* In the Name of the Trinity: They had **NO Defect**, as they were the Sacrament of Baptism; whatsoever Deficiencies of Spiritual Graces she is suppos'd to have then labour'd under, were not owing to the Imperfection of the Sacrament, but to the Sinfulness and Ucharitableness of the suppos'd Heresy or Schism she is said to have been in: 'Twas only by this *Obstacle*, that those Spiritual Benefits can be suppos'd to have been *obstructed*, which *Obstacle* being remov'd by her *Repentance* and *Reformation*, those Spiritual Graces take effect; but her *Commission* it self is *no more* than it was before, the *Validity* thereof is just the same, only the *Obstacle* is now remov'd, which before [is suppos'd to have] hinder'd the receiving
of

of those Inward and Spiritual Graces, which are constantly annex'd to the Commission it self, whether the Commission'd Baptizer be **Wicked** or no; as our Church has taught us in her Twenty-Sixth Article.

§ VII. Before I conclude this Chapter, I must observe, that the *Rite of Imposition* of Hands, whereby Men who had formerly been Baptiz'd by *Heretical* and *Schismatical* Priests, were receiv'd into the Church, was not appointed to supply any *suppos'd Defect* in the Baptism it self which they had receiv'd, for it was the *Rite* whereby Penitents, even those that had been baptiz'd in the Church it self, were us'd to be receiv'd; it was the Ceremony of *Reconciliation*, and *Absolution*, and not us'd to give any *pretended Validity* to a Baptism, or Ordination, which was [*before such Imposition of Hands*] suppos'd to have been **Invalid**. And this was the Case of the *Schismatical Novatian* Clergy, whose Orders the great Council of *Nice*, which was a *General Council*, did not pretend to **make Valid** by Imposition of Hands; for Mr. *Bingham* himself observes in his 92d Page, That
 “ * the great Council of *Nice* decreed in the Case of
 “ the *Novatians*, that upon their Return to the
 “ Church, they should **Continue** in the same Sta-
 “ tion and Clerical Degrees they were in before,
 “ only receiving a **Reconciliatory** Imposition of
 “ Hands by way of **Absolution**,” which was plainly allowing the *Validity* of their Orders; and the Imposition of Hands was *Reconciliatory*, and by way of **Absolution**, according to Mr. *Bingham*; and the Canon has nothing in it, that supposes any

* *Con. Nic. Can. 8.*

Defect in the Ordination it self of the Novatian Schismaticks to be supply'd by Imposition of Hands. And when the Case of our *Dissenters* shall be prov'd to be *the same* with those *Novatians*; when their having **no Episcopal Commission** shall be prov'd to be the same with the *Novatians*, who plainly **had one**; then, and not till then, can a "**Reconciliatory Imposition of Hands, by way of Absolution,**" be sufficient, for the receiving of our *Dissenters* as *validly Baptiz'd Persons*, in the Sense of the *Catholick Church*; for there are *no Instances*, that can be brought, to prove, that the *Ancient Catholick Church* ever receiv'd, by Imposition of Hands, *without Baptism*, such Persons as were only wash'd before, by those who were known (or suppos'd) to have been never **Episcopally Commission'd** to Baptize.

C H A P. VII.

Mr. Bingham's Account of the suppos'd Practice of Lay-Baptism by the Modern Greeks, Muscovites, and Foreign Reform'd, Examin'd; and prov'd to be no Evidence of the General Sense and Practice of the Church.

§ I. **O**UR Reverend Historian begins his Account of the Modern Greeks, with telling us in his 101st Page, That “*in the Greek Church there has been some Dispute about this Matter, [i. e. of Lay-Baptism] and some seeming Variation in the Decrees of their Councils, tho' they have more generally agreed with the Latins so far, as to allow the Baptism of Lay-men in Cases of Extreme Necessity.*”

His first Instance is from the Time of the Patriarch Nicephorus, in the beginning of the Ninth Century, whose two Canons allow of Baptism by a Christian Lay-man, “*where there is no Priest.*” Mr. Bingham reckons, “*this was the declared Sense of the Greek Church, Authentically deliver'd in those two Canons made in a Patriarchal Council, where 270 Bishops were present, if the Council of Constantinople, Anno 814. was the Council in which these Canons were made, Page 105.*—In his 102d Page he produces Georgius Hamartolus, about the Year 840. making “*a bitter Invective against the Lawfulness of this, as either not knowing the Decrees of Nicephorus, or else as Contemning and insulting them, Page 102.*—
That

That in the Twelfth Century “*there were some*
 “ *who made Opposition to them; for Michael*
 “ *Glycas, about the Year 1120. takes occasion to*
 “ *urge several Arguments against the Validity of*
 “ *Lay-Baptism in any Cases of Necessity what-*
 “ *soever, Page 104.—That “ about 100 Years*
 “ *after, one Theodorus Scutariota, maintain’d the*
 “ *Invalidity of Lay-Baptism, Page 105.—That,*
 “ *that which seems—to bear down the foresaid*
 “ *Authority [of Nicephorus’s two Canons] is ano-*
 “ *ther Decree made in the Council of Constantinople,*
 “ *under Lucas Chrysoberges the Patriarch, An. 1166.*
 Mr. Bingham acknowledges, That “*this Council*
 “ *cannot be deny’d to speak plainly against the Va-*
 “ *lidity of Lay-Baptism, and in favour of [what he*
 “ *calls] “ Re-baptization, in the Case that was then*
 “ *laid before them, which was the Ordinary Mi-*
 “ *nister of Baptism by such as counterfeited Or-*
 “ *ders, and pretended to be Priests, when they*
 “ *were not so, Page 106.—That “ the Best Greek*
 “ *Writers of late Days, in speaking of the Mi-*
 “ *nister of Baptism and the Practice of their*
 “ *Church, always except the Case of Extreme Ne-*
 “ *cessity, in which they allow a Lay-man, or Wo-*
 “ *man to Baptize, rather than suffer a Child to die*
 “ *without Baptism.”* He produces “*Jeremy, the*
 “ *late Patriarch of Constantinople,*” as allowing
 of this; also another “*Evidence from what Suice-*
 “ *rus has observ’d out of Metrophanes Critopu-*
 “ *lus, a late Writer of that Communion; Arcu-*
 “ *dus’s Remark out of Gabriel Severus, Arch Bi-*
 “ *shop of Philadelphia;*” and lastly, our Learned
 Dr. Smith, who gives this Account from one of
 their Publick Confessions of Faith, Printed 1662.
 “*That it is not Lawful and Proper for any One to*
 “ *Baptize, but a Lawful Priest, Except in a*

“ *Time of Necessity, and then a Secular Person,*
 “ *whether Man or Woman, may do it, Page 107,*
 108.

These are Mr. Bingham's Evidences for the Practice of the *Greeks*; and now let us see the Force of their Testimony, as to the Matter we are enquiring about, which is, whether the *Ancient Catholick Church* has any Law, Tradition, or Custom, for the Validity of *pretended Baptism*, by Persons never Commission'd to baptize; for if we don't keep our Eye upon this, we shall be *very apt* to wander from the *great Point* now in Debate.

§ II. It is then to be observ'd, that in Mr. Bingham's whole *Scholastical History*, there is not so much as **One Instance** of the *Greek Church's* having ever attempted to Authorize *their Lay-men* to baptize in Case of Necessity, for the *first Eight Hundred Years* of Christianity, nor any Proof that the *Greek Church* ever had in that Period *any pretended Baptisms* by Persons never Commission'd to baptize.—So that, for the *first Eight Hundred Years*, that Church has *no Rule, Ecclesiastical Law, or Custom*, whereby to determine the pretended Validity of any Lay-Baptisms whatsoever; and this Negative is a good Argument, that the *Validity* of Baptism by *Laicks*, never was the *General Sense and Practice* of the *Ancient Catholick Church*; for, if the *Ancient Catholick Church* had esteem'd it so, it is a most unaccountable thing, to find *nothing of this* attested to by the *Greek Church* for *Eight Hundred Years* together, when we consider the **Great Extent** of that Church, that it was *so Significant* a Part of the *Catholick Church*, as that the most celebrated and most receiv'd Councils were

were held in it; and when we consider also the *Great Number* of *Greek* Authors, whose Writings make so remarkable a Figure as they do, among the Works of the *Primitive Fathers*; and who, both *Councils* and *Greek Fathers*, are thus silent for Eight Hundred Years together, in so *Important a Matter*, as this of the pretended general Sense and Practice of the Church, in favour of Baptism by Laicks, must needs have been, if it had ever been a *Catholick Tradition, Ecclesiastical Law, or Custom*.

§ III. Add to this, that tho' there was such a *profound Silence* in the *Greek Church*, concerning any *Validity* in such Baptisms, for the first Eight Hundred Years; yet, there was **no such Silence** about their **Invalidity**; for, we have already seen, that *St. Chrysoftom* and *St. Basil*, in the Fourth Century, pronounc'd them to be **Null and Void**. *St. Basil's* Epistle, wherein he affirm'd this, was a *Canonical Epistle*, and receiv'd into the Code of the *Greek Church*, as part of their *Canon Law*; so that this was the Sense of the *Ancient Greek Church*, and was never oppos'd by any *Greek Council*, or the contrary taught by any of the *Greek Fathers*, till the Time of the *Corrupt Ages* of the Church; when other **Superstitions** very dangerous to *Christianity*, crept into the *Greek*, as well as into the *Latin Church*.

§ IV. *Mr. Bingham* begins his Account of the suppos'd Practice of the *Greek Church* (as to Lay-Baptism) in the Ninth Century, one of the most corrupt and superstitious Ages of the Church; wherein the Practice of the **Worshipping of Images** was carried on, both in the *East* and *West*

with a high Hand; and **Nicephorus* Patriarch of *Constantinople*, [our Reverend Historian's Author] was a very zealous Promoter of *this Superstition*, insomuch as to *Suffer* and *Die* in Banishment for it, as if it had been the *Cause of God*; which is no *great Reputation*, to his *supposed two Canons*, produced by our Reverend Historian in favour of *Lay-Baptism*; and his *Authority* is of no *more Value* in this Case, than it is in the other, of the *Use of Images* in *Divine Worship*.

§ V. 'Tis true, Mr. *Bingham* glories in this as
 “ the Declared Sense of the Greek Church authentically deliver'd in these two Canons, made in a
 “ Patriarchal Council, where 270 Bishops were present, **If the Council of Constantinople,**
 “ Anno 814. was the Council in which these Canons
 “ were made, [says he] Page 105.” But the Reader may easily see, that Mr. *Bingham* dare not say, **This was the Council**; he puts it only upon the weak Foundation of an, “ **If the Council of**
 “ Constantinople, &c.—was the Council, in which
 “ they were made.” Our Reverend Historian do's not so much as *attempt to prove*, that those *two Canons* were made in *that Council*; and therefore we may fairly conclude, that *it is not to be prov'd*; this Gentleman however shews his Inclination to have it so, but it is no ways becoming a *faithful Historian*, to prejudice his Readers with **It's, May-be's, and Perhaps's**, so frequently as our Author do's; because, abundance of People do not so much mind every single word, [**If, Perhaps, &c.**] but that they may be carried

* *Du Pin's Ecclesiastical History*, Cent. IX. p. 1, 5.

away with a Belief of what is annex'd to such "If's and *May-be's*," especially, when the rest of the words are *big and ostentatious*: As here, we have the glaring shew, of "*The declar'd Sense of the Greek Church Authentically Deliver'd, and a Patriarchal Council of 270 Bishops;*" these are *great Things*, apt enough to fill up the whole Imagination of *many careless Readers*, who may neglect the *If* to which they are join'd: But let us a little enquire, what reason Mr. *Bingham* has *thus partially* to Name *this*, any more than the *other Councils*, said to have been held by *Nicephorus*? Nay, upon what good Foundation he could suppose those two Canons, to have been made in any *Authentick Council* at all?

Nicephorus was made Patriarch of *Constantinople*, Anno 806; in that same Year a * Council was held at *Constantinople* about the Restoration of *Joseph* the Steward of that Church to his Office, out of which he had been turn'd by *Nicephorus's* Predecessor *Tarasius* the Patriarch; and there are *no Records* of any such Canons made in that Council.

In the Year 809. *Nicephorus* held another † Council, "In which *Joseph* was not only Confirm'd in his Place, but the second, *Adulterous, Marriage* of *Constantine Copronymus* the Emperour, who after he had divorc'd his Wife, married another nam'd *Theodota*, was declar'd Lawful, by Dispensation, and every one that should maintain the contrary was Anathematiz'd." Neither did this Council make those Canons; and if

* *Du Pin's Chron. IX. Cent.*

† *Du Pin's Eccles. Hist. Cent. IX. p. 5.*

they had, 'twould have been but very little to their *Reputation*, to have been decreed by those who could **Confirm** even **Adultery** it self.

In the Year 813. *Leo Armenus* possess'd himself of the Empire, and was Crown'd by *Nicephorus* the 11th of (a) *July*. This *Leo* declar'd against **Image Worship** in favour of the *Iconoclasts*, who were (b) *Nicephorus's Enemies*, upon the account of his great *Zeal* for that *Superstition*. "The Emperor resolving to root out that *Corruption*, consulted with *Antonius* Metropolitan of *Silea*, to assist him in this (c) *Design*, promising to make him Patriarch of *Constantinople* instead of *Nicephorus*, which *Antonius* promis'd the Emperor he would." *Du Pin*, in his *Chronicle* of the Ninth Century, says, "that this Year, 813. was held the Council of *Constantinople*, against *Antonius* of *Silea*." *Labbe* says 'twas in the (d) Year 814. and that it consisted of 270 Bishops; so that this must be the Council *Mr. Bingham* speaks of. Now 'tis plain, that there appears to have been no other *Business* transacted at that Council, but the *Anathematizing* of *Antonius*, for endeavouring to put down *Image Worship*. There are no such **Canons** of that Council Extant; and therefore *Mr. Bingham* has no more reason to suppose *Nicephorus's* two **Canons** to have been made in **this Council**, than he has to affix them to either of the other two Councils held by that Patriarch.

(a) *Du Pin's Chron.* IX. Century.

(b) *Du Pin's Eccles. Hist.* Cent. IX. p. 1.

(c) *Concil. Labbei*, Tom. 7. p. 129.

(d) *Ib. d.* 1290.

There was another Council at *Constantinople*, Anno 814. but it was held by the *Iconoclasts* [Opposers of Image Worship] after *Nicephorus's* Banishment for his superstitious Zeal to promote and uphold that great Corruption, when *Theodosius* the *Iconoclast* was made Patriarch in his stead, who presided in that Council; so that *Nicephorus*, to be sure, neither would, nor could sit in that Council, and consequently his *two Canons* were not made there; in short, they cannot be prov'd to have been made by him in any Council at all; and therefore our Reverend Historian can hardly clear himself from the Imputation of Partiality, when he pitches upon *the Council* against *Antonius*, rather than any other, and all because of the great show that it makes of 270 Bishops; who, if they had made these *two Canons*, would have no more shew'd the Sense of the Ancient *Catholick Church* in this Matter, than they did in the other of *Image Worship*, when they Anathematiz'd a Bishop for opposing that great Superstition.

§ VI. It is true, that immediately after this Council, Anno 814. *Labbe* places Seventeen Canons of *Nicephorus*, among which are the two Canons we are speaking of; but then 'tis as true, that *Labbe* do's not reckon them as *Acts* of that Council, but acknowledges that * he took them from the same Author as our Reverend Historian receiv'd them, viz. from *Leunclavius*; and that he

* *Concil. Labb. Tom. 7. p. 1290.* Eidem quoque subjiciemus Leges Synodicas ab eodem Ni ephoro Sanctitas ex *Libro III. Tom. 1. Juris Græco Romani à Joanne Leunclavio Concinnati: heque eim Indagare ullatenus potuimus ad quem potissimum Appum sint revocandæ.*

could not at all affix them to any particular Year wherein they were made, and therefore by consequence to no *particular Council*.

Labbe indeed calls 'em *Synodical Laws*, but *Leunclavius* from whom he took 'em, gives 'em no other Name than only *the *Canons of Nicephorus the Confessor*, and says nothing of their having been made in any *Synod* at all. But some are apt to think they were decreed in a *Synod of Bishops*, because they are found in *Leunclavius's* Third Book, which bears this Title, [Lib. III. *Qui continet Sententias Synodales, & Sanctiones Pontificias Archiepiscoporum & Patriarcharum Constantinopolis.*]
 “ The Third Book, containing the *Synodical Judgments*, and *Pontifical Decrees of Arch-Bishops*,
 “ and *Patriarchs of Constantinople* :” In which 'tis to be observ'd, that *Leunclavius* gives his Reader to understand, that in his Third Book he had collected two sorts of Decrees; *First*, Those which were made in Councils at *Constantinople*. *Secondly*, Others that were made by particular *Arch-Bishops* and *Patriarchs* of that *See*. When they are *Canons* or *Decrees of Councils*, he expressly calls them so; when they are *Constitutions of Particular Patriarchs*, or *Arch-Bishops*, he entitles them as such, and does not give Notice of any Council whatsoever as having appointed them: Thus for Example, in his Third Book, Page 186. he gives us a Constitution of *St. John Chrysoftom*, *Arch-Bishop of Constantinople*, and do's not call it *Synodical*. In Page 187. he has a *Synodical One*, made by *Gennadius*, *Patriarch of Constantinople*, in a *Council assembled there with him*, and so *Leuncla-*

* *Leunclav. Jus Græco. Rom. Vol. I. Lib. III. p. 196.*

vius expresse it; but when he gives us *Nicephorus's* Canons, he only calls 'em "*Canons of Nicephorus the Confessor,*" as I have before observ'd, without saying that they were ever made *in any Council,* and he is remarkably particular in this Distinction; so that, since there is no Council to which these two Canons can be *appropriated,* we may conclude, that they were made by no other than *Nicephorus* himself; and every Body who has look'd into Ecclesiastical History, knows that particular Popes, Patriarchs, Arch-Bishops, Bishops, and Abbots, &c. have made many Canons by their own Authority, without any Councils assembled, and concurring with them in those Canons.

§ VII. Add to this, that these two Canons are not to be found in the Collection of *Nicephorus's* Thirty Seven Canons, nor in that of his Nine Canons, both publish'd by **Cotelerius*; only *Leunclavius* (from *Harmenopulus*) in his Collection of the *Greek* and *Roman* Laws, has publish'd Seventeen Canons, attributed to *Nicephorus*, all which are in *Cotelerius's* Collections, except the 2d, 3d, 9th, 12th, 13th, and 16th of the Seventeen: These Six Canons look very suspiciously, being mix'd with Eleven others, which Eleven are found in the former Collections, *when the Six are not be found in them*; among these Six are the Two Canons for Lay-Baptism, about which we are disputing; *viz.* the 13th and 16th of the Seventeen; so that their being *Nicephorus's*, is founded only upon the single Testimony of *Harmenopulus*, who

* *Inter Monumenta, Eccles. Græc. Tom. 3. p. 445.*

wrote his Epitome of the *Greek* Canons about the Year 1150. from whom *Leunclavius* says he took them; which Evidence, supposing it to be as good as can be desir'd, is **no Argument** that they were of any *Publick Authority*, as the Authentick Sense of the *Greek Church*, but only that they were the *Decrees of One Patriarch*. And we have seen that he was not so very exactly sound in *Principle* and *Practise*, but that he could be carried away with a false Zeal for the Promoting of Superstition, and did not scruple to ratify and confirm even **Adultery** it self.

§ VIII. But further, these Canons appear to have been but of very little, if of any Authority at all in the *Greek Church*; for if they had been the *declar'd Authentick Sense of that Church*: How should some of the *Greek Writers* [*who never were accus'd of Contumacious opposing the standing Rules and Orders of their Church*] write so zealously as they have done, against the **Lawfulness** of Lay-Baptism, even in Cases of *pretended Necessity*? As *Georgius Hamartolus*, about the Year 840. *Glycas*, Anno. 1120. and *Theodorus Scutariota*, Anno 1220. Sure these knew the *general Sense and Practise of the Greek Church*; and why should we believe they would have written so boldly against it, if this had been the *approv'd Lawful Sense and Practise* thereof? They plainly pass over and neglect these Two Canons, as if they never had been; or if they had any Knowledge of them, they look'd upon 'em only as the Opinion of one Man, to be only of Private, if of any Authority, and not the *declar'd Authentick Sense of the Greek Church*, which we may reasonably believe they would have been more tender of Opposing, if it had been
truly

“ *truly Catholick and agreeable to the Word of God.*”
 Since Mr. *Bingham* do's not give us any Instance of their Contradicting the standing Rules and Orders of their Church in any other respect whatsoever.

§ IX. And great reason had those Writers so strenuously to oppose Lay-Baptism in any Case whatsoever; for the Institution it self gives not the least encouragement to such a Practice, but the contrary: *St. Basil*, in his Canonical Epistle to *Amphilochius*, part of the Canon Law of the Greek Church, pronounced such Baptism Null and Void; *St. Chrysostom*, Arch-Bishop of *Constantinople*, did the same; these both in the Fourth Century: The Constitutions, call'd Apostolical, very much esteem'd by that Church, absolutely prohibit Laicks from meddling in such Holy Things; and the Greek Church, for the first Eight Hundred Years of Christianity, had nothing that favour'd such a Practice as that of Lay-Baptism; so that even if *Nicephorus*, Anno 814. had endeavour'd by his Patriarchal Authority to introduce such a Novelty, and those Writers had known of this his Design, yet they had good Foundation whereon to build their Arguments against it; especially, if we also consider that it was a Novelty of some of the *Latins*, and that the Emissaries of the Bishops of *Rome* were very early in their Attempts upon other Churches, particularly the Greek Church, to make them submit to their *Erroneous Doctrines* and *Practices*; for even *St. Basil*, in his Tenth Epistle, complains of the *Western* Bishops in his Days, particularly the **Roman**, [“ *Quod veritatem neque Norunt, neque discere sustinent*—
 “ *Cum iis qui veritatem ipsis annunciant Contenden-*
 “ *tes,*

“ *tes; heras in autem per se ipsos stabilientes.*”]
 “ That they neither know the Truth, nor care to
 “ learn it; but they contend with them who tell
 “ ’em the Truth, and by themselves establish He-
 “ refy.” Our *Nicephorus*’s familiar Correspondence
 with the then Bishop of Rome, Pope *Leo III.* whereof we have an Instance in * a Letter *Nicephorus* wrote to him, *Anno 811.* in which he acknowledges the Invocation of Saints, and Worship of Images—and excuses himself to the Pope that he did not write to him sooner; and says, that the Cause was, that he was made to believe that the Church of Rome was at Ennity with that of Constantinople; but now the Cause of the Division being remov’d, he doubted not but there would be a perfect Agreement between the two Churches. I say, this and such like familiar Correspondence of *Nicephorus*, and other *Greeks*, with the Bishops of Rome then and afterwards, together with the restless Endeavours of the Bishops of that Church, to make other Churches submit to their Erroneous Doctrines and Practices, without which the Church of Rome, in her corrupt Ages, would have no perfect Agreement with any other Church; gave but too just occasion to others of the *Greek Church* who were jealous for the Truths of Christianity, to give that Church timely Warning of Dangerous *Romish* Novelties creeping in among them; of which Number *Georgius Hamartolus*, *Glycas*, and *Theodorus Scutariota*, appear to have been, in vigorously opposing the pretended Lawfulness of *Lay-Baptism*, which was first started only in the *Latin Church*; and in Defence of which, we have no In-

* Du Pin IX. Cent.

stance in the Primitive *Greek Church*: And *Nicephorus's* suppos'd Two Canons, in the Ninth Century, were but of his private Authority, and not at all regarded, but neglected and contemn'd, if they were so much as known by those Writers from the Year 840. to 1220.

§ X. But our Reverend Historian will have it that *Nicephorus's* Two Canons “ continued in force “ among the Greeks for some Ages after [the Year 840.] Page 103. Of this he is *very Positive*; and now let us see what is his Reason for it? Why truly no more than this, *viz.* “ For Harmenopu- “ lus, who lived in the middle of the Twelfth Cen- “ tury, and wrote his Epitome of the Greek Canons “ about the Year 1150. has inserted them both into “ his Collection; and they are the **only Canons** “ that are mention'd upon this Subject, which seems “ to argue, that they were then the standing Rule of “ the Greek Church,” Page 104. This is his whole Argument; in which there are several things worth our Notice: *First*, That he asserts the Two Canons continu'd in force for some Ages, because they were inserted by a Writer, in his Collection of Canons, above Three Hundred Years after *Nicephorus*: This is just as good an Argument, as if I should say, that a Modern *English* Writer's collecting *Ancient English Canons*, made Three Hundred Years ago, whether by Men in the right or the wrong for making them, is a good Proof that such *Old English Canons* continued in force in the Church of *England* all that while, to the time of his Collecting them; the Weakness of which betrays it self. *Secondly*, He says they are the **Only Canons** that are mention'd upon this Subject: This confirms what I observ'd before, that there

there were none such in the *Greek Church* for the first Eight Hundred Years; and now they stand Singular by themselves for Three Hundred and Fifty Years after, during which Time we have not yet had so much as *one Argument*, that they were of any *standing Authority*, or Force in the *Greek Church*; the Practice countenanc'd by them was oppos'd very early after they are suppos'd to have been made, *viz.* by *Georgius Hamartolus* within Twenty Six Years after, and by *Glycas* not above Thirty Years before *Harmenopulus* collected them; so that in these Three Hundred and Fifty Years they made no Figure in the *Greek Church*, as *Lawful Constitutions* thereof, since they were either not known, or *contemn'd and despis'd*, by two Writers who are not accus'd of being either *Hereticks* or *Schismaticks*, and who very well knew, and did not quarrel with, the *Lawful and Genuine Rules of their Church*.—But, *Thirdly*, *Harmenopulus's* inserting them in this Collection, and they being “the **Only Canons** mention'd upon this Subject, **seems to argue**, that they were then the standing Rule of the *Greek Church*.” First, Our Reverend Historian was **positive** that they continued in Force for some Ages; and for this Positiveness one would have thought he was going to introduce as Positive a Reason, when he begins it with a **For**, but at last he finishes with only, it **Seems**; so that all he has said to prove their continuing in Force for some Ages, amounts to no more, than that *Harmenopulus's* Collecting them do's but “**seem to argue**,” it is no convincing Argument that they were then the standing Rule of that Church, it only seems so; But Mr. *Bingham* must give us more than **Seeming Arguments** for the *Greek Church's* **Standing Rules, Ecclesiastical Laws** and

and Canons about this matter; (all is not Gold that glisters) 'till our Reverend Historian proves them to be the *Authentick Constitutions* of that Church, we shall esteem those Two Canons not to have been the *Greek Church's standing Rule*, but a singular Innovation of no Publick Authority or Obligation.

§ XI. And now let us see what can be made of these Two Canons; why truly no more than this: That if *Bishops have Power* by Canon to authorize their own Lay-men to Baptize, in want of a Priest, (*which has not yet been prov'd that they have*) then *Nicephorus*, by these Two Canons, authoriz'd *his Greek Lay-men* for that purpose. And what would this be to us if it were so? Nothing at all certainly; for *his Canons*, even in that case, have *no Obligation* upon us: Our Lay-men can receive *no Authority* at all from them, and therefore they are of no Use in our present Controversie, which is, about the Validity of that *pretended Baptism* which is given by Persons, who, upon *no account whatsoever*, can be said to have been at all commission'd or authoriz'd by Bishops to Baptize, if Bishops could so authorize their own Lay-Communicants.

§ XII. Before I proceed any farther I must take notice, that Mr. *Bingham* rejects all *Glycas's Arguments* against Lay-Baptism, and says of 'em from *Cotelerius*, That "*his Arguments are grounded upon several Mistakes in matters of Fact, which makes them weak and inconclusive,*" pag. 104. But because *Glycas* was mistaken in some Facts, nay some but pretended Facts; Do's it therefore follow that he has no good Argument against this Practice? Let us try one of that *Greek Writer's Arguments*

guments, and see how our Reverend Historian can disprove it. “*Glycas alledges the Authority of the Apostolical Canons prohibiting Lay-men to meddle with the Priest’s Office, whatever Cases of Necessity may seem to require it.*” Mr. Bingham finds fault with this, and says, “*The Case of Necessity is never so much as once mentioned in all the Apostolical Canons or Constitutions; only Lay-men are severely prohibited in general from thrusting themselves into the Offices of the Ecclesiastical Function,*” pag. 104. Now who is there that do’s not see, that Mr. Bingham, by this Observation, confirms *Glycas’s* Allegation? “*The Case of Necessity is not once mentioned in all the Apostolical Canons or Constitutions,*” says Mr. Bingham; and I in return do say, that for this very reason, *Glycas* had good Authority to affirm, That “*Lay-men were prohibited to meddle with the Priest’s Office, whatsoever Cases of Necessity may seem to require it.*” For, since the Apostolical Canons or Constitutions do not once mention, they consequently make no Provision for, any Case of Necessity whatsoever. And since *Lay-men are severely prohibited in general*, by Mr. Bingham’s own Confession, therefore, this Prohibition is *absolute and unlimited*, it includes all Cases, and consequently the pretended Case of *Necessity*, because it *excepts none*; and all this because it relates to a Thing, which was never valid before ’twas *commission’d*, and owes its Validity to the Observation of the first Institution, which *annex’d it to a Commission*, and made no *Proviso* for its Validity *without a Commission* in any Case whatsoever: Therefore the **general Prohibition** of the Apostolical Canons, against Persons who have *no Commission*, includes even the suppos’d Case of *Necessity*, and excludes such Persons (as *Glycas* very well infers) *from*

from meddling in the Priest's Office, whatsoever Cases of Necessity may seem to require it. For there is no Case of Necessity that can really require it, because the Institution points at no such Case, nor makes any Provision for it; the worst Case may in some Mens Opinion seem to require it, yet it do's but seem to do so: For if we put them upon the Proof that the Case certainly requires it, they are at a great stand, and have no Arguments to produce for it; nay, so far from that, that some of 'em say, 'Tis sinful for an uncommission'd Person to meddle in it, when at the same time they call it necessary, and run themselves into the Contradiction of asserting the Necessity of a Sin, or that the Case is a Case of Necessity, and that some-body must supply it, tho' by sinning against the Law of God himself, as we have seen by some late Attempts about this matter, set forward by those, from whom we should least have expected them.

§ XIII. But to return to the *Greek Church*: It is plain, that hitherto we have found *no authentick Act of hers* giving Countenance to the suppos'd Validity of Lay-Baptism; and as for the Testimony of particular Writers of that Church, 'tis evident from what has been said, that the *Majority* is against the Validity thereof, so far as to the Year 1220, when *Theodorus Scutariota* maintain'd the Invalidity of such Baptism. Let us now see what the *Greek Church* assembled in Council has done, and her *Authentick Sense* against such Baptisms as those are, against which we are now disputing, viz. Baptisms perform'd by Persons who never were Episcopally ordain'd, and who yet presume to reckon themselves as Ministers of Christ, and to Baptize as if they were really such.

In the Year 1166. there was a great Council at Constantinople *, where were present Three Patriarchs, Lucas Chrysoberges of Constantinople, Athanasius of Antioch, and Nicephorus of Jerusalem, with Fifty seven Metropolitans, besides other Bishops.—Mr. Bingham owns, that in this Synod, a “ Question was put by Manuel Arch-Bishop of Heraclea, ” “ Whether a Man ought to be received as a Christian, who was baptiz’d by one who pretended to be a Priest, but was not so? For such a Case had lately happened in his Diocese. In answer to this the Synod decreed, That such ought to be re-baptiz’d; because the Administration of Baptism is only committed to Bishops and Priests, according to the 46th and 47th Canons of the Apostles, ” pag. 106. Our Reverend Historian acknowledges also, That “ this Council cannot be deny’d to speak plainly against the Validity of Lay-Baptism, and in favour of [what he calls] “ Re-baptization in the Case that was then laid before them, which was the ordinary Ministration of Baptism by such as counterfeited Orders, and pretended to be Priests when they were not so. ” And this is most evidently our present Case; for our Lay-Baptisms are by Persons pretending to be in Orders who are not so, and they give their false Baptisms ordinarily, claiming the ordinary Ministration of Baptism: And therefore the declared, authentick Sense of the Greek Church, in a Synod of Three Patriarchs, Fifty seven Metropolitans, and other Bishops, is full and direct against the Validity, and positive for the Invalidity of their false Baptisms; and Mr. Bingham cannot produce any

* Cave Hist. Lit. Vol. 1. p. 676. Vol. 2. p. 418, 419.

one Council that was ever held, either in the *Eastern* or *Western Church* for the first Twelve hundred Years of Christianity, that he can prove would have decreed any otherwise than this Council did in this matter.

§ XIV. Our Reverend Historian seems not willing to believe, that the Decree of this Council was so *extensive*, as some of the Enemies of Lay-Baptism may be apt to believe; for he says thus, “*But whether they [i. e. the Members of that Council] intended by this, wholly to invalidate the Baptism of Deacons and Lay-men, in extraordinary Cases of absolute Necessity, when neither a Bishop nor Presbyter can be had; as they have not express’d themselves particularly upon this point; so it is more than I can pretend positively to determine,*” pag. 106. Here again Mr. Bingham repeats his artful but very *unfair* way of joyning **Deacons** with *Lay-men*, as if Deacons were *no more* Partakers of the Priestly Power, than *Lay-men*: But the Fallacy of this I have already sufficiently expos’d, and therefore shall here only speak of *Lay-men*, *Persons never commission’d* by Bishops to baptize; and I do affirm, that Baptism by such Persons, tho’ done when none of the Priesthood can be had, is by this *Synodical Act* declared *Null and Void*.

First, Because the Baptism by the *Pretender to Holy Orders*, who *deceiv’d* the baptiz’d, was to the Receiver, equivalent to a Lay-Baptism in want of a Priest, and esteem’d *Null and Void* by those Bishops; for, this pretended Baptism was as much a Case of Necessity to the baptiz’d, as if no Priest could have been had, because the *Deceiver* appear’d *as a Priest*; as such he was receiv’d by the baptiz’d, and he had, at the time of his Baptism, no

Medium by which to discover the *Fallacy*, and therefore 'twas to him equivalent to a Case of Necessity, because (by reason of the *Delusion*) he had no free Choice to be baptiz'd by a *Priest*; and therefore, since that Council would not admit this *pretendedly baptiz'd Person as a Christian* without *Sacerdotal Baptism*, and all because the Pretender had no *Priestly Character*, and for this *only reason too*; it must needs be, that they null'd a *pretended Baptism* receiv'd from a Lay-man, by one in a Case of Necessity, when he could (in his Circumstances) have no Priest to baptize him. And,

Secondly, The Reason given by that Council proves this Assertion; for they affirm'd expressly, That "*such ought to be re-baptiz'd, because the Administration of Baptism is only committed to Bishops and Priests, according to the 46th and 47th Canons of the Apostles.*" The Power of Baptizing being committed *only* to those who are vested with a *Priestly Power*, is made the *Reason* why *Priestly Baptism* was decreed to be given to him, who before was *falsly baptiz'd*, by one who had no *such Sacerdotal Power*; and this without distinguishing, that it might be otherwise in any Case whatsoever: 'Tis *absolute* and *unlimited* without any Exception, and therefore includes all Cases ordinary and extraordinary: 'Tis apply'd by the Council, particularly to the Case before us, which was an *extraordinary Case* to the *pretendedly baptiz'd*, by reason of the *Delusion* and *Cheat* put upon him; they did not decree in his favour, because he was thus deluded, and under that Circumstance could have no other Baptism, which made his a Case of Necessity; that therefore, because his was such a Case, his *false Baptism* was good and valid; no, they determin'd *only upon this Principle*, that there was *really*

no Priestly Power, therefore no Baptism; and for this reason, and this only, they decreed that he should be baptiz'd: It is not recorded, whether the counterfeit Priest pretended to minister *Ordinarily*, where true Priests were to be had, or *Extraordinarily* where they were Absent; and let the Adversary chuse which of them he will, the Case was still the same to the pretendedly Baptized; for, the false Baptizer made him believe, that he was such a One as could give True Baptism; and the Baptized being deceiv'd, took him for such. If true Priests were to be had, he esteem'd the counterfeit One, under his Delusion, as true, and therefore as eligible, as any of them, and so saw no Necessity of Addressing to One of them for Baptism, rather than to him; which put him under a *Necessity* of being supposedly baptiz'd by him: And if true Priests could not be had, it would but have been the *same Case of Necessity*; but notwithstanding, upon sifting the Matter, 'twas only the *want of Commission*, that was the reason of the Invalidity of the Baptism, in the Sense of that Council; and the Case is but just the same, when a Laick, a Person *never Commission'd* to baptize, attempts to give Baptism in an Extraordinary Case, where Priests are not to be found; for, the Laick's *Open and Known Usurpation*, of what was never Committed to him, do's *no more vest him with a Commission*, than the covert and sly Pretences of the counterfeit Priest, [who is no Priest at all] do's Authorize him; they are both *equally without any Commission*; and the Absence of true Priests, do's not give any Advantage to the Lay-Usurper's Case; for, *this Negative* can confer *no Positive Power or Authority* to baptize; the Laick never had it before, for such a Case, either by the *Law of Na-*

ture, for *that* has nothing to do in the Matter; or by the Law of God, for *that* never vested him with it; or lastly, by any suppos'd *Donation* of the Catholick Church, or of the Bishops, to whom he owes Subjection, [if either the *Catholick Church*, or those Bishops, could make such a *Donation*, or Gift of Power, to Laicks;] consequently this Laick, in Absence of the Priests, is *as much without a Commission*, as the counterfeit Priest was; and since this Council decreed, the pretended Baptism administer'd by the counterfeit Priest, to be Null and Void, "*because the Administration of Baptism was never Committed to him,*" and he had therefore **No Priestly Character**; it necessarily follows, that the same Decree censures pretended Baptism to be Null and Void, when given by a Laick, one *never Commission'd to Baptize*, tho' done in *Destitution* and want of *Priests*, because the Laick, even in this Case, has *no more a Commission* than the *Counterfeit Priest*: The Ministration of Baptism was no more Committed to this Laick, than it was to that Impostor; they are both *equally Laicks*, both exactly alike, *Non-Commission'd*.

And if any favourable Construction may be made for *pretended Baptism* by one, rather than by the other, to the Advantage of the supposedly Baptized; it is more equitable to allow of that which was perform'd by the **Counterfeit Priest**, than to acquiesce in that, which was done by the known *presumptuous Lay-man*; because, the supposedly Baptized has a better colour of Excuse, by reason of the *Cunning* of the Impostor, and the *great Difficulty*, if not *Impossibility* (under his Circumstances) of discovering the Cheat, when he had *no Suspicion* of it, nor any Grounds given why he should

should suspect the *Administrator's Commission*; when on the other hand, the presumptuous ~~to~~ Lay-man, who puts on no Disguise, is easy to be discover'd; for the People are us'd to receive Baptism from the Hands of the Priests, they know 'tis their Office to give it, so that when a *known Laick* presumes to do it in any Case whatsoever, there's something shocking in it; and the meanest unprejudic'd understanding of those Men, who are us'd (as all ought) to study their Bibles, may easily see, that *No Appearance of Necessity* can vest Men with that Sacred Office which God has appropriated to others, to minister in Holy Things; and therefore, they are in such Case, *less excusable* for submitting to such *open unwarranted Usurpations*. But this Council of *Constantinople* used no such *false Judgment*, they decreed the false Baptism, given by the *Cunning Impostor*, to be Null and Void, notwithstanding all the pleadable Difficulty of suspecting or discovering the Cheat; and consequently the same Determination stands good, against the Validity of pretended Baptism, given (tho' in Absence of the Clergy) by known Lay-men, Persons never Commission'd to baptize; because there is *less colour* for Excuse, in favour of those who receive these false Baptisms, than there is in behalf of such as are almost *unavoidably deluded*, by the *other Cunning and Subtile Pretenders*. But without favouring one more than the other, they are *both equally without Commission*; and therefore by this *Greek Council* their *Ministrations* are both *Null and Void*.

§ XV. Our Reverend Historian says, Page 106.
 “ If it was so [*viz.* if this Council design’d to
 Invalidate such Lay-Baptisms] “ then I can say,
 “ it was plainly contrary to the Decrees of the
 “ Former Council under Nicephorus, which
 “ prevail’d in Practice both before and since this
 “ Council, and still do’s in the Greek Church to this
 “ Day.” And then he charges some Learned Per-
 sons with Error for thinking otherwise. But Mr.
 Bingham has not yet produc’d the Council which
 he talks of, he has given us nothing but an *If*
 for his supposed Council under *Nicephorus*; nay,
 he cannot prove that this Patriarch’s Two Canons
 were ever made by any Synod at all, but yet he
 calls ’em the Decrees of the *Former Council*,
 very emphatically, as if he had given Proof of
 some particular Synod wherein they were made,
 which he has not at all done; so that Mr. *Bing-*
ham is here very positive upon an *Uncertainty*,
 (to make the best of it) even in *direct Opposition* to
 what is *Evident* and *Certain*; for he insists up-
 on a *supposititious Council’s Decrees*, against an
undoubted Decree of an *Incontested, Indisputable*
Authentick Council; and would make us believe
 that the former (*tho’ not prov’d*) were of most
 force, in that “ they prevail’d in Practice, both be-
 “ fore and since this *Certain and Undisputed*
 “ *Council*; How they prevail’d in Practice be-
 fore, we have seen already; Mr. *Bingham* has hi-
 therto produc’d no Evidence for this their suppos’d
Prevalency; and if he had, it still wants to be
 prov’d that this Practice was founded upon
 the *general Sense of the Greek Church*, and
 not rather upon the *false Principles*, introduc’d
 among some *Latinizing Greeks*, by the Craft and
 Cunning

Cunning of Popish Emissaries, who have been continually endeavouring to corrupt that poor, oppressed, and afflicted Church: But this Council of *Constantinople*, held by Three Patriarchs, Fifty Seven Metropolitans, and other Bishops besides, is a *Glaring Evidence*, that this Corruption of Popery had not yet in the Year 1166. prevail'd in the *Greek Church*; for if it had, 'tis *inconceivable* how such a *Numerous Synod*, as that was, should make a Decree so directly contrary to the Popish Notion of Lay-Baptism.

§ XVI. But our Author goes on with his Endeavours to prove, that this Piece of Popery "*prevail'd*" *in the Greek Church, since this Council, and still do's to this Day*; For (says he) *the Best Greek Writers of late Days, in speaking of the Minister of Baptism, and the Practice of their Church, always except the Case of Extreme Necessity, in which they allow a Lay-man, or Woman, to baptize, rather than suffer a Child to die without Baptism.*" And he instances *Feremy Patriarch of Constantinople*, in the Sixteenth Century; *Suicerus's* Observation out of *Metrophanes Critopulus*; *Arcudius's* Remark out of *Gabriel Severus*, Arch-Bishop of *Philadelphia*, and our *Dr. Smith's* present State of the *Greek Church*.

§ XVII. In Answer to all which 'tis evident, that our Reverend Historian's *Best Greek Writers*, as he calls 'em, have betray'd themselves to be *Uncatholick* in their Principles; and the Practice they speak of, to be also *Uncatholick and Popish*; for they espouse the Cause of *Baptism by Women*, whom *Mr. Bingham* acknowledges never to have been allow'd by the *Ancient Church* to Baptize:

tize: This shows of what Party those *Greeks* are, who allow of this, and that they learn'd and took it from the corrupt Church of *Rome*, the known *Promoter* and *Abettor* of this *Erroneous* and *Uncatholick* Practice; but the Authors mention'd by our Historian, are no more than *particular Men*, and their *Authority* of no Importance against that of the Council of *Constantinople*, Anno 1166. And 'tis very Notorious, that in these latter Ages the *Greeks* are, by the Craft and Subtilty of the *Romish* Emissaries, divided into two Parties; one that adheres to the Principles and Practices of their *Ancestors*, the *Ancient Greeks*; and the other that embraces the Novelties and Superstitions of the Church of *Rome*.

Dr. *Smith*, in the Preface to his Account of the *Greek Church*, shews us how *Cyrillus Lucaris* Patriarch of *Constantinople*, 1621. by opposing the Designs of the *Jesuits*, got to himself the *Hatred* and *Ill-will* of the *Latinizing Greeks*; and from Page 239. and forward of that Book, how by the Instigation of the *Jesuits*, and *Conspiracy* of some *Greek Bishops*, he was *Prosecuted*, *Dethron'd*, *Banish'd*, and at last *Barbarously Murder'd*, An. 1638. In Page 249. we see how the *Romish Emissaries* and *Latinizing Greeks* bribe the *Turks* to get their *own Party-Men* advanc'd to the Patriarchate; there we find how the Church of *Rome* sends *Titular Bishops* among them, and how the *Romish Ambassadors*, as well as *Romish Priests*, disturb and rend that poor *distressed Church*, by *Corrupting* the *Greek Bishops*.

Sir *Paul Ricaut*, late Consul at *Smyrna*, in his Present State of the *Greek* and *Armenian Churches*, Anno 1678. tells us in his Preface, Page 15. that a *Confession of Faith*, suppos'd to have been written

ten by *Cyrillus Patriarch of Constantinople* in the Year 1629. was believ'd in a great measure to have been *father'd on him by the Jesuits*, to render him odious both to *Greeks* and *Latins*.—In the 28th Page of his Book he assures us, that “*The Roman Priests frequent all Places where the Greeks Inhabit, endeavouring to draw them unto their side, both by Preaching and Writings, of which one being written in the Vulgar Greek by Francis Richard a Jesuit, and Printed at Paris, call'd, Τάγμα τῆς Ρωμαικῆς Ἐκκλησίας, was dispers'd in all Parts where that Language was Current. That, [Page 29.] Whereas now the Ancient Structures and Colleges of Athens are become ruinous——and all Greece Poor and Illiterate, such Spirits and Wits among them, who aspire unto Sciences and Knowledge, are forc'd to seek it in Italy; where sucking from the same Fountain, and eating Bread made with the same Leaven of the Latins, it is natural that they should conform to the same Principles and Doctrine. So that it will not be strange, if in Exposition of those Points wherein the Church of God for some Ages hath been silent, and but now controverted in these latter Days, the Greek Priests should with little Variety follow the Sense of the Latin, which they take up at adventure, not being of themselves capable either to prove or try the meaning of the Scriptures, or examine the Ancient Tenets of their own Church.*” And in Page 333. “*Italy is the sole Gymnasion and Library of their Knowledge and Learning; for in most Points of Controversy, where the Patriarchal Authority is not concern'd, they exactly concur with the Sense of the Roman Schools.*” And the Friars of the Church of Rome are so industri-

ous to make the World believe that the *Oriental Churches* are like their own, that the same Writer in his 447th Page assures us, that “*some*” Friars of the *Roman Church* perswaded the *Armenian Patriarch* and Bishops at *Constantinople* to subscribe a Confession agreeable to the Tenets of the *Roman Faith*—a Copy of which Sir *Paul Ricaut* saw and read, as it was deliver’d to him from the *Mertabet*, or *Armenian Bishop*.

Dr. *Smith*, in the 6th Page of his above-mention’d Preface, says, “*It is manifest to all who understand Antiquity, how much the present Greeks have in several Points of Doctrine varied from the Belief of their Ancestors, and have corrupted the Simplicity and Purity of Religion by odd Opinions and Fancies.*” So that ’tis now no wonder if we find some of their late particular Bishops Latinize so far, as to run into the Popery of Baptism by *Lay-men* and *Women*.

What Regard then is due to *Jeremias* the Patriarch’s Opinion in this Matter, when he * was displeas’d with the *Lutherans* for believing “*Invocation of Saints to be vain and frivolous,*” and for despising that Adoration which is paid to their *Images and Holy Relicks*, as they are called? Mr. *Bingham* might with as good a Grace have produc’d that Patriarch’s Testimony for these Popish Corruptions, as for the other; and the rest of his Instances are of so modern a Date, that we have reason to believe they are no better than the meer Effects, of some *Greeks* being too much infected with the Superstitions of the Church of *Rome*.

* *Du Pin’s XVI. Cent. Tom. 2. p. 441. Lond.*

§ XVIII. Dr. *Smith* tells us, in the 109th Page of his Account of the *Greek Church*, “ *They believe such an absolute Necessity of this Sacrament— as that they entertain hard and cruel Thoughts of the State of Infants, which by some Misfortune and Casualty are depriv’d of it, to prevent which Mischiefs, and secure their Fears, where there is a real and certain Danger of imminent Death in the Absence of a Priest, who is at all other times the only Lawful Minister of this Sacred Rite, it is allowed to Lay-Persons of either Sex, as it is expressly laid down in their Publick Confession of Faith, Written in the Vulgar Greek, and Printed in the Year 1662.*” “ It is not lawful and proper for any one to baptize but a lawful Priest, except in time of Necessity ; and then a Secular Person, whether Man or Woman, may do it.” By this we see, that the Reason of this Practice of some of the *Greeks*, is the uncharitable and cruel Opinion which some of the *Romanists* hold of Infants dying without Baptism, and which those *Greeks* have learn’d from them: That the Practice founded upon that Opinion, is no other than *Popish*, since it allows *Women* as well as *Lay-men* to baptize; which is a peculiar Practice of the corrupt Church of *Rome*. And ’tis no sufficient Answer to say, That this is the Sense of the *genuine Greek Church*; because ’tis “ *expressly laid down in their Publick Confession of Faith, Anno 1662.*” For it cannot be prov’d that the *true Greek Church*, without any Mixture of *Romish Priests and Fryars*, or *Latinizing Greeks*, made that Confession of Faith; nay, it is most likely, that *Popish Emissaries* had a great Hand in making it: For Dr. *Smith*, in the 6th Page of his Preface, to the above-cited Book, makes *the*

bold

bold Determinations of this very Confession of Faith, Anno 1662. and of the Bethleemetick Synod, said to have been Held in 1671. to be such Instances “ *as will incline any sober and considering Man to believe, that the Greeks have of late, more than ever, been wrought upon by the sly Artifices and underhand Dealing of the subtle Emissaries of Rome, who watch continually over the poor Greeks, and take Advantage of their Poverty and Distress, to bring them to a farther Compliance, and in time to a downright Subjection.*” So that upon a serious Consideration of the whole Matter, Mr. Bingham’s producing these *Modern Instances* of some particular *Greeks* allowing of Baptism by Lay-men, and even by *Women*, amounts to no more, than if he had given us the like Instances from the *Church of Rome*; for ’tis well known, that, that Church has infected *some of the Greeks* with her false Doctrines and unwarrantable Practices, insomuch as that some of their late Synodical Determinations, and Confessions of Faith, have been made by the Instigation of Popish Priests, and founded upon *Romish Principles*, especially in some Doctrines and Practices which were never held or us’d in the *Ancient Greek Church*, as this of Baptism by *Lay-men* and *Women* never was, before some of their *Bishops* and *Clergy* were too easily wrought upon by the cunning Craftiness of Popish Emissaries in the *declining Ages of the Church*.

§ XIX. As for the *Moscovites*, Mr. Bingham says, pag. 109. “ *Their Rules and Canons give particular Orders about this matter;*” and for Proof of this he says, pag. 110. That “ *the first Canon of John their Metropolitan, who is commonly call’d their Prophet, gives this Direction, That Children,*”
“ *in*

“ *in Case of Necessity, should be baptiz’d without a Priest.*” And this is all he produces for the Practice of the *Moscovite Churches*; one *single Man’s Authority*; no *Synod or Council* mention’d wherein this Canon was made, and yet this must stand for the *authentick Sense and Practtice of those Churches.* Strange arguing this! as if the Opinion of *One Bishop* was the Opinion of *all those Churches*: But the contrary to this is very evident from *Mr. Bingham’s* own Observation, in the Words immediately following, which are these; “ *The People indeed do not always observe this Rule, for some Authors tells us, many of them think a Priest so absolutely requisite to perform this Office, that, whatever Case of Necessity happen, they will not permit it to be done by any other but a Priest.*” From whence ’tis plain, the *Moscovites* do not think their *Metropolitan* to be in the right, tho’ he do’s say, That “ *Children may be baptiz’d*” in Case of Necessity “ *without a Priest.*”

§ XX. But *Mr. Bingham* replies to this, That “ *we are to judge of the Sense and Practtice of a Church from the Rules and Canons made by its Governours, and not by the Practtice of the Vulgar, who often transgress their Rules, either through Ignorance, Neglect or Contempt; in which Case it would be injurious to any Church, to judge of her Doctrines by the contrary Practtice of the common People.*” In return to this I must tell our Reverend Historian, that there are some *first Principles in Christianity*, which when the common People have been thoroughly inform’d of, and *accustom’d to*, they cannot be easily drawn from them, but will persist in them, in *Opposition* to the contrary *Novel Innovations* of some of their mi-

ftaken Governours: It is eafie to conceive upon what Principle fome in high Stations may have been tempted to enact that which they ought not; and which the Vulgar, upon the *common Principles* of Chriftianity, are bound not to submit to: As for Instance;

“ * *Several Bifhops of Lithuania, and Ruffia-*
 “ *Nigra, who had hitherto continued in the Commu-*
 “ *nion of the Greek Church, wrought upon by feveral*
 “ *Temporal Advantages and Honours, which they*
 “ *propos'd to gain in the Diet and Government of*
 “ *Poland, fent Two of their Number to Rome, in*
 “ *the Year 1595, in order to their being reconcil'd*
 “ *to that Church.— But their going thither,*
 “ *and doing this in the Name of all the Ruthorick*
 “ *Churches was protefted againft, and a publick*
 “ *Act made of it by Constantine, Duke of Ofterovia,*
 “ *and feveral others who diflik'd this intended Union.”*

Now 'tis eafy to fee how and upon what Motives thofe Bifhops, if they had not been publickly oppos'd, might have caball'd together, and made *Rules and Canons* in favour of many of the *Corruptions* of the Church of Rome, which the *Moscovites* were never us'd to *Practice*; and 'tis as eafie to fee into the Reason, why the People, in fuch cafe, would for a long time have *perifted*, in the *Practice* of what their *Bifhops and Priests* had all along before taught them, contrary to thofe *Innovations*: So that the *Peoples* not observing fome fingular Rule, made by one or *some few* of their Governours, is not *always* an Instance of their *Ignorance, Neglect* or *Contempt* of the *wholfome Laws* of their Church, but fometimes is a *Proof* of the *Novelty* and *Corruption*

* *Dr. Smith's Account of the Greek Church, p. 242, 243.*

of the *Imposition*; and that the People have been accustom'd to be taught *better things*, and will therefore persist in their *ancient Customs and Practices*.

What Mr. *Bingham* observes, That "we are to Judge of the Sense and Practice of a Church from the Rules and Canons made by its Governours, and not by the Practice of the Vulgar," is very true in some Cases, but not in all. 'Tis true, when Rules and Canons are made by Synods of the Bishops and other Clergy of a Church *fully and freely* assembled, then those Rules are the *Sense* of the governing Part of that Church; and when they are reduc'd to Practice, by the Members both Clergy and Laity, then they are the Sense and Practice of that Church: But of such *Rules and Canons* of the *Governours* and *Clergy* of the *Moscovite Churches*, Mr. *Bingham* has not given us one Instance. On the other hand, 'tis false to suppose when only *one Governour* of the Church makes, or some few cabal together to make, a *new Rule* or Canon to which that Church was not *before accustom'd*, that such a Rule or Canon is the Sense and Practice of that Church, 'tis no better than a *novel Imposition* of one or *some* of its particular Governours; and the Multitude of Peoples not taking any notice of, but acting contrary to it, *upon a religious Principle*, is an Argument that their Minds are prejudic'd against it, either by former *long Practice and Custom*, or else by the Instructions and Teachings of the greater Part of their Clergy, or both of these together; and in such case the Practice of the People, and not the Novel Canon made by a particular Bishop, shews the Sense of that Church; and this is the Case before us. *John* the Metropolitan of the *Moscovites*, has a particular Canon which affirms,

that Baptism in Time of Necessity may be given *without a Priest*: This Canon do's not appear to have been made by any Synod or Council of that Church, but by his singular Authority; the People, "*whatever Case of Necessity happens, will not permit it to be done by any other but a Priest*: They regard not their Metropolitan's Canon; and why? Not thro' Ignorance or Neglect, as Mr. Bingham Insinuates, but from a Religious Principle; because they think *No Man* sufficient for this Holy Function, in any Case of Necessity whatsoever, *but a Priest*; as is plain by the * Author quoted by Mr. Bingham, in his 111th Page; and the same is also attested to by † Gerhard, another of this Reverend Gentleman's Authors.—And even Arcudius, a Romish Priest, another of our Historian's Authors, who wrote a Book, Printed in the Year 1626. to make the World believe that the *Oriental Churches* agreed with the *Roman*, is free enough to Acknowledge, || That "*for the most part all Grecia,*

* *Joh. Fabri. de Relig. Moscovit. p. 176.* Huic muneri fungendo quæcunque Necessitas inciderit, *Nemo hominum* sufficere putatur nisi *Sacerdos* extiterit.

† *Gerhard Loc. Com. Tom. 4. De Baptismo, n. 37. p. 242.* In Moscovitas aliqui perhibent baptizandi muneri quæcunque necessitas inciderit, neminem hominum sufficere, nisi *Sacerdos* extiterit. *In opere de variis rerum Moscovitic. Autorib. p. 136.*

|| Postquam de materia & forma Baptismi Egimus, superest ut de ministro aliquid dicamus: Quod eo alacrius aggredior, quo totam ferme Græciam, Ruffiam, Moscoviam, & alias Provincias quæ in fide Christi ritu Græco perseverant, ex imperitia in eo versari errore, scrupulo & religione animadverto; ut absente Presbytero malint permittere, ut Infantes si e Baptismo è vita decedant, quàm eos saluari lavacro abluere; quod existiment sibi laicis ne in necessitate quidem licere hoc munere fungi. *Arcud. de Concord. Eccles. Orient. & Occid. Lib. 1. c. xi. p. 24. Paris 1626.*

“ Russia, Moscovia, and other Provinces, who, af-
 “ ter the manner of the Greek Church, continue in
 “ the Faith of Christ, when a Priest is Absent, had
 “ rather suffer their Infants to Die without [what
 he calls] “ Baptism, than suffer them to be baptiz’d
 [as he terms it] “ by any other, because they think
 “ that it is not Lawful, even in Necessity, for
 “ Laicks to Execute this Office.” He is pleas’d in-
 deed to call this, their Error, and to say that it
 proceeds from their Ignorance, and want of Know-
 ledge; but that is usual enough with *Romish*
Priests; ’tis their Custom to call every Body that
 differs from the false Tenets of their Church, *Ignorant*
 and *Erroneous*; but that is no Proof, that
 they are so. Here are confessedly vast Multitudes
 of Christians, inhabiting far *Extended Kingdoms*,
 and Provinces, who hold, that *Laicks cannot Bap-*
tize, even in want of *Priests*; ’tis a part of their
 Religion to think so; and in consequence of this,
 no false Notions of Charity and Natural Affection
 to their Tender Infants, can prevail with them to
 suffer *Laicks to meddle* in this Sacred Function;
 even in Times when no other can be had; no,
 they venture the Souls of their Children, and
 leave them to the Mercy of God, without attempt-
 ing to secure their Salvation by *uninstituted, un-*
commanded, and in their Opinion, *prohibited Mini-*
strations; they don’t think, they must do Evil, or
 what they think to be Evil, that Good may come of
 it; and whence should it come to pass, that Chri-
 stians should, in such *prodigious Numbers*, run
 unanimously into this Opinion and Practice, of
 esteeming it better, and therefore suffering their
 Children rather to Die without *Lay-Baptism*, when
Priests are not to be had, than let them be *pro-*
fanelly Wash’d by Laicks? Do’s it not at least pro-
 ceed

ceed from hence, that they have been us'd to be taught no other than *Priestly Baptism*? And that they have been accustom'd to no other? And who have been their Teachers, but the Bishops, Priests, and Deacons of those Churches? They have not been us'd to the Impudent Usurpations of Unordain'd Lay-Teachers, as we are; so that this Opinion and Practice of theirs, being so Universal, must proceed originally from their own Clergy of the *Greek* and *Moscovite* Churches; and their persevering in them, in Opposition to some few singular Novel *Romish* Attempts to the contrary, must be attributed to this, that the *Romish* Priests and *Latinizing Greeks*, have not yet been so powerful in their Attempts, but that still the *Greeks* and *Moscovites* for the **most part** dissent from them in this Matter: We have no less than the Evidence of [*Arzudius*] a Modern *Romish* Priest for this, who wrote his Book on purpose to shew the Agreement of the *Eastern* Churches with the *Latin*; and who yet, when he comes to the Article of Baptism, is forc'd to acknowledge, that for the *most part* all Greece, Russia, *Moscovy*, and other Provinces in Communion with the *Greek Church*, dissent so very much from the *Roman Church* about the *Minister of Baptism*, as that they suffer their Children rather to Die without Lay-Baptism, when a Priest cannot be had, than let any Laick pretend to Baptize them; and purely upon this Principle, "That it is not Lawful, even in Times of Necessity, for Laicks to Execute the Office of Baptizing.

§ XXI. Having been thus long upon the Sense and Practice of the *Greeks* and *Muscovites*, I shall be the more brief upon that of the *Foreign Reform'd*; because, they can be no Evidence of the
general

general Sense and Practice of the Ancient Catholick Church, except they produce her *Ecclesiastical Laws, Traditions, or Customs*, [for the Validity of Baptisms perform'd by Persons who were never Commission'd by Bishops to baptize] which I am sure they cannot do.

And first for the *Lutherans*; Mr. Bingham in his 111th Page, &c. introduces *some of them* asserting that "any Person who is a Christian, Man, or Woman, may be the Extraordinary Minister of Baptism——when there is imminent Danger of Death, and a Minister of the Word cannot be had." And here we may easily see, that these *Lutherans* are so far *Papist*, in that they allow of Baptism by *Women*, which by Mr. Bingham's own Confession, never was allow'd by the *Ancient Catholick Church*; so that, in this of Baptism by *Women*, the *Lutherans* Mr. Bingham speaks of, are *Uncatholick*; and as for the other, of Baptism by *Lay-men*, we have abundantly seen already, that they have *No Catholick Principle* whereon to found that Practice, since the *Ancient Catholick Church* never had any *Ecclesiastical Law, Tradition, or Custom* for it. The supposed Reasons they give [as in his 112th and 113th Pages] for the Baptism of *Lay-men* and *Women*, are very weak, insignificant, and false, and have been already obviated and answer'd in several * Treatises published long since. Mr. Bingham himself do's not care to be concern'd "what weight and force there is in their [pretended] Arguments," and

* *Lay-Baptism Invalid. Sacerdotal Powers. Dissenters Baptism Null and Void.*

therefore I will not trouble the Reader with them.

§ XXII. Mr. Bingham's next Instance is of the *Helvetick* Body, the Followers of *Zuinglius*, wherein he tells us [in his 114th and 115th Pages] that *Zuinglius* was of Opinion, "that Baptism (in Case of Necessity) might be given by **Any Man**, [*Quivis Hominum*] yea by a **Woman** also;" which is plainly the *Popish Novelty* in its full Extent, and therefore needs no further Confutation. "His Followers disapprov'd of *this Latitude* of Baptism by **Women**, and therefore after his Death *prohibited it*," says Mr. Bingham: So far they did well. But says our Reverend Historian, "No Prohibition was [by them] laid up on **Men**, in Cases of Necessity, nor any Order made for Re-baptizing those who were irregularly baptiz'd by others." And what do's this signify more, than that they have laid aside one Piece of **Popery**, and not provided against another; that is, *Baptism by Women is forbidden*; but still [*Quivis Hominum*] **Any Man**, [as *Zuinglius* words it] may baptize: His Followers have not forbidden *this*; that is, they have not forbidden *Turks, Jews, or Pagans to Baptize*, so they be but **Men**, [for all this is included in *Zuinglius's Quivis Hominum, Any Man*] a very hopeful Reformation indeed! as Mr. Bingham has describ'd it; so that, we need not wonder why they made no Order for what he calls *Re-baptizing*. Thus far may suffice, for what Mr. Bingham has told us, of the **Popery** of some of the *Lutherans* and *Zuinglians*.

§ XXIII. And now for the *Calvinists*. Our Reverend Historian owns in his 115th Page, that “*Calvin freely declares his mind against the Lawfulness of Lay-Baptism in Any Case whatsoever.*” That “*he thinks there can be No Necessity sufficient to Authorize private Men or Women, to do the Office of a Publick Minister.*” Mr. *Bingham* tells his *English Reader*, that “*Calvin owns indeed, that the Contrary Practice had generally prevail'd, not only several Ages before his own Time, but, in a manner, from the first beginning of the Church, Lay-men always baptized in danger of Death, If a Minister could not be had in due Time.*” But that He, [*i. e. Calvin*] thinks the Grounds they went upon were “*not justifiable.*” By Mr. *Bingham's* thus representing the Sense of *Calvin*, the Reader may be induc'd to think, that *Calvin* could not but own, that Lay-Baptism had generally prevail'd, that is, had been the General Practice of the Catholick Church, and that Lay-men had always baptiz'd, &c. whereas in Truth, *Calvin's* Words, as Mr. *Bingham* has 'em in his Margin, contain nothing that shews he own'd this to have generally prevail'd; not one Word that acknowledges “*Lay-men always Baptiz'd, &c.*” For the whole of what he says is only, * That “*Many Ages before,*” his Time, “*and so far, as almost from the first be-*

* *Calvin Instit. Lib. 4. cap. 15. N. 20.* Quod autem multis ab hinc seculis, adeoque ab ipsa fere Ecclesie exordio, usu receptum fuit, ut in periculo mortis Laici Baptizarent, si minister in tempore non adesset, non video quam firma ratione defendi queat.

“ginning of the Church, it was a Receiv’d Custom [he do’s not say it generally prevail’d] “that Lay-men should Baptize” [he do’s not say Lay-men always baptiz’d] “in danger of Death, if a Minister could not be had in due Time; and that He [i. e. Calvin] did not see how or by what substantial Reason this” Custom “could be defended.” So that this Custom which Calvin thought was so early taken up, do’s not appear from his Words, to have been own’d by him as a Practice that Generally Prevail’d; for a suppos’d Custom of some few singular Persons, may be call’d a Custom, and an early one too, without being the Custom or Practice of the Church it self: Some of the Members of the Church may have suppos’d Practices of their own, which never were own’d by the Church as her Customs and Traditions; so that, if Calvin reckon’d, that there was a receiv’d Custom very early for Lay-men to baptize in danger of Death, when Clergy-men could not be had; this do’s not prove that he thought it was a Custom receiv’d by great Multitudes, much less that it Generally Prevail’d, as Mr. Bingham expresses it; and whoever they were, that by Calvin’s Supposition took up this Custom [which by all that has been said before, was not by any one so early receiv’d as he [i. e. Calvin] fancy’d it, yet Calvin contemns their Authority, and plainly shews, that he thought their Practice could not be defended.

But notwithstanding all this, Mr. Bingham says in his 116th Page, that Calvin “do’s not peremptorily pronounce such Baptisms, absolutely Null and Void, but the contrary.” And for this he quotes

quotes Arch-Bishop * *Whitgift's* Words, because they have these Expressions, *viz.* " *It is sufficient for us to know the Hand and Seal of the Lord in his Sacraments, by whomsoever they be deliver'd——we shall be sufficiently defended [i. e. against the Anabaptists, who deny'd Baptism to be right, because given by Idolatrous Persons in the Church of Rome] " if we think that we were Baptiz'd, not in the Name of any Man, but in the Name of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, and therefore Baptism not to be of Man, but of God, by whomsoever it be minister'd.* And because of this [*whomsoever*] Mr. *Bingham* concludes, that *Calvin* do's not absolutely *Null and Void* Baptism by Lay-men. But, in answer to this, if the word *whomsoever*, as Arch-Bishop *Whitgift* has it, must be taken in its full Extent and Meaning; then *Calvin* will be made to have esteem'd as *Good and Valid*, all the pretended Baptisms of *Lay-men and Women, Jews, Turks, Infidels, and Pagans*, which is plainly a Novelty of **Corrupt Popery**. And not only so, but the Validity of Baptism by Private Persons, if it be included in this word *whomsoever*, will be an *Inconsistency and Contradiction* to what Mr. *Bingham* said before, *viz.* that "*Calvin declares his Mind against the Lawfulness of Lay-Baptism in any Case whatsoever;*" and that "*he thinks there can be no Necessity sufficient to Authorize private Men or Women to do the Office of a publick Minister;*" so that, *Calvin* will be made to speak inconsistently with himself, and to contradict his own Principle. For, if Baptism by

* *Whitgift's Defence of the Answer to the Admonit. Tract. 9. p. 518. ex Calvin Instit. Cap. 17. Sect. 16.*

Lay-men, or Women, be not **Lawful** in any Case whatsoever; and there can be no Necessity sufficient to Authorize it [according to Calvin:] Then 'tis plain, that in Calvin's Opinion, such pretended Baptisms, have **No Law, Rule, or Authority**; for if they have, then they are **Lawful and Authoriz'd**, which Calvin says they are not; since then they have no **Law or Rule**, and are Destitute of any **Authority** in Calvin's Sense, it necessarily follows, that "*the Hand and Seal of the Lord cannot be in such false Ministrations, and therefore they are Invalid;*" for if the *Hand and Seal of the Lord* is in them, then they have *His Authority*, and are therefore **Lawful**, because the *Hand and Seal of a Principal*, really set to any Instrument, is either by himself, or his Authoriz'd Attorney or Representative, and so is *His*, and therefore *His Authority*; and consequently **Lawful**, and therefore *Valid*, because *His Hand and Seal*: But Calvin says on the contrary, that they are *not Lawful* in any Case whatsoever, no Necessity can be sufficient to Authorize them; therefore the *Hand and Seal of the Lord cannot be* in them, and consequently they cannot be *Valid*, by whomsoever perform'd, if we take *whomsoever*, in the full extensive Meaning of the Word, to include *Private Men and Women*, Persons never Authoriz'd or Commission'd to Baptize; that is, Calvin reckons such Baptisms *Valid*, by saying the *Lord's Hand and Seal is in them*; tho' by what he said before, they are *Invalid*, because utterly *Unlawful*, and void of Authority; except it can be prov'd, that, in this Case, *there is Validity* where there is **no Law, no Rule, no Hand and Seal of the Lord**, and **Nothing of His Authority**.

Thus

Thus we see *Calvin's* Inconsistency, if his *Whomsoever* must be taken in the full Latitude of the Word, to include Lay, *i. e.* Uncommission'd Baptizers; and therefore they who would make him *Consistent* with himself, must understand by his *Whomsoever*, only whomsoever "*Publick Minister,*" whether Reform'd Protestant, or *Idolatrous Papist*, since Arch-Bishop *Whitgift's* Words, taken from *Calvin*, were levell'd against the then *Anabaptists*, who deny'd Baptism to be *Right*, because given by *Idolatrous Baptizers* in the Church of *Rome*. For, 'tis plain, that *Calvin* not only declares his Mind against the Lawfulness of Lay-Baptism in any *Case whatsoever*, as *Mr. Bingham* has rightly observ'd; but that the same *Calvin* did in a Publick and Authentick manner Sign to it *, that such Baptism is utterly Null and Void in exprefs Terms, Witness his Hand to the **Publick Act of the Ministers and Doctors in the Church of Geneva**, [as they are call'd] who were at the National Synod of *Lyons*, Anno 1563. wherein, Article the First, it is expressly affirm'd that such Baptism "*is of No Force, Power, Validity, or Effect,*" and to which *John Calvin* sign'd his Name in full Length. *see whole as quoted in many*

Mr. Bingham acknowledges that *Beza*, *Calvin's* Successor, "*declares positively against the Validity of Baptism administer'd by private Persons,* p. 116. And that it is certain the *French Reform'd* do all join with him "*in the Doctrine of the Invalidity and Nullity of Lay-Baptism,* p. 117. And it is

* As may be seen in *Quick's Synodicon*, Vol. 1. Chap. XXI. p. 50. Or more easily in a little Book, call'd, *The Judgment of the Reform'd in France, &c. Concerning the Invalidity of Lay-Baptism*, Page 16. Printed for *H. Clements*, Anno 1712.

notorious that this was asserted by them in no less than Six National Synods, namely, the First held at *Paris*, Anno 1559. the Second at *Poitiers* 1560. ^{p. 18} another at *Lyons* 1563. where the Deputies of *Geneva* were also present agreeing thereto; another at *Rochel* 1571. where *Beza* of *Geneva* was Moderator; the National Synod of *Gap*, Anno 1603. and that at *Rochel*, Anno 1607. to which Mr. *Bingham* adds another Synod of *Alençon* 1637. in his 118th Page, and justly concludes, that the Doctrine of the Invalidity of Lay-Baptism "is indisputably the Practice of the French Church," to which he should have added that of *Geneva* too, as is plain by two at least of those Seven Synods. These were full National Synods, and very solemnly held; and Mr. *Bingham* cannot produce such full flagrant Evidence among the *Lutherans*, for the other side of the Question.

Besides, he thinks that the *Dutch* also join with the *French* in this particular Page 119th, as he judges by the *General Current* of the *Dutch* Writers; so that here are no less than the *French* and the *Genevans*, in National Synods; and the *Dutch* also for us against the *Validity of Lay-Baptism*.

Mr. *Bingham* comes next to the *Palatines*, and says, Page 120. "The Churches of the *Palatinate*, commonly follow the Doctrine of the *Calvinists*;" So that here our Reverend Historian acknowledges, that the *Palatine* Protestants are commonly against the *Validity of Lay-Baptism*—very well. But says he, "In One Case some of their Divines make an Exception, as in a Time of great Persecution, or Dispersion of the Ministry in some grand Dissipation of the Church. And for this he produces but One of their Divines, Dr. *Alting*, who says, "Baptism administer'd by private Men

See of Discipline p 44
cap XI can
1. Quick vol
1. of Relig:
exercises
of Baptism
p. 97 of
Bapt. N. 17

“ Men, in a grand Dispersion of the Church, is
 “ not to be reiterated.” But what signifies the
 Saying of one Man only, among the *Palatines*,
 when [according to Mr. Bingham] the Churches
 of the *Palatinate* commonly follow the *Contrary*
Doctrine; especially, when 'tis also consider'd,
 that this very Dr. *Alting*, says of this *same* *Bap-*
tism thus, “ We do not say it is *Legitimate*, or
 “ *Lawful*,” and thereby is *inconsistent* with him-
 self, and so we may leave him as a Doctor of no
 Moment in this *Affair*; for, he brings false *Argu-*
ments against repeating the *Baptism*, which he ac-
 knowledges to be *Unlawful* and *Illegitimate*,
 and therefore *False* and *Invalid*. He endeavours
 to prove, that they should not be repeated, “ be-
 “ cause the *Jewish* *Circumcisions* and *Popish* *Bap-*
 “ *tisms* were not repeated, tho' they were per-
 “ form'd and attended with many *Superstitions*
 “ in the corrupt State of the *Jewish* and *Romish*
 “ Church.” As if *Corruptions* of *Superstition*, &c.
 attending a *True Commission*, were just the same
 as *no Commission* at all; the *Fallacy* of which be-
 trays it self.

Thus we have seen the *Thoughts* of the *Foreign*
Reform'd in this *Matter*; we have observ'd from
 Mr. *Bingham*, that some of the *Lutherans* and
Zuinglians are very *Popish* about it. And it has
 been prov'd, that the *French* *Protestants*, the *Gene-*
vans, the *Dutch*, and the *Palatines*, do not sub-
 mit to this *Corruption* of *Popery*; but have very
 justly reform'd from it in *Principle* and *Doctrine*.

But says Mr. *Bingham*, “ The *Dutch* and *French*
 “ Churches are [by some] reckon'd of no *Account*
 “ but *Anchurh'd*, because they want *Episcopacy*,
 “ and consequently *True Ordinations*, and *Chri-*
 “ *stian Sacraments*, in their *Opinion*; and then
 “ what

“ what signifies their Testimony, in such a Case, if
 “ as soon as they have deliver’d their Evidence
 “ about Christian Baptism, they shall be Cashier’d,
 “ and positively declar’d to be no Christians? See
 his 119th Page. This of Unchurching has been
 long since answer’d in * another Place; and if
 some do hold that there are “ no True Ordinations
 “ and Christian Sacraments,” where there is no
 Episcopacy, they are very much in the right of it;
 and if Mr. Bingham do’s not approve of this,
 [which he emphatically calls] **Their Opinion,**
 [as if it were separate, and of another Nature,
 from what he Holds himself] then let him give
 us a *Scholastical History*, of the *Sense and Practice of*
the Church, in Defence of the *Contrary Principle*,
 if he is able; that so we may see from Authentick
 Testimonies, that there were anciently *True Or-*
dinations and Christian Churches and Sacraments
without Episcopacy. But this I am sure he will
 never be able to prove from any of the *Antiqui-*
ties of the Christian Church; for the direct contra-
 ry is notorious Matter of Fact, as is Evident both
 from Scripture and Ecclesiastical History, That
 there never was any *Christian Church, True Ordi-*
nations, or Christian Sacraments, without Episcopa-
cy, no one Instance whatsoever can be produc’d in
 Proof that there was; and therefore we must still
 Hold [what he calls] our Opinion, which is more
 than barely so, for ’tis an *Ancient Catholick*, and
 therefore a *Substantial Truth.*

And tho’ the *French and Dutch* are so deeply
 concern’d [as our Reverend Historian says some
 reckon them to be] in this Truth; yet still **Their**

* *Lay-Baptism Invalid.*

Evidence against Lay-Baptism is very *Significant*, and of great *Importance* both to themselves and us. For,

First, It shews *them* the great Necessity of securing to *themselves* a Real, and therefore Valid *Mission*; since, by their *own Confession*, they have no *Christian Baptism*, if their Baptizers are not in *Valid Holy Orders*. And,

Secondly, Their Evidence is a Benefit to us, because it shews the prevailing Power of Truth; which Men [seriously considering the Nature of Things] are obliged to submit to, even tho' themselves are involved in the Consequences of it. It is no small Motive of Credibility, when a Truth is attested to, not only by those who are its avowed *Friends*, and Practice according to it, but also by those very Men, who, in the Opinion of unprejudic'd Standers by, are oblig'd, considering their Circumstances, either to oppose and gainsay it, or else to reform their own Practice, that they may be truly consistent therewith. It is a pleasant and delightful thing, to see Men in love with **Truth in the Abstract**: It is no Abatement of the Truth how much soever they are concern'd in the *Consequences* which they *themselves* have made; those Consequences may indeed [and ought to] be *reform'd*, but the Truth they are Witnesses for, is *unchangeable*, and is not in the least alter'd by their contrary, irregular *Circumstances* and *Practices*. *Nathan's Parable* to King *David* contain'd an excellent Truth, of the great Deformity, and heinous Demerit of Mens acting contrary to the Rules of *Justice* and *Equity*. *David* assented to this *Truth*; and in the Case that *Nathan* put to him was so very *zealous*, that he, like a Just and Righteous Judge, resolv'd, that the Man who was guilty of

the Injustice *Nathan* complain'd of, *should surely die*. The King did not reckon, that the *Application* was to be made to himself; no matter for that, the Truth was still the same: And when *Nathan* said unto him, "**Thou art the Man;**" he still acknowledg'd the *Truth* he had assented to before, he submitted to the Justice of the Sentence himself had pronounc'd, and sincerely repented of, without endeavouring to excuse or extenuate, the **Occasion** which himself had given for *Nathan's* Parable; and God grant that the *French*, and the *Dutch*, and other Reform'd abroad, &c. may go and do likewise, so as really to put in *Practice* what is agreeable to, and *consistent* with their own avowed *Principles*, in the matter before us!

As for what Mr. *Bingham* says of the Church of *England*, and Sense of her Members, from his 122d, to his 137th Page, it is needless to repeat in Answer thereto what has been already said in * *Treatises* already published, and in which our Reverend *Historian's* Remarks are *obviated* and *answer'd*: And therefore the Reader is refer'd to them, that I may now proceed to sum up the whole Evidence of the *Antients* in the next Chapter, and so conclude.

* *Dissenters and other unauthoriz'd Baptisms Null and Void by the Articles, Canons and Rubricks of the Church of England. The Bishop of Oxford's Charge Consider'd.*

C H A P. VIII.

The whole Evidence of Antiquity sum'd up; proving, That the far greater Majority of Ancient Testimony, is against all pretended Baptisms perform'd by Persons, who never were authoriz'd by Bishops to baptize, and consequently that such Baptisms are not valid by any Ecclesiastical Law, Tradition or Custom of the ancient Catholick Church: The Conclusion containing a true State of the Question about suppos'd Cafes of Necessity, where Episcopally Authoriz'd Baptizers are not to be had.

WE have already seen in *Chap. 3.* That the ancient Catholick Church never attempted to *Authorize or Commission* Lay-men to baptize, in any Case whatsoever; and that all the *Endeavours* of this sort have been made only by *some few particular Persons*, who can upon no account whatsoever be said to make up, **The ancient Catholick Church**; and whose Attempts, if they were right, are also of no Importance to favour the Practice of those who have not even so much as any Pre-*tence to this suppos'd Authority*, and Commission, from Bishops to baptize, as certainly our Laicks [the Dissenting Teachers] have not.

It remains now that I sum up the whole Evidence relating to Baptisms perform'd by a *real* [or *suppos'd*] *Episcopal Commission*, and concerning other pretended Baptisms by Persons who never had such a Commission at all, that the Reader may,

in a narrow Compass, see the whole Evidence of the Antients for and against these *never-Commission'd* Baptisms, and pass Judgment accordingly: And that he may do it the more easily, I note the Whole in the following Table, in which the Antients, &c. who are thought to have been for *Baptisms* by Persons *never Commission'd* by Bishops, are noted on the Left-side; and those, whose Evidence is for Baptisms perform'd by Episcopal Authority only, are on the Right, with the Pages in this Book, where their several Testimonies, and the Arguments thereupon, are to be found, thus:

The Antients, &c. whose Testimonies are thought to make for the Validity of Baptism by Persons never Commission'd by Bishops.

The Antients, &c. whose Testimonies make for Baptism perform'd by Episcopal Authority only, and who Null Unauthoriz'd Baptisms.

Jesus Christ, in his Institution of Baptism, gave his Commission only to his Apostles, the first Bishops, and to such as they and their Successors should Authorize, Page 5.

This Commission to continue to the End of the World, and necessary to preserve the Church according to the

the

the **Order of Christ**,
as *Mr. Bingham* owns,

p. 5.

The Truth of this Nulls
Uncommision'd Bap-
tisms,

p. 6, 28.

None baptiz'd at first
but by Authority re-
ceiv'd from the Apo-
stles, according to one
of *Mr. Bingham's* Au-
thors,

p. 7.

No one can have a Power
of Baptizing, but he
who receives some
way or other, a *Com-
mission* from them, ac-
cording to *Mr. Bing-
ham's* said Author, *p. 8.*

The Original Power of
Baptizing lodg'd *sole-
ly* and *entirely* in Bi-
shops, and *derivative-
ly* convey'd from them
to others, ordinarily
and extraordinarily,
according to *Mr. Bing-
ham*,

p. 11.

Baptism by such Persons
was reputed as the **Bi-
shop's Act**,

ibid.

Lay-men *always* debarr'd
from Baptizing in all
ordinary Cases, ac-
cording to *Mr. Bing-
ham*,

p. 30.

He owns that **particular Churches** would not allow *Lay-men* to baptize in want of the Clergy, p. 32.

I. and II. Centuries.

I. and II. Centuries.

St. Ignatius says, "*Without Bishops, Priests, and Deacons,*" there is no Church, p. 35.

And without the Bishop it is not *Lawful* to baptize, p. 35.

St. *Hermas* names no other than *Authoriz'd* Baptizers for greatest Extremities, p. 38.

III. Century.

III. Century.

Tertullian, about Anno 200, thinks *Lay-men* have a *Right* in themselves to baptize in absence of the Clergy, p. 39.

Tertullian refers us to the Practice of the Church whereby the Bishop had the Power of Baptism, and after him Presbyters and Deacons, yet **not** without the **Authority** of the **Bishop**, p. 39, 41.

But founds it upon a false Principle, which allows Women to baptize, p. 45.

He will not allow Women to baptize, p. 47.

St. *Cyprian* makes Baptism without a Priestly Power, *i. e.* Episcopal Commission, to be Null and Void, p. 48.

Firmilian does the same, p. 54.

Novatus

Novatus à Thamugade,
 the same, p. 55.
 Confessor Pomponius à
 Dionysiana, do's so like-
 wise, p. 55.
 Confessor Clarus à Mas-
 cula the same, p. 56.
 The XLVII Canon call'd
 Apostolical, nulls Bap-
 tism for the same Rea-
 son, p. 57.

IV. Century.

IV. Century.

Nineteen Bishops in the
 Spanish Council of *Eli-
 beris*, made a Canon,
 which [according to
 Mr. Bingham] vested
*some of their own Lay-
 men*, but not all, with
Authority to baptize in
 want of the Clergy;
 but this with particu-
 lar Limitations and
 Restrictions, p. 58.
 So this Council is of no
 Benefit for *unautho-
 riz'd Baptisms*, but the
 direct contrary. p. 59.
 The Author of the Life
 of *Athanasius* in *Pho-
 tius*, supposes that the
 Boy *Athanasius* bap-
 tiz'd his Play-fellows
 by a **Divine In-
 stinct**, p. 72.

About this time comes
 in the Fable of the
 Boy *Athanasius* bapti-
 zing his Play-fellows
 in Sport, and the pre-
 tended Determination
 of Bishop *Alexander*,
 that the Baptism was
 Valid, refuted at large,
 p. 62.

And this he judg'd from
Alexander's suppos'd
Determination about
it, *p. 88.*

Therefore [in his Opin-
ion] *Alexander* took
it for a divinely Au-
thoriz'd Baptism, *ibid.*

Mr. Bingham says, It
would be strange! if
any Canon should be
made in the Church
for such ludicrous Bap-
tisms, *p. 90.*

Fifty Years after the
Council of *Eliberis*;
Hilary, the Deacon of
Rome Witnesses, that
Lay-men did not then
baptize, *p. 97.*

Pacian, Bishop of *Bar-
celona*, teaches, that
the New Birth cannot
be effected but by Epif-
copal Baptism, *p. 99.*

Optatus's Words candid-
ly interpreted, speak
only of Baptism ad-
minister'd by the then
ordinary Ministers of
Baptism, whether Ca-
tholicks or Schisma-
ticks; and they were
Episcopally Commis-
sion'd, *p. 106.*

Optatus, Bishop of *Mile-
vis*, [if his Words are
taken in their full La-
titude] allows of Bap-
tism not only by *Chri-
stian Lay-men*, but also
by *Women*, nay by un-
baptiz'd *Infidels*, *Jews*,
or *Pagans*, even in or-
dinary Cases, *p. 103.*

But Mr. *Bingham* acknowledges this Latitude was never allow'd by the Church; and that 'tis a *Novelty of Popery*, p. 105.

St. Jerom reckons it frequently *Lawful* for Lay-men to baptize; but this when Necessity compels, p. 120. He refers to no Law of God, or the *Catholick Church* for this, p. 121. His false Maxim whereon he founds this Power of Lay-men, p. 122. This Assertion of his, inconsistent with his *Dialogue* against the *Luciferians*, p. 131.

St. Basil, Bishop of *Cæsarea*, Nulls Lay-Baptism, p. 109.

St. Chrysostom, Arch-Bishop of *Constantinople*, do's the same, p. 114.

The *Constitutions* call'd *Apostolical* do so likewise, p. 117.

St. Jerom, derives the Power of Presbyters and Deacons to baptize, from the *Original Power of the Bishop*, p. 120.

If *St. Jerom* on the other side, means that some *Bishops* authoriz'd *Lay-men* to baptize in Case of Necessity, then 'tis plain his Evidence is only for what he thought were *Episcopally Authoriz'd Baptisms*, p. 122.

He Nulls Lay-Baptism in his *Dialogue* against the *Luciferians*, in which he confutes their Assertion, that *Arian Priests* were *Laicks*, by this Principle, "That if they were
" *Laicks*, the *Baptisms* administer'd
" by them *ought to be*
" rejected, p. 123, &c.

He

St. *Augustin* allows of the Validity of Baptism in ordinary as well as extraordinary Cases, tho' perform'd by any **Dan**; which includes *Jews* and *Pagans* as well as *Christians*,
p. 143, 154, &c.

He founds uncommis-
sion'd Baptisms upon
hearsay Stories, p. 143,
147.

And false, or rather no
Arguments, p. 148,
151, 156.

In expounding Scripture
he follow'd a Path
wholly new, p. 161.

He says, That without
Priests there is no
Church; therefore say
I, no Baptism, p. 139.

St. *Augustin*, as quoted
by *Gratian*, speaking
of Lay-mens bapti-
zing in Case of Ne-
cessity, founds it
upon Authority of
Commission descend-
ed by *Bishops* from
the Apostles, p. 144.

Another Passage of his
as quoted by *Gratian*,
which Nulls Baptisms
by our Laicks, p. 146.

St. *Augustin* hesitates a-
bout the Validity of
usurped Lay-Baptism
in time of supposed
Necessity, p. 151.

He is not positive, but
such a *Usurpation* is a
Sin. p. 153.

Therefore 'twas not the
general Sense and Pra-
ctice of the Church,
p. 153, 154.

He acknowledges that
the Validity of Lay-
Baptism in ordinary
Cases [tho' his own
Opinion] was not the
Determination of any
general Council, con-
sequently

sequently 'twas not the general Sense of the ancient Catholick Church, p. 155. He calls such Baptisms **unlawful Usurpations**; and says, That the unlawful Usurpation must be *corrected* by a sincere and affectionate *Repentance*, else the *Baptism* will remain to the **Punishment** of the *Giver* and *Receiver*, p. 154. This is in effect a Nulling of such Baptisms, p. 157.

V. Century.

Gratian makes *Isidore* say, That Baptism by a *Pagan* is Valid.

VI. Century.

Gratian makes *Isidore* say, That Baptism by a *Pagan* is Valid.

V. Century.

Gelasius, Bishop of Rome, restrains the Office of Baptizing in *ordinary* and *extraordinary Cases* to Persons *authoriz'd* by Bishops, p. 162, 164.

VI. Century.

Isidore, Bishop of *Sevil*, in *Spain*, do's the like, p. 165.

Mr. Bingham makes the Sum of his whole Evidence to be, that for the first Six hundred Years of Christianity, the

the *general Sense and Practice of the Church* was this; That *Baptism*, whether in *Ordinary* or *extraordinary* Cases, was administer'd either by the *Bishop* himself, or else by such as had, [or were suppos'd to have had] *Apostolick, i. e. Episcopal Authority* or *Commission* to baptize, p. 169.

And that the *Question of usurp'd and unauthoriz'd Baptism by Lay-men*, is a *more difficult Question*; and he cannot resolve, that their *Validity* has any *Catholick Tradition of the Church*, whereon to suppose it grounded, p. 189.

Mr. Bingham endeavours to represent as *Unauthoriz'd, Uncommission'd, and Anti-Episcopal*, the *Heretical and Schismatical Baptisms* which were allow'd to be *Valid* by some *ancient Churches*.

The *Ancient Heretical and Schismatical Baptisms*, allowed of by some *Churches*, were not *Unauthoriz'd, Uncommission'd, and Anti-Episcopal Lay-Baptisms*; this prov'd from the *general Council of Nice*, the *African Code*, and *Mr. Bingham's own Account of em*, p. 193.

So that upon a just Consideration of this Table, and all that has been said before, 'tis evident, that the Sum Total of all that our Reverend Historian and I have have said upon this Subject, is, That the ancient Catholick Church never had any Ecclesiastical Law, Tradition, or Custom, in Favour of the Validity of Baptisms perform'd by those, who are notoriously known to have been never Commission'd by Bishops to baptize. If Men will then venture to pronounce them Valid, 'tis plain that they have no Law of God, or of *his ancient Catholick Church*, whereon to found such a *Determination*. And therefore it must be done upon some private Principle of their own: But from such fatal Practices, I pray God to deliver and preserve his Church for ever.

I shall without any the *least Pedantry* conclude with these following Observations about suppos'd *Cases of Necessity*, concerning which some [without any Necessity at all] do make so great a Bustle.

1st, Supposing a Person duly qualified for Baptism, but not Baptiz'd, should be in such Circumstances, as that he could not possibly obtain Baptism, tho' from a duly Ordained Priest there present, but with an *Uninstituted Form*, not in the Name of the Trinity; the Priest, for Supposition's sake, being an *Anti-Trinitarian*: If this Person should desire Baptism in the Name of the Trinity, and yet accept of this *False Baptism*, reckoning it to be Right, because he can have no Other; 'Tis plain, he is *not actually Baptiz'd*, notwithstanding the suppos'd Necessity, and therefore is not in *Actual Covenant* with God; and consequently, if he Dies without True Baptism, he must be left to God's Uncovenanted Mercy; but with this Disadvantage, That he acquiesces in a Sin, though ignorantly, to make the best of it. —————

2^{dly},

2dly, Supposing this Person to have a right sense of his Duty, and to Die with the Refusal of this False Baptism, because 'tis contrary to the Institution; 'tis plain, he Dies *Unbaptiz'd*, and so is not in *Actual* Covenant with God, and therefore must be referr'd to the same *Uncovenanted Mercy*; but with this great Advantage on his side, That he would do his Duty, but cannot: He knows 'tis sinful to Break the Institution; and consequently, through a pious, just fear of Transgressing, will not admit of an *Uninstituted Form*, and consequently, of False Baptism instead of the True: He trusts to *Uncovenanted Mercy*, with the Advantage of not breaking God's Law to obtain it: And let any one in his Senses judge, which of the Two is the *safest* to be chosen. So,

3dly, A Baptism *with the Form in the Name of the Trinity*, perform'd by a **Person never Commission'd** to Baptize, tho' done *when no Commission'd Person can be had*, is as much a Breach of the *Institution* as the other, and therefore we must have recourse to *Uncovenanted Mercy* for its Acceptance: For by *what Covenant* has God obliged himself to accept of it? But then our Confidence in this Mercy is abated, nay, is liable to be confounded, by our Sin and Presumption, in doing and acquiescing in a *sinful Ministration*, which is a Breach of the *Essential Law of God* about this Matter. Whereas,

4thly and Lastly, By refusing the *Never-commission'd Pretender*, when we can have *No Commission'd* Baptism, we express our *Pious* Regard to the Divine Institution; we show, That we must not do or acquiesce in *Evil*, with a design that *Good may come of it*: But we refer ourselves to the Divine Mercy, without venturing to break his Law; and
so

so we escape the Imputation of Presumption, and are the more capable Objects of his Pity and Compassion, tho' we have no Claim to it by virtue of an *Explicit Baptismal Covenant*, when we Die in this Case without the *Instituted Ministration* of Baptism by a Commission.

In short, Upon the present Supposition, Persons pretendedly Baptiz'd by Non-commission'd Usurpers, and so Dying, must be referr'd to an *Uncovenanted Mercy* for Acceptance, [because they were not receiv'd into Covenant by the *Instituted Ministration*;] as must also others, who [refuse those False Baptisms, and] Die without True Baptism, because they cannot procure *Commission'd Baptism*. But the difference to the *Disadvantage* of the *first* is very great, for their Case is attended with Sin, even in the Baptized himself, when he consents to, acquiesces in, defends, and never endeavours to amend the Usurpation, [as is the Case of *too many* with us, who are come to Years of Discretion, &c.] Whereas *these latter*, who so Die *without Commission'd Baptism*, are so far from having any Sin to answer for, upon the account of *refusing an Uncommission'd Usurper's Act*, that their *very Refusal* of it, was an Act of *Piety and Religion*; and therefore their and *our Confidence* in God's Mercy, is *much better founded*, while 'tis thus free from the *base alloy of Presumption*.

And it were to be wish'd, that they who talk so much of *pretended Cases of Necessity*, [especially among us, where there are *really none*] would seriously consider, which of these Two is the *safest Way*; and the *very great Danger* of *Encouraging People* to sit down contented with that, which themselves acknowledge to be a *Sin*, when 'tis so easie among us to *correct and amend*

it

it, by a *Validly Commission'd Baptism*, every-where to be obtain'd, if those who have Power will but administer it, and they who want it will but qualifie themselves to receive and seek for it.

But I Conclude; Humbly and Earnestly Praying to Almighty God, "*Who gathers his Flock out of all Nations into the Saving Fold of One Catho-lick Church; Who has also appointed divers Orders [Bishops, Priests, Deacons] in his Church,*" [in their several Degrees and Stations, to represent the Great Mediator between God and Man, Christ Jesus, for this Sacred Purpose;] "*That He would be pleas'd to Inspire All Bishops and their Clergy, with Courage and Skill, and Fatherly Care, to Edifie and Guard their several Charges;*" to keep that which is committed to their Trust, and in Christ's stead, here on Earth, to Open the Kingdom of Heaven to all Believers: That he would Bless all the Laity "*with a filial Love, and due Obedience to their Spiritual Superiors;*" That the Clearness of Truth, and Beauty of Holiness, daily increasing in his Church, "*through every one's devout Pursuance of their Duties, all Hereticks and Schismaticks*" may be converted, and "*all Jews and Pagans be happily wou into her Sacred Bosom the sole Ark of Salvation;*" through the Power and Merits of the *Eternal Son of God, Jesus Christ our Lord*, To whom with his Eternal Father, and the Holy Ghost, eternally proceeding from the Father and the Son; *Three Persons, but One Incomprehensible God!* be all Honour, Praise, and Glory, Might, Power, Majesty and Dominion, for Ever and Ever, *Amen.*

F I N I S.

A
SUPPLEMENT

TO THE

First and Second Parts

OF

LAY-BAPTISM Invalid;

SHEWING,

That the Heretical and Schismatical BAPTISMS
which some Ancient CHURCHES esteem'd
to have been Valid, were not LAY-BAPTISMS,
in the Opinion of those Churches.

In ANSWER to the

Second Part of Mr. *Bingham's* pretended
Scholastical History of Lay-Baptism.


And prov'd out of that same Book, and the other
Writings of Mr. *Bingham.*

*With a CAVEAT against Dr. White Kennet's Dan-
gerous Notion of the Power of Divine Grace, and his
Sophistical Rule for Judging of Doctrines: In his
Sermon at the Funeral of the Duke of Devonshire,
and his Spittal-Sermon on Easter-Tuesday, 1714.*

By the Author of *Lay-Baptism Invalid.*

Ex Ore tuo.

London, Printed by G. James, for HENRY CLEMENTS,
at the *Half-Moon* in St. Paul's Church yard, 1714.





THE
 CONTENTS
 OF THE
 PREFACE.

§ I.		HE deplorable Condition which Men of Learning run themselves into, by engaging on the wrong Side of an important Question, Page i
§ II.	—	Some of Mr. <i>Bingham's</i> Errors, and fallacious Dealings in the first Part of his <i>Scholastical History</i> , which he has not retracted, ii
§ III.	—	his childish Behaviour towards his Opponent, iv
§ IV.	—	his Rudeness in wrongfully accusing <i>Dr. Hikes</i> , <i>ibid.</i>
§ V.	—	his Misrepresenting Things in his <i>Epistle Dedicatory</i> to my Lord Bishop of <i>Winchester</i> , v
§ VI.	—	his false Charge on the Church of <i>England</i> , that she has Rules for confirming Lay-Baptisms, refuted, <i>ibid.</i>
§ VII.	—	Our Lay-Baptiz'd Persons have no Right to Confirmation, the Eucharist, or Christian Burial, viii
§ VIII.	—	The unaccountable Practice of admitting such to be Register'd as Baptiz'd, in our Parish Books, and to partake of the Holy Eucharist, ix
§ IX.	—	The Deformity of Church Priests burying with our Office of Burial, Lay-Baptiz'd Schismatics, who died out of the Church's Communion, <i>ibid.</i>

The CONTENTS.

- § IX. A Remedy for these Evils humbly propos'd, x
- § X. The Act of Exemption, vulgarly call'd the Toleration Act, does not oblige our Church Priests, to receive such Lay-Baptiz'd Persons, to the Eucharist, or Christian Burial, xii
- § XI. The same Act does not take off the Spiritual Censures of our Church against such as our Dissenting Separatists, therefore they are excommunicate, *ipso facto*, by our Canons, and so have no Right to the Eucharist, or to Christian Burial, xiii
- § XII. The illegal Practice of the Dissenters setting up their Academies and Nurseries of Schism, Sedition, and Rebellion, xiv
- § XIII. Mr. *Bingham's* Complaint of being charg'd as an Encourager of Dissenters, consider'd, xv
- § XIV. A suppos'd Power in Bishops to confirm Lay-Ordinations, prov'd to be destructive of Episcopacy it self, xvii
- § XV. My Answer to those who ask why I who am but a Laick &c., do so zealously concern myself in these Matters, xix
- § XVI. A Repetition of what I have said of Bishops Power to delete the Priestly Character, xxii
- § XVII. From which 'tis plain, that I hold no such Deleting Power in the Church, as Mr. *Bingham* does; namely, a Power of Nulling only the Commissions of Heretical and Schismatical Bishops and Priests, without Nulling their Ministrations also, which is a gross Contradiction, xxv
- § XVII. The Deleting Power, which I suppose to be in the Church, is no other than that which St. *Cyprian* and his Collegues claim'd, *viz.* a Power of Nulling the Ministerial Acts of Heretical and Schismatical Clergymen, which the Churches who differ'd from St. *Cyprian* did not claim. But I will not quarrel and dispute with those, who reckon that the Church has not such a Deleting Power, *ibid.*
- § XVIII. My Reason for writing against Mr. *Bingham*, tho' the Reverend and Learned Dr. *Brett* has already sufficiently refuted him, xxviii
- § XIX.

The CONTENTS.

- § XIX. He owns himself not to be exact Master of St. *Jerome's* Dialogue against the *Luciferians*, and yet would have his Opponents submit to his fanciful Interpretation of it, xxix
- § XX. His haughty Call upon me, either to make good my Assertions, or confess my Errors, answer'd, xxx
- § XXI. To extricate himself out of the Difficulties he is involv'd in, he has invented a new threefold Distinction of Laymen, ibid.
- § XXII. This he did, because he expected to be charg'd with Contradictions, but such a poor Shift will not defend him, xxxii
- § XXIII. He begs his Opponent not to multiply Disputes about *hard Terms*, nor to charge him with Contradictions; when at the same time his Contradictions are notorious, and his Terms which he uses in this Controversy are very ambiguous and fallacious, xxxiii
- § XXIV. He pretends to be at a Loss to know what I would have, because I object against a Proposal he made to the last Convocation, to confirm *Lay-Baptisms*, xxxiiii
- § XXV. I therefore tell him, once more, what I would have, that my Demand is just and reasonable, and that his Novel Proposal to the Convocation is not sufficient to answer it, xxxv
- § XXVI. He advances the Purpose of his propos'd Form for Confirming Lay-Baptisms, to an Equality with the End and Design of our *Common Prayers of the Church of England*, xxxvi
- § XXVII. Some farther Reasons humbly offer'd against Bishops Confirming Lay-Baptisms, xxxvii
- § XXVIII. Mr. *Bingham's* disingenuous Insinuation, of my charging Pope *Stephen* with an Opinion, That Persons Baptiz'd by Hereticks and Schismaticks "were in a State of Salvation, while they continued in Heresy or Schism," expos'd, xliii
- § XXIX. Mr. *Bingham*, before he is aware, confirms my Assertion, That the obscure Evidence he has produc'd for Lay-Baptism in the *Greek Church*, is of no more Value than the Testimonies he can bring for


The CONTENTS.

- for **Image Worship**, and consequently, his obscure Evidence is no Argument that Lay-Baptism is agreeable to the general Sense and Practice of the Ancient Catholick Church, xlvi
- § XXX. He avoids the Merits of the Cause, and is angry at his Opponent, for considering his suppos'd Matters of Fact, and Matters of Right together; tho' this is the only way of Distinguishing what is *truly Catholick*, from what is but of obscure and private Authority, l
- XXXI. *Nicephorus's* two Canons for Lay-Baptism, no Argument that they were the authentick Sense of the *Greek Church*, lii
- § XXXII. The whole Evidence of the *Greeks* for, and against Lay-Baptism summ'd up; from whence 'tis Evident that the authentick Sense of the *Greek Church* is against the Validity of Lay-Baptism, liii
- An Answer to Mr. *Bingham's* Question, about a cruel Opinion among the *Greeks*, of Infants dying without Baptism, lv
- § XXXIII. His Remark upon my Charge against the Advocates for Lay-Baptism, and the Consequence he draws from it, are altogether fallacious, and grounded upon Principles which he cannot prove, lvi
- § XXXIV. His Call upon me to prove my heavy Charge against them, That they *take away the Necessity of the Christian Priesthood; consequently, of Christ's Authority here on Earth; and so of all reveal'd Religion too*; fairly answer'd in a short Specimen of the Proof of this heavy Charge, lix
- § XXXV. Their vain Endeavour to evade it, and Mr. *Bingham's* violent Anger against me for this Charge, and for my not blindly following his, and some other Mens *private Opinions*, with a *Popish Implicite Faith*; but his Patience is here lost, and a *bad Cause* makes him forget his Character, for which I pity him, lxi





THE CONTENTS.



CHAP. I.




THE true State of the present Controversy.

- § I. II. The Adversary reminded of the Merits of the Cause, *viz.* of *Baptism by Persons* who never were at all commision'd to Baptize, Pag. 1, 2
- § III. This, the Subject of the first Part of *Lay-Baptism Invalid*, 2
- § IV. This also the Subject of the Book of *Sacerdotal Powers*, in answer to the Bishop of *S—m's* Attempt in Favour of Lay-Baptism, 2, 3
- § V. As it is also, of *Dissenters, &c. Baptisms Null and Void*, by the *Articles, Canons, &c. of the Church of England*. In Answer to a Pamphlet, entituled, *The Judgment of the Church of England*, written in Favour of Lay-Baptism, 3
- § VI. So is it likewise, of the *Bishop of Oxford's Charge consider'd*, written in Answer to his Lordship's Charge in Defence of Lay-Baptism, 4
- § VII. Several other Writers in Favour of Lay-Baptism not worth Notice, and why 5
- § VIII. The main Plea of all these Writers for Lay-Baptism, is, the *pretended Practice of the Catholick Church*, which none of them have prov'd, *ibid.*
- Great Things expected from Mr. *Bingham*, but the first Part of his *Scholastical History* is so far from proving this pretended Practice of the Church, that it proves the direct contrary; as I have shew'd in the second Part of *Lay-Baptism Invalid*, 5, 6, 7

The CONTENTS.

- § IX. His vain Attempt in the first Part of his *Scholastical History*, to make ancient Heretical and Schismatical Baptisms, allow'd of by some Churches, look like Baptisms by *Persons never commission'd*; and his Starting from the Merits of the Cause, 7, 8
- § X. This the Design of the second Part of his *Scholastical History*, viz. to make Heretical and Schismatical Baptisms look like Lay-Baptisms, tho' he still spoils such his Design in the same Book, 8, 9
- § XI. The Necessity of keeping to the Merits of the Cause, tho' Mr. *Bingham* is displeas'd at it, 9, 10
- § XII. The Inconsistency and Contradiction he is involv'd in, by his inventing a new sort of Laymen, 11
- § XIII. My Design in the following Chapter, is, to argue with him upon his own declar'd Principles, still keeping my Eye upon the Merits of the Cause, 11, 12



CHAP. II.



H A T by Mr. *Bingham's* own Account of the Matter, the ancient Heretical, Schismatical, Degraded, and Excommunicated Priests [whose Baptisms some Churches allow'd to be Valid] were not meer Laymen when they Baptiz'd, but Priests ordain'd by Bishops, whose Ordination was Valid in the Opinion of those Churches; and that consequently, the Baptisms administer'd by such Priests, were not Baptisms of the *same Nature* with our false Baptisms, perform'd by Persons who never were at all commission'd to Baptize; and that therefore the Practice of those Churches is no Proof, that they held these latter to be Valid Baptisms.

- § I. His Argument for the Validity of Baptism, by unauthoriz'd Persons, 13
- § II. The Fallacy of it expos'd, 14, 15
- § III. That Baptisms by Hereticks and Schismaticks, allow'd of by some Churches, were not of the same Nature

The CONTENTS.

- Nature with false Baptisms, perform'd by Persons never ordain'd or authoriz'd to Baptize, prov'd from Mr. *Bingham* himself, 16
- § IV. His first Instance of the Censure of the famous Council of *Nice*, against *Meletius* Bishop of *Lycopolis*, in *Egypt*, 16
- § V. He gives but a partial Account of the Censure, 17
- § VI, VII. The Censure did not Null his Episcopal Order, 18 to 20
- § VIII. The Councils Decree about the Bishops, &c. Ordain'd by him, misrepresented by Mr. *Bingham*, 21
- Four Arguments drawn from the Decree, to prove that the Persons Ordain'd by *Meletius* were in Valid Orders, 22 to 24
- § IX. *Valesius* and *Du Pin's* Notion, that Imposition of Hands, appointed by the Council to be perform'd over those Persons, was a New Ordination, is no Proof that it was so, for it was only a Confirmation, 24
- Mr. *Bingham* fallaciouſly represents this Particular, 25
- § X. And yet, at last, if he would speak Sense, he mistrusts *Valesius* and *Du Pin's* Notion, and reckons that it was not a New Ordination, 26, 27
- § XI. He owns, that the Bishops Ordain'd by *Meletius* were properly Bishops; consequently, Valid Bishops; and therefore Baptisms by them, and such as they Ordain'd, were not Lay-Baptisms, 28, 29
- § XII. His next Instance of the depos'd and excommunicated *Arian* Clergy, whom he reckons to have been less than Laymen, 29 to 31
- § XIV. His new Notion of a Complete Layman consider'd and expos'd, 31 to 33
- § XV. The *Arian* Clergy's Orders were not Null'd, 33, 34
- § XVI. If they were, then the Catholicks countenanc'd Lay-Ordination, Lay-Baptism, Lay-Consecration, and Administration of the Eucharist, Lay-Excommunications, and Lay-Absolutions; which is absurd, 35
- § XVII.

The CONTENTS.

- § XVII. For 'tis notorious, that the Catholicks own'd the *Arian* Clergy to have had Valid Orders, 36
- § XVIII. And Mr. *Bingham* himself acknowledges the same, 37, 38
- § XIX. But yet says they were not authoriz'd Priests, the Fallacy of which is clearly discover'd, 39
- § XX. And also of his artful Way of Denying that they were Proper and Perfect Priests, 40
- § XXI. The Absurdity of his Notion, that those Priests who have no Right to receive, have no Authority to give the Sacraments to others, 41
- § XXII. That Baptism by the *Arian* excommunicated depos'd Clergymen, was not of the same Nature with our Lay-Baptisms, 44
- § XXIII. Mr. *Bingham's* fallacious Way of inducing Men to believe, That "the Church receiv'd the Baptism of some Hereticks and Schismaticks who never had any Orders from any Episcopal Ordination," 45
His Three pretended Reasons to prove that *Novatian* never was a Bishop, 46
- § XXIV. His first imaginary Argument nulls all Ordinations, and Priestly Ministrations, perform'd irregularly out of Mens proper Diocesess and Districts; and consequently, before he is aware, makes void the pretended Ordinations and Baptisms of all our Dissenting Teachers, 47, 48
- § XXV. His second pretended Argument nulls the Orders of the Church of *England*; and consequently, Mr. *Bingham* himself has no Valid Orders, 49, 50
But 'tis notoriously fallacious, and contrary to the 26th Article of the Church of *England*, 51
- § XXVI. And renders all Ordinations at this time of Day, very precarious and uncertain, 52
- § XXVII. His third pretended Argument prov'd to be of no Value, 53
- § XXVIII, XXIX, XXX. This farther prosecuted, 53 to 59
- § XXXI. *Novatian* was a Valid Bishop, 59
XXXII.

The CONTENTS.

- § XXXII. Mr. *Bingham* owns that the Bishops Ordain'd by him were properly Bishops, and consequently *Novatian* himself must have been a Valid Bishop, 59, 60
- § XXXIII. He interprets the eighth Canon of the Council of *Nice*, so, as to prove the same thing, 61 to 63
- § XXXIV. And yet puts a Blind before his *English* Reader's Eyes, by his false Translation of the *Greek*, 63
The Unaccountableness of this in a Man of Mr. *Bingham's* Character, with some wholesome Advice to him upon this Occasion, 64
- § XXXV. His *great Boast*, that he would prove the Church receiv'd the Baptism of some ---- who never had Episcopal Ordination, and instancing the *Novatians* Baptism, as such, is a most notorious Banter, 66
- § XXXVI. The Reason why I now proceed to confute him out of his other most celebrated Writings, 67
- § XXXVII. Mr. *Bingham's* Rule to know Valid Bishops, is a Key to unlock the Secret, and discover the Fallacy of his frequent Use of the ambiguous Terms of "False Bishops; not a True Bishop; not True Shepherds or Bishops, *super-ordain'd*, pretended Bishops into a full See; Persons not authentically Ordain'd," and such like, in this Controversy, 68 to 70
- § XXXVIII. He acknowledges, That "a common Rule and Practice of the Church, was not simply and absolutely of the Essence of Ordination." This destroys all that he insinuates in the Second Part of his *Scholastical History*, 70, 71
- § XXXIX. He shews, that Episcopal Ordinations were esteem'd to have been Valid, even in Schism, 71
The same again, from the Instance of the *Donatist* Bishops, 72
- § XL. The same again, from the Instances of the *Novatian* and *Meletian* Bishops, 74

The CONTENTS.

- § XLI. He produces Authorities to prove, that the Character of Orders given in the Church, was *Indelible*; even when such ordain'd Persons were *Suspended* from the Execution of their Office for their *Misdemeanours*, 75
 This turn'd against himself, 75, 76
- § XLII. His Account of New Ordinations examin'd into, and the Imposition of Hands, which he calls *New Ordinations*, prov'd to have been no other than a *Reconciliatory Imposition of Hands* by way of *Absolution*, for *Discipline's Sake*, to put a *Mark of Infamy* upon the *Crimes of Heretical and Schismatical Clergymen*, 77 to 80
- § XLIII. His Guess, that the *Arian Clergy in France* were not re-ordain'd, tho' they were oblig'd to submit to a *New Imposition of Hands*, is an *Argument* against his *Notion of the Re-Ordination of the Melitian Clergymen*, 80
- § XLIV. His Account of the general Councils of *Nice* and *Ephesus*, their owning the *Episcopal Orders of Heretical and Schismatical Clergymen*, 82
 His Account of the *African Church*, and most other Churches in *St. Augustin's Days*, that they thought the Character of the *Priesthood* to be *Indelible*, 82, 83
 Inſomuch that if a *Clergyman turn'd Apoſtate*, or was *suspended*, or *depriv'd* for any *Crime*, his Character of Orders; they reckon'd, remain'd *entire*, 83, 84
 Hence 'tis evident, that they did not esteem them to have been *Laiicks*, 85
 Mr. *Bingham* confirms all this, in those very Books, where he endeavours [tho' very oddly] to make *Heretical, Schismatical, and Excommunicated Priests* appear *Laymen*, 85
- § XLV. For, in the first Part of his *Scholastical History*, he makes the *Ordination* of a *Bishop or Priest*, to be *Indelible and Indivisible*, even if he turns *Heretick*, or *Schismatick*, or *Apoſtate*, or is *Excommunicate*, or *Degraded*, *ibid.*

The CONTENTS.

- He says, there are *none among the Ancients*, but will allow them to be *Bishops* or *Priests* according to their respective Orders, 86
- Consequently, none among the Ancients will call their Baptisms Lay-Baptisms, *ibid.*
- § XLVI. He opposes those who might fancy, that the Church reduc'd Clergymen to Laymen, when she wholly depriv'd them of the Honour of their Places for their Crimes, *ibid.*
- § XLVII. His Examination of the Doctrine of the *Indelible* Character of Orders, 88
- He reckons the best Way to know the Truth of that Doctrine, is to examine it by the Character of Baptism, which he owns to be *Indelible*, 89
- § XLVIII, XLIX. The same, 90, 91
- § L. He affirms, that the *Indelible* Character of Ordination, is of the same Nature with that of Baptism, 92
- § L, LI, LII. Hence Heretical and Schismatical, Excommunicate, Apostate, and Degraded Priests, had an indeleted Character of Priesthood, 92 to 96
- § LII. He owns, that such were not Laymen, 96
- § LIII. His great Outcry for fear the Force of the Church's Censures against wicked Priests would be taken away, if they should be suppos'd to be Priests, while under the Church's Censures of Excommunication and Degradation, 98
- § LIV. This fully answer'd, 99
- § LV, LVI. The Sum of all Mr. *Bingham's* Assertions concerning such Priests, put together, whereby he notoriously confirms this Proposition, that Heretical and Schismatical Baptisms were not esteem'd to have been Lay-Baptisms, by those Churches, whose Discipline was different from that of the *Cyprianick* Churches, 105
- He has not produc'd so much, as *but one Instance*, of a Lay-Baptism, which the ancient Catholick Church pronounc'd to have been Valid; neither has he prov'd our Lay-Baptizers to have any such Priestly Character,

The CONTENTS.

- Character, as the ancient Heretical and Schismatical Baptizers were esteem'd to have had, 111
- § LVII. Till he does one of these, he can be no Umpire in this Controversy, *and his way of writing will never bring it to an Issue,* 112
- The necessary Qualifications and Dispositions of the Person who may close up this Dispute, *ibid.*
- A great and difficult Task to be done by Mr. Bingham, before he can be admitted to be an Arbitrator in this Controversy, 113
- § LVIII. His Reason why an End should *be put* to this Dispute, consider'd; and the true Reason given why he should never have meddled in it, 114, 115
- § LIX. His Design to take his Leave of this Subject, "*if the Adversary will suffer him to go on quietly with a more necessary Work,*" animadverted upon, 116
- § LX. The "*general Benefit and Satisfaction he hopes he has given,*" by his *Antiquities of the Christian Church*, would have been much greater, if they were freed and purged from his own erroneous and uncorrect Observations, some Particulars whereof are mention'd, 117
- § LXI. Reasons, for instancing some of the Faults of these his most celebrated Writings, 119
- § LXII. The Conclusion, with sincere Professions of Charity towards him, &c. 121



A


C A V E A T, &c.

- § I.  R. Kennet's excellent Account of some of the Properties of Christian Charity, in his Sermon last *Easter-Tuesday*, Pag. 123
The Unnaturalness of a faithful Preacher's uttering any Thing in such a Sermon, in Favour of the Opposers of Truth, and of the proud Disturbers and Contemners of the Unity of the Church, and of the Authority of Christ in his Representatives the Bishops, 124, 125
- § II. Whether that Sermon does not contain something which is thus notoriously *Uncharitable*, &c. will be seen by the following Observations, 125
- § III. His Introduction to the Aspersions he casts on the Doctrine of the Invalidity of Lay-Baptism, 126
- § IV. This contains two Rules, the one true, but the other false and sophistical, whereby to judge of false Doctrines, *ibid.*
His true Rule; by which his Doctrine of the Power of Divine Grace, taught in his Sermon at the Funeral of the Duke of *Devonshire*, is prov'd to be a false Doctrine, *ibid.*
- § V. Because it derogates from the Almighty Power of God, 128
- § VI. 'Tis uncharitable against Sinners "of distinguish'd Sense and Judgment," *ibid.*
- § VII. 'Tis also uncharitable against the "meaner sinful Wretches," 129
- § VIII. It implies, that even Devils themselves are more capable of Repentance, than Men are, 130

And

The CONTENTS.

And lastly, 'tis directly contrary to the Doctrine of the Holy Scripture,	130
§ IX. Dr. <i>Kennet's</i> false and sophistical Rule whereby to judge of Doctrines,	134
The great Danger of being guided by it,	136
§ X to XVIII. His <i>sad and terrible Consequences</i> of the Doctrine of the Invalidity of Lay-Baptism, examin'd, and found to be nothing but trifling Insinuations, and Encouragements of Schism and Popery,	138 to 151



ERRATUM.

IN Lay-Baptism Invalid, *third Edition*, Preliminary Discourse, Page 14. Line 12. *instead of Major, read Minor.*



T H E



THE P R E F A C E.

§ I.



WHEN Men of Reputed Learning, and Good Parts, are unhappily engag'd on the wrong Side of a Question of Great Importance, 'tis a deplorable Thing to see how they wound their own Reputation, by the little Fallacies, mean pedantick Triflings, Inconsistencies, and Self-Contradictions, which the Badness of their Cause does almost fatally oblige them to have recourse to for its Defence.

And what is yet a farther Aggravation of their Misfortune, is, that tho' they many times do, by their own way of Arguing, establish that very Truth which they by Opposition are endeavouring to destroy; yet they themselves, at the same time, either do not see, or else [give the World Occasion to believe that] they forcibly shut their Eyes against that Light, which the Divine Providence makes them, by such their Opposition, to hold out to others for their Benefit and Advantage.

But this is not all; for it sometimes comes to pass, that to patch up a decaying Reputation, they do but go the way more effectually to destroy it, and so increase yet more their own Unhappiness,

a

by

by a disingenuous Pride, which makes them scorn to retract any the grossest Errors, whereof they have been convicted; by a hardy Perseverance, in Asserting and Repeating over again, what they never can prove; and by an angry and peevish Spirit, which causes them to lose all Temper, and to run out into imprudent and unmanly Reflexions on Persons and Things, which do not at all affect the true Merits of the Cause.

§ II. *How far Mr. Bingham may be concern'd in the Truth of every one of these Observations, I must leave to the Determination of such Judicious and Impartial Readers, as have examin'd both Sides of the Controversy about Lay-Baptism; but in this, I doubt not, they will readily concur with me; That*

His frequent, but false Appeal to (a) Socrates Scholasticus, as an Evidence for the Truth of the Fable of a sportive Baptism by Children, and its being receiv'd as Valid by the Church of Alexandria, when Socrates has not one word about that idle Story of the Ludicrous Baptism, in all his History:

His Calling to witness to the Truth of the same foolish Dream, (b) Johannes Moschus, one of the most ridiculous, fabulous, visionary Writers, that infested the Church in the Seventh Century; with abundance of such superstitious Stories:

His Misrepresenting (c) and false Translating St. Augustin's Words, as taken from Gratian, to

(a) Second Part of *Lay-Baptism Invalid*, p. 69, 70, &c.

(b) *Ibid.* p. 72.

(c) *Ibid.* p. 143, 144.

make his own Notions appear the more plausible to an English Reader.

His (d) Perhapsing upon St. Basil's Testimony against Lay-Baptism, and thereby fallaciously Inducing his English Reader to believe, that St. Basil, "perhaps, did not condemn Lay-Baptism in extraordinary Cases; when St. Basil, in the Passage quoted by Mr. Bingham, does not give the least Countenance to such a **Perhaps** as this, but speaks in such absolute and unlimited Terms, as do condemn Lay-Baptism in all Cases whatsoever:

His (e) fallacious Speaking of Tertullian's Notion of Lay-Baptism, as if it were Matter of Fact, that Men "were so Baptiz'd by Laymen," in Tertullian's Days; when in Truth, there is not the least Proof yet produc'd by him, of any such early Matter of Fact at all:

His partial Misguiding his English Reader to believe, that two Canons were, or might be made in Favour of Lay-Baptism, by a Patriarchal Council (f) of 270 Greek Bishops, ann. 814, when in Reality, there is no Proof whatsoever that this Council made any such Canons at all; and they are manifestly no other than the Canons of Nicephorus, the Superstitious and Idolatrous Patriarch of Constantinople:

I say, Impartial and Judicious Readers will, doubtless, concurr with me in this, That such gross Errors, and fallacious Dealings in Controversy, do loudly call for Mr. Bingham's publick and ingenuous Retraction and Amendment, because they

(d) Second Part of *Lay-Baptism Invalid*, p. 182.

(e) *Ibid.* p. 185.

(f) *Ibid.* p. 214.

were publicly committed, to the Prejudice of Truth; and since he has not yet thus ingenuously retract-ed, no not so much as the grossest, and most unpardonable of these Mistakes, &c. namely, his false Appeal to Socrates the Ecclesiastical Historian; he, of all Men living, ought to have avoided Pedantick Insultings about the little Trifle of another's wrong Transcribing a Major instead of a Minor, which was [with Thanks utterly thrown away upon him, for discovering the unwillful Slip] fairly and publickly own'd, and amended, before Mr. Bingham could have an Opportunity of thus frequently and childishly sporting himself again, as he does in the Appendix of his Second Part, with that, which Men of any Spirit becoming the Character of a Man of Sense and Gravity, would scorn to concern themselves about.

§ III. But when to this Childishness we add the great Indecency, nay the Uncharitableness, of his inconsiderate and imprudent Flying out against the truly Reverend and Learned Dr. Hickes, upon Account of this Trifle; as if he was to blame for letting it pass and escape his Correction; 'tis an Argument, that his Passion carries him beyond his Reason, and exposes him to the Censure of all wise and considerate Men; for, says Mr. Bingham, (g) "I cannot but a little wonder, — that so Learned and Acute a Man, as Dr. Hickes, should carefully read over his Papers, [viz. of the Author of Lay-Baptism Invalid] and never observe such an Heap of Blunders, &c." As if the Doctor had read

(g) Scholast. Hist. Part II. Appendix, p. 3.

over the Manuscripts, where this one Slip [which by a peculiar Art of Multipling, very useful! for Men in his Circumstances, Mr. Bingham calls "An Heap of Blunders"] was committed, viz. Sacerdotal Powers, and the Preliminary Discourse to Lay-Baptism Invalid, 3d Edition. When, in Truth, that worthy Person never read over any of those Manuscripts at all, and so had it not in his Power to correct that one Slip, to hinder its being printed. And therefore, Mr. Bingham's thus hastily, and without just Reason, censuring so valuable a Person, and in so Publick a Manner too, for what no ways concern'd him, is such a Transgression even against the Rules of common Good Manners, and Good Breeding, that it requires no less than his Publick Acknowledgment of the Fault, by asking the Doctor's Pardon as openly as he has offer'd him the Affront. And this I take upon me to put Mr. Bingham in Mind of, tho' I have no Commission for so doing, from the Reverend and Learned Person he has so indecently abus'd.

§ IV. He tells my Lord Bishop of Winchester, in the 3d Page of his Epistle Dedicatory, That "All the Bishops of both Provinces were unanimously of — Opinion, — there were other Ways of supplying a faulty Baptism, than by Re-Baptization, if given in due Form by a Layman; —" that the Deficiency, whatever it be, may most certainly be rectify'd by Confirmation: "And that "so far both the Rules and Practice of the Church of England, for these last 200 Years, are clear; for we have neither Order

a 3

" nor

“ nor Example to encourage Re-Baptization
 “ in any such Case, &c. ”

All which is nothing but asserting, without Proof, nay contrary to Experience, [witness the Case at Exeter] that “ all the Bishops were un-
“ nimously ” of that Opinion ; — but what is
best of all, is, that he says the Deficiency of Lay-
Baptism may most certainly be rectify'd by Con-
firmation ; when neither he, nor any of his Friends
in this Controversy, have produc'd so much as but
one Argument in Proof of this pretended Cer-
tainty. But he boldly says, “ so far the
“ Rules — of the Church of England are
“ clear ; ” Clear for what ? Why clear for this
Confirming Power. Egregious Falsity ! has she any
Rules for confirming such deficient Baptisms ? where
are they ? when, and by whom were they made ?
Let 'em be produc'd, that we may see them, and
believe. And now, behold his all-convincing Rea-
son, that her Rules, &c. are so far clear ;
“ for [says he] we have neither Order nor
“ Example to encourage Re-Baptization. ” A
doughty Argument this, so pompously introduc'd
with an ostentatious FO ! And it amounts to thus
much : That the Church has Rules for supplying
the Deficiencies of Lay-Baptism by Confirmation ;
because, she has neither Order, nor Example to
encourage what is call'd Re-Baptizing ; that is,
a no Rule to Baptize, is a Rule to supply by
Confirmation ; which is all one as to say, that
Silence relating to one Thing of a positive Nature
is a Rule about another Thing of a positive Na-
ture ; and if this be good Arguing, then farewell
all Reasoning for the future.

§ V. *Oh! But says he;* “ We have nei-
 “ ther Order, nor Example to encourage Re-
 “ Baptization, — no not after the Rubrick
 “ had confirm’d the Ministration of Baptism
 “ wholly to the Hands of a Lawful Minister.
 “ For still no Rule was made, that such as
 “ were not Baptiz’d by a Lawful Minister
 “ should be Re-Baptiz’d; but they were re-
 “ quir’d to receive the Bishop’s Confirma-
 “ tion, and then were admitted to the Eu-
 “ charist, and the Privilege of Christian Burial,
 “ neither of which are allow’d to Un-Baptiz’d
 “ Persons. ”

Here he affirms, that “ such as were not
 “ Baptiz’d by a Lawful Minister were re-
 “ quir’d to receive the Bishop’s Confirma-
 “ tion, ” *but not to be* [*what he calls*] *Re-*
Baptiz’d. I am perfectly confounded at the Posi-
tiveness of this Assertion! What Rubrick is there
that requires such to be confirm’d by the Bishop?
Does not the whole Office of Confirmation run all
along upon a Supposition of the Person’s having been
already perfectly and rightly Baptiz’d by a Law-
ful Minister? Is it not consequent to our Offices
of Baptism, which by his own Confession do now
confine “ the Ministration of Baptism wholly
 “ to the Hands of a Lawful Minister? ” *Is*
not every Person to be confirm’d, suppos’d to have
been Baptiz’d by one of those confining Offices
of Baptism? Are they not all address’d to at the
Beginning of the Office of Confirmation, as Persons
that had God-Fathers and God-Mothers, and so
are reckon’d to have been Baptiz’d at Church, or
at Home by a Lawful Minister without God-Fa-
thers and God-Mothers, and afterwards presented

in the Church, and undertaken for, by their God-Fathers and God-Mothers; all which necessarily supposes the Rubricks of our Offices of Baptism to have been observ'd; and consequently, that the Persons to be confirm'd were Baptiz'd by Lawful Ministers? Where does the Office of Confirmation suppose any one to have been Baptiz'd by a Layman? In what Part of that Office is there any Pretence to the supplying of the Deficiency in a Lay-Baptism before receiv'd? How then can it be said, that in our Church "the Deficiency of " Lay-Baptism may most certainly be rectify'd by Confirmation," when our Church has no Form of Confirmation, that pretends to rectify any such Deficiency? And with what Truth can it then be said, that such, only " Lay-Baptiz'd Persons, were requir'd to receive " the Bishop's Confirmation," when our Church has made no Rubrick at all, that requires them so to do?

§ VI. *And, therefore, their Admission " to " Confirmation, to the Eucharist, and to the " Privilege of Christian Burial, " are not according to any Rule of our Church; they are not our Church's Acts, but only the Personal Acts of particular Men, acting [to make the best of it] without any Rule to support their Practice; for, by all that our Church has said, and order'd about these Matters, such Persons have no Right to those Privileges, but ought to be deny'd them, as not having receiv'd the Baptism which our Church expressly requires to be receiv'd at the Hands of Lawful Ministers, even in Times of greatest Necessity, and has made no Provision at all for granting any Privileges whatsoever to those, who have*

have been only Baptiz'd by Persons that never were Commission'd at all for that Purpose; and her Articles, Canons, and Rubricks are such, as that they do, by fair Construction, Null and make Void all such Baptisms as I have abundantly prov'd in (h) another Place to which the Reader is referr'd.

§ VII. And 'tis one of the most unaccountable Things in the World, to see Persons so pretendedly Baptiz'd, registred in our Church-Books, and admitted to our Sacred Altars, with as great Freedom, as those who without all Dispute have receiv'd Valid Baptism. Even the Gentlemen who dispute against us, do affirm those Baptisms to be disorderly, irregular, and wicked; that they are deficient, and want to have their Deficiency rectify'd, but they should rather say supply'd; and yet, for all this, they who have receiv'd such confessedly deficient Baptisms, are receiv'd to the Holy Eucharist, as freely, as if they had receiv'd Perfect, Catholick Baptism; and this, without any Previous Attempt to supply the acknowledged Deficiency of their Baptism.

§ VIII. If these Things are thus wretchedly practis'd, what Wonder is it to see the dead Bodies of departed Schismatics, who never were incorporated Members of the Church by Baptism, and who always detested and avoided the Communion of our Church in their Life-time, and at their Death were not reconcil'd to it; yet, after Death, ceremoniously own'd, as in the Church's Communion; in

(h) Dissenters, and other unauthoriz'd Baptisms, Null and Void, by the Articles, Canons, and Rubricks of the Church of England.

their

their Procession to their Graves, solemnly preceded by some One, or more, of the Priests of the Church; gravely carry'd into the very Church it self, [which is a Ceremony, signifying, that the Departed dy'd in the Church's Communion;] the Divine Service, appointed only for the Burial of the Faithful departed in the Communion of Saints, said over their Bodies, who, it may be, never were in visible Communion with them, [or, if they seem'd to be so at any time, it was without any Right at all;] and then, to hear such departed Schismatics call'd each of them, Our Dear Brother, or Dear Sister, in the Sense of our Church, signifying their Spiritual Relation to us, as Members of the same Family and Communion; when, it may be, they never were so, at least, they never appear'd to have been so: And lastly, to see their Remains deposited in that Sacred Place, the Church of God, into which, in their Life-time, they abhorr'd to enter, and join with the Members of the Church in the Divine Worship? To see these Things, I say, tho' 'tis no great Wonder to common Beholders, by reason of the Frequency of the Practice, yet 'tis very Dreadful to the Minds of those, who seriously consider, and lay to Heart the great Importance, and sad Consequences of such Practices.

§ IX. All which might easily be remedy'd, by obliging Persons concern'd, to bring Certificates well attested, of the Regular Baptism of those for whom 'tis desir'd that they should be register'd, or admitted to the Eucharist, or to the Privilege of Christian Burial: For then, which of our Lay-Dissenting Teachers would have the Hardiness to subscribe a Certificate of his having crept into any Man's House, and Baptized [as they call it] any Child, or Person?

son? And, which of our Parish-Priests would so far take part with Schismatics, as to Register such a False Baptism among the True ones? I know one of the Reverend Incumbents of this City, who was apply'd to, by a rich Dissenter, to have his Child Register'd, as Baptiz'd, in his Parish-Book; he ask'd the Dissenter, Is your Child Baptiz'd? The Dissenter answer'd, Yes. The Priest said, Tho' you live in my Parish, I know nothing of your Child's Baptism; for neither I, nor my Curate, nor any body else of our Clergy, by my Leave, Baptiz'd it. Who was the Baptizer? The Dissenter said, 'Twas one of our Ministers [as he call'd him;] says the Priest, Then I am resolv'd it shall not be Register'd. The Dissenter still persisted, sometimes endeavouring to Persuade, at other times Threatning what he would do, if his Child was not Register'd; and this from Day to Day. At last, my Reverend Friend thought of an Expedient, to get rid of him; says he to the Dissenter, Bring me a Certificate of your Child's Baptism, and let your Teacher, who you say Baptiz'd it, sign the Certificate; and then I will make him, and you know, what it is for him to invade my Province, and intrude himself thus into a House in my Parish about such Matters: The Dissenter from that Day forward never more ask'd him to register his Child. And if the same were vigorously insisted upon by the rest of our Clergy, upon Account of Mens Admission to the Holy Eucharist, and the Privilege of Christian Burial, we should not have such frequent Prophanations of our Altars, and of our Office for Burial of the Dead, as now we have. For no Man has any Right to the Altar, or to Christian Burial, of whose Baptism there is no Proof. And the Priests of the
Church

Church are not oblig'd, by any Law either of Church or State, to admit a Man to either of them, without good Proof of his Baptism. If a Dissenting Lay-Teacher should presume to give a Certificate, that he Baptiz'd a Person, there is no Law either in Church or State, that obliges a Clergyman to accept of such a Certificate, as a Valid Proof of Baptism, to qualify a Man to be admitted to the Communion, or to Christian Burial.

§ X. For, the Act of Exemption, vulgarly call'd the Act of Toleration, does not oblige our Church Priests to accept of any such pretended qualifying Certificate from the Dissenting Teachers; it only frees the Dissenters from the temporal Penalties, and Punishments due to their Separation from the Church, by Virtue of former Acts of Parliament; it does not make their Baptizers to be Lawful Ministers; it does not give them Holy Orders, but on the contrary does suppose some of them not to be in Orders; for it expressly calls their Guides, by the Names of "Teachers or Preachers in Holy Orders, or pretended Holy Orders," in several Places of the Act; plainly intimating, that as some of them might probably, at that time, have been in Holy Orders, [for 'tis not deny'd, that some of the old Dissenting Teachers had receiv'd Episcopal Ordination] so, others of them had but "Pretended, not real Holy Orders;" and, therefore, now since the Decease of their old Teachers, their remaining Guides, who were not ordain'd by Bishops, have but pretended Orders; the Act does not mend this Pretence, and turn it into a Reality, but leaves 'em only Pretenders still; consequently their Baptisms are not the Baptisms of Lawful Ministers; and, therefore, our
Priests

*Priests are not bound to receive and own them.
Again,*

§ XI. *The Act of Exemption does not Null the Canons of our Church, but leaves them as it found 'em; for in all that Act, there is not so much as the least Mention of any one Canon of the Church, that was design'd to be vacated, or made void by that Act; and, consequently, such Dissenters, as "deny the Church of England to "be a True and Apostolical Church;" such as are "Impugners of the Publick Worship "establish'd in that Church;" such as are "Impugners of any of her 39 Articles;" such as are "Impugners of her Rites and Ceremonies establish'd by Law;" as separate from her Communion, and "combine together "in a New Brotherhood, accounting the Christians who are conformable to the Doctrine, "Government, Rites, and Ceremonies of the "Church of England, to be — unmeet for "them to join with in Christian Profession;" as affirm, that—such as refuse to subscribe "to the Form and Manner of God's Worship "in the Church of England, —" and their "Adherents, may take unto them the Name of "another Church, not establish'd by Law:" "As maintain, that there are within this Realm "other Meetings, Assemblies, or Congregati- "ons, — than such as by the Laws of this "Land are held and allow'd, which may rightly "challenge to themselves the Name of True "and Lawful Churches:" And lastly, "Main- "tainers of Constitutions made in Conven- "ticles." These are by the III, IV, V, VI, VIII, IX, X, XI, and XIIth Canons excommuni- cated,*

cated, ipso facto, and “ not to be restor’d ” [most of ’em] but by the Arch-Bishop “ after “ their Repentance, and Publick Revocation “ of these their wicked Errors. ” The Act of Exemption frees Dissenters, only from the temporal Penalties of certain Laws ; but such, as I have mention’d, are not thereby freed from these spiritual Censures ; they are still left in this State of Excommunication ; and ’tis in the Opinion of Canonists, the greater Excommunication, tho’ there be no express Declaratory Sentence ; and, therefore, such Schismaticks as these have certainly no Right to be admitted to our Altars, while they impenitently live in these their Sins ; or to the Privilege of Christian Burial, when they die thus Excommunicate.

§ XII. There is another very great Nuisance among us, and so long as ’tis practis’d, these Nations will never be freed from the dreadful Mischiefs of Schism, Sedition, and Rebellion ; and that is, that the Dissenters have Academies or Nurseries, wherein Children and Youth are brought up, and taught in the dangerous Principles, that so divide and confound us, by unlawful and unlicens’d Schismatical School-Masters and Tutors : There is nothing in all the Act of Exemption, that gives the least Countenance or Toleration to these Dissenting School-Masters ; and therefore every one of them is a Transgressor against the Canons, which require School-Masters to have the Bishop’s Licence, &c. and ’tis not to be suppos’d, that any of our Bishops would grant a Licence to a Dissenter ; because the 77th Canon enjoins licens’d School-Masters to subscribe, that they own the Supremacy of our Sovereign for the Time being ;

being ; and that the Church of England is a True and Apostolical Church, teaching and maintaining the Doctrine of the Apostles, &c. The 79th Canon requires School-Masters to bring their Scholars to Church upon Holy and Festival Days ; which Things to be sure these Dissenting School-Masters will not submit to, and, therefore, they to be sure have no Licence under the Hand and Seal of the Bishop of the Diocese, where they set up their Schismatical and Seditious Academies to teach and poison Children, and Youth, with Principles pernicious to the Good and Welfare both of Church and State ; and so they may be prosecuted in our Spiritual Courts, and suspended from teaching School any longer, by the 77th and 79th Canons ; and happy would it be for this Nation, if they were so prosecuted, and turn'd out ; that the Seeds of Schism and Rebellion might not be so early sow'd in the tender Minds of our Children and Youth, as now they are, by such scandalously unlawful Tutors, who go on in this their Wickedness with Impunity, Publickly, and in Defiance to all our Constitutions and Canons, when they have no Law whatsoever to uphold them in such their mischievous Practise. But to return to Mr. Bingham.

§ XIII. He mournfully complains in the 4th Page of his Epistle Dedicatory ; That he is “ charg'd by some as a false and self-interested Writer ; as one that is writing against the true Church of England ; and as “ an Encourager of Dissenters. ”

As to his being a self-interested Writer, I leave that to God and his own Conscience ; but for his writing against the Church of England, 'tis certainly true, that he does so, if he writes “ as
“ an

“ an Encourager of Dissenters ” from her Communion ; and that his Writings do encourage them, is manifest ; for upon the Coming out of his First Part, they grew extravagantly Bold, and even at Oxford carry'd a Child in Publick Procession to one of their Meeting-Houses, to be pretendedly Baptiz'd by one of their Lay-Teachers ; a Thing never seen before in that Place, by any of its then Inhabitants : And not only so, but now, since the Publishing of his Second Part, the Dissenters take him to be such an Encourager of them, that this his last Book was lately recommended to a large Congregation of them, by their Teacher, as an unanswerable Book, in a Discourse held forth to them in one of the most noted Meeting-Houses of this City ! If this is not a sure Mark of a Writer's being an Encourager of Dissenters, then such a Writer can never be known. But why do they thus hug and caress his Book ? It is not because of the Validity of Lay-Baptism, which it espouses ; no, the Dissenters are as much against him for that whimsical Piece of Popery, as we are ; but they value and esteem his Book, because it does so much favour their pretended Ordinations ; for first, it endeavours to prove, that the Bishops who ordain'd the Heretical and Schismatical Baptizers, whose Baptisms some Churches esteem'd to have been Valid, were not Bishops : Secondly, That the Persons so ordain'd by these his pretended No-Bishops, did, notwithstanding, minister Valid Baptism : And thirdly, That the Church did not need to give these Baptizers any New Ordination, to qualify them to minister in the Sacred Offices of the Church ; but that they might, upon receiving the Church's Reconciliatory Imposition of Hands, without any New Ordination, perform

perform the Sacred Functions; all this he aims at, and frequently asserts in the Second Part of his Scholastical History. From whence the Dissenters naturally enough infer, supposing the Truth of these Premises, that there is no Necessity for Episcopal Ordination to qualify a Man to minister in Holy Things, since Mr. Bingham reckons, that the Church was not oblig'd to give Episcopal Ordination for that Purpose, to Persons who were before ordain'd [according to him] by Men who were not Bishops; and this is so pleasing to Presbyterians and Independents, and the rest of our Church's Enemies, that 'tis no wonder to find them recommending a Book as unanswerable, which endeavours so much to promote their Cause against Episcopacy: And so long as it does so, Mr. Bingham may thank himself for being reckon'd an Encourager of Dissenters.

§ XIV. *If Mr. Bingham and his Friends, who are in Communion with our Church, shall, to support his Reputation, say, that this Notion of the Church's allowing such Ordinations as were not Episcopal, is not a favouring of our Dissenters, and other Lay-Ordinations, to the endangering of Episcopacy; because, it is necessarily suppos'd, that these Non-Episcopal Ordinations must be allow'd and confirm'd by real Bishops, and consequently there must be Bishops always to confirm such Non-Episcopal Ordinations, and so there is no Danger of destroying Episcopacy by such a suppos'd Confirming Power in the Church: I answer, that I cannot assent to this, for these following Reasons.*

1st. *Because it never has been prov'd, that Bishops have any such Confirming Power.*

2dly. *Because such a Confirming Power would, in its own natural Consequence, be destructive of Episcopacy it self. For, if Lay-Ordinations to the Office of a Bishop may be confirm'd by Episcopally-Ordain'd Bishops, and Persons may officiate in that Office, by Virtue of this Confirmation, without Episcopal Ordination; then 'twill come to pass, that there may be Valid Bishops in the Church [who for that Reason will be real Bishops] without Episcopal Ordination; these Lay-Ordain'd Bishops must then be vested with all the Powers of the Episcopate, without Episcopal Ordination, consequently they also will have the suppos'd Confirming Power, and then they also may confirm other Lay-Ordain'd Bishops; and these last may confirm others, and so on, till the Lay-Ordain'd Bishops become vastly Superiour in Number and Power to the Episcopally-Ordain'd Bishops, and so at last, by reason of the Decease of Episcopally-Ordain'd Bishops, there may be none but Lay-Ordain'd Bishops in the Church, and thus all Episcopal Ordination may be utterly rooted out; which shews, that this suppos'd Confirming Power is destructive of the very Office, that is suppos'd to be vested with it; viz. the Office of an Episcopally-Ordain'd Bishop, and consequently is an Inconsistency and Contradiction to it self, and therefore is nothing but a meer Fancy; for it cannot be suppos'd, that our Lord Jesus Christ, who is infinite Wisdom it self, would establish Episcopal Ordination in his Church, and vest Episcopally-Ordain'd Bishops with a Power or Commission, of Confirming Lay-Ordain'd pretended Bishops, and thereby authorize them at last to destroy his own Institution in the Order of Episcopally-Ordain'd Bishops: This is a Contradiction so gross, that*

Men

Men who invent it, must not charge it on our Lord's Appointment, but take it to themselves, as an Invention of their own, and not be offended with those who cannot swallow so great an Absurdity. It would be well, if such Men would but consider how productive and fruitful Error is; for we see in the Case now before us, that the corrupt Popish Doctrine of the Validity of Lay-Baptism, has brought forth another very dangerous Error, namely, the Validity of Lay-Ordination, to support and uphold it.

§ XV. *If any one shall ask me, why I, who am but a Laick, &c. concern my self so much about these Matters, and express so great a Zeal against, not only Laymens Baptizing, but also the Church's Confirming such their Baptisms? I answer, That I think my Zeal and Concern should be offensive to none, who are the True Friends of the Church; and as for others who may blame me for Dissenting from their Notions, I care not for their Censures, since in so Dissenting. I oppose not any Practice of the Truly Ancient Catholick Church; the Practice of some Moderns, particularly of the corrupt Church of Rome, and her Followers, in the Matter of Lay-Baptism, I have Reason to write against, and also to oppose the novel Fancy of Confirming such false Baptisms; and my Reasons for thus opposing, tho' I am but a Layman, are these.*

1st. Because I have a Right to Valid Baptism, and therefore am personally concern'd in this weighty Matter; consequently, I may humbly offer to the Church my Objections against what some Persons have endeavour'd to persuade me was Valid Baptism; when I am so nearly concern'd, both for my self, and others committed, or that may be committed to my Charge, in the Validity of mine and their Baptism.

2dly. *Because I never could find that the Ancient Catholick Church did, by any Act of hers, allow of the Validity of Lay-Baptism, Baptism by Persons who were never Commission'd by Bishops to Baptize; nor could I ever yet discover that she confirm'd any such Baptisms. And by all that has hitherto been written, I am more and more establish'd in this, That the Ancient Catholick Church never did allow of, or confirm these False Baptisms.*

3dly. *Because I farther observe, That our Holy Mother the Church of England, by her present Articles, Canons, and Rubricks, is so far from Allowing of, or Confirming such Baptisms, that she does forbid them, and by just Inferences drawn from these her Publick Acts, does make them Null and Void.*

4thly. *Because the contrary Assertions and Practices of particular Men are nothing but private Fancies, and may therefore be very reasonably oppos'd by any Christian, provided it be done with Decency, and due Respect to his Superiors; since such their Assertions and Practices are not countenanc'd by the Ancient Catholick Church, nor by the Publick Acts of the Church of England, whereof they are Members.*

5thly. *Because every Man has a Right modestly to propose what may contribute to the Establishing of such Great and Important Truths, as relate to the Welfare and Eternal Happiness of Mens Souls; which Valid Baptism most certainly does. And,*

6thly. *Because I hope, and I find my Hopes not fruitless, that my poor Endeavours may stir up the Learned Clergy to oppose the Enemies of the Christian Priesthood, to much better Purpose than I can pretend to do.—— And if they who are offended at my Zeal, can prove what Mr. Bingham has not been able to do, That the Ancient Catholick Church did allow of, the Validity of Baptism by Persons*
never

never Commission'd, or claim a Power to Confirm them ; then I promise 'em, that I will so far submit, as to own, that I have oppos'd the General Sense and Practice of the Catholick Church ; that she has determin'd the Dispute against me ; and I will never more controvert the Point with the Adversary about this suppos'd Matter of Fact : But if this be not prov'd, [as I believe it never will] 'tis very Unreasonable, and highly Dangerous, to be always appealing, as some do, to the great and venerable Name of the Catholick Church, for an erroneous Practice, which she never countenanc'd ; for by thus charging her with our own novel Fancies and Inventions, we too much copy after the Example of the present corrupt Church of Rome, and thereby expose the Authority of the Ancient Catholick Church, to the Scorn and Contempt of the Enemies of Christianity.

§ XVI. *Mr. Bingham next, in the sixth Page of his Epistle Dedicatory, tells my Lord Bishop of Winchester, That I* “ own there is a Real and
 “ Effectual Power in the Church to withdraw
 “ the Sacerdotal Commission from Heretical
 “ and Schismatical Bishops and Priests, and de-
 “ prive them of their Authority, and reduce
 “ them to the State of Laymen ; in which
 “ Case [*says Mr. Bingham*] he confesses their
 “ Baptisms are as much unauthoriz'd, and un-
 “ commission'd, as those of any other Laymen.
 “ But then he pretends [*says Mr. Bingham*] that
 “ no Church, except the *Cyprianick* Churches,
 “ ever exercis'd this Power against Hereticks
 “ and Schismaticks : Tho' their Commissions
 “ were Delible, and the Church had Power to
 “ Delete them ; yet no Church, beside the Cy-
 “ b 3 prianick,

“ *prianick*, ever actually deleted them. So that
 “ according to him [*says Mr. Bingham*] He-
 “ reticks and Schismaticks were still acknow-
 “ ledg’d by the Church to be lawful Priests, in
 “ actual and full Commission; and the Church
 “ was so kind to them, even during their He-
 “ resy and Schism, as to leave them in full
 “ Possession of their Sacerdotal Authority, and
 “ never withdraw her Commission from them;
 “ which is such a Representation of the Pri-
 “ mitive Church, and so grand a Reflexion on
 “ her Discipline, as I believe no one ever made
 “ before him, *says Mr. Bingham*.

*This of the Church’s Power to withdraw the Sa-
 cerdotal Commission, &c. he collects from a Passage
 in the 6th Page of my Preface to the Second Part
 of Lay-Baptism, where I ask thus;*

“ Why should not the Spiritual Supreme Go-
 “ vernors of the Church have Power, to make
 “ such Laws, as shall so far limit and restrain
 “ the Commission they give to Ordain’d Per-
 “ sons, that when they presume to do any thing
 “ by Virtue thereof, in Heresy or Schism, their
 “ Acts shall be wholly Null and Void, by
 “ Virtue of such Laws? *St. Cyprian* and his
 “ Collegues did make Ecclesiastical Laws to
 “ this Purpose; — and in so doing, I reckon
 “ that they acted like themselves, and took the
 “ most effectual way to beat down Heresy and
 “ Schism: If the rest of the Churches had made
 “ such Laws as they did, those Laws being in
 “ such case Universal, might, in all likelihood,
 “ have preserv’d the Unity of the Church. —
 “ But these Churches would not concur so far
 “ with that Blessed Martyr; they would not
 “ agree with him, to make Frustrate and
 “ Void,

“ Void, during their Heresy and Schism, the
 “ Commissions once receiv’d by their Hereti-
 “ cal and Schismatical Subjects; and because
 “ they were not so Null’d, by such wish’d-for
 “ Laws, therefore their Ministrations were by
 “ those Churches esteem’d to be Good and Val-
 “ lid in themselves, tho’ the Persons concern’d
 “ in them, both Administrators and Receivers,
 “ were tainted with the sinful Circumstances
 “ of Heresy and Schism; insomuch that tho’
 “ these Churches did not declare those Bap-
 “ tisms to be Null and Void in the Admini-
 “ stration, for want of Commission in the
 “ Administrator, yet they reckon’d that the
 “ Spiritual Graces were impeded, or hinder’d
 “ from descending on the Baptiz’d, by reason
 “ of the Sins of Heresy and Schism, till the
 “ Baptiz’d return’d to the Unity of the Church,
 “ and as Penitents, receiv’d Absolution by Im-
 “ position of the Bishops Hands, &c.

*So again, in the 194th Page of the Second Part
 of Lay-Baptism Invalid; I tell the Reader, that*
 “ there were two Sorts of Discipline in the
 “ ancient Churches about Heretical and Schif-
 “ matical Baptisms. ”

First, “ That of the *Cyprianick* Churches,
 “ who made Ecclesiastical Laws, that if the
 “ Clergy fell into Heresy or Schism, their Or-
 “ dinations, and other Ministrations should
 “ be Null and Void, and that consequently
 “ the Baptisms given by them, during their
 “ Heresy or Schism, should be look’d upon as
 “ no Christian Baptism, &c. ” — *And*
Page 196. “ So that in Consideration of these
 “ Synodical Decrees, the Baptisms of the He-
 “ retical and Schismatical Subjects of those
 “ Churches

“ Churches were term’d Unauthoriz’d, Un-
 “ commission’d, and Anti-Episcopal: And
 “ why may not the Bishops of Christ’s Church
 “ make such wholesome Laws, if they see it fit,
 “ for the Government of their own Churches,
 “ when they do not impose them [*as St. Cy-*
 “ *prian did not*] upon other Churches, whose
 “ Spiritual Governors think it not fit to be
 “ so severe in the Discipline of their Churches;
 “ as ’tis plain the Churches did not, who
 “ acted otherwise than the *Cyprianick* Churches
 “ in this Matter? ” *For,*
 “ Secondly, “ The other Sort of Discipline,
 “ which was practis’d by the Churches, who
 “ would not come up to the *Cyprianick Severity*,
 “ was, that they did not **Null and make**
 “ **Void** the Commissions of either; *1st*, those
 “ Heretical and Schismatical Clergymen who
 “ had been ordain’d in the Church; *or 2dly*,
 “ of those who had been ordain’d only by
 “ Heretical and Schismatical Bishops: They
 “ receiv’d their **Orders as Good and Valid**,
 “ and their Baptisms in the Name of the
 “ Trinity — to be so too; so that when
 “ they, or any Baptiz’d by them, return’d
 “ to the Unity of the Church, they were re-
 “ ceiv’d [*as all other Penitents us’d to be*] by
 “ Imposition of Hands; the Clergy as Clergy-
 “ men, and the Laicks as Lay-Christians al-
 “ ready Baptiz’d, without requiring any other
 “ Ordination or Baptism, than what they had
 “ receiv’d before. ” *And this I immediately*
prove in the same Place, [and shall now more
largely prove it in this Book] from Mr. Bingham
himself.

§ XVII. From all which the Reader may easily see, that I do not suppose the Church may have such a Power, as Mr. Bingham fancies; namely, a Power of Deleting or Nulling only the Commissions of Heretical and Schismatical Bishops and Priests, without Nulling their Ministrations also; for such a Power as this, is no Power at all, but a Contradiction; for, to what Purpose can a Commission be suppos'd to be null'd, when the very Ministrations, for which alone that Commission was given, shall be Valid, tho' perform'd after the suppos'd Nulling of the Commission? This would imply, that a Commission to perform Ministrations is made ineffective, [for 'tis ineffective, if 'tis null'd] and that yet the Ministrations are effected, by the Person whose Commission [once given him only to effect those Ministrations] is become Void and Ineffectual. That is, the Person has not Power to effect, and yet he has Power to effect the same Ministrations, which is a most palpable, and gross Contradiction. The Power, which, I suppose, may be in the Church, [and I will not quarrel, or dispute with those who believe that she has no such Power] is this; namely, a Power of Making such Ecclesiastical Laws, as shall frustrate and void the Commissions of Heretical and Schismatical Bishops and Priests, by Nulling all their Ministrations perform'd in Heresy or Schism: This Power [if any such there be] does effectually, and in Earnest null their Commissions; when it strikes at, destroys and nulls the Ministrations, for the Sake of performing which, Commissions were instituted, and are given; this makes the Commissions themselves to be of no Effect at all, by taking away the Validity of the Acts pretended

pretended to be done by Commission; whereas the Fancy of Deleting or Nulling a Commission, without Nulling the pretended Acts which ought to have been done by Commission, but were not, and reckoning them to be Valid, is a meer Jest and Banter upon the Design of Giving and Nulling Commissions. For, the Design of giving Men Commissions, is to make their Acts [appointed to be done by those Commissions] Valid in Law; and the End of Taking away, or Nulling Mens Commissions, is, that they may not perform such Acts; and that if they do, they may not be Legally Valid; But these Ends are wholly frustrated, by supposing the Acts of such Men to be Valid in Law, and their Commissions Null at the same time; for hereby the very Giving and Nulling of Commissions are both made a meer Impertinence, and of no Effect at all, since the same Acts are Valid without Commission, and therefore the Commission was not necessary to be given; and consequently, 'twas but a Jest to pretend to Null that, the Being or not Being whereof, has no Relation to the Validity of the Ministerial Acts. Such a fancy'd Power, therefore, I never could imagine to be in the Church, because 'tis an Inconsistency and Contradiction. But the other, I know not but the Church may have, and 'tis upon this, that I ask [without desiring to determine others] Why should not the Governors of the Church have such a Power, as St. Cyprian and his Collegues claim'd? namely, "to make such
 " Laws, as shall so far limit and restrain the
 " Commission they give to ordain'd Per-
 " sons, that when they presume to do any
 " Thing, by Virtue thereof, in Heresy or
 " Schism, their Acts shall be wholly Null
 " and

“ and Void, by Virtue of such Laws? Ec-
 “ clestiaſtical Laws, by which their Ordinations
 “ and other Miniſtrations ſhould be Null
 “ and Void. ” This is the Deleting Power I
 talk of, and ask why it ſhould not be in the
 Church; namely, a Power of Nulling and Making
 Void the Miniſtrations of Heretical and Schiſma-
 tical Clergymen; a Power, for Example, of Null-
 ing their Miniſtration of Baptiſm, and thereby
 making their Commiſſion to Baptize, Null and Void;
 for 'tis Nonſenſe to ſuppoſe a Commiſſion to re-
 main Good and Valid, when at the ſame time,
 the Acts, by Inſtitution confin'd to the Com-
 miſſion, and done by Virtue, and in Purſuance
 of that Commiſſion, are Null and Void. The
 Nullity of ſuch Acts argues the Nullity of the
 Commiſſion, by which they were ſaid to be done;
 and ſo does the Nullity of the Commiſſion argue
 the Nullity of the Acts; becauſe both the Commiſ-
 ſion, and the Acts, are equally of a poſitive Na-
 ture, equally inſtituted, inſeparably connect-
 ed together by the Inſtitution; the Acts had no Validity
 before they were thus connect- ed to the Commiſſion;
 and ſeparate from the Commiſſion, the Inſtitution
 provides not for their Validity; conſequently they
 are of the ſame Nature as inſtituted; therefore what
 is true of one, is true of the other; and conſequently,
 if ſuch Acts are Null, the Commiſſion is Null at
 the ſame time; and if the Commiſſion is Null,
 the Acts at the ſame time are alſo Null. St. Cy-
 prian and his Colleagues did claim and exerciſe a
 Power of thus Deleting, Nulling, and Making
 Void the Commiſſions and Miniſtrations of Here-
 tical and Schiſmatical Clergymen; they did not
 inconſiſtently ſeparate theſe from one another, ſup-
 poſing one to be Valid, the other to be Null; but
 ſhew'd,

shew'd, that they null'd the Commissions, by Nulling the Ministrations also; their Ecclesiastical Laws struck at, and voided both; and the other Churches null'd neither the Orders, nor Ministrations of such their Clergymen: As they receiv'd their Ministrations for Valid, so they did their Orders likewise; as shall largely be prov'd from Mr. Bingham himself, in the Sequel of this Discourse.

§ XVIII. *His State of the present Controversy, and indeed all his Book, except the Appendix, has already been sufficiently answer'd by the Reverend and Learned Dr. Brett, in his "farther Enquiry into the Judgment and "Practice of the Primitive Church, &c."* And it would be needless for me to say any Thing after that Reverend and Learned Gentleman, were it not for Mr. Bingham's magisterial Way of calling upon Dr. Brett and me, to submit to his pretended Demonstrations; which are no more, than meer ambiguous, fallacious Insinuations, double Meanings, and false Reasonings, that require a much more severe Animadversion, than the great Candor of that excellent Person would allow him to make upon them, and which I therefore think necessary to be done by some Body else; that Mr. Bingham may know, what Treatment his Way of writing Controversy does justly deserve, and not fancy, that the Reverend Doctor's very great and undeserv'd Civility is due to him upon Account of any good Learning he has shew'd [for he has shew'd none, that can be truly call'd so] in this particular Dispute; for, his Quoting a Multitude of Councils and Fathers to no Purpose, tho' it shews that he has look'd
into

into abundance of Books, yet [if he means as he applies them] it plainly proves, that tho' he has read, he has not learn'd them; for how can a Man be said to have truly learn'd, what he falsely interprets, and misapplies to a wrong Purpose?

§ XIX. He is so far ingenuous, as to own, p. 21. that he is "at a loss to understand St. Jerome's Reasoning, &c." And p. 37. that "he will not pretend to be exact Master" of what he calls a "difficult Passage of St. Jerome;" viz. in St. Jerome's Dialogue against the Luciferians; when that very Passage is no more difficult to be understood, than any other in the Dialogue; and yet, for all this, he would have his Opponents to submit to his fanciful Interpretation of that Dialogue, against what they are satisfyd, and have prov'd to be the true Meaning of it; and which he, who owns himself to be no exact Master of it, must not pretend to interpret to the Satisfaction of those, who are not to be led by such unexact Writers, as find Difficulties in easy Passages, that make against themselves.

His very long Appendix does chiefly consist of frequent Repetitions of what these Papers are purposely design'd to answer; and, therefore, I have no need here to be particular about any Thing of the Commission of Hereticks and Schismaticks, which is so largely handled in the following Supplement; and effectually answers all his Positiveness about them, so often repeated in his Appendix.

I shall, therefore, in this place only take Notice of some remarkable Passages therein, which do fully demonstrate the Temper of our Adversary,
and

and the hard Shifts he is put to, to hold up his Head in this Dispute.

§ XX. *In the 7th Page of his Appendix, he accosts me with an Air of Authority, much above his Station; " I require him, [says he] either " to make good his Assertion, [i. e. of the Priesthood of Hereticks and Schismatics] " which I am " confident [very natural!] he can never do; " or else confess his Errors, and put an end to " this whole Debate, so far as concerns the " History of the Church; and then he may " dispute, for me, with whom he pleases," says our Historian.*

I never knew that Mr. Bingham, a private Priest, and one who has no actual, particular Authority over me, as my Parish-Priest, had Power to require me to do that publick Penance, which he himself is so loth to submit to, tho' there is a great deal of Reason he should; namely, to " confess Errors. This Episcopal Air is too hastily assum'd; but to let that pass, he shall see, that tho' I am not bound to submit to his Injunction, yet for the sake of others, who may be misled by him, I have made good my Assertions in such a manner, as will abundantly satisfy the Impartial, that he, of all Men living, has no Cause to be thus assuming, and that I have no such Errors to recant, as he takes upon him to require me to confess.

§ XXI. *To salve the Difficulties he is reduc'd to, by engaging in this Dispute; he has now given us a new Discovery, in the 19th Page of his Appendix; namely, his own fancied " threefold Acceptation of the Word Laymen."*

1st, “ Catholick Laymen, who never had any
 “ Pretence to Sacerdotal Authority, or Com-
 “ mission in the Church.

2^{dly}, “ Heretical Laymen, who pretended
 “ to have a Sacerdotal Commission, when they
 “ really had none. *And he instances the No-*
vatians, and says, he has shew'd them to be so in
the Ancient Church; when 'tis manifest, that the
Council of Nice own'd, and himself also acknow-
ledges them to have been Clergymen in Valid Or-
ders; and the Churches who reckon'd the Baptisms
of these his second Sort of pretended Laymen to
have been Valid, did esteem these his fanciesd Lay-
men to have Valid, because indeleted Episcopal
Orders; as we shall hereafter see prov'd, even from
his own Account of them.

3^{dly}, *His last Sort of pretended Laymen, he*
calls, “ Such Laymen, as once had a true Sa-
“ cerdotal Commission, but were afterward de-
“ priv'd of their Commission, by the same
“ Power of the Church which first gave it,
“ and so were reduc'd to the State and Con-
“ dition of Laymen again, says he. And these
also I have prov'd from himself, were not Laymen
in the Opinion of those Churches who held their
Baptisms to have been Valid.

§ XXII. *The Reason why he invented these*
two last Sorts of pretended Laymen, is, because he
expects to be charg'd with Contradictions; for
[as he acknowledges in the same Page] “ in
“ the former Part of his Scholastical History,
“ he has said, that the Usurped Baptism of
“ Laymen was not decreed to be Valid, by
“ the Determination of any General Coun-
“ cil.” Now he pretends “ to prove, that
 “ the

“ the Baptism of Hereticks and Schismaticks,
 “ is but the Baptism of Laymen, by the
 “ Determination of all the General Councils; ”
and that these suppos'd Lay-Baptisms were de-
termin'd to be Valid by these Councils, is the
Design of his Second Part to insinuate; which
not only “ carries the Face and Appearance of
“ a Contradiction, ” but is as real and direct
a Contradiction in Terms, as any can possibly be.
And he is so well aware of this, that he begs
his Adversaries not to charge him with it, which
he still believes they will do, and he is very much
in the right to suppose so; and therefore, to
shelter himself from the Force of such their Charge,
he has invented this new Whim of a threefold Sort
of Laymen, which will not at all defend him; for
the Fallacy of it is so very weak and thin, that
the smallest Strength can easily pierce thro' it.

§ XXIII. *In the 21st Page of his Appendix,*
he begs again not to be charg'd with Contradi-
ctions; he desires I would not multiply Disputes
about hard Terms, &c. Poor Gentleman! his
Task is very difficult, when he can't prevail with
his Adversaries to let him go on quietly with his
Contradictions; nor persuade 'em to let him use
ambiguous Terms, but they will still be exposing
the one, and discovering the Fallacies of the other.
But if his Case be thus hard, he must bear with
it, since 'tis of his own making. For his Contra-
dictions cannot be hid, he himself discovers 'em;
witness the Contradiction, which in this very Page
makes him stoop so low; for here he owns, that
 “ in the First Part of the Scholastical History
 “ he asserted, that Heretical Pnestts were in
 “ some Sense allow'd to be Priests, and their
 “ Divi

“ Ordination to be Valid even after De-
 gradation. ” *And this he does not recant.*
So far is he from doing so, that he explains it,
by saying, that “ he still allows the Character
of a Priest degraded for Heresy, by the
Censures of the Church, to be Indelible : ”
And yet asserts a little lower, that “ Hereticks
were depriv’d of all Authority and Com-
mission, and, during their Heresy, deny’d
all Sacerdotal Powers, as much as any
other Laymen. ” And this he takes “ to
be no Contradiction to what he said be-
fore, but fairly consistent with it, in the
Understanding of any intelligent and unpre-
judic’d Reader. ” Wonderful Consistency ! The
Sacerdotal Character is Indelible, yet the Priest
is “ depriv’d of all Sacerdotal Powers, as
much as any other Laymen. ” Laymen are
absolutely without the Sacerdotal Character, the
Priest then is absolutely without the Sacerdotal
Character, and yet he has it, because ’tis Inde-
lible ; if these Things are consistent, in the Under-
standing of such as Mr. Bingham calls Intelli-
gent ; I desire not to be one of his Company of
Intelligents, and I doubt not but judicious and
unprejudic’d Readers will scorn to have it said,
that their Understanding is of so low a Degree as
this would make it.

§ XXIV. *In the 31st Page of his Appendix,*
he says, “ he is a little at a Loss to know
“ what I would have, ” because I object against
a Form of Confirmation he propos’d to the last
Convocation, That (i) “ it is not more ancient

(i) *Preface to the Second Part of Lay-Baptism Invalid, p.9:*

“ than the Ninth Century, and by Confe-
 “ quence wants the Noble Character of what
 “ is Catholick, *i. e.* has Antiquity, Univer-
 “ sality, and Consent; and he might with
 “ as much Reason have given an Instance
 “ of Image-Worship, and Invocation of Saints,
 “ from the second Council of *Nice* ;” upon
 which my Objection, he asks me, “ Why so much
 “ Anger against an innocent Form of Prayer?
 “ Since a Man may as reasonably object a-
 “ gainst some of our Common Prayers, that
 “ they are taken out of the Mass-Book, as
 “ this Author does against this Form, because
 “ ’tis only fetch’d from the Ninth Century.—
 “ But if our Author is not more sparing in
 “ such Objections as these, I shall be oblig’d
 “ to be a little more sparing in my Answers,”
 [says Mr. Bingham.] And in this I heartily
 believe him, because such Objections do effectually
 stop his Mouth, and even oblige him to be sparing
 in his Answers to them; because in Truth, he
 cannot answer them to any Purpose.

§ XXV. And now, that he may no longer be
 at a Loss, I will tell him what I would have; and
 he himself needed not to have been thus at a Loss,
 if he would have look’d but four Lines farther than
 the Paragraph he has transcrib’d; for I would have
 him Present the Convocation, with an Ancient Ca-
 tholick Form of Confirming Baptisms, perform’d
 by Persons who never were Commission’d by Bi-
 shops to Baptize. This is what I would have, and
 this is what he cannot lay before the Convocation;
 but instead of such an Ancient Catholick Form, he
 presents them with a Form of Prayer made in the
 Ninth Century, to be said over Penitents return-
 ing

ing from their Heresy or Schism, to the Communion of the Church, which he proposes for the Exemplar of a Form of Confirmation, to be made for such as were Baptiz'd by our Hereticks and Schismatics, Men who never receiv'd any Episcopal Commission at all to Baptize. I tell him, that his propos'd Form was not made, nor us'd for such a Purpose, and I prove it in the 8th, 9th, and 10th Pages of that Preface. I tell him farther, That his propos'd Form was not more Ancient than the 9th Century, a very corrupt Age of the Church; and therefore, if it had been appointed for the purpose of Confirming Lay-Baptism, as it was not, it would not have been a Catholick Form; it would not have had the Noble Characters of Antiquity, Universality, and Consent, which are certainly necessary for the recommending of a Form, Valid for so great a Purpose: And if he can trace such a pretended Confirming Power, and such a suppos'd Confirming Form, no higher than the 8th or 9th Centuries, I repeat it again, that he may with as good Reason produce the Second Council of Nice, to recommend Image-Worship, and Praying to Saints, as only such an exemplary Form, to confirm Lay-Baptism by; because, the one stands upon as Good, and as Ancient a Foundation as the other; Nay, the Corruptions of that Council claim the Preference by far, if these Things are to be estimated and valued by the Numbers of Men, who espous'd them; for, this Form propos'd for Confirming of Lay-Baptism, was not us'd for such a Purpose in the 9th Century; nay, this End, for which it was propos'd, appears to be nothing but a singular Peculiarity of Mr. Bingham's own Contrivance; for he has produc'd no Vouchers to prove that it was ever made, or us'd at all, for Confirming of Baptisms by Persons never

c 2

Commission'd :

Commission'd: And thus he may see " why so much " Anger [as he terms it] not " against an Inno- " cent Form of Prayer, but the mischievous End and Purpose, for which he propounded it to the Convocation; and this he might as easily have seen before, (if he had been pleas'd) in my said Preface, where I expressly tell him, Page 9. That " he can " produce no Authority at all, for that sort of " Confirmation"; And that he " might as " reasonably have produc'd the Authority of " the Second Council of Nice, " for the establish- " ing of" their " Idolatrous Practices, as this " Form of Confirmation for the Exemplar of " a Form, to be made to confirm the False Bap- " tisms of those, who have been only wash'd " or sprinkled by our Hereticks and Schis- " maticks, who were never Commission'd " to Baptize, if his Exemplary Form had been " us'd to Confirm such False Baptisms, as indeed " it was not. " And I give Reasons immediat- ly after, why it was not us'd for the Purpose he propounded it; and he has not answer'd the Reasons I there produc'd.

§ XXVI. *And now, what's become of his Assertion, that " a Man may as reasonably object " against some of our Common Prayers, that they " are taken out of the Mass-Book? &c. The Ob- jection is against the Design of Mr. Bingham's Proposal. Are any of our Common Prayers design'd for such Uncatholick Purposes? No certainly, the End of every Prayer in our Liturgy, even of those taken out of the Mass-Book, is certainly Scriptural and Catholick; as the End for which he proposes his Form, most certainly is not: but thus he advances his own Uncatholick Pur- pose*

pose, to an Equality with the undoubted Catholick Design of our Common Prayers; his propos'd Form of Prayer is justly objected against, not for it self, but for the novel Purpose of Confirming Lay-Baptism, to which [without any Catholick Precedent for so doing] he would have it apply'd; and then truly, that this his pretty Invention may not be blasted, he says, "A Man may as reasonably object against some of our Common Prayers."

A hopeful way of answering Objections, to make it as reasonable to object against our Common-Prayers [which are all apply'd to truly Catholick and Apostolick Purposes] as 'tis to object against his Proposal of Confirming Lay-Baptisms by his propounded Form of Prayer, without any Apostolick Rule, or Catholick Precedent for so doing. If this be all that he can say in Answer to such Objections, he may very well tell us, that he "shall be obliged to be sparing in his Answers;" for, in Truth, he is obliged, for his own Reputation's sake, to make no Answers to such Objections, so long as he answers 'em no better, than by thus Levelling the Dignity of our Common Prayers, with that of his own novel Invention.

§ XXVII. And now that I am considering Mr. Bingham's New Proposal made to the last Convocation, of Confirming Lay-Baptisms, I beg Leave here to observe, against such a suppos'd Confirming Power:

1st, That our Saviour has commanded his Apostles, and their Successors the Bishops, and such as are Commission'd by them, actually to Baptize all those who are capable of, and have not receiv'd Baptism at their Hands; this is plain from the Institution of Baptism, and other Places of Holy

xxxviii The PREFACE.

Scripture ; whereby 'tis evident, that he forbids them Denying or Refusing to Baptize those capable Persons who were never Baptiz'd by them.

2dly, Hence it follows, that Christ forbids all Acts of Confirmation, suppos'd to be perform'd by them instead of that Baptism which he requires them actually to administer.

3dly, The Law of Christ, about Baptizing, is plain and obvious ; but, as yet, there is no Appearance of any Law of his about Confirming, instead of Baptizing those who never were Baptiz'd by his Commission'd Officers. So that, by all that has been discover'd of Christ's Will and Pleasure, every capable Person, that has not been Baptiz'd by one of his Commission'd Officers, must be Baptiz'd by one. Upon this I beg to know, by what Law can an Inferiour Power [viz. that of Bishops, which is Inferiour to Christ's] Dispense with this Superiour Law of actually Baptizing, in any Case whatsoever? If there be not produc'd a Law, as plain and obvious, and as binding and obliging, for this Dispensing Power, as that other Law, which requires the Clergy [Persons first authoriz'd by the Bishops] to Baptize, our Minds will still mistrust the Validity of this Dispensing Power, and be continually inclin'd to an incurable Aversion against it, which will necessarily arise from the prevailing Evidence and Conviction of that other Law of Baptizing, which is Supreme. And the more we give our selves Leave to enquire, we shall be so much the more dissatisfy'd with the fanny'd Validity of that Baptism, which in Fact [notwithstanding any Bishop's Attempt of Confirmation] was never actually administred to us, by one whom the Institution authorizes and commands to Baptize, and of whom we are, by the same Institution, required to receive Baptism. For, if after
such

such Attempt of Confirmation, it should be ask'd, Was the Man ever really and truly Baptiz'd by one of these instituted Baptizers, or no? The Answer will, in Truth, be still the same after, as it was before the suppos'd Confirmation; namely, he never was actually Baptiz'd by an instituted Baptizer, the Bishop, or one Commission'd by him. And if it should be said, that he is now interpretatively so Baptiz'd, the same Difficulty will still return; he is not actually Baptiz'd by one, whom the Institution authorizes and commands to Baptize; and 'tis Baptism actually to be given by Commission'd Persons, which the Institution does require. For this Law of the Institution was deliver'd by the Sovereign Head of the Church, to his Apostles and their Successors the Bishops, and such as are Commission'd by them, with an express Command, enjoining and requiring them to do this, "Go ye, &c. "Baptizing;" whereby they are positively commanded to initiate all Nations into the Church by Baptizing them, to the End of the World. But, with what Propriety of Speech can it be truly said, that they have actually obey'd this express Command, with respect to a Person, who was never thus initiated by them? 'Tis inconceivable, except it should be allow'd that this Command was not design'd to be always literally observ'd, which will give a fair Handle to the Quakers, and other Enthusiasts, who deny the Necessity of outward Sacraments; or except it can be prov'd, that this, or some other Law of the same Sovereign, does authorize his Representatives to commute for the Act of Baptization, by some other Act [say, of Imposition of Hands] to be perform'd by them instead thereof. But till this other Law is produc'd, Bishops, who, by the known standing Fundamental

Law of Christ, are bound as his Proxies, either in their own Persons [or by those whom they Commission] to sign and seal to us, by Baptism, the Christian Covenant between God and us, cannot, by a Post-Fact of Imposition of Hands, &c. give a Legal Validity to the Un-Authoritative, and therefore false Sign and Seal, of such pretended and counterfeit Attorneys, as never were at all commission'd to sign and seal the Christian Covenant in Christ's Stead; because, the Post-Fact of a Bishop thus attempting a Ratification, is not that Act [viz. of Baptism] which the Law for Signing and Sealing of the Christian Covenant does expressly require.

4thly, *Indeed, if Bishops, and Persons commission'd by them, were not oblig'd by the Law and Command of Christ to Baptize; and if our Lord's Promise to concur with them herein to the End of the World, did not imply their constant Obligation to pay Obedience thereto till his second Coming; then indeed there might be some Colour for this Dispensing Power of commuting one Act for another, by a Post-Fact of Confirmation; but, forasmuch as they are bound and oblig'd by a Supreme Law of their Sovereign, which is of a much higher Nature, than any that the Church can now make; 'tis plain, that Bishops cannot dispense with that Law, and refuse to pay Obedience thereto, when 'tis in their Power to fulfill it, as it certainly is, where they attempt to Confirm instead of Baptize. Tho' the Church [say, the Spiritual Governors thereof] as being the Supreme Hierarchical Powers on Earth, can, for all Emergencies, make, relax, dispense with, and abrogate Canons about Circumstantials; yet she can make no Canons of Validity to enervate the Essentials of*
Christ's

Christ's own Institutions, nor can she abrogate any of his Appointments, which he has instituted to continue to the End of the World. She may dispense with her own Laws about indifferent Things, but she is not therefore empower'd to dispense with the Essentials of her Supreme Lord and Master's Institutions; and the Reason of this is plain, because Essentials are of constant and unalterable Obligation; they were appointed not by her, but by Christ, and can always be had in our Case, where Bishops, or Persons commission'd by them, do reside among our selves, and may reside even among the Foreign Reform'd, as well at least as they did among the Primitive Christians in the three first Centuries, when the temporal Powers of the Earth did not protect, but persecute the Church of Christ, and more especially the Bishops thereof; and yet for all this, they were not destitute of a very numerous Succession of Bishops in those perilous Times of Persecution.

5thly, And for my part I can see no Motive for such a Dispensing Power, as shall take away the Necessity of Episcopal Baptism, by substituting a suppos'd Confirmation in its Stead, but to please the unreasonable Demands of the Pride and Insolence, Tenaciousness and Obstinacy of Anti-Episcopal Hereticks, Schismaticks, and other wicked and ignorant Men. And if these must be SO provided for, what will it be, but to provide Encouragements, or, at best, Excuses for gross Sin? And what then will be the End of these Things? Where shall we stop? And what Security shall we have at last for any one Institution of Christianity?

6thly and lastly, Tho' this suppos'd Dispensing Power may, by some, be thought sufficient, to awe such Anti-Episcopal Usurpers as much,
and

and as effectually, as the closest Doctrines for the Necessity of Episcopal Baptism, — since without such Dispensation and Confirmation, they have no better Title to Grace, Remission of Sins, and the Kingdom of Heaven, than meer Heathens :

Yet, if Persons pretendedly Baptiz'd by Anti-Episcopal Usurpers, do discover that this Dispensing Power is not sufficiently prov'd, they will not at all be aw'd by it, but the contrary, so long as they are taught, that there is no Necessity for them to receive Episcopal Baptism. For, will it not be natural for them to argue after this manner ? “ We have been Baptiz'd already by one of
 “ our own Teachers, who never was Episcopally
 “ Commission'd to Baptize : We are taught that
 “ we need not now be Baptiz'd by an Episcopal
 “ Minister, What Fault is there then in our Baptism ? Certainly, none at all, with respect to
 “ the Essence of the Institution. It is true, we are
 “ told indeed, that our Baptism is irregular, deficient, and unoperative, for want of Authority in the Baptizer, and that therefore it must
 “ be supply'd by the Bishop's Confirmation : But,
 “ how do those, who assert this, prove that the
 “ Bishop's Confirmation was instituted to supply
 “ this suppos'd Want of Authority ? Either our
 “ Baptism was essentially Good and Valid before,
 “ or it was not ; if it was not, then it must certainly have been essentially Null, for want of Authority, and consequently we are bound to receive
 “ Episcopal Baptism, and so the Episcopal Confirmation to supply that Essential Defect, is useless and insufficient ; if our Baptism was Essentially Good and Valid without Episcopal Authority in the Baptizer, then 'tis plain, that
 “ this

“ *this Episcopal Authority is not Essentially ne-*
 “ *cessary to the Ministration of Baptism; and if*
 “ *not Essentially necessary to its Ministration, then*
 “ *'tis not Essentially necessary, that the Absence*
 “ *of this Authority in a Baptizer should be sup-*
 “ *ply'd by the Bishop's Authority, in a Post-Fact*
 “ *of his Confirmation, since this Post-Fact adds*
 “ *nothing to the Essence of our Baptism it self;*
 “ *so that our Baptism is Good and Valid with-*
 “ *out this Confirmation, and therefore we have*
 “ *no need of the Bishop's Confirmation to supply*
 “ *a suppos'd Defect in the Ministration of our*
 “ *Baptism, any more than they have, who were*
 “ *Baptiz'd by Episcopal Ministers; except the*
 “ *Advocates for Episcopacy can prove [which*
 “ *they have not yet done] that Christ or his A-*
 “ *postles did institute this Power of Episcopal*
 “ *Confirmation, on purpose to supply the Want of*
 “ *an Episcopal Commission in Non-Episcopal Bap-*
 “ *tisms.*” This, I think, will be natural for
Anti-Episcopal Hereticks to conclude; and that
consequently, their Awe for this unprov'd Dispen-
sing Power will be none at all, and they will have
no Fear of their Title to Grace, Remission of S'ns,
&c. without such a Confirmation as this, so long
as they are taught the No-Necessity of Episcopal
Baptism, and have not good Proofs laid before
them, of the Divine Institution of this suppos'd
Power of supplying, by Confirmation, the Want of
Authority or Commission in their Lay-Baptisms.

§ XXVIII. *In the 33d Page, &c. of his Ap-*
pendix, he insinuates to his Reader, that I charge
Pope Stephen with this Opinion, that Persons
Baptiz'd by Hereticks and Schismaticks “ were
 “ *in a State of Salvation, while they conti-*
 “ *nue*

“ nu’d in Heresy or Schifm; ” which is an
Insinuation as false, as the Thing he insinuates I
charge on Pope Stephen, is black and horrid;
and because it is so, I must beg the Reader’s Pa-
tience, while I lay before him the whole Passage,
from whence Mr. Bingham draws this false Insi-
nuation; ’tis in Pages 11 and 12 of my Preface
to the Second Part of Lay-Baptism Invalid;
where I note a captious Question he made to me,
viz. “ In what Writing of the Stephanians I
“ find this maintain’d, that they who had re-
“ ceiv’d Baptism from Hereticks and Schif-
“ maticks, were in a State of Salvation? ”
in answer to which, I tell him thus, that “ him-
“ self, and all who have look’d into St. Cy-
“ prian’s Works, do know, that Stephen Bishop
“ of Rome did hold, that such Baptiz’d Per-
“ sons were in a State of Salvation; for they
“ esteem’d them to have been Validly Baptiz’d,
“ [and (k) therefore refused to give them
“ any other Baptism, and quarrell’d with
“ St. Cyprian, &c. for judging otherwise]
“ and sure they who held Men to have been
“ Validly Baptiz’d, esteem’d them to have
“ been in a State of Salvation, otherwise
“ what signify’d the Validity of their Bap-
“ tism? (l) But for farther Answer to this
“ captious Question, the Reader may find e-

(k) These Words between the two Crotchets, Mr. *Bingham* has fallaciously left out of the Passage he quotes from me, because they notoriously witness against the Disingenuity of his black Insinuation, as we shall see by and by.

(l) The following Part of my Answer, Mr. *Bingham* wholly omits, and it abundantly exposes his Disingenuity.

“ nough

“ nough in St. *Cyprian's* Epistles to *Jubaianus*
 “ and *Pompeius*, and in *Firmilian's* Epistle to
 “ St. *Cyprian*; in all which, the Arguments
 “ of Pope *Stephen*, and his Followers, are par-
 “ ticularly mention'd, and endeavour'd to be
 “ answer'd by St. *Cyprian* and *Firmilian*; and
 “ tho' Mr. *Bingham* makes himself ignorant of
 “ the *Stephanians* Maintaining, ” “ *That they who*
 “ *had receiv'd Baptism from Hereticks or Schisma-*
 “ *ticks, were in a State of Salvation*; ” yet as
 “ Learned and Judicious an Author, as any Mo-
 “ dern Writer whatsoever, ” [see *Vindica-*
 “ tion of a Discourse of the Principles of the
 “ *Cyprianic Age*, pag: 304.] “ has expressly af-
 “ firmed, that they affirm'd, ” “ *That all Ca-*
 “ *techumens, who died Un-Baptiz'd, were not*
 “ *therefore damn'd*; ” “ much less those who
 “ had receiv'd Baptism, tho' from Here-
 “ ticks or Schismatics, ” which is the
 “ very Argument of the *Stephanians*, that I
 “ have mention'd in the Place, on which Mr.
 “ *Bingham* makes his Remark, and from which
 “ alone he deduces his captious Question. ”
 Thus I have given the Reader the whole Pas-
 sage, from whence Mr. *Bingham* has drawn his
 false Insinuation; wherein 'tis evident,

1st, That there is not one Word about “ He-
 “ reticks and Schismatics ” being “ in a State
 “ of Salvation, while they continu'd in He-
 “ resy or Schism. ” And this at once be-
 trays his Disingenuity.

2dly, That the Persons, whom I say Pope
Stephen held to have been in a State of Sal-
 vation, were those to whom the *Stephanians*
 “ refused to give — any other Baptism, ”
 because they reckon'd they had been Validly Bap-
 tiz'd

tiz'd by *Hereticks and Schismaticks* before, which plainly determines them to have been such Penitents as return'd to the Church, about the Manner of whose Reception *St. Cyprian and Pope Stephen* disputed, and this latter "refus'd to give them any other Baptism," because he esteem'd them to have *Valid Baptism*; and certainly Penitents returning to the Church must be in a State of Salvation, if they have *Valid Baptism*; and 'twas only about the Reception of returning Penitents, that the Dispute was rais'd.

3dly, This is farther confirm'd by the *Stephanians Assertion*, "That all Catechumens, who died Un-Baptiz'd, were not therefore damn'd; much less those who had receiv'd Baptism, tho' from Hereticks or Schismaticks;" for this plainly shews, they held these latter to be "in a State of Salvation," not "while they continu'd in Heresy or Schism," as *Mr. Bingham* most disingenuously represents it; for as I observ'd before, the Dispute between the *Stephanians and Cyprianists* was not about such, but about Returning Penitents, "who had receiv'd Baptism, tho' from Hereticks or Schismaticks;" and therefore 'twas upon their Repentance, and Return from their Heresy or Schism, that the *Stephanians* reckon'd them to be much more in a State of Salvation than Catechumens, because they judg'd them to have been *Validly Baptiz'd*. And 'tis not to be doubted, that *Valid Baptism* is effectually operative, and an actual State of Salvation to those who have receiv'd it, and who do not by their Wickedness and Impenitence obstruct the Receiving of the Spiritual Graces, which are never separate from *Valid Baptism* it self, but always convey'd thereby to those who are capable of

of receiving them; as our Church has admirably well determin'd in her most excellent Catechism, where she expressly affirms, of Valid Baptism, that a Person is "therein made a Member of Christ, a Child of God, and an Inheritor of the Kingdom of Heaven;" and this she as positively calls in the same Catechism, "A State of Salvation," as well she might; for, "being by Nature born in Sin, and the Children of Wrath, we are hereby made the Children of Grace;" that is, by Valid Baptism, the operative Efficaciousness whereof is always still the same in it self, and cannot be obstructed, and hinder'd, but by the Sins and Iniquities of the Recipient.

§ XXIX. *In my Second Part of Lay-Baptism Invalid, p. 210, &c. I have examin'd and expos'd the Fallacies of Mr. Bingham's Account of the suppos'd Practice of Lay-Baptism by the Modern Greeks, Muscovites, and Foreign Reform'd, and largely prov'd, that all he has said about them, is no Evidence of the general Sense and Practice of the Church, in Favour of Lay-Baptism.*

I have there prov'd, that the two Canons of Nicephorus, which allow'd of Baptism by a Christian Layman, were not made by a Patriarchal Council of 270 Bishops, Anno 814. as Mr. Bingham artfully insinuates, but were only the Canons of Nicephorus, the superstitious and idolatrous Patriarch of Constantinople, a zealous Promoter of Image-Worship, who liv'd in the ninth Century, one of the most corrupt and superstitious Ages of Christianity, wherein the Practice of Worshipping Images was carry'd on with a high Hand; and
that,

that, therefore, "Nicephorus's Authority" in the Case [of Lay-Baptism] "is of no more Value," than it is in the other, of the Use "of Images in Divine Worship." To which Mr. Bingham answers in the 60th Page of his Appendix, very ingenuously, that he "did not desire it to be of any greater Value; —" and then he adds, That "the Question was not whether it was lawful or unlawful in it self, but whether it was then the Practice of the Greek Church: And his Testimony is sufficient to decide this to be their Practice, tho' their Practice might chance to be against a Divine Law, which is another Question. So if the Question had been about Image-Worship, as to Fact only, whether it was then set up in the Greek Church, the Testimony of Nicephorus, or the second Council of Nice, had been Good in this Case to have prov'd the Fact, tho' not sufficient to have justify'd the Lawfulness of the Practice. But our Author [says Mr. Bingham] cunningly confounds these Questions of Fact and Right together, and labours artificially to work his Reader into an ill Opinion of Nicephorus, only to ruin his Credit as an Historian."

Thus we see how this poor Gentleman gives in, to his Opponent's Assertion, and is forc'd to subscribe to what his Adversary has prov'd, that Nicephorus's Authority for Lay-Baptism, is of no more Value, than it is for Image-Worship; Mr. Bingham acknowledges, that he "did not desire it to be of any greater Value;" this is enough, he and I need never more to dispute about these two Canons; for 'tis certain,
that

that Nicephorus's Authority for Image-Worship, is of no Value at all, to prove that Image-Worship was the general Sense and Practice of the ancient Catholick Church; and since, by Mr. Bingham's own Confession, 'tis not of any greater Value for Lay-Baptism, it unavoidably follows, that his Authority for Lay-Baptism is of no Value at all, to prove, that the Practice of Lay-Baptism was agreeable to the general Sense and Practice of the ancient Catholick Church, which is the very Thing, for which I brought all my Arguments against Nicephorus's two Canons; and which Mr. Bingham does now [before he is aware] manifestly establish by this Confession.

But farther, Mr. Bingham's Supposition, that the Practice of Lay-Baptism, allow'd of by Nicephorus's two Canons, "might chance to be against a Divine Law;" and that Nicephorus's, or the Second Council of Nice's Testimony would "not be sufficient to justify the Lawfulness of the Practice of Image-Worship," does most evidently corroborate what I just now observ'd, that Nicephorus's Testimony, in his two Canons, is no Argument, that the Practice of Lay-Baptism was agreeable to the general Sense and Practice of the ancient Catholick Church; for, if Nicephorus's Testimony for Lay-Baptism, which confessedly might chance to be against a Divine Law, be, as Mr. Bingham owns, of no greater Value, than his Testimony for Image-Worship; and if his Testimony for Image-Worship would not [tho' strengthen'd by the concurrent Testimony of the Second Council of Nice] be sufficient to justify the Lawfulness of that idolatrous

d

trous

trous Practice ; it necessarily follows, that Nicephorus's two Canons for Lay-Baptism, are not sufficient to justify the Lawfulness of Lay-Baptism, any more than of Image-Worship ; and if not sufficient to justify its Lawfulness, then his Testimony is no Proof, that the Practice of Lay-Baptism was agreeable to the general Sense and Practice of the ancient Catholick Church ; except Mr. Bingham will suppose, that what might chance to be against a Divine Law, might be agreeable to the general Sense and Practice of the ancient Catholick Church, which is one of the vilest Reproaches that can be cast upon her, and ought therefore to be detested and abhor'd.

§ XXX. *Again, he says, the Question of Lay-Baptism in the Greek Church, about which he is concern'd, is " not whether it was Law-
" ful or Unlawful in it self ; but whether it
" was then the Practice of the Greek Church ;
" and his [viz. Nicephorus's] Testimony is
" sufficient to decide this to be their Practice,
" tho' their Practice might chance to be a-
" gainst a Divine Law, which is another
" Question. "*

At this rate, he might have spar'd all his Writing ; for to what Purpose does he tell us of Practices, if he is not concern'd, whether they are Lawful or Unlawful ? It was thought by his Friends, that he would have shew'd the World what was that Practice of the Church, which might safely be rely'd on, and follow'd as a sure Pattern to copy after ; that he would have prov'd the Church's Practice to have been such, as that the Opposers of Lay-Baptism might rest satisfy'd there-

therein, and quiet their Scruples, and lay aside any farther Disputes about it, which certainly must be something that is truly Lawful; otherwise he writes to no Purpose at all, but only to amuse Mankind. And, indeed, so he does in Effect now tell us; since he owns, that his Question about the Practice of Lay-Baptism in the Greek Church is "not whether it was Lawful or Unlawful?" No, he proposes their suppos'd Practice for our Imitation, [or else he proposes it for nothing at all] but troubles not himself whether it be Lawful or Unlawful, that is "another Question" with which he does not concern himself: A hopeful Way to quiet disturbed Consciences! but if this is not Mr. Bingham's Question, 'tis ours, for 'tis a Matter of the highest Consequence, to distinguish between Lawful and Unlawful Practices, because particular [especially Modern] Churches may take up, and have follow'd Practices unlawful in themselves, which the truly ancient Catholick Church, about whose Practice we are now enquiring, was always a Stranger to, and did never in the least countenance or encourage by her Example. We piously believe, that the truly ancient Catholick Church, properly so call'd, never took up the Practice of what was "unlawful in it self;" tho' some particular Churches, particularly Modern ones did; and therefore we conclude, that the Practices of some particular Churches are many Times no Argument at all, that such their Practices are lawful, and agreeable to the Sense and Practice of the ancient Catholick Church, when the ancient Catholick Church herself did never, by her Practice, give Testimony to their Lawfulness; and

'tis for this very Reason thought highly necessary by the Author of Lay-Baptism Invalid, to consider Questions of Fact and Right together; and happy would it have been for Mr. Bingham, if he had done so too; for then he would have distinguish'd what was truly Catholick and Lawful, from what is but private, modern, unlawful, and therefore dangerous to the Souls of Men.

§ XXXI. But why is Nicephorus's Testimony sufficient, as Mr. Bingham says it is, to decide that Lay-Baptism was the Practice of the Greek Church in the 9th Century? Is his Testimony sufficient, because Mr. Bingham says it is? No certainly, his two Canons appear to be no other than his private Dictates; there is not so much as one Proof, that they were ever made in any Greek Council at all; as I have abundantly shew'd from Page 213 to 220, of the Second Part of Lay-Baptism Invalid. He asks me in his 61st Page, "How came Harmenopolus to make use of them as Canon-Law, in a Collection of Rules to direct Men in their Practice? This Question I have already answer'd very fully in Pages 219, 220, 223, and 224, of the Second Part of Lay-Baptism; to which I add, that Mr. Bingham cannot prove that Harmenopolus collect'd them as Canon-Law, or Rules to direct Men in their Practice, any more than many other such Writers have collect'd Ancient Canons, who [as we see every Day] do not make use of them as Rules to direct Men in their Practice, but only write them as Historical Curiosities, of no manner of Obligation, at the time when they collect them. And farther, tho' it could be prov'd [as it cannot] that these two Canons were the authentick Sense

Sense of the Greek Church, in the Ninth Century, yet they are of no manner of Advantage to Mr. Bingham's Cause, for which he writ his Scholastical History, as may be seen in Page 225, of the Second Part of Lay-Baptism Invalid.

§ XXXII. Upon the whole, all Mr. Bingham's Evidence for Lay-Baptism in the Greek Church, commences from the Beginning of the Ninth Century, one of the corruptest Ages of Christianity, and consists only of the private Opinion of particular Men, and those not corroborated so much, as but by one Council of the Greek Church; his whole Evidence being no more than these two obscure Canons of Nicephorus; The Opinion of Jeremy, the late Patriarch of Constantinople; Metrophanes Critopulus, a late Greek Writer; Gabriel Severus, Archbishop of Philadelphia; and Dr. Smith's Extract out of one of their Confessions of Faith, printed anno 1662, which Confession of Faith is of obscure Original; and Dr. Smith in the 6th Page of his Preface to his Account of the Greek Church, makes the bold Determinations of this very Confession of Faith, anno 1662, enough "to
 " incline any sober and considering Man to
 " believe, that the Greeks have of late, more
 " than ever, been wrought upon by the sly
 " Artifices and under-hand Dealing of the sub-
 " tle Emissaries of Rome." And this Confession of Faith, and Jeremy the Patriarch, Metrophanes Critopulus, and Gabriel Severus, do all allow Women, as well as Laymen, to Baptize, which by Mr. Bingham's own Confession [Schol. Hist. Part I. p. 46.] "the Ancient Church did not allow them to do;" and every body knows,

that this Practice is a peculiar Corruption of the Church of Rome, and consequently, may easily guess where these few Greeks learned this Latitude: But in Opposition to Lay-Baptism, "let their Opinions" in other Matters be what they will, the Greeks have given abundant Testimony, viz. St. Chrysostome and St. Basil in the Fourth Century; Georgius Hamartolus, about the Year 840; Michael Glycas, about the Year 1120; a great Council at Constantinople, where were present three Patriarchs, Lucas Chrysoberges of Constantinople, Athanasius of Antioch, and Nicephorus of Jerusalem, with Fifty seven Metropolitans, besides other Bishops, in the Year 1166; and Theodorus Scutariota, about the Year 1220; and if to all this we add the Testimony of Arcudius, a Romish Priest, who wrote a Book, Printed anno 1626, to make the World believe, that the Oriental Churches agreed with the Roman, where he owns, That "for the most part, all Grecia, Russia, Muscovia, and other Provinces, who, after the manner of the Greek Church, continue in the Faith of Christ, when a Priest is absent, had rather suffer their Infants to die without [what he calls] Baptism, than suffer them to be baptiz'd [as he terms it] by any other, because they think, that it is not Lawful, even in Necessity, for Laicks to execute this Office. I say, if we sum up this whole Evidence, which I have produc'd in my Second Part of Lay-Baptism Invalid, we shall have a great Cloud of Witnesses against Lay-Baptism's being agreeable to the Sense and Practice of the Greek Church; and these vastly Superiour in Number, Credit, and Reputation, to the private Authorities

Authorities produc'd by Mr. Bingham, on the other Side; as any Man may easily see, that will but Impartially consider the Evidence on both Sides, which is a full Answer to all his little Cavilings against my Examination of his Account of Lay-Baptism in the Greek and Muscovite Churches.

He asks me in his 70th Page, "How I am assur'd, that the Uncharitable and Cruel Opinion [of St. Augustin] about Infants Dying without Baptism, was embrac'd by the Greeks at all, &c. when I have already told him in my Account of the Greek Church, Page 239 of the Second Part of Lay-Baptism Invalid, That the Learned Dr. Smith relates this of them; and that this Cruel Opinion is the Cause of a Notion among them, that Women, as well as Laymen, may Baptize in Want of a Priest; which, Mr. Bingham very well knows, is a Popish Fancy; that it is not agreeable to the Sense of the Ancient Catholick Church; and it is therefore a shrewd Sign, that this is only a Novel Opinion of some singular Latinizing modern Greeks, and no Argument of the authentick, genuine Sense of the Greek Church; as I have abundantly prov'd in the Pages before and after the 239th Page above-mention'd, where Mr. Bingham might have seen his Question answer'd, before he put it.

I would here have finish'd my long Preface, but I must not neglect to answer his very angry Remark upon what, I find by his Behaviour, has struck him to the very Quick, which is "the Sting, [as he calls it] in the Close of my Preface to the Second Part of Lay-Baptism Invalid.

§ XXXIII. *In the 38th Page of his Appendix, he says, That my Charge upon the Advocates for Lay-Baptism, of Dissolving the Necessity of the Christian Priesthood, &c.* “equally reflects upon the Principles
 “and Practice of the whole Catholick Church in
 “all Ages.” *This looks black indeed. And now, let us see how he endeavours to prove it. The Charge I lay on the Advocates for Lay-Baptism is (m) thus;* “I leave this with our Reverend Historian, &c. that if Baptism perform’d by Persons who were never really, and truly
 “Commission’d by Bishops to Baptize, and who act herein rebelliously against, and in
 “Opposition to the Divine Right of Episcopacy, be Good and Valid Baptism; then,
 “Authoritative Preaching, Administring the other Sacrament, the Power of Excommunicating, of Binding and Loosing, of Retaining and Absolving Mens Sins, and all the Spiritual Functions of the Clergy, are also Good and Valid, when attempted by unauthoriz’d, never Commission’d Lay-Persons; the Consequence of which is, the utter Dissolution, and Taking away the Necessity of the Christian Priesthood, therefore, of Christ’s Authority here on Earth, and so of all reveal’d Religion too, which is a dreadful Consideration; and much more so, if any who ought to be the Guardians of these Sacred Things, should endeavour, by

(m) Preface to the Second Part of *Lay-Baptism*, p. 20.

“ their

“ their Writings and Preaching, to establish the
 “ dangerous Premisses, from whence such pro-
 “ phane Consequences do naturally flow.” *This*
is the Charge, upon which Mr. Bingham tells me,
 I “ had done much better to have prov’d this
 “ solidly, than to have barely said it.” *That*
 “ let the Consideration be as dreadful as it
 “ will—— he has prov’d that it neither af-
 “ fects him, nor the, &c.—— any more than
 “ it does the whole Catholick Church, which
 “ allow’d the Validity of Heretical Baptism, at
 “ the same time that she depriv’d Hereticks
 “ of their Sacerdotal Commission, and esteem’d
 “ them really and truly no more Priests du-
 “ ring their Heresy, (tho’ they once had a Com-
 “ mission) than the most unauthoriz’d Layman
 “ who never had a Commission at all. *And*
then he draws up what he calls my Accusation a-
gainst the Primitive Church, thus ; “ If Baptism,
 “ perform’d by Persons who are really and truly
 “ depriv’d of their Commission to Baptize, by
 “ the Bishops of the Catholick Church, and
 “ who act after such Deprivation, rebelliously
 “ against, and in Opposition to the Divine
 “ Right of Episcopacy, be Good and Valid
 “ Baptism, as the Ancient Church asserted ; then
 “ Auhoritative Preaching, &c. are also Good
 “ and Valid, when attempted by unauthoriz’d
 “ Priests, whom the Church makes Laymen,—
 “ the Consequence of which is the utter Disso-
 “ lution, and Taking away of the Necessity of
 “ the Christian Priesthood, &c.” *in the rest of*
my Words. And thus we see how he has prov’d,
that my Charge against himself, and his Adhe-
rents, equally reflects upon the Principles and
 Practice

Practice of the whole Catholick Church in
 “ all Ages.” But, in this his pretended Proof,
 he takes for granted several notorious Fal-
 sities.

1st, That the whole Catholick Church, in
 all Ages, allow'd of the Validity of Heretical
 Baptism; which is false; for the numerous Cy-
 prianick Churches did not allow of it.

2dly, That the Bishops of the Catholick Church,
 reduc'd Heretical Priests to the same Incapacity
 for Sacred Functions, “ as the most unautho-
 “ riz'd Layman, who never had a Commis-
 “ sion at all, ” and so null'd their Commission;
 when in Truth, the Churches who differ'd from
 the Cyprianick Churches, had no such nullifying
 Discipline; as I have prov'd against Mr. Bing-
 ham. And

3dly, He takes for allow'd, that Heretical
 Priests after their Deprivation, Baptiz'd in “ Op-
 “ position to the Divine Right of Episco-
 “ pacy, ” which is a most notorious Fallacy put
 upon his Reader; for 'tis well known, that those
 Hereticks were Episcopal. And therefore, my
 Charge of dissolving the Necessity of the Christian
 Priesthood, still stands good against him and his
 Friends in this Controversy, without reflecting
 “ upon the Principles and Practice of the
 “ whole Catholick Church in all Ages, ” as
 he falsely insinuates; for my Charge against them,
 is purely founded upon their holding the Validity
 of Baptism “ perform'd by Persons who were
 “ never really and truly Commission'd by Bi-
 “ shops to Baptize, and who act herein re-
 “ belliously against, and in Opposition to the
 “ Divine Right of Episcopacy; ” and he
 has

has not prov'd, neither can he prove, that any ancient Churches, much less the whole Catholick Church in all Ages, held such false Baptisms to be Valid; for they never were infested with such Baptizers.

§ XXXIV. He calls upon me, p. 39. to prove this heavy Charge against them; and therefore, that he may see how plain and easy the Proof is, I shall here give him a short Specimen of it; and 'tis this.

I. Christian Baptism with Water in the Name of the Trinity is a Divine Positive Institution, and the Validity of its Ministration is founded upon Christ's Commission and Authority, if we may believe Divine Revelation, and the Articles, Canons, and Rubricks of the Church of England; as I have prov'd (n) elsewhere.

II. The Christian Priesthood, is Christ's Commission and Authority, as is manifest from Scripture.

III. Persons who were never really and truly Commission'd by Bishops to Baptize, and who also act herein rebelliously against, and in Opposition to the Divine Right of Episcopacy, have not Christ's Commission and Authority, in any Respect whatsoever, as has been abundantly prov'd, by many of our excellent Writers, against the pretended Ordinations of the Sectaries; to some of which I have referr'd in (o) another Place.

(n) First Part of *Lay-Baptism Invalid*; and Dissenters Baptism Null and Void.

(o) First Part of *Lay-Baptism Invalid*, third Edition, p. 100.

IV. *If then these never Commission'd Persons can Validly minister Baptism, 'tis plain that there may be a Valid Ministration of Baptism which is not founded on, but is without, and contrary to Christ's Commission and Authority. Consequently,*

V. *It is not necessary to the Validity of the Ministration of Baptism, that there should be Christ's Commission and Authority in the Ministration of it. Therefore,*

VI. *No need of Priesthood, [which is Christ's Commission and Authority] for the Valid Ministration of Baptism. Consequently,*

VII. *The Divine Positive Revelation which makes Christ's Commission and Authority necessary for the Validity of that Ministration, is frustrated and made Void.*

VIII. *Authoritative Preaching, Administring the other Sacrament, the Power of Excommunication, of Binding and Loosing, of Retaining and Absolving Mens Sins, &c. are each of them no other than Divine Positive Institutions, and their Validity [as that of the Ministration of Baptism] founded upon Christ's Commission and Authority; as is manifest from Multitudes of Texts of Scripture. Consequently,*

IX. *Whatsoever is true of the Validity of the Ministration of Baptism, is true also of the Validity of the Ministration of these. Therefore,*

X. *Persons never Commission'd can Validly minister these, as well as Baptism, and for the very same Reason.*

XI. *Hence will follow the No-Necessity of Priesthood, [which is Christ's Commission and Authority]*

ity] for the Valid Ministration of these. And therefore,

XII. The Divine Positive Revelation, which makes Christ's Commission and Authority necessary for the Validity of these Ministrations, is made of no Effect. Consequently,

XIII. If the Obligation of Divine Positive Revelation may be set aside in so many Instances, it may for the same Reason in more, and so on, till we take away the Obligation of all positive reveal'd Religion, properly so call'd. Of such dangerous Consequence is it, to part with One Divine Positive Institution of Religion, as they most notoriously do, who say and teach, that it is not necessary for Persons to be Baptiz'd by those who bear Christ's Commission and Authority.

§ XXXV. They have no way, whereby they endeavour to extricate themselves out of this Difficulty, but by saying, that the Church may confirm Baptism given by Persons who never had Christ's Commission and Authority; which Confirming Power they have been often call'd upon to prove, but have not done it; and yet, for my not acquiescing in such their groundless, and never once prov'd Assertions; for my bringing this Charge against them, and for my not being so popishly addicted, as blindly to follow his, and some other Mens private Opinions, with an implicate Faith; Mr. Bingham is so civil as to affirm [what he does not endeavour, because he is not able to prove] that I "insult the Fathers
" of the Church with Contempt and Scorn, and that "under the Professions of Respect to Priests, I treat all those rudely, who are not my
" Followers

“ Followers and Admirers. And that he may strike me the more home, he is pleas'd, in his great Meekness, to set me in the Place of the Devil, and brand me with one of his most remarkably wicked Characters, calling me, **The Accuser of the Brethren**; and taking to himself the Words us'd by St. Michael the Arch-Angel, when he was disputing with the Devil about the Body of Moses, he consigns me over [as an obstinate and irreclaimable Fiend] to the Judgment of God, with this dreadful Sentence; “ **the Lord rebuke thee.** ” Shocking Language this, to come from a Christian Priest! who should rather pray for, and endeavour the Conversion of his Adversary, if he were in the wrong, than thus fearfully wish, that the Lord may rebuke him! But alas, the poor Gentleman's Patience is here lost; the Badness of his Cause betrays him into this indecent Excess, and whets his Passion; he is [contrary to the Blessed Example of St. Michael the Arch-Angel] got on the worst, because the false Side of the Question; and has, without due Consideration, assum'd to himself too high a Character, and hastily utter'd what no ways befits a Man in his sad Circumstances, who is thus unhappily engag'd in the Defence of those Lay, Anti-Sacerdotal, Anti-Episcopal False Baptisms, which, as a Christian, and a Priest, he ought to detest and abhor, and with all his Power and Ability to oppose and destroy, as they strike at his own Sacred Function, and therein at the very Authority even of our Lord Jesus Christ himself, the Supreme Head of the Church. But I pity his Case, that he is so unfortunately hurry'd by a bad Cause into such wretched Indecencies,

cencies, as [with Compassion I say it] expose him to Contempt, and which [I am willing to have so much Charity, as yet to believe] he, by this time, may find Reason to be sorry for, repent of, and wish he had never committed!

St. Philip and St.
James, 1714.







A

SUPPLEMENT


TO THE

First and Second Parts

OF

LAY-BAPTISM

INVALID.



CHAP. I.

The true State of the present Controversy.

§ I.



THE best way to deal with the *Advocates for Lay-Baptism*, is, 1st, To keep them always very strictly close to the *Merits of the Cause*, from which, by their frequent Wandrings, they di-

vert the Attention of their Readers : And 2^{dly}, To argue with them upon their own *Principles*, by which [*'tis notorious*] they often

B

establish

establish the very Thing we are contending for.

§ II. First then, **The Merits of the Cause** [as they have been often told] is this, *viz.* Whether by the Law of Christ, (which is the Institution of Christian Baptism) *Lay-Baptism* be Valid or Invalid? Or, [to speak so plainly, as that there may be no Ambiguity in the Term *Lay-Baptism*] Whether the pretended Baptism which is perform'd by Persons who *never were at all commission'd to Baptize*, be Valid or Invalid? This is the *true Merits of the Cause*; and this is the great Question, to which I must endeavour to keep the Reverend Mr. Bingham.

§ III. That such Baptism is wholly Null and Void, I have endeavoured to prove from the Holy Scripture, in my Book of *Lay-Baptism Invalid*, wherein I strictly confine myself, to the Question of Baptism by Persons who *never were at all commission'd*, calling them *Lay-Baptisms*; and 'tis only with these *never commission'd Baptisms* that we are now concern'd:

§ IV. The Bishop of *S—m* has been pleas'd to call the Doctrine of the Invalidity of such Baptisms, "*A Step towards Popery*," when 'tis notorious, that the contrary Notion of their pretended Validity, is one of the peculiar Doctrines of the *corrupt Church of Rome*. But no matter for that; his Lordship would have the World believe, that the Authority of the Church favours the Validity of such uninstituted Washings; and therefore I answer'd all his Lordship's Allegations, in my Book of *Sacerdotal Powers*, wherein

wherein I still limit my Discourse to Baptism performed by Persons, who never were commission'd, and call them Unauthoriz'd Lay-Baptisms, Unauthoriz'd Baptisms, and Uncommission'd Baptisms; all which Terms are made use of by me, one in one place, another in another place, to signify one and the same thing; namely, Baptism by Persons who *never were at all commission'd to Baptize*; and this, purposely to avoid frequent Circumlocutions.

§ V. The next that appear'd in Favour of Lay-Baptism, was the Author of a Book falsely intituled, *The Judgment of the Church of England*; but this Author frankly owns, that "he did not pretend to enter into the Merits of the Cause," but only to shew the Opinion of the Church of England; in Answer to which I wrote, "Dissenters and other unauthoriz'd Baptisms Null and Void, by the Articles, Canons, and Rubricks of the Church of England." And this Book also was level'd against the same *never commission'd Baptisms*, as the other two were. The same Author, a little after, sent forth what he calls *The Second Part of the Judgment*, &c. in which Pamphlet he still industriously avoids the Merits of the Cause; fills his Paper with much the same things he had said in his First Part, and fairly tells his Reader, that he does not design it as a Reply to *Dissenters Baptism Null and Void*.

§ VI. Another Writer in Favour of Lay-Baptism, who ought by no means to have been neglected, is my Lord Bishop of Oxford, who in his *Charge to his Clergy*, endeavours to con-

vince them of the Validity of that Baptism, which is perform'd by Persons who have no Episcopal Orders. To all his Lordship's Reasonings I have reply'd, in *The Bishop of Oxford's Charge consider'd*, still confining myself to the Dispute about Baptism by Persons who *never were commission'd to Baptize*. And 'tis but just and reasonable to observe, that his Lordship is more ingenuous than some other of the Advocates for Lay-Baptism are; for, his Lordship (a) expressly owns, that "there is no magis and minus," [no Degrees of greater or lesser] "in the Validity or Invalidity of Sacraments, which cannot be partly Valid, and partly Invalid." From which Concession, we gain thus much from his Lordship at least, That if Baptism by a never commission'd Person, be at all Invalid, it must be wholly and entirely so, and therefore Null and Void: And whether it has any Invalidity or no, has been [I think] sufficiently enquir'd into, in (b) another Place; and the Affirmative, I hope, fairly prov'd, from the Nature of the Divine Institution it self of Christian Baptism.

§ VII. There have been several other Writers of a lower Form, who have endeavour'd to give Credit and Reputation to the contrary corrupt and Popish Notion; but their Performances are such, that they deserve no particular Answer, farther than what has been already provided for, in my Treatise of Lay-

(a) *Bishop of Oxford's Charge to his Clergy*, p. 14.

(b) *Lay-Baptism Invalid*.

Baptism, and what has also been given in my other Books, to the Right Reverend Prelates, &c. before-mention'd, from whom they have borrow'd and transcrib'd their *seeming Arguments*; to which they have added but little of their own, except very poor and indecent Reflections on Persons, which are foreign to the Matter in Hand, and therefore utterly unworthy of any Notice in this Controversy.

§ VIII. 'Tis very observable, that all these Writers insist very much upon the pretended Sense and Practice of the **Catholick Church**, as if *that* were entirely on their Side of the Question; but alas! they only *speak big* of what they do not produce, and *boast* of that Authority, which never was prov'd by any of them to have been at all in the World.

Indeed, when the Reverend Mr. *Bingham* embark'd himself in their Cause, mighty Things were expected from his great Reading in Ecclesiastical History! 'Twas thought by some, that he [if Any Body could] would have fully prov'd this *pretended Authority*, and set it in a clear Light, to the Confusion of all Opposers. But when his *Scholastical History of Lay-Baptism* [as he calls it] came forth, it had a very contrary Effect; for, 'tis so far from producing the *pretended Authority* of the ancient Catholick Church in Favour of Baptism by Persons who *never were commission'd to Baptize*; that it expressly asserts, that (c) the Commission to Baptize was “to continue to the **End of the**

(c) *Scholast. Hist. of Lay-Baptism*, p. 3.

“**World;**” that is, ’twas instituted to continue to the End of the World; which makes the Commission as much Essential, as the Water and the Form in the Name of the Trinity; because they are all three but equally instituted to continue to the End of the World. But this is not all; for he says farther, that [1st] “Whom the Apostles actually authoriz’d to Baptize; and [2dly] to whom they gave Commission to authorize others to Baptize, were both necessary to preserve the Church, according to the Order of Christ, at least in future Ages.” Whereby Mr. Bingham makes the Commission to Baptize, to be even necessary to preserve the Church, and consequently necessary to preserve Baptism, [because, no Baptism, no Church, as all our Antagonists do allow by their great Outcries of unchurching the Foreigners.] Nay more still, to let these Gentlemen see what mighty Reason they have to boast of the Church’s pretended Authority, in Favour of Baptism by Persons never commission’d, this great Searcher into Ecclesiastical Antiquity! sums up his whole Account of the first six hundred Years of Christianity, with this very remarkable Testimony, That for six hundred Years, “the (d) general Sense and Practice” of the ancient Church was grounded, as they suppose, upon the Commission given to the Apostles, whereby Bishops, as the Apostles Successors, are qualify’d, first to give Baptism themselves, and then to grant a Commission to others to Baptize ——— in ordi-

(d) Scholast. Hist. p. 38.

“ nary Cases, and in Cases extraordinary, and
 “ of extreme Necessity. ————— ” By
 which 'tis evident, that he makes the *ancient Church* to be an Evidence for no other Baptism, than that which was perform'd by Persons, who *were commission'd* [or suppos'd to have been commission'd] by *Bishops* to Baptize, and this for no less Space of Time than the first six hundred Years of Christianity; and consequently [according to this Historian] the general Sense and Practice of the Church, during that long Tract of Time, which includes the purest Ages, was not in Favour of our *pretended Baptisms*, perform'd by Persons who *never were at all commission'd by Bishops*. Thus our Antagonists may see, that the Writer in whom they plac'd so much Confidence, has done nothing to support their Cause; but on the contrary, has expos'd and abundantly discover'd the weak and sandy Foundation on which they rested; for 'tis very notorious throughout his whole History, and every impartial Reader, that rightly considers, may be thoroughly convinc'd thereby, that *the ancient Catholick Church never had any Ecclesiastical Law, Tradition or Custom, for the Validity of that pretended Baptism, which is perform'd by Persons, who never were commission'd by Bishops to Baptize*, as I have largely prov'd from Mr. *Bingham's* own *Scholastical History*, in my *Second Part of Lay-Baptism Invalid*.

§ IX. There is one Place in that History, (e) where Mr. *Bingham* labours hard to make

(e) *Scholast. Hist.* p. 51.

the ancient Heretical and Schismatical Baptisms allow'd of by some Churches, to look like our Lay-Baptisms. But in answer to that, I have prov'd from his own Words, (f) that those Heretical and Schismatical Baptizers had Valid Ordination in the Opinion of those Churches; and that consequently the Baptism they administer'd, was Episcopally commission'd Baptism, and therefore *not the same, as our never commission'd Baptisms*; and that so, the Validity of these latter does not follow from that of the former. Now here 'tis very observable, that Mr. Bingham being hard press'd, and uncapable to find any Testimony of the ancient Catholick Church, for the Validity of Baptism by Persons never commission'd, starts from this Point, forsakes the Question which so nearly concerns us, and endeavours to divert us from the Merits of the Cause, to engage us in a Dispute that no ways belongs to it.

§ X. To which End he has sent forth another Book, which he calls "*A Scholastical History of Lay-Baptism, Part II.*" whereas in Truth, upon Perusal of the Book, 'tis found to be a History of nothing else, but of some Heretical and Schismatical Clergymens being depos'd and excommunicated; with the Historian's own Insinuations, that such Clergymen utterly lost their Priestly Character, and so were reduc'd to *meer Laymen*; and that consequently the Church, by allowing of the Validity of

(f) *Second Part of Lay-Baptism Invalid, p. 197, &c.*

Baptisms perform'd by *them*, did allow of the Validity of Lay-Baptism, Baptism by Persons utterly destitute of any Priestly Character. This is the great Design of all his Toil and Labour in this Second Part of his pretended *History of Lay-Baptism*, when yet he is still so unhappy, as to spoil this very Design, by contradicting himself in the same Book, as well as in several Parts of his other Writings, where he teaches, that the *Priestly Character is as Indelible as that of Baptism*, and thereby gives in, to our Assertion, that the Baptism of Heretical, Schismatical, and Degraded Priests, allow'd of by some Churches, was not the same, as that pretended Baptism which is administer'd by Persons, who *never had any Priestly Character*, never were at all commission'd to Baptize.

§ XI. The Reverend Historian is very much nettled at the Term of Baptism by Persons who never were at all commission'd to Baptize, so frequently made use of by me in this Controversy, and is pleas'd in several Places of his Second Part to call it *Quibbling*; but this does not at all move me, for I am stedfastly resolv'd not to be *banter'd* out of this necessary Distinction; for, 'tis so plain a one, and free from any *Ambiguity* whatsoever, that it is the most *Proper* to express the Case about which we are concern'd, and effectually discovers the many Fallacies that are made use of, to give Countenance to our present [and in former Ages of the Church unheard of] *Usurpations*. And 'tis so notorious, that such *False Baptisms* have not the Authority of
the

the ancient Catholick Church, in Favour of their Validity, that even Mr. *Bingham* himself cannot but own, as indeed he does ingenuously, (g) that the Question about them “*makes a wide Difference in the Case,*” and is “*a more difficult Question,*” [viz. than that of *Lay-Baptism* suppos’d to be authoriz’d by Bishops in Cases of Extremity, about which he had been treating before] nay farther, that *such usurped Baptism* (h) “*was not decreed to be Valid, by the Determination of any General Council;*” and that he “*does (i) not yet remember*” [after all his preceding laborious Searches in Ecclesiastical Antiquity] “*any General Council that has directly determin’d any Thing for — the Validity of Baptism administer’d by such Laymen,*” that is, “*Laymen (k) who never had any Pre- tence to Sacerdotal Authority or Commission in the Church.*” And therefore I am still resolv’d to talk of these Laymen, these *never commission’d Persons*; to make use of this Term as of a sure *Standard*, and thereby to examine, and try, whether Mr. *Bingham’s* new *Sett of Laymen* invented by himself, [whose Baptisms some Churches allow’d to be Valid] were as utterly destitute of Holy Orders when they Baptiz’d, as our never once commission’d pretending Baptizers most certainly are.

(g) *Scholast. Hist.* Part I. p. 41.

(h) *Append. to 2d Part of Scholast. Hist.* p. 19.

(i) *Ibid.* p. 20.

(k) *Ibid.* p. 19.

§ XII. For you must know, that one Sort of our Reverend Historian's Laymen were, as he tells you, (l) such as "once had a true Sacerdotal Commission, but were afterward depriv'd of their Commission, by the same Power of the Church which first gave it, and so were reduc'd to the State and Condition of Laymen again." Tho' still he allows (m) the Priestly Character of this new invented Layman to be even Indelible so far, as "that the Church upon his Repentance needs not give him a new Ordination." A pretty Sort of Laymen these, Men who have no Sacerdotal Commission, because they were depriv'd of it; and yet truly they have a Sacerdotal Commission at the same time, because the Church needs not give them a new One, by reason that the old one was still in Being! for to be sure it was not null'd, if it was Indelible: Such Inconsistencies and Contradictions do Men run into, when they are hard press'd by the just Merits of a Cause, and endeavour to evade the convincing Power and Force of it.

§ XIII. Secondly, I shall therefore argue with Mr. Bingham upon his own declar'd Principles, and, keeping my Eye still upon the Merits of the Cause, shall in the following Chapter shew, even from his own Account of the Matter, that the Baptisms [allowed of by some Churches] which had been administred by Heretical, Schif-

(1) *Append. to the 2d Part of Scholast. Hist.* p. 19.

(m) *Ibid.* p. 21.

matical, Degraded and Excommunicated Priests, were not the Baptisms of meer Laymen : That is, were not Baptisms of the same Nature with those *False Baptisms*, which are now perform'd by Persons who never were at all commission'd by Bishops to Baptize : And that consequently the Church's Testimony for the Validity of those Ancient Baptisms, is no Evidence in Favour of the pretended Validity of our never commission'd Baptisms.



C H A P. II.

That by Mr. Bingham's own Account of the Matter, the ancient Heretical, Schismatical, Degraded, and Excommunicated Priests [whose Baptisms some Churches allow'd to be Valid] were not meer Laymen when they Baptiz'd, but Priests Ordain'd by Bishops, whose Ordination was Valid in the Opinion of those Churches; and that consequently the Baptisms administred by such Priests, were not Baptisms of the same Nature with our False Baptisms, perform'd by Persons who never were at all commission'd to Baptize; and that therefore the Practise of those Churches is no Proof that they held these latter to be Valid Baptisms.

§ I.



UR Reverend Historian's Imaginary Argument for the Validity of Baptism by *unauthoriz'd Persons*; [that is, Persons who *never were at all commission'd*; for this he must mean, if he would dispute with me] stands thus, (n) "*The Baptism of Hereticks and Schif-*

(n) *Schol. Hist. Part II. p. 79.*

" maticks,

“ *matics, and Degraded Clerks, and Excommu-*
 “ *nicated Clerks, is the Baptism of unauthoriz’d*
 “ *Persons, according to the Sense of the four first*
 “ *General Councils.*

“ *But the Baptism of Hereticks, Schismatics,*
 “ *Degraded Clerks, and Excommunicated Clerks,*
 “ *if ministred in due Form, was always receiv’d by*
 “ *the Church without Re-Baptizing.*

“ *Therefore the Baptism of unauthoriz’d Persons,*
 “ *if ministred in due Form, was always receiv’d*
 “ *by the Church without Re-Baptizing.”*

§ II. If by *Unauthoriz’d*, our Historian means Persons utterly destitute of Commission, Men of the very same Incapacity with those who never were at all Commission’d; Persons who have no more Priesthood, than those who never were Ordain’d; and all this he must mean, if he would make the Church (by this Argument) to be an Evidence for the Validity of Baptism by Persons *who never were at all commission’d to Baptize*, [which are the Baptisms we are disputing against] then I affirm, 1st, That his major Proposition is false, and I shall prove it to be so out of his own Mouth. 2^{dly}, That his minor is notoriously false, take his Word *unauthoriz’d* in what Meaning you will; and that so, 3^{dly}, is his Conclusion. For, with what tolerable Sense can it be said, that “ *the Baptism of Hereticks and Schismatics, &c. if ministred in due Form, was always receiv’d by the Church,*” when every one that has been conversant in Ecclesiastical Antiquity, knows, that during the Three first Centuries, there is no other Instance of any Church, than *that of Rome*, receiving Heretical and Schismatical Baptisms as Valid; and that

that Stephen, Bishop of Rome, was herein vigorously oppos'd by St. Cyprian and his Collegues, Bishops of the numerous and far extended African and Eastern Churches, who in the Councils of Carthage, Iconium and Synnada, unanimously rejected such Baptisms, and appeal'd to the Ecclesiastical Laws and Practice of their Ancestors, for the Necessity of so doing, as has been abundantly prov'd (o) elsewhere? So that, if by "Always," Mr. Bingham means in every Age of Christianity, as he ought to mean, if he would speak Sense; And if by "the Church," he understands the Catholick or Universal Church, as 'tis plain he must, because he says "the Church," without limiting it to any particular Diocese, Province, Kingdom or Empire, as a Part or Parts of the Catholick Church; then 'tis plain, that his minor Proposition is false, [except to make it look true, we must run into the Popery of calling the Church of Rome, "the Church," the Catholick or Universal Church; and except we allow that Always, namely, Seventeen hundred Years is the same as not Always, namely, Three hundred Years, the first and purest Ages taken out of the Seventeen hundred, which I believe no Man in his Senses will desire us to do] and consequently his Conclusion also, that "the Baptism of Unauthoriz'd Persons, was always receiv'd by the Church," is a notorious Falsity, since numerous Orthodox Churches of the Three first Centuries did absolutely reject such Baptisms: This,

(o) Prelim. Discourse to Lay-Baptism Invalid. Second Part of Lay-Baptism Invalid.

if I should say no more, is sufficient to shew what an excellent Reasoner our Historian is, and that the Validity of Baptism by *Unauthoriz'd Persons*, such as are utterly destitute of Commission, is a Doctrin that stands destitute of the truly noble Characters of *Antiquity, Universality* and *Consent*, and so is not founded upon the Sense and Practice of the *Catholick Church*, properly so call'd.

§ III. I come now to examine Mr. *Bingham's* major Proposition; namely, That "*the Baptism of Hereticks and Schismaticks, &c. is the Baptism of Unauthoriz'd Persons, according to the Sense of the four first General Councils*": And shall prove even from himself, that those Baptisms were not of the *same Nature* with our False Baptisms administred by Persons who never were ordain'd, or authoriz'd to Baptize.

§ IV. His first Instance is (p) of the Censure of the Famous Council of *Nice* against *Meletius Bishop of Lycopolis in Egypt*, "*Who in the Time of the Dioclesian Persecution, had deny'd the Faith, and offer'd Sacrifice to Idols; for which, and some other Reasons, he was, according to the Laws of the Church, depos'd, by Peter Bishop of Alexandria.*" *Meletius, instead of submitting to this Legal Censure, rais'd a Schism*" against the Bishop of *Alexandria, ordaining Bishops and Priests throughout Egypt and Thebais.* — *And this he continu'd to do, to the Time of the Council of Nice.* The Coun-

(p) *Scholast. Hist. Part. II. p. 54.*

“ cil therefore to correct this Presumption, and
 “ confirm the Sentence which before had been
 “ pass’d upon him, made this Peremptory Decree
 “ against him, — That Meletius should have
 “ no manner of Power or Authority either of
 “ Ordaining, or Making Elections; that he should
 “ be confin’d to his own City, and neither appear
 “ in the Country, nor in any other City upon such
 “ an Occasion, but only retain the bare Name and
 “ Title of his Dignity. And for such Bishops
 “ and Presbyters as had been ordain’d by him,
 “ they should not be admitted to officiate, as Mi-
 “ nisters in the Catholick Church, till they were
 “ Μυστικῶτερα χειροτονία βεβαιωθέντες, confirm’d, or
 “ authoriz’d ” [says Mr. Bingham] “ by a more
 “ Sacred Imposition of Hands, together with the
 “ Approbation and Allowance of the Bishop of A-
 “ lexandria; which Valefius and Du Pin, and
 “ other Learned Men, take to imply a new Or-
 “ dination.” Thus far Mr. Bingham; and he
 concludes from all this, that Baptisms per-
 form’d in the Schism by Meletius, and such as
 were ordain’d by him, were unauthoriz’d Bap-
 tisms, “ and (q) yet the Council (says he)
 “ made no Decree, that the Baptisms of all these
 “ should be annull’d, and that such as came over
 “ from them should be Re-baptiz’d again.”

§ V. And now, let us see whether these
 Baptisms were of the same Nature, with our
 False Baptisms by Persons who never were or-
 dain’d or commission’d. To do which the more
 clearly, ’tis necessary to observe, that the Sen-

(q) Scholast. Hist. Part. II. p. 55.

tence of the Council, as represented by Mr. *Bingham*, does not so manifestly shew the Truth of the Censure against *Meletius* and his Accomplices, as the Words of the Synodical Epistle it self do ; for Mr. *Bingham* gives us but a *partial Account* of this Matter ; he leaves out some Things, and adds others, whereby an uncautious Reader's Judgment is easily byass'd, and diverted from Truth to Falshood.

§ VI. Thus, he makes the Sentence to have been, " That *Meletius* should have no manner of Power or Authority, either of Ordaining, or making Elections," &c. Now, this " no manner of Power " is most absolute and universal ; but the Synodical Epistle (r) of the Council of *Nice*, where this Sentence is recorded, says only, That he " should have no [*Ἐξουσίαν*, *Licentiam*, *Potestatem*, *Authoritatem*, *Jus*, that is, License, Leave, Liberty, Rule, Dominion, Lordship, Sovereignty, Authority, Power, Jurisdiction, &c. so that the Word *Ἐξουσίαν* signifies such a Power as has Jurisdiction annex'd to it, and therefore Dr. *Shorting* very judiciously renders it] " Jurisdiction either to Ordain, or to propose the Names of those that were to be ordained," &c. And *Socrates Scholasticus*, who doubtless well knew what was the true Intent of this Sentence, tho' he says a little after the Conclusion of the Synodical Epistle, That " the Synod took away all Episcopal Power from *Meletius* " ; yet a little before, he tells us, That " they receiv'd him, *Meletius*, into Communion,

(r) *Socrat. Scholast. Hist. Lib. I. c. 9.*

" allowing

“ allowing him indeed the Liberty of Retaining the
 “ Dignity of a Bishop, but they depriv’d him
 “ of the Power of Doing any thing as a Bi-
 “ shop;” which plainly shews, that they did not
 Un-Bishop him, but only took away his Power
 of Jurisdiction: Now the Taking away of a
 Bishop’s Jurisdiction, is no Reason that he
 should therefore “ have no manner of Power ”;
 for some manner of Power may still remain,
 even after the Loss of Jurisdiction: For Ex-
 ample, If a Bishop in *England* were divested of
 his Bishoprick, by his own *Legal Cession* to an-
 other, he would lose his Jurisdiction of Or-
 daining, if he were not put into some other
 Diocese; he would have no particular Diocese,
 where he could by *Canonical Right*, namely, by
 the Canon-Laws of this Church, oblige any
 Candidates for Holy Orders to be ordain’d
 by him; but tho’ he would have no such Juris-
 diction, which is but a *Circumstance* consequent
 to, and not of the *very Essence* of his Order,
 yet certainly he would still have some Power
 of Ordaining, *viz.* That Essential Power which
 he at first receiv’d at his Consecration when
 he was made a Bishop; for then, he re-
 ceiv’d an Indefinite Power of Ordaining, by be-
 ing consecrated and ordain’d a Bishop at large;
 his Ordination made no mention of any par-
 ticular District, to which his Power, as a Bi-
 shop, should be confin’d; and his Designation
 to a particular Diocese, is Matter only of *Cir-
 cumstance*, not of *Essence*; for the Apostles were
 essentially Bishops, before there was any such
 Circumstance as a particular District assign’d to
 each of them. And therefore, if in our sup-
 pos’d Case, this Bishop, without a particular

Dioceſe, and conſequently deſtitute of Canonical Jurisdiction, ſhould Ordain in another Man's Dioceſe, without his Leave or Conſent, no doubt his Act would be irregular, with reſpect to the Circumſtantial Canons and Laws of the Church, which require that the Candidates for Holy Orders ſhould be ordain'd by the Biſhop of the Dioceſe where they reſide; yet his Ordination would be Valid, becauſe he was eſſentially a Biſhop, ſince his Want of a Dioceſe does not Null his Epiſcopal Power or Capacity.

§ VII. If it be ſaid, that this was not the Caſe of *Meletius*, becauſe he made no *Ceſſion* to another, but was *legally depriv'd of Jurisdiction* for his Crimes.

I answer, That a *legal Ceſſion* of Jurisdiction by an innocent Man, is as much a Loſs of Jurisdiction, as a *legal Deprivation* of it, for Crimes committed; for, he that *legally* ſurrenders a Thing, is *as much without it*, as he is, from whom it is taken; 'tis equally abſent from them both, and the one has no more legal Right to it, than the other, becauſe the Law has equally diveſted them of it; ſo that until it can be prov'd, that a Biſhop's *Loſs of Jurisdiction* is a Nulling of his Orders, it will ſtand good, that the Biſhop of *Alexandria's*, and the Council of *Nice's* Depriving *Meletius* of Jurisdiction, was not a Nulling of his Orders which he had receiv'd in the Church; and this is farther confirm'd by the Council's Act it ſelf, whereby they own'd the Validity of thoſe Orders which *Meletius* had conferr'd on others, even after the Biſhop of *Alexandria* had Depriv'd him, as we ſhall ſee preſently,

presently, tho' Mr. *Bingham* has artfully conceal'd it from his Reader. For,

§ VIII. He makes the Council of *Nice's* Decree about those who had been ordain'd by *Meletius*, to have been that “ for such Bishops
 “ and Presbyters as had been ordain'd by him,
 “ they should not be admitted to officiate as Ministers in the Catholick Church, till they were
 “ confirm'd or authoriz'd by a more Sacred Imposition of Hands, together with the Approbation
 “ and Allowance of the Bishop of Alexandria. ”
 Whereas in Truth, the Sentence, as 'tis recorded in the Synodical Epistle before refer'd to, stands thus; and it decrees, that “ as for
 “ those that had been ordain'd by him to any
 “ Function, being confirm'd by a more Sacred
 “ Imposition of Hands, ” [as Mr. *Bingham* rightly renders it] “ they should be admitted
 “ into Communion, ” [Dr. *Shorting* renders it] “ they should afterwards be admitted into Communion, ”] “ and upon this Condition they may
 “ [retain, keep, or] continue possess'd of their
 “ Preferment and Function. ” [This Part of the Sentence Mr. *Bingham* omits, let the Impartial judge for what Reason; the Council says farther,] — “ They shall have no Power
 “ to propose or nominate whom they please, or to
 “ act in any Thing at all, without the Knowledge
 “ and Consent of some Catholick Bishop, who is
 “ one of Alexander's Suffragans. ” — “ And
 “ if it shall happen, that some of those who now
 “ hold Ecclesiastical Preferments die, then let
 “ those that are newly admitted and receiv'd into
 “ the Church ” [viz. the Bishops, Priests, and Deacons, whom *Meletius* had ordain'd, as *Val-*
 C 3 *lesus,*

lesius observes] “ *be preferr’d to the Dignities of the Deceas’d, &c.* ” From all which ’tis manifest, that

1st. The Council calls those Persons ordain’d, who had receiv’d Orders from *Meletius*; and the *Nicene* Fathers, in another Part of the Epistle, call ’em “ *those that had been by him admitted into Sacred Orders*; ” and not only so, but they receiv’d them as such to minister in the Church without any other Ordination; for

2dly. The “ *more Sacred Imposition of Hands,* ” by which they were to be confirm’d, was previous to their being admitted into *Communion*; for the Council appoints, [and *Mr. Bingham* omits it] that “ *being confirm’d by a more Sacred Imposition of Hands, they should be admitted into Communion*; ” that is, they should, after such Imposition of Hands, be admitted into *Communion*; this shews that the Imposition of Hands was only “ *Reconciliatory, and by way of Absolution,* ” in order to the receiving of them into the *Communion* of the Church; such an Imposition of Hands as us’d to be perform’d over other returning Penitents, before they were admitted into the Church; and therefore ’twas not a new Ordination, for who will believe that the Council appointed this for an Ordination, when the Persons were not yet in *Communion*? Would a Catholick Council decree, that Catholick Bishops should ordain Men into Holy Orders, even while they were out of the *Communion* of the Church? No certainly; but

3dly. The Council does not say ordain’d by a *more Sacred Imposition of Hands*, but “ *confirm’d* ”;

“firm’d;” that is, establish’d or strengthen’d by their Reconciliation and Absolution, as other Penitents us’d to be by Imposition of Hands; or (to make the utmost of it) confirm’d in “the Sacred Orders” [as the Council calls ’em] which they had before receiv’d of *Meletius*; that is, in short, no more than this, that they might be absolv’d from the Guilt and Punishment due to the *circumstantial Irregularity* of being ordain’d without and against the Consent of their Metropolitan the Bishop of *Alexandria*, which was the Crime that attended their Ordination; for by the Ecclesiastical Canons, no Ordinations ought to have been perform’d in his Jurisdiction without his Leave and Consent; and therefore to secure his Authority, the Council would oblige the Persons so ordain’d by *Meletius*, to submit to their Metropolitan the Bishop of *Alexandria*, by receiving Imposition of Hands either from him or one of his Suffragans, that so they might be confirm’d in their Sacred Orders before receiv’d, by their Absolution from the Guilt and Punishment of their Irregularity. They were in Holy Orders before their being thus confirm’d; for if they were not, then they were confirm’d in Nothing, which is absurd; for of Nothing there can be no Confirmation; and consequently those Persons were in Holy Orders, before this Imposition of Hands, which was appointed to confirm them. But this is farther Evident,

4thly. Because the Council says, “upon this Condition [of their being so confirm’d, &c.] they may retain, keep, or continue possess’d of their Preferment and Function.” This manifestly shews that they were in Orders before;

for if they had no Sacred Function before this Confirming Imposition of Hands, then 'twould have been absurd to have said, "*they may continue possess'd of their Function;*" for how can a Man continue possess'd of that which he never had? And how can that be call'd "*their Function,*" which never was theirs? The Decree, at the very time that it was made, calls it *their Function*, this was before they could submit to the requir'd Imposition of Hands; therefore the Function of a Bishop, a Priest, or a Deacon, was respectively *theirs*, who had been ordain'd by *Meletius*; *theirs* before this Imposition of Hands, they were in Possession of it before; and therefore upon their Submission to their Metropolitan, they might continue possess'd of it.

§ IX. But Mr. *Bingham* says of this Imposition of Hands, that "*Valesius and Du Pin, and other Learned Men, take*" it "*to imply a new Ordination.*" To which I answer, what if they do take it to imply so? is this a Proof, that it therefore was a new *Ordination*? Even one of these two Moderns, *Du Pin* (*Eccles. Hist. Fourth Cent. p. 251.*) says, that "*the Council permitted Meletius to retain the Name of a Bishop, and the Honour annex'd to that Office; but it absolutely forbid him to ordain any Body; it preserv'd also the Rank, Honour, and Office of those whom he had ordain'd; provided nevertheless, that they should be confirm'd by a more Sacred Imposition of Hands;*" this is his Relation of Matter of Fact, and then he gives you a Remark of his own upon it, "*which is a Kind of Re-Ordination,*"

“*dination*,” says he. He modestly supposes it to be but a *Kind of Re-Ordination*; and in the Note (i) there is this farther Remark, that “*it is commonly thought that this Imposition of Hands — was only a Ceremony; but Valesius has very well prov’d, that it was a new Ordination, and this is the Thing which the Word does properly signify;*” so that *Du Pin* takes his Notion, that it was a *Kind of Re-Ordination*, only from *Valesius*, against whom we see it is commonly thought [*i. e.* by Learned Men, for ignorant People don’t think on these Things] that this Imposition of Hands was *only a Ceremony*; the Learned commonly think of this Matter differently from *Valesius*; and therefore tho’ *Valesius* supposes it to be a new Ordination, it does not necessarily follow that it really was so. Is his private Opinion that it was a new Ordination, an Argument that the Council thought so too, or appointed it as such? Where does this appear? The Words of the *Nicene Fathers* are “*confirm’d by a more Sacred Imposition of Hands.*” *Mr. Bingham* says, “*confirm’d or authoriz’d;*” this *authoriz’d* is his own, and put in by him, as if he would make it look like a *new Ordination*, when in Truth the Greek *βεβαιωθεις*, signifies no more than *confirm’d, establish’d, strengthen’d*, and such like; and therefore for him to add this Word *authoriz’d*, when the *Greek Text* has it not, looks like something, which, I believe, his very Friends in this Controversy, who have any Candor and Impartiality, will not commend in him: But not to dwell too long upon that, which so palpably discovers it self;

§ X. He, with an Air of Diffidence, as if he suspected that this Imposition of Hands was in Reality no *New Ordination*, says, “*Valesius and Du Pin, &c. take it to imply a New Ordination;*” (s) “*however [says he] it certainly implies a new Authority and Confirmation from the Church, &c.*” He is at a Loss how to prove this Imposition of Hands to have been a *New Ordination*; his Modesty will not suffer him *positively* to affirm that it was one, and finding himself *destitute* of any Proof either from the Decree it self of the Council of *Nice*, or from any of the ancient Fathers, his great Knowledge in Ecclesiastical Antiquity is at a Stand about this Matter, and so he tells us only of a Notion of some few Moderns, *Valesius, Du Pin, &c.* who take this Imposition of Hands to *imply a New Ordination*; but then he does not so much confide in their Opinion, as to endeavour to defend it; no, he leaves it just as he found it, and as if he fear’d that it could not be rely’d on, he tells us, “*however, it certainly implies a new Authority and Confirmation, &c.*” which is just as if he had said thus, namely, *if the Imposition of Hands implies not a New Ordination, it certainly implies a new Authority and Confirmation;* by which ’tis plain, he makes this suppos’d *new Authority, &c.* to be something distinct and separate from a *New Ordination*; and so he has at last found out something, upon which he and we may all *certainly* depend; namely, that this
which

(s) *Scholast. Hist. Part II. p. 55.*

which he calls “ a new Authority and Confirmation from the Church, ” was really no New Ordination ; for if it was, then the Sense of his Words will stand thus, “ *Valesius, &c. take it to imply a New Ordination ; however, it certainly implies a New Ordination ;* ” this is as good Sense, as if he should have said, “ *however, i. e. if it does not imply a New Ordination, it certainly implies a New Ordination ;* ” which is a Contradiction in Terms. And therefore, that Mr. *Bingham* may speak good Sense, his undoubted Conclusion is this, That the Imposition of Hands here spoken of, certainly implies [something which was not a new Ordination but] a Confirmation, as is plain from the Decree it self ; and then he may make as much as he pleases of his own Term, “ *New Authority,* ” so long as it was not a *New Ordination*. For when an Ordination is Valid, some Circumstantials may be, and among us are, superadded, which Men may call *New Authorities*, if they please ; for Instance, after a Man has been Ordain'd a Priest, he must, by the Canon, receive a License from the Bishop to preach ; and that he may be legally possess'd of a Living, and canonically exercise his Function therein, without Interruption from others, and oblige the Inhabitants, the Christians of that District, to attend on his Ministrations, he must have Institution ; these we may call *New Authorities*, if we will ; but 'tis plain, they are not New Ordinations, only *Circumstantial Authorities* given for the sake of Peace and Order. A Man Episcopally ordain'd is in Valid Orders before his receiving any such

New

New Circumstantial Authority; As, no doubt, were the Bishops, Priests, and Deacons, validly Ordain'd by *Meletius*, before they receiv'd what Mr. *Bingham* calls a *New Authority*, which was only a Confirmation by Imposition of Hands. For *Meletius* was a Validly Ordain'd Bishop, his Orders were not Null'd, but only his Jurisdiction taken from him by his Metropolitan, and by the Council of *Nice*; his Orders therefore remain'd, consequently those whom he Ordain'd were in Valid Orders, which the great Council of *Nice* did not deny, but acknowledge, by only decreeing them to be confirm'd [not Ordain'd] by their Metropolitan's, or one of his Suffragan's more Sacred Imposition of Hands, and so to be received into the Communion of the Church; and upon this Condition to "Continue possess'd of their Preference and Function", which they had before receiv'd of *Meletius*, as is plain from all that has been said upon this Subject.

§ XI. But that Mr. *Bingham's* Friends may see, that even he himself is a Witness to this Truth, I will present them with his own unprejudic'd Account of the *Meletian Bishops*, as it stands in his *Origines Ecclesiastica*, Vol. 1. p. 172. where speaking of "such Bishops whom the ancient Writers and Canons term Vacant Bishops, not being permitted to officiate in their own Church, were admitted to act, as Chorepiscopi under any other Bishop that would entertain them." He instances the *Novatian and Meletian Bishops*, as so admitted to act by the Council of *Nice*, [which is the very Case now before us] and then he expressly and positively affirms, without any Scruple or
Hesitation,

Hesitation, that “ All such Chorepiscopi as these, [namely, as these *Meletians*, &c.] were properly Bishops, because they were originally ordain’d Bishops, before they came to act in the Quality of Country Bishops under others.” In which Words ’tis plain, that he refers to their *Original Ordination* by *Meletius*; and from hence it unavoidably follows, that he owns the *Meletian* Bishops to have been “ Properly Bishops,” originally ordain’d Bishops; [they are his own Words] and that consequently the *Meletian* Bishops, Priests, and Deacons were properly Bishops, Priests, and Deacons, and therefore [to use Mr. *Bingham*’s Phrase, “ ’tis as clear as the Sun at Noon Day, that ”] Baptism perform’d by those Men, was Baptism by Men in Valid Episcopal Orders, and therefore not of the same Nature with the false Baptisms administered by our *Laicks*, who never were ordain’d or commission’d by Bishops to Baptize.

§ XII. Mr. *Bingham*’s next (t) Instance is of *Arius* the Priest, and two Bishops, *Secundus* and *Theonas*, who were depos’d and excommunicated by *Alexander* Bishop of *Alexandria*, and by the Council of *Nice*, for the *Arian* Heresy: And he argues about them thus; says he, (u) “ By the Tenor of these direful Censures, *Arius* and all his Adherents were not only depos’d from their Clerical Office and Orders, but also expell’d from Lay-Communion, and all

(t) *Schol. Hist.* Part II. p. 57.

(u) *Ibid.* p. 58.

“ the Privileges of Christians, save only that their
 “ Baptism entitled them to be admitted again
 “ into the Church, upon a true Repentance. But
 “ in the mean time they were neither authoriz’d
 “ Priests, nor compleat Lay-Christians,
 “ whilst they were under such Bonds of Excommuni-
 “ cation; for no Man is a Compleat Layman, who
 “ is not in full Communion with the Church. Upon
 “ this Account, Catechumens who are unbaptiz’d,
 “ and Hereticks, and Schismaticks, and Excom-
 “ municate Persons, are but imperfect Christians:
 “ The first of these communicate with the Church
 “ in the Faith, but not in the Sacraments; the o-
 “ ther Three either excommunicate themselves, or
 “ are excommunicated by the Power of the Keys
 “ and Church-Censures. Till therefore they are
 “ admitted again, and loosed by the same Power
 “ of the Keys, they are not in full Communion with
 “ the Church, and consequently but imperfect Chri-
 “ stians. Now, it would be absurd to say, that
 “ those who are not so much as Proper and Per-
 “ fect Lay-Christians, are Proper and Perfect
 “ Priests; that they who have no Right to re-
 “ ceive themselves the Sacraments, have Authori-
 “ ty to give the Sacraments to others: Therefore
 “ Hereticks, and Schismaticks, and Priests under
 “ Anathema, can have no Authority to minister the
 “ Sacraments, whilst they are in that State; or if
 “ they do, it is all done without Authority, and
 “ by Usurpation. And this was the Case of Arius
 “ and all his Adherents, whilst they were under
 “ the Anathema of the Council of Nice. The Bap-
 “ tisms which they gave in that State, were given
 “ without Authority, and were not so much as the
 “ Baptisms of Perfect Lay-Christians: And yet the
 “ Church did not Re-baptize such Persons as were
 “ Baptized

“ Baptized in due Form by them, but only sup-
 “ ply’d what was deficient in their Baptisms at
 “ their Return to the Church, by Imposition of
 “ Hands, and Confirmation. — This then, I
 “ think, [says he] is Demonstration, that if the
 “ Council of Nice took away all Clerical Autho-
 “ rity from the Meletians and Arians, and left
 “ one in a State of Laymen, and the other not
 “ so much as Laymen, and yet receiv’d the Bap-
 “ tisms that were given by both these, without Re-
 “ baptizing; She must receive the Baptisms of
 “ those who in her Opinion had no Authority to
 “ give Baptism, because she her self had taken
 “ that Authority from them, &c.

§ XIII. In Answer to all which, it has been
 already prov’d, both from the Act of the Council,
 and from Mr. *Bingham* himself, that the *Mele-*
tians were not *Laymen*, but *Proper Bishops, Priests,*
and Deacons; and therefore we are now at pre-
 sent only concern’d with the *Arians*; about
 whom we are to enquire, whether all that
 Mr. *Bingham* has said, amounts to any Proof,
 that the Council of *Nice* esteem’d the depos’d
 and excommunicated *Arian* Bishops, Priests, and
 Deacons, to have been as utterly destitute of
 Sacred Orders, as those Persons are, who ne-
 ver were at all ordain’d or commission’d by
 Bishops?

§ XIV. But before I come to speak of their
 Orders, I must observe that he says, “ They
 “ were not compleat Lay Christians, whilst they
 “ were under such Bonds of Excommunication.
 “ For [says he] no Man is a compleat Lay-
 “ man, who is not in full Communion with the
 “ Church.”

“ Church. — ” So again he calls ’em “ not so much as proper and perfect Lay-Christians ; ” and towards the latter End of this Passage, he says, they were “ not so much as Laymen ; ” tho’ yet he acknowledges that they were Baptiz’d Persons ; for he says, that “ their Baptism entitled them to be admitted again into the Church upon a true Repentance. ” So that the Excommunication did not unbaptize them ; for even while they were under this Censure, they were baptiz’d Christians, otherwise they could have had no Title to any thing at all, by Virtue of their Baptism. The excommunicated *Arians* then were baptiz’d Persons, therefore they were either Laymen or Clergymen, for baptiz’d Persons must be one or other of these two Sorts ; if they were not Laymen, then they were Clergymen, and we shall prove by and by, that Mr. *Bingham* owns they were really Clergymen ; in the mean time, I must beg the Reader’s Patience, while I shew him what it is, that can be understood by Mr. *Bingham*’s “ compleat Layman. ” Every Body knows what is meant by a compleat Christian, but then this Term is common to both Clergy and Laity ; whereas “ compleat Layman, ” in Contradistinction to Clergyman, is a Term wholly new, and necessarily inferrs Degrees of Laity ; so that a Layman being a Baptiz’d Person, who is not ordain’d or commission’d to minister in Holy Things, and Mr. *Bingham*’s compleat Layman possessing the Superlative Degree of Laity, it will come to this pass, that one Baptiz’d Man may be a Layman, another more a Layman, and a third most of all, or a compleat Layman ; that is, one Man is not ordain’d or not commission’d, another is more not ordain’d

ordain'd or not commission'd, and a third is most of all not ordain'd or not commission'd; which in short amounts to this, that a meer Negative has Degrees of Comparison, and so it will be very proper to say, that one Thing is not, another is more not, and a third most not, which is insufferable Nonsense, and is necessarily included in the new invented Term of a "*Compleat Lay-man.*" But to leave this ridiculous Term to it self; there is no doubt, but every Baptiz'd Person who is justly excommunicated, is far from being a *perfect* or *compleat* Christian in that State; but then the very same may be said of other Baptiz'd Persons, who tho' they are in visible Communion with the Church, yet have, by reason of their wicked impenitent Lives, no more Right to the Benefits of that Communion, than the Excommunicated themselves have, and so are as far from being compleat or perfect Christians, as the Excommunicated are; but then this is equally Common to the Clergy and Laity both; and therefore, if this Want of Perfection does not *annihilate* the Baptism they receiv'd, there is no Reason can be given why it should null or utterly make void either their Lay or Clerical Order.

§ XV. But says Mr. Bingham, "*Arius and all his Adherents were — depos'd from their Clerical Office and Orders,*" — "*they were not authoriz'd Priests — whilst they were under such Bonds of Excommunication.*" But what does he mean by this? would he have it understood, that their being depos'd and excommunicated was a *Nulling* of their Orders? *Alexander* the Bishop has said no such Thing;

no more have the *Nicene* Fathers. Where is this nullifying Censure then to be found? Mr. *Bingham* has not produc'd it.

Socrates Scholasticus says, (w) " Alexander having conven'd a Council of many Bishops, degraded [or depos'd] Arius, and those that embrac'd his Opinion." Alexander, in his Letter to the Bishops of every City, says, " We — have anathematiz'd [curs'd, or excommunicated] Arius, — together with all his Adherents, " — " they are expell'd out of the Church and anathematiz'd, " — " we — have — openly declar'd them estrang'd from the Catholick Church and Faith, " — " it is our Duty not to say to such Men, so much as God Speed." The Synodical Epistle of the Council of Nice says, (x) " That the Council's Determination, which was confirm'd by the Suffrages of all, was, that his [i. e. Arius's] impious Opinion, and execrable Terms and Names should be anathematiz'd, " [viz. the blasphemous Terms and Names he apply'd to the Son of God.] — " All these Tenets the Holy Synod hath anathematiz'd: " — " He drew into the same Pit of Perdition with himself, Theonas Bishop of Marmarica, and Secundus Bishop of Ptolemais. For the same Sentence that had been given against him, was pronounc'd against them; " viz. the Sentence whereby they were depos'd and excommunicated. All this shews, that Arius and his Followers were excommunicated and depos'd; but it does not

(w) *Eccles. Hist. Book I. Chap. 6.*

(x) *Ibid. Book I. Chap. 9.*

from hence follow, that their Clerical Orders were null'd, and made void; Nay, the very Form of their Deposition, to be seen at large in *Cotelerius' Notes*, (y) on the Constitutions call'd *Apostolical*, has nothing in it that nullifies their Orders.

§ XVI. And indeed, if their Orders had been Null'd, they would have been no other than *meer Laymen*, Persons as utterly *incapable* of *Ministring* in Holy Things, as those who never were at all Ordain'd or Commission'd; and consequently, if ever the Church receiv'd them into Communion as Clergymen, and let them minister *as such*, without Ordaining them, she would have suffer'd and approv'd of *meer Laymen's* ministring in all the **Sacred Functions** of Bishops, Priests, and Deacons; and so *Lay-Ordination, Lay-Baptism, Lay-Consecrations, and Administration of the Holy Eucharist, Lay-Absolution, and Lay-Excommunications, &c.* would have been countenanc'd and esteem'd Valid in the Opinion of the Church; which is an Absurdity by no means to be allow'd of, because it reflects upon the Church after the Council of *Nice*, as if she had been guilty of *Conniving* at and *Encouraging* the most *Sacrilegious Usurpations*; and makes even *Episcopal*, or indeed, any suppos'd *Sacerdotal Ordination* to be an insignificant and useless thing: For, in the first place, What signifies any Ordination by a Bishop? Or secondly, any pretended Ordination by Presbyters, if *Lay-Ordination* be Valid?

(y) *Coteler. Not. in Constitut. Apostol. Lib. VIII. Cap. 28.*

And Valid it must have been in the Sense of those Churches, who receiv'd as Clergymen, the *Arian* Bishops, and such as were ordain'd by them ; if the *Arian* Bishops, Priests, and Deacons, had their Orders null'd, by being depos'd and excommunicated.

§ XVII. For 'tis notorious Matter of Fact, that the *Arian* Bishops, Priests, and Deacons were, upon their Repentance, receiv'd by the Catholicks in the same Rank and Degree of Clergymen, as they held while they were Hereticks. And they were thus receiv'd into the Church, without the Catholicks giving them any new Ordination, upon Account of the Invalidity of the old ; which manifestly shews one of these two Things ; either *1st*, That if the Catholicks held those *Arian* Bishops, who ordain'd, to have been no other than *meer Laicks* before, then the Catholicks, by receiving as *Clergymen*, Persons who had been ordain'd by them, esteem'd *Lay-Ordination* to be Good and Valid ; but this of receiving *Lay-Ordination* is a very great Absurdity, highly dangerous to the Christian Religion, and contrary to the constant Doctrine and Practice of the Church. It is plain therefore, *2dly*, That the Catholicks, by thus receiving the *Arian* Clergy without Ordaining them, did own their Clerical Orders to have been Good and Valid ; for if they had been *Null*, their Incapacity to minister in Holy Things, would have been the same in every Respect, as that of Persons who *never were at all Ordain'd*, [because there are no Degrees of *Nullity*] and consequently the Catholicks would have been as much oblig'd to ordain
such

such *Arians*, as to ordain any other Layman to minister in the Sacred Functions. But we find that the Catholics did not reckon themselves to have been so oblig'd to ordain those *Arians*, because they receiv'd them as Clergymen, without Ordaining them; and therefore they esteem'd the Sacred Orders they receiv'd before, to have been Good and Valid, as is very evident from St. *Jerome's* Dialogue against the *Luciferian* Schismatics, who separated from the Church, upon this very score, because she so receiv'd the *Arians* as Clergymen.

§ XVIII. And Mr. *Bingham* is so very well appriz'd of this Truth also, that he himself has given his Testimony to it, in the first Part of his *Scholastical History*, Pag. 88, and 89. where he expressly affirms of Bishops and Priests who turn'd Hereticks or Schismatics, or Apostates, or were Excommunicated or Degraded; That

“ When in the Discipline of the Church it was
 “ thought proper to deprive them of the Power
 “ and Honour of their Places; yet even in that
 “ Case, the Church did not intend to deny the
 “ Validity of their Ordination, but suppos'd
 “ that still to remain so ENTIRE, as
 “ that if ever after the Church should recall them
 “ to those Offices, she would not do it by giving
 “ them a New Ordination, any more than a New
 “ Baptism; which is largely insisted on by St. Au-
 “ stin (z) against the Donatists, and St. Jerome
 “ against the Luciferians, (a) both which Sects

(z) Augustin. *contra* Parmen. Lib. II. Cap. 13.

(a) Hieron. *adver.* Luciferian.

“pleaded for the Invalidity of Heretical Or-
 “dinations, but were refuted, upon this Prin-
 “ciple of the Catholick Church, that Baptism and
 “Ordination, tho’ sinfully given, if they be Valid,
 “are not to be wholly annull’d or afterward re-
 “peated.” All these are Mr. Bingham’s own
 Words, by which he evidently makes it the
 Principle of the *Catholick Church*, That the Or-
 ders of the *Arian Hereticks* were Valid; for ’twas
 in Defence of their Orders, that *St. Jerome* wrote
 against the *Luciferians*, and Refuted them. The
Luciferians had a Notion, that the Orders of
 the *Arians* were Invalid; but *St. Jerome* wrote
 his Dialogue against them, to convince them
 of this their Error, and they “were Refuted,”
 says Mr. Bingham; from whence ’tis manifest,
 even to a Demonstration, that Mr. Bingham him-
 self asserts the Orders of the depos’d and ex-
 communicated *Arian* Bishops and other Clergy,
 to have been Valid; and consequently they were
 Valid Priests, even while they were under the
 Censure; for, if they were not, then their Or-
 ders were Null, perfectly none at all, utterly
 annihilated; and how their Sacred Orders should
 come into Being again, without a new Ordi-
 nation, is inconceivable: For the Church is an
 utter Stranger to any way of giving Holy Or-
 ders, except by that of Ordination. But we
 find, that the *Arians* were esteem’d to have
 had Valid Orders, without any new Ordina-
 tion, and Mr. Bingham himself informs us that
 they had; and therefore he must acknowledge,
 that while they were under the Censure, they
 were Valid Priests.

§ XIX. But still he will have it, that “they were not authoriz’d Priests;” which is a notorious Falſity, and a Contradiction to himſelf, if by authoriz’d Priests, he means *Validly ordain’d Priests*; for they were *Validly ordain’d* by his own Account of them, as we have already ſeen; and *Validly ordain’d Priests* are *authoriz’d Priests*, that is, Priests veſted with that original Authority, which they receiv’d at their Ordination; which Authority muſt ſtill remain, ſo long as their Ordination continues Valid. As for any other Authority, which is but *accidental*, ſuch as a *License* for Clergymen to exerciſe their Sacred Function in a *particular Diſtrict*, with a Power to oblige the Chriſtians, inhabiting that Diſtrict, to attend upon, and ſupport them in the Execution of their Office, &c. ſuch Authority as this, is only *circumſtantial*, not *essential* to Sacred Orders; for a Man is a Valid [and therefore an essentially authoriz’d] Priest, by Virtue of his Ordination only, who is not ſuch a *circumſtantly authoriz’d Priest*, who has no ſuch *circumſtantial Authority* and *Power*; as we ſee every Day in our own Church. In reſpect to ſuch an *accidental*, and but *circumſtantial Authority*, Mr. Bingham may call the *Arian Priests*, “not authoriz’d Priests”, if he pleaſes; but then he ought to expreſs and determine in what Senſe, and not to make uſe of the *little Artifice*, of calling them ſo in *absolute and unlimited Terms*, ſuch as are apt to miſlead an uncautious and unexperienc’d Reader into a wrong Opinion of their having been, in *all Reſpects* whatſoever, “not authoriz’d Priests; when ’tis notorious, even from Mr.

Bingham's own Account of them, as well as from the Arguments and Practice of the Ancient Catholicks, against the *Luciferians*, That they were Priests; that their Ordination was Valid; and that consequently they were essentially authoriz'd Priests, so long as their Orders were not made null and void.

§ XX. Mr. *Bingham* says of these *Arian* Priests, "It would be absurd to say, that those who are not so much as proper and perfect Lay-Christians, are proper and perfect Priests." But I have shew'd in *Sect. XIV.* That these *Arians* had their *Baptism* entire, it was not deleted by their having been excommunicated; that consequently they must have been either Laymen, or Clergymen; that to say there are Degrees of Laity, is Nonsense; that if they were not Laymen, they must have been Clergymen. And in *Sect. XV, XVI, XVII.* That they were really Clergymen, originally authoriz'd Priests having valid Orders, as I have prov'd out of his own Mouth; and therefore his Terms of proper and perfect Priests are nothing to the Purpose, but serve only for meer Amusement; for, so far as a Man is *Validly ordain'd* a Deacon, a Priest, or a Bishop, he is a proper and perfect Bishop, Priest, or Deacon; and the Reason is plain, because [as I have observ'd before] there are no Degrees of Nullity, and consequently no Degrees of Validity. Mr. *Bingham* knows this very well, and therefore he says of the *Meletian* and *Novatian* Bishops, that "they were properly Bishops, [i.e. proper Bishops] because they were originally ordain'd Bishops," as I have prov'd upon him in my *XIth Sect.* and conse-

consequently since these *Arians* were originally ordain'd *Priests*, and their Orders remain'd Valid, therefore they were properly *Priests*, that is, proper and perfect *Priests*, by Virtue of their valid Ordination.

§ XXI. And yet notwithstanding all this, Mr. *Bingham*, because they were excommunicated, says,

“ It would be absurd to say — that they who
 “ have no Right to receive themselves the Sacra-
 “ ments, have Authority to give the Sacraments
 “ to others.”

But as absurd as he may fancy this to be, the Contrary to this is a very great Absurdity; if by *Authority* he would have us to understand *Valid Orders*, that *Original Authority* which a Man receiv'd at his Ordination. For 'tis highly Absurd, nay, a false and pernicious Principle, to teach, That, if a Man has no Right to receive, he can have no such *Original Authority* to give to others the *Holy Sacraments*; because, if this Principle were true, then all *Original Authority* to minister the *Holy Sacraments* would be as precarious and uncertain, as *Mens Words*, *Thoughts*, and *Actions* are; and so we *Laicks* could have no certain Rule whereby to judge of the Truth and Reality of any *Clergyman's Authority*, or *Sacred Orders*; for which of us [how charitable soever in our Opinions] can be positive of the Sincerity of any Man's Repentance? And if a Man's Repentance be not sincere, he can have no Right to receive the Sacraments; [for what Right has a Man to receive, without sincere Repentance?] and if he has no Right to receive them, he can have no *Authority* to give them

them to us, according to Mr. *Bingham*; thus our just *Satisfaction* concerning a Man's *Authority* to give us the Sacraments, must rise and fall with our Certainty and Uncertainty about the Sincerity of his Repentance, when he ministers them to us; and at this rate, all Authority to minister the Sacraments will be but a precarious thing to the Receivers; but this is just as absurd, tho' not the same as the Popish Doctrine, which makes our Receiving the Sacraments to depend on the Intention of the Priest. Further yet, If this Notion of Mens having no Authority to give, because they have no Right to receive the Sacraments, be true; then, even the Authority of some Priests, in visible Communion with the Church, may upon this Account be lost too; for, if any of them should live wicked, impenitent Lives, they would, while in that State, have no more Right to receive the Sacraments, than any excommunicated Person whatsoever; for impenitent Sinners have not the least Right, they have *no Right at all* to receive the Sacraments while impenitent. Their Presuming to receive them is Sacrilege it self, and a high Aggravation of their other Sins; their being admitted is no Argument of their Right, but only an Instance, it may be, of the *short-sightedness* of those who admit them, and too often 'tis the sad Effect of Want of Discipline; but neither of these can give them any the *least Right imaginable*; and therefore, if they have no Right to receive [as 'tis most certain *they have none*] then, according to Mr. *Bingham's* Maxim, 'twill be absurd to say, *that they have Authority to give the Sacraments to others*. The Consequence of which is this, That it will be therefore

therefore sinful for us to receive them at their Hands. But this is a pernicious false Doctrine, contrary to the Holy Scriptures, and repugnant to the Doctrine of our Holy Mother the Church of England, who in her 26th Article teaches us; that “ *Although in the Visible Church the* ”
 “ *Evil be ever mingled with the Good; and* ”
 “ *sometime the Evil, [i. e. the Wicked] have* ”
 “ *chief Authority in the Ministration of the —* ”
 “ *Sacraments; yet, forasmuch as they do not* ”
 “ *the same in their own Name, but in Christ’s,* ”
 “ *and do minister by his Commission and* ”
 “ *Authority, we may use their Ministry — in* ”
 “ *receiving of the Sacraments. Neither is* ”
 “ *the Effect of Christ’s Ordinance taken away by* ”
 “ *their Wickedness, nor the Grace of God’s* ”
 “ *Gifts diminish’d from such, as by Faith, and* ”
 “ *rightly do receive the Sacraments ministred unto* ”
 “ *them, which be effectual because of Christ’s In-* ”
 “ *stitution and Promise, altho’ they be ministred* ”
 “ *by evil Men.* ” In which Article our Church most expressly affirms, that “ *sometimes* ”
 “ *Evil,* ” *i. e.* wicked Men [who sure, while such, have no Right themselves to receive the Sacraments] “ *have chief Authority in the* ”
 “ *Ministration of the Sacraments;* ” that these wicked Men “ *do minister by Christ’s Commis-* ”
 “ *sion and Authority, &c.* ” Now that these Men, who *have Authority* to minister, are such as have no Right to receive the Sacraments, is evident, by the Church’s speaking of their *Unworthiness* in the Title of the Article, and of their being *evil Men*, and of their *Wickedness* also in the Body of the Article; this must infer their Want of Right to receive the Sacraments, except Men will be so hardy

hardy as to say, that *unworthy, evil, and wicked Men*, while such, have Right to receive the Sacraments, and therefore 'tis plain from this Article of our Church, that Men who have *no Right* to receive, may have *Authority* to give to others the Holy Sacraments; and consequently 'tis not absurd, but highly agreeable to Christianity to affirm, that *meer Want of Right to Receive*, does not take away a Priest's *original Authority* which he receiv'd at his Ordination, to give the Holy Sacraments.

§ XXII. Mr. *Bingham* concludes about the *Meletians* and *Arians* thus: " *This then I think* " [says he] *is Demonstration, That, if the* " *Council of Nice took away all Clerical Au-* " *thority from the Meletians and Arians, and* " *left the one in a State of Laymen, and the* " *other not so much as Laymen, and yet receiv'd* " *the Baptisms that were given by both these,* " *without Re-Baptizing; she must receive the* " *Baptisms of those who in her Opinion had no* " *Authority to give Baptism, because she herself* " *had taken that Authority from them, &c.* " Thus he; but it is evident, by what has been already said, that the *Meletians* were properly Bishops, Priests, and Deacons; and this has been prov'd not only from the Council of *Nice*, but also from Mr. *Bingham's* own Account of them, as is plain by Sections VI, VII, VIII, IX, X, and XI, of this Chapter; and it is as true, that the Council did not null the Orders of the *Arians*; that the ancient Catholics own'd, and Mr. *Bingham* himself also asserts, their Clerical Orders to have been Valid; as has been abundantly

dantly prov'd in the XV, XVI, XVII, and XVIII Sections; and therefore I [not only think, but] am sure, 'tis Demonstration, that if they had Valid Orders [as Mr. *Bingham* affirms they had, and I do not disbelieve him] the Baptisms they perform'd were Baptisms administred by Men who were " *Properly Bishops,* " Priests, and Deacons; and that consequently they were not of the same Nature with our false Baptisms perform'd by Persons who never were ordain'd or commission'd by Bishops to Baptize; and that therefore the Council of *Nice's* receiving the Baptisms of the *Meletians* and *Arians*, was not a Receiving of such Baptisms as our never commission'd Baptisms, which are administred by meer Laicks who never had any Valid Ordination or Commission to minister that Sacrament, as the *Meletians* and *Arians* most certainly had.

§ XXIII. Before I leave the Council of *Nice*, I must consider the Act of that Council about the *Novatian Schismaticks*, whose Baptisms were receiv'd by the Church; and the rather, because Mr. *Bingham* tells the Reverend and Learned Dr. *Brett*, that (b) " *the Church receiv'd the Baptism of some Hereticks, and Schismaticks, who never had any Orders from any Episcopal Ordination;* " and to make this good, he is so hardy as to affirm, (c) that " *the Novatians* " wanted " *a real and lawful Ordination;* " that " *Novatian himself, who*

(b) *Schol. Hist.* Part II. p. 51.

(c) *Ibid.* p. 95.

“ was the Father of the Novatians, was never
 “ ordain’d a true and lawful Bishop, but only was
 “ a Bishop in Pretence : Therefore all such Mi-
 “ nisters, as deriv’d the Original of their Orders
 “ and Authority from him, were only pretended
 “ Ministers like their Founder. ”

Now by all this, a Reader that is unacquaint-
 ed with Ecclesiastical History, would be apt to
 judge, that *Novatian* never was ordain’d by any
 Bishop at all ; but to prevent such a Mistake,
Mr. Bingham is so honest and ingenuous ! as to ac-
 knowledge, that (d) it is own’d he had three
 Bishops to ordain him ; so then, *Novatian* was
 ordain’d by no less than three Bishops, and
 this is so notorious from History, that *Mr. Bing-*
ham cannot withstand the Evidence, and there-
 fore fairly submits to it ; and therefore *Novatian*
 was certainly a Bishop, if three Bishops could make
 him one.

But *Mr. Bingham* says No, (e) “ the Ordination
 “ which they gave him was Null from the very
 “ first. ” And the pretended Reasons he gives,
 are these :

1st. “ Because these three Bishops being fetch’d
 “ from the farthest Corner of Italy, had nothing
 “ to do to ordain *Novatian* a Bishop at Rome,
 “ without a Regular and Synodical Election. ”

2dly. “ When *Novatian* had got them into
 “ his Possession, he set some of his Party to make
 “ them drunk, and shut them up Prisoners, and
 “ then ——— he compell’d them by Force to give
 “ him the Bishoprick by an Imaginary, and Delu-

(d) *Scholast. Hist.* Part II. p. 97.

(e) *Ibid.* p. 97.

“ *five, and Vain Ordination, as Cornelius the true Bishop words it in his Epistle to Fabian Bishop of Antioch.* ”

3dly. (f) “ *There was another Reason (says Mr. Bingham) which utterly annull'd the Ordination of Novatian; and that was, that — he intruded himself into a full See, where another was Regularly and Divinely chosen before him.* ” “ *This is the Argument so much insisted on by Cyprian in particular to prove him no true Bishop;* ” — (g) *he is not a second Bishop, but none at all.* ” And for these suppos'd Reasons, Mr. Bingham would have it believ'd, that the Ordination which *Novatian* receiv'd, was Null and Void from the beginning; in answer to which I affirm, that the Ordination was Valid, tho' it was attended with these *circumstantially Irregular* and sinful Circumstances.

§ XXIV. 1st. Because it was perform'd by *real Bishops*, Persons vested with a Power of Ordaining and Making Bishops; their doing it out of their Jurisdiction did not Un-Bishop them; and tho' their coming to *Rome* to ordain was an Irregularity against circumstantial Canons, yet this did not Null the Ordination they gave; for if it did, then the Acts of all Bishops, Priests, and Deacons, done irregularly out of the Places of their own Jurisdiction; will be Null and Void; and so if a Priest Baptizes out of his own Parish, intruding into another Man's

(f) *Scholast. Hist.* Part II. p. 99.

(g) *Ibid.* p. 100.

District without his Leave and Consent, or without any Necessity at all, the Baptism he administers must be Null and Void, if a Bishop's Act of Ordination be Null and Void, for his having perform'd it irregularly out of his own Diocese and Jurisdiction. But this is absurd; for a Valid Bishop is a Bishop in all Places of the Catholick Church, and so is a Valid Priest undoubtedly a Priest in every Parish; their Acts of Ordaining, Baptizing, &c. are Valid *wheresoever perform'd*; and their Designation to particular Districts is only a Circumstance of *Order*, not of *Essence*; if they break through *this Circumstance*, the *Essence* is not *destroy'd*. The Breaking thro' this Order is without all Doubt a Crime to be punish'd in all Parties that are concern'd; but if the Transgression of such *circumstantial Rules*, destroy'd the Essential Functions of Bishops and Priests, then, for the same Reason that a Bishop's Act of Ordaining irregularly out of his own District is a *Nullity*, a Priest's Baptizing irregularly out of his own Parish is a *Nullity* also; but this is an Absurdity which will run our Author into a great Difficulty, for hereby he will not only make Null and Void the Ordination given to *Novatian*, but also the very Baptisms whose Validity he is vainly endeavouring to defend; for, all our *Lay-Baptizers*, all our *Dissenting Teachers* are Intruders into other Mens Provinces; to make the best of them, they break through all the circumstantial Rules, Laws, and Orders of the Church, and attempt to Baptize, where "they have nothing to do" to Baptize, and therefore by Mr. *Bingham's* own Rule [which is indeed a very odd one] for Nulling of Holy Orders, the pretended Baptisms

tisms of our Dissenting Teachers are *Null and Void*, if they could be suppos'd to be Priests, as they most certainly are not, even upon Mr. *Bingham's* own Principle; because their pretended Ordinations are also perform'd, "where they have nothing to do to ordain," which is his first pretended Reason against the Validity of the Ordination given to *Novatian*, whereby he at the same time destroys the suppos'd Ordinations and Baptisms of our Dissenters, and at once overthrows what himself is endeavouring to establish. But

§ XXV. 2dly. The Wickedness of *Novatian*, and of the three Bishops who ordain'd him, was doubtless very great; the one for making them Drunk, and compelling them to ordain him; the other for being Drunk, and being drawn by Compulsion to give him Ordination: But will any body be so bold as to say, that these Personal Iniquities of the Ordainers did Un-Bishop them, and utterly annihilate their Episcopal Capacity? If this be true, then where shall we find Valid Orders on the Face of the Earth, since Ordainers are but Men, and some of them may have been grievous Sinners in one Age of the Church or other, and thereby may have broken the Line of Succession irreparably, so as never to be made whole again?

If Personal Immoralities in those who are Bishops, do Null their Episcopal Character, and render the Ordinations perform'd by them Null and Void, then it will unavoidably follow, that we have no Valid Orders in the Church of *England*; since Orders were originally convey'd to our Clergy by the wicked immoral Bishops

of the Church of *Rome*, whom I call Immoral and Wicked, upon Account of that notorious and gross Idolatry, which is, and has been for several hundred Years, most scandalously practis'd in that Apostatizing Church; and I myself can prove [by having liv'd some Years among them in Foreign Parts] that they are as much addicted to the Practice of that flagitious Immorality, as ever the *Jews* or *Heathens* were. And thus our Historian, by endeavouring to Null the Ordination given to *Novatian*, most unluckily invalidates his own Orders, together with those of all his Fathers the Bishops, and of his Brethren the rest of the Clergy of the Church of *England*; if his pretended Argument should be allow'd to be a good one; So very unhappy is he in *his Way* of Reasoning about Holy Orders. And it will be utterly impossible for him to extricate himself out of this Labyrinth, by saying, That *Novatian's* great Wickedness, in making the three Bishops Drunk, and compelling them to Ordain him, added to the Wickedness of those three Bishops, did all together make the Ordination Null and Void; for the same Difficulty will still remain, because, if the Immorality of those who Ordain, join'd to the Immorality of the Ordain'd, does make an Ordination to be a *meer Nullity*, then the Idolatry, &c. of those who Ordain'd, taken together with that of those who receiv'd Ordination in the corrupt Church of *Rome*, must necessarily make Orders in that Church to be Null and Void; and so the *Romish* Bishops, who ordain'd our first Reformers, had no Orders themselves, consequently our Reformers receiv'd no Orders, and therefore they could conferr none;
and

and so, all Orders in the Church of *England* are *meer Nullities*, if Mr. *Bingham's* odd way of Arguing should be esteem'd to be good Reasoning: But alas! 'tis wretchedly Fallacious, and the Church of *England* has determin'd against him in her 26th Article, that a wicked immoral Man may have *Christ's Commission and Authority*; and if by that Commission, a wicked Priest can minister Valid Sacraments, then a Bishop, tho' Immoral, can by *Christ's Commission* perform a Valid Ordination; because, if Sacraments are *not null'd* by the Wickedness of the commission'd Administrator of them, it is highly Ridiculous to say, that Ordinations are *null'd* by the Immorality of the *commission'd Ordainer*: For, the the same Reason which may be given for the Validity of the Sacraments administred by a wicked Priest, is good also for the Validity of Ordinations perform'd by an immoral Bishop, *viz.* " *Because they do not the same in their own Name, but in Christ's, and do minister by his Commission and Authority*; which is true in both Cases of ministring Sacraments, and giving Ordinations, since they are both of them but equally Divine positive Institutions, appointed by Jesus Christ. And then, as for the Ordained, the Scripture it self is clear, that a Commission conferr'd on an immoral Man is not a Nullity; for if it were, our Saviour Christ himself would never have ordain'd or commission'd so vile a Wretch as *Judas Iscariot*, nor have sent him forth to preach and work Miracles, who was a Thief, a Robber, and even a Devil in his Temper and Disposition, as the Sacred Writings do abundantly testify.

§ XXVI. There is but One thing more to be consider'd in Mr. *Bingham's* second Fallacious Argument against the Validity of *Novatian's* Ordination; and 'tis this: That *Novatian* "compell'd them" [the three *Italian* Bishops] "by Force, to give him the Bishoprick by an imaginary, and delusive, and vain Ordination, as Cornelius words it, &c." Now the Whole of this Objection against the Validity of the Ordination, is, That it was obtain'd by Force and Compulsion, and therefore 'twas Null and Void. But the Fallacy of this will plainly appear, when we call to mind, that at this rate all Ordinations whatsoever that have been obtain'd by such Means, must have been meer Nullities for the same Reason; and so, wheresoever any Powers, either of the Popes, or *Roman* Emperors, have compell'd Bishops to ordain such as they otherwise would not have ordain'd, if they had been left to their own Liberty, those Ordinations must have been Null and Void. Nay, farther, if Force and Compulsion upon the Ordainers, does Null their Ordinations, then every Ordination must be void, when obtain'd by any such Cheat or Trick, as puts Bishops upon a *Necessity* of Ordaining; and this by reason of the *Force* which is hereby put upon their Understanding and Will; and so, false Titles, unfaithful Certificates, and undue Testimonials, &c. will make Ordinations so obtain'd, to be meer Nullities. But who is there that does not see the Impertinence of all this, and how precarious Ordinations will be at such a rate? But enough of this, which deserves no farther Consideration, because it may all be resolv'd into
the

the Immorality of the Ordainers, and Ordained, which has been largely spoken to in the XXVth Section. —

§ XXVII. His Third supposititious Reason against the Validity of that Ordination, which was given to *Novatian*, is, That “ he intruded himself into a full See,” and this “ utterly annull’d his Ordination, &c.” And the Reason, according to him, was, because “ Another [viz. *Cornelius*] was Regularly and Divinely chosen before him, [viz. to be Bishop of *Rome*,] and that therefore he was “ not a second Bishop, but none at all.”

In Answer to which, ’tis not to be doubted, that *Cornelius* was the true and lawful Bishop of *Rome*, and that consequently *Novatian*’s Attempt to get himself made Bishop of *Rome*, and the three *Italian* Bishops Designation of him to that full Diocese, was a Nullity, with respect to his being Bishop of *Rome*, but the Ordination of him to be a Bishop was not therefore a Nullity; and the Reason is plain, because Designation to a particular Diocese is one thing, Ordination to the Office of a Bishop is another; the first is only a Circumstance, and infinitely variable and changeable from time to time, as long as a Man may be translated from one Diocese to another, while he is still but the same individual Bishop he was at first, by Virtue of one single Ordination only. But the other, viz. Ordination to the Office of a Bishop, is Matter of Essence, and can be, without the Circumstance of being possess’d of a Diocese. For a Man can be, and many have been ordain’d to the Episcopal Function, without being, immediately upon their

Ordination, possess'd of particular Districts, wherein to exercise their Episcopal Authority, as sole Bishops of such Sees; witness "such Bishops as were ordain'd to assist some other Bishops, in Case of Infirmary, or Old Age, and were to be subordinate to them, as long as they liv'd, and succeeded them when they died," as Mr. Bingham himself has told us (h) in his *Antiquities of the Christian Church*. These certainly could not be sole Bishops of the respective Sees, whose Bishops they were ordain'd to be Assistant to, and yet they were ordain'd Bishops; which manifestly proves, even according to him, that Ordination to the Episcopal Function is Valid, where there is no immediate full Possession of a particular Diocese by the Bishop ordain'd.

§ XXVIII. But farther, if when one Bishop is rightfully possess'd of a City, the Ordination of a second Bishop, and his Designation to that City, while 'tis fill'd by the first Bishop, does, in the Divine Instituted Nature of the Thing, make the Ordination of this second Bishop to be Null and Void; then 'twill necessarily follow, that there never could have been, in any City whatsoever, a *second Valid Bishop* ordain'd to be a Co-Bishop with the first; and so in the Nature of the Thing it self, one City could not have two Valid Bishops. But this is certainly contrary to Matter of Fact; for "some very Learned Persons are — of Opinion, that the Rule about one

(h) Vol. I. p. 167. 2d Edit.

“ Bishop in a City did not take place in the Apostolical Age.” They think that ——— “ there were two Bishops in many Cities, one of the Jews, and another of the Gentiles. Thus they think it was at Antioch, where Euodius and Ignatius are said to be Bishops ordain’d by the Apostles ; as also Linus and Clemens at Rome. ——— Epiphanius seems to have been of this Opinion,” says Mr. Bingham. (i) But whether it was so or no in the Apostolick Age ; it is certain Matter of Fact, that in After-Ages of the Church several Cities had each of them two Bishops, and yet the Ordination of the latter was not esteem’d to have been Null, but the direct contrary, Good and Valid. Thus

Jerusalem had *Narcissus* for its Bishop, and *Alexander*, a second Bishop, to be his Co-adjutor, in his old Age.

Cesarea had *Theotecnus* for its Bishop, and he made *Anatolius* [a second Bishop] his Co-adjutor, designing him to be his Successor.

Jerusalem another Time had *Maximus* for its Bishop, together with *Macarius*.

Palabisca had *Orion* for its Bishop, and he being grown old, ordain’d *Siderius* his Co-adjutor and Successor.

Apamea had *John*, and one *Stephen* for his Colleague.

Nazianzum had *Gregory Nazianzen* for its Bishop, together with his aged Father. This *Gregory* was only his Father’s Co-adjutor. “ He enter’d upon the Office with this Protestation,

(i) *Antiq. of the Christian Church*, Vol. I. p. 166. 2d Edit.

“ That he would not be obliged to continue Bishop
 “ there any longer than his Father liv’d, as he
 “ himself acquaints us in his own Life, and other
 “ Places ; so that after his Father’s Death, he
 “ actually resign’d, and getting Eulalius to be or-
 “ dain’d in his room, he betook himself to a pri-
 “ vate Life.” Lastly, to mention no more ;

Hippo had *Valerius* for its Bishop, and *St. Augustin* sat with him for some Time as his Co-adjutor, which he did by the Consent of the Primate of *Carthage*, and Primate of *Numidia*, who ordain’d him.

These Instances which I have produc’d, even from *Mr. Bingham* (k) himself, are evident Proof, that the Ancients thought a second Bishop in a City, ordain’d during the Life and actual Possession of the first, was a Valid Bishop, and that consequently, in the Nature of the Thing it self, the Ordination of a second Bishop to a full See is not Null, but Valid as to his being a Bishop.

§ XXIX. If it be said, that these were Cases of Necessity, and occasion’d by the Infirmities and old Age of the first Bishops, who could not discharge that great Office, without the Assistance of such second Bishops ; and that consequently, the Ordinations of these second Bishops were Valid, and yet notwithstanding this, the Ordination of a second Bishop to a full See, where there is no such Necessity, must be Null and Void : I answer, that what we call Necessity, cannot alter the Nature of

(k) *Antiq. of the Christian Church*, Vol. I. p. 168, 169.
 2d Edn.

a *Divine Positive Institution*; for indeed there can be no such Thing as *any Necessity* at all to act contrary to it. If it be *Essential* to the Ordination of a Bishop, that there should be but one Bishop in one City, and that he should not be ordain'd to a *Full*, but to a present Vacant See; then, whatsoever Person is ordain'd to a Full See, he is no Ordain'd Bishop, the Ordination is Null and Void, because 'twas contrary to what was Essential to the Ordination; and so *Anatolius, Siderius, Gregory Nazianzen, and St. Augustin, &c.* who were ordain'd second Bishops into full Sees, had no Valid Ordination, and therefore were no Bishops at all; there was *no absolute Necessity* to have ordain'd them into the Full Sees, if 'twas Essential to their Ordination, that they should have been ordain'd immediately to fill Vacant ones; for if the first Bishops could not have discharg'd their Office, they should have made a Cession, and vacated their Thrones to them, that an Essential of the Ordination of Bishops might have been preserv'd. We can never do too much to preserve and secure such *Essentials*; for the Cession and Vacating of an Episcopal Throne, by one who is almost incapable of exercising his Episcopal Function, is to him but a very Trifle, compar'd to the vast Benefit which the Church receives, by being sufficiently supply'd with *Valid Bishops*; the most that he can lose, is but a temporary Honour and Profit, and 'tis necessary to part with such Things, for the securing of an Essential of Religion.

§ XXX. If it be answer'd, that there was no need for the first Bishops to resign to the second, because 'tis not Essential to the Ordination of such second Bishops, that they should be ordain'd immediately to fill vacant Sees, but they may be validly ordain'd to the Office of Bishops at large, and afterwards be receiv'd by such first Bishops into Co-Partnership with them, to assist them in the Discharge of their Episcopal Function; I grant it, and that these second Bishops were Valid Bishops by Virtue of their Ordination; but then I have hereby gain'd what I contend for, which is this; That Ordination to the Office of a Bishop is one Thing, and Designation to a particular District, wherein to exercise that Function, is another; and that consequently, whatsoever Faults are chargeable on the *Designation* of a Bishop to a particular Diocese, do not, in the Nature of the Thing, necessarily affect his Ordination to the Office of a Bishop; and that, therefore, the Wickedness and Nullity of *Novatian's* Designation to the See of *Rome*, did not, in the Nature of the Thing, necessarily Null and make Void his Ordination to the Office of a Bishop; but he was a Valid Bishop, tho' he had no particular Diocese, wherein canonically to exercise his Function. The Circumstances that attended his Ordination were highly sinful, but the Ordination it self was not destitute of the Essentials that were absolutely necessary to the Ordination of a Bishop; for, as to the *Person ordain'd*, tho' he was very wicked, yet he had a *Capacity at least* of receiving Orders; if *Judas Iscariot* may
be

be allow'd to have had such a Capacity, as we find he had, by our Saviour's giving him a Commission; and then, as for the *Persons who ordain'd* him, tho' they also were wicked, yet they were Bishops, Real and Valid Bishops, who could give Orders, and they did actually give him the Order of a Bishop. And therefore, *Novatian* was a Valid Bishop, tho' the Circumstances attending his Ordination were irregular and sinful.

§ XXXI. But farther yet, That he was a Valid Bishop, is evident by his having ordain'd Valid Bishops, and other Clergymen, whose Orders were own'd to be Good and Valid; which they could not have been, if he himself had not been a Valid Bishop; for the Church is an absolute Stranger to Valid Ordinations made by Persons who never were Bishops. Now, to prove, that the Bishops and other Clergymen who were ordain'd by *Novatian*, and by his Bishops, were in Valid Orders, I shall produce 1st, *Mr. Bingham* himself against himself; and 2^{dly}, The Council of *Nice* against him likewise.

§ XXXII. And first, *Mr. Bingham* affirms of the *Novatian Bishops* who were suppos'd to have been allow'd by the Council of *Nice* to act as *Chorepiscopi*; I say, he positively asserts concerning these *Novatian Bishops* whom he expressly mentions, that "All such" (1) "*Chorepiscopi* as these," [viz. as these "*Nov-*

(1) *Antiq. of the Christian Church*, Vol. I. p. 172.

“*Novatian Bishops*”] “*were properly Bishops, because they were originally ordain’d Bishops, before they came to act in the Quality of Country Bishops under others.*” Nothing can be more express, than this which he here affirms of such, as the *Novatian Bishops* were; that they were “*Properly Bishops.*” Now if they were *properly Bishops*, sure they were *Valid Bishops*, for ’tis Noaisense to say, that a *no Bishop* is “*Properly a Bishop.*” But why were the *Novatian Bishops* “*Properly Bishops?*” His following Reason tells you why they were so; says he, “*Because they were originally ordain’d Bishops.*” But who did originally ordain them, and make them *properly Bishops*? They were originally ordain’d by other *Novatian Bishops*, and these by others, and so on, till you come to *Novatian* himself, whom *Mr. Bingham* (m) owns to have been “*the Father of the Novatians;*” so that the *Novatian Bishops* were “*Properly Bishops,*” *because they were originally ordain’d Bishops;* by that Episcopal Ordination which was successively convey’d to them from their Father *Novatian*; and since they were *properly Bishops*, *Novatian* must of Necessity have been *properly a Bishop*, and therefore a *Valid Bishop*; otherwise the *Novatian Bishops*, “*who deriv’d the Original of their Orders from him,*” could not have been *properly Bishops*, as *Mr. Bingham* says they were. But we have

(m) *Scholast. Hist.* Part. II. p. 95.

better Evidence than our Historian, to confirm this Truth. For

§ XXXIII. Secondly, The Council of *Nice* “ decreed in the Case of the Novatians, ” [as Mr. *Bingham* (n) himself also acknowledges] “ 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. ” This is his own just and unprejudic'd Paraphrase upon the 8th Canon of that Council, which I choose to give the Reader in Mr. *Bingham*'s express Words, not only because I am resolv'd, as much as possible, to confute him out of his own Mouth ; but also because they fully express the true Sense and Meaning of that Canon.

And now here is a full Proof, that the *Nicene* Fathers, assembled in Council, own'd *Novatian* to have been a *Valid Bishop* ; for they decreed concerning the *Novatian* Schismatical Clergy, “ who deriv'd the Original of their Orders from *Novatian* ; ” that if they would come over to the *Catholick Church*, they should continue in the same Station and Clerical Degrees they were in before, that is, before their Return to the Church ; but before their Return they were Schismaticks, and had no Clerical Degrees but what they deriv'd originally from *Novatian* ; if then, in the Opinion of that Council, those Clerical Degrees were

(n) *Scholast. Hist.* Part I. p. 92.

Null before, if they were not Clergymen but Laicks, the Council would have banter'd them by making a Decree, that they should continue in the same Clerical Degrees they were in before; for this would have been the same as to have said, they were all of 'em Laicks before, but upon their Return to the Church they shall continue in the same Clerical Degrees; which is ridiculous; nay, 'tis egregious Nonsense to say, that a Laick shall continue a Clergyman; for how can he continue to be, what he never was? The Terms are utterly inconsistent, and as incompatible the one to the other, as a Negative is to an Affirmative. And, therefore, if we will allow [as we ought] that the 8th Canon of the Council of *Nice* means any Thing that can be call'd Good Sense, it must signify, that the *Novatians*, in whose Favour this Canon was made, were *Valid Clergymen* before, and that therefore the Council decreed, "they should continue or remain in the Clergy;" that is, as Mr. *Bingham* rightly explains it, "they should continue in the same Station and Clerical Degrees they were in before;" so that, if, upon their Return to the Church, they "should continue *Valid Clergymen*," as 'tis plain the Council design'd they should; then they were *Valid Clergymen* before their Return, because they afterwards did but continue what they were before. And therefore, since the *Novatian* Clergy were Valid Clergymen, the *Novatian* Bishops who ordain'd them were Valid Bishops; and consequently *Novatian* himself also, from whom their Orders were deriv'd, was a Valid Bishop, by the 8th Canon of the Council of *Nice*. And as for

for the Imposition of Hands, which the Council enjoin'd them to submit to, it was, that they should only "receive a Reconciliatory Imposition of Hands, by way of Absolution." As Mr. *Bingham* ingenuously confesses; and 'tis well known, that such an Imposition of Hands has nothing to do with Ordination, being only for reconciling and absolving of Penitents, and not for ordaining of Clergymen to Holy Functions. Consequently, this Imposition of Hands was no new Ordination of the *Novatian* Clergy, and therefore they were proper, *i. e.* Valid Clergymen, by Virtue only of that Ordination which was originally deriv'd to them from *Novatian*; or rather, to speak more exactly, they were Valid Clergymen by Virtue only of that Commission to Ordain, which was originally given by Christ to his Apostles, and by them to other Bishops, and so on, till it was convey'd to those Bishops who ordain'd *Novatian*, and handed from him to the *Novatian* Bishops who ordain'd the *Novatian* Clergymen we are now speaking of.

§ XXXIV. But notwithstanding that these Things were so; notwithstanding that the *Novatian Clergymen* were in real Valid Orders, and the Council own'd that they were; yet Mr. *Bingham* does considerably cloud the Brightness of this Truth, by putting a Blind before the Eyes of his *English Reader*; for he falsely interprets the *Greek* (ο) *Χειροθετημένους αὐτῶν ΜΕ'ΝΕΙΝ ἕτως ἐν τῷ κλήρῳ.* And says, that the 8th Canon of the Council

(ο) *Scholast. Hist. Part II. p. 106.*

of Nice “appoints them to be receiv’d among the Catholick Clergy, by Imposition of Hands.” These are his very Words, and to them he immediately annexes, for Proof of his Assertion, the *Greek* Words I have above transcrib’d from him. Now, by Mr. *Bingham*’s thus Representing the Matter, an unskilful Reader would be apt to think, that the *Novatians* were not Clergymen, but were order’d to be made so, by being “**Receiv’d among the Catholick Clergy, by Imposition of Hands.**” For ’tis very natural to say of a newly ordain’d Person, who never was in Orders before, that he was “**Receiv’d among [or into the Number of] the Clergy, by Imposition of Hands.**” But the great Fallacy thus put upon the *English* Reader, is, in Mr. *Bingham*’s false Translating the Word ME’NEIN, into “**Receiv’d,**” when it signifies, in Truth, quite another thing; nay, the very Contrary to his Translation, namely, to “**Remain or Continue;**” And most evidently shews, that the Synod’s Decree was, “*Let them Remain or Continue in the Clergy,*” [or] “*They shall Remain or Continue in the Clergy,*” and that consequently they were in the Clergy before; otherwise, to decree that they should **Continue** in the Clergy, would have been ridiculous, since no Man can be said to **continue** in that, which he never was in before.

It is a very unaccountable Thing to consider, how it came to pass, that Mr. *Bingham*, who boasts and insults so much, upon Account of his Knowledge in *Greek* and *Latin*, could construe ME’NEIN by the Word **Receiv’d**, instead of **Remain or Continue.** I dare

dare not say, or so much as imagine, that it was through Ignorance, for this would be **Detraction**; to say that 'twas design'd, looks *very Severe*, and has something too much of the Uncharitable in it; for, Can it be suppos'd, that he would offer so great an Affront to his Learned Brethren of the Clergy, as to fancy that they would not be able to discover the Fallacy? Or, Can it be just and reasonable to believe, that he had not already had so good Experience of the Great Learning and Sagacity of our two Famous Universities, but that he might yet hope so gross an Error would escape them too? No! these Things are not to be suppos'd; for, how much soever the *London Laick* may be impos'd upon, in such Matters, [tho' Mr. *Bingham* sees that he will not in this Particular] yet 'tis not to be imagin'd that he could intend to palm so gross a Fallacy upon those *Venerable and Truly Learned Bodies*; and therefore, by no means let us suppose that this was a **Design**, when it lay so Open, as that he who runs may see the Error. What was it then? Was it only a **Slip**, an **Overlight**, a **Miscast** of the Eye, such as may occasion a Miscopying out of an Author, a *Major* instead of a *Minor*? It must be a prodigious Charity to believe this, when it does not appear that he copy'd the Word **Receiv'd** instead of **Remain**, out of any other Author than his *own Brain*, when he falsly construed the Word **ME'NEIN**, a Word so very common and well known, that every School-Boy, tho' but beginning to learn *Greek*, can find its Meaning: But not to teaze my Reader any longer, I promise to acknowledge this, with the rest of his Errors committed in his Writings,

to have been only *Slips and Oversights, the meer Effects of humane Frailty*, when I find Mr. Bingham to be so **JUGENIOUS** as to own, retract, and amend them; particularly those, which have been prov'd upon him, to have been committed in the First Part of his *Scholastical History*, not one of which has he yet own'd or amended. In the mean time, I leave him to the Censure of Impartial Judges, [not personally concern'd with him in this Controversy] withall advising him, for his own Sake, to let his *many Falls* put him in mind of the Apostle's Charge, "Be not high-minded, but fear." For, "Where is Boasting, when Men do so publickly, and so very frequently stumble and fall, where they may easily stand upright? But to return:

§ XXXV. Having thus at large prov'd; 1st, From the Nature of Ordination it self: 2dly, From Mr. Bingham's own Account of them: And, 3dly, From the Decree of the Council of Nice, That the *Novatian* Clergymen were in Valid Orders, and that consequently *Novatian*, from whom they deriv'd their Orders, was a Valid Bishop; It hence follows, that Mr. Bingham's great Boast, that he would prove, (p) That "the Church receiv'd the Baptism of some — who never had any Orders from any Episcopal Ordination;" And his Producing the (q) *Novatians* [whose Baptisms were esteem'd Valid] as an Instance of this, is a most notorious *Banter*, &c. put

(p) *Schol. Hist.* Part II. p. 51.

(q) *Ibid.* p. 95, &c.

upon the World, since the Baptisms administered by them, were Baptisms by Men who had Valid Episcopal Ordination, and were really in Episcopal Orders when they Baptized, as has been fully prov'd against him.

§ XXXVI. I might now proceed to consider the Instances he gives out of the following Councils; but his way of Arguing from them, is just the same as before; and to baffle all that he says, I need only to repeat what has been already urg'd against him. It remains now, that I expose to the World, and more especially to Mr. *Bingham's* own Friends in this Controversy, how much he has contributed still farther, to his own Confutation, by his *Antiquities of the Christian Church*, which some People do so highly applaud, as also by both the Parts of his *Scholastical History* of what he falsely calls *Lay-Baptism*, wherein he has abundantly testify'd, That the ancient Heretical and Schismatical Baptisms, allow'd of by some Churches, were not such as our Lay-Baptisms perform'd by Persons never commission'd, but Baptisms by Persons who were in Valid Episcopal Orders when they Baptiz'd. For,

§ XXXVII. In his *Antiquities*, Vol. I. p. 86: 2d Edition, speaking against Ordination by Presbyters: He tells you of a Question put to Pope *Leo* by *Rusticus Narbonensis*; and 'twas this: "Whether the Ordination of certain Persons might stand Good, who were only ordain'd by some Pseudo-Episcopi, False Bishops, who had no Legal and Canonical Right to their Places? To this *Leo* answers, "That if the Lawful Bishops

“ of those Churches gave their Consent to the Ordination, it might be esteem’d Valid and allow’d; otherwise to be disannull’d.” This he produces for an ancient Instance, which some reckon “ seems to make for the Ordination of Presbyters; ” but he was at that time so jealous for Episcopacy, that he opposes this Supposition in the same Place with these remarkable Words:

“ But here [says he] it is to be consider’d, That these Pseudo-Episcopi were in some Sense Bishops, as being ordain’d tho’ illegally to their Places: For they seem to be such as had Schismatically intruded themselves into other Mens Sees, or at least obtain’d them by some corrupt and irregular Practices.”

In this Passage Mr. Bingham affirms, that Persons, tho’ illegally ordain’d Bishops by other Bishops, [for he is talking against Presbyterian Ordination] nay, though they should have Schismatically intruded themselves into other Mens Sees, or have obtain’d them by some corrupt and irregular Practices; yet, notwithstanding all this, they were [says Mr. Bingham] in some Sense Bishops, and the only Reason he gives why they were in some Sense Bishops, is, “ as being ordain’d; ” so that according to him, their Ordination alone, tho’ illegally, into full Sees, or by corrupt and irregular Practices, made them in some Sense Bishops; and, therefore, they must have been at least Valid Bishops, otherwise they could have been in no Sense whatsoever Bishops; for an Invalid or Null Bishop is in no Sense at all a Bishop. Hence, even according to Mr. Bingham, Novatian who intruded himself Schismatically

tically into the full See of Rome, was “ in
 “ some Sense a Bishop, ” and therefore a
Valid Bishop, “ as being ordain’d tho’ ille-
 “ gally by three Bishops. ” So *Maximus* (r)
 the *Cynick*, who Schismatically intruded him-
 self into the full See of *Constantinople*, “ by the
 “ Help of seven Bishops that ordain’d him ; ”
 tho’ he was not Bishop of *Constantinople*, yet
 he was [by *Mr. Bingham’s Rule*] “ in some
 “ Sense a Bishop, ” and therefore a *Valid*
Bishop, “ as being ordain’d tho’ illegally ”
 by no less than seven Bishops ; consequently
 Bishops, Priests, and Deacons ordain’d by them,
 “ were in some Sense ” Bishops, Priests, and
 Deacons, and therefore *Valid Bishops, Priests,*
 and Deacons, “ as being ordain’d ” “ tho’ ille-
 “ gally ” by *Valid Bishops*. The Consequence
 of which is this, that Baptisms perform’d by
 all these, were Baptisms by *Valid Bishops,*
 Priests, and Deacons, and so were not of the
 same Nature with our *Lay-Baptisms*, by Per-
 sons who never were at all commission’d to
 Baptize.

And this Principle of his, “ *That these Pseudo-*
 “ *Episcopi* ” [these *False Bishops* as they are
 term’d] “ were in some Sense Bishops, as
 “ being ordain’d tho’ illegally, &c. ” serves for
 a Key to unlock the Secret, and discover the
 Fallacy of his so frequently making use of the
ambiguous Terms of “ *False Bishop,* ” “ not a
 “ true Bishop ; not true Shepherds or Bishops ; super-
 “ ordain’d, pretended Bishops into a full See, ”
 “ *Persons not authentically ordain’d ;* ” and such

(r) *Schol. Hist.* Part II. p. 62.

like, throughout the second Part of his *Scholastical History*, to make them look as if they were *no Bishops*, and the Persons ordain'd by them *no Priests*, but *Laymen*; for here we see, that all these ambiguous Terms are not sufficient to hide this Truth, that *such False Bishops*, " *tho' ordain'd illegally,* " tho' " *they Schismatically intruded themselves into other Mens Sees,* " or tho' " *they obtain'd them by some corrupt and irregular Practices;* " yet they were in *some Sense Bishops*, [consequently Valid Bishops] as being ordain'd, [that is, by reason of their *Ordination*] " *tho' illegally.* " The Illegality did not here destroy or null the Ordination, according to him: These which he calls *False Bishops*, &c. were yet *Bishops*. And so he in this short Paragraph destroys all his Insinuations in the 2d Part of his *Scholastical History*, that such False Bishops, as he calls them, and the Clergy ordain'd by them, were but *Laymen*. Again,

§ XXXVIII. In the 147th Page of the same Book of the *Antiquities*; after having spoken of the General Practice of the Church, that three Bishops were requir'd to the Ordination of a Bishop, he adds thus; " *Yet it must be observ'd, that tho' this was the common Rule and Practice of the Church, yet it was not Simply and Absolutely of the Essence of Ordination.* " And then he gives us a large Catalogue of Bishops, who were Ordain'd contrary to this common Rule, some only by two Bishops, and others by no more than one, who were, notwithstanding, Valid Bishops, tho' this Rule of the Church was broken. All the Use that

that I make of this, is, That what is **Essential** to an Ordination, is one thing; and that the circumstantial Rules of the Church about Ordination, are another; that Mr. *Bingham* makes the **common Rule** of the Church for Ordinations, to be “not **Simply and Absolutely** of the **Essence of Ordination**; and that consequently there may be an **Essential Ordination**, when at the same time that Ordination may not be **Regular**, or agreeable to the circumstantial Rules and Laws of the Church, but *wholly contrary* to such Laws. And that therefore, if an Ordination have what is “**Simply and Absolutely of the Essence of Ordination**, ’tis essentially Valid, tho’ not attended with those Circumstantials which the Church has appointed. And this Distinction alone is sufficient to answer all that Mr. *Bingham* has advanc’d in the Second Part of his *Scholastical History*, against the Holy Orders of such Persons, as were ordain’d by **Bishops**, in an irregular Manner, and contrary to “*the common Rule and Practice of the Church*;” since, even according to him, a **common Rule and Practice of the Church**, may be such as is “*not simply and absolutely of the Essence of Ordination*.”

§ XXXIX. In Pages 163, 164. of the First Volume of his *Antiquities*, he shews, that the Episcopal Ordinations of **Schismaticks** were esteem’d to be Valid. For there he tells you, p. 163. that

“*Meletius Bishop of Antioch made*” a “*Proposal to Paulinus his Antagonist, who though he was of the same Faith, yet kept up a Church*”

“ divided in Communion from him, ” and, therefore, he was doubtless a Schismatick.

Meletius's Proposal to Paulinus was this,

“ Forasmuch as the Lord hath committed to me the Care of these Sheep, and thou hast receiv'd the Care of others, and all the Sheep agree in one Common Faith, let us join our Flocks, my Friend, and dispute no longer about *Pri* *macy and Government*; — and if it be the *Throne* that creates the Dispute, I will try to take away this Cause also; we will lay the Holy Gospel upon the Seat, and then each of us take his Place on either Side of it. And if I die first, you shall take the Government of the Flock alone; but if it be your Fate to die before me, then I will feed them according to my Power; — but Paulinus would not acquiesce nor hearken to him. ”

Here we see, that *Paulinus*, the Schismatical Bishop, was not thought to have been Un-Bishop'd by his Schism; no, so far was he from that, that *Meletius* own'd him to be a Bishop, by offering him a Share in his own Episcopal Throne, during his Life, and that he should wholly possess and enjoy it after his Death, if he surviv'd him. Which Offer he could never have justly made him, if he had utterly lost his Episcopal Character by reason of his Schism, in the Opinion of those Churches where this happen'd.

So again he tells you, p. 164. there was another such Proposal made to the Donatist Bishops, by all the Catholick Bishops of Africk assembled together at the Opening of the famous Conference at Carthage. There they offer'd them freely, — that if they would return to the
“ Unity

“ Unity and Communion of the Church, upon due
 “ Conviction, they should retain their Episcopal
 “ Honour and Dignity still; ——— ” “ That e-
 “ very Catholick Bishop should take the other to
 “ be his Co-Partner, and share the Honour
 “ with him; allowing him to sit with him in his
 “ own Chair, as was usual for Bishops to treat
 “ their Fellow-Bishops that were Strangers;
 “ ——— till such Time as one of them should
 “ die, and then the Right of Succession should be
 “ always in a single Bishop as it was before. And
 “ this they say was no new Thing in Africk; for
 “ from the beginning of the Schism, they that
 “ would recant their Error, and condemn their
 “ Separation, and return to the Unity of the
 “ Church, were, by the Charity of Catholicks, al-
 “ ways treated in the same courteous Manner. ”
 “ From hence it is plain, [says Mr. Bingham]
 “ That this had been the Practice of Africk for
 “ above one whole Century. ”

And therefore, say I, there was a long Suc-
 cession of *Donatist* Schismatical Bishops, Priests,
 and Deacons for above one hundred Years, who
 in the Opinion of the Churches of *Africk* had
 Valid Ordination, and so were Valid Bishops,
 Priests, and Deacons even during their Schism;
 for if they had not Valid Orders, they had no
 Orders at all; and so the Catholick Bishops
 propos'd to admit meer Laymen to be Co-
 Partner Bishops with them; which is ridiculous
 to imagine; nay, at this rate, the Catholick
 Bishops would have offer'd meer Laymen, “ that
 “ if they would return to the Unity — of the
 “ Church, — they should retain their Episco-
 “ pal Honour and Dignity still, ” “ which is
 emphatical Nonsense. ” And, therefore, in
 the

the Opinion of these *African* Fathers, Schism did not Un-Bishop the first *Donatist* Bishops, nor Null their Ordinations perform'd in the Schism, but their Succession was a Succession of Valid Bishops, Priests, and Deacons, since the Charity and courteous Treatment of the Catholicks towards them was not the denying of their Orders they before receiv'd, and giving them a *New Ordination*; but an Admission of them to partake with 'em in their Ecclesiastical External Honours and Profits which they enjoy'd in the Church, by the Exercise of their Episcopal Functions in their several Dioceses.

§ XL. In Page 172. of the same Volume, he tells you of some who are thought to have been *Chorepiscopi*, and particularly names the *Novatian* and *Meletian* Bishops who were ordain'd in Schism, and says, " 'Tis plain, that
 " all such *Chorepiscopi* as these were properly
 " Bishops, because they were originally or-
 " dain'd Bishops; " but this I have taken Notice of in two Sections before, and therefore will no farther enlarge upon it in this Place; after I have observ'd, that he hereby makes Men to have been properly Bishops by Virtue of their original Ordination to that Function, though ordain'd even in Schism by Schismatical Bishops.

§ XLI. In the Second Volume of his *Antiquities*, p. 183. he says of Re-Ordinations thus:

" Such Orders as were given regularly in the
 " Church, they were suppos'd like Baptism to im-
 " press a sort of Indelible Character, so as
 " that

“ that there was no Necessity upon any Occa-
 “ sion to repeat them, but on the contrary it was
 “ deem’d a Criminal Act so to do. The third
 “ Council of Carthage following the Steps of the
 “ Plenary Council of Capua or Capſa, decreed,
 “ that it was equally unlawful to Re-Baptize and
 “ Re-Ordain. And those called the Apostolical
 “ Canons, make it Deposition both for the Or-
 “ dainer and Ordained to give or receive a Se-
 “ cond Ordination.” “ St. Augustin says, it
 “ was not the Custom of the Catholick Church
 “ to repeat either Orders or Baptism; for Men
 “ did not lose their Orders, as to their In-
 “ ternal Character and Virtue, though they
 “ were suspended from the Execution of their
 “ Office for some Misdemeanour. Optatus testi-
 “ fies the same, telling us, that Donatus was
 “ condemn’d in the Council of Rome under Mel-
 “ chiades, for Re-Ordaining such Bishops, as
 “ had laps’d in Time of Persecution; which was
 “ contrary to the Custom of the Catholick
 “ Church.”

From all which ’tis evident, that Orders once
 regularly receiv’d in the Church, were esteem’d
 by those Ancients to have been Indelible; they
 could not, it seems, be annihilated, they could
 not be lost; they constantly remain’d entire,
 even when Men for their Crimes “ were su-
 “ spended from the Execution of their Office; ”
 nay, tho’ they “ had laps’d ” into “ Ido-
 “ latry ” “ in Time of Persecution, ” yet still
 they remain’d Bishops [if they were at first or-
 dain’d Bishops in the Church] nothing could
 Un-Bishop them, for “ there was no Necessi-
 “ sity upon any Occasion ” to repeat their Or-
 dination. No, “ It was not the Custom of
 “ the

“ the Catholick Church to repeat their Orders ! ” Nay more, it was even “ contrary to the Custom of the Catholick Church ” to do so, if we may believe Mr. Bingham, the third Council of Carthage, the Apostolical Canons, St. Augustin, Optatus, and the Council of Rome under Melchiades. And from hence it follows, that these originally ordain’d Bishops in the Church, having their Episcopal Character or Order Indelible, “ so as that there was no Necessity upon any Occasion to repeat ” the giving them Orders, were Valid Bishops even while under Suspension, or Excommunication, &c. because their Orders were not lost, but remain’d indeleted, not taken away ; consequently Persons ordain’d by them, even while they were under Suspension, or Excommunication, were ordain’d by Valid Bishops ; and because they were ordain’d by Valid Bishops, therefore they also receiv’d Valid Orders : And thus it is easy to account for the Council of Nice’s decreeing, that the Schismatical Bishops, &c. ordain’d by Meletius, who was made a Bishop in the Church ; and the Schismatical Bishops and Clergy ordain’d by Novatian, [who was made a Bishop by three Church Bishops] should, upon their Return to the Church, remain in the same Clerical Functions which they had before, without giving them a New Ordination, as I have before prov’d ; from hence also we may account for the Catholicks letting the Arian and Donatist Clergy, remain in the same Stations they held before their Return to the Church, without repeating their Orders. For they had all of them Episcopal Orders originally convey’d to them from Christ, by Church Bishops, whose

whose Transgressions did not, in the Opinion of those Ancients, *Null* the Orders which those Bishops had themselves, and consequently *not Void* the Orders which they gave to others. And so all Baptisms by such Persons so ordain'd, were Episcopal, and therefore 'tis no Wonder to find the third Council of *Carthage* decreeing, that it was "*unlawful to Re-Baptize*" as well as to "*Re-Ordain*;" for, as all Ordinations were *Episcopal*, so were *all Baptisms* too; and Mr. *Bingham* has not, in all that he has written upon this Controversy, given so much as one Instance of any *real*, well attested **Matter of Fact**, of a Baptism perform'd by any one Person, who was reckon'd never to have had an Episcopal Commission to Baptize, which this or any other ancient Council decreed was "*unlawful*" to be repeated. And I challenge him to produce any one such Instance and Decree about it, from the Records of the ancient Catholick Church. But to proceed:

§ XLII. In the 185th Page of his Second Volume of *Antiquities*, he says, that "*such as were ordain'd out of the Church by Schismatical or Heretical Bishops, — the Church did not always allow of their Ordinations, but sometimes for Discipline Sake, and to put a Mark of Infamy upon their Errors, made them take a New Ordination.*"

Here, before I proceed any farther, the Question that arises about this Matter, is, Upon what Principle were these *supposed New Ordinations* enjoin'd? Either they were requir'd, 1st, Because Hereticks and Schismaticks have

no Valid Orders at all, and it was *Simply and Absolutely of the Essence of Orders*, that they should receive [what we now for Argument sake call] *A New Ordination*, the first being a *meer Nullity*. Or else, 2dly, They had Valid Orders before, but were appointed to submit to this suppos'd *New Ordination*, as to a *Ceremony* appointed, not to give them Holy Orders, but to be a Rite of *Absolution* from the Punishment due to their Crimes, and of *Reconciliation* to the Unity of the Church, for Discipline's sake.

If the first was the Reason of those *suppos'd New Ordinations*, then 'tis plain that they were not *Re-Ordinations*, but properly Ordinations to the *Sacred Functions*, and so the Church did not *Re-Ordain*, but *Ordain* only: But if this be true, then the Church, when she let the *Novatians*, *Arians*, and *Donatists* [who were Schismaticks and Hereticks] minister in Holy Things, as Bishops, Priests and Deacons, upon their Return to her Communion, without requiring them to be Ordain'd by [what Mr. *Bingham* calls] "*A New Ordination*, did omit, let pass, and neglect what was simply and absolutely of the Essence of Orders, and reckon Men to have the Orders of Bishops, Priests and Deacons, without what was esteem'd to be simply and absolutely of the Essence of those Orders; which is a most egregious Absurdity, because it makes *Things to be*, without what is of the Essence of their Being. And therefore, since the *Novatians*, *Arians*, and *Donatists*, as great Schismaticks and Hereticks, as any whatsoever, were esteem'd to have had the Orders of Bishops, Priests, and Deacons, by Virtue of their first Episcopal Ordination, without this *New Ordination*; it is plain;

plain, that they were reckon'd to have had what was Essential to those Orders, without this *New Ordination*; and consequently, that this *New Ordination* was not thought to be of the Essence of those their Orders; and if not of the Essence of *their Orders*, then consequently it could not have been of the Essence of Orders to other Hereticks and Schismaticks, who had the same Episcopal Ordination, as the *Novatians*, *Arians*, and *Donatists* had; and therefore, the *New Ordination* Mr. Bingham talks of, was not requir'd, because it was simply and absolutely of the Essence of Orders to those suppos'dly new Ordain'd Heretical and Schismatical Clergymen, and so they were 'in valid Orders without it, [as much as the *Novatians*, *Arians*, and *Donatists* were] by Virtue of their first Ordination by Bishops; consequently, their suppos'd New Ordination was no Ordination at all, but something of quite another Nature. And therefore,

Secondly; These suppos'd New Ordinations were only a Rite or Ceremony of Imposition of Hands, to which those returning Heretical and Schismatical Clergymen [*who were Ordain'd out of the Church, by Schismatical, or Heretical, but yet Real Bishops*, and had therefore Valid Orders] were appointed to submit, whereby they receiv'd *Absolution* from the Punishment due to their Crimes, and were reconcil'd to the Church, as other Penitents us'd to be; and this [as Mr. Bingham says] "*For Discipline's sake, and to put a Mark of Infamy upon their Errors,*" but not as an Essential of Ordination, to give them Orders they had not before; for they were all of them as much in Orders

ders before, as the *Arians*, *Novatians*, and *Donatists* were ; and consequently, the Imposition of Hands they receiv'd, was not Essential to the giving of Holy Orders, and therefore could be nothing but a reconciliatory Imposition of Hands, by way of Absolution.

§ XLIII. In the 188th Page of the same Volume, he says, “ *In France, the Custom was in the*
 “ *time of Clodoveus, to give a New Imposition of*
 “ *Hands to the Arian Clergy, that return'd to the*
 “ *Catholick Faith, as appears from the first Council*
 “ *of Orleans, which made a Decree about it ; but*
 “ *that perhaps, does not mean a New Or-*
 “ *dnation, but only such a reconciliatory Im-*
 “ *sition of Hands, as was us'd to be given to Pe-*
 “ *nitents in Absolution.*” The Decree it self, as it stands in his Margin, is this, *Concil. Aurel.* 1. Cap. 12. “ *De Hereticis Clericis, qui ad fi-*
 “ *dem Catholicam plena fide & voluntate venerint,*
 “ *id censuimus observari — ut Officium, quo*
 “ *eos Episcopus dignos esse censuerit, cum imposi-*
 “ *ta manûs Benedictione suscipiant.*”

Here we see, the Council appoints, that these Returning Clergymen should, upon Imposition of Hands, Receive such Office, as the Bishop should judge them worthy, or fit to discharge. And tho' they did thus Receive such Office, yet Mr. *Bingham* here rightly guesses, that this Imposition of Hands, perhaps, does not mean a New Ordination. He might have left out his *perhaps*, and have asserted positively, that it was no New Ordination, without leaving his Reader to doubt and hesitate upon the Matter ; For the Council calls them Clergymen, before their Return to the Catholick Faith,
 and

and before their so Receiving their Office. But to let that pass, his Guess has hit on the Right in this Place, and serves for an Argument against himself in other Instances. For 'tis certain, that an Adversary's meer Guess, in Favour of that very Truth he is using all his Power and Skill to oppose, does very often prove the Partiality and Inconsistency of his way of Arguing against that Truth; and that he himself, to make the best of all that he says, is only making contrary Conjectures and Guesses [if not something worse] against the very same Thing in other Instances; as is plain in the Case before us, where Mr. *Bingham* can suppose, that a Returning *Arian* Clergyman's Receiving an Office upon Imposition of Hands, was not a New Ordination; and yet, that a *Meletian* Returning Clergyman's being "Continued in his Function," when he was Confirm'd by Imposition of Hands, was a New Ordination. Imposition of Hands on the *Arian* Heretick was no New Ordination; but Imposition of Hands on the *Meletian* Schismatick was a New Ordination. A Man who Receiv'd an Office was not thereby Re-ordain'd; but a Man who was Continued in his Function, was thereby Re-ordain'd. In short, the *Arian* he supposes was not Re-ordain'd by the New Imposition of Hands; but the *Meletian* he affirms was Re-ordain'd by the New Imposition of Hands; and yet the suppos'd Reason, why the *Meletian* is reckon'd to have been Re-ordain'd, is only this, that he was oblig'd to submit to Imposition of Hands, as the *Arian* was likewise, tho' the *Arian* was not thereby Re-ordain'd: Egregious

Partiality and Inconsistency this ! for if it was at all reasonable [as, I doubt not, it was] for him to believe, that the *Arian* Clergyman, who receiv'd an Office with a *New Imposition of Hands*, was not thereby re-ordain'd ; it was certainly *contrary to Reason* for him to believe, that the *Meletian* Clergyman was re-ordain'd, when he [receiv'd not, but] was continu'd in his Function, upon such a *New Imposition of Hands* ; but enough of this, for I have already prov'd, Sections VIII, XI. That the *Meletians* were not re-ordain'd ; and Mr. *Bingham's* notorious Inconsistency with himself about them has been sufficiently expos'd.

§ XLIV. The last Instance out of his *Antiquities*, which I shall trouble the Reader with, is in *Vol. II. p. 189.* There he tells us, that
 “ the General Council of Ephesus made an Or-
 “ der concerning the *Massalian Hereticks*, otherwise
 “ call'd *Euchites* and *Enthusiasts*, that if any
 “ of their Clergy would return to the Church, and
 “ in Writing anathematize their former Errors,
 “ they should continue in the same Station
 “ they were in before ; — ” that “ the Coun-
 “ cil of Nice is thought to have made the like
 “ Decree in Favour of the *Novatian Clergy*, only
 “ given them a *Reconciliatory Imposition of*
 “ *Hands* by way of *Absolution*, not *Re-Ordina-*
 “ *tion*. And there is nothing more certain,
 “ than that the *African Fathers* so treated the
 “ *Donatists* ; particularly *St. Austin* in all his
 “ *Writings* pleads as much for the *Validity of*
 “ *Heretical Ordinations*, as *Heretical Bap-*
 “ *tisms* ; and says farther, that when the Church
 “ judged it expedient not to suffer the *Donatist*
 “ — tist

" tist Bishops to officiate upon their Return to
 " the Church, he did not thereby intend to
 " deny the Reality or Validity of their Or-
 " dination, but suppos'd that to remain still
 " Perfect and Entire in them. And this is
 " what St. Austin meant by the Sacrament of
 " Ordination, as he words it, or THE IN-
 " DELIBLE CHARACTER, which was
 " THEREBY IMPRINTED; that
 " though a Man turn'd Apostate, or was su-
 " spended, or depriv'd for any Crime, yet
 " if, upon his Repentance and Satisfaction, the
 " Church thought fit to admit him to officiate a-
 " gain, there was no Necessity of giving him
 " a New Ordination, no more than a New
 " Baptism, for the Character of both remain'd
 " entire. This was the Doctrine and Practice of
 " the African Church, and most others, in the
 " Time of St. Austin;" says Mr. Bingham.

From all which, these following Particulars are manifest, even to a Demonstration :

1st, That not only the General Council of Nice, [as I have prov'd before] but also the General Council of Ephesus, did own and acknowledge the Episcopal Orders of Hereticks to have been *Valid Orders*, even during their Heresy. For, says the Council of Ephesus, [as Mr. Bingham himself notes it in his Margin] *Si Clerici fuerint, manean Clerici*. If they were Clergymen, let them remain, or continue Clergymen. The Decree did not make them Clergymen, but only allow'd them to exercise their Function, " that they should Continue, as Mr. Bingham has it, " in the same Station they were in before," that is, remain Valid Clergymen, as they were before.

2dly, From hence 'tis plain, that the *African* Fathers, and St. *Austin*, asserted the Validity of *Heretical Ordinations* perform'd by Heretical Bishops; and as for St. *Austin's* affirming the Validity of Heretical Baptisms, that is no Wonder at all, for those Baptisms, were perform'd by Men who had receiv'd Episcopal, tho' Heretical Ordinations; and 'tis consistent enough to affirm the Validity of Baptisms perform'd by those whom we assert to have been validly Ordain'd Clergymen.

3dly, We hereby see farther, that St. *Augustin*, the *African* Church, and most other Churches in his Time, reckon'd, that when Returning Heretical Clergymen were *not suffer'd to Officiate*, or Exercise their Function in the Church, they were, for all that, Clergymen still, and not Laymen, as Mr. *Bingham* endeavours to represent them, in the Second Part of his *Scholastical History*; for we see that the Church hindering the *Donatist* Bishops from Exercising their Function, "did not thereby intend to deny the Reality or Validity of their Ordination, but suppos'd That to remain still Perfect and Entire in them."

4thly and lastly; We see that the *African* Churches, and most Churches in St. *Augustin's* Time, thought that Episcopal Ordination imprinted such an *indelible Character* of Priesthood on the Ordained, that even Apostacy it self, or Suspension, or Deprivation, tho' for any Crime committed, did not delete, blot out, or absolutely take away his Character of Priesthood, but it was suppos'd still to remain Entire in him; so that upon his Repentance, there was no Need, "no Necessity" of giving him

a *New Ordination*, to qualify him to officiate again in the Sacred Functions, because the Character he receiv'd at his first Ordination *remain'd* still Entire in him; and he that can be so hardy, as to say all this of meer Laicks, Persons who never were at all Ordain'd or Commission'd, will be hardy indeed; and so long as he shall continue in that unhappy Temper, will be Proof against all the Impressions that Reason and Argument will make on Men of less obstinate Dispositions. But enough of our Historian's *Antiquities of the Christian Church*; I proceed next to shew, That he confirms all this of the indelible Character of Priests, in those very Books, where he very unartificially endeavours to make his Reader believe, That the Priestly Character of Heretical, Schismatical, and Excommunicated, &c. Priests, was *utterly lost*, in the Opinion of those Churches who allow'd of the Validity of Baptism perform'd by such Priests. And they are the First and Second Parts of his *Scholastical History* of what he calls *Lay-Baptism*.

§ XLV. In his First Part, p. 87, 88. he enquires, " *Whether Hereticks be Clergymen or Laymen, Priests or not Priests, Bishops or not Bishops?* " And he himself answers this Question in the following Words, " *If by a Bishop or Priest be meant one that has receiv'd such an Ordination from the Church to the Office of Bishop or Priest, as that if the Man turns Heretick, or Schismatick, or Apostate, or is excommunicate or degraded, yet his Ordination remains so far Indelible and Inviolable, as that if the Church thinks*

“ fit, after all his Crimes and Suspensions, to ad-
 “ mit 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 Hereticks and Schismaticks, to
 “ be Bishops or Priests according to their re-
 “ spective Orders. ” We see here how posi-
 tive he is, that there are none among the An-
 cients, but will allow, that Heretical, Schismatical,
 Apostatizing, Excommunicated, or Degraded
 Bishops and Priests, who were ordain'd in the
 Church, had their Ordination still remaining
 Indelible and Inviolable ; it was not null'd by
 their Heresy, Schism, Apostacy, Excommunication,
 or even Degradation ; these Things, [and a-
 mong them Degradation it self] did not re-
 duce them to meer Laymen, they did not need
 a New Ordination ; [but sure, Mr. Bingham !
 meer Laymen do stand in Need of Ordina-
 tion] to qualify them to officiate in the Sa-
 cred Functions. These Hereticks and Schif-
 maticks were “ Bishops or Priests, accord-
 “ ing to their respective Orders ; and “ there
 “ are none among the Ancients, but will allow this, ”
 says Mr. Bingham ; and consequently, say I,
 there are none among the Ancients, that will
 allow that their Baptisms were Lay-Baptisms ;
 Baptisms of the same Nature with our False
 Baptisms, perform'd by those who never were
 Ordain'd, or Commission'd to Baptize.

§ XLVI. But, says Mr. Bingham, “ Some, in-
 “ deed, were against their being allow'd to officiate
 “ in those Dignities, and were for Depriving
 “ them wholly of those Honours, when they re-
 “ turn'd

“ turn’d to the Catholick Church, as thinking
 “ them unworthy to enjoy those Privileges, who
 “ had so manifestly prevaricated with the Church,
 “ and gone contrary to the Design and Duties of
 “ their Station. ” This total Deprivation of
 them, may, in some Mens Fancies, look like
 the Church’s reducing them to meer Laymen;
 to prevent which Mistake, Mr. Bingham im-
 mediately subjoins; “ But none [i. e. none of
 “ the Ancients] ever said, that if the Church
 “ should think fit to allow them to continue in her
 “ Service, she must of Necessity give them a
 “ New Ordination. Thus far therefore they were
 “ allow’d to be of the Clergy, and upon this
 “ Foot many Churches and Councils accepted
 “ them upon their Return, ——— and permitted
 “ them to continue in their Offices, without a Re-
 “ Ordination. And when in the Discipline of the
 “ Church, it was thought proper to deprive them
 “ of the Power and Honour of their Places,
 “ yet even in that Case the Church did not in-
 “ tend to deny the Validity of their Ordina-
 “ tion, but suppos’d that to remain so entire, as
 “ that if ever after the Church should recall them
 “ to those Offices, she would not do it by giving
 “ them a New Ordination. ” ——— “ In this
 “ Sense Hereticks and Schismaticks, and Degraded
 “ Priests, were allow’d to be Priests still, and
 “ their Acts to be Valid, tho’ done irregularly,
 “ sinfully, and unlawfully, against the Rule and
 “ Authority of the Church to their own Destru-
 “ ction, p. 89. ——— ” And this is enough
 out of the First Part of his Scholastical History,
 to shew, that he himself owns with the An-
 cients, that such Heretical, Schismatical, and
 Degraded Priests, had still Valid Orders, even

while they were Hereticks, or Schismaticks, or under the Sentence of Degradation, their Ordination “remain’d entire,” notwithstanding their being depriv’d of the “Power and Honour of their Places;” “none ever said, that [to qualify them to minister in Holy Things] the Church must of Necessity give them a New Ordination.” But every Christian, that is in his Senses, will say, and all the Ancients have said and practis’d accordingly, that Laymen must needs be ordain’d to Holy Offices, before they can be qualify’d to serve in the Sacred Ministry of the Church; and consequently, there is an essential Difference between the abovesaid Heretical, Schismatical, and Degraded Priests, who want not because they have Valid Ordination, and Laymen who never had it; and therefore the Ministrations of the former are essentially Different from those of the latter; consequently, Baptism by such Heretical, Schismatical, and Degraded Priests, was not of the same Nature with Baptism by Persons who never were ordain’d or commission’d to Baptize, and therefore the pretended Validity of these latter does not follow from the Validity of the former.

§ XLVII. I am now come to the Second Part of his *Scholastical History*, where he still confirms all that he has said in his other Books before; for in pag. 147. he undertakes to discourse of, and examine “the Notion of an Indelible Character imprinted in the Ordination of a Priest.” He says, [p. 148.] that “the best Way to come by the true Notion and Im-
port

“ port of this Term, is to examine first what it
 “ was taken to signify in Baptism? For [says he,
 “ p. 149.] an Indelible Character was always
 “ suppos’d to be imprinted as much in Baptism,
 “ as in Ordination. — ” “ And that is this,
 “ as it relates to Baptism; that a Man who is
 “ once truly Baptiz’d, can never do any
 “ Thing, that will so far craze or cancel his Bap-
 “ tism, as that he shall need upon any Occa-
 “ sion to be Re-Baptiz’d with a Second Baptism.
 “ Thus far the Ancients believ’d an Indelible
 “ Character in Baptism. Tho’ a Man turn
 “ his Back on Christianity, and totally apostatize
 “ and fall away from the Profession of it. —
 “ Tho’ he excommunicate himself, or be excom-
 “ municated by the Church. — Tho’ he curse
 “ and blaspheme Christ in a Synagogue, or in a
 “ Temple, as many of the old Apostates did, &c.
 “ Yet after all, if this Man turn again to Chri-
 “ stianity, he was not to be receiv’d by a Second
 “ Baptism: His Repentance and the Church’s Ab-
 “ solution was sufficient in that Case to reinstate
 “ him in his ancient Profession, and he was not
 “ to be Re-baptiz’d, to be made again a Christian.
 “ The Church had but one Baptism for the Re-
 “ mission of Sins, and the Virtue of that was
 “ so far Indelible, that it would always qualify
 “ the Man that had receiv’d it to be admitted
 “ to Communion again, after the greatest Apo-
 “ stacy, only by a true Repentance and Recon-
 “ ciliatory Imposition of Hands, without Re-
 “ baptizing. This was what the Ancients under-
 “ stood by what we now call the Indelible Character
 “ of Baptism, says Mr. Bingham.” Thus accord-
 “ ing to him, a Person once truly Baptiz’d, remain’d
 “ still a Baptiz’d Person, even in the greatest Apo-
 stacy :

stacy: He was, tho' turn'd *Jew, Turk, or Heathen*, still a Baptiz'd Person, and therefore in *that Respect*, of a higher Degree and Order [if it may be proper to use such Terms here] than any Person whatsoever, who *never was Baptiz'd at all*; for the once Baptiz'd Person, whose Baptism remains indeleted, always stands more nearly related to the Church, as Baptiz'd, than any such never Baptiz'd Persons can do, because he does not want Baptism to qualify him for the Privileges of the Church, as they do. And therefore, there is still an Essential Difference, with respect to Baptism, between such a never Baptiz'd Person, and an Apostate Christian who *was once Baptiz'd*.

§ XLVIII. Mr. Bingham says, p. 150. of the Ancients, That "they were far from thinking that a Man who was such an Apostate had any Right or Authority, whilst he was an Apostate, to challenge any of the Common Privileges of a Christian." As for his Authority to challenge, &c. he had better have left that out, for it is utterly foreign to his present Subject, about the Right of Baptiz'd Persons, who, consider'd only as Baptiz'd, have no Authority, tho' they may have Right, to challenge the Common Privileges of a Christian; for *Right* and *Authority* are not convertible Terms. An *Apostate* Christian has certainly no more Right than an *Impenitent* Wicked Christian professing Christianity has, to the Common Privileges of a Christian, but he has *as much Right* so long as his Baptism remains indeleted, not taken away; his Baptism gives him Right upon his Repentance and Absolution, and the Baptism
of

of the Impenitent Wicked Christian, who professes Christianity, does give him no more than such Right upon his Repentance and Absolution also.

§ XLIX. Mr. Bingham, p. 150. says of such an Apostate, "His Baptism was such as nothing could obliterate; it would remain with him when he was an Apostate;" and in p. 151. he adds, "Yet there is something of a Christian in this Apostate, that is, his Baptism; in respect of which, he is not so perfectly a No-Christian, as one that never was Baptiz'd: And if in this respect only, in such a qualify'd Sense, any one will give him the Title of an Apostate Christian, which is, as the Schools speak, only a Christian secundum quid, in respect of the Baptism, which he once receiv'd in the Christian Church, and which will for ever continue with him; I cannot think it worth while to contend about Words or Names, when Men are otherwise agreed about the Import and Signification of them." The Sum of which is this, that an Apostate, who was once Baptiz'd, is, even while a Jew, Turk, or Pagan, still a Christian in respect of his Baptism, and therefore not the same as a No-Christian, a Jew, Turk, or Pagan, or any other who never was Baptiz'd. This I desire the Reader to take Notice of, because we are now going to see how he runs the Parallel, and what Conclusions he makes from hence, concerning the Indelible Character of the Christian Priesthood.

§ L. He begins p. 151. with this Title,
 “ That the Indelible Character of Ordination is
 “ of the same Nature, ” that is, of the same
 Nature with the Indelible Character of Bap-
 tism. He says, p. 152. “ A Priest, when he
 “ is ordain’d, receives such a Consecration to
 “ a Ministerial Office by Imposition of Hands, as
 “ needs not upon any Occasion to be a second
 “ Time repeated to establish him in the Execu-
 “ tion of such an Office. There is the Inde-
 “ lible Character of it, the very same as in Bap-
 “ tism ; a Man needs no more to be Re-
 “ Ordain’d, than to be Re-Baptiz’d. ” Here
 he artfully drops his Parallel, and therefore I
 will pursue it for him, because he says, that
 “ the Indelible Character of Ordination is of the
 “ same Nature ” with that of Baptism. Hence
 it follows [to use his own Words, only changing
 what relates to Baptism into what belongs to
 Ordination] “ That a Man who is once ” truly
 ordain’d, “ can never do any Thing, that
 “ will so far erase or cancel his ” Ordination,
 “ as that he shall need upon any Occasion to be ”
 Re-ordain’d “ with a second ” Ordination.
 “ Thus far [by reason of the Sameness of Nature,
 which, Mr. Bingham says, there is between the
 Indelible Character of Ordination, and that
 of Baptism] “ the Ancients believ’d an Indelible
 “ Character in ” Ordination, according to him.
 “ Tho’ a Man turn his Back on Christianity, and
 “ totally apostatize and fall away from the Profes-
 “ sion of it. — ” “ Tho’ he excommuni-
 “ cate himself, or be excommunicated by the
 “ Church. — ” Tho’ the Priest degrade
 himself by wickedly forsaking the Exercise of
 his

his Priestly Function, or tho' for his Crimes the Church should so degrade him. [See my XLVI. Section.] "Tho' he curse and blaspheme
 " Christ in a Synagogue, or in a Temple, as many
 " of the old Apostates did, &c. yet after all, if
 " this Man turn again to Christianity, he was not
 " to be receiv'd [to the Exercise of his Priestly
 Function in the Church] "by a second" Or-
 dination: "His Repentance, and the Church's
 " Absolution was sufficient in that Case to re-
 " instate him in his ancient " Privileges, Ho-
 nours, and Profits due to Christian Priests ex-
 exercising their Sacred Functions in the Church.
 " And he was not to be Re-ordain'd to be made
 " again " a Priest. " The Church had but
 " one " Ordination for the making of Priests;
 " And the Virtue of that was so far Indelible,
 " that it would always qualify the Man that had
 " receiv'd it to be admitted " to the Exercise
 of his Function in the Church " again, after
 " the greatest Apostacy, only by a true Repentance,
 " and Reconciliatory Imposition of Hands,
 " without " Re-ordaining. " This was what the
 " Ancients understood by what we now call the
 " Indelible Character " of Ordination, and this
 they must have understood thereby, if they
 thought " that the Indelible Character of Ordi-
 " nation was of the same Nature with that
 " of Baptism, " as Mr. Bingham says it is;
 for which Reason I have thus far carried and
 continued the just Parallel, as the Reader may
 see, by comparing my XLVIIth with this Se-
 ction; from whence it necessarily follows, by
 reason of Mr. Bingham's Assertion, [of the In-
 delible Character of Ordination's being of the
 same Nature with that of Baptism] that he
 must

must acknowledge, to be consistent with himself, that a Person once Validly Ordain'd, remain'd still a *Validly Ordain'd Person*, even in the greatest Apostacy and Degradation; he was, tho' turn'd *Jew, Turk, or Pagan*, Heretick, or Schismatick, Self-Degraded, or Degraded by the Church, still an Ordained Person, and therefore in that respect, of a higher Degree and Order than any Person whatsoever, who never was Ordain'd at all. For the once Validly Ordain'd Person, whose Ordination is *Indeleted*, stands always more nearly related to the Church, as Ordain'd, than any such *Never Ordain'd Persons* can do, because he does not want Ordination to qualify him for the Exercise of the Priestly Functions in the Church, as they most certainly do; and therefore there is still an *Essential Difference*, with respect to Holy Orders, between such never Ordain'd Persons, and an Apostate, Heretical, Schismatical, and Degraded Priest, who was once Validly Ordain'd, and whose Ordination still remains indeleted, not taken away, null'd, or made Void. And this will be confirm'd, by considering farther, and continuing the Parallel between Baptism and Ordination, the Indelible Character of both which Mr. *Bingham* affirms to be of the same Nature. For, by re-assuming what I have observ'd [in my XLIXth Section] he says of the Indelible Character of Baptism, it will follow, using still his own Words, *mutatis mutandis*—
That,

§ LI. Such an Apostate, Heretical, Schismatical, and Degraded Person, who was once validly Ordain'd, receiv'd such an Ordination,

“ as

“ as nothing could obliterate, it would remain with him, when he was an Apostate, &c. There is something of a ” Priest, “ in this Apostate, &c. that is his ” Ordination, “ in respect of which he is not so perfectly a ” Non-Priest, “ as one that never was ” Ordain’d; that is, in short, he is a Priest, and the other is not, [for, to say there are Degrees in Nullities, is Nonsense.] “ And if in this respect only, in such a qualify’d Sense, any one will give him the Title of an Apostate ” Priest, “ which is, as the Schools speak, only a ” Priest “ secundum quid, in respect of the ” Ordination “ which he once receiv’d in the Christian Church, and which will for ever continue with him, I cannot think it worth while to contend about Words or Names, when Men are otherwise agreed about the Import and Signification of them. ” The Sum of which is this, that an Apostate, &c. who was once ordain’d, is, even while an Apostate, &c. still a Priest in respect of his Ordination, and therefore not the same as a Non-Priest, a Person who never was at all ordain’d or commission’d.

§ LII. And this Mr. Bingham is bound to acknowledge, so long as he affirms, as he does, that “ the Indelible Character of Ordination is of the “ same Nature ” with that of Baptism; for the Character impress’d on a Man who is validly Ordain’d a Priest, is Priesthood; and therefore, so long as his Character of Ordination lasts, [that is, always, because ’tis Indelible, says Mr. Bingham] so long must his Priesthood last, and therefore he is always a Priest, upon this Hypothesis.

Mr.

Mr. *Bingham* says of the Apostate Priest; that "he needs no more to be re-ordain'd, p. 151. "There was no need to ordain him a second time, in order to admit him to Clerical Communion," p. 153. "He was in a Capacity to Officiate again, without Re-ordination," p. 154. "The Ancient Councils — own'd, that a Man who was once truly ordain'd a Priest, could never want a second Ordination to qualify him to officiate as a Minister in the Church, p. 155, 156. All the Ancients allow both Baptism and Ordination to be given inseparably to those to whom they are given: They are Indelible so far as that neither of them need to be repeated upon Apostates, p. 158." All this, and abundance more of the like Kind he frequently repeats in several Places of his Book, and thereby abundantly confutes himself, when he calls Heretical, Schismatical, Excommunicated, or Degraded Priests, by the Name of *Laymen*; for he himself makes them not to be *Laymen* but Priests, by saying that they have no need of Ordination, that they are Men who need not to be ordain'd, who want not Orders to qualify them to officiate as Ministers in the Church: "If such Men as these, are not [with respect to Priestly Orders] Essentially Different from *Laymen*, Persons who never were ordain'd; If Validly ordain'd Persons, who want no Ordination, are not [with respect to Priesthood] Essentially Different from those, who never receiv'd, and therefore want Ordination, "to qualify them to officiate as Ministers in the Church;" then we must despair of ever knowing one Thing from another, and irrationally conclude, that 'tis the same

same Thing to have Valid Orders, as never to have had any at all ; that is, a Layman and a Clergyman are the same Thing ; and so a Layman, one who never was ordain'd, is as much an ordain'd Priest, as he who was ordain'd a Priest, and whose Priestly Character, impress'd on him by Ordination, remains indeleted and not taken away. But this is not the only gross Absurdity that follows from so wild a Notion ; for if Heretical, Schismatical, and Degraded Priests, are confess'd to have been such Men, as were “ *in a Capacity to officiate again, without a Re-Ordination ;* ” if it be allow'd, that “ *there was no need to ordain them a second Time ; —* ” and that still, notwithstanding this, they were but *meer Laymen*, of the *same Incapacity* with those who never were ordain'd ; then 'twill follow, that *meer Laymen*, who never were ordain'd, have the same Capacity to officiate, as those Priests ; and so these Laymen want no Ordination, to qualify them neither ; consequently the Church needs not to ordain them to minister in the Sacred Functions ; which is highly Ridiculous and Absurd, contrary to Holy Scripture, and the Doctrine and Practice of the whole Catholick Church, and directly repugnant to the Offices of Ordination, and to the 23d Article of our Holy Mother the Church of *England*. And, therefore, it must needs be, that Heretical, Schismatical, and Degraded Priests, whose Character of Ordination is own'd to have remain'd indeleted, or not taken away, were, upon the Truth of that Supposition, Priests still, and, as such, had, while they were Hereticks and Schismaticks, or were

under the Censure of Degradation, a Capacity to minister in Holy Things, by Virtue of their indeleted Ordination, which Laymen, Persons not ordain'd, never had ; and consequently were, in respect of *Priestly Capacity*, Essentially Different from them ; and therefore their Ministrations were wholly Different from, and not of the same Nature with, the pretended Ministrations of meer Laicks, who never had any such Priestly Capacity at all.

§ LIII. “ *But [says Mr. Bingham, p. 152.]*
 “ *what if a Priest should turn Idolater or Apo-*
 “ *state, and offer Sacrifice at the Heathen Altars,*
 “ *instead of the Altar of God ? Would he pre-*
 “ *serve the Authority of a true Christian Priest,*
 “ *whilst he was actually engag'd in such Diaboli-*
 “ *cal Prevarication ? Would the Virtue of Inde-*
 “ *lible Character have been thought to extend so*
 “ *far as this, by the ancient Councils of the Church ?*
 “ *They who say so, and would persuade the World*
 “ *to believe so, must first reconcile Contradictions,*
 “ *and shew how a Man can have the Authority*
 “ *of a Priest, when his own Apostacy, and God,*
 “ *and the Church, by their Censures, have taken*
 “ *his Authority from him.* ” So in p. 153, 154,
 155. “ *An Apostate Priest had not the Right*
 “ *and Authority of a Christian Priest, whilst he*
 “ *continu'd an Apostate, notwithstanding any Force*
 “ *of the Indelible Character of his Ordina-*
 “ *tion ; but only was in a Capacity to offi-*
 “ *ciate again, without Re-Ordaining, if the Church*
 “ *should find it necessary to employ such an one*
 “ *again, by restoring him to the Authority which*
 “ *by her Censures she had taken from him. And*
 “ *unless this be allow'd, we make plain Nonsense*
 “ *of*

“ of all the Ancients Councils, and charge them
 “ moreover with Tyranny and Usurpation, in pre-
 “ tending God’s Authority to take away the Name,
 “ and Office, and Authority of the Priesthood from
 “ Delinquent Clerks, when no such Power and Au-
 “ thority was committed to them. And there is
 “ an End too of all the Discipline of the Church,
 “ as to what concerns the Censure of her Delin-
 “ quent Clergy: She may curb and correct her
 “ Laity, and deprive them of all Right and Ti-
 “ tle to the Communion of Christian Laymen; but
 “ all her Censures are but a Brutum Fulmen a-
 “ gainst the Clergy. For if after she has degraded
 “ a Priest, and said he neither is nor shall be a
 “ Priest; shall neither have the Name, nor Of-
 “ fice, nor Dignity, nor the Authority of a Priest;
 “ but only act and communicate as a private Lay-
 “ man: If, after she has also excommunicated a
 “ contumacious Priest, and by casting him out of
 “ the Church reduc’d him to a State one Degree
 “ below a Layman; notwithstanding all this, that
 “ Priest can pretend, that by Virtue of his Inde-
 “ lible Character, he is as true an authoriz’d
 “ Priest, after all the Thunderings of the Church
 “ against him, as he was before: What then be-
 “ comes of all the Power and Discipline of the
 “ Church, and all her Authority to censure and
 “ silence Offending and Apostate Priests? A Cen-
 “ sure, it seems, may affect the Conscience of a
 “ Priest, but not his Authority: That will re-
 “ main entire to him by Virtue of his Indelible
 “ Character, let the Church use what Authority
 “ she will to deprive or degrade him.”

§ LIV. To all which, the Answer is very Easy; That the Just Censures of the Church

against her Delinquent Clergy, are certainly effectual, so far as her Censures do really extend. If her Censures did extend so far as to the absolute Nulling of such Delinquent Clergymens Ordination, then their Ordination was absolutely made Null and Void, and so their Ordination was, thenceforward, as if it had never been at all. But thus far, Mr. *Bingham* himself tells us, the Church did not extend her Censures against Heretical, Schismatical, Apostate, or even Degraded Clergymen; for, when she depriv'd them of the *Power and Honour of their Places*, yet, even in that Case, she did not intend to deny the *Validity of their Ordination*, — they were “*Priests still, and their Acts Valid*,” says he, as I have prov'd already, in my XLV, XLVI, L, LI, and LIId Sections; And therefore, she did not Null their Ordination; But the Character of that remain'd with them still, that is, their Priesthood was not obliterated. What then, says Mr. *Bingham*, “*Had they the Authority of True Christian Priests? Are they True Authoriz'd Priests? What signify then the Church's Censures?*” I answer, so far as *Ordination* makes Men to have the *Authority of True Christian Priests*, they had the *Authority of True Christian Priests*; so far as *Ordination* makes Men to be *True Authoriz'd Priests*, they were *True Authoriz'd Priests*; and all this, because their *Ordination* remain'd *Indeleted*, not *Null'd*, but *Valid*, by his own Confession. Men may have the *Authority of True Christian Priests*, they may be *True Authoriz'd Priests*, and yet be destitute of such a *Circumstantial Authority*, as is necessary for the *Regular Execution* of that

Original

Original, Essential Authority, which they receiv'd at their Ordination; they may have this *Original Essential Authority*, and yet, at the same time, have none of the Honours, Privileges, and Benefits, which Priests enjoy in the Church, by Virtue of that *Circumstantial Authority* wherewith the Church has vested them. Thus, for Example, a Priest Validly Ordain'd, is a True Authoriz'd Priest, has the Original, Essential Authority of a Priest, tho' he wants the Circumstantial Authority of his Bishop's giving him a farther License, by Virtue of which, or a Parish where, to execute his Original Authority; tho' he has, consequently, no Circumstantial Authority to oblige any Number of Christians, or indeed, any One Christian, to submit to, or support him in his particular Ministrations; tho' he has therefore none of the Honours, Privileges, and Profits due to those Priests, who have such farther License, and Institution into a Living, yet still he is a True Authoriz'd Priest, that is, an Essentially Authoriz'd Priest, by Virtue of his Ordination, tho' he be not thus Circumstantially Authoriz'd.

This shews, that the Church's just Censures against Offending Clergymen, [tho' their Orders should not be Null'd thereby] ought not to be esteem'd as no more than a *Brutum Fulmen*; For if by the Church's Censures they lose all *Circumstantial Authority*, all Power of Obliging any Christians to attend on their Ministrations, or of obtaining those Honours, Privileges, Profits, and that Support and Maintenance from them, which otherwise would be their Due; if by Excommunication, they

are put into such a sad and deplorable State, as that, [besides the Spiritual Miseries their Souls are expos'd to, during that Censure] all Christians are bound, not only to avoid their Conversation and Society, but also, not knowingly to *Communicate* with them in any of their Ministrations; If such a just Censure puts them into so miserable a Condition, that tho' their Orders remain Valid, yet, if they set up Altar against Altar, Exercising their Functions, while under this Censure, they incur the Guilt of Schism; and consequently, those who knowingly join with them, incur the same dreadful Guilt of Schism with them, and thereby put an Obstacle in their own way, which, by reason of their Uncharitableness and Disobedience, [in forsaking Regular and Faithful Priests, who are in Communion with the Church, and following such Disorderly, Schismatical Priests] hinders their present Receiving the Spiritual Graces of those Sacraments, which are administred to them by the Hands of Schismatical Priests; if such are the dreadful Effects of the Church's just Censures against wicked Priests, whose Orders the Church does not null and obliterate, then certainly her Censures against them are infinitely more Direful than a *Brutum Fulmen*, as Mr. *Bingham* is pleas'd to term it; since they take from such a wicked, censur'd Priest or Bishop, all Circumstantial Authority over any Flock; all Property to any particular Church or Altar, where he before had Possession and Right to exercise his Function; all Honours, Privileges, Profits, Support, and Maintenance, which before were due to him upon Account of his Relation to
any

any such Flock, and which were annex'd to his Property in any such Church or Altar: Since farther, these Censures make him fall into the damning Guilt of Schism, if he contumaciously sets up another Altar; and not only so, but involve those into the same Guilt, who knowingly communicate with him at it; since those who knowingly receive Sacraments at his Hands, do by their Uncharitableness and Disobedience to the Church, obstruct the Spiritual Graces of those Sacraments, which Graces they will not receive, till by Repentance of such their Uncharitableness, they remove the Obstacle and Impediment that hinder'd the Receiving of them; since such are the Dire Effects of the Church's Censures of Degradation, and Excommunication against wicked Priests, it is plain, that the Church does not lose *her Power, and Discipline, and Authority to censure and silence Offending and Apostate Priests.*"

For, we see that tho' these Censures do not Null their Orders, yet they not only *affect the Conscience* of such Priests, but their Authority too; for they take away their Circumstantial Authority, and so they lose not only their External Honours and Privileges, but with them, all Lawful Support and Maintenance, which they might otherwise enjoy by their Office; and as for their *Essential Authority* conferr'd on them by Ordination, tho' *that* does remain indeleted, and not taken away, yet by reason of the Sin of Schism, &c. which a Man incurs, by knowingly submitting to their Ministrations, [while they are under such Censure] he obstructs, and so does not at present, till he repents, receive the Spiritual Benefits con-

veyable by their Essential Authority still remaining in them; and therefore, in this Sense, their original Essential Authority, receiv'd in Ordination, tho' not null'd, is in some sort affected by the Censures of the Church; because, if all Men did their Duty, none would knowingly leave the Priests who are in Communion with the Church, and Schismatically have recourse to his Ministrations who is under the Church's Censures; considering, that tho' his Ministrations are Valid in themselves, by reason of the Validity of his Orders which remain to him indeleted; yet such their Schismatical Application to him, would, by reason of the Sinfulness of it, because Schismatical, hinder their receiving the *Graces* of those Sacraments, &c. which he administers to them; and so, *his Essential Authority*, as an ordain'd Priest, would in this Circumstance be of no present Benefit or real Advantage to him, during the Force of the Censure. 'Tis true, that all Men are not thus knowing and conscientious of their Duty, to avoid the Communion of such Schismatical and Degraded Priests, and that some thro' Ignorance, and others tho' more Knowing, yet thro' Pride, Rebellion, Worldly-Mindedness, Self-Interest, Partiality, Love of Mens Persons and Abilities on the one hand, and Hatred, and Disaffection to them on the other, will follow and communicate with such censur'd Priests. But this does not abate of the *real Dreadfulness* of the Censure; for the Reasons above-mention'd will still take Place, tho' the Censure did not Null and make Void their Orders, but leave them Valid Priests: For they can receive no worldly Benefit at present,

present, during the Censure, but from the Ignorant and Disobedient, and what such censur'd Priests receive from them, will only be the accurs'd Reward of their Iniquity, their Schismatical Rebellion against, and Division of or from the Church, which without Repentance will but increase their own Damnation in the World to come.

§ LV. And therefore Mr. *Bingham's* great Outcries, as if he fear'd, that the Authority of the Church's Censures against wicked Priests would be of no Signification, if such censur'd Priests should be allow'd to be authoriz'd Priests still, while under Censure, is nothing but meer Banter and Amusement; since her just Censures against them are thus dreadful in their Consequences; and since he himself, notwithstanding such her Censures against them, does affirm, That Heretical, Schismatical, Excommunicated, Degraded, and even Apostate Clergymen have their Ordination still remaining Valid; by his asserting,

That the Schismatical *Meletian* Bishops ordain'd by *Meletius*, the censur'd Schismatical Bishop even while he was under Censure, were "Properly Bishops, because they were originally ordain'd Bishops." See my Section XI.

That the Heretical, Schismatical, and Excommunicated *Arian* Clergy had Valid Ordination. Section XVIII.

That the Schismatical *Novatian* Bishops "were Properly Bishops, because they were originally ordain'd Bishops." Sections XXXII, XXXIII.

That

That *Pseudo-Episcopi, False Bishops*, [as he calls them] “ were in some Sense Bishops, ” [and therefore, as I have prov'd, *Valid Bishops*] “ as being ordain'd, though illegally, to their Places, ” says he. Section XXXVII.

That the *African Churches* own'd the Schismatical *Donatist Bishops*, and did not deny the *Reality or Validity* of “ their Ordination. ” Sections XXXIX, XLIV.

That “ such Orders as were given regularly in the Church, — were suppos'd — to impress a sort of *Indelible Character*, so as that there was no Necessity, upon any Occasion, to repeat them. ” Section XLI.

That “ the 3d Council of Carthage, following the Steps of the Plenary Council of Capua, decreed, that 'twas — unlawful to Re-Ordain such as had been ordain'd in the Church. ” Section XLI.

That the “ *Apostolick Canons* make it Deposition, to Re-Ordain such. ” Section XLI.

That *St. Austin* and *Optatus* affirm it was contrary to the Custom of the *Catholick Church* to Re-Ordain, because Men did not lose their Orders, by being suspended from the Execution of their Office; nor indeed, even by Lapsing in Time of Persecution. Section XLI.

That Imposition of Hands given to Returning *Arian Clergymen*, might not mean a *New Ordination*. Section XLIII.

That the General Council of *Nice*, gave the Returning *Novatian Clergy* Imposition of Hands, only as *Reconciliatory* “ by way of Absolution, not Re-Ordination. ” Section XLIV. And,

That

That the General Council of *Ephesus*, order'd the *Massalian* Heretical Clergymen to "continue in the same Station," i. e. of Clergymen, they were in before; and this without Re-ordaining them. Section XLIV.

That it "was the Doctrine and Practice of the African Church, and most others in the Time of St. Austin," concerning the Indelible Character imprinted by Ordination, that "tho' a Man turn'd Apostate, or was suspended, or depriv'd for any Crime," yet upon his Return, "there was no Necessity of giving him a New Ordination" to officiate again, because the Character of his Ordination "remain'd entire." Section XLIV.

That "if a Bishop or Priest" ordain'd by the Church, "turns Heretick or Schismatick, or Apostate, or is Excommunicate or Degraded, yet his Ordination remains so far Indelible and Indivisible, as that if the Church thinks fit ——— to admit him upon his Repentance to officiate in that Station again, he shall not need a New Ordination: ———" and that "in this Sense there are none among the Ancients, but will allow Hereticks and Schismaticks to be Bishops or Priests according to their respective Orders." Section XLV.

That "thus far they were allow'd to be of the Clergy." Section XLVI.

That "when in the Discipline of the Church, it was thought proper to deprive them of the Power and Honour of their Places, yet even in that Case the Church did not intend to deny the Validity of their Ordination, but suppos'd that to remain so entire," [that
is,

is, entire, for 'tis Nonsense to say there are Degrees of Entire] “ as that if ever after the Church should recall them to those Offices, she would not do it by giving them a New Ordination. ” Section XLVI.

That “ in this Sense Hereticks and Schismatics, and Degraded Priests were allow'd to be Priests still, and their Acts to be Valid, tho' done irregularly, sinfully, and unlawfully, against the Rule and Authority of the Church. ” Section XLVI.

That “ the Indelible Character, ” imprinted by Baptism, is such, that “ a Man who is once truly Baptiz'd, can never do any Thing that will so far erase and cancel his Baptism, as that he shall need upon any Occasion to be Re-Baptiz'd with a second Baptism ; — it was so far Indelible, that it would always qualify the Man that had receiv'd it, to be admitted to Communion again, after the greatest Apostacy, only by a true Repentance, and Reconciliatory Imposition of Hands ; — this was what the Ancients understood by what we now call the Indelible Character of Baptism, ” [says he] Section XLVII.

That a Baptiz'd Person, tho' “ an Apostate, is not so perfectly a No-Christian, as one that was never Baptiz'd. ” Section XLIX.

That “ the Indelible Character of Ordination is of the same Nature with the Indelible Character of Baptism. ” Section L.

That “ a Priest when he is ordain'd receives such a Consecration to a Ministerial Office by Imposition of Hands, as needs not upon any Occasion to be repeated, to establish him in the Execution of such an Office.

“ There

“ *There is the Indelible Character of it* [says he] *i. e. of Ordination.* ” Section L.

That an Apostate Priest “ *needs no more to be Re-Ordain’d.* ” Section LII.

That “ *he was in a Capacity to officiate again, without Re-Ordination.* ” Section LII.

That “ *the ancient Councils own’d, that a Man who was once truly ordain’d a Priest, could never want a second Ordination, to qualify him to officiate as a Minister in the Church.* ” Section LII.

That “ *all the Ancients allow—Ordination to be given inseparably to those* ” to whom it is given; that it is “ *Indelible so far,* ” as that it does not “ *need to be repeated upon Apostates.* ” Section LII.

§ LVI. From the Truth of all which his Assertions, it demonstrably follows, That tho’ St. Cyprian, and his Collegues, the numerous Bishops of the *African* and *Eastern* Churches, did judge and decree, and by their Censures, determine for themselves, and their several respective Churches, that Hereticks and Schismatics lost, and had not the Character of Ordination, *i. e.* their Priesthood, but were meer Laymen, and so had neither Valid Orders, nor Valid Sacraments in their Heresy and Schism, and therefore they would never admit such to officiate, as Ministers in the Church, upon their Repentance and Conversion; and the Persons Baptiz’d by them, were not admitted upon Repentance, without receiving Baptism in the Church, because they were reckon’d to have been only Baptiz’d by Laymen before; yet

yet the other Churches, who differ'd from them in their Discipline, by receiving as Valid in the Ministration, the Baptisms perform'd by Heretical and Schismatical Priests, did at the same time esteem the Orders of those Priests to have been Valid too; for they reckon'd that neither Heresy, nor Schism, nor Excommunication, nor Degradation, nor even Apostacy it self, did ever Delete, absolutely take away, or Null the Character of Priesthood, which they had receiv'd by Episcopal Ordination: No! *they remain'd Priests still;*" they had receiv'd an *Indelible Character,* "*the Character of their Ordination remain'd Entire:*" There was no *Necessity* "*to give them a New Ordination, to officiate again;*" their "*Ordination was given them Inseparably.*" Nay more, when the Church, to make them an Example, thought it "*proper to deprive them of the Power and Honour of their Places,*" and so to oblige them always to abstain from the Execution of their Priestly Power, and to receive the Sacrament, not among the rest of the Clergy in the most Sacred Place, within the Rails at the Altar, [as was the Custom] but among the Laity in a more inferiour and less honourable Part of the Church; "*yet even in that Case the Church did not intend to deny the Validity of their Ordination.*" Hereticks and Schismatics, and Degraded Priests were allow'd to be "*Priests still,*" and their Acts to be *Valid tho' done irregularly, sinfully, and unlawfully* in the Opinion of those Churches, if we may believe Mr. Bingham himself, as an Historian giving a just Account of the Acts of those Churches. And therefore,

fore, Baptisms perform'd by such Hereticks and Schismatics, &c. who in the Opinion of those Churches did not want Ordination, did not stand in need of a Priestly Character, but had that Character Indelible by Virtue of their Ordination once receiv'd, according to Mr. Bingham, [and therefore to be sure *In-deleted*, say I] were not (in the Sense of those Churches) Baptisms by Laymen ; they were not, in their Opinion, of the same Nature with those False Baptisms which are now perform'd by Persons, who *do most certainly want Ordination*, because they never were Ordain'd or Commission'd, by any Bishops whatsoever, to qualify them, or give them a *Capacity* to Baptize. And consequently, those Churches receiving Persons so Baptiz'd by such Hereticks, and Schismatics, &c. without Re-baptizing them, is no Argument that they did receive, or would have receiv'd such as our Lay-Baptiz'd Persons, for validly Baptiz'd ; or, that they would in General Council have decreed, that they ought to be receiv'd into the Church, without submitting to be Baptiz'd by one Ordain'd, or Commission'd by Bishops. And Mr. Bingham, with all the Stir that he has made, *1st*, has not produc'd, neither can he produce, any one Instance of a Baptism perform'd by one, who was notoriously known to have been never Ordain'd, or Commission'd by a Bishop or Bishops, which the Ancient Catholick Church pronounc'd to have been Valid in the Ministration : And as for our Lay-Baptizers, Persons who never were Commission'd by Bishops to Baptize, *2dly*, he has not prov'd, neither indeed can he prove, that they have ever receiv'd,

ceiv'd, by Episcopal Ordination, any such Priestly Character; or, that they have any such indeluted Character of Priesthood at all, as those Ancient Heretical, Schismatical, Excommunicated, or Degraded Priests are, by himself and the Ancients, acknowledg'd to have had. And when he proves this, which will never be, then 'twill be time enough to own, that he, as an Historian, will have done something to the purpose, in relation to the Discovery of the Ancient Catholick Church's Practice, about what we call, and are still resolv'd to call *Lay-Baptism*.

§ LVII. Till he does One of these two Things, 'tis in vain for him to set himself up for an Umpire in this Controversy; Inconsistencies, and Self-Contradictions, *Perhaps's*, and *May be's*, Hesitations, and uncertain Guessees, Misrepresentations of the Ancients, and Appeals to Historians, for what they never said, and to Legendary, Visionary Writers for the Truth of Foolish and Ridiculous Fables, are utterly improper for the Closing of this Dispute. He that would bring about so glorious a Design, must be a Man of Good Temper and Sound Judgment, as well as of Much Reading; he must have that Gravity and Gentility, which will preserve him from Pedantick Insultings upon Trifling Occasions. — He must be so Humble and Ingenuous, as to be ready to retract and own any Gross Errors, when convicted of them. He must be all of a Piece, and Consistent with himself; Sound in the Faith, and Zealous for the Just Honour of the Christian Priesthood, as it is instituted

stituted to be Representative of the Priesthood of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, the Great High-Priest of our Profession: And with all this, he must not be one that harbours unreasonable Jealousies and Fears, as if we Laymen of the Church of *England*, who deny the Validity of pretended Baptisms, perform'd by such never-Ordain'd or Commission'd Persons as ourselves, did thereby debase ourselves too low, and endeavour to bring ourselves, and others under spiritual Slavery and Bondage to the Priests, by our Advancing the Prerogatives of the Christian Priesthood too high, above what was design'd by its Divine Institution. Such an unreasonably jealous Temper as this, will certainly betray a Man into too many Indecencies, and make him the most unfit Man in the World to decide our Controversy.

And if the Reverend Mr. *Bingham* will undertake to be the Great Arbitrator about the Ancient Catholick Church's Sense and Practice, and convince the World, that she has, in Truth, given her Suffrage to the Opinion of the Validity of Baptism, perform'd by Persons who never were at all Commission'd to Baptize; then, I must beg Leave to tell him, that he has one Great and Difficult Task to do, by way of Introduction to so Prodigious an Undertaking; and that is, to perform the heavy, if supportable Penance of a *Publick Act of Self-Denyal*, by Retracting openly the many Things he has Publish'd on our Side of the Question, as an Historian, in his Volumes of the *Antiquities of the Christian Church*, and the Two Parts of his *Scholastical History*, which do manifestly shew, that the Ancient Catholick Church has not given

given her Suffrage to this Opinion, as I have abundantly prov'd in these Papers, and (a) elsewhere, out of his own Works. And when he has made these Retractions, then he must begin his Work again; and when he has fairly gone through it, then the Unprejudic'd will see, what mighty Things he shall produce. But till then, he must not fancy, that he has brought this Controversy to a *fair Issue*; for some of his best and most valuable Friends can tell him, and 'tis not unreasonable to suppose they have kindly hinted to him, that he is very much mistaken, if he thinks so; since, as yet, he has said nothing at all to the Purpose of bringing this Matter to a Conclusion against us.

§ LVIII. And this puts me in mind of his saying, that he (b) "*thinks it now high Time to put an End to such a Dispute, after all Things have been so fully discussed, and set in so fair a Light, that have any relation to it;*" [this he says of the imagin'd Conclusiveness of his own Performances;] "*and therefore [continues he] I intend to take my Leave of this Subject, if the Adversary will suffer me to go on quietly, with a more necessary Work, in which I have already made some Progress, and I hope not without General Benefit and Satisfaction to the Church*"; still in Praise of his own Works, in collecting the Antiquities of the Christian Church.

Now, here I see, that my very good Friend Mr. Bingham and I shall agree in *something*;

(a) *Second Part of Lay-Baptism Invalid.*

(b) *Schol. Hist. Part II. p. 168.*

and that is, “ *that ’tis high Time to put an End to this Dispute;* ” but we shall still disagree in the Reason of this our Agreement; for he reckons that there ought to be an End of the Dispute, because “ *all Things have* ” by himself “ *been fully discuss’d and set in a clear Light,* in Favour of the Church’s Sense for the Validity of Lay-Baptism; whereas, in Truth, the Reason why he ought to have done with the Dispute, and indeed never to have troubled himself with it, in the manner he has, to his own great Disreputation, is, that all he has said, or can say, is only like Striving in vain to put out the Light of the Sun, which affects our Sight the more strongly, after the Interposition of a dark Cloud: For, his Endeavours to make us believe, that the Ancient Catholick Church has, by her Practice, evidenc’d her Belief, that Lay-Baptism, Baptism by Persons never Commission’d by Bishops, is Valid, do all conspire and center in this, That she never gave such her Suffrage, to the Validity of any such Baptism; and that all Baptisms, the Validity whereof she has countenanc’d, were only Baptisms by Men Episcopally Commission’d, who were suppos’d to have had an Indelited, Episcopal Commission when they Baptiz’d. This he more and more establishes, by his Endeavours to the contrary; and since he does so, ’tis high time for him to give over the Dispute, and not balk those who plac’d so much Confidence in his Abilities any longer, but ingenuously and honourably come over to that Side of the Question, which, he sees, grows yet more Evident and Convincing to the Impartial, by his Opposition against it.

§ LIX. As for his “*taking Leave of this Subject, if the Adversary will suffer him to go on quietly with*” what he calls “*a more necessary Work, &c.*” He must not expect, that the Adversary will be so Tame, and supinely Negligent, as to let him go on writing what he pleases, without opposing him when he’s in the Wrong about important Truths. If in the present Controversy he shall think fit to write again, *as he has hitherto done*, let him depend upon it, that the Adversary, by the Grace of God, “*will not suffer him to go on quietly;*” if Opposition to his false Insinuations gives him any Disquiet. He must not think, that we have such a mighty Value for what he calls a more necessary Work, meaning his *Origines*, as that to let him go on with it, we shall quietly and tamely swallow, without Examination, every Thing that he says, for fear of hindering his Prosecution of it by our opposing him. The Necessity of that Work is not yet so very Great as this comes to. It is not of such vast Moment, as that his Going on with it must be a Protection for him to write whatsoever else he shall think fit. No! let him be a generous and consistent Advocate for Truth, and then he may go on quietly and prosper; otherwise he must expect Disquiet, if necessary Contradiction gives him Disturbance.

§ LX. The “*General Benefit and Satisfaction*” he hopes he has given to the Church, by the Progress he has made in his *Origines*, would have been yet greater than it is, if he

he had been more careful than he has in that Work; for even those useful Collections are not altogether free from something of an Alloy of his own uncorrect Observations, which that Work wants to be purg'd of; witness,

1st. His Remark where he says, that (c) "Tertullian grants no other Priesthood to Laymen, save that they may Baptize — when none of the Ecclesiastical Order can be had." When in Truth, Tertullian erroneously grants them much more, that in the Absence of the Clergy, (d) Laymen are Priests for themselves, and have Power not only to Baptize, but also to offer and minister the Memorial of the Sacrifice of Christ's Body and Blood. And if Mr. Bingham should say, that he made this erroneous Remark from that Edition of Tertullian, which he had at that time; I must only tell him, that still his Uncorrectness is very manifest, for he might have been better inform'd from other Editions of Tertullian's Works, that he gives more of Priesthood to Laymen, than that they may Baptize, &c. So again,

2dly. His Observation, that Laymen may Baptize in want of the Clergy, (e) was according to the Principles and Practice of the

(c) *Antiq. of the Christian Church*, Vol. I. p. 42.

(d) *Nonne & Laici Sacerdotes sumus? ----- ubi Ecclesiastici Ordinis non est concessus, & offers, & tinguis, & Sacerdos es tibi solus.* Tertull. de Exhortat. Castitatis, Cap. 7. Edit. Rigalt. Lutet. Paris. 1634.

(e) *Antiq. of the Christian Church*, Vol. I. p. 42.

“*Primitive Church*,” is another great Mistake, as we have abundantly seen in the Course of this Controversy.

3dly. His Saying of Presbyterian Ordinations, that (f) “*they were commonly revers’d and disannull’d*,” thereby giving room to his Reader to believe, that they might yet, *sometimes* in the Primitive Church, stand as Good and Valid, is another Instance of his uncorrect Way of relating Matters of Fact; when he might, and therefore should have affirm’d, that “*they were always revers’d and disannull’d*.”

4thly. Speaking of Schismatics, whom he says the Church made to take a New Ordination, he says, “*this (g) was decreed by the Great Council of Nice, in the Case of those Bishops and Presbyters whom Meletius the Schismatick ordain’d in Egypt; ———*” “*they were not to be admitted to serve in the Catholic Church, till they were first authoriz’d by a more Sacred Ordination;*” which is a very great Mistake, as I have prov’d already.

5thly. His Saying of the Imposition of Hands given in France to the *Arian* returning Clergy, (h) “*but that perhaps does not mean a New Ordination*,” when it really was *no New Ordination*, shews, that he sometimes guesses at Things without any Rule; leaves his Reader, that has not Skill to determine about these Matters, very much in the Dark

(f) *Antiq. of the Christian Church*, Vol. I. p. 83.

(g) *Vol. II. p. 180.*

(h) *Ibid. p. 189.*

to doubt about Matters of Fact; without assisting him to extricate himself out of the Difficulty he plunges him into, by making Imposition of Hands on one who was ordain'd before, to be sometimes a *New Ordination*, and at other times “*perhaps no New Ordination.*”

§ LXI. I know not how many more of these *Perhapsings*, for what is plain and evident; these *Commonlys*, for what has not one Exception; these *Mistakes*, and *false Observations* in our Historian's *Origines*, may be yet discover'd by those who have Ability, Time, and Leisure to compare them with the Originals of the ancient Fathers and Councils: But sure I am, that these are Instances sufficient to prove, that he might easily have been more exact and correct in his boasted *Origines*, than he appears always to have been; and if his Friends shall think me too severe, [and it may be some of 'em may, after his Example, call me Rude] for this Plain Dealing, I have only to tell them, that Authors, *as such*, stand upon the same Level with one another, and that in this respect I owe no more to Mr. *Bingham*, than he does to me. As he is a Priest of the Most High God, I revere his Sacred Character, and acknowledge, that I am infinitely below him in that respect: But as he is a Writer of Controversy in Opposition to me, I have *as much Right* to expose his publick Errors for the Common Good, and his own Humiliation, as he has mine; and if upon the Balance of both our Accounts as Disputants, his Errors shall ap-

pear to be *much more numerous, more inexcusable*, and so [for want of ingenuous Acknowledgment and Retraction] even more censurable than mine; if, upon a fair and impartial Examination, it shall be found, that he has very magisterially insulted, at least as Learned and Reverend a (i) Priest as himself, whose Christian Meekness and Candor are so remarkably Great, [I say this without that excellent Person's Knowledge or Leave] that a Man of *any Ingenuity* must even *do Violence* to himself, to treat so worthy a Person with the least Incivility; if lastly [which is of the meanest Consideration, because it concerns myself] Mr. *Bingham* has, without any just Provocation, and very much beneath the Gravity of his own Character, rudely treated a Layman, who was endeavouring to do something toward rescuing the Sacred Ministrations appropriate to the Christian Priesthood, from the vile Usurpations of common, unconsecrated Lay-Hands: If all these Things do plainly occur in his two last Books, [as I will appeal to the Impartial if they do not] then 'tis manifest, that there is something in his Way of writing Controversy, &c. which calls for Correction and Amendment, and which is no otherwise to be dealt with, than by thus plainly letting him and his Friends see his Errors and Mistakes, whereby he may learn for the future to be more careful and cautious, and they may hereafter reap more Benefit from his Labours.

(i) *The Reverend and Learned Dr. Brett.*

§ LXII. I shall have done for this time, when I have sincerely told him, that I have no Ill-Will at all to his Person and real Interest, but would gladly serve him in both with all Christian Love, and Charity, to the best of my Power, if Occasion did require. If he could have finish'd this Controversy [and prov'd the direct Contrary to what I have asserted] by sound Reasoning, and good Argument, I would not have stood out against, but have readily submitted to his Decision. But since the Case is quite otherwise, I must not compliment him with a *false Acknowledgment* of, and *Resignation* in that, which he cannot [as far as I see] convince me of. I am always ready to receive *Truth*, let it come from *whomsoever* it will; and, I pray, that all Men may have the same most necessary Christian Temper and Disposition, to the end that *God in all Things may be glorify'd, thro' Jesus Christ, to whom, with the Father, and the Holy Ghost, Three Persons Co-Eternal together, and Co-Equal, yet but One God, be all Honour and Glory for ever and ever.*
Amen.



Faint, illegible text, possibly bleed-through from the reverse side of the page.





A

C A V E A T

A G A I N S T

Dr. *WHITE KENNET*'s

Dangerous ~~NOTION~~ of the

Power of Divine Grace;

A N D H I S

Sophistical R U L E for Judging of

D O C T R I N E S.

§ 1.



W H E N a Preacher undertakes to describe “the Properties of Christian Charity,” as Dr. *Kennet* does in his Spittal Sermon last *Easter-Tuesday*; when he very rightly tells us,

p. 5. That “for fear some forward hasty People should run away with the Name, and not understand the Nature, of this eminent Grace and Virtue; the Apostle [1 Cor. xiii.] is describing the Tree to be known by its Fruits;”

“ he

“ he gives out the many admirable Qualities and
 “ Properties of a true Christian Charity; not
 “ as we now confine the Word to relieving the
 “ Poor only, or to forgiving Injuries, or to de-
 “ siring Reconciliation; but all this, and more,
 “ even the whole Spirit of Religion, the
 “ Love of God, and of our Neighbour; all that
 “ we can pay to our Creator, and all that
 “ we can DO for our Fellow-Creature.” When
 in another Place of the same Sermon, he very
 justly teaches, [p. 10.] That “ Charity is use-
 “ ful and serviceable unto others.” That “ it
 “ is not the Form of Civility, but the Power
 “ of it; not the Ceremonial Part, and the out-
 “ ward Show, but the Heart, and the Spirit, of
 “ true unfeigned Love, and Neighbourhood, and
 “ Friendship: Not a meer Conformity to this
 “ World, and the Courtier so call’d, but a sin-
 “ cere Affection, and the Christian in Deed, and
 “ in Truth. — ” That [p. 13.] “ it en-
 “ vyeth not.” That “ Envy — maketh Op-
 “ position to every good Word and Work; would
 “ stifle the Intention, would pervert the De-
 “ cision, would blast the Reputation, would
 “ misrepresent the Deed, and even hate and
 “ vilify the Doer of whatever Things in the
 “ Eye, and Estimate of others, are lovely, and of
 “ good Report.” When we hear a Man preach
 all this, and see him publish it under the Title
 of “ The Properties of Christian Charity: ”
 It is not natural to expect from a Faithful Dis-
 penser of the Word of God; that, in such a
 Sermon especially, he would teach any Thing,
 that is Inconsistent with a very necessary and
 indispensable Property of this Christian Duty;
 namely, that it rejoiceth not in INIQUITY,
 but

but rejoiceth in THE TRUTH, [1 Cor. xiii. 6.] much less, that he would affirm any Thing, in Favour of the Wickedness of those, who act *directly contrary* to another of the Properties of this most excellent Virtue, which “doth not behave it self unseemly;” [ver. 5.] as they most notoriously do, who like *Corah, Dathan,* and *Abiram,* and their Company, endeavour to assume to themselves the Powers of the Christian High-Priesthood and Priesthood, without being call'd of God, as was *Aaron*; by which their Spiritual Pride and Rebellion, they not only disorder and disturb the Church of Christ, but also despise him, the Sovereign thereof, and his Holy Institutions, by despising *his Representatives,* and the Sacred Ministrations by *their Hands,* whom he has sent.

§ II. Whether Part of Dr. Kennet's Sermon is not thus inconsistent with, and disagreeable to its specious Title? Whether he does not therein transgress, even against that very Duty of Christian Charity, the Excellent Properties whereof, he, in that Sermon, undertakes to describe? Whether it does not contain something that is inconsistent with himself, and highly unbecoming the Sacred Character he bears, and derogatory from the Authority of our Lord, whose Representative, in some respects, he is appointed to be? will be easy to determine, when we shall have consider'd the following Paragraphs of his Sermon, and those suitable Remarks that are made upon them.

§ III. By way of Introduction to those Aspersions which he is going to cast on the Doctrine of the *Invalidity of Lay-Baptism*; he says, p. 25. “ We may judge of Doctrines as we do of Men: Those that tend to hard and uncharitable Thoughts of our Fellow Christians, to prejudicial and mischievous Effects against them, and to drawing, as it were, a Circle of Salvation round our selves, and leaving out our Brethren to be damn’d, or by Miracle to be sav’d, by the uncovenanted Mercies of God: Such Tenets are so harsh and offensive to Charity and Brotherly Love, that certainly they are not founded upon the Scriptures, but on the Perverting of them.”

§ IV. Here the Doctor proposes several Rules, whereby he would have us judge that Doctrines “ certainly are not founded upon Scriptures, but on the Perverting of them;” and they may be reduc’d to Two, the one True, and the other False and Sophistical.

First, His true Rule is, That such Doctrines as tend to “ uncharitable Thoughts,” are false Doctrines; and here we shall agree with him, taking the word *Uncharitable* in its true Meaning; because to have *uncharitable Thoughts*, properly so call’d, is, to think of our Neighbour *wrongfully, unjustly, and without Reason*; and certainly, no true Doctrine can tend to make us have *such Thoughts* of our Brethren, because unjust Thoughts cannot be the Result of Truth and Righteousness, which can never produce, or cause any Thing that’s wrong. And by this Rule we can safely determine,

termine, that Dr. Kennet's Novel Doctrine in his Sermon at the Funeral of the Duke of Devonshire, viz. that "the more Intelligent Nature is the more susceptible of Divine Grace," is a False and Anti-Scriptural Doctrine; for upon this Foundation, he has utter'd wrong Things both of God, and of his Neighbour; and if we believe his Doctrine to be true, we must think unjustly of them too, and agree with him in his uncharitable Assertions concerning Sinners, in that Sermon. For there, after he had observ'd, that an acceptable Death-bed Repentance is "not a Precedent to follow, it is rather a Miracle;" he immediately after very partially adds, "This [viz. this Miracle] rarely happens but in Men of distinguish'd Sense and Judgment; ordinary Abilities may be altogether sunk, by a long vicious Course of Life. The duller Flame is easily extinguish'd, the meaner sinful Wretches are commonly given up to a Reprobate Mind, and die as stupidly as they liv'd; while the nobler and brighter Parts have an Advantage of understanding the Worth of their Soul, before they resign it. If they are allow'd the Benefit of Sickness, they commonly awake out of their Dream of Sin, and reflect, and look upward. They acknowledge an Infinite Being; they feel their own Immortal Part; they recollect, and relish the Holy Scriptures; they call for the Elders of the Church; they think what to answer at a Judgment Seat. Not that God is a Respector of Persons, but the Difference is in Men; and the more Intelligent Nature is the more susceptible of Divine Grace."

§ V. Here the Divine Grace of a late Death-bed Repentance, is call'd a Miracle; God is affirm'd to be *no Respector of Persons* in working this Miracle upon Sinners; the Sinners of distinguish'd Sense and Judgment, are reckon'd, by reason of their more intelligent Nature, to be more capable of this Miracle, than "meaner sinful Wretches", of "ordinary Abilities," are; the Miracle is affirm'd to be commonly unoperative and ineffectual upon these latter: The Consequence of all which is plainly this, That the *miraculous Power* of God has Degrees of Effectuality, and that it sometimes *cannot work* upon meaner intelligent Natures; which is not only egregious Nonsense, but Blasphemy in a very high Degree, because it derogates from the Almighty Power of God, to whom all Things are equally possible, and in whose Power there are no Degrees of Potentiality.

§ VI. Here is also Uncharitableness against Sinners of *distinguish'd Sense and Judgment*, and against the *meaner sinful Wretches*; for, if this Miracle, this Divine Grace of an acceptable Death-bed Repentance rarely happens, but in *Men of distinguish'd Sense and Judgment*, then it commonly happens in these; and this, because their *more intelligent Nature is more susceptible of Divine Grace*: If they should believe this to be true, it would naturally harden them in the Prosecution of their Sins, and make them deferr their Repentance, till the time of Sickness, when, the Doctor says, "they commonly awake out of their Dream of Sin." This

This is apt to make 'em fanfy, that their *Nobler and Brighter Parts* give them a sort of a Right and Title to the Divine Grace, which meaner Sinners have not ; that notwithstanding their sinful Course of Life, they are the more peculiar Favourites of Heaven ; that God has a Miracle in Store for them, even at their last Gasp, which will then be effectual for their Salvation, because of the great Capacity of their intelligent Nature. From hence they'll be apt to conclude, that a present Amendment of Life is not so necessary for them, as for the *meaner sinful Wretches* : And so, presuming that they shall have the same Advantage at last, which, the Doctor teaches, does commonly happen to Men of their *Bright Parts*, they may run on securely in their Delusion, till they are awak'd out of it in a miserable Eternity. And therefore, the Doctrine which makes 'em thus deceive their own Hearts, is highly Uncharitable, because it teaches 'em to entertain false Conceits of themselves, and their Capacities ; it consequently exposes 'em to eternal Misery, and must therefore be notoriously False, and contrary to Holy Scripture.

§ VII. So again, for the *meaner sinful Wretches*, 'tis highly uncharitable against them too ; for if they believe the Doctor, they will presently be apt to conclude [*after they have gone on in a long vicious Course of Life*] that 'tis in vain for them to endeavour to repent, since they have no reason to suppose themselves to have an Exemption from the *common Fate* of Sinners of the same low Rank of Abilities with them ; for the Doctor says, “ They are
K “ com:

“ commonly given up to a reprobate Mind,
 “ and die as stupidly as they liv’d. ” And
 the Reason of this their Reprobation, the Do-
 ctor teaches, is, “ not that God is a Respector
 “ of Persons, but the Difference is in Men,
 “ and the more intelligent Nature [which
 these meaner sinful Wretches find they have
 not] “ is the more susceptible of Divine Grace ” ;
 and so concluding themselves to have little or
 no Capacity, they will be apt to conclude, that
 they are given up to a reprobate Mind ; and
 this will hinder all Endeavours of Repentance,
 and leave them to die, either as stupidly as
 they liv’d, or else in the utmost Ravings of a
 desperate and fearful Despair of God’s Mercy ;
 which plainly shews the vile Uncharitableness
 of this partial Doctrine, and by Dr. Kennet’s
 own Rule, its Uncharitableness proves the
 Falseness of it.

§ VIII. And farther yet, for him to say,
 that “ the more Intelligent Nature is the
 “ more susceptible of Divine Grace, ” does in-
 ferr a very wild extravagant Fancy, that the
 Devils themselves are more capable of Re-
 pentance than Men are ; for theirs is, no doubt,
 the more Intelligent Nature of the two ; but
 who does not see the Madness of this, and
 consequently of the Premises from whence it
 naturally flows ? But we need not thus mul-
 tiply Arguments against the Falseness of this
 Doctrine ; the Scripture it self does in the
 plainest Terms contradict it ; it evidently de-
 monstrates, that the *meanest Intelligent Nature*
 is as much *susceptive* of Divine Grace, as the
 most exalted is, and that God in his just
 Judgments

Judgments against Sinners of more Intelligent Natures, whose Guilt is so much the more aggravated, by how much they have more Abilities than their Inferiors, has pass'd them by for their Abuse of his greater Gifts, and has preferr'd Persons of *meaner, and more ordinary Abilities*, before such Men of distinguish'd Sense and Judgment; that " *he is able* " even of dull " *Stones* [Men of the most stupid Intellects] *to raise up Children unto Abraham, St. Matt. iii. 9.* " that " *out of the Mouth of Babes and Sucklings* " [who are not arriv'd to distinguish'd Sense and Judgment] " *he has perfected Praise, St. Matt. xxi. 16.* " that [he deny'd his Divine Grace] " *he hid the Mysteries of his Kingdom from the Wise and Prudent,* " [Men of distinguish'd Sense and Judgment] " *and reveal'd them unto Babes,* " Men illiterate, and unlearn'd, [of " *ordinary Abilities,* " and of a " *duller Flame*] *St. Matt. xi. 25.* " that among the Men of nobler and brighter Parts, not many " *Wise Men after the Flesh, not many Mighty, not many Noble are call'd, but God hath chosen the foolish Things of the World, to confound the WISE; — that no Flesh should glory in his Presence, 1 Cor. i. 26, 27, 29.* " God speaking of such Sinners of distinguish'd Sense and Judgment, has expressly said, " *I will destroy the Wisdom of the Wise, and will bring to nothing the Understanding of the Prudent. Where is the Wise? Where is the Scribe? Where is the Disputer of this World? Hath not God made foolish the Wisdom of this World? Ver. 19, 20.* " The Divine Oracles have clearly reveal'd to us, in

Opposition to Dr. Kennet's Doctrine of the
 " *more Intelligent Nature's being the more suscep-*
 " *tive of Divine Grace,*" that 'tis Matter of
 Fact, that the more Intelligent Natures, who
 had sinned, did not receive the Divine Grace;
 and that the less Intelligent Nature, who sinned,
 did receive it. Thus we are assur'd, that to
 the Intent Christ might redeem Lost Mankind,
 [the LESS INTELLIGENT NA-
 TURE] " *and deliver them, who thro' Fear*
 " *of Death [the sad Consequent of their Sin]*
 " *were all their Life-Time subject to Bondage, he*
 " *took not on him the Nature of Angels; but*
 " *he took on him the SEED OF ABRA-*
 " *HAM, Hebr. ii. 15, 16.*" Or, as Dr.
 Hammond translates it, " *he does not any where*
 " *lay hold on Angels; but he lays hold on the*
 " *Seed of Abraham.*" Which he paraphrases
 thus; " *for 'tis not said any where, that he*
 " *catches hold of Angels as they are falling, or*
 " *running, or carry'd Captive from him, to save*
 " *or rescue them from Ruin, or to bring them*
 " *out of Captivity; but only to BEN does he*
 " *this Fabouit peculiarly.*" No! St. Jude tells
 us of these Spirits of a MORE INTEL-
 LIGENT NATURE who sinned, that
 God " *hath reserv'd them in everlasting Chains*
 " *under Darknes, unto the Judgment of the*
 " *great Day, St. Jude, ver. 6.*" And St. Peter,
 that " *God spar'd not the Angels that sinned,*
 " *but cast them down to Hell, and deliver'd them*
 " *into Chains of Darknes, to be reserv'd unto*
 " *Judgment, 2 St. Pet. ii. 4.*" Which is a
 fearful Example to teach the more Intelligent
 Natures, particularly our Men of *distinguish'd*
Sense and Judgment, that by how much the
 more

more they are endow'd with *Understanding*, with greater *Abilities*, and with *nobler* and *brighter Parts*, than others, by so much the more they enhance and aggravate the Guilt and Punishment of their Sins, and are therefore the more likely to be given up to A REPROBATE MIND, and to die as impenitently, as they liv'd. And tho', upon a sick Bed, [after a long Course of Wickedness] they should some of them, terrify'd by the Lashes of a guilty Conscience, "*awake*" "*out of their Dream of Sin, and reflect, and*" "*look upward; tho' they should acknowledge an*" "*Infinite Being, and feel their own Immortal*" "*Part,*" [as the Devils do, and tremble] tho' they should *recollect*, and [thro' Presumption, as is too frequent, *falsly*] *relish the Holy Scriptures*; tho' they should "*call for the Elders*" "*of the Church; and think what to answer at*" "*a Judgment Seat:*" Yet, considering the Exaltedness of their *Intelligent Nature*, and the *Nobility*, and *Brightness of their Parts*, which, like the Fallen Angels, they have so vilely and scandalously abus'd, by their *repeated Rebellions against God*; employing them to his Dishonour, to the Encouragement of Wickedness and Vice; and to the Discouragement of true Religion and Virtue, and consequently to the eternal Misery of great Multitudes, who may have been infected by, and follow'd, and propagated the Iniquities they have given Reputation to, by their leading Example: I say, considering these Things, they have just Reason to believe, that it will be a very uncommon, and unusual MIRACLE, if God does not verify this his dreadful Threat a-

gainst them: " Because I have call'd, and ye
 " refused; I have stretch'd out my Hand, and
 " no Man regarded; but ye have set at nought
 " all my Counsel, and would none of my Reproof;
 " I also will laugh at YOUR CALAMITY,
 " I will mock when YOUR FEAR cometh;
 " when your Fear cometh as Desolation, and your
 " Destruction cometh as a Whirlwind, when Di-
 " stress and Anguish cometh upon you. Then
 " shall they CALL UPON ME, BUT I
 " WILL NOT ANSWER; THEY
 " SHALL SEEK ME EARLY, BUT
 " THEY SHALL NOT FIND ME.
 " For that they hated Knowledge, and did not
 " choose the Fear of the Lord. They would none
 " of my Counsel; they despis'd all my Reproof.
 " Therefore shall they eat the Fruit of their own
 " Way, and be fill'd with their own Devices,
 " Prov. i. 24, to 31. " And the Reason is
 very manifest; for, if " the Turning away of
 " the SIMPLE shall slay them, and the Pro-
 " sperity of FOOLS shall destroy them; " as
 God has told us, Prov. i. 32. much more may
 it be expected, that the Turning away of the
 " MORE INTELLIGENT " shall slay
 them, and the sinful Prosperity of Men of
 NOBLER AND BRIGHTER PARTS
 shall destroy them. But enough of this.

§ IX. The Doctor's second Rule whereby
 to know Doctrines, that " certainly are not
 " founded upon the Scriptures, but on the Per-
 " verting of them, " is, that they are " those,
 " that tend to hard — Thoughts of our Fellow-
 " Christians, to prejudicial and mischievous
 " Effects against them, and to drawing, at it
 " were,

" were, a Circle of Salvation round our selves, and
 " leaving out our Brethren to be damn'd, or by
 " Miracle to be sav'd by the uncovenanted Mer-
 " cies of God ; " see his Sermon on Easter-
 Tuesday, 1714. And this, I say, is a false
 Rule, and highly Dangerous to true Religion.
 For, it is so loose, and indeterminate, that it
 leaves Room for Accusations against any the
 best Doctrines whatsoever, which are utterly
 contrary to the wicked Practices of many
 Sinners, who are esteem'd to be our Fellow-
 Christians ; because he does not lay it down
 as one Condition of this Rule, that these our
 suppos'd *Fellow-Christians* must be **Christians**
 indeed, whose Faith and Practice are in all
 Things regulated by the Word of God ; no, if
 they are such as are commonly call'd " our
 " *Fellow-Christians,* " without distinguishing of
 what sort soever, 'tis enough for his Rule of
 Latitude ; and so for our hard Thoughts
 of them, he does not concern himself so
 far as to inform his Hearers and Readers,
 whether by the *Laws of Christianity,* we are
 not bound to think hard Things of the Faith
 and Practice of some of our suppos'd Fellow-
 Christians, who are known *Hereticks, Schis-
 maticks, Priest-Haters, Idolaters, Seditious, Re-
 bellious, &c.* to think rightly of whose misera-
 ble State and Condition, will by many be in-
 terpreted to be very hard ; no matter for
 this Caution, he makes no Provision for it,
 his Rule must be of a more extensive Nature,
 none that are call'd our *Fellow-Christians,* must
 lose the Benefit of it ; whatsoever Doctrine
 makes us to have hard Thoughts of them,
 tho' never so well grounded, tho' we cannot

think well of them, and be true to Christianity at the same time, must certainly be a Doctrine not of God, "if it tends to PREJUDICIAL AND MISCHIEVOUS Effects against them, and to drawing, as it were, a Circle of Salvation round our selves, and leaving out our Brethren ['tis to be remember'd that they are, undoubtedly, still our Brethren, be they never so wicked] " to be damn'd, or by Miracle to be sav'd by the uncovenanted Mercies of God." These prejudicial and mischievous Effects against our Brethren [no matter how justly the Scripture exposes them to 'em] are sure Marks of Tenets that are "harsh and offensive to Charity and brotherly Love"; and that the Doctrines from whence they are inferr'd, are certainly not founded on the Word of God.

At this rate, all the harsh Doctrines of the Sacred Scriptures, and all the just Anathemas of the Church against Hereticks and Schismatics, &c. which consign them over to eternal Damnation, without sincere Repentance and Amendment, are false Doctrines, unjust and cruel Censures, by reason of these mischievous Effects, and drawing a Circle of Salvation round the truly Orthodox and Obedient Members of Christ's Church, excluding those Sinners, our Brethren, to be damn'd; or, by Miracle "to be sav'd by the uncovenanted Mercies of God. At this rate, St. Paul's black List of Sinners, who "shall not inherit the Kingdom of God, must be chang'd into a Catalogue of glorify'd Saints, tho' they still remain in their vile Abominations; and so we must not be so harsh as to affirm, that our Fellow Christians, who
live

live and die in the Works of the Flesh ; *Adultery, Fornication, Uncleanness, Lasciviousness, IDOLATRY*, [here is good Provision for Papists !] *Witchcraft, Hatred, Variance, Emulation, Wrath, Strife, SEDITIONS, HERESIES*, [here Hereticks, Schismaticks, and Rebels, need not fear] *Envyings, Murders, Drunkenness, Revellings, and such like* — shall not inherit the Kingdom of God, Gal. v. 19, 20, 21. No, this makes us have “ *hard Thoughts of them ;* ” this tends to “ *prejudicial and mischievous Effects against them ;* ” this, some will say, is “ *offensive to Brotherly Love,* ” to be thus severe ! for, it “ *draws a Circle of Salvation round* ” those who have the Fruits of the Spirit ; *Love, Joy, Peace, Long-Suffering, Gentleness, Goodness, Faith*, [which must constantly attend all the other Graces, Dr. Kennet] *Meekness, and Temperance*, ver. 22, 23. and leaves out those others to be damn'd.

So again, our Saviour's Doctrine, that *except* a Man be born of *Water*, and of the Spirit, he cannot enter into the Kingdom of God, St. *Joh. iii. 5.* Which all sound and orthodox Christians affirm to be spoken of *Water Baptism*, may, by Dr. Kennet's Rule, be justly objected against by the *Quakers*, who reject Baptism ; for may they not say, “ *this tends to hard Thoughts* ” of us your Fellow-Christians, [as they will call themselves] this tends to “ *prejudicial and mischievous Effects against us ; it draws a Circle of Salvation round you Baptiz'd Christians, leaving out us your BRETHEREN to be damn'd, or by Miracle to be sav'd by the uncovenanted Mercies of God.* ” This Tenet is “ *so harsh* ” and

“ and offensive to Brotherly Love, that cer-
 “ tainly ” Water Baptism is “ not founded
 “ upon the Scriptures, but on the Perverting of
 “ them, ” according to Dr. Kennet’s Rule for
 judging which are false and uncharitable Do-
 ctines.

Such, and no less than such, are the dire
 Effects of being led by, and following this
 his loose, indeterminate, extravagant Latitudina-
 rian false Rule for judging of Doctrines; where-
 by, the Force, Power, and Obligation of every
 Doctrine of Christianity [that tends to hurt-
 ful Consequences against the Careless, Sloth-
 ful, Wicked, and Disobedient] are taken a-
 way, and render’d of no Effect; but let us
 not be “ deceiv’d, God is not mocked, for what-
 “ soever a Man soweth, that shall he also reap,
 “ Gal. vi. 7. ” And therefore let Conse-
 quences be never so terrible, Men must look
 to themselves, and endeavour to escape them.
 Truth is not less Truth, for any mischievous
 Consequences that Men involve themselves into,
 by departing from, or not coming up to it.
 Truth is immutable, and standeth firm for
 ever, let Consequences be what they will;
 and ’tis only by THIS TEST, that all
 Doctrines must be try’d, and ’tis by this we
 can safely determine, that Dr. Kennet’s Rule
 for trying Doctrines is notoriously False, and
 therefore highly Dangerous to the Christian
 Religion. Let us now see how he exempli-
 fies this false Rule.

§ X. He gives us for an Example, what
 he calls “ The New Doctrine, that Persons Bap-
 “ tiz’d by any Minister not Episcopally Ordain’d,
 “ (whe-

“ (whether at Home, or in Foreign Protestant
 “ Churches) must renounce their Baptism as In-
 “ valid, and ought to be Re-Baptiz’d. A Do-
 “ ctrine [says he] expressly contrary to the
 “ Judgment and Practice of our own Church, and
 “ sufficiently confuted by the best of our Di-
 “ vines, of the past and present Age, p. 25. ”

In answer to which, ’tis manifest from all that has been written upon this Subject, and even Mr. *Bingham* has confirm’d it, that the ancient Catholick Church never had any other Baptism, than Episcopal ; consequently, the ancient Catholick Church never had a Doctrine, that Baptism by Persons never commission’d by Bishops, was Valid ; and therefore, the pretended Validity of such Baptisms is, in Truth, the NEW DOCTRINE ; and every Body may know from whence it came, viz. from the corrupt Church of *Rome*, and consequently, that it is no other than **POPERY** it self.

What he asserts of the Judgment of our Church, is notoriously Fallacious, and has been prov’d to be so, in *Dissenters*, and other unauthoriz’d Baptisms, Null and Void, by the Articles, Canons, and Rubricks of the Church of England.

And that this Doctrine has been sufficiently confuted, &c. is a great Mistake, it never was confuted at all ; if it was, why does he not name by whom, and when, that we may believe him ? His bare *ipse dixit* will not do, let him produce his Vouchers.

§ XI. Next he asks, “ What is the Consequence of this Doctrine, so industriously spread
 “ at this Time ? The Consequence [he says] is,
 “ and

“ and he doubts not was intended to be, that
 “ in our own Communion 'tis hard to know, who
 “ was rightly made a Christian, p. 26. ”

This is one of his “ *sad and terrible Consequences,* ” when yet 'tis as easy to know, “ *who was rightly made a Christian,* ” as it is to know, who is in *Episcopal Orders*. And if this be not easy, then I am sure all pretended Orders whatsoever, and all pretended Baptisms too, are liable to the same Objection of Difficulty, and indeed to very much greater Objections; but this is nothing but meer Trifling.

§ XII. Another of his sad and terrible Consequences is, That “ *out of our Communion Protestants are no Christians.* ” He means Protestants who are not Episcopally Baptiz'd. If by *Christians* be understood Persons incorporated into Christ's Church, as Christ himself has appointed, then 'tis own'd by the Assertors of the Invalidity of Lay-Baptism, that this is a Consequence of that Doctrine; that such Protestants are not *Christians* in this Sense of the Word, because 'tis manifest, and has been prov'd, that they are not so incorporated into the Church of Christ; and if Dr. Kennet calls this *hard and uncharitable*, he must not expect that his Calling it so will be look'd upon as an *Argument* that it is really uncharitable, when he does not prove, that they are *actually incorporated into Christ's Church by un instituted Baptizers*, as 'tis notorious he does not once endeavour to do. But in another Sense of the Word *Christians*, the Assertors of the Invalidity of Lay-Baptism do believe, and hope,
 that

that many Thousands of sincere Persons among those Protestants are Christians, tho' they have not yet receiv'd Valid Baptism, namely, in the same Sense that the Ancient *Catechumens*, or Candidates for Holy Baptism were esteem'd Christians, in the Times of the *Primitive Church*. For we do not scruple to believe, that Multitudes of 'em have that *Faith and Repentance*, which qualify Men for Baptism; and that if they thought, or could learn, that they were not yet validly Baptiz'd, they would seek for, and endeavour to receive Valid Baptism, with even as *great Zeal and Earnestness*, as any of the Ancient Candidates for Baptism did use to do: And we think as favourably of their future State, tho' they happen [not thro' their own Fault] to die without Valid Baptism, as the Primitive Christians did of that of their *Catechumens*, who happen'd to die before they could be Baptiz'd. But this does not excuse their wilful Neglect of Episcopal Baptism, who can have it; as the Primitive Christians Charity for their departed *Catechumens*, did not excuse the Neglect which others were guilty of, for not qualifying themselves for, and receiving Baptism when they might have had it. And this the Advocates for Lay-Baptism have been told often enough, in almost every Piece that has been written against Lay-Baptism, if they would but take Notice of it; and if this Charity is not of the same Nature with their **LATITUDE**, it is, because their Latitude is contrary to the Holy Scripture, and therefore in a very high Degree *uncharitable*, and consequently, dangerous to the Interests of True Religion.

§ XIII. Another *sad and terrible Consequence* of the Invalidity of Lay-Baptism, he says, is,
 “ *That the Baptism of Papists is Good and*
 “ *Valid; but that of the Reformed, and of the*
 “ *Evangelical, suppose in France and Germany,*
 “ *is Void and of no Effect.*

A *dreadful Thing* this, that a *Papist* should have Valid Baptism! This is a terrible Consequence indeed! Is it possible that *Papists* should have any Thing among them that's good, which Protestants abroad have not? Yes, certainly, 'tis possible, and most notorious it is that they have; for, as wicked as they are, [and doubtless, the Wickedness of that Church is very Great] they have *Valid Orders*, because they have Episcopacy, which is Christ's Institution; and this Multitudes of Protestants have not. Our Church owns this, and practises accordingly; for she does not Ordain one, who has been Episcopally Ordain'd in the Church of *Rome*, when he is converted from his Errors, and returns to our Church, but she reckons him to have *Valid Orders* to minister in the Sacred Functions; and he ministers accordingly by Virtue of *those Orders*. But such as come from the Non-Episcopal Protestants, and would so officiate, she requires to be *Episcopally Ordain'd*, and regards not their *former Pretences* to Holy Orders; she owns them not for Ministers of Christ, whatsoever some of her Communion may have esteem'd and call'd them. And since *Papists* have this *one good Thing*, which some Protestants have not; and since 'tis no such terrible Consequence, as should make our Church admit of the Validity of those Protestants Lay-Ordinations, there is

no Reason why their *Lay-Baptisms* should be esteem'd Valid, for fear the Papists, who have Episcopal Baptism, should be thought to have Valid Baptism, which such Protestants have not. For, their Lay-Baptisms are as much condemn'd, nay, null'd, as their Lay-Ordinations are, by the Institution of Christ; and to this we must adhere, let Consequences be what they will. The best way to avoid ill Consequences, is closely to follow the Holy Institutions of our Lord and Master, and not by our false REFININGS, to set our selves up as *wiser* than he. Those Protestants may as easily have Valid Orders, and consequently Valid Sacraments, which Papists have, as the Primitive Christians had, under all the dreadful Persecutions they suffer'd during the Three first Centuries; when the Violence of the Fury, and Malice of their Enemies, was certainly discharg'd principally on the Heads of their Bishops: This did not hinder the Succession of Bishops, tho' 'twas at that time commonly a Succession to the Suffering of Martyrdom; their Ordinations still went on, and so they might still have gone on among those Foreigners, if Men had more of that true genuine Spirit of Christianity, wherewith Christians were inspir'd in those Days; but if we will not have, nor be Bishops, except with worldly Pomp and Splendor, with large Estates, and noble Palaces, and Equipages: If in Places, where these Things cannot be had, there must be neither Bishops, nor Episcopally Ordain'd Priests and Deacons; then, those who are concern'd in the hindering of such Orders, or in not seeking for 'em, must be charg'd

charg'd with all the sad and terrible Consequences, that follow from the Want of a Valid Ministry, and Valid Sacraments; for Christ's Holy Institutions must not be dispens'd with to give way to the Pride, Vanity, Worldly-Mindedness, Sloth, Idleness, Timorousness, and Fearfulness of sinful Men.

§ XIV. His last *sad and terrible* Consequence of the Invalidity of Lay-Baptism, he makes to be, "*That we are nearer to P O-
P E R Y, than we are to the rest of the Re-
formation.*" This is an Echo of the B—p of S—m's Outcry, that the Doctrine of the Invalidity of Lay-Baptism, is a **Step towards Popery**. But such Outcries as these are notoriously ridiculous, so long as 'tis well known, that the Validity of Lay-Baptism is one of the peculiar Corruptions of Popery; and Dr. Kennet himself, doubtless, knows it to be so, tho' he now represents the opposite Doctrine to be a nearer Approach to *Popery*, than to the Reformation. Strange Insinuation this, we are the nearer to corrupt Popery, the farther we are remov'd from it! By denying the Validity of Lay-Baptism, we come nearer to Popery which owns its Validity! But alas, 'tis to be fear'd, the great Grievance is insinuated to be, that by having **Episcopal Baptism**, "*we are nearer to Popery, than we are to the rest of the Reformation.*" At this rate, Episcopal Baptism is a Corruption of Popery; [for when we talk of *Popery*, we mean no other than the Corruptions of the Church of *Rome*] and so we must lay aside
Episcopal

Episcopal Baptism, and take up Lay-Baptism as a purer Ordinance! That we may be "nearer to the rest of the Reformation," than we are to what he calls Popery. Thus the best of Things, if found among *Papists*, must, to serve a Turn, be falsely call'd Popery; and we must not retain it, but follow its very Opposite, that we may be like some of the rest of our Neighbours! Here's Charity with a witness; no matter for Truth; the Primitive Christians, from the very Times of the Apostles, had; according to Christ's Institution, no other than Episcopal Baptism; they were in this respect nearer to what the Doctor calls Popery, than they were to that Reformation! which has departed from *Episcopacy*. But this Reformation! must be our Standard; we must not regard the Apostolick, nor following pure Ages of the Church! No, our *New Reformers* have given us a better Scheme of Religion; they are our safest Guides! If we do not concur with, and follow them, in any one Particular, how near soever we thereby keep to the Original Institution] 'tis all Popery, if the wicked Papists happen to be bless'd so far, as to be in the Right in that one Instance! But, 'tis an amazing Thing to see Men of Sense and Learning thus affront their own Reason and Understanding.

§ XV. He says, "There be other sad and terrible Consequences in it, [viz. in the Doctrine of the Invalidity of Lay-Baptism] "that a charitable Christian would avoid, and cannot but abhor. It seems, at THIS JUNCTURE, to be calculated for the Services of Popery,

L

" and

“ *and for Lessening the Protestant Interest in*
 “ *Europe.*

This is all just as good as what he said before. No doubt, 'tis very much for the *Ser- vices of P O P E R Y*, to write and preach against one of the peculiar Corruptions of the Papists ! as Lay-Baptism most certainly is. But this has been spoken to already. How came the Doctor to fancy that it was “ *calculated at THIS* “ *JUNCTURE?* Has he never heard that *St. Ignatius*, in the Apostolick Age, espous'd this Doctrine? That 'twas expressly taught by *St. Cyprian*, and Multitudes of his Colleague Bishops, of the *African* and *Eastern* Churches in the Third Century ; *St. Basil*, *St. Chryso- stome*, and *Pacianus* in the Fourth, and calcu- lated by them from the Institutions of our Sa- viour himself? Why this Insinuation of its having been calculated at *this Juncture*, any more than at another? But, how can it be design'd to lessen “ *the Protestant Interest in* “ *Europe?* Does it lessen their Interest, to put 'em in mind of the Necessity of following the Rules of our Saviour Christ, the Supreme Head of the Church ; and consequently, to secure Val- id Orders, and Valid Sacraments? What sort of Interest does it lessen? Is it their Spiritual? No certainly, for Christ's Institutions do infal- libly promote that. Is it then their worldly Interest which is lessen'd hereby? If it be, In what respect does it lessen it? He leaves that to his Hearers and Readers, which shews he could not tell in what Particular their world- ly Interest is lessen'd by this Doctrine. And indeed, he will never be able to prove that 'tis lessen'd thereby in any respect whatsoever ;
 and

Whether [to speak in his own Words, p. 13. as near as I can] he has not, contrary to all Christian Charity, endeavour'd to "*stifle the Intention,* to "*pervert the Occasion,*" to "*blast the Reputation,* to "*misrepresent the Deed,* and even to *vilifie* [the Opposers of Popery] the Revivers of the Doctrine of the Invalidity of Lay-Baptism; a Doctrine, "*which, in the Eye and Estimate of others,* [particularly of some of the *earliest* and *wisest* Sages of the Christian Church] was, [and even is so now, to *many, very many* of the Best and most Learned Members of our own Church] "*Lovely and of Good Report*"? Whether, I say, he has not thus acted, to the Prejudice of Truth, and uncharitably endeavour'd to give Reputation to a Popish Error; I leave to the *Impartial,* and *Unprejudic'd* to determine, who have duly consider'd the Nature of this Doctrine, and his uncomely Manner of treating it.



F I N I S.

Some BOOKS printed for, and sold by Henry Clements at the Half-Moon in St. Paul's Church-yard.

Lay-Baptism Invalid. An Essay to prove, that such Baptism is Null and Void, when administered in Opposition to the Divine Right of the Apostolical Succession. Occasion'd chiefly by the Anti-Episcopal Usurpations of our English Dissenting Teachers. The 3d Edition more correct and enlarg'd than the former; in which some Notice is taken of a Declaration lately propos'd to be establish'd, &c. with an Appendix, wherein the boasted Unanswerable Objection of the B---- of S---- and other new Objections are answer'd, by a Lay-Hand. To which is prefix'd a Letter to the Author, by the Reverend George Hickes, D. D.

The Second Part of *Lay-Baptism Invalid*: Shewing, that the Ancient Catholick Church never had any Ecclesiastical Law, Tradition or Custom, for the Validity of Baptisms perform'd by Persons who never were commission'd by Bishops to Baptize. All prov'd from the Reverend Mr. Bingham's *Scholastical History of Lay-Baptism*, and from other Evidences not produc'd by that Historian.

Sacerdotal Powers: Or the Necessity of Confession, Penance and Absolution. Together with the Nullity of unauthoriz'd Lay-Baptism asserted.

Dissenters; and other unauthoriz'd Baptism Null and Void, by the Articles, Canons, and Rubricks of the Church of England; In Answer to a Pamphlet call'd, *The Judgment of the Church of England, in the Case of Lay Baptism, and of Dissenters Baptism*.

The Bishop of Oxford's Charge consider'd, in reference to the Independency of the Church upon the State. A proper Sacrifice in the Sacrament of the Lord's-Supper. The Nature and Necessity of Sacerdotal Absolution. And the Invalidity of Baptism administered by Persons not Episcopally Ordain'd. In an humble Address to his Lordship. All these by the Author of *Lay-Baptism Invalid*.

A Letter to the Author of *Lay-Baptism Invalid*; wherein the Popish Doctrine of Lay-Baptism, taught in a Sermon preach'd by the B---- of S---- the 7th of November 1710, is censur'd and condemn'd by the Greek Church, the Church of England, the Reformed abroad, and even by our English Presbyterian Sectaries; which may be added as an Appendix to *Sacerdotal Powers*.

The Judgment of the Reformed in France, extracted out the Acts of their Publick Synods, as also that of Mr. Calvin, and other Genevans, concerning the Invalidity of Lay-Baptism. In a Letter to the Author of *Lay-Baptism Invalid*. By a Priest of the Church of England, and Rector of a Church in the City of London.







